

Position note:
Enriched cages do not meet the welfare needs of laying hens.



Scientific research, including reports by the European Commission's Scientific Veterinary Committee¹ and by the European Food Safety Authority², has established that hens have powerful drives to lay their eggs in a nest, peck and scratch at the ground (foraging behaviour), dustbathe, perch and perform wing-stretching and flapping. There are negative welfare impacts if these cannot be performed^{3,4,5,6}.

Enriched (furnished) cages provide 750cm² per hen, and equipment for feeding, drinking, egg collection, manure removal, insertion and removal of hens⁷. In addition, they provide equipment intended to enable hens to express some of their behavioural needs: perches, nest boxes, a pecking and scratching area⁷. Compared to the barren battery cages, which lack any resources for nesting, perching, foraging and comfort behaviours, and provide only 600cm² of space, enriched cages are a marginal improvement. However, in enriched cages there is still insufficient space, competition for resources and inappropriate design e.g., of perches and scratching areas, meaning the behavioural needs of hens are mostly not met^{8,9}.

There is insufficient space in enriched cages, both horizontally and vertically, to perform even the most basic species-specific behaviours. For example, up to 1190 cm² is required for hens to perform dustbathing¹⁰, 563cm² for standing, 1315cm² for standing and 1378cm² for wing flapping¹¹, whereas an enriched cage only offers 750cm² and a height of 45cm. Running, jumping and flying – common behaviours of hens – are simply not possible in a cage.

There is not enough horizontal space for all birds to perch at once¹⁰; hens are all motivated to perch on elevated structures at night (and to a lesser extent during the day), and they become agitated if roosting is prevented¹². Due to the lack of vertical space in enriched cages, perching birds are often in contact with the roof of the cage and are forced to crouch, which reduces the preference of hens to perch¹³. Enriched cages have perches less than 10cm high⁷, however, studies have shown that hens prefer to use perches elevated at 50-90cm^{12,14,15}. Also, lower perches are found to increase the risk of vent pecking^{16, 17, 18}.

Dustbathing, foraging, scratching and searching behaviours, are rarely fully expressed in an enriched cage^{19,20}. To avoid the risk of high dust levels, the provision of foraging and scratching substrate (e.g. feed, sand, wood-shavings, sawdust and straw) is commonly minimal, and it has been found that fewer hens perform foraging behaviours in enriched cages compared to a barn system (15% vs 38% of hens expressing foraging, respectively)²¹. Due to the lack of space, any birds attempting to dustbathe are commonly interrupted, jostled or pecked by their companions²². Given the absence of any dustbathing substrate and sufficient space, most dustbathing is sham-dustbathing^{8,21}, taking place on the wire floor without substrate and is therefore insufficient to sate the motivation of the hen for this important behaviour, and leads to feather damage and loss.

Enriched cages are provided with a darkened area for birds to nest. However, nesting material is not provided. Research shows that hens prefer to lay in nests containing loose material which can be both moulded by their body and feet movements and manipulated with their beaks during nest building²³.

Being unable to express their innate behaviours, hens experience frustration which can result in abnormal behaviours. For example, feather pecking is thought to be the result of redirected pecking behaviour^{4,5}; it is a serious welfare concern in caged systems because it causes pain²⁴ and results in negative production consequences due to mortality, reduced productivity and increased feed consumption^{25,26}. Due to the serious consequences of feather pecking, beak trimming is widely employed. However, beak trimming (either using hot blade or infrared methods) is a welfare concern in itself as it is painful^{27,28} and results in a loss of function of the beak²⁹.

Extensive scientific reviews demonstrate that only cage-free systems provide the potential for animals to express their full behavioural repertoire and for a good quality of life, when the right combination of house design, breed, rearing conditions and management are met^{30,2}. Key features of good design for cage-free housing can be found here: [higher-welfare-systems-for-laying-hens-practical-options.pdf](https://compassioninfoodbusiness.com/higher-welfare-systems-for-laying-hens-practical-options.pdf) (compassioninfoodbusiness.com).

Enriched cages, despite the marginal improvements they offer compared to the barren battery cages, are still cages and lack most features needed to ensure an acceptable level of welfare to the hens. They have a low welfare potential by design, and no amount of good stockmanship can make up for the physical and behavioural restrictions imposed on the animals. Scientists, citizens and consumers around the world are calling on producers and food businesses to phase out cages and invest in future-fit cage-free systems.



