Opportunities (and challenges) in dairy cattle cognition research: A key area needed to design future high welfare housing systems

Nawroth, C.¹, Rørvang, M. V.^{2,3*}

¹ Research Institute for Farm Animal Biology (FBN), Institute of Behavioural Physiology, Wilhelm-Stahl-Allee 2, 18196 Dummerstorf, Germany

² Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Dept. Biosystems and Technology, Box 190, 234 22 Lomma, Sweden

³ Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Dept. Animal Environment and Health, Box 234, Gråbrödragatan 19, 532 31 Skara, Sweden

* Corresponding author: +46 724-530532, mariav.rorvang@slu.se

Abstract

The ability of dairy cattle to adapt to husbandry systems and management routines is crucial for ensuring welfare and efficient production. However, this ability can be compromised by our limited knowledge of their cognitive abilities, which may result in suboptimal husbandry and management standards. In this review, we highlight three topics of cattle cognition research that are currently understudied, and yet key to develop future high welfare dairy cattle housing systems: 1) transmission of information from cow to calf, 2) mechanisms to attenuate fear, and 3) processes involved in the human-cattle relationship. We review the currently available literature on all three topics, and elucidate promising research areas from an animal husbandry point of view. Future studies should focus on elucidating what and how much calves learn from their dam during prolonged cow-calf contact in dairy cattle systems. Such information could constitute an important part of the discussion of whether to keep cows and calves together for a longer time after calving in the dairy industry. Fear in the cattle group might be lowered by the use of calm companions and future studies could uncover if attenuation of fear might even be induced by conditioning positive experiences of cattle with unrelated stimuli e.g. odours. Lastly, the human-cattle relationship might benefit from utilising the already established training regimes from other species, e.g. positive reinforcement training or target

training, which may have the potential to decrease risk of injury during handling for the cow and handler.

Keywords: bovidae, cattle management, human-animal relationship, learning, social behaviour

Introduction

Commercial production systems require dairy cattle to attain information about their physical and social environment and to adapt when their environment changes (reviewed in Rørvang and Nawroth, 2021). Dairy cattle in general have been shown to quickly adapt to novel environments, such as when learning how to use an automated milking system (e.g. Jacobs and Siegford, 2012), or when accessing automatic feeders (e.g. Collis, 1980). Cattle's ability to learn about and adapt to their physical and social surroundings is thus crucial for the functionality of the production system, for animal welfare and for the safety of the handlers involved. In spite of this, knowledge of the cognitive abilities of cattle is still very limited (George and Bolt, 2021; Marino and Allen, 2017; Nawroth et al., 2019). This lack of knowledge makes it likely that commercial housing systems and management routines are only partially adapted to the behavioural and cognitive repertoire of cattle. An example of this is the presence of oral stereotypies such as tongue rolling and bar biting (reviewed in Radkowska et al., 2020; Redbo, 1992), which are believed to be caused by insufficient opportunities to express natural behaviours (e.g. grazing, rumination, lying down ruminating etc.) (Redbo, 1992). Cattle are motivated to work for access to items or areas that many current husbandry systems are lacking e.g. access to an automatic brush (McConnachie et al., 2018), and pasture (e.g. von Keyserlingk et al., 2017; Charlton et al., 2013). Providing cattle with opportunities to utilise their cognitive abilities such as opening gates to obtain food rewards, could improve their welfare in terms of providing a sense of control over their environment, or by offering an outlet from boredom (Mandel et al, 2016; Wechsler and Lea, 2007). This collectively highlights the need for housing systems and management routines that are better suited for the behavioural and cognitive repertoire of cattle, and in order to provide such future

systems, it is important to understand the breadth of the cognitive capacities of cattle. There is thus a need for further research on this topic – our current lack of knowledge raises challenges, but it may also be viewed as an opportunity for developing better and improved housing systems and management routines in the future.

Interactions with their social environment is part of the everyday life of dairy cows. The social environment entails both interactions with humans and with conspecific herd mates. Early experiences in a calf's life are often crucial for its further development (e.g. von Keyserlingk et al., 2009), and thus providing proper early life experiences is important for the production. In intensive, commercial dairy housing systems, cow and calf are often separated shortly after birth of the calf (von Keyserlingk and Weary, 2007; Vasseur et al., 2010). In such systems, calves are often moved to individual pens, where they are raised during the milk-feeding period, which has previously been shown to be beneficial for weight gains (Maatje et al., 1993), lowering of incidence of disease (Tomkins, 1991), and reducing cross-sucking (Van Putten, 1982). This management style is markedly different from what would happen in nature or in extensive management systems, where calves live in social groups forming attachments to both adult cows, and other calves (Kilgour and Dalton, 1984; Vitale et al., 1986). Depriving calves of access to peers can have a negative impact on their welfare and later productivity. Recent studies point to negative effects of individual housing on feed intake and weight gains (Bernal-Rigoli et al., 2012; Costa et al., 2015), but also behavioural problems (Jensen and Larsen 2014). Individual housing of dairy calves can also result in measurable learning deficits, indicating impaired behavioural flexibility (Gaillard et al., 2014; Meagher et al., 2015), all of which may influence the animal's ability to adjust to variable environments on the dairy farm. Raising calves without access to dams (or peers) can have additional benefits, as older individuals often have experience with their environment. An experience that could be used by the younger and more naïve individuals.

In dairy production, humans and animals interact on an everyday basis: Cows need to be handled in several aspects of the production such as moving to milking, to veterinary treatments, or new pastures, or when assisting the cow during calving. Handling of cattle can however be a dangerous job (Doupbrate et al., 2012) and research indicates that many injuries to both humans and cattle in the dairy industry happen in relation to manual livestock-handling (Pinzke and Lundqvist 2007; Doupbrate et al., 2006; Boyle et al., 1997; Pratt et al., 1992). Areas found to be especially associated with a high injury risk are situations where humans and cattle interact directly such as during moving (Erkal et al., 2008; Rasmussen et al., 2000) and hoof trimming (Boyle et al., 1997). In a Swedish study examining injuries to stock people and impeded ability to work in 2004, 5000 incidents were reported with 30% occurring on dairy farms (Doupbrate et al., 2006). Lindahl (2014) reports that farms specialising in milk production in Sweden were further found to suffer most injuries and these were often severe with long periods of leave or even fatal. From the US, Layde et al. (1996) reported that cattle were involved in the majority of animal related injuries, and Doupbrate et al. (2006) further reported that the risk of livestock handling injuries increased on larger operations (>10 workers). With the current trend towards increasing farm size worldwide (Barkema et al., 2015) this incident rate can be expected to rise. The main underlying reason for the many accidents on farm is believed to be fear reactions from the animal (Boyle et al., 1997; Grandin, 1999; Lindahl, 2014). Fearful cattle are thus dangerous to the humans interacting with them, while also experiencing stress contributing negatively to their welfare, and productivity (Hemsworth and Coleman 1998). Hence, as manual handling of cattle happens on a regularly basis (e.g. for milking, regrouping, calving, insemination, treatments etc.) and is unavoidable, there is a clear need for optimizing the procedures in order to avoid human and animal injuries.

