

Scotland's Rural College

## **Quality of life and adolescents' communication with their significant others (mother, father, and best friend): the mediating effect of attachment to pets**

Marsa-Sambola, F; Williams, J; Muldoon, J; Lawrence, AB; Connor, M; Currie, C

*Published in:*

Attachment and Human Development

*DOI:*

[10.1080/14616734.2017.1293702](https://doi.org/10.1080/14616734.2017.1293702)

First published: 20/02/2017

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Marsa-Sambola, F., Williams, J., Muldoon, J., Lawrence, AB., Connor, M., & Currie, C. (2017). Quality of life and adolescents' communication with their significant others (mother, father, and best friend): the mediating effect of attachment to pets. *Attachment and Human Development*, 19(3), 278 - 297. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616734.2017.1293702>

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 Quality of Life and adolescents' communication with their significant others  
2 (mother, father and best friend) in adolescents: The mediating effect of  
3 attachment to pets.

4 Ferran Marsa Sambola<sup>1§</sup>, Joanne Williams<sup>2</sup>, Janine Muldoon<sup>1</sup>, Alistair  
5 Lawrence<sup>3</sup>, Melanie Connor<sup>3</sup>, Candace Currie<sup>1</sup>.

6 <sup>1</sup>Child and Adolescent Health Research Unit (CAHRU), University of St  
7 Andrew, St Andrews, Fife, KY16 9TF.

8 <sup>2</sup>Clinical Psychology; University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh.

9 <sup>3</sup>Scotland's Rural College, West Mains Road, Edinburgh EH9 3JG

10 Email addresses

11 FMS: [fms7@st-andrews.ac.uk](mailto:fms7@st-andrews.ac.uk)

12 JM: [jcm23@st-andrews.ac.uk](mailto:jcm23@st-andrews.ac.uk)

13 JW: [Jo.Williams@ed.ac.uk](mailto:Jo.Williams@ed.ac.uk)

14 AL: [Alistair.Lawrence@sruc.ac.uk](mailto:Alistair.Lawrence@sruc.ac.uk)

15 MC: [Melanie.Connor@sruc.ac.uk](mailto:Melanie.Connor@sruc.ac.uk)

16 CC: [cec53@st-andrews.ac.uk](mailto:cec53@st-andrews.ac.uk)

## 17 **Author Note**

## 18 **Acknowledgments**

19 The authors would like to thank DEFRA for funding this project (SMDO-  
20 ZGLD15). The authors would also like to thank Dorothy Currie at the Children  
21 and Adolescent Research Unit for her support of this project.

## 22 **Funding Sources**

23 *"An investigation of 13-17 year olds' attitudes and behaviour to animals and*  
24 *development and testing of interventions to promote the concept of Duty of*

1 *Care*” was funded by the UK Government Department for Environment, Food  
2 and Rural Affairs (SMDO-ZGLD15).

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1 Quality of Life and adolescents' communication with their significant others  
2 (mother, father and best friend): The mediating effect of attachment to pets.

3 Abstract

4 The relationship between adolescents' communication with their significant  
5 others (mother, father and best friend) and quality of life (KIDSCREEN) was  
6 investigated in 2262 Scottish adolescent pet owners. The variable attachment  
7 to pets was also tested and assessed as a mediator of this relationship.

8 A positive relationship between adolescents' communication with their  
9 significant other (mother, father and best friend) and quality of life decreased  
10 when controlling for attachment to dogs. In cat owners, a positive relationship  
11 between communication with a best friend and quality of life decreased when  
12 controlling for attachment to cats. In cat and dog owners, attachment to these  
13 pets predicted higher levels of quality of life. Higher attachment to dogs and  
14 cats was explained by good communication with parents and best friends.  
15 Mediation effects of attachment to dogs and cats might be explained in terms  
16 of the caring activities associated with these types of pets.

17

18 Keywords: Attachment to pets, Quality of Life, communication, parents, best  
19 friend, adolescence.

20

21

22

## 1 **Introduction**

2 More than 50% of the households in Western countries keep pets, mainly  
3 dogs and cats (Barker, Rogers, Turner, Karpf, & Suthers-McCabe 2003;  
4 Downes, Canty & More 2009; Marsa-Sambola et al., 2015; Murray, Browne,  
5 Roberts, Whitmarsh, & Gruffydd-Jones 2010; Westgarth et al., 2013). There  
6 is a growing research interest in the impact of human animal interactions  
7 (HAI) on human health in people with a higher risk of social isolation such as  
8 older people (Krause-Parello, 2008; Parslow, Jorm, Christensen, Rodgers  
9 & Jacomb, 2005), people with HIV (Kruger, Stern, Anstead & Finley, 2014;  
10 Siegel, Angulo, Detels, Welsch & Mullen, 1999) or people with mental or  
11 physical problems (Crawford, Worsham & Swinehart, 2006; Kwong &  
12 Bartholomew, 2011). However, little is known about the influence pets have  
13 on the general population, particularly in adolescents (Esposito, McCune,  
14 Griffin & Maholmes, 2011). Several studies have suggested attachment to  
15 pets may act as a mediating variable on the influence pets have on human  
16 health (Crawford et al., 2006; McNicholas et al., 2005; Parslow et al., 2005;  
17 Staats, Miller, Carnot, Rada, & Turnes, 1996). Conversely, only one study has  
18 properly tested this hypothesis through a mediation analysis (Krause-Parello,  
19 2008). In Krause-Parello's study (2008) it was found attachment to pets  
20 mediated the relationship between loneliness and general health in older  
21 women living in the community (Krause-Parello, 2008). This study in line with  
22 Lazarus and Folkman stress theory (1984) considered attachment to pets as  
23 a coping mechanism of social and emotional support. It was suggested  
24 through this coping mechanism older women could attain from pets the  
25 affection and social support they were lacking from their social relationships

1 with a significant other. Krause-Parello's (2008) study considered loneliness  
2 as an independent variable (IV) and a general measure of health as a  
3 dependent variable (DV) within the mediation analysis. According to previous  
4 research, there is wide scientific evidence that supports how a lack of healthy  
5 and close relationships with other human beings may act as a risk factor of  
6 illness and a worst quality of life (Sanderson, 2014). Thus, Lazarus and  
7 Folkman's stress theory (1984) seems to be a logical theoretical framework  
8 when understanding the impact pets may have on human health in people  
9 with a higher risk of social isolation. However, to our knowledge, no previous  
10 studies have used this theoretical framework to understand the influence pets  
11 may have on adolescents' daily lives. In line with Headey & Grabka (2007)  
12 when understanding the benefits pets may have in human health, diverse  
13 benefits may exist between different types of pet owners (older people, shy  
14 people, sedentary people or young people who grow up with pets). This study  
15 aims to examine the potential role of pets (dogs and cats) in the association  
16 between adolescents' communication with their significant others and quality  
17 of life

### 18 *Human-animal interaction: Health benefits in adolescents?*

19 Most studies of pet-keeping among children and adolescents have focused on  
20 socio-demographic aspects of pet ownership (Westgarth et al., 2013), children  
21 with autism (Grandgeorge et al., 2012) or animal-assisted therapy with  
22 adolescents in psychiatric facilities (Banman, 1994). These studies do not  
23 necessarily consider the influence of attachment to pets, particularly during a  
24 period of development when social relationships with parents and friends  
25 have a particularly important influence on quality of life (Park, 2004, Shaffer &

1 Kipp, 2014). Headey and Grabka (2007) suggest there may be benefits to  
2 young people of growing up with pets, in terms of opportunities to develop  
3 caring behaviours and compassion, as well as the general health benefit of  
4 the development of a stronger immune system. However, HAI research often  
5 fails to analyze the influence of psychosocial factors on health benefits  
6 (Downes et al., 2009; Müllersdorf, Granström, Sahlqvist & Tillgren, 2010;  
7 Murray et al., 2010). Westgarth et al., (2013) argue that there is a need to  
8 better understand which psychosocial and demographic factors are  
9 associated with ownership of, and attachment to, different types of pets.

10

11 *Attachment to pets*

12 Human-pet bonds potentially have an important role in child and adolescent  
13 development and health (Covert, Whiren, Keith, & Nelson, 1985; Headey &  
14 Grabka, 2007; Marsa-Sambola et al., 2015). A pet can be accepting, openly  
15 affectionate, consistent, loyal and honest, characteristics that can fulfil a  
16 person's basic need to feel a sense of self-worth and loved (Carr et al., in  
17 press; Kwong & Bartholomew, 2011; Zilcha-Mano, Mikulincer, & Shaver,  
18 2011a; Zilcha-Mano, Mikulincer, & Shaver, 2011b). Crawford et al., (2006)  
19 used the concept of emotional attachment to assess human-pet bonds,  
20 including characteristics of Bowlby's (1969) original infant attachment theory.  
21 Studies of human-pet attachment and interpersonal closeness (e.g., Carr et  
22 al., in press; Crawford et al., 2006; Friedmann, Son, & Tsai, 2000; Payne,  
23 Bennett, & McGreevy, 2015) suggest that there are positive effects of  
24 attachment to pets for human health. However, because different assessment  
25 tools are used, various outcomes ensue and there is no overall agreement on

1 health impact. Some questionnaires use items mainly focused on emotional  
2 relationships between the owner and the pet in order to be psychologically  
3 meaningful whereas others focus generally on caring, sharing and feeding  
4 activities (Anderson, 2006).

