



Is cognition the secret to working dog success?

Brian Hare^{1,2,3} · Morgan Ferrans^{1,2}

Received: 3 February 2021 / Revised: 9 February 2021 / Accepted: 10 February 2021 / Published online: 9 March 2021
© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer-Verlag GmbH, DE part of Springer Nature 2021

Abstract

Dogs' special relationship with humans not only makes them ubiquitous in our lives, but working dogs specifically perform essential functions for us such as sniffing out bombs and pulling wheelchairs for the disabled. To enhance the performance of working dogs, it is essential to understand the cognitive skills that underlie and lead to their success. This review details recent work in the field of canine cognition, including how dogs have evolved socio-cognitive skills that mimic or, in some cases, rival even our closest primate relatives. We review how these findings have laid the foundation for new studies that hope to help enhance working dog programs. This includes work that has begun to reveal the development and stability of the most important traits for service work. Discoveries like these suggest the possibility of translating what we have learned to improve breeding, selection, and training for these jobs. The latest research we review here shows promise in contributing to the production of better dogs and, consequently, more help for people.

Keywords Canine · Cognition · Working dogs · Assistance dogs · Behavior

Introduction

Dogs and humans have long cooperated in remarkable ways. For thousands of years, dogs have improved the outcome of human hunting, helped guard people and livestock and detected and warned of danger humans cannot perceive (Hare and Woods 2013). Through careful breeding, rearing and training, this cooperative relationship has been further enhanced in today's working dogs that help solve a host of societal problems. Guide dogs help lead people without sight or hearing. Detector dogs use olfactory cues to find bombs, contraband, diseases and even endangered animals. Assistance and therapy dogs aid children and adults with physical disabilities or need of emotional support. All of these jobs are evidence that dogs' relationship with humans remains essential in today's society.

Because of working dogs' success, there is a growing demand for a larger supply of dogs for all these different job types (Otto et al. 2019). To match the growing need, scientists are investigating how enhanced breeding, selection, and training of working dogs can improve their supply and success. Since working dogs rely heavily on their cognitive skills, meeting this challenge is one of the most exciting questions in animal cognition. If we can identify cognitive traits that make success possible and then reliably measure individual variability in these traits, we will not only unlock the secrets of the canine mind but also develop tools designed to get more highly qualified dogs working to help those in need (Lazarowski et al. 2018; MacLean and Hare 2018).

Here we review work that launched a new era of research focused on dog cognition. We start with the identification of dogs' unusual social skills and explain how this basic research led to the latest approaches for applying cognitive theories and methods to the challenge of enhancing working dog programs. Both the basic and applied work suggest this is a particularly exciting moment for researchers and students studying dog cognition.

✉ Morgan Ferrans
morgan.ferrans@duke.edu

¹ Department of Evolutionary Anthropology, Duke University, Durham, USA

² Center for Cognitive Neuroscience, Duke University, Durham, USA

³ Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, Duke University, Durham, USA

Unusual minds

Before 1998, understanding cooperative communicative intentions appeared to be a *unique* maturational accomplishment of human infants. Between 9 and 12 months of age, infants begin to understand that the perceptions and intentions of others can differ from their own (Carpenter et al. 1998). Critical evidence for this transition is the comprehension and production of pointing gestures. Infants not only follow the pointing gestures of adults, but they understand the cooperative-communicative intentions behind them (Tomasello and Farrar 1986; Tomasello et al. 2007). This way, as infants, we already can rapidly learn from others and acquire cultural knowledge—including language.

On the contrary, nonhuman primates in their natural interactions and in captive experiments do not readily comprehend helpful human gestures—unless they have been raised with intense exposure to humans (Wobber et al. 2014). This led to the prediction that no other nonhuman animal would show infant-like understanding of human gestures. It was a surprise to psychologists when domestic dogs use human gestures skillfully in experiments. In 1998, two papers were published demonstrating that dogs can use these gestures to find hidden food and objects (Hare et al. 1998; Miklösi et al. 1998). Follow up studies demonstrated how similar dogs' ability to use gestures is to that of humans.

All of this work was heavily influenced by theories and methods used by developmental psychologists studying human infants. A simple search game used with infants became a standard method: food or a toy is hidden in one of two hiding locations. The experimenter shows the dog they are hiding a reward but does not allow the dog to see in which location (e.g. the empty hiding spot is sham baited). Then, the experiments gives the dog a variety of cues (e.g. pointing, bowing, glancing) to indicate the location of the reward. This game is repeated such that a dog's ability to locate the reward reliably across repeated trials can be compared to chance levels (i.e. 50% correct across trials if two hiding spots are used; Miklösi et al. 1998).

In playing this search game with a range of pet dogs, a number of low-level explanations were immediately ruled out. Without a visual gesture from the experimenter, dogs were unable to find food or toys, and their chance performance ruled out the use of olfactory cues (Agnetta et al. 2000; Bhattacharjee et al. 2020; Hare et al. 1998; Riedel et al. 2008; Rossano et al. 2014; Soproni et al. 2001; Stewart et al. 2015). Dogs were able to use a variety of gestures—including novel ones (Agnetta et al. 2000; Riedel et al. 2008; Rossano et al. 2014), and their responses also did not rely solely on orienting to the motion of the arm being extended.

Dogs can use the gestures of strange humans and even the body posture of another dog “pointing” toward the correct hiding locations (Hare and Tomasello 1999). This level of flexibility is far more similar to that displayed in human infants than nonhuman primates—including mother-reared great apes. It led our team and others to conclude that the comprehension of gestures by our dogs is unusual and human-like (Hare and Tomasello 2005).

Cognitive origins

The unusual nature of dogs' understanding of our gestures created interest in understanding the origins of these abilities both from an ontogenetic and phylogenetic perspective.

Dog puppies' ability to read human gestures emerges early in development, regardless of their rearing history (Hare et al. 2002; Riedel et al. 2008). They seem prepared to comprehend humans, even with varying levels of human contact. Both feral village and assistance dog puppies use pointing and novel gestures on their first trial around the age of weaning (Agnetta et al. 2000; Bhattacharjee et al. 2020; Hare et al. 1998; Riedel et al. 2008; Rossano et al. 2014; Soproni et al. 2001; Stewart et al. 2015; Bray et al. 2020a, b).

Phylogenetically, all dog breeds and populations that have been studied perform above chance levels in human gesture tasks (Horschler et al. 2019). However, within the species, there is variability in adult dogs' success in following human social cues. For example, even New Guinea singing dogs and dingoes, who have not been under intense artificial selection, are skilled at understanding human gestures when searching (Wobber et al. 2009; Smith and Litchfield 2010). Like chimpanzees, some adult wolves can learn to comprehend human gestures through practice and intense exposure to humans, but they do not show the early emerging skills observed in dog puppies (Gácsi et al. 2009; Udell et al. 2012; Lampe et al. 2017; Virányi et al. 2008). In a recent comparison, dozens of wolf puppies were hand-reared from 10 days after birth and exposed to humans 24 h a day (i.e. they slept together with their caregivers). Even with intense exposure to humans, they were less likely to approach a human, use human gestures, and make eye contact than dog puppies with far less human exposure (Salomons et al. 2021).

The early emerging understanding of human gestures in dogs, but not wolves, is likely a result of domestication. Fox kits experimentally selected for friendly behavior toward humans (i.e. approaching, wagging tail, initiating physical contact, etc.) are also as skilled at using human gestures as dog puppies. Fox kits from the control line perform similarly to wolf pups (Hare et al. 2005). The fox work suggests that as the domestication process was initiated and wolves were selected to interact with humans, this same selection led to enhanced abilities to cooperatively communicate with humans

(Hare and Tomasello 2005; see also Hernádi et al. 2012). Later artificial selection on dogs likely enhanced these cooperative communicative abilities as a result of direct selection on social skills (Wobber et al. 2009).

Social genius

With the initial discovery of unusual cooperative communicative understanding in dogs, researchers began examining other forms of cognition. This work has revealed both cognitive flexibility and constraints. Dogs do not just comprehend but also produce signals. For example, in some contexts, dogs intentionally communicate when they need help. When dogs were shown a locked box they had previously opened to obtain food, they quickly made eye contact with a nearby human. When the human did not help them, some dogs pawed at the human or alternated gaze between the person and box while barking (MacLean and Hare 2018; Miklósi et al. 2003). On the other hand, when a human is not present, dogs do not use communicative behaviors, emphasizing dogs' sensitivity to human attentional states (Hare et al. 1998; Kaminski et al. 2017).

Some dogs (or breeds) may be particularly gifted at learning object labels. When playing fetch, several border collies have demonstrated the ability to learn the names of new objects using the principle of exclusion. After the dog learned the label for a familiar object, a human-introduced a novel object and asked the dog to retrieve it. When this novel label was used, dogs made an inference and retrieved the unfamiliar object instead of the familiar one. After only a few repetitions, they continue to bring back this same object in response to the same label. Other than humans, no other species has demonstrated the ability to rapidly match and learn object labels in this way (Kaminski et al. 2004; Pilley and Reid 2011). Dogs can also learn to spontaneously imitate some novel actions demonstrated by humans. Using the “do as I do” training method, dogs learn to approximate the actions they see a human demonstrate with their own bodies. For example, without teaching the specific target behavior, after hearing the command “do as I do”, dogs will spin in a circle or place a ball in a basket after their first observation of a human doing these simple actions (Topál et al. 2006). They also can reproduce actions they have seen demonstrated after significant delays—suggesting they may recall past actions episodically (Fugazza et al. 2020).

Dogs also use their eyes and bodies to strengthen their bond with us. Experimental evidence suggests that dogs and humans that make the most eye contact have the strongest bonds. This has been linked to the release of oxytocin—both humans and dogs show increases in levels of circulating oxytocin when making eye contact or after

positive physical interactions (i.e. petting; Romero et al. 2014). The use of eye contact is likely aided by the evolved eye morphology of dogs. A morphological study revealed that dogs, but not wolves, have enhanced eye muscles (AU101 muscle) that function to reveal more white sclera tissue. These muscles are thought to have evolved during domestication to facilitate the interspecific oxytocin loop and bonding between human and dog (Waller et al. 2013). Support comes from the higher rate of adoption for shelter dogs that show a higher baseline rate of flexing the AU101 muscle in the presence of strange humans (Kaminski et al. 2019). In addition, a study of dog facial expressions showed that dogs produce more facial movements when a human is attending to them versus not (Kaminski et al. 2017). Thus, it appears dogs evolved to understand and communicate with humans.

In addition to communicating using their own faces, dogs also pay close attention to human facial expressions. They are able to discriminate between happy, angry, and neutral expressions (Albuquerque et al. 2016; Morisaki et al. 2009; Nagasawa et al. 2011), and they exhibit behavioral reactions to different human emotions. For example, one study showed that dogs avoided looking at angry human faces and paid closer attention to faces showing fear (Deputte and Doll 2011). Dogs also provided empathic-like “comforting behaviors” such as sniffing, nudging, licking to strangers who were pretending to cry instead of approaching their owners (Custance and Mayer 2012). These social skills make dogs especially suited to live as close human companions, as well as therapy animals and in other service capacities.

However, dogs do not always use their understanding of humans to our benefit. Dogs are also sensitive to when a human is watching them. They are more likely to disobey a command when a human has their back turned or eyes closed than when they are being watched (Call et al. 2003). For instance, smaller dogs, in particular, are more likely to take forbidden food when a human has their eyes closed or face covered (Horschler et al. 2019). The dependency of dogs on human social information is also so strong that it can mislead them; dogs will follow a human gesture pointed toward an incorrect hiding spot instead of searching for food where they recently saw it hidden (Stewart et al. 2015). Dogs will even search a hiding location a human touched last over one they saw repeatedly baited (Kis et al. 2012; Kupán et al. 2011; Topál et al. 2009). This tendency to prioritize human information or instructions can badly interfere with some types of work (i.e. detector dogs; Szeteci et al. 2003). Moreover, the unusual social skills of dogs seem limited to cooperative-communicative context. When compared to chimpanzees in a social reversal learning paradigm (i.e. two humans acted as the hiding locations with one or the other holding food in their hand), dogs were utterly unremarkable. In the first trial of the social task, chimpanzees were

able to inhibit what they had previously learned, while dogs were no faster in the social than nonsocial tests (Wobber and Hare 2009). Moreover, dogs may be limited in their ability to assess what a human can or cannot see when following their gestures (MacLean et al. 2014).

