

| | |
|--|---|
|  <p>ESCOLA DE CIÊNCIAS DA SAÚDE E DA VIDA</p> | <p>PSICO</p> <p>Psico, Porto Alegre, v. 52, n. 4, p. 1-8, jul.-set. 2021 e-ISSN: 1980-8623 ISSN-L: 0103-5371</p> |
| <p> http://dx.doi.org/10.15448/1980-8623.2021.4.35289</p> | |

SEÇÃO: ARTIGO

Fatores de personalidade, depressão, ansiedade e estresse em proprietários de animais

Personality factors, depression, anxiety, and stress in pet owners

Personalidad, depresión, ansiedad y factores de estrés en propietarios de animales

Valéria Gonzatti¹

orcid.org/0000-0002-9545-8334
valeria.gonzatti@acad.pucrs.br

Camila Rosa de Oliveira²

orcid.org/0000-0003-2115-604X
oliveira.crd@gmail.com

Letícia Oliveira Alminhana¹

orcid.org/0000-0001-8829-4493
leticia.alminhana@pucrs.br

Daiane Oliveira Hausen¹

orcid.org/0000-0002-5116-4393
daianehausen@gmail.com

Daiana Meregalli Schütz¹

orcid.org/0000-0002-9861-0063
daischutz@gmail.com

Dalton Breno Costa¹

orcid.org/0000-0002-8167-1513
daltonbrenocosta@yahoo.com.br

Luciano Trevizan¹

orcid.org/0000-0002-1819-0653
lucianoveterinario@hotmail.com

Irani Iracema de Lima

Argimon¹

orcid.org/0000-0003-4984-0345
argimoni@pucrs.br

Tatiana Quarti Irigaray¹

orcid.org/0000-0002-3078-4219
tatiana.irigaray@pucrs.br

Recebido em: 9 ago. 2019.

Aprovado em: 14 out. 2021.

Publicado em: 19 jan. 2022.

Resumo: O presente estudo compara fatores de personalidade, sintomas de depressão, ansiedade e estresse entre proprietários e indivíduos que não possuem animais de estimação. Participaram 145 adultos, entre 18 e 78 anos (M = 30,96, DP = 12,10). Os participantes foram divididos de acordo com a espécie do animal de estimação: (a) cães, (b) gatos, (c) cães e gatos. Os resultados sugerem que pessoas sem animais de estimação apresentaram mais sintomas de ansiedade do que aquelas que possuem. Proprietários de cães e gatos apontaram maiores escores no fator de personalidade conscienciosidade do que os participantes que não possuíam nenhum animal de estimação. Desta forma, há diferenças em possuir um animal. Contudo, novos estudos na área, utilizando análises de variáveis mediadoras, bem como pesquisas longitudinais que possam explorar a possível relação causal entre diferentes características de pessoas que possuem animais de estimação e bem-estar, fazem-se necessárias.

Palavras-chave: animais, personalidade, depressão, ansiedade, estresse

Abstract: The study compares personality factors, symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress between owners and non-pet owners. A total of 145 adults participated, between 18 and 78 years (M = 30.96, SD = 12.10). Participants were divided according to the type of pet they had: 1) dogs, 2) cats, 3) dogs and cats. The results suggest that people who do not have pets showed more anxiety symptoms than those who have pets. Dogs and cats owners showed higher scores of conscientiousness personality factor than participants who did not have any pets. The results reveal differences between animals owners and non-owners. There is a need for studies using mediating variables analyzes, as well as longitudinal research that can explore the feasible causal relationship between different characteristics of people who own pets and well-being.

