

Pet Animals: To Own and To Love

Luz Remedios Quito Del Rosario,MA

Antonio Yango,PhD

Rissel C.Dela Paz

Jodel Clarissa B.Margate

Eire Ramallosa P. May

Abstract

This study aimed to determine the perceived impact of pet animals on the owners' psychological, physiological, social, and emotional well-being in the select barangays in Biñan, Laguna. What you may not know is that pets can also improve our emotional and mental well-being; reduce anxiety levels, fight depression, enhance family life and childhood development. They make us laugh, relax us and divert us from daily concerns and stressors (Schivinski, 2009). The respondents of the study were the one hundred (100) pet owners; the study used purposive sampling technique and descriptive research design as well. Most of the respondents were 40 years old and above, male, single, dog owner, and owned a pet for 3 years and below, had high level of attachment to their pets in terms of time, money, and love and care, agreed that their pets had a positive impact to their psychological, physiological, social, and emotional well-being, significant difference was found in their level of attachment in terms of time when grouped according to age, love and care when grouped according to the type of pet they owned as well as in the perceived impact of pet animals on their social well-being when grouped according to age and significant relationship between their level of attachment to their pet animals and the perceived impact on their well-being were observed. Better psychological well-being of the respondents is caused by spending more time for their pets. On the other hand, better physiological, social, and emotional well-being is caused by showing more love and care for their pets.

Keywords: emotional, physiological, psychological, social, well-being

INTRODUCTION

Many are aware of the physical and medical benefits of owning a pet, such as a reduction in blood pressure and cholesterol, fewer visits to the doctor, even an increase in physical activity and exercise. Anyone who has ever cared for a pet animal understands their role in our overall health as they offer unconditional love and attention, they make us laugh, relax us and divert us from daily concerns and stressors. Research has documented many psychological benefits of pet ownership. The first advantage is the reduction in loneliness, not only because they provide companionship, but they also often persuade human contact, interaction and socialization. Most recently, research has linked family ownership of a pet with high self-esteem among young

children and teen-agers, especially in cognitive development. In addition, children with pets at home score significantly higher on empathy and pro-social skills such as speech, writing and poetry than non-pet owners. These studies only scratched the surface of the growing body of scientific research that has been conducted about the beneficial effects animals have on our physical, emotional and mental well-being to both adults and children. Often people are encouraged to get a pet after experiencing the death of a loved one. Man's "best friend" has sure proven his loyalty and devotion to the human race in unperceived ways never thought possible. With all these premises, this study determined the perceived impact of pet animals to their owners' psychological, physiological, social, and emotional well-being. Specifically, it answered questions on the profile of the respondents as to age, gender, civil status, type of pet animal owned and duration of pet ownership, their level of attachment to their pet animals along time, money and love and care, the perceived impact of pet animals to their well-being along psychological, physiological, social and emotional, the significant difference in their level of attachment to their pet animals when grouped according to profile variables, the significant difference in the perceived impact of pet animals on their well-being when grouped according to profile variables and how their level of attachment to pet animals related to their perceived impact of well-being.

This study was anchored on Bowlby's Attachment Theory which theorizes that attachment is a "lasting psychological connectedness between human beings" and it holds that mothers who are available to their babies and responsive to their needs create feelings of security in their kids. Likewise, the baby knows he can count on his mother to take care of him, which gives him a solid foundation from which he can go out and explore the world (Becker, 2012).

Literature and studies were presented to support the study about the impact of the pets to their owners' well-being. This was composed of facts to which the study is essentially related. Written publications like books and journals, and internet websites were used to come up with good reviews of related literature and studies. Hernandez-Kahayon & Villacarlos-Berba, (2004) mentioned that psychological health is a state of good adjustment with a subjective state of well-being, enjoyment in living and feeling that one is exercising his talents and abilities. As to Green & Hardman(2005), health benefits of being physiologically active are well known and the evidence suggests that being physically active can help in both the prevention and treatment of many common, but serious, health conditions. Health and happiness are influenced not only by

social cognition but also by social relations and people who enjoy close, supportive relationships are at less risk for illness and premature death (Myers, 2005).

For many people, life without a pet would be unthinkable for pets provide companionship, affection and protection and they can become playmates and partners, with unique bonds being formed between humans and the animals, which become essential parts of their lives (FEDIAF, 2001). As mentioned by O'Haire (2009), pet owners spend large amount of money, time, and energy on their pets that seem to give no useful value in return. They allow them to live in their homes for free, pay for their food and medical bills, and sometimes purchase toys and accessories for them. On the other hand, Wells (2011) posited that the evidence in support of animals promoting human well-being is fairly convincing and some benefits may arise from the mere provision of companionship. It appears that the presence of another living being can help to reduce loneliness and feelings of isolation thus pets may be particularly advantageous for people living alone. People keep pets for companionship, recreation and protection, rather than for the specific purpose of enhancing their health. (Smith, 2012). Becker (2010) comprehensively disclosed that animals have a calming influence on people. This calming effect can be used as protection against loneliness, depression, and anxiety in people. Pets' unconditional love and acceptance solve issues of people who are living alone or do not have close relationship with their families (VPI Pet Insurance, 2008).

According to Casciotti (2011) people with pets have healthier hearts, make fewer visits to the doctor, get more exercise, and are less depressed and pet provides a social support that can make a person more relaxed and decrease stress. Nazario (2012) gave ways on how our pets can improve our health hence he expounded that animals can make people feel good. It only takes few minutes watching a dog or cat or a fish swimming to feel less anxious and less stressed and your body goes through changes that alter your mood. A study published in the *Western Journal of Nursing Research* found that even pet fish can help by facilitating healthy weight gain among Alzheimer's patients, who often suffer from a lack of adequate nutrition. In the presence of an aquarium, patients who paced tended to sit still longer, while patients who were typically lethargic became more attentive. Both effects led to better eating at mealtimes (Oz, 2012). In addition, animals can also give you the sense of healing that your friend cannot provide you. There is an intervention wherein an animal becomes part of health-care treatment called the animal-assisted therapy (AAT) and it helps individuals develop social skills (Uyemura, 2011).

