

EXPERIMENTATION ON COGNITION OF DOMESTIC AND STREET CANNIS FAMILIARIS

ShaamNatheshwar^{1*}, Preetha Sivakumar²

^{1,2}Vellore Institute of Technology, Vellore, TamilNadu, 632014

*Student, School of Bio-Science and Technology, Vellore Institute of Technology, TamilNadu, India

Abstract -Dogs are very common domesticated animals, which are descendants of gray wolves. Dogs were probably the first creatures ever domesticated by humans. Dogs are widely respected in various parts of the globe. Attributes of devotion, kinship, defense, and heat have acquired dogs an important position in human culture. The behavior of dogs is aided by the reactions of individuals or groups of dogs. Dog's behavior has been formed through centuries of contact with people and their lifestyles. Because of this physical and social development, dogs more than some other species, have obtained the capacity to comprehend with humans.

Key Words: Behavior, Comprehend, Dog, Domesticated, Diversely, Relationship, Species

1.INTRODUCTION

The dog is an exemplary illustration of a homegrown creature that probably voyaged a communal pathway into training. [1] Genetic studies suggest a process of domestication that began more than 25,000 years ago in one or more wolf populations in Europe, the High Arctic, or East Asia. [2] . A resurgence in canine cognition research revealed the range (and variability) of skills such as tracking pointing and looking at clues. [3] Because of this physical and social advancement, Dogs, more than some other species, have obtained the capacity to comprehend and speak with people. A resurgence of exploration in dog cognizance has uncovered the reach (and fluctuation) of abilities, for example, the following pointing and look prompts. [3][5][6]. All through the course of training, the canine has been changed to meet a large number of the useful and feelings of people[7]. Since dogs can segregate passionate demeanors of human faces [8] and body stances [9], react to people's yawns [10], show basal degrees of compassion [11], and respond likewise to some enthusiastic state changes of different canines and people [12], we expect that they are fit for sharing positive, passionate states by repeating appearances (ROM) and stances (PBOW) of conspecifics quickly and harmoniously (fast mimicry) during their fun-loving collaborations.

As feelings are regularly uncovered using social and physical reactions [13], it is most likely versatile for creatures to separate others' enthusiastic articulations since this permits them to expect the conduct reaction of the noticed individual and to change their conduct in like

manner [13,]. From this point of view, if rapid mimicry is valuable to close companions, we expect it to improve the accomplishment of game meetings, estimated by their duration after some time.

In the two persons and creatures, mimicry is unilateral towards more comparable persons, natural or socially close [14,15,16]. In canines, there is ongoing proof of a solid linkage between common looking and canine proprietor alliance and that this linkage is interceded by oxytocin [19], which additionally assumes a comparable part in canine social association [17,18]. Because rapid mimicry involves common gaze—relationship-based behavior—we expect rapid mimicry to be more incessant between canines that share an undeniable degree of association and similarity. The presence or nonattendance of the proprietor appeared to be the main figure liable for changes to the stance score during the test and not its length. Social referring incorporates two unmistakable parts: the subject's referential checking out the witness (for example looks quickly went before and additionally followed by a look to the clever article), and the subject's conduct guideline dependent on the enthusiastic data got from the source[22]. The primary point of the current review was to evaluate whether when confronting equivocal upgrade canines, similar to newborn children [22] [23][24][25][26], will utilize referential looking towards the witness paying little mind to their degree of commonality (more interesting versus proprietor). Given baby considers, this would permit us to show that the canines' looking conduct can't be clarified as far as solace looking for from the connection figure, however, addresses a quest for data from the individual effectively associated with the circumstance. The subsequent point was to test canines with a social referring to system intently reflecting that utilized with babies, to assess whether the destitution of the conduct guideline reaction saw in the past study with the proprietor as the witness might have been because of methodological contrasts. Finally, we focused on assessing whether the social guidelines would change, as shown by the dog's relationship with the bystander (more unusual than that of the owner).

Different reviews suggest that canines structure a solid link with their owners, like the human mother-baby relationship [27], [28], and that, similar to kids, they utilize their proprietor as a 'secure base' [29].