Keywords: pets, personality, depression, anxiety, stress

Resumen: El estudio compara factores de personalidad, síntomas de depresión, ansiedad y estrés entre propietarios y no propietarios de animales. Participaron 145 adultos de 18 a 78 años (M = 30,96, SD = 12,10). Los participantes se dividieron según el tipo de mascota: 1) perros, 2) gatos, 3) perros y gatos. Los resultados sugieren que las personas que no tienen mascotas mostraron más síntomas de ansiedad que las que tienen mascotas. Los dueños de perros y gatos presentaron puntuaciones más altas del factor de conciencia de la conciencia que los participantes que no tenían ninguna mascota. Los resultados revelan diferencias entre propietarios de animales y no propietarios. Hay una necesidad de estudios que utilicen análisis de variables mediadoras, así como encuestas longitudinales que puedan explorar la posible relación causal entre las diferentes características de las personas que tienen mascotas y el bienestar.

Palabras clave: animales, personalidad, depresión, ansiedad, el estres



Artigo está licenciado sob forma de uma licença
[Creative Commons Atribuição 4.0 Internacional](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

¹ Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS), Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil.

² Instituto Meridional IMED Passo Fundo.

Human life, shared with animals, is established as a new form of existence that fulfill the current needs of particular groups of people. This interaction can bring benefits to the human being over special situations and important moments of life, such as childhood, adolescence, divorce, widowhood, and old age (Almeida *et al.*, 2009). The relationship between men and animals is one of the strongest interspecific relationships that exist and provides a lot of benefits to human physical and mental health (Almeida, 2015). The bond developed between animals and your tutors is one of the first reasons why several people have pets and explain how the animal with the past years to closed are human (Holbrook *et al.*, 2001). In addition, dogs play an important role in social relations between humans, as demonstrated in the pioneer study of Robins *et al.* (1991). In this study, the researchers observed that dogs helped their owners to start conversations with strangers in a public park, facilitating social communication. Today, is common see people sharing their lives with their pets. A study showed that 92% people view their pets as family members because pets provide opportunities for involving experiences; like to appreciate nature and wildlife, inspiration, to be playful, to be altruistic and nurturing (Lancendorfer *et al.*, 2008).

Other studies suggest favorable consequences from human-animal interaction (Allen, *et al.*, 2002; Allen *et al.*, 1991; McCabe *et al.*, 2002; Motomura *et al.*, 2004). It was also found that having a pet is associated with less chance of developing depression, a greater sense of comfort, safety, and enjoyment (Holbrook *et al.*, 2001), and reduction of stress symptoms (Allen *et al.*, 2002; Allen *et al.*, 1991). Scholars also observed better socialization of pet owners with severe mental disorders (McCabe *et al.*, 2002, Motomura *et al.*, 2004) and improved physical and psychological elderly quality of life (Enmarker *et al.*, 2015; Friedmann, *et al.*, 1980). On the other way, there are contradictory results from studies that assess the relationships between owning pets and well-being (Islam & Towell, 2013). There are some researches indicating that caring for pets can increase symptoms of depression and

stress levels in the elderly, and decrease women physical health (Islam & Towell, 2013; Müllersdorf *et al.*, 2010; Parslow *et al.*, 2005). One of the reasons for this contradiction between studies may be the selection of different designs, samples, and instruments, making it difficult to compare results (Islam & Towell, 2013).

The studies of Gosling *et al.* (2010) and Reevy & Delgado (2015) evaluated the personality of pets owners. For them, there are some differences in the personality traits of people who prefer dogs or cats. When comparing dogs and cats owners, it is clear that dog owners have high traits of extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness, and lower rates of neuroticism and openness to experience. That is, they are sociable, altruistic, compassionate, more confident, and persistent individuals (Costa & McCrae, 2007). On the other hand, those who have both dogs and cats also show high levels of extraversion and agreeableness, but they score high in openness to the experience (Reevy & Delgado, 2015), making them generally sociable, altruistic, compassionate as well, but more creative and open to new experiences and intellectual interests (Costa & McCrae, 2007).

