

Research Paper

## Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners

Aditi Mishra<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr. Soni Kewalramani<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The impact of owning a pet on emotional health, social assistance, and general quality of life has been vastly studied through numerous investigations examining these relationships. Pets play an integral role in the home, offering steadfast companionship, emotional stability, and a feeling of belonging. They grant unconditional fondness, comfort during challenging eras, and a wellspring of delight, strengthening the emotional bonds within the family unit. This research aims to explore the contrast in companionship, life quality, and psychological well-being between individuals who have pets compared to those without. Snowball sampling was employed to recruit a group of 281 participants aged 18 or older who filled out an extensive questionnaire comprising various assessments such as the Psychological Well-being Scale, the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support, and the World Health Organization Quality of Life Assessment—Brief Version. Independent sample t-tests were run for all participants. The results suggest households with pets generally experience enhanced psychological health, social support, and improved quality of life (Bao & Schreer, 2016). Pets enhance companionship by providing continuous backing that improves human social interactions (Antonacopoulos & Pychyl, 2010). Additionally, households with pets frequently report better overall well-being, benefiting from improved physical health, stronger social bonds, and increased quality of life (Allen et al., 2002).

**Keywords:** *Psychological well-being, Quality of Life, Companionship, Pet-owners, Non-pet Owners*

Pets provide comfort, enrich lives, and reduce loneliness, significantly boosting emotional wellness, as evidenced by various analyses. While pet guardians regularly experience decreased anxiety levels and increased social interaction, individuals without pets may look to alternative resources of connection and contentment. Exploring these variations offers important insights into how human-animal bonds impact mental health and overall happiness. Whereas past research explored the connections between pet ownership, psychological well-being, fellowship, and quality of life, recent studies present a more nuanced view. Dargan found that canine keepers reported greater psychological health and joy, yet tension levels displayed no considerable gap between pet owners and non-owners. Similarly, Sawoo and Mukherjee saw that pet owners experienced lower unease and

<sup>1</sup>Researcher

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Amity Institute of Behavioural and Allied Sciences, Lucknow campus Amity University Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India.

\*Corresponding Author

Received: April 07, 2025; Revision Received: April 15, 2025; Accepted: April 18, 2025

## **Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners**

depression alongside an enhanced quality of living, strengthening the idea that pets positively contribute to mental health. However, a comprehensive review by Brooks and colleagues, analyzing 54 studies on pet ownership and mental health, revealed a more complex picture. While 17 studies reported good outcomes, 19 showed blended results, proposing that the relationship between pet ownership and psychological well-being is multifaceted and influenced by various elements. These discoveries accentuate the need for further research to fully grasp how pet ownership shapes companionship, mental health, and life satisfaction in all its intricacy.

### **PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING AND PET-OWNERS**

Psychological well-being profoundly impacts quality of life, encompassing emotional balance, satisfaction with life's journey thus far, and strategies for handling stressors (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Recently, researchers have delved into diverse influences on well-being, such as interpersonal connections, lifestyle elections, and environmental determinants (Diener et al., 2017). One determinant generating significant notice is the presence of animal friends. Cohabiting with a pet has been demonstrated to deeply affect psychological well-being, offering emotional aid, mitigating anxiety levels, and boosting overall mental health (McConnell et al., 2011). Sharing one's home with a furry companion can provide solace and joy during difficult times. Pets offer unwavering affection and comfort no matter life's ups and downs. Animals provide friendship and constant fondness, helping to combat loneliness and fostering a sense of security (Antonacopoulos & Pychyl, 2010). Studies indicate that engaging with pets can lower cholesterol counts, uplift mood, and stimulate the secretion of oxytocin—a hormone related to attachment and relaxation (Beetz et al., 2012). Moreover, having a pet cultivates a sense of routine and duty, which can be particularly advantageous for individuals facing depression or anxiety (Purewal et al., 2017). Everyday chores such as feeding, walking, or engaging in play with a pet foster a sense of stability and importance (Serpell, 1991).

Moreover, pets can improve social interaction, as dog owners often converse with fellow pet owners during walks, reducing feelings of social isolation (Wood et al., 2015). Participating in physical activities is another significant benefit, particularly for dog owners who often take their dogs for walks, leading to improved physical and mental well-being (Christian et al., 2013). Therapy and emotional support animals are essential for individuals with PTSD, autism, and different mental health challenges by providing comfort and aiding in emotional regulation (Mueller et al., 2019).

