

1 **USE OF OUTDOOR RANGES BY LAYING HENS IN DIFFERENT SIZED**
2 **FLOCKS**

3

4 Sabine G. Gebhardt-Henrich¹, Mike Toscano¹, Ernst K.F. Fröhlich

5 Center for proper housing: poultry and rabbits, FVO, Burgerweg 22, CH-

6 3052 Zollikofen, Switzerland

7 sabine.gebhardt@vetsuisse.unibe.ch

8 mike.toscano@vetsuisse.unibe.ch

9 ernst.froehlich@bvet.admin.ch

10

11

12 Corresponding author:

13 Sabine G. Gebhardt-Henrich, sabine.gebhardt@vetsuisse.unibe.ch, Tel.

14 +41-31-631 5752

¹ Present address: Research Center for Proper Housing: Poultry and Rabbits (ZTHZ), Division of Animal Welfare, VPH Institute, University of Bern

15 **Abstract**

16 In studies assessing outdoor range use of laying hens, the number of hens
17 seen on outdoor ranges is inversely correlated to flock size. The aim of this
18 study was to assess individual ranging behavior on a covered (veranda)
19 and an uncovered outdoor run (free-range) in laying hen flocks varying in
20 size. Five to ten percent of hens (aged 9 to 15 months) within 4 small (2-
21 2500 hens), 4 medium (5-6000), and 4 large (≥ 9000) commercial flocks
22 were fitted with RadioFrequencyIDentification (RFID) tags. Antennas were
23 placed at both sides of all popholes between the house and the veranda
24 and the veranda and the free-range. Ranging behavior was directly
25 monitored for approximately three weeks in combination with hourly
26 photographs of the free-range for the distribution of hens and six hour long
27 video recordings on two parts of the free-range during two days. Between
28 79 and 99% of the tagged hens were registered on the veranda at least
29 once and between 47 and 90% were registered on the free-range at least
30 once. There was no association between the percentage of hens registered
31 outside the house (veranda or free-range) and flock size. However,
32 individual hens in small and medium sized flocks visited the areas outside
33 the house more frequently and spent more time there than hens from large
34 flocks. Foraging behavior on the free-range was shown more frequently
35 and for a longer duration by hens from small and medium sized flocks than
36 by hens from large flocks. This difference in ranging behavior could account
37 for the negative relationship between flock size and the number of hens
38 seen outside at one point of time. In conclusion, our work describes
39 individual birds` use of areas outside the house within large scale
40 commercial egg production.

41 **Keywords: Laying hen; Flock size; Free-range; RFID**

42 **1. Introduction**

43 Animal friendly production systems are gaining popularity in Europe and
44 elsewhere (Magdelaine and Mirabito, 2001). Especially in poultry, animal
45 welfare concerns are being raised by the public regarding intensive
46 husbandry practices, particularly in regard to high density systems with
47 thousands of animals (Kunzmann, 2011). Perceived natural production and
48 animal welfare are central concepts mentioned by consumers regarding
49 quality of food (Brunsjø, 2002 in Grunert, 2005). Laying hens ranging
50 outside fit into these perceived concepts. For instance British consumers
51 consider free-range eggs more animal-friendly than cage eggs (Bennett
52 and Blaney, 2003).

53 However, most laying hens are kept in large flocks and only a small
54 percentage can be seen outside the house at any one time (e.g. Bubier and
55 Bradshaw, 1998). Generally, flock size inversely correlates to the number
56 of hens observed outside (Bubier and Bradshaw, 1998; Bestman and
57 Wagenaar, 2003; Gilani et al., in press; Hegelund et al., 2005; Kijlstra et al.,
58 2007; Whay et al., 2007), although other factors, e.g., stocking density and
59 rearing conditions with or without access to outside areas can affect this
60 behavior, were not controlled for and represent confounds (except in Gilani
61 et al., in press). It is also not clear whether the same birds consistently
62 venture onto the range, or whether different birds use the range at different
63 times. Recent findings by Richards et al (2011) indicated that the majority
64 of the flock ventured into the pophole at some point during the laying cycle,
65 though they were unable to confirm if birds continued onto the range or the
66 associated duration. Other influences on the percentage of a flock
67 observed outside include genetics (Icken et al., 2008), weather (Gilani et
68 al., in press; Hegelund et al., 2005) (Richards et. al., 2011), experience
69 through exposure to an outside area during rearing (Grigor et al., 1995a;

70 but see Gilani et al, in press) or age (Bestman and Wagenaar, 2003; Icken
71 et al., 2008), cockerel presence and ratio, cover (Bestman and Wagenaar,
72 2003; Gilani et al., in press; Hegelund et al., 2005), light intensity in the
73 house and pop hole availability (Gilani et al., in press), diversity of
74 structures (Zeltner and Hirt, 2008), vegetation (Nicol et al., 2003), and the
75 presence of keel bone fractures (Richards et al., 2012). Different reasons
76 for the unexpected low range usage may include: fear (of predation,
77 novelty) (Grigor et al., 1995b), presence of unfamiliar birds (Grigor et al.,
78 1995c), missing feeding times in the hen house (Bubier and Bradshaw,
79 1998), or unattractive habitat (e.g. due to destruction by the hens) (Bubier
80 and Bradshaw, 1998). Higher stress can also be associated with a higher
81 use of the outdoor area (Mahboub et al., 2004).

