Heriot-Watt University
Research Gateway

'At home, he's a pet, at work he's a colleague and my right arm': Police dogs and the emerging posthumanist agenda

Citation for published version:
Knight, C & Sang, K 2019, ''At home, he's a pet, at work he's a colleague and my right arm': Police dogs and the emerging posthumanist agenda', *Culture and Organization*.
https://doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2019.1622544

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):
10.1080/14759551.2019.1622544

Link:
Link to publication record in Heriot-Watt Research Portal

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Published In:
Culture and Organization

Publisher Rights Statement:
his is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Culture and Organization on 30/5/2019, available online: http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/14759551.2019.1622544

General rights
Copyright for the publications made accessible via Heriot-Watt Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy
Heriot-Watt University has made every reasonable effort to ensure that the content in Heriot-Watt Research Portal complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact open.access@hw.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 04. Oct. 2023

‘At home, he’s a pet, at work he’s a colleague and my right arm’: Police dogs and the emerging posthumanist agenda.

Increased attention is being paid to non-human animals, inspired in part by Human-Animal Studies and theoretical frameworks which reveal the fragility of human/animal dualism. Via application of posthumanist performativity, we explore the recruitment and careers of police dogs via organisational analysis. It reveals a complex process of a dog *becoming* a police dog. Police dogs are placed within a speciesist hierarchy where they hold a position of ‘good’ non-human animals, rather than instrumental tools of the organization. However, this position is tenuous, with dogs’ retirement often resulting in death. The paper concludes by arguing that posthumanist frameworks can be used to decentre the human subject. Contributions of our work include empirical insights on the use of non-human animals in policing coupled with theoretical application of posthumanism to intersubjectivity in organisations

Keywords: non-human animals, organisational actors, policing, police dogs, posthumanism, performativity

Introduction

When considering non-human animals, Lennerfors and Sköld (2018) note that it is '…the dead and dying animal that has occupied the most prominent place in the field of organisation and management' (263); a thread seen in Schwartz's (2018) analysis of the Swedish meat industry, Hamilton and McCabe's (2016) work on chicken factory meat inspectors or Baran et al.'s (2016) exploration of slaughterhouse workers. Hannah and Robertson (2017) note that despite many organisations involving Human-Animal Work (HAW) '…it has received almost no attention from scholars in the field of management' (116) and is an area of 'neglect' (Hamilton and Mitchell 2018).

However, increasing attention is now being paid to non-human animals within organisational studies, in order to reconsider their agency rather than seeing them as commodified products (DeAngelo 2018, Hekman 2014, Reinhold 2018). Efforts have been made to reconceptualise the worker to include non-human labourers and consider them as actors able to influence organisational politics (Cunha, Rego and Munro 2018, Hribal 2003, O'Doherty 2016). By investigating non-human animals' labour and their relationships with human actors, we can understand how this relationship is mutually constituted in specific organisational and temporal contexts, leading to a more sophisticated understanding of co-dependent relationships and reducing this neglect (Hamilton and Mitchell 2018).

This paper explores the recruitment, working lives and 'retirement' of police dogs and considers their discursive framing, within a context of relatively high social status and where human actors represent the British state. We begin by outlining current sociological conceptualisations of non-human animals. The underlying theoretical framework of this paper is set out, namely a posthumanist framework informed by the feminist work of Haraway (1989; 1991; 1992; 2003), Barad (2007) and Braidotti

(2013). The empirical investigation considers specifically posthumanism performativity or rather the '…the sociospatial process of becoming a particular body in a particular place' (Geiger and Hovorka, 1113). Here this is represented by a dog *becoming* a police dog. As discussed below, this provides a way to link previous studies on Human-Animal Work with the theoretical positions outlined above and in the literature review as a way to illustrate the scope for more specifically management focused empirical explorations of this area. We then analyse, via structured document analysis and documentary footage for supporting qualitative insights, the career path of police dogs and identify key recurring themes in organisational narratives about their place. We compare this to police forces websites and other public documents which provide an idealised view of police dogs as representing the same values, behaviours and norms as human police officers. The paper concludes by considering how this performativity within policing and its organisational discourse demonstrate a temporary blurring of a speciesist hierarchy that provides a direction for further investigation in this area.

Conceptualizing non-human animals

Studies of organisations are starting to give more focus to non-human animals, their activities and networks of interactions. Recent studies have demonstrated the importance of understanding these networks in terms of how to organise human and non-human animals for understanding the potential to save endangered species (O'Mahoney et al. 2016) and the role of non-human animals in pedagogical processes (Pederson 2012). This allows us to see the complexity of organisations, from creativity between the human and the non-human (Duff and Sumartojo 2017) to the role of Bo the dog in Obama's US presidency (Skoglund and Redmalm 2016). The first step to understanding human and non-human (animal) relations in organisations is to understand what we mean by these terms - specifically, determining whether human and

non-human animals are distinct categories or identities. Species identities are performative; what we (as humans) say about non-human animals both reflects and constitutes a social reality (Pegg 2009). Recent sociological literature has revealed the importance of non-human animals to humans, particularly in terms of multispecies kinship (Charles 2014; Wilkie 2015). McCarthy (2015) has used such sociological advances to understand how 'dangerous' dogs are symbols of (lower) human social class and often frame popular political discourse. But, ultimately, such work recentres the human into sociological analysis, relegating the non-human animal to a reflection of human relationships. Fundamentally the specific and widespread exclusion of non-human animals from sociological and organisational analyses is rooted in a false distinction between human and non-human animal minds (Irvine 2007).

The work of Descartes (1993) underpins the Western dualism of transcendental human animals with immaterial souls possessing dominion over purely biological and physical non-human animals (Anglin 2014, Templer et al. 2006). These dualistic norms underpin much of the hierarchical structures among humans as well as between human animals and non-human animals (Deckha 2012). Critical theory has challenged the Cartesian dualistic hierarchy of mind and body, for example through the work of Derrida (2008) who views this ontological position as a type of primacy identity politics that reinforces oppression and inequality. Derrida's (2002) consideration of the relationship with his pussycat [sic], and being naked in front of the cat, demonstrates the complex questions which are raised when we begin to examine 'the animal'. Namely, if we consider the non-human animal, this means analysing ontologically the human and understanding how the two mutually constitute each other.

Non-human animals, including those genetically most closely related to humans, have been key components of the construction of knowledge (Haraway 1989). Knowledge, even when nominally about the 'Other', is imbued with the human through the imposition of our cultural understandings of other species. For example, human understandings of the social organisation of primates are rooted in human gender stereotypes (Schiebinger 1999). Thus, existing research runs the risk of anthropomorphism i.e. non-human animals' matter because they have had 'human' qualities or rights attributed to them (Braidotti 2013; Non-human Rights Project 2014).

Posthumanism

Posthumanism allows for a bridging between the epistemological traditions of the humanities and the 'sciences'; specifically, with advances in the natural sciences, we see that the lines between the human and the non-human animal, the human and the technological, are blurred (Geiger and Hovorka 2015; Haraway 1991). Behaviours or traits once considered uniquely 'human' are discovered within non-human societies, for example, metacognition (awareness of one's own thought processes) is not limited to human animals, but is also exhibited by chimpanzees (Beran, Smith, and Perdue 2013). In addition, there is evidence that non-human animals, such as capuchin monkeys, exhibit concern for the perceived equity in division of labour (Takimoto and Fujita 2011).