Nevertheless, owning a pet comes with difficulties, such as financial responsibilities and the emotional anguish of losing a beloved animal (Chur-Hansen et al., 2011). The level of psychological benefits varies according to factors like the type of pet, the owner's lifestyle, and the personal relationship (Barker & Wolen, 2008). Despite these challenges, for many people, owning a pet significantly enhances emotional strength, alleviates stress, and increases overall happiness in life (Bao & Schreer, 2016). Study by Endenburg and Baarda (1995) found that having a pet encourages family members to participate more, promoting a feeling of teamwork and shared responsibility (Anthrozoös). Triebenbacher (1998) suggested that pets act as a social link, enhancing interaction and relationships among family members (Journal of Social and Personal Relationships). Beside improving relationships, pets also contribute to reducing stress levels. A study by Allen et al. (1991) showed that families who owned pets had reduced blood pressure and heart rates in stressful circumstances compared to those without pets (Psychosomatic Medicine). There's an

## **Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners**

exceptionally calming effect of having a pet close by, whether it's a dog cuddling beside you after a long day or a cat softly purring in your lap. Research conducted by McConnell et al. (2011) found that pet owners often reported higher levels of life satisfaction, increased self-esteem, and better social support, contributing to a happier home environment (*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*).

### **COMPANIONSHIP AND PET OWNERS**

Staats, Wallace, and Anderson (2008) suggested that having pets can satisfy essential human needs, especially the desire for companionship (*Journal of the Human-Animal Bond*). Their focus is on the ability of animals to ease loneliness, offer assistance during difficult periods, and help in sustaining an active lifestyle. Pet owners frequently describe dogs as more than mere animals, depicting them as kids, buddies, companions, and confidants—this description aligns with the definition of a pet by Campos and Hernandez (2011) (*Anthrozoös*).

Pet owners often experience a bond that goes beyond their connection with their pets—this relationship influences their interactions with others as well. The love and care they offer to their animals naturally foster qualities like empathy, patience, and emotional awareness, shaping their interactions with others (McConnell et al., 2011). Since pets rely on their owners for affection and support, this feeling of obligation improves their ability to form meaningful connections in all areas of life (Brown, 2015).

One of the sweetest elements of owning pets is the deep emotional bond that forms. Animals coexist with their owners and offer unwavering love and companionship, teaching important lessons about loyalty and silent communication (Serpell, 1996). Such a connection can help pet owners cultivate increased understanding and compassion in their interactions with others (Zilcha-Mano et al., 2011). By dedicating time to care for a non-verbal animal, people enhance their emotional awareness, enabling them to recognize feelings and respond with empathy during human interactions too. Studies have shown that people who have a strong bond with their pets tend to display increased empathy and emotional strength—traits essential for building solid, lasting relationships (Paul, 2000; Meehan et al., 2017). Pets additionally assist their owners in feeling more linked to their surroundings environment. A dog for a walk, exploring pet friendly areas or just engaging with the community of animal enthusiasts fosters opportunities for social connection. Numerous pet owners often engage in conversations with other dog walkers socialise with neighbours or build friendship in pet communities owning a pet inherently promotes orders and depend ability qualities that contribute to create strong and nurturing connection with others.

### **QUALITY OF LIFE AND PET OWNERS**

Pet owners often find that their lives feel more lively and fulfilling because of the love, companionship, and joy that their pets bring (McConnell et al., 2011). Be it the happiness of a dog greeting them at the entrance, the soothing touch of a cat curled up beside them, or the cheerful singing of a bird at sunrise, these small yet meaningful instances have a profound effect (Serpell, 1996). Pets provide more than just company; they alleviate stress, enhance moods, and promote a feeling of purpose in daily life (Beetz et al., 2012).

Studies show that people with pets tend to be happier, more active, and experience lower levels of loneliness than those without pets (Gilbey & Tani, 2015). This signifies continually having a loyal partner—someone who offers quiet assistance in challenging moments and

## **Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners**

shares in life's simple joys (Zasloff & Kidd, 1994). From morning walks to evening snuggles, owning a pet offers solace and emotional support that enhances overall well-being (Bao & Schreer, 2016). It's not surprising that, for many pet owners, these furry friends are more than mere animals—they are family (Barker & Wolen, 2008).

