

ISAZ 2020 Abstract Submission guidelines

Please ensure that you have read the submission guidelines prior to making your submission. To submit an abstract, please visit the **online submission system that can be found on www.isaz2020.com**

Abstract Requirements

- All submissions must be written in English, the official language of the congress.
- Additionally, all accepted posters must be written in the English language.
- All abstracts must be based on empirical research and report actual (not promised) results, along with relevant statistics and significance values (for quantitative research).
- Abstracts for all submissions are limited to a **maximum 300 words** (excluding title, authors and affiliations).

Submission Types

- Standard research abstract - Oral or poster
- Critical Review
- Hot Topic in Anthrozoology Discussion
- Other proposal (eg. Workshop or panel)

The conference always receives a larger number of submissions for oral presentations than can be accommodated and have to prioritize abstracts very carefully. Some submissions that are not accepted in the preferred presentation format may be offered a 'flash' (4 min) oral presentation or poster.

Program themes

Corresponding authors are asked to select themes/tracks (multiple can be chosen) that best describes their abstract submission.

- Animal Welfare in Animal Therapy/Assistance/Service
- Companion Animal Welfare
- Human Health
- Animal Histories
- Cats/Felines-Human Interaction
- Equine-Human Interaction
- Wildlife/Conservation
- Animal Therapy
- Farm Animal and Food Chains
- Animal Law
- Animals in Education
- Qualitative Research
- Quantitative Research
- Other

Abstract submissions regarding any aspect of anthrozoology will be considered. ISAZ welcomes scholarly presentations from the arts & humanities as well as from social, medical, and veterinary sciences.

Preparing your abstract(s)

For abstract submissions, you must be prepared to complete all required information via the online form. Please note that authors will not be able to save abstract drafts and return to them later for completion. However, once your submission shows as complete in the system, you can return to this at any point until the deadline to make amendments.

The required information fields include: Title, Presentation Type, Content (abstract text), Key words, Programme Track and Authors (including title, first name, last name, organization, and email for each author). You may first prepare your abstract in a Word document and then copy and paste your text into the online system.

Abstracts for research/critical reviews should be prepared using the headings below:

Introduction: This section can include aims, research questions or hypotheses as appropriate.

Methodology: Please state clearly any methods used, including analysis methods.

Main results/findings: All abstracts must include results, work in progress submissions will not be considered. Appropriate statistical values must be reported for quantitative studies, including p values, confidence intervals and/or effect sizes for key findings.

Principle conclusions and implications for field: The Conclusion section must provide the main transferrable/generalisable message resulting from the research reported, i.e. the sentence(s) that someone citing the study might use to describe the findings. Please also state clearly the implications of the findings for policy, practice or further research.

Any references should be included in the 300 word limit, but try not to use them unless completely necessary. Standard abbreviations may be used undefined, but non-standard abbreviations must be defined. Arabic numerals should be used for numbers except when beginning a sentence. Abstracts should not include promissory statements such as “Results will be discussed.”

Sample research and critical review abstracts can be found at the end of this guide.

‘Hot topics’ and other’ proposals do not need to follow a specific format, they are unstructured but 300 word limit.

All authors should proof-read the abstract for grammar and spelling. If English is not the author(s)’ first language it is recommended that the author(s) have the final abstract proof-read by someone fluent in English before the abstract is submitted.

Other information that you will be asked to provide are:

- Whether you are a current ISAZ student wishing the abstract to be considered for best student presentation (oral or poster)
- Permission to publish
- Confirmation an author will attend
- Author approval to submit

Once an abstract form is submitted, you will receive an automated confirmation email including the abstract identification number and abstract text. You will be able to log in and edit your submission up to the deadline date. **Please contact us on d.c.gallard@ljmu.ac.uk should you wish to withdraw you abstract.** Notifications of acceptance will be sent **during early March 2020.**

Assessment process

We will operate a blind peer-review for all research/critical review abstracts in which reviewers will judge abstracts on the quality of the content.

Abstracts will be assessed and evaluated by reviewers based on the following criteria:

- Introduction & background relevant, appropriate, & concise
- Objectives clearly stated & relate to background
- Methods (study design & participants, or description of review methodology and any relevant theory) appropriate & clear
- Statistics/data presentation or synthesis of reviewed information is appropriate & clear
- Results/findings clear & appropriate to study
- Conclusions are supported by the data/study design or reviewed literature
- Overall importance of the research question
- Novelty of research question and/or design (or review)
- Likelihood that results (both positive and negative findings) or critical review will have major impact on the field

Abstract submission will close on Monday 3rd February 9am UK time.