82 Range size is typically proportional to flock size but often most hens are
83 seen in a small area immediately surrounding the house (Hirt et al., 2000;
84 Zeltner and Hirt, 2003; Elbe et al., 2005). The concentration of grazing may
85 lead to a problematic accumulation of nitrogen due to faeces (Aarnink et al.,
86 2006) and destruction of grass cover. Given the lack of accurate
87 information regarding individual hens` usage of the range and the
88 implications for flock management, we sought to provide this information
89 using a radio frequency identification (RFID) system that could accurately
90 track the passage of hens` entry and exit onto the range. The aim of this
91 study was to assess individual ranging behavior within system containing a
92 covered (veranda) and an uncovered outdoor run (free-range) in laying hen
93 flocks varying in size. Verandas provide many potential welfare benefits of
94 outdoor runs. Verandas also provide their own benefits including: space for
95 extensive locomotion, foraging, dust-bathing, lower density in the house
96 and the veranda, and reduced exposure to UV light while protecting birds
97 from adverse weather, predation, and infection from wild birds. In pursuit of

98 this aim we monitored the frequency and duration of visits to the outdoor
99 areas, the behavior of birds on the range, as well as the distance from the
100 house. We also assessed these variables to determine the effect of flock
101 size (independent of stocking density).

102 **2. Materials and Methods**

103 **2.1. Flocks**

104 Characteristics of the investigated flocks are shown in Table 1. The
105 particular flock sizes chosen were based on Swiss legislation which limits
106 number of laying hens that a farmer is allowed to keep to a maximum of
107 18,000 (Verordnung 916.344, 26.11.03),
108 [http://www.admin.ch/opc/de/classified-](http://www.admin.ch/opc/de/classified-compilation/20030950/index.html#a2)
109 [compilation/20030950/index.html#a2](http://www.admin.ch/opc/de/classified-compilation/20030950/index.html#a2), accessed 5-31-13). Thus,
110 commercial flocks numbering from 2,000 to 18,000 hens were chosen for
111 investigation. As most laying hens in Switzerland are white hybrids and no
112 large flocks with brown hybrids were available, all flocks (n = 8) in the small
113 (2,000 to 2,460 hens) and large (9,000 to 18,000 hens) categories were
114 white. Half (two) of the medium sized flocks consisted of brown hybrids. All
115 hens were between 9 and 14 months of age. During rearing after the 42nd
116 day of age flocks had access to a veranda but not to a free-range. They
117 were given access to a free-range from the 24th week of age onwards. The
118 flocks were housed in single and multitier systems with access to separate
119 outdoor ranges (Fig 1). All houses had an adjacent covered outdoor run
120 (hereafter called ‘veranda²⁾) with a concrete floor with litter. Verandas were
121 positioned on one long side of the house except on farm 2. At the opposite
122 long side of the veranda, hens had access to an open outdoor range
123 consisting of grassland and, on some farms, trees, shrubs, or artificial
124 shelters (e.g. elevated nets) (hereafter called ‘free-range²⁾). For all flocks,
125 an area approximately ten meters adjacent to the veranda was without
126 vegetation but covered with gravel stones of various sizes except on Farm
127 3 where shredded bark was provided..

² Terms used by EFSA (www.efsa.europa.eu)

128 Flocks were considered to be statistically independent because they lived
129 in different buildings with different ranges although three were located on
130 one farm and two belonged to the same farm in two instances. Flock sizes
131 were balanced in regard to the seasons and years; stocking density was
132 constant across all flocks (according to Swiss legislation). Spring was
133 defined as mid-March until the end of June and fall as the period between
134 the end of August and the end of November. Due to equipment limitations,
135 the use of the veranda of one flock (farm 8) was measured after
136 assessment of the range during January; use of the veranda of the flocks
137 (farm 6) was not assessed. Three flocks (farm 4, 6) had been reared on
138 the same farm; the others had been bought from rearing farms.

139

140 **2.2 Housing**

141 With the exception of farm 2, all houses were equipped with aviaries
142 that consisted of several tiers where feed, water, and perches were
143 provided. Space on the litter and at the feeders, number of drinkers, and
144 perch length per bird were maintained in compliance of Swiss legislation.
145 The outdoor areas veranda and free-range as well as the total space of
146 pop-holes and the management of using these areas conformed to Swiss
147 regulations for subsidies and were controlled by officials regularly. Faeces
148 were removed by mechanically driven belts approximately once a week.
149 Farm 2 had a floor housing system with perches, raised areas with litter,
150 and a manure pit. In all houses, group laying nests were attached to the
151 walls of the hen houses or on a tier of the aviary rack. Access points
152 between the house and the veranda and the veranda and the free-range
153 (termed popholes) varied in size and numbers with flock size. Access to the
154 veranda began between 5:30 and 10:00 h and concluded between 16 to
155 18:00 h depending on individual farm protocol. Access to the free-range via

156 the popholes was provided from between 8 and 12:00 h to 16 to 18:00 h
157 also depending on individual farm protocol. No housing parameters or
158 management procedures were altered during data acquisition to obtain an
159 accurate representation of bird movements within the flock.

160

161 **2.3 RFID equipment**

162 Antennas of the *Gantner Pigeon System* (<http://www.benzing.cc/>, accessed
163 on Feb. 21, 2013) were placed on either side of each pophole linking the
164 house/veranda and veranda/free-range at least three weeks before data
165 were collected to allow birds to acclimate to the presence of the antennas.
166 The width of the popholes ranged from 1.2 to 4.6 m. Depending to the size
167 of the pophole, up to 12 antennas, six on each side of the pophole, were
168 put side-by-side to cover the entire width (Gebhardt-Henrich et al., 2011).
169 The RFID system operated by registering and recording the time and date
170 that individual tags (\varnothing 4.0 / 34.0 mm Hitag S 2,048 bits, 125 kHz, attached
171 to leg bands worn by the birds and described in detail below) came within
172 15 cm vertical distance of an antenna. The inclusion of antennas on either
173 side of the pophole represents an added level of assurance as transition
174 between two areas required registration of two events – both entrance into
175 the pophole in one area (e.g. inside the house) followed by exit from the
176 pophole into a second area (e.g. to the veranda). Collected data, including
177 the unique tag identification number, timestamp (with a precision of 0.1 s),
178 and the antenna number, were written to a connected computer. The
179 system allowed for multiple tags (and the associated hen) to be registered
180 by the same antenna at the same time. The direction of movement was
181 referred from the sequence of antennas. More details of the RFID system
182 and its reliability are provided in Gebhardt-Henrich et al. (2011).

183

184 **2.4 Procedures**

185 Hens were acclimated to the presence of the equipment (e.g.,
186 antennas and cables) at least three weeks before data collection. At night
187 when hens were perching in the dark house, RFID tags were attached to
188 10% of the hens of the first three flocks (summer 2008 - to spring 2009)
189 and later to 5% of the flock via a stratified selection process to insure
190 representative covering of all locations in the hen house (i.e., aviary, litter,
191 slats, nestbox). A blue head lamp was used and all hens remained at their
192 position during tagging. Each building was divided into different sections
193 and the same number of tags were used in each section. Tags, previously
194 placed inside a wing band, were mounted to one leg of the hen with an
195 adjustable RFID leg band, both commercially available (IDs, Roxan,
196 Scotland). At depopulation, most tags were recovered (Table 1). Tags that
197 were not recovered were excluded from analyses. Ten flocks were
198 monitored at least 21 days during which access to the outdoor ranges was
199 provided, though in some cases inclement weather caused the producer to
200 deny free-range access and reduced the number of days assessments
201 could be made of free-range usage. Two flocks were monitored for 18
202 (farm 3, 6000 hens) and 19 days (farm 2).

203 On two days without rain during the recording period, the entire free-
204 range was photographed every hour between 10:00 and 16:00 h. Weather
205 conditions (e.g. sunshine, temperatures, wind exposure etc.) could not be
206 standardized and varied across farm. Resulting images were used to count
207 the number of hens in the different parts of the free-range relative to
208 vegetation, shelters, and distance from the house. In one flock (Farm 4)
209 crowding prevented reliable counting and on this farm no photographs were
210 taken. During the same period that photographs were taken, video
211 recordings were made of two areas next to the veranda (one area covered

212 with pebbles and a second with grass) to provide a behavioral assessment
213 of each flock within these areas. Recordings were coded with Observer 5.0
214 software (Noldus Information Technology, Wageningen, The Netherlands)
215 using behaviors defined in an established ethogram (Table 2). At the top of
216 each hour, a focus hen was chosen which was closest to the center of the
217 screen and observed for 5 min. If the hen left the screen before the 5 min
218 observations could be completed, another hen was chosen for observation
219 from the center of the screen and observed as long as she was visible or
220 until the 5 min were over. These observations were repeated to obtain 5
221 min of observation time for each area at every hour that access to the free-
222 range was provided.

223

224 **2.5 Analyses**

225 The reliability of registration by the RFID equipment largely depended on
226 the velocity of the hens as they passed through the popholes with 1.5 m/s
227 representing a threshold above which greater velocities reduced reliability
228 (Gebhardt-Henrich et al., 2011). When calculating durations of stay, two
229 missed registrations of a tag as it passed over an antenna would distort the
230 measured duration considerably. Therefore, only durations on days when
231 the individual hen had 100% matching registrations, i.e. each passage to
232 the free-range required a passage back to the veranda etc., were included
233 in the final data set. When discrepancies in the dataset were identified,
234 e.g. daily time records for individual hens where time spent on the veranda
235 and/or free-range did not equal the time outside the house, these records
236 were deleted. Durations of stays on the veranda or free-range shorter than
237 0.5 min. were excluded. Median duration on the veranda and the free-range
238 were calculated for each hen, day, and each farm separately.

239 Data were checked for normality with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and
240 the daily duration on the veranda and the free-range were logarithmically
241 transformed as was duration of sitting, standing, and the ratio of foraging to
242 walking.

243 Data were analyzed using SAS[®] 9.1.3 and 9.2. Full models including all
244 interactions were computed first. Non-significant interactions ($p > 0.2$) were
245 pooled. Individual Spearman`s correlations were calculated between daily
246 duration on the free-range with number of days on the free-range and
247 between daily duration on the free-range with the time of day they went out
248 then averaged per farm. To test for the presence of bimodality, the
249 coefficient of bimodality was calculated as $(\text{skewness}^2 + 1) / \text{kurtosis}$ where
250 a value greater than 0.555 indicates bimodality (Freeman and Dale, 2013),
251 (calculated by Proc MODECLUS in SAS[®]
252 <http://support.sas.com/documentation/onlinedoc/stat/121/modeclus.pdf>,
253 accessed on 6-3-2013). For the analyses, 0.555 was deducted from each
254 calculated coefficient and determined whether equal to 0 by a sign test in
255 Proc UNIVARIATE (SAS[®]). The test statistic M was calculated as $M =$
256 (number of values greater than 0 - number of values smaller than 0). To
257 account for the bimodal distribution of use of the outdoor ranges the
258 frequency of ranging was analysed as a bimodal variable (at least or less
259 than 2/3 of the days) with Proc GENMOD (SAS[®]) using farm as a subject
260 factor. A generalized linear model with maximum likelihood estimation was
261 used and the p-values based on their chi-square distributions. The
262 estimated parameters of the [generalized linear_model](#) GEE are given in the
263 text. Further details about the specific analyses are given with the
264 results. The experiment was approved by the Office of Agriculture of the
265 Canton Bern for all Swiss cantons (19/07).

