



Supplementary Materials: Expectations versus Reality: Long-Term Research on the Dog–Owner Relationship

Esther M.C. Bouma *, Lonneke M. Vink + and Arie Dijkstra

Department of Social Psychology, Faculty of Behavioural and Social Sciences, University of Groningen, 9712 CP Groningen, the Netherlands; arie.dijkstra@rug.nl

- * Correspondence: e.m.c.bouma@rug.nl
- + Deceased.

Table S1. Advantages of dogs and dog ownership.

What Advantages Do You see in Dogs/Dog Ownership? 1. Having company 2. Faciling more confident about musclf

- 2. Feeling more confident about myself
- 3. Feeling more safe
- 4. Having a companion
- 5. Feeling more connected with nature
- 6. Feeling less lonely
- 7. Being outside more often to clear my head
- 8. Getting more exercise
- 9. Having less stress
- 10. Being more physically fit
- 11. Getting sick less often
- 12. Having someone to talk to
- 13. Being taken more seriously by other people
- 14. Having more structure in my life
- 15. Have someone to play with
- 16. Having more social contact with other people
- 17. Have a better mood
- 18. Experiencing more livelihood around the house
- 19. Feeling less depressed
- 20. Have someone who is there for me unconditionally
- 21. Feeling more complete
- 22. Having my house guarded
- 23. Having fewer physical complaints
- 24. Feeling more happy
- 25. Feeling more valued by other people

Table S2. Disadvantages of dogs and dog ownership.

- 1. Because of my dog... I have less freedom to go away spontaneously
- 2. I have to get out of the house multiple times a day, despite the weather
- 3. I have an extra and significant responsibility in my life
- 4. I have to spend much time on my dog's care
- 5. I have to spend more money
- 6. I have to clean my house more often
- 7. I have to get up early to walk my dog
- 8. I have to clean dog feces
- 9. I have to plan my life more
- **10.** I have a house that smells less nice

Table S3. Overview of canine behavioral problems.

- 1. Not responding to stop commands
- 2. Bad eating manners
- 3. Not listening when called upon
- 4. Pulling the leash
- 5. Inappropriate soiling
- 6. Inappropriate soft/playful biting
- 7. General disobedience
- 8. Aggression toward other dogs
- 9. Aggression toward unfamiliar people
- 10. Aggression toward familiar people
- 11. Inappropriate digging
- 12. Destructive behavior
- 13. Inappropriate chewing or biting inedible objects
- 14. Hyperactivity
- 15. Inappropriate barking
- 16. Jumping onto people

Table S4. Descriptive elements by group and time point.

| Group | | Overall (<i>n</i> =183) | | First (<i>n</i> = 30) | | Previous $(n = 73)$ | | Current (<i>n</i> = 80) | |
|--------------------------|-------|--------------------------|-------|------------------------|-------|---------------------|-------|---------------------------------|------|
| Variable | Range | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| Self-efficacy T0 | 1–10 | 8.9 | 10.03 | 8.27 | 13.05 | 8.82 | 0.95 | 9.26 | 0.79 |
| Self-efficacy T1 | 1–10 | 8.9 | 0.93 | 8.98 | 0.90 | 8.73 | 10.04 | 9.12 | 0.85 |
| Self-efficacy T2 | 1–10 | 8.92 | 0.97 | 8.83 | 0.93 | 8.80 | 10.57 | 9.05 | 0.88 |
| Advantages T0 | 1–25 | 3.43 | 0.55 | 3.04 | 0.55 | 3.44 | 0.59 | 3.56 | 0.54 |
| Advantages T1 | 1–25 | 3.55 | 0.51 | 3.43 | 0.54 | 3.57 | 0.47 | 3.57 | 0.53 |
| Advantages T2 | 1–25 | 3.70 | 0.51 | 3.55 | 0.41 | 3.70 | 0.53 | 3.75 | 0.47 |
| Disadvantages T0 | 1–10 | 3.58 | 0.5 | 3.74 | 0.59 | 3.64 | 0.49 | 3.46 | 0.51 |
| Disadvantages T1 | 1–10 | 3.44 | 0.58 | 3.55 | 0.48 | 3.48 | 0.51 | 3.36 | 0.63 |
| Disadvantages T2 | 1–10 | 3.45 | 0.53 | 3.51 | 0.72 | 3.48 | 0.51 | 3.40 | 0.57 |
| Social comparison T0 | 1–7 | 6.03 | 0.72 | 5.74 | 0.72 | 5.99 | 0.68 | 6.19 | 0.71 |
| Social comparison T1 | 1–7 | 5.82 | 0.69 | 5.87 | 0.86 | 5.78 | 0.68 | 5.83 | 0.70 |
| Social comparison T2 | 1–7 | 5.79 | 0.72 | 5.86 | 0.33 | 5.76 | 0.69 | 5.80 | 0.70 |
| Commitment T0 | 1–5 | 4.67 | 0.32 | 4.52 | 0.32 | 4.66 | 0.34 | 4.74 | 0.29 |
| Commitment T1 | 1–5 | 4.75 | 0.29 | 4.70 | 0.30 | 4.75 | 0.27 | 4.76 | 0.29 |
| Commitment T2 | 1–5 | 4.79 | 0.32 | 4.77 | 0.26 | 4.78 | 0.28 | 4.80 | 0.36 |
| Problematic behaviors T1 | 1–16 | 1.73 | 0.34 | 1.66 | 0.23 | 1.73 | 0.35 | 1.72 | 0.37 |
| Problematic behaviors T2 | 1–16 | 1.66 | 0.30 | 1.65 | 0.26 | 1.66 | 0.27 | 1.68 | 0.34 |
| Satisfaction T1 | 1–7 | 6.11 | 0.98 | 1.89 | 0.53 | 1.77 | 0.57 | 1.68 | 0.54 |
| Satisfaction T2 | 1–7 | 6.14 | 0.80 | 1.91 | 0.50 | 1.73 | 0.57 | 1.75 | 0.54 |
| Perceived costs T1 | 1–5 | 1.75 | 0.55 | 6.15 | 0.75 | 6.16 | 0.98 | 6.04 | 1.06 |
| Perceived costs T2 | 1–5 | 1.77 | 0.56 | 6.15 | 0.66 | 6.13 | 0.83 | 6.14 | 0.85 |

