THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ANIMAL WELFARE ACT IN TUGUEGARAO CITY

Prof. Irene P. Aquino, MSIT, Faculty Member and Thesis Adviser, Cagayan State University, Andrews Campus, Tuguegarao City, Cagayan, Philippines

Maybelle L. Daggay, Student-Researcher, Bachelor of Science in Legal Management, College of Business, Entrepreneurship and Accountancy, Cagayan State University, Andrews Campus, Tuguegarao City, Cagayan, Philippines

Christian Andrey T. Cadangan, Student-Researcher, Bachelor of Science in Legal Management, College of Business, Entrepreneurship and Accountancy, Cagayan State University, Andrews Campus, Tuguegarao City, Cagayan, Philippines

Denniellepebenito, Student-Researcher, Bachelor of Science in Legal Management, College of Business, Entrepreneurship and Accountancy, Cagayan State University, Andrews Campus, Tuguegarao City, Cagayan, Philippines

Nikee F. Rigor, Student-Researcher, Bachelor of Science in Legal Management, College of Business, Entrepreneurship and Accountancy, Cagayan State University, Andrews Campus, Tuguegarao City, Cagayan, Philippines

Abstract: *This study was undertaken to assess the implementation of Animal Welfare Act (R.A. 8485) particularly in Tuguegarao City. The Animal Welfare Act is a statutory act enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Philippines intended to protect and promote the welfare of all animals in the Philippines. This study was designed to evaluate the four steps to determine the measurement on how pet owners treat their pet/s and the reliability, effectiveness and efficiency of the said statute, namely: i.) assessing the profile of respondents; ii.) identifying the type of respondent's pet; iii.) processing the usual treatment of respondents to their pets and; iv.) showing the possible outcomes of their treatments. This study will give the pet-owners, community, implementing agencies and future researchers the awareness and the importance of their role in promoting and protecting the welfare of all animals. The results of this study revealed that most of the respondents whose age falls within 16-20 are engaged in pet owning, and that pet owners admitted there is no maltreatment of against their pets were committed by them considering that pet owners are unaware of the laws protecting the rights of their pets. With the data gathered by the researchers, it is strongly recommended that the animal*

implementing agencies should exert more effort in informing the pet owners about the "Animal Welfare Act" in order to increase awareness of the people concerning the rights of animals as well as to their pets.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of animal abuse is something that disgusts most people. The idea of hurting an innocent animal is something that most people cannot fathom. Many times, cases of animal abuse and animal cruelty go unreported because the victims have no voice. Unfortunately, cases of animal cruelty occurs tremendous frequency. It is a second form of violence that has recently come into sharpens focus: "socially unacceptable behavior that intentionally or unintentionally causes unnecessary pain, suffering or distress to and/or death of an animal." Human society in general tends to place less emphasis on animal suffering than on human suffering. Nonetheless, the effects of animal abuse are sobering. It is impossible to estimate the outcomes for animals in cases that are never reported to authorities, although presumably a majority of these animals do not receive proper treatment for their injuries. Animals that survive abuse may display long term fearfulness, aggression, depression, or eating disorders, a social behaviour.

Moreover, people do not even realize the mistreatment with their pet. It is very unfortunate to say that before people own a pet, they do not really think about how much responsibility it is rather they just leave their pets in the cage or forget to play with them. More so, we could tell that people with emotional problems more likely to hurt animals.

Divergent approaches to laws concerning animal cruelty occur in different jurisdictions throughout the world. For example, some laws govern methods of killing animals for food, clothing, or other products, and other laws concern the keeping of animals for entertainment, education, research, or pets.

There are conceptual approaches to the issue of cruelty to animals. For example, the animal welfare position holds that there is nothing inherently wrong with using animals for human purposes, such as food, clothing, entertainment, and research, but that it should be done in a way that minimizes unnecessary pain and suffering, sometimes referred to as "humane" treatment.

The three types of animal abusers are the following, to wit:

1. **Unintentional Abusers** - Majority of the people unintentionally abuse animals. They offend animals because they don't think about or realize what they are doing. Many of these people are not aware that what they are doing is cruel. Also some people will try to keep their pet under control by using cruel types of discipline. They may think that punishment and deterrence are the best ways of solving problems. Furthermore other people are cruel because they don't pay attention. For example, someone might forget to give their cat water for a few days or leave their dog in a car on a hot day with the windows rolled up. Often these people know better, but they either forget or don't care enough to pay attention. Finally, some people hurt animals even though they think they're helping them. For example, some people have so many pets that they can't care for them all. These people are called hoarders, and they take in so many animals because they love them. Unfortunately, they can't care for all the animals they take in, and the animals end up living in a place that's cramped and unhealthy.

2. **Intentional but Intermittent Abusers** - the next category of animal's abusers do it on purpose, but don't keep doing it for a long period of time. For example, a group of kids may decide to throw rocks at a nest of baby birds they happened to see, or they may hurt a stray cat they find. These people are normally young, and they hurt animals because they aren't thinking, or because they can't stand up to their friends and peer pressure. The ones who aren't really thinking might be mad at someone else (like their parents) and kick their pet dog because they can't kick their parents, or they may think it is fun to watch an animal run away frightened without really thinking about how the animal feels. The ones who are giving in to peer pressure might be attempting to show off their friends, or they may be with a group of friends who are all trying to imprint each other. Hence, they go along with what everyone else is doing.

