

PET-FACILITATED THERAPY : THE MAPLES PROJECT

By

Erica Amy Copley

B.A. in Ed., Western Washington University, 1982

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
Department of Counselling Psychology

We accept this thesis as conforming to the required standard

.....
.....
.....

.....
.....
.....

.....
.....
.....

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

August, 1992

© Erica A. Copley 1992

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

(Sig

Department of Counselling Psychology

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Date 92-10-08

ABSTRACT

The value of pet-facilitated therapy is explored in this study. The interactions between visiting dogs and the adolescents in a treatment centre are examined. An ethnographic/participant observation method is used. Subjects also complete an open-ended sentence questionnaire and participate in an interview. Several themes pertaining to the pet-human interactions are extracted. A summary of the perceived benefits of pet-facilitated therapy and recommendations for further study are provided.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	vi
Acknowledgements	vii
 Chapter 1: Introduction	 1
Key Definitions and Constructs	1
PFT	1
The Maples Adolescent Treatment Centre	1
Rationale	2
Significance of the Research	4
Methodology	4
Procedures	6
 Chapter 2: Literature Review	 9
The Role of Pets in Psychiatry and Psychotherapy	9
The Role of Pets in Child Therapy	11
The Role of Pets in Developmental Psychology	13
Pets in Attachment and Use as Transitional Objects	14
Animals as a Connection to Nature	17
Levinson	17
Pets and Child Development	17
Animals and Psychotherapy	19
Pets in Caretaking Institutions	24
The Search for a Unifying Theory	26
 Chapter 3: Methodology	 29
Setting	29
Subjects	31
B.C. Interact and the Dogs in the Study	32
Procedures	33
Participant Observation as a Research Method	38
Issues in Participant Observation	45
 Chapter 4: Results	 48
The Study	50
The Introductory Meeting	50
The Visits	51
Visit #1	51
Cottage 1	51

CATC II	54
CATC III	57
Issues	58
Visit #2	60
Cottage 1	60
CATC II	61
CATC III	62
Visit #3	63
Cottage 1	63
CATC II	64
CATC III	65
Visit #4	66
Cottage 1	66
CATC II	67
CATC III	67
Visit #5	69
Cottage 1	69
CATC II	70
CATC III	71
Visit #6	72
Cottage 1	72
CATC II	73
CATC III	74
The Interviews	75
Cottage 1	76
Gary	76
Joe	78
Max	79
Peter	80
Nadine	82
Justin	82
Sharon	84
CATC II	85
Ross	85
Rob	86
Shelly	87
Alexis	87
Myron	88
Darren	88
Darla	89
Don	90
CATC III	90

Joan	90
Tara	90
Sandy	91
Ann	92
Delbert	93
Andy	93
Ray	93
Emergent Themes	95
Abuse	95
Abuse of Animals	95
Animal Abuse as an Analogy	95
Death, Loss, and Aging	96
Biological Functioning	96
Ingestion and Elimination	96
Sexuality	97
Anatomy	97
Acceptance Versus Rejection	97
Acceptance by the Animal	97
Acceptance of the Animal	98
Perceived Rejection by the Animal	98
Rejection of the Animal	98
Nurturance	98
Power and Control	99
Power Over the Animal	99
The Animal as a Symbol of Power	99
Control Over the Environment	100
Freedom Versus Confinement	100
Anthropomorphism and Projection	100
Anthropomorphism	100
Projection	101
Chapter 5: Conclusion and Recommendations	102
Overview of the Maples Project	102
Recommendations	105
References	108
Appendices	113

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 : Identification of Subjects and Non-Subjects Involved in the Visitations	43
--	----

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the residents of the Maples Adolescent Treatment Centre for their participation in the study, and for their courage in sharing their innermost feelings and ideas. I also wish to extend my thanks to the Maples management, to the supporting professional personnel (the social workers, psychologists, and psychiatrists), and particularly to the 'front line' staff.

I am also greatly indebted to the individuals at B.C. Interact, who provided much support and offered needed research materials. Special thanks are relayed to Bob Meiklejohn and his dogs, Buddy and Shadow, for their many hours of quality visitation time.

My heartfelt appreciation is extended to Dr. Norm Amundson, whose calm yet encouraging manner kept me on task.

I would like to thank my father, Professor Richard Copley, for his scholarly example and his gentle ways, and my mother, Jean Copley, for her unfailing support and encouragement. A great many thanks are given to my husband, Bruce Cuthbertson, who spent vast amounts of time typing, editing, and cheerleading. Finally, I would like to acknowledge my cat 'Boris,' for once again showing me the incredible value of pets.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

This thesis will explore the advantages of pet-facilitated therapy (PFT) in an adolescent treatment centre. I observe and interview residents at the Maples Adolescent Treatment Centre utilizing a qualitative ethnographic approach to extract psycho-social themes. Although research has been done on the use and benefits of PFT in residential treatment centres, the reasons why PFT can be so beneficial have not been understood. This is therefore an exploratory study which utilizes an ethnographic research methodology and tells the story of how PFT affected one population in one setting.

Key Definitions and Constructs

PFT

Pet-facilitated therapy is the introduction of a pet animal into the immediate surroundings of an individual or a group as a medium for interaction and relationships, with the therapeutic purpose of eliciting physical, psychosocial, and emotional interactions and responses. Pets act as mediators, social catalysts, aids to therapy, cotherapists, pet companions, mascots, and psychological support systems (Cass, 1981).

The Maples Adolescent Treatment Centre

The Maples is located in Burnaby, B.C., and provides psychiatric residential care for adolescents aged twelve to seventeen. The subjects in this study involved self-selected residents from three of the units; thought disordered clientele from Cottage 1, and

conduct disordered youth from Contained Adolescent Treatment Centres II & III.

The visitation project consisted of one hour per week canine visits to each of the three units, for a total of six visits. The same two dogs were used for the duration of the project. The dogs who participated were screened by B.C. Interact, a society for human-animal companionship. B.C. Interact supplied the dogs and the volunteer in order to conduct these visitations.

Rationale

PFT is currently being practiced in a variety of settings, both noninstitutional and institutional. Outside of institutions, PFT is utilized with the physically disabled (the blind, the deaf, the wheelchair confined), and with those who are at risk of becoming institutionalized (the physically or psychosocially impaired, the mentally disturbed, the elderly). Pet therapy is also used in institutions such as hospitals, nursing homes, prisons, psychiatric treatment centres, schools for the learning impaired, and facilities for the chronically ill and dying.

Although many studies have demonstrated the various benefits of PFT (such as increased physical health, increased social interaction, increased emotional well-being, decreased need for psychotropic drugs among psychiatric patients , decreased violence among inmates, etc.), researchers are still finding difficulty pinpointing the underlying psychological factors which explain why PFT is so effective.

In this thesis I test the probability that a pet-facilitated therapeutic program at the Maples will be beneficial to the residents. Do the residents report increased self-esteem and increased social interaction? If so, why? How do they view themselves in the world? Do they feel bonded/attached to significant others? Perhaps an existential loneliness pervades. If so, how do the animals help?

To answer these questions, several themes emerge from a review of the literature. Pets are often thought of as having Rogerian qualities such as unconditional positive regard, respect, genuineness, and empathy. Michael Fox (1975) suggests that animals are perceived as empathic whether or not they actually are. The benefits of touch, idle play, and the sense of security with pets have also been noted.

In a study done by Mugford (1979), companionship emerges as the most significant reason for acquiring and maintaining pets. The two measures of companionship--affiliation and self-esteem--are defined by Mugford. Affiliation refers to the desire for communication, friendly interaction, and close physical proximity to other living things. Self-esteem refers to contentment with one's self and being appreciated, wanted, or loved by others. Mugford's study demonstrates that the presence of pets improved morale and created a sense of being needed. Playfulness and increased humor were also reported.

Intraspecies attachment is noted by Voith (1981). Some of the parameters considered as mechanisms of attachment are proximity, care-soliciting behaviors, feelings of joy or happiness evoked by

behaviors of another, and tactile stimulation. Attachment, at least among human beings, can result in altruistic behaviors.

Significance of the Research

I speculate that many of the residents at the Maples may feel alienated and alone. Residents often experience few outlets for self-expression of an altruistic nature. By playing with the dog, they develop a sense of commitment to a task, and inadvertently develop a sense of community with other residents in the program. The animals do not judge or reject. Yet they will not allow the people to abuse or mistreat them, reacting quickly with a growl or a nip. The residents are not able to manipulate or lie to the animals-the dogs do not respond to incongruent behaviors. This forces residents to be truthful and honest with the animals, and, by extension, with themselves. Because one of these particular animals in the Maples Project was unloved and unwanted (coming from the SPCA), the residents may identify with him.

By demonstrating the benefits of pet programs at the Maples Adolescent Treatment Centre, this study hopes to encourage the use of PFT in mental health facilities and elsewhere.

Methodology

I use a qualitative approach utilizing ethnographic methodology and a participant observation design for this study. I recognize that this design provides theoretical replication as I describe and analyse the effects of PFT on the thought disordered and conduct disordered residents of the treatment units at the

Maples. Using this design, I was able to base my evidence on documentation, archival records, direct observation, participant-observation, and physical artifacts. It is important for a researcher to use multiple sources of evidence to create a case study data base, and to maintain a chain of evidence. I do, however, restrict my data collection (as it could become grossly out of hand and develop a life of its own) to direct [participant] observation techniques, current pertinent 'progress notes' in the child's chart, psychiatric diagnoses and any history referring to animals, and to an interview at the end of the pet visitations. This interview included a sentence completion task, and involved consulting with the participants to determine 'truth,' or at least agreement or lack thereof, with my conclusions.

At this juncture I should explain that I am employed at the Maples and work as a counsellor in Cottage 1. This 'closeness' to the research environment proved helpful as I was aware of the underlying rules and modalities of the facility, and was able to more easily understand the 'cultural' effects of this institution (i.e. particular language usage, Maples procedures, etc.). As I am an employee of this facility, I had easy access to needed information--information that may have remained confidential (and therefore inaccessible) to the 'outsider'.

Specifically, I visited each of the units (Cottage 1, CATC II and CATC III) for one hour per week for six visits. Accompanying me were the dogs and the dogs' person. My rationale for bringing the dogs' owner was two-fold: 1) I was able to observe and record freely, and 2) the owner was able to answer pertinent questions that the children may ask about the dogs, was able to handle the animals

better, and was able to model the appropriate relationship and nurturance behaviors seen in people/pet partnerships.

The adolescents who resided in these units were briefed about the program and were informed of what would be asked of them. They were told that it was volunteer participation only and that confidentiality would be assured. Those who chose to participate were informed of the request to answer open-ended questions and participate in an interview at the end of the visitations. The comments from the interviews are included in the study and serve to enhance accuracy and increase construct validity.

Procedures

The following is a 'recipe' which outlines the procedures used in the Maples Project:

- 1) Receive approval from management to run the study.
- 2) Ensure that B.C. Interact can supply an appropriate dog for the study. Interview and select the specific volunteer person and dog who will be involved in the study.
- 3) Set up an appointment to explain the study to the prospective subjects. Explain what is needed from them if they agree to participate (1 hour/week for 6 weeks, 1 hour interview time). Broach the topics of confidentiality, the purpose of the study, the disposal of the data after the study is completed, etc. Have the participants sign the research consent form and set up

scheduling for each unit. The above is explained to the staff members as well.

4) Begin visitations. During each visit (1 hour) record all noticeable events and key statements. Use the 'group note taking techniques' which reflect not only subjective statements but also behavioral observations and analyses of the situation. Specifically record changes in behavior and interactional style. Both the insight of the staff members and the information in each subject's chart will provide a strong data base for past and present behaviors. With these added tools, the impact of PFT should be clearly noted.

5) After the visitations are completed, categorize observations and begin analysis of data. Check perceptions with staff to see if they would categorize observations in the same manner.

6) During the interview session, use sentence completion forms and open-ended questions about the study to determine perceptions. Interview the participants to determine if the participants agree with the 'conclusions' that I have arrived upon.

As mentioned above, I chose three treatment units for this project. The reason for this was two-fold: 1) The length of stay is substantially longer in these units than in the response units, and 2) these clients had been at the Maples long enough to have developed relationships with the staff--they were a 'known' entity in which to compare and contrast behaviors.

Admission into the program was clearly defined. Animal abuse was not tolerated, and would result in immediate expulsion from the project. Participants were self-selected by their expression of interest in the program. The project may also have inadvertently served as a unit incentive program. Hopefully, further steps may now be taken to implement pet visitations, dog grooming, and perhaps dog training as part of the canine service at the Maples.

CHAPTER II : LITERATURE REVIEW

The use of animals as psychologically therapeutic agents has been around for a long time. Much has not been properly documented; the benefits of pet companionship have always been merely assumed, accepted, and innately 'known'. The first documented case of pet-facilitated therapy was in the 1780's, in which a psychiatric clinic used 'rabbits and fowls' as instruments of therapy to help patients develop self-control and accept responsibility (Brickel, 1980). Many other such findings demonstrate the effectiveness of the use of pets. Pets have been used in a variety of settings, such as in psychiatric hospitals, on cancer wards, in prisons, and in geriatric nursing homes. Several studies and theories will be discussed below, with an emphasis on pet-facilitated therapy in psychiatric settings.

The Role of Pets in Psychiatry and Psychotherapy

Corson and Corson (1980) and Corson et al. (1977) emphasize the importance of animals (and dogs in particular) as co-therapists. Often, mentally distressed patients perceive negative non-verbal signals from their therapist, which may exacerbate feelings of mistrust, self-doubt and suspicion, and may create social isolation. Dogs are generally thought of as open, honest, and without ulterior motive. In therapy, the dog co-therapist is seen as a partner who helps generate the crucial non-verbal communication process. This type of communication creates trust, confidence, assurance, and enhances self-esteem, thereby diminishing the suspicion, shyness, social isolation and lack of self respect. The 'existential

significance' (Bergler, 1982) of non-verbal communication in human development--stroking, touching, eye-contact, mimicry, gesticulation, pantomime, etc.--has led to the use of dogs as co-therapists with patients who have deficient or non-existent communication skills (Corson and Corson, 1980).

Pet-facilitated therapy (PFT) is designed to supplement, not replace, other forms of psychotherapy. It is a tool to assist in the psychotherapeutic process, and to encourage resocialization. The success of PFT is measured by the fact that patients often accept 'love' from a pet more easily than from humans. PFT is regarded as a form of 'reality conditioning'--"not only is the patient's own self-esteem enhanced and stabilized through interaction with the animal and its reactions, but he is made aware of the limitations of his own behavior and the modalities of mutual dependency (Bergler, 1988, p. 40)."

Corson et al. (1977) describe a study in which dogs were introduced to withdrawn children in a psychiatric centre. Every encounter between dog and child was recorded on video tape, and the tapes were played back to each patient. The researchers noted rapid initial success--the young patients began talking to other children again, asked to see the dog more often, and inquired if they could help look after the animals. As the patients grew more accustomed to the dogs, their radius of movement became progressively enlarged. In some cases, patients actually moved freely around the clinic with their dogs, striking up conversations about the dog with people they came across. (This is an example of the pet acting as a social catalyst.) A quantitative analysis of the video material

revealed that patients were more immediate and direct in their verbal reactions both to the dog and to other people when the dog was present. There was also an increase in the number of words used per response. Of the fifty patients in the study, all those who 'accepted' a pet (three refused) showed increased self-esteem, a desire for independence, and an increased sense of responsibility. These feelings were strengthened by the degree of care and responsibility assumed by the patient for the care of his dog.

Brickel(1982) suggests that some of the positive effects of a pet in psychotherapeutic treatment are caused by an 'attention shift'. The animal diverts the patient's attention, thereby diminishing an undesired behavior. A possible anxiety reaction in a crucial situation is rendered less likely by the patient's growing interest in the pet.

The Role of Pets in Child Therapy

Levinson (1962,1964,1965,1969,1970,1972,1975,1980), a New York psychoanalyst, was one of the first to study the psychology of the relationship between pets and humans. His main focus has been on the use of pets in child therapy with children who have been diagnosed with perceptual, experiential, or behavioral disorders rooted in a lack of emotional security. Levinson notes that the important difference between playing with dolls or other toys and with an animal (particularly a dog) is that the child becomes aware of the fact that his feelings are reciprocated. In Levinson's work, a dog is used as a co-therapist in his sessions. The child first

interacts with the dog. Slowly the therapist is drawn into the interactions between the child and the dog as the child's desire to play with the dog fades into the background. The focus of the attention gradually shifts to the interaction between the child and the therapist. Through the relationship with the dog the child gains valuable emotional support. The child develops confidence in the dog, and hence develops self-confidence. Making contact with other people (in this case with the therapist) becomes much easier. The child eventually becomes able to relate to experiences outside the therapeutic sessions in an equally well-adjusted manner (Levinson, 1970).

Levinson (1970) applies a psychoanalytic approach to his work. He states that the function of the animal should be to give the child pure pleasure, and not to impose constraints like some kind of super-ego. Other researchers have suggested different theories to explain the effectiveness of PFT.

Kusnetzoff (1982) reports on the role played by a dog in therapy with an adolescent for whom the parental home was a source of identification conflict. Sherick (1981) emphasized the therapeutic value of dogs in the treatment of children who have difficulty freeing themselves emotionally from their mothers and becoming emotionally self-sufficient. Frith (1982) was able to show that dogs and cats help handicapped children experience feelings of emotional attachment and fulfillment. In a more general way, Teutsch (1980) noted the positive impact of pets in therapy with behaviorally disturbed children.