Ravn (2011), pets can affect your physiological and psychological well-being for based on the study conducted that a year after being released from a coronary care unit, pet owners were more likely to have survived than those who didn't have pets. People are hardwired to pay attention, respond to, and be motivated by animals and have increased brain activity when confronted by animals due to early relationships between predator and prey. The scientists assessed the influence of the human-animal bond, attachment and commitment to evacuate homes prior to an oncoming hurricane. They hypothesized that stronger levels of both would result in a greater likelihood of evacuating, since owners should want to get both themselves and their animals to safety, and under the PETS act, are legally guaranteed the opportunity to do so (Kight, 2012).

Recently the diversity of workplaces that benefit from pets have expanded and while cats, and some birds have an important place next to the many professionals and business owners working from home, dogs seem to have found their way into the office (Phillips, 2011). Dodman (2004), food play a large role in feelings of affection between pet and owner, but animals do not live by food alone and the mere presence or touch of a person has been shown to reduce the heart rate of animals which is a sign of bonding, likewise ,they need to be emotionally ,socially, psychologically and physiologically attached to the pet owners. Like people, dogs don't simply like or love someone just because they are there.

A new report by Pets at Home on the beneficial effects of pet ownership suggests that owning a pet may in fact help children with their homework rather than hinder their progress. The survey of 1,000 pet-owning children, aged between 5-16 years old, revealed that the vast majority (79%) believe their pet friends have a positive effect on their homework and schoolwork in general (London, 2012). Dogs and other animals can help children cope with a variety of ailments – depression, emotional disorders, and even poor immune function. Pets are also good preventive medicine for healthy children to help them avoid developing allergies, increasing weight, or becoming social outcasts (Foti, 2009).

New research shows that children who live in a home with a pet during their first year of life are more likely to be healthier, compared with kids who don't live in a pet-owning household. It's more support in a growing body of evidence that exposure to pets early in life can stimulate the immune system to do a better job of fighting off infection. Specifically, kids who had a dog during their first year of life had 31% fewer respiratory tract infections than kids who

didn't live with a dog. Kids from dog-owning homes also had fewer ear infections, 44 % fewer than kids from non-dog-owning homes (Chan, 2012).

A study done by the State University of New York at Buffalo revealed that couples with pets have closer relationships and are more satisfied in their marriage than those who don't have pets (Quintana, 2009). However, it was reported that pets are sources of therapy for the mind and keeping pet means giving our life an involvement and attachment to someone else. Our mind keeps on worrying about the needs of the pet as a complete individual (Rafique, 2007). On the contrary, Moran (2012) unveiled that pet owners do the strangest things for their animal pets. This is because pets reduce stress and depression. When someone reaches middle age and menopause starts to set in, there is nothing like owning a pet that is devoted to you. The fact that pets make us happy and healthier increase the use of animals such as dogs, cats mostly, but also birds, fish, and horses, in settings like hospitals, nursing homes, schools, and mental institutions (Rovner, 2012).

To strengthen the claims of the study the following the stories and testimonies were considered: Rusty is a certified comfort dog that visits hospitals, schools, and nursing homes and brings companionship and joy to those in need. Rusty was there, with his owner Carl Maier, during the tragic event after September 11, offering comfort to those who had lost children, parents, and friends. His quiet presence and giving heart encourage them to hug him and cry. Freud also loved dogs in the later part of his life. He often had Jofi, one of his dogs, on his office with him when he was seeing patients. By observing the dog's behavior, Freud could tell if the patient might be under stress or deeply depressed (Miele & Tiegreen, 2006) and people love their pets and consider them as members of their family. They celebrate their pets' birthdays, confide in their animals, and carry pictures of them in their wallets. So when their pet dies, it's not unusual to feel overwhelmed by the intensity of their sorrow and has a lot of psychological effects to the owners. The loss of a pet may be a child's first experience with death. The child may blame himself, his parents, or the veterinarian for not saving the pet, and he may feel guilty, depressed, and frightened that others he loves may be taken away from him. Coping with the loss of a pet can be particularly hard for seniors. Those who live alone may feel a loss of purpose and emptiness. The pet's death may also trigger painful memories of other's loss and remind of their own mortality (Humane Society of the United States, 2012).

In the same manner, owning a pet can be one of the greatest joys in life, but owning a pet isn't all positive. First, you have to consider the costs of food, vet bills, medicines, and its supplies. Next is the time required you will spend with your pet. Pets require lots of attention. If you are already struggling to find time to take a spare moment every day, or if your family is constantly on the go and out of the house, then owning a pet is only going to make a bad situation even more difficult (Ellis, 2011). Robinson and Segal (2012) stated that owning a pet is emotionally beneficial and comforting only for those who love and appreciate animals.

Lue, (2007), in her study found out that those with the strongest pet bonds are more likely to follow veterinarian recommendations, regardless of its cost. Care decisions are not necessarily based on the owner's income, but rather on their attachment to their pet and their understanding of the importance and value of their veterinarians' recommendations. Kikusui's team videotaped the sessions and measured how long a dog spent gazing its owner. Based on the analysis, the researchers split the pairs that were allowed to play into two groups: "long gaze", who locked eyes for an average of 2.5 minutes during the play session, and "short gaze", who made eye contact for fewer than 45 seconds, on average. They found that these groupings showed changes in owner's oxytocin levels. In participants that spent a long time making eye contact, oxytocin levels rose by more than 20% during the play session. In the control group, owners that avoided their dogs' gaze saw their oxytocin levels drop slightly (Callaway, 2009).

Hutchings and Phillips' (2001) study was about the effect of pet ownership on overall health and the results showed that there was no significant difference in the overall physical and emotional health of pet-owners as opposed to non-owners. The results were not consistent with the research, thus, further research should be done in this area in an attempt to replicate the results.

According to English (2011), there were three experiments that relied on surveys from pet owners as well as individuals without pets. At first, it was unclear whether people sought comfort in their pets because they lacked closeness to family and friends. One experiment with data from 217 respondents suggested this isn't the case, and that closeness to pets increased with a person's relationship with friends and family. With the increasingly urban lifestyles of modern industrialized societies, many people find fewer opportunities to interact with animals and nature. Researchers have tested this phenomenon by using a modification of the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT (O'Haire, 2009).

