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#### Abstract

The temperament of a dog is defined as a dog's innate tendency to respond to a given stimulus in a particular way. It looks for signs of shyness and fear. In this study, we used the ATT (American Temperament Test), which is a temperament test prescribed for dogs. The purpose of the ATT is to warn dog owners about any issues that may be resolved with training. This study was conducted on 62 dogs of various breeds, including 16 Cane Corso from the working group, 14 German Shepherds from the herding group, and 32 Griffons from the toy group. A statistical analysis of the current study, including descriptive analyses, Cronbach's alpha to evaluate the extracted factor's internal reliability, and dimension reduction, was computed to evaluate the factor's internal validity. Interestingly, results show that the Griffons from the toy group had a significantly higher passing rate than the other two breed groups. This is due to the fact that there is a difference in temperament among breed groups, as the Griffon's temperament from the toy group is intelligent, alert, sensitive, full of selfimportance, and curious. In contrast, the Cane Corso's temperament from the working group is protective of property and owners, easily trained, docile, and affectionate with family, and the German Shepherd's temperament from the herding group is fearless, confident, aloof with strangers, and quietly stands ground.
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## INTRODUCTION

According to the American Kennel Club (2019), temperament is defined as "a person's innate tendency to respond to a given stimulus in a particular way." In the event that

[^0]a dog fails a temperament test item, the AKC Temperament Test (ATT) program provides remediation resources that are prescribed. This temperament test looks for signs of shyness, fear, lack of cooperation, and incapacity to recover. The dog should have the following qualities: it should be cooperative, curious, emotionally stable, adequately social for its breed, and biddable. Temperamentally related behaviors can be changed through exposure and education over time.
Diederich and Giffroy (2006) proposed that the correct term for "temperament" is
reserved for describing a dog's overall behavior and that characteristics associated with temperament should be expressed in an objective and scientific manner.
In six categories-social, auditory, visual, tactile, proprioceptive, and unexpected-the American Kennel Club developed the AllBreed Temperament Test (ATT) to gauge how companion (pet) dogs react to stimuli. Four test items are possible within each category. In each of the six categories, dogs are graded on three of the four test items (a total of 18 items). The elevator chooses the three tests. The proprioceptive category comprises a low teeter, a low platform, intersecting hoops, and a cavaletti (PVC ladder) as test items. Using a behaviorally anchored rating system, the ATT is graded on a range of 0 to 5 . Using a behaviorally anchored rating system (BARS), a performance management instrument that uses behavior "statements" as a point of reference. In addition to being rated on a numerical scale (Daniels \& Bailey, 2014).
The purpose of this study was to assess the temperamental behaviors of the dogs in order to inform breeders about their dogs' undesirable behaviors, which can be corrected with training.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

## Ethical statement

The present study was evaluated and authorized by the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Cairo University, and the Veterinary Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) (Approved Number: vetCU8/03/2022/438).

The temperaments of the 62 dogs of different breeds that took part in this test were evaluated, including 16 Cane Corso from the collective of the working group, 14 German Shepherds from the herding group, and 32 Griffons from the toy group (Fig. 1). The age of each dog was at least one year. These tests were conducted on 20 dog farms in the Greater Cairo Region (Cairo, Giza, and Qalyubia) in Egypt.

## Breed Groups

Based on their respective classifications from the American Kennel Club (www.akc.org) and the United Kennel Club (www.ukcdogs.com), the breeds were divided into "breed groups" according to the purpose they used for (Table 1).

Table 1: the breed groups used for analyses.


Fig. 1: The images represent the three assessed dog breeds used in the study

## Temperament test

The dog was assessed using a set of behavioral categories, (supplementary material Table 2) which were then divided into distinct sub-tests. Each of the subtests was created to measure a different temperamental trait. As stated, the test was regarded as failing if any one of the separate sub-tests was unsuccessful.
Prior to the dog taking the temperament test, the dog's owner gives the assessor with a brief explanation of the breed temperament of the dog once the dog enters the ring. If a dog doesn't pass the test, its owners will receive guidance on how to resolve the problem.

The temperament test must have all its subtests passed to receive a passing grade. The subtest was deemed unsuccessful if the dog displayed strong avoidance behavior, unprovoked aggression, or panic without showing a quick recovery (within 5 seconds). (Slabbert and Odendaal, 1999; Seksel et al., 1999; Svartberg, 2002; Ruefenacht et al.,

2002; Van den Berg et al., 2003; Fuchs et al., 2005).