The Role of Pets In Developmental Psychology

Levinson (1972,1978,1980) assumes that the role of animals is age specific. According to Levinson, children in their first year of life need a special 'cuddly animal' (a soft toy) that is always there to act as a bridge between them and the world around them. This helps children develop confidence in the world and in themselves. As children mature, they are expected to develop a measure of independence, and are more likely to succeed if they are able to explore the world from a position of independence. If accompanied on their explorations by a pet, they are less likely to be afraid. If a child is responsible for looking after and training his or her pet, he/she will accustom his/herself to the discipline of a fixed routine. He/she will also learn to accept the animal's individual peculiarities, which can lead to greater tolerance and acceptance of one's own weaknesses. If one loves a pet and wishes to 'read' its feelings, one must place oneself in the pet's position (i.e., become empathic). Constant association with a pet shows the child how the behavior they employ affects the animal and vice versa. The child comes to understand what it means to co-exist in a state of mutual dependency. The sense of being the pet's 'master' helps the child feel on a more equal footing with his/her parents, and increases feelings of independence (Levinson, 1978,1980). As a child continues to mature, the pet can facilitate contact with others and secure social recognition.

Pets can also serve as a point of reference which parents can use as a basis to discuss difficult topics such as sexuality and basic facts of life and death. A pet can be the medium through which the

child learns to witness and comprehend the process of procreation, birth, and death. During times of transition (a move, for instance), pets are able to give a child stability and reassurance. If a new sibling is born and the parents seem to focus all their attention on the baby , the child can turn to his pet for emotional support.

Wolfe (1977) focuses on the 'mediating function' of pets in adolescent relationships. Pets can satisfy the need for consolation and facilitate adjustment to other people. A mediating function is also apparent in the way pets are perceived and experienced. Pets are perceived as having desirable social and personal characteristics such as friendliness, warmth, constancy, reliability, sympathy, and empathy. According to Wolfe, the 'value' of the pet to the adolescent consists of the mediation of characteristics that are desirable and necessary for that person's psychological stability.

Pets in Attachment and Use as Transitional Objects

Rynearson (1978) suggests that the nature of the human-dog bond is one of basic reciprocal attachment. Both dogs and humans live in 'packs,' with attachment being of crucial importance. The drive and need for attachment is a biological instinct separate from the instincts of sexuality, aggression, dominance, and territoriality. It is an instinct based on nurturance, care-giving, and emotional and physical closeness.

Bowlby (1969) believes that bonding is an instinctual rather than a secondary drive. When these natural needs for attachment are not met, there may be regressed attachment needs from this period. These needs show themselves either in anxious attachment behavior,

such as over-dependency and clinging, in anxious attachment because of fears of abandonment, or by a reaction formation of excessive care-giving. Cases of obsessive care-giving to pets symbolize projective identification; the caring for the pet represents an attempt to care for the self. In the early attachment between mother and child, there has to come separation to allow for growth and development. Separation and growth are ongoing aspects of our humanity, and the experience of separation from the pet (through death, for example) can allow for healing earlier experiences of separation. If there is a fixation at some point in development, situations may develop in which a person becomes a compulsive care-giver to pets and is therefore inconsolable at the time of the pet's loss.

Pets too can become transitional objects--intermediaries for expressing wants, fantasies, and aggressive ideas. Levinson (1969) believes that pets (especially dogs) can act as transitional objects, as the original 'not me' possession. Because a dog lives in a natural way, interaction with a dog provides children with a way of responding to and accepting sexual feelings, sibling rivalry, aggression, and bowel habits. As children learn tolerance of the dog's difficulties, they develop tolerance of their own inabilities.

A dog also allows the child to be master. Close identification with humans has often made the dog a scapegoat; humans derive ego gratification by passing onto the dog the indignities they receive from others. In scolding a dog, these grievances can be dissipated, but this displacement can also be a source of animal abuse (Bossare 1944).

The use of pets as socializing agents has been suggested by many researchers, mainly through anecdotal accounts. Katcher (1984) used more 'scientific' (or at least quantitative) techniques to measure this phenomenon. He found that keeping a pet is both statistically normal and culturally normative, and that over one-half of the families in the United States keep pets and feel that they are important in their lives. In a study with children, Katcher found that both pulse and blood pressure were lowered significantly in children who were brought into a room for an interview in which a dog was also present (ibid). He found a similar decrease in the heart rate and blood pressure of people petting dogs (in Fogle, 1981). Men pet dogs as much as women do, leading Katcher to conclude that perhaps in Western culture this is an acceptable way for men to openly express their affection. We know that people who are single, widowed, or divorced have a higher death rate than those who are married, but Katcher also showed that in white subjects hospitalized for coronary artery disease the presence of a pet was the strongest social predictor of survival for one year after hospitalization. Katcher also measured the blood pressure of individuals talking to their pets, and found again a decrease in blood pressure. His findings showed that eighty percent of people owning animals talked to their pets. From these studies, Katcher concluded that safety and intimacy are the organizing concepts behind our bond to dogs, reminiscent of a time when our ancestors could feel safe when they saw a resting animal--a sign that there was no danger present.

Animals as a Connection to Nature

Searls (1960), as well as Rynearson (1978), Bowlby (1969), and Levinson (1969), views pets as transitional objects. Searls, as well as Katcher (1984) and Lorenz (1953), sees pets in a mediating role between humans and nature. Psychoanalytic literature usually stresses the importance of pets as substitutes for other humans through transference and projection. Yet Searls (1960) points out that dogs are of real significance to human beings and that they are able to enter into human emotional relationships bilaterally. The dog is the object that we can relate to transferentially. Yet it is also a living being that eats, bites, destroys, urinates, lavishes affection, has a sexual life, and is subject to many human-like travails between life and death. Through the dog we can relate to the non-human environment, which paradoxically gives us a sense of unity to all living things (Woloy, 1990).

Levinson

As noted above, Boris Levinson has made huge contributions to the field of PFT. Because his contributions are so great, and all subsequent PFT studies spring from his initial research and theories, I would like to use this section to further review his work.

Pets and Child Development

Levinson (1962, 1964, 1965, 1969, 1970, 1972, 1975, 1980) believes that in today's troubled family systems a pet is often the only common interest uniting parents and children. Our therapies have become more 'scientific,' and the intuitive, emotional aspects

of living have been neglected. Introducing a love object in the form of a pet can help restore the balance between the external and the internal world.

Pets can help children develop their potential without undue restraints placed on them by parents or peers. Pets have been proven to alleviate stress and to act as therapeutic agents and as aids to normal childhood development. Taking care of a pet is the beginning of assuming responsibility for someone else. And by becoming an authority figure by being 'in charge' of the pet, children learn to accept authority more easily.

As children explore their environment accompanied by a trusted animal friend, they are able to shed some of their dependence on adults and broadens their social skills. If a child is foiled or rebuffed in his/her attempt to make friends with peers, he or she can always find acceptance from his/her pet. The pet will not disappoint him/her or make excessive demands. The child is in no way vulnerable when he or she expresses his/herself to a pet. The pet may also help in the formation of the child's identity, as identity formation is dependent upon the opportunity to interact and to learn. "Play and constructive leisure activities are one essential element in this needed interaction (Levinson, 1969b, p. 81)." As the child plays with a pet he/she can learn about his/herself. The handling of a pet can be a reflection of the child--something that a perceptive child can recognize. Is he/she cruel or kind? The pet is helpless in many ways, and cannot berate the child or underscore the child's kindness or cruelty. Because the child is in control, he/she is unable

to excuse his/her behavior by claiming a lack of responsibility for his/her actions.

The child also learns that there are limits to what can be accomplished either with his/herself or with the pet. Acceptance of these limitations can enhance the sense of reality and strengthen the ego of the child. The child's realization and acceptance of the negative sides of his or her personality will also facilitate the acceptance of the negative aspects of other individuals. This encourages the development of empathy toward people as well as animals.

Children experience 'love' of a pet in different ways. Some children see their pets as an extension of themselves and treat the animal in the way they themselves would like to be treated. The pet may also unconsciously symbolize a liked or disliked person, and will be treated accordingly. Some children like or love their pets because these are the only living things they can relate to, having experienced so much hurt at the hands of people. Often only after they have had a satisfactory relationship with an animal can they make a start at developing human relationships.

Animals and Psychotherapy

The use of animals in psychotherapy is rather extensive, yet until recently it has not been recognized as a viable adjunct to therapy. Levinson 'stumbled' across the therapeutic benefits of pets when his dog, 'Jingles,' happened to meet one of his child clients. The unexpected positive results of this interaction led Levinson to begin including his dog in therapy sessions.

Levinson believes that pets, particularly dogs and cats, are useful in psychological evaluation, in psychotherapy (child, group, and family), and in work with mentally or physically handicapped individuals.

In psychological examination, the presence of an animal creates a more natural and relaxing environment for the child under observation. The child's interactions with the pet and his/her conversations about the pet can provide important diagnostic clues to his/her personality and problems. The pet acts as an 'ice breaker' and helps the therapist establish the beginnings of rapport.

In therapy sessions, pets help children modify their maladaptive response patterns. For very young children, pets offer a natural prop for the acting-out that precedes verbalization of experience. In the same way, children fixed at early developmental levels can gratify their regressive needs through play with the pet. Eventually they will achieve a measure of maturity which will enable the therapist to reach them.

For the child who is disorganized and fears losing his/herself, working with a pet means a setting of limits (there is just so much a pet will allow!) that protects him/her against possibly destructive impulses and aids in bringing some organization into the thought and behavior of the child. By contrast, the submissive, withdrawn child finds that through a pet's acceptance, he or she is able to better take on life's challenges.

Acting-out children also benefit from the influence of a loved pet, as in the example below:

Donald, the younger of two children in an emotionally disturbed family, had multiple problems which had gotten him into trouble at home, at school, and in the neighborhood. Diagnosed as exhibiting a psychotic reaction, he was suspended from school at eight years of age after disrupting the class with his aggressive, bizarre behavior. Tests showed him to have mild organic brain damage, a moderate hearing loss in one ear, a severe loss in the other (he wears a hearing aid), and borderline intelligence, although the school's impression was that his intelligence was normal. Donald played the role of scapegoat in his family, being the target of both physical and verbal abuse.

At the end of a successful season in summer camp, Donald was rewarded by his family with a dog, Brownie. The dog was also intended to teach Donald responsibility and provide him with some companionship, as he was unable to keep friends. Donald fed the dog when reminded and accompanied his father when the latter took Brownie outdoors. The dog helped to unify the family members by providing opportunities for them to work together in caring for it and teaching it tricks.

For the most part, child and dog got along well together. When Donald was overaggressive with his pet, Brownie snapped at him and put an end to the behavior, thus providing more effective control than human beings had been able to achieve.

Brownie also provided his young master with physical contact and affection which the child craved but was afraid to accept from people, against whom he struck out when they attempted to

come close. The dog's love was not threatening, and Donald could love his pet in return, thus learning that affection and companionship can be enjoyable and not destructive.

The animal also served as a nonreactive listener, and in Donald's opinion, a comprehending one. The role diminished in importance as Donald learned to make friends and communicate with his peers. The dog served as a link to other children by arousing their interest, which then came to encompass Donald. Donald still does not like adults as much as he does his pet, but Brownie and other children are now on a par in his affection.

Brownie helped Donald develop patience and self-control as he cared for and trained his pet and discovered the limits of permissible behavior with her. She was a valuable adjunct in bringing about improvement in this severely disturbed boy (Austin, in Levinson, 1972a, p. 138).

PFT is especially helpful in the treatment of the nonverbal, severely ego-disturbed child whose contact with reality is tenuous. A therapist often has trouble entering their fantasy world and gaining their trust. The pet has no such problem; the child quickly accepts it as a real playmate and accompanies it into the real world so that the therapist can make contact.

Disturbed children generally have a great need for physical contact, yet they fear human contact because people have hurt them so much and so often. Often children are able to tell the pet their troubles. The pet, of course, asks no questions and makes no demands. Schizophrenic children, especially, fear physical closeness to the therapist as they are so unsure of their own ego

strength that they fear being overwhelmed by the ego of the therapist. In playing with a pet co-therapist, the child is able to create his own boundaries. The child may be asked to imagine that he is a dog, and encouraged to act like a dog (bark, walk on all fours, and so on), which helps the child orient himself to his surroundings and reach into the real world. As the therapist is a participant in this common adventure, rapport is established and the doors to communication are opened.

Pets can satisfy a number of needs. "For a child who needs love and something to cuddle, the pet provides much solace. For the child who needs to dominate, to master the situation, the pet serves as an obedient slave. For all disturbed children, who fear being rejected and criticized, the pet offers unfailing, nonthreatening acceptance (Levinson, 1972, p 142)."

Sometimes a pet can even serve a useful but unexpected purpose by eliciting unforeseen responses. The case of 'John,' summarized below, illustrates this point:

John, an eight-year-old adopted child who was much disturbed by the fact that his real mother had deserted him, could not accept his foster mother's reassurance that he was indeed a "chosen" child, that he was really wanted and loved. He felt that he had been taken "on approval" and feared he would be returned if he misbehaved. He threatened to kill his sister (also an adopted child) and himself because he was convinced that they must be very bad to have been surrendered for adoption.

My cat had been sleeping in her basket in the office for a few sessions before John noticed her.

He began to fondle her and wanted to feed her. He asked questions about her, wanting to know where she came from. I explained to him that we acquired her at the ASPCA, where she had been left as one of a litter of abandoned kittens. I told him how much we loved her and how my two sons often fought for the privilege of having her in their room at night.

At first John found it difficult to accept the idea that an animal that had been abandoned by her mother and her owner could be loved and accepted by others. He kept returning to this subject; he obviously began to see an analogy between the kitten's situation and his own, and to consider the possibility that he actually was loved by his adoptive parents. His recovery seemed to begin with our discussions about my "adopted" cat (Levinson, 1965)."

Pets in Caretaking Institutions

Many institutions have concerns about having pets. Management and staff worry that the pet may scratch or bite, may cause health problems (such as allergies), or may be sadistically treated by the residents. The idea of PFT has historically not been accepted as a viable form of treatment in such facilities.

Residents, especially children, need love objects. Many of the children in institutions are depressed, have poor self concepts, and are distrustful of close relationships. In many institutions, staff turnover is great and the children feel continuously abandoned. Alternately, staff may become too close to residents (counter-transference issues, boundary problems), and may make a child feel

uncomfortable and/or arouse jealous reactions from the other children. A pet can help in these situations and can become a loving and forgiving companion.

A pet can also serve as a source of constant stimulation. Being around a pet tends to decrease behaviors such as head-banging, excessive masturbation, rocking, and finger-sucking. When the child finds adequate pleasurable tactile contact and activity with the pet, he/she no longer has to seek these needs through his/her own body. A well trained pet can help children abort such behavioral 'deviations,' and can aid in the creation of positive relationships with staff and peers. Often, in a residential setting, preparations for sleep are anxiety-provoking. Taking a pet to bed, or having contact with the pet just before bedtime, can help ward off the fears and nightmares that disturb sleep.

In implementing a PFT program in institutions, staff should be well informed about the role pets play, and about behavioral changes to be expected in the children. The children should also be informed of the new program. Levinson (1972a) believes that the introduction of pets into an institution breaks up the sometimes monotonous routine of institutional life and adds spontaneity.

In choosing the type and character of pets to be utilized in a PFT program, the psychological and physical needs of the clients are considered. Levinson lists the following guidelines for choosing the animals, in this case for selecting dogs:

1. They should relate equally well to all children and adults and not tend to become a one-master dog.
2. They should be sensitive and yet be able to take rough play in their stride, whether from children or adults, without resorting to biting or withdrawal.
3. They should be good looking, intelligent, alert, inquisitive, of a happy disposition, affectionate, and willing to please and to serve.
4. They should know a few tricks such as fetching, "shaking hands," "dancing," and "begging."
5. They should obey the therapist's orders implicitly and should be able to remember these orders for quite a while (Levinson, 1972a, p. 180).

Much of my work has been based on the views of Levinson. His basic beliefs will be supported by my findings presented in this paper.

The Search for a Unifying Theory

Researchers in the field of PFT have been accused of having no theoretical foundations on which to base their work. Yet, while there is no overall inductive, deductive, or functional theory (McBurney, 1983) to explain PFT data, there are three basic model theories: animal/animal, human/human, and human/object relationships which are analogous to human/animal relationships and attachments (Kidd and Kidd, 1987).

The animal/animal model has limited application for animal/human attachments. Ethologists (Tinbergen, 1951; Lorenz,

1952; Griffin, 1976) hypothesize that animal social behavior endures because it has survival value for the species and for the individual. The focus is on intra- or species-specific rather than inter- or cross-species behaviors and characteristics. The appearance and helplessness of very young animals elicit nurturing and care-taking behaviors from the adults. In the domestication process, animals are bred to retain infantile characteristics which elicit a care-taking response from humans. In this theory, the human/companion animal bond consists of care-taking responses elicited by the neotenized (infantile) features of the animals.

The human/human inter-relationship analogy is explained through psychological and cultural factors. Leisure theory (Neulinger, 1980) holds that as leisure time increases, more time can be spent on personal interests. Crandall (personal communication to A. H. Kidd and R. M. Kidd, 1986) notes that pets provide one type of important human leisure activity, since pets may be useful in reducing the stress that increased leisure can produce.

Brickel (1982) applies Learning Theory to view pets as a form of stimuli for humans, and views the pets' behavior as a form of reward for the humans' behavior toward the pets.

Developmental psychology suggests models based on touch and play (Montagu, 1971; Jourard, 1974). With this theory, as with Learning Theory, it is assumed that models developed to explain human interaction also apply to the human/animal bond.