METHODOLOGY

The population of the study was composed of one hundred (100) adults and children, who owned any type of pet, and were from Barangay San Vicente, City of Biñan, Laguna. They were selected using convenience sampling technique and based on their knowledge of the subject being studied or information desired. The study used a self-made questionnaire for the purpose of collecting the needed data and was divided into three (3) parts namely: the respondents' demographic profile, level of attachment to their pets and the impact of pets to their well-being.

Authorization to conduct the study and administer the questionnaire was secured from the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the pet owners. Actual visit to the research locale was also done for the personal administration of the questionnaire and to ensure a 100% retrieval of the accomplished questionnaire. The answered questionnaires were tallied, tabulated, and subjected to statistical treatment then analyzed and interpreted. To guarantee the consistency of the treatment and analysis of the data gathered, frequency and percentage were utilized for the profile of the respondents, weighted mean for the level of attachment to pet animals and for the perceived impact of pet animals to their well-being, t- test for the difference in the level of attachment to pet animals when grouped according to profile variables, and for the difference in the perceived impact of pet animals to their well-being when grouped according to profile variables, and multiple regression for the relationship between the level of attachment to pet animals and its impact to their well-being. The consent form contained: the right of the respondents to voluntarily withdraw from the study at any time; the central purpose of the study and the procedures to be used in the collection of data; comments about protecting the confidentiality of the respondents; a statement about known risks associated with participation in the study; and the signature of the respondents as well as the researcher.

RESULTS and DISCUSSION

1. Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' profile in terms of age, gender, civil status, type of pet owned, and the duration of pet ownership in years.

Table 1
Profile of the Respondents

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
20 & below	30	30
21 - 39	32	32
40 & above	38	38
Gender		
Male	59	59
Female	41	41
Civil Status		
Single	51	51
Married	44	44
Widow	4	4
Separated	1	1
Type of Pet Owned		
Dog	68	68
Cat	4	4
Bird	4	4
Others	24	24
Duration of Pet Ownership (years)		
3 & below	37	37
4 – 8	29	29
9 & above	34	34
Total Number of Respondents = 100		

As seen on table 1, out of the 100 respondents, 30 percent were 20 years of age and below, 32 percent were 21-39 years old, and 38 percent were 40 years old and above. It was depicted that 59 percent were male and 41 percent were female. Most of the respondents that covered 51 percent were single, while 44 percent were married, 4 percent were widowed, and 1 percent was separated. Sixty eight percent (68%) owned a dog, 4 percent owned a cat, 4 percent owned a bird, and the remaining 24 percent owned different types of pets. Thirty seven percent (37%) of the respondents had been taking care of their pets for 3 years and below, 29 percent for 4 to 8 years, 34 percent for 9 years and above. As a whole, most of the respondents were 40 years old and above, male, single, dog owner, and owned a pet for 3 years and below.

2. Respondents' Level of Attachment

Table 2 presents the respondents' level of attachment to their pet animals in terms of time, money, love and care.

Table 2
Respondents' Level of Attachment to their Pet Animals in terms of time, money, love and care

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Indicators	Rank
I spend time...			
1. reading books, magazines, and other reading material about my pet.	2.53	Agree (High)	5
2. cleaning its shelter regularly.	3.50	Agree (High)	2
3. playing with my pet.	3.46	Agree (High)	3
4. shopping for my pet's needs.	2.92	Agree (High)	4
5. feeding my pet.	3.82	Strongly Agree (Very High)	1
Average	3.25	Agree (High)	
I spend money...			
1. to buy good quality food for my pet.	3.14	Agree (High)	1
2. to buy vitamins for my pet.	2.84	Agree (High)	2
3. to bring my pet to the clinic to be checked-up.	2.79	Agree (High)	3
4. to buy toys and accessories for my pet.	2.74	Agree (High)	4
5. to buy books related to my pet.	2.35	Disagree (Low)	5
Average	2.77	Agree (High)	
I show my love and care by...			
1. thinking of my pet while I am away from him/her during the day.	3.32	Agree (High)	3
2. seeking health care advice for my pet.	3.33	Agree (High)	1.5
3. feeding my pet with good quality food.	3.33	Agree (High)	1.5
4. bringing my pet along with me if possible.	2.79	Agree (High)	5
5. staying with my pet if it's sick.	3.08	Agree (High)	4
Average	3.17	Agree (High)	
Over-all Average	3.06	Agree (High)	

As seen, the respondents strongly agreed on the item no. 5 that ranked 1st which is spending time with their pets by feeding them (x=3.82). They also agreed on item no. 2 that ranked 2nd which is spending time with them by cleaning their shelter regularly (x=3.50), on item no. 3 that ranked 3rd which is playing with them (x=3.46), on item no. 4 that ranked 4th which is shopping for their pet's needs (x=2.92), and on item no.1 that ranked 5th which is reading books, magazines, and other reading materials about their pets (x=2.53). An average weighted mean

score of 3.25 revealed that the respondents had a high level of attachment to their pets in terms of giving time.

Likewise, the respondents agreed on item no. 1 that ranked 1st which is spending money to buy good quality food for their pets ($x=3.14$), on item no. 2 that ranked 2nd which is buying vitamins for their pets ($x=2.84$), on item no. 3 that ranked 3rd which is bringing them to the clinic for a check-up ($x=2.79$), and on item no. 4 that ranked 4th which is buying toys and accessories ($x=2.74$). However, the respondents disagreed on item no. 5 that ranked 5th which is spending money to buy books related to their pets ($x=2.35$). The average weighted mean of 2.77 showed that the respondents have a high level of attachment to their pets in terms of spending money.

It was also shown that the respondents agreed on items no. 2 and 3 that both ranked 1.5 which are showing their love and care for their pets by seeking health care advice ($x=3.33$) and feeding them with good quality food ($x=3.33$), on item no. 1 that ranked 3rd which is thinking of their pet while they are away from them during the day ($x=3.32$), on item no. 5 that ranked 4th which is staying with their pet if it's sick ($x= 3.08$), and on item no. 4 that ranked 5th which is bringing their pet along with them if possible ($x= 2.79$). The average weighted mean, 3.17 revealed that the respondents had high level of attachment to their pets in terms of showing love and care.