Finally, a number of nonsocial skills have been investigated in dogs. Dogs can solve an array of problems using their memory or self-control (Bray et al. 2014, 2015). They do have some basic understanding of causality as well. At least in some situations, dogs appreciate that solid objects cannot pass through each other, but their appreciation of connectivity and gravity are more limited. For example, dogs do not seem to understand that when two objects are connected (i.e. by a leash), they act together. While a dog can learn this relationship through shaping and practice, they show little ability to generalize what they learn in one context to another novel situation (Hare and Woods 2013). These findings can help trainers understand the limits of flexible problem-solving in working dogs.

Cognitive profiles

Research with dogs is not constrained by sample size like those with primates and other large animals (Hare et al. 2001; MacLean et al. 2014). This means techniques initially developed to study individual differences in human infant cognition can be used to examine dogs (Herrmann et al. 2007; 2010). Test batteries that include a dozen or more cognitive measures have been used in conventional laboratory settings and by citizen scientists. Our research group designed the Dog Cognitive Test Battery (DCTB) that includes as many as two dozen social, non-social and general cognitive measures. We tested hundreds of dogs with the DTCB and used a factor analysis to discover that individual differences in performance across the tests could not be explained by a single general factor. Variability in performance was best explained by up to six different factors corresponding to domains of intelligence including: social referencing, inhibition, cooperative-communication, working memory, perceptual bias, and discriminatory ability (MacLean et al. 2017). A similar pattern is found when thousands of dogs were tested using dognition.com by citizen scientists. This citizen science project allows people to test their dogs at home on a related set of tasks to the DCTB. Analyzing this large data set we again find a strong signal for domains of cooperative-communication, inhibition, and working memory (Gnanadesikan et al. 2020a, b; Horschler et al. 2019; Stewart et al. 2015).

Test batteries have also begun to be developed for use with dog puppies (Lazarowski et al. 2019, 2020). Our own team modified the DCTB for use with puppies. We then used this developmental battery of cognitive tasks with puppies as

young as 2 months of age—or shortly after weaning (Bray et al. 2020a, b). Longitudinal analysis of over one hundred and fifty dogs revealed that individual variation in cognition was trait-like. Furthermore, the individual variation observed in almost 2 puppies was correlated with cognitive variation observed in the same dogs as adults. This means that, to a certain degree, cognitive differences between individuals are stable across the lifetime—although this stability is stronger in some measures than others (Bray et al. 2020b). This work promises to point to cognitive profiles in puppies that might predict training outcomes as adults. These profiles could be used as a powerful tool to select the most promising puppies for working jobs, potentially increasing the graduation rate in training programs.

Further analysis suggests that the individual variability observed in test batteries is highly heritable. As much as 40–50% of individual variability in skills using gestures, memory, and inhibition are explained by genetic factors in both the citizen science and university lab-tested dogs (Gnanadesikan et al. 2020a, b). Using a genome-wide association, it was further demonstrated this same individual variability was associated with genes implicated in brain development and function (Gnanadesikan et al. 2020b). Together with work demonstrating the heritability of individual differences in emotional reactivity (MacLean et al. 2019), these findings point to new approaches to breeding dogs with enhanced emotions and cognition related to their success working with humans.

Results from cognitive batteries have also allowed for the first large-scale breed comparisons of cognition. Over seventy dog breeds tested on ten cognitive measures by citizen scientist were examined. On most measures there was little difference explained by breed. However, larger dogs performed better with human gestures and tasks requiring inhibition and memory. Smaller dogs were more skillful at stealing food based on whether a human was watching them after forbidding them to take it (Horschler et al. 2019). Interestingly, though, recent neuroscientific evidence suggests that strong neuroanatomical differences between breeds is best explained by breed and not by body, skull, or brain size. In addition, these anatomical differences correlate with behavioral specializations such as hunting, guarding, and companionship. Phylogenetic analysis of these results suggests that these specializations are the result of recent selection pressure on dogs by humans (Hecht et al. 2019). These findings highlight the success of selection for working performance as well as a need for further exploration into cognitive variations between breeds.

A factor analysis was also conducted to revisit the idea that dogs' cognitive abilities are human-like. Large samples of dogs, human infants and chimpanzees were all tested on the same eight cognitive tasks—with half being social and half being nonsocial measures. For both dogs and human

infants, performance on one social task predicted performance on another, but was not associated with skill on non-social tasks. Chimpanzees, on the other hand, showed no association between the social and nonsocial tasks. This means dogs have a more human-like organization of their cognitive abilities than chimpanzees, with clear differentiation between social and nonsocial abilities (MacLean et al. 2017). Even the individual level dogs appear more human-like on measures of cooperative-communication than our closest primate relatives.

Finally, test batteries have also begun to be used to enhance the selection and training of working dogs. In a large set of assistance and detector dogs that were tested with the DCTB before training, the performance was associated with a number of cognitive measures. These initial associations were used to develop predictive models for a separate set of dogs tested before training. These models were able to predict, with up to 95% accuracy, which dogs were most likely to succeed in training before training began (MacLean and Hare 2018; see also Bray et al. 2020a, b). Cognition tests batteries, once further refined, may provide a powerful tool in the future for increasing success rates for working dog training programs, especially if they can predict the success early on in young working dog puppies (Bray et al. 2020a, b; Lazarowski et al. 2018; MacLean and Hare 2018).

Working future

This is an exciting moment in the field of animal cognition. Dogs offer a powerful way to answer new and old questions while providing a sustainable research model (i.e. allowing for replication, large-scale studies, application to the real world, and a range of funding opportunities). Dogs' unique relationship with humans and the evolution of social skills that rival even our closest relatives make them ideal candidates for the jobs that are crucial to human society, as well as fascinating subjects for studying behavior. The future is bright for both the study of dog cognition and the prospect for enhancing breeding, selection, and training of working dogs due to the discoveries we make about the minds of our best friends. In particular, future research on training dogs using social learning models instead of simple individual instrumental learning techniques could be particularly promising (i.e. Pongrácz et al. 2001; Slabbert and Rasa 1997; Topál et al. 2006). Integrating any advances with an understanding of development will also allow for the largest impact on working dog programs; the earlier in a dog's life we can predict their future abilities, the more likely we can provide them the support they need to be successful (Bray et al. 2020b). The exciting challenge remains how we can

use all we learn to improve the ability of dogs to do all the important jobs they continue to help us with while protecting their welfare while they do it. That way we can be their best friends too.

Acknowledgements Thank you to Jeff Katz and Debbie Kelly for inviting our submission. This work was funded in part by grants from the Office of Naval Research (N00014-16-12682) and the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NIH-1R01HD097732).