Social psychology indicates that people select mates and friends on the basis of 'birds of a feather flock together,' *similarity* (Murstein, 1970), and 'you have what I myself lack,' *complementarity*

(Winch, 1958). Kidd and Kidd (1984) found that pet selection is based on the above characteristics, yet these researchers believe that it is difficult to attempt to find parallels between the human/human and the human/animal studies.

Kidd and Kidd (1987) believe that the analogies between human/human and human/animal relationships merely provide a limited utility model. The model is further distorted by 'anthropomorphism,' the attribution of human mental and emotional capacities to animals. These researchers suggest that PFT should be further investigated 'scientifically' in order to generate 'valid' and 'valuable' theories.

Many others believe that the conclusions derived from utilizing only 'scientific' quantitative methodologies will not adequately reflect the human/companion animal bond. Herzog and Burghardt (1987) believe that our lack of a unifying theory is not surprising, and that the construction of any all-encompassing theory will only end in failure. They ask:

Doesn't a science need to go through initial stages of observation, description, and taxonomy, along with seat-of-the-pants generalization and speculation before donning the mantle of theory or model with all the quantitative precision this implies (p. 130)?

To conclude, Rollin (1987) comments:

Our relationships with animals are important--common sense, art and literature all attest to this. Animals are beneficial to humans--again this is unquestionable... I submit that the area of human/animal relationships needs less, not more, scientism (p.131).

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

The Maples Project was created to provide pet visitations within the walls of the institution. The interactions between residents and the visiting dogs were observed. The study includes these observations plus data derived from completed open-ended sentence forms and from respondent interviews. Subjects were asked to share their perceptions of the pet project with the researcher. The methodology is described below, followed by documentation from the literature which supports the choice of the participant observer research method.

Setting

The Maples Adolescent Treatment Centre is a residential facility that services teens aged twelve to seventeen. The Maples, located in Burnaby, B.C., is a large self-contained complex, which boasts a school, full food services, and complete recreational programs. Three residential treatment units and two response units house the adolescent clients.

Of the three residential units, two service 'conduct disordered' youth; children who 'act out' and have become management problems for their families and their communities. Many residents are involved with the court system; some have been ordered to reside at the Maples in lieu of sentencing to Willingdon Youth Detention Centre. The conduct disordered youth generally have little or no family contact, and the majority of these children have been abused sexually, physically, and emotionally. In addition to anger

management difficulties, many have substance abuse problems and act out sexually. Some have organic problems such Fetal Alcohol Syndrome or Attention Deficit Disorder. Others reside in these secure units because they are at high risk to themselves or others; some of these clients are certified. The two units for conduct disordered adolescents are located in the locked unit building referred to as the Contained Adolescent Treatment Centre, or CATC for short. The two CATC units included in our study were CATC II and CATC III.

The other residential unit used in the study was Cottage 1. This cottage is 'open,' i.e. the doors are not locked. The clientele are diagnosed with 'thought disorders'--illnesses that are psychiatric in nature. This program is presently situated on the Maples Complex, but at the time of the study it was based at Inman House, a group home located in a neighborhood setting two kilometers from the main complex. The relocation of Cottage 1 took place to accommodate rebuilding after one of the other units was destroyed by fire.

Cottage 1 children have a range of problems including schizophrenia, autism, obsessive compulsive disorder, and borderline personality disorder. Medication is used more frequently on this unit than on other units, and the behaviors of the residents seem more 'bizarre.' To the lay person, residents of the CATC units appear as 'juvenile delinquents,' while Cottage 1 residents appear psychiatrically ill.

The average stay in the residential units (CATC II, CATC III, and Cottage 1) is one year. The two response units were not

included in this study since these children stay for a shorter thirty day assessment period. I focused my study on the residents who would 1) reside at the Maples for the duration of the study, and 2) have significant data backgrounds and have formed interpersonal relationships from which inferences could be drawn.

Subjects

As the setting and the subjects are often inseparable, much about the subjects has already been discussed. All three units used in the study are co-ed, and each resident has his/her own room. The CATC units house a maximum of eight residents at one time, while the cottage has a capacity for twelve residents.

In the following list of subjects, as in the rest of this paper, the subjects' real names have been replaced by pseudonyms to ensure confidentiality.

At the time of the study the numbers were as follows:

Cottage 1 :	Two females:	Sharon and Nadine
	Five males:	Justin, Joe, Max, Peter and Gary (Justin was admitted after first session had taken place)
CATC II :	Three females:	Alexis (in detention, attended a few sessions, then discharged) Darla (AWOL the whole time) Shelly (committed suicide)

Five males : Rob, Ross, Darren, Myron
 Don (unable to take part due to
 cadets)

CATC III : Four females : Joan, Tara, Ann, Sandy

Three males : Ray, Delbert, Andy
 (two were discharged during the
 study)

The total number of residents qualified to take part in the study was nine females and thirteen males, or twenty-two subjects in all.

Because this is merely an exploratory study, I considered all the subjects one group and therefore did not try to differentiate between the three subgroups when analyzing the data.

B.C. Interact and the Dogs in the Study

B.C. Interact is a non-profit society whose purpose is to provide and encourage human-animal companionship. B.C. Interact has many volunteers who visit various homes, hospitals, and institutions with their pets. The organization is also involved in lobbying for legislation to promote healthy living with our companion animals. An example of proposed legislative changes is the recent effort to allow seniors to keep their pets (bring their pets with them) when they move from their home to a seniors' complex. B.C. Interact is also involved in educating the general public about the benefits of pet animals. Through B.C. Interact, I was able to secure a volunteer named Bob Meiklejohn, who offered

his two dogs for the study. I accompanied Bob on an earlier visit to Riverview Psychiatric Hospital, and was impressed by the professionalism of both Bob and his dogs. The original draft of the study proposed that just one dog be involved, but since Bob worked with his two dogs together, the study was altered to incorporate both animals. As it worked out, the change from one dog to two dogs added unexpected elements to the study.

Bob is a man in his mid-thirties with an outgoing personality and an honest, straightforward manner. His dogs are Buddy, a five year old male Doberman-Labrador cross, and Shadow, an adult male Rottweiler-Shepherd cross (age unknown). Both are large animals. Buddy is energetic and enjoys rough-housing. Shadow is more relaxed and somewhat aloof. Both dogs have been screened by B.C. Interact for their suitability as visitation animals. They listen carefully to Bob, are affectionate, and show no signs of aggression, nor are they fearful of interactions. They are able to 'shake a paw,' 'sit,' and 'lie down.' It appears that both Buddy and Shadow fit the pet profile for visitation animals as suggested by Levinson (1972a, p. 180).

Procedures

To implement the Maples pet visitation project, I first sought research approval from the Forensic Psychiatric Services Commission. The subsequent approval may have been eased by the fact that I am employed by the Maples as a counsellor, and am therefore already permitted access to confidential information regarding the residents. Having worked at the Maples for the last

four years, I have an intimate understanding of the institutional rules, both explicit and implicit. I have worked extensively with both the conduct disordered and the thought disordered clients. Because I am familiar to the residents, the subjects were more open and trusting of the research process. Also, my involvement in their lives on other levels somehow made the practise of research seem more humane and less intrusive than if an 'expert'-- with no other connection to the children-- had conducted the study.

On the other hand, because of my existing relationships with the children, the interactions with the pets could be 'contaminated' by the fact that the children knew this was my project. Some children may have tried to please, while others may have tried to sabotage the research because of my involvement. This issue was addressed by me and acknowledged by several of the residents.

Permission was granted by U.B.C. Ethical Approval, and by B.C. Interact. I received parental/guardianship approval and written permission from each resident who took part in the study (Appendix A). Before the visitations began, I spoke with each staff and resident group regarding the study. Each resident was informed that inclusion in the study was completely voluntary, and that one could withdraw from the study at any time. Each resident was also informed that I would be taking notes during the visits, and would request that they fill out an incomplete sentence form and participate in an interview. They were told that the only rule of the study was that they could not hurt the animals. The staff were requested to note any behaviors or comments made by the children

regarding the pet visitations. A recording pad was left in each unit for this purpose, alongside a copy of the project proposal.

The visitations were organized on Wednesday evenings for six consecutive weeks. Due to illness in Bob's family, the actual study took eight, not six weeks to complete. (Sufficient warning was given to the units regarding the cancellations; I don't feel these delays were detrimental to the study.) On Wednesday evenings, the visits began at Cottage 1 from 1800 to 1900 hrs., then moved to CATC II from 1900 to 2000 hrs., then lastly to CATC III from 2000 to 2100 hrs. Thus, each visit lasted approximately one hour.

While the visits took place, the unit environment remained as natural as possible. The visits were designed not to interrupt any other regular activities. All visits took place in the living room areas of the units. Due to B.C. Interact policies, the dogs remained on a leash at all times.

As Bob and the dogs visited and mingled with the staff and residents, I sat with the group as a participant observer and took extensive notes. I also made comments and participated by petting the animals, speaking with the residents, making eye contact, and smiling. Bob, with his dogs, conducted visits as he had in many other situations before--by talking idly with clients, by moving from one resident to another, by allowing the residents to approach, by answering questions, and by responding to comments.

My recording style was similar to the 'SOAP' charting used at the Maples. SOAP stands for Statement, Objective observable behavior, Analysis, and Plan. My recordings quoted specific comments (statements) and listed observable behaviors. I also

noted the overall situation at hand. Analyses were formulated and checked with each resident during the interview period after the visits had been completed.

The entire process of the research was open and shared within the Maples community. The residents were aware of the research process and understood my note-taking behavior. Many asked questions about what I was writing.

The residents were reminded on the fifth visit that the next one would be the last. This was done so that they could prepare for their good-byes and ease the separation process. The subjects were also told that their involvement in the project may help pave the way for a more permanent pet visitation project at the the Maples.

About a week after the last visit took place, I began to meet with each resident to discuss their perceptions of the dog visitations. Each interview took place privately in the unit supervisors' offices. Two of the residents were in Youth Detention at the time, and were interviewed in a private office at the facility. One resident was undergoing assessment at Riverview Psychiatric Hospital. She was interviewed in the commons room.

The interview process was altered somewhat from the initial proposal. Because of the childrens' resistance to scheduling the interviews, I decided to combine the open-ended question answering interview (Appendix B) with the perception checking interview. Originally, responses to the open-ended questions were to be analyzed in an initial interview, followed by a second interview which was designed to check with each subject to see if my perceptions of their views were correct. However, as I became more

acquainted with my subjects and more aware of scheduling problems and their resistance to formal interview time, I changed the procedure and conducted a dual-purpose single interview for each subject.

The interviews were conducted as follows: I often arrived without an appointment as I found that spontaneous interviews provoked less anxiety in the residents than did scheduled interviews. This approach also seemed to lessen the 'power struggle' dynamic in which many of the residents engage. The informal approach seemed less structured, less 'authoritarian,' and therefore less threatening. The residents were asked to complete the open-ended sentence forms. I stressed that honest answers were needed, and that my feelings would not be hurt by negative responses. Most responded to the written section readily, although a few refused to write. Those who refused to write did, however, allow me to write responses down as they dictated their answers orally.

Before I went into these interviews, I carefully reviewed all the data I had gathered that pertained to the child during the six visits. After the child completed the open-ended sentences, I asked him/her if I could read their answers. During the process, I remained extremely gentle and communicated that there were no wrong responses. As I read the answers they had written, I asked for clarification or elaboration, being careful not to appear judgmental or negative about their work. After we had reviewed the sentence completion exercise, I then used my notes (which I had summarized in preparation for the interview) to relay my

observations to the child. Often the child was able to clarify my perceptions, and was able to add pertinent information.

During the first interview I conducted with a subject, I changed my tactics slightly from what I had originally planned. This first subject, a very articulate and intelligent young man named Gary, brought to light some areas which otherwise would have been excluded. As a result of my initial interview with Gary, I incorporated two structured questions at the end of the perception checking portion. The questions were: 1) What would you do differently if you were implementing a pet program at the Maples?, and 2) What is your one specific memory that stands out in your mind about the visits? Both of these added questions garnered useful information.

I concluded the interview by extending my heartfelt thanks to the subjects for sharing their thoughts and feelings with me, and for contributing to the field of pet-facilitated therapy.

Participant Observation as a Research Method.

The Maples Project has been described and the procedures and implementation of the study have been communicated to the reader. I will now use this section to support and substantiate my chosen method of inquiry.

The participant observer observes the interactions of people in situations; how they behave, what they do and what they say. The task of a participant observer is more than just gathering data--he/she also interprets events and makes decisions about what to pursue. The participant observer is an active researcher in the field.

The following features distinguish participant observation from other research methods:

(1) This method does not require the researcher to have a clearcut research problem, or a set of hypotheses prior to doing the field work. The method is appropriate for the type of research in which the researcher does not feel comfortable enough to develop hypotheses because he does not know enough about the group or organization he wants to study. In the course of conducting field work, the researcher hopes to develop, as well as test hypotheses.

(2) Participant observation allows a researcher to observe social events as they take place in their natural setting. This type of observation is different from observations in laboratories where conditions are artificially contrived. Unlike a survey researcher who usually asks the respondents questions related to their past experiences, a participant observer participates in the life of people he studies. He has an opportunity to observe an event before, during, and after it happens. He can also find out from the participants how they feel about the event, and how their interpretations may change in the course of development. In brief, participant observation generates rich data for understanding social situations.

(3) Rather than collecting one type of data, a researcher using participant observation gathers all kinds of information which are related to the group he is studying. A participant observer writes field notes, conducts interviews, collects materials such as minutes of meetings, by-laws of a club, notices, and correspondence. All these

materials constitute the data base for the cross reference of events to check their consistency and reliability.

(4) Unlike a cross-sectional survey (as opposed to a longitudinal survey) in which a researcher usually has only one chance to gather data from the respondents, a participant observer stays in the research site for an extended period of time, and observes the participants in a variety of situations. If he discovers that some points are neglected in one field trip, he can always check with the participants the next time he returns to the field (Li, 1981, p. 57).

This list of features supports the research design of the Maples Project.

The Maples Project observes the subjects in their natural setting (the study is interested in reactions to PFT within the Maples Adolescent Treatment Centre). I, the researcher, participate in the lives of the subjects as I am present during the visitation sessions and am, in a larger sense, a participant in the institutional milieu due to my position as a counsellor. The data gathered for the study are varied--field notes, informal and structured interview questions, incomplete sentence forms, case histories, and staff perceptions are used. The study allowed for data to be gathered on many occasions, from the introductory discussion of the project , through the visits, to the interview process.

In participant observer studies, the researcher must determine whether to be an observer, a participant, or both. the researcher must also determine whether or not the respondents will be made aware of his/her identity. In order to fully understand the group, a

researcher has to be included to some degree in the group. It is important, however, that involvement in the group not change the development of events in a radical way (Li, 1981).

Li (1981) appears to support, when possible, sharing with subjects information about the research. If the members of the group become aware that the researcher is studying them, then the researcher's task becomes easier as he may ask questions, write notes, etc. without appearing too inquisitive. "By telling people who he is, a researcher can legitimize his presence among the members, especially when the group accepts the presence of a researcher among them(Li, 1981, p. 58)."

I believe that, especially in this study, it was extremely important to share my reasons for conducting the study with the subjects, and to put everything 'on the table' as it were. The subjects have had many negative life experiences and are therefore mistrustful and wary of the intentions of others. My approach, therapeutically and ethically constructed, has been to remain as open and honest as possible. This manner tends to promote the respect that all human beings cherish. Li (1981) agrees that it is better to be forthright about one's identity and purpose. Although it may take longer to gain the confidence of the group, it is easier (and ethically more correct) to operate in one's true identity. It should be noted that since many of the subjects already knew me, several instances of pleasing or sabotaging behaviors occurred.

In determining what role I should play (participant, observer, or both) I discovered myself wearing both hats simultaneously. I observed (recorded objective comments, behaviors, situations),

participated as part of the group, analyzed situations and causations, and formulated possible theories. I worked on many levels, but found this process quite comfortable due to my many years of group-work experience, during which I performed much the same function. As there are no definitive procedures for using participant observation as a research method, this relatively loose structure allowed me to mold and shape the study to best extract pertinent themes. The 'openness' to change allowed for the inclusion of important elements which would otherwise not have been measured had I stayed with the original format. Naturally, procedural changes were applied equally to all subjects. The approach felt commonsensical, addressed the uniqueness of the group, and allowed for a more 'natural' research environment.

Participant observation is effective in observing the events in a relatively small group of people. With three small groups totalling twenty-two subjects in the Maples study, the participant observation method worked well. Since the Maples Project is but an exploratory study on the impact of pet visitations at a treatment centre, I have grouped the three units into one group for the purpose of analysis. A further breakdown of data regarding the differences between conduct disordered and thought disordered populations, or a study on the different interactions between the male and female subjects would be interesting, but is not within the scope of this study. Further research needs to be done to examine more fully these interactions, or antithetically, to generalize the findings of the Maples Project to other populations.

The choice of research topic is largely subjective. I chose pet-facilitated therapy because of my personal interest and my belief that pets provide therapeutic benefits for human beings. Because of my familiarity with the Maples, the site for my research became obvious. In fact, Li (1981) recommends that the researcher become familiar with the site and have some background knowledge of the social milieu. "The more background information a researcher has prior to entering the field, the less time he will take to learn about the group, and the earlier he will be able to raise meaningful questions for his research (p. 61)." In addition to already having an understanding of the workings of the institution, I took time to read client histories, psychiatric reports, and other pertinent information regarding each child in the study. I was allowed access to confidential files because of my position at the Maples.

A participant observer is looking for facts that tell him/her about the lives of the people, how they behave in various situations, and how they interpret events. The researcher hopes to develop more general concepts from these facts and come up with summary statements about the group-- statements which are supported by evidence. Therefore, even studies that are basically descriptive in nature can provide themes and support theories. Evidence can take many forms--in the Maples Project field notes, unstructured and structured interviews, staff opinion, family histories, sentence completion forms, and psychiatric summaries were all used as data.