Understanding how dogs can represent an attachment figure for people, and how human-animal relationship occurs to establish attachment, especially when distancing from pets can trigger anxiety and anguish. While the close presence of pets makes tutor more thinking about future goals, relationships and more confident (Savalli & Mariti, 2020), there are social constructions regarding the characteristics of dogs and cats perceived by the guardians, which can guide the choice of the pet considering the expected behavior of each species. For example, humans perceive dogs as more playful, affectionate, friendly, available and social while cats are perceived as more independent and distant. However, this data does not reflect reality given the limitations of studies that assess the behavior of cats (Menchetti *et al.*, 2018).

Studies that evaluate the results of human-animal interaction still provide controversial findings, indicating the need of further investigation. Apart from this study, there are only a few attempts to

identify the relationship between having a pet and the personality of its owner. Therefore, future studies are needed to explore the personality factors associated with pet owners. The present study aimed to compare personality factors, symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress, and levels of empathy between pet owners and non-pet owners, specifically in the following populations: 1) dogs owners, 2) cats owners, 3) owners of both species, and 4) individuals who do not live-in with animals.

Method

Design

This is a cross-sectional study.

Participants

The participants consisted of 145 adults, recruited using convenience sampling, aged between 18 and 78 years ($M = 30.96$; $SD = 12.10$), 107 women (74%) and 38 men (26%), most had higher education ($n=133$). Regarding marital status, 103 (71%) were single, 31 (21%) married, seven (4.80%) divorced and four (2.8%) widows. The criteria for inclusion were: (1) to be over 18 years old, (2) to be literate and (3) to accept participating in the research. The sample were divided according to the type of pet they had: only dogs ($n = 72$), only cats ($n = 21$), dogs and cats ($n = 21$), and none ($n = 31$).

Instruments

The following instruments were applied, complying the order below.

Sociodemographic data questionnaire. Used to collect the following information: age, sex, marital status, educational level and economic classification criteria (ABEP, 2008).

Big Five Inventory (IGFP-5) - The IGFP-5 (John et al., 1991). It is a brief self-report measure composed of 44 items investigating personality dimensions based on the Big Five Personality factors model. The participant must answer to statements that contain personality features using a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5 (1 = totally disagree and 5 = totally agree). The big five dimensions evaluated are: openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agree-

ableness, and neuroticism. The applied version was translated, adapted and validated by Andrade (2008) for research and psychological screening purposes in the Brazilian context. In the version adapted for Brazil, internal consistency of factors ranged from .65 to .75. While in the present study the subscales presented Cronbach's alpha values ranging between .39 and .81.

Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale (DASS-21). Developed by Lovibond & Lovibond (1995) to measure and distinguish as much as possible the symptoms of anxiety, depression, and stress. Participants should indicate the extent to which they experience each of the symptoms during the last week (previous week), using a 4-point Likert scale (0 = does not apply to me, until 3 = applies to me a lot or most of the time). the depression, anxiety and stress outcomes are determined by adding up the 21 items scores. In Brazil, this scale was adapted and validated by Machado and Bandeira (2013). The DASS-21 version used in this study was an adaptation of the Vignola and Tucci (2014) version, used for Brazilian adults. In the Brazilian version, internal consistency of the Depression subscale was equivalent to .92, for the Stress subscale was equivalent to .90, and for the Anxiety .86. In this study, Cronbach's alpha values were, respectively, .88, .83 and .84.

Empathy Inventory (I.E.) (Falcone et al., 2008). It is a Brazilian self-report instrument composed of 40 items, which must be answered using a five-point Likert scale (1 = never until 5 = always). The items measure the cognitive, affective and behavioral components of empathy and are distributed in four subscales: Perspective, Interpersonal Flexibility, Altruism, and Affective Sensitivity. In the original study, the factors had internal consistency indices ranging from .72 to .85, while in the present study the subscales presented Cronbach's alpha values ranging between .72 and .86.

Procedures

Data collection

The data used for the development of this research came from a research project approved by an ethical research committee, recognized by the

National Health Council (CNS) under the number 22090113.2.0000.5347, which comply with ethical aspects that guarantee the integrity of the participants. The data and information about the animal's owners were obtained through a survey fulfilled online, with a time average response of 20 to 30 minutes. Confidentiality was assured concerning the participant's identity, who voluntarily agreed to sign down the free and informed consent (TCLE).