5 Furthermore, most research has focused on assessing the physical health  
6 benefits of pet ownership, mainly among dog owners (Gadomski, Scribani,  
7 Krupa, Jenkins, 2016; Ogechi et al., 2016). There remains a need to use  
8 measures of health that combine physical, social and psychological wellbeing  
9 such as quality of life (McNicholas et al., 2005). Despite these limitations in  
10 evidence, the possibility that attachment to pets is an emotional relationship  
11 with consequences for adolescent health and their social interactions has yet  
12 to be examined.

### 13 *Communication with parents and best friends and quality of life*

14 The relationships adolescents have with their parents and best friends are  
15 important in the transition from adolescence to adulthood (Hartup & Stevens,  
16 1997; Sillars, Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2005). Poor quality communication  
17 between adolescents and their parents, and family conflicts are associated  
18 with low self-esteem and poorer psychological well-being among adolescents  
19 (Sweeting & West, 1995; Xiao, Li, Stanton, 2011). Moreover, adolescents  
20 who have a good relationship with their parents have been found to  
21 experience higher levels of wellbeing and fewer emotional problems  
22 (Garnefski & Diekstra, 1997), fewer psychological complaints (Moreno et al.,  
23 2009) and higher perceived life satisfaction (Levin & Currie, 2010) than those  
24 who reported a bad relationship with their parents.



1 A good relationship with peers, specifically with a best friend, has been found  
2 to positively influence a range of developmental outcomes, such as levels of  
3 physical activity (Duncan, Duncan, & Strycker, 2005), mental health and  
4 quality of life (Shaffer & Kipp, 2013). Positive peer relationships are also a  
5 source of social and emotional support (Hartup & Stevens, 1997; Shaffer &  
6 Kipp, 2014; Widman, Choukas-Bradley, & Helms, 2014). However, there are  
7 also studies that show negative influences of peer relationships on health-  
8 related habits such as smoking (Holliday, Rothwell, & Moore, 2010) or risky  
9 sexual behaviours (Potard, Courtois, Rusch, 2008)

10

11 *The present study*

12 The influence of attachment to pets on adolescents' communication with their  
13 significant others (mother, father and best friend) and quality of life is the  
14 focus of this study. Pet owners often feel highly connected to their animal  
15 companions in a similar manner to members of the family (Albert & Bulcroft,  
16 1988). For example, it has been reported that pet owners talk to their pets in a  
17 comparable way with how parents talk to their children (Mitchell, 2001). This is  
18 reinforced by Kurdek (2008), who reported that undergraduate students  
19 assessed their levels of attachment to their dogs as very similar to their  
20 attachment to family members. Investigating the implications of pet-ownership  
21 and attachment to pets for important human relationships may provide  
22 insights into how pets affect adolescents' health. This study examines two key  
23 relationships. First, it examines the influence that adolescents' communication  
24 with their significant others (mother, father and best friend) has on attachment  
25 to pets (cats and dogs). According to Walsh (2009), pets can be a key

1 element in bringing together family members and reducing conflicts between  
2 them. Sharing pet care activities between family members has been shown to  
3 improve interaction and communication (Melson & Fine, 2006; Sussman,  
4 1985). In line with Headey & Grabka (2007), we might expect adolescents  
5 who have good communication with their parents and best friends to show  
6 stronger levels of attachment to their pets. However, as mentioned earlier  
7 strong attachment to pets may be a consequence of lack of social support  
8 from their social environment (Krause-Parello, 2008; McNicholas et al., 2005).  
9 Secondly the study examines the influence of attachment to pets on the  
10 association between adolescents' communication with their significant others  
11 (mother, father and best friend) and quality of life. Although it is known that  
12 better communication with parents and peers is related to higher levels of  
13 quality of life (Schaffer & Kipp, 2013), the potential influence of attachment to  
14 pets on this association has not yet been assessed. Previous studies have  
15 reported that pets may act as homeostatic regulators in social environments  
16 (Allen & Blascovich, 1996) maintaining social systems as stable and constant  
17 despite changes such family conflicts that would otherwise alter the  
18 equilibrium in social systems. This study sought to provide answers to the  
19 following questions

- 20 1. What is the relationship between adolescents' communication with their  
21 significant others (mother, father and best friend) and quality of life in  
22 adolescents?
- 23 2. What is the relationship between attachment to pets and quality of life in  
24 adolescents?

1 3. What is the relationship between adolescents' communication with their  
2 significant others (mother, father, best friend) and attachment to pets in  
3 adolescents?

4 4. Does attachment to pets mediate the effect of adolescents'  
5 communication with their significant others (mother, father and best friend) on  
6 quality of life among adolescents? (See Figure 1)

## 7 **Methods**

### 8 *Participants*

9 The sample consisted of 2262 participants from the Scottish HBSC survey  
10 who reported they had a pet and considered it to be their own (boys = 1041;  
11 46, girls = 1221; 54). All the participants came from three age groups sampled  
12 through cluster sampling of school classes across Scotland (11 years =  
13 33.1%; 13 years = 33%; 15 years = 33.1%). The mean age for boys was  
14 13.02 years old (SD = 1.50), and 13.50 years (SD = 1.60) for girls.

### 15 *Instruments*

16 *The Health Behaviour in School-aged Children: WHO Collaborative Cross-*  
17 *National Study (HBSC)* (Currie et al., 2011a) is an internationally standardized  
18 self-report questionnaire, which evaluates issues related to health in children  
19 and adolescents. From the 2010 Scottish HBSC survey the following items  
20 were chosen: "How easy is it for you to talk to your *mother/father/ best friend*  
21 about things that really bother you?" (1 = Very easy, 2 = Easy, 3 = Difficult, 4  
22 = Very difficult, 5 = Don't have or don't see the person"). Answers from  
23 participants who marked "Don't have or don't see the person" were not

1 included in the analyses. For the mediation analyses, Gaito's (1980)  
2 suggestion that likert scales be treated as an ordinal scales was followed.  
3 Gaito (1980) suggests that the distance between answers to likert-type items  
4 (1=Very Easy, 2= Easy, 3=Difficult, 4=Very Difficult, 5=Don't have) is not likely  
5 to be the same (i.e., the distance between 1 and 2, 2 and 3 or 4 and 5 may be  
6 different). Following Gaito's (1980) suggestions and taking a conservative  
7 approach with these variables, communication with parents (mother and  
8 father) and best friend were analyzed as categorical variables. These  
9 variables were dichotomised as 1(Good communication) = "Very easy" and  
10 "Easy" vs. 0 (Poor communication) = "Difficult" and "Very Difficult". We were  
11 interested in assessing how response patterns (good communication/bad  
12 communication with father/mother/best friend) influenced quality of life and  
13 attachment to pets.

14 The Kidscreen 10 index (Ravens-Sieberer et al., 2010) consists of the  
15 following 10-items (that assess children's and adolescents' subjective health  
16 and well-being: 1) Have you felt fit and well? 2) Have you felt full of energy? 3)  
17 Have you felt sad? 4) Have you felt lonely? 5) Have you had enough time for  
18 yourself? 6) Have you been able to do the things that you want to do in your  
19 free time? 7) Have your parent(s) treated you fairly? 8) Have you had fun with  
20 your friends? 9) Have you got on well at school? 10) Have you been able to  
21 pay attention? It is a self-reported measure applicable for both healthy and  
22 chronically ill children and adolescents aged from 8 to 18 years. Each item is  
23 answered on a 5-point response scale (1=Not at all, 2=Slightly, 3=Moderately,  
24 4=Very, 5=Extremely). Kidscreen provides a global one-dimensional score. A  
25 low score indicates poor quality of life, and a high score is indicative of better

1 quality of life. This is one of the most comprehensive tests for assessing  
2 Quality of Life in children and young people with high levels of validity and  
3 reliability (Erhart et al., 2009, The Kidscreen Group, 2004).

