

1 **The importance of social behaviour for goat welfare in livestock farming**

2

3 <sup>a</sup>Miranda-de la Lama, G.C.\*, <sup>b</sup>Mattiello, S.

4

5 <sup>a</sup> Department of Animal Production and Food Science, University of Zaragoza, Miguel  
6 Servet 177, 50013 Zaragoza, Spain.

7

8 <sup>b</sup> Department of Animal Science, University of Milan. Via G. Celoria, 10, 20133, Milan,  
9 Italy.

10

11

12 \* Corresponding author:

13 Genaro C. Miranda-de la Lama

14 Facultad de Veterinaria, Departamento de Producción Animal y

15 Ciencia de los Alimentos.

16 Miguel Servet 177, 50013

17 Zaragoza, Spain.

18 Tel.: +34 976761000 4146; fax: +34 976761612.

19 E-mail address: [genaro@unizar.es](mailto:genaro@unizar.es) (Miranda-de la Lama, G.)

20

21

22

23

24

## 1 **Abstract**

2 The domestic goat is a sociable, inquisitive, and intelligent species, which has been used  
3 for its meat, milk, skin, and fur since it was first domesticated c. 10,000 years ago.  
4 Although it exhibits a wide range of behaviours, the domesticated goat has been the  
5 subject of relatively few behavioural studies. In domestic goats, the opportunity to express  
6 certain social behaviours can be limited by captivity and management systems, especially  
7 in modern production systems, where goats are reared intensively under high stocking  
8 densities, sexual segregation, early separation of kids from their mothers, frequent  
9 regrouping, and manipulation during critical periods, including gestation and weaning. To  
10 better understand the requirements of this species and to identify possible tools for the  
11 detection of early modifications in natural behaviours that might indicate poor welfare and  
12 the establishment of positive human-animal interactions, this review provides a detailed  
13 description of goat social behaviour. Practical recommendations arising from observations  
14 of goat social behaviour are provided in the conclusions.

15 **Keywords:** Goat; Welfare; Social behaviour; Social organization; Social dominance;  
16 Human-animal relationships.

17

## 18 **1. Introduction**

19 Domesticated about 10,000 years ago (Mason, 1984; Zeder and Hesse, 2000), goats were  
20 probably the first ruminant livestock species (Hatziminaoglou and Boyazoglu, 2004).  
21 Changes in the availability or accessibility of space, food, water, and shelter, exposure to  
22 risk of predation, and changes in the social environment often accompany the transition  
23 from living free to captivity. Those changes set the stage for the development of the  
24 domestic phenotype (Price, 1999). During domestication, many of the behavioural traits of  
25 the wild types were replaced by those found in existing domesticated populations

1 (Mignon-Grasteau et al., 2005) and goats evolved domestic traits that enabled them to live  
2 and reproduce in captivity (Gautier, 1990). Present-day domesticated goats are the product  
3 of those adaptations, the artificial selection by breeders for specific traits in meat, milk,  
4 and fur, and the effect of natural selection for fitness under variable conditions (Galal,  
5 2005).

6

7 Small ruminant livestock occur widely, including many developing countries, which use  
8 traditional extensive production systems designed to meet the needs of the families. In the  
9 more developed countries, to be more efficient and to increase production, the systems are  
10 changing from traditional to semi-intensive or intensive conditions (Miranda-de la Lama  
11 et al, 2010). With the intensification of animal production systems, the animal's way of  
12 life has become progressively artificial. Animal nutrition, reproduction, and diseases have  
13 been the subject of considerable research; however, the development of efficient  
14 management techniques that optimize production and high standards of animal welfare  
15 requires a better understanding of the mechanisms of goat behaviour (Bouissou, 1980).

16

17 Behaviour is one of the most important early indicators of the welfare of an individual and  
18 its adaptation to its environment and reflects the immediate response to the interaction  
19 between the animal and its environment (Metz and Wierenga, 1997). Social behaviour can  
20 vary considerably in response to different environmental factors because it evolved to  
21 allow adaptations to specific environments (Mattiello, 2001). The social behaviour of  
22 small ruminant species has been studied, but much of the research has focused on sheep  
23 because, of its ubiquity; however, goat behaviour is quite different from sheep behaviour.  
24 In general, goats are more reactive than are sheep, because they are more aggressive (e.g.,  
25 when they are attacked, goats tend to face the attacker, but sheep usually flee) and they

1 exhibit more exploratory behaviours, whereas sheep are more fearful and shy (Kilgour  
2 and Dalton, 1984; Houpt, 2005). To better understand the specific requirements for  
3 ensuring sufficiently good welfare for goats, especially for those in intensive production  
4 systems, this review provides a detailed description of the social behaviour of the  
5 caprines.

6

## 7 **2. Principles of social behaviour**

8 Social behaviour is all of the interactions between two or more individuals in a group that  
9 modify the activity of the group (Fraser and Broom, 1990) and that cover the function of  
10 intra-specific communication (Immelmann, 1988). The motivation to perform a behaviour  
11 depends on the interactions between internal and external factors that involve feedback  
12 control mechanisms (Galindo et al., 2000). Physiological, environmental, and behavioural  
13 mechanisms that serve to maintain the balance in the relationships within a group that  
14 otherwise would be transitory or null regulate social activity (Mendl and Held, 2001).

15

16 The social group is part of the complex, dynamic environment of the individual (Mendl  
17 and Deag, 1995), in which many strategies have evolved to enhance survival and maintain  
18 the viability of the group (Mendl and Held, 2001). Social behaviour serves many  
19 purposes, including group cohesion and ecological integration (Fraser and Broom, 1990),  
20 and provides a number of advantages (Immelmann, 1988), such as better protection from  
21 predators, more efficient foraging, easier potential access to sexual partners, and more  
22 successful defence of neonates (e.g., Jarman, 1974; Hunter and Skinner, 1998; Estevez et  
23 al., 2007), which is why most ungulate species exhibit a high level of social organization  
24 (Mattiello, 2001). However, living in a group can have costs, particularly, competition for

1 food or access to other resources, which can lower the fitness of individuals (Estevez et  
2 al., 2007).

### 3 4 **3. Communication**

5 Social relationships among individuals in a group can be conveyed by a variety of  
6 communication signals (Immelmann, 1988). Communication plays a key role in the  
7 development and maintenance of social behaviours. For example, communication is  
8 essential for the recognition of individuals within the group, locating other group  
9 members, sending signals intended to establish or maintain an individual's social status, or  
10 informing other animals about one's temporary state (e.g., receptivity to males by fertile  
11 females) (Immelmann, 1988). The recognition of a familiar individual and the formation  
12 of a social memory are essential to the development of social bonds (Lim and Young,  
13 2006).

14  
15 In goats, more than in sheep, olfactory signals are important, especially in sexual and  
16 maternal behaviour (Levy et al., 2004). For example, the "buck effect" is stimulated  
17 mainly through olfactory cues (Gelez and Fabre - Nys, 2004). Urine is one of the main  
18 vectors for signals of individual identity and goats frequently urinate, especially when  
19 expressing their reproductive status. In addition, they secrete olfactory signals through  
20 pedal glands and a tail gland. Typically, volatile odorants are perceived by the olfactory  
21 epithelium and non-volatile substances (pheromones) can be perceived with the aid of the  
22 vomeronasal organ (or Jacobson's organ) by performing the flehmen behaviour, which is  
23 typical of the males of all ruminant species, including goats (Haupt, 2005; Wakabayashi  
24 et al., 2002).

1 An olfactory learning process is the primary basis for the development of the relationship  
2 between dam and their kids (Poindron et al., 2007a), although an additional role of visual  
3 and/or auditory stimuli during the sensitive period cannot be excluded (Poindron et al.,  
4 2007b). Romeyer et al. (1994) found that damage to the main olfactory system before  
5 parturition inhibited the formation of selective nursing bonds and Houpt (2005) reported  
6 that a week-old kid subjected to open castration was rejected by his mother, possibly  
7 because of the smell of the fresh wound. In livestock systems where kids are nursed by  
8 their dams, to limit odour contamination, manipulation of newborn or young kids should  
9 be performed with caution in order to minimize the risk that a kid will be rejected by its  
10 mother, taking into account that visual characteristics of the young are probably not able  
11 to compensate for the loss of olfactory cues (Romeyer et al., 1994).