Furthermore, two surveys show that the understanding and use of signs opened by dogs is influenced by the personality of the source/recipient. In one review, canines were bound to illuminate their proprietor than an outsider with regards to the area of a secret item which was of interest just to the individual [30]; indifferent, canines that got a directing signal toward an unfilled holder from their proprietor contrasted with an outsider, took more time to quench their reaction when the proprietor was playing out the prompting task [31]. There is likewise some proof that the nature of the canine proprietor bond might influence the canines' critical thinking capacities [32, [33], and that in certain circumstances canines show clear special visual consideration towards their proprietor [43]. Taken together, these results suggest that, essentially in certain circumstances, canines show different practices based on the character of the person they notice or connect with.

1.1 The Objective of the study

The primary reason for this examination was to examine the dog interactions in different scenarios.

- 1) To detect the dog's behavior with a different person
- 2) To understand their relationship with humans

2. Materials and Methods

Although our experimentation does not require the use of laboratory creatures, all dogs are appropriate for this kind of testing. We selected 2 dogs, one of which was a stray dog and the other a companion dog. Before the sweep, the dogs were properly evaluated for our research. Ideal attributes included tranquility, proof of interest, not unfortunate of outsiders or different dogs, smoothness when progressing to novel conditions, not being scared of boisterous commotions, not being terrified of statures, the capacity to stay loose in an encased climate, and in particular, proof of inspirational drive. These characters were really important for our research study. Canines were extensively experimented with for 13 days. There were no behavioral or health conditions throughout the incident. We found no symptoms of stomach upset, fever, or other problems. The experiment was conducted in 3 phases. Where phase one took place for the first 5 days, Which was followed up by phase two which took place for another 5 days. Phase 3 was just one day for analyzing dogs' behavior. Where the first 2 days before the start of the experiment were used to test the dogs and the rest 11 days is where the experiment took place. To do this, we needed the assistance of 4 persons were person 1(A) took care of the pet dog for the first phase,1(B) took care of a pet for the second phase, 2(A) took care of the pet dog for the second. Just to improve outcomes, we choose to feed these dogs only when they are really hungry, which happened for 11 days. Firstly, the canines were prepared and fed by only one person. Phase, 1(B) took care of a

stray dog for the second phase. The first person was made to feed the dogs around 7 pm every day without any time delay for the first 5 days. No specific food was chosen. We nourished those dogs. As face one began the dogs showed more sharpness towards person 1(A),1(B). Dog feeding time was approximately 1-2 minutes, regardless of food.

Then, As the day passed, we planned to feed those dogs with other two persons 2(A)2(B) for both stray dogs and street dogs respectively.

At the point when the dogs there was a slight change over their feeding behavior which included sniffing.

3. RESULT AND CONCLUSION

less canines, we pointed toward surveying the presence of social guidelines dependent on the proprietors'/outsiders' facial passionate responses to the food and assessed expected contrasts in the canines' response.

Various examinations have detailed practically referential correspondence in canines, showing that canines use look and look shift as an informative apparatus in an assortment of circumstances to demand far-off food [38]–[39], [40], [41]. Starter proof likewise recommends that canines, other than utilizing the look for mentioning purposes, check out their proprietors to screen their response to a weird item [42]. Current outcomes affirm those of our past study, with 76% of canines thinking back to the proprietor when gone up against with a peculiar item, and expands them by showing that this conduct happens similarly oftentimes when a more abnormal goes about as the source (60% of canines looking back to the outsider). The example of look variation among source and uncertain articles is likewise unaffected by witness personality (62% proprietor versus 52% outsider). These discoveries are like those rising out of the baby social referring to writing and showing that, in a comparable circumstance, newborn children look referentially towards their mom (88%) yet in addition towards an outsider (83%) or a natural guardian (86%) [43], [44], [45]. As per various creators [46], [47] viewing at a more bizarre as much as at a recognizable guardian (going about as the source) shows that looking conduct can't be viewed as a type of solace looking for because of the initiation of the connection framework, yet rather it ought to be deciphered as a quest for data about the particular setting.