4 The Short Attachment to Pets Scale (Marsa-Sambola et al., 2015; Muldoon &  
5 Williams, 2010) consists of the following 9 items, focusing on aspects of  
6 attachment to pets that are salient to children and adolescents, as well as  
7 their general perceptions of animals/ pets: 1) I don't really like animals, 2) I  
8 spend time every day playing with my pet, 3) I have sometimes talked to my  
9 pet and understood what it was trying to tell me, 4) I love pets, 5) I talk to my  
10 pet quite a lot, 6) My pet makes me feel happy, 7) I consider my pet to be a  
11 friend, 8) My pet knows when I'm upset and tries to comfort me, and 9) There  
12 are times I'd be lonely without my pet. Participants were asked to answer on  
13 a 5 point Likert scale (1=*Strongly agree*, 2=*Agree*, 3=*Not sure*, 4=*Disagree*,  
14 5=*Strongly disagree*). SAPS provides a global one-dimensional score. A low  
15 score indicates weak attachment to pets and a high score is indicative of  
16 stronger attachment. The test is a reliable and valid self-report tool for  
17 assessing general aspects of attachment to pets within surveys for children  
18 and young people (Marsa- Sambola et al., 2015).

### 19 *Procedure*

20 The data are from national surveys conducted in 2009/2010 in Scotland as  
21 part of the HBSC study. The HBSC survey is piloted in member countries  
22 (currently 43 in Europe and North America) every four years (Currie et al.,  
23 2012). The methods employed in gathering this data are described in detail  
24 elsewhere (Currie et al., 2011b). Parents had to give their consent for their

1 children to be part of the survey. The Ethics Committee of the Moray House  
2 School of Education, University of Edinburgh, approved the protocol. Data  
3 collection was anonymous and the demographic information collected did not  
4 permit identification of the individual student. The HBSC study uses an  
5 anonymous self-administered questionnaire, which was developed according  
6 to international standards and distributed in schools (Roberts et al., 2009).

### 7 *Statistical analysis*

8 Descriptive data (Means and SD), Cronbach's  $\alpha$ , Pearson correlation  
9 coefficients (KIDSCREEN and SAPS) and point-biserial correlations  
10 (Communication with mother, father and best friend) were performed using  
11 the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 21 for  
12 Windows (SPSS, Inc., 2010). The mediation analyses were performed  
13 through PROCESS, a freely-available statistical tool for SPSS and SAS to  
14 perform mediation, moderation, or conditional process analysis. In our  
15 analysis, adjusting for age and gender, we considered communication with  
16 mother/father/best friend as an independent variable, quality of life  
17 (KIDSCREEN) as a dependent variable, and attachment to pets (SAPS) as a  
18 mediator. Demographic variables such as gender and age are certainly  
19 associated with general health and quality of life, and research that does not  
20 adjust for these variables may lead to confusing outcomes (Michel, Bisegger,  
21 Fuhr, & Abel, 2009).

22 According to Baron and Kenny (1986), mediation exists when (a) the  
23 independent variable (communication with mother/father/best friend) is  
24 significantly correlated with the dependent variable (Quality of Life); (b) the

1 independent variable (communication with mother/father/best friend) is  
2 significantly related to the mediator (attachment to pets); c) the mediator  
3 (attachment to pets) is significantly related to the dependent variable (Quality  
4 of Life) while controlling for the independent variable (communication with  
5 mother/father/best friend); and (d) the relationship of the independent variable  
6 (communication with mother/father/best friend) with the dependent variable  
7 (Quality of Life) decreases significantly when controlled for the mediator  
8 (attachment to pets).

## 9 **Results**

### 10 *Correlational analysis*

11 Quality of life (KIDSCREEN) showed positive, significant relationships with  
12 attachment to pets (SAPS) and good communication with father, mother and  
13 best friend. Table 1 indicates which variables in the analyses are significantly  
14 associated with each other and justifies the use of attachment to pets as a  
15 mediator between communication with mother/father/best friend and quality of  
16 life. It also justifies the use of gender and age as control variables in further  
17 analyses.

18 [Insert table 1 here]

### 19 *Mediational analyses*

#### 20 *Adolescents with their own pet dog*

21 The 3 following mediation analyses are depicted in Figure 2: 1) IV:  
22 Communication with mother, M: Attachment to dogs, DV: Quality of Life; 2) IV:

1 Communication with father, M: Attachment to dogs, DV: Quality of Life; 3) IV:  
2 Communication with best friend, M: Attachment to dogs, DV: Quality of Life).

3 These analyses permitted the assessment as to whether good  
4 communication with mother (IV), father (IV) and best friend (IV) predicts  
5 quality of life (DV), and if this relationship is weaker in the presence of  
6 attachment to dogs as a mediator variable. The outcome showed that in the  
7 first group of models good communication with mother (M1:  $\beta=0.57$ ,  $t=11.33$ ,  
8  $p<0.001$ ), father (M2:  $\beta=0.55$ ,  $t=9.09$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), and best friend (M3:  $\beta=0.42$ ,  
9  $t=8.16$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) predicts higher levels of quality of life. In the second group of  
10 models, when attachment to dogs (the mediator) was added into the  
11 analyses, in these models  $\beta$  values were reduced somewhat but were still  
12 significant for good communication with mother (M4:  $\beta=0.55$ ,  $t=11.03$ ,  
13  $p<0.001$ ), father (M5:  $\beta=0.53$ ,  $t=8.75$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), and best friend (M6:  $\beta=0.39$ ,  
14  $t=11.0318$ ,  $p<0.001$ ).

15 Therefore, in these second group of models, attachment to dogs also  
16 predicted higher levels of quality of life (M4:  $\beta=0.02$ ,  $t=3.29$ ,  $p=0.0010$ ; M5:  
17  $\beta=0.02$ ,  $t=3.38$ ,  $p=0.007$ ; and M6:  $\beta=0.02$ ,  $t=2.93$ ,  $p=0.0034$ ). Attachment to  
18 dogs was found to improve the prediction of higher levels of quality of life over  
19 and above the other independent variables: communication with mother  
20 ( $\Delta^2=0.02$ ,  $F(4, 1502)=81.74$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) communication with father ( $\Delta^2=0.02$ ,  
21  $F(3, 1480)=82.27$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and communication with best friend ( $\Delta^2=0.02$ ,  
22  $F(4, 1458)=64.22$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). In the third group of models, when attachment to  
23 dogs was considered as the outcome variable, good communication with  
24 mother (M7:  $\beta=0.76$ ,  $t=3.96$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), father (M8:  $\beta=0.87$ ,  $t=3.78$ ,  $p<0.001$ ),



1 and best friend (M9:  $\beta=1.32$ ,  $t=6.90$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) predicted higher levels of  
2 attachment to dogs.

3 A Sobel test was performed in each mediation analysis to test the mediating  
4 criteria and evaluate whether the mediating influence of attachment to dogs  
5 between adolescents' communication with their significant others (mother,  
6 father, best friends) and quality of life was statistically significant. The  
7 outcomes showed that the mediation effect of attachment to dogs was  
8 statistically significant in the 3 mediation analyses: 1) IV: Communication with  
9 mother, M: Attachment to dogs, DV: Quality of Life ( $z=2.48$ ,  $p=0.012$ ); 2) IV:  
10 Communication with father, M: Attachment to dogs, DV: Quality of Life  
11 ( $z=2.47$ ,  $p=0.013$ ) and; 3) IV: Communication with best friend, M: Attachment  
12 to dogs, DV: Quality of Life ( $z=2.67$ ,  $p=0.007$ ). Accordingly, this indicates that  
13 attachment to dogs partially mediates the effects of communication with  
14 mother, father and best friend on quality of life in adolescents who reported  
15 owning a dog that they consider their own. See Figure 2 for further details.

