2016 AUCD Annual Conference Poster Symposium on Inclusive Higher Education

Poster Title: Linking Social Network Assessment and National Core Indicators for Students in Inclusive Higher Education

Authors: Laura T. Eisenman, Brian Freedman, Audrey Rossi

Affiliation: University of Delaware, College of Education and Human Development, Center for Disabilities Studies

Poster Content:
1) **What**: Explore options for simple, valid measures of the social experiences of students with intellectual disabilities in an inclusive higher education program.

2) **Who**: Student Demographics (n=12)
   a) Age: 18-24, average 20.5
   b) Year in program: 7 entering; 3 first year; 2 second year
   c) Gender: 4 female; 8 male
   d) Race/Ethnicity: 5 Black, 4 White, 2 Hispanic, 1 Asian
   e) High School Diploma: 5 diploma, 7 certificate
   f) Residence: All students resided in their family home

3) **Measures:** Two individual interviews

    a) 44 items from the 2014-2015 National Core Indicators - Adult Consumer Survey (NCI-ACS)
      i) Community Participation & Leisure, Friends & Family, Home, Choices, and Supports
      ii) Primary focus on activities in last month

    b) Locally-developed semi-structured social network interview
      i) Activities (location, integration, purpose, frequency) and the People with whom activities are done (primary relation, length of relation, closeness, and reciprocity)
      ii) Focus on activities and people in the last year

4) **How**

    a) Students completed both interviews on the same day with different interviewers and in different order

b) Descriptive statistics
  i) students' responses on each interview --attention to correspondence between students' responses on the NCI-ACS's Community Inclusion Subscale, Expanded Friendships, and Loneliness items and students' reported Activities on the social network interview.

c) Two student cases were selected to further illustrate the range of responses:
  i) John, age 20, completing his second year and reporting many activities on the social network interview
  ii) Kate, age 24, just prior to starting the program and reporting very few activities on the social network interview

5) Comparing Responses

a) Participation: NCI-ACS
  i) What percentage of students reported participation in activities on the NCI-ACS Community Inclusion Subscale items? How did their responses compare to a similar age (18-34) group nationally and in the state?

(1)   Table Data: Comparing Responses to 4 Items by Program, State, and National Groups.

    (i)   Item: Shopping

       1. Program 91%, n=12

       2. State 100%, n=159

       3. National 100%, n=9,814

    (ii)   Item: Errands and Appointments

       1. Program 91%, n=12

       2. State 87%, n=152

       3. National 84%, n=9,760

    (iii)   Item: Entertainment

       1. Program 82%, n=12

       2. State 56%, n=156

       3. National 73%, n=9,782

    (iv)   Item: Restaurants/Coffee Shops

       1. Program 91%, n=12

       2. State 72%, n=155

       3. National 85%, n=9,791

ii) In response to the NCI-ACS interview, with whom did students report doing these community activities?
- (a) All students reported doing these activities "with family and friends." One or two students also indicated on some items that they sometimes do activities alone.

b) Participation: Social Network Interview

i) In response to the social network interview, what types of activities were identified by students?

- (1) Across the 12 students, a total of n=121 activities were listed. Individual students listed 5 to 18 activities (average n=10).

- (2) Table Data: Distribution of Activities by Purpose, Location, and Integration.
  - (a) Purpose
    - (i) Social n=82, 68%
    - (ii) Work n=25, 21%
    - (iii) Academic n=14, 12%
  - (b) Location
    - (i) Community n=62, 51%

(ii)   University Campus n=45, 37%

(iii)   High School n=7, 6%

(c) Integration

(i) Integrated n=80, 66%

(ii)   Hybrid n=25, 21%

(iii)   Specialized n=16, 13%

ii) On the social network interview, with whom did students report doing activities and how did they characterize their relationships?

(1)   Students identified n=181 unique individuals or groups (range 3-34, average 15) with whom they engaged across their 121 social network activities. A total of n=201 individuals or groups were mentioned in connection with activities (individuals or groups sometimes shared more than a single activity with a student).

(2)   Table Data: Characteristics of Relationships by Type of Relation, Time Known, Reciprocity, and Closeness.

(a)   Relation
  (i)   Peers n=60, 33%
  (ii)   Authority n=55, 30%
  (iii)   Family n=41, 23%
  (iv)   Acquaintance/Group n=25, 14%

(b)   Time Known
  (i)   Just Met/1 year n=58, 32%
  (ii)   Longtime (greater than or equal to 5 years) n=56, 31%
  (iii)   Few Years (less than or equal to 4 years) n=49, 27%
  (iv)   Mixed Group n=18, 10%

(c)   Reciprocity
  (i)   Equal n=108, 60%
  (ii)   Student Receives n=41, 23%
  (iii)   Group/Can't Decide n=21, 12%
  (iv)   Student Gives n=11, 6%

(d)   Closeness
  (i)   Very Close n=87, 48%
  (ii)   Sort of/Not Close n=71, 39%
  (iii)   Group/Can't Decide n=23, 13%

c) Agreement on NCI-ACS and Social Network Interview
   i) Do student reports of activities on the NCI-ACS Community Inclusion Subscale items and the social network (SN) interview agree?

      (1)   There is limited agreement.