The focus of this review is to approach the available knowledge on dairy cattle social cognition from an animal husbandry point of view on three distinct topics derived from the issues reported above: the transmission of information from cow to calf, potential general mechanisms to attenuate of fear in cattle, and the human-cattle relationship during handling and management processes. Subsequently,

we will also highlight the challenges and possibilities within each topic in commercial dairy cattle production. From this knowledge, we further aim to propose future key research questions, which hold potential to improve the functionality of the current housing/management systems, ultimately benefitting both animal welfare and human safety. The review focusses on dairy production systems, but the suggested focus areas might also be relevant to beef cattle systems.

Vertical transmission of information from cow to calf

In commercial dairy production, it is common practise to remove the calf from the dam within the first few days after birth (reviewed in Flower and Weary, 2003). This practise is of increasing public concern (Busch et al., 2017) and as a result, several new housing systems with increased or prolonged cow-calf contact have been studied (e.g. Busch et al., 2017; Meagher et al., 2019). Further research on the potential welfare benefits of cow-calf contact systems is needed (Weary and von Keyserlingk, 2017) to ensure better alignment of dairy farming with public values but also to ensure feasibility of these systems for both the cow, the calf and the farmer. Although this area of research is relatively new, the number of studies is growing, with indications of welfare benefits despite the loss of sellable milk (Meagher et al., 2019).

Cattle, as group-living animals, rely on social information in their daily life. Work done on other species provides some evidence that the severing of the maternal bond at birth can be detrimental to behavioural development (rats: Lévy et al., 2003; Melo et al., 2006), and studies on dairy calves indicate that early social contact including maternal contact improves the flexibility of learning new contingencies (de Paula Vieira et al., 2010; 2012; Meagher et al., 2015). There is thus a risk that dairy calves do not develop proper learning skills when they are isolated at an early age, and as a result may lack key abilities to optimally adapt to changes in the commercial housing system later on.

We here suggest as an additional important topic the role that the dam plays in the transmission of information to her offspring. The studies available on social learning skills of cattle, in general, indicate that the cognitive mechanisms involved are mainly social facilitation and stimulus enhancement (Rørvang and Nawroth, 2021). Whether cattle can also rely on higher social learning mechanisms (i.e. goal emulation (Boesch and Tomasello, 1998) and imitation (Galef, 2013; Nicol, 1995)) is to our knowledge not known. Social transmission skills (i.e. covers the cognitive processes that involve a simple transfer of information and/or behaviour between individuals of the same or different species (Rørvang et al., 2018a)) could be beneficial in a commercial setting when cows e.g. have to learn how to operate automatic feeding bins or other automatic fixtures in their environment. Although the mechanisms at work might still be unclear for many instances of social information transfer, even social facilitation and enhancement effects alone can lead to a faster adaptation to almost all novel husbandry features. Such examples can include learning how to use automatic cattle brushes or feeding bins – where watching another cow interacting with the fixture/apparatus will result in an increased motivation to engage with the item themselves that can ultimately lead to a faster acquisition of the task by the naïve cow via individual associative learning. From that perspective, the ability to acquire information from peers is beneficial for the dairy cow: Social transmission results in increased grazing time (Phillips 2004), and feed intake (e.g. Babu et al., 2003; 2004; Jensen et al., 2015) and acquiring information from peers can shape behavioural flexibility (Gaillard et al., 2014; Meagher et al., 2015)). It should thus be a priority to ensure that dairy calves grow up in an environment where they have social contacts and make use of these social cognitive skills from early life stages on in order to properly develop them (see Costa et al., 2016 for review of group vs single housing of dairy calves). We therefore encourage studies on the long-term effects of cow-calf and calf-calf contact in early life on calves' ability to adequately rely and act upon social information in the short and the long term, i.e. later in life.

Another important aspect of socially acquiring skills from the dam is learning where and how to feed or graze. As dairy production is relying on cows with an efficient feed intake and specific feeding

behaviour, this particular behaviour plays a central role in the production. We know that naïve heifers benefit from being grouped with an experienced cow in the first hours after being introduced to pasture (Costa et al., 2016a), and that calves develop preferences from their dam (or foster dam) for specific pasture locations later in life (Howery et al., 1998; Provenza et al. 1992). Social transmission skills are thus also important for the development of feeding behaviour of calves; when watching the dam graze, the a naive calf, that is, one who has not learned yet how to graze, stimulus enhancement might make the calf more likely to approach and touch the grass, and hence more likely to learn how to graze. It is therefore also fair to argue that these mechanisms are important in developing feeding behaviour fitted to the indoor housing of dairy cows in commercial housing such as eating novel feed i.e., concentrates or straw. Hence, knowing more about how, and from whom, calves learn to feed and how this may be affected by prolonged cow-calf contact should be a future research focus.

For calves, it might be also important to acquire information about the human in the environment from the dam. Research on horses, e.g., shows that foals benefit from observing their mothers' reactions in potentially fear-eliciting situations, which enables them to learn when to not be scared (Christensen, 2015), and increases their acceptance of humans (Christensen et al., 2020). We already know that calves are better able to adapt to novel circumstances when kept with companions (Bolt et al., 2017; Costa et al., 2016b; Gaillard et al., 2014; Meagher et al., 2015), and results from studies of the effects of longer contact between the cow and calf on the calf's responses to stressors also indicate a reduction in stress or fear responses although some studies are conflicting (reviewed in Meagher et al., 2019).

Studies comparing calves reared with, versus reared without, their dams show that calves reared with their dams express more play behaviour and social interaction (Waiblinger et al., 2020), potentially indicating more developed social skills for later life. Higher social competence of calves reared with the dam has also been found in studies where calves were confronted with an unfamiliar cow (Buchli

et al., 2017), and when heifers was integrated into the cow herd (Wagner et al., 2012). It may thus be advantageous to keep cow and calf together in order to lower fear, and to develop higher social competences. Future studies could focus on such aspects, and investigate whether reduced fear reactions in the offspring may be sustained over time and context of the fear eliciting object or situation.

Attenuating fear in cattle by use of conspecifics and conditioning cues

Social buffering

Dairy cattle breeds have been selected for various temperamental traits to ensure a so-called workable milking temperament, and gain high sociability with low intra-specific aggression and less reactivity in response to novelty and social separation (see e.g. Haskell et al., 2014). This selection is done with the aim of having tranquil and docile cows, but some situations (e.g. when exposed to novel or potentially threatening stimuli) might still make cows react fearful. Fearful reactions in cattle are often abrupt and unpredictable, and thus can make the animals hazardous to handle (Grandin, 1999, 1996; Lindahl et al., 2016). One of the underlying reasons for cows reacting unpredictably may arise from the fact that is often not clear which stimuli or context might elicit fear in individual animals. Information on how to reduce fearful behaviour in cattle is generally lacking in cattle research, although studies of fear reactions are relatively abundant in other large mammalian species, such as horses (Christensen et al., 2008, 2005; Rørvang et al., 2015). Fearful cows are not only a threat to human safety (Boyle et al., 1997; Lindahl et al., 2016) but fear is also detrimental to animal welfare (Broom, 2014; Mota-Rojas et al., 2020) and productivity (Hemsworth and Coleman, 1998; Mota-Rojas et al., 2020). On a larger scale, high degrees of fearfulness can impact the sustainability of dairy production either; 1) as cows have lower productivity (i.e. lower growth, yield and reproduction) and thereby a higher risk of culling, or 2) as cows have a higher risk of involuntary culling as they are at higher risk of getting sick or injured, all of which causes a lower longevity (shorter life in the herd) (reviewed in Mota-Rojas et al., 2020). Adding to this, fear reactions are often contagious in a group of

animals (Griffin, 2004). Fear may thus affect animals who are not in direct contact with the fear-eliciting stimuli, and even at a distance, making individual fear reactions difficult to predict for the human handlers involved. Innovative ways to reduce fearful behaviour in cattle are thus needed in order to improve animal welfare and handler safety.

Social buffering, which refers to the notion that the presence of a peer reduces the negative effect of a stressful event (Rault, 2012), might be an adequate mechanism to reduce stress during handling practices. Dairy calves have been shown to vocalise less and explore more when placed in a novel room with a companion than calves placed in the novel room alone (Duve and Jensen, 2011; Færevik et al., 2006). Heifers more readily approached a human and ate more when accompanied with a companion in a novel place (Veissier and le Neindre, 1992), and moreover, the mere sight of conspecifics seem to reduce the behavioural responses to isolation regardless of the identity of the companion (Boissy and Le Neindre, 1997; Veissier and le Neindre, 1992). Recent research suggests that fear can additionally be socially attenuated in groups of animals via trained, calm companions. In horses, reducing fear within a group of three naïve horses can be achieved by adding just one calm companion (demonstrator to observer ratio 1:3) (Rørvang and Christensen, 2018). Using calm companions in groups of cows might similarly have the potential to reduce fear. When groups of naïve dairy cows ($n=3$) were tested in a fear-eliciting situation (i.e. sudden opening of a colourful umbrella as used in the horse study (Rørvang and Christensen, 2018)) with either a trained, calm companion or an untrained (i.e. not calm) companion, the naïve cows who were accompanied with a calm companion reacted less fearfully, returned faster to their feed bucket after being frightened, and had significantly lower heart rate increase during the test ((Stenfelt et al., in press), Fig. 1). Future research should investigate if social buffering of fear responses is affected by different demonstrator to subject ratios; proven efficacy using larger groups would allow for easier transferability to on-farm scenarios. Additional information on consistency over time and across different contexts is also needed, including applied situations such as training naïve heifers to enter the automatic milking unit.

238 *Mediating attenuation of fear through conditioning of olfactory stimuli*

239 Another important mediator in the controlling of social fear is the sensory apparatus of cows. It has
240 been argued that visual cues are the main modality mediating attenuation of fear (e.g. Guzmán et al.,
241 2009), but it is very likely that other senses also play a role. Cattle have been found to react more
242 fearfully when exposed to olfactory cues from stressed conspecifics (Terlouw et al., 1998), and can be
243 trained to differentiate between conspecific based on olfactory cues alone (Baldwin, 1977). It is thus
244 possible that cattle rely on olfaction in more contexts than we currently know (Wyatt, 2003). Research
245 on the sensory abilities of cattle is generally sparse, highlighting a need for more knowledge on how
246 sensory information is processed and prioritised by cows and how different senses might be utilised in
247 attenuating fear in cow groups (Nielsen, 2018). One potential line of inquiry is to determine if cattle
248 are able to learn to associate an odour with a pleasant situation. If cattle are able to form a conditioned
249 response, the use of odours could potentially be used to mitigate the stressors associated with certain
250 known stressful events, such as loading onto a transporter. Another option could be to utilise calming
251 odours e.g. lavender has been found to lower cortisol levels in horses being transported (Heitman et
252 al., 2018), and reduce travel induced sickness in pigs (Bradshaw et al., 1998). Studies on dairy cattle
253 however remain to be done.

254

255 *Role of conditioned stimuli on stress responses*

256 Another aspect of conditioning, which is important to consider in the aims of lowering fear in cattle, is
257 the possibility that fear reactions can function as conditioning stimuli. Such mechanisms have been
258 studied in rodents (reviewed in (Curzon et al., 2009)) and humans (e.g. Vervliet et al., 2013). This
259 means that when a cow is exposed to a fearful companion, she may learn to associate the experienced
260 fear with a specific situation, object or conspecific (Olsson and Phelps, 2007). These aspects are
261 important in cattle handling as it means that cattle may react unpredictably to certain situations,
262 objects or persons. A cow may e.g. react fearful towards an automatic feeding bin although she has no

own experience from interacting with the automatic feeding bin - the reaction could be caused from watching another cow reacting fearful near the automatic feeding bin. Future studies should thus include these aspects as they remain rather unexplored in farm animal species.

The human-cattle relationship

How cattle perceive and interact with humans

In dairy cattle farming systems, the cows interact with humans on a daily basis. It should be noted that cattle are able to discriminate between humans from an early age on (de Passillé et al., 1996; Munksgaard et al., 1999; Rybarczyk et al., 2001). It is thus important to establish a good human-animal relation from the very beginning of the calf's life, which may even last for the entirety of the production cycle (Breuer et al., 2003; Rushen et al., 1999). Several studies have investigated the human-cattle relationship and ways to improve it. For example, Lange et al. (2020) and Lürzel et al. (2016) investigated the effects of gentle stroking of heifers, and found that avoidance distance decreased when heifers had been stroked by a human as calves (Lürzel et al., 2016), while the exact manner of stroking applied seems less relevant in the promotion of positive affective states in cattle (Lange et al., 2020). Early handling also seems crucial for later acceptance (i.e. allowing the human within close proximity) of dairy cows to humans, e.g. Jago et al. (1999) found that handling in the first 2 days after birth resulted in calves readily approaching and interacting with an unknown human regardless of any later interactions with humans. Breuer et al. (2003) found that negative tactile handling lead to both a behavioural and a physiological acute and chronic stress response in dairy heifers. While most of these have focused exclusively on how tactile stimulation can affect the human-animal relationship, humans and cattle can also interact via other modalities via olfactory or acoustic stimulus. Cattle are able to detect similar and higher sound frequencies than humans (Heffner and Heffner, 1992, 1983) and their sense of smell plays a central role in both social and sexual behaviour (Wyatt, 2003). It is therefore likely that cattle gather much more information from human handlers than is currently considered. Research from horses e.g. show that horses handled by calm

and positive humans show lower heart rates and lower cortisol concentrations (reviewed in Rørvang et al., 2020). Recent research hints that cattle may be able to recognise human stress related chemosignals (Destrez et al., 2021). If cattle are able to associate these signals with negative human-animal interactions, they may consequently change their behaviour, hence these results should be explored further on larger samples and other breeds (only Charolaise were tested in Destrez et al., 2021), as to be able to make a final conclusion on the common saying that cows can smell a person's bad mood.