16 [Insert Figure 2 here]

### 17 *Adolescents with their own pet cat*

18 The 3 following mediation analyses are depicted in Figure 3: 1) IV:  
19 Communication with mother, M: Attachment to cats, DV: Quality of Life; 2) IV:  
20 Communication with father, M: Attachment to cats, DV: Quality of Life; 3) IV:  
21 Communication with best friend, M: Attachment to cats, DV: Quality of Life).  
22 These analyses permitted the assessment as to whether good communication  
23 with mother (IV), father (IV) and best friend (IV) predicts quality of life (DV)  
24 and if this relationship is weaker in the presence of attachment to cats as a

1 mediator. In the first group of models, outcomes showed that good  
2 communication with mother (M1:  $\beta=0.58$ ,  $t=8.82$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), father (M2:  
3  $\beta=0.50$ ,  $t=6.06$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), and best friend (M3:  $\beta=0.42$ ,  $t=5.10$ ,  $p<0.001$ )  
4 predicts higher levels of quality of life. In the second group of models, when  
5 attachment to cats (the mediator) was added in to the analyses,  $\beta$  values  
6 were reduced somewhat, but were still significant for good communication  
7 with mother (M4:  $\beta=0.56$ ,  $t=8.58$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), father (M5:  $\beta=0.48$ ,  $t=5.88$ ,  
8  $p<0.001$ ), and best friend (M6:  $\beta=0.39$ ,  $t=5.67$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). In the second group  
9 of models, attachment to cats also predicted higher levels of quality of life  
10 (M4:  $\beta=0.03$ ,  $t=3.11$ ,  $p=0.0019$ ; M5:  $\beta=0.02$ ,  $t=3.43$ ,  $p=0.006$ ; and M6:  $\beta=0.02$ ,  
11  $t=5.67$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). Attachment to cats slightly improved the prediction of higher  
12 levels of quality of life over and above the following independent variables:  
13 communication with mother ( $\Delta^2=0.02$ ,  $F(4, 794)=48.60$ ,  $p<0.001$ )  
14 communication with father ( $\Delta^2=0.02$ ,  $F(4, 777)=37.27$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and  
15 communication with best friend ( $\Delta^2=0.03$ ,  $F(4, 770)=36.16$ ,  $p<0.001$ ).

16 Furthermore, in the third group of models, when attachment to cats was  
17 considered as the outcome variable, good communication with best friend  
18 (M9:  $\beta=1.33$ ,  $t=5.10$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) predicted higher levels of attachment to cats.

19 A Sobel test was performed in each mediation analysis to test the mediating  
20 criteria and evaluate whether the influence of attachment to cats between  
21 adolescents' communication with their significant others (mother, father and  
22 best friend) and quality of life was statistically significant. The outcomes  
23 showed that the mediation effect of attachment to pets was statistically  
24 significant in the following mediation analysis: IV= Communication with best  
25 friend, M= Attachment to dogs, DV= Quality of Life ( $z=2.45$ ,  $p=0.014$ ). The

1 Sobel test was not statistically significant in the following mediation analyses:  
2 IV= Communication with mother, M= Attachment to dogs, DV= Quality of Life  
3 ( $z=1.78$ ,  $p=0.07$ ); 2) IV= Communication with father, M= Attachment to dogs,  
4 DV= Quality of Life ( $z=1.47$ ,  $p=0.140$ ). Accordingly, attachment to cats  
5 partially mediates the effects of communication with best friend on quality of  
6 life but does not mediate the effects of communication with parents (mother  
7 and father) and quality of life.

8 [Insert Figure 3 here]

## 9 **Discussion**

10 This study evaluated several mediational models in which attachment to pets  
11 (dogs and cats) served as a mediator in the relations between adolescents'  
12 communication with their significant others (mother, father and best friend)  
13 and quality of life in 11 to 15-year-old adolescents.

### 14 *Communication with parents/ best friend (IV) and Quality of Life (DV)*

15 Good communication with adolescents' significant others (mother, father and  
16 best friend) predicted higher quality of life among adolescents with pet dogs  
17 and cats. During adolescence parents remain a key source of social support  
18 and emotional attachment and are influential in socio-emotional development  
19 across the life-span (Kullik & Petermann, 2013; Schaffer & Kidd, 2014).  
20 Several studies have reported that good communication with parents (Crosby,  
21 2002; Sillars, Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2005) and friends (Hartup, 1983;  
22 Newcomb & Bagwell, 1995) have a positive impact on physical and mental  
23 health in adolescents.

24

### 25 *Attachment to pets (dogs and cats) as a mediator*

1 Attachment to pets (dogs and cats) was found in our study to serve as a  
2 psychological mechanism to improve adolescents' quality of life. This  
3 statement was supported through our mediation analyses. Attachment to pets  
4 (dogs) mediated the effect of adolescents' communication with their significant  
5 others (mother, father and best friend) on quality of life among adolescent dog  
6 owners. In cat owners, the mediation effect only appeared between  
7 communication with best friend and quality of life. The mediating effects of  
8 attachment to dogs and cats were found to be quite similar, both in terms of  
9 the degree of predictability ( $\beta$  values range from 0.30 to 0.61) and the effect  
10 itself ( $\Delta^2$  =from 0.02 to 0.03). However, differences between the mediational  
11 role of attachment to dogs and cats could be explained by the different  
12 behavioural profiles of dogs and cats in their interactions with human beings.  
13 Dogs are more likely than cats to adapt their behaviours and emotions to  
14 emotional human signals (social referencing) (Paynet, Bennet & McGreevy,  
15 2015). In line with this it has been suggested that dogs are also more likely  
16 than cats to see human beings as peers who frequently offer significant  
17 information about the environments (Serpell, 1996; Potter & Mills, 2015). In  
18 line with Payne et al., (2015), further HAI research should also consider the  
19 influence pets' emotional (fear, happiness) and behavioural (stranger/owner  
20 directed aggression, dog/cat directed aggression, trainability, attention  
21 seeking, and energy) responses to humans and the impact of these on  
22 human-animal interaction.

23 These outcomes agree with Krause-Parello's (2008) study which found that  
24 attachment to pets mediated the relationship between loneliness and general  
25 health in older females living in the community. In line with Lazarus &

1 Folkman's stress theory (1984), Krause-Parello's (2008) study helped to  
2 demonstrate that attachment to pets might function as a coping mechanism  
3 (social/emotional support) in the relationship between stress (loneliness) and  
4 adaptation (health). Further applications of Lazarus & Folkman's stress theory  
5 (1984) in the general population have also demonstrated problem-focused  
6 coping mechanisms (logical analysis, seeking guidance, problems solving or  
7 social/emotional support) are related to better health outcomes in the general  
8 population (Sanderson, 2014). In our representative sample of Scottish  
9 adolescents, attachment to pets (dogs and cats) mediated the relationship  
10 between adolescents' communication with their significant others (mother,  
11 father and best friend) and quality of life (Models 4-6). This finding suggests  
12 pets may also be helpful not only in people with a higher risk of social isolation  
13 but also in typical adolescent development.

14

15 *Control variables (gender and age): Communication with parents/ best friend*  
16 *(IV) and Quality of Life (DV)*

17 Younger age and male gender predicted better levels of quality of life in  
18 adolescents who reported owning dogs and cats, even when attachment to  
19 these pets was considered as the mediator variable. Previous research has  
20 highlighted early adolescence (11-13 years old) and female gender was  
21 associated with lower quality of life for a variety of reasons relating to  
22 adolescent development including puberty and social development (Hampel,  
23 2007; Patton & Vinner, 2007; Plancherel & Bolognini, 1995). Young female  
24 adolescents are more likely than young adolescent males to experience rapid  
25 physiological changes like the menarche and imbalance of hormonal status

1 (Patton & Viner, 2007), more stressful events (Nolen-Hoeksema, Girgus &  
2 Seligman, 1991), and as a consequence, poorer psychological well-being  
3 (Gadin & Hammastrom, 2005; Kuehner, 2003; Steinberg & Morris, 2001).

4

5 *Attachment to pets (IV) and quality of life (DV)*

6 While controlling for communication with parents and best friend (Models 4-6),  
7 attachment to dogs and cats predicted higher levels of quality of life. In line  
8 with Julius, Beetz, Turner, Uvnäs-Moberg, & Kotrschal, (2013) these findings  
9 suggest that adolescent dog and cat owners with high levels of attachment to  
10 their pets may engage in positive human-animal interactions that support  
11 quality of life. Several studies have suggested that taking care of a pet helps  
12 owners learn how to be more responsible (Siegel, 1990), increases  
13 opportunities to interact with other human beings (Julius et al. 2013;  
14 McNicholas et al., 2005; Robin & Bensele, 1985), and provides benefits from  
15 sharing secrets and mood states with a non-judgmental "loyal friend" (Zilcha-  
16 Mano et al., 2011a). Cat and dog owners may differ in personality variables,  
17 which might also relate to their ability to form and maintain social bonds with  
18 their pets and other human beings. Studies have found adult dog owners tend  
19 to show lower levels of neuroticism and high levels of agreeableness and  
20 extroversion whereas adult cat owners tend to show higher levels of  
21 neuroticism and openness and lower levels of extraversion, agreeableness  
22 and conscientiousness (Gosling, Sandy & Potter, 2010; Payne et al., 2015;  
23 Kis, Turcsán, & Gácsi, 2012). This might explain why attachment to dogs and  
24 cats showed differential mediation effects in our study. Further research  
25 should replicate our results by testing the influence (mediation or moderation)

1 of human personality variables on owner-pet interactions and the way in  
2 which human beings relate to other human beings through their pets  
3 Our results are also in line with previous research that shows a 'pet effect' on  
4 adult health. For example, dog and cat owners have been found to use health  
5 care systems less than people with no pets (Headey, 1999). Other studies  
6 using general measures of pet ownership report improved survival rates from  
7 myocardial infarction (Friedmann, Katcher, Lynch & Thomas, 1980), a lower  
8 risk of heart disease (Anderson, Reid & Jennings 1992) and better  
9 psychological health (Straede & Gates,1993) compared with people who have  
10 no pets. Among children and adolescents, it has also been found that  
11 exposure to pet allergens when young, leads to reduced occurrence of  
12 allergic rhinitis and asthma later on (Nafstad, Magnus, Gaarder, & Jaakkola  
13 2001; Owby, Johnson & Peterson, 2002). Pet owners have also been found to  
14 have lower rates of absenteeism from school (McNicholas et al., 2005).