Interestingly, results from our review show that when the witness is more unusual and the proprietor is preoccupied, canines take a gander at both similarly. Subsequently, uniquely in contrast to babies, canines appear to check out the more interesting source yet additionally search out the proprietor by looking towards him/her. Regardless of whether this conduct is pointed toward acquiring data likewise from the proprietor, or is a type of solace chasing, stays an open inquiry.

A further level headed of this review was to inspect the impact of the source's vocal and look on the canines' conduct towards the uncertain article (the conduct guideline part of social referring to). Results showed that canines were influenced by the message got yet in various ways as indicated by the witness' personality.

There were no conduct or medical problems in the whole range of episodes. We didn't record any manifestations of stomach throb, fever, and whatever other issues When the 1(A) went about as the feeder

The homeless canine initially sniffed the nourishment at some point before having it for the primary several days, additionally, we saw that the lost canine started to follow individual 1(A) for additional taking care of. Alternately, in the case of a pet canine, when individual 2(A) fed the canine, it sniffed the nourishment for quite a while and it began to have his food. The comparative taking care of component was followed for the initial 5 days. For sure, when tried with their parental figure (1(A)/2(A)), the two canines and that got a positive message drew nearer to the item and connected with it sooner than individual [48]–[49], though the last associated less with the article and showed diminished explorative conduct [50], [49]–[51]. Further, following 5 days the trial canines were exposed to individuals 1(B),2(B) separately. However comparative conduct was seen (sniffing) they didn't stay away from the food given via caretakers(1(B),2(B)). Test subjects were additionally held under study for one more 5 days. The oppressed canine even became acquainted with their new caretakers(1(B),2(B)). Hence, utilizing an exploratory worldview we took test way forward by making both (1(A),1(B) for canine 1 and (2(A),2(B)) for canine 2 to take care of at some time. At the point when canines were exposed to this incredibly both the canines tasted the food given via caretakers(1(B),2(B)) respectively. The just significant contrast between our outcomes is that road canine continued rotating his food in the wake of tasting food given by auxiliary caretaker[52], our canines looked all the more frequently than the optional caretakers(1(B),2(B) when contrasted with (1(A),1(B). In our circumstance, this clarification is improbable since the canine's conduct was influenced by message valence. The trial canines became more joined towards caretakers(1(B),2(B)) than (1(A),2(B)). Subsequently, it is conceivable that canines accurately deciphered their auxiliary guardians as a sign to investigate the food.

Results evaluating the viability of the message when conveyed by an outsider showed that, even though canines in both message bunches looked referentially to the more peculiar as frequently concerning the proprietor, they didn't approach and associate more with the fan in the positive contrasted with the negative gathering. Curiously, canines in the negative message bunch invested more energy in the space near the entryway (for example near the situated proprietor), showing more static conduct and looking all the more regularly to the situated proprietor.

Additionally to what exactly has been found with babies, keeping up with closeness with the proprietor might be an outflow of solace chasing. Taken together these outcomes recommend that most likely canines were touchy to the enthusiastic articulation of the outsider (following [53], [54]), however, how they changed their conduct was dependant on their relationship with the source. To be sure when a positive message was being passed on fundamentally more canines cooperated with the fan if the proprietor instead of the outsider was the witness. These outcomes are somewhat as per those arising out of the newborn child's writing. Like our canines, newborn children tried with a more peculiar as the witness, will look for the mother more while getting a negative message: be that as it may, uniquely in contrast to our canines, they will move toward the item more while getting a positive message from the outsider [55], [56], [57], [58]. There are two potential clarifications for canines' not moving toward the article: initially, as was referenced over, the boost utilized in newborn child studies was intrinsically more appealing, though we picked an item that most canines discovered somewhat scary. The inspiration to investigate it might thus have been very low, and just be enacted by the proprietor's consolation. Another chance is the distinction in the proprietor/mother commitment in the scene. In baby contemplates, moms are available and mindful of the association that is happening between the odder, youngster, and item, while in our review the proprietor was perusing a magazine and confronting away from the scene. It is conceivable that while the mindful mother gave newborn children enough consolation that 'everything was well' when the outsider gave a positive message, the unmindful proprietor was a component of vulnerability that repressed canine's expected response to the more abnormal's positive message. Future investigations will be expected to address these focuses, but results from the current review show that albeit the conduct of canines was distinctive relying upon witness personality, an unmistakable contrast arose relying upon the message sent, showing that canines were for sure ready to recognize the source's passionate message.

