



**HAL**  
open science

## Vocal expression of emotional valence in pigs across multiple call types and contexts

Elodie Briefer, Pavel Linhart, Richard Policht, Lisette M C Leliveld, Sandra Döpjan, Birger Puppe, Mónica Padilla de La Torre, Andrew M Janczak, Cécile Bourguet, Véronique Deiss, et al.

► **To cite this version:**

Elodie Briefer, Pavel Linhart, Richard Policht, Lisette M C Leliveld, Sandra Döpjan, et al.. Vocal expression of emotional valence in pigs across multiple call types and contexts. 2019. hal-02375173

**HAL Id: hal-02375173**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02375173>**

Preprint submitted on 22 Nov 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

# 1 **Vocal expression of emotional valence in pigs across** 2 **multiple call types and contexts**

3  
4 Elodie F. Briefer<sup>1</sup>, Pavel Linhart<sup>2</sup>, Richard Policht<sup>2</sup>, Marek Špinko<sup>2</sup>, Lisette M. C. Leliveld<sup>3</sup>, Sandra Döpjan<sup>3</sup>,  
5 Birger Puppe<sup>3</sup>, Mónica Padilla de la Torre<sup>4</sup>, Andrew M. Janczak<sup>4</sup>, Cécile Bourguet<sup>5</sup>, Véronique Deiss<sup>6</sup>, Alain  
6 Boissy<sup>6</sup>, Carole Guérin<sup>7</sup>, Eva Read<sup>7</sup>, Marjorie Coulon<sup>8</sup>, Edna Hillmann<sup>9</sup>, Céline Tallet<sup>7</sup>

7  
8 <sup>1</sup> Institute of Agricultural Sciences, ETH Zürich, Switzerland

9 <sup>2</sup> Institute of Animal Science, Czechia

10 <sup>3</sup> Leibniz Institute for Farm Animal Biology, Germany

11 <sup>4</sup> Department of Production Animal Clinical Sciences, Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Norway

12 <sup>5</sup> Bureau E.T.R.E., France

13 <sup>6</sup> INRA UMR 1213 Herbivores, France

14 <sup>7</sup> INRA UMR 1348 PEGASE, France

15 <sup>8</sup> Cabinet EASIER, France

16 <sup>9</sup> Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany

17

18 Corresponding Author:

19 Elodie F Briefer<sup>1</sup>

20 Present address: Behavioural Ecology Group, Section for Ecology and Evolution, Department of Biology,

21 University of Copenhagen, Denmark

22 Email address: elodie.briefer@bio.ku.dk

## 23 Introduction

24 Emotions, unlike mood, are short-lived reactions associated with specific events. They can be characterized  
25 by two main dimensions; their arousal (bodily activation) and valence (negative versus positive) (Mendl et al.  
26 2010). Knowledge of the valence of emotions experienced by domestic and captive animals is crucial for  
27 assessing and improving their welfare, as it enables us to minimize the negative emotions that they might  
28 experience and to promote positive ones. Emotions can affect vocalizations directly or indirectly through the  
29 brain, lungs, larynx or vocal tract. As a result, vocal expression of emotions has been observed across  
30 species (Briefer 2012), and could serve as a non-invasive and potentially very reliable tool to assess animal  
31 emotions. In pigs (*Sus scrofa*), vocal expression of emotions has been relatively well studied (e.g. Leliveld et  
32 al. 2016; Briefer et al. 2019). However, it is not known if the vocal indicators revealed in previous studies are  
33 valid across call types and contexts. To find this out, we conducted an analysis of the effect of emotional  
34 valence on a large database of pig vocalizations, including calls recorded in the most common emotional  
35 situations encountered by pigs throughout their lives, from birth to slaughter.  
36

## 37 Materials & Methods

### 38 Recordings

39 Pigs of various ages (piglets to finishing pigs) were recorded in 22 contexts triggering both negative emotions  
40 (e.g. crushing, missed nursing, castration, fear conditioning, isolation, restraint, barren environment, and  
41 slaughter), and positive emotions (e.g. nursing, huddling, social reunion, exposition to an enriched arena,  
42 and running) (for more details see Tallet et al. 2013; Linhart et al. 2015; Leliveld et al. 2016; Leliveld et al.  
43 2017; Briefer et al. 2019). The putative valence of the various contexts was based on the function of  
44 emotions to trigger avoidance (negative emotions) or approach (positive emotions) and the behavior of the  
45 pigs (Mendl et al. 2010). Experiments included in this analysis were approved by the respective authorities  
46 for each country (Germany: Federal State of Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania (AZ:7221.3-2-045/13);  
47 Switzerland: Swiss Cantonal Veterinary Office (TG02/2014); Czechia: Institutional Animal Care and Use  
48 Committee of the Institute of Animal Science and the Czech Central Committee for Protection of Animals,  
49 Ministry of Agriculture (dMZe 1244 and 44248/2007–17210); Norway: National animal research authority  
50 (FOTS id 12021)).  
51