3. **Intentional and Continuous Abusers** - this group of people is a worst offender. These are people who intentionally hurt animals because they enjoy hurting things, or because it makes them feel powerful. Many of these people would hurt other people if they could get away with it; they just choose to hurt animals because animals are

more helpless than people. Why do these people do this? There are different reasons why these people do these such acts. A lot of these people want to have command over others. They will hurt an animal because they think this means they control the animal. Second, they may hurt the animal to control another person. Third, others simply enjoy pain and violence. Those who relish violence might also destroy inanimate objects as well as animals and people.

Most animals are not aggressive by nature. A leading cause of aggressive behavior in animals is when a person chooses to abuse them. **"A wide range of actions from animal neglect to violence against animals can be considered animal cruelty"**. In many cases, an abused animal fears humans. Because of that fear, they are more likely to bite and attack not only people, but also other animals. Many of the abused animals are unable to trust again, causing an uprising in the number of animals in shelters. Thus, when people abuse animals, the animals become aggressive or frightened and end up in shelters.

Animal cruelty has stirred into the limelight as society has given the issue further consideration. Fortunately, this perpetuates our law-making body to implement an act that would provide protection and would speak the rights for these voiceless species and at the same time, would impose punishment upon people who would violate this act.

This statutory law is **RA 8485** and also known as **"The Animal Welfare Act"**.

On one hand, the Animal Welfare Act specified the punishable acts which are the following, to wit:

1. Torture any animal.
2. Neglect to provide adequate care, sustenance, or shelter.
3. Maltreat any animals or to subject any dog or horse to dog fights or horse fights.
4. Kill or cause or procure to be tortured or deprived of adequate care, sustenance or shelter.
5. Maltreat or usage of animals in research or experiments not expressly authorized by the committee on animal welfare.

On other hand, there are types of animals which are allowed to be used for human consumption namely: cattle, pigs, goats, sheep, poultry, rabbits, carabao, horse, deer and crocodiles provided, it must be done in a humane procedure which means to kill it in the most scientific methods available.

Furthermore, despite of the specified punishable acts imposed by this statute, there are also exceptions that made to be known before this study, to wit:

a) as part of the religious rituals;

b) when the animal is afflicted with an incurable communicable disease;

c) the killing is deemed necessary to put an end to the misery;

d) to prevent imminent danger to the life of human being;

e) purpose of animal population control;

f) killed after it has been used in authorized research or experiments; and

g) any other analogous ground.

According to Ascione, Frank R., the author of Animal Abuse and Youth Violence dated September 2001, the past two decades have witnessed a resurgence of interest in the relation between cruelty to animals, or animal abuse, and serious violent behavior, especially among youthful offenders. As an illustration, a recent study by Verlinden (2000) of 0 schools shootings in the United States (from Moses Lake, WA, in 1996 to Conyers, GA, in 1999) reported 5 (45 percent) of the 11 perpetrators had histories of alleged animal abuse. Also, the well-documented example was the case of Luke Woodham who, in the April before his October 1997 murder of his mother and two schoolmates, tortured and killed his own pet dog (Ascione, 1999). This Bulletin reports on the psychiatric, psychological, and criminological research linking animal abuse to juvenile and adult perpetrated violence. It addresses the challenge of defining animal abuse and examines the difficulty deriving accurate incidence and prevalence data for this behavior. It also explores the relationships between animal abuse and conduct disorder (CD), analyses the motives of child and adolescent animal abusers, and considers the contexts that may lead to the emergence of animal abuse as symptom of psychological disorder. Although a few studies examine the neurobilogical correlates of cruelty to animals as presented in Lockwood and Ascione, 1998, such topic is beyond the scope of this review. The importance of including information about animal abuse in assessments of youth at risk of committing interpersonal violence is emphasized throughout, and a list of national organizations with programs related to the link between animal abuse and other violent behavior is also provided. This bulletin does not suggest that attending to animal abuse is a cure-all for dealing with the challenges of identifying and addressing youth violence. Violent behavior is multidimensional and multi-

determined, and its developmental course is still the subject of concerted research investigation (Moffit, 1997). However, it is argued here that animal abuse has received insufficient attention, in fact, is sometimes explicitly excluded (e.g., Stone and Kelner, 2000) - as one of a number of "red flags," warning signs, or sentinel behaviours that could help identify youth at risk for perpetrating interpersonal violence (a relation first noted in the psychiatric literature by Pinel in 1809) and youth who have themselves been victimized.

All fifty (50) States of the U.S.A. have legislation relating to animal abuse. Most States categorize it as a misdemeanor offense, and thirty (30) States also have instituted felony-level statutes for certain forms of cruelty to animals. However, legal definitions of animal abuse, and even the types of animals that are covered by these statutes, differ from State to State (Ascione and Lockwood, 2001; Frasch et al., 1999; Lacroix, 1998). The research literature also fails to yield a consistent definition of animal abuse or cruelty to animals; however, the following definition captures features common to most attempts to define this behavior: **"socially unacceptable behavior that intentionally causes unnecessary pain, suffering, or distress to and/or death of an animal"** (Ascione, 1993:228). This definition excludes practices that may cause harm to animals yet are socially condoned (e.g., legal hunting, certain agricultural and veterinary practices), since the status of a particular animal may vary from one culture to another. The definition takes into account the social context that help determine what is considered animal abuse. For the purposes of this review, the animals that are victims of abuse are most often vertebrates since this is the category of animals to which are attributed the greatest capacity for experiencing and displaying pain and distress. The forms of abuse to which animals may be subjected are parallel to the forms of child maltreatment. Animals may be physically or sexually abused, may be seriously neglected, and, some might argue, may be psychologically abused. Although vandalism may represent costly and psychologically significant destructiveness (Goldstein, 1996), smashed windshields and graffitied walls do not feel pain or cry out when they are damaged. Animals, however, do express their distress when they have been abused, and their distress calls out for attention. This Bulletin has provided an overview of the underreported and understudied phenomenon of animal abuse in childhood and adolescence. Addressing cruelty to animals as a significant form of aggressive and antisocial behavior may add one more piece to the puzzle of understanding and preventing youth violence.