References

- 1 European Commission, 1996. Scientific Veterinary Committee, Animal Welfare Section. Report on the welfare of laying hens. 30 October 1996. Brussels, Belgium.
- 2 EFSA, 2005. Opinion of the Scientific Panel on Animal Health and Welfare (AHAW) on a request from the Commission related to the welfare aspects of various systems of keeping laying hens. *The EFSA Journal* 197, 1-23.
- 3 Hughes BO, 1983. Conventional and shallow cages: a summary of research from welfare and production aspects. *World's Poultry Science Journal*, 39, 218–228.
- 4 Weeks, C.A. and Nicol, C.J., 2006. Behavioural needs, priorities and preferences of laying hens. *World's Poultry Science Journal*, 62(2), pp.296-307.
- 5 van Staaveren N and Harlander A, 2020. Cause and prevention of injurious pecking in chickens. Understanding the behaviour and improving the welfare of chickens. Burleigh Dodds Science Publishing. pp. 509–566
- 6 Shimmura T, Azuma T, Hirahara S, Eguchi Y, Uetake K and Tanaka T, 2008. Relation between social order and use of resources in small and large furnished cages for laying hens. *British Poultry Science*, 49, 516–524
- 7 EFSA, 2023. EFSA Panel on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (AHAW), Nielsen, S.S., Alvarez, J., Bicout, D.J., Calistri, P., Canali, E., Drewe, J.A., Garin-Bastuji, B., Gonzales Rojas, J.L., Gortázar Schmidt, C. and Herskin, M., 2023. Welfare of laying hens on farm. *EFSA Journal*, 21(2), p.e07789.
- 8 Rodenberg, T.B., Tuytens, F.A.M., de Reu, K., Herman, L. Zoons, J., and Sonck, B. (2008) Welfare assessment of laying hens in furnished cages and non-cage systems: an on-farm comparison. *Animal Welfare*, 17: 363-373.
- 9 Platz, S., Heyn, E., Hergt, F., Weigl, B., and Erhard, M., 2009. Comparative study on the behaviour, health and productivity of laying hens in a furnished cage and an aviary system. *Berl Munch Tierarztl Wochenschr.* 122(7/8):235-40
- 10 Riddle, E.R., Ali, A.B., Campbell, D.L. and Siegford, J.M., 2018. Space use by 4 strains of laying hens to perch, wing flap, dust bathe, stand and lie down. *PloS One*, 13(1), p.e0190532.
- 11 Mench, J.A. and Blatchford, R.A., 2014. Determination of space use by laying hens using kinematic analysis. *Poultry Science*, 93(4), pp.794-798.
- 12 Olsson, I.A.S. and Keeling, L.J., 2000. Night-time roosting in laying hens and the effect of thwarting access to perches. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 68(3), pp.243-256.
- 13 Struelens E, Tuytens FAM, Duchateau L, Leroy T, Cox M, Vranken E, Buyse J, Zoons J, Berckmans D, Odberg F and Sonck B, 2008. Perching behaviour and perch height preference of laying hens in furnished cages varying in height. *Poultry Science*, 49, 381–389
- 14 Newberry RC, Estevez I and Keeling LJ, 2001. Group size and perching behaviour in young domestic fowl. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 73, 117–129
- 15 Brendler C, Kipper S and Schrader L, 2014. Vigilance and roosting behaviour of laying hens on different perch heights. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 157, 93–99.

- 16 Moinard, C., Morisse, J.P. and Faure, J.M., 1998. Effect of cage area, cage height and perches on feather condition, bone breakage and mortality of laying hens. *British Poultry Science*, 39(2), pp.198-202.
- 17 Wechsler, B. and Huber-Eicher, B., 1998. The effect of foraging material and perch height on feather pecking and feather damage in laying hens. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 58(1-2), pp.131-141.
- 18 Lambton, S.L., Knowles, T.G., Yorke, C. and Nicol, C.J., 2015. The risk factors affecting the development of vent pecking and cannibalism in free-range and organic laying hens. *Animal Welfare*, 24(1), pp.101-111.
- 19 Nicol, C. J., 1987. Behavioural-responses of laying hens following a period of spatial restriction. *Animal Behaviour* 35:1709- 1719
- 20 Platz, S., Heyn, E., Hergt, F., Weigl, B. and Erhard, M., 2009. Comparative study on the behaviour, health and productivity of laying hens in a furnished cage and an aviary system. *Berliner und Munchener Tierarztliche Wochenschrift*, 122(7-8), pp.235-240.
- 21 de Jong, I.C., Reuvekamp, B. and Fiks, T., 2005. Evaluation of substrate quality in two different housing systems (barn systems and furnished cages) for laying hens with respect to dustbathing and foraging behaviour. *LayWel—Welfare Implications of Changes in Production Systems for Laying Hens. Work package, 4*, pp.2045-2.
- 22 Louton *et al.*, 2016. Dust-bathing behavior of laying hens in enriched colony housing systems and an aviary system. *Poultry Science* 00:1–10
- 23 Duncan, I.J.H. and Kite, V.G., 1989. Nest site selection and nest-building behaviour in domestic fowl. *Animal behaviour*, 37, pp.215-231
- 24 Cheng, H., 2006. Morphopathological changes and pain in beak trimmed laying hens. *World's Poultry Science Journal*, 62(1), pp.41-52.
- 25 Rodenburg TB, Van Krimpen MM, De Jong IC, De Haas EN, Kops MS, Riedstra BJ, Nordquist RE, Wagenaar JP, Bestman M and Nicol CJ, 2013. The prevention and control of feather pecking in laying hens: identifying the underlying principles. *World's Poultry Science Journal*, 69, 361–374.
- 26 Glatz PC, Lunam CA, Barnett JL (1998) Feeding behaviour of 10-week-old pullets following beak trimming at hatch. In 'Proceedings of the 10th Australian Poultry Science Association conference'. (Ed. D Balnave) p. 132. (The University of Sydney: Sydney, NSW, Australia)
- 27 Jongman EC, Glatz PC and Barnett JL, 2008. Changes in behaviour of laying hens following beak trimming at hatch and re-trimming at 14 weeks. *Asian-Australasian Journal of Animal Sciences*, 21, 291–298. <https://doi.org/10.5713/ajas.2008.60152>
- 28 Marchant-Forde, R. M., Fahey, A. G. & Cheng, H. W. Comparative effects of infrared and one-third hot-blade trimming on beak topography, behavior, and growth. *Poult. Sci.* 87, 1474–1483 (2008).
- 29 Glatz, P.C. and Underwood, G., 2020. Current methods and techniques of beak trimming laying hens, welfare issues and alternative approaches. *Animal Production Science*, 61(10), pp.968-989.
- 30 Nicol, C.J., Bouwsema, J., Caplen, G., Davies, A.C., Hockenhull, J., Lambton, S.L., Mullan, S. and Weeks, C.A., 2017. *Farmed bird welfare science review* (p. 321). Melbourne: Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources.