Minimising fear and anxiety in working dogs: a review
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Abstract
The causes of fear and anxiety in working dogs are multifactorial, including inherited characteristics that differ between individuals (e.g. Goddard and Beilharz, 1982; 1984a, b), influences of the environment (Lefebvre et al., 2007), and learnt experiences during particular sensitive periods (Appleby et al 2002) and throughout life as well as inappropriate initial introduction to new stimuli. Fear-related behaviour compromises performance, leads to significant numbers of dogs failing to complete training (e.g. Murphy, 1995; Batt et al., 2008), early withdrawals from working roles (Caron-Lomier et al 2016) and can jeopardize dog and handler safety. Hence, its amelioration is critical to maintain dogs in working roles, as well as ensuring their wellbeing. Whilst current methods of selection and training are seemingly effective at producing many dogs which work in a remarkable array of environments, some dogs do not make the grade, and longevity of service is not always maximized. Programmes should strive for optimal efficiency and they need to continually analyse the value of each component of their programme, seek evidence for its value and explore potential evidence-based improvements. Here we discuss scientific evidence for methods and strategies which may be of value in reducing the risk of fear behaviours developing in the working dog population and suggest potentially valuable techniques and future research to explore the benefit of these approaches. The importance of environmental influences and learning opportunities as well as underlying temperament on the outward expression of fear and anxiety, should not be underestimated. Identification of characteristics which predict resilience to stress are valuable, both to enable careful breeding for these traits and to develop predictive tests for puppies and procured animals. But vitally important also is rearing animals in optimal environments and introducing them to a range of stimuli in a positive, controlled and gradual way, as these can all help minimize the number of dogs which develop work-inhibiting fears. Future research should explore innovative methods to best measure the relative resilience of dogs to stressful events. This could include developing optimal exposure protocols to minimize the development of fear and anxiety; exploring, the influence of social learning and the most effective elements of stimulus presentation.
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1. Introduction

Domestic dogs are used for a variety of working roles in which they are required to continue performing trained tasks in environments which may include novel, unexpected or potentially aversive stimuli. Roles include herding, deterring predators, guarding, transportation, hunting, entertainment (e.g. racing), contraband detection (police, military and rescue services e.g. Rooney et al. 2004), emotional therapy and medical alert dogs (Strong et al., 1999; Rooney et al., 2013). This diverse range of activities can expose dogs to potentially stressful stimuli in their surroundings, including: high levels of noise from machinery and gunfire explosions (and subsequent shock waves); transportation; variable terrain with unstable and varied surfaces underfoot; high levels of dust and smoke, and loud machinery and traffic (Brown, 2011). In addition to this huge range of physical factors, dogs may need to cope with a variety of people, some behaving in unpredictable ways, the presence of other animals, and variable routines. Dogs can respond to these types of situations with behavioral signs of fear or anxiety, such as freezing, withdrawing, or showing aggression (Casey, 2010), and such responses are likely to interfere with a dogs’ ability to perform its role. In this paper, fear is defined as the behavioral responses shown to actual danger (Boissy, 1998) and anxiety as the emotional state elicited in potentially threatening situations, e.g. novelty, or when some elements of the environment predict a negative outcome (Ennaceur et al., 2006; Massar et al., 2011). Both affective states (fear and anxiety) are particularly concerning in roles for which optimal performance is critical for safety. For example, fear-related behaviors on the part of guide dogs or military search dogs, can be life-threatening to both dog and handler, and is therefore a common reason for failure in these roles (e.g. Murphy, 1995; Rooney et al., 2002; Batt et al., 2008).
The experience of fear is aversive (Grandin and Deesing, 2002), and by analogy with the experience of humans, it is likely that anxiety is similarly aversive since it too functions to promote avoidance of eliciting stimuli. Individual dogs which show fearful behaviors in a rehoming kennel environment appear to have an impaired ability to learn operant tasks (Blackwell et al., 2010), with similar effects demonstrated in a range of species (e.g. Shors 2004). This potentially makes training more time consuming and costly. Research has also suggested that high levels of fear related behaviours can lead to increased disease risk (Terlouw et al., 1997) through modulation of immune responses, and perhaps even ultimately lead to a reduced lifespan (Dreschel, 2010). Particularly relevant to dog programmes with breeding schemes is the finding that decreased sperm quality is associated with anxiety in dogs (Memon, 2007), whilst fear and anxiety can inhibit complete erection and ejaculation (Kutzler, 2012, cited in Mills et al 2014), as well as reducing proceptive and receptive behaviors in bitches resulting in a failure to breed (Grundy, 2002). Thus, in addition to welfare concerns arising from exposing working dogs to fear-provoking situations for which they are poorly prepared, and the issue of handler safety when dogs perform poorly, there are potential economic consequences. Fearfulness and anxiety can lead to the loss of dogs from programmes at assessment, during training, or even fully trained dogs being withdrawn early from active working roles (Caron-Lomier et al 2016), with an associated loss of the potential contribution they could make during their working lives.

Fear responses develop when animals are exposed to events or stimuli that they perceive as negative and salient (i.e. above their individual threshold of tolerance). On first exposure, animals will tend to show a startle response towards a novel stimulus, and also orientate towards it – an adaptive response to a change in their environment, as this may have some survival relevance. On subsequent exposures, this response may either increase or decrease. Habituation is the process whereby a response gradually reduces with repeated presentation of the eliciting stimulus, and the threshold thus increases (Grissom and Bhatnagar, 2009). In contrast, sensitisation is the process
whereby an animal’s response increases on presentation of a stimulus (Davis, 1974). Having sensitized to a stimulus, and identified it as a threat, the animal will attempt to both identify predictors for the stimulus, and develop a response to avoid it e.g. to flee. In the working dog, as in the companion animal world, the aim is to manipulate factors both in the dog and its environment in order to maximise the chance that habituation occurs, whilst minimising the risk of sensitisation.

Multiple factors influence the development of anxiety and fear behaviors across species and specifically in dogs. The nature of the stimuli and the manner in which it is first presented, including the social context, are both important (Section 4). High intensity stimuli (e.g. explosions), or situations where aversive events occur consecutively without allowing animals a chance to recover, are very likely to provoke a response in most animals. Sensitisation is more likely to occur when the presented stimulus is of high intensity or low predictability to an individual (Gray, 1971). Risk is also increased where animals have had prior exposure to other negative events in their general environment or in the specific context (Section 3). However, individual differences in response thresholds mean that even seemingly benign stimuli will provoke a fear response in some individuals. Thus, in apparently identical situations, some individuals develop signs of fear and anxiety whilst others do not. This can be attributed partly to inherited characteristics that differ between individuals (i.e. aspects of personality), but also to previous environmental influences, learnt experiences throughout life and especially during sensitive periods, and to interactions between these effects.

Studies of personality in a range of species shed light on individual differences in the likelihood of animals developing fears, and sensitising to stimuli, as opposed to habituating. For example, the so-called ‘shy-bold’ continuum has been demonstrated in a wide range of species (Jones and Gosling 2005). Brown et al. (1978) were able to develop a distinct population of pointer dogs that showed
extreme fear responses by selecting those which reacted most to a range of standardised fear-inducing tests involving a range of stimuli (e.g. loud noises). The relevance of the ‘shy-bold’ continuum in dogs is further supported by Svartberg and Forkman (2002) who used trained observers to score dogs undertaking a standard set of sub-tests, and identified five underlying factors of which four appeared to form a higher order factor analogous to the shy-bold characteristic.

However, if we simply test the appearance of fear behaviours in an individual, we can’t be sure of the extent to which observed behaviour is a manifestation of previous experience or underlying personality. What we actually need to assess in working dogs are those underlying characteristics or traits that influence ‘resilience’ to withstand stressful circumstances. Measuring these characteristics may be a promising approach in identifying risk factors for the occurrence of fear, independent of the influence of environmental context.

Resilience (Yehuda et al., 2006a) is defined as the extent to which an individual is able to adapt in the face of adversity, trauma, or risk of threat. Whilst the concept of resilience is relatively new, the idea that individuals have characteristics that confer differing abilities or strategies to cope with stress is not. Coping strategies are well studied, and have been defined in terms of approach (active or proactive coping) or avoidance (passive or reactive coping) styles; Roth and Cohen, 1986). It has been suggested in humans that active coping strategies improve individuals’ ability to manage stressful situations and reduce their risk of psychiatric illness (Valentiner et al., 1994). For example, people who showed active coping strategies had lower levels of distress and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder six months after the New York World Trade Center attacks (Silver et al., 2002).

Proactive and reactive types of responding have been well documented in laboratory rodents (de Boer et al., 2003) and in other species (see review, Koolhaas et al., 1999; but see also Forkman et al., 1995, and Jensen et al., 1995). Attempts have been made to characterise ‘coping styles’ in dogs in
rehoming centres, based upon their physiological and behavioural responses a to kennelling and their ability to learn a operant task, and these suggested either a 'reactive' style of responding, or a more 'proactive' style (Blackwell et al 2010). In contrast, a study of police dogs found three, not two, categories of dogs (Horvath et al., 2007), which illustrates some of the conceptual issues with the approach of applying post-hoc determination of characteristics from behaviour that may have differing motivations (e.g. anxiety, fear, aggression). Coping responses are also not immune to environmental influences or circumstantial changes in emotion, and individuals will often learn to show different behaviours in response to different situations (Roth and Cohen, 1986). They are also particularly important to consider in a working dog context when some coping response, such as avoidance, may not be possible, hence we may be inadvertently be selecting dogs with specific coping styles, or causing stress by not enabling dog to perform their preferred response.

This variation in coping styles also means that not all individuals of a given species will respond to equivalent stressors in the same way. Hence the outward manifestation of the same inner emotional state will differ between animals. Some dogs may appear less overtly fearful than others, since their coping strategy is more passive or reactive rather than proactive. This raises an important challenge both when identifying signs of fear and anxiety when testing individuals (Section 2) or when introducing new stimuli at an appropriate intensity (Section 5). It is also essential when assessing the welfare of working dogs that different types of response to stressful circumstances are recognised: dogs which show a more active response, such as spinning or wall bouncing show more obvious signs, but dogs which are inactive and inhibited may also be in a negative emotional state.

Given that there are both heritable and environmental aspects influencing the development of fear behaviours, there are three potential approaches to reducing the risk of these behaviors developing in working dog populations;
a) select and breed individual dogs with the lowest risk of developing these behaviors (section 2);
b) control the environment in which dogs are kept and where possible reared to minimize the risk of fear behaviors developing (section 3);
c) optimize the method of initial stimulus exposure (section 4), to minimize the risk of dogs sensitising and fears becoming established.

Most working dog agencies aim to achieve all of these, but they vary in their approaches. In this paper we describe some of the methods used and review evidence for their success. Possible practical solutions, such as improved selection (2), management (3.1.2) and training (3.1.1) of working dogs (are also discussed, and questions raised about the value of some current practices. In addition, since rigorous studies of fear prevention in the working and pet dog environment are generally lacking, we draw on evidence from other species and suggest areas where empirical evidence and future research is still required.

2. Selection of animals most suitable for working environments

Working dogs are selected in a variety of ways. Most large assistance dog agencies have their own established breeding programmes, smaller organisations often procure puppies which may be selected on the basis of a suite of tests (with varying degrees of validation) and are puppy walked in homes, before being reassessed to decide which are best suited to go on to further training. Police, military and security dog programmes around the globe include several breeding schemes, but a majority rely upon purchasing adult dogs from private breeders or vendors. Some agencies also rely on procuring unwanted companion animal from owners or rehoming centres. Whilst the Scandinavian military (Swedish and Norwegian) have well established and validated methods for testing dogs prior to selection (e.g. Dog Mentality assessment DMA: Wilsson and Sundgren 1997), a multitude of less scientifically tested selection tests also exist. Most working dog agencies have their own criteria for breeding and/ or selecting animals with an assumed reduced risk of developing
problematic fear and anxiety related behaviors, in particular fears of humans, loud noises and novel environments. Criteria are implemented differently between programmes and may involve selection of breeding stock, adult dogs, and/or puppies. Those agencies which breed in-house select both breeding animals and suitable puppies or any combination thereof; others procure puppies, adolescent or adult dogs from private breeders, working-dog breeding establishments, vendors or from the rescue population and they are selected at this stage. In all cases, knowledge of the best methods for screening dogs, their efficacy and reliability, as well as knowledge of the heritability of fearfulness is imperative.

2.1 Testing for fearful behavior

Many agencies train working dogs have developed tests aimed at screening out animals predisposed to show fear behaviors. It is clearly beneficial to preserve resources by selecting animals which are least likely to fail during training or operations because of the development of fear responses. When procuring adult dogs, or when puppies progress from controlled breeding populations into training, there will still inevitably be some whose temperament is unsuitable for the working environment. Many details of the commonly used tests are undocumented (e.g. UK military; Rooney et al., 2003), although others are published, such as those used with guide dogs (Serpell and Hsu, 2001; Asher et al., 2013); police dogs (Slabbert and Odendaal, 1999; Svobodová et al., 2008), general service dogs (Wilsson and Sundgren, 1997), IED detection (Sherman et al 2015), and military dogs (Haverbeke et al., 2009; Sinn et al 2010). Predictive testing is fraught with also several other difficulties, and the extent to which this is objectively assessed is variable. There are several potential problems with many tests which need to be addressed. Below we review each of the main problems and suggest possible improvements.

2.1.1 Poor validity
Many tests have poor validity (Taylor and Mills, 2006); since conducting single tests in one context is not necessarily indicative of behavioral responses in others. For example, tests of behavioral tendencies in rehoming centres show limited predictability of later owner reports of fearful and anxious behaviors in the home (Mornement et al., 2015). Similarly, tests routinely performed to select US military dogs, including tests for environmental and gun shyness, have been shown to have limited predictive validity when compared to later certification outcomes (Sinn et al 2010). Haverbeke et al. (2009) found that although some test elements seemed to predict later fear behaviors in Belgian military dogs, most tests were poorly predictive of later undesired behaviors. What’s more, for many working dog tests the predictive value cannot actually be calculated, as dogs which ‘fail’ initial testing do not enter training and so no data is available on how these dogs would have performed compared to those that passed, and hence criterion validity cannot be ascertained (Taylor and Mills, 2006). We suggest that more data should be collected on the relationship between such tests and the outcome, including for dogs that would ordinarily be rejected.