A potential factor impacting the differential conduct of canines in the various gatherings is the span of the vocal and facial messages communicated by the sources, but these came about to be comparable across every one of the four gatherings.

One more chance is that canines were influenced by the overall mindset of the source (and all the more explicitly the proprietor), as opposed to understanding that the enthusiastic message alluded to a particular item. Disposition alteration (sensu [59]) is an interaction by which the eyewitness is influenced by the feelings of the entertainer and henceforth reflects those equivalent feelings [60]. Though various newborn child concentrates on concocted trial standards to prod these cycles separated [59], the current review didn't decide to do as

such. Nonetheless, it ought to be noticed that, when tried with the proprietor, the social changes authorized by canines might have been coordinated either at the article or the situated outsider. On the off chance that canines had not been touchy to the referential idea of their proprietor's correspondence we would have anticipated expanded cooperation with the situated individual in the positive gathering, and aversion in the negative gathering yet this was not the situation: canines' social changes were explicitly coordinated to the fan and the region around it.

At last, results seem intriguing additionally according to banter about 'joint consideration'. As indicated by various creators look rotation conduct showed by the subject between the item and the sharer of consideration is an important yet additionally adequate condition to show joint consideration [61]. Subsequently, as per this view, in a social referring to worldview, babies (and for our situation canines) show joint consideration towards the food with the guardian who remarks on it. Notwithstanding, more as of late, various specialists have reclassified joint consideration, by stressing the 'jointness' viewpoint [62], [63]. As per these creators taking care of the same thing that one's accomplice is taking care of isn't sufficient for joint consideration; rather there should be (l), an inspiration to impart consideration and interest to others with no other more instrumental objective; and (b), that the two people know together that they are sharing consideration. As indicated by this view social referring to doesn't need joint consideration, since the subject may essentially take advantage of the information on the source without fundamentally being occupied with offering thoughtfulness regarding him/her, for example without the 'knowing together' component of joint consideration. In the current review we took on a severe meaning of look rotation, expecting canines to do 3-way conduct (fan-witness fan, or source fan-witness) and, even though we didn't embark to test the 'jointness' speculation, there might be various components of interest identifying with it. Initially, the inspiration driving the canines' look shift conduct overall couldn't be viewed as a longing to acquire the item since canines were fairly insinuated by it. Furthermore and all the more significantly, there was a functioning hunt on the canines' part to include the proprietor when s/he was inert by look switching back and forth between him/her and the fan. If canines needed proprietors to take care of them, they didn't have to look substitute towards the item, other alluring practices or looking to the proprietor alone would have been adequate. Taken together these outcomes imply that canines "needed their proprietor" to take care of a similar article they were taking care of, potentially because the more interesting's criticism was not adequate or significant enough for them. Third, an alternate example of look variation was apparent with the proprietor and the outsider relying upon his/her attentional position. Canines look substituted all the more much of the time when the individual was the witness and

subsequently was additionally look switching back and forth among them and the article than when s/he was situated and negligent, recommending that they could perceive when this conduct was shared. Considering these primer outcomes it will be exceptionally intriguing to configuration contemplates fit for prodding separated the inspiration driving canines' human-coordinated looking conduct.