Posthumanism therefore provides an avenue for reconceptualising and acknowledging non-human animals as workers and organisational members (Haraway 2008; Pederson 2012; Peggs 2012). Within organisational studies, efforts have begun to explore the potential role of posthumanist thinking for understanding the relationships between humans and technologies (Anglin 2018, Godfrey, Lilley, and Brewis 2012,

Häkli 2018,). However, such efforts have largely neglected non-human animals and Humanism itself has historically viewed the universal face of the human as the Vitruvian ideal, a white male, with no apparent disability (Braidotti 2013; Haraway 1992). This ideal has serious consequences for *who* and *what* can be considered 'human' via its claims to universality despite the fragility and relational nature of the concept of human (Haraway 1991). Those who do not conform to this 'universal' man are Other; less than human (Braidotti 2013).

Feminist critiques of Humanism occur concurrently with efforts to build theoretical frameworks that give no special weight to humans but rather see distributive agency based around relationships and interactions and challenge ideas of subject/object, artifice/nature (Latour 2012; Schmidt 2014). We can see here an immediate link to previous work undertaken on dogs such as Kirk (2014) who discusses the concept of intersubjectivity as being more than simply shared spaces between human minds but also encompassing non-human animals. Using the example of land-mind detecting dogs, he asserts that this cross species intersubjectivity is evidenced by '…those who trust dogs to detect mines and those that do not' (3). Kirk (ibid) explicitly links to Haraway's (2008) idea of a 'responsible-able' relationship based upon an attentive understanding of how a dog or other non-human animal may communicate its subjective experience of the world (hunger, fear, boredom). Similarly, Bear (2011) drawing together the work of Deleuze and Haraway notes, using angling as an example, that this type of intersubjectivity or 'coconstitutive encounters' (336) involve's trying to anticipate and adapt to the non-human animal.

Considering further the Cartesian dualism, Barad (2003; 2007) has argued that bodily existence is theorised out of academic discourse, through the linguistic turn.

Through agential-realism, Barad's posthumanism allows for the human to be seen as part of nature and for the agency of the material. Agential-realism allows for matter to matter, while recognising that the material-discursive practices of science do not reveal knowledge, rather they create it. Within Barad's (2007) framework, entities are formed through material-discursive practice, whereby the human and the non-human can never be seen as distinct. Importantly, for Barad, matter or materiality are not fixed or inherent, rather 'materiality is a doing not a thing' (Mauthner 2015, 327). From a sociological perspective, this is not simply another way to identify new boundaries or reassert old ones, rather it allows for 'the very nature of what is deemed to be human [to be] dissolved back into the world' (Bolton 2014, 55).

Given this blurring, the exclusion of non-human animals partially rests with sociology's focus on who can be considered subjects with agency (Tovey 2003). In contrast, Bennett (2010) advances the idea of 'distributive agency' where collaborative alliances represent a 'ontologically heterogeneous field, rather than being a capacity localized in a human body...' (23) and thus asserts the importance of non-human bodies within organisational contexts. At the ontological level, posthumanism moves the human from a coherent and autonomous subject to one which is co-constituted with other forms of life (Nayar 2013). The denial of agency for non-human animals, traditionally considered the preserve of the human, is also contested (Peggs 2012). From a diverse range of perspectives, non-human animal agency is gaining increasing attention (Ojalehto, Medin, and Garćia 2017; Pearson 2016, Špinka and Wernelsfelder 2011). However, the idea that non-human animals have agency is contested in various ways and it is arguable that the concept of agency itself is anthropocentric (McFarland and Hediger 2009).

Turning to understandings of work, within traditional humanist theoretical lenses, who (or what) can qualify as a 'worker' has been limited. Traditional Marxist approaches deny women as 'workers' (Haraway 2008) and other lenses similarly are based around human exceptionalism (Marguiles and Bersaglio 2018; Menon and Karthik 2017; Napletano et al. 2018). Posthumanism, with its capacity to destabilize what is taken for granted, opens avenues for understanding who can be considered as 'workers' and whose labour can be examined (Bryant and Wolfram Cox 2014). Space is opened to consider non-human animals, but with a note of caution. Critical theory relies on the use of human language and methodological conventions, seen by humanists as one of the core characteristics of 'man' (Braidotti 2013). More simply, the posthumanist project to consider non-human animals is constrained by the language and research methods used by humans and is therefore always likely to reflect a human perspective.

Thus, humanist notions of the primacy of the human agent are increasingly open to critique in the academy and here we use dogs to deepen our understanding of the 'innumerable non-human elements are that interwoven in human processes' (Taylor and Carter 2013, 2). Haraway (2003) refers to the co-constitution of the human and the animal, specifically the dog, as occurring over 'two time-space scales' (63). Firstly, dogs and humans have co-evolved, as demonstrated through the emergence of the dog from the wolf via the process of human domestication (as evidenced through mitochondrial DNA). Humans selectively bred certain dogs; those who displayed behaviours more suited to human needs. In turn, humans evolved away from needing to make use of senses such as smell, due to reliance on dogs for this (ibid). Secondly, the co-constitution takes place through the interactions of bodies and individuals (the face-

to-face time) in common tasks such as hunting and tracking in the past and here in the use of police dogs for policing activities. As such, the relationship between humans and dogs has co-constituted both at the material bodily level. Within contemporary society dogs have been used as tools to control or 'police' humans (DeAngelo 2018; Haraway 2003) or even by criminal gangs to indicate status, intimidate and attack rival gangs. Moreover, although there is a large body of literature on how humans can control dogs through training, dogs have been engaged in 'policing' humans including controlling slaves and tracking criminals through to the use of dogs within warfare (Haraway 2003; Pemberton 2014).

This paper focuses on police dogs, whose labour has been integral to Western policing since the 19th century (Pemberton 2014). Although they have some public relations value, they mainly occupy operational specialist roles in individual police forces. However, their position as workers remains curiously unexamined beyond exploring the public relations aspect (Skoglund and Redmalm 2017). Although there has been a lack of previous work with police dogs, work with other non-human animals is useful to illustrate the potential for posthumanist understandings of non-human animals' labour. Geiger and Hovorka's (2015) work using a feminist posthumanism exploration of the performativity of donkeys in Botswana can be seen as one of the few attempts to make this shift. They see this relationship creating '…performativities beyond an individual's engagement with the social world' (1101). Similarly, here we see the performativity of the 'police dog' as a hybrid constituted by the dog, police officers and policing.

From a Foucauldian perspective, policing represents a disciplinary technology or practice of power to determine the conduct of individuals (Foucault 1977, 2010). Police dogs provide a specialist labour force that is often more productive than human animals for common dominative tasks, such as searching for individuals or drugs or physically controlling the movement and actions of humans (Ensminger 2011). Indeed, they are often compared to technology such as helicopters with the 'eye in the sky' being supported by the 'noise on the ground' (*Send in the dogs* 2008c). Police dogs allow for a type of functional interdependence, integrated into the routine of policing, shaping the performances and tasking of organisational business units in order to comply with externally set targets (Ashby, Irving, and Longley 2007; Butterfield et al., 2005). DeAngelo (2018) has suggested that dogs can be seen as a form of militarized technology. However, within this body of work, bi-species policing has been neglected. One of the small number of studies in this area itself notes that '...little attention has been given to the role of animals in policing work, despite a burgeoning literature on both policing and animal geographies' (Yarwood 2015, 278). Accordingly, this paper aims to understand the role that other species, namely police dogs, have as agents of the state, and the portrayal of the dynamics of the relationships between police dogs and their human handlers.

Research Methods

Understanding the relationship between humans and non-human animals, in this case police dogs, requires an understanding of some of the unique characteristics of policing as process and the cultural milieu created. Researching the work of non-human actors within organisations poses particular problems, namely, lack of direct access to these actors' lived experiences. Rather, alternative forms of data collection and analysis are necessary, for example, the use of documentaries (Krawczyk and Barthold 2018).