12

13 Goats are a vociferous (Lenhardt, 1977) and exhibit a variety of vocalizations including  
14 snorts, bleats, and sneezes (Kilgour and Dalton, 1984). Vocal signals (e.g., distress calls  
15 and isolation bleats emitted by kids) are important in the establishment of the mother-  
16 infant relationship and are helpful to mothers in locating the lying-out site of their kid  
17 (Poindron et al., 2003). Vocalisations by goats are indicators of social isolation (Boivin  
18 and Braadstad, 1996). Alarm vocalizations consist of high-pitched sneezes, which are  
19 often accompanied by visual signals such as stamping, although the latter seem to be of  
20 lesser importance to goats (Houpt, 2005). During the season of sexual activity, bucks  
21 vocalize more frequently, but there is no evidence that these vocalizations stimulate  
22 sexual activity in anoestrous females (Vielma et al., 2008).

23

24 Olfactory, vocal, and visual signals from females are important to bucks in detecting  
25 oestrus females. Signs that indicate females are in heat are more pronounced in goats than

1 they are in sheep (Sevi et al., 2009), possibly because: there is sexual segregation among  
2 goats and females might have to attract bucks from a distance, whereas in flocks of sheep  
3 signals from females can be less obvious.

#### 4 5 **4. Social organization**

6 Goats are very gregarious, prefer to stay close together, and individuals are rarely seen  
7 apart from the group (Ross and Berg, 1956). In goats that have been isolated from their  
8 social group, cortisol concentrations are elevated, which reflects an increase in emotional  
9 stress (Kannan et al., 2002). Furthermore, in pregnant goats, isolation is stressful and can  
10 affect the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenocortical axis and the sympatho-adrenomedullary  
11 system of their offspring (Duvaux-Ponter et al., 2003; Roussel et al., 2005). However, the  
12 temporary isolation of individuals from their group is a common practice in goat farm  
13 management (Price and Thos, 1980). Whenever it is possible, that practice should be  
14 avoided or minimized, especially in pre-parturient goats. If, for the purpose of hygiene,  
15 dams have to be isolated from the group just before they are due to give birth, it is better  
16 to create small groups (only pre-parturient dams) or to keep isolated dams in individual  
17 pens, but allow them the opportunity to maintain olfactory, vocal, and visual contact with  
18 other goats in their group, which can will minimize the negative effects of social isolation  
19 on dams and their offspring.

20  
21 Once the structure of goat social groups is established, it persists for several years  
22 (Barroso et al., 2000; Rout et al., 2002). As in the studies of other ruminants, those that  
23 described the social organization of caprines were based on physical structure, social  
24 structure, and group cohesion (Broom, 1981).

#### 1 4.1 Physical structure

2 The physical structure of a group includes its size and some of the characteristics of  
3 individuals, such as their age, sex, and parentage (Fraser and Broom, 1990). In extensive  
4 systems, the size of the herd is influenced by the characteristics of the ecological niche  
5 that the animals occupy (Houpt, 2004). In open habitats such as savannas and pastures,  
6 ungulate group sizes are generally larger than they are in forested or brush areas (Schaal,  
7 1982; Putman, 1988). Among feral goats, the average group size is about 4 (range = 1-  
8 150) (Shakleton and Shank, 1984), and in some European populations, group sizes can  
9 vary from 50 to 100 individuals (Alados and Escós, 1996). In Australia, Blackshaw et al.  
10 (2003) recorded group sizes of up to 300 individuals. Typically, goatherds are smaller  
11 than sheep flocks and are composed of extended family groups (Kilgour and Dalton,  
12 1984). Thus, it is advisable to avoid creating large groups of goat, although the most  
13 appropriate group size is largely dependent on environmental conditions and the herd  
14 management strategies.

15

16 The physical structure consists of several minor familiar units composed of two or three  
17 adult females and their kids, who remain with their mothers from birth until 11-12 mo of  
18 age (Fabre - Nys, 1999), although changes in the mother-infant relationship (e.g., a  
19 progressive reduction in the amount of suckling and an increase in kid rejection) can occur  
20 much earlier (Bungo et al., 1998). The first 2-4 h after parturition (i.e., the sensitive  
21 period) are essential for the establishment of the relationship between a mother and her  
22 kid (Poindron et al., 2007a). Results from earlier research (Bordi et al., 1994) showed that  
23 maternal selectivity in goats is developed within 4 h after parturition. The mother-  
24 offspring relationship can be split into three phases: 1) 0-1 wk: *ad libitum* suckling and  
25 complete dependence on the dam; 2) 2-5 wk: the kid remains largely dependent on milk



1 for food, but the dam starts to reject solicitations to suckle and rejections increase in  
2 frequency; 3) > 5 wk: the kid becomes less dependent on milk and begins to eat other  
3 foods (Bungo et al., 1998). One potential problem with the early weaning of kids is that  
4 they might not have sufficient time to learn appropriate grazing strategies from their dams  
5 (Boivin and Braadstad, 1996).

6

7 Typically, in the first four weeks after parturition, contact between a kid and its mother is  
8 infrequent and, until after this period, mother-kid behaviours are not well synchronised  
9 (Lickliter, 1987), which is typical of species that use a “hider” strategy to protect  
10 newborns from predators. In contrast, sheep use a “follower” strategy for the defence of  
11 newborns and mother and infant behaviours are highly synchronized. Kids tend to  
12 associate and form bonds with other kids of the same age, rather than with their mothers  
13 (Lickliter, 1987). In goats, the formation of “crèches” is the first sign of a weakening in  
14 the mother-young bond (Shackleton and Shank, 1984). A crèche forms when juveniles of  
15 different ages and both sexes coalesce into large groups that do not include their mothers  
16 (O’Brien, 1984a; 1984b; 1988).

17

18 If the practice on a commercial farm is to have the kids suckled by their mother (typical in  
19 extensive systems), to allow the proper development of the mother-offspring bond it is  
20 important to avoid disturbing the animals during the sensitive period. In those systems,  
21 kids are separated from their mothers within the first few weeks, even though under  
22 natural conditions kids normally remain with their mothers for a much longer period. As  
23 the kids become more independent after the age of 5 wk (Bungo et al., 1998), weaning  
24 should not occur before 6-7 wk of age, in order to increase the likelihood of a normal  
25 behavioural development and good animal welfare. However, in commercial dairy farms,

1 the mother-infant bond is interrupted much earlier: in these farms, separation from the  
2 dam is usually accomplished soon after birth and, in any case, within the first two days  
3 after birth, in order to set aside milk for commercial purposes. In these cases a sudden  
4 weaning, consisting of a rapid and complete separation of the couple, is advisable, as the  
5 persistence of fragmentary contacts (for example due to restricted suckling twice a day)  
6 may be frustrating for the kid, that will continuously look for its nursing mother,  
7 sometimes showing evidence of abnormal oral behaviour (Mattiello et al., 2008a).  
8 Ramírez et al., 1996a and 1996b demonstrated that an immediate separation, preventing  
9 any contact between the dam and the kid, will inhibit all maternal responses, whereas a  
10 separation carried out after 5 minutes post-partum seems to be sufficient to allow the  
11 establishment of some bond, although maternal responses completely disappear after a  
12 separation period of 24 h. However, the kids' behavioural response (consisting of high  
13 levels of activity and frequent call rates) can persist for several days after weaning (Boivin  
14 and Braastad, 1996). Weaned kids may also experience a reduction in growth rates, often  
15 losing body weight; furthermore, chronic responses such as the development of  
16 stereotypies and abnormal oral behaviours are common consequences of early removal  
17 from the mother (Newberry and Swanson, 2008; Atasoglu et al., 2008). Goat is a “hider”  
18 species, and therefore the maintenance of a constant mother-infant relationship early in  
19 life is probably less important than in “follower” species; however, both behavioural and  
20 productive data indicate that the separation of kids from their mothers is a stressful event  
21 for this species, as well as for most other mammal species.

22 Other aspects of the physical structure of the group can vary in response to several  
23 extrinsic factors. For instance, in temperate climates, females and males remain together  
24 throughout the year (Côte, 2000; Houpt, 2004), but in the non-breeding period, females  
25 are usually segregated from males, which are isolated or form satellite herds (Blackshaw

1 et al., 2003). Sheep, a more promiscuous species, always tend to maintain mixed-sex  
2 groups throughout the year (Sevi and Casamassima, 2009). In feral goats, apparently, the  
3 main factor influencing sexual segregation is the difference in the activity rhythms of the  
4 sexes, although other factors (e.g., predation, forage quality, and social preferences)  
5 probably contribute to this phenomenon (Calhim et al., 2006).