REFERENCES

- [1] Irving-Pease, Evan K.; Ryan, Hannah; Jamieson, Alexandra; Dimopoulos, Evangelos A.; Larson, Greger; Frantz, Laurent A. F. (2018). "Paleogenomics of Animal Domestication". In Lindqvist, C.; Rajora, O. (eds.). *Paleogenomics. Population Genomics*. Springer, Cham. pp. 225–272. doi:10.1007/13836_2018_55. ISBN 978-3-030-04752-8.
- [2] Ostrander, Elaine A.; Wang, Guo-Dong; Larson, Greger; Vonholdt, Bridgett M.; Davis, Brian W.; Jagannathan, Vidyha; Hitte, Christophe; Wayne, Robert K.; Zhang, Ya-Ping (2019). "[Dog10K: An international sequencing effort to advance studies of canine domestication, phenotypes, and health](#)".
- [3] Hare B, Brown M, Williamson C, Tomasello M. The domestication of social cognition in dogs. *Science*. 2002;398:1634–1636. [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
- [4] The Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register for British and Foreign India, China, and Australia. 10: 38. 1820.
- [5] Hare B, Tomasello M. Human-like social skills in dogs? *Trends Cogn Sci*. 2005;9:439–444. [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
- [6] Teglas E, Gergely A, Kupan K, Miklosi A, Topal J. Dogs' gaze following is tuned to human communicative signals. *Current Biology*. 2012;22:209–212.
- [7] Schoenebeck JJ, Hutchinson SA, Byers A, Beale HC, Carrington B, Faden DL, Rimbault M, Decker B, Kidd JM, Sood R, Boyko AR, Fondon JW 3rd, Wayne RK, Bustamante CD, Ciruna B, Ostrander EA
- [8] *PLoS Genet*. 2012; 8(8):e1002849.
- [9] Müller CA, Schmitt K, Barber ALA, Huber L. 2015. Dogs can discriminate emotional expressions of human faces. *Curr. Biol.* 25, 1–5. (doi:org/10.1016/j.cub.2014.12.055) [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
- [10] Rooney NJ, Bradshaw JWS, Robinson IH. 2001. Do dogs respond to play signals given by humans? *Anim. Behav.* 61, 715–722. (doi:10.1006/anbe.2000.1661) [[Google Scholar](#)]