266 **3. Results**

267 **3.1. Registration on veranda and free-range**

268 During the investigation $90.4\% \pm 2.2$ (mean \pm standard error) of the marked
269 laying hens per flock were registered on the veranda and $70.5\% \pm 3.4$ were
270 registered on the free-range at least once (Table 1). There was no
271 association of flock size on the percentage of tagged hens on the veranda
272 ($r^2 = 0.14$, $N = 10$, NS) or on the free-range ($r^2 = 0.08$, $N = 12$, NS).
273 However, individual hens used the veranda and the free-range differently
274 and many of them did not enter the veranda or the free-range every day
275 (Table 3). Using the hens registered in the outdoor areas at least once as a
276 subset of the overall dataset, the number of days when the veranda or free-
277 range was used had bimodal distributions (Fig. 2 a, b) and confirmed by the
278 coefficients of bimodality being larger than 0.555 (number of days on the
279 veranda: $M = 5$, $P = 0.002$, $N = 10$, number of days on the free-range: $M =$
280 6 , $P = 0.0005$, $N = 12$).

281 Individuals as well as farms differed in the daily duration on the free-
282 range (mixed model, farm: $F_{9,23000} = 697.26$, $P < 0.0001$, individual nested
283 in farm: $F_{1735,23000} = 9.77$, $P < 0.0001$). When attendance of the free-range is
284 categorized into spending $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{3}{4}$, and more than $\frac{3}{4}$ of the days there,
285 hens going to the free-range more often also spent more time there
286 (repeated analysis with farm as the subject factor, $F_{3,32} = 500.69$, $P <$
287 0.0001). This means that hens which spent a greater daily amount of time
288 in the outdoor areas were more likely to spend more days in those areas,
289 as well. The proportion of hens in the categories using the free-range at
290 least or less than $\frac{2}{3}$ of the days was influenced by flock size: Flock size
291 was negatively associated with the percent of days spent on the free-range
292 ($\chi^2_2 = 7.85$, $P = 0.02$, small flocks = 0, medium flocks = -1.23, large flocks =
293 -1.68, modeling the category 'spending more than $\frac{2}{3}$ of all days on the

294 free-range') and the duration ($\chi^2_2 = 8.15$, $P = 0.02$, small = 0, medium = -
295 295.3, large = -319.3, for the variable total time on the free-range[min.]).
296 Similarly, the number of hens in a flock was negatively correlated with the
297 percentage of days that were spent on the veranda ($r_s = -0.66$, $P = 0.04$, N
298 = 10). The duration spent on the veranda was significantly different among
299 flock sizes ($F_{2,5} = 13.13$, $P = 0.01$, least square means, log transformed:
300 small = 4.22 ± 0.077 (4 flocks), medium = 3.80 ± 0.077 (4 flocks), large =
301 3.65 ± 0.09 (2 flocks)) while the contrasts between large vs. medium and
302 small flocks as well as small vs. medium and large flocks were significant
303 ($F_{1,5} = 11.56$, $P = 0.02$; $F_{1,5} = 25.65$, $P = 0.004$). The sooner after the
304 opening of the popholes the hens went out on the free-range compared
305 with other hens on the same farm, the greater the total duration on the free-
306 range was ($r_s = -0.55 \pm 0.03$, $P < 0.0001$, $N = 12$ flocks).

307

308 **3.2. Areas of the free-range**

309 The percentage of hens seen on the area with gravel adjacent to the
310 veranda vs. the percentage of hens on the grass varied among flocks but
311 was not correlated with flock sizes ($r_s = -0.28$, $P = 0.40$, $N = 11$). The mean
312 percentage of hens on the free-range that were underneath artificial
313 structures was 6.8 % (minimum, maximum: 0.2, 69%); underneath
314 vegetation like bushes or trees 22.4% (minimum, maximum: 3.9, 57.7%);
315 and on open grass 41.8% (minimum, maximum: 31.8 and 60.7%).

316

317 **3.3. Behavior on the free-range**

318 Hens spent more time moving (walking and foraging) on grass than on
319 gravel ($F_{1,9} = 13.01$, $P = 0.006$) though was unrelated to flock size ($F_{2,9} =$
320 1.64 , $P = 0.25$). However, the ratio of foraging to walking differed both for
321 the location (i.e., grass or gravel) and flock size (location: $F_{1,9} = 49.51$, $P <$

322 0.0001, size: $F_{2,9} = 12.43$, $P = 0.003$, interaction between location and flock
323 size: $F_{2,9} = 2.4$, $P = 0.15$, Fig. 3) with hens generally foraging more on grass
324 than on gravel. Large flocks displayed less foraging behavior than medium
325 and small flocks (contrast: $F_{1,9} = 11.63$, $P = 0.008$), a relationship
326 maintained when brown hybrids are excluded (contrast: $F_{1,7} = 10.03$, $P =$
327 0.016). Hens stood longer on gravel than on grass ($F_{1,9} = 12.95$, $P = 0.006$)
328 and their sitting duration varied with flock size ($F_{2,7} = 5.05$, $P = 0.044$).
329

330 **4. Discussion**

331 To the authors' knowledge, this is the first study monitoring continuous
332 ranging behavior of individual hens in large scale commercial flocks where
333 no aspect of their housing (e.g. size and number of popholes) was altered.
334 Previous related work included small experimental groups of 50 birds
335 (Mahboub et al., 2004) and a flock of 12,000 that was divided into groups of
336 1,500 birds (Richards et al., 2011). In this latter study however, registration
337 in the pophole rather than time on range was recorded, thus the
338 methodology did not allow quantification of actual time on range or if the
339 hen actually exited the house. Hens in studies by Icken et al. (2008, 2011)
340 had a veranda though no free-range. In this regard, this is the first study to
341 test the influence of flock size on the number of hens on a veranda and
342 free-range and the duration of their stay in those areas.