6  
7 For management purposes, the separation of bucks from does outside the breeding season  
8 is advisable and their introduction into groups of females is useful as a stimulus for the  
9 onset of synchronised ovulations (Buck Effect). In situations where artificial insemination  
10 is used, female contact with bucks is not required, which can have negative consequences  
11 for females (because of the absence of the natural Buck Effect and, in some cases, does  
12 might have to be induced artificially to enter heat), and males, especially when semen has  
13 to be collected in the non-breeding season. In that case, occasional contact with an oestrus  
14 doe might be helpful in stimulating sexual activity in bucks (Kilgour and Dalton, 1984). In  
15 addition, reproductive factors can influence the composition of groups. Before the  
16 breeding season, many small groups of females search for potential mates (O'Brien,  
17 1984a; Fabre - Nys, 1999) and, once a male joins a group, a subgroup of females and their  
18 kids is established (Blackshaw et al., 2003).

#### 19 20 *4.2 Social structure*

21 The social structure of a group is "all of the relationships among individuals in the group  
22 and their consequences for spatial distribution and behavioural interactions" (Fraser and  
23 Broom, 1990). In small ruminants, several mechanisms of recognition and communication  
24 signals maintain the social structure of groups. Short inter-individual distances within a  
25 group are essential for maintaining social contact and enabling individual recognition

1 through those signals and, therefore, intra-group distances are shorter than inter-group  
2 distances (Clutton-Brock et al., 1982). For instance, Arnold and Dudzinski (1978)  
3 observed that two herds with different origins living in the same pasture formed two  
4 distinct groups that grazed in different areas.

5

6 Social distances are affected by the quality of social bonds and the ages at which goats are  
7 placed in groups. Distances between dyads of amicable goats are shorter than those  
8 between dyads of antagonistic goats, and the average distance between dyads of goats that  
9 were grouped as juveniles are shorter than the distances between the dyads of goats that  
10 were grouped as adults (Aschwanden et al., 2008). Within a group, the activities of  
11 individuals often are highly synchronized. Under ideal conditions of social stability and  
12 animal welfare, 90% of the individuals in the herd are engaged in the same activity  
13 simultaneously (Arnold and Dudzinsky, 1978) because of social facilitation, which is an  
14 increase in the frequency or intensity of responses, or the initiation of a particular  
15 response, when shown in the presence of others engaged in the same behaviour at the  
16 same time (Clayton, 1978).

17

18 The social facilitation of reproductive activities occurs in feral goats (Restall et al., 1995):  
19 oestrous females can induce anoestrous females to ovulate (the Female–female Effect).  
20 Other examples of social facilitation are involved in feeding behaviour: in farmed goats,  
21 Van et al. (2007) found that an increase in the number of kids in a pen led to an increase  
22 in daily individual DM intake (g/Kg BW), which is interpreted as result of social  
23 facilitation (Haupt, 2005). Shrader et al. (2007) observed that, when more goats are in the  
24 same pasture, individual intake rates increased, possibly because of an increase in  
25 competition for food or the amount of social information. In addition, goats are able to

1 access social information from other animals and can use it to locate better foraging areas  
2 (Shrader et al., 2007), which is evidence that social facilitation can have a strong influence  
3 on the likelihood that an individual will sample plants or other foods that are eaten by  
4 other members in the group (Ralphs and Provenza, 1999).

5

#### 6 *4.3 Group cohesion*

7 Group cohesion is reflected in the duration of associations among the members of the  
8 group and the frequency of fissions (one or more members leave the group) (Fraser and  
9 Broom, 1990), and it can be affected by the degree of kinship and the origin of the  
10 animals. Cohesion is a result of all of the forces that act to keep individuals in a group and  
11 is a measure of the attractiveness of the group to its members (see review by Taube-Schiff  
12 et al., 2007). Schwarz and Sambras (1997) observed in groups of kid goats a marked  
13 sense of group cohesion. In stable groups, goats develop affinity and affiliative  
14 relationships, which increase the cohesion of the group and decrease the frequency of  
15 agonistic interactions. Miranda-de la Lama (2005) interpreted the behaviour of a goat that  
16 interrupted a fight between two group members as an affiliative interaction. Social  
17 mediation by a group member appears to be more frequent when the levels of aggression  
18 are high (Tønnesen et al., 2008). In addition, Shino (1998) found evidence of post-conflict  
19 reconciliation in domesticated goats. Such interactions are interpreted as reconciliatory  
20 because they appear to repair relationships that were damaged by conflicts and they help  
21 to maintain group cohesion.

22

### 23 **5. Intra-specific relationships**

24 Group structure is established and maintained by the agonistic and affiliative social  
25 interactions among individuals.

1

## 2 *5.1 Agonistic behaviour*

3 In all social species, agonistic behaviour is necessary for the establishment and  
4 maintenance of dominance relationships in a group (Blanchard et al., 1993). Agonistic  
5 behaviour has the biological function to influences an individual's access to vital  
6 resources, such as food, water, shelter, and space. In addition, it can influence access to  
7 reproductive partners (although in male goats, levels of aggression do not appear to be  
8 related to testosterone levels (Ortiz - de Montellano et al., 2006). Agonistic behaviour is  
9 intended to dissuade, injure, cause pain, or reduce the freedom of an individual (Sisto,  
10 2004). In social groups, individuals often experience some type of threat from  
11 conspecifics.

12

13 In goats, agonistic behaviour can be expressed as aggression with contact, e.g., biting,  
14 bumping, or aggression without contact, e.g. threat displays, chases, escapes (Alvarez et  
15 al., 2003; Miranda de la Lama, 2005; Alvarez et al., 2007; Tölü and Savaş, 2007; Van et  
16 al., 2007). During feeding, aggressive postures in goats can include side-on locking of  
17 horns, butting the flank of another feeding goat, and ear biting (Syme and Syme, 1979;  
18 Szabo, 2008). When a conflict between goats escalates, the typical aggressive behaviour  
19 involves one goat standing up on its hind legs, lowering its head, and striking it against its  
20 opponent's head.

21

22 In intensive goat production systems, the levels of aggression are higher than they are in  
23 semi-intensive or extensive farming systems (Orgeur et al., 1990). Barroso et al. (2000)  
24 found that the frequency of aggressive interactions was higher among goats that were kept  
25 indoors than among goats in pastures, probably because of differences in the amount of

1 space available, which was more limited indoors. Thus, the per capita space provided to  
2 goats is critical in goat management, especially in systems in which the animals are  
3 penned. Recommended stocking densities are influenced by factors such as the age, breed,  
4 and class of stock. In general, for adult goats housed indoors, 1.5 m<sup>2</sup>/head is appropriate  
5 (Kilgour and Dalton, 1984). Loretz et al. (2004) detected a significant reduction in the  
6 amount of time that individuals spent feeding when per capita space was reduced from 2  
7 to 1 m<sup>2</sup>/head. In addition, a reduction in the per capita feeding space along a feed trough  
8 from reduced from 20 to 10 cm/head led to a significant reduction in the amount of time  
9 spent feeding. Feed trough length and the frequency of aggressive behaviour are strongly  
10 negatively correlated. To avoid unnecessary aggression for competition, per capita trough  
11 space should be sufficient to allow all animals' unfettered access to food.

12

13 In situations where individual distances were reduced and goats had fewer opportunities to  
14 perform butting activity, biting became a more frequent means for goats to maintain  
15 individual distances (Tölü and Savaş, 2007). In a study by Pretorius (1970), in groups of  
16 goats of heterogeneous weights, the light animals performed very few aggressive acts, but  
17 the frequency of aggression among the same animals increased when the weights of the  
18 individuals in groups were homogenous.

19

20 Typically, just after they are born, kids do not exhibit aggressive behaviour and their  
21 relationship with their mothers and their twin usually is quite amicable; however, they can  
22 be attacked by adult goats if, for example, they try to approach other mothers or mature  
23 bucks (Hafez et al., 1969). Under some circumstances, e.g., when attempting to gain  
24 access to desirable food such as Jackfruit (*Artocarpus heterophyllus*), kids can become  
25 rather aggressive, and they are more aggressive than are lambs of the same age (Van et al.,

1 2007). Furthermore, group size can have a significant effect on the expression of agonistic  
2 behaviour: This appears to be an effect of density, rather than group size, per se, but group  
3 size did not have an effect on growth rate or feed conversion rate (Van et al., 2007).

4  
5 After repeated regrouping, aggression can increase and feeding and resting times decrease  
6 (Andersen et al., 2008). Similarly, when goats were repeatedly regrouped, Sondresen et al.  
7 (2008) found evidence of chronic stress, such as increased aggression and reduced  
8 production rate. In French Alpine breed, Fernandez et al. (2007) observed an increase in  
9 aggressive behaviour whenever goats were regrouped, but milk production decreased after  
10 the first regrouping, only, which suggests that goats have a remarkable capacity to adapt  
11 to novelty and management practices that are stressful to them. The introduction of an  
12 unfamiliar individual into a group of feral goats initially led to an increase in the number  
13 of interactions, including exploratory and agonistic behaviours; however, aggressive  
14 interactions decreased dramatically 24 h after the introduction of the new individual  
15 (Alley and Fordham, 1994). Similarly, Addison and Baker (1982) observed an increase in  
16 agonistic behaviours (displacements, threats, and butts) in a goatherd after the  
17 introduction of two new animals, which was followed by a progressive reduction in the  
18 frequency of these behaviours.

19  
20 In summary, the common practice of regrouping can have negative consequences for goat  
21 welfare because it interrupts the process of individual recognition, which is a basic  
22 requirement for maintaining group cohesion and stability (Millman and Duncan, 2001).  
23 The introduction of new goats to herds can increase aggression, disrupt the social structure  
24 of an established herd, and alter the social hierarchy of the group (Addison and Baker,  
25 1982; Andersen et al., 2008). For those reasons, we recommend against repeated



1 regrouping in goat management. To minimize the stress on individuals, groups should be  
2 kept as stable as possible and the introduction of new individuals should be monitored  
3 closely because the integration of unfamiliar animals into a group always is a stressful  
4 event for goats (Sevi et al., 2009). Whenever it is possible, to minimize the level of  
5 aggression, visual familiarization should precede any opportunity for physical contact (for  
6 example, by penning the new individual adjacent to its future group). When unfamiliar  
7 animals are added, an increase in the space provided to the group might help to minimize  
8 the increase in the levels of aggression.

9

## 10 *5.2 Affiliative behaviour*

11 Affiliative behaviours facilitate the establishment of bonds of affinity and association  
12 between individuals. In goats, affiliative behaviour improves group cohesion, creates or  
13 strengthens bonds between group members, and reduces aggression (Shino, 1998;  
14 Miranda-de la Lama, 2005; Tønnesen et al., 2008). Common affiliative behaviours  
15 include grooming, sniffing, licking the base of the udder, and resting in pairs. On farms  
16 where there are space restrictions, however, Andersen and Bøe (2007) found that goats  
17 preferred to rest against a wall, with no body contact with other individuals. Miranda-de la  
18 Lama and Galindo (2007) found that high-ranking individuals used affiliative behaviour  
19 more often than did low-ranking individuals. Tønnesen et al. (2008) observed that the  
20 frequency of affiliative interactions (e.g., social grooming, exploring, and resting with  
21 body contact) and group size were negatively correlated, which suggests that affiliative  
22 behaviour has an effect on the quality of social interactions within a group. Evidently,  
23 allowing and encouraging the animals to perform behaviours that are associated with  
24 positive emotions improves their welfare (Špinka, 2006).

25

### 1 *5.3 Social dominance*

2 Social dominance is the ability of an individual to have priority over others for access to  
3 resources (e.g., food, water, space, mates), with a limited need to fight (Francis, 1988;  
4 Mendl and Deag, 1995; Fabre - Nys, 2000). In goats, social dominance is clearly  
5 established and quite stable, and a nearly linear hierarchical order exists in a herd (Barroso  
6 et al., 2000; Rout et al., 2002; Miranda-de la Lama, 2005). The establishment of the  
7 dominance order in goats is influenced by the aggressiveness (Rout et al., 2002; Szabo,  
8 2008), age, size, body weight (Keil and Sambraus, 1996; Shinde et al., 2004), breed, sex,  
9 parentage, experience, the presence of horns, horn length (Kilgur and Dalton, 1984;  
10 Barroso et al., 2000), and individual differences (Miranda-de la Lama, 2005). The manner  
11 in which individuals establish and maintain their hierarchical relationships can differ  
12 depending on the individual's hierarchical rank. In one study, Miranda-de la Lama and  
13 Galindo (2007) found that low-ranking female goats usually receive, rather than initiate,  
14 any type of aggression; i.e., use a passive strategy, while high-ranking goats tended to  
15 frequently engage in passive and active affiliative interactions. Usually, males are  
16 dominant over females, but a female with horns can dominate a male without horns  
17 (Haenlein et al., 1992). In general, horned goats are heavier than and dominant over the  
18 others and they occupy more space at the feed trough than do hornless goats (Tölü et al.,  
19 2007). Furthermore, horned goats are more aggressive (Loretz et al., 2004). For those  
20 reasons, we recommend that horned and hornless goats be housed separately whenever  
21 possible.

22

23 Dominant goats tend to produce dominant offspring (Haenlein et al., 1992), although  
24 mothers always maintain a dominant position over their kids (Kilgur and Dalton, 1984).  
25 Ortiz - de Montellano et al. (2006) found that dominant bucks had higher levels of

1 testosterone than did subordinate bucks, but in the breeding season only. At 6 mo of age,  
2 goats first assume their position in the social hierarchy (Orgeur et al., 1990) and, in the  
3 absence of the introduction of new individuals, they tend to maintain this position year  
4 after year (Syme and Syme, 1979). Apparently, changes in the physical environment do  
5 not affect the stability of the dominance hierarchy. In a study of female Saanen goats, the  
6 hierarchical order before and after environmental enrichment was highly (98%) correlated  
7 (Pinal, 2004).

8

9 When new members are introduced into a group, the social structure is altered,  
10 temporarily, and the linear social hierarchy of the group is disrupted (Addison and Baker,  
11 1982). In goats, rank is very important for gaining access to resources, e.g., food.  
12 Matsuzawa and Hagiya (1991) found that high-ranking goats gained access to more food  
13 than did low-ranking individuals. Thus, to insure that all individuals, regardless of rank,  
14 attain sufficient access to food, the animals need to be provided with adequate feeding  
15 space. In goats, social dominance can be positively correlated with some measures of  
16 productivity including body mass gain, fur production (mohair goats), and milk output  
17 (Pretorius, 1970; Patón et al., 1995). Repeated aggression and displacements by dominant  
18 animals can cause subordinate goats to lose up to 10% of their body mass (Haupt, 2004).  
19 Individual milk production can vary with social position, but the relationship is not always  
20 linear. In Spanish breeds (Malagueña, Serrana, Granadina), medium-ranking goats  
21 produced more milk than did high- and low-ranking goats (Barroso et al., 2000).

22

23 Alvarez et al. (2003) observed that high-ranking female spent more time in proximity to  
24 the buck and ovulated earlier than did low-ranking individuals. In mountain goats,  
25 dominant females had higher reproductive success than did subordinates (Côté and Festa-

1 Bianchet, 2001). In their study of social dominance and the responses to oestrous  
2 synchronisation and superovulatory treatments, Ungerfeld et al. (2007) concluded that  
3 social rank did not influence significantly conception rate or litter size. In the non-  
4 breeding season, however, hierarchical position can affect the number of *corpus luteum*  
5 that developed. In a study of social dominance and susceptibility to disease, Ungerfeld  
6 and Correa (2007) showed that gastrointestinal parasitic faecal egg counts increased more  
7 slowly in high-ranking females than in medium- or low-ranking individuals, which might  
8 have resulted from reduced immune function in subordinate individuals caused by social  
9 stress.

10

#### 11 *5.4. Leadership*

12 Leadership is the ability of an animal to influence the affiliative movements and activities  
13 of its group mates (Bouissou et al., 2001). All herding animals show leader-follower  
14 behaviour in a variety of social circumstances. Leadership is “social” when it involves  
15 controlling aggression and apparent altruism, such as the protection of other members  
16 when the group is faced with a threat, and it is “spatial,” when it refers to group  
17 movements (Syme and Syme, 1979).

18

19 A leader should possess three permanent qualities: experience, the confidence of the  
20 group, and the ability to lead in the search for resources such as food, water, and shelter.  
21 In goats, as in other species, leadership is strongly influenced by experience, and not  
22 necessarily by dominance rank (Escos et al., 1993). Gorecki and Wojtowski (2004)  
23 evaluated leadership at the entrance of a milking parlour and found that, dominant  
24 individuals preceded subordinates through the entrance. Donaldson et al. (1967, cited by  
25 Syme and Syme, 1979) reported that younger goats entered the milking shed before older

1 animals entered. Margetínová et al. (2003) observed a significant effect of age and level of  
2 milk production on the milking order. Indeed, the order of access to the milking parlour  
3 seemed to be affected mainly by individual milk yield. Although the relationship between  
4 milk yield and age can vary greatly among breeds and regions, milk yield is usually higher  
5 in young animals (Crepaldi et al., 1999).