### **RATIONALE OF THE STUDY**

The relationship between humans and animals has intrigued psychologists for many years, with growing evidence showing that pet ownership significantly impacts mental health, companionship, and overall life quality (Serpell, 1996; Beetz et al., 2012). However, while numerous studies highlight the benefits of pet ownership, further insight into how pet owners differ from non-owners in these areas is still needed (McConnell et al., 2011). This research aims to explore these distinctions and contribute to the growing knowledge of human-animal interactions (Herzog, 2011).

The scholarly work acknowledges the meaningful bond individuals form with their animals as a source of emotional assistance and friendship, emphasizing how pets enrich lives in distinctive ways. Psychological prosperity signifies total mental health, involving elements like reduced stress, more balanced emotions, and resilience against hardship, areas where furry friends seem particularly helpful. Past studies indicate people with pets usually experience less stress, anxiety, and unhappiness compared to those without, though more exploration is needed into whether effects are uniform across demographics like age, gender, and living situations. This investigation aims to compare how significantly pets aid emotional and psychological well-being by contrasting those who share their homes with canine or feline friends against those who do not. Companionship plays a pivotal role in the relationships that define our humanity, shaping sensations of security and completeness, as many pet parents feel their pets offer unconditional care that soothes solitude and fosters community participation. While pets sometimes substitute for human friendship, they also push owners to join with neighbors through walks in which tails happily wag. This research intends to inspect whether owning a pet notably enhances a sense of fellowship relative to individuals without pets and how these ties correlate with bonds between people. Quality of life encompasses a vast array of factors that contribute to one's well-being, including physical health, psychological footing, and social connectedness. Indeed, the World Health Organization defines quality of life as such. Prior investigations indicate that pet ownership frequently cultivates active lifestyles, nurtures community ties, and fosters emotional resilience among companions. Companionship with an animal friend has demonstrated mental and social perks for people. However, some scholars point out that the responsibilities and expenses that come with caring for critters can induce anxiety in certain temperaments. This analysis aims to examine both the upsides and downsides of having pets at home, presenting a nuanced perspective on influences on general prosperity. A balanced understanding is sought of how companionship impacts an individual's quality of life in its totality.

While much of the prior research has centered on specific aspects of owning a pet, more nuanced examinations are still needed that juxtapose those who share their lives with animal companions against those who do not. Indeed, numerous investigations have focused solely on pet guardians, overlooking how their experiences may diverge from individuals without furry family members. This study aims to further illuminate whether having pets is truly advantageous or if other determinants, such as one's personality traits, lifestyle choices, or external social assistance, wield a greater impact on psychological wellness and standard of

## Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners

living. It seeks to paint a richer picture of how pet ownership may interconnect with or be impacted by various personal and environmental factors in shaping owners' and non-owners' quality of life and mental health.

### **METHOD**

#### *Objective*

To study psychological well-being, companionship and quality of life of pet owners and non-pet owners.

#### *Hypothesis*

There is positive difference in psychological wellbeing, companionship and quality of life of pet-owners than non-pet owners.

#### *Sample*

The study mechanism for simple random sample recruit 281 participants of aged 18 and above, Initially, individuals within this age range were selected from the researcher's personal network including friends, family and acquaintances. These participants were then encouraged to share the study questionnaire within their own social circles facilitating the expansion of the sample through snowballed sampling this approach aimed to ensure a diverse representation of perspectives and backgrounds within the specified age. By leveraging snowball sampling method, the study sought to capture a broad range of experiences, enriching the depth and diversity of collected data.