15

#### 16 *Communication with parents/best friend (IV) and attachment to pets (DV)*

17 It was also found a higher attachment to pets (dogs) was also explained by a  
18 good communication with the significant others (mother, father, best friend) in  
19 adolescent dog owners (Model 7-9). In cat owners only good communication  
20 with best friends predicted higher levels of attachment (Model 9). In  
21 adolescent dog owners, due to the demanding levels of care, adolescents and  
22 their parents could share care activities such as feeding or walking the dog  
23 (Julius et al., 2013). Through these shared activities, parents may verbalize  
24 caring skills to their children that may help to improve the attachments  
25 adolescents have with their dogs. Aspects such as sensitivity, positive affect,

1 affection, synchrony, mutuality, support and stimulation (De Wolf & Ijzendoon,  
2 1997) could be taught through caring, feeding, walking and playing activities  
3 with pets.

4 Regarding adolescent dog and cat owners, the relationship between better  
5 communication with a best friend and higher levels of attachment to these  
6 pets could also be explained by social imitation (Bandura, 1986). Adolescent  
7 dog and cat owners could share their own positive caring activities with their  
8 best friends, which would help to improve and/or reinforce the levels of  
9 attachment adolescents have with their pets. According to Cain (1985) pets  
10 may be seen as the “glue” that unifies family members and increases family  
11 cohesion. Walsh (2009) also suggests that pets may improve daily family life  
12 and promote greater interaction and communication within the family. Similar  
13 effects could also happen with adolescents and their friends.

14 *Control variables (gender and age): Communication with parents/ best friend*  
15 *(IV) and Attachment to pets (DV)*

16 Lower age together with the female gender predicted stronger levels of pet  
17 attachment in adolescents. Previous studies have reported similar results in  
18 children (Vidovic , Stetic, & Bratko, 1999) and adults (Holcomb, Williams, &  
19 Richards, 1985; Kidd & Kidd 1990). Kellert (1985) suggests that females tend  
20 to have stronger humanistic and moralistic attitudes than males. However,  
21 Ganster and Voith (1983) and Stevens (1990) found no significant differences  
22 between gender and generalised attachment to pets. These contrasting  
23 results could be explained by the use of different scales and/or populations  
24 assessed (Marsa-Sambola et al., 2015; Stevens, 1990; Westgarth et al.,  
25 2013). Regarding age, higher levels of attachment to dogs and cats were



1 associated with the lower age group. This is consistent with previous studies  
2 that highlight a decline in adolescent's interest in animals with age (Prokop &  
3 Tunnicliffe, 2010; Williams, Muldoon, & Lawrence, 2010). This may be related  
4 to a greater interest in socializing with best friends, rather than the family  
5 (Vidovic et al., 1999).

6

7 *Limitations*

8 Some limitations of the present study should be considered. First, our study  
9 focused on assessing cross-sectional relationships between variables. In  
10 order to assess the causal effects of our variables a longitudinal study is  
11 required. Second, in our study, we were not able to gather information about  
12 attachment to parents and best friends and the influence these variables may  
13 have in the relationship between adolescents' communication with their  
14 significant others (father, mother and best friend) and attachment to pets.  
15 Further studies should replicate our analyses adding reliable and valid  
16 measures of attachment to parents and best friends to analyze the influence  
17 of internal working models of human attachment on attachment to pets.

18

19 *Implications*

20 These results may support Headey & Gabka's (2007) study which suggests  
21 different types of pet owners (older people, shy or lonely people, sedentary  
22 people and young people) may benefit in different ways of pets' company.  
23 Specifically, they stated benefits to young people who grow up with pets may  
24 involve both being socialized to look after others and to have a stronger  
25 immune system. From our analyses it can also be stated attachment to pets

1 (dogs and cats) may also improve adolescent's quality of life and  
2 communication with their significant others.

3 Social contact has long been viewed as important in staving off social  
4 isolation and feelings of loneliness, as well as facilitating access to social  
5 support. As McNicholas & Collis (2000) argue, pets appear to act as "social  
6 catalysts", inducing social contact between people. Caring and playing with  
7 dogs and cats may facilitate communication with others through shared  
8 emotional bonds with the pet, and also ensures that basic pet care such as  
9 feeding, walking and grooming have been carried out. Although it has been  
10 stated this is more likely to happen with people with a higher risk of social  
11 isolation (Allen, Kellegrew & Jaffre, 2000; Banks & Banks, 2002; Cherniack &  
12 Cherniack, 2014; Grandgeorge et al., 2012; Hutton, 2015; Krause-Parello,  
13 2008; Lane, McNicholas & Collis, 1998; Siegel, 1990; Siegel et al., 1999;  
14 Zimolag & Krupa, 2009), the evidence from this study suggests it may also  
15 happen in typical adolescent development. In line with Siegel (1990), we  
16 argue that the main health benefits in human-animal interactions ensue when  
17 the person plays a significant role in caring for the pet and is highly attached  
18 to them. We have demonstrated that attachment to pets affects physical,  
19 psychological and social components of wellbeing, as captured by  
20 KIDSCREEN showing the breadth of the pet effect on adolescent wellbeing  
21 (McNicholas et al., 2005).

## 22 *Conclusion*

23 Higher levels of attachment to dogs and cats in adolescents may improve  
24 their quality of life and enhance communication with parents and best friends.

1 These phenomena can be explained by the caring activities related to dog  
2 and cat ownership.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1 **References**

- 2 Albert, A., & Bulcroft, K. (1988). Pets, families, and the life course. *Journal of*  
3 *Marriage and the Family*, 50, 543-552.
- 4 Allen, K., & Blascovich, J. (1996). The value of service dogs for people with  
5 severe ambulatory disabilities. *Journal of the American Medical*  
6 *Association*, 275, 1001–1006. doi:10.1001/jama.275.13.1001.
- 7 Allen, J. M., Kellegrew, D. H. & Jaffe, D. (2000). The experience of pet  
8 ownership as a meaningful occupation. *Canadian Journal of*  
9 *Occupational Therapy*, 67(4): 271-278.
- 10 Anderson, D. C. (2006). Measuring the bond: Instruments used to assess the  
11 impact of animal-assisted therapy. In A. H. Fine (Ed.), *Handbook on*  
12 *animal-assisted therapy* (pp. 391-411). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.
- 13 Anderson, W.P., Reid, C.M., Jennings, G.L.(1992). Pet ownership and risk  
14 factors for cardiovascular disease. *The Medical Journal of Australia*  
15 ,157(5):298-301.
- 16 Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social*  
17 *cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice- Hall, Inc.
- 18 Banks, M. R. & Banks, W. A. (2002). The effects of animal-assisted therapy  
19 on loneliness in an elderly population in long-term care facilities. *The*  
20 *journals of gerontology series A: biological sciences and medical*  
21 *sciences*, 57(7): 428-432.
- 22 Banman, J. (1994). Animal-assisted therapy with adolescents in a psychiatric  
23 facility. *Journal of Pastoral Care*, 49(3), 274-278.
- 24 Barker, S. B., Rogers, C. S., Turner, J. W., Karpf, A. S., & Suthers-McCabe,  
25 H. M. (2003). Benefits of Interacting with Companion Animals A

- 1 Bibliography of Articles Published in Refereed Journals during the Past  
2 5 Years. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 47(1), 94-99.
- 3 Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable  
4 distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and  
5 statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social  
6 Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- 7 Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and Loss*. New York: Basic Books.
- 8 Cain, O. (1985) Pets as Family Members. *Marriage & Family Review*, 8(3-4),  
9 5-10. doi:10.1300/J002v08n03\_02.
- 10 Carr et al., (in press). Fostering secure attachment: Experiences of animal  
11 companions in the foster home. *Attachment & Human Development*
- 12 Cherniack, E. P. & Cherniack, A. R. 2014. The benefit of pets and animal-  
13 assisted therapy to the health of older individuals. *Current Gerontology  
14 and Geriatrics Research*. doi: 10.1155/2014/623203.
- 15 Covert, A., Whiren, A., Keith, J. & Nelson, C. 1985. Pets, early adolescents  
16 and families. *Marriage and Family Review*, 8: 95-108.
- 17 Crawford, E. K., Worsham, N. L., & Swinehart, E. R. (2006). Benefits derived  
18 from companion animals, and the use of the term "attachment".  
19 *Anthrozoos*, 19(2), 98-112. doi: 10.2752/089279306785593757.
- 20 Crosby, L. (2002). The relation of maternal empathic accuracy to the  
21 development of self concept. *Dissertation Abstracts International:  
22 Section B: The Sciences & Engineering*, 62, 3374-3385.
- 23 Currie, C., Levin, K., Kirby, J., Currie, D., van der Sluijs, W., & Inchley, J.  
24 (2011a). *HBSC Scotland National Report*. St Andrews: University of St  
25 Andrews.