6

7 Leadership seems to be less well defined in goats than it is in sheep. Sheep move in a  
8 compact flock and follow a single leader, but goat herds move forming a thin line when  
9 alarmed or chased and, in a mixed-species herd, goats usually show their higher level of  
10 independence by leading sheep (Hafez et al., 1969). The presence of leaders in goat herds  
11 is particularly important in extensive grazing systems: some old and experienced goat  
12 should always be present to lead the herd to the best feeding sites. In large herds, it is  
13 possible that more than one goat assumes the leadership in turn. Leader animals can be  
14 provided with bells, which are quite useful for helping the shepherd to find his animals  
15 when the visibility is poor and for helping other goats to locate the leaders and, thereby,  
16 maintaining good group cohesion (Borelli et al., 1996).

17

## 18 **6. Human-goat relationships**

19 As herding animals, goats need to establish some sort of social relationship and, as in  
20 many other herding species, they can develop strong bonds with humans. Gentling is a  
21 form of positive physical attention that serves to calm the animal and increases the affinity  
22 for a healthy animal-human bond, which in turn can have a positive effect on body  
23 weight, behaviour, quality and amount of milk produced, and the overall health of the  
24 animal (e.g., Hemsworth et al., 2000). Research on various livestock species has shown  
25 that gentled animals have shorter avoidance distances (Le Neindre et al., 1996; Lensink et

1 al., 2000). Boivin and Bradstaad (1996) observed that gentled kids were calmer, more  
2 easily approached by humans and, when isolated, were less frightened than were non-  
3 gentled kids. In Italy, Mattiello et al. (2008b) observed shorter avoidance distances in  
4 goats that were reared in small old farms than in large modern farms. That difference  
5 might have been due to the closer relationships between the farmer and each individual  
6 goat on the small farm, which was possible because of the smaller number of animals on  
7 these farms. Furthermore, the old farms had a very low level of mechanization and,  
8 consequently, every operation had to be performed manually by the farmers, which  
9 frequently brought them in close contact with the animals. Habituation to humans by goats  
10 caused by frequent manipulation of the goats during daily activities might have played a  
11 role in improving the quality of the human-animal relationships.

12

13 In a study of dairy goats, Jackson and Hackett (2007) found a significant increase in heart  
14 girth (a correlate of body weight) in dairy goats after a short gentling treatment (only 10  
15 min/d for 24 d); however, gentling did not have a significant effect on milk quality (fat  
16 and protein concentrations). Lyons et al. (1988a) found that goats exhibited marked  
17 individual differences in their attitude towards humans. Behavioural and pituitary-adrenal  
18 responses provide a means of distinguishing between bold and timid kid goats; however, a  
19 goat's experience can influence the attitude of a goat towards humans. The importance of  
20 early contact with humans and gentling treatments on the establishment of the human-  
21 animal bond has been studied in many ungulate species, and positive, early contact can  
22 improve this relationship and result in tamer animals, which exhibit less fear and,  
23 therefore, are easier to handle (Hemsworth and Coleman, 1998).

24

1 In goats, a taming effect was evident when hand-reared and dam-reared kids were  
2 compared and dam-reared goats exhibited greater avoidance distances from humans and  
3 were more fearful than were human-reared goats, although these behavioural differences  
4 were not accompanied by significant differences in heart rate (Lyons and Price, 1987). Le  
5 Neindre et al. (1996) found that young animals that were not exposed to human handling  
6 were more fearful and sometimes aggressive towards its caretaker. Lyons et al. (1988b)  
7 concluded that genetic factors and early postnatal environments are responsible for  
8 individual temperament, including its attitude towards humans, which largely persists  
9 throughout the lifetime of the animal. Lyons (1989) observed that adult dairy goats that  
10 had been dam-reared were more reactive to novel stimuli and exhibited higher levels of  
11 milk ejection impairment (greater residual milk volumes) than did human-reared goats.  
12 However, Boivin and Braadstad (1996) reported that artificial feeding is not a sufficient to  
13 tame kids goats and if kids are gentled, the age of the kid at the time of gentling seems to  
14 play a role in the quality and persistence of the human-animal relationship. Hand-reared  
15 kids handled gently for 2 wk from the age of 1 wk (immediately after weaning) were  
16 tamer than hand-reared kids gentled in the same manner from the age of six weeks. To  
17 facilitate handling practices, increase production, and improve animal welfare, we  
18 recommend positive daily contact between the stockperson and the goats, starting when  
19 the animals are very young.

20

## 21 **7. Conclusions**

22 In domesticated goats, captivity and management practices, especially in intensive  
23 production systems, can limit the opportunity to express social behaviours. Limitations of  
24 space, changes in feeding practices, regrouping, and animal manipulations during  
25 sensitive periods such as weaning and gestation, can prevent animals from expressing

1 their natural behaviour, which can induce stress-related reactions. Under those  
2 circumstances, competition for resources increases and the social structure of the group  
3 can become unstable. Based on the observations of goat social behaviour discussed above,  
4 we propose the following practical recommendations:

5

- 6 1. Stocking densities should be carefully evaluated, especially in intensive management  
7 systems, and animal age, size, and class of stock should be taken into consideration.
- 8 2. Group size is largely dependent on environmental conditions and on the experience  
9 and ability of the caretaker. In general, small groups should be preferred to large  
10 groups.
- 11 3. Outside the breeding season, the sexes should be separated. The introduction of a  
12 buck into an all-female group can be used to stimulate the onset of synchronised heat.
- 13 4. If artificial insemination is used, occasional contact with an oestrus doe might be  
14 useful in stimulating sexual activity in the buck.
- 15 5. Whenever it is possible, individual animals should not be isolated. If animals have to  
16 be isolated for management purposes, it is advisable to provide them with olfactory,  
17 vocal, and visual contact with their group members.
- 18 6. Groups should be kept stable, repeated regrouping should be avoided, and the  
19 introduction of new individuals should be monitored closely, especially in the first 24  
20 h after regrouping.
- 21 7. Horned and hornless goats should be kept separate.
- 22 8. Feed trough space should be sufficient to guarantee access to food by all individuals,  
23 which should limit the amount of aggressive behaviour.



1 9. If kids are dam-reared, human disturbance and manipulation of the newborn during  
2 the sensitive period should be minimised. Weaning is a stressful event and it should  
3 not occur before 6-7 wk of age.

4 10. In extensive grazing systems, an old and experienced goat is beneficial for leading  
5 herd movements. To facilitate group cohesion, leaders can be provided with bells.

6 11. Positive daily contact between humans and goats should be encouraged.

7  
8 To conclude, we emphasize that, despite the constraints posed by farming systems on the  
9 expression of some species-specific behavioural patterns, a thorough understanding of the  
10 animal's needs can help farmers to reduce the stress experienced by the animals. The role  
11 of the stockperson is extremely important in order to detect early modifications of natural  
12 behaviour that might indicate poor welfare (e.g., unusually high levels of aggression,  
13 isolated individuals, low levels of activity synchronization) and to help to establish a  
14 positive human-animal bond, which can reduce fear and stress-related reactions that may  
15 jeopardize animal welfare.

## 16 17 **Acknowledgments**

18 The authors are grateful to the anonymous referees for their insightful comments, which  
19 helped to improve the paper significantly. Our thanks to Professor Gustavo María, for  
20 valuable discussions and review of the manuscript.

## 21 22 **References**

23 Addison, W.E., Baker, E., 1982. Agonistic behaviour and social organization in a herd of  
24 goats as affected by the introduction of non-members. *Appl. Anim. Ethol.* 8, 527-  
25 535.

- 1 Alados, C.L., Escós, C., 1996. Ecología y comportamiento de la cabra montes,  
2 consideraciones para su gestión. In: Monografías del Museo Nacional de Ciencias  
3 Naturales. Consejo Superior de Investigación Científica, CSIC. Madrid, España.  
4 329 pp.
- 5 Alley, J.C., Fordham, R.A., 1994. Social events following the introduction of unfamiliar  
6 does to a captive feral goat (*Capra hircus L.*) herd. Small Rumin. Res. 13, 103-  
7 107.
- 8 Alvarez, L., Galindo, F., Martin, G.B., Zarco, Q.L., 2003. Social dominance of female  
9 goats affects their response to the male effect. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 84, 119-  
10 126.
- 11 Alvarez, L., Zarco, Q.L., Galindo, F., Blache, D., Martin, G.B., 2007. Social rank and  
12 response to the “male effect” in the Australian Cashmere goat. Anim. Reprod. Sci.  
13 102, 258–266.
- 14 Andersen, I.L., Bøe, K.E., 2007. Resting pattern and social interactions in goats: the  
15 impact of size and organisation of lying space. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 108, 89-  
16 103.
- 17 Andersen, I.L., Roussel, S., Ropstad, E., Braastad, B.O., Steinheim, G., Janczak, A.M.,  
18 Jørgensen, G.M., Bøe, K.E., 2008. Social instability increases aggression in groups  
19 of dairy goats, but with minor consequences for the goats’ growth, kid production  
20 and development. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 144, 132-148.
- 21 Arnold, G.W., Dudzinski, M.L., 1978. Social organization and animal dispersion. In:  
22 Ethology of free-ranging domestic animals. Elsevier Scientific Publishing  
23 Company. Amsterdam, The Netherlands. pp. 51-96.

- 1 Aschwanden, J., Gygax, L., Wechsler, B., Keil, N.M., 2008. Social distances of goats at  
2 the feeding rack: Influence of the quality of social bonds, rank differences,  
3 grouping age and presence of horns. *Appl. Anim. Behav.* 144, 116-131.
- 4 Atasoglu, C., Yurtman, I.Y., Savas, T., Gültepe, M., Özcan, Ö., 2008. Effect of weaning  
5 on behavior and serum parameters in dairy goat kids. *Anim. Sci. J.* 79, 435-442.
- 6 Barroso, F.G., Alados, C.L., Boza, J., 2000. Social hierarchy in the domestic goat: effect  
7 on food habits and production. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 69, 35-53.
- 8 Blackshaw, J.K., Allan, D.J., Mc Greevy, P., 2003. Goat behaviour. In: Notes on some  
9 topics in applied animal behaviour. University of Sydney. Sydney, Australia, pp.  
10 23.
- 11 Blanchard, D.C., Sakai, R.R., McEwen, B., Weiss, S. M., Blanchard, R. J., 1993.  
12 Subordination stress: Behavioral, brain, and neuroendocrine correlates. *Behav.*  
13 *Brain Res.* 58, 113-121.
- 14 Boivin, X., Braadstad, B.O., 1996. Effects of handling during temporary isolation after  
15 early weaning on goat kid's later response to humans. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 48,  
16 61-71.
- 17 Bordi, A., De Rosa, G., Napolitano, F., Litterio, M., Marino, V., Rubino, R., 1994.  
18 Postpartum development of the mother-young relationship in goats. *Appl. Anim.*  
19 *Behav. Sci.* 42, 145-152.
- 20 Borelli, G., Corti, M., Testa, M., 1996. Il pascolo montano eco-compatibile. Linograf  
21 S.n.C., Cremona, Italy.
- 22 Bouissou, M.F., 1980. Social relationships in domestic cattle under modern management  
23 techniques. *Boll. Zool.* 47, 343-353.

- 1 Bouissou, M.F., Boissy, A, Le Neindre, P., Veissier, I., 2001. The social behaviour of  
2 cattle. In: Social Behaviour in farm animals. Keeling, L. and Gonyou, H. (Editors).  
3 CABI Publishing. Wallingford, Oxon, U.K.
- 4 Broom, D.M., 1981. Biology of Behaviour. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, U.K.
- 5 Bungo, T., Shimojo, M., Nakano, Y., Okano, K., Masuda, Y., Goto, I., 1998. Relationship  
6 between nursing and suckling behaviour in Tokara native goats. Appl. Anim.  
7 Behav. Sci. 59, 357-362.
- 8 Calhim, S., Shin, J., Dunbar, R.I.M., 2006. Sexual segregation among feral goats: testing  
9 between alternative hypothesis. Anim. Behav. 72, 31-41.
- 10 Clayton, D.A., 1978. Socially facilitated behavior. Quart. Rev. Biol. 53, 373–391.
- 11 Clutton-Brock, T.H., Guinness, F.E., Albon, S.D., 1982. Red deer: Behaviour and ecology  
12 of two sexes. Edimburgh University Press. Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.
- 13 Côté, S., Festa-Bianchet, M., 2001. Reproductive success in female mountain goats: the  
14 influence of age and social rank. Anim. Behav. 62, 173-181.
- 15 Côte, S.D., 2000. Determining social rank in ungulates, a comparison of aggressive  
16 interaction recorded at a bait site and under natural conditions. Ethol. 106, 945-  
17 955.
- 18 Crepaldi, P., Corti, M., Cicogna, M., 1999. Factors affecting milk production and  
19 prolificacy of Alpine goats in Lombardy (Italy). Small Rumin. Res. 32, 83-88.
- 20 Duvaux-Ponter, C., Roussel, S., Tessier, J., Sauviant, D., Ficheux, C., Boissy, A. 2003.  
21 Physiological effects of repeated transport in pregnant goats and their offspring.  
22 Anim. Res. 52, 553–566.
- 23 Escós, C., Alados, C.L., Boza, J., 1993. Leadership in a domestic goat herd. Appl. Anim.  
24 Behav. Sci. 38, 41-47.

- 1 Estevez, I., Andersen, I.L., Nævdal, E., 2007. Group size, density and social dynamics in  
2 farm animals. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 103, 185-204.
- 3 Fabre - Nys, C., 1999. Le comportement sexuel des caprins. In: XIV Reunión Nacional de  
4 Caprinocultura. Colegio de Posgraduados. Sept. 9-11. Montecillos, Estado de  
5 México, México.
- 6 Fabre – Nys, C., 2000. Le comportement sexuel des caprins: contrôle hormonal et facteurs  
7 sociaux. *INRA Prod. Anim.* 13, 11-23.
- 8 Fernandez, M.A., Alvarez, L., Zarco, L., 2007. Regrouping in lactating goats increases  
9 aggression and decreases milk production. *Small Rum. Res.* 70, 228-232.
- 10 Francis, R.C., 1988. On the relationship between aggression and social dominance. *Anim.*  
11 *Behav.* 78, 223-237.
- 12 Fraser, A.F., Broom, D.M., 1990. Farm animal behaviour and welfare. Third Edition.  
13 Bailliére Tindall. London, U.K.
- 14 Galal, S., 2005. Biodiversity in goats. *Small Rum. Res.* 60, 75-81.
- 15 Galindo, F.M., Broom, D.M., Jackson, P.G., 2000. A note on possible link between  
16 behaviour and occurrence of lameness in dairy cows. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 67,  
17 335-341.
- 18 Gautier, A., 1990. La Domestication. Et l'Homme Créè a ses Animaux, Editions Errance,  
19 Paris, France.
- 20 Gelez, H., Fabre - Nys, C., 2004. The "male effect" in sheep and goats: a review of the  
21 perspective roles of the two olfactory systems. *Horm. Behav.* 46, 257-271.
- 22 Gorecki, M.T., Wojtowski, J., 2004. Stability of milking order in goat over a long period.  
23 *Arch. Tierzucht.* 47, 203-208.
- 24 Haenlein, G.F.W., Caccese, R., Sammelwitz, P.H. 1992. Behaviour. Goat Extension  
25 Handbook. University of Delaware, Newark, New Jersey, USA.

- 1 Hafez, E.S.E., Cairns, R.B., Hulet, C.V., Scott, J.P., 1969. The behaviour of sheep and  
2 goats. In: The behaviour of domestic animals. E.S.E. Hafez (Ed.). Bailliére,  
3 Tindall & Cassell, London, U.K.
- 4 Hatziminaoglou, Y., Boyazoglu, J., 2004. The goat in ancient civilisations: from the Fertile  
5 Crescent to the Aegean Sea. *Small Rumin. Res.* 51, 123-129.
- 6 Hemsworth, P.H., Coleman, G.J., 1998. Human-Livestock Interactions: The Stockperson  
7 and the Productivity of Intensively Farmed Animals. CAB International,  
8 Wallingford, Oxon, U.K.
- 9 Hemsworth, P.H., Coleman, G.J., Barnett, J.L., Borg, S., 2000. Relationships between  
10 human-animal interactions and productivity of commercial dairy cows. *J. Anim.*  
11 *Sci.* 78, 2821-2831.
- 12 Houpt, K.A., 2004. Livestock behavior. In: Notes of Farm Animal Behavior. Department  
13 of Animal Science. Cornell University. Ithaca, New York, U.S.A. 26 pp.
- 14 Houpt, K.A., 2005. Domestic animal behavior for veterinarians and animal scientists. 4<sup>th</sup>  
15 Edition. Blackwell Publishing, Ames, Iowa, U.S.A.
- 16 Hunter, L.T.B., Skinner, J.D., 1998. Vigilance behaviour in African ungulates: the role of  
17 predation pressure. *Behav.* 135, 195-211.
- 18 Immelmann, K., 1988. Introduzione all'etologia. Bollati Boringhieri, Torino, Italy.
- 19 Jackson, K.M., Hackett, D., 2007. A note: the effects of human handling on heart girth,  
20 behaviour and milk quality in dairy goats. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 108, 332-336.
- 21 Jarman, P.G., 1974. The social organization of antelope in relation to their ecology.  
22 *Behav.* 48, 215-267
- 23 Kannan, G., Terrill, T.H., Kouakou, B., Gelaye, S., Amoah, E.A., 2002. Simulated  
24 preslaughter holding and isolation effects on stress responses and live weight  
25 shrinkage in meat goats. *J. Anim. Sci.* 80, 1771-1780.

- 1 Keil, N.M., Sambras, H.H., 1996. On social behaviour of milk goats in large groups.  
2 Arch. Tierz. 39, 465-473.
- 3 Kilgur, R., Dalton, C., 1984. Livestock behaviour a practical guide. Westview Press.  
4 Boulder, Colorado, U.S.A.
- 5 Le Neindre, P., Boivin, X., Boissy, A., 1996. Handling of extensively kept animals. Appl.  
6 Anim. Behav. Sci. 49, 73-81.
- 7 Lenhardt M.L., 1977. Vocal contour cues in maternal recognition of goat kids. Appl.  
8 Anim. Ethol. 3, 211-219.
- 9 Lensink, B.J., Fernandez, X., Boivin, X., Pradel, P., Le Neindre, P., Vessier, I., 2000. The  
10 impact of gentle contacts on ease of handling, welfare, and growth of calves and  
11 the quality of veal meat. J. Anim. Sci. 78, 1219-1226.
- 12 Levy, F., Keller, M., Poindron, P., 2004. Olfactory regulation of maternal behavior in  
13 mammals. Horm. Behav. 46, 284-302.
- 14 Lickliter, R.E., 1987. Activity patterns and companion preferences of domestic goat kids.  
15 Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 19, 137-145.
- 16 Lim, M.M., Young, L.J., 2006. Neuropeptidergic regulation of affiliative behavior and  
17 social bonding in animals. Horm. Behav. 50, 506-517.
- 18 Loretz, C., Wechsler, B., Hauser, R., Rüsç, P., 2004. A comparison of space  
19 requirements of horned and hornless goats at the feed barrier and in the lying area.  
20 Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 87, 275-283.
- 21 Lyons, D.M., 1989. Individual differences in temperament of dairy goats and the  
22 inhibition of milk ejection. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 22, 269-282.
- 23 Lyons, D.M., Price, E.O., 1987. Relationships between heart rates and behaviour of goats  
24 in encounters with people. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 18, 363-369.

- 1 Lyons, D.M., Price, E.O., Moberg, G.P., 1988a. Social modulation of pituitary-adrenal  
2 responsiveness and individual differences in behaviour of young domestic goats.  
3 *Physiol. Behav.* 43, 451-458.
- 4 Lyons, D.M., Price, E.O., Moberg, G.P., 1988b. Individual differences in temperament of  
5 domestic goats: consistency and change. *Anim. Behav.* 36, 1323-1333.
- 6 Margetinová, J., Brouček, J., Apolen, D., Mihina, Š., 2003. Relationship between age,  
7 milk production and order of goats during automatic milking. *Czech J. Anim. Sci.*  
8 48, 257-264.
- 9 Mason, I.L., 1984. *Evolution of Domesticated Animals*. Longman, London, U.K.
- 10 Matsuzawa, Y., Hagiya, K., 1991. Relationship between feeding behavior and social  
11 dominance in a small herd of goats. *Sci. Rep. Fac. Agric.* 39, 1-6.
- 12 Mattiello, S., 2001. Il comportamento sociale degli ungulati. *Obiettivi e Documenti*  
13 *Veterinari* 6, 15-18.
- 14 Mattiello, S., Villa, S., Cioccarelli, G., 2008a. Effetto delle modalità di gestione  
15 dell'alimentazione sul benessere del capretto. *Large Anim. Rev.* 4, 202-208.
- 16 Mattiello, S., Villa, S., Cioccarelli, G., 2008b. Il benessere negli allevamenti caprini del  
17 fondovalle valtellinese. *Quaderno So. Zoo. Alp.* 5, 179-188.
- 18 Mendl, M., Deag, J.M., 1995. How useful are the concepts of alternative strategy and  
19 coping strategy in applied studies of social behaviour? *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.*  
20 44, 119-137.
- 21 Mendl, M., Held, S., 2001. Living in groups: an evolutionary perspective. In: *Social*  
22 *Behaviour in farm animals*. Keeling, L. and Gonyou, H. (Editors). CABI  
23 Publishing. Wallingford, Oxon, U.K.



- 1 Metz, J., Wierenga, H., 1997. Behavioural criteria for the design of housing systems for  
2 cattle. Cattle housing systems, lameness and behaviour. Martinus Nijhoff  
3 Publishers, Boston, Massachusetts, U.S.A.
- 4 Mignon-Grasteau, S., Boissy, A., Bouix, J., Faure, J.-M., Fisher, A.D., Hinch, G.N.,  
5 Jensen, P., Le Neindre, P., Mormede, P., Prunet, P., Vandeputte, M., Beaumont,  
6 C., 2005. Genetics of adaptation and domestication in livestock. *Livest. Prod. Sci.*  
7 93, 3-14.
- 8 Millman, S.T., Duncan, I.J.H., 2001. Social cognition of farm animals. In: *Social*  
9 *Behaviour in farm animals*. Keeling, L. and Gonyou, H. (Editors). CABI  
10 Publishing. Wallingford, Oxon, U.K.
- 11 Miranda-de la Lama, G.C., 2005. Social strategy and the effect of environmental  
12 enrichment on the reactivity of handling and adrenocortical activity in dairy goats  
13 (*Capra hircus*). M.Sc. Thesis. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,  
14 México.
- 15 Miranda-de la Lama, G.C., Galindo, F., 2007. Efecto de las estrategias sociales en el  
16 orden de dominancia en cabras lecheras. In: *XXXII Jornadas Científicas y XI*  
17 *Internacionales de la Sociedad Española de Ovinotecnia y Caprinotecnia*. Palma de  
18 Mallorca, Spain. 193-196 pp.
- 19 Miranda-de la Lama, G.C., Rivero, L., Chacón, G., Garcia-Belenguer, S., Villarroel, M.,  
20 María, G.A., 2010. Effect of the pre-slaughter logistic chain on some indicators of  
21 welfare in lambs. *Livest. Sci. In Press*. [doi:10.1016/j.livsci.2009.10.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2009.10.013)
- 22 Newberry, R.C., Swanson, J.C., 2008. Implications of breaking mother–young social  
23 bonds. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 110, 3-23.
- 24 O'Brien, P.H., 1984a. Feral goat home range: influence of social class and environmental  
25 variables. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 12, 373-385.

- 1 O'Brien, P.H., 1984b. Leavers and stayers: maternal post-partum strategies in feral goats.  
2 Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 12, 233-243.
- 3 O'Brien, P.H., 1988. Feral goat social organization: a review and comparative analysis.  
4 Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 21, 209-221.
- 5 Orgeur, P., Mimouni, P., Signoret, J.P., 1990. The influence of rearing conditions on the  
6 social relationships of young male goats. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 27, 105-113.
- 7 Ortiz - de Montellano, A.M., Torres, F.O., Galindo, F., Aguayo A.M., 2006. Relationships  
8 between the social rank of male goats and their testosterone levels, aggressiveness,  
9 and libido. In: Proceedings of the 40<sup>th</sup> International Congress of the ISAE, August  
10 8-12, Bristol, U.K. 249 pp.
- 11 Patón, D., Martín, L., Cereijo, M., Rota, A., Rojas, A., Tovar, J., 1995. Relationship  
12 between rank order and productive parameters in Verata goats during milking.  
13 Anim. Sci. 61, 545-551.
- 14 Pinal, R.P., 2004. Efectos del enriquecimiento ambiental y el orden de dominancia en el  
15 comportamiento de cabras lecheras en un sistema intensivo de producción. DVM  
16 Thesis. Universidad Autónoma de Tlaxcala. Tlaxcala, México.
- 17 Poindron, P., Gilling, G., Hernández, H., Serafín, N., Terrazas, A., 2003. Early  
18 recognition of newborn goat kids by their mother: I. nonolfactory discrimination.  
19 Dev. Psychobiol. 43, 82-89.
- 20 Poindron, P., Terrazas, A., Navarro Montes de Oca, M.L., Serafín, N., Hernández, H.,  
21 2007a. Sensory and physiological determinants of maternal behavior in the goat  
22 (*Capra hircus*). Horm. Behav. 52, 99-105.
- 23 Poindron, P., Lévy, F., Keller, M., 2007b. Maternal responsiveness and maternal  
24 selectivity in domestic sheep and goats: the two facets of maternal attachment.  
25 Dev. Psychobiol. 49, 54-70.