343

344 **4.1 Flock size and numbers of ranging hens**

345 Although there was no significant influence of flock size on the percentage
346 of hens that were registered at least once on the veranda and/or the free-
347 range during three weeks, flock size was associated with the behavior of
348 the hens in the outdoor areas. Unexpectedly, many hens that were
349 registered on the veranda or the free-range during the investigation did not
350 go there every day. The average number of hens seen outside at any one
351 time is similar to that seen in other studies (Fig. 4, Supplementary data)
352 which showed an inverse relationship between flock size and hens outside.
353 Taken together, these results suggest that while the percentage of the flock
354 on the range at any point in time varies and is relatively low, the percentage
355 of the flock that actually uses the range at some point is much higher, a
356 finding which raises several important issues. Firstly, the ability to range
357 might be important to a large percentage of the flock and not just a subset

358 of hens. Given the varied systems that are currently being developed for
359 laying hen production as replacements for battery cages, our results
360 suggest consideration should be given to ranging ability given the
361 widespread usage. Particularly given that hens in semi-natural conditions
362 spend most of their time foraging (Savory et al., 1978), our results suggest
363 that this is a behavior which is maintained in current genetic stock despite
364 intense breeding. Secondly, assuming that ranging is a critical behavior
365 which some hens have a strong motivation to perform, research is needed
366 to assess the variable use of the range with varying flock size, changes in
367 individual bird behavior, and consequences to animal welfare.

368 Our methodology also indicated a bimodal distribution of hen: those
369 using the free-range every day for a long time and those using the free-
370 range sporadically for short periods of time. It is unclear whether these
371 differences present unique personality types, e.g. as shown in great tits
372 between fast and slow explorers and individuals dispersing and philopatric
373 birds (Dingemanse et al., 2003), or some other mechanism. The
374 percentage of days when hens used the free-range was associated with
375 flock size so environmental effects on this trait are likely although a genetic
376 component might also be present (Drent et al., 2003; Van Oers et al.,
377 2004). Substantial individual variation in the length of stay on the veranda
378 was also found by Icken et al. (2008) and in the frequency of pophole use
379 by Richards et al. (2011). In the latter study 80% of the hens frequently
380 used the popholes but length of stay on free-range was not measured.

381 Long and frequent stays on the free-range are sometimes taken as
382 indicators for good welfare (Swiss Animal Protection, pers. comm.) though
383 scientific evidence for this is lacking. Since we did not assess welfare-
384 related parameters we cannot interpret our results in this respect, though
385 our methodology and results offer an interesting means to interpret

386 assumptions regarding welfare and range use. Knierim (2006) states that
387 access to free-range offers opportunities both to increase and decrease
388 welfare. On the one hand access to a free-range provides enrichment for
389 the hens improving welfare, while predation, diseases, or an imbalanced
390 diet might decrease welfare. Other studies have shown that use of an
391 outdoor range reduces feather pecking which is thought to be redirected
392 foraging behavior (Green et al., 2000; Bestman and Wagenaar, 2003; Nicol
393 et al., 2003; Mahboub et al., 2004; Whay et al., 2007) and thus improves
394 welfare. Given our methodology and results, we should interpret these
395 findings at the individual level to ensure theoretical benefits are actually
396 realized throughout the flock rather than an unknown and likely variable
397 subset of animals.

398

399 **4.2 Flock size and behavior of hens on free-range**

400 Foraging (moving with head held low) was observed more on grass than on
401 gravel and more in small and medium sized flocks than in large flocks, for
402 reasons that are not clear. Hens in semi-natural conditions spend most of
403 their time awake foraging (Savory et al., 1978). Those hens were released
404 on an island and they were not fed by people. Hens in larger flocks might
405 have foraged more inside the house where they were not observed. The
406 interior of hen houses of larger flocks might have been more attractive than
407 the houses of smaller flocks due to environmental (e.g. improved
408 temperature regulation with more birds, more absolute space), social (e.g.,
409 greater feelings of security), or nutritional (e.g., increased number of
410 feeders) factors, though appropriately designed studies would need to test
411 these possibilities.

412 It is important to note that flock sizes were not manipulated so that
413 causality cannot be concluded. Care was taken to balance flock sizes with

414 environmental conditions (seasons and years). However, farms differed in
415 many aspects and this likely plays a role in the large variation in range use
416 and behavior. Weather conditions like cloud cover which is known to
417 influence ranging behavior could not be standardized. Some flocks were
418 located on the same farm and thus were not entirely independent. Due to
419 the small sample size of twelve flocks, parameters like hybrid,
420 management, size of popholes, and structure of the free-range could not be
421 analyzed. Instead of standardization, a realistic variation in these
422 parameters was selected to provide representative results that could be
423 applied to commercial conditions. In this sense the flock with the fewest
424 hens registered on the free-range (47%) and the flock with one of the
425 highest registrations (90%) belonged to flocks of 6,000 hens. The free-
426 range that was only visited by 47% of the tagged hens consisted of grass
427 only. Outdoor areas without structures and shelters are known to attract
428 fewer hens (Bestman and Wagenaar, 2003; Zeltner and Hirt, 2003; Zeltner
429 and Hirt, 2004; Hegelund et al., 2005; Zeltner and Hirt, 2008). Likewise, the
430 distribution of hens with regard to the distance to the house which was not
431 associated with flock size might have been influenced by the structure and
432 vegetation of the free-range (Zeltner and Hirt, 2003). Brown hybrids range
433 more than white hybrids (Mahboub et al., 2004) and this was reflected in
434 this study where the duration outside was highest in the medium sized
435 flocks that contained two brown flocks. These influences, namely hybrid
436 and range characteristics, seemed more important than flock size to predict
437 how many hens were entering the outdoor areas. However, these results
438 cannot be readily extrapolated to small groups of hens or much larger
439 flocks that are common outside Switzerland.