2.1.2 Study bias

Often studies which claim to reduce fear behaviors via selection tests concurrently change several procedures making it difficult to determine true causation. For example, whilst Haverbeke et al. (2010) reported increased efficiency in military dogs which were selected specifically not to show fear of people, they simultaneously introduced the Human Familiarisation and Training Programme, which changed other factors, such as increasing levels of training for both dogs and handlers. Hence the impact of selection based on exhibition of fear is difficult to ascertain from outcome measures.

2.1.3 Presentation of high intensity stimuli

Many selection tests involve presentation of sudden unexpected stimuli. For example, the popular Dog Mentality Assessment (Wilsson and Sinn 2012) used in Scandinavia presents a stranger, a dark room, loud metallic noises, an unstable surface, dummies, human “ghosts” and gunfire – all of which
are potentially fear-provoking. This risks causing sensitisation during testing, resulting in increased fear behaviour on subsequent presentation (Davis, 1974). This is a particular concern as tests tend to be conducted consecutively (Wilsson and Sundgren, 1997; Sherman et al, 2015), so sensitisation risk is increased because dogs may still be emotionally aroused from the previous stimulus when the next is presented (De Meester et al., 2011).

Rather than high intensity exposure of particular stimuli, which risks sensitisation, we suggest observing the dog’s reaction to gradual exposure to specific stimuli which they are likely to encounter during operational activities. Exposure to a gradually increasing intensity not only indicates the situations to which a dog may react, but also the level of exposure at which such a reaction occurs. Identification of this for particular stimuli may be indicative of the potential value of entering animals into treatment programmes for specific fears (Section 5), rather than rejecting animals which may otherwise be suitable for a working life. Similar ideas have been posed by Ogata et al. (2006) who applied a Pavlovian aversive conditioning protocol and measured autonomic and behavioral parameters. They saw increased heart rate and body temperature in response to a conditioned stimulus, and suggested using their fear-conditioning as a method to test for trait fear (by measuring extinction of to the learned CS) in dogs. Behavioral changes did not consistently correlate with physiology and the authors concluded that autonomic reactions can be more reliable and consistent measures than some behavioral measures. Testing may thus benefit from the use of physiological measures, such as heart rate variability, shown to be associated with dogs’ behavioral responses to perceived stressors (Vincent and Leahy, 1997), and may prove more valuable than simple heart rate which was not seen to correlate with behavioral signs of fear and anxiety during working dog assessments (Sherman et al, 2015).

2.1.4 Lack of attention to fear behaviours during testing
In some organisations, testing focusses on perceived priority working traits such as motivation to work and exhibition of trained attack behaviours, and may neglect to observe or record behavioural signs of anxiety or fear. Although the selection of confident dogs is a major priority for many agencies, recent research has cast doubt on whether selection tests effectively select against fear. Objective video analysis of Swedish military selection tests, actually revealed higher levels of fear amongst those dogs which went on to be selected than those that did not (Foyer et al 2016). This suggests personnel may have inadvertently been selecting those dogs which showed higher levels of fear-related behaviour. It is well established that people, even owners and carers, are variable in their ability to accurately interpret behavioural responses, and in particular subtle early signs of fear and anxiety (Tami and Gallagher 2009; Marti et al 2012). This is also likely to be the case for working dog trainers and assessors. However in everyday practice, accurate and early detection of behavioural indicators of fear is critical (Clark et al in prep; Loftus et al 2012). Hence resources to teach observers to recognize the commonly missed signs have been developed (Loftus et al 2012) and will potentially prove valuable when used in conjunction with physiological indicators of behavioral reactivity.

2.1.5. Reliance on testing puppies

For those organisations which breed or purchase puppies there is obvious value in rejecting the puppies least likely to succeed as early as possible. Many agencies employ a suite of “puppy tests” which try to predict fearfulness amongst other traits. Most test fear of loud noises, for example by: using weights dropped in buckets (Murphree and Dykman, 1965) or on tables (Svobodová et al., 2008); whistles (Pfaffenberger and Scott, 1976); metal cans (Fisher and Volhard, 1985); party poppers (Hoffmann et al., 1995); simulated thunderstorms (Seksel et al., 1999); clapping (Champness, 1996); or pistols (Slabbert and Odendaal, 1999). Many tests also examine fear of novel people (e.g. Murphree and Dykman, 1965; Slabbert and Odendaal, 1999); novel objects, including umbrellas (Hoffmann et al., 1995); hair driers (Seksel et al., 1999); novel environments (e.g. open
stairs; (Goddard and Beilharz, 1986); and unstable surfaces (London Metropolitan police, pers. comm). In addition to the problems identified for testing in general (2.1.1-2.1.4), a major flaw of testing at a very young age, is that it does not account for modification by ontogeny and the considerable effect of learning which follows especially during sensitive periods. For example, analysis of the test commonly used by Australian Guide dogs (Goddard and Beilharz, 1982; 1984a; b; 1985; 1986) revealed that although fearfulness as an adult was significantly predicted by a test at eight weeks of age (and was the only predictable trait), the predictive value increased with age of testing. This may be unsurprising, given the reduced period between test and outcome and the fact that past learning during puppyhood will affect test results conducted at a later age. However in a large meta-analysis of 31 “personality” tests in dogs, Fratkin et al (2013) found that puppy behaviors were moderately consistent even with longer inter-test intervals but that fearfulness (along with responsiveness to training) in puppies was one of the least consistent dimensions.

Scott and Bielfelt (1976) saw no increase in the adult performance of guide dogs when breeding stock were selected on the basis of their puppy test scores. This is supported by a study of the development of Arms and Explosives search dogs (Rooney et al., 2003), which saw very little correlation between behaviors shown by eight week old puppies and those seen in equivalent tests in adult dogs, and even noted an inverse correlation between fear of slippery surfaces at 8 weeks and that at 11 months. Similarly, Asher et al. (2013) saw that puppies which scored as more confident on a ramp, (one of five stimuli tested), were less likely to qualify as guide dogs. These discrepancies may be partially due to carers using deficiencies highlighted in the puppy test to direct remedial training, as puppy tests detect predispositions that can subsequently be by operant conditioning (e.g puppies finding their existing behavior ‘unsuccessful’ and changing to an alternative strategy). The variable and general low degree of success in such tests suggests that, at least for individuals not at the extremes of population variance, trying to predict adult behavior from puppy tests is problematic, and as failures at procurement tests are rarely trained, the true test
reliability is not assessed. The value of puppy testing is this questionable and programmes need to fully assess predictive validity, before rejecting valuable young dogs on the basis of such tests.

2.1.6 The influence or prior learning as well as temperament

The fear-related behavior which a dog or puppy exhibits is a result of both underlying temperament, previous experience and the interaction between these. Many tests purport to measure ‘temperament’ but in fact measure dogs’ behavioral response to a specific contextual challenge. In many situations this is desirable e.g. to detect if dogs being rehomed show aggression when handled. It is potentially more problematic where tests are screening breeding animals as some dogs may show fear responses to specific stimuli as a result of a particular aversive experience in their history rather than any underlying predisposition. Whilst it is unlikely that the ‘temperament’ and ‘learnt’ component of a behavior in an individual dog can be teased apart, it is important that the different contributions of these elements are understood to enable appropriate testing protocols to be developed for different requirements.