Data analysis

Data were analyzed using SPSS statistical package for Windows, version 22. Data distribution was verified using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (considering normal distribution p -values $> 0,05$). Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation and percentage) and inferential statistics were used. Chi-square test was used for comparison between groups in categorical variables. Results from IGFP-5 (openness, neuroticism, extraversion, conscientiousness and kindness), from DASS-21 (depression, anxiety and stress) and from empathy inventory

(perspective, interpersonal flexibility, altruism and affective sensitivity) were compared by ANOVA with post hoc Bonferroni. Cohen's d was used to investigate effect size: values $< 0,10$ (small), $0,30$ (moderate), and $> 0,50$ (large) (Rosnow & Rosenthal, 2003). P -values $< 0,05$ were considered significant.

Results

The characteristics of the sample are presented on Table 1, and no significant differences were found regarding educational level, sex, and marital status between the four groups. Table 2 presents the comparison between the personality factors, mood symptoms, and empathy between the groups. Regarding the IGFP-5 scores, participants who had dogs and cats showed significantly higher levels of conscientiousness than participants who did not have any pets ($F = 3,055, p = .028$), large effect size. There were no significant differences between the groups concerning the other four personality factors.

Table 1 – Characteristics of the sample

| Sample | Dogs | Cats | Cats•Dogs | None | χ^2 |
|------------------------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|----------|
| | n(%) | n(%) | n(%) | n(%) | |
| Education level | | | | | |
| Elementary/High school | 6(8) | 2(10) | 2(10) | 2(7) | .973 |
| Graduation | 66(92) | 19(90) | 19(90) | 29(93) | |
| Sex | | | | | |
| Female | 53(74) | 18(86) | 16(76) | 20(65) | .394 |
| Male | 19(26) | 3(14) | 5(24) | 11(35) | |
| Marital status | | | | | |
| Single | 47(65) | 17(80) | 16(76) | 22(71) | .846 |
| Married | 19(26) | 2(10) | 4(19) | 6(19) | |
| Divorced | 4(6) | 1(5) | 1(5) | 2(7) | |
| Widowed | 2(3) | 1(5) | 0(0) | 1(3) | |

Note: χ^2 chi-square distribution

Participants who did not have any pets showed higher anxiety symptoms than those who had only dogs ($F = 5,930, p \leq .001$), only cats ($F = 5,930, p = .033$), and dogs and cats ($F = 5,930, p = .015$), large effect size for all comparisons. However, no differences

were found regarding the intensity of the symptoms among the groups of animal owners. Finally, all groups obtained similar scores on empathy ability (Table 2).

Table 2 – Comparison between groups: IGFBP-5, DASS-21 and Empathy Inventory Scores