440 In even small flocks an uneven distribution of hens crowding near
441 the house was detected similar to the findings of Elbe et al (2005). They

442 measured a high concentration of the amount of nitrogen in the soil of up to
443 2086 kg N / ha close to the house. Similar figures are probably true for our
444 flocks and could be a problem for the environment.

445

446 **4.4 Conclusion**

447 Although a majority of hens visited the veranda and at least half of the
448 tagged birds accessed the free-range, relatively few hens used those areas
449 extensively every day. Usage of the outdoor ranges had a bimodal
450 distribution where a subpopulation of hens appeared to use the range with
451 different patterns, i.e. many days at a long duration or infrequently of short
452 duration. The proportion of hens using the outdoor ranges frequently was
453 greater in small and medium sized flocks. The reason of the association
454 between time on the free-range and flock size and the implications for the
455 welfare of the hens in small and large flocks between 2,000 and 18,000
456 hens remain unclear and should be studied further.

457 **5. Acknowledgements**

458 Financing was provided by the Federal Veterinary Office (FVO), Federal
459 Office for Agriculture (FOAG), COOP, Migros, and the Swiss Animal
460 Protection. Besides setting the range of flock sizes the sponsors had no
461 influence on data collection, analyses, and interpretation. This project
462 would have grounded right at the beginning without the advice of people
463 knowledgeable in RFID technology including Oliver Sanders, Stefan
464 Thurner, M. Lampe, and S. Eisen and without the strong support of
465 Hans Oester and Martin Reist who convinced others to continue
466 financing this project. We also thank Dominik Frei at ART Tänikon who
467 spent two days sending the tags back and forth, as well as Maité
468 Poucheret who coded the behavior on the video tapes. Comments from
469 Alexandra Harlander and Hanno Würbel greatly improved the
470 manuscript. Last but not least thanks to the hospitality of the eight
471 farmers who had their hen houses filled with antennas and cables.
472

473 **6. References**

474 Aarnink, A., Hol, J., Beurskens, A., 2006. Ammonia emission and nutrient
475 load in outdoor runs of laying hens. *NJAS* 54 (2), 223–234.

476

477 Bennett, R.M., Blaney, Ralph J. P., 2003. Estimating the benefits of farm
478 animal welfare legislation using the contingent valuation method.
479 *Agr. Econ.* 29 (1), 85–98.

480

481 Bestman, M.W.P., Wagenaar, J.P., 2003. Farm level factors associated
482 with feather pecking in organic laying hens. *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 80,
483 133-140.

484

485 Bubier, N.E., Bradshaw, R.H., 1998. Movement of flocks of laying hens in
486 and out of the hen house in four free-range systems. *Brit. Poultry*
487 *Sci.* 39, S5-S18.

488

489 Dingemanse, N.J., Both, C., van Noordwijk, A. J., Rutten, A.L., Drent, P.J.,
490 2003. Natal dispersal and personalities in great tits (*Parus major*).
491 *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 270 (1516), 741–747.

492

493 Drent, P.J., van Oers, K., van Noordwijk, A. J., 2003. Realized heritability of
494 personalities in the great tit (*Parus major*). *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 270
495 (1510), 45–51.

496

497 Elbe, U., Ross, A., Steffens, G., Van den Weghe, H., Winckler, C., 2005.
498 Organic layers in large flocks: use of the outdoor run and
499 accumulation of nutrients in the soil, In: Heß, J., Rahmann, G.

500 (Eds.), 8. Wissenschaftstagung Ökologischer Landbau, Kassel
501 University Press, Kassel, pp. 307-310.
502
503 Freeman, J., Dale, R., 2013. Assessing bimodality to detect the presence of
504 a dual cognitive process. *Behav. Res.* 45 (1), 83–97.
505
506 Gebhardt-Henrich, S.G., Burose, F., Gantner, M., Fröhlich, E.K.F., Zähler,
507 M., 2011. Untersuchung des Auslaufverhaltens von Legehennen mit
508 Transpondern im Niederfrequenzbereich, In: Steinmetz, A.-K. (Ed.),
509 Elektronische Tieridentifizierung in der landwirtschaftlichen
510 Nutztierhaltung, KTBL, Fulda, Germany, pp. 42-51.
511
512 Gilani, A.-M., Knowles, T.G., Nicol, C.J., in press. Factors affecting ranging
513 behaviour in young and adult laying hens. *Brit. Poult. Sci.*
514
515 Green, L.E., Lewis, K., Kimpton, A., Nicol, C.J., 2000. Cross-sectional study
516 of the prevalence of feather pecking in laying hens in alternative
517 systems and its associations with management and disease. *Vet.*
518 *Rec.* 147, 233-238.
519
520 Grigor, P.N., Hughes, B.O., Appleby, M.C., 1995a. Effects of regular
521 handling and exposure to an outside area on subsequent
522 fearfulness and dispersal in domestic hens. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.*
523 44, 47-55.
524
525 Grigor, P.N., Hughes, B.O., Appleby, M.C., 1995b. Emergence and
526 dispersal behaviour in domestic hens: effects of social rank and
527 novelty of an outdoor area. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 45, 97-108.

528

529 Grigor, P.N., Hughes, B.O., Appleby, M.C., 1995c. Social inhibition of
530 movement in domestic hens. *Anim. Behav.* 49, 1381-1388.

531

532 Grunert, K.G., 2005. Food quality and safety: consumer perception and
533 demand. *Eur. Rev. Agric. Econ.* 32, 369-391.

534

535 Hegelund, L., Sørensen, J.T., Kjær, J.B., Kristensen, I.S., 2005. Use of the
536 range area in organic egg production systems: effect of climatic
537 factors, flock size, age and artificial cover. *Brit. Poultry Sci.* 46, 1-8.

538

539 Hirt, H., Hördegen, P., Zeltner, E., 2000. Laying hen husbandry: group size
540 and use of hen-runs, International IFOAM Scientific Conference,
541 Basel.

542

543 Icken, W., Caverro, D., Schmutz, M., Thurner, S., Wendl, G., Preisinger, R.,
544 2008. Analysis of the free range behaviour of laying hens and the
545 genetic and phenotypic relationships with laying performance. *Brit.*
546 *Poultry Sci.* 49, 533-541.

547

548 Icken, W., Caverro, D., Thurner, S., Schmutz, M., Wendl, G., Preisinger, R.,
549 2011. Relationship between time spent in the winter garden and
550 shell colour in brown egg stock. *Arch. Geflügelkd.* 75, 145-150.

551

552 Kijlstra, A., Traag, W.A., Hoogenboom, L.A.P., 2007. Effect of Flock Size
553 on Dioxin Levels in Eggs from Chickens Kept Outside. *Poult Sci* 86,
554 2042-2048.

555

556 Knierim, U., 2006. Animal welfare aspects of outdoor runs for laying hens: a
557 review. *NJAS* 54, 133-145.
558

559 Kunzmann, P., 2011. Ethics in the poultry industry - answering moral
560 questions. *Lohmann Information* 46, 3-9.
561

562 Magdelaine, P., Mirabito, L., 2001. Changes in consumer demands for
563 eggs and egg products and relationships with the development of
564 welfare regulations. *Brit. Poultry Sci.* 42, S15-S16.
565

566 Mahboub, H.D., Müller, J., von Borell, E., 2004. Outdoor use, tonic
567 immobility, heterophil/lymphocyte ratio and feather condition in free-
568 range laying hens of different genotype. *Brit. Poultry Sci.* 45, 738-
569 744.
570

571 Nicol, C.J., Potzsch, C., Lewis, K., Green, L.E., 2003. Matched concurrent
572 case-control study of risk factors for feather pecking in hens on free-
573 range commercial farms in the UK. *Brit. Poultry Sci.* 44, 515-523.
574

575 Richards, G.J., Wilkins, L.J., Knowles, T.G., Booth, F., Toscano, M.J.,
576 Nicol, C.J., Brown, S.N., 2011. Continuous monitoring of pophole
577 usage by commercially housed free-range hens throughout the
578 production cycle. *Vet. Rec.* 169, 338.
579

580 Richards, G.J., Wilkins, L.J., Knowles, T.G., Booth, F., Toscano, M.J.,
581 Nicol, C.J., Brown, S.N., 2012. Pophole use by hens with different
582 keel fracture status monitored throughout the laying period. *Vet.*
583 *Rec.* 170, 494-498.

584

585 Savory, C.J., Wood-Gush, D.G.M., Duncan, I.J.H., 1978. Feeding
586 behaviour in a population of domestic fowls in the wild. *Appl. Anim.*
587 *Ethol.* 4, 13-27.

588

589 van Oers, K., Drent, P.J., Goede, P. de, van Noordwijk, A. J., 2004.
590 Realized heritability and repeatability of risk-taking behaviour in
591 relation to avian personalities. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 271 (1534), 65–73.

592

593 Verordnung 916.344, 26.11.03, [http://www.admin.ch/opc/de/classified-
594 compilation/20030950/index.html#a2](http://www.admin.ch/opc/de/classified-
594 compilation/20030950/index.html#a2), (accessed 5-31-13)

595

596 Whay, H.R., Main, D.C.J., Green, L.E., Heaven, G., Howell, H., Morgan, M.,
597 Pearson, A., Webster, A.J.F., 2007. Assessment of the behaviour
598 and welfare of laying hens on free-range units. *Vet. Rec.* 161, 119-
599 128.

600

601 Zeltner, E., Hirt, H., 2003. Effect of artificial structuring on the use of laying
602 hen runs in a free range system. *Brit. Poultry Sci.* 44, 533-537.

603

604 Zeltner, E., Hirt, H., 2004. Organic Laying hen husbandry: Structuring of
605 hen runs. *DGS Magazin* 56, 22-24.

606

607 Zeltner, E., Hirt, H., 2008. Factors involved in the improvement of the use of
608 hen runs. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 114, 395-408.

609

List of Figures

610

611 **Fig. 1.** Drawing of a laying hen house with the different outdoor ranges
612 veranda and free-range. Antennas were placed on both sides of the
613 popholes between the house and the veranda and between the veranda
614 and free-range. A part of the free-range closest to the veranda was without
615 vegetation, mostly consisting of gravel.

616

617 **Fig. 2.** Bimodal distributions of the percentage of days that hens entered
618 the veranda (a) and the free-range (b). Data of all farms are pooled. The
619 height of the bars denotes the percentage of hens in the flock that falls into
620 the following categories: using the veranda (a) or free-range (b) up to 10 %
621 of the monitored days (bar at the most left), between 10 and 20% of the
622 days (next bar to the right) etc.

623

624 **Fig. 3.** Boxplots (showing the median (50th percentile) line inside box, the
625 third quartile (75th percentile) upper edge of box, the first quartile (25th
626 percentile) lower edge of box, and the minimum and the maximum
627 (endpoints of lower and upper whiskers) of the ration between foraging and
628 walking movements for hens on the gravel and vegetation portions of the
629 free-range in differently sized flocks. Significant differences are marked with
630 different letters.

631

632 **Fig. 4.** Relationship between flock size and number of birds seen outside at
633 one instance. The references and actual numbers are shown in Appendix
634 1. The outside areas are classified as veranda when they were covered or
635 free-range when they were uncovered. The data of the present study are
636 included but distinguished by separate symbols.

637

Table 1

Table 1. Attributes of the investigated flocks and the number of tags which were recovered during depopulation (% recovered), how many tagged hens were registered at the antennas inside of the house (% house), at the antennas at the outer side of the popholes between house and veranda or the antennas at the inner side of the popholes between veranda and free-range (% veranda), and at the antennas on the free-range (% free-range). LSL are white and LB are brown hens. The number and the width [m] of the popholes between house and veranda and veranda and free-range are given. On farm 5 the size of the popholes between veranda and free-range were variable and ranged between 1.2 (1 pophole) and 4.6 m (4 popholes).

# hens	Hybrid ¹	Season	Farm	House veranda	Veranda free-range	% recovered	% house	% veranda	% free-range
2,000	HN White	Spring 09	1	4 (1.15)	3 (1.5)	84	99	98	90
2,000	LSL	Fall 09	2	2 (3)	1 (5)	68	87	82	72
2,000	HN White	Spring 10	3	5 (1.2)	2 (1.2)	72	97	90	63
2,460	HN White	Fall 08	1	5 (1.2)	3 (1.5)	77	97	90	66
5,000	LB	Fall 08	4	8 (1.2)	8 (1.5)	72	97	96	85
5,600	HN Brown	Spring 10	1	13 (1.3)	11 (1.5)	88	100	99	90
6,000	HN White	Fall 09	3	9 (1.2)	3 (4.6)	91	98	96	47
6,000	LSL	Spring 09	5	8 (1.2)	5 (var.)	82	98	91	78
9,000	LSL	Fall 10	6	-	13 (3)	68.2	-	-	70
9,000	LSL	Fall 10	6	-	13 (3)	82	-	-	70
12,000	LSL	Spring 08	7	15 (1.5)	10 (2)	22	83	79	56
18,000	LSL	Fall 09	8	21 (1.2)	15 (2.25)	85	88	83	59

¹ Hybrids: LSL = Lohmann Selected Leghorn, LB= Lohmann Brown (www.ltz.de) HN White = H&N Nick Chick, HN Brown = H&N Brown Nick (www.hn-int.com)

Table 2. Ethogram of behaviors scored from collected video recordings. Each flock was videotaped at two locations on the free-range on two non-rainy days between 10 and 16 hrs. One location was close to the veranda without vegetation and the other location was on the grass further away from the veranda.

Behavior	Definition
Sit	Stationary, legs are not visible
Stand	Stationary, at least one leg is visible and stretched, no pecking
Walk	Locomoting with head above the body
Forage	Locomoting with head below the body, or standing and pecking

Table 3. Summary statistics of the ranging behavior in the twelve flocks. Summary statistics were only computed when a particular hen had no mismatching records for a day (see text). Means with standard errors are provided for the number of hens as indicated. This number includes only those hens in the flock that were registered on the veranda and the free-range and whose tags were recovered at depopulation. Durations are given in min. % veranda is the percentage of days that hens visited the veranda and % free-range is the percentage of days that hens visited the free-range.

# hens	Veranda	Free-range	% veranda	% free-range	N hens
2,000	98.27 ± 7.05	31.00 ± 4.12	85.15 ± 1.80	54.13 ± 2.73	196
2,000	67.09 ± 11.25	14.67 ± 2.52	86.49 ± 2.73	54.67 ± 4.84	76
2,000	107.42 ± 11.17	54.88 ± 9.90	91.38 ± 2.48	78.24 ± 3.99	96
2,460	61.13 ± 5.57	18.18 ± 3.07	70.76 ± 2.34	53.54 ± 3.06	222
5,000	127.90 ± 8.08	102.13 ± 55.31	90.76 ± 1.02	85.17 ± 0.91	347
5,600	113.25 ± 10.59	36.89 ± 3.75	70.22 ± 1.60	57.42 ± 1.54	291
6,000	77.00 ± 9.95	45.45 ± 4.90	73.97 ± 1.96	70.62 ± 2.79	276
6,000	91.59 ± 5.13	52.19 ± 4.28	80.71 ± 1.84	68.35 ± 2.42	269
9,000	-	36.24 ± 4.49	-	39.92 ± 1.94	313
9,000	-	73.74 ± 8.49	-	53.43 ± 2.19	324
12,000	60.42 ± 5.05	9.77 ± 5.25	77.54 ± 2.89	52.24 ± 4.26	99
18,000	59.76 ± 3.24	37.68 ± 2.82	26.73 ± 1.30	52.81 ± 1.61	560

Fig. 1






Fig. 2 a)



b)

Fig. 3



Figure

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

