ACME An International Journal for Critical Geographies

Thinking-Together through Ethical Moments in Multispecies Fieldwork: Dialoguing Expertise, Visibility, and Worlding

Jonathon Turnbull

Department of Geography, University of Cambridge, UK
jjt44@cam.ac.uk

Lauren Van Patter

Department of Clinical Studies, University of Guelph, Canada
vanpattl@uoguelph.ca

Abstract

The recent proliferation of multispecies research contains a conspicuous gap when it comes to the methodological and ethical dimensions of navigating relations with more-than-human participants. Although codified protocols can be a useful starting point, the ethical tensions that inevitably emerge during fieldwork are often fetishized in final outputs. Whilst calls to 'stay with the trouble' are important, they often remain descriptive and un-actionable. In contrast, this paper offers a method for working through these tensions, asking what obligations they place on researchers and how they might be negotiated in practice, without slipping into advancing prescriptive rules or guidelines. We discuss this in the context of a range of 'ethically important moments' that we each encountered in the field, which were both complex and ambiguous. During our respective periods of fieldwork with dogs in Chornobyl and urban coyotes in Canada, we have each faced moments in which rapid decisions must be made as we navigate the affective intensities that move us as geographers, participant observers, and community members. In this paper, we perform and reflect upon Kohl and McCutcheon's (2015) 'kitchen table reflexivity' as one approach for working through these moments, not just staying with them. Here, ethical tensions are worked through via dialogue. This paper is both method and product, as stories from our individual research are brought into dialogue around three fraught dimensions of multispecies research: *negotiating expertise and positionality*, *making visible or concealing the animal*, and *intervening in animal worlds*.

Published with Creative Commons licence: Attribution–Noncommercial–No Derivatives

Keywords

More-than-human geographies, kitchen table reflexivity, fieldwork, dialogue, animal geographies

Introduction

As multispecies researchers, our relationships and responsibilities to more-than-human[1] participants present challenges rarely discussed in dominant anthropocentric social research contexts. Though working with human participants is undoubtedly fraught and complex, there is a wealth of scholarly reflections and formal procedural guidance available on consent, deception, harm, vulnerability, representation, reciprocity, and power asymmetries, to name a few. Conversely, there is virtually no guidance available for social researchers working with nonhuman research participants (for exceptions, see Collard, 2015; Oliver, 2021; Palmer and Greenhough, 2021; Van Patter and Blattner, 2020). Formal review processes for animal-based research (Animal Use Protocols through Animal Care Committees) are firmly entrenched in invasive experimental paradigms and are of limited relevance for naturalistic enquiry where animals are not 'used' and 'disposed of' (Gillespie and Collard, 2015; Van Patter and Blattner, 2020). We both found, and others have noted (e.g., Collard, 2015; Gillespie and Collard, 2015), that the animal use protocols required by our research institutions failed to include many of the ethical dimensions which became relevant to us, and therefore did not prepare us for making decisions during data collection. Although limitations of institutional review processes for human social research have been noted (e.g. Dyer and Demeritt, 2009; Guillemin and Gillam, 2004; Halse and Honey, 2005), the more robust process of developing protocols and receiving methodological feedback at least allows researchers to anticipate potential ethically-charged scenarios and how they might be mitigated in a way that is not possible for research with entities which/whom are not regarded as active participants, or as 'persons' whose 'rights' must always be safeguarded.

In practice, critical geographers note that beyond formal protocols, the true work of *enacting* ethical research practices is located in navigating unanticipated or ambiguous 'ethically important moments' (Guillemin and Gillam, 2004). These can range from dramatic instances of internal or interpersonal conflict, to the everyday decisions that constitute our overall ethos as researchers. Often when facing such moments, internal processes of reflection are combined with dialogue with trusted friends, colleagues, mentors, or community collaborators to work through possible implications and opportunities, and to decide on the best, or least problematic, course of action. This practice of what Kohl and McCutcheon (2015) term 'kitchen table reflexivity' presents an opportunity to engage with our positionalities and enact an earnest and ongoing commitment to the complex and fluid nature of our relationships with participants and the operations of power that inevitably permeate research. In working through ethical moments during multispecies fieldwork, kitchen table reflexivity allows for practical and theoretical reflection on inevitable tensions, aids in muddling through them, and fosters a culture of care between researchers – a vital but often backgrounded element of academic research, which presumes the 'always-already stable' researcher as its subject (Todd, 2020). In what follows, we outline this method in more detail, offer a performance of it via dialogue, reflect on our own practices, and speak to the wider relevance of kitchen table reflexivity for researchers and practitioners.

---

[1] We use the terms 'more-than-human' and 'nonhuman' throughout the paper. The former refers to situations involving humans and nonhumans (mostly animals, due to our research focus). The latter specifically refers to entities/relations in which humans are not included, e.g. when we speak of nonhuman animals independently.

Feminist and decolonial geographers have been key to advancing understandings of ethics in research. Feminist geographers have long highlighted the importance of situated ethics, discussing the need for reflexive practices which take into account positionalities, subtle relations of power, and responsibilities to diverse participants (England, 1994; Hopkins, 2007; McDowell, 1992; Valentine, 2003). Feminist research praxes are situated, embodied, attentive to emotional relations and care for partners, and ask larger political questions about the purpose of research and social change (Cahill et al., 2007; Kobayashi, 2003; Sharp, 2005). Indigenous and decolonial scholars have highlighted the deeply problematic extractivist research practices of colonial research institutions (Asselin and Basile, 2018; Esson et al., 2017; Radcliffe, 2017; Tuck and Yang, 2014), which have also been the status quo in research *on* 'nature'. Decolonial research praxes advance participatory, relational, pluriversal, and non-hierarchical understandings of knowledge, ethics, and expertise. They foreground social justice and work to situate and deconstruct Eurocentric ontologies which are frequently generalized as universal, and which are founded upon harmful binaries including nature/culture, animate/inanimate, human/animal, masculine/feminine, and subject/object (Lugones, 2010; Murrey et al., 2017; Sundberg, 2014; Tuck and Guishard, 2013). Posthuman approaches also interrogate binary ontologies, along with the ethico-political dimensions of more-than-human inclusions/exclusions (e.g. Braidotti, 2013, 2019; Wolfe, 2009). There are overlaps and tensions between decolonial and posthuman perspectives, but they both create possibilities for changing and/or resisting the "individualistic, possessive, and competitive subjectivity … portrayed as the ideal of the neoliberal model in higher education" (Zembylas, 2018, 255).

In multispecies scholarship, a great deal of attention has been paid to affirmative accounts of more-than-human flourishing, and the need for situated, relational ethics to be worked through contextually by, as Haraway (2016) writes, 'staying with the trouble'. However, there have been limited instances of dialogue illustrating the complexity, messiness, and emotional labour required to do so in practice, amidst fraught real-world entanglements (but see Gillespie and Collard, 2015; Gillespie, 2019; Giraud, 2019; Giraud et al., 2019; Lopez and Gillespie, 2016; Oliver, 2020). And whilst geographers have contributed important interventions on animal ethics in laboratory settings (e.g. Davies, 2012; Davies *et al*., 2016; Greenhough and Roe, 2011), little attention has been given to research outside of the laboratory. One important exception is Bastian et al.'s (2016) writing on 'Participatory Research in More-than-human Worlds'. Through a series of workshops, the authors "sought to take the tenets of both participation and the more-than-human as seriously as possible, [and to] put them into action" (Bastian, 2016, 21). They conclude that participatory frames are useful in asking 'what matters' to nonhumans involved in research, but answers to these questions and their ethical import need to be worked through contextually. This highlights a key challenge involved in multispecies ethics in anthropocentric research contexts: beyond recognising the relationality or entanglement of naturalcultural phenomena (Giraud, 2019), how do we make decisions in the field in ethically important moments?

This paper emerges from two years of in-person and virtual communication dialoguing the challenges, failures, and tensions we faced as early career field researchers working with animals (and diverse human groups working with animals). These conversations constitute labours of care in themselves, as we work to support one another emotionally and academically. Our experimental mobilization of 'kitchen table reflexivity' contributes to ongoing conversations in geographical research surrounding feminist and decolonial praxis, emotional geographies, and resistance to the neoliberalized academy. Our method resonates strongly with the 'buddy system' proposed by Lopez and Gillespie (2016), and Dorling's (2019) call for kindness in geography: to each other, ourselves, our students, and, we add, to our more-than-human research participants/collaborators. We offer our reflections on the emotional geographies of multispecies research and 'caring-with' each other against the pressures of the neoliberalized academy, with a desire to foster accountability for the worlds brought into being through our knowledge practices.

We briefly outline our individual projects on urban coyotes in Canada (LVP) and canids in the Chornobyl[2] Exclusion Zone (JJT), and the methods engaged for this dialogue. We then relay and respond to each other's fieldwork stories which speak to emergent themes of *negotiating expertise and positionality*, *making visible or concealing the animal*, and *intervening in animal worlds*. We conclude by reflecting on the ethical complexities of caring for and with more-than-human participants in multispecies research, and the potential of dialogue as method for helping researchers to practice multispecies ethics whilst supporting and caring for each other during the research process.

Methods

This paper both performs and presents the findings of an experiment in 'kitchen table reflexivity' to navigate and reflect upon ethically important moments encountered in multispecies field research. The starting point for this paper was a number of informal conversations throughout the course of our field seasons which helped us to work through fraught and everyday decisions. At the time of writing, Jonny was in the midst of ongoing fieldwork and was reflecting on data already generated, whilst Lauren had recently completed data collection and was reflecting on the process post-hoc. Our work is situated within a feminist-posthuman approach to more-than-human geographies, committed to an anti-oppressive and decolonial praxis.

The stories from my (JJT) fieldwork emerge from ongoing more-than-human ethnographic work in the Chornobyl Exclusion Zone (hereafter, 'the Zone' or 'Chornobyl'), the site of the 1986 nuclear disaster. My research explores the apparent resurgence of nature to the Zone, with a focus on two species of canid - domestic dogs and wolves. This focus allows me to reflect on how different species are enrolled by different groups to narrate the Zone as either a 'wildlife haven' or a 'contaminated wasteland' (contrast Oriazola, 2019 with Mousseau, 2016). These narratives are part of a wider discourse concerning the resilience of Nature to anthropogenic impacts, particularly the effects of industrial accidents and polluting industries. They are also entangled with our sense of responsibility towards the nonhumans that are left to dwell in spaces of anthropogenic ruin. To explore these themes, I conduct more-than-human ethnographic work with a range of scientists, local workers (see Turnbull, 2020), tourists, and an animal NGO which cares for the free-roaming dogs living in the Zone. In 2019 and 2020 I observed their spay/neuter campaign and winter-feeding programme, and I also follow their adoption/rescue programme to North America.

The stories from my (LVP) fieldwork stem from eight months of data collection in 2018-2019 exploring the lives, ecologies, and management of urban eastern coyotes in a community within the Greater Toronto Area, Canada, situated on the traditional territories of the Anishinaabe, Attawandaron, Wendat, Haudenosaunee, and Mississaugas of the Credit First Nations. Coyotes have been impacted by histories and ongoing processes of colonialism in North America, subject to range expansion and extermination due to large scale landscape changes and predator management practices (Gompper, 2002; Rutherford, 2018). They face routine violence, including being shot, trapped, and poisoned in rural areas, and frequently lethally removed from urban areas where they are perceived as pests or dangerous to humans and companion animals. Research was undertaken in collaboration with Coyote Watch Canada (CWC), a community-based wildlife management and advocacy not-for-profit. The mixed-methods approach employed semi-structured interviews, trail cameras, existing GPS collar datasets, and participant observation. My reflections herein centre on one incident involving a situation of heightened conflict in a suburban neighbourhood where a coyote family who had lived in the area for years relocated

---

[2] Chernobyl is transliterated from the Russian, Чернобыль. In Ukraine, Chornobyl is used, transliterated from the Ukrainian, Чорнобиль.

their young pups to a culvert under a t-intersection of a fairly busy road near a school. This caused concern, fear, and antagonism amongst some residents, especially those with dogs. Unplanned, I took on a more active role with CWC's Canid Response Team and did my best to mitigate conflict during the four weeks of heightened visibility and intensified interactions before the family moved on and the situation largely resolved. My stories contain excerpts directly from my fieldnotes (for further discussion see Van Patter, 2021).

Throughout our fieldwork, we both had 'kitchen tables' composed of various personal and professional contacts.[3] In terms of the dialogue between us, we regularly conversed via audio/video calls and text conversations, as well as exchanging periodic longer emails which reflected on the challenges we faced, responding to one another with our personal thoughts and relevant dialogues within the literature. These conversations began at a conference held in Cambridge in 2018. Our shared interests emerged during this period and regular dialogue ensued. Later we reflected on this dialogue as integral to our thinking and practice. In assembling this paper, therefore, we drew on these raw stories and responses, which are presented below, lightly edited for coherence and completeness. We acknowledge that the editorial work involved in translating to publishable format renders the exchange somewhat more artificial and polished, and less dialogical. However, we have endeavoured to leave the accounts true to spirit, and to format the paper in a way that captures the performative intent of this piece – that it not only reflect on kitchen table reflexivity, but represent our exercise in practicing it. We then collaborated to turn our individual responses into more nuanced and contemplative reflections around three emergent themes we identified as central to our exchanges: *negotiating expertise and positionality*; *making visible or concealing the animal*; and *intervening in animal worlds*. These themes speak to broader audiences concerned with more-than-human and multispecies research in general. The paper, therefore, makes two main contributions to the literature: one concerning methods; the other concerning these substantive themes.

Dialogue: Navigating Ethically Important Moments in Multispecies Research

Key ethically important moments we experienced during the course of our multispecies research aligned with three primary themes. *Negotiating expertise and positionality* considers the ways in which perceptions of expertise and collaborations with 'experts' became relevant to our relationships with, and responsibilities to, more-than-human participants. *Making visible or concealing the animal* attends to the complexities, uncertainties, and responsibilities associated with making decisions to reveal or conceal details of our more-than-human participants' lives and geographies. *Intervening in animal worlds* speaks to our own involvement in the lives of more-than-human research participants, and the opportunities that either come into being or are foreclosed as a result of our own or our collaborators' work. We relay stories from the field and reflect on these themes below, thinking-together through fraught ethical moments. Our reflections speak to researchers and practitioners whose work involves nonhuman animals in a range of contexts.

Negotiating Expertise and Positionality

Field Story and Response 1

Negotiating local expertise: dogs and wolves (JJT)	*LVP Response*

[3] These included mentors, supervisors, colleagues, family and friends, of which there are too many individuals to list here!

Wolf-dog conflict is often reported by local people, including local scientists, in the Zone. During fieldwork, foreign scientists were reluctant to trust accounts of wolf-dog altercations and encounters from local people, like checkpoint border guards and Chornobyl Nuclear Power Plant (ChNPP) workers, often dismissing their claims as inaccurate or impossible. Instead, they suggested wolves do not come close enough to where most Chornobyl dogs hang out – workers' dormitories, the main hostel and hotel, guarded checkpoints, and the ChNPP – for conflict to arise. They also dismissed the claims of local veterinarians who identified certain scat samples as belonging to wolves. In contrast to these dismissals, I was told many stories of wolf sightings, encounters, and dog-wolf attacks by local workers and scientists. I was even shown a picture of a wolf that had been intentionally run over and killed by a worker's bus when found attacking dogs that lived around the ChNPP. Situated local knowledge revealed another side to the story of the human-dog-wolf relations at Chornobyl.

Conflicts with local people also arose whilst working at the spay/neuter clinic with the animal NGO. Local residents sometimes resisted attempts to spay and neuter 'their' dogs by cutting off ear tags with the dual purpose of identification and radiation dose monitoring, releasing dogs from traps, and not handing them over to the NGO volunteers. In an extreme case, stray dogs from Slavutych, a city outside the Zone where ChNPP workers live, were poisoned by a controversial local animal advocate who believed culling to be the best management strategy. These events reveal how animals' lives are implicated in knowledge controversies. How do local knowledges get included/excluded from such controversies and deliberations, and with what impacts for practices of more-than-human care and companionship? What are the implications for human-dog-wolf co-existence in the Zone? Whose knowledge and expertise of the animals

The politics of animal management can be especially fraught in cross-cultural contexts, or where intervening 'experts' are considered outsiders. We must acknowledge the long colonial histories wherein dominant groups pass judgement upon the animal practices of marginalized, racialized, or colonized peoples, whose actions become inscribed as deviant and defined through animalizing discourses, rendered as 'barbaric' or 'savage' (Deckha, 2012; Elder et al., 1998; Hovorka, 2017; Kim, 2015). There are compelling arguments for researchers seriously committed to social justice and decolonization to refrain from passing judgement on local animal practices, and instead attend to and respect the pluralistic nature of human-animal relations. However, when we also acknowledge relations with and responsibilities to the more-than-human Others implicated in our research, we are forced to confront uncomfortable questions about what flourishing, or justice, means for all. An honest and informed reflexivity is key, which involves a genuine desire to understand diverse perspectives and question our own assumptions and worldviews: how does our own ontological baggage concerning who or what animals are and how we should relate to them factor into our judgements?

In your case, why is the local populace against sterilization? Do they hold a different belief about what constitutes a 'good life' for dogs? Do they feel it is a waste of time and resources that could be put to better use in providing for the needs of the humans in the community? Is this perhaps a valid consideration (not that the needs of humans ought to uncritically supersede those of animals)? The common assumption in western contexts that sterilizing feral/free-living dogs is in their best interest rests on biopolitical assumptions about individual and population health that merit critical questioning, as Srinivasan (2013) highlights. Interconnected vulnerabilities within more-than-human communities also merit consideration, where rather than seeing 'dogs' and 'humans' as two discrete groups, should we instead consider

should be privileged when disagreements arise?	how diverse more-than-human bodies become situated within intersecting multispecies relations of power (Hovorka, 2019)? For instance, Narayanan (2017) discusses the relationship between the urban poor in India and street dogs who often provide security and companionship. Thus, programs to 'manage' these dogs often adversely impact the most disadvantaged human inhabitants of cities, who are rarely considered or given a voice in canine management debates. In your research, what are the relationships between diverse human individuals or groups and the dogs in question? Who has a voice in deciding how they are treated/managed and why?

Field Story and Response 2

Coyote researcher? Expert? Educator? (LVP)	*JJT Response*
During fieldwork, "*there were times when I felt uncomfortable about whether I should be correcting misinformation during interviews, or whether this would be disrespectful, or put the participants off, rather than simply attending to their truths… If someone was citing harmful myths about coyotes as fact, I would be inclined perhaps to point out that studies show X or whatnot, but it is uncomfortable to be in a position where people are volunteering to share their perspective with you, and you shoot them down for being wrong*" (fieldnotes, May 16, 2019). This question was especially pressing when misinformation could put coyotes, humans, or companion animals at risk. Where coyote behaviours such as inquisitiveness or familial protection against domestic dogs were misinterpreted as aggression, such beliefs had the potential to cause unwarranted fear and demands for lethal removal. I felt uncomfortable about my positionality and role, being viewed by participants as an 'expert', and how to navigate my relationships with them alongside my responsibility to coyotes dwelling in the community. In one of my final	Understanding how people construct and represent coyotes is extremely important in effectively attending to questions of coexistence and human-wildlife conflict. There seems to be a politics associated with *waiting* here; all data is interesting and important, but for how long are we expected to endure things that we disagree with ethically and intellectually when interacting with our research interlocutors? And what is our educational responsibility in this relationship? I think the two key issues here are when to intervene – when to listen and when to offer your own view – and how to intervene. These things are evidently inseparable but point to the importance of navigating ethically important moments sensitively and with caution given the unstable and changing contemporary public relationship with experts and expertise (Clarke and Newman, 2017). It seems like you managed this situation well in these regards. Feeling uncomfortable with your positionality and role – with being viewed as an expert – is another key issue to consider when it comes to social scientific research with

interviews, "*It was the first time that I really felt like my role shouldn't be only to listen to their experiences, but to educate. [The participant] kept saying she was afraid, and wasn't sure if they would attack her or not. I felt like 'to hell with the objective observer', and spent the last five minutes of our communication trying to present some information…I hope the educational materials help to quell their fears*" (fieldnotes, July 5, 2019). How can we navigate this tension of attending to participants' truths concerning animals, versus drawing on our knowledge to shape their understandings in a way that might promote coexistence? Decisions about what role to play, and how to mobilize our perceived expertise could have real-world consequences for the human-animal relations being investigated.

animals that draws from the expertise of natural scientists. How do we best represent the knowledge of our natural science interlocutors, how confident can we be in our representations, and how can we avoid problematically reinstating knowledge hierarchies wherein scientists are the only *real* experts, a move which lies at the root of western imperialist thinking (Clement, 2019)? We're entangled in relationships of expertise with our research interlocutors such that knowledge production is always co-constructed from the outset. We need to judge how to most effectively and appropriately convey our co-produced research (and our interlocutor's research) to specific publics in ways that are sensitive to the publics in question, all whilst carefully responding to the interests of animals at the centre of our research. This means relentlessly pursuing a critical rigour in how we approach our own research, and the research of others (across disciplines), to trust ourselves when required to intervene in more-than-human worlds. Dialoguing like we do here, and with others outside our field, is key to achieving this.

Shared Reflections on Negotiating Expertise and Positionality

Critically questioning expertise and the politics of knowledge production requires that we ask ourselves how best to respect opposing truth claims whilst moving to synthesize knowledge in a way that foregrounds the circumstances and needs of diverse more-than-human communities. Too often questions of animal justice are interwoven with, or problematically constructed as antithetical to, questions of social justice (Kim, 2015). How can we make visible the interconnections of social, animal, and environmental justice which operate in our research contexts, and highlight the shared precarity of life amidst the ongoing colonial-capitalist realities of the Anthropocene? Perhaps this is the question we should be most concerned with in our multispecies research.

There are complex connections between care, expertise, and legitimate ways of knowing within multispecies relations (Davies, 2012; Giraud, 2019; Greenhough and Roe, 2011). There is danger in reinscribing knowledge hierarchies and attendant exclusions, pertaining to *right* and *wrong* ways of caring for animals. We have a responsibility to critically interrogate contested histories and current configurations of human-animal encounters, challenge the 'truths' we may find ourselves clinging to, and push ourselves to 'stay with the trouble' that arises when multispecies entanglements are embroiled in political, economic, and social oppressions. Only by doing so can we form appropriate *responses* to the always uniquely situated problems we encounter in our fieldwork.