Hence the research team adopted an exploratory and iterative research design that has two stages in regard to data gathering and one to data analysis.

Data Gathering

The analysis makes use of two types of empirical sources; thematic analysis of all UK police forces' websites and 13 hours of documentaries which focus on the work of police dogs and their handlers in the UK. The aim here is to understand how the working relationship between police dogs, their handlers and police forces as employers of both is articulated across the dogs' career trajectories via organisational artefacts.

The websites of each police constabulary (there are 45 territorial police forces in the UK of varying sizes) were searched for material relating to Dog Units or the use of police dogs or where members of the public had made Freedom of Information requests related to their activities and forces had made a response beyond refusing the request. The searches were limited to the five years ending 10th December 2016 for manageability purposes and to ensure material reflected current not historical practices. The websites themselves differed in design and the level of coverage that they had on Dog Units or their activities. This data collection process was made more complex by the fact that not all forces' websites had specific sections relating to their Dog Units (for example Cumbria), and neighbouring forces may share a Dog Unit and thus duplicate the same information across two sites. Those websites (as of 2016) with dedicated Dog Unit websites which contained information on the recruitment, selection, working lives and retirement of dogs were selected. This was supplemented with any press releases that were made about significant events such as recruitment, the death of a police dog or where they were indicated to be otherwise remarkable (such as winning a commendation or being noted for their operational activities). This resulted in 168

documents representing around 30,000 words of text. A document for our purposes is either a captured webpage turned into text or a downloaded artefact from a website such as a PDF press release. We acknowledge that the presentation of the police dogs on official websites and our analysis represents a human interpretation of a human perspective, but this is unavoidable given the research methodology. Further, although direct observation would provide a different focus, gaining access to policing is difficult and, in this situation, gaining access to every stage of a police dog's working life (recruitment, training, service and retirement) represents additional complexity.

To supplement these documents, we also collected 13 hours of UK TV documentaries: this was 12 hours of the documentary series 'Send in the dogs' and one hour of the documentary series 'Coppers'. The use of these documentaries is secondary but was used to contextualise the documents captured from the websites.

Data analysis

This data was analysed via NVivo, by both authors, to identify common representative themes and sort the data into manageable nodes. This is a well-accepted technique in organisational research (Brown, Gianiodis, and Santoro 2015; Oh et al. 2014; Tate 2015). This allowed the authors to consider how UK policing organisations frame and discuss the 'careers' of these non-human actors. This approach of using organisational websites to explore the relationship between human and non-human animals has also been used previously in a study exploring the relationships between anglers and managing fishing stocks (Sims and Danylchuk 2017).

The lead researcher coded the website content for description of dogs' careers including recruitment, selection, work activities, welfare, the dog-human relationship

and retirement. This coding was done via an interpretive approach where the researcher tried to identify common thematic connections for analysis and to identify key actors (the police dogs themselves, dog handlers, the wider organisation and other stakeholders) and the nature of their multi-species relationship. The coding was then verified by the second member of the research team. The resulting data was used to map the career of a police dog in the UK and the discourse used to describe these careers and dog-handler relationships. The organisational documents analysed and documentaries tended to cluster around a small number of themes.

The secondary source of data was the documentary series *Send in the dogs* (2008a,b,c,d; 2009a,b), which focused on the work of police dogs and their handlers in four different police forces, and a single episode of the documentary series *Coppers* (2012) which focused on this type of work. These are works of popular entertainment produced by the UK national TV channels ITV and Channel 4 respectively. These were chosen because each focus, not on generic accounts of policing, but specifically on the aspects of the working lives and human relationships that we were interested in. Furthermore, they at different points concentrate on the tasks and responsibilities that police dogs are expected to carry out. This allowed a narrative richness and ability to observe intersubjectivity and posthumanism performativity of the type discussed previously that could not be achieved simply by reviewing organisational documents.

Each documentary was viewed with detailed notes taken by the lead author who coded the language and visual aspects of the material. The second author watched selected documentaries in order to understand decisions and agree the coding with the first author. The importance of documentaries for sociologists in this area is discussed

in detail by Wilkie (2015). Previously, documentaries have been used to explore various aspects of organisational life (Aitken 1998), including the use of dogs in wartime (Hediger 2013). They have also been used to study organisational behaviour such as the perception of accountants in the wake of the Enron scandal (Carnegie and Napier 2010) and the activities of organisations such as McDonald's and Walmart (Pompper and Higgins 2007). Police documentaries serve a dual purpose, firstly to represent the work of police officers, which may be absent from the general public's view. Secondly, documentaries are designed to serve as a virtual form of policing in that they are intended to prevent the committing of crime (Lee and McGovern 2012). Sociologically this is also important at multiple levels because there has been a shift to looking at non-human animals as subjects not simply objects and part of society rather than as just symbols (Knight 2005); however, police dogs intersect the complex relationship between all as they are both subject (of the documentary) and symbol (of the police).

Furthermore, in the material focused on their training, we see how a dog *becomes* a police dog, this idea of the hybrid that Geiger and Hovorka (2015), building on the work of Birke et al. (2004) and Barad (2003), position as 'posthumanist performativity'. Documentaries are a valuable tool for understanding how contemporary police work is constituted, albeit through a particular metanarrative determined by the documentary producers (Hassard and Holliday 1998). Importantly, we agree with Hassard (1998) that documentaries can provide a useful sociological tool for understanding representations, rather than reproductions, of organisational life, showing '*a* truth, rather than *the* truth' (58).

For the purpose of the current study, the focus of analysis was organisational websites, to uncover the discourses of police dogs' careers. The documentaries were used as supplementary material to support the analysis of the websites. Taken together, the documents and videos analysed therefore represent either the organisation's own perspective or one sanctioned by them: these can be seen in terms of 'framing'. The authors were therefore mindful that this represents a preferred or selective representation of the work of police dogs and their interaction with human actors but still felt it added valuable 'colour' to the research because of the rich representation of the relationships between human and non-human animals that the documentaries profile.

Findings and discussion

Reflecting the narratives constructed by the media and the police themselves, the findings and discussion are structured to reflect the career trajectory of a police dog and cover recruitment, selection and training, active duty and then finally retirement.

Recruitment, selection and training

The police force websites reveal similar recruitment and selection practice but all are looking for '...various social-cognitive skills' in their dogs (Diverio, Menchetti and Riggio 2017, 67). There are three main routes to recruitment, dogs which are gifted from the public, in-house breeders and some forces have relationships with external breeders. While some forces have relationships with breeders to ensure a steady supply of new recruits, some forces such as British Transport Police (BTP) and Bedfordshire Police adopt dogs from the public. Such dogs are referred to as 'gift dogs'. At this early stage, police forces use the language of a career for their canine recruits: 'Once a gift dog has successfully completed its' [sic] training it becomes part of the team enjoying a

long and worthwhile career' (Bedfordshire Police, nd).

Like with human recruits, characteristics are used to filter applicants. Police forces indicate preferences for specific breeds of dog and age ranges. For example the BTP states a preference for breeds such as Rottweilers and Dobermans, and for dogs under two years since older dogs are 'harder to train when they are past adolescence' (British Transport Police, nd). Here the use of human terminology e.g. adolescence is used to describe a dog's age. Following recruitment dogs are then subject to a selection process, undergoing a range of tests to assess their suitability. Many, such as West Midlands Police (nd) force, set out their requirements for a police dog and discuss the need for 'courage and determination'. While some forces use 'gift dogs', website analysis reveals that many police forces prefer to breed their own animals in-house rather than recruit from outside and the documentaries reveal that over a training period of three months or more, most dogs are expected to fail the selection process (*Send in the dogs,* 2008a, b, c). For some dogs, reflecting Pemberton's (2014) historical account of bloodhounds in policing, they are selected because they are bred from previous police dogs and it is felt that being a good dog is 'in the blood' (*Send in the Dogs, 2008a)*.

