



Recent advances in animal welfare science VIII

Virtual UFAW Animal Welfare Conference

29th- 30th June 2021

FORMAT OF ABSTRACTS

Abstracts should be formatted as follows:

Talk / Poster

TITLE OF PAPER

AB Authorone ¹, CD Authortwo ¹, EF Authorthree ² and G Authorfour ^{1,2}

¹ Department of Animal Welfare Science, University of Wheathampstead, Hertfordshire, UK

² Department of Applied Animal Welfare, University of Brewhouse Hill, Ontario, Canada
ab.authorone@wheathampstead.ac.uk

Abstracts should be written in English and not exceed 400 words, excluding the title and the authors' names and addresses, which should be formatted as above. Please use Microsoft Word for Windows when submitting an abstract. Text should be in Ariel 10 pt font.

The title should be centred and in bold capital letters (as above). Authors who have contributed to the abstract should be identified using their initials and surname and centred under the title in bold upper and lower case. Superscript numbers (eg ¹) should be used as necessary to indicate each author's institutional address. Institutional addresses should be centred and in title case, with superscript number used to link them with author(s) as necessary. Each address should start on a new line. The email address of the main author to be contacted with regard to the abstract in italics should follow. A blank line should precede the text. The text should clearly and concisely outline the main findings or premise **without reference(s)** to other text or paper or to future findings. It can include graphs or tables but must fit on one side of A4.

An example of how to format an abstract from a previous meeting can also be seen below.

Please send a copy of the abstract by email to Stephen Wickens @ wickens@ufaw.org.uk by **18th January 2021**.

If you wish to present a poster rather than a talk, please indicate this at the top of the submitted abstract.



Recent advances in animal welfare science VIII

Virtual UFAW Animal Welfare Conference

29th- 30th June 2021

Example of formatted abstract

DO ANY FORMS OF PLAY INDICATE THE PRESENCE OF POSITIVE AFFECTIVE STATES?

J Espinosa ¹, JA Dallaire ² and GJ Mason ¹

¹ Department of Animal Biosciences, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, Canada

² Department of Comparative Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, California, USA
gmason@uoguelph.ca

To ensure good or excellent animal well-being, we need objective welfare indicators that are sensitive to positive affective states. Could some forms of play behaviour be useful, valid tools for this job? Researchers wanting to test this hypothesis by validating play behaviours as indicators of positive affective states must overcome two major challenges. The first is that the term 'play' covers a heterogeneous group of behaviours, such that data from one form or species cannot be directly applied to another form or species. The welfare significance of each type of play must therefore be validated *de novo* on its own merits (and furthermore, we already know that some forms of play actually increase rather than decrease in animals and humans in aversive situations). The second challenge is that identifying conditions that induce *absolutely* positive states in animals (rather than merely *relatively* positive states) is surprisingly difficult. To do this, we need clear, objective ways to operationalize 'pleasure', 'happiness' or 'contentment' in animals; and furthermore, we then need to be able to experimentally induce differing degrees of positive affect to assess empirically whether these influence play. The vast majority of welfare-oriented play research has not done this, but instead has compared animals in sub-optimal environments (e.g. those in isolation, or housed in small barren cages) with animals in better ones. However, despite the general lack of relevant data, two possible forms of play *have* plausibly been shown to be sensitive to positive affective states in animals: rough-and-tumble play in rats and locomotor play in piglets. Given this, and also given the great need for indicators of 'positive animal welfare', we will discuss how future validity research could constructively build on these two intriguing cases, including highlighting some welfare-relevant *qualitative* aspects of human play that so far have been overlooked in animal play research (e.g. the degrees to which play behaviour is 'fragmented', oscillating between non-play and play activities). We hope our guidelines will pave the way for more rigorous validity research, some of which might then identify qualitative or quantitative aspects of sub-types of animal play that do indeed indicate positive affective states.