| | Dogs | | Cats | | Dogs+Cats | | None | | ANOVA | | Post hoc | Cohen's d |
|------------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|------------------|
| | M | DP | M | DP | M | DP | M | DP | F | p | | |
| IGFBP-5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Openness | 36.40 | 4.13 | 37.14 | 5.05 | 36.29 | 4.58 | 34.39 | 5.44 | 1.875 | .137 | | |
| Neuroticism | 24.68 | 3.46 | 24.24 | 2.34 | 26.19 | 2.79 | 25.00 | 3.35 | 1.553 | .203 | | |
| Extroversion | 28.33 | 3.53 | 29.14 | 3.83 | 29.10 | 2.95 | 27.65 | 2.79 | 1.178 | .320 | D+C > N* | .884 |
| Conscientiousness | 33.00 | 3.73 | 33.29 | 3.91 | 34.24 | 3.55 | 31.32 | 3.04 | 3.055 | .030 | | |
| Agreeableness | 32.81 | 3.24 | 33.33 | 3.54 | 33.38 | 2.99 | 32.81 | 3.10 | .292 | .831 | | |
| DASS 21 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Depression | 4.00 | 4.48 | 4.19 | 4.57 | 4.19 | 4.29 | 6.10 | 5.19 | 1.575 | .198 | D<N** | .729 |
| | | | 2.61 | | 2.86 | | 2.57 | | 5.87 | | C<N* | .661 |
| Anxiety | | 3.34 | | 3.55 | | 2.27 | | 5.37 | | ≤ .001 | D+C < N* | .800 |
| Stress | 6.79 | 4.18 | 6.38 | 4.12 | 6.33 | 4.35 | 9.06 | 4.06 | 2.862 | .059 | | |
| Empathy Inventory | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Perspective | 42.61 | 7.11 | 41.95 | 5.85 | 45.29 | 7.54 | 40.94 | 7.20 | 1.658 | .179 | | |
| Interpersonal flexibility | 31.08 | 5.38 | 33.00 | 5.81 | 31.62 | 6.91 | 30.16 | 6.65 | .993 | .398 | | |
| Altruism | 29.64 | 5.59 | 31.71 | 5.67 | 31.10 | 6.07 | 30.52 | 5.53 | .915 | .435 | | |
| Affective sensitivity | 36.31 | 4.47 | 36.57 | 4.51 | 37.33 | 5.37 | 34.42 | 5.26 | 1.848 | .141 | | |

Note. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p \leq .001$.

Discussion

The present study aimed to compare personality factors, symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress, and levels of empathy between pet owners and non-pet owners. The main results showed that participants who didn't have any pets showed higher anxiety symptoms comparing those who had pets. Social and physical interactions often produce wellness sensations that may partially explain an anxiety decrease in humans who are in contact with pets, also providing social support in stressful situations of people's lives (Almeida, 2015; Holbrook et al., 2001). This human-animal interaction can offer significant comfort, becoming a possible protective factor for depression and loneliness (Holbrook et al., 2001).

Effects of human-animal interaction have been reported in studies since the 1990s: decreased heart rate and blood pressure, and greater release of pleasure-related and well-being hormones (Friedmann et al., 2003; Garrity & Stallones, 1998).

These outcomes indicate that there may be reduced loneliness and increased self-esteem in adults pet owners. Thereby, it is understood that increasing self-esteem and reducing loneliness may result in benefits for individuals, such as decrease of anxiety and depression symptoms. Owning a pet is associated with a reduced chance of depression, a greater sense of comfort, security, and entertainment (Holbrook et al., 2001).

Studies indicate that pets offer benefits to their owners' life, providing companionship, protection, loyalty, unconditional acceptance, health care, and peacefulness. When this bond continues until old age, it also has a positive effect on levels of satisfaction with life and personal safety (Enmarker et al., 2015; Friedmann et al., 1980; Holbrook et al., 2001; Ownby et al., 2002; Pachana et al., 2011). Elderly, especially those who live alone, consider the animal their family (Pachana et al., 2011). The results of a Portuguese study (Reis et al., 2017) showed that having a dog was associated with a

better perception of well-being, more satisfaction with life and less psychopathological symptoms.

Participants who had dogs and cats showed significantly higher scores on the conscientiousness factor comparing to those who had no pets. This personality factor is characterized by greater organization, planning, initiative, and focus to reach objectives, making easier the completion of obligations and duties. Individuals with higher levels of this factor are more organized, responsible and self-disciplined (Andrade, 2008). One hypothesis of explanation for this finding would be to understand that dog and cat owners have higher requirements for the daily and domestic arrangement because they have two different types of animals. Thus, they need higher levels of planning and responsibility, characterizing greater conscientiousness. Some studies point conscientiousness as one of the central features of pets owners' personality (Gosling et al., 2010; McConnell et al., 2011).

McConnell et al. (2011) investigated personality factors among people who owned pets and others who did not and found positive correlations between measures of well-being (such as self-esteem and subjective happiness) and personality factors, especially conscientiousness. When analyzing the differences between the two groups, pet owners scored higher on conscientiousness but did not show significant differences in well-being measures.

According to Almeida (2015), pet owners perform different behaviors and attitudes in relation to their animal, and this interaction provides a high emotional load, varying according to each individual's personality. The animals are part of their owners' lives and can arouse feelings of happiness, companionship, nutrition, tranquility, security, and responsibility in their owners (Reis et al., 2017). In this way, it can be inferred that human life, shared with animals, is established as a new form of existence, meeting the current needs of certain groups of people (Almeida et al., 2009).

The reduced size of the sample, especially the owners of only cats, it is pointed as a limitation of this study. The authors suggest future studies including bigger samples, and cross-cultural studies that assess sociodemographic and personality features,

the presence of psychopathology and social skills in order to investigate if there is a personality profile associated with owners of different types of animals.

Despite the limitations, the results of the present study suggest that individuals who do not have any pets showed more anxiety symptoms compared to those who have pets. Thus, it is recognized that regardless of the species, dog or cat, the interaction with these animals is beneficial. It was also found that owners of both species (dogs and cats), showed higher scores of conscientiousness comparing to the participants who had no pets, characterizing them as people with greater capacity of planning, organization, and fulfillment of duties.

The present research can indeed inform and help us to understand human-animal relations (Auger & Amiot, 2019). The findings reported in the present study highlight the role of pets in triggering less anxiety symptoms broadly human-animal relations. In conclusion, this results show that have pets can be beneficial to human health and wellbeing (Amiot & Bastian, 2015; Auger & Amiot, 2019; Walsh, 2009).

References

- Allen, K. M., Blascovich, J., Tomaka, J., & Kelsey, R. M. (1991). Presence of human friends and pet dogs as moderators of autonomic responses to stress in women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *61*(4), 582. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.61.4.582>
- Allen, K., Blascovich, J., & Mendes, W. B. (2002). Cardiovascular reactivity and the presence of pets, friends, and spouses: The truth about cats and dogs. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, *64*(5), 727-739. https://journals.lww.com/psychosomaticmedicine/fulltext/2002/09000/cardiovascular_reactivity_and_the_presence_of.5.aspx?casa_token=wc4ws0trqhwaaaaa:2fj1smpqqymbo-ozglcid402zp2ma-n8_kmtqhr-gqsa7ymtgzagwgbwk-jymw7q0jvzjfufbbjyft40zuhm2vvlmpjbruo
- Almeida, J. L. D. E. A. (2015). *Comparação entre bem-estar psicológico do tutor e problemas comportamentais no seu animal de companhia* [Tese de Doutorado, Universidade Lusófona de Humanidades e Tecnologias, Faculdade de Medicina Veterinária]. <http://recil.grupolusofona.pt/bitstream/handle/10437/6794/JOANA%20ANTUNES%20DE%20ALMEIDA.pdf?sequence=1>
- Almeida, M. L., Almeida, L. P. D., & Braga, P. F. D. S. (2009). Aspectos Psicológicos na interação homem-animal de estimação. *Anais do IX Encontro Interno e XIII Seminário de Iniciação Científica*. Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Uberlândia, Minas Gerais: PIBIC.
- Amiot, C. E., & Bastian, B. (2015). Toward a psychology of human-animal relations. *Psychological Bulletin*, *141*, 6-47. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038147>

Andrade, J.M. de. (2008). *Evidências de validade do inventário dos cinco grandes fatores de Personalidade para o Brasil* [Tese de Doutorado, Instituto de Psicologia, UnB]. Repositório da UnB. http://repositorio.unb.br/bitstream/10482/1751/1/2008_JosembergMouraAndrade.pdf

Associação Brasileira de Empresas de Pesquisa. (2008). *O Novo critério Brasil de classificação econômica*. ABEP. <http://www.abep.org/criterio-brasil>

Auger, B., & Amiot, C. E. (2019). Testing the roles of intergroup anxiety and inclusion of animals in the self as mechanisms that underpin the "pets as ambassadors" effect. *Anthrozoös*, 32(1), 5-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08927936.2019.1550277>

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (2007). *NEO PI-R: inventário de personalidade NEO revisado e inventário de cinco fatores NEO revisado NEO-FFI-R [versão curta]*. Vetor Editora Psico-Pedagógica.

Enmarker, I., Hellzén, O., Ekker, K., & Berg, A. G. T. (2015). Depression in older cat and dog owners: the Nord-Trøndelag Health Study (HUNT)-3. *Aging & Mental Health*, 19(4), 347-352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2014.933310>

Falcone, E. M. O., Ferreira, M. C., Luz, R. C. M., Fernandes, C. S., Faria, C. A., D'Augustin, J. F., Sardinha, A., & Pinho, V. D. (2008). Inventário de Empatia (I.E.): desenvolvimento e validação de uma medida brasileira. *Avaliação Psicológica*, 7(3), 321-334. <http://www.redalyc.org/html/3350/335027185006/>

Friedmann, E., Katcher, A. H., Lynch, J. J., & Thomas, S. A. (1980). Animal companions and one-year survival of patients after discharge from a coronary care unit. *Public health reports*, 95(4), 307-312. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1422527>

Friedmann, E., Thomas, S.A., Stein, P. K., & Kleiger, R. E. (2003). Relation Between Pet Ownership and Heart Rate Variability in Patients With Healed Myocardial Infarcts. *The American Journal of Cardiology*, 91(6), 718-721. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-9149\(02\)03412-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-9149(02)03412-4)

Garrity, T. F. & Stallones, L. (1998). Effects of pet contact on human well-being: Review of recent research. In Wilson, Cindy C. (Ed); Turner, Dennis C. (Ed). *Companion animals in human health* (pp. 3-22). Sage Publications.

Gosling, S. D., Sandy, C. J. & Potter, J. (2010). Personalities of Self-Identified "Dog People" and "Cat People". *Anthrozoös*, 3, 213-222. <https://doi.org/10.2752/175303710X12750451258850>

Holbrook, M. B., Stephens, D. L., Day, E., Holbrook, S. M., & Strazar, G. (2001). A collective stereographic photo essay on key aspects of animal companionship: the truth about dogs and cats. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, (1), 1-17. <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.470.7981&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Islam, A., & Towell, T. (2013). Cat and dog companionship and well-being: A systematic review. *International Journal of Applied Psychology*, 3(6), 149-155. <https://doi.org/10.5923/jijap.20130306.01>

John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The Big Five Inventory-Versions 4a and 5a*. University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.

Lancendorfer, K. M., Atkin, J. L., & Reece, B. B. (2008). Animals in advertising: Love dogs? Love the ad! *Journal of Business Research*, 61(5), 384-391. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.08.011>

Lovibond, P. F., & Lovibond, S. H. (1995). The structure of negative emotional states: Comparison of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS) with the Beck depression and anxiety inventories. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 33(3), 335-343. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brp.2012.05.003>

Machado, W. L., & Bandeira, D. R. (no prelo). *Adaptação e validação da Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale (DASS-21) para o Português brasileiro*.

Menchetti, L., Calipari, S., Guelfi, G., Catanzaro, A., & Diverio, S. (2018). My dog is not my cat: Owner perception of the personalities of dogs and cats living in the same household. *Animals*, 8(6), 80. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani8060080>

McCabe, B. W., Baun, M. M., Speich, D., & Agrawal, S. (2002). Resident dog in the Alzheimer's special care unit. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 24(6), 684-696. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01939450232055421>

McConnell, A. R., Brown, C. M., Shoda, T. M., Stayton, L. E., & Martin, C. E. (2011). Friends With Benefits: On the Positive Consequences of Pet Ownership. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(5), 1239-1252. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024516>

Motomura, N., Yagi, T., & Ohya, H. (2004). Animal assisted therapy for people with dementia. *Psychogeriatrics*, 4(2), 40-42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1479-8301.2004.00062.x>