All the police forces' websites refer to their police dogs using the inanimate pronoun 'it', while simultaneously using terms indicative of perceived innate personality traits of the dogs. Indeed, the recruitment and selection of police dogs favours the same characteristics favoured in human officers, such as 'loyalty', 'hard working', 'courage', resilience' and 'tenacity' (Wilsson and Sunddgren 1996). Dogs must exhibit traits such as boldness and assertiveness, 'without being too aggressive'. The dog must simultaneously be under the control of his or her human handler, while

exhibiting the human trait of courage. As one trainer notes, ‘any dog that shows any distress for any reason is simply removed from the training’ (*Send in the Dogs* 2008a). In contrast to ‘dangerous’ dogs (O’Neil 2007) the police dog represents reason and self-control, attributes shared with human officers, extending to some discussion of canine agency (Greenebaum 2010). As with their fellow human officers, dogs are sought who ‘like nothing more than confronting people’ (*Send in the dogs* 2008b) and who will ‘get stuck in there [become aggressive], often without prompting’ (*Send in the dogs* 2008c). Such articulations are important because they demonstrate how violence and confrontation with non-police actors are entirely normal activities. Further they evidence the position of Kirk (2014) that intersubjectivity can be extended to animals on the basis that the human actor trusts they will successfully undertake a given important activity or as Haraway (2008) notes demonstrates ‘…inside connections that demand and enable responses’ (8). Thus, the performativity discussed above starts to emerge, with a trainer noting that when working with a new dog called Otis that ‘He needs to understand me’ rather than the human understanding the dog and also that ‘we need to trust each other’ (*Send in the dogs 2008a*) and the emergence of Geiger and Hovorka’s (2015) hybrid. Similarly, this type of trust can be seen as the ‘responsible-able’ relationship indicated by Kirk (2014).

Many of the forces do not specify what happens to dogs which are deemed not to have the appropriate qualities for a police dog. The BTP, which has the most comprehensive website for its canine force, states that it rehomes dogs who do not meet the selection criteria. Reported care for the welfare of police dogs, both working and retired, is emphasised across many of the websites. At the end of the training programme, dogs selected to work as police dogs receive a “licence’ to work (West

Midlands Police, nd). Note it is the dog who is positioned as receiving the licence not the human handler.

Police dog training also parallels human officer recruitment and selection process with assessors determining which generalist or specialist role a police dog may fulfil. These could be to find drugs, cash or explosives. Others might have specialisms based on their ability to detect human blood, tissue, bones or other bodily fluids. Although rare, this can lead to situations such as dogs intended to support armed officers being trained to abseil into buildings and send back images via cameras attached to their heads (*Send in the dogs*, 2008a). This itself is presented as a type of hierarchy, with only experienced well trusted dogs being accepted for further training for this role.

A police dog's life and moves for enhanced status

Once trained, police dogs undertake several roles, including searching for suspects/missing people, locating illicit items, tracking lost people and detaining suspects. Dogs' roles may be breed specific, for example the Metropolitan Police Service notes on its website that general-purpose dogs (who do a range of tasks) are 'usually German or Belgian Shepherd Dogs'.

There is a direct connection between the UK police's ability and right to apply violence to manage the behaviour of members of the public. Whereas the Dangerous Dogs Act (1991) applies to dogs that are known for aggression and fighting ability, these are praised characteristics in the police dog. In contrast to the control of 'dangerous' dogs owned by members of the public (McCarthy 2015), police dogs have long been used as a 'mechanism' for the deployment of state sanctioned violence

against civilian populations (Campbell, Berk, and Fyfe 1998). These are dogs that in political and popular discourse aboutthe 'under-class' are often associated with 'street capital' (Harding 2012). Here we would argue that police dogs represent bio-political (authority over humans) activity that extends the term beyond self-regulation as discussed by scholars such as Skoglund and Redmalm (2016, 216) to a more active management of the population by non-human species.

Moves by police lobbying groups for attacks on police dogs to be reclassified from criminal damage to be an equivalent offence to attacking a police officer (Graham 2012) also reveal the blurred stratification systems that exist within policing organisations to engender belonging (police officer/dog) and exclusion (the deviant or criminal class). Here boundary work emerges through blurring of the clear hierarchy and dualism between humans and non-human animals (Arluke and Sanders 1996; Bryant and Wolfram Cox 2014). The police dog moves from object towards being a subject who can be the victim of a crime. The police dog gains the status of organisational member with associated privileges, something that is also reflected in the language used by handlers, with dogs being described as a 'workmate' and 'partners' (*Send in the dogs* 2008c) and '*loving to work*' (*Send in the dogs* 2008d). While through a posthumanist lens, we can see the dualism between human police officer and police dog becoming blurred, it is necessary to question the effects of this. Attempts to protect police dogs as organisational members may reframe a dichotomy and hierarchy rather than remove it. Dogs more closely associated with civilised human values are privileged, while other dogs (such as status dogs) are associated with criminal activity and stigmatised (McCarthy 2015). Indeed, *Send in the dogs* (2008c) illustrates that dog handlers are also used to identify and remove from the streets dogs that are subject to

the Dangerous Dogs Act (1991) which in itself may represent a different type of imposed posthumanism performativity - that of the criminal - dangerous dog – criminal gang.

Bi-species working relationships (entanglement)

Both the documentaries and the websites emphasise the blurring of work and home boundaries with police dogs living at home with their handlers while off shift. Officers claim that the relationship between handler and dogs is a '...bond that is unreal' (*Coppers,* 2012). The bond is essential, 'otherwise the dog will not work with you' (*Send in the dogs,* 2009b). These statements illustrate how humans normalise the assumption that dogs can be part of a close relationship with humans via the handler assuming a personality for the dog (Beck and Katcher 1996). Equally there is an assumption that the dog can speak via his/her behaviour which the human actor understands and articulates. Police dogs communicate with their handler, not by barking, but by wagging their tail to signify something of importance or rather something the officer deems to be important (*Send in the dogs,* 2008a,b,c,d). The officer is constructing an understanding of the police dog's mind to allow them to 'know' about the dog's subjective experience (Eddy et al. 1993).

The websites and documentaries also reveal that police dogs fulfil multiple roles of tool, force, partner and augmenter of human labour, often working 60 hours a week or more (*Send in the Dogs,* 2008a). This is in excess of the average 40 hour working week which is suggested for human police officers. Police dogs are used for two main protection and apprehension techniques; bite-and-hold and circle-and-bark. Bite-and-hold involves a police dog (often a German Shepherd) finding and restraining a suspect

until commanded to release. Circle-and-bark involves the dog preventing the movement of an individual without biting them (Dorriety 2005; Meade 2006). When a dog-handler says 'stop' to a fleeing suspect, also serving as a command to the dog to bite-and-hold (*Send in the dogs,* 2008a). The police dog is used to augment human labour (via smell and force) and also, depending on the breed of dog, for the physical protection of property. Property that as per Benton's (1993) Marx based analysis of human relations with non-human animals that they can never own because of their lack of moral agency.

Police dogs therefore occupy different roles, as a living extension or prosthesis of the police officer (e.g. using scent for drug detection) and as a defence mechanism. In their specialist roles as sniffer or search dogs, they are often seen as more productive than humans because of their enhanced senses (*Send in the dogs,* 2008c). In some situations the concept of augmentation is reversed with situation such as a drug dog using motion and whining sounds to indicate to its human partner that they should search a certain area the dog cannot access or lift the animal to enable them to do so (*Send in the Dogs 2008a).*The dualism between human (police officer) and non-human animal (police dog) is again blurred and if we adopt a position of posthumanist performativity disappears. We can see that the police officer and police dog are mutually constituted and cannot be disentangled (Barad 2003; Haraway 2003).