References

- Agnetta B, Hare B, Tomasello M (2000) Cues to food locations that domestic dogs (*Canis familiaris*) of different ages do and do not use. *Anim Cogn* 3:107–112
- Albuquerque N, Guo K, Wilkinson A, Savalli C, Otta E, Mills D (2016) Dogs recognize dog and human emotions. *Biol Lett* 12(1):20150883
- Bhattacharjee D, Mandal S, Shit P, Varghese MG, Vishnoi A, Bhadra A (2020) Free-ranging dogs are capable of utilizing complex human pointing cues. *Front Psychol* 10:2818
- Bray E, MacLean E, Hare B (2014) Context-specificity of inhibitory control in dogs. *Anim Cogn* 17:15–31
- Bray E, MacLean E, Hare B (2015) Increasing arousal enhances inhibitory control in calm but not excitable dogs. *Anim Cogn* 18:1–13
- Bray EE, Gruen ME, Gnanadesikan GE, Horschler DJ, Levy KM, Kennedy BS, Hare BA, MacLean EL (2020a) Dog cognitive development: a longitudinal study across the first 2 years of life. *Anim Cogn*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-020-01443-7>
- Bray EE, Gruen ME, Gnanadesikan GE, Horschler DJ, Levy KM, Kennedy BS, Hare BA, MacLean EL (2020b) Cognitive characteristics of 8-to 10-week-old assistance dog puppies. *Anim Behav* 166:193–206
- Call J, Bräuer J, Kaminski J, Tomasello M (2003) Domestic dogs (*Canis familiaris*) are sensitive to the attentional state of humans. *J Comp Psychol* 117(3):257
- Carpenter M, Nagell K, Tomasello M, Butterworth G, Moore C (1998) Social cognition, joint attention, and communicative competence from 9 to 15 months of age. *Monogr Soc Res Child Dev* 63(4):i
- Custance D, Mayer J (2012) Empathic-like responding by domestic dogs (*Canis familiaris*) to distress in humans: an exploratory study. *Anim Cogn* 15(5):851–859. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-012-0510-1>
- Deputte BL, Doll A (2011) Do dogs understand human facial expressions? *J Vet Behav Clin Appl Res* 6(1):78–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jveb.2010.09.013>
- Fugazza C, Pogány Á, Miklósi Á (2020) Depths and limits of spontaneous categorization in a family dog. *Sci Rep*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2016.09.057>
- Gácsi M, Gyoöri B, Virányi Z, Kubinyi E, Range F, Belényi B, Miklósi Á (2009) Explaining dog wolf differences in utilizing human pointing gestures: selection for synergistic shifts in the development of some social skills. *PLoS One* 4(8):e6584
- Gnanadesikan GE, Hare B, Snyder-Mackler N, MacLean EL (2020a) Estimating the heritability of cognitive traits across dog breeds reveals highly heritable inhibitory control and communication factors. *Anim Cogn* 23(5):953–964
- Gnanadesikan GE, Hare B, Snyder-Mackler N, Call J, Kaminski J, Miklósi Á, MacLean EL (2020b) Breed differences in dog