During our fieldwork, we were both required to question, and rely on, our own expertise and to reflect on our role as researchers. An 'ethics of humility' is useful here, which acknowledges that "[w]e don't know it all. In fact, we don't know much" (Limes-Taylor Henderson and Esposito, 2017, 886). This also resonates with Saville's (2021, 6) call to move towards more 'humble geographies', wherein humility allows us to concede our shortcomings whilst remaining "teachable, motivated to improve, [and] develop." As field researchers, we are always a "visible and integral part of the research setting" (England, 1994, 84). Working against problematic knowledge hierarchies enacted through research institutions by seeing ourselves as learners rather than experts is an integral part of a decolonial epistemology. However, there may be times when we feel our own situated knowledge could valuably inform particular issues or decisions. This is the aim for many researchers: co-producing knowledge that will be useful in creating meaningful change. Our task then is to discern how to best share our knowledge with our interlocutors and, where possible, develop collaborative interventions that empower people rather than imposing top-down decisions. As Saville (2021, 6) notes, we need "to question how we tell research stories and share co-produced knowledge in ways that reflect a humble position without becoming an invisible witness." Often, rather than seeing our responsibility as arriving at final resolutions, meaningful and careful interventions can entail practices of mediation in which we support others as they negotiate fraught entanglements and contested practices. Navigating how to most appropriately engage with and mobilize our own and others' expertise often involves communicating research to different publics, which raises questions around the ethics of making visible the lives of more-than-human research participants.

Making Visible or Concealing the Animal

Field Story and Response 3

Digital traces (JJT)	*LVP Response:*
In 2018 researchers tracked the movement of a pack of 13 European Grey Wolves within the Zone. A young male wolf, outfitted with a GPS-tracker and dosimeter to measure radiation exposure, travelled 369 kilometres across Belarus, Ukraine, and into Russia, until the GPS signal and the wolf's location was lost. The media reacted with alarm, and reports of 'radioactive mutant wolves' spreading 'mutant genes' across Europe proliferated. The fate of the wolf in question remains unknown, but the media representations framed the wolves of Chornobyl as *more dangerous* than other wolves by using cultural tropes related to radioactivity and mutants. I interviewed the researchers responsible for the tracking to understand more about the lives of wolves in Chornobyl. We discussed how their research was taken up by the media, and how the dispersing male wolf was represented. I was particularly concerned with the unintended	Your story brings to mind work by Adams (2019) and Sandbrook et al. (2018) on the ethics of tracking technologies and conservation surveillance. Though they largely speak to the implications for humans, many of the concerns (surveillance, privacy, the implications of being 'fixed' by the gaze of conservation) are relevant to non-humans who coproduce our research. Often it feels like the most cautious course of action is to conceal findings about animals' locations and movements. We can never be certain how such information will be mobilized, and what interests it might ultimately serve. In contexts where animals live precarious existences within a "topography of enmity" (Pachirat, 2018, 339), what is *not* known about them is often their greatest defence. But how are we to change the narrative, to make people think differently about the more-than-human world if we refrain from sharing stories of animals' lives due to a paralysis of uncertainty? As

consequences their research might have for wolf populations in the area and how making visible animals' movements (and mobilities) has impacts on the ground. My question was: 'could the digital trace produced by the researchers and its enrolment into particular digital (or media) ecologies have ethical consequences for wolves living in the Zone'? On the Belarusian side of the Zone where the wolves were caught and collared, hunting is increasingly encouraged to 'control' the population. Revealing the territories of wolves via our writing and the research of those we work with thus has potential ethical consequences related to the lives and deaths of wolves. As a geographer working with those who track wolves, what is my role in the tracking/concealing/revealing process? What are the unintended consequences my work can have for the lives of the animals we study alongside our interlocutors? And can we mitigate these impacts prior to, during, and/or after fieldwork?	Hamilton and Taylor (2017) point out, failing to attend to the experiences of animals reinforces dominant humanist systems of thought, and countering anthropocentrism requires that we work carefully to make the lives of nonhumans visible in responsible ways. Your story highlights the importance of understanding the sociocultural contexts in which our work is taking place to better predict how certain details might be taken up and travel, and the implications in terms of broader material-discursive practices which ultimately shape the lived realities of individuals (human and nonhuman). In this example, how might your research either feed into, or disrupt the narrative of 'radioactive mutant wolves' spreading 'mutant genes'? In my work, I am careful to avoid invoking the 'coywolf' figure, a biopolitical discourse which operates to construct eastern coyotes as 'hybrid' predators, conjuring images of the 'big bad wolf' in your neighbourhood (Kays, 2015; Rutherford, 2018). This speaks to the politics of representation, and questioning "*which* forms of representation and constructions of animal subjectivity are affectively (and by extension ethically and politically) productive" (Giraud, 2019, 151, emphasis in original).

Field Story and Response 4

On-the-ground translations (LVP)	*JJT response*
I received five months of GPS-collar data from the preceding year of a coyote living around an urban forest, which assisted me in siting trail cameras. Whilst following coyote tracks through deep snow to mount cameras, I became concerned about the trails I was creating. I worried they might make coyotes more visible, opening their secluded spaces to increased traffic by recreating humans: "*One disconcerting thing is that further along the trail, right next to our camera, there are fresh*	Understanding the mobilities, spatialities, and geographies of animals is a burgeoning area of research in more-than-human and animals' geographies (Hodgetts and Lorimer, 2015). But what happens when animals' use of space is reliant upon elusiveness or concealment from humans? Your story again highlights that what is not known about them can be their greatest defence. However, it is not simply what is *not* known about animals, but *what* is not known

human tracks over our tracks from last week. Last week when we were here there were no human tracks in this area at all. And so I'm worried that through moving in and out of here several times, we've created a trail that then other people have started to use, which is really what I did not want to happen. I feel sort of responsible for opening up this area to human use if it previously wasn't and it was a space for animals to be using safely away from humans and dogs" (field notes, March 8, 2019). The coyotes had become visible to me through surveillance technology, and I was translating this visibility to the public, on the ground, through my own movements across the landscape. I worried: should I simply stay out of the area? What impact might this creation of new paths have on this coyote family? My greatest fear was that humans would bring dogs near possible den sites. I began to take precautions, like going out during or just before snowfall, hoping my tracks would be covered, but still felt uneasy about my presence within this space and the implications of potentially increasing coyote visibility due to following their tracks.

by whom. Your story raises the question of whether animals have a right to privacy – privacy in general or privacy from specific people?

We must not assume that, as researchers, our participation in 'official' forms of knowledge production somehow makes our decision to insert ourselves into animals' geographies ethically sound, especially relative to members of the public. Researchers are tightly embroiled in the politics of visibility/concealment from the moment we choose to intervene into animals' lives. There is a need, therefore, to consider the beneficiaries of our research (researchers? particular human communities? animals themselves? all three?), along with how this configuration of beneficiaries is affected by the fieldwork methods we deploy. Could we build into our research ways for animals to benefit from being tracked? This could range from policy recommendations that protect the territory of coyotes, to community education and outreach programmes that make people aware of the nonhumans with whom they coexist. But eventually, we must balance the configuration of beneficiaries: the risk posed to animals and others when their geographies are made public should be weighed against the potential positive outcomes of our research, without falling into a binary and individualistic cost-benefit analysis that smooths over relationality and power. This is no easy task. Thinking-with and supporting one another through these situations by deploying skills acquired through formal and informal training, mentorship, and past experience as researchers is the best means of ensuring risks to animals associated with our research are thought through in advance and mitigated to the degree possible; something that the bureaucratic nature of institutional risk assessments doesn't adequately facilitate.

Shared Reflections on Making Visible or Concealing the Animal

The politics of visibility have long been central concerns of critical animal studies (Adams, 2000; Hamilton and Taylor, 2017; Twine, 2012). Key tensions centre on animals' rights to privacy, the ethical decision to *not know*, and how to ensure our research remains responsible to the configuration of beneficiaries most appropriately. A central question is *how* we make animals visible through our research. Haraway (1992, 311) advocates for a "politics of articulation rather than representation", wherein rather than "ventriloquate for the subaltern" (Tuck and Yang, 2014, 226), we find creative means of *articulating with* more-than-human research participants/collaborators, providing a platform for their voices to be heard (Giraud, 2019). Thus, animal scholars often foreground methodological opportunities for investigating 'what matters' to nonhumans (Buller, 2015), exploring animals' geographies through ethological (Barua and Sinha, 2019) or welfare (Grandin, 2005) frames. But there are practical difficulties to participatory approaches which engage experimental methods to articulate situated needs and interests by making visible "those who are often unseen by dominant actors" (Bastian, 2016, 30).