Indeed, often the idea that the officer controls the animal disappears with one police dog deciding to chase and bite a suspect with no prompting and the officer noting 'The dog decided to do it off his own back and bit him' and that 'with the best will in the world, I wasn't going to step in and stop him' (*Sending in the dogs* 2008a). Similarly, officers often fade into the background with the police dog controlling the scene, as one notes 'sometimes I forget that I'm working him, he works so well on his own, I stand back and get mesmerised and I just get totally absorbed' (*Send in the dogs*

2008a).

In terms of Foucault's idea of the 'police-prison' system (1977) and how it is used to organise the population via creating the idea of prison being the end result of deviance, the police dog (like the human officer) is an extension of the prison in that it is used to organise space, control actions and bodies - often in the most literal fashion via biting. One dog handler commented 'we want the dog to bark to intimidate people' (*Send in the dogs,* 2008a) and that police dogs are 'often more of a deterrent than a firearm because they know we will use the dog' (ibid). Hence, police dogs are often deployed at large events such as football matches and the purpose is not simply that encompassed by governmentality (police activity meant to shape the conduct of fans) but also to ensure the free movement of capital and people as economic actors at these large events (Edensor, 2014).

It would be easy to see the police dog as a living but instrumental version of the police truncheon without agency, but it is here that some of the contradictions and tensions start to emerge. We follow the categorisation used by Arluke (2004) in that we see police dogs holding the position of 'good' animals rather than being useful as 'tools'. This boundary confusion is caused by their partner officer taking the dog into their home and having responsibility for their care and welfare at all times. As one dog-handler noted 'at home, he's a pet, at work he's a colleague and my right arm' (*Coppers,* 2012). Similarly, while as noted the police websites uses the term 'it', officers do not, with one noting on the death of a police dog, '…losing *someone* you work with every day is devastating' (*Send in the dogs* 2008a). In contrast, a 'tool' describes animals that are subject to de-anthropomorphization; for example, non-human

animals reared for human consumption are described in terms of 'the yield' that can be rendered from their carcasses. Such non-human animals are by their very nature standardised and 'pure' - what Arluke (2004) deems 'Super Objects' - and their systematic incorporation into production processes by the assignment of a number or meaningless name gives them a corporate rather than individualistic identity. Stibbe (2003) notes that industry manuals and domain specific terminology are a direct reflection of the industry discourse on how non-human animals are viewed. Within the meat industry it is noted that the industry speaks metaphorically and reconstructs pigs as inanimate objects (Hamilton and Taylor 2013).

Language here is used to redefine non-human animals as objects rather than subjects, or vice versa and to place non-human animals into hierarchical species relationships (Hamilton and Taylor 2013; Yates 2010). Human language hierarchically organises non-human animals by the giving of proper names, personalising the recipient, resulting in affection (Feinberg 2012) and a 'link to the social emergence of personality' (Philips 1994, 123). In contrast to the approaches adopted in slaughterhouses, police dogs have names, are given homes and are often used in public relations material. They are often the subject of hagiographic biographies with titles such as 'Cassius - The True Story of a Courageous Police Dog' (Thorburn 2010) or 'A Hero's Tail' (Gaye and O'Grady 2013) illustrating the exceptionalism of such 'good' animals. Recently animal welfare charities have launched honours awards for non-human animals, including police dogs and it is not uncommon for them to be described as 'heroes' as one of the book titles above suggests (Anon 2014). Further, as Kohn (2007) argues, the trans-species interactions between humans and dogs assume some intersubjectivity, and if canine subjectivity were to be truly acknowledged, it would

break down our understanding of 'human' through challenging our assumed dominance and uniqueness. Although it should be noted that, regarding dominance and animals as Arluke's 'super objects' as discussed before, others such as Williams (2004) argue that the food industry has used this intersubjectivity to further enhance and make the production process more effective by providing an emphasis on care to animals to be slaughtered.

Arguably then, because members of other animal species must demonstrate their likeness with human animals in order to be afforded moral status, this actually reinforces rather than disrupts a human 'norm' (Mills 2010). So does the police dog truly represent something transgressive? The police dog when biting a human is not a 'bad' *animal*, it is a state and organization sanctioned 'good' *actor* embedded with a degree of moral qualification that separates them from objects for consumption (Catlaw and Holland 2014). Furthermore Hearne (1987) has described agency and intent in regards to the interactional and emotional experiences of non-human animals and their ability to take 'the role of the other' (44) to shape interactions to achieve their goals: for example, attracting the attention of an owner to be fed or indeed to respond to the emotional state of the owner and act accordingly. In this situation, the correct reaction to the aggressive confrontation stance of the officer is to mirror it and bite-and-hold or bark-and-circle.

Drawing on Haraway (2008) and Catlaw and Holland (2014) it is therefore evident that the non-human animal world is divided (by humans) into those whom it is acceptable to kill and those it is not. Within this framework police dogs are embedded with a degree of moral qualification that separates them from the commodification of

non-human animals for consumption, even in situations where a police dog kills a human (Ensminger 2011, 261). Moreover, police dogs can provide 'canine evidence', via finding contraband or detaining a suspect, that may be admissible in court (Ensminger and Papet 2014). Arguably this is partly related to social construction of a relational identity on the part of the human animal. In other words, to treat the police dog as purely instrumental would be a part-repudiation of the values of policing or, to put it another way, respect for police dogs by police officers and society is ennobling or self-validating for their use in policing (Schmidtz 2001). This is a contrast to the idea of the 'status dog' used by those engaged in what has been described as criminal or 'deviant' behaviour to harass and intimidate members of the public (Hughes et al. 2011) and which has led to increasingly strong restrictions on private dog ownership, The UK Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act (2014), for example, makes it an offence, with the threat of seizure, if a dog snarls aggressively at members of the public.

The early use of bloodhounds in the 19th century to track criminals also highlights this divide between classes. It was a practice made acceptable by positioning the English pure-breed hound as the 'embodiment of ideals of pure-breed and purity' (Pemberton 2014, 205). Seen as 'efficient, modern and humane' (ibid: 206), these dogs were nonetheless able to recognize the domination of man and their position within both an anthropocentric and racial hierarchy - one they side-stepped when hunting 'bad' humans. The use of police dogs thus reveals the mechanisms of power and how policing, as an aspect of governmentality and the control of the population and their conduct, has an institutionally-sanctioned ability to transgress the normal human to non-human power relationships.

The retirement of the police dog (disentanglement)

As with human officers, police dogs have a clearly defined and delineated career trajectory. As with the human officer, illness or injury in the line of active duty may cut short a career but on average, a police dog undertakes active service of around five years (*Send in the dogs,* 2008a,b,c).

As suggested earlier, the police dog is seen to represent various traits or even moral characteristics that mirror the perceived best of wider police culture - loyalty, courage and an ill-defined, but feted, ability to sense that someone is a criminal or of low moral character. At the end of active service, we can see police dogs undertake another organisationally sanctioned transformation. Recruitment and selection transform a dog into a *police* dog with the modification of status changing their relationships to non-organisational actors and their ability to transgress norms such as biting and barking at humans. Further, police dogs are constructed as a working partner and a 'pet' at home. At the end of their career, police dogs make the reverse journey and move back to the status of *dog*. Although accurate data is hard to locate, media reports indicate many are deemed unsuitable for 'civilian life' and, although otherwise fit and healthy, are euthanized (Pettifor 2012). There are parallels here with the classification of violent and aggressive dogs as 'waste' which is seen with so-called dangerous dogs (McCarthy 2015). Still, another contrast becomes evident - dangerous dogs, falling under the Dangerous Dogs Act, are 'destroyed' (ibid., 8), while police dogs are 'put down'.