- cognition associated with brain-expressed genes and neurological functions. *Integr Comp Biol* 60(4):976–990
- Hare B, Tomasello M (1999) Domestic dogs (*Canis familiaris*) use human and conspecific social cues to locate hidden food. *J Comp Psychol* 113:1–5
- Hare B, Tomasello M (2005) Human-like social skills in dogs? *Trends Cogn Sci* 9:439–444
- Hare B, Woods V (2013) The genius of dogs: how dogs are smarter than you think. Penguin
- Hare B, Call J, Tomasello M (1998) Communication of food location between human and dog (*Canis familiaris*). *Evol Commun* 2:137–159
- Hare B, Call J, Tomasello M (2001) Do chimpanzees know what conspecifics know? *Anim Behav* 61(1):139–151
- Hare B, Brown M, Williamson C, Tomasello M (2002) The domestication of social cognition in dogs. *Science* 298:1636–1639
- Hare B, Plyusnina I, Iganacio N, Wrangham R, Trut L (2005) Social cognitive evolution in captive foxes is a correlated-by-product of experimental domestication. *Curr Biol* 16:226–230
- Hecht EE, Smaers JB, Dunn WD, Kent M, Preuss TM, Gutman DA (2019) Significant neuroanatomical variation among domestic dog breeds. *J Neurosci* 39(39):7748–7758. <https://doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.0303-19.2019>
- Hernádi A, Kis A, Turcsán B, Topál J (2012) Man's underground best friend: domestic ferrets, unlike the wild forms, show evidence of dog-like social-cognitive skills. *PLoS ONE* 7(8):e43267
- Herrmann E, Call J, Hernández-Lloreda MV, Hare B, Tomasello M (2007) Humans have evolved specialized skills of social cognition: the cultural intelligence hypothesis. *Science* 317(5843):1360–1366
- Herrmann E, Hernández-Lloreda MV, Call J, Hare B, Tomasello M (2010) The structure of individual differences in the cognitive abilities of children and chimpanzees. *Psychol Sci* 21(1):102–110
- Horschler DJ, Hare B, Call J, Kaminski J, Miklósi Á, MacLean EL (2019) Absolute brain size predicts dog breed differences in executive function. *Anim Cogn* 22(2):187–198
- Kaminski J, Call J, Fischer J (2004) Word learning in a domestic dog: evidence for “fast mapping”. *Science* 304(5677):1682–1683
- Kaminski J, Hynds J, Morris P, Waller BM (2017) Human attention affects facial expressions in domestic dogs. *Sci Rep* 7(1):12914. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-12781-x>
- Kaminski J, Waller BM, Diogo R, Hartstone-Rose A, Burrows AM (2019) Evolution of facial muscle anatomy in dogs. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 116(29):14677–14681. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1820653116>
- Kis A, Topál J, Gácsi M, Range F, Huber L, Miklósi Á, Virányi Z (2012) Does the A-not-B error in adult pet dogs indicate sensitivity to human communication? *Anim Cogn* 15(4):737–743
- Kupán K, Miklósi Á, Gergely G, Topál J (2011) Why do dogs (*Canis familiaris*) select the empty container in an observational learning task? *Anim Cogn* 14(2):259–268
- Lampe M, Bräuer J, Kaminski J, Virányi Z (2017) The effects of domestication and ontogeny on cognition in dogs and wolves. *Sci Rep* 7(1):1–8
- Lazarowski L, Haney PS, Brock J, Fischer T, Rogers B, Angle C, Katz JS, Waggoner LP (2018) Investigation of the behavioral characteristics of dogs purpose-bred and prepared to perform Vapor Wake® detection of person-borne explosives. *Front Vet Sci* 5:50. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2018.00050>
- Lazarowski L, Strassberg LR, Waggoner LP, Katz JS (2019) Persistence and human-directed behavior in detection dogs: ontogenetic development and relationships to working dog success. *Appl Anim Behav Sci* 220:104860
- Lazarowski L, Krichbaum S, Waggoner LP, Katz JS (2020) The development of problem-solving abilities in a population of candidate detection dogs (*Canis familiaris*). *Anim Cogn* 23:1–14
- MacLean E, Krupenye C, Hare B (2014) Dogs account for body orientation but not visual barriers when responding to pointing gestures. *J Comp Psychol* 128:285
- MacLean E, Herrmann E, Suchindran S, Hare B (2017) Individual differences in cooperative-communicative skills are more similar between dogs and humans than chimpanzees. *Anim Behav* 126:41–51
- MacLean EL, Snyder-Mackler N, VonHoldt BM, Serpell JA (2019) Highly heritable and functionally relevant breed differences in dog behaviour. *Proc R Soc B* 286(1912):20190716
- Maclean E, Hare B (2018) Enhanced selection of assistance and explosive detection dogs using cognitive measures. *Front Vet Sci* 5:236
- Miklósi Á, Polgárdi R, Topál J, Csányi V (1998) Use of experimenter-given cues in dogs. *Anim Cogn* 1(2):113–121. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s100710050016>
- Miklósi Á, Kubinyi E, Topál J, Gácsi M, Virányi Z, Csányi V (2003) A simple reason for a big difference: wolves do not look back at humans, but dogs do. *Curr Biol* 13(9):763–766
- Morisaki A, Takaoka A, Fujita K (2009) Are dogs sensitive to the emotional state of humans? *J Vet Behav Clin Appl Res* 2(4):49
- Nagasawa M, Murai K, Mogi K, Kikusui T (2011) Dogs can discriminate human smiling faces from blank expressions. *Anim Cogn* 14(4):525–533. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-011-0386-5>
- Otto CM, Cobb ML, Wilsson E (2019) Editorial: working dogs: form and function. *Front Vet Sci* 6:351. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2019.00351>
- Pillely JW, Reid AK (2011) Border collie comprehends object names as verbal referents. *Behav Proc* 86(2):184–195
- Pongrácz P, Miklósi Á, Kubinyi E, Gurobi K, Topál J, Csányi V (2001) Social learning in dogs: the effect of a human demonstrator on the performance of dogs in a detour task. *Anim Behav* 62(6):1109–1117
- Riedel J, Schumann K, Kaminski J, Call J, Tomasello M (2008) The early ontogeny of human–dog communication. *Anim Behav* 75(3):1003–1014. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2007.08.010>
- Romero T, Nagasawa M, Mogi K, Hasegawa T, Kikusui T (2014) Oxytocin promotes social bonding in dogs. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 111(25):9085–9090
- Rossano F, Nitzschner M, Tomasello M (2014) Domestic dogs and puppies can use human voice direction referentially. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 281(1785):20133201
- Salomons H, Smith K, Callahan-Beckel M, Callahan M, Brey E, Levy K, Kennedy B, Gnanadesikan G, Horschler D, Gruen M, Tan J, MacLean E, Hare B (2021) Cooperative communication with humans evolved to emerge early in dogs. *BioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.12.425620>
- Slabbert JM, Rasa OAE (1997) Observational learning of an acquired maternal behaviour pattern by working dog pups: an alternative training method? *Appl Anim Behav Sci* 53(4):309–316
- Smith BP, Litchfield CA (2010) Dingoes (*Canis dingo*) can use human social cues to locate hidden food. *Anim Cogn* 13(2):367–376
- Soproni K, Miklósi Á, Topál J, Csányi V (2001) Comprehension of human communicative signs in pet dogs (*Canis familiaris*). *J Comp Psychol* 115(2):122
- Stewart L, MacLean EL, Ivy D, Woods V, Cohen E, Rodriguez K, McIntyre M, Mukherjee S, Call J, Kaminski J, Miklósi Á, Wrangham RW, Hare B (2015) Citizen science as a new tool in dog cognition research. *PLoS One* 10(9):e0135176
- Szetei V, Miklósi Á, Topál J, Csányi V (2003) When dogs seem to lose their nose: an investigation on the use of visual and olfactory cues in communicative context between dog and owner. *Appl Anim Behav Sci* 83(2):141–152. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591\(03\)00114-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(03)00114-X)
- Tomasello M, Farrar MJ (1986) Joint attention and early language. *Child Develop*. Retrieved December 10, 2021, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1130423>