Bringing animals back 'within sight', in a manner respectful of their needs and lifeways, can be a fruitful means of 're-storying' shared more-than-human worlds. But, as our fieldwork experiences reveal, we must proceed with care. The stories we tell through our research have the potential for both radical societal restructurings along more equitable multispecies lines, as well as for reinforcing or exacerbating existing vulnerabilities amongst our nonhuman (and human) participants. Ultimately, in deciding what to conceal and what to make visible, we have a responsibility to understand as much as possible about the contexts of our research: who are the actors and what motivates them? What forms of knowledge exist, what are their histories, and how have they been mobilized? 'Kitchen table' dialogues can assist us in comprehending, to the extent possible, the many entangled relationalities and possibilities that may hang in the balance. To bring particular worlds into being comes with this responsibility. We turn next to the issues that arise when we are called to practically intervene in animal worlds.

Intervening in Animal Worlds

Field Story and Response 5

Sterilization and ethics of encounter (JJT)	*LVP Response*
Part of my fieldwork involved observing the work of 'dog catchers' in the Zone who drove around and caught dogs to be brought to the makeshift veterinary clinic/laboratory to be spayed or neutered, vaccinated, and examined by veterinarians and research scientists. One afternoon whilst on 'patrol' with the catch team, I was asked to assist with chasing and catching a number of dogs – something I hadn't been trained to do, nor had I anticipated in my risk assessment. In the thick of the moment, my active participation felt like part of the bargain for being granted access to their work. I had to make a quick decision about participating and intervening. The experience of the other members of the team ranged from no previous experience to being veteran catchers, so I decided to assist, using my body	I feel this question lacks a parallel within most research with human participants, where informed consent is mandated and the balance of harms versus benefits is often more obvious. I'm aware of different approaches advocated by diversely situated multispecies researchers. Some colleagues will participate in any animal practice that would otherwise be conducted, even if it involves harm. Others argue that research conducted in situations of animal exploitation risks complicity (e.g. Gillespie, 2016; 2019). In your case, collaborations with animal welfare organizations often feel straightforward because they generally aim to help, not harm. The trouble comes in defining 'harm'. As Limes-Taylor Henderson and Esposito (2017, 883) ask, "[h]ow do we know what harm is, or the extent of it, outside of our

in collaboration with others to manoeuvre dogs into humane traps and corners where they could be easily caught, or occasionally darted with an anaesthetic by trained veterinarians. This involved dogs walking right up to us in response to food offerings (Figure 1), and other times involved high-octane chases that culminated with dogs hiding under buildings and then being anaesthetised by blow dart, and brought to the clinic under anaesthetic. Sometimes, the dogs were clearly put under stress during such chases and interactions with unfamiliar people. They were not used to being handled due to their lives as semi-domestic/street dogs. I felt intensely conflicted about my involvement, given I had only anticipated observing the catch team at work. The visible stress the dogs were placed under and my intent to critique spay/neuter campaigns made the experience fraught with anxiety. How might the dogs be affected by this encounter? Will they survive the sterilisation operation? Does my participation matter given the process would have gone ahead anyway? What do I make of the embodied experience as generative of research materials?

immediate experience?" Elsewhere, building on Mancini (2017), I argue we should obtain embodied assent from animals, and watch closely for communications of dissent (Van Patter and Blattner, 2020). But our relationships with animals are often permeated by paternalism, wherein we feel we know what is best for them and proceed against their obvious communications of dissent or resistance to enact our visions of care. Sometimes this may seem fairly straightforward, like when capturing a severely ill or injured animal for rehabilitation and release. But in other cases, such as sterilization, how can we face our uncertainty about whether this constitutes care or harm in the context of our research?

I am especially struck by your description of enticing dogs near with affection or food to capture them. Reading your story, I could picture the scene, feel the uneasiness in my body, the deception entirely other than the overt intention and even violence of chase and capture. As it would be done regardless, perhaps there is value in bearing witness. But I can imagine the tension of standing, one hand extended with food in a gesture of friendship, other hand behind my back ready to capture. In my work hazing coyotes, I was intentionally scaring my animal participant – something he clearly did not assent to – based on an assumption that I knew best how to secure his family's long-term survival within the community. But should we as researchers make these decisions on behalf of animals, or should we take more seriously what they communicate to us about their lifeworlds and desires and adjust our own practices?

Figure 1. Dogs offered food before being caught. Photograph by Jonathon Turnbull.

Field Story and Response 6

'Hazing' for survival (LVP)	*JJT Response*
In the volatile situation of coyotes denning in a culvert next to a busy road, I was compelled to take on a more active role than I had intended. I communicated both with human residents about the situation, and directly with the coyotes, the father in particular, in an attempt to reshape his behaviour and aid the family's chances of survival. He had become highly protective of his two remaining pups, behaving defensively towards approaching domestic canines, and his efforts to scare them off often frightened accompanying humans (Figure 2). I began to use 'aversion conditioning', or 'humane hazing', techniques to interrupt any	Moments of direct bodily encounter with animals during fieldwork are often the most challenging to reflect on and endure as they are felt on registers that go uncaptured by the representational logics we use when discussing other important moments in the field. They require attention to what Greenhough and Roe (2011, 50) term 'somatic sensibilities' – the "affectual, embodied understandings of human and nonhuman relations." Nonrepresentational (Anderson and Harrison, 2010) and more-than-representational (Lorimer, 2005) geographies help us to think through how embodied encounters with nonhumans in the field shape our emotional responses and practices towards

interactions, as further altercations posed risks to both him and the dog, and increased the chances of residents demanding the family's lethal removal (Sampson and Van Patter, 2020). Thus, day after day, I chased him, snapping a large plastic garbage bag, away from any approaching dogs, as I asked humans to temporarily walk an alternate route. My time there was fraught with uncertainty: "*the question of whether or when to haze him around the den and pups is unimaginably complex*" (fieldnotes, June 9, 2019). "*if we haze them so that they feel they need to move immediately, what if they relocate to somewhere even worse? What if they flee in a panic and are hit by a car? We will feel responsible, and wish we hadn't intervened. But what if they get so comfortable they stick around, the neighbourhood ultimately loses patience, and demands that they be lethally removed? … The uncertainty is weighing on me. I know all we can do is take things as they come … but when lives hang in the balance it feels so deeply inadequate*" (fieldnotes, June 10, 2019). "*What is my purpose here? What good am I doing? I try to comfort myself that I'm here to witness the negotiations and struggles, which is important. But I've done more than merely witness here. I've intervened and helped to shape the course of events, which makes me feel uncomfortably responsible for the outcomes. I know researchers can never be detached observers, but my level of activity in this whole scenario crosses so many boundaries of what I am comfortable with and what I had envisioned doing during my research"* (fieldnotes, June 13, 2019).	them, generating spaces in which care might be enacted (Greenhough and Roe, 2011). When a situation like yours arises, we must reflect on this experience as a means of learning to 'attune' ourselves to nonhuman bodies in new, critical, and care-full ways (Despret, 2004). We must dwell in these difficult embodied relations to muddle through them and learn to trust ourselves to make the best decision for the more-than-human communities we work with, acknowledging that there are no simple or prefigured solutions. Reflecting with each other like this, combined with being mindfully aware of ourselves and our research participants during fieldwork (Whitehead et al., 2016), cannot determine our actions but may prime us for making the best decisions in the heat of such encounters. Ensuring the people living in proximity to the coyote den were aware that you were hazing them, and aware of what hazing is, was a very important step. You went to great lengths to ensure that community members were comfortable with your actions, which is evidence that your intervention was considered and open to critique from relevant stakeholders. In intervening in multispecies worlds like this, we are forced to embody our research in ways that are often forgotten, undiscussed, or seen as moments in which our positionality as impartial researchers is lost. It is clear, however, that these moments are essential in understanding practices that are often interrogated through ethnography or interviews. Although imbued with our own subjective experience, we should see them as beneficial to our reflections rather than detracting from them, by attending to and highlighting the importance of the nonrepresentational qualities of multispecies research.

Figure 2. Coyote father with pups. Photograph by Lauren Van Patter.

Shared Reflections on Intervening in Animal Worlds

There needs to be more dialogue acknowledging that our knowledge practices have material consequences, and that "research itself is a political act, one that creates social worlds at the same time as studying them" (Hamilton and Taylor, 2017, 195). But we need to push past a mere recognition of these complex entanglements and begin to engage with questions regarding our responsibility for the particular worlds that we bring into being and the inevitable exclusions that foreclose certain possibilities as others are materialized (Giraud, 2019). Rather than being governed by obligation, ethics is speculative, and the affirmative is not ready-made (Gerlach, 2020). Encouraging one form of care within a particular multispecies community could entail harmful effects to others at various scales. We must face the 'contradictory truths' (Haraway, 2008) that arise during our fieldwork and "take responsibility for the ways in which we help to tie and retie our knotted multispecies worlds" (van Dooren 2010, 142). The challenge with this lies in the deep uncertainties we often face in navigating the complex and emotional terrain of multispecies fieldwork that requires us to make care-full, yet spontaneous, decisions that, however big or small, touch the lives of our more-than-human interlocutors. In many cases, we do not know what opportunities or relations we are foreclosing or opening through our actions, and for whom. In sterilizing dogs, we are foreclosing their opportunities to reproduce, to be a parent, and to have particular relations of biological kinship which may be meaningful to them. But we may also be foreclosing further suffering – nutritional stress in the case of continuously pregnant and lactating mothers, and difficult and possibly short lives of pups born into precarious circumstances.

We need to be accountable to our *uncertainties*, and also to our *noninnocence*. Critical geographers highlight the need to be more honest about the intrusiveness of our research, as we are often a disrupted, uninvited presence in the lives of our participants (England, 1994; Limes-Taylor Henderson and Esposito, 2017). By uncritically asserting that more knowledge is inherently good, or that interventions guided by 'care' or benevolent intentions are unproblematic, we are dispensing with our responsibilities to carefully evaluate the worlds brought into being through our interventions. We need to hold ourselves accountable to the disruptions and burdens caused by our research, even if we feel the outcomes we are striving to cultivate for a well-balanced constellation of beneficiaries are worth the risks. We need to constantly grapple with these tensions, but we do not need to do so alone. Continuously dialoguing and reflecting with colleagues and collaborators, both within the academy and in the communities with which we work, is key to a responsive ethics for 'as well as possible' research processes and outcomes (Puig de la Bellacasa, 2017).

Our stories speak not only to the ways our research (in)advertently brings certain worlds into being, but also to the worldliness of ourselves, as bodies, in the research process. We recount using our bodies to influence the behaviour of animals, to catch them with the result that they would undergo vaccination and fertility surgery (JJT), and to affect their territorial practices to mitigate human-wildlife conflict (LVP). These acts emphasize the importance of the more-than-representational and affectual dimensions of multispecies research, ethics, and care. Rather than the discursive tools of text and language, the multispecies encounter is mediated through touch, sound, movement and the choreography of material selves: "[t]he body is essential in this kind of research" (Greenhough and Roe, 2011, 49). We therefore advance that future multispecies research endeavour to foreground the nonrepresentational and embodied dynamics of encounters, being open about the ways in which they reconfigure identities, space, and political economies (Barua, 2016), and are central to shaping the research process itself (Wilson, 2016). Honest, sustained, and experimental engagement with emotions, affects, bodily communications, and intuitions is key to a more-than-human research praxis which aims to *articulate with* nonhuman participants rather than uncritically representing them or advocating on their behalf based on preconceived (often humanist) assumptions. This is especially important when we are required to do so in difficult situations and to diverse audiences.

Conclusion: Unhiding Care, Emergent Ethics, and Future Directions

Stories from our respective research on eastern coyotes in urban Ontario (LVP) and canids in the Chornobyl Exclusion Zone (JJT) highlight some key challenges we faced in navigating the affective intensities that move us as geographers, participant observers, and community-members. Thinking-together through these dynamics proved both methodologically and theoretically fruitful. Methodologically, genuine reflexivity and engagement with our positionalities must include an earnest and ongoing commitment to the complex and fluid nature of our relationships with more-than-human participants and operations of power. Informal conversations with colleagues open up possibilities for critical reflection and nuanced perspectives on institutional privilege and the challenges inherent in negotiating the complex terrain of multispecies research. The method sits outside various institutional confines, giving rise to an openness that is essential, but often hidden from view in academic processes and spaces, and where formal ethical review protocols have little to offer in guiding research with other-than-human participants (Oliver, 2021; Van Patter and Blattner, 2020). Although codified protocols can be a useful starting point, the ethical tensions that inevitably emerge during fieldwork are often fetishized in final outputs. This is 'trackless territory' (Haraway, 2008), where we must operate "without 'best practice' guides or formulae to tell practitioners how to live and act in multispecies, connected worlds" (Houston et al. 2018, 197). We therefore advocate the value of 'everyday talk' as an analytical tool with the potential to "push our understandings of ourselves and our situated, fluid, and relational positionalities" (Kohl and McCutcheon, 2015, 758). As friends and colleagues, being able to reflect with

each other, to share our concerns, and to offer advice when appropriate allows us to navigate the complex ethical terrain involved in being not only observers, but participants, in research involving complex and contested animal practices. For example, after one fraught day of fieldwork, I (LVP) wrote in my fieldnotes: "*I have been texting with [my colleague] about my ethical dilemma, which has been helpful. [They] reminded me not to take on too much responsibility or get too mired in the situation*" (June 5, 2019). Similarly, I (JJT) noted in an email "Working together makes navigating the field theoretically and practically (in terms of day-to-day anxieties/worries) so much easier and being able to share these with each other is a form of caring and mutual support that we shouldn't forget" (August 9, 2019).

Thus, this paper represents an example of 'unhiding care' (Katz, 2001) – of the solidarity vital to undertaking multispecies research within an anthropocentric and neoliberal(izing) academy. Dorling (2019) argues for geographers to embrace and reveal acts of kindness, which he identifies as a crucial but unseen aspect of academic work. For him, kindness is a kind of rigour. Our dialogue was often about offering emotional support, encouragement, and validation when necessary, allowing each other's uncertainties and negotiations to be voiced and heard. Practicing kitchen table reflexivity is simultaneously an academic, emotional, and political act. It is a 'buddy system' that provides opportunities to *care with* one another; as well as a means of resisting the oppressive logics of the neoliberal academy (Lopez and Gillespie, 2016). Similar to Bayfield et al. (2020), we advance that this is part of rising to the ongoing challenge of working against dominant extractivist and productionist paradigms, ever at odds with approaches and temporalities required for a careful research praxis. While perhaps only a small gesture of resistance, practicing acts of kindness within a 'buddy system' offers palpable respite to what can often be a lonely and uneasy research process, especially in work that runs against the grain of dominant ideologies (e.g., by resisting anthropocentrism and institutionalized violence against nonhuman Others).

Theoretically, this exercise allowed us to think-together through the ethical complexities of multispecies entanglements, congealing into shared reflections on practices surrounding expertise, visibility, and worlding. These themes and our reflections on them are relevant not only to researchers, but to individuals concerned with the ethical dimensions of working or interacting with other-than-humans in a variety of capacities and settings.

In navigating the complexities surrounding the politics of *expertise*, we must be sensitive to competing truth claims, critically interrogate our own assumptions, and approach our research as learners by practicing an 'ethics of humility' (Limes-Taylor Henderson and Esposito, 2017). This entails a responsibility for the products of our research, in which we "momentarily presence something or someone in spite of their absence" (Cubellis, 2020, 2). This is particularly true when working across disciplines with a variety of actors and stakeholders where our voices as academics may be privileged over others, such as lay publics. A key task for multispecies researchers, then, is finding ways to remain accountable for the presences we create that draw from the knowledge and expertise of others. This requires not only critical thinking, but critical listening, and working against colonial knowledge hierarchies by empowering others through co-produced knowledges. This could involve re-thinking the author-ity of our work (Dowling et al., 2016) but also taking the time to reflect with each other, like we have done here, when making decisions.

In terms of *visibility*, the balance between our desires to understand the lives of animals, and the need to respect what might be better left unknown – what ought to be 'off-limits' from the "conquest and the colonization of knowledge" (Tuck and Yang, 2014, 225) – must be negotiated with an understanding that our animal participants can never fully assure us that our interventions are proceeding in a way they feel is valuable. We cannot be held accountable in the same way as researchers working with communities of whom they can ask, "[h]ow can I get this right?" (Limes-Taylor Henderson and Esposito, 2017, 887). As such, we need "more complex, multifaceted articulations of specific issues that refuse a

reductive logic of representation" (Giraud, 2019, 31), whilst not abdicating us of any responsibility. It is tempting to speak on behalf of those who often lack a 'political voice' (Meijer, 2013), but as Pitt (2015) argues, rather than speaking on behalf of others we must reframe our questions so that they open space for new voices and new answers that we cannot anticipate. For example, asking, 'what am I being shown?' encourages us to attend to the needs of other-than-humans (Dowling et al., 2016) without prefiguring a problem and solution. Methods for such explorations and articulations provide an exciting avenue for future multispecies research.

Taking seriously our responsibility for the complexities, uncertainties, and ambiguities in research encounters, and the unintended consequences of our (or our interlocutors') *worlding* practices "requires a speculative opening" amidst our "thick, impure, involvement in the world" (Puig de la Bellacasa, 2017, 6). Rather than a cost-benefit analysis of pre-established harms and benefits to autonomous, discrete subjects, caring for/with more-than-human participants requires diverse approaches which acknowledge all beings' differently-situated embeddedness within more-than-human communities, and the participation of researchers themselves within these webs of relationality.

In dialoguing and writing about the difficulties we faced during fieldwork as well as the actions we took, and decisions we made, we have attempted to not only stay with the trouble, but to advance a set of considerations around our practices that can help inform other researchers and practitioners working with animals in a range of contexts. In performing kitchen table reflexivity, we were driven by a desire to not only describe, but to process and work through the challenges faced during fieldwork. In our reflections, our intent is to offer readers food for thought in terms of their own fieldwork, illuminating the *process* of 'doing ethics' in multispecies fieldwork rather than prescribing a set of rules. This aligns with our understanding of ethics as speculative—or emergent—given our unsurety towards "how bodies, worlds and things will play out" (Gerlach, 2020, 200). Going forward, it would be fruitful to facilitate interdisciplinary conversations between more-than-human geographers and, for example, ethologists, primatologists, and conservation biologists to learn how different disciplines navigate such challenges.

Moving forward, we wish to leave open the question of how we can advance from research *on* or *about* more-than-human participants, to a *collaborative* praxis of researching-*with* (see Van Patter et al., forthcoming). Affective and non-representational approaches to knowledge production acknowledge the role other-than-humans play in shaping the experience of the researcher (Forsyth, 2013; McLeod, 2014), as we are struck by an ethical call to *respond* to certain situations, being 'drawn' into "immanent connectivity" with other-than-humans not always consciously or by choice (Povinelli, 2011, 28). Dialogue surrounding how this acknowledgement might be translated into workable methods or praxis, or the ethics associated with such multispecies research, remains limited (but see Bastian et al., 2016; Bawaka Country et al., 2015; Dowling et al., 2016; Gillespie, 2019). What might it mean to genuinely engage with other-than-humans as active collaborators in knowledge production who ought to have a say in which questions are asked and how research proceeds, is interpreted, and mobilized? How might other-than-humans call on us to respond to multifaceted naturalcultural problems together? We advance 'more-than-human collaborations' as a critical area of future inquiry, experimentation, and dialogue in moving towards an ethics for multispecies research.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank our field participants and collaborators, human and nonhuman. Jonny would like to thank Ihor Chizhevskyy for his ongoing support in the fieldwork process. Lauren would like to give special thanks to Lesley Sampson for her support in the field. We are also very grateful to three

anonymous reviewers whose feedback was incredibly helpful, caring, and generous, and to Katie Gillespie for her fantastic editorial support and guidance.

References

Adams, Carol. J. 2000. *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist Vegetarian Critical Theory*. New York: Continuum.

Adams, William M. 2019. "Geographies of conservation II: Technology, surveillance and conservation by algorithm." *Progress in Human Geography* 43, no. 2: 337-350.

Anderson, Ben, and Paul Harrison. (eds.) 2010. *Taking-Place: Non-Representational Theories and Geography*. New York: Routledge.

Asselin, Hugo, and Suzy Basile. 2018. "Concrete Ways to Decolonize Research." *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographers* 17, no. 3: 643-650.

Barua, Maan. 2016. "Lively commodities and encounter value." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 34, no 4: 725-744.

Barua, Maan, and Anindya Sinha. 2019. "Animating the urban: an ethological and geographical conversation." *Social and Cultural Geography* 20, no8: 1160-1180.

Bastian, Michelle. 2016. Towards a more-than-human participatory research. In *Participatory Research in More than Human Worlds*, edited by Michelle Bastian, Owain Jones, Niamh Moore , and Emma Roe, 33-51. Abingdon: Routledge.

Bastian, Michelle, Owain Jones, Niamh Moore, and Emma Roe (Eds.). 2016. *Participatory Research in More than Human Worlds*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Bawaka Country, Sarah Wright, Sandie Suchet-Pearson, Kate Lloyd, Laklak Burarrwanga, Ritjilili Ganambarr, Merrkiyawuy Ganambarr-Stubbs, Banbapuy Ganambarr, and Djawundil Maymuru. 2015. "Working with and learning from Country: decentring human author-ity." *Cultural Geographies* 22, no. 2: 269-283.

Bayfield, Hannah, Laura Colebrooke, Hannah Pitt, Rhiannon Pugh, and Natalia Stutter. 2020. "Awesome women and bad feminists: the role of online social networks and peer support for feminist practice in academia." *Cultural Geographies* 27 no 3: 415-435.

Braidotti, Rosi. 2013. *The Posthuman*. Hoboken: Wiley.

Braidotti, Rosi. 2019. *Posthuman Knowledge*. Cambridge: Polity.

Buller, Henry. 2015. "Animal geographies II: methods." *Progress in Human Geography* 39, no. 3: 374-384.

Cahill, Caitlin, Farhana Sultana and Rachel Pain. 2007. "Participatory ethics: Politics, practices, institutions." *ACME: an international e-journal for critical geographies* 6, no. 3: 304-318.

Clarke, John and Janet Newman. 2017. "'People in this country have had enough of experts': Brexit and the paradoxes of populism." *Critical Policy Studies* 11, no. 1: 101-116.