#### *Variables*

Psychological well-being, Companionship, Quality of life

#### *Tools Used in Data Collection-*

- **Psychological Well-Being Scale:** The Psychological Well-Being (PWB) Scale, included within the Measuring Mobility toolkit from SPARQTools.org, is a widely used instrument generated to appraise numerous elements of an individual's psychological prosperity (Stanford SPARQ, n.d.). Crafted by Dr. Carol D. Ryff in 1989, the scale gauges six pivotal dimensions: liberty, environmental command, personal evolution, meaningful bonds with others, life intention, and self-acknowledgment (Ryff, 1989). The scale has shown resilient dependability and legitimacy, rendering it an consequential device in psychological analysis (Ryff & Keyes, 1995; Abbott et al., 2006). Over time, this multifaceted evaluation continues to provide crucial perception into human potential and thriving.
- **Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support:** The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) is a widely used tool to gauge an individual's view of assistance from three primary sources: relatives, companions, and significant others. Created in 1988 by Gregory D. Zimet and partners, this poll comprises three four-item subscales, each estimating perceived backing from a specific source. Exploration has consistently shown the MSPSS's solid inward consistency, with Cronbach's alpha qualities ordinarily extending from 0.85 to 0.95. Every subscale has likewise been appeared to be autonomously solid. The viability of the MSPSS has been approved through different estimates of basic legitimacy. Factor investigation has affirmed its auxiliary legitimacy, demonstrating that it successfully separates between the three expected wellsprings of social help. This guarantees that the scale precisely determines observed backing rather than unimportant

## Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners

psychological constructions. Additionally, the MSPSS shows concurrent legitimacy, showing solid connections with other psychological estimates, just as cross-cultural legitimacy, demonstrating its dependability across assorted populaces, dialects, and social settings.

- **World Health Organization Quality of Life Bref (Who-Qol-Bref):** The WHOQOL-BREF is a widely utilized evaluation device intended to quantify quality of life across differing populations and wellbeing conditions. Created by the World Health Organization (WHO) in 1996 as a shortened form of the WHOQOL-100, it furnishes a comprehensive yet proficient appraisal of life quality. The poll comprises of 26 things covering four key spaces: actual wellbeing, mental prosperity, social connections, and natural variables. Each thing is graded on a 5-point Likert scale, with more elevated scores showing a superior quality of life. Exploration consistently supports its solid inside consistency, with Cronbach's alpha qualities ordinarily extending from 0.70 to 0.90. What's more, its development legitimacy, concurrent legitimacy, and cross-cultural legitimacy have been well built up, affirming its unwavering quality across assorted clinical and social settings. The WHOQOL-BREF fills in as a standardized device for strategy producers and medicinal services experts, empowering the appraisal and examination of a person's observed actual, psychological, and social prosperity—principal variables in by and large wellbeing and prosperity.

### *Statistical Analysis-*

Data analysis were organised employing the Independent Sample t-test, otherwise linked to as the Unpaired t-test. This statistical methods contrasts the means of 2 different sets to find whether a important difference exists among them. It aids assess whether noticed variances in sample means are because of actual variation or simply unpredictable luck. The test functions under three pivotal presumptions: a standard distribution of information, homoscedasticity of variance (equal variation between sets), and separateness of trials.

The Independent Sample t-test gives a valuable technique for assessing the differences b/w 2 unrelated groups in this study. This best statistical tool permit for a powerful analysis of how the means compared while accounting for potential random chance. While other techniques could have been used, the t-test was well-suited due to its ability to determine if observed variance were real or simply due to happenstance. The assumptions of normality, equal variance, and independence were evaluated and satisfactorily met, confirming the appropriateness of using this approach.

### *Procedure-*

The investigation deployed multiple evaluations to assess members from diverse backgrounds, calculating aspects such as psychological prosperity, perceived social aid, and quality of living using established scales. Participants were recruited through a snowball sampling method, leveraging personal networks to ensure a diverse example aligned with the intended demographic group. To facilitate inclusive involvement while maintaining privacy, data collection was conducted via an anonymous online questionnaire, enabling nationwide participation from the aimed age bracket. Before participating, persons provided informed consent after reviewing the study's goals and potential repercussions, in accordance with moral guidelines for human subjects. Demographic data—such as sex, age, job, relationship status, and pet ownership—were accumulated to illustrate the sample composition while circumventing privately identifiable details. The poll took roughly 20 to

## Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners

25 minutes to finish. Participants interested in the discoveries received a post-study briefing, summarizing key results while protecting confidentiality. This ethical and well-structured methodology ensured participant protection, privacy, and respect throughout the research process.