- 1 Pretorius, P.S., 1970. Effect of aggressive behaviour on production and reproduction in  
2 the angora goat (*Capra hircus angoraensis*). *Agroanimalia* 2, 161–164.
- 3 Price, E.O., Thos, J., 1980. Behavioural responses to short-term social isolation in sheep  
4 and goats. *Appl. Anim. Ethol.* 6, 331-339.
- 5 Price, E.O., 1999. Behavioural development in animals undergoing domestication. *Appl.*  
6 *Anim. Behav. Sci.* 65, 245-271.
- 7 Putman, R., 1988. The natural history of deer. Comstock Publishing Associates, Cornell  
8 University Press, Ithaca, New York, U.S.A.
- 9 Ramírez, A., Quiles, A., Hevia, M.L., Sotillo, F., Ramírez, M.C., 1996a. Effects of  
10 immediate and early post-partum separation on maintenance of maternal  
11 responsiveness in parturient multiparous goats. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 48, 215-  
12 224.
- 13 Ramírez, A., Quiles, A., Hevia, M.L., Sotillo, F., del Carmen Ramírez, M., 1996b.  
14 Influence of forced contact on the maternal-filial bond in the domestic goat after  
15 different periods of post-partum separation. *Small Rum. Res.* 23, 75-81.
- 16 Ralphs, M.H., Provenza, F.D., 1999. Conditioned food aversions: principles and practices,  
17 with special reference to social facilitation. *Proc. Nutr. Soc.* 58, 813-820.
- 18 Restall, B.J., Restall, H., Walkden-Brown, S.W., 1995. The induction of ovulation in  
19 anovulatory goats by oestrous females. *Anim. Reprod. Sci.* 40, 299-303.
- 20 Romeyer, A., Poindron, P., Orgeur, P., 1994. Olfaction mediates the establishment of  
21 selective bonding in goats. *Physiol. Behav.* 56, 693-700.
- 22 Ross, S., Berg, J., 1956. Stability of food dominance relationships in a flock of goats. *J.*  
23 *Mammal.* 37, 129-131.

- 1 Roussel, S., Boissy, A., Montigny, D. Hemsworth, P.H., Duvaux-Ponter, C., 2005.  
2 Gender-specific effects of prenatal stress on emotional reactivity and stress  
3 physiology of goat kids. *Horm. Behav.* 47, 256–266.
- 4 Rout, P.K., Mandal, A., Singh, L.B., Roy, R., 2002. Studies on behavioural patterns in  
5 jamunapari goats. *Small Rumin. Res.* 43, 185-188.
- 6 Schaal, A., 1982. Influence de l'environnement sur les composantes du group social chez  
7 le daim *Cervus (Dama) dama L.* *Rev. Ecol. Terre Vie* 36, 161-174.
- 8 Schino G., 1998. Reconciliation in domestic goats. *Behav.* 135, 343-356.
- 9 Schwarz, E., Sambras, H.H., 1997. Integration of young goats into a herd of adult goats.  
10 *Berl. Munch. Tierarztl. Wochenschr.* 110, 214-219.
- 11 Sevi, A., Casamassima, D.V., 2009. Ovi-caprini. In: *Etologia applicata e benessere*  
12 *animale*, Vol. 2, Parte speciale. Carenzi, C. and Panzera M. (Editors). Le Point  
13 Veterinaire Italie srl, Milano, Italy.
- 14 Sevi, A., Casamassima, D.V., Pulina, G., Pazzona, A., 2009. Factors of welfare reduction  
15 in dairy sheep and goats. *It. J. Anim. Sci.* 8, 81-101.
- 16 Shackleton, D.M., Shank, C.C., 1984. A review of the social behavior of feral and wild  
17 sheep and goats. *J. Anim. Sci.* 58, 500-509.
- 18 Shinde, A.K., Verma, D.L., Singh, N.P., 2004. Social dominance-subordinate  
19 relationships on a flock of Marwari goats. *Indian J. Anim. Sci.* 74, 216–219.
- 20 Sisto, A.B., 2004. Etología aplicada en los caprinos. In: *Etología Aplicada*. Galindo, F.A.,  
21 Orihuela, T. A. (Editors). IFAW, UNAM. México. D.F. 147-160 pp.
- 22 Shrader, A.M., Kerley, G.I.H., Kotler, B.P., Brown, J.S., 2007. Social information, social  
23 feeding, and competition in group-living goats (*Capra hircus*). *Behav. Ecol.* 18,  
24 103-107.

- 1 Sondresen, T., Bakken, M., Andersen, I.L. 2008. Social instability and consequences on  
2 eating and resting time in goats. In: Proceedings of the 18th Nordic Symposium of  
3 the ISAE, January 16-18, Oscarsborg, Norway. 9 pp.
- 4 Syme, G.J., Syme, L.A., 1979. Social structure in farm animals. Elsevier Scientific  
5 Publishing Company, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- 6 Szabo, S., 2008. Behaviour of dairy goats in the collecting area - influence of space  
7 allowance and shape. M.Sc. Thesis. University of Natural Resources and Applied  
8 Life Sciences, Wien, Austria.
- 9 Špinko, M., 2006. How important is natural behaviour in animal farming systems? Appl.  
10 Anim. Behav. Sci. 100, 117–128.
- 11 Taube-Schiff, M., Suvak, M.K., Antony, M.M., Bieling, P.J., McCabe, R.E., 2007. Group  
12 cohesion in cognitive-behavioral group therapy for social phobia. Behav. Res.  
13 Ther. 45, 687-698.
- 14 Tønnesen, H.G., Bøe K.E., Andersen, I.L.2008. Group size and social interactions in  
15 goats. In: Proceedings of the 18th Nordic Symposium of the ISAE, January 16-18,  
16 Oscarsborg, Norway. 29 pp.
- 17 Tölü, C., Savaş, T., 2007. A brief report on intra-species aggressive biting in a goat herd.  
18 Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 102, 124-129.
- 19 Tölü, C., Savaş, T., Pala, A., Thomsen, H., 2007. Effects of goat social rank on kid  
20 gender. Czech J. Anim. Sci. 52, 77-82.
- 21 Ungerfeld, R., Correa, O., 2007. Social dominance of female dairy goats influences the  
22 dynamics of gastrointestinal parasite eggs. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 105, 249-253.
- 23 Ungerfeld, R., González-Pensado, S., Dago, A.L., Vilariño, M., Menchaca, A., 2007.  
24 Social dominance of female dairy goats and response to oestrous synchronisation  
25 and superovulatory treatments. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 105, 115-121.

- 1 Van, D.T.T., Mui, N.T., Ledin, I., 2007. Effect of group size on feed intake, aggressive  
2 behaviour and growth rate in goat kids and lambs. *Small Rumin. Res.* 72, 187-196.
- 3 Vielma, J., Terrazas, A., Véliz, F.G., Flores, J.A., Hernandez, H., Duarte, G., Malpoux, B.,  
4 Delgadillo, J.A., 2008. Vocalizations of male goats do not stimulate neither LH  
5 secretion nor ovulation on anovulatory female goats. *Téc. Pecu. Méx.* 46, 25-36.
- 6 Wakabayashi, Y., Mori, Y., Ichikawa, M., Yazaki, K., Hagino-Yamagishi, K., 2002. A  
7 putative pheromone receptor gene is expressed in two distinct olfactory organs in  
8 goats. *Chem. Senses.* 27, 207-213.
- 9 Zeder, M., Hesse, B., 2000. The initial domestication of goats (*Capra hircus*) in the  
10 Zagros mountains 10,000 years ago. *Sci.* 287, 2254-2257.
- 11