With an overall weighted mean of 3.06, it signified that the respondents' level of attachment to their pets was high in terms of time, money, and love and care. This is supported by the study made by Lue (2007) which stated that pet owners who exhibit stronger bonds with their pets seek higher level of veterinary care and it affects the amount of time and activities they spend with their pets.

3. Perceived Impact of Pet Animals to the Respondents Psychological, Physiological, Social, and Emotional Well-Being

Table 3 presents the perceived impact of pet animals to the respondents' psychological, physiological, social, and emotional well-being.

Table 3
Perceived Impact of Pet Animals to the Respondents' Psychological, Physiological and Emotional Well-Being

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
Psychological: Owning a pet helps me to...			
1. enhance my self- esteem.	3.18	Agree	4
2. feel more competent and responsible.	3.43	Agree	1
3. feel less anxious and less stressed.	3.40	Agree	2
4. think more creatively.	3.10	Agree	5
5. have better outlook in life.	3.22	Agree	3
Average	3.27	Agree	
Physiological: Owning a pet helps me to...			
1. become more active.	3.29	Agree	1
2. lower my blood pressure.	2.86	Agree	4
3. make fewer visits to my doctor.	2.76	Agree	5
4. get well easily whenever I'm sick.	2.95	Agree	3
5. become healthier.	3.09	Agree	2
Average	2.99	Agree	
Social: Owning a pet helps me to...			
1. reduce my feelings of isolation and loneliness.	3.60	Strongly Agree	1
2. increase my social interaction, especially with strangers.	3.24	Agree	2
3. become better at talking to people.	3.14	Agree	3.5
4. go outside more.	3.14	Agree	3.5
5. become more understanding to other people.	3.13	Agree	5
Average	3.25	Agree	
Emotional: Owning a pet helps me to...			
1. lessen my loneliness and depression.	3.59	Strongly Agree	2
2. temporarily relieved from my problems.	3.34	Agree	5
3. reduce my stress when there is a conflict.	3.39	Agree	4
4. increase my fun and enjoyment.	3.66	Strongly Agree	1
5. feel secured.	3.46	Agree	3
Average	3.49	Agree	
Over-all Average	3.25	Agree	

As shown, the respondents agreed on item no. 2 that ranked 1st which indicates that their pets helped them to feel more competent and responsible ($x=3.43$), on item no. 3 that ranked 2nd which is they feel less anxious and stress ($x=3.40$), on item no. 5 that ranked 3rd which is having

better outlook in life ($x=3.22$), on item no. 1 that ranked 4th which is enhancing their self-esteem ($x=3.18$), and on item no. 4 that ranked 5th which indicates that they think more creatively ($x=3.10$). An average weighted mean score of 3.27 revealed that the respondents agreed that their pets had impact to their psychological well-being.

The respondents agreed on item no. 1 that ranked 1st indicating that their pets helped them to become more active ($x=3.29$), on item no. 5 that ranked 2nd which is they become healthier ($x=3.09$), on item no.4 that ranked 3rd which is they get well easily whenever they are sick ($x=2.95$), on item no. 2 that ranked 4th which is their pets help them to lower blood pressure ($x=2.86$), and on item no. 3 that ranked 5th which is they make fewer visits to the doctor ($x=2.76$). It was asserted by the weighted mean score of 2.99 that the respondents agreed that their pets had impact to their physiological well-being.

It was viewed that the respondents strongly agreed on item no. 1 that ranked 1st indicating that their pets helped them to reduce their feelings of isolation and loneliness ($x=3.60$). They agreed on item no. 2 that ranked 2nd which is their pets helped them to increase their social interaction, especially with strangers ($x=3.24$), on item no. 3 and 4 that have the same rank which are becoming better at talking to people ($x=3.14$) and going outside more ($x=3.14$), and on item no. 5 that ranked 5th which is becoming more understanding to other people ($x=3.13$). The average weighted mean of 3.25 illustrated that the respondents agreed that their pets had impact to their social well-being.

The respondents strongly agreed on item no. 4 that ranked 1st which is their pets helped them increase their fun and enjoyment ($x=3.66$), and on item no. 1 that ranked 2nd which is lessening their loneliness and depression ($x=3.59$). They agreed on item no. 5 that ranked 3rd which is their pets helped them to feel secured ($x=3.46$), on item no. 3 that ranked 4th which is reducing their stress when there is a conflict ($x=3.39$), and on item no. 2 that ranked 5th which indicates that they temporarily relieved from their problems ($x=3.34$). It was pointed out that the respondents agreed that their pets have impact to their emotional well-being with the weighted mean score of 3.49.

As a whole, the overall weighted mean score of 3.25 showed that the respondents agreed that owning pets had impact to their psychological, physiological, social, and emotional well-being. This contradicts the findings of the study made by Hutchings and Phillips (2001) which

explains that pet animals have no impact to their owner’s well-being because the overall physical and emotional health of pet owners is just the same compared to non-pet owners.

3. Difference in the Respondents’ Level of Attachment when grouped according to profile variables

Table 4 shows the difference in the respondents’ level of attachment in terms of time when grouped according to age, gender, type of pet, and their duration of ownership.

Table 4
Difference in the Respondents’ Level of Attachment in Terms of Time When Grouped According to Profile Variables

Profile	Mean	Test Statistics	Critical Value	Interpretation
Age 20 & below 21 – 39 40 & above	2.9333 3.3125 3.2632	F = 3.7678	F = 3.0902	Significant (between 20 & below and 21-39)
Gender Male Female	3.2780 3.2000	Z = 0.7360	Z = ± 1.960	Not Significant
Type of Pet Dog Cat Bird Others	3.29 3.10 2.70 3.24	X ² = 6.84	X ² = 7.82	Not Significant
Duration of Ownership (years) 3 & below 4 – 8 9 & above	3.1622 3.1931 3.3824	F = 2.1962	F = 3.0902	Not Significant

Level of significance = 0.05

As reflected, a significant difference was noted in the respondents’ level of attachment in terms of time when grouped according to age (F=3.7678). Furthermore, the difference was noted between age bracket of 20 & below (x=2.9333) and 21-39 (x=3.3125). The result implied that the respondents had different level of attachment in terms of time when grouped according to age. Respondents aged 20 & below had lower level of attachment to their pets in terms of giving time than those who aged 21-39.

It was also noted that there was no significant difference in the respondents’ level of attachment in terms of time when grouped according to gender (Z=0.7360), type of pet (X² =

6.84), and duration of pet ownership ($F=2.1962$). This signified that the respondents' level of attachment in terms of time is the same regardless of gender, type of pet owned, and duration of ownership. The results support the study made by O'Haire (2009) which posits that pet owners spend large amount of money, time, and energy on their pets that seem to give no useful value in return.

Table 5 shows the difference in the respondents' level of attachment in terms of money when grouped according to age, gender, type of pet, and their duration of ownership.

Table 5
Difference in the Respondents' Level of Attachment in Terms of Money When Grouped According to Profile Variables

Profile	Mean	Test Statistics	Critical Value	Interpretation
Age 20 & below 21 – 39 40 & above	2.7467 2.8188 2.7526	$F = 0.1141$	$F = 3.0902$	Not Significant
Gender Male Female	2.7560 2.7951	$Z = 0.2770$	$Z = \pm 1.960$	Not Significant
Type of Pet Dog Cat Bird Others	2.86 2.55 2.90 2.54	$X^2 = 4.02$	$X^2 = 7.82$	Not Significant
Duration of Ownership (years) 3 & below 4 – 8 9 & above	2.7514 2.8345 2.7588	$F = 0.1447$	$F = 3.0902$	Not Significant

Level of significance = 0.05

As analyzed, there was no significant difference in the respondents' level of attachment in terms of money when grouped according to age ($F=0.1141$), gender ($Z=0.2770$), type of pet ($X^2 = 4.02$), and duration of pet ownership ($F=0.1447$). The result indicated that the respondents' level of attachment in terms of money is the same regardless of age, gender, type of pet owned, and duration of ownership. The results support the study made by O'Haire (2009) which claims that pet owners allow their pets to live in their homes for free, pay for their food supplies and medical bills, and sometimes purchase toys and accessories for their personal needs.

Table 6 shows the difference in the respondents' level of attachment in terms of love and care when grouped according to age, gender, type of pet, and their duration of ownership.

Table 6
Difference in the Respondents' Level of Attachment in Terms of Love and Care When Grouped According to Profile Variables

Profile	Mean	Test Statistics	Critical Value	Interpretation
Age 20 & below 21 – 39 40 & above	3.1067 3.2375 3.1631	F = 0.3849	F = 3.0902	Not Significant
Gender Male Female	3.0829 3.2305	Z = 1.1747	Z = ± 1.960	Not Significant
Type of Pet Dog Cat Bird Others	3.21 2.85 2.80 3.16	X ² = 10.02	X ² = 7.82	Significant
Duration of Ownership (years) 3 & below 4 – 8 9 & above	3.0973 3.1172 3.2941	F = 1.1677	F = 3.0902	Not Significant

Level of significance = 0.05

As gleaned from Table 6, a significant difference in the respondents' level of attachment in terms of love and care when grouped according to type of pet owned ($X^2 = 10.02$) was observed. It means that the respondents who owned a dog had the highest level of attachment to their pets due to love and care they showed them.

However, there was no significant difference in the respondents' level of attachment in terms love and care when grouped according to age ($F=0.3849$), gender ($Z=1.1747$), and duration of pet ownership ($F=1.1677$). It means that the respondents' level of attachment in terms of love and care is the same regardless of age, gender, and duration of ownership.

The results of the study supported the study made by Ellis (2011) which states that owning a pet can be one of the greatest joys in life, but owning a pet isn't all positive, you have to consider the costs of food, vet bills, medicines, and its supplies, and the time required you will spend with your pet. Pets require lots of attention and if you are already struggling to find time

to take a spare moment every day, or if your family is constantly on the go and out of the house, then owning a pet is only going to make a bad situation even more difficult.

4. Difference in the Perceived Impact of pet animals on the respondents' well-being when grouped according to profile variables

Table 7 shows the difference in the perceived impact of pet animals on the respondents' psychological well-being when grouped according to age, gender, type of pet, and their duration of ownership.

Table 7
Difference in the Perceived Impact of Pet Animals on the Respondents' Psychological Well-Being When Grouped According to Profile Variables

Profile	Mean	Test Statistics	Critical Value	Interpretation
Age 20 & below 21 – 39 40 & above	3.3333 3.1875 3.2789	F = 0.7178	F = 3.0902	Not Significant
Gender Male Female	3.2780 3.2576	Z = 0.2096	Z = ± 1.960	Not Significant
Type of Pet Dog Cat Bird Others	3.27 3.35 3.25 3.25	X ² = 2.34	X ² = 7.82	Not Significant
Duration of Ownership (years) 3 & below 4 – 8 9 & above	3.2595 3.1655 3.3470	F = 1.1127	F = 3.0902	Not Significant

Level of Significance = 0.05

The result showed that there was no significant difference in the perceived impact of pet animals on the respondents' psychological well-being when grouped according to age (F=0.7178), gender (Z=0.2096), type of pet (X² = 2.34), and duration of pet ownership (F=1.1127). It testified that the perceived impact of pet animals on the respondents' psychological well-being is the same regardless of age, gender, type of pet owned, and duration of ownership.

Table 8 shows the difference in the perceived impact of pet animals on the respondents' physiological well-being when grouped according to age, gender, type of pet, and their duration of ownership.

Table 8
Difference in the Perceived Impact of Pet Animals on the Respondents' Physiological Well-Being When Grouped According to Profile Variables

Profile	Mean	Test Statistics	Critical Value	Interpretation
Age 20 & below 21 – 39 40 & above	3.1333 2.7813 3.0000	F = 2.1312	F = 3.0902	Not Significant
Gender Male Female	2.9593 3.0341	Z = 0.6187	Z = ± 1.960	Not Significant
Type of Pet Dog Cat Bird Others	3.01 3.10 2.75 2.97	X ² = 2.52	X ² = 7.82	Not Significant
Duration of Ownership (years) 3 & below 4 – 8 9 & above	3.0649 2.8897 3.01177	F = 0.6891	F = 3.0902	Not Significant

Level of Significance = 0.05

As shown on Table 8, there was no significant difference in the perceived impact of pet animals on the respondents' physiological well-being when grouped according to age (F=2.1312), gender (Z=0.6187), type of pet (X² = 2.52), and duration of pet ownership (F=0.6891). It revealed that the perceived impact of pet animals on the respondents' physiological well-being is the same regardless of age, gender, type of pet owned, and duration of ownership. Freud could tell if the patient might be under stress or deeply depressed (Miele & Tiegreen, 2006) and people love their pets and consider them as members of their family. They celebrate their pets' birthdays, confide in their animals, and carry pictures of them in their wallets. So when their pet dies, it's not unusual to feel overwhelmed by the intensity of their sorrow and has a lot of psychological effects to the owners.

Table 9 shows the difference in the perceived impact of pet animals on the respondents' social well-being when grouped according to age, gender, type of pet, and their duration of ownership.

Table 9
Difference in the Perceived Impact of Pet Animals on the Respondents' Social Well-Being
When Grouped According to Profile Variables

Profile	Mean	Test Statistics	Critical Value	Interpretation
Age 20 & below 21 – 39 40 & above	3.5000 2.9688 3.2895	F = 5.6570	F = 3.0902	Significant (between 20 & below and 21-39)
Gender Male Female	3.2068 3.3122	Z = 1.0033	Z = ± 1.960	Not Significant
Type of Pet Dog Cat Bird Others	3.29 3.35 3.05 3.16	X ² = 7.62	X ² = 7.82	Not Significant
Duration of Ownership (years) 3 & below 4 – 8 9 & above	3.2324 3.2345 3.2824	F = 0.0910	F = 3.0902	Not Significant

Level of Significance = 0.05

As reflected on the table, a significant difference was noted in the perceived impact of pet animals on the respondents' well-being in terms of social aspect when grouped according to age (F=3.7678). Furthermore, the difference was noted between age bracket of 20 & below (x=3.5000) and 21-39 (x=2.9688). The result implied that there is difference in the perceived impact of pet animals on the respondents' social well-being in terms of age. Respondents aged 21-39 had lower perceived impact on their social well-being than those who aged 20 & below.

It was also noticed that there was no significant difference in the respondents' social well-being when grouped according to gender (Z=1.0033), type of pet (X² = 7.62), and duration of pet ownership (F=0.0910). This signified that the perceived impact of pet animals on the respondents' social well-being is the same regardless of gender, type of pet owned, and duration of ownership. For many people, life without a pet would be unthinkable for pets provide companionship, affection and protection and they can become playmates and partners, with unique bonds being formed between humans and the animals, which become essential parts of their lives (FEDIAF, 2001).

Table 10 shows the difference in the perceived impact of pet animals on the respondents' emotional well-being when grouped according to age, gender, type of pet, and their duration of ownership.

Table 10
Difference in the Perceived Impact of Pet Animals on the Respondents' Emotional Well-Being When Grouped According to Profile Variables

Profile	Mean	Test Statistics	Critical Value	Interpretation
Age				
20 & below	3.5933	F = 0.9630	F = 3.0902	Not Significant
21 – 39	3.4478			
40 & above	3.4421			
Gender				
Male	3.4475	Z = 0.9893	Z = ± 1.960	Not Significant
Female	3.5463			
Type of Pet				
Dog	3.44	X ² = 7.62	X ² = 7.82	Not Significant
Cat	3.75			
Bird	3.45			
Others	3.58			
Duration of Ownership (years)				
3 & below	3.4324	F = 0.4669	F = 3.0902	Not Significant
4 – 8	3.4897			
9 & above	3.5470			

Level of significance = 0.05

As appeared on Table 8, there was no significant difference in the perceived impact of pet animals on the respondents' emotional well-being when grouped according to age (F=0.9630), gender (Z=1.960), type of pet (X² = 7.82), and duration of pet ownership (F=0.4669). It reveals that the perceived impact of pet animals on the respondents' emotional well-being is the same regardless of age, gender, type of pet owned, and duration of ownership. Robinson and Segal (2012) stated that owning a pet is emotionally beneficial and comforting only for those who love and appreciate animals.

5. Relationship between the Respondents' Level of Attachment and Perceived Impact to their Well-Being

Table 11 presents the relationship between the respondents' level of attachment to their pet animals and perceived impact to their psychological well-being.

Table 11
Relationship between Respondents' Level of Attachment to their Pet Animals and Perceived Impact to their Psychological Well-Being

Multiple R	0.41845	Moderate correlation			
ANOVA	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F
Regression	3	4.4352	1.4784	6.7925	0.000335
Residual	96	20.8944	0.21765		
Total	99	25.3296			
		P – value		Interpretation	
Time		0.03715		Significant	
Money		0.35815		Not Significant	
Love and Care		0.39373		Not Significant	

Level of Significance = 0.05

As a whole, there was a moderate correlation ($R=0.41845$) between respondents' level of attachment and perceived impact of psychological well-being. This relationship was significant since P-value of 0.000335 was less than the level of significance of 0.05. Likewise, a significant relationship was noted between level of attachment in terms of time and perceived impact of psychological well-being ($p=0.03715$). This implies that the more time the respondents give to their pets, the higher the level of attachment as well as the perceived impact to their psychological well-being.

Table 12 presents the relationship between the respondents' level of attachment to their pet animals and perceived impact to their physiological well-being.

Table 12
Relationship between Respondents' Level of Attachment to their Pet Animals and Perceived Impact to their Physiological Well-Being

Multiple R	0.4398	Moderate correlation			
ANOVA	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F
Regression	3	6.9968	2.3323	7.6769	0.0001
Residual	96	29.1651	0.3038		
Total	99	36.1619			
		P – value		Interpretation	
Time		0.4545		Not Significant	
Money		0.1370		Not Significant	
Love and Care		0.0129		Significant	

Level of Significance = 0.05

Summing up the results, it was noticed that there was a moderate correlation ($R=0.4398$) between respondents' level of attachment and perceived impact of physiological well-being. This relationship was significant since P-value of 0.0001 was less than the level of significance of 0.05. Correspondingly, a significant relationship was noted between level of attachment in terms of love and care and perceived impact of physiological well-being ($\rho=0.0129$). This signifies that the more love and care the respondents give to their pets, the higher the level of attachment as well as the perceived impact to their physiological well-being.

Table 13 presents the relationship between the respondents' level of attachment to their pet animals and perceived impact to their social well-being.

Table 13
Relationship between Respondents' Level of Attachment to their Pet Animals and Perceived Impact to their Social Well-Being

Multiple R	0.3438		Low correlation		
ANOVA	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F
Regression	3	3.4080	1.1360	4.2898	0.0069
Residual	96	25.4220	0.2684		
Total	99	28.83			
	P – value		Interpretation		
Time	0.6937		Not Significant		
Money	0.4509		Not Significant		
Love and Care	0.0363		Significant		

Level of Significance = 0.05

In general, there was a low correlation ($R=0.3438$) between respondents' level of attachment and perceived impact of social well-being. However, a significant relationship was noted between level of attachment in terms of love and care and perceived impact of social well-being ($\rho=0.0363$). This assumes that the more love and care the respondents give to their pets, the higher the level of attachment as well as the perceived impact to their social well-being.

Table 14 presents the relationship between the respondents' level of attachment to their pet animals and perceived impact to their emotional well-being.

Table 14
Relationship between Respondents' Level of Attachment to their Pet Animals and Perceived Impact to their Emotional Well-Being

Multiple R	0.3433		Low correlation		
ANOVA	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F
Regression	3	2.8786	0.9595	4.2751	0.0070
Residual	96	21.5470	0.2244		
Total	99	24.4256			
		P – value		Interpretation	
Time		0.1551		Not Significant	
Money		0.6132		Not Significant	
Love and Care		0.0014		Significant	

Level of Significance = 0.05

In totality, a low correlation ($R=0.3433$) between respondents' level of attachment and perceived impact of emotional well-being was observed. This relationship has low significance since P-value of 0.0070 was less than the level of significance of 0.05. On the other hand, a significant relationship was noted between level of attachment in terms of love and care and perceived impact of emotional well-being ($p=0.0014$). This suggests that the more love and care the respondents give to their pets, the higher the level of attachment as well as the perceived impact to their emotional well-being. Considering the results on the respondents' level of attachment to their pet animals as to psychological, physiological, social and emotional, Dodman (2004) mentioned that food plays a large role in feelings of affection between pet and owner, but animals do not live by food alone and the mere presence or touch of a person has been shown to reduce the heart rate of animals which is a sign of bonding, likewise, they need to be emotionally, socially, psychologically and physiologically attached to the pet owners. Like people, dogs don't simply like or love someone just because they are there.

CONCLUSIONS

Most of the respondents were 40 years old and above, male, single, dog owner, and owned a pet for 3 years and below, had high level of attachment to their pets in terms of time, money, and love and care, agreed that their pets had a positive impact to their psychological, physiological, social, and emotional well-being, significant difference was found in their level of attachment in terms of time when grouped according to age and as to love and care when grouped according to the type of pet they owned, significant difference in the perceived impact

of pet animals on their social well-being when grouped according to age was also noted, and significant relationship between their level of attachment to their pet animals and the perceived impact on their well-being were observed.

Considering the conclusions made, the following future directions are recommended: pet owners must continue taking care of their pets by spending more time, love and care because these develop higher level of attachment that provides more impact to their psychological, physiological, social, and emotional well-being, they should promote pet ownership because of the fact that it will benefit the owners' well-being likewise it will also support their business, animal organizations may strengthen the advocacies concerning the welfare of pet animals by means of persuading people about their importance to humans, psychologists may instill the society that not only the persons around you and your environment can affect your well-being hence, animals also affect us because like us, people, they also have behaviors that contribute to our well-being, and future researchers may use other variables aside from time, money, and love and care to identify the owners' level of attachment.

References

- American Humane Association (2011) *Animal-assisted therapy*. Retrieved January 18, 2013, from <http://www.americanhumane.org/interaction/programs/animal-assisted-therapy/>
- Becker, K. (2010). *The positive power of pet ownership*. Retrieved January 18, 2013, from <http://healthypets.mercola.com/sites/healthypets/archive/2010/04/14/positive-effects-of-owning-a-pet.aspx>
- Becker, K. (2012). *How attached are you to your four-legged companion*. Retrieved March 1, 2013, from <http://healthypets.mercola.com/sites/healthypets/archive/2012/10/17/pet-attachment-theory.aspx>
- Calderon, J.F. (2000). *Statistics for Educational Research Simplified*. Educational Publishing House
- Callaway, E. (2009). *Pet dogs rival humans for emotional satisfaction*. Retrieved January 29, 2013, from <http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn16412-pet-dogs-rival-humans-for-emotional-satisfaction.html>
- Casciotti, D. (2011). *Pets and health: The impact of companion animals*. Retrieved January 18, 2013, from <http://center4research.org/healthy-living-prevention/pets-and-health-the-impact-of-companion-animals/>