### RESULTS

The tables below consist of **Psychological Wellbeing Scale**

**Table 1.1 Group Statistics**

DO YOU HAVE PET		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Autonomy Score	NO	112	14.57	2.602	0.246
	YES	168	14.78	3.036	0.234

**Table 1.2 Independent Sample Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
AUTONOMY_SCORE	Equal variances assumed	9.959	0.002	-0.595	278	0.552	-0.208	0.350	-0.898	0.481
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.614	261.003	0.540	-0.208	0.340	-0.877	0.460

Using Levene's test, it was found that the variances were not equal. As such the Welch's t test was used for interpretation. The t value was  $t=-0.614$  and it was not significant ( $p=0.540$ )

**Table 2.1 Group Statistics**

DO YOU HAVE PET		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
ENVIRONMENTAL_MASTERY_SCORE	No	112	14.46	2.657	0.251
	Yes	168	15.10	1.957	0.151

**Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners**

**Table 2.2 Independent Sample Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
ENVIRONMENTAL_MASTERY_SCORE	Equal variances assumed	10.099	0.002	-2.308	278	0.022	-0.637	0.276	-1.180	-0.094
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.174	189.292	0.031	-0.637	0.293	-1.215	-0.059

Using Levene’s test, it was found that the variances were not equal. As such the Welch’s t test was used for interpretation. The t value was t=-2.174 and it was significant (p=0.031) at 0.05 level.

**Table 3.1 Group Statistics**

DO YOU HAVE PET		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PERSONAL_GROWTH_SCORE	No	112	16.25	2.877	0.272
	Yes	168	17.37	2.421	0.187

**Table 3.2 Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
PERSONAL_GROWTH_SCORE	Equal variances assumed	1.500	0.222	-3.511	278	0.001	-1.119	0.319	-1.747	-0.492

**Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means								
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Equal variances not assumed			-3.392	209.509	0.001	-1.119	0.330	-1.769	-0.469	

Using Levene's test, it was found that the variances were equal. As such the student's t test was used for interpretation. The t value was  $t = -3.511$  and it was significant ( $p = 0.001$ ) at 0.01 level.

**Table 4.1 Group Statistics**

DO YOU HAVE PET	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
POSITIVE_RELATIONS_SCORE	No	112	12.88	0.373
	Yes	168	14.71	0.217

**Table 4.2 Independent Samples Test**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means								
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
POSITIVE_RELATIONS_SCORE	Equal variances assumed	22.501	0.000	-4.526	278	0.000	-1.830	0.404	-2.627	-1.034
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.239	184.872	0.000	-1.830	0.432	-2.682	-0.978

**Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners**

Using Levene's test, it was found that the variances were not equal. As such the Welch's t test was used for interpretation. The t value was  $t=-4.239$  and it was significant ( $p=0.000$ ) at 0.01 level.

**Table 5.1 Group Statistics**

DO YOU HAVE PET		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PURPOSE_IN_LIFE_SCORE	No	112	13.16	3.543	0.335
	Yes	168	12.49	3.544	0.273

**Table 5.2 Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
PURPOSE_IN_LIFE_SCORE	Equal variances assumed	0.358	0.550	1.556	278	0.121	0.673	0.432	-0.178	1.524
	Equal variances not assumed			1.556	238.100	0.121	0.673	0.432	-0.179	1.524

Using Levene's test, it was found that variances were not equal. As such the Welch's t test was used for interpretation. The t value was  $t=-1.556$  and it was not significant ( $p=0.121$ ).

**Table 6.1 Group Statistics**

DO YOU HAVE PET		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SELF_ACCEPTANCE_SCORE	No	112	14.71	3.489	0.330
	Yes	168	17.44	2.978	0.230

**Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners**

**Table 6.2 Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
SELF_ACCEPTANCE_SCORE	Equal variances assumed	3.918	0.049	-7.002	278	0.000	-2.726	0.389	-3.493	-1.960
	Equal variances not assumed			-6.785	211.840	0.000	-2.726	0.402	-3.518	-1.934

Using Levene’s test, it was found that the variances were not equal. As such the Welch’s t test was used for interpretation. The t value was t=-6.785 and it was significant (p=0.000) at 0.01 level.

The tables below consist of **Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support**

**Table 1.1 Group Statistics**

Do You Have Pet		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PSS_SCORE	No	112	2.997023809523810	1.283360075938580	0.121266 128695802
	Yes	168	2.989087301587300	1.096953362860160	0.0846317 89320752

**Table 1.2 Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
PSS_SCORE	Equal variances assumed	3.034	0.083	0.055	278	0.956	0.007936507936508	0.143327278495741	-0.274208109275092	0.290081125148107

**Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	0.054	212.029	0.957	0.007936507936508	0.147878374796652	-0.283563635230378	0.299436651103394			
Equal variances not assumed										

Using Levene's test, it was found that the variances were equal. As such the student's t test was used for interpretation. The t value was  $t=0.055$  and it was not significant ( $p=0.956$ ).

**Table 2.1 Group Statistics**

DO YOU HAVE PET		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SIGNIFICANT_OTHER_SCORE	No	112	2.8058	1.62217	0.15328
	Yes	168	2.8899	1.33518	0.10301

**Table 2.2 Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
									Lower	Upper	
SIGNIFICANT_OTHER_SCORE	Equal variances assumed	5.256	0.023	-0.473	278	0.636	-0.08408	0.17768	-0.43385	0.26570	
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.455	205.980	0.649	-0.08408	0.18468	-0.44818	0.28003	

**Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners**

Using Levene's test, it was found that the variances were not equal. As such the Welch's t test was used for interpretation. The t value was  $t=-0.455$  and it was not significant ( $p=0.649$ ).

**Table 3.1 Group Statistics**

DO YOU HAVE PET		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
FAMILY_SCORE	No	112	3.2321	1.44638	0.13667
	Yes	168	3.1027	1.30416	0.10062

**Table 3.2 Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
FAMILY_SCORE	Equal variances assumed	0.988	0.321	0.779	278	0.437	0.12946	0.16624	-0.19778	0.45671
	Equal variances not assumed			0.763	220.818	0.446	0.12946	0.16971	-0.20500	0.46393

Using Levene's test, it was found that the variances were equal. As such the student's t test was used for interpretation. The t value was  $t=0.779$  and it was not significant ( $p=0.437$ ).

**Table 4.1 Group Statistics**

DO YOU HAVE PET		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
FRIENDS_SCORE	No	112	2.9531	1.58985	0.15023
	Yes	168	2.9747	1.42939	0.11028

**Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners**

**Table 4.2 Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
FRIENDS_SCORE	Equal variances assumed	1.417	0.235	-0.118	278	0.906	-0.02158	0.18244	-0.38071	0.33755
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.116	220.37	0.908	-0.02158	0.18636	-0.38885	0.34570

Using Levene's test, it was found that the variances were equal. As such the student's t test was used for interpretation. The t value was  $t = -0.116$  and it was not significant ( $p = 0.906$ ). The tables below consist of **World Health Organization Quality of Life Bref (WHO-QOL-BREF)**

**Table 1.1 Group Statistics**

Do You Have Pet	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
QOL_SCORE	No	112	61.772560586734700	17.435432326302100
	Yes	168	59.703178146258500	15.076920036437700

**Table 1.2 Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
QOL_SCORE	Equal variances assumed	1.045	0.308	1.056	278	0.292	2.069382440476150	1.959146227445150	-1.787263469538020	5.926028350490310

**Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
								Lower	Upper	
Equal variances not assumed			1.026	2138	0.306	2.069382440476150	2.016752706339610	-1.905870170647750	6.044635051600040	

Using Levene's test, it was found that the variances were equal. As such the student's t test was used for interpretation. The t value was  $t=1.056$  and it was not significant ( $p=0.292$ ).

**Table 2.1 Group Statistics**

DO YOU HAVE PET		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PHYSICAL_HEALTH_SCORE	No	112	61.543367346938	17.443616934405000	1.648266870496810
	Yes	168	61.989795918367	17.515053991389600	1.351315752819160

**Table 2.2 Independent Samples Test**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
								Lower	Upper	
PHYSICAL_HEALTH_SCORE	Equal variances assumed	0.277	0.579	-0.209	278	0.834	-0.446428571428505	2.133142575915930	-4.645592204870750	3.752735062013740

**Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners**

	Equal variances not assumed			-0.209	238.68	0.834	-0.4464285714285	2.131393426891090	-4.645172379018590	3.752315236161580
--	-----------------------------	--	--	--------	--------	-------	------------------	-------------------	--------------------	-------------------

Using Levene's test, it was found that the variances were equal. As such the student's t test was used for interpretation. The t value was  $t=-0.209$  and it was not significant ( $p=0.834$ ).

**Table 3.1 Group Statistics**

DO YOU HAVE PET		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PSYCHOLOGICAL_SCORE	No	112	58.630952380952300	21.623269412042700	2.043206907014810
	Yes	168	57.787698412698400	19.668321781405800	1.517443969501650

**Table 3.2 Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
PSYCHOLOGICAL_SCORE	Equal variances assumed	0.150	0.698	0.338	278	0.736	0.843253968253940	2.497242428614960	-4.072652595387880	5.759160531895760
	Equal variances not assumed			0.338	223	0.741	0.843253968253940	2.545060051442790	-4.172281072052430	5.858789008560310

Using Levene's test, it was found that the variances were equal. As such the student's t test was used for interpretation. The t value was  $t=0.338$  and it was not significant ( $p=0.736$ ).

**Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners**

**Table 4.1 Group Statistics**

DO YOU HAVE PET		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SOCIAL_RELATIONSHIPS_SCORE	No	112	64.136904761904800	22.255210660526300	2.102919742253790
	Yes	168	58.730158730158700	19.766802562398800	1.525041926708700

**Table 4.2 Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
SOCIAL_RELATIONSHIPS_SCORE	Equal variances assumed	2.458	0.118	2.131	278	0.034	5.406746034	2.536866335448680	0.412838461294080	10.400653602198000
	Equal variances not assumed			2.108	218.319	0.039	5.406746034	2.597695963845670	0.286974295908554	10.526517767583600

Using Levene's test, it was found that the variances were equal. As such the student's t test was used for interpretation. The t value was  $t=2.131$  and it was significant ( $p=0.034$ ) at 0.05 level.

**Table 5.1 Group Statistics**

DO YOU HAVE PET		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
ENVIRONMENT_SCORE	No	112	62.77902	19.686421	1.860192
	Yes	168	60.30506	18.303566	1.412151

**Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners**

**Table 5.2 Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
ENVIRONMENT_SCORE	Equal variances assumed	0.620	0.432	1.075	278	0.283	2.473958	2.301645	-2.056907	7.004824
	Equal variances not assumed			1.059	225.929	0.291	2.473958	2.335484	-2.128158	7.076075

Using Levene's test, it was found that the variances were equal. As such the student's t test was used for interpretation. The t value was  $t=1.075$  and it was not significant ( $p=0.283$ ).

**DISCUSSION**

The data from my investigation aligns reliably with a sizeable body of previous examine, backing the thought that owning pets is frequently related with enhanced psychologic prosperity, fellowship, and all-out quality of life (Hughes et al., 2020). In any case, as recognized in earlier considers, the degree of these advantages shifts relying upon statistical variables, kind of pet, and exploration strategies (Westgarth et al., 2019). Investigate distributed in BMC Psychiatry (2018) found that pets give mental backing, helping proprietors to adapt to psychological well-being issues like clinical misery, uneasiness, and PTSD (Brooks et al., 2018). Likewise, a think about delivered in Frontiers in Psychology (2020) uncovered that pet proprietors experienced elevated self-esteem, less forlornness, and a more prominent feeling of reason (Antonacopoulos & Pychyl, 2020).

What's more, an exploration article in the Journal of Social and Personal Relationships (2022) found that pet proprietors—particularly those with canines—appreciate improved social help and more grounded interpersonal relationships (Carr et al., 2022). In any case, specific inquire about, including one discharged in Anthrozoös (2019), recommends that while pets don't absolutely substitute human connections, they act to upgrade them (Meehan et al., 2019). Exploration showing up in the American Journal of Cardiology (2019) demonstrated that canine proprietorship is connected to diminished danger of cardiovascular infection, generally because of expanded physical movement (Kramer et al., 2019). Additionally, a think about distributed in the Journal of Aging and Health (2023) appeared that having pets as associates enormously upgrades mental fortitude and cognitive wellness in more seasoned grown-ups (Dye et al., 2023).

## Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners

The outcomes of this examination are steady with a huge amount of current examination, particularly the 66% of considers that have demonstrated an optimistic connection between pet proprietorship and psychological well-being (Brooks et al., 2018). In any case, it is basic to perceive the different outcomes watched in different considers, featuring the need for more comprehensive look into that considers components like pet sorts, individual contrasts, and socio-environmental settings (Westgarth et al., 2019).

### *Limitations*

The study includes 281 participants, offering a suitable sample size, yet it may not represent the larger population accurately. The participants' geographical and cultural backgrounds are vague, limiting the applicability of the findings. The study relies on self-reported surveys, which are subjective and can lead to social desirability bias (participants may exaggerate their well-being). Their response might be influenced by feelings or current occurrences rather than a thorough assessment of their well-being. The study appears to be cross-sectional, suggesting it gathers data at one point in time rather than monitoring changes over a period. A longitudinal study would provide a better understanding of how pet ownership affects mental health over time. Other confounding factors (such as income, previous mental health concerns, or personality traits) may influence both pet ownership and mental well-being. The study did not differentiate between various types of pets (such as dogs, cats, birds, etc.) that could affect well-being in distinct manners. Notwithstanding these constraints, the research offers significant understanding of the intricate connection between psychological elements and the quality of life for both pet owners and non-pet owners among adults, setting the stage for further studies in this field.

## CONCLUSION

The study validates the theory that companionship with animals positively impacts psychological wellness, social bonds, and quality of daily life. The findings expose beneficial differences in areas assessing autonomy, control over environment, personal development, robust relationships, purposefulness, and self-acceptance, as well as perceived social assistance and satisfaction with life. Owners of pets reported stronger support networks, preferable fellowship, and elevated mental health compared to those without. Households with animals also experience deeper social engagement, reduced pressure, and improved routines, further enhancing well-being. Yet families occasionally face sacrifices to devote time and money to the needs of pets. While care provides joy, it also comes with duty and restricts spontaneity. However, for most the benefits outweigh any disadvantages, offering comfort through unconditional care that relieves isolation or loneliness and motivates.

## REFERENCES

- Admin. (2018, July 2). *Ryff Scales of Psychological Well-Being | Wabash National Study*. Center of Inquiry at Wabash College. <https://centerofinquiry.org/uncategorized/ryff-scales-of-psychological-well-being/>
- Bennett, P. C., Trigg, J. L., Godber, T., & Brown, C. (2015). An Experience Sampling Approach to Investigating Associations between Pet Presence and Indicators of Psychological Wellbeing and Mood in Older Australians. *Anthrozoös*, 28(3), 403–420. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08927936.2015.1052266>
- Brown, C. R., Edwards, S., Kenney, E., Pailer, S., Albino, M., Carabello, M., Good, K., & Lopez, J. (2023). Family Quality of Life: pet owners and veterinarians working

## Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners

- together to reach the best outcomes. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*, 261(8), 1238–1243. <https://doi.org/10.2460/javma.23.01.0016>
- Chakma, S. K., Islam, T. T., Shahjalal, M., & Mitra, D. K. (2021). Depression among pet owners and non-pet owners: a comparative cross-sectional study in Dhaka, Bangladesh. *F1000Research*, 10, 574. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.53276.1>
- Coe, J. B., Adams, C. L., & Bonnett, B. N. (2007). A focus group study of veterinarians' and pet owners' perceptions of the monetary aspects of veterinary care. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*, 231(10), 1510–1518. <https://doi.org/10.2460/javma.231.10.1510>
- item. (n.d.). [https://fctc.who.int/resources/publications/i/item/WHOQOL-BREF?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://fctc.who.int/resources/publications/i/item/WHOQOL-BREF?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- McConnell, A. R., Brown, C. M., Saint Louis University, Shoda, T. M., Stayton, L. E., Martin, C. E., & Miami University. (2011b). Friends with Benefits: on the positive consequences of pet ownership. In *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (Vol. 101, Issue 6, pp. 1239–1252) [Journal-article]. <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/releases/psp-101-6-1239.pdf>
- The truth about cats and dogs: Pets are good for mental health of “everyday people.”* (2011, July 11). ScienceDaily. <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/07/110711111923.htm>
- WHOQOL-BREF. (n.d.). [https://www.who.int/tools/whoqol/whoqol-bref?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.who.int/tools/whoqol/whoqol-bref?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- Writer, S., & Writer, S. (2025, March 17). *Independent T Test explained: Examples and applications in research*. ConsumerSearch.com. [https://www.consumersearch.com/technology/independent-t-test-explained-examples-applications-research?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.consumersearch.com/technology/independent-t-test-explained-examples-applications-research?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- Zimet, G. D., Powell, S. S., Farley, G. K., Werkman, S., & Berkoff, K. A. (1990). Psychometric characteristics of the multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 55(3–4), 610–617. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.1990.9674095>

### **Acknowledgment**

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

### **Conflict of Interest**

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

**How to cite this article:** Mishra, A. & Kewalramani, S. (2025). Psychological Wellbeing, Quality of Life and Companionship of Life of Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 13(2), 459-478. DIP:18.01.042.20251302, DOI:10.25215/1302.042