1 Currie, C., Levin, K., Kirby, J., Currie, D., van der Sluijs, W., & Inchley, J.  
2 (2011b). *Health Behaviour in School-Aged Children (HBSC): Scotland*  
3 *National Report*. Edinburgh: Child and Adolescent Health Research  
4 Unit (CAHRU).

5 Currie, C., Zanotti, C., Morgan, A., Currie, D., De Looze, M. E., Roberts, C., . .  
6 Barnekow, V. (2012). *Social determinants of health and well-being*  
7 *among young people. HBSC international report from the 2009/2010*  
8 *Survey. Health Policy for Children and Adolescents No. 6.*  
9 Copenhagen, Denmark: WHO Regional Office for Europe.

10 De Wolff, M. S., & Van IJzendoorn, M. H. (1997). Sensitivity and attachment:  
11 A meta-analysis on parental antecedents of infant attachment. *Child*  
12 *Development*, 68, 571–591. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.1997.tb04218.x

13 Downes, M., Canty, M. J., & More, S. J. (2009). Demography of the pet dog  
14 and cat population on the island of Ireland and human factors  
15 influencing pet ownership. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*, 92(1): 140-  
16 149.

17 Duncan, S. C., Duncan, T. E., & Strycker, L. A. (2005). Sources and types of  
18 social support in youth physical activity. *Health Psychology*, 24(1), 3-  
19 10.

20 Erhart, M., Ottova, V., Gaspar, T., Jericek, H., Schnohr, C., Alikasifoglu, M., . .  
21 Ravens-Sieberer, U. (2009). Measuring mental health and well-being of  
22 school-children in 15 European countries using the KIDSCREEN-10  
23 Index. *International Journal of Public Health*, 54 (2), 160-166. doi:  
24 10.1007/s00038-009-5407-7.

- 1 Esposito, L., McCune, S., Griffin, J. A., & Maholmes, V. (2011). Directions in  
2 Human–Animal Interaction Research: Child Development, Health, and  
3 Therapeutic Interventions. *Child Development Perspectives*, 5(3), 205-  
4 211. doi: 10.1111/j.1750-8606.2011.00175.x.
- 5 Friedmann, E., Katcher, A.H., Lynch, J.J.& Thomas, S.A (1980). Animal  
6 companions and one-year survival of patients after discharge from a  
7 coronary care unit. *Public Health Reports*. 95(4): 307–312.
- 8 Friedmann, E., Son, H., & Tsai, C. (2000). The animal-human bond: Health  
9 and wellness. In A.H Fine (Eds.), *Handbook on Animal-Assisted*  
10 *Therapy: theoretical foundations and guidelines for practice* (pp. 41-  
11 58). Boston, MA: Elsevier.
- 12 Gadin, K. G., & Hammarstrom, A. (2005). A possible contributor to the higher  
13 degree of girls reporting psychological symptoms compared with boys  
14 in grade nine? *European Journal of Public Health*, 15(4), 380–385.
- 15 Gadomski, A.M., Scribani, M.B., Krupa, N., Jenkins, P. (2016). Pet dogs and  
16 child physical activity: the role of child-dog attachment. *Pediatric*  
17 *Obesity*. doi: 10.1111/ijpo.12156.
- 18 Gaito, J. (1980). Measurement scales and statistics: Resurgence of an old  
19 misconception. *Psychological Bulletin*, 87(3), 564-567.
- 20 Ganster, D., & Voith, V. L. (1983). Attitudes of cat owners toward cats. *Feline*  
21 *Practice*, 13, 21–29.
- 22 Garnefski, N., & Diekstra, R. F. (1997). Adolescents from one parent,  
23 stepparent and intact families: emotional problems and suicide  
24 attempts. *Journal of Adolescence*, 20(2), 201-208.

- 1 Gosling, S.D., Sandy, C.J., Potter, J. (2010). Personalities of Self-Identified  
2 "Dog People" and "Cat People". *Anthrozoos*, 23 (3), 213-222.
- 3 Grandgeorge, M., Tordjman, S., Lazartigues, A., Lemonnier, E., Deleau, M. &  
4 Hausberger, M. (2012). Does pet arrival trigger prosocial behaviors in  
5 individuals with autism. *PloS one* 7(8): e41739.  
6 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0041739
- 7 Hampel, P. (2007). Brief report: Coping among Austrian children and  
8 adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 30(5), 885–890.
- 9 Hartup, W. W. (1983). Peer relations. In P. H. Mussen & E. M. Hetherington  
10 (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Socialization, personality, and*  
11 *social development* (pp. 103–196). New York: Wiley.
- 12 Hartup, W. W., & Stevens, N. (1997). Friendships and adaptation in the life  
13 course. *Psychological Bulletin*, 121(3), 76-79.
- 14 Headey, B (1999) Health Benefits and Health Cost Savings Due to Pets:  
15 Preliminary Estimates from an Australian National Survey. *Social*  
16 *Indicator Research*, 47(2), 233-243.
- 17 Headey, B., & Grabka, M. M. (2007). Pets and human health in Germany and  
18 Australia: National longitudinal results. *Social Indicators Research*,  
19 80(2), 297-311.
- 20 Holcomb, R., Williams, R. C., & Richards, P. S. (1985). The elements of  
21 attachment: relationship maintenance and intimacy. *Journal of Delta*  
22 *Society*, 9, 28–34.
- 23 Holliday, J. C., Rothwell, H. A., & Moore, L. A. (2010). The relative importance  
24 of different measures of peer smoking on adolescent smoking  
25 behavior: cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses of a large British



1 cohort. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 47(1), 58-66. doi:  
2 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.12.020.

3 Hutton, V.E. (2015). Social Provisions of the Human—Animal Relationship  
4 amongst 30 People Living with HIV in Australia. *Anthrozoös*, 28(2):  
5 199-214.

6 Julius, H., Beetz, A., Turner, D.C., Uvnäs-Moberg, K., & Kotrschal, K.  
7 (2013). *Attachment to Pets An Integrative View of Human-Animal*  
8 *Relationships with Implications for Therapeutic Practice*. Boston:  
9 Hogrefe.

10 Kellert, S. (1985). Effects of having pets at home on children's attitudes  
11 toward popular and unpopular animals. *Journal of Environmental*  
12 *Education*, 3, 29–39.

13 Kidd, A. H., & Kidd, R. M. (1990). Factors in children's attitudes toward  
14 pets. *Psychological Reports*, 66(3), 775–786.

15 Kis, A., Turcsán, B., Gácsi, M. (2012). The effect of the owner's personality on  
16 the behaviour of owner-dog dyads. *Interactional Studies*, 13(3): 383-  
17 391.

18 Krause-Parello, C.A (2008). The Mediating Effect of Pet Attachment Support  
19 Between Loneliness and General Health in Older Females Living in  
20 the Community, *Journal of Community Health Nursing*, 25:1, 1-14, DOI:  
21 10.1080/07370010701836286.

22 Kruger, K.S., Stern, S.L., Anstead, G., Finley, E.P. (2014). Perceptions of  
23 companion dog benefits on well-being of US military veterans with  
24 HIV/AIDS. *Southern Medical Journal*. 107(3):188-93. doi:  
25 10.1097/SMJ.0000000000000078.