Even during recent scientific studies of temperament testing some of these problems remain implicit. For example, when using an open-field model to assess sound-induced fear and anxiety in potential IED (improvised explosives detection) dogs, Gruen et al., (2015) exposed animals to loud noises on consecutive days, but did not explore differences in the dogs’ past experiences or exposure to noises. In the same population of dogs, Sherman et al (2015) saw differences between individuals in their “emotional reactivity”; the dogs showed consistency in their individual responses to a large number of stimuli which may be related to underlying personality, but could equally be affected by the dogs’ past history. The degree to which these responses predicted working ability in the operational conditions remains to be tested as does the relative importance of genetic and experiential factors. Thus to overcome this and detect dogs prone to developing fear and anxiety (rather than ones which have a preexisting fear), we suggest testing for variance with respect to
underlying decision-making processes that influence resilience to stress exposure (Yehuda et al., 2006a), rather than testing dogs’ responses to specific stimuli. Understanding whether dogs exhibit ‘proactive’ or ‘reactive’ styles of responding (Koolhaas et al., 1999; see section 1) may be valuable to identify the nature of their response to fear evoking stimuli. Other approaches might include measuring the relative degree of ‘optimism’ and ‘pessimism’ (or cognitive bias). Animals that have a more ‘pessimistic’ cognitive bias (and hence tend to judge novel or ambiguous stimuli as ‘more likely to be negative’) may be more likely to develop fear responses. For example, a more ‘pessimistic’ cognitive bias has been associated with a tendency to show separation-related behavior (Mendl et al., 2010), and is reduced by treatment with a selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor (SSRI), fluoxetine (Reconcile (TM), combined with behavior modification (Karagiannis et al., 2015). Since cognitive bias appears to be a better measure of underlying mood state rather than more transient emotional responses (Mendl et al., 2010) it may be a better predictor of behavioral responses across contexts and hence a valuable tool in predicting success in working environments; we suggest this is a promising area which requires further research.

Research into methods by which to better predict behavioural tendencies and predictors of resilience is required, in particular better understanding the extent to which the underlying temperament characteristics themselves become plastic with environmental changes and stress exposure (Yehuda et al., 2006a). For this reason, we suggest it is beneficial to also investigate whether variation in underlying characteristics of temperament, map onto patterns of allelic variation in genome wide association studies (GWAS), or the expression in targeted areas of the genome. Several novel measures have been associated with increased resilience to stressors in laboratory species and humans (Yehuda et al., 2006a). For example, Neuropeptide Y (NPY) may have an important role in reducing risk through modulatory effects on important regulatory systems in the brain such as the HPA axis (Heilig, 2004), and noradrenalin release (Pich et al., 1993). NPY has been found to be higher in human military service veterans who have been exposed to extreme
stress but not developed PTSD, as compared to those with PTSD. NPY also appears to correlate with the extent of symptom improvement in those previously affected (Yehuda et al., 2006b). Hence this may be an interesting biological measure of either resilience to, and/or ability to recover from, exposure to stressors. The ratio of plasma dehydroepiandrosterone sulphate (DHEA) to cortisol has also been suggested as a possible marker of resilience to stress, for example high DHEA-S-cortisol ratios were positively correlated with peoples’ ability to perform well in stressful military situations (Morgan et al., 2004). Other potential markers of resilience associated with differences in HPA axis activity include, 24 hour urinary cortisol secretion, circadian rhythm of cortisol release, lymphocyte glucocorticoid receptor number, and lysozyme IC50 as an indicator of enhanced glucocorticoid responsiveness (Yehuda et al., 2006a). Investigation of some of these new measures, either in isolation or through examination of metabolomics profiles may shed valuable light on the profile of animals that are most likely to withstand the stress of working dog life.

Another emerging technology with great potential is measuring emotional valance using skin conductivity. Measures of patterns in sweat production that are linked to emotional responses such as fear; these measures can be obtained non-invasively in humans (Lin et al., 2011) and sheep (Reefmann et al., 2009a; b), although measurement in the dog would require modification due to differences in mechanisms of sweat production. Additionally, recent studies of “laterality” (preferential use of one side of the body) suggest possible links with guide dog success (Batt et al., 2008), and specific aspects of guide performance (Batt et al., 2010) general problem solving ability (Marshall-Pescini et al., 2013) and with measures of fear, although not with agility competition success (Siniscalchi et al., 2014). In humans, an association between hand preference and the propensity to experience anxiety has been described; a finding that Branson and Rogers (2006) also identified in dogs: individuals with weaker paw preferences (a measure of cerebral lateralisation) were more reactive to thunderstorm and firework noise. Interestingly motor laterisation (along
with other factors), measured by paw preference to remove tape from the nose and the frequency that both paws were used to hold a food enrichment toy (Batt et al., 2007), was indicative of success in potential guide dogs (Batt et al., 2008). There are however some inconsistencies in these studies, with different measures often yielding differing results and the possibility of chance effects resulting from multiple testing, hence the use of laterality measures for other working disciplines requires further testing.

2.2 Breeding against propensity to show fearfulness

Several breeding experiments have suggested some heritability in fearful behavior (Murphree and Dykman, 1965; Goddard and Beilharz, 1982), and have succeeded in changing the behavioral phenotype of subsequent generations by selecting breeding animals of extreme ‘types’ at either end of a continuum, i.e. the most and least fearful. These studies predominantly concentrate on social fearfulness, although several also look at non-social stressors including reactions to loud noises. Hence, it may be possible to select away from more extreme phenotypes of fearful behaviors where animals are likely to have reduced flexibility of response to environmental events. This approach is relevant for those agencies that or breed in-house but also those that utilize regular suppliers. For example, the breeding programme for UK guide dogs has been effective in reducing the occurrence of fear associated behaviors (Willis, 1995) and many breeding programmes have similarly bred against outward expression of fear.

Studies using working dog populations (e.g. Hsu and Serpell 2003, Arvelius et al 2014a, b) have similarly suggested that the expression of fear behaviors is partly heritable. For example, in the Swedish armed forces the behavioral scores for confidence and environmental sureness as measured during the Dog Mentality Assessment (DMA; a standardized selection test including presentation of several consecutive fear-inducing stimuli ) were found to give heritability estimates of 0.23 and 0.15 respectively (Arvelius et al. 2014a), meaning that 23% or 15% of the variation in the
poulations’ test scores an be accounted for by the genetic componenet, in comparison human 
weight shows a heritability of approximateley 0.78 (Emde and Hewitt 2001). When assessing Rough 
Collies Arvelius et al. (2014b) found similar heritability values for test scores and also relatively high 
correlations between fearbehavior during testing and that reported by owners using the Canine 
Behavioral Assessment and Research Questionnaire (CBARQ, Hsu and Serpell, 2003). Arvelius et al 
(2014b) concluded that breeding animals were to be selected on the basis of scores for 
curiosity/fearlessness in the Dog Mentality Assessment, then breeders would also report a 
concurrent decrease in non-social fear scores. When examining general fearfulness, one of three 
fear-realtled factors derived from multivariate analysis of multiple subtests used on potential guide 
dogs, Goddard and Beilhraz, (1984) obtained heritability estimates as high as 0.80.