### 52 Vocal analyses

53 In order to exclude very short sounds, in which parameters might not be accurately measured, only high  
54 quality calls with a duration  $> 0.05$  s were selected for the acoustic analysis ( $n = 7392$  calls). We used the  
55 acoustic features of the calls to classify them as low-frequency stable, modulated or tonal calls, high-  
56 frequency stable or modulated calls, or mixed calls (6 types), based on Tallet et al. (2013). Then, depending  
57 on the call type, we extracted 11 to 18 vocal parameters using a custom-built script in Praat, which batch-  
58 processed the analyses and the exporting of output data. The measured parameters belonged to the six  
59 following categories: source-related (fundamental frequency, “F0”), energy spectrum distribution, duration,  
60 amplitude modulation (“AM”), noise, filter-related (vocal tract resonances).  
61

### 62 Statistical analyses

63 To eliminate redundancy, we used a principal component analysis to select one vocal parameter within each  
64 category, which explained most of the variance in the data across all call types, for further analyses. Since  
65 the minimum formant dispersion (“DFmin”), originally categorized along with the linear predictive coding  
66 (“LPC”) coefficients never associated (i.e. loaded highly ( $r \geq 0.5$ ) on the same PC) with these parameters,  
67 it was analyzed separately. These selected seven parameters (i.e. one for each of the six categories and  
68 DFmin; Table 1) were then used as outcome variables in linear mixed-effects models (lmer function in R  
69 software), to assess if they were affected by the valence of the contexts (positive or negative; fixed factor).  
70 The models included as control factors the age category and the call type. The context of production nested  
71 within the identity of the pig, nested within the experiment number, nested within the team who performed the  
72 recording was added as a random factor to control for repeated measurements and dependencies. The p-  
73 values were calculated with parametric bootstrap tests.  
74

## 75 Results and Discussion

76 Five of the seven tested vocal parameters were affected by the valence of the context (Table 1). After  
77 controlling for the type of call and the age category (control factors), our analyses revealed that pigs

78 produced calls characterized by a higher center of gravity, a shorter duration, less noise (lower Wiener  
79 entropy), lower formants (measured using the formant dispersion) and LPC coefficients in positive compared  
80 to negative contexts.

81 **Table 1.** Model estimates, lower (lo.ci) and upper (up.ci) 95% confidence intervals for the vocal parameters  
82 included in the linear mixed-effect models, as a function of the valence of the contexts (\* $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* $p < 0.01$ ;  
83 "NS" Non significant).  
84  
85

Parameter	Valence	estim	lo.ci	up.ci	P value
<b>Mean F0 (Hz)</b>	Pos	132.91	124.81	141.13	NS
	Neg	138.19	130.49	146.26	
<b>Spectral centre of gravity (Hz)</b>	Pos	967.70	877.57	1084.53	*
	Neg	895.54	806.46	996.58	
<b>Duration (s)</b>	Pos	0.17	0.14	0.21	**
	Neg	0.42	0.34	0.51	
<b>AM extent (dB)</b>	Pos	5.77	4.60	7.30	NS
	Neg	5.67	4.50	7.24	
<b>Wiener entropy</b>	Pos	-1.63	-1.84	-1.44	**
	Neg	-1.52	-1.71	-1.33	
<b>DFmin (Hz)</b>	Pos	846.64	778.01	921.82	**
	Neg	964.72	899.40	1035.78	
<b>4th LPC coefficient (Hz)</b>	Pos	3913.22	3742.58	4069.90	**
	Neg	4185.93	4020.41	4334.90	

86 Some of these changes are in line with previous findings (e.g. spectral center of gravity, Leliveld et al. 2016;  
87 duration, Briefer et al. 2019). In particular, shorter durations in positive contexts have been observed across  
88 multiple species and could be a feature conserved throughout evolution (Briefer 2012). Overall, our results  
89 suggest that some parameters change with the valence experienced by pigs in a similar way across call  
90 types. These vocal parameters could be very useful for developing automated methods to monitor pig  
91 welfare on-farm.  
92  
93

## 94 References

- 95 Briefer, E. F. (2012). Vocal expression of emotions in mammals: mechanisms of production and evidence.  
96 *Journal of Zoology*, 288:1–20
- 97 Briefer, E. F., Vizier, E., Gyax, L., Hillmann, E. (2019). Expression of emotional valence in pig closed-mouth  
98 grunts: Involvement of both source- and filter-related parameters. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of*  
99 *America*, 145:2895–2908.
- 100 Leliveld, L. M. C., Düpjan, S., Tuchscherer, A., Puppe, B. (2016). Behavioural and physiological measures  
101 indicate subtle variations in the emotional valence of young pigs. *Physiology & Behavior*, 157:116–124.
- 102 Leliveld, L. M. C., Düpjan, S., Tuchscherer, A., Puppe, B. (2017). Vocal correlates of emotional reactivity  
103 within and across contexts in domestic pigs (*Sus scrofa*). *Physiology & Behavior*, 181:117–126.
- 104 Linhart, P., Ratcliffe, V. F., Reby, D., Špinková, M. (2015). Expression of emotional arousal in two different  
105 piglet call types. *PLoS ONE*, 10:e0135414.
- 106 Mendl, M., Burman, O. H. P., Paul, E. S. (2010). An integrative and functional framework for the study of  
107 animal emotion and mood. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 277:2895–2904.
- 108 Tallet, C., Linhart, P., Policht, R., et al (2013). Encoding of situations in the vocal repertoire of piglets (*Sus*  
109 *scrofa*): A comparison of discrete and graded classifications. *PLoS ONE*, 8:e71841.