The scale of euthanasia of police dogs is difficult to understand and map as an organisational activity, because the information that police organisations hold on this

aspect of the life of a police dog is difficult to obtain. Moreover, the police record and report on the death of nameless dogs (plural) as a group, not on the circumstances of the death of an individual dog who may have previously been praised or featured in publicity material. Limited information can be found through Freedom of Information requests on individual force websites. However, the fate of retired police dogs has received some media attention. A recent investigation by the BBC (2013) suggested that some police dogs are rehomed with their handler, while other working dogs including sheepdogs and military dogs are shot or otherwise killed. Nonetheless, Boyle and Thornhill (2013) revealed that between 2010 and 2013 more than 80 police dogs in the UK had been euthanised at the end of their careers.

Here we can see a tension between the positioning of police dogs as distinct from the material objects deployed in contemporary policing, and the killing of dogs when they are no longer useful. Police dogs, like other dogs bred for specific working purposes, become 'waste' animals (Bauman 2013; McCarthy 2015), at which point necropolitics (who and how human and non-human animals live and die) becomes salient (Braidotti, 2007). 'Undesirable' retired police dogs are subject to perhaps the most extreme assertion of biopower; killing those who are not socially desirable such as police dogs who are not viewed as suitable for rehoming – unlike almost all search and rescue dogs (Lee 2013).

Conclusions

Through the lens of posthumanism performativity, this paper explored the implications of non-human animals being recognised as organisational actors, through an examination of the process of dog *becoming* police dogs. The analysis suggests that the distinction between human and canine police actors is simultaneously blurred and

reinforced depending on content. During recruitment and selection dogs are described as having human like qualities, while simultaneously using the dehumanising language of 'it'. Descriptions of multi-species policing activities reveal the co-constitution of the labour of both the police officer and the police dog, and where humans augment non-humans and the instinct and 'voice' of the non-human animal drives action. These all destabilize the traditional primacy afforded to human organisational actors.

Police dogs represent a number of wider contradictions about human and non-human animals in organisations; they must be both aggressive and obedient, friendly yet distant and both a law enforcement tool and a symbol of protection (Sanders 2006). This places the police dog into contexts where they display superagency such as deciding when to bite suspects while active organisational members before being cast aside on retirement. Furthermore, human-companion animal relationships are underpinned by the emotional intensity in which the animals are seen as unique and thoughtful friends or family members (Sanders 1995). Aspects of non-human animals' behaviour are anthropomorphized and categorised within a certain human cultural register. Indeed, we see the role of the police dog as within Foucault's idea of biopower, with the dog's primary role being 'the subjugation of bodies and the control of populations' (Foucault 1978, 140).

This study is supported by arguments that the human-animal dualism is being revealed as false, with the fragility of the human subject becoming evident (Braidotti 2013; Haraway 2003). It has proposed that the adoption of posthumanist frameworks, which aim to decentre the human subject, can be used to reframe sociological studies of organisations and work. Namely, this reframing can be used to consider non-human

animals as organisational members rather than tools of the organization. This paper has demonstrated that not only are dogs used as tools of power within contemporary policing, but the strict delineation between the human officer and their canine 'partner' is blurred in the construction of the police dog. Police dogs are used to augment the labour of human police officers, for example through use in the restraining of suspects or through drug detection. As such the human police officer and the police dog are co-constituted. Through the recruitment and active service stage of police dogs' careers, they are constructed as imbued with 'human' qualities which indicate assumptions of agency and moral character. As such a hierarchy is created between police dogs and other dogs. However, such actions also anthropomorphise police dogs, ultimately recentring the human. Police dogs are 'better' than other dogs because they share qualities with humans. The blurring of the dualism between the human police officer and the non-human police dog is contingent on assumed commonalities predicated on human characteristics. And yet any blurring is temporary, with retirement often signalling the end of life for police dogs, who return to the status of dog (or a tool). As such the police dog moves from organisational member to tool of the organization, or a waste animal.

Further work is needed to explore the role of non-human animals as organisational members or workers in organization theory. This can usefully be done via the framing lens of posthumanist performativity as discussed and applied here. Such work may wish to consider further how class and gender intersect in the human-non-human animal relationship, particularly given recent work on status and weapon dogs (Harding 2014). Drawing on these sociological analyses will help to reveal how hierarchies are drawn even within the same species. In addition, given posthumanism's

concerns with agential-realism (Barad 2003), efforts should be made to understand the agency of other organisational actors, for example, material objects.

A limitation of the current study is its reliance on materials produced by human beings to understand the working life of police dogs. This has two main problems, firstly, that the material is produced with a particular (human) agenda. The materials rarely reflect on dogs' resistance to their training or work. Hribal (2003) has charted evidence of non-human animals' resistance to humans' efforts to control their labour. Future researchers should consider understanding how dogs may exhibit resistance.

Secondly, the reliance on human language, in various forms, is a common critique of posthumanism. We suggest our approach has allowed for analysis of the discursive framing of the police dog as worker, and how this is contextual and temporal. But, given the reliance of the posthumanist project on human language and methods, such work is problematic. If the human subject relies on anthropocentric understandings of agency, how can the agency of non-human animal organisational members be understood? These concerns have been raised by Calvert-Minor (2014), whose critique of Barad's posthumanism rests on an argument that the human must remain at the centre of theorising, as only humans 'know'. This position would appear to make speciesist assumptions about the special characteristics of human animals, specifically, language and knowing.

Here there is benefit to drawing on feminist critiques of the natural sciences. One such example is feminist primatology, where feminist methods have been used to reveal the patriarchal underpinning of previous understandings of non-human animal

behaviour. Fedigan (2001) argues that research methods which are sensitive to the specific group of non-human animals under study and recognise the cultural underpinnings of the human scientific approach may be useful for understanding agency. Such approaches have resulted in the language of agency being applied to primate societies. However, as Fedigan argues, we are still constrained by the language which is available to us as human researchers. Multi-species ethnography may provide opportunities to explore the everyday working lives of non-human animals (Ogden, Hall, and Tanita 2013). Perhaps the first step for human organisational scholars is to recognise the humanist speciesist bias that pervades our discipline, limiting how we can understand and theorise organisations and who can be considered organisational actors.

References

Anglin, S.M. 2014. "I think, therefore I am? Examining conceptions of the self, soul, and mind". *Consciousness and Cognition* 29: 105-116.

Ashby, D.I., Irving, B.L. and Longley, P.A. 2007. "Police reform and the new public management paradigm: matching technology to the rhetoric". *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 25(2):159 – 175.

Anon. 2014. "OBEs For Riot Hero police dog and Horses" *Sky News*, 17th June 2014. Http://news.sky.com/story/1284190

Arluke, A. 2004. *Brute Force: Animal Police and the Challenge of Cruelty*. Indiana: Purdue University Press.

Arluke, A. and Sanders, C.R. 1996. *Regarding Animals*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press,U.S.and: Northeastern University Press.

Barad, K. 2003. “Posthumanist performativity: Towards an understanding of how matter comes to matter”. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28(3):801-831.

Barad, K. 2007. *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Duke university Press.

Baran, B..E, Rogelberg, S.G. and Clausen, T. 2016. “Routinized killing of animals: Going beyond dirty work and prestige to understand the well-being of slaughterhouse works.” *Organization* 23 (3): 351-369.