- Tomasello M, Carpenter M, Liszkowski U (2007) A new look at infant pointing. *Child Dev* 78(3):705–722. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01025.x>
- Topál J, Byrne RW, Miklósi A, Csányi V (2006) Reproducing human actions and action sequences: “do as I do!” in a dog. *Anim Cogn* 9(4):355–367
- Topál J, Gergely G, Erdőhegyi Á, Csibra G, Miklósi Á (2009) Differential sensitivity to human communication in dogs, wolves, and human infants. *Science* 325(5945):1269–1272
- Udell MA, Spencer JM, Dorey NR, Wynne CD (2012) Human-socialized wolves follow diverse human gestures... and they may not be alone. *Int J Comp Psychol* 25(2)
- Virányi Z, Gácsi M, Kubinyi E, Topál J, Belényi B, Ujfalussy D, Miklósi Á (2008) Comprehension of human pointing gestures in young human-reared wolves (*Canis lupus*) and dogs (*Canis familiaris*). *Anim Cogn* 11(3):373
- Waller BM, Peirce K, Caeiro CC, Scheider L, Burrows AM, McCune S, Kaminski J (2013) Paedomorphic facial expressions give dogs a selective advantage. *PLoS ONE* 8(12):e82686
- Wobber V, Hare B (2009) Testing the social dog hypothesis: are dogs also more skilled than chimpanzees in non-communicative social tasks? *Behav Process* 81:423–428
- Wobber V, Koler-Matznick J, Hare B, Wrangham R, Tomasello M (2009) Breed differences in domestic dogs’ comprehension of human communicative signals. *Interact Stud* 10:206–224
- Wobber V, Herrmann E, Hare B, Wrangham R, Tomasello M (2014) Differences in the early cognitive development of children and great apes. *Dev Psychobiol* 56(3):547–573

Publisher’s Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.