Müllersdorf, M., Granström, F., Sahlqvist, L., & Tillgren, P. (2010). Aspects of health, physical/leisure activities, work and socio-demographics associated with pet ownership in Sweden. *Scandinavian Journal of Social Medicine*, 38(1), 53-63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1403494809344358>

Ownby, D. R., Johnson, C. C., & Peterson, E. L. (2002). Exposure to dogs and cats in the first year of life and risk of allergic sensitization at 6 to 7 years of age. *Jama*, 288(8), 963-972. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.288.8.963>

Pachana, N. A., Massavelli, B. M., & Robleda-Gomez, S. (2011). A developmental psychological perspective on the human-animal bond. In C. Blazina, G. Boyraz & D. Shen-Miller (Eds.) *The psychology of the human-animal bond* (pp. 151-165). Springer.

Parslow, R. A., Jorm, A. F., Christensen, H., Rodgers, B., & Jacomb, P. (2005). Pet ownership and health in older adults: Findings from a survey of 2,551 community-based Australians aged 60-64. *Gerontology*, 51(1), 40-47. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000081433>

Reevy, G. M., & Delgado, M. M. (2015). Are emotionally attached companion animal caregivers conscientious and neurotic? Factors that affect the human-companion animal relationship. *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, 18(3), 239-258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888705.2014.988333>

Reis, M., Ramiro, L., Camacho, I., Tomé, G., Brito, C., & Gaspar de Matos, M. (2017). Does having a pet make a difference? Highlights from the HBSC Portuguese study. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 15(5), 548-564. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2017.1317242>

Robins, D., Sanders, C., & Cahill, S. (1991). Dogs and their people: Pet-facilitated interaction in a public setting. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 20, 3-25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124191020001001>

Savalli, C., & Mariti, C. (2020). Would the Dog Be a Person's Child or Best Friend? Revisiting the Dog-Tutor Attachment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 576713. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.576713>

Rosnow, R. L., & Rosenthal, R. (2003). Effect sizes for experimenting psychologists. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 57(3), 221-237. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0087427>

Vignola, R., & Tucci, A. (2014). Adaptation and validation of the Depression Anxiety and Stress Scale (DASS) to Brazilian Portuguese. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 155, 104-109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2013.10.031>

Walsh, F. (2009). Human-animal bonds I: The relational significance of companion animals. *Family Process*, 48, 462-480. doi:10.1111/j.1545-5300.2009.01296.x

Valéria Gonzatti

Doutora e mestre pela Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS), em Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil; psicóloga clínica em Canoas, RS, Brasil.

Camila Rosa de Oliveira

Doutora em Gerontologia Biomédica pela Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS), em Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil; psicóloga e professora no Instituto Meridional (IMED), em Passo Fundo, RS, Brasil.

Leticia Oliveira Alminhana

Pós-Doutorado pela Universidade de Oxford, Reino Unido; Doutorado em Saúde pela Faculdade de Medicina da Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora (UFJF), em Juiz de Fora, MG, Brasil; Mestre em Teologia pela Escola Superior de Teologia (EST), em Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil.

Daiane Oliveira Hausen

Mestranda em Gerontologia Biomédica pela Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS), em Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil; psicóloga clínica em Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil.

Daiana Meregalli Schütz

Doutoranda e mestre em Psicologia Clínica pela Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS), em Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil.

Dalton Breno Costa

Graduado pela Universidade Federal de Ciências da Saúde de Porto Alegre (UFCSA), em Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil.

Luciano Trevizan

Doutor e Mestre em Zootecnia pela Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), em Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil; médico veterinário em Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil.

Irani Iracema de Lima Argimon

Doutora em psicologia pela Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS), em Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil.

Tatiana Quarti Irigaray

Doutora em gerontologia biomédica pela Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS), em Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil.

Endereço para correspondência

Daiane Oliveira Hausen

Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul
Av. Ipiranga 6681, Prédio 11, sala 901
Partenon, 90619-900
Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil

Os textos deste artigo foram revisados pela Poá Comunicação e submetidos para validação do(s) autor(es) antes da publicação.