- Catane, J. (2000). *Conducting research: A practical application. Revised edition*. Quezon City: JMC Press, Inc.
- Chan, A. (2012). *Pet health benefits: Study shows dogs and cats may make kids healthier*. Retrieved January 29, 2013, from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/07/09/health-benefits-pets-respiratory-infection-healthier-kids_n_1659424.html
- Corbin, C., Welk, G., Corbin, W. & Welk, K. (2009). *Concepts of fitness and wellness: A comprehensive lifestyle approach 8th edition*. New York City: McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.
- Dodman, N. (2004). Do Our Pets Really Love Us? *Women's Journal*, p. 46
- Ellis, S. (2011). *What are the disadvantages of owning a pet?* Retrieved March 1, 2013, from http://www.ehow.com/info_12052124_disadvantages-adopting-pet.html
- English, M. (2011). *Pet ownership improves well-being*. Retrieved March 1, 2013, from <http://news.discovery.com/human/pet-ownership-better-for-well-being.htm>
- FEDIAF (2001). *Pets in society: Overall benefits*. Retrieved February 28, 2013, from <http://www.fedialf.org/pets-in-society/overall-benefits/>
- Foti, S. (2009). *The positive effect of pet ownership for kids*. Retrieved January 29, 2013, from <http://www.everydayhealth.com/pet-health/effects-of-pets-on-kids.aspx>
- Global Animal (2011). *Are people and animals inherently connected?* Retrieved January 28, 2013, from <http://www.globalanimal.org/2011/09/09/are-people-and-animals-inherently-connected/50247/>
- Green, K. & Hardman, K. (2005). *Physical education essential issues*. London, U.K.: SAGE Publications
- Hernandez-Kahayon, A. & Villacarlos-Berba, M.R.T. (2004). *Psychology towards a new millennium*. Mandaluyong City, Metro Manila: National Book Store
- Humane Society of the United States (2012). *Coping with the death of your pet*. Retrieved January 30, 2013, from http://www.humanesociety.org/animals/resources/tips/coping_with_pet_death.html
- Hutchings, M. & Phillips, T. (2001). The effect of pet ownership on overall health (Undergraduate research, Missouri Western State University Department of Psychology, 2001). Retrieved January 30, 2013, from <http://clearinghouse.missouriwestern.edu/manuscripts/281.php>
- Kight, C. (2012). *The impact of pets on decisions about disasters*. Retrieved January 29, 2013, from http://www.science20.com/anthrophysis/impact_pets_decisions_about_disasters-89593

- London, B. (2012). *Children with pets 'are cleverer'*. Retrieved January 29, 2013, from <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/femail/article-2174318/Children-pets-clever-according-new-survey-chinchilla-owners-getting-best-results.htm>
- Lue, T. (2007). *Perceptions and attitudes of pet owners: The impact of the bond*. Retrieved January 29, 2013, from http://www.idexx.com/pubwebresources/pdf/en_us/smallanimal/education/bn-research-pet-owner-bond.pdf
- Macmillan Dictionary (2009). *Companion animal definition*. Retrieved February 27, 2013, from <http://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/companion-animal>
- McCardle, P., McCune, S., Griffin, J. & Maholmes, V. (2011). *How animals affect us: Examining the influence of human-animal interaction on child development and human health*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association
- Miele, C. & Tiegreen, M. (2006). *1001 reasons to love dogs*. New York City: Harry N. Abrams Inc.
- Moran, K. (2012a). *Why humans do strangest things for their pets?* Retrieved January 29, 2013, from <http://www.philstar.com/pet-life/2012-08-25/841682/why-humans-do-strangest-things-their-pets>
- Moran, K. (2012b). *Bless and pets and the children*. Retrieved January 29, 2013, from <http://www.philstar.com/pet-life/2012-10-13/858893/bless-and-pets-and-children>
- Myers, D. (2005). *Social psychology 8th edition*. New York City: McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.
- Nazario, B. (2012). *27 ways pets can improve your health*. Retrieved January 18, 2013, from <http://pets.webmd.com/ss/slideshow-pets-improve-your-health>
- O'Haire, M. (2009). *The benefits of companion animals for human mental and physical health*. Retrieved January 27, 2013, from http://www.rspca.org.au/assets/files/Science/SciSem2009/seminars09_paper_ohaire.pdf
- Oz, M. (2012). *Dr. Oz reveals why pets really improve your health*. Retrieved January 30, 2013, from <http://www.oprah.com/spirit/Pets-and-Health-Benefits-Why-Keeping-A-Pet-is-Good-For-You/2>
- Phillips, S. (2011). *Pets in the Office: Unexpected Resources*. Retrieved January 30, 2013, from <http://blogs.psychcentral.com/healing-together/2011/04/pets-in-the-officeunexpected-resources/>
- Quintana, R. (2009). *The positive impact of pets on marriage*. Retrieved January 30, 2013, from <http://www.examiner.com/article/the-positive-impact-of-pets-on-marriage>
- Rafique, S. (2007). *The effects of pets on our lives*. Retrieved January 29, 2013, from <http://voices.yahoo.com/the-effects-pets-our-lives-336227.html?cat=5>

- Ravn, K. (2011). *Pets and your health: The good and the bad*. Retrieved January 27, 2013, from <http://articles.latimes.com/2011/jul/18/health/la-he-pets-good-bad-20110718>
- Robinson, L. & Segal, J. (2012). *The therapeutic benefits of pets*. Retrieved January 29, 2013, from <http://www.helpguide.org/life/pets.htm>
- Rovner, J. (2012). *Pet therapy: How animals and humans heal each other*. Retrieved January 28, 2013, from <http://www.npr.org/blogs/health/2012/03/09/146583986/pet-therapy-how-animals-and-humans-heal-each-other>
- Schivinski, E. (2009). *The emotional benefits of owning a pet*. Retrieved January 18, 2013, from <http://www.altmd.com/Specialists/Perfect-Pet-Connection/Blog/The-Emotional-Benefits-of-Owning-a-Pet>
- Smith, B. (2012). The pet effect: Health related aspects of companion. *Australian Family Physician*, 41 (6), 439-442. Retrieved January 27, 2013, from <http://www.racgp.org.au/afp/2012/june/the-pet-effect/>
- The Free Dictionary (2005). *Mental health definition*. Retrieved February 27, 2013, from <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/Mental+wellness>
- Uyemura, B.A. (2011). *The truth about animal-assisted therapy*. Retrieved January 18, 2013, from <http://psychcentral.com/lib/2011/the-truth-about-animal-assisted-therapy/>
- VPI Pet Insurance (2008). *Pets and people*. Retrieved January 18, 2013, from <http://www.petinsurance.com/healthzone/pet-articles/pet-owner-topics/Pets-and-People.aspx>
- Wells, D. (2011). The value of pets for human health [Electronic Version]. *The Psychologist*, 24, 172-176
- Wiki Progress (2009). *Human well-being*. Retrieved February 27, 2013, from http://www.wikiprogress.org/index.php/Human_Well-Being
- Zilcha-Mano, S., Mikulincer, M. & Shaver, P. (2011). *An attachment perspective on human–pet relationships: Conceptualization and assessment of pet attachment orientations*. Retrieved March 1, 2013, from <http://xa.yimg.com/kq/groups/14571870/130135962/name/pet%20attachment.pdf>