      (2)   Table Data: Number and Percentage of Respondents Who Identified Activities from the Community Inclusion Subscale and Other Community Activities on Both Interviews, Neither Interview, the NCI-ACS interview only, or the social network (SN) interview only.
        (a) Item: Shopping
           (i)   Both n=3, 25%
           (ii)   Neither n=2, 17%
           (iii)   NCI-ACS Only n=7, 58%
           (iv)   SN Only n=0, 0%
        (b) Item: Errands and Appointments
           (i)   Both n=0, 0%
           (ii)   Neither n=2, 17%
           (iii)   NCI-ACS Only n=10, 83%
           (iv)   SN Only n=0, 0%

(c) Item: Entertainment
   (i)   Both n=10, 83%
   (ii)   Neither n=0, 0%
   (iii)   NCI-ACS Only n=0, 0%
   (iv)   SN Only n=2, 17%

(d) Item: Restaurants/Coffee Shops
   (i)   Both n=1, 8%
   (ii)   Neither n=2, 17%
   (iii)   NCI-ACS Only n=9, 75%
   (iv)   SN Only n=0, 0%

(e) Item: Religious Services
   (i)   Both n=6, 50%
   (ii)   Neither n=6, 50%
   (iii)   NCI-ACS Only n=0, 0%
   (iv)   SN Only n=0, 0%

(f) Item: Group Involvement
   (i)   Both n=10, 83%
   (ii)   Neither n=0, 0%
   (iii)   NCI-ACS Only n=0, 0%
   (iv)   SN Only n=2, 17%

(g) Item: Vacation

(i)   Both n=1, 8%
(ii)   Neither n=2, 17%
(iii)   NCI-ACS Only n=9, 75%
(iv)   SN Only n=0, 0%

d) Expanded Friendships/Loneliness: NCI-ACS

i) What percentage of students reported having expanded friendships and what percentage reported being lonely on the Community Inclusion Subscale items of the NCI-ACS? How did their responses compare to a similar age (18-34) group in the state and nationally?

(1)   All students had expanded friendships. 5 of 7 new students reported being lonely very often or sometimes. Of 5 students in the program, 1 in his 2nd year reported being lonely sometimes although his network of activities and people were among the largest in the sample.

(2)   Table Data: Comparing Responses on Friendship Item by Program (n=12), State (n=140), and National Groups (n=6,496).
   (a) Expanded Friendships
      (i)   Program 100%
      (ii)   State 72%
      (iii)   National 78%
   (b) Staff/Family Friendships Only
      (i)   Program 0%
      (ii)   State 16%
      (iii)   National 14%
   (c) No Friendships
      (i) P   rogram 0%
      (ii)   State 11%
      (iii)   National 8%
(3)   Table Data: Comparing Responses on Loneliness Item by Program (n=12), State (n=137), and National Groups (n=6,303).
   (a) Not Lonely
      (i)   Program 50%
      (ii)   State 61%
      (iii)   National 61%
   (b) Sometimes Lonely

      (i)   Program 25%

      (ii)   State 23%

      (iii)   National 14%

  (c) Often Lonely

      (i)   Program 25%

      (ii)   State 15%

      (iii)   National 10%

6) Two Case Illustrations

a) John's Social Experiences

  i) Social Network Activities

    (1)   15 activities (5 more than average for the sample).

    (2)   6 activities were community-based and 9 campus-based.

    (3)   11 of the activities identified as social, 3 as work, and 1 as academic.

    (4)   1 activity was specialized, 2 were hybrid, and 12 were integrated.

    (5)   8 activities done weekly, 3 occasionally, 2 monthly, 2 annually.

  ii) Social Network People

    (1)   25 unique individuals associated with social network activities (10 more individuals than average for the sample).

    (2)   13 peers, 7 authorities, 4 acquaintances/groups, and 2 family.

(3)   10 were met within the last year, 10 were known for a few years, 5 long time or mixed group.

(4)   16 reciprocal relationships, 4 provided help, and 2 received help.

(5)   10 individuals were considered very close.

iii) NCI-ACS Items

(1)   Participation in shopping, errands, entertainment, dining out, community groups, and vacation.

(2)   Expanded friendships and not lonely.

b) Kate's Social Experiences

i) Social Network Activities

(1)   5 activities (5 less than the average for the sample).

(2)   4 activities were community-based and 1 home-based.

(3)   3 activities identified as social, 2 as work.

(4)   1 activity was identified as specialized, 2 hybrid, 2 integrated.

(5)   2 activities done weekly, 2 occasionally, 1 monthly.

ii) Social Network People

(1)   3 unique individuals associated with her social network activities. (12 less than average for the sample.)

(2)   1 identified as mixed group of peers, 1 as an authority, 1 as family

  (3) 1 known for a long time, 1 for few years, and the group was mixed length.

  (4) 1 person provided help, 1 received help, and the group was mixed reciprocity.

  (5) 1 individual very close.

 iii) NCI-ACS Items

  (1) Participation in shopping, errands, community group, and vacation, but not entertainment and dining out.

  (2) Expanded friendships and very often lonely.

7) Discussion Points

 a) Two interviews capture different pictures of social experiences

  i) Mundane community activities (e.g., errands) reported on NCI-ACS go unreported on social network interview, perhaps due to interviewer prompts or memorableness of activity.

  ii) More detail about integration, purpose of activities, and associated people on social network interview.

b) Comparison groups
  i) May not be similar populations; traditional NCI-ACS respondents may have more extensive support needs than students in college program.

c) Social networks and loneliness
  i) Consider adding loneliness item to social network interviews.
  ii) Administering both interviews highlights that extensive networks may not always be associated with lack of loneliness.
  iii)Consider delineating between activities conducted with families and friends on NCI-ACS.