APPENDIX 1: SAMPLE RESEARCH ABSTRACT

Type: Oral Presentation

Title: The value of aerial photography in the study of bat–human interactions

Authors: **Bram L. Stoker**, Norman H. Pendergast, & Joseph A. Sokoloff

Affiliation: School of Natural Sciences, University of Wichita, USA

Correspondence: blstoker@uwich.edu

Introduction. Assessments of bat-human relations have long been hampered by a lack of suitable methods for accurately observing and recording encounters between bats and humans (Watson & Sonar, 2003). This paper describes the development and validation of a novel technique for measuring bat-human interactions using aerial photography.

Methodology. A sample of 58 Livingstone’s Fruit Bats (*Pteropus livingstonii*) living in a large (50 x 30 m.) outdoor flight aviary were observed interacting with zoo visitors using two separate methods. Method 1 involved the use of a tripod-mounted video camera that recorded interactions from a lateral perspective (TMV). Method 2 used a time-lapse digital camera set to record images every 10 secs. while suspended pointing downwards from the roof of the aviary (ADC). The ability of the two methods to accurately record the number, duration and quality of bat-human interactions was compared statistically using SPSS software.

Main Results. Analysis suggests that ADC detects significantly more bat-human interactions than TMV (Unpaired t test, $t = 8.43$, $p < 0.001$), although it is no more effective at recording the duration and quality of these interactions. While much less time-consuming to analyze than TMV recordings, a drawback with the ADC method was the tendency of bats to roost on the camera, thereby obscuring the lens. Future studies will need to consider ways to overcome this problem.

Principal Conclusions and Implications for Field. These findings suggest that aerial time-lapse photography has a valuable role to play in studies of bat-human interactions, especially where the emphasis is on frequency of interactions.

References:

Watson, J. B., & Sonar, A. (2003). *Bats in My Belfry*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

APPENDIX 2: SAMPLE CRITICAL REVIEW ABSTRACT

Type: Oral Presentation

Title: A comprehensive review of dog walking correlates for increasing physical activity of both dogs and people

Authors: Carrie Westgarth¹, Robert M. Christley^{1,2} and Hayley E. Christian³

Affiliations:

¹ Department of Epidemiology and Population Health, Institute of Infection and Global Health, and School of Veterinary Science, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, University of Liverpool, Leahurst Campus, Chester High Road, Neston, Cheshire CH64 7TE, UK

² NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections, Liverpool L69 7BE, UK

³ Centre for the Built Environment and Health, School of Population Health, and Telethon Kids Institute, The University of Western Australia (M707), 35 Stirling Highway, Crawley, WA 6009, Australia

Correspondence: Carri.Westgarth@liverpool.ac.uk

Introduction: Physical inactivity and sedentary behaviour are major threats to population health, with rising levels of obesity in both people and their pets. A considerable proportion of people own dogs, and there is good evidence that dog ownership is associated with higher levels of physical activity. However not all owners walk their dogs regularly. This paper comprehensively reviews the evidence for correlates of dog walking so that effective interventions may be designed to increase the physical activity of dog owners, and improve dog welfare.

Methodology: Published findings from 1990–2012 in both the human and veterinary literature were collated and reviewed for evidence of factors associated with objective and self-reported measures of dog walking behaviour, or reported perceptions about dog walking. Study designs included cross-sectional observational, trials and qualitative interviews.

Main Findings: There is good evidence that the strength of the dog-owner relationship, through a sense of obligation to walk the dog, and the perceived support and motivation a dog provides for walking, is strongly associated with increased walking. The perceived exercise requirements of the dog may also be a modifiable point for intervention. In addition, access to suitable walking areas with dog supportive features that fulfill dog needs such as off-leash exercise, and that also encourage human social interaction, may be incentivising.

Principal Conclusions and Implications for Field: Current evidence suggests that dog walking may be most effectively encouraged through targeting the dog-owner relationship and by providing dog-supportive physical environments. Future studies must be of a higher quality methodological design, including accounting for the effects of confounding, and longitudinal designs and testing of interventions in a controlled design in order to infer causality.