Facilitating positive interactions

Although fearful or aggressive animals are believed to be the cause of animal-handling injuries (Boyle et al., 1997; Grandin, 1999; Lindahl, 2014), the possibility of facilitating positive human-animal interactions by applying learning theory to train cows has received sparse attention. In other domestic animal species, there is considerable work on mapping how the animal reacts to cues from humans and conspecifics in order to avoid risky situations. Horses can e.g. be habituated to otherwise fear-eliciting situations (e.g. Christensen et al., 2008) and positive reinforcement training is an efficient tool to lower stress in numerous situations across different animal species (e.g. horses: Dai et al., 2019, lions: Callealta et al., 2020, primates: Perlman et al., 2012, ring-tailed lemurs: Spiezio et al., 2017). Positive reinforcement training has also become common in biomedical research, ensuring reliable experimental results and welfare of the laboratory animals (Laule et al., 2003, Scott et al., 2003), and recently this technique has also been increasingly implemented in modern zoos, enhancing animal husbandry standards and welfare (e.g. Laule et al., 2003, Laule and Whittaker 2007). These approaches have only to a limited extent been applied to cattle, although cattle are routinely handled, and have to 'behave' within farm routines. The North American cattle handlers Bud Williams (proposed the "Low-stress cattle management" principles in the 90's, Williams, 2012) and Dylan Biggs (teaching the "Low-stress principles", Biggs, 2013) have pointed to such concepts indirectly when stressing the importance of the stock person spending time walking through the herd, in order to

reduce the size of the flight zone (i.e. habituate cattle to the presence of the human) (Stookey and Watts, 2014). In addition to this practical viewpoint, research have also pointed to cows' general trainability. Cows can e.g. easily learn to follow a target using positive reinforcement training (Rørvang et al., 2018b). Such training principle could be useful in many ways while handling cattle, especially in situations where it is beneficial to distance the human from the cow such as during moving for various purposes e.g. loading for transport (Rasmussen et al., 2000), which has also proven an efficient method in horses (Dai et al., 2019). Another example is a study by Lomb et al., (2021), showing that heifers trained, using a combination of positive reinforcement and counterconditioning, readily tolerated a painful procedure, and Chen et al. (2016) showing that positive reinforcement training is beneficial during restraining of cattle. The authors also interestingly noted that the training moreover reduced avoidance behaviour both during the procedure and after the procedure. Adding to this, there is evidence to suggest that while training will reduce fear in cattle, it may also enhance the quality of the relationship between handler and cow (Ceballos et al., 2018; Lürzel et al., 2016), which could even be generalised to other handlers. Much more information thus remains to be uncovered on this topic, and future studies should focus on mapping which already established training regimes are useful for cattle, and in which context. Studies should also include investigations of potential long-term effects this may have on the human-animal relationship, and whether this can be generalised to other human handlers.

Based on the capacity of cattle to learn and remember information about different humans, it might be an intriguing questions if cattle could possess the ability to use social information from heterospecifics i.e. humans. To the best of our knowledge, it remains unknown if information can be socially transmitted from humans to cattle (reviewed for farm animals by Nawroth et al., 2019). These aspects thus remain to be investigated and highlight the potential of adjusting procedures during handling practices.

A note on science communication and knowledge transfer

In addition to future research, the authors also want to stress the importance of communicating knowledge derived from both applied but especially basic research on the cognitive capacities of cattle to the industry. As the industry is the end-user of this information, making information accessible and understandable to this and other stakeholders is important if we are to safeguard implementation of this knowledge in husbandry and management procedures. Although initiatives aiming to improve e.g. cattle handling (the “Low-stress cattle management”, proposed by Guy Williams, 2012) do exist, collaboration between practitioners and researchers need to be increased on this topic, as otherwise this can pose a risk both to the practical applicability of the research and the scientific grounding in the practical knowledge. We therefore encourage researchers and practitioners to bridge this gap further to safeguard a successful implementation of scientific findings alongside practical initiatives.

Communicating both the abilities, but also the limitations, of cattle cognition will help ensure that human expectations on cattle’s ability to adapt to husbandry systems and routines matches their actual mental capacities. Future research project should thus include a stronger dissemination of results from basic cognitive research in farm animal cognition.

Conclusion

Cognitive abilities of dairy cattle is an understudied area, although there may be unexploited potential to use such information in various aspects of dairy cattle housing, and management. Three such central aspects are: 1) vertical transmission of information between cow and calf, 2) attenuation of fear via social buffering and the usage of conditioning cues such as odours, and 3) improving the human-cattle relationship by enforcing positive interactions via positive reinforcement training. Future studies should focus on elucidating what and how much calves learn from their dam during

prolonged cow-calf contact in dairy cattle. Such information could be a prominent part of the discussion of whether or not to keep cows and calves together for a longer time after calving in the dairy industry. Fear in the cattle group might be lowered by the use of calm companions and future studies could uncover if attenuation of fear might even be induced by conditioning positive experiences of cattle with unrelated stimuli e.g. odours. Lastly, the human-cattle relationship might benefit from utilising the already established training regimes from other species, e.g. positive reinforcement training or target training, which may have long-term effects on the animals and humans involved. Cattle welfare, productivity, farm staff safety and sustainability of dairy and meat production could benefit from future advances in cattle cognitive research, and we hope this review will assist in paving the way for future research endeavours.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the ISAE scientific committee for the invitation to submit this contribution. The authors would also like to thank Dr. Janne Winther Christensen, Aarhus University, Denmark, Johanna Stenfelt, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden and Dr. Jenny Yngvesson, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden for motivating discussions on social transmission in cattle. The authors would also like to thank Prof. Linda Keeling and Prof. Peter Lundqvist, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, for their input on the human-cattle relationship in relation to farm safety and animal welfare. Lastly, we would like to thank the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Dept. Biosystems and Technology, Sweden, for providing funding for the open access fee.

Author contributions

Contributor roles according to CRediT.