- 1
- 2 Kuehner, C. (2003). Gender differences in unipolar depression: an update of  
3 epidemiological findings and possible explanations. *Acta psychiatrica*  
4 *Scandinavica*, 108(3), 163–174.
- 5 Kullik, A., & Petermann, F. (2013). Attachment to parents and peers as a risk  
6 factor for adolescent depressive disorders: The mediating role of  
7 emotion regulation. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 44,  
8 537-548.
- 9 Kurdek, L. A. (2008). Pet dogs as attachment figures. *Journal of Social and*  
10 *Personal Relationships*, 25(2), 247-266. doi:  
11 10.1177/0265407507087958
- 12 Kwong, M.J., & Bartholomew, K. (2011). “Not just a dog”: an attachment  
13 perspective on relationship with assistance dogs. *Attachment & Human*  
14 *Development*, 13(5), 421-436.
- 15 Lane, D., McNicholas, J., & Collis, G. M. (1998). Dogs for the disabled:  
16 benefits to recipients and welfare of the dog. *Applied Animal Behaviour*  
17 *Science*, 59(1), 49-60.
- 18 Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New  
19 York: Springer.
- 20 Levin, K. A., & Currie, C. (2010). Family structure, mother-child  
21 communication, father-child communication, and adolescent life  
22 satisfaction: A cross-sectional multilevel analysis. *Health Education*,  
23 110(3), 152-168.
- 24 Marsa- Sambola, F., Muldoon, J., Williams, J., Lawrence, A., Connor, M., &  
25 Currie, C. (2015). *The Short Attachment to Pet Scale (SAPS) for*

1            *Children and Young People: Development, Psychometric Qualities and*  
2            *Demographic and Health Associations. Child Indicator Research*, doi:  
3            10.1007/s12187-015-9303-9.

4    McNicholas, J., & Collis, G. M. (2000). Dogs as catalysts for social  
5            interactions: robustness of the effect. *British Journal of Psychology*, 91  
6            (1), 61-70.

7    McNicholas, J., Gilbey, A., Rennie, A., Ahmedzai, S., Dono, J. A., & Ormerod,  
8            E. (2005). Pet ownership and human health: a brief review of evidence  
9            and issues. *British Medical Journal*, 331(7527), 1252-1254. doi:  
10           10.1136/bmj.331.7527.1252.

11   Melson, G.F., & Fine, A.H. (2006). Animals in the lives of children. In A.H.  
12           Fine (Ed.) *AnimalAssisted Therapy: Theoretical foundations and*  
13           *guidelines for practice* (pp. 207–226). San Diego: Academic Press.

14   Michel, G., Bisegger, C., Fuhr, D. C., & Abel, T. (2009). Age and gender  
15           differences in health-related quality of life of children and adolescents  
16           in Europe: a multilevel analysis. *Quality Life Research*, 18(9), 1147-  
17           1157. doi: 10.1007/s11136-009-9538-3.

18   Mitchell, R. W. (2001). Americans' talk to dogs: Similarities and differences  
19           with talk to infants. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*,  
20           34(2), 183-210.

21   Moreno, C., Sánchez-Queija, I., Muñoz-Tinoco, V., de Matos, M. G., Dallago,  
22           L., Ter Bogt, T., . . . Rivera, F. (2009). Cross-national associations  
23           between parent and peer communication and psychological  
24           complaints. *International Journal of Public Health*, 54(2), 235-242.

- 1 Muldoon, J., & Williams, J. (2010). *Developing questions for the HBSC study:*  
2 *findings from the Defra- funded project 'Promoting a Duty of Care*  
3 *towards animals among young people'*. Edinburg, UK: University of  
4 Edinburgh.
- 5 Müllersdorf, M., Granström, F., Sahlqvist, L. & Tillgren, P. (2010). Aspects of  
6 health, physical/leisure activities, work and socio-demographics  
7 associated with pet ownership in Sweden. *Scandinavian Journal of*  
8 *Public Health* 38: 53-63.
- 9 Murray, J. K., Browne, W. J., Roberts, M. A., Whitmarsh, A. & Gruffydd-Jones,  
10 T. J. (2010). Number and ownership profiles of cats and dogs in the  
11 UK. *The Veterinary Record* 166(6): 163-174.
- 12 Nafstad, P., Magnus, P., Gaarder, P.I., Jaakkola, J.J.K. (2000). Exposure to  
13 pets and atopy-related diseases in the first 4 years of life. *Allergy*;  
14 56:307–312.
- 15 Newcomb, A.F., Bagwell, C.L. (1995) Children's friendship relations: A meta-  
16 analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*. 117: 306–347.
- 17 Nolen-Hoeksema, S., Girgus, J. S., & Seligman, M. E. P. (1991). Sex  
18 differences in depression and explanatory style in children. *Journal of*  
19 *Youth and Adolescence*, 20(2), 233–245.
- 20 Ogechi, I., Snook, K., Davis, B.M., Hansen, A.R., Liu, F., Zhang, J. (2016) Pet  
21 Ownership and the Risk of Dying from Cardiovascular Disease Among  
22 Adults Without Major Chronic Medical Conditions. *High Blood Pressure*  
23 *& Cardiovascular Prevention*. DOI 10.1007/s40292-016-0156-1

- 1 Park, N. (2004). The role of subjective well-being in positive youth  
2 development. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and*  
3 *Social Science*, 591(1), 25-39.
- 4 Parslow, R.A., Jorm, A.F., Christensen, H., Rodgers, B.,  
5 & Jacomb P. (2004). Pet Ownership and Health in Older Adults:  
6 Findings from a Survey of 2,551 Community-Based Australians  
7 Aged 60–64. *Gerontology*;51:40–47. doi:10.1159/000081433
- 8 Patton, G. C., & Viner, R. (2007). Pubertal transitions in  
9 health. *Lancet*, 369(9567), 1130–1139.
- 10 Payne, E., Bennett, P.C & McGreevy, P.D (2015). Current perspectives on  
11 attachment and bonding in the dog–human dyad *Psychology Research*  
12 *& Behaviour Management* , 8: 71–79.
- 13 Plancherel, B., & Bolognini, M. (1995). Coping and mental health in early  
14 adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 18(4), 459–474.
- 15 Polter, A. & Mills, A.P. (2015). Domestic Cats (*Felis Silvestris Catus*) Do Not  
16 Show Signs of Secure Attachment to Their Owners. *Plos One*, 10 (9),  
17 e0135109. Doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0135109.
- 18 Potard, C., Courtois, R., Rusch, E. (2008) The influence of peers on risky  
19 sexual behaviour during adolescence. *The European Journal of*  
20 *Contraception & Reproductive Health Care*. 13(3):264-70. doi:  
21 10.1080/13625180802273530.
- 22 Prokop, P., & Tunnicliffe, S. D. (2010). Effects of having pets at home on  
23 children’s attitudes toward popular and unpopular animals. *Anthrozoös*,  
24 1, 21–35.

- 1 Serpell, J.A. (1996). Evidence for an association between pet behaviour and  
2 owner attachment levels. *Journal of Applied Animal Behavioural*  
3 *Science*, 47 (1), 49-60.
- 4 Staats, S, Miller, D., Carnot, M. J., Rada, K & Turnes, J. (1996) The Miller-  
5 Rada Commitment to Pets Scale. *Anthrozoös*, 9(2), 88-94.  
6 DOI10.2752/089279396787001509.
- 7 Stevens, L. T. (1990). Attachment to pets among eighth graders. *Anthrozoös*,  
8 3, 177–183.
- 9 Straede, C. M., & Gates, G. M. (1993). Psychological health in a population of  
10 Australian cat owners. *Anthrozoös*, 6, 30-42.
- 11 Sussman, M. (1985). *Pets and the family*. New York: Haworth Press.
- 12 Ravens-Sieberer, U., Erhart, M., Rajmil, L., Herdman, M., Auquier, P., Bruil,  
13 J., . . . Kilroe, J. (2010). Reliability, construct and criterion validity of the  
14 KIDSCREEN-10 score: a short measure for children and adolescents'  
15 well-being and health-related quality of life. *Quality of Life Research*,  
16 19(10), 1487-1500. doi: 10.1007/s11136-010-9706-5.
- 17 Roberts, C., Freeman, J., Samdal, O., Schnohr, C. W., de Looze, M. E., Nic  
18 Gabhainn, S., . . . Rasmussen, M. (2009). The Health Behaviour in  
19 School-aged Children (HBSC) study: methodological developments  
20 and current tensions. *International Journal of Public Health*, 54 (2),  
21 140-150. doi: 10.1007/s00038-009-5405-9.
- 22 Robin, M., & Bense, R. (1985). Pets and the socialization of children.  
23 *Marriage & Family Review*, 8(3): 63-78. doi:10.1300/J002v08n03\_06.