To increase the reliability and validity of my field records, I took copious notes during each visit and reviewed them immediately after the evening visits were over. At this time I filled in any

useful information that I had missed during my initial note-taking. The immediacy of this review increased accuracy in recording. I did not discuss my findings with anyone until my daily record was completed in an effort not to become confused or be unduly influenced by others.

I also took pains to record statements and events as accurately and as precisely as possible. Quotes were made verbatim--I recorded not only what was said but how the statement was made. This record is important, as a specific word or phrase, particularly the way in which it was expressed, may have special meaning. Any queries or analyses were recorded separately--what I 'thought' was kept apart from what I 'observed.' All notes were dated and events which may have had effects on the milieu (such as the suicide of a resident) were recorded. I kept my notebooks with me at all times so that I could record accurately any information shared outside of the visitation or interview sessions. Any staff comments were also written in my recording notebooks.

The analysis of field materials and notes was conducted throughout the process of the field research. I looked for concepts and statements which best summarized the group situation. I began by searching for similarities among the cases in order to make general statements about my findings. Some statements could not be applied to all cases, yet these 'deviant' cases are equally important to note. I looked for underlying norms, relationships, and structures (Strauss, 1990). Field notes were used to illustrate and support my analyses and to provide contextual meaning for the reader.

Interviews consisted of a sentence completion exercise and structured and unstructured questions which checked field perceptions against the actual perceptions of the subjects. To properly conduct the unstructured interviews, the researcher must constantly evaluate the respondents' answers, make decisions regarding the direction of the interview, and draw tentative conclusions during the process of interviewing (Li, 1981). One must carefully guide the interview, and continuously create contingency plans. I felt as though many of my counselling skills were called upon to conduct these interviews appropriately. Language was kept at an understandable level--throughout the interview I checked for comprehension and encouraged the subjects to ask me for clarification.

Issues in Participant Observation

Although there are numerous advantages in participant observation as a research method, one must also acknowledge its limitations. It is not designed to generate data which are suitable for statistical inference. Field materials are qualitative in nature and are therefore difficult to quantify in a systematic way. Respondents and observations are selected on an informal basis, and are not chosen by probability sampling. For this reason, participant observation often yields results which are tentative and exploratory in nature. It is also more difficult to assess the reliability of measurements in participant observation due to the subjective interpretations of the field workers. Yet if one is aware of these limitations, acknowledges them, and deals with them honestly, they

need not become liabilities. In the Maples Project, I admitted to my belief that pets are an asset to the quality of human life, yet I was still able to observe and record interactions with this bias in mind. Because of the research design, I had no preconceived notions or expectations of the study outcome, which eliminated any directing of the results. The participant observation design is very useful for developing concepts and hypotheses, and has become a widely used research method among social scientists (Li,1981).

To conclude, I refer to Dabbs (1982) who expertly summarizes the essence of qualitative research methodology.

Dictionary definitions are useful: Quality is the essential character or nature of something; quantity is the amount. Quality is the what; quantity the how much. Qualitative refers to the meaning, the definition or analogy or model or metaphor characterizing something, while quantitative assumes the meaning and refers to a measure of it. The difference is related to Tukey's (1977) distinction between exploratory and confirmatory analysis. The difference lies in Steinbeck's (1941) description of the Mexican Sierra, a fish from the Sea of Cortez. One can count the spines in the dorsal fin of a pickled Sierra, 17 plus 15 plus 9. "But," says Steinbeck, "if the Sierra strikes hard on the line so that our hands are burned, if the fish sounds and nearly escapes and finally comes in over the rail, his colors pulsing and his tail beating the air, a whole new relational externality has come into being." Qualitative research would define the being of

fishing, the ambiance of a city , the mood of a citizen, or the unifying tradition of a group (p. 32).

CHAPTER 4 : RESULTS

In this chapter, I describe the nature of the visitations and the interviews. I also compare my observations with background information about the subjects and the social milieu. Several themes are extracted from this process, and are discussed in the 'conclusions' section in terms of their application to pet-facilitated therapy.

As there are three units and twenty-two subjects involved in the study, the reading of the 'results' section can become quite confusing. In an attempt to try to clarify and organize the subjects for the reader, I shall provide a 'cast of characters' which can be utilized as a reference tool to keep track of those involved.

Table 1

Identification of Subjects and Non-Subjects Involved In the Visitations.

<u>Residents</u>				
<u>Cottage1</u>				
<u>Name</u>	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Diagnosis</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Gary	M	17	Depressed. Substance abuse issues.	Intellectualizes issues. Often plays adult role. Little interaction with peers.
Joe	M	17	Paranoid Schizophrenic.	Delusional persecutory episodes. May behave in a threatening manner. Misogynist beliefs.
Max	M	15	Asperger's Syndrome. Obsessive Compulsive Disorder.	Very personable, yet can't be touched, even accidentally. History of animal abuse.
Peter	M	15	Bipolar.	Often hyperactive/hypersexual. Mourning the losses which his illness has caused.

Cottage 1 Cont.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Diagnosis</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Nadine	F	16	Schizophrenic.	Delusional at times. Believes she is her mother. Takes on different personas.
Justin	M	15	Obsessive Compulsive. Conduct Disordered.	Aggressive, manipulative. Harmful to others. Interested in negative peer culture.
Sharon	F	15	Borderline Personality.	Histrionic. Can develop relationships with staff & others who care for her. Black and white thinking.

CATC II

Ross	M	14	Tourette's Syndrome	Unfocused. Short attention span. Requires much staff attention. High energy. Impulsive. Affectionate.
Rob	M	13	Conduct Disordered. Sociopathic.	Aloof. Poor impulse control. Verbally abusive. Often aggressive/hostile.
Shelly	F	15	Depressed. Suicidal gesturing.	Intelligent. Creative. Artistic. Very isolative. Well defended. Closed.
Alexis	F	14	Borderline Personality.	Street focus. Long AWOLs. Either submissive or rebellious. Identity crisis.
Myron	M	14	Conduct Disordered.	Very sociable. Manipulative/charming. Good sense of humor.
Darren	M	15	Conduct Disordered.	Detached from other youth and staff.
Darla	F	15	Conduct Disordered. Borderline Personality	Self abusive. Puts self in victim role. Manipulative. High AWOL risk. Engages in high risk activities.
Don	M	16	Anxiety Disorder	Independent. Isolative. Goal oriented.

CATC I I I

Joan	F	16	Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome. Depressed.	Attention seeking. Resented by peers for extra staff attention she receives. Self abusive, Suicidal gesturing.
Tara	F	14	Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome. Borderline Personality. Self abusive.	Attention seeking. Sexualizes relationships. AWOLs frequently.

CATC III Cont.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Diagnosis</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Sandy	F	14	Borderline Personality, sociopathic tendencies.	Attention seeking. Tests relationships. Little interaction with peers. Drug focused. AWOLs frequently.
Ann	F	15	Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome. Borderline Personality, sociopathic tendencies.	Histrionic. Creates crises. Amoral qualities.
Delbert	M	15	Borderline Personality.	Structure and limit focused. Dismissing attitude toward peers. Increasing alcohol/drug use.
Andy	M	15	Conduct Disordered.	Challenges peers through street knowledge. Violent temper outbursts. A loner.
Ray	M	17	Bipolar with episodes of psychosis.	Volatile mood swings. Narcissistic. Experiences flight of ideas. Aggressive.

Non-Residents

<u>Name</u>	<u>Role</u>
Bob	Dog owner. B.C Interact Volunteer.
Erica	Researcher. Counsellor at Cottage 1
Buddy	Dog.
Shadow	Dog.

The Study**The Introductory Meeting**

A few days before I began the pet visitations, I met with the staff group during their 'shift change' discussions, and described the specifics of the study. The 'OK' for the study had been provided by

the Professional Advisory Committee and by the unit supervisors long in advance of this shift change meeting. After meeting with the staff, I then met with the residents of the units. At Cottage 1, Gary expressed concern regarding confidentiality issues. Joe made 'shoot 'em up' gestures while I discussed the pets. In CATC II, both Ross and Myron expressed interest in the project. In CATC III, Delbert, Ann, and Joan were present. They mentioned that they would like a crocodile, guinea pig or an elephant to be the visiting pet.

The Visits

Visit #1

Cottage 1

On our first visit, Nadine approached the dogs and greeted them. Peter asked Bob how one could tell Buddy and Shadow apart, then commanded the dogs to 'sic.' Max stated that he wouldn't touch the dogs because Nadine had touched them. He did, however, breathe into the dogs and command them to sit.

Peter stated that he wanted to ride Buddy, and Max volunteered that he used to ride his dog, who would chase after trucks with Max on his back. Sharon tried to pet the dogs, but Max insulted her by telling her to "Fuck off." Nadine continued to give the dogs gentle, sweet hugs.

Nadine mentioned that she had had two dogs and that one had died. Peter said that his dogs had been run over. After Peter shook the dog's paw, Max followed suit but told the dogs, "I touched you last." (Max must always touch people and things last.) Max tried to touch the dog's tongue with his tongue and got licked. Max then

attempted to run outside to spit but was sent to the bathroom instead. When Max returned he said, "I kissed the dog," and gave Buddy a backwards pat (using the back of his palm and stroking against the hair growth of the animal).

Peter began to scream and yell (in jest) because he was wrestling with the dog and the dog was playing back. Max looked over at Sharon who appeared to be pouting, then told the dogs to "lick her cuts." (Sharon had open sores from chicken pox at the time.) Max then picked up Buddy's front paws, but Buddy collapsed and rolled over. Max again picked up Buddy's front paws and did the 'Ooga Booga Dance' with the dog. In this dance that Max developed, one chants "ooga booga" while stepping in beat side to side across from a partner. The partners join hands across from each other and dance in unison. This dance has often been the only time that Max will allow staff or others to touch him. After the dance, Peter resumed wrestling with the dog and pinned him.

As Max left, Sharon approached and rubbed Shadow's belly and tickled his paws. Max returned from the kitchen and fed the dogs french fries. Gary kept coming into the room and looking, but did not approach the animals. Peter declared upon inspecting Buddy's underside, "He has pimples." Bob replied that they were nipples and that there were six of them. Max retorted, "Oh, a six pack." Sharon continued with gentle petting while Max and Nadine began their 'Mr. McNee' chant. (The chant repeats the name of their teacher over and over in unison. It is chanted loudly and with specific inflections and tone. This chant was created by Max and other peers join in.)

Max then scurried out the door and Sharon mentioned that Shadow looked bored. Max returned from outside where he had been looking for a ball for the dogs to play with, and began to talk about his dog who had been killed by a porcupine. Apparently, the quills had become lodged in its mouth so it couldn't eat. He shared that both he and his brother were very sad when the dog died.

Max called Shadow a lazy bum, while Sharon stated that Shadow was just bored. Sharon made cat sounds and giggled while Peter demonstrated how his father lifts up his Shar-pei (like game on a stick). Sharon stated that her "American Sanford Terrier" had been run over. Peter added that his last two dogs were run over and that they were expensive animals.

As Sharon petted Shadow, Buddy put his paw on Sharon's face. Sharon commented "I think he's a little jealous." While staff conversed about the pets they used to have, Sharon continued with quiet, slow petting. Both Sharon and Peter found a tickly spot on Buddy's underside.

Peter searched for fleas and found another ticklish spot on Buddy's back. Peter asked about feeding, suggested the dogs be shaved to resemble a punk 'do' and performed the Heimlich Maneuver on Buddy. He also began massaging the dogs explaining that he was 'channelling energy' as they do in Chinese movies.

The dogs wandered over to Bob, who pushed them away, explaining that he was not being mean, but that he could see his dogs at any time. Peter then examined Buddy's teeth and explained that dogs throw up if they are fed the wrong things. He also stated that when his dog hears things his ears perk up.

The discussion then turned to Shadow. Peter observed that Shadow had white hairs and inferred he was getting old. Bob explained that he did not know how old Shadow was because he got him from the SPCA. As Peter looked in Shadow's ear, he noticed a tattoo. Bob then talked about the meaning of the identification tattoo, and how it also prevented Shadow from being used for animal experiments. A rather gruesome discussion of animal experiments was discussed among the adults--the children seemed to tune this out.

Sharon rubbed Shadow's ear as he leaned into her, and asked Bob where else he takes his dogs. Bob told her that he takes them to Riverview and to rest homes and hospitals. The visit ended in a slow and quiet mood -- the dogs were resting as Sharon and Peter patted them. There was no talking when the dogs left. Peter began fake crying.

CATC II

As Bob, the dogs, and I approached from our cars, a resident yelled, "Fucking mutts!" from the outside airing court. Once inside the unit, however, it turned out that Ross, the boy who made the comment, was really excited about the visits. Rob laughed about the dogs "sniffing each others bums," and Ross brought out his stuffed cat to play with the visitors.

Ross explained that he was trying to get a puppy on the unit. Myron petted the dogs briefly, smelled his hands, said, "Yuk!" and disappeared. Rob and Ross told the dogs to 'sit,' 'shake a paw,' and then said, "Good dog!" after the trick was performed.

Ross asked Bob what kind of dogs they were, and expressed concern about Buddy's leg being caught in the leash. "I won't hurt you," Ross said as he untangled the lead. The boys moved onto the couch and Buddy jumped up and lay across both of them.

Ross became excited about feeding the dogs and brought out two bowls of chili for them. Ross worried about the dogs getting 'gas' and talked about a St. Bernard he knew who took 'big dumps.' Rob commented that they were going to be "farting all night." As Ross brought out a huge bowl of water for the dogs, Rob said that it would be funny if it was juice or beer instead.

The boys asked if they could go outside into the airing court--the fenced outside area adjoining the unit. Bob gave each boy a dog and the dogs ran around in the court, yet the dogs looked to Bob continuously for reassurance. We returned inside and the boys wrestled with the dogs.

Ross discussed Shelly's rat who had died. Ross said that she had killed it by throwing it across the room, while Rob said that she had accidentally killed it while she was having a 'fit.'

Rob stated that he has a hamster and a Siamese cat, while Ross said that his mom has a cat who drinks hot coffee. Rob began dancing with the dogs and put a sock on Buddy's back. Ross remarked about how he used to throw puppies down the hill in the snow. Ross then pretended to be a cat, then a dog. While inspecting Shadow, Ross asked what was wrong with his eyes, as he 'looks stoned.'

Ross asked Buddy, "Wanna fight?" as Buddy pushed him over and licked him. Ross said, "Whoops. Oh God!" and giggled. While petting him he said, "You like that, don't you?"

Rob returned from the kitchen with peanut butter and jam toast, and fed the dogs, commenting on how the peanut butter stuck to the roofs of their mouths. Ross then ran into the kitchen and returned with cold cuts. "Take it nice!" he said to the dogs. At this point Bob said, "Enough food guys." Myron returned and petted the dogs again, and stated that licking was "gross."

Rob said that he used to have birds at home, and that his cat took care of the mouse problem. Myron shared that he had cats at home. Rob went into the kitchen and snuck more cold cuts for the dogs.

Ross called Shadow an "old fart," and encouraged Buddy to wrestle with Rob and him. Both boys started giggling and Ross said, "You think you're tough!" to Buddy. Rob said, "I'll have to take a shower after this." The boys kept talking 'tough' with the dogs, then, when the dogs displayed their strength, Ross said, "Whoa, they're pretty strong!" Myron, meanwhile, was in the washroom washing his hands.

The boys became distracted by what was on TV, and the dogs lay down to rest. Buddy was panting and Shadow was resting quietly. After a few minutes, Ross pulled on Buddy's paws to pull him up on the couch and yelled, "Tickle him!" With Buddy sitting on top of the boys and wrestling, Rob fell off the couch and Myron said, "Get them away from me." Ross asked Buddy, "Why do you like ears?" as Buddy nibbled on Ross' ear, and asked Shadow, "Do you feel jealous?" Ross gave Buddy 'trouble' for 'eating' Ross' earring.

As the visit progressed, the interactions became less boisterous and there was more quiet petting. Rob got down on the

floor and asked Shadow in a concerned manner, "What's wrong, Shadow? You're a little grumpy." Ross asked Bob about muzzles and about his other pets.

Rob insinuated that CATC II already had a pet rat indicating Ross. ('Rat' is a colloquialism for informer.) Ross looked uncomfortable but smiled. Ross then asked Bob what he fed the dogs, and talked about his web-footed Labrador. He commented that Shadow looked sad. When Bob and the dogs took leave, Ross called to the dogs, "You guys be good. See you next week!"

CATC III

As we entered CATC III, Ray was reclined on the couch, smiling. Shadow sniffed around the floor in search of food-- Ray helped him retrieve a cracker that was out of reach.

Ann came to greet the dogs with her face all made up. She was worried that they would eat her makeup off. She then took off all her makeup with makeup remover. Ann asked, "Why are you looking at me, dog?" Ray responded, " 'Cuz you look like food." Ann punched him and they fought with him for possession of the preferred TV watching spot.

As the TV show *21 Jump Street* aired, Ray said that his dad had a shepherd that was a guard dog. Ann exclaimed, "I think this dog kinda likes me!" as Buddy licked her hand. Ray was busy playing with Buddy's ears. "He's smiling," Ann said.

After a few minutes, Ann and Ray began to fight again and swear loudly at each other. Although this was done mostly for our benefit (to impress us), the feigned punching and yelling resulted in

both Buddy and Shadow slinking away. A staff member told the kids that the dogs were not used to violence and were afraid. Ann then rushed over to the dogs, and, in a very concerned manner, pleaded, "Please don't go away." The dogs then came back and re-engaged.