Bauman, Z. 2013. *Wasted lives: Modernity and its outcasts*. John Wiley & Sons.

BBC 2013. “Who, what, why: where do working dogs go when they retire?” *BBC News,* 18th September. http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-24143338

Bear, C. and Eden, S. 2011. “Thinking like a fish? Engaging with non-human difference through recreational angling.” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 29: 336-352.

Beran, M. J., Smith, J. D. and Perdue, B. M. 2013. “Language-trained chimpanzees (Pan troglodytes) name what they have seen but look first at what they have not seen.” *Psychological science* 24(5):660-666.

Bennett, J. 2010. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things.* Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Benton, T. 1993. *National Relations, Ecology, Social Justice and Animal Rights*. London: Verso.

Boyle, S. and Thornhill, T. 2013. “Now it's police dogs under fire”. Daily Mail, 21 September. http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2427875/The-police-destroyed-84-retired-working-dogs-past-years.html

Braidotti, R. 2013. *The Posthuman*. Cambridge, UK. Polity Press.

Brown, J. A., Gianiodis, P. T. and Santoro, M. D. 2015. “Following Doctors’ Orders: Organizational Change as a Response to Human Capital Bargaining Power.” *Organization Science* 26(5):1284-1300.

Bryant, M and Wolfram Cox, J. 2014. “Beyond authenticity? Humanism, Posthumanism and New Organization Development.” *British Journal of Management* 25:706-723.

Butterfield, R., Edwards, C. and Woodall, J. 2005. “The New Public Management and Managerial Roles: The Case of the Police Sergeant.” *British Journal of Management* 16(4): 329-341.

Carnegie, G.D. and Napier, C..J. 2010. “Traditional accountants and business professionals: Portraying the accounting profession after Enron.” *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 34(3): 360-376.

Calvert-Minor, C. 2014. “Epistemological misgivings of Karen Barad’s ‘Posthumanism’.” *Human Studies* 37(1): 123-137.

Catlaw, T.J. and Holland, T.M. 2012. “Regarding the Animal.” *Administrative Theory and Praxis* 34(1):.85.

Campbell, A., Berk, R. and Fyfe, J.J. 1998. “Deployment of Violence: The Los Angeles Police Department's Use of Dogs.” *Evaluation Review* 22(4): 535-561.

Charles, N. 2014. “Animals just love you as you are’: Experiencing kinship across the species barrier.” *Sociology* 48(4): 715-730.

Coppers 2012, Episode 7, police dogs. Channel 4. 20 February, 21:00.

Cunha M.P., Rego, A. and Munro, I. 2018. Dogs in organizations. *Human relations; studies towards the integration of the social sciences*. SAGE Publications Ltd: 0018726718780210.

DeAngelo, D. 2018. Demilitarizing disarmament with mine detection rats. *Culture and Organization* 24 (4): 285-302.

Deckha, M. 2012. “Toward a postcolonial, posthumanist feminist theory: centralizing race and culture in feminist work on non-human animals.” *Hypatia* 27(3): 527-545.

Descartes, R. 1993. *Meditations on First Philosophy: In Which the Existence of God and the Distinction of the Soul from the Body Are Demonstrated*. 3rd edition. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.

Derrida, J. 2008. *The animal that therefore I am*. Fordham Univ Press.

Driver, F. 1985. “Power, Space and the Body: A critical assessment of Foucault’s Discipline and Punish.’ *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 3: 425-446.

Dorriety, J. 2005. “Police Service Officers in the Use-Of-Force Continuum.” *Criminal Justice Review* 16(1): 88–98.

Diverio S, Menchetti L, Riggio G, et al. 2017. “Dogs’ coping styles and dog-handler relationships influence avalanche search team performance.” *Applied animal behaviour science* 191(Supplement C): 67–77.

Duff, C., & Sumartojo, S. 2017. “Assemblages of creativity: Material practices in the creative economy.” *Organization* 24(7): 418-423.

Eddy, T.J., Gallup, G.G. and Povinelli, D. 1993. "Attribution of Cognitive States to Animals: Anthropomorphism in Comparative Perspective." *Journal of Social Issues* 49 (1): 87-101.

Ensminger, J. 2011. *Police and Military Dogs: Criminal Detection, Forensic Evidence, and Judicial Admissibility*. CRC Press.

Ensminger, J.J., & Papet, L. 2014. "Walking search warrants: canine forensics and police culture after Florida v. Harris." *Journal of Animal & Natural Resource Law* 10 (2): 1-39.

Fedigan, L. M. 2001. The paradox of feminist primatology: the goddess's discipline. Creager et al, *Feminist in 20th Century Science, Technology and Medicine*. University of Chicago Press 46-72.

Feinberg, J. 2012. The rights of animals and unborn generations. Ethical Theory: An Anthology Shafer-Landau, R. (Ed.). (2012). *Ethical theory: an anthology* (Vol. 13). John Wiley & Sons. 14, 372.

Foucault, M. 1977. *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Vintage.

Foucault, M. 1978. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction, Volume 1.* New York:Vintage

Foucault, M. 1994. 2 Foucault and the history of madness. *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, 47.

Foucault, M. 2010. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979.* London: Palgrave Macmillan

Gaye, J. and O'Grady, P. 2013. *A Hero's Tail*. Wood Green The Animals Charity.

Geiger, M. and Hovorka, A.J. 2015. "Animal performativity: Exploring the lives of donkeys in Botswana." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 33(6):1098-1117.

Godfrey, R., Lilley, S. and Brewis, J. 2012. "Biceps, bitches and borgs: Reading Jarhead's representation of the construction of the (masculine) military body." *Organization Studies* 33(4): 541-562.

Häkli, J. 2018. "The subject of citizenship – Can there be a posthuman civil society?" *Political Geography* 67: 166-175.

Hamilton, L. and Taylor, N. 2013. *Animals at work: Identity, politics and culture in work with animals*. Brill Academic Publishers

Hamilton, L. and McCabe, D. 2016. "'It's just a job': Understanding emotional work, de-animalization and the compartmentalization of organized animal slaughter." *Organiation* (23)3: 330-350.

Hamilton, L. and Mitchell, L. 2018. "Knocking on the Door of Human-Animal Studies: Valuing Work Across Disciplinary and Species Borderlines." *Society and Animals* (26)5.

Hansen, P. (2014). "Becoming bovine: Mechanics and metamorphosis in Hokkaido's animal-human-machine." *Journal of Rural Studies* 33: 119-130.

Haraway, D. J. 2003. *The companion species manifesto: Dogs, people, and significant otherness* (Vol. 1). Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.

Haraway, D. 1992. "Ecce homo, ain't (ar'n't) I a woman, and inappropriate/d others: the human in a post-humanist landscape." *Feminists theorize the political*, 86-100.

Haraway, D. 1991. *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of women.* London and New York: Routledge.

Haraway, D. J. 1989. *Primate visions: Gender, race, and nature in the world of modern science*. Psychology Press.

Harding, S. 2014. *Unleashed: The phenomena of status dogs and weapon dogs*. Policy Press.

Hassard, J. 1998. Representing reality: cinema verite. in Eds Hassard, J., & Holliday, R. (Eds.). (1998). *Organization-representation: Work and organizations in popular culture*. Sage., 41-66.

Hassard, J., & Holliday, R. (Eds.). 1998. *Organization-representation: Work and organizations in popular culture*. Sage.

Hediger, R. 2013. "Dogs of War: The Biopolitics of Loving and Leaving the U.S. Canine Forces in Vietnam." *Animal Studies Journal* 2(1):55-73.