MVR & CN: conceptualization; writing – original draft; writing – review & editing

391

392 **Conflict of interest**

393 The authors declare no conflict of interest in the current work.

394

395 **References**

- 396 Bailey, D.W., Howery, L.D., Boss, D.L., 2000. Effects of social facilitation for locating feeding sites
397 by cattle in an eight-arm radial maze. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 68, 93–105.
398 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591\(00\)00091-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(00)00091-5)
- 399 Baldwin, B.A., 1977. Ability of goats and calves to distinguish between conspecific urine samples
400 using olfaction. *Appl. Anim. Ethol.* 3, 145–150. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3762\(77\)90023-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3762(77)90023-2)
- 401 Benham, P.F.J., 1982. Synchronisation of behaviour in grazing cattle. *Appl. Anim. Ethol.* 8, 403–404.
- 402 Bernal-Rigoli, J.C., Allen, J.D., Marchello, J.A., Cuneo, S.P., Garcia, S.R., Xie, G., Hall, L.W.,
403 Burrows, C.D., Duff, G.C., 2012. Effects of housing and feeding systems on performance of neonatal
404 Holstein bull calves. *J. Anim. Sci.* 90, 2818–2825. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2011-4722>.
- 405 Biggs, D., 2013. Dylan Biggs Cattle Handling. www.dylanbiggs.com, accessed: 14th of April 2022.
- 406 Boesch, C., Tomasello, M., 1998. Chimpanzee and Human Cultures. *Curr. Anthropol.* 39, 591–614.
407 <https://doi.org/10.1086/204785>
- 408 Boissy, A., Le Neindre, P., 1997. Behavioral, cardiac and cortisol responses to brief peer separation
409 and reunion in cattle. *Physiol. Behav.* 61, 693–699. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-9384\(96\)00521-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-9384(96)00521-5)
- 410 Bolt, S.L., Boyland, N.K., Mlynski, D.T., James, R., Croft, D.P., 2017. Pair housing of dairy calves
411 and age at pairing: Effects on weaning stress, health, production and social networks. *PLoS One.*
412 12e0166926. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0166926>
- 413 Boyle, D., Gerberich, S.G., Gibson, R.W., Maldonado, G., Robinson, R.A., Martin, F., Renier, C.,
414 Amandus, H., 1997. Injury from Dairy Cattle Activities. *Epidemiology* 8, 37–41.
415 <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001648-199701000-00006>
- 416 Bradshaw, R.H., Marchant, J.N., Meredith, M.J., Broom, D.M., 1998. Effects of lavender straw on
417 stress and travel sickness in pigs. *J. Altern. Complement. Med.* 4, 271–275.
418 <https://doi.org/10.1089/acm.1998.4.3-271>
- 419 Breuer, K., Hemsworth, P., Coleman, G., 2003. The effect of positive or negative handling on the
420 behavioural and physiological responses of nonlactating heifers. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 84, 3–22.
421 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591\(03\)00146-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(03)00146-1)
- 422 Broom, D., 2014. Chapter 5: Feelings and emotions, in: Broom, D. (Ed.), *Sentience and Animal*
423 *Welfare*. CABI, pp. 57–71.

424 Buchli, C., Raselli, A., Bruckmaier, R., Hillmann, E. 2017. Contact with cows during the young age
425 increases social competence and lowers the cardiac stress reaction in dairy calves. *Appl Anim Behav*
426 *Sci.* 187, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2016.12.002>.

427 Busch, G., Weary, D.M., Spiller, A., Von Keyserlingk, M.A.G., 2017. American and German
428 attitudes towards cow-calf separation on dairy farms. *PLoS One* 12, e0174013.
429 <https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0174013>.

430 Callealta, I., Lueders, I., Luther-Binoir, I., Ganswindt, A., 2020. Positive reinforcement conditioning
431 as a tool for frequent minimally invasive blood and vaginal swab sampling in African lions (*Panthera*
432 *Leo*). *J Appl Anim Welf Sci.* 23, 508-519. doi:10.1080/10888705.2019.1709066.

433 Ceballos, M.C., Sant’Anna, A.C., Boivin, X., Costa, F. de O., Carvalhal, M.V. d. L., Paranhos da
434 Costa, M.J.R., 2018. Impact of good practices of handling training on beef cattle welfare and
435 stockpeople attitudes and behaviors. *Livest. Sci.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2018.06.019>.

436 Charlton, G.L., Rutter, M.S., East, M., Sinclair, L.A., 2013. The motivation of dairy cows for access
437 to pasture. *J. Dairy Sci.* 96, 4387-4396. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2012-6421>.

438 Chen, Y., Stookey, J., Arsenault, R., Scruten, E., Griebel, P., Napper, S., 2016. Investigation of the
439 physiological, behavioral, and biochemical responses of cattle to restraint stress. *J Anim Sci.* 94,
440 3240-3254. doi:10.2527/jas.2016-0549.

441 Christensen, J.W., 2015. Early-life object exposure with a habituated mother reduces fear reactions in
442 foals. *Anim. Cogn.* 19, 171–179. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-015-0924-7>

443 Christensen, J.W., Beblein, C., Malmkvist, J., 2020. Development and consistency of fearfulness in
444 horses from foal to adult. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 232.
445 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.APPLANIM.2020.105106>

446 Christensen, J.W., Keeling, L.J., Nielsen, B.L., 2005. Responses of horses to novel visual, olfactory
447 and auditory stimuli. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 93, 53–65.
448 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2005.06.017>

449 Christensen, J.W., Malmkvist, J., Nielsen, B.L., Keeling, L.J., 2008. Effects of a calm companion on
450 fear reactions in naive test horses. *Equine Vet. J.* 40, 46–50.
451 <https://doi.org/10.2746/042516408X245171>.

452 Collis, K.A., 1980. The effect of an automatic feed dispenser on the behaviour of lactating dairy cows.
453 *Appl. Anim. Ethol.* 6, 139-147. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3762\(80\)90065-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3762(80)90065-6).

454 Costa, J.H.C., Costa, W.G., Weary, D.M., Machado Filho, L.C.P., von Keyserlingk, M.A.G., 2016a.
455 Dairy heifers benefit from the presence of an experienced companion when learning how to graze. *J.*
456 *Dairy Sci.* 99, 562–568. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2015-9387>

457 Costa, J.H.C., Meagher, R.K., von Keyserlingk, M.A.G., Weary, D.M., 2015. Early pair housing
458 increases solid feed intake and weight gains in dairy calves. *J. Dairy Sci.* 98, 6381-6386.
459 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2015-9395>.

460 Costa, J.H.C., von Keyserlingk, M.A.G., Weary, D.M., 2016b. Invited review: Effects of group
461 housing of dairy calves on behavior, cognition, performance, and health. *J. Dairy Sci.* 99, 2453–2467.
462 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2015-10144>.

Curzon, P., Rustay, N.R., Browman, K.E., 2009. Cued and Contextual Fear Conditioning for Rodents, in: *Methods of Behavior Analysis in Neuroscience*. CRC Press/Taylor & Francis, Boca Raton (FL), pp. 19–37. <https://doi.org/10.1201/noe1420052343.ch2>.