We suggest that such selection based on test scores should be considered with some caution since 
little is known about exactly what underlying characteristics might be selected for with breeding 
programmes based on behavioral phenotypes. It is unknown, for example, whether dog populations 
show the type of structure suggested by Wilson et al., (1994) for shy-bold characteristics where 
animals at both population extremes show low environmental flexibility. If this were the case, then 
selection against ‘innately shy’ (or fearful) dogs may not just alter the proportion of dogs which 
exhibit fear but also the proportion which are flexible to environmental conditions; clearly a 
disadvantage in a working animal needing to adapt to a range of environments. Furthermore, it is 
unknown whether such selection acts at the level of the animal’s perception of fear-inducing stimuli, 
the central evaluation of stimuli and assignment of emotional significance, their expression of fear 
behaviors, or even the animal’s ability to inhibit these behaviors. By selecting against dogs which 
show an active fear response (e.g. for those whose behavior changes little when presented by 
stimuli), we maybe selecting against ‘proactive’ characteristics by favouring more passive or 
‘reactive’ fear responses, (Koolhaas et al., 1999). It is also unknown whether dogs with a ‘passive’ 
style of responding have a different strategy for achieving rewards as well as avoiding aversive
events, with consequent implications for training success. A less obvious behavioral response to a stimulus may not indicate a reduced negative emotional experience and the concern, that selective breeding programmes may result in unreactive “zombies” (D'Eath et al., 2010), has been expressed in the farm animal literature, and is equally, if not more relevant to dogs. Similarly, behavior traits may be genetically linked to other morphological, or physiological characteristics (e.g Mackenzie et al., 1985), which may be undesirable. Hence, although it is theoretically attractive to select animals from which to breed offspring with a reduced risk of showing fearful behaviors, current knowledge about the characteristics which underlie risk of behavioral signs, their patterns of inheritance, and their association with allelic variation in genome-wide studies, is currently insufficient to determine with any confidence the efficacy, or indeed undesired consequences, of such an approach. It may be that a more suitable approach is to investigate the heritability of underlying characteristics (or putative ‘endophenotypes’ e.g. Gottesman and Gould, 2003) such as stress resilience and optimism (see 2.1.6), rather than selecting directly for phenotypic presentations of fearful behavior.

3. Reducing the risk of fear related behaviors through environmental manipulation and rearing

Preventing problems is ultimately more cost effective than managing them. Therefore, in addition to identifying those animals least likely to develop fear responses, it is important to focus on the aspects of the environment that may influence the development of such responses and are open to manipulation. In this section we discuss aspects of the living environment (3.1) which can be manipulated and which evidence suggests may reduce the risk of fear and anxiety development. For working dog populations with breeding programmes or regular suppliers, we then emphasize the opportunities to control both pre- and post-natal maternal environment (3.2), when there is considerable synaptic plasticity and appropriate actions can ameliorate the chance of later problems developing for example changing the time of weaning and ensuring optimal social environments.
3.1 Manipulation of factors affecting susceptibility to stress and hence likelihood of developing fears

Background levels of arousal and concurrent causes of fear and anxiety during stimulus presentation can increase the risk of sensitisation (Davis, 1974). There is considerable evidence that states of anxiety in rodents increase the magnitude of the startle response (Bijlsma et al., 2010), whilst people with anxiety disorders are more likely to develop a range of conditioned fear responses (Lissek et al., 2005). Therefore adapting living environments, human contact and general training methods to avoid anxiety provoking situations is important, both for home-living and kennelled working dogs. Detailed reviews exploring ways to minimize stress of kennelled dogs are separately available (e.g. Gaines, 2008; Rooney et al., 2009), however factors which may be considered include the following.

3.1.1 General human contact

Interactions between dogs and human handlers are important. Unusual to the domestic dog is the potentially great effect of the interspecific relationship upon numerous aspects of social behavior, including the development of fears. Whilst some studies claim to show evidence of emotional contagion, between human and dog (e.g. Custance and Mayer, 2012), whether this is evidence of true empathy, remains a source of debate (e.g. Edgar et al., 2012). Human interaction can be beneficial to dogs in reducing the stress of confinement (Coppola et al., 2006), as well increasing indicators of positive wellbeing such as decreased blood pressure and increased β-endorphin (Odendaal and Meintjes, 2003). A programme of human interaction in chronically stressed shelter dogs resulted in reduced excitation and cortisol in a novel environment compared to controls (Hennessy et al., 2006). Handlers of military dogs who took their dogs home after work described them as less fearful, more sociable, more accepting of stroking by strangers, and less likely to bite compared to those handlers whose dogs remained in kennels (Lefebvre et al., 2007). Similarly pet
dog owners who shared more activities with their dogs were less likely to categorize them as “nervous” (Bennett and Rohlf, 2007). Although this may be in part due to increased exposure to stimuli and consequent habituation, the effect of human contact is likely profound. Increased human contact is desirable and beneficial for fear reduction in for the majority of dogs, although when individual animals show an established fearful or aggressive response towards people, forced interaction will not be valuable (Rooney et al., 2007a), and a programme of gradual desensitisation and counter-conditioning to handling is required (section 5).

3.1.2 Reduction of stress during routine training

The type of contact is also important, in particular the type of training used to develop the necessary working skills is integral to the risk of development of fear responses. Studies (Hiby et al., 2004; Blackwell et al., 2008 Rooney and Cowan, 2011), strongly suggest that punishment-based methods may increase levels of fear and anxiety, and potentially lead to sensitisation to other environmental stimuli. Punishment-based training of pet dogs is linked to an increased incidence of behavior problems (Hiby et al., 2004), including fear, anxiety and aggression (Blackwell et al., 2008), wariness towards strangers, reduced playfulness (Rooney and Cowan, 2011), and increased anxiety-related aggression and excitability (Arhant et al., 2010). Dogs regularly trained with electric shocks show behavioral evidence of fear and distress in the presence of their owner, even outside the training context (Schilder and van der Borg, 2004). Dogs subjected to physical reprimands have been shown to score significantly higher for aggression (Hsu and Sun, 2010) and dogs whose owners report using a higher proportion of punishment are less likely to interact with a stranger (Rooney and Cowan, 2011), which could be due to fear and anxiety.

Although opinions are gradually changing, with most working dogs being trained primarily using positive reinforcement and negative punishment, there are still some trainers who use coercive based approaches based on the ‘dominance’ approach to interpreting dog behavior (Bradshaw et al.,
2009), and rough handling remains common in specific disciplines and organisations (Haverbeke et al., 2009). Aversive methods, including pulling the leash and hanging, were associated with low body postures indicative of fear or distress and poor performance in military working dogs (Haverbeke et al., 2008), and those military dogs suspected to have been handled roughly in the past were perceived to be more fearful (Lefebvre et al., 2007). During protection and obedience work, those dogs which had received more punishment, tended to show more fear behaviors (Haverbeke et al. 2009) and when examining prison officer’s behavior towards their search dogs Rooney et al. (2007b) found that handlers who believed in using high levels of punishment tended to have less confident dogs. These studies to date are all correlational, and cannot prove causation, since dogs with specific problems may be more likely to be trained using coercive methods. However they do show a consistent pattern between aversive training methods and behavioral problems including fears. Longitudinal cohort studies, and experimental trials are now needed to ascertain any causative links.