- [11] Madsen EA, Persson T. 2013. Contagious yawning in domestic dog puppies (*Canis lupus familiaris*): the effect of ontogeny and emotional closeness on low-level imitation in dogs. *Anim. Cogn.* 16, 233–240. (doi:10.1007/s10071-012-0568-9) [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
- [12] Romero T, Konno A, Hasegawa T. 2013. Familiarity bias and physiological responses in contagious yawning by dogs support link to empathy. *PLoS ONE* 8, e71365 (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0071365) [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
- [13] Silva K, de Sousa L. 2011. 'Canis empathicus'? A proposal on dogs' capacity to empathize with humans. *Biol. Lett.* 7, 489–492. (doi:10.1098/rsbl.2011.0083) [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
- [14] Custance DM, Mayer J. 2012. Empathic-like responding by domestic dogs (*Canis familiaris*) to distress in humans: an exploratory study. *Anim. Cogn.* 15, 851–859. (doi:10.1007/s10071-012-0510-1) [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
- [15] Andics A, Gácsi M, Faragó T, Kis A, Miklósi Á. 2014. Voice-sensitive regions in the dog and human brain are revealed by comparative fMRI. *Curr. Biol.* 24, 574–578. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2014.01.058) [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
- [16] Anderson DJ, Adolphs R. 2014. A framework for studying emotions across species. *Cell* 157, 187–200. (doi:10.1016/j.cell.2014.03.003) [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
- [17] Seyfarth RM, Cheney DL. 2013. Affiliation, empathy, and the origins of theory of mind. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* 110, 10349–10356. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1301223110) [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
- [18] Norscia I, Palagi E. 2011. Yawn contagion and empathy in *Homo sapiens*. *PLoS ONE* 6, e28472 (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0028472) [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
- [19] Nagasawa M, Mitsui S, En S, Ohtani N, Ohta M, Sakuma Y, Onaka T, Mogi K, Kikusui T. 2015. Oxytocin-gaze positive loop and the coevolution of human–dog bonds. *Science* 348, 333–336. (doi:10.1126/science.1261022) [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
- [20] Romero T, Nagasawa M, Mogi K, Hasegawa T, Kikusui T. 2014. Oxytocin promotes social bonding in dogs. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* 111, 9085–9090. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1322868111) [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
- [21] Romero T, Nagasawa M, Mogi K, Hasegawa T, Kikusui T. 2015. Intranasal administration of oxytocin promotes social play in domestic dogs. *Comm. Int. Biol.* 8, e1017157 (doi:10.1080/19420889.2015.1017157) [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
- [22] Siegel S, Castellan NJJ. 1988. *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill. [Google Scholar]
- [23] Camas LA, Sachs VB (1991) Social Referencing and Caretaker expressive behavior in a day care setting. *Infant Behavior and Develop.* 14: 27–36.
- [24] Klinnert MD, Campos JJ, Emde RN, Sorce JF (1983) Emotions as behaviour regulators. Social referencing in infancy. In R Plutchik and H Kellerman (Eds) *The Emotions* New York Academic Press vol 2 57–59.
- [25] Klinnert MD, Emde RN, Butterfield P, JF Campos JJ (1983) Social Referencing: the infant's use of emotional signals from a friendly adult with mother present. *Developmental Psychology* vol 22 427–432.
- [26] Zaratany L, Lamb ME (1985) Social referencing as a function of information source: mothers versus strangers. *Infant Behav and Dev* 8: 25–33.
- [27] Stenberg G, Hagekull B (1997) Social referencing and mood modification in 1 year olds. *Infant Behav Develop* 20: 209–217.
- [28] Topál J, Miklósi A, Csányi V, Dóka A (1998) Attachment behavior in dogs (*Canis familiaris*): a new application of Ainsworth's (1969) Strange Situation Test. *J Comp Psychol* 112: 219–29.
- [29] Prato-Previde E, Custance DM, Spiezio C, Sabatini F (2003) Is the dog-human relationship an attachment bond? An observational study using Ainsworth's strange situation. *Behav* 140: 225–249.
- [30] Palmer R, Custance D (2008) A counterbalanced version of Ainsworth's Strange Situation procedure reveals secure-base effects in dog-human relationship. *Appl Anim Behav Sci* 109: 306–319.
- [31] Kaminski J, Neumann M, Bräuer J, Call J, Tomasello M (2011) Domestic dogs communicate to request and not to inform. *Anim Behav* 82 (4): 651–658.
- [32] Elgier AM, Jakovcevic A, Mustaca AE, Bentosela M (2009) Learning and owner-stranger effects on interspecific communication in domestic dogs (*Canis familiaris*). *Behav Proces* 81: 44–49.
- [33] Topál J, Miklósi A, Csányi V (1997) Dog-human relationship affects problem solving behavior in the dog *Anthrozoos*. 10: 214–224.

- [34] Prato-Previde E, Marshall-Pescini S, Valsecchi P (2008) Is your choice my choice? The owners' effect on pet dogs' (*Canis lupus familiaris*) performance in a food choice task. *Anim Cogn* 11: 167–174.
- [35] Mongillo P, Bono G, Regolin L, Marnelli L (2010) Selective attention to humans in companion dogs, *Canis familiaris*. *Anim Behav* 80: 1057–1063.
- [36] Topál J, Miklósi A, Csányi V, Dóka A (1998) Attachment behavior in dogs (*Canis familiaris*): a new application of Ainsworth's (1969) Strange Situation Test. *J Comp Psychol* 112: 219–29.
- [37] Prato-Previde E, Cusance DM, Spiezio C, Sabatini F (2003) Is the dog-human relationship an attachment bond? An observational study using Ainsworth's strange situation. *Behav* 140: 225–249.
- [38] Merola I, Prato-Previde E, Marshall-Pescini S (2012) Social referencing in do-owner dyads? *Anim Cogn* 15: 175–185.
- [39] Miklósi A, Polgárdi, Topál J, Csányi V (2000) Intentional behaviour in dog-human communication: an experimental analysis of “showing” behaviour in the dog. *Anim Cogn* 3: 159–166.
- [40] Virányi Zs, Topál J, Miklósi A, Csányi V (2006) A nonverbal test of knowledge attribution: a comparative study on dogs and children. *Anim Cogn* 9(1): 13–26.
- [41] Kaminski J, Neumann M, Bräuer J, Call J, Tomasello M (2011) Domestic dogs communicate to request and not to.
- [42] Gaunet F (2010) How do guide dogs and pet dogs (*Canis familiaris*) ask their owners for their toy and for playing? *Anim Cogn* 13: 311–23. *inform. Anim Behav* 82 (4): 651–658.
- [43] Merola I, Prato-Previde E, Marshall-Pescini S (2012) Social referencing in do-owner dyads? *Anim Cogn* 15: 175–185.
- [44] Camas LA, Sachs VB (1991) Social Referencing and Caretaker expressive behavior in a day care setting. *Infant Behavior and Develop.* 14: 27–36.
- [45] Klinnert MD, Emde RN, Butterfield P, JF Campos JJ (1983) Social Referencing: the infant's use of emotional signals from a friendly adult with mother present.
- [46] Stenberg G, Hagekull B (1997) Social referencing and mood modification in 1 year olds. *Infant Behav Develop* 20: 209–217.
- [47] Walden TA, Geunyoung K (2005) Infants' social looking toward mother and stranger. *Inter Journal Behav Dev* 29: 356–360.
- [48] Stenberg G (2003) Effects of maternal inattentiveness on infant social referencing. *Inf Child Dev* 12: 339–419.
- [49] Walden TA, Ogan TA (1988) The development of social referencing. *Child Dev* 59: 1230–40.
- [50] Klinnert MD, Campos JJ, Emde RN, Sorce JF (1983) Emotions as behaviour regulators. Social referencing in infancy. In R Plutchik and H Kellerman (Eds) *The Emotions* New York Academic Press vol 2 57–59.
- [51] Mumme DL, Fernald A, Herrera C (1966) Infants' responses to facial and vocal emotional signals in a social referencing paradigm. *Child Dev* 67: 3219–37.
- [52] Gunnar M, Stone C (1984) The effects of positive maternal affect on infant responses to pleasant, ambiguous, and fear-provoking toys. *Child Dev* 55: 1231–1236.
- [53] Walden TA, Ogan TA (1988) The development of social referencing. *Child Dev* 59: 1230–40.
- [54] Deputte BL, Doll A (2011) Do dogs understand human facial expressions? *J Vet Behav* 6: 78–79.
- [55] Ruffman T, Morris-Trainor Z (2011) Do dogs understand human emotional expressions? *J Vet Behav* 6: 97–98.
- [56] Klinnert MD, Emde RN, Butterfield P, JF Campos JJ (1983) Social Referencing: the infant's use of emotional signals from a friendly adult with mother present. *Developmental Psychology* vol 22 427–432.
- [57] Stenberg G, Hagekull B (2007) Infant looking behavior in ambiguous situation: Social referencing or attachment behavior? *Infancy* 11: 111–129.
- [58] Stenberg G (2003) Effects of maternal inattentiveness on infant social referencing. *Inf Child Dev* 12: 339–419.
- [59] Tomonaga M, Tanaka M, Matsuzawa T, Myowa-Yamakoshi M, Kosugi D, et al. (2004) Development of social cognition in infant chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*): Face recognition, smiling, gaze and the lack of triadic interactions. *Japanese Psychological Research* 46: 227–235.
- [60] Stenberg G, Hagekull B (1997) Social referencing and mood modification in 1 year olds. *Infant Behav Develop* 20: 209–217.

- [61] de WaalFBM (2008) Putting the altruism back into altruism: the evolution of empathy. *Annu Rev Psychol.* 59: 279-300.
- [62] Leavens DA, Racine TP (2009) Joint attention in apes and humans: are humans unique? *J Conscious Studies* 16: 240-267.
- [63] Carpenter M, Tomasello M (1995) Joint attention and imitative learning in children, chimpanzees and enculturated chimpanzees. *Soc Dev* 4: 217-237.
- [64] Carpenter M, Call J (in press) How joint is the joint attention of apes and human infants? In H.S. Terrace & J. Metcalfe (Eds.), *Agency and joint attention*. New York: Oxford University Press.