Dai, F., Dalla Costa, A., Bonfanti, L., Caucci, C., Di Martino, G., Lucarelli, R., Padalino, B., Minero, M., 2019. Positive reinforcement-based training for self-loading of meat horses reduces loading time and stress-related behavior. *Front Vet Sci.* 6, 350. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2019.00350>.

de Passillé, A.M., Rushen, J., Ladewig, J., Petherick, C., 1996. Dairy calves' discrimination of people based on previous handling. *J. Anim. Sci.* 74, 969. <https://doi.org/10.2527/1996.745969x>

de Paula Vieira, A., von Keyserlingk, M.A.G., Weary, D.M., 2010. Effects of pair versus single housing on performance and behavior of dairy calves before and after weaning from milk. *J Dairy Sci* 93, 3079-3085.

de Paula Vieira, A, von Keyserlingk, M.A.G., Weary, D.M., 2012. Presence of an older weaned companion influences feeding behaviour and improves performance of dairy calves before and after weaning from milk. *J Dairy Sci* 95, 3218-3224

Destrez, A., Costes, M., Anne, T., Viart, S., Prost, F., Patris, B., 2021. Male mice and cows perceive human emotional chemosignals : a preliminary study. *Anim. Cogn.* 24, 1205–1214. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-021-01511-6>

Douphrate, D.I., Rosecrance, J.C., Wahl, G., 2006. Workers' compensation experience of Colorado agriculture workers, 2000–2004. *Am. J. Ind. Med.* 49, 900–910. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.20387>

Douphrate, D.I., Fethke, N.B., Nonnenmann, M.W., Rosecrance, J.C., Reynolds, S.J., 2012. Full shift arm inclinometry among dairy parlor workers: A feasibility study in a challenging work environment. *Appl Ergo* 43, 604-613. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2011.09.007>.

Douphrate, D.I., Stallones, L., Lunner Kolstrup, C., Nonnenmann, M.W., Pinzke, S., Hagevoort, G.R., Lundqvist, P., Jakob, M., Xiang, H., Xue, L., Jarvie, P., McCurdy, S.A., Reed, S., Lower, T., 2013. Work-Related Injuries and Fatalities on Dairy Farm Operations—A Global Perspective. *J. Agromedicine* 18, 256–264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1059924X.2013.796904>

Duve, L.R., Jensen, M.B., 2011. The level of social contact affects social behaviour in pre-weaned dairy calves. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 135, 34–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.APPLANIM.2011.08.014>

Erkal, S., Gerberich, S.G., Ryan, A.D., Renier, C.M., Alexander, B.H., 2008. Animal-related injuries: A population-based study of a five-state region in the upper midwest: Regional rural injury study II. *J. Safety Res.* 39, 351–363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsr.2008.03.002>

Færevik, G., Jensen, M.B., Bøe, K.E., 2006. Dairy calves social preferences and the significance of a companion animal during separation from the group. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 99, 205–221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2005.10.012>

Flower, F.C., Weary, D.M., 2003. The effects of early separation on the dairy cow and calf. *Anim. Welf.* 12, 339–348. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0168-1591\(00\)00164-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0168-1591(00)00164-7)

Gaillard, C., Meagher, R.K., von Keyserlingk, M. a. G., Weary, D.M., 2014. Social Housing Improves Dairy Calves' Performance in Two Cognitive Tests. *PLoS One* 9, e90205. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0090205>

502 Galef, B.G., 2013. Imitation and local enhancement: Detrimental effects of consensus definitions on
503 analyses of social learning in animals. *Behav. Processes.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2013.07.026>

504 George, A.J., Bolt, S., 2021. Livestock cognition: stimulating the minds of farm animals to improve
505 welfare and productivity. *Livestock*, 26. <http://doi.org/10.12968/live.2021.26.4.202>

506 Grandin, T., 1999. Safe handling of large animals. *Occup. Med.* 14, 195–212. PMID: 10329901.

507 Grandin, T., 1996. Factors that impede animal movement at slaughter plants. *J. Am. Vet. Med. Assoc.*
508 209, 757–759. PMID: 8756875.

509 Griffin, A.S., 2004. Social learning about predators: A review and prospectus. *Learn. Behav.* 32, 131–
510 140. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193188>

511 Guzmán, Y.F., Tronson, N.C., Guedea, A., Huh, K.H., Gao, C., Radulovic, J., 2009. Social modeling
512 of conditioned fear in mice by non-fearful conspecifics. *Behav. Brain Res.* 201, 173–178.
513 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2009.02.024>

514 Heffner, R.S., Heffner, H.E., 1992. Hearing in large mammals: Sound-localization acuity in cattle
515 (*Bos taurus*) and goats (*Capra hircus*). *J. Comp. Psychol.* 106, 107–113. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7036.106.2.107)
516 7036.106.2.107

517 Heffner, R.S., Heffner, H.E., 1983. Hearing in large mammals: Horses (*Equus caballus*) and cattle
518 (*Bos taurus*). *Behav. Neurosci.* 97, 299–309. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7044.97.2.299>

519 Heitman, K., Rabquer, B., Heitman, E., Streu, C., Anderson, P., 2018. The Use of Lavender
520 Aromatherapy to Relieve Stress in Trailered Horses. *J. Equine Vet. Sci.* 63, 8–12.
521 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JEVS.2017.12.008>

522 Hemsworth, P.H., Coleman, G.J., 1998. Human-Livestock interactions: The stock person and the
523 productivity and welfare of intensively farmed animals. CAB International, New York.

524 Howery, L.D., Provenza, F.D., Banner, R.E., Scott, C.B., 1998. Social and environmental factors
525 influence cattle distribution on rangeland. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 55, 231–244.
526 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591\(97\)00054-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(97)00054-3).

527 Jacobs, J.A., Siegford, J.M., 2012. Lactating dairy cows adapt quickly to being milked by an
528 automatic milking system. *J. Dairy Sci.* 95, 1575–1584. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2011-4710>.

529 Jago, J.G., Krohn, C.C., Matthews, L.R., 1999. The influence of feeding and handling on the
530 development of the human–animal interactions in young cattle. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 62, 137–151.
531 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591\(98\)00219-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(98)00219-6)

532 Jensen M.B., 2018. The role of social behavior in cattle welfare. In: *Advances in Cattle Welfare*, ed:
533 Tucker, C.B., pages: 123–155. Woodhead Publishing, <https://doi.org/10.1016/C2015-0-04881-X>

534 Jensen, M.B., Larsen, L.E., 2014. Effects of level of social contact on dairy calf behavior and health.
535 *J. Dairy Sci.* 97, 5035–5044. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2013-7311>.

536 Kilgour, R., Dalton, C., 1984. *Livestock Behavior: A Practical Guide*. Granada Publishing Ltd.,
537 London, UK. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429049699>

538 Lange, A., Franzmayr, S., Wisenöcker, V., Futschik, A., Waiblinger, S., Lürzel, S., 2020. Effects of
539 Different Stroking Styles on Behaviour and Cardiac Parameters in Heifers. *Animals* 10, 426.
540 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10030426>.

541 Laule, G., Bloomsith, M.A., Schapiro, S.J., 2003. The use of positive reinforcement training
542 techniques to enhance the care, management, and welfare of primates in the laboratory. *J Appl Anim*
543 *Welf Sci.* 6, 163-173. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327604JAWS0603_02.

544 Laule, G., Whittaker, M., 2007. Enhancing nonhuman primate care and welfare through the use of
545 positive reinforcement training. *J Appl Anim Welf Sci.* 10, 31-38.
546 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888700701277311>.