Within the present study, we used six categories to determine the temperament of the dog: social, auditory, visual, tactile, proprioceptive, and unexpected stimuli. Four test items are possible within each category. Each of the six categories has four test items, for a total of 24 test items, on which dogs are evaluated (Table 2).

## Statistical analysis

In the current study, we used the ATT form, which included 24 items and six tests. To ensure that each item's contents were maintained. Each comment received varied from 0 to 4 ( 0 refusal to do the item).
(1) (nervous or agitated) Has recovered within 30 seconds or needs 3 tries. (2) (moderate fear or startle) It takes a while to recover (within 15 seconds) or needs two tries. (3) (Brief fear or brief startle but recovers quickly (within 5 -sec.) or needs 1 try) (4) calm and confident. (No startle or refusal). We employed the facet and factor scores by using the AKC Temperament Test Scoresheet (ACK 2019).

The component ratings were calculated by averaging the ratings for each relevant raw item. The factors' individual component scores were averaged to determine the factor scores for each factor. For the individual, no aspect or factor score was generated if one item score was absent. "social, auditory, visual, tactile, proprioceptive, and unexpected stimulus" are the six assessments. The internal reliability of the retrieved factors was evaluated by calculating Cronbach's alpha (the average covariance is divided by the average total variance). Each of the six exams' constituent parts. Subtests were separated out (Tabe 2).

## RESULTS

## Creation of ATT category scores and reliability evaluation

The present sample's six ATTS tests (Social 0.853 , Auditory 0.911, Visual 0.921, Tactile 0.831 , Proprioceptive 0.971, and Unexpected

Stimulus 0957) had internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) ranging from 0.83 to 0.97 .

Generation of Factor Scores and Assessment of Validity
The five questionnaire components in the current sample have internal consistency (Component Matrix) ranging from 0.80 to 0.99 . (Social 0.803 , Auditory 0.954 , Visual 0.951 , Tactile 0.879., Proprioceptive 0.990 and Unexpected Stimulus 0.953).

Tabe 2: ATT materials include components of each of the six tests' subtests and each test subdivided into 4 subtests in a total of 24 subtests.

| Social | S1. Greets handler, pets' dog. |
| :---: | :--- |
| tests | S2. Evaluator approaches, brief <br> exam. |
|  | S3. Approach standing person who |
|  | pets dog. |
|  | S4. Person approaches (carrying |
| item), pets |  |
| Auditory | A1. Shake large plastic bottle |
| tests | w/coins. |
|  | A2. Vacuum cleaner (handheld). |
|  | A3. Loud whistle. |
|  | A4. Bike horn (bulb). |
| Visual | V1. Umbrella opened |
| tests | (REQUIRED). |
|  | V2. Roller bag, wagon, crate dolly, |
|  | cooler. |
|  | V3. Streamers on stick. |
|  | V4. Shake hand towel. |
| Tactile | T1. Walks on wire grate |
| tests | (REQUIRED). |
|  | T2. Plastic tarp. |
|  | T3. Plastic lattice over memory |
|  | foam. |
|  | T4. Pegboard over air mattress. |
| Proprio- | P1. Cavaletti (pve ladder or low |
| ceptive | bars). |
| tests | P2. Intersecting hoops. |
|  | P3. Low teeter. |
|  | P4. Up and over low platform (e.g., |
|  | Klimb TM). |
| Unexpected |  <br> Stimulus <br> objects. |
|  | U2. Approach drops chair. |
|  | U3. Uses walker, crutches, or |
|  | wheelchair. |
|  | U4. Approach briskly - unusual |
| clothing. |  |
|  |  |

## Descriptive Information of the ATT test categories

Each of the ATT test's averages, standard deviations, ranges, lowest and maximum scores, and percentiles are displayed in (Table 3). All dogs in the six tests of ATT received scores between 3.4 and 3.7, indicating a negative skew for Social,
between 3.5 and 4.00 for Auditory, and between 3.4 and 4.00 for Visual and between 3.2 and 4.00 for and Tactile and between 3.00 and 4.00 for Proprioceptive and between 3.2 and 4.00 for Unexpected Stimulus. The scores that ranged the furthest were obtained for the Unexpected Stimulus test, while the Proprioceptive test possessed the least range.