The book entitled **Animal Abuse: Helping Animals and People** which was written by Tiplady, Catherine during the year of 2013. Part one comprises chapters examining definitions of animal abuse, namely: (i) the definition of animal abuse; (ii) the history of animal abuse; (iii) discussion of why people abuse animals; and (iv) discussion of why some people behave in a converse manner and care for animals. Also, its part two comprises five chapters. Which that cover abuses across different areas and industries including animals used in the food and fiber industries, animals abused for entertainment including hunting, sport, and art. Other chapters examine philosophical, social, ethical and religious influences on our treatment of animals. It also includes an enormous breadth of information, mostly touching the surface of most of the issues covered but certainly providing sufficient seed for the reader to pursue in depth elsewhere. In Part three, Phil Arkow discusses the *One Health* model which proposes the bridging of commonalities between human medicine and veterinary medicine. Through collaborative efforts among health science professionals, the objective of the One Health model is to work locally, nationally, and globally to optimize the health of people, domestic animals, wildlife, plants, and the environment. The proposed means of doing so is through building of closer interactions between different professional groups. Other chapters in this applied section of the book examine: (i) relationships between human and animal abuse; (ii) issues associated with sheltering abused animals and families together; (iii) A program that looks at fostering empathy in child victims of abuse through animal-assisted therapy. The final chapter in this section examines the very difficult topic of mental health issues arising from exposure to animal abuse during the course of one's work and provides useful strategies with which to deal with such issues.

According to Tiplady, Catherine Mary author of **Investigating Cruelty to Animals in Private and Commercial Settings** written during the year 2016 she examined the animal abuses occurring in the context of domestics violence, among animals encountered by veterinarians in practice and in media broadcasts of animal cruelty. Whilst the focus on the thesis is on animal abuse within a domestic violence context, The study also includes people's response to animal abuse, following a media expose of animal cruelty. The connection between human interpersonal violence and animal abuse has grained increasing interest in recent years: however, very little research has been undertaken from a veterinary perspective which focuses on animal welfare. The first part of the thesis examines the impact of human

interpersonal violence on companion animals by interviewing women survivors of domestic violence. Thirteen women were interviewed about the impact of domestic violence on their companion animals and whether veterinarians were a source of support. All women reported animals showing changed behavior during the violent relationship and eight reported animals being abused or threatened by their partner. Private practice veterinarians were not generally seen as a source of support. A subsequent study of five of these women six months after leaving the violence relationship found that animals' behavior was reported to have reverted to normal. However, aggression/fear of men and proximity seeking to women continued in several cases. In a second study, 385 veterinarians from Australia, New Zealand, USA, Canada, UK, and South Africa self-selected to participate in an on-line survey covering issues of human/animal abuse and mandatory reporting. Most were supportive of mandatory reporting of suspected animal abuse many felt they were poorly educated in human/animal abuse and were distressed by cases of animal abuse encountered at work. The majority also reported they had been victims of abuse in the veterinary workplace. Dogs were reportedly the most frequently abused animals and males were more likely to be animal abusers than female. A third study surveyed members of the public who encountered media broadcasts of animal cruelty of cattle exported for slaughter during a media expose in May 2011. Whilst, most people were emotionally affected by the media coverage (e.g. feeling pity for the cattle, sadness, helplessness, anger), this did not translate into significant behavior change, as only minority took actions such as writing to politicians or newspapers about their concerns. This research assists our understanding of how animal abuse impacts on a range of animals, with a primary aim being to improve veterinary awareness. Improving awareness should enhance outcomes for people and animals living with violence.

According to Singer, the author of **Why Do Some People Start to Abuse Animal** written during the year of 1995 presents that in order to understand why some people start to abuse animals, it is first necessary to define human aggression and develop an understanding of the psychology involved in human behavior and motivations. This chapter combines case studies and research from around the world to examine people's motivations to abuse animals. Human aggression has been defined as behavior performed by a person (the aggressor with the deliberate intention of harming another person (the victim) who is

believed by the aggressor to be motivated to avoid the harm' (Gullone, 2009, p.38). Harm in this context includes physical harm (such as punching someone), psychological harm (such as verbal abuse) and indirect harm, such as damaging someone's property (Gullone, 2009). As an animal can be both victim as well as someone's 'property' they are at increased risk of abuse. Attitudes People may hold toward animals before we attitudes people may abuse animal it is worthwhile to consider the various attitudes people may hold towards animals. Rather than attempt to neatly slot ourselves or others into one of these ten categories, it is more likely that people have a mixture of these attitudes, and these may change over time and depending on personal experiences with the type of animal involved. For example, many view 'pest' animals differently to companion animals. There is no single category that is pathognomonic for an abuser. Animal hoarders, for an example may initially be motivated by moralistic and humanistic attitudes to rescue and house unwanted animals that would otherwise be euthanized. Soon, however, these people may be overwhelmed and neglect and suffering of animals is the result. Does this mean that the cat hoarder is actually negativistic? Or even dominionistic by forcing animals to live confined in filthy cages and rooms? There are various hypotheses to help us understand why some people perform abusive acts. A few of these hypotheses are the following:

The theory of social learning is that every individual is socialized to seek approval and affection from those they love (Dollard and Millar, 1950). When this is successful, both parties feel satisfied; however, when this does not occur the resulting frustration and anger may be transferred toward 'weaker creatures' (such as animals) that cannot retaliate (Wright and Hensley, 2003). According to the theory of social learning, violent behaviours are learned from early childhood (Bandura, 1973; Reitzel-Jaffe and Wolfe, 2001). A study involving over 1000 children and adolescents in Italy found that those who had witnessed their friends and mothers abusing animals were more likely to abuse animals themselves (Baldry, 2003). Similarly, a study involving 281 adolescents in Australia found that animal abuse was more common among those who had observed animal abuse by a parent, sibling, relative or friend (Thompson and Gullone, 2006).

The deviance generalization theory rejects the hypothesis that there is an inevitable progression of animal abuse leading to human abuse. Animal abuse is instead viewed as a form of antisocial behavior that may occur before, after or concurrently with other

antisocial behavior directed toward humans (Arluke et al., 1999). A study of officially recorded offences by criminals and members of the public found that animal abusers were more likely to perform a range of other antisocial behaviours (e.g., drug, property, interpersonal violence and public disorder offences) and animal abuse preceded or followed violence toward humans (Arluke et al., 1999). It needs to be emphasized that the study by Arluke et al. (1999) utilized official reports of animal abuse and crimes to determine order of occurrence. The data therefore tell us order of apprehension for animal abuse offences and other crimes. The data however, do not tell us whether the acts (detected or undetected by others) of animal abuse precede, follow or co-occur with commission of criminal acts (detected or undetected by others). It would be necessary to undertake longitudinal research or retrospective reporting to explore this question. In another study, owners of so-called high-risk or 'vicious' dogs had significantly more criminal convictions that owners of low-risk dogs (Barnes et al., 2006) Motivations of Animal Abuse Researchers interviewed over 150 criminals and found that 25% of aggressive criminals reported five or more acts of animal cruelty, compared to 6% among moderate and non-aggressive criminals and none in the non-criminal group (Kellert and Felthous, 1985).

According to **Henderson, Brandy B, the author of Childhood Animal Cruelty Methods and Their Link to Adult Interpersonal Violence** written during May 2010, recent research has begun to establish a relationship between childhood acts of animal cruelty and later violence against humans. However, few studies have focused on the influence of animal cruelty methods on later interpersonal violence. In a replication of a study by Hensley and Tallichet (2009) and based on a sample of 180 inmates at medium- and maximum-security prisons in a Southern state, the present study examines the relationship between several retrospectively-identified animal cruelty methods (drowned, hit, shot, kicked, choked, burned, and had sex with) and interpersonal violence committed against humans. Four out of Five inmates reported hitting animals. Over one-third of the sample chose to shoot or kick animals, while one in five had sex with them. Less than one-fifth of the sample drowned or chocked animals, and less than one-sixth of the inmates burned animals. Regression analyses revealed that the age at which offenders began animal cruelty and having sex with animals were predictive of adult interpersonal violence. Of the varying definitions of animal cruelty, perhaps Ascione (1993) said it best. He described animal cruelty as: "Socially

unacceptable behavior that intentionally causes unnecessary pain, suffering, or distress to and/or the death of an animal" (p. 228). Unlike humans, animals are victims of abuse and exploitation who truly cannot speak on their own behalf. In the past two decades, researchers have begun to unravel the complex nature of animal and human interactions, including animal cruelty. In fact, these studies have revealed a potential link between childhood animal cruelty and adult interpersonal violence. MacDonald (1961) was one of the first to publicly recognize the relationship between childhood animal cruelty and later interpersonal violence. He reviewed the childhood characteristics of 48 psychotic and 52 non-psychotic inpatients in a mental hospital who had threatened to commit homicidal behavior. He discovered the sadistic patients often shared three common childhood characteristics: enuresis (bed-wetting), fire setting, and animal cruelty. These are now commonly referred to as the MacDonals triad and are considered possible warning signs for those who are prone to violent behavior. Like MacDonald, Mead (1964) found that childhood animal cruelty was a possible red flag for later violent behavior toward humans. She indicated that childhood cruelty to animals may indicate the formation of a spontaneous, assaultive character disorder. Three separate cases led her to believe that there might be a relationship between the two. The first case involved a boy who had killed cats by banging their heads against an alley wall. The boy later stabbed a schoolmate in the eye. The second case focused on Joe, who killed his neighbours' animals. Sometimes, instead of killing animals, he would cut off their ears and eat them while they were still alive. Joe would get drunk and inevitably find himself in a bar fight, typically due to winning poker. When the loser of the game decided he did not want to pay Joe the money he had lost, Joe would become very violent and attack him with a pocket knife, almost always sending the man to the hospital with multiple stab wounds. The third case involved a boy with low impulse control. The boy had a record of nonstop violence at home and had wrung the neck of his canary. Mead (1964) argued that children must be taught to distinguish between permissible and impermissible killing. She suggested that animal cruelty, which society considered a forbidden type of killing, was a warning sign which could be diagnosed early and treated before a violent path was undertaken. She also warned that a lack of punishment with respect to an act of animal cruelty by a child was far worse than punishment that was too harsh. If the child went unpunished or uncaught, he or she would

continue to progress to more violent behavior against larger animals until eventually, these acts might be committed against humans. By using a sample of violent and non-violent inmates, Merz-Perez, Heide, and Silverman (2001) provided an example of this in their study of childhood cruelty to animals and their subsequent violence toward humans. One of the nonviolent inmates recalled shooting and killing a neighbour's pig when he was eight years old. Although the child was not being deliberately cruel, and instead just wanted to test the limits of the new gun given to him for his birthday, he was punished quite severely. The same grandfather who had given him the gun refused to believe his recounting and broke his gun and ordered him to assist with chores on the neighbour's farm for one year. Providing support for Mead's line of reasoning, the participant reported that as a result of the way the incident was handled, he felt remorse for killing the animal, and not simply regrets that he had been caught. Overall, Merz-Perez et al (2001) found that some of the violent offenders reported using the same methods on their animal victims as they later did on their human victims. Wright and Hensley (2003) discovered similar findings during their investigation of the relationship between childhood acts of animal cruelty and serial murder. Case studies revealed that each murderer used the same method on his human victims as he did on the animals that he had killed as a child. For example, Caroll Edward Cole's first act animal cruelty was choking his puppy to death. When Cole moved his violence from animals to humans as an adult, his preferred method of murder was strangulation. The effect of childhood animal cruelty methods on later interpersonal violence has been vastly understudied. In fact, only one study has empirically examined the relationship between childhood methods of animal cruelty and later violence towards humans (Hensley &Tallichet, 2009). Using an inmate sample, the present study, which replicates Hensley and Tallichet (2009) study, focused on several retrospectively-identified methods of childhood animal cruelty and their possible relationship to adult interpersonal violence.

According to **Beirne, Piers, author of From Animal Abuse to Interhuman Violence? A Critical Review of the Progression Thesis** written during 2004, he reviewed evidence of a progression from animal abuse to interhuman violence. It finds that the "progression thesis" is supported not by a coherent research program but by disparate studies often lacking methodological and conceptual clarity. Set in the context of a debate about the theoretical adequacy of concepts like "animal abuse" and "animal cruelty", it suggests that the link

between animal abuse and interhuman violence should be sought not only in the personal biographies of those individuals who abuse animals but also in those institutionalized social practices where animal abuse is routine, widespread, and socially acceptable. Impassioned claims of a significant relationship between nonhuman animal abuse and interhuman violence have been made by such diverse thinkers as Pythagoras, Thomas Aquinas, Immanuel Kant, Mary Wollstonecraft, Mahatma Gandhi, and Margaret Mead. Espoused by its holders at a high level of abstraction and disseminated in the mantra-like catchphrase "The Link." it nowadays is advanced most prominently by members of state agencies and philanthropic organizations who work with abused animals and/or at-risk families. It also implicitly appears in the writings of moral philosophers and feminists on animal welfare and animal rights. By the mass media and by numerous practitioners and activists in the animal protection community, moreover, knowledge claims about The Link are projected as indisputable scientific fact with urgent policy ramifications. This paper, too, assumes that animal abuse and interhuman violence are linked in a concatenation of sites, but it reviews evidence of only one aspect of this "animal abuse web" (Solot, 1997), namely, whether there is a progression from animal abuse to interhuman violence. The chronological causal relationship posited between animal abuse and interhuman violence I term, "the progression thesis." As an embryonic idea about human-animal interactions, the progression thesis originated in the 1980s, but, as a more focused object, it has appeared only in the last decade, chiefly in the United States. Recently, it has garnered interest in some other countries-including Australia, Belgium, Canada, England, Italy, Scotland, and Wales. Among scholars of human-animal interactions, most assessments of the progression thesis, extended or brief, currently lie on a continuum between possible disconfirmation (Miller & Knutson, 1997; Arluke, Arnold, Levin, Luke, & Ascione, 1999) and a cautious attitude of wait-and-see (Dadds, Turner, & McAloon, 2002). Few would subscribe to the ironclad determinism embedded in the view of Farrington (2002), past president of the American Society of Criminology that people graduate from hyperactivity at age two to cruelty to animals at age six, shoplifting at ten, burglary at fifteen, robbery at twenty, and eventually spouse assault, child abuse and neglect, alcohol abuse, and employment and later health problems later on in life. (p.58) Confirmation of the progression thesis ultimately depends on the successful combination of two quite separate propositions.

Chronologically and casually, one proposition looks forward, the other, backward. In the one, those who abuse animals must be more likely than those who do not subsequently to act violently toward humans. In the other, those who act violently toward humans must be more likely than those who do not previously to have abused animals. Logically, these propositions need not entail strict humane causality. Robust and persistent statistical association will suffice. If the association is found to be robust, then how is it explained? What is its direction? Might some other variable(s) influence it? In reviewing the merits of the progression thesis, I begin with its originating site, which is commonly lodged in the social dynamics of families in crisis. Among the chief dysfunctional qualities of these families is their propensity for interpersonal violence, to whose stated links with animal abuse I now turn.

Even so our Congress established statute to abate animal cruelty, our institution have lagged in creating effective control mechanisms in spite of the growth of this modern day pandemic. Thus, this study will discuss the reliability, effectiveness and efficiency of the RA 8485 or Animal Welfare Act particularly in the City of Tuguegarao.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study aims to assess the implementation of the **"Animal Welfare Act (R.A. 8485)"** in Tuguegarao City. Specifically, the study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What are the profiles of respondent involved in terms of:

    1.1 Age

    1.2 Sex

    1.3 Civil Status

2. What kind of animals or pets do these respondents own/guard?

    2.1 Human Animal/Species

    2.2 Non-human Animal/Species

3. What are the usual treatments that pet owners/guardians are using in regard to the view point of their pets?

    3.1 Favorable

    3.2 Non-favorable

4. How reliable the implementation of the Animal Welfare Act in eradicating the maltreatment of any person to the animals?

5. How efficient and effective is the Animal Welfare Act as regards to:

5.1 Extent of attainment of objectives.

5.2 Responsiveness and awareness of the community/people to the Animal Welfare Act.

STATISTICAL TOOLS

This study utilized the sampling technique that will be used is the Slovin's formula:

$$n = N/(1+Ne^2)$$

Wherein:

n = a sample size

N = population size

e = the margin of error (at .05, minimum)

The total population of Tuguegarao City is 153,502. The researchers took the respondents into sample size as representative of the total population of Tuguegarao City for it would be ideal to use this type of sampling technique because the findings that will be obtained will be considered as valid and will require less expenses, time and effort since the overall population of Tuguegarao City is statistically enormous.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1.1 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents According to Age

AGES	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE	RANK
11-15	18	4.5	6
16-20	161	40.25	1
21-25	65	16.25	2
26-30	48	12	3
31-35	27	6.75	4
36-40	14	3.5	7
41-45	12	3	9
46-50	19	4.75	5
51-55	12	3	9
56-60	13	3.25	8
61-65	11	2.75	10
TOTAL	**400**	**100**	

Table 1.1 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondent's profile as to their age. As noted in the table, it can be determined that most of the respondents who is engaged in pet-owning are young persons whose age fall within the range from 16-20 and constitute 161 respondents comprising 40.25% of the group or two-fifth (2/5) of the group.

The smallest group has a number of 11 respondents or 2.75% of the group. Other researchers have scientifically shown that owning a pet is good for a person's emotional and physical well-being. Given that teenagers whose age is within 16-20 are more vulnerable to emotional and mental disorder, the idea of having a companion animal could actually improve their well being. As to the smallest group whose age falls within 61-65, researches have consistently shown that within this age or as referred as "retirement age", older people are already concerned about their ability to take care of a pet as they age.

Table 1.2 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents According to Sex

SEX	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Male	172	43
Female	228	57
TOTAL	**400**	**100**

Table 1.2 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of respondent's profile as to their sex. The table clearly implies that most of the respondents who are engaged to owning a pet are females which comprise the larger group with 228 of them or constituting a proportion of 57%. In general, women have significantly higher positive attitudes towards owning a pet than male subjects.

Table 1.3 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents as to Civil Status

CIVIL STATUS	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Single	241	60.25
Married	112	28
Widow/er	47	11.75
TOTAL	**400**	**100**

The Table 1.3 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondent's assessment as to civil status. As shown in the table, the most number of respondents are single and constitute 241 of them comprising 60.25% of the group. The smallest group has a number of 47 or 11.75% of the group. Research has shown that singles are taking their search for love into the wild - as they look to fill a sense of love and family in their live. It seems that these little creatures are serving as creatures of comfort for singles. Single people are discovering comfort and satisfaction that owning a pet can offer.

Table 2.1 Classification and Frequency Distribution of the respondent's pet

HUMAN ANIMAL	FREQUENCY	NON-HUMAN ANIMAL	FREQUENCY
Dog	178	Snake	14
Cat	66	Tarantula	13
Pig	22	Turtle	10

Rabbit	15		
Hamster	14		
Birds	13		
Chicken	12		
Horse	11		
Rat	11		
Carabao	11		
Duck	10		
TOTAL	363		37

Table 2.1 presents the classification and frequency distribution of respondent's pet. As revealed in the data, the most common type of pet that is owned or guarded by the respondents are domesticated or human animal which has been tamed and made fit for a human environment. It comprises the larger group with a number of 363 or constitutes a proportion of 90.75%. It is also shown in the table under the type of human animal that most of the respondents own dog as their pet which consists of 178 or 44.5%. Furthermore, the smaller group which is the wild animal or non-human animal is consisted only a number of 37 or 9.25%. Domesticated animals are the most common type of pets that are being owned by the respondents due to different factors such as their attractive appearances, loyal or playful personalities, and inexpensiveness and easy to handle but the most possible reason is that it gives less danger to humans compared to wild animals. As can be noticed from the questions above, these seek for positive response or called positive-question-tag which means, if the respondent answers for "YES" - it is satisfactory or favorable answer and concludes that there are no animal maltreatment. On the other hand, if the respondent answers for "NO"-then it is unsatisfactory or non-favorable and there can be a cruelty to their pets.

Table 3.1 Frequency Distribution of "Do you feed your pet?"

HUMAN ANIMAL	FREQUENCY OF YES	PERCENTAGE	FREQUENCY OF NO	PERCENTAGE
Dog	156	39	22	5.5
Cat	56	14	10	2.25
Pig	19	4.75	3	0.75
Rabbit	12	3	3	0.75
Hamster	11	2.75	3	0.75
Birds	10	2.5	3	0.75
Chicken	9	2.25	3	0.75
Horse	7	1.75	4	1
Rat	6	1.5	5	1.25

Carabao	6	1.5	5	1.25
Duck	7	1.75	3	0.75
NON-HUMAN ANIMAL				
Snake	11	2.75	3	0.75
Tarantula	7	1.75	6	1.5
Turtle	6	1.5	4	1
TOTAL	**323**	**80.75**	**77**	**19.25**

Table 3.1 shows the frequency distribution of question number 3. As noted in the table, it is shown that most of the respondents answered YES which constitutes 323comprising 80.75% of the group. The smallest group with a NO answer has a number of 77 respondents or 19.25%. In general, most of the pet owners provide an adequate sustenance for their pets and with this; we can conclude that the treatment used here is favorable.

Table 3.2 Lists of Pets that must and must not be bathed

MUST	MUST NOT
Dog	Cat
Pig	Rabbit
Horse	Hamster
Carabao	Birds
Duck	Chicken
Snake	Tarantula
Turtle	Rat

In the table above, it reveals the list of pets or animals which **Must** and **Must not** be bathed by their owners or guardians considering that it is not vital and proper for them or might cause risk to their health. In connection to this, we made two tables separating **"Must"** and **"Must not"**.

Table 3.3 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondent's Pets that MUST BE BATHED

	FREQUENCY OF YES	PERCENTAGE	FREQUENCY OF NO	PERCENTAGE
Dog	145	36.25	33	8.25
Pig	19	4.75	3	0.75
Horse	7	1.75	4	1
Carabao	6	1.5	5	1.25
Duck	4	1	6	1.5
Snake	4	1	10	2.5
Turtle	5	1.25	5	1.25
TOTAL	**190**	**47.5**	**66**	**16.5**

Table 3.3 presents the frequency distribution of pets that must be bathed in connection to question number 4. We can see now from the data above that most of the respondents answered YES and constitutes 190 of them comprising 74.22%. On the other hand, there are still respondents whose answer are NO constituting 66 from the group or have a percentage of 25.78.In regards to this, most of the respondents bathe their pets and with this; we can conclude from the data that pets which are allowed to be bathed has a favorable treatment.

Table 3.4 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Pets that MUST NOT BE BATHED

	FREQUENCY OF YES	PERCENTAGE	FREQUENCY OF NO	PERCENTAGE
Cat	12	3	54	13.5
Rabbit	7	1.75	8	2
Hamster	4	1	10	2.5
Birds	5	1.25	8	2
Chicken	5	1.25	7	1.75
Tarantula	5	1.25	8	2
Rat	5	1.25	6	1.5
TOTAL	**43**	**10.75**	**101**	**25.25**

As you can notice from the data, the smallest group of respondents whose answer is YES has a number of 43 with a percentage of 29.86, while others who answered NO has 101 respondents with 70.14%. Therefore, it can be gleamed from the data that there is a satisfactory or favorable treatment since most of the pet owners does not bathe their pets which are not allowed to be bathed due to some reasons.

Table 3.5 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Time Spent with their Pets

HUMAN ANIMAL	FREQUENCY OF YES	PERCENTAGE	FREQUENCY OF NO	PERCENTAGE
Dog	139	34.75	39	9.75
Cat	49	12.25	17	4.25
Pig	8	2	14	3.5
Rabbit	11	2.75	4	1
Hamster	11	2.75	3	0.75
Birds	5	1.25	8	2
Chicken	7	1.75	5	1.25
Horse	7	1.75	4	1
Rat	6	1.5	5	1.25
Carabao	6	1.5	5	1.25
Duck	7	1.75	5	1.75
NON-HUMAN ANIMAL				
Snake	7	1.75	7	1.75

Tarantula	7	1.75	6	1.5
Turtle	6	1.5	4	1
TOTAL	**274**	**68.5**	**126**	**31.5**

Table 3.5 presents the frequency distribution of question number 5. As can be seen from the data above, the larger group of respondents whose answer is YES comprises with a number of 274 of them or constituting a proportion of 68.5% while the smaller group on the other hand has only a number of 126 respondents or 31.5%. As a result, most of the respondents have stronger bond with their pets through spending some time, and in

Table 3.6 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents as to Bringing their Pets for Consultation or Medication to an Animal Specialist

HUMAN ANIMAL	FREQUENCY OF YES	PERCENTAGE	FREQUENCY OF NO	PERCENTAGE
Dog	53	13.25	125	31.25
Cat	17	4.25	49	12.25
Pig	8	2	14	3.5
Rabbit	7	1.75	8	1
Hamster	6	1.5	8	1
Birds	5	1.25	8	1
Chicken	5	1.25	7	1.75
Horse	5	1.25	6	1.5
Rat	5	1.25	6	1.5
Carabao	6	1.5	5	1.25
Duck	4	1	6	1.5
NON HUMAN ANIMAL				
Snake	6	1.5	8	2
Tarantula	5	1.25	8	2
Turtle	5	1.25	5	1.25
TOTAL	**137**	**34.25**	**263**	**65.75**

Table 3.6 presents the frequency distribution of question number 7. The table shows that the larger group of respondents whose answer is NO comprises a number of 263 or constituting a proportion of 65.75% while the other has 137 respondents or 34.25%. Most of the pet owners do not consult their pet from any medications or from any animal care specialist because it requires a high-cost of payment and most of them don't want to spend expensively. Hence, the result can be interpreted as unsatisfactory or non-favorable. There is no reliable implementation of Animal Welfare Act in eradicating the maltreatment of any person to the animals. Based from the interviews we conducted to the implementing agencies of the said act, the director claims that animal maltreatment in fact exists but they

cannot take action to prosecute alleged animal abusers without reporting it to the proper authority along with a valid evidence. In regards to this, there are no reported cases of animal cruelty due to the unawareness of the community to the said act protecting and promoting the welfare of animals.

Based from the responses we have gathered from our interview, the objective of the Animal Welfare Act has not fully attained since there are no cases of animal cruelty reported yet due to the lack of the said act to fully inform the community on how to complain in cases wherein there is maltreatment happening. Therefore, the objective of the statutory act has lagged in creating effective implementation.