547 Layde, P.M., Nordstrom, D.L., Stueland, D., Wittman, L.B., Follen, M.A., Olson, K.A., 1996.
548 Animal-related occupational injuries in farm residents. *J Agricul Safety Health.* 2, 27-37.
549 <https://doi.org/10.13031/2013.19439>.

550 Lévy, F., Melo, A.I., Galef, B.G., Madden, M., Fleming, A.S., 2003. Complete maternal deprivation
551 affects social, but not spatial, learning in adult rats. *Dev. Psychobiol.* 43, 177–191.
552 <https://doi.org/10.1002/dev.10131>

553 Lindahl, C., 2014. Risk factors for occupational injuries during cattle handling on Swedish dairy
554 farms. PhD thesis, SLU, Sweden.

555 Lindahl, C., Pinzke, S., Herlin, A., Keeling, L.J., 2016. Human-animal interactions and safety during
556 dairy cattle handling-Comparing moving cows to milking and hoof trimming. *J. Dairy Sci.* 99, 2131–
557 2141. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2014-9210>

558 Lomb, J., Mauger, A., von Keyserlingk, M.A.G., Weary, D.M., 2021. Effects of positive
559 reinforcement training for heifers on responses to a subcutaneous injection. *J. Dairy Sci.* 104, 6146–
560 6158. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2020-19463>

561 Lürzel, S., Windschnurer, I., Futschik, A., Waiblinger, S., 2016. Gentle interactions decrease the fear
562 of humans in dairy heifers independently of early experience of stroking. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.*
563 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2016.02.012>

564 Maatje, K., Verhoeff, J., Kremer, W.D.J., Vrujisen, A.L.M., van Ingh, T.S.G.A.M., 1993. Automated
565 feeding of milk replacer and health control of group-housed veal calves *Vet. Rec.* 133, 266-270.
566 <https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.133.11.266>.

567 Mandel, R., Whay, H.R., Klement, E., Nicol, C.J., 2016. Invited review: Environmental enrichment of
568 dairy cows and calves in indoor housing, *J. Dairy Sci.* 99, 1695-1715.
569 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2015-9875>.

570 Marino, L., Allen, K., 2017. The psychology of cows. *Animal Behaviour and Cognition*, 4, 474-498.
571 <https://dx.doi.org/10.26451/abc.04.04.06.2017>

572 Meagher, R., K., Beaver, A., Weary, D., M., von Keyserlingk, M., A., G., 2019. Invited review : A
573 systematic review of the effects of prolonged cow – calf contact on behavior , welfare , and. *J. Dairy*
574 *Sci.* 102, 5765–5783. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.3168/jds.2018-160-21>

575 Meagher, R.K., Daros, R.R., Costa, J.H.C., von Keyserlingk, M. a. G., Hötzel, M.J., Weary, D.M.,
576 2015. Effects of Degree and Timing of Social Housing on Reversal Learning and Response to Novel
577 Objects in Dairy Calves. PLoS One 10, e0132828. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0132828>

578 Melo, A.I., Lovic, V., Gonzalez, A., Madden, M., Sinopoli, K., Fleming, A.S., 2006. Maternal and
579 littermate deprivation disrupts maternal behavior and social-learning of food preference in adulthood:
580 Tactile stimulation, nest odor, and social rearing prevent these effects. Dev. Psychobiol. 48, 209–219.
581 <https://doi.org/10.1002/dev.20130>

582 Miller, K., Wood-Gush, D.G.M., 1991. Some effects of housing on the social behaviour of dairy
583 cows. Anim. Prod. 53, 271–278. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003356100020262>

584 Mota-Rojas, D., Broom, D.M., Orihuela, A., Velarde, A., Napolitano, F., Alonso-Spilsbury, M., 2020.
585 Effects of human-animal relationship on animal productivity and welfare. J. Anim. Behav.
586 Biometeorol. 8, 196–205. <https://doi.org/10.31893/JABB.20026>

587 Munksgaard, L., de Passillé, A., Rushen, J., Ladewig, J., 1999. Dairy cows' use of colour cues to
588 discriminate between people. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 65, 1–11. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(99)00055-6)
589 [1591\(99\)00055-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(99)00055-6)

590 Nawroth, C., Langbein, J., Coulon, M., Gabor, V., Oesterwind, S., Benz-Schwarzburg, J., von Borell,
591 E., 2019. Farm Animal Cognition—Linking Behavior, Welfare and Ethics. Front. Vet. Sci. 6, 24.
592 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2019.00024>

593 Nicol, C.J., 1995. The social transmission of information and behaviour. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 44,
594 79–98. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1591\(95\)00607-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1591(95)00607-T)

595 Nielsen, B.L., 2018. Making sense of it all: The importance of taking into account the sensory abilities
596 of animals in their housing and management. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 205, 175–180.
597 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.APPLANIM.2018.04.013>

598 Olsson, A., Phelps, E.A., 2007. Social learning of fear. Nat. Neurosci. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1968>.

599 Perlman, J.E., Bloomsmith, M.A., Whittaker, M.A., McMillan, J.L., Minier, D.E., McCowan, B.,
600 2012. Implementing positive reinforcement animal training programs at primate laboratories. Appl
601 Anim Behav Sci. 137, 114–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2011.11.003>.

602 Pfister, J.A., Stegelmeier, B.L., Cheney, C.D., Ralphs, M.H., Gardner, D.R., 2002. Conditioning taste
603 aversions to locoweed (*Oxytropis sericea*) in horses. J. Anim. Sci. 80, 79–83.
604 <https://doi.org/10.2527/2002.80179x>

605 Pinzke, S., Lundqvist, P., 2007. Occupational accidents in Swedish agriculture. Agric. Eng. Res. 13,
606 159–165.

607 Pratt, D.S., Marvel, L.H., Darrow, D., Stallones, L., May, J.J., Jenkins, P., 1992. The dangers of dairy
608 farming: The injury experience of 600 workers followed for two years. Am. J. Ind. Med. 21, 637–650.
609 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.4700210504>

610 Provenza, F.D., Pfister, J.A., Cheney, C.D., 1992. Mechanisms of learning in diet selection with
611 reference to phytotoxicosis in herbivores. J Range Manage. 45, 36–45.

612 Radkowska, I., Godyn, D., Kinga, F., 2020. Stereotypic behaviour in cattle, pigs and horses – a
613 review. *Animals Science Papers and Reports*. 38, 303-319.

614 Rasmussen, K., Carstensen, O., Lauritsen, J.M., 2000. Incidence of unintentional injuries in farming
615 based on one year of weekly registration in Danish farms. *Am. J. Ind. Med.* 38, 82–89.
616 [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0274\(200007\)38:1<82::AID-AJIM9>3.0.CO;2-Q](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0274(200007)38:1<82::AID-AJIM9>3.0.CO;2-Q)

617 Rault, J.L., 2012. Friends with benefits: Social support and its relevance for farm animal welfare.
618 *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 136, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.APPLANIM.2011.10.002>

619 Redbo, I., 1992. Stereotypies in dairy cattle and their relation to confinement, production-related
620 factors, physiological reactions, and adjoining behaviours. PhD thesis, Swedish University of
621 Agricultural Sciences (SLU), Uppsala, Sweden.