Animals **2019**, 9, x

4 of 6

Table S5. Differences between the ownership groups for all variables by time point.

| Variable | F-value | df | <i>p</i> -value | Sig. Difference |
|-------------------------|---------|-------|------------------|----------------------------|
| Self-efficacy T0 | 11.08 | 2,183 | <i>p</i> < 0.001 | first < previous < current |
| Self-efficacy T1 | 2.07 | 2,183 | 0.129 | |
| Self-efficacy T2 | 1.39 | 2,183 | 0.250 | |
| Advantages T0 | 10.47 | 2,183 | p < 0.001 | first < previous < current |
| Advantages T1 | 1.01 | 2,183 | 0.367 | |
| Advantages T2 | 1.60 | 2,183 | 0.205 | |
| Disadvantages T0 | 4.47 | 2,183 | 0.013 | first > current |
| Disadvantages T1 | 1.47 | 2,183 | 0.234 | |
| Disadvantages T2 | 0.71 | 2,183 | 0.496 | |
| Social comparison T0 | 4.71 | 2,183 | 0.010 | first < current |
| Social comparison T1 | 0.24 | 2,183 | 0.782 | |
| Social comparison T2 | 0.20 | 2,183 | 0.821 | |
| Commitment T0 | 5.51 | 2,183 | 0.005 | first < current |
| Commitment T1 | 0.60 | 2,183 | 0.550 | |
| Commitment T2 | 0.15 | 2,183 | 0.859 | |
| Problematic behavior T1 | 0.74 | 2,183 | 0.480 | |
| Problematic behavior T2 | 0.02 | 2,183 | 0.985 | |
| Satisfaction T1 | 0.12 | 2,183 | 0.988 | |
| Satisfaction T2 | 0.32 | 2,183 | 0.726 | |
| Perceived costs T1 | 1.68 | 2,183 | 0.190 | |
| Perceived costs T2 | 1.14 | 2,183 | 0.324 | |

5 of 6

Table S6. Rise and fall between time points for all variables by dog ownership group.

| Variable | First (<i>n</i> = 30) | | | Previous (<i>n</i> = 73) | | | Current (<i>n</i> = | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|------|-----------------|----------------------------------|------|-----------------|----------------------|------|-----------------|
| | t-value | df | <i>p</i> -value | t-value | df | <i>p</i> -value | t-value | df | <i>p</i> -value |
| T0 to T1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Self-efficacy | -3.25 | 1,29 | 0.003 | 0.77 | 1,72 | 0.442 | 1.81 | 1,79 | 0.075 |
| Advantages | -3.55 | 1,29 | 0.001 | -2.77 | 1,72 | 0.007 | -0.23 | 1,79 | 0.821 |
| Disadvantages | 1.71 | 1,29 | 0.098 | 2.77 | 1,72 | 0.007 | 1.81 | 1,79 | 0.075 |
| Social comparison | -1.08 | 1,29 | 0.289 | 2.47 | 1,72 | 0.016 | 4.65 | 1,79 | < 0.001 |
| Commitment | -2.06 | 1,29 | 0.048 | -2.19 | 1,72 | 0.032 | -0.74 | 1,79 | 0.464 |
| T1 to T2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Self-efficacy | 1.01 | 1,29 | 0.320 | -0.64 | 1,72 | 0.520 | -0.33 | 1,79 | 0.740 |
| Advantages | -1.90 | 1,29 | 0.067 | -3.27 | 1,72 | 0.002 | -4.32 | 1,79 | < 0.001 |
| Disadvantages | -0.38 | 1,29 | 0.710 | -0.04 | 1,72 | 0.967 | -0.69 | 1,79 | 0.494 |
| Social comparison | 0.10 | 1,29 | 0.925 | 0.16 | 1,72 | 0.871 | 0.54 | 1,79 | 0.592 |
| Commitment | -1.70 | 1,29 | 0.100 | 0.10 | 1,72 | 0.290 | -1.25 | 1,79 | 0.217 |
| Problematic behavior | 0.23 | 1,29 | 0.818 | 1.96 | 1,72 | 0.054 | 2.98 | 1,79 | 0.004 |
| Perceived costs | -0.23 | 1,29 | 0.822 | 0.79 | 1,72 | 0.430 | -1.13 | 1,79 | 0.264 |
| Satisfaction | 0.00 | 1,29 | 1.000 | -0.34 | 1,72 | 0.737 | 0.86 | 1,79 | 0.390 |