Table 3: The sample size, mean, standard deviation (SD), range, minimum, maximum, and quartiles of the ATT tests.

|  | Social test | Auditory <br> test | Visual <br> test | Tactile <br> test | Proprioceptive <br> test | Unexpected <br> stimuli test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| Mean | 3.4758 | 3.6169 | 3.5323 | 3.5444 | 3.5363 | 3.4395 |
| SD | 0.6018 | 0.4953 | 0.6098 | 0.68282 | 0.55413 | 0.85733 |
| Variance | 0.362 | 0.245 | 0.372 | 0.466 | 0.307 | 0.735 |
| Range | 2.75 | 2.25 | 2.75 | 2.75 | 2 | 3.25 |
| Minimum | 1.25 | 1.75 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 2 | 0.75 |
| Maximum |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Percentiles | 25 | 3.4375 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.25 | 3 |
|  | 50 | 3.75 | 3.75 | 3.75 | 3.75 | 3.75 |
|  | 75 | 3.75 | 4 | 3.75 | 4 | 4 |

The groups were compared to find out if there were any significant differences in the percentage of dogs among the three groups that passed the temperament test. It was found that there were no significant
differences in the percentage of dogs in the working and herding groups that passed. In contrast, there were significant differences between the toy group and the other two groups (p < 0.01) (Table 4 and Fig. 2).

Table 4: Three breed categories are correlated with the six ATT test results in the linear model.

| Breed Group | Breed |  | Social | Auditory | Visual | Tactile | proprioceptive | Unexpected Stimuli |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Working | Cane Corso | N | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mean | 3.5 | 3.58 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.00 |
|  |  | SD | 0.53 | 0.41 | 0.68 | 0.70 | 0.38 | 0.44 |
|  |  | T | -0.96 | -1.509 | -1.278 | -1.579 | 0.56 | -1.445 |
|  |  | P-Value | 0.353 | 0.175 | 0.242 | 0.158 | 0.593 | 0.192 |
| Herding |  | N | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | German Shepherd | Mean | 2.9 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
|  |  | SD | 0.79 | 0.47 | 0.46 | 0.38 | 0.39 | 0.68 |
|  |  | T | -1.08 | -0.647 | -1.533 | -1.754 | 1.835 | -1.651 |
|  |  | P-Value | 0.308 | 0.533 | 0.155 | 0.113 | 1.00 | 0.133 |
| Toy | Griffon | N | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mean | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.9 |
|  |  | SD | 0.14 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.04 |
|  |  | T | -2.11 | -3.994 | -0.676 | -4.899 | -0.655 | 0.00 |
|  |  | P-Value | 0.043 | 0.00 | 0.547 | 0.016 | 0.559 | 1.00 |

Significant indicated bold $\mathrm{p}<0.01$.

Three distinct breeds were assessed using the ATT test. There were 58 dogs that passed the exam overall, and there were 4 dogs that failed it. It was $93.5 \%$ on average for all dogs to pass away.

## Interpretation for results

PASS: denoting scores between 3 and 4; a test item may only receive a score of 1 .
DOES NOT PASS, which implies "NEEDS WORK.": zero on any given item. Several
items received a score of 1 . Two points for more than three items. Any indication of aggression or excessive shyness.
The toy group was the one with the highest percentage of breed groupings passing the temperament test $(100 \%)$. The herding group ( $86 \%$ of the dogs in this group passed the temperament test) was the least successful group (Table 5).


Fig. 2: The results of different tests:(A) Social, (B) Auditory, (C) Visual, (D) Tactile, (E) Proprioceptive and (F) Unexpected stimuli in dogs of each group who passed the sixtemperament tests.

Table 5: Dogs in each breed group that were tested (n), dogs that passed the test (X), and dogs that failed at least one subtest are the numbers that are used to calculate the temperament test percentage.

| Group | Dog | Total dogs <br> tested <br> $(\mathbf{n})$ | Total dogs <br> passed <br> $\mathbf{( X )}$ | Total dogs <br> failed | Percentage <br> passing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Working | Cane Corso | 16 | 14 | 2 | $88.24 \%$ |
| Herding | German <br> Shepherd | 14 | 12 | 2 | $86.00 \%$ |
| Toy | Griffon | 32 | 32 | 0 | $100.00 \%$ |
| All |  | $\mathbf{6 2}$ | $\mathbf{5 8}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $90.63 \%$ |

## DISCUSSION

Our results discussion is based on a comparison of other available published studies on the same subjects.