As Ray was eating Jello, Buddy kept staring at him and following every movement with his eyes. Ray tried to get him to stop but kept laughing.

The shift supervisor then returned from an outing without the kids. Both Delbert and Tara had AWOLed while on the outing. The other residents absent from this session were Joan, who was at the hospital, and Sandy, who was also AWOL.

Ray began playing floor hockey with a ball. He said he liked having the dogs watch the ball. He then had the dogs follow his finger with their eyes, and he rolled the ball to Buddy.

By the end of the visit, the dogs were low-key and resting. The residents were petting the dogs quietly while watching television. Ann gave Buddy a big kiss on the nose.

The subject of the Riverview visitations also arose in this unit, and Ray stated that Ann belongs there. This prompted another punching and wrestling display. The staff then set some limits regarding horseplay.

Issues

A number of issues arose after the first session took place; issues which I believe are necessary to include in this study. I will mention each briefly.

CATC II staff stated that the visits were 'great,' but allowing pets to live on the units leads to disaster-- animals get killed. They were referring to the demise of Shelly's rats.

Ann initially refused to sign the consent form, but later signed it when she witnessed other residents signing the forms readily.

The Cottage 1 social worker informed me that we were admitting a boy named Justin. His parents had bought him a dog on recommendation by their therapist. The dog apparently is useful in comforting Justin.

Two of the staff had mild allergic reactions to the dogs being on the units. One of the staff was able to take her break at the time the dogs were visiting, thus avoiding potential problems. The other staff member worked on a unit that the dogs did not visit and only had problems while visiting CATC II.

Gary from Cottage 1 was asked by staff why he did not participate in the first dog visitation. He stated that he thought this was animal abuse, as "animals are being put on display for human pleasure." He asked the staff member, "Would you let your kids do this?" He also expressed concern regarding my analysis of his refusal to participate. "Did you think I was scared or what?" he asked.

The mother of Nadine (Cottage 1) warned us that Nadine may sexually abuse the dogs, as she had allegedly been found trying to French kiss a poodle. She also informed us that Nadine had sexually abused a bird. The social worker thanked the mother for this information, although we were aware that the mother's perceptions are at times questionable.

Shelly (CATC II) committed suicide before the second session took place. Her death greatly affected all of us.

Visit #2

Cottage 1

Justin was immediately concerned about jealousy issues between the two dogs. "My mom pats me on the head and my dog gets jealous," he stated as he petted Shadow and ignored Buddy, causing Buddy to nudge for attention. Justin was also curious to know if the dogs were neutered, and stated that those who weren't neutered may be more aggressive.

All the kids talked about past pets, and Joe shared with us how his family had to shoot one of his dogs because the dog attacked his mom. "We took it out and blew its brains out," he related, looking directly at Buddy.

Bob talked about his last dog who passed away, and how he found Shadow on 'death row' at the SPCA. All of a sudden Peter, who was petting Buddy, 'freaked out' screaming and ran upstairs. As the others continued talking about the dogs they had, Peter returned and told the group that he "got 'come' on him" from Buddy. The boys then huddled around and talked sexually with each other, laughing uproariously.

Everyone began encouraging Max to do the Ooga Booga Dance with Buddy. He refused, so Peter did it, then Max decided to do it also. Sharon played with the dogs with staff encouragement and then said, "OK, I've played with them," and went outside.

Buddy had to go to the bathroom, so Bob took him out. The boys laughed and acted embarrassed. Max followed Bob and the dog outside to watch.

Once inside, Max clamped his hands over Buddy and tried kissing him. "Oh, his first ever kiss," Joe said. As Buddy lay down, Max allowed him to rest on his feet.

Nadine talked with staff about her pets and spent time petting the dogs. Gary participated in the discussion, but did not pet the animals. Joe, watching all the attention the dogs received, stated, "Boy, I wish I was this popular."

When Bob told us how much the dogs ate each day, Joe said, "If my dogs ate that much they'd be shot." Peter made shooting gestures.

As the dogs left, Joe said, "See you, Buddy. Goodnight!" Gary followed me outside and asked me exactly what I wrote.

CATC II

Ross was watching a show about animals and their mating habits. He was excited about the dogs and introduced them to a new staff member. The dogs were busy licking up Jello from an earlier Jello fight.

Ross invited Alexis over to play with the dogs. Myron ignored them. Rob wandered by, but looked in rough shape. This is the unit where Shelly had resided and the resident appeared very shaken by the suicide.

Ross told us, "My dog used to drink out of the toilet. If he was hungry he'd eat shit out of the toilet." While watching the nature show, Ross said, "I'd take an Uzi to the hyenas." He then began

playing and wrestling with Buddy. He was much gentler with Shadow. Rob came over and Buddy jumped up on him and they began wrestling. Darren came in, did the splits and put some cigarettes on the floor. "These are only cigarettes, nothing to eat," he explained to the dogs. "This is my food. You touch, you die."

CATC III

Tara exclaimed, "Hi, puppies!" and wanted to know why they had to be on a leash. Joan thought they must hate being on a leash, and was concerned that the leash was choking them. Joan was very close to the dogs, petting them gently. Tara wanted them to come one more time, since they missed the dogs last time.

Sandy said to Buddy, "You smell like a street kid, but that's OK." As she gently stroked Buddy she said, "I like animals. They're smart." Sandy asked Bob if he ever hit his animals, and talked about how her brother broke her dog's ribs.

Tara investigated the dogs from nose to tail. "What are these?" she asked referring to the pads on Shadow's feet. "They're like Nikes."

Bob showed the kids how to tickle the dogs' noses and make them sneeze. The kids laughed. Tara gave Shadow a big kiss.

Sandy tried to engage Shadow, but Shadow did not respond as Sandy wished. "I hate you!" Sandy cried, pointing her finger at Shadow as she left the room.

The residents asked if the dogs fight. Bob said no, but that he made sure to give them each a bone so that they did not have to fight. "You don't torment them," Joan said, referring to the fact that

Bob did not set them up to fight. She then curled up beside Buddy as she watched her video *Dying Young*. "They look dead," Joan said, watching the dogs sleep. "Do they run with you? Do they run free?" she asked. As we departed, Joan said, "So you're coming back next Wednesday? Good!"

Visit # 3

Cottage 1

Peter began playing quietly with the dogs. "Drool, it's OK, 'cause I drool too," he told Shadow.

Justin wandered in, asked, "Which one is jealous?" and immediately began playing with the other one. Gary was invited to pet the dogs, but he quickly said, "No, no. I have to go to a meeting."

Nadine stated, "This time I'm going to do the Ooga Booga Dance," and then performed the dance with Buddy. Next she recited a poem as follows: "Roses are red, violets are blue. I'm schizophrenic, and so am I." Max also did the Ooga Booga Dance. At this time, Sharon came storming out of her room and out the back door.

Max tried to kiss Buddy, and shook his paw. Max then patted a staff member on his back while the staff member patted Buddy. Sharon came back and went wailing into her room. Justin took the sleep out of Shadow's eye, as Max talked about his brother's friend who nailed a frog up on the wall and then shot at it with a pellet gun. He laughed at this, 'farted' at Nadine, then told Shadow to 'sit.' As Shadow lowered himself slowly to sit, Max said, "He's going to poop." A few minutes later Max said, "God made man in His own image. If He can see the future, so can we."

Max pulled Buddy's face back so that his eyes were slanted. "Chinese dog," he said. He then pushed Buddy's eyes closed. Bob and the staff were talking about Shadow's past and how he may have been abused.

CATC II

Before the dogs arrived, Ross told the staff, "Fuck, I hate those dogs! I wish those dogs would stop coming!" Once we came onto the unit, Ross introduced the dogs by name to a staff member who had not yet met the dogs, and explained when they come, what they do, and so forth. Ross began to play with Buddy, who licked Ross' hair and ears. Myron wandered over and asked for a staff to take him outside for a cigarette. Buddy put his paws on Ross, then Ross put Buddy's leg, and then his tail in his mouth.

In the other room, there was much screaming and yelling. The staff were talking with Alexis and Myron about the suicide. Rob was in seclusion and could be heard banging and shouting. Myron then threw a laundry hamper across the hall. While Ross gave the dogs peanut butter, the staff were strategizing on how to stabilize the unit. One staff member was concerned for the dogs and how the dogs were handling the stress on the unit.

Alexis walked over and talked to Buddy. "You're such a beautiful puppy, you remind me of home." She became tearful and kissed Buddy. "I don't understand how people can abandon animals or hurt them," she said, as she reminisced about her dog, Sheba.

Rob was let out of seclusion and came over to Shadow. "I'll come pet you. I've been ignoring you. I can't believe how good these

dogs are!" He talked about his dog at home, and how his dog meets him at the door and jumps on him and licks him all over.

CATC III

Sandy met us at the door. "Which one is the cuddly one?" she asked. Tara squealed, "Oh, it's Wednesday!" and gave Buddy a big kiss on the mouth. The new resident, Andy, said, "Oh, puppies. Come here..." He hung up the phone, ran over, and gave the dogs big hugs. Delbert declared, "The dogs are here," and Tara retorted, "No, they're rabbits." "I like dogs," Delbert said.

Tara called Buddy over. "He's my friend," she said as Sandy looked on sweetly. Ann bounced in, petted the dogs, and left again. Bob helped Buddy up on the couch to be with Sandy. Sandy's wrists, the back of her hands, and her neck were recently cut from self-inflicted wounds. Sandy and Tara tried tickling the dogs so that the dogs would sneeze.

Joan sat down on the floor and the dogs came over to her. "You smell," she said as Buddy licked her face.

Sandy lay on the couch with the dogs on the floor beneath her. She had her hand resting on Buddy. Sandy then went down on the floor with Shadow, and performed slow spider-crawl motions with her hand across Shadow's fur, staring at her hands. She looked sad, and wandered off with her blanket to her room. A few minutes later she returned, sat by Buddy and stared at him intently as she petted his nose and forehead and played with his ears. Joan was on the floor too, lying close to Buddy, intensely and quietly stroking him.

Visit #4

Cottage 1

Justin met us in the office and told us he had just returned from a ten mile hike with his dog. Max didn't want to see the dogs at first but staff convinced him to visit for a while anyway. Justin played with Buddy and wrestled. After Buddy licked his face, Justin left to wash his hands. Max then went over to blow on Buddy.

Joe said, "I had the loyalist dog. He waited for me 'til seven at night until I came back to the school and got him."

Nadine petted both Buddy and Shadow and recommended that the staff also do this. Peter was out with his 'one-on-one worker,' and Gary was focused on cleaning his room. The living room was very quiet and the kids were low key.

Joe looked down on the floor at Buddy. "How's the temper on this one?" he asked before petting him.

Justin held on tightly to Shadow then called Buddy and asked, "You jealous now?" He asked Bob if he was married because he wondered if Buddy and Shadow would try to bring him and his wife together if they walked apart from each other. He said that his dog does this; his dog grabs his dad's leg gently and tries to bring him back towards his mom and him.

Sharon was in hysterics in her room dealing with past abuse issues. Gary had to leave for his meeting.

Max was encouraged to do the Ooga Booga Dance with Buddy, and did so. He also touched Shadow's stomach, and stated, "He's got strong stomach muscles." As Bob and I left, Max told Bob, "She's

Wonder Woman. Erica's Wonder Woman. Don't you think she's Wonder Woman?"

CATC II

Ross came out immediately to meet us and Buddy followed Ross to the couch and jumped up. They began wrestling, with Ross giving Buddy 'noogies.' Ross gave Buddy the paper, but then said, "You paper trained? I'd better not give you that [the paper]. You might know what that's for!" Rob looked on, somewhat despondent.

Ross then brought out his stuffed rabbit and rubbed him all over Buddy. "Where's your rabbit hole?" Ross asked. "Rabbit's going to beat you up. " He put the rabbit on Buddy's collar. "Ride him," he said.

Rob sat back on the couch and shared his peanut butter sandwich with the dogs. He threw pieces in the air and the dogs caught them. He began giving Buddy a tummy rub and shook his paw. Then both boys lifted Buddy up onto the couch. Rob gave Buddy a big hug and got kisses. Buddy lay down on Rob who began giving him a tummy rub.

CATC III

As we entered the unit, one of the boys was in seclusion. The staff explained that the girls were really looking forward to seeing the dogs, and that this visit helped as an incentive to keep the unit calm while the boys were explosive.

Tara immediately began interacting with the dogs, while Sandy came over and gave the dogs quiet, still pats. When one of the boys

became verbally abusive to the staff, Sandy put her hands over Buddy's ears and said, "Don't listen, you shouldn't hear swear words."

"I have a cat and two rats. My mom killed one of the rats by accident," Sandy said. As the noise from the boys continued, Sandy added, "The dogs are more civilized than the people here." She continued, "I brought home a dog from AWOL and my mom didn't like me and she 'lost' it."

Tara played with the pads on Buddy's feet. "He's dead," she said, "I can't feel him breathing... No, he's not dead." Tara asked Bob why Shadow's 'weird.' Bob explained that it was because he was mistreated before Bob got him. Perhaps he was beaten or not fed properly. Sandy said, "Aww..." Tara thought it was 'cool' when they were told that Shadow was from the pound. Sandy gave Shadow kisses.

Sandy became worried that there were only two sessions left. "No," she said. "I love you," she told Buddy. She then disappeared into her room and re-emerged in her pyjamas and was all wrapped up in her blanket. She sat down on the floor and cuddled the dogs. "I wish they could stay here longer," she said. Then, to Shadow, she asked softly, "Were you abused as a child?"

Bob answered, "We'll never know. But he couldn't have had that rough a life 'cause he's a pretty good dog..."

Sandy sighed, "Yeah..."

Joan came in briefly and looked at the dogs. Ray brought out a toy gun and said, "I want to shoot everyone in the world."

As we walked out, Sandy touched Bob's arm and smiled at him.

Visit #5

Cottage 1

The boys asked Bob about his visits to Riverview. "Did anything scary ever happen there?" Peter asked as he stroked Shadow.

"It's kind of a village there," Gary added as Bob described the institution.

Justin was busy 'training' Buddy not to lick. "No," he said, and smacked him on the face. "Shake a paw," he said, "No, the other one!" He asked Bob if he tried to teach him not to lick and Bob replied that he'd tried but it hadn't worked. "He probably knows what he's supposed to do, but he pretends he doesn't," Justin responded.

As Peter and Justin cuddled the dogs, Justin said, "Sometimes when I cry, my dog likes to lick my tears." Justin continued to discipline Buddy. "I'm going to muzzle you. That's it, I've had enough!" Justin made grunting noises, whispered something sexual to Peter, and both boys left.

Nadine sat on the couch staring. Gary was interacting with Bob. Sharon stated, "Eww, they stink. Whenever it smells like feet, I know the dogs are here." Justin came back, looked carefully at Buddy's eyes, and said, "Yuk, it's gross, slimy stuff!"

"The pink thing popped out," Max said, referring to the dog's penis.

"That's something you whisper to someone, and to someone your own age and sex," Justin coached.

Max asked which dog does the Ooga Booga. "Get up," he said to Buddy and did the dance. Buddy flipped over and Max wiped his feet on him.

Joe said, "Touched you last," and touched Buddy. Max then had to touch Buddy last.

Justin came in with food and instructed Buddy to sit, and walked away from him.

"You're setting him up!" Joe said.

Max commented, "The pink thing's popped out," and added, "Why do you let Nadine touch the dogs? She's touching the dogs!" Then he said to Buddy, "Bad doggy, you should be ashamed of yourself!" When asked why he said that, he replied, "I'm trying to make him feel guilty. I like doing that."

Justin showered Shadow with affection. He looked to Buddy. He then shook his finger at Buddy. "Dogs hate it when I do this," he said, as he used his finger like a gun and said, "Bad. Bad!"

Justin used the choke chain to 'train' Buddy. He then pretended to shoot him, patted him, and walked away.

Joe was the only resident left in the room. "What are you writing, Erica? Let's give her time to write." As he played with Buddy, he said, "Dogs are so fun to play with." He added, "My other dog saw my dad shoot the shepherd, so every time it hears a bang, it freaks."

CATC II

Ross invited Buddy onto the couch. Shadow came too. "You're friendly today," Ross said to Shadow. The dogs left paw marks on

the sheet covering the couch. "It's OK, we change them every day. We usually throw food around here," Ross explained.

He played with the dogs, blew in their noses, and checked their feet. Shadow went down and began licking the floor. One of the staff asked what Shadow was finding down there. Ross responded, "It's probably the banana bread that Darren ate and threw at Rob who breathed some in then horked it all over the floor."

Ross continued playing with Buddy. "Are you a goat?" he asked, referring, I think, to a mountain goat. He began making meowing noises.

As Darren entered the room, Ross pointed out the soiled sheets. "Ass wipe," he said. Darren asked, "OK, which one of you pups shit all over?" "The one looking the other way," Ross replied.

Darren had Buddy upside down. "Is he a he?--yep, he's a he. I can tell," as he examined Buddy's genitals.

Ross came back with peanut butter and put it on the roofs of the dogs' mouths. Darren played with the choke chains and held onto the scruff of Buddy's neck. He then patted Shadow's head and ears, and made loud 'yippling' noises as we left.

CATC III

Tara ran over to us and gave the dogs hugs. She then called Buddy over to the couch. Sandy sat down on the floor with Buddy. "Is next week the last week?" she asked, as Buddy gently licked the stitches on Sandy's hands. "They smell better this week," Sandy commented, smiling at Bob. She groomed Buddy carefully, as if looking for fleas, then lay down beside him. As she stroked him she

whined, "Eww," lifting up extra flaps of skin on his back. Bob pinched his arm to show that people have extra skin too. Tara and Sandy continued to pet and caress the dogs. Sandy tickled Buddy's paws, stroked Shadow, then slowly rubbed Buddy's tail back and forth under her chin for a long time.

Visit #6

Cottage 1

"Remember when that pink thing popped out?" Max asked. Joe and Peter played with the dogs. Max made smacking noises at Buddy's mouth and blew at him. Buddy offered Max his paw. Max asked, "Do you wanna do the Ooga Booga?" and danced with Buddy.

As Nadine came from upstairs she asked, "Erica, are they here?" Max told her not to touch the dogs. "I won't touch them anymore if you touch them," Max said. Nadine patted them as Max tried to block her way and blew on her.

Sharon said, "Stinky dogs." When she was informed that this was their last visit she said insincerely, "Bye-bye dogs." She put her feet on Buddy to rest on him, then petted him.

Justin came back from Kung Fu practice and lay on top of Shadow. "This guy doesn't like it," he said, referring to Buddy who gets jealous. "No licking!" he commanded Buddy. He then made a face at Buddy and whispered to Joe, who said, "Do it. Do it!" daring him to touch Buddy's penis. Justin said, "It's disgusting." "Why look at it, then?" Joe replied. "It's funny too," said Justin. Peter chimed in, "You have one too." "Yeah, but dogs are different. Filthy animal, gross!" Justin replied. Justin hugged Shadow to make Buddy jealous.

Nadine said good-bye to the dogs and left to go shopping. Gary shook hands with Bob and thanked him, then left for his meeting. Joe tried to make Buddy chase after a hockey puck. Justin went upstairs to drop off some belongings, then returned and started to do Kung Fu moves on the dogs. "What are you trying to do to me? Maybe he wants me to rub him," Justin said as he pulled Buddy by the neck toward him. "Oh greedy animal. 'Harder, harder,' he says. Oh vicious animal!"

Peter put the dogs' heads together so they would kiss. He said good-bye to the dogs as did Joe. Justin said, "Nice meeting you Bob. Maybe I'll see you again sometime."

CATC II

The dogs came in and sniffed the floor. "They can't find any food. We just finished unit chores," Ross explained. Myron, Ray, and Darren were on their way out on 'dates.' Darren was on the unit and came out to meet the dogs with an ice cream sandwich hidden behind his back. "My dog was small and skinny. Now he's ninety-six pounds," Darren stated.

As Ross wrestled and played with the dogs, both staff and kids reminisced about their pets. Ross talked about a dog he had who got into the medicine cabinet and ate vitamin C chewables. The dog also drank Pepto Bismol, Ross said, "And his poop was pink."

Darren was running around the unit with an imitation dagger that the staff were trying to confiscate. He returned from his room with a 'Ken' doll dressed in an Islamic Warrior outfit. The doll was shaped into what Darren called "permanent splits." Darren was about

to do the splits himself, but he had to go put his Spandex on to do so. "Oh joy," a staff member said. Ross coached, "Put the pink ones on."

Ross brought out his stuffed tiger. "Someone said you can make candles out of ear wax," he mentioned. The two boys traded insults. As the dogs left, Ross looked at them. "You're not coming no more," he remarked.

CATC III

Joan appeared with heavily bandaged wrists. Tara had a sprained wrist from putting her hand through a wall. Tara asked, "I wonder who I'm gonna hit tomorrow?" Sandy said hello, smiled at us, and petted the dogs. Tara bit Bob's knee and tried leaning on him. She was given a clear limit by staff about respecting boundaries. Bob looked quite uncomfortable.

When the door opened as a staff member left, Joan went running out causing several staff to give chase. The girls commented on how Joan gets blood and 'puke' all over the place. As Joan talked to a nurse, Tara said, "Maybe she's asking for Gravol." "I wish I had some," said Sandy.

Tara complained, "You can feel Buddy's ribs. You're not feeding him enough! How come he's so tired? He's not breathing. He's dead! He's hollow!" Then the two dogs sniffed each other. Tara continued, "Oh my God! Keep your nose away from his mouth! Oh my God! That's not normal--they're both boy dogs. They're gay!" And then, "I can see his ribs. He's going to die. I'll have to keep him here. I'll have to keep both of them." Tara asked if the dogs would eat her guinea pig

or her cat. Bob thought they might eat her guinea pig. "Oh no, not little Damien!" she squealed.

Bob instructed the dogs to say their good-byes. Tara and Sandy gave the dogs big hugs and kisses. Tara asked, "If you had to put them to sleep, would you?" Bob explained under which circumstances he'd put an animal to sleep. Tara cried, "No, don't leave. No, Buddy, he's my dog!" Sandy walked us to the door. Tara followed us through the locked door and had to be cajoled back onto the unit.

The Interviews

Each subject was interviewed after the six sessions were completed. During this interview time, the subjects completed the open-ended pet visitation questions, commented on my observations of their behavior during the visitations, and responded to two structured questions, namely 1) What would you do differently if you were doing the pet program? and, 2) What was one specific memory about the pet visitations?

I will summarize each interview, and will group the subjects by their respective units. Copies of the completed open-ended sentence forms can be found in Appendix C. A box around certain answers on the forms denotes my writing--the subjects have either dictated their answers to me or have expanded upon their answers which I then recorded.

Cottage 1

Gary

From his answers on the pet visitation questions, Gary explained that when he first saw the dogs, he was a bit afraid because he didn't know what to expect (fear of the unknown). He also was interested in how others reacted to the dogs, and in the interactions between the people and the dogs.

I shared with Gary several of my observations of his behavior during the visitations. I listed his concerns about confidentiality and his interest in what I was recording. I also noted that he did not interact much with the dogs but was part of the group because of his interactions with the adults. I also noted Gary's concern about animal abuse issues, and his worry that the dogs were "on display for humans."

Gary acknowledged that he was concerned about anonymity, but was also very interested in the research process as he plans to study psychology in university.

Gary shared that he was not too certain of how to interact with pets. He believes that this is in his family background, as his mother used to be scared to walk home for fear a dog might run out at her. He said that he had had a small dog that he used to throw around, and that he hadn't known how to interact with it. Nonetheless, Gary stated that he is interested in 'the idea of animals.' It seems he can talk about things intellectually, but has trouble applying his knowledge and ideas behaviorally. "I do that with humans, too," Gary stated. "I can talk about things but if I don't know someone, what do I do? What do I expect? I guess I make

judgements." Gary also shared that he can hug a dog but cannot hug a person as easily.

On the topic of animal abuse, Gary said that his concerns about the pet visitations came at about the same time that he was involved in protesting against the aquarium and was affiliated with Greenpeace in a fight against extra packaging. He also spoke about his views on eating domesticated animals:

"With cows, there's a reproductive system. If we don't use them, they'd go to waste. Where would the cow go if it died? Into the air? Like, when we die, we donate our bodies. Maybe one day scientists will find better proteins than a cow will provide."

Regarding pets, Gary felt that there are problems in keeping them cooped up. He felt that they should be allowed to roam and have freedom of movement. He stated that he is against cages. He then reflected on his statements:

"Dogs--some should be leashed, and some shouldn't. Like humans, If you do an assault, you should be jailed. A dog, if it bites or something, it should go into a program to get discipline or go on a leash. But it shouldn't be shot like lots of people do."

I asked if he believed in responsible dog ownership. "I believe in responsible dogs, too," he replied. "We as a society want dogs to be responsible so we depend on the owner. Like our government, we expect people to be responsible, but we depend on the law to help us out."

When asked what he would do differently if he were running the pet visitations, he stated that he would ask more questions during the visitations. He would become more involved in the

ongoing conversations and would ask the subjects how they felt about the animals at the time.

Gary's one specific memory was the Ooga Booga Dance.

Joe

Joe stated in his pet visitation questions that the dogs made him feel like a little kid again, and a little nervous. He liked the dog's friendliness, and felt that they were kind.

I shared with Joe some of my observations of his behaviors. I noticed that he too had concerns about confidentiality issues, and that he mentioned several times that he had dogs that were 'shot if they were bad.' I also noted his comment, "I wish I was this popular [as the dogs were]."

In response, Joe stated that he was edgy around the dogs because he thought they were going to "do something dumb." He thought the dogs were lazy because "they were not allowed to be too active." Joe stated that he "could care less about confidentiality," but was just curious to see what I was writing.

If Joe were running the pet program, he would let the dogs roam around, and would do it on a live-in basis (for up to three weeks at a time), "to see how people react in a natural environment rather than in an artificial setting." He would also use only one dog. He also stated that it was "too concentrated with just the one hour- -I'd want to see what it's like in everyday life."

Joe's one specific memory was "when me and Peter were goofing around telling jokes. They were not really related to the dogs."

During the interview process Joe was thoughtful and introspective. I make note of this because Joe's usual interactive tone was quite arrogant and angry.

Max

Max refused to attend the interview session. He stated, "No!" definitively many times, until staff 'bribed' him with a Slurpee. He stated that filling in the incomplete sentences was "too hard," so I wrote his answers down as he dictated them orally. During the process he was very nervous, constantly asking, "How long will this take?"

I decided not to share my observations of his behaviors with him, as I felt he might find this too confrontational and leave the session. Luckily he began talking about the pet visitation experience on his own. He repeated many of the comments he had made during the visits, then added his recent experiences of abusing animals.

"It's funny the way you dance with a dog, because they have four legs; I had a dog and I danced with it."

"Remember when the pink thing popped out? That was gross. I thought the dog was horny. Shadow wasn't playful because he's neutered. My uncle told me that neutering's bad."

"When we were still at Cottage 1, I killed a bird; a baby bird that fell out of a nest. I hit the cat [kitten] at Inman. Once I threw a cat off a bridge."

"I like dogs. I wouldn't hurt a dog. Dogs are OK because they're more intelligent. I hurt the other animals 'cause they run away when I get close to them and it makes me mad."

When asked what he'd do differently if he were running the program, Max said that he'd have the dogs stay longer, for a week or so. "They could stay all day and go home at night. There should be two dogs. Buddy can come, but not Shadow."

Max's special memory was when the dogs first came in and he patted them. He thought they were friendly.

As I thanked Max for his participation, Max stated, "There's one more thing I'd like to add. I didn't like it when Nadine touched them 'cause she's ugly. I didn't want to touch the dogs after Nadine touched them because I'd get Nadine germs. Nadine germs make have to wash my hands."

It should be noted that we (the staff group) were concerned about Max abusing the dogs, given his history of animal abuse. As it turned out, other than an occasional wiping of his feet on the dogs, Max treated the dogs well. His reports of abuse are accurate. When he killed the baby bird, staff had asked why. He had replied, "Because it's invulnerable."

Peter

Peter responded to the open-ended question, 'The most important thing about the dogs was...' "having an owner, a loving friend." When asked to expand upon this, he said it's important to have someone "to care for them so they won't be homeless , and to feed them and to play with them."

I shared with Peter my observations of his cuddling and wrestling with the dogs, his comments about the cost of the dogs,

his sexual comments, and his concerns about dirt and about the dogs getting old.

He told me he felt like a "lab rat" in the interview. Then he stated that he liked touching and wrestling with the dogs. He said it would be nice to have a monkey. "They're so human-like. My uncle in China has one."

"If my dog was getting really old, I would try to give it away or get rid of it 'cause I don't want to see it die. Once I saw a mother dog eat a puppy she had accidentally squished."

On the subject of sexuality, Peter said, "Dogs have their own pleasure. I accidentally touched his [Buddy's] privates, and Justin bugged me. It's nature when I accidentally put my hand under, but when Justin bugged me I felt grossed out. He asked me to touch--you know."

If Peter were organizing pet visitations, he would bring one pet in for each resident--all different types of pets except for dangerous ones. The pet that works out the best (the residents decide) gets to be the unit pet for a certain amount of time (a month or two). The staff should check on the pet "to make sure the kids don't kill it." If it's a dog, it should be brought out for walks. The dog should be loose in the house unless a kid "spazzes out," then staff should take the pet away for awhile.

Peter's one specific memory was the dog trying to lick his face.

As I gave Peter my thanks for participating in the project, Peter said, "Do I now get my twenty dollars? Just kidding..."

Nadine

Nadine quickly answered the open-ended questions. In the discussion portion, Nadine shared that she liked the dogs' faces; they were cute. She stated that the dogs made her feel good because "they were there and you could pet them." She said she really likes animals in general.

If she were to conduct the pet visits, Nadine would have shorter visits of approximately thirty minutes long. She would invite different types of dogs--a "Lassie," or "ones more interesting, more furry." She would like to go for walks with them.

Nadine's one specific memory was Buddy licking. "He was kind of cute, but I didn't like getting wet."

I asked her if there was anything else she would like to add (as the interview was very short). "Where are the dogs right now?" she asked.

Justin

Justin completed the pet visitation questions. On one sentence, he wrote: "When I touched the dogs, I remembered my dog."

I shared with Justin some of my observations, and asked him about certain events. The themes I addressed were jealousy issues, sexuality, and training style (aggressiveness).

"I teased Bud by playing with Shadow 'til Bud got upset, then I played with Bud. It's funny. I do that with my dog--I pretend I'm mad at him then I hug him and his tail comes out from between his legs and he wags it and he's all happy. It looks real funny to see his reactions. I wouldn't do that with a pit bull though."

In regards to sexual commenting, Justin stated, "When dogs have erections, this pink thing comes out of his dick with stuff dripping out. I wanted someone else to see it to gross them out."

"Dogs do that when they get a lot of praise or they smell something good. One time my Mom was baking strudel and my dog had an erection. My dog doesn't play fight with you, he mounts you. My Dad reacts by laughing--my Mom says 'filthy animal'."

In response to my comment about his 'aggressive' tactics (I didn't use the word 'aggressive'; it's too judgmental), Justin responded as follows:

"First you use a ring choke chain when you train. You tug hard on it and tell the dog to sit. If that doesn't work, you twist its ear."

"Be gentle at first, when first teaching it, then if the dog tries to slack off, you get a little rough but not rough enough to hurt it."

"My theory is that you can be rough with labs 'cause they're a gentle breed. My dog knows when he's bad. When he's good, I give him lots of extra praise. Dogs like to please their owners."

If Justin were setting up a pet visitation project, he would ask the kids what kind of dogs they would like, and ask them how many times a week they'd like to see them. He would find a dog who likes to play and knows a lot of tricks. Justin would use a puppy because they're very playful. "A puppy would be good for us and good for them, especially Shepherd and Rottweiler pups. They need to be socialized when they're little or they'll be shy of people and they might bite."

"The girls would go crazy over a puppy. I used to do that deliberately [walk around the neighborhood] with my puppy and the girls would go crazy."

"The owner and the kids should exchange ideas about dogs. Maybe we could walk the dog."

Justin's specific memory about the visits was Buddy always trying to lick him. "It was funny," he said.

Sharon

On the pet visitation questionnaire, Sharon stated that the dogs made her feel "unpreoccupied." She also stated that the dogs made her feel "kind of important," because "they seemed to like me." When the dogs visited the other kids, she "thought, said , and felt nothing."

I mentioned to Sharon several of my observations I had made of her behavior during the study. I wondered how she felt about jealousy between the dogs and jealousy about the project because it took so much of my time. Sharon was my 'primary resident,' and I was in the role of being her primary caregiver. I noted that Sharon often ignored the dogs and regularly chose not to take part in the visits.

She explained 'unpreoccupied' as being able to block out thinking about problems for a while. She stated that the reason she didn't interact with them much was because they were "all chained up and you couldn't do much with them." Sharon stated that I was "way off key" when I asked if the reason she was not interested in the dogs was because the study was taking my time away from her.

I asked her what she would do differently if she were in control of the pet visitation project. "I wouldn't be. What's the point? You already have enough information--you spent so much time on it," she said rolling her eyes. "OK, get a pit bull. Get a vicious dog. See how the psychiatric patients take that!" she laughed.

"It might not be a good idea to have resident animals at the Maples 'cause the kids are not responsible," she continued on, more somberly. "Kids like Max and Ross have anger management problems and might be abusive. If we go as far as to have a dog in the house, why can't we smoke in the house?"

When asked what her one specific memory might be, she said it was the part when she was petting Shadow and he lifted up his chin and he looked so cute.

CATC II

Ross

In answering his questionnaire, Ross wrote about giving the dogs food and playing with them. He responded that the most important thing about the dogs was "to be gentle towards them."

I mentioned that I had noticed him referring quite often to bodily functions. I also asked Ross about feeding the dogs, playing with his stuffed animals, and wrestling.

Ross spoke about Buddy eating his earring, and how the back of his earring got nibbled off once. He also listed the three different animal places he knew of; The Vancouver Game Farm, Stanley Park,

and the SPCA. He said that he had fed the wolves at the zoo by jumping into the cage with them.

If Ross were doing pet visitations, he would let the dogs off the leash and let them run in the airing court. He would bring in his pit bull to let people know that pit bulls can be really friendly if treated right. "They are only mean if people treat them mean."

Ross suggested taking the dogs outside before they come in so they can go to the bathroom. "If they're puppies, you'll have to put down a lot of paper."

It should be noted that Ross usually has a very short attention span and needs constant adult attention. With the dogs he was able to focus on the animals for an extended period of time (ten to fifteen minutes) and was able to do so without staff intervention.

Rob

Rob was interviewed at the Youth Detention Centre. He was somewhat distracted by the photos he saw on the walls of the warden's office--the office which I was given to conduct the interview. Rob apparently recognized some of the 'inmates' displayed in the photos.

In the questionnaire segment, Rob admitted that he felt "kind of jealous" when the dogs visited the other kids. His favorite thing about the dogs was that "they were really friendly and would not try to bite or harm me." He thought that the most important thing about the dogs was "to treat them with respect."

I mentioned to Rob that I observed him making comments about bodily functions. I also noticed that he was very interested in feeding and wrestling with them.

Rob confided that he did feel jealous when the dog walked away from him toward the other kids. "Like, why is this dog leaving me...?" Rob commented. When I asked Rob what he meant by 'respect,' he replied, "Not to abuse them in any way or to hit them or smack them or pull their ears."

If he were to do the visits himself, he would "not have the dogs on chains 'cause I think that's mean." He would try some different animals, like cats, and have them stay longer and come twice a week.

When asked what his one memory of the visits was, he said, "Oh, just that the dogs were playful."

Usually on the unit Rob was aloof and uninvolved. He also was quite abusive and hostile. When the dogs were visiting, Rob became involved and socially appropriate. Although he at first 'tested' the dogs to see how far he could 'push' them, he soon learned their limits and respected them.

Shelly

Shelly committed suicide on the weekend after the first session of the pet visitations took place. She was not present during the first session.

Alexis

Alexis was discharged before the end of the study.

Myron

Myron wrote that he ignored the dogs, felt bored during the visits, and didn't like their smell. His answers seemed to reflect his behaviors during the pet visitations.

He stated that he didn't want the dogs around because they were too smelly and he didn't want to smell bad because he was "going out with some girls." (It is unfortunately true that Buddy and Shadow did have a distinctive 'doggy' odor.) "I love animals generally but these guys are just too strong smelling. I had to wash my hands."

If Myron were to conduct the pet visitations himself, he would bring cats, whom he feels are more cuddly and playful. If he brought dogs he would let them run outside. He would bring in kittens and a big snake--a new kind of animal each week. He would also bring in more animals at a time so that the kids could share the animals more easily.

Myron's specific memory was that of watching *Cheers* and trying to avoid the dogs, who were sitting right beside him.

Darren

Darren did the splits while he answered the open-ended questions. He yelled at the staff and residents to be quiet so that he could concentrate on his answers. He wrote that the dogs made him feel like he belonged with them, and that touching the dogs made him feel more relaxed.

Darren spoke a lot about a wolf pup he grew up with, and who taught him how to track deer. The wolf's name was 'Kaivik,' meaning

"mixed wolf." He asked to borrow my notebook so that he could accurately spell the wolf's name for me. He looked for his photo album which had a picture of this pup, but he couldn't find the album.

"The dogs you brought were healthy. They had no film on their eyes, their fur was shiny, they were well groomed, their toenails were the proper length, their eyes weren't glassy, their ears were pink, and their leg muscles were firm so they'd been hard trained."

"I really appreciated the first question," Darren said. He had responded to the question 'When I first saw the dogs I...' by adding, "felt that my tension disappeared."

If Darren had supervised the visits, he would bring his wolf and shepherd cross 'Magnum' in, and his pet rat. He would also bring in bats and jungle cats to visit.

His one specific memory of the visits was of "the younger one licking me in the face. I was soaking wet."

"The worst thing was when the dogs had to go. I mean, they were cute. Even the older one was cute."

Darren's general demeanor on the unit was very detached from peers and staff. Although he had limited participation in the visits, increased interaction with his peers and with Bob (the dogs' owner) was noted.

Darla

Darla remained AWOL during all the visits.

Don

Don was unable to attend visits due to his involvement with cadets.

CATC III**Joan**

I visited Joan at Riverview Hospital where she was undergoing a psychiatric assessment. She appeared quite sedated during our interview, and asked me to write her answers to the questionnaire for her. She stated that the dogs made her feel good and cared about. Several of the answers were "I don't know."

Because of her condition, the interview was very short. Joan stated that she really liked animals.

When asked what she would do differently if she were running the program, she said "nothing." Then she added that she would use the same dogs but would take them off the leashes, and would have two visits per week.

Her memory of the visits was "Buddy licked me."

Tara

Tara initially refused to participate in the interview process. Her staff tried to encourage her by stating that this study may help to obtain a permanent pet visitation program at the Maples. Tara still refused to come into the office for an interview, so I went to her on the couch. She refused to write any answers, but responded orally to a few of the questions. She stated that she felt the dogs' fur and kissed them. She didn't like the way the dogs smelled.

When asked what she would do differently if she ran the pet program, she said she would bring in "bunnies, a pussycat, a chinchilla, a rat, a mouse, a snake, and a lizard." She would also do the visits "way more than one hour per week." Her one memory of the visits was, "He [Buddy] kissed me!"

Sandy

Sandy was very compliant and participated willingly in the interview, which is unusual for her. Once in the interview office, she looked at the questions and said, "This is for kindergartners." She wrote in the open-ended sentences that her favorite thing about the dogs was "they don't swear." She also wrote that the dogs made her feel important and that the most important thing about the dogs was that they were "adorable."

The issues I had noticed about Sandy's interactions during the visits were shared with her. I listed her concern that the animals were being abused and her reaction of getting angry at the dog and walking away on the first visit. I also noted how she changed into her pyjamas and brought out her blanket to cuddle with the dogs, and the way she gave the dogs still, quiet pets. I asked her about her Mom 'losing' a dog she had brought home.

Sandy stated that she was worried about abuse because Shadow had been in the SPCA. She did not expand upon this.

She also stated, "I don't think animals have feelings for people other than the fact that they get fed."

In response to my mention of cuddling the dogs with the blankets, Sandy stated, "I do this because they're so cute and so warm. They're better than a person because they don't move."

"My Mom probably got rid of [the dog] on purpose, she's such a bag," referring to the incident of the 'lost' dog.

I asked what she would do differently if we ran the pet visitations again. She said she would use the same dogs. "They were just perfect, so calm." She would also have them come at the same time. "It was perfect, they came just before bedtime." She stated that the dogs got to know the people here. For the next visitation project, Sandy stated, "I won't be here, though."

Sandy's one specific memory was of Shadow putting his head on her knee as she petted him. "It was so cute because he fell asleep."

It should be noted that Sandy is generally very angry and often acts aggressively. She has little interest in interactions with peers and adults other than to set up negative situations. During the dog visits, however, Sandy noticeably 'softened' and exposed the nurturing, vulnerable side of herself. This contrast was quite remarkable.

Ann

I visited Ann in the Youth Detention Centre where she was serving time for assault and armed robbery. When she spotted me she squealed, "Oh, I've got a visitor!" While filling out the questionnaire, she commented, "This is cool."

Ann wrote that the dogs made her remember her dogs at home, and that the dogs made her feel "happy and loved." The most important thing about the dogs was that "they were friendly."

I shared with Ann my observations. I noted that she seemed very friendly with the dogs and kissed them. She also seemed distressed when the dogs wandered away.

She said that she really loves dogs, and that the kids should let the dogs visit other people, "unlike Darren, who always stole them back."

If Ann were running the program, she would let the dogs come without their owner because the owner made her feel that she couldn't touch them-- "don't do this and don't do that..." She would also bring other dogs, ferrets, mice and rats, and have visits about once a week. She wouldn't let them out of their cages unless she was sure that they were going to stay in control.

Ann's specific memory of the visits was, "I liked it when they licked my face. I liked it even though they stunk."

Delbert

Delbert was discharged before the end of the study.

Andy

Andy was admitted after the study began and was discharged before it ended.

Ray

Ray answered the open-ended sentence questionnaire by writing that the dogs felt "rough" when he touched them. He also wrote that the thing that he didn't like about the dogs was "it was

just an act. They had to be given limits by their master because they're guard dogs."

I shared with Ray my observations about him helping the dogs get food, and his interest in having the dogs follow his movements with their eyes. He did not really respond to these observations.

He did, however, expand upon his written answers. "Why I didn't like them was because I saw them outside and they were guard dogs. They behaved in here 'cause [Bob] told them to--you could tell it in their eyes. When people came towards them, you could tell they didn't trust anyone. They had to look back at their owner for a nod."

Ray stated that their fur felt rough because it was "the fur of a guard dog, always on edge." He liked that the dogs were quiet. "Inside they didn't growl or anything. The owner never had to give them limits."

If Ray were to run a pet visitation project, he'd bring all different types and temperaments of dogs, but the same dogs each time. He'd have the owner leave so that the dogs would act naturally, and he would let the dogs go outside and play.

His one specific memory was when he made eye contact with the dog. "He looked so sad. He looked like he didn't want to be here and wanted to be somewhere else. I felt bad that they were being bossed around, but they had that commitment to their master."

As we departed, Ray offered to help. "If you need any more ideas just ask me," he said.

Emergent Themes

Themes were extracted from the data that was obtained during the study. This list is by no means exhaustive, but it does represent the main participant issues presented within the project. These themes will be further discussed in the 'conclusions' section.

Abuse

Abuse of Animals

Abuse of animals was a major theme throughout the study. Several subjects spoke openly about their own abusive acts toward animals, while others reported on animal abuse that they had witnessed. During the interview segment, many residents suggested that the animals should be extremely well supervised during visits, so that no harm could come to the pets. Staff also expressed similar concerns about residents abusing the animals.

Animal Abuse as an Analogy

A few of the participants appeared to talk about animal abuse as an analogy for their own abuse. They were concerned that Shadow was a previously abused animal, and that he had been in the pound (analogous to being in a placement). These same subjects seemed fascinated that Shadow could turn out 'OK,' even though he had been abused. Perhaps these subjects thought, "If Shadow can do it, I, too, have hope."

In this situation, as in others, information gleaned from the child's interaction with the animal provided fertile assessment, diagnostic, and counselling material. Animal abuse may indicate

other forms of abuse within the family structure; information about animal abuse can provide useful insight into individual and family dynamics.

Death, Loss, and Aging

Death was a theme which emerged many times during the study. The death of some animals was seen as abuse (in cases where the animal had been shot), although in other cases, the death was seen as a 'loss.' In at least one case, the animal was given away against the child's wishes. In other cases, the subjects expressed concern about the dog aging (and therefore approaching death). In these situations, many subjects wanted to 'get rid of' the animal before it got too old, or, alternately, never allow themselves to get attached so that they wouldn't be hurt if the animal leaves or dies. This may be representative of the personal attachment and abandonment issues within the subjects. It may also indicate the child's developmental stage, and his struggle to comprehend the inevitability of death.

Biological Functioning

Ingestion and Elimination

Most of the subjects talked about feeding the dogs, while some had actually fed them. Many asked questions about the type and amount of food the dogs ate. This interest in feeding could be viewed as an attempt to establish rapport with the animal, or as an attempt to nurture (discussed below). A few of the subjects

performed 'experimental feeding' to see how the dogs would react to certain foods.

The subjects were also very concerned about the urination and defecation habits of the dogs. For a few of the children this proved to be a prime focus.

Sexuality

The male subjects seemed interested in the sexual functioning of the dogs. The Cottage 1 boys in particular made many references to 'semen,' 'neutering,' and 'mounting,' and joked about the dogs' genitals.

Anatomy

The children, almost universally, performed a careful inspection of the animals. This is part of a tactile response, yet also involved a thorough examination of body parts. Much of this was educational, as the subjects asked questions while they scrutinized the animals.

Acceptance Versus Rejection

Acceptance by the Animal

Most of the subjects reported feeling 'accepted' by the dogs. They attached positive human qualities to the animals, and felt that the dogs were 'good,' 'kind,' and 'loving.'

Acceptance of the Animal

The subjects seemed to accept the dogs the way they were. A few complained about the dogs' odor, but most seemed to overlook this and other 'faults.' Many treated the animals as they themselves would like to have been treated.

Perceived Rejection by the Animal

Only one subject felt rejected by the dogs, and this was, thankfully, short-lived. Because these clients have such low self-esteem, any perceived rejection becomes traumatic.

Another subject expressed some anger that a resident kept 'stealing' the dogs, but she did not seem to perceive this as a rejection by the dogs. One boy discussed feeling 'let down' when the dogs walked away from him.

A Cottage 1 boy attributed his abuse of animals (historic) to his feelings of rejection by them. He stated that when these animals ran away from him, it made him mad so he hurt them.

Rejection of the Animal

Only one resident rejected the dogs' advances. He feared that the odor of the animals on his hands would 'turn off' girls. He did, however, state that it was 'nothing personal' against these animals.

Nurturance

As the children nurtured the dogs, they also appeared to nurture themselves (via the dogs). This dog-child bond appeared reciprocal in nature.

Nurturing activities took the form of feeding, grooming, cuddling, and playing. Close proximity and increased tactile involvement were noted. Many of the children went into a 'trance-like' state while petting the dogs. They also seemed to derive a sense of security and serenity in the presence of these animals. During play the children became immersed in the activity, and were free from judgement or repercussion from the animals.

Power and Control

Power Over the Animal

Children need to have an effect on other things. Through the dogs, the subjects were able to instruct the animals to do specific tricks and respond in certain ways. They were listened to.

The children also engaged in wrestling behaviors with the dogs. At first, the wrestling was quite aggressive, but as the dogs reacted with similar force, the 'testing' ended and respect developed.

The Animal as a Symbol of Power

Many of the subjects talked about owning or wanting animals who were fierce and scary. Through these animals, the children could attain status and create a sense of physical security. Many children also mentioned unusual animals--having such an animal meant being 'unique' and was seen as an attribute which forces social recognition and provides personal power.

Control Over the Environment

A few of the subjects discussed having a fierce animal to serve as an extension of themselves, causing the subjects to be perceived as tough and therefore feared in their environment. One boy spoke about having a cute puppy to attract the girls, thereby using the animal to control (manipulate) the interactions within his social environment.

Freedom Versus Confinement

A dominant theme was the concept of freedom. Many of the subjects commented on how it was cruel to keep animals on a leash or in a cage. Some believed the the dogs were being oppressed by their owner. Many of the children, especially those in the locked units and at the Youth Detention Centre, had strong views about confinement. Some felt that the dogs should be 'free,' while others felt that the dogs should be carefully supervised for their own protection. This group recommended strict control until the animals proved that they were responsible. These comments appeared to be projective statements reflecting the subjects' perceptions of their own control needs.

Anthropomorphism and Projection

Anthropomorphism

The subjects attributed many human-like qualities to the dogs. When the dogs performed human-like behaviors, they were perceived as 'good.' Alternately, when they acted like 'animals,' their behaviors were judged 'bad.' Almost all the children believed that

the dogs had emotions and feelings of a human nature, and believed that the dogs were motivated by such emotions.

Projection

One of the reasons that pet-facilitated therapy appears to be such a valuable tool is because people project their desires, fears, and needs onto the pet. In this study, there were numerous examples of the subjects' speaking on two levels; as they addressed the dogs they also addressed their own issues. This type of interaction provides rich material for counselling.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, I will provide an overview of the Maples Project and discuss the perceived benefits of the pet visitations. I will also offer recommendations for future programs and subsequent research.

Overview of the Maples Project

The results of the Maples Project wholeheartedly supported the current theories of pet-facilitated therapy as presented in the literature. With the exception of one subject, all the children reported benefits from the pet visitations. The staff were also overwhelmingly in favor of the pet visitation program, and provided information regarding the perceived benefits observed during the study.

Many of the themes described above which emerged during the visits and interviews perfectly matched the expected benefits of PFT. The dogs in this study provided unconditional positive regard and acted as social catalysts. For many of the attention deficit disordered children, the interactions with the animals diverted attention away from negative behaviors and increased their attention spans.

Throughout the visits, the subjects demonstrated their ability to practice empathy and accept the 'faults' of the animals. They also explored the issues of sexuality and the facts of life and death.

Many of the children used the animals as transitional objects--as intermediaries for expressing ideas. They also projected many of their traits and ideas onto the animals.

The dogs provided a needed vehicle for tactile stimulation and play. They provided 'acceptable' touching for the males, a phenomenon noted by Katcher (1984). Several children reported feeling more secure when the dogs were present. Increased social interaction, increased play, and decreased limit setting were also noted.

The dogs offered a nonthreatening relationship for the children. Many schizophrenic and otherwise thought disordered clients find the therapist ego too strong, yet can enter into a relationship with a dog without being overwhelmed.

The line staff at the Maples offered some specific observations regarding the benefits of the pet visitations. They noted that the dogs greatly increased the attention span for their boys. The presence of the dogs noticeably reduced the anxiety level in the units, and the visits were particularly helpful if they happened right before bedtime. (Many 'disturbed' children have great difficulty settling in at bedtime.) The staff also noticed that the dog visitations acted as an impromptu incentive system for 'good behavior.' Apparently the children wanted to be in good shape so that they would be able to visit with the dogs.

The Maples staff also mentioned that the presence of the dogs encouraged social interaction in a natural way (the pet as a social catalyst). It appeared that the residents had a focal point and jointly shared this experience with one another.

One staff member noted that the dogs could be utilized as a teaching tool to discuss biology and the facts of life. He also noted that the dogs could be used to reflect back to the child the impact

that the child had on others. (The example this staff member gave was when the dogs cowered while one of the residents screamed at a peer--the resident was appalled that she had scared the dogs with her behavior.)

The areas which I found most fascinating and which were somewhat unexpected were the many examples of clear-cut projective statements. The children seemed to project their own issues and concerns onto the animal. This 'projection' took place so openly that a therapist could see these analogies clearly. Children who were normally well defended seemed unaware that they were openly addressing issues which they had previously kept well hidden. As a counsellor, I found this opportunity to address crucial issues invaluable.

I also realized during the study that PFT could be very useful in the assessment process. The child's interactive style with the dogs seemed to accurately reflect his/her interactive style with others, and could mirror family issues. "[Such] information could act as an external reflection of similar phenomena within the 'family' dynamic (Hutton, 1983)."