Avoiding positive punishment based techniques and interacting with dogs in a calm and consistent way is likely to be very important in reducing the development of fear related behaviors, as demonstrated in numerous species. Horses trained using positive reinforcement interacted more with the handler (Sankey et al., 2010) whilst zoo rhinos (Holden et al., 2006) and primates (Savastano et al., 2003) have been successfully trained to present various body parts in a calm safe manner through operant conditioning using positive reinforcement. This type of approach is also starting to be used in farm environments for ease of handling, reduction of stress (Kilgour et al., 1991) and even cognitive enrichment (Manteuffel et al., 2009). In a study of military dogs in which positive reward training sessions, as well as altered selection procedures and handler training were used, dogs demonstrated increased confidence and overall performance (Haverbeke et al., 2010), suggesting that training methods are vital in working dog operations.
3.1.3 Kennel management and routines

Gaines (2008) stresses the importance of considering husbandry regimes when aiming to decrease stress of kennelled dogs. Specific husbandry processes can lead to distress, for example shutting dogs in small dark inner kennels whilst cleaning their home kennel (Gaines, 2008), using noisy equipment such as cleaning hoses (Mills, 2005) and separating dogs from conspecifics (Walker et al., 2014). Identification and amelioration of these types of procedures is important in reducing overall levels of stress. Increasing the predictability of a dog’s routine is likely important, for example walking and feeding at predictable times (Gaines et al., 2008). However, we suggest, care also needs to be taken not to make the routine too predictable, as having a highly predictive and regimented daily routine can build strong expectations in the dogs and limit future flexibility (Gaines et al., 2008). This may be problematic when dogs’ training experiences and regimes are very different to that in which they will be expected to work. Hence, in order to best prepare dogs for a range of situations and activities, it may be better to gradually adapt from an initially predictable routine to a less predictable and more variable daily schedule over time. In this way, dogs will ‘have an expectation of the unexpected’ and are likely to cope better with changing circumstances when they become necessary.

3.2 Early life environments

3.2.1 Pre and post-natal effects

Those programmes with breeding and puppy walking schemes have the added potential to affect adult dog behavior by influencing pre- and post-natal environment. Much work on early-life effects has focused on human development (e.g. Grant et al., 2009; Hellemans et al., 2010), with comparative studies in rodents (Bosch et al., 2007), and farmed species (e.g. pigs; Jarvis et al., 2006; sheep; Dodic et al., 2002) and has shown that pre-natal anxiety adversely affects stress reactivity in
offspring. In comparison, very little is known about the impact of pre-natal experience on the behavior and development of puppies; however, given the compelling evidence in other species, the ability of pups to recognize odours learned in utero (Wells and Hepper, 2006), and similar endocrine profiles and changes in cortisol in pregnant bitches as in other mammalian species (e.g. sheep; Concannon et al., 1978), it is likely that they are similarly influenced by variation in maternal exposure to stressors during pregnancy. It would therefore seem prudent that due attention is given to the range of experiences of breeding bitches during pregnancy, whilst maintaining normal routines of social interaction with people and other dogs and providing enriching experiences when expected (Gaines et al., 2008).

In addition there is some evidence that puppies manipulated in the neonatal period differ in later stress responsiveness. Battaglia (2009) describes a study on a bio-sensor programme for military dogs. Puppies of 3-16 days of age were stimulated daily using a range of handling techniques, including being placed on a cold towel, They identified improved cardiovascular function (HR), stronger heart beats, stronger adrenal gland function, greater tolerance to stress and greater resistance to disease (Battaglia, 2009). These studies are based on principles of promoting resilience via mild stressors applied in early life (Macri and Würbel, 2006, 2007; Macri et al., 2009; 2010; 2011). It should be therefore assumed that to reduce the likelihood of puppies developing fear responses, the pregnant mother and neonatal puppies should be provided with a stimulating environment but not be exposed to the kinds of severe stressors capable of inducing fears such as moving to new environments (Rooney et al., 2007b), mixing bitches into new social groups, unaccustomed confinement or social isolation, malnutrition (Poore et al., 2010), inconsistent handling, transport or exposure to specific fear-eliciting situations (e.g. loud noises).
3.2.2 Management of weaning

In most ‘natural’ environments, the process of weaning is a gradual one, with offspring becoming progressively more independent, both emotionally and nutritionally, from maternal care (Latham and Mason, 2008). However, in most companion animals, especially dogs, offspring are removed suddenly from their mothers, and generally concurrently from their familiar social and physical environment. Behavioural (Houpt and Hintz, 1983; McCall et al., 1985), and physiological (McCall et al., 1987; Malinowski et al., 1990) signs of distress at this sudden weaning are observed in many species, Activation of the hypothalamic-pituitary (HPA) axis has also been shown to continue for several weeks after weaning in both rodents and primates, (Levine, 2000), and there is no reason to assume this is not the case for dogs.

Appropriate management of weaning can however reduce the risk of inducing fears developing. The nature and period over which maternal separation occurs, can have positive or detrimental effects on later resilience to stressors. For example, studies on rodents show that early separation of pups from their mother, can induce short and long-term changes in the stress reactivity system as indicated by the potentiated HPA axis response to subsequent stressors (e.g. Knuth and Etgen, 2007, Lippmann et al., 2007). It also enhances manifestations of anxiety and depression-like behaviors (Fabricius et al., 2008, Lambás-Señas et al., 2009) and impairs spatial learning and memory (Aisa et al., 2007 Tata et al., 2015) during adulthood. In contrast, repeated maternal separation, increased resilience to stressful events later in life (Parker et al., 2006; Benetti et al., 2007) and reduced fearfulness (Macrì and Würbel, 2006). Although these separations were of short duration and it has been suggested that the positive effects may have resulted from increased attention from the mother when the pups were returned. Increased maternal stimulation appears to have a beneficial effect on neural development and can reverse the effects of early-life stressors (Imanaka et al., 2008). Slabbert and Rasa (1993) studied South African Police dog puppies which were separated from their mothers at either six or 12 weeks. Both groups received equal human
contact but the late weaned puppies gained weight quicker and were in better condition, the study did not note any differences in fear behavior towards people or other stimuli.

Evidence of optimal weaning protocols for working dogs is limited, but this appears to be critical - for avoiding fear-related and abnormal behaviors in other species. The advantages associated with maternal care, social interaction with littermates, learning social signalling and avoidance of sudden traumatic events, tend to support later and gradual weaning of puppies destined for working environments. In spite of this, some established assistance dogs organisation routinely wean early, in order to ensure socialisation opportunities are maximized. For example, in the UK, Guide Dogs for the Blind routinely remove puppies from their mother at six – eight weeks, and below the age generally permitted for other dogs It it has been shown that the relative quality of breeding and rearing environments of pet dogs affects the ideal weaning time (Appleby et al 2002), and we suggest that research should focus on the optimal time for working dogs if both environments are well controlled.
4. Introduction of potentially fear provoking stimuli in an optimal way

4.1 Habituation

Critical, is the judgement by the animal of the degree of threat posed by a stimulus, since an avoidance response will not develop where the stimulus is not salient and the animal habituates. The relative risk of habituation or sensitisation will vary with both characteristics of the stimulus, the personality of the dog and the state of the individual animal at the time of stimulus presentation. Hence controlling all these factors is important to minimize the chances of a working dog developing fear associated behaviors. Habituation protocols are commonly utilized by working dog programmes aiming to introduce dogs to stimuli to which they will be exposed when working.

Research from other species suggests that evolutionarily relevance, suddenness, predictability, intensity, frequency of exposure of the stimulus and along with the ability of the animal to control exposure its current emotional state, will all affect the probability of an animal experiencing sensitisation. In a recent review of stress in pet dogs, (Mills et al., 2014) similarly identified important aspects of a stressor for dogs to be to be physical characteristics including, affective quality, intensity, magnitude, duration, and predictability, as well as the expectation of the animal in relation to this stressor and the preparation given to enable coping and opportunities for control over the stressor.