622 Rørvang, M.V., Ahrendt, L.P., Christensen, J.W., 2015. A trained demonstrator has a calming effect
623 on naïve horses when crossing a novel surface. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 171.
624 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2015.08.008>

625 Rørvang, M.V., Christensen, J.W., 2018. Attenuation of fear through social transmission in groups of
626 same and differently aged horses. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 209, 41–46.
627 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2018.10.003>

628 Rørvang, M.V., Christensen, J.W., Ladewig, J., McLean, A., 2018a. Social Learning in Horses—Fact
629 or Fiction? *Front. Vet. Sci.* 5, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2018.00212>

630 Rørvang, M.V., Herskin, M.S., Jensen, M.B., 2018b. The motivation-based calving facility: Social
631 and cognitive factors influence isolation seeking behaviour of Holstein dairy cows at calving. *PLoS*
632 *One*. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0191128>

633 Rørvang, M.V., Nielsen, B.L., McLean, A.N., 2020. Sensory Abilities of Horses and Their
634 Importance for Equitation Science. *Front. Vet. Sci.* 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2020.00633>

635 Rørvang, M. V., Nawroth, C., 2021. Advances in understanding cognition and learning in cattle, in:
636 Endres, M. (Ed.), *Understanding the Behaviour and Improving the Welfare of Dairy Cattle*. Burleigh
637 Dodds Science Publishing, Cambridge, p. Part 1, chapter 2.

638 Rushen, J., Taylor, A.A., de Passillé, A.M., 1999. Domestic animals' fear of humans and its effect on
639 their welfare. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 65, 285–303. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591\(99\)00089-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(99)00089-1)

640 Rybarczyk, P., Koba, Y., Rushen, J., Tanida, H., de Passillá, A.M., 2001. Can cows discriminate
641 people by their faces? *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 74, 175–189. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0168-](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0168-1590(01)00162-9)
642 [1590\(01\)00162-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0168-1590(01)00162-9).

643 Scott, L., Pearce, P., Fairhall, S., Muggleton, N., Smith, J., 2003. Training nonhuman primates to co-
644 operate with scientific procedures in applied biomedical research. *J Appl Anim Welf Sci.* 6, 199-208.
645 https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327604JAWS0603_05.

646 Spiezio, C., Vaglio, S., Scala, C., Regaiolli, B., 2017. Does positive reinforcement training affect the
647 behaviour and welfare of zoo animals? The case of the ring-tailed lemur (*Lemur catta*). *Appl Anim*
648 *Behav Sci.* 196, 91-99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2017.07.007>.

649 Stenfelt, J., Yngvesson, J., Rørvang, M. V., in press. A calm companion lowers fear in groups of dairy
650 cows. *J. Dairy Sci.*

651 Stookey, J.M., Watts, J.M., 2014. Low-stress restraint, handling and sorting of cattle., in: Grandin, T.
652 (Ed.), *Livestock Handling and Transport*. CABI, Wallingford, pp. 65–76.
653 <https://doi.org/10.1079/9781780643212.0065>

654 Terlouw, C.T.M., Boissy, A., Blinet, P., 1998. Behavioural responses of cattle to the odours of blood
655 and urine from conspecifics and to the odour of faeces from carnivores. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 57,
656 9–21. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591\(97\)00122-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(97)00122-6)

657 Tomkins, T., 1991. Loose-housing experience in North America. *Proc. of the Int. Symp. on Veal Calf*
658 *Production*, EEAP, Wageningen, The Netherlands. 67-70.

659 Van Putten, G., 1982, Welfare in veal calf units. *Vet. Rec.* 111. 437-440.

660 Veissier, I., le Neindre, P., 1992. Reactivity of Aubrac heifers exposed to a novel environment alone
661 or in groups of four. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 33, 11–15. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(05)80079-6)
662 [1591\(05\)80079-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(05)80079-6)

663 Vervliet, B., Craske, M.G., Hermans, D., 2013. Fear Extinction and Relapse: State of the Art.
664 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050212-185542> 9, 215–248.
665 <https://doi.org/10.1146/ANNUREV-CLINPSY-050212-185542>

666 Vitale, A.F., Tenucci, M., Papino, M., Lovari, S., 1986. Social behavior of the calves of semi-wild
667 Maremma cattle, *Bos primigenius taurus*. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 16, 217-231.
668 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1590\(86\)90115-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1590(86)90115-2).

669 von Keyserlingk, M.A.G., Cestari, A.A., Franks, B., Fregonesi, J.A., Weary, D.M., 2017. Dairy cows
670 value access to pasture as highly as fresh feed. *Scientific reports*. 7, no: 44953.
671 <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep44953>.

672 von Keyserlingk, M.A.G., Rushen, J., de Passillé, A.-M., Weary, D.M., 2009. Invited review: The
673 welfare of dairy cattle—Key concepts and the role of science. *J. Dairy Sci.* 92, 4101-4111.
674 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2009-2326>.

675 von Keyserlingk, M.A.G., Weary, D.M., 2007. Maternal behaviour in cattle. *Horm and Behav.* 52,
676 106-113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2007.03.015>.

677 Wagner, K., Barth, K., Palme, R., Futschik, A., Waiblinger, S. 2012. Integration into the dairy cow
678 herd: long-term effects of mother contact during the first twelve weeks of life. *Appl Anim Behav Sci.*
679 141, 117–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2012.08.011>.

680 Waiblinger, S., Wagner, K., Hillmann, E., Barth, K., 2020. Play and social behaviour of calves with or
681 without access to their dam and other cows. *J Dairy Research*. 87, Special Issue S1: DairyCare:
682 Husbandry for wellbeing, 144 – 147. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022029920000540>.

683 Weary, D.M., von Keyserlingk, M.A.G., 2017. Public concerns about dairy-cow welfare: how should
684 the industry respond? *Anim. Prod. Sci.* 57, 1201. .

685 Wechsler, B., Lea, S.E.G., 2007. Adaptation by learning: Its significance for farm animal husbandry.
686 *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 108, 197-214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2007.03.012>.

687 Williams, B., 2012. Bud Williams Stockmanship. <http://www.stockmanship.com/>, accessed 14th of
688 April 2022.

689 Wyatt, T.D., 2003. Pheromones and Animal Behaviour - communication by taste and smell.
690 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

691

692 **Figure captions**

693 Fig. 1. Picture from a study by Stenfelt et al., (in press). One calm companion (trained cow)
694 successfully lowered fear in naïve groups of dairy cows in a fear-eliciting situation. The fear-eliciting
695 situation is illustrated in the picture as a sudden opening of a red and white umbrella, while the cows
696 were feeding from their yellow feed buckets. The demonstrator to observer ration were in this test 1:3.
697 Photo curtesy: Johanna Stenfelt.