I was surprised by the severity and sheer number of animal abuse stories offered by the subjects. In a study done by Robin (1983), the most striking difference between delinquent and non-delinquent populations was the number of delinquent youths whose special pet was killed accidentally or on purpose. In the Maples study, the stories about the deaths of pets were mainly historical. Yet during my time at the Maples, I have heard of many instances of

small pets being killed or tortured. Fish, birds, and rats have all met an early death at the hands of residents.

Another major factor that I noticed during the pet visitations was the intense neediness that emerged when the children interacted with the dogs. The animals seemed to provide some of the largely unmet emotional needs for these youth. The children appeared more sensitive and vulnerable when interacting with the dogs, as if the weight of their protective shields had been lifted, and the 'real' person was allowed to surface.

If I were to run another pet visitation program, I would be certain to play the role of 'counsellor' rather than that of 'researcher.' I found the many 'missed' opportunities difficult, for I could not follow up on important issues due to my 'researcher' position. The children's concern about 'being studied' would also be alleviated.

I would make certain to run the visitation program considerably longer--for at least twelve weeks. This longer period would allow for stronger relationships to develop between the pets and the residents. It would also more clearly indicate whether the interest in the pet visitations was because it was a new stimulus (through the introduction of Bob and the dogs), or because the children truly appreciated the time spent with the animals.

Recommendations

If one were interested in setting up a pet visitation program for conduct and thought disordered youth in a treatment centre, I would strongly recommend large, durable dogs. Two dogs can offer

valuable insight into how the children perceive relationships (jealousy, sibling rivalry, etc.). The dogs should fit the profile for a therapy animal (Levinson, 1972a, p. 180). They should interact well, be sensitive and playful, behave affectionately, know tricks, and be obedient.

My belief is that therapy animals must be strong enough to defend themselves to some degree, and must be highly interactive. Any animal who is vulnerable or unattractive to the residents may meet with harm. I also firmly believe that the animals should be carefully supervised at all times. I do not necessarily believe that the animals should stay on a leash, but I do emphasize that the animals should remain in control at all times.

I recommend running the visits for a period of at least twelve weeks, as discussed above. I feel as though the one hour per week visitation schedule worked well.

When issues arise while the pet visitations are ongoing, I recommend trying to deal with the issues contemporaneously. If the issues are a group concern, discussion could take place immediately. If they are more private or sensitive topics, perhaps the individuals could be taken aside and the issues discussed privately at the soonest convenient time.

One element which should not forego mention is the professional recognition that the subjects themselves are perhaps the best 'researchers' and 'program developers' available. It is they who truly know if a project or theory 'works.' By asking the participants for their input, we not only gather premium

information, but our interest in client views serves to empower these individuals.

I encourage other researchers to replicate this study, perhaps with a larger number of subjects. It would be interesting to carefully examine the differences between the conduct disordered and thought disordered populations in terms of their interactions with the pets. Analysis of the results across gender may also provide new insights.

On a broader scale, the effects of the human-animal bond need to be further researched. The formation of policies and laws supporting pet ownership is imperative as animals become a more integral part of our living environment (Robin, 1983).

I wish well all those individuals who continue to contribute to the field of pet-facilitated therapy. The human-companion animal bond is a powerful phenomenon worthy of greater recognition and acceptance.

REFERENCES

- Bergler, R. (1982). Psychologie in wirtschaft und gesellschaft. Koln: Dt. Inst. Verl.
- Bergler, R. (1988). Man and dog: The psychology of a relationship. New York: Howell.
- Bossare, J. H. S. (1944). The mental hygiene of owning a dog. Mental Hygiene, 28, 408.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment and loss. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Brickel, C. M. (1980/81). A review of the roles of pet animals in psychotherapy and with the elderly. International Journal of Aging and Human Development./ International Journal of Aging, 12, 119-128.
- Brickel, C. M. (1982). Pet-facilitated psychotherapy: A theoretical explanation via attention shifts. Psychological Reports, 50, 71-74.
- Cass, J. (1981). Pet-facilitated therapy in human health care. In B. F. Fogle (Ed.), Interrelations between people and pets. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Corson, S.A., Corson, E.O., Gwynne, P.H., & Arnold, E. (1977). Pet dogs as nonverbal communication links in hospital psychiatry. Comprehensive Psychiatry, 18, 61-72.
- Corson, S.A., & Corson, E.O. (1980). Ethological and nonverbal communication in mental health. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Fogle, B. (Ed.). (1981). Interrelations between people and pets. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Fox, M. (1975). Pet-owner relations. In R. S. Anderson (Ed.), Pet animals in society. London: Bailliere Tindall.
- Frith, G. H. (1982). Pets for handicapped children: A source of pleasure, responsibility, and learning. Pointer, 1, 24-27.

- Griffin, D. (1976). The question of animal awareness: Evolutionary continuity of mental experience. New York: Rockefeller University Press.
- Herzog, H. A. Jr., & Burghardt, G. M. (1987). Are we ready for a theory of human-animal relations? Anthrozoos, 1, 129-130.
- Jourard, E. M. (1974). Healthy personality. New York: MacMillan.
- Katcher, A. H. (1984). Untitled lecture presented at annual meeting of American Psychiatric Association, Los Angeles, CA.
- Kidd, A. H., & Kidd, R. M. (1984). Animals: Best friends and good medicine. In 1985 medical and health annual, (pp.90-105). Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica.
- Kidd, A. H., & Kidd, R. M. (1987). Seeking a theory of the human/animal companion bond. Anthrozoos, 1(3), 126-137.
- Kusnetzoff, J. C. (1982). Un doberman en la transferencia? Revisita de Psicoanalisis, 2/3, 369-385.
- Levinson, B. M. (1962). The dog as a co-therapist. Mental Hygiene, 46, 59-65.
- Levinson, B. M. (1964). Pets: A special technique in child psychotherapy. Mental Hygiene, 48, 243-248.
- Levinson, B. M. (1965). The veterinarian and mental hygiene. Mental Hygiene, 49, 320-323.
- Levinson, B. M. (1969a). Pets and old age. Mental Hygiene, 3, 364-368.
- Levinson, B. M. (1969b). Pet-owned child psychotherapy. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Levinson, B. M. (1970). Pets, child development and mental illness. Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association, 157, 1759-1766.
- Levinson, B. M. (1971). Household pets in training schools serving delinquent children. Psychological Reports, 2, 475-481.

- Levinson, B. M. (1972a). Pets and human development. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Levinson, B. M. (1972b). Man, animal, nature. Modern Veterinarian Practice, 4, 35-41.
- Levinson, B. M. (1975). Pets and Environment. In R. S. Anderson (Ed.), Pet animals and society. London: Bailliere Tindal.
- Levinson, B. M. (1978). Pets and personality development. Psychological Reports, 42, 1031-1038.
- Levinson, B. M. (1982). The child and his pet: A world of nonverbal communication. In S. A. Corson, & E. O. Corson (Eds.), Ethology and nonverbal communication in mental health. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Li, P.S. (1981). Social research methods. Toronto: Butterworths.
- Lorenz, K. (1952). King Solomon's ring. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
- Lorenz, K. (1953). Man meets dog. New York: Penguin Books.
- McBurney, D. H. (1983). Experimental psychology. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- McCall, G. C., & Simmons, J.L. (1969). Issues in participant observation: A text and reader. Reading Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- Montagu, A. (1971). Touching: The human significance of skin. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mugford, R. (March 23-25, 1979). Basis of the normal and abnormal pet/owner bond. Proceedings of meeting of group for the study of human companion animal bond. Dundee, Scotland.
- Murstein, B. (1970). Stimulus - value - role: A theory of marital choice. Journal of Marriage and Family, 32, 465-481.
- Neulinger, J. (1980). To leisure: An introduction. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Robin, M., ten Bense, R., Quigley, J. S., & Anderson, R. K., (1983). Childhood pets and the psychosocial development of adolescents. In A. H. Katcher, & A. M. Beck (Eds.), New perspectives on our lives with companion animals. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Rollin, B. E. (1983). Morality and the human-animal bond. In A. H. Katcher, & A. M. Beck (Eds.), New perspectives on our lives with companion animals. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Ryngerson, E. K. (1978). Humans and pets and attachment. British Journal of Psychiatry, 133, 550-555.
- Searls, H. F. (1960). The nonhuman environment. New York: International University Press.
- Sherick, I. (1981). The significance of pets for children: Illustrated by latency-age girl's use of pets in her analysis. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 36, 193-215.
- Steinbeck, J. (1941). The log from the Sea of Cortez. New York: Viking Press.
- Strauss, A., Corbin, J. (1990) Basics of qualitative research : Grounded theory procedures and techniques. London: Sage Publications.
- Teutsch, G. M. (1980). Kinder und tiere: Von der erziehung zu mitgeschopflichem verhalten. Unsere Jugend, 32, 435-455.
- Tinbergen, N. (1951). The study of instinct. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tukey, J.W. (1977). Exploratory data analysis. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Van Maanen, J., Dabbs, J. M. Jr., & Faulkner, R. R. (1982). Varieties of qualitative research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

- Voith, V. L. (1981). Attachment between people and their pets: Behavior problems of pets that arise from the relationship between pets and people. In B. F. Fogle (Ed.), Interrelations between people and pets. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Winch, R. F. (1958). Mate selection. New York: Harper & Row.
- Wolfe, J. (1977). The use of pets as transitional objects in adolescent interpersonal functioning. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Columbia.
- Woloy, E. M. (1990). The symbol of the dog in the human psyche: A study of the human-dog bond. Wilmette, IL: Chiron Publications.

Appendix A : Consent Form

Erica A. Copley, M.A. Candidate
 Department of Counselling Psychology
 University of British Columbia
 (604) 775-0701

Dr. Norm Amundson, Thesis Supervisor
 Department of Counselling Psychology
 University of British Columbia
 (604) 822-6757

Pet Facilitated Therapy: The Maples Project Informant Consent Form

I, _____, agree to take part in the Maples Pet Visitation Project.

I understand that my involvement in this project is completely voluntary (that I am free to stop seeing the pet any time I wish and that doing so will not affect my treatment at Maples), and that any information I provide will remain confidential and anonymous, so that no one (other than Erica Copley) will be able to find out what I said. All information gathered from this project will be destroyed after the report has been written.

I understand that the Project will take one hour per week for six weeks, in which a dog will visit my unit at Maples. I also understand that there will be two interviews at the end of the Project which will last about one hour each. The observations made and the information gathered from watching you interact with the dog will be used to write a thesis about 'pet-facilitated therapy'.

I have received a copy of this form.

Resident's signature:

Guardian's signature:

Dated:

(If you have any questions about this project, please call Erica Copley at the number shown at the beginning of this form.)

Appendix B
PET VISITATION QUESTIONS

When I first saw the dogs I

When I touched the dogs I ...

The dogs made me feel ...

When the dogs came towards me ...

When the dogs visited the other kids ...

My favorite thing about the dogs was...

The thing I didn't like about the dogs was ...

The most important thing about the dogs was ...

PET VISITATION QUESTIONS

Gary

When I first saw the dogs I felt a little bit strang

- fear of unknown → didn't know what to expect

When I touched the dogs I ... don't really know

The dogs made me feel ... don't really know

When the dogs came towards me ... alright

When the dogs visited the other kids ... it made me feel
good to see how other people
react

My favorite thing about the dogs was... don't really know

The thing I didn't like about the dogs was ... don't really know

The most important thing about the dogs was ... how they
reacted. For me to see how they
reacted.

- interested in interactions

PET VISITATION QUESTIONS

Joe

11

116

When I first saw the dogs I ... ~~was~~ was glad to see them.

When I touched the dogs I ... ~~nothing nothing~~

The dogs made me feel ... like a little kid again, and a little nervous

When the dogs came towards me ... I more or less felt a edgy

When the dogs visited the other kids ... (Don't know)

My favorite thing about the dogs was... their friendliness

The thing I didn't like about the dogs was ... they were lazy

The most important thing about the dogs was ... they were kind

PET VISITATION QUESTIONS

Max

117

When I first saw the dogs I ...

wanted to pet them.

When I touched the dogs I ...

wanted to dance w them

The dogs made me feel ...

happy because they're fun to play w.

When the dogs came towards me ...

I wanted to play w them.

When the dogs visited the other kids ...

they thought they were fun to play w.

My favorite thing about the dogs was...

they were playful.

The thing I didn't like about the dogs was ...

when they licked me.

The most important thing about the dogs was ...

they're friendly

When I first saw the dogs I really wanted to touch and pet the dogs.

When I touched the dogs I ... felt satisfied.

The dogs made me feel ... happy.

When the dogs came towards me ... I welcomed them.

When the dogs visited the other kids ... I think it was really neat.

My favorite thing about the dogs was... petting them.

The thing I didn't like about the dogs was ... its licking.

The most important thing about the dogs was ... having a owner, a loving friend.

When I first saw the dogs I *liked them alot*

When I touched the dogs I ... *felt there fur*

The dogs made me feel ... *good*

When the dogs came towards me ... *I pet them*

When the dogs visited the other kids ... *I liked it*

My favorite thing about the dogs was... *there faces*

The thing I didn't like about the dogs was ... *there licking*

The most important thing about the dogs was ... *being around them*

When I first saw the dogs I liked them

When I touched the dogs I ... *reminded my dog*

The dogs made me feel ... *good*

When the dogs came towards me ... *petted them*

When the dogs visited the other kids ... *watched them*

My favorite thing about the dogs was... *petting them*

The thing I didn't like about the dogs was ... *they smell bad*

The most important thing about the dogs was ... *I enjoyed watching them*

When I first saw the dogs I ... thought it was neat.

When I touched the dogs I ... thought that it was going to be fun having them visit.

The dogs made me feel ... Unpreoccupied.

When the dogs came towards me ... I felt kind of important, because they seemed to like me.

When the dogs visited the other kids ... I thought, said, and felt nothing.

My favorite thing about the dogs was...

When Buddy gets jealous; over shadow cause of attention; it was funny.

The thing I didn't like about the dogs was ...

that they were always chained up to each other, and we couldn't do much with them.

The most important thing about the dogs was ...

they were loving, friendly and fun.

When I first saw the dogs I gave them food
play

When I touched the dogs I ... started to play with them

The dogs made me feel ... happy

When the dogs came towards me ... They started licking

When the dogs visited the other kids ... they had fun

My favorite thing about the dogs was... they played

The thing I didn't like about the dogs was ... when it rained & smelled

The most important thing about the dogs was ...

her gentle towards them

When I first saw the dogs I liked them and started to feed them and pet + play with them

When I touched the dogs I ... lightly petted them

The dogs made me feel ... good

When the dogs came towards me ... I would wrestle or pet them

When the dogs visited the other kids ... I felt kind of jealous

My favorite thing about the dogs was... they were like really friendly and would not try to bite or harm me

The thing I didn't like about the dogs was ... they kind of stunk a little bit.

The most important thing about the dogs was ... to treat them with respect

When I first saw the dogs I I LEFT

When I touched the dogs I ... FELT LIKE BEING NICE TO
THE DOGS

The dogs made me feel ... BORED

When the dogs came towards me ... I IGNORED THEM

When the dogs visited the other kids ... DIDN'T NOTICE

My favorite thing about the dogs was... THEIR LOOKS

The thing I didn't like about the dogs was ... WAS THE SMELL

The most important thing about the dogs was ... NOTHING IMPORTANT

When I first saw the dogs I felt ^{that} ~~that~~ my tension
had ~~disa~~ disappeared.

When I touched the dogs I ... felt more relaxed.

The dogs made me feel ... Like I Belonged with them.

When the dogs came towards me ... ^{I sensed} ~~I sensed~~ that they liked me.

When the dogs visited the other kids ... I think that I felt the same
happiness that they did.

My favorite thing about the dogs was... their attention span.

The thing I didn't like about the dogs was ... nothing.

The most important thing about the dogs was ... That they were healthy
looking.

When I first saw the dogs I

I don't know

When I touched the dogs I ...

Felt their warmth

The dogs made me feel ...

good

When the dogs came towards me ...

I felt like I was
cared about

When the dogs visited the other kids ...

I felt good

My favorite thing about the dogs was...

Buddy licking me

The thing I didn't like about the dogs was ...

nothing

The most important thing about the dogs was ...

I don't know

When I first saw the dogs I ...

don't know

When I touched the dogs I ...

Felt their hair

The dogs made me feel ...

don't know

When the dogs came towards me ...

I kissed them

When the dogs visited the other kids ...

don't know

My favorite thing about the dogs was...

don't know

The thing I didn't like about the dogs was ...

they smelled

The most important thing about the dogs was ...

don't know.

When I first saw the dogs I Said , Ahh how sweet.

When I touched the dogs I ... thought they felt wet.

The dogs made me feel ... Important.

When the dogs came towards me ... I petted them.

When the dogs visited the other kids ... they investigated their ears and teeth.

My favorite thing about the dogs was... they didn't snare.

The thing I didn't like about the dogs was ... they smelt a bit once.

The most important thing about the dogs ^{were} ~~was~~ ... they were adorable

When I first saw the dogs I *felt very happy.*

When I touched the dogs I ... *remember my dogs at home.*

The dogs made me feel ... *happy and = loved.*

When the dogs came towards me ... *I was pleased*

When the dogs visited the other kids ... *I let them*

My favorite thing about the dogs was... *their fur. the feel of the fur against my hands.*

The thing I didn't like about the dogs was ... *the smell.*

The most important thing about the dogs was ... *they were friendly*

When I first saw the dogs I ... Petted them a bit and tried to play with them

When I touched the dogs I ... felt that they were rude

The dogs made me feel ... fine

When the dogs came towards me ... I petted them

When the dogs visited the other kids ... I left

My favorite thing about the dogs was... they were so quiet

The thing I didn't like about the dogs was ... it was just an act
they had to be given
limits by their master
because their guard dog

The most important thing about the dogs was ... that they are nice