Initial intensity of stimulus presentation needs to be below the threshold of startle for the animal. In general the principle is to start as low as possible, since it is better to increase the level gradually from well below all dogs’ tolerance than risk sensitisation in some individuals. Since each animal will have a unique tolerance to different types of stressors, in developing a programme applicable to populations of dogs it is important to select an initial level of exposure which is below that to which
any in the population will respond aversely. In a diverse population of procured dogs, it may be
difficult to find a level to which no dogs respond. Hence we suggest a preliminary test to identify
those outlying individuals with established fears which require remedial training, desensitisation and
counter conditioning (Section 4), and then start controlled exposure and habituation of the
remaining animals at an appropriately low level.

The benefits of this type of gradual introduction to novel stimuli, as compared to repeated
exposure of a full intensity stimulus (often termed “flooding”), are understood by many animal
trainers. Horses for example, given a gradual introduction to a moving white nylon bag showed both
behavioral and physiological differences compared to those without such an introduction. Those
with gradual exposure protocols needed fewer training sessions to remain calm on stimulus
presentation, and all subjects in the gradual exposure group completed training in contrast to the
full exposure group (Christensen et al., 2006). Research on noise fears in IED dogs showed that
sixteen dogs tested showed an overall reduced response over a 5-day testing period, but as the
noises presented in each day were different it is likely that they may have habituated to the testing
environment. However, the fact that some dogs did not decrease in responsiveness, suggests that
the initial exposure level may have been too high (Gruen et al., 2015).

In rats, habituation to noise is more likely when there is a longer gap, 24 hrs compared to 60 minute,
between stimulus presentations. (Masini et al.2008). Although behavioral and physiological
responses in both groups were similar on the last when re-exposed to the stimulus two days later,
the rats which had been presented larger gaps between showed a lower response. The effect has
been suggested to be associated with animals having rapid eye movement (REM) sleep between
training sessions (e.g. Levin and Nielsen, 2007) and hence habituation sessions may benefit from
being separated by a period of sleep but this requires further stud in dogs.
Further research on laboratory rodents (Jordan and Strasser, 2000), suggests habituation is context-specific, so ‘recovery’ of the response occurs in new contexts to where the habituation took place). Should elements of the context alter, a startle response may recur, particularly if the change of context is salient to the animal. Hence a dog may habituate to a noise presented in one situation, but it may react when this is presented at the same intensity in a new context (Leiner and Fendt, 2011). This effect in rats is influenced by the extent to which the ‘new’ context is familiar or novel; behavioral responses in rats reoccurred when a habituated stimulus was presented in a novel context, but not when the animal was familiar with the context (Nyhuis et al. 2010). Hence, prior habituation to environments in which stimuli will be presented, such as introducing dogs to the environments in which potentially frightening stimuli may occur, may aid with the process of habituation and help prevent fears developing. We suggest that to ensure thorough ‘proofing’ of working dogs against stimuli likely to be of high intensity and salience, a protocol which involves a gradual presentation in a range of circumstances, and in progressively less predictable, but familiar, circumstances is needed

Despite the evidence and practical expertise relating to gradual and slow habituation of novel stimuli, many industries do not use this gradual approach. For example, initial greyhound schooling generally happens in an unfamiliar location, in the presence of new people, and dogs may have been transported in a new vehicle to the schooling location. Numerous potential stressors are presented simultaneously, which likely leads to sensitisation in some individuals (Rooney 2012; Cobb et al., 2015). Similarly, working dog programmes often employ screening tests which present stimuli at full intensity (see section 2.1). In addition when adult dogs are procured from different sources they may have very different background experiences, meaning that test elements will identify a mixture of reactions to previously encountered stimuli and temperamental characteristics. For some dogs, having a previously learnt fear response may that result in a response at a very low level of stimulus presentation. For others, test scenarios may be entirely novel and potentially lead to the risk of
sensitisation due to exposure to multiple novel stimuli in a novel environment. Hence the importance of pre-testing with gradual exposures to ascertain the levels to which dogs in the population respond for each potential stressor.

4.2 Social context affecting fear responses

4.2.1 Conspecifics

The potential for dogs to be influenced in their development of fear by the presence and behavior of other dogs is important. This has implications both for the context in which dogs should be tested for their propensity to exhibit fear and anxiety, and also for the conditions under which dogs should be introduced and habituated to potentially fear-inducing stimuli. It is commonly reported that if a dog first encounters a new stimulus in the presence of a fearful dog, it is more likely to develop fear itself (e.g. Landsberg et al., 2012) whilst introduction in the presence of a previously conditioned and calm dog may reduce the likelihood of a fearful response. Trainers of a variety of animal species use the presence of calm unreactive conspecifics as a means of reducing fear in “nervous” animals but the potential for using a calm “demonstrator” dog in working scenarios needs to be evaluated scientifically.

4.2.2 Human contact

Human interaction during stressful events can also exert a calming effect. Twenty minutes of gentle stroking inhibited the immediate increase of cortisol during a venipuncture procedure (Hennessy et al., 1998). Humans generally have greater success at inhibiting stress responses to a novel environment in dogs than do familiar dog companions (Tuber et al., 1996).

In contrast certain types of human interaction can be detrimental and increase the likelihood of fears developing. It is commonly asserted that fear “travels down the lead”; that anxious owners and
handlers can increase the likelihood of dogs reacting fearfully. In agility dogs, levels of cortisol increased when their male owners became angry after losing a competition (Jones and Josephs, 2006). Inexperienced owners were more likely to describe their dogs as showing fear of traffic, loud noises and other dogs (Jagoe and Serpell, 1996), suggesting that fear and anxiety may result from owners lacking the understanding or ability to respond an appropriate way. Dogs may also be influenced by the behavior and personality of their owner; tense and emotionally less stable owners for example, are more likely to own aggressive dogs (Podberscek and Serpell, 1997). Since aggression in dogs is often motivated by fear, it is possible that owner personality affects the way the person behaves towards and interacts with their dog, which in turn affects the dog’s propensity to be fearful (Podberscek and Gosling, 2000). Dreschel and Granger (2005) noted that owners scoring highly for anger/hostility, depression/dejection and fatigue were less likely to interact with their fearful dog during a simulated thunderstorm and although there were no significant effects of owner behavior on the dogs' behavior. However, this study could not disentangle the extent to which personality per se and past owner behaviour produced this effect. Traditionally interaction with dogs during fearful episodes was not recommended as it may inadvertently reward and thus reinforce fearful responses. In support of this, a survey of dog owners in New Zealand found an association between owners comforting their dogs and increased severity and duration of fear behavior over time (Dale et al., 2010). Whether this is causative cannot be ascertained from this association, and recently the advice against comforting fearful dogs, has been challenged: the reinforcement is argued to be of the coping response rather than the fear itself (Casey, 2013). These studies together highlight the importance of the handler’s behavior in the development of fear, and how calm, informed and diligent handlers or trainers are critical to any effective fear-reduction programme.
4.3 Introduction of puppies to potential stressors sensitive period of learning (‘socialisation period’)