The temperament might be defined as an individual's articulated, observable, and quantifiable behavioral patterns in response to their environment. Age, sex, socialization, health, and inheritance are the main factors that affect an animal's temperament in higher vertebrates. Dog temperament needs to be specific to each individual, and if we try to incorporate entire families, breeds, breed groupings, or species, it will ultimately become more and more generic and all-encompassing.

The ATT test has not been evaluated statistically for reliability or validity. Moreover, there are no previous studies discussing the results of our study. In constructing the ATTS test, it was evaluated, by Dowd (2006).

This article's main contribution is the extension of previously published research through the introduction of the idea of the ATT, a prescriptive temperament test designed for companion dog owners that uses a prescriptive method of temperament testing. Dog owners are advised to utilize the ATT to
find issues with their dogs' responses to particular stimuli and then address these issues using specifically designed training materials that are grounded in applied behavior analysis methodologies and learning theory.

It is significant to note that even if the dog can now correctly complete a test item, its temperament has not been permanently altered when a prescriptive training regimen is successfully completed after the dog has failed an item on the ATT. Instead, certain actions connected to the temperament test have been altered. Training can prevent the dog from displaying frightened behaviors in a range of real-world scenarios, while it is doubtful that the timid or scared dog would never again display any hesitation or anxiety in relation to new activities (e.g., walking on strange surfaces).

For dogs, the prescriptive temperament test concept holds significance as it can enhance their capacity to manage and perform in real-life scenarios.

In this present study, after the ATT test completed, it was observed that Griffon breed passed all test categories and subtests at $100 \%$, followed by Cane Corso breed ( $88 \%$ ), and lastly, German Shepherd breed ( $86 \%$ ).

According to our findings, $80 \%$ of the Cane Corso breed of working dogs worked perfectly in several distinct sectors. These findings completely disagree with previous studies by Arnott et al. (2014a), Arnott et al. (2014b), Batt (2008), and Maejima et al. (2007), who reported that $50 \%$ of working dogs are typically completely operational across many businesses.

Our findings also showed the ability of individuals in working dogs to do well in specific tasks, with the most likely reasons for their success being behavioral traits and/or physical attributes like sensory sensitivity. These findings are shown in earlier studies by Foyer et al. (2014) and Rooney et al. (2007).

We discovered that behavioral and/or physical characteristics affect the public's perception of the worth of working dogs in society and the task's financial worth. This is confirmed by Rayment et al. (2015).

The results of the present study fully agreed with Morton et al. (1995), who claimed that the Cane Corso is very heavy and strongly constructed.

Notari \& Goodwin (2007), agreed with our results that the German Shepherd breed of herding group is regarded as having a very low responsiveness rating and a high level of aggression.

## CONLUSSION

The toy group representing the griffon has a good temperament as it is social, alert, and more officiant than the working group and the herding group.

## REFERENCES

AKC (American Kennel Club). (August 2019): AKC family dog program. Retrieved from https://www.akc. org/sports/akc-family-dogprogram/, September 1, 2019.
Arnott, E.R.; Early, J.B.; Wade, C.M. and McGreevy, P.D. (2014a): Estimating the economic value of Australian stock herding dogs. Animal Welfare, 23, 2, 189—97. DOI: 10.7120/ 09627286.23.2.189.

Arnott, E.R.; Early, J.B.; Wade, C.M. and Mcgreevy, P.D. (2014b): Environmental factors associated with success rates of Australian stock herding dogs. PLOS ONE, 9, 8, e104457. DOI: 10.1371/journal. pone. 0104457
Batt, L.S.; Batt, M.S.; Baguley, J.A. and McGreevy, P.D. (2008): Factors associated with success in guide dog training. J. Vet. Behav. Clin. App. Res., 3, 4, 143-51. DOI: 10.1016/j. jveb.2008.04.003
Daniels, A.C. and Bailey, J.S. (2014): Performance management: Changing behavior that drives organizational effectiveness. Performance Management Publications.
Diederich, C. and Giffroy, J.M. (2006): Behavioural testing in dogs: A review of methodology in search for standardisation. Applied Animal Behaviour Science, 97(1), 5172.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applani m.2005.11.018

Dowd, S.E. (2006): Assessment of canine temperament in relation to breed groups. Matrix Canine Research Institute. PO BOX 1332, Shallowater, TX 79363, sdowd@canineresearch.org, http://www.canineresearch.org .

Foyer, P.; Bjällerhag, N.; Wilsson, E. and Jensen, P. (2014): Behaviour and experiences of dogs during the first year of life predict the outcome in a later temperament test. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci., 155, 93-100. DOI: 10.1016/j.applanim. 2014.03.006.

Fuchs, T.; Gaillard, C.; GebhardtHenrich, S.; Ruefenacht, S. and Steiger, A. (2005): External factors and reproducibility of the behaviour test in German shepherd dogs in Switzerland. Applied Animal Behaviour Science, 94(3-4), 287301.

Maejima, M.; Inoue-Murayama, M.; Tonosaki, K.; Matsuura, N.; Kato, S. and Saito, Y. (2007): Traits and genotypes may predict the successful training of drug detection dogs. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci., 107, 3-4, 287-98. DOI: 10. 1016/j.applanim.2006.10.005.
Morton, D.J.; Anderson, E.; Foggin, C.M.; Kock, M.D. and Tiran, E.P. (1995): Plasma cortisol as an indicator of stress due to capture and translocation in wildlife species. Vet. Rec. 136, 60-63.
Notari, L. and Goodwin, D. (2007): A survey of behavioural characteristics of pure-bred dogs in Italy. Applied Animal Behaviour Science, 103(1-2), 118-130.
Rayment, D.J.; De Groef, B.; Peters, R.A. and Marston, L.C. (2015): Applied personality assessment in domestic dogs: Limitations and caveats. Appl.

Anim. Behav. Sci., 163, 1-18. DOI:
10.1016/j.applanim.2014.11.020.

Rooney, N.J.; Gaines, S.A.; Bradshaw, J.W.S. and Penman, S. (2007): Validation of a method for assessing the ability oftrainee specialist search dogs. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci., 103,1-2, $\quad 90-104 . \quad$ DOI: 10.1016/j.applanim.2006.03.016.

Ruefenacht, S.; Gebhardt-Henrich, S.; Miyake, T. and Gaillard, C. (2002): A behaviour test on German Shepherd dogs: heritability of seven different traits. Applied Animal Behaviour Science, 79(2), 113-132.
Seksel, K.; Mazurski, E.J. and Taylor, A. (1999): Puppy socialisation programs: short- and long-term behavioural effects. Applied Animal Behaviour Science, 62(4), 335-349.
Slabbert, J.M. and Odendaal, J.S. (1999): Early prediction of adult police dog efficiency-a longitudinal study. Applied Animal Behaviour Science, 64(4), 269-288.
Svartberg, K. (2002): Shyness-boldness predicts performance in working dogs. Applied Animal Behaviour Science, 79(2), 157-174.
Van den Berg, L.; Schilder, M.B.H. and Knol, B.W. (2003): Behavior genetics of canine aggression: behavioral phenotyping of golden retrievers by means of an aggression test. Behavior genetics, 33, 469483.

# تقييم مزاج الكلاب من السلالات المختلفة باستخدام اختبار ATT في مزارع الكلاب 

## أزهار فوقينيـيازي، ، بسمة محمد بعويش، محمد يوسف معتوق

E-mail: $11022019416660 @$ pg.cu.edu.eg Assiut University web-site: www.aun.edu.eg

يتم تعريف مز اج الكلب على أنه الميل الفطري للكلب للاستجابة لمحفز معين بطريقة معينة. يبحث عن علامات الخجل والخوف. في هذه الار اسة، استخدمنا اختبار المز اج الأمريكي (ATT)، وهو اختبار مز اج مخصص للكالابِ. الغرض من هذا الإختبار هو تحذير أصحاب الكلاب بشأن أية مشكلات سلوكية يمكن حلها من خلال التدريب. أجريت هذه الار اسة على
 في ذلك التحليلات الوصفية، "ألفا كرونباخ" لتقييم الموثوقية الداخلية للعامل المستخرج، وتخفيض الأبعاد، لتقيبيم
 نجاح أعلى بكثبر من مجموعتي السلالات الأخريين. ويرجع ذلك إلى وجود اختلاف في المزاج بين مجموعات السلالات، حيث أن مزاج غريفون من مجموعة الألعاب ذكي، يقظ، حساس، مليئ بالأهية الذاتية، وليا وفضولئي. في المقابل، فإن مزاج كورسو من مجمو عة العمل بحمي الممتلكات والملاكّ، وسهل التنريب، وسهل الانقياد، وحنون مع العائلة، أما مزاج الراعي الألماني من مجمو عة الرعي فهو شجاع، واثق، ومنعزل مع الغرباء، ويقف بهذوء.

الكلمات اللالة: السلاتات، الكلاب، المجموعات، اختبارات المزاج
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