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Abstract

There are a variety of studies which show the benefits of animal assisted therapy on mental health but the effectiveness of on-campus animal program interventions has not been as well investigated. In the current study, college students’ stress and self-efficacy levels were measured before and after interacting with a therapy dog or after participating in a control condition. It was found that there were significant differences for both the Perceived Stress Scale and General Self-Efficacy pre- and post-tests but no differences between the animal and control conditions.

Introduction

- Due to the vulnerability of college students to anxiety and depressive disorders, pets are becoming a more familiar sight on college campuses.
- Barker, Barker, McCain, and Schubert (2016) found that perceived stress was reduced for students on a college campus before final exams after interaction with therapy dogs.
- In the current study stress and self-efficacy levels were measured and compared between students who interacted with therapy dogs and students who do not interact with dogs.
- It was hypothesized that undergraduate students who interact with a therapy dog will show decreased stress and increased self-efficacy scores compared to students in a control group.

Methods

Participants
- Thirty-five SHU undergraduates and one therapy certified dog.

Procedure
- Students were randomly placed in one of three groups.
  - Group 1: Students interacted with the therapy dog for five minutes.
  - Group 2: Students interacted with the therapy dog for ten minutes.
  - Group 3: Students watched a ten-minute stress neutral video.

Measurements
- Students were given the Perceived Stress Scale and the Self-Efficacy Scale before the session and again forty eight hours after the session concluded.

Results

- A repeated measures ANOVA revealed that there was a significant difference between the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) pre-test and post-test but no differences between the conditions, $F(1,31) = 8.55, p = .002; F(2,31) = .13, p > .05$, respectively. On average participants scored two points lower on the post-test compared to the pre-test. See Figure 1
- A repeated measures ANOVA revealed that there was a significant difference between the General Self-Efficacy (GSE) pre-test and post-test but no differences between the conditions, $F(1,31) = 4.4, p = .044; F(2,31) = .21, p > .05$, respectively. On average participants scored 1.5 points higher on the post-test compared to the pre-test. See Figure 2
- Multiple paired t-tests revealed significant overall differences between the pre- and post-tests for the PSS and GSE but not for specific conditions, $t(33) = 3.53, p = .001; t(33) = 2.16, p = .038$, respectively.

Discussion

- Contrary to the hypothesis all groups displayed decreased stress levels and increased self-efficacy.
- It is possible that the stress scores improved on the post-test in all groups because the participants knew they had been involved in a study about stress. They also may have been influenced by the belief that the researcher would expect decreased stress levels after the study.
- Although self-efficacy scores only increased by 1.5 points it was still significant. A possible explanation as to why this occurred in the control group post-study could be because they assumed that since they signed up for a “stress study” it made them more mindful and cognitively aware of their emotions which may have helped them manage their stress after the session (Het et al., 2009).
- One possible limitation included having too few participants. More participants will be added in the future.
- Further research is important in this area to investigate if animal therapy programs on campus are effective at decreasing stress and increasing self-efficacy or if other activities result in similar positive outcomes.

Mean Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>5 min dog</th>
<th>10 min dog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Mean Pre- and Post-Test Perceived Stress Scale Scores for the Three Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>5 min dog</th>
<th>10 min dog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Mean Pre- and Post-Test Self-Efficacy Scores for the Three Conditions
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