In programmes that breed or rear puppies, appropriate early introduction to potential stressors is important. The period of development and maturation of senses until about 12-14 weeks, when puppies become more independent, is an important time of enhanced synaptic plasticity, where exposure to environmental stimuli has a profound influence on later behavior (Casey and Bradshaw, 2008). Using this period to ensure that puppies have had positive experiences of stimuli and situations they are likely to come across in their adult lives is commonly acknowledged to reduce the risk of fear-related behaviors in companion (Appleby et al., 2002; Howell and Bennett, 2011) and laboratory (Boxall et al., 2004) dogs. In general, it is suggested that dogs must be introduced to the types of situations and stimuli they will encounter in adult life before three months of age (preferably by eight weeks and certainly no later than 12 weeks; (Scott and Fuller, 1965,). As well as being curious of novelty, puppies readily develop fear behaviors from around eight weeks. Studies on research dogs have shown that handling for three minutes per day and exposure to stressors (e.g. changes in ambient temperature, different flooring, different handlers) of gradually increasing intensity and duration, had positive effects on resistance to disease, emotional reactivity and problem solving (Meunier, 2006). Similarly, Gazzano et al. (2008) saw well-handled puppies of various breeds to be calmer. A further study suggested that presenting video images of animate (e.g. people, dogs) and inanimate (e.g. traffic, vacuum cleaner) stimuli to puppies was associated with a reduction in later fear behaviors (Pluijmakers et al., 2010), although whether the audio or visual elements of these presentations were most important, and their potential in a working dog rearing programme is yet to be explored.

Many working dog breeding establishments (e.g. USA Transport Security Administration TSA; Thomas, 2011) use this sensitive period of development, to successfully introduce dogs to a variety of stimuli including other animals, people, children, noises, slippery surfaces and unstable floors.
When considering socialisation programmes and exposure to potentially frightening stimuli, it is important to control exposure and the level of stimulus, increasing intensity gradually to avoid sensitisation and inadvertently creating anxiety or fear responses. For example, gradual habituation to an indoor crate, followed by an outdoor kennel environment reduced physiological stress levels when search dogs entered military training kennels (Rooney et al., 2007b). As risk of sensitisation is also increased in animals experiencing concurrent stress (see Section 3.1), the experience of puppies with respect to kennelling, handling, and enrichment also needs to be addressed (as with adult dogs).

In the domestic situation, puppy socialisation classes are often used to introduce exposure to stimuli which commonly cause fear reactions in adult dogs, social situations as well as stimuli such as fireworks and thunder (Blackwell et al., 2013) urban noises such as engines (Sherman and Mills, 2008). Population-based studies have had mixed findings as to the benefit of these classes on later behavior. Four, weekly puppy socialisation classes, were successful in training companion puppies but produced no significant change in responses to social stimuli 4-6 months later (Seskel et al 1999). Similarly, five socialisation sessions did not affect the success rate of guide dog puppies (Batt et al., 2008). However large scale population surveys have, identified positive effects; dogs that attended puppy socialisation classes were less likely to be reported to show undesirable reactions to other dogs (Blackwell et al., 2008). Attending puppy classes also produced a protective effect against owner reported aggression (Casey et al., 2014) but was associated with an increased risk of human-directed aggression in a clinical population (Lord et al.in press). The methods used in these classes however are variable and whether they are conducive to reducing fear will depend on stimuli presentation method, for example whether less confident puppies are overwhelmed or able to control their own exposure.

In working dogs there have been several studies on early life experience, for example Goddard and Beilharz (1984) examined fearfulness and activity/distraction in 102 potential Guide. When the
quality of puppy-walking experiences were rated and compared to later behavior, the most significant correlations were between high quality puppy walking and decreased fear of unusual objects (Goddard and Beilharz, 1985). In support of this, Rooney et al. (2003) saw that compliance of puppy-walkers to a programme of introduction to new experiences, was a major factor in determining the later success of specialist search dogs. Programmes that provide gradual, early introduction, to stimuli for working dogs, combined with optimal weaning may therefore be very beneficial and should be investigated further. Play and relaxed social interactions provide ideal contexts in which for puppies to encounter stimuli and learn that they are not threatening. Slabbert and Rasa (1997) used observational learning to demonstrate that pups, allowed to stay with their mothers and observe them in a search and retrieve task, were better at completing the same task (without reinforcement) than non-exposed pups at 6 months old. It seems, therefore, that the behavior of the mother could potentially be very powerful in influencing the behavior of her offspring and may be a potential area for research in the reduction of fear responses (provided that mothers are previously well habituated to stimuli).

In working environments, the number of potential stressors is often great. For example, search and rescue or military search dogs may be exposed to explosions in which loud noise, shock waves and dust are experienced simultaneously. Little evidence exists as to the optimal timing of stimulus exposure in early life, whether composite stimuli need to be initially broken down and presented alone, or whether puppies will tolerate combined stimuli at low intensity. However, because of the importance of this period in influencing adult life across species (Casey and Bradshaw, 2008), we can be confident that controlled exposure will be beneficial and hence would suggest that agencies which breed puppies for working roles carefully consider policy in this area, and those which use regular suppliers, encourage gradual controlled exposure.
5. Treatment

Whilst following evidence-based selection criteria, manipulating the living environment, and providing opportunities for learning will help to minimize the number of working dogs which develop fears and anxiety, some fear responses remain inevitable when animals are working and training in an unpredictable and potentially dangerous environments. Most of the fear-related behaviors in USA military working dogs were reported to be acquired as adult dogs (Burghardt, 2003). There is value to developing effective treatment protocols for dogs showing fear responses both animals which demonstrate pre-existing fear responses at procurement, or before training that may then interfere with ability in training, and for dogs already in training, in service, or returning from operations, which have developed fear responses. Any treatment should include a full medical and behavioural work up of the animal to ensure there is no underlying medical condition. This should be followed investigation of eliciting and maintaining stimuli and deciding on basis of this information what to do in order to restore the animal's well-being. Such investigations may lead to some dogs ending their working career, but many dogs may be able to continue working much longer than if they were untreated. Behavior modification programmes based on desensitisation and counter-conditioning (e.g. Levine et al., 2007); a combination of presenting an animal with the fear-eliciting stimulus at an initially low level, and also positively rewarding the animal for showing an alternative (calm) response to that shown previously, are vital and are described elsewhere (Clark et al in prep).

6. Conclusions

Propensity to show anxiety and specific fear responses results from an interplay of individual differences in animals and learning throughout life. Since significant failures amongst working dogs are a result of the development of fearful behavior; attention to methods likely to minimize fear in working populations is critical. Whilst current methods are seemingly effective and allow dogs to work in a remarkable array of environments, programmes should strive for optimal and improved
efficiency to reduce the wastage of dogs. As such, programme managers should continually analyse
the value of each component of their programme, for puppies and adult dogs alike, seek evidence
for its value and explore potential evidence-based improvements. In this paper, we have suggested
potentially valuable techniques already utilized, discussed evidence from dogs and other species,
and suggested important areas for future research effort.

Whilst the development of fear behavior has been seen to have some heritable component, the
environment and past opportunities for learning are also vitally important. Identification of
characteristics which reliably predict resilience to stress, and careful breeding for these traits, the
derivation of predictive tests for puppies and procured animals, rearing animals in optimal
environments and introducing them to a range of stimuli in a positive, controlled and gradual way,
can help minimize the number of dogs which develop work-inhibiting fears. Future research should
explore innovative methods of best measuring the relative resilience of dogs to stressful events and
develop optimal protocols to ‘proof’ dogs for exposure to potentially fear provoking stimuli, such as
the influence of social learning and the most effective elements of stimuli and appropriate exposure
protocols.
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