- 1 Sanderson, C.A (2014). Managing stress: The role of personality and social  
2 support. In Eds Sanderson C.A. *Health Psychology*. (pp142-188). New  
3 York: USA.
- 4 Shaffer, D.R & Kipp, K. (2014). Emotional Development, Temperament and  
5 Attachment. In Eds Shaffer, D.R & Kipp, K. *Developmental Psychology:  
6 Childhood and Adolescence*. (pp100-200)Washington, USA: Cengage  
7 Learning.
- 8 Sillars, A., Koerner, A., Fitzpatric, M.A (2005). Communication and  
9 understanding in parent-adolescent relationship. *Human  
10 Communication Research*, 31(1), 102-128.
- 11 Siegel, J. M. (1990). Stressful life events and use of physician services among  
12 the elderly: the moderating role of pet ownership. *Journal of Personality  
13 and Social Psychology*, 58(6), 1081-1086.
- 14 Siegel, J. M., Angulo, F. J., Detels, R., Wesch, J. & Mullen, A. (1999). AIDS  
15 diagnosis and depression in the Multicenter AIDS Cohort Study: the  
16 ameliorating impact of pet ownership. *Aids Care* 11(2): 157-170.
- 17 Steinberg, L., & Morris, A. S. (2001). Adolescent development. *Annual Review  
18 of Psychology*, 52, 83–110.
- 19 Stevens, L. T. (1990). Attachment to pets among eighth graders.  
20 *ANTHROZOÖS*, 3, 177–183.
- 21 Straede, C. M., & Gates, G. M. (1993). Psychological health in a population of  
22 Australian cat owners. *Anthrozoös*, 6, 30-42.
- 23 Sweeting, H., & West, P. (1995). Family life and health in adolescence: a role  
24 for culture in the health inequalities debate. *Social Science & Medicine*,  
25 40(2), 163-175.

1 The KIDSCREEN Group (2004). KIDSCREEN Project Information. Retrieved  
2 from <http://www.kidscreen.org/english/project/>

3 Vidovic, V., Stetic, V., & Bratko, D. (1999). Pet ownership, type of pet and  
4 socio-emotional development of school children. *Anthrozoös*, 12(4),  
5 211–217.

6 Walsh, F. (2009). Human-animal bonds II: the role of pets in family systems  
7 and family therapy. *Family Process*. 48(4):481-99. doi: 10.1111/j.1545-  
8 5300.2009.01297.x.

9 Westgarth, C., Boddy, L. M., Stratton, G., German, A. J., Gaskell, R. M.,  
10 Coyne, K. P., . . . Dawson, S. (2013). Pet ownership, dog types and  
11 attachment to pets in 9-10 year old children in Liverpool, UK. *BMC*  
12 *Veterinary Research*, 9, 100-112. doi: 10.1186/1746-6148-9-102.

13 Widman, L., Choukas-Bradley, S., & Helms, S.W (2014). Sexual  
14 Communication Between Early Adolescents and Their Dating Partners,  
15 Parents, and Best Friends. *Journal of sex research*, 51(7), 731–741.

16 Williams, J. M., Muldoon, J., & Lawrence, A. (2010). Children and their pets:  
17 Exploring the relationships between pet ownership, pet attitudes,  
18 attachment to pets and empathy. *Education and Health*, 28(1), 12–15.

19 Xiao, Z., Li, X., & Stanton, B. (2011) Perceptions of parent-adolescent  
20 communication within families: it is a matter of perspective. *Psychology*  
21 *Health & Medicine*.16(1):53-65. doi: 10.1080/13548506.2010.521563.

22 Zilcha-Mano, S., Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2011a). An attachment  
23 perspective on human-pet relationships: Conceptualization and  
24 assessment of pet attachment orientations. *Journal of Research in*  
25 *Personality*, 45(4), 345-357. DOI 10.1016/j.jrp.2011.04.001.



1 Zilcha-Mano, S., Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P.R (2011b). Pet in the therapy  
2 room: an attachment perspective on Animal-Assited Therapy.  
3 *Attachment & Human Development*, 13(6), 541-561. DOI  
4 10.1080/14616734.2011.608987.

5 Zimolag, U. U. & Krupa, T. (2009). Pet ownership as a meaningful community  
6 occupation for people with serious mental illness. *American Journal of*  
7 *Occupational Therapy*, 63(2): 126-137.

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

1 Table 1. Correlations, means, standard deviations and Cronbach's  $\alpha$  for all the  
 2 variables in the study.

Dogs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(1)Age	1	-.022	-.294**	.115**	.174**	-.067**	-.299**
(2)gender	-.022	1	-.112**	.157**	-.013	-.190**	.086**
(3) Quality of Life	-.294**	-.112**	1	-.282**	-.328**	-.171**	.177**
(4) Father communication	.115**	.157**	-.282**	1	.398**	.170**	-.017
(5) Mother communication	.174**	-.013	-.328**	.398**	1	.239**	-.084**
(6) Best friend communication	-.067**	-.190**	-.171**	.170**	.239**	1	-.066**
(7) Attachment to dogs	-.299**	.086**	.177**	-.017	-.084**	-.066**	1
Mean & SD			46.08±9.17				35.16±3.84
Cronbach's $\alpha$			0.82				0.83
<b>Cats</b>							
(1)Age	1	-.006	-.294**	.133**	.164**	-.079**	-.296**
(2)gender	-.006	1	-.104**	.202**	.042	-.190**	.156**
(3) Quality of Life	-.294**	-.104**	1	-.276**	-.353**	-.169**	.197**
(4) Father communication	.133**	.202**	-.276**	1	.417**	.133**	-.004
(5) Mother communication	.164**	.042	-.353**	.417**	1	.224**	-.074*
(6) Best friend communication	-.079**	-.190**	-.169**	.133**	.224**	1	-.143**
(7) Attachment to dogs	-.296**	.156**	.197**	-.004	-.074*	-.143**	1
Mean & SD			46.60±9.65				35.36±3.86
Cronbach's $\alpha$			0.80				0.82

3 Note: \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$

4

5

6

7

8


9

10

1 Figure 1. The theoretical model proposing that attachment to pets mediates  
2 the effect of adolescents' communication with their significant others and  
3 quality of life.

4

5



6

7

8

9

10

11

12


13

14

15

1 Figure 2. Mediation analyses: Dog owners.

2



3

Model	Mediation analyses (N=1463)		
— →	(X) Communication with father, (Y) Quality of Life, (M) Attachment to dogs (Z= 2.67 p=0.007)		
	DV: QoL	DV: QoL (Attachment)	DV: Attachment
age	$\beta=-0.15, t=-10.15, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.13, t=-8.92, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.61, t=-10.82, p<0.001$
gender	$\beta=-0.24, t=-4.98, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.25, t=-5.26, p<0.001$	$\beta=0.60, t=3.25, p<0.001$
→	(X) Communication with mother, (Y) Quality of Life, (M) Attachment to dogs (Z= 2.47 p=0.013)		
	DV: QoL	DV: QoL (Attachment)	DV: Attachment
Age	$\beta=-0.16, t=-10.83, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.16, t=-10.83, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.14, t=-9.50, p<0.001$
gender	$\beta=-0.16, t=-3.28, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.16, t=-3.28, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.18, t=-3.60, p<0.001$
→	(X) Communication with best friend, (Y) Quality of Life, (M) Attachment to dogs (Z= 2.48 p=0.012)		
	DV: QoL	DV: QoL (Attachment)	DV: Attachment
Age	$\beta=-0.19, t=-13.06, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.18, t=-11.61, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.67, t=-12.02, p<0.001$
gender	$\beta=-0.30, t=-5.99, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.31, t=-6.14, p<0.001$	$\beta=0.37, t=1.91, p=0.040$


4

5

6

1 Figure 3. Mediation analyses: Cat owners

2



Model	Mediation analyses (N=799)		
-->	(X) Communication with father, (Y) Quality of Life, (M) Attachment to cats (Z= 1.47 p=0.140)		
	DV: QoL	DV: QoL (Attachment)	DV: Attachment
age	$\beta=-0.15, t=-7.92, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.13, t=-6.70, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.67, t=-8.65, p<0.001$
gender	$\beta=-0.13, t=-2.12, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.17, t=-2.63, p<0.001$	$\beta=1.26, t=4.90, p<0.001$
————>	(X) Communication with mother, (Y) Quality of Life, (M) Attachment to cats (Z= 1.78 p=0.074)		
	DV: QoL	DV: QoL (Attachment)	DV: Attachment
Age	$\beta=-0.16, t=-8.26, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.14, t=-6.91, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.64, t=-8.70, p<0.001$
gender	$\beta=-0.19, t=-1.35, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.13, t=-1.91, p<0.001$	$\beta=1.25, t=4.73, p<0.001$
————>	(X) Communication with best friend, (Y) Quality of Life, (M) Attachment to cats (Z= 2.45 p=0.014)		
	DV: QoL	DV: QoL (Attachment)	DV: Attachment
Age	$\beta=-0.19, t=-9.70, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.17, t=-8.34, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.71, t=-9.30, p<0.001$
gender	$\beta=-0.25, t=-3.62, p<0.001$	$\beta=-0.27, t=-3.96, p<0.001$	$\beta=0.91, t=3.44, p<0.001$

3

4

5

1

2