Hekman, S. 2014. *The Feminine Subject*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Hribal, J. 2003. "Animals are part of the working class": a challenge to labor history. *Labor history 44*(4): 435-453.

Irvine, L. 2007. "The question of animal selves: Implications for sociological knowledge and practice." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 3(1): 5-22.

Kirk, R. 2014. "In dogs we trust? Intersubjectivity, response-able relations, and the making of mine detector dogs." *Journal of the history of the Behavioural Sciences* 50(1): 1-36.

Kemmerer, L. A. (Ed.). (2011). *Sister species: Women, animals, and social justice*. University of Illinois Press.

Kohn, E. 2007. "How dogs dream: Amazonian natures and the politics of transspecies engagement." *American ethnologist* 34(1): 3-24.

Krawczyk, V. J. and Barthold, C. 2018. "The affordance of compassion for animals: a filmic exploration of industrial linear rhythms." *Culture and Organization* 24(4): 268-284.

Latour, B. 2012 *Enquête sur les modes d'existence : Une anthropologie des modernes* Editions La Découverte: Paris

Lee, M., & McGovern, A. 2012. *Image work (s): The New Police (Popularity) Culture. Crime, Justice and Social Democracy: International Perspectives*, 120-133.

Lee, A. 2013. "The doomed dogs of war*".* The Daily Express, September 21. http://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/431049/The-doomed-dogs-of-war-What-happens-to-military-dogs-when-they-are-no-longer-needed

Lennerfors, T., & Sköld, D. 2018. "The animal." *Culture and Organization* 24(4): 263-267.

Marguiles, J.D. and Bersaglio. 2018. "Furthering post-human political ecologies." *Geoforum* 93: 103-106.

Martin, C.J. 2016. "The sharing economy: A Pathway to sustainability or a nightmarish form of neoliberal capitalism?" *Ecological Economics* 121: 149-159.

Manning, P.K. 1992. "Information Technologies and the Police." *Crime and Justice* 15:349–398.

Mauthner, N. 2015. "The past was never simply there to begin with and the future is not simply what will unfold': a posthumanist performative approach to qualitative longitudinal research." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 18(3):321-336.

McCarthy, D. 2015. "Dangerous Dogs, Dangerous Owners and the Waste Management of an 'Irredeemable Species". *Sociology* 50(3): 560-575.

McFarland, S.E. and Hediger, R. 2009. *Animals and Agency: An Interdisciplinary Exploration*. Leiden ; Boston: Brill Academic Publishers.

Menon, A. and Karthik, M. 2017. "Beyond human exceptionalism: Political ecology and the non-human world". *Geoforum* 79: 90-92.

Nayar, P. K. (2013). *Posthumanism*. Polity.

Non-human Rights Project. 2014. *About the project*. Available from: <http://www.non-humanrightsproject.org/>. [5 July 2014].

Napolento, B.M., Urquijo, P.S., Paneque-Galvez, J., Clark, B., York, R., French-Pardo, I., Mendez-Lemus, Y., and Vieyra, A. 2018. "Has (even Marxist) political ecology really transcended the metabolic rift?" *Geoforum* 92: 92-95.

O'Doherty, D. 2016. "Feline Politics in organization: The nine lives of Olly the Cat." *Organization* (23)3: 407-433.

O'Mahoney, J., O'Mahoney, H., & Al-Amoudi, I. 2017. "How can the loggerhead sea-turtle survive? Exploring the journeys of the Caretta caretta using ANT and critical realism." *Organization* 24(6):781-799.

Ogden, L. A., Hall, B. and Tanita, K. 2013. "Animals, plants, people, and things: A review of multispecies ethnography." *Environment and Society: Advances in Research* 4(1): 5-24.

Ojalehto,.B.L, Medin, D., & Garcia, S. 2017. "Grounding principles for inferring agency: Two cultural perspectives." *Cognitive Psychology* 95: 50-78.

Oh, H.J., Ozkaya, E. and Larose, R. 2014. "How does online social networking enhance life satisfaction? The relationships among online supportive interaction, affect, perceived social support, sense of community, and life satisfaction". *Computers in Human Behavior* 30: 69-78.

Pearson, C. 2016. "Canines and contraband: dogs, non-human agency and the making of the Franco-Belgian border during the French third Republic." *Journal of Historical Geography* 54: 50-62.

Pedersen, H. 2011. "Release the moths: Critical animal studies and the posthumanist impulse." *Culture, Theory and Critique* 52(1): 65-81.

Pedersen, H. 2012. "Education, animals, and the commodity form." *Culture and Organization* 18(5):415-432.

Pemberton, N. 2013. 'Bloodhounds as Detectives': Dogs, Slum Stench and Late-Victorian Murder Investigation. *Cultural and Social History*, 10(1):69–91.

Pettifor, T. 2012. More than 70 police dogs put down in past five years. *The Mirror*. 18th June 2012.

Phillips, M. 1994. "Proper names and the social construction of biography: The negative case of laboratory animals." *Qualitative Sociology* 17(2):119–142.

Pompper, D. and Higgins, L. 2007. “Corporation-bashing in documentary film: A case study of news media coverage organizational response.” *Public Relations Review* 33(4):429-432.

Reinhold, E. 2018. “How to become animal through writing: the case of the bear.” *Culture and Organization* 24(4):318-329

Sanders, C. R. 1995. “Killing with kindness: Veterinary euthanasia and the social construction of personhood.” *Sociological Forum* 10(2):195-214.

Schwartz, B. 2018. “The animal welfare battle: the production of affected ignorance in the Swedish meat industry debate.” *Culture and Organization* Online early.

Send in the dogs 2008a, Episode 1. ITV. 15 July, 21:00.

Send in the dogs 2008b, Episode 2. ITV. 22 July, 21:00.

Send in the dogs 2008c, Episode 3. ITV. 29 July, 21:00.

Send in the dogs 2008d, Episode 4. ITV. 5 August, 21:00

Send in the dogs 2009a, Episode 5. ITV. 21 July, 21:00

Send in the dogs 2009b, Episode 6. ITV. 28 July, 21:00

Skoglund, A. and Redmalm, D. 2017. “‘Doggy-biopolitics’: Governing via the First Dog.” *Organization* 24(7): 240-266.

Špinka, M. and Wemelsfelder, F. 2011. *Environmental challenge and animal agency. Animal welfare*. 2nd edition. Wallingford: CAB International. 27-44.

Sims,B. and Danylchuk, A.J. 2017. “Characterizing information on best practice guidelines for catch-and-release in websites of angling-based non-government organizations in the United States.” *Fisheries research* 186 (3): 688–692.

Takimoto, A. and Fujita, K. 2011. “I acknowledge your help: Capuchin monkeys’ sensitivity to others’ labor.” *Animal cognition* 14(5):715-725.

Tate, W. L., Ellram, L. M. and Kirchoff, J. F. 2010. “Corporate social responsibility reports: a thematic analysis related to supply chain management.” *Journal of supply chain management* 46(1):19-44

Templer, D.I., Connelly, H.J., Bassman, L. and Hart, J. 2006. “Construction and validation of an animal-human continuity scale.” *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal* 34 (7): 769-776.

Thorburn, G. 2010. *Cassius, the True Story of a Courageous police dog*. London: John Blake Publishing Ltd.

Tovey, H. 2003. “Theorising nature and society in sociology: the invisibility of animals.” *Sociologia Ruralis* 43(3):196-215.

Wilkie, R. 2015. "Multispecies scholarship and encounters: Changing assumptions at the human-animal nexus." *Sociology* 49(5): 329-339

Yarwood, R. 2015. "Lost and hound: The more-than-human networks of rural policing." *Journal of rural studies* 39(Supplement C): 278–286.