Detailed Information on Significant Effects of Covariates

GLM analyses revealed effects of the following covariates: educational level, age of the dog (pup or adult) and of participants' age. No effects of gender were present.

With regard to **educational level**, *self-efficacy* patterns were significantly (F(2,181)=3.09, p=0.047) different between owners with a low/intermediate (n=75) and owners with a high educational level (n=108). At all three time points, people with a high educational level had significantly more self-efficacy (M(SD) T0= 8.79 (10.57), T1 = 8.9.4 (0.93), T2 = 8.97 (0.96)) compared to people with a low/intermediate education level (M(SD) T0= 9.05 (0.90), T1 = 8.83 (0.94), T2 = 8.83 (0.97). People with a low/intermediate education start high at T0 and decline over time in their self-efficacy levels while this is the other way around for people with a high educational level. However, at none of the time points the level of self-efficacy is significantly different between the two education groups (T0: F(1,182 = 3.16, p =

0.077; T1: F(1,182 = 0.58, p = 0.448; T2: F(1,182 = 0.914, p = 0.340). Moreover, dog owners with a high education (n=108: M(SD) T0 = 3.32 (0.56), T1 = 3.46 (0.49), T2 = 3.63 (0.53), report regardless of time, significantly lower levels of *perceived advantages* (F(1,182) = 8.16, p = 0.005) than dog owners with a (low/intermediate education (n = 75: M(SD) T0 = 3.59 (0.50), T1 = 3.66 (0.50), T2 = 3.79 (0.47). Group analyses revealed significant differences at all three point in time for perceived advantages (T0: F(1,182 = 11.27, p = 0.001; T1: F(1,182 = 7.11, p = 0.008; T2: F(1,182 = 4.30, p = 0.040).

Participants who acquired a **puppy** (n=139) have overall significantly (F(1,182) = 12.64, p < 0.001) higher levels of *self-efficacy* (M(SD) T0= 8.99 (0.99), T1 = 90.36 (0.85), T2 = 90.40 (0.90) compared to people who acquired an adult dog (n = 44, M(SD) T0= 8.61 (0.99), T1 = 8.45 (10.39), T2 = 85.23 (10.67). At all three time points levels are significantly higher (T0: F(1,182 = 4.69, p = 0.032; T1: F(1,182 = 13.99, p < 0.001; T2: F(1,182 = 10.34, p = 0.002). Participants who acquired a puppy (n=139) also had overall significantly (F(1,182) = 9.88, p = 0.002) higher levels of *social comparison* (M(SD) T0 = 6.12 (0.67), T1 = 5.91 (0.68), T2 = 58.8 (0.65) compared to people who acquired an adult dog (n=44, M(SD) T0 = 5.81 (0.84), T1 = 5.54 (0.67), T2 = 5.52 (0.87). At all three time points levels are significantly higher (T0: F(1,182 = 8.75, p = 0.004). And finally, participants who acquired a puppy (n=139) had overall significantly (F(1,182) = 4.68, p = 0.032) higher levels of *pet satisfaction* (M(SD) T1 = 6.21 (0.73), T2 = 6.17 (0.93)) compared to people who acquired an adult dog (n=44, M(SD) T1 = 5.93 (10.05), T2 = 5.90 (10.99). This difference was only significant at T1 (F(1,182 = 4.05, p = 0.046) but not at T2 (F(1,182 = 2.66, p = 0.105).

Age had an overall effect on perception of *advantages* (F(1,182) = 5.38, p = 0.022) and perception of *disadvantages* (F(1,182) = 4.32, p = 0.006). With increasing age, participants perceive more disadvantages and less advantages of dog ownership. When we compare four age groups (18-30, 31-45, 46-60 and 60 years or older) no significant difference between the groups were present, not for advantages (T0: F(3,180) = 1.64, p = 0.182, T1: F((3,180)= 2.13, p = 0.10, T2: F((3,180)= 1.30, p = 0.78) and neither for advantages (T0: F(3,180) = 1.67, p = 0.175).