Table 5.2 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents on the Responsiveness and Awareness of the Community/People to the Animal Welfare Act

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
YES	154	38.5
NO	246	61.5
TOTAL	400	100

As revealed from the data, the respondents are unaware or not familiar with the law protecting and promoting the welfare of animals since large group of respondents comprise 246 or 61.5%. In connection to this, the community is not aware and has no desired response to the said act. Most of the pet owners have no knowledge in the legislation and they are treating their pets favorably based from their personal choice and not because the law says so.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The salient findings of the study are as follows:

1. Assessing the profile of the respondents.

    1.1 Most of the respondents whose age falls within 16-20 are engaged in pet owning.

    1.2 Females have higher frequency in owning a pet than males.

    1.3 Single people have the highest frequency in pet owning.

2. Identifying the type of respondent's pet.

    2.1 Domesticated animals or human animals are the most common type of pet, especially dogs.

3. Processing the usual treatment of respondents to their pets.

4. There is no reliable implementation of Animal Welfare Act in eradicating the maltreatment of any person to the animals.

5. How efficient and effective is the Animal Welfare Act as regards to:

5.1 The objective of Animal Welfare Act has not fully attained.

5.2 The respondents are unaware or not familiar with the law protecting and promoting the welfare of animals

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn: The researchers conclude that:

1. There is no maltreatment of animals from pet owners. In contrary to this, pet owners are unaware of the laws protecting the rights of their pets.

2. The researchers conclude that pet owner's treatment results to satisfactory or favorable in regards to the view point of their pets. Simply, there is no animal maltreatment.

3. The researchers conclude that the implementation of the law on Animal Welfare Act by the different animal implementing agencies here in Tuguegarao City are ineffective since the pet owners are unaware of the law in regards to the rights of their pets.

4. The researchers also conclude that the favorable and effective treatment of animals among pet owners are based on their moral or personal decision and not because a law that prohibits them to do so.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions presented the following recommendations are suggested:

1. The researchers recommend that the animal implementing agencies should exert more effort in informing the pet owners about the "Animal Welfare Act" in order to increase awareness of the people concerning the rights of animals as well as to their pets.

2. The researchers recommend that the pet owners should courageously and immediately report cases on animal maltreatment to the police station by showing documents, videos or witnesses to prove the same.

3. The researchers recommend that the pet owners should be required to attend seminars conducted by animal implementing agencies in order to enlighten their selves about the "Animal Welfare Act" that protects rights of their pets.

REFERENCES

1. Agnew, R. (1998). The Causes of Animal Abuse: A Social-Psychological Analysis. *Theoretical Criminology*, *2,* pp. 177-209.

2. Arluke, A., Levin, J., Luke, C., and Ascione, F. (1999). The Relationship of Animal Abuse to Violence and Other Forms of Antisocial Behavior. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14,* pp. 963-975.

3. Ascione, F.R. (1993). Children Who Are Cruel to Animals: A Review of Research and Implications for Developmental Psychopathology.

4. Ascione, F.R. (1999). The Abuse of Animals and Human Interpersonal Violence: Making The Connection. In Child Abuse, Domestic Violence, and Animal Abuse: Linking the Circles of Compassion for Prevention and Intervention, edited by F.R. Ascione and P. Arkow. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, pp. 50-61.

5. Ascione, Frank R. (2001). Animal Abuse and Youth Violence. U.S. Department of Justice: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

6. Beirne, Piers (2004). From Animal Abuse to Interhuman Violence? A Critical Review of the Progression Thesis. University of Southern Maine.

7. Beirne, Piers. (2009) Confronting Animal Abuse: Law, Criminology, and Human-Animal Relationships. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefied Pub.

8. Blosh, Marie (2012). The History of Animal Welfare Law and The Future of Animal Rights. The University of Western Ontario.

9. Boat, B.W. (1999). Abuse of Children and Animals: Using the Links to Inform Child Assessment and Protection. In Child Abuse, Domestic Violence, and Animal Abuse: Linking the Circles of Compassion for Prevention and Intervention, edited by F.R. Ascione and P. Arkow. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, pp. 83-100.

10. Bulliet, Richard W. (2005). Hunters, Herders, and Hamburgers: The Past and Future of Human-Animal Relationships. New York: Columbia University.

11. Clark, Stephen R.L. (1997). Animals and their Moral Standing. London and New York: Routledge

12. Fine A. (2000). Handbook on Animal Assisted Therapy: Theoretical Foundations and Guidelines for Practice. New York: Academic Press.

13. Flynn, C.P. (1999). Exploring The Link Between Corporal Punishment and Children's Cruelty To Animals. Journal of Marriage and the Family, *61* pp. 971-981.

14. Flynn, C.P. (2000). Woman's best friend: Pet abuse and the role of companion animals in the lives of battered women. *Violence Against Women 6* pp. 162–177.

15. Henderson, Brandy B. (2010) Childhood Animal Cruelty Methods and Their Link to Adult Interpersonal Violence. Chattanooga: The University of Tennessee.

16. Singer (1995). Why Do Some People Start to Abuse Animal.

17. Tiplady, Catherine (2013). Animal Abuse: Helping Animals and People. Queensland Australia: Centre for Animal Welfare and Ethics University.

18. Tiplady, Catherine (2016). Investigating Cruelty to Animals in Private and Commercial Settings. Queensland Australia: School of Veterinary Science Centre for Animal Welfare and Ethics.