Clement, Vincent. 2019. "Beyond the sham of the emancipatory Enlightenment: Rethinking the relationship of Indigenous epistemologies, knowledges, and geography through decolonizing paths." *Progress in Human Geography* 43, no 2: 276-294.

Collard, Rosemary-Claire. 2015. "Ethics in research beyond the human." In *The Handbook of Political Ecology,* edited by Tom Perrault, Gavin Bridge, and James McCarthy*,* 127-139. New York: Routledge.

Cubellis, Lauren. 2020. "Gestures of care and recognition: An Introduction." *Cultural Anthropology* 35: 1-5.

Davies, Gail. 2012. "Caring for the multiple and the multitude: Assembling animal welfare and enabling ethical critique." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 30, no 4: 623-638.

Davies, Gail et al. 2016. "Developing a collaborative agenda for humanities and social scientific research on laboratory animal science and welfare." *PLoS One* 11, no 7.

Deckha, Maneesha. 2012. "Toward a postcolonial, posthumanist feminist theory: Centralising race and culture in feminist work on nonhuman animals." Special Issue: Animal Others. *Hypatia* 27, no 3: 527-545.

Despret, Vinciane. 2004. "The Body We Care For: Figures of Anthropo-zoo-genesis." *Body and Society* 10, no 2–3: 111-134.

Dorling, Danny. 2019. "Kindness: A new kind of rigour for British Geographers." *Emotion, Space and Society* 33: 100630.

Dowling, Robyn, Kate Lloyd, and Sandra Suchet-Pearson. 2016. "Qualitative Methods II: 'More-than-human' methodologies and/in praxis." *Progress in Human Geography* 41, no 6: 823-831.

Dyer, Sarah and David Demeritt. 2009. "Un-ethical review? Why it is wrong to apply the medical model of research governance to human geography." *Progress in Human Geography* 33, no. 1: 46-64.

Elder, Glen, Jennifer Wolch and Jody Emel. 1998. "Le Pratique Sauvage: Race, place, and the human-animal divide." In *Animal Geographies: Place Politics and Identity in the Nature-Culture Borderlands*, edited by Jennifer Wolch and Jody Emel, 72-90. London: Verso.

England, Kim. V. 1994. "Getting personal: Reflexivity, positionality, and feminist research." *The Professional Geographer* 46, no. 1: 80-89.

Esson, James, Patricia Noxolo, Richard Baxter, Patricia Daley and Margaret Byron. 2017. "The 2017 RGS-IBG chair's theme: decolonising geographical knowledges, or reproducing coloniality?" *Area* 49: 384-388.

Forsyth, Isla. 2013. "The more-than-human geographies of field science." *Geography Compass* 7, no. 8: 527-539.

Gerlach, Joe. 2020. "A Brief Word on Ethics." *Geohumanities* 6, no. 1: 199-204.

Gompper, Matthew E. 2002. "Top Carnivores in the Suburbs? Ecological and Conservation Issues Raised by Colonization of North-eastern North America by Coyotes: The expansion of the coyote's geographical range may broadly influence community structure, and rising coyote densities in the suburbs may alter how the general public views wildlife." *BioScience* 52, no. 2: 185–190.

Gillespie, Kathryn. 2016. "Witnessing animal others: Bearing witness, grief, and the political function of emotion." *Hypatia* 31, no. 3: 572-588.

Gillespie, Kathryn. 2019. "For a politicized multispecies ethnography." *Politics and Animals* 5: 17-32.

Gillespie, Kathryn and Rosemary Collard (eds.). 2015. *Critical animal geographies: Politics, intersections and hierarchies in a multispecies world*. New York: Routledge.

Giraud, Eva. 2019. *What comes after entanglement: Activism, anthropocentrism, and an ethics of exclusion*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Giraud, Eva, Eleanor Hadley Kershaw, Richard Helliwell and Gregory Hollin. 2019. "Abundance in the Anthropocene." *The Sociological Review* 67, no 2: 357-373.

Grandin, Temple. 2005. *Animals in Translation*. London: Bloomsbury.

Greenhough, Beth and Emma Roe. 2011. "Ethics, space, and somatic sensibilities: comparing relationships between scientific researchers and their human and animal experimental subjects." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 29, no. 1: 47-66.

Guillemin, Marilys, and Lynn Gillam. 2004. "Ethics, reflexivity, and "ethically important moments" in research." *Qualitative inquiry* 10, no. 2: 261-280.

Halse, Christine and Anne Honey. 2005. "Unraveling ethics: Illuminating the moral dilemmas of research ethics." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30, no. 4: 2141-2162.

Hamilton, Lindsay and Nik Taylor. 2017. *Ethnography after humanism: Power, politics and method in multi-species research*. New York: Springer.

Haraway, Donna. 1988. "Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective." *Feminist studies* 14, no. 3: 575-599.

Haraway, Donna. 1992. "The promises of monsters: A regenerative politics for inappropriate/d others." In *Cultural studies*, edited by Lawrence Rossberg, Cary Nelson and Paula A. Treichler (eds.),295-337. New York: Routledge.

Haraway, Donna. 2008. *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Haraway, Donna. 2016. *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Hodgetts, Timothy and Jamie Lorimer. 2015. "Methodologies for animals' geographies: Cultures, communication and genomics." *Cultural geographies* 22, no. 2: 285-295.

Hopkins, Peter E. 2007. "Positionalities and knowledge: Negotiating ethics in practice." *ACME: an international journal for critical geographies* 6, no. 3: 386-394.

Hovorka, Alice J. 2017. "Animal geographies I: Globalizing and decolonizing." *Progress in Human Geography* 41, no. 3: 382-394.

Hovorka, Alice J. 2019. "Animal geographies III: Species relations of power." *Progress in Human Geography* 43, no. 4: 749-757.

Katz, Cindi. 2001. "Hiding the target: Social reproduction in the privatized urban environment." In *Postmodern geography: Theory and praxis*, edited by Claudio Minca 93–112. Oxford: Wiley.

Kays, Roland. 2015. "Yes, eastern coyotes are hybrids, but the 'coywolf' is not a thing." *The Conversation,* Available from: https://theconversation.com/yes-eastern-coyotes-are-hybrids-but-the-coywolf-is-not-a-thing-50368

Kim, Claire Jean. 2015. *Dangerous Crossings: Race, Species, and Nature in a Multicultural Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kobayashi, Audrey. 2003. "GPC ten years on: Is self-reflexivity enough?" *Gender, Place and Culture* 10, no. 4: 345-349.

Kohl, Ellen and Priscilla McCutcheon. 2015. "Kitchen table reflexivity: negotiating positionality through everyday talk." *Gender, Place and Culture* 22, no. 6: 747-763.

Limes-Taylor Henderson, Kelly and Jennifer Esposito. 2019. "Using others in the nicest way possible: On colonial and academic practice(s), and an ethic of humility." *Qualitative Inquiry* 25, no. 9-10: 876-889.

Lopez, Patricia and Kathryn Gillespie. 2016. "A love story: for 'Buddy System' research in the academy." *Gender, Place and Culture* 23, no. 12: 1689-1700.

Lorimer, Hayden. 2005. "Cultural geography: the busyness of being 'more-than-representational'." *Progress in human geography* 29, no. 1: 83-94.

Lugones, María. 2010. "Toward a decolonial feminism." *Hypatia* 25, no. 4: 742-759.

Mancini, Clara. 2017. "Towards an animal-centred ethics for Animal–Computer Interaction." *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 98: 221-233.

McDowell, Linda. 1992. "Doing gender: feminism, feminists and research methods in human geography." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 17, no. 4: 399-416.

McLeod, Kim, 2014. "Orientating to Assembling: Qualitative Inquiry for More-Than-Human Worlds." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 13, no. 1: 377-394.

Meijer, Eva. 2013. "Political communication with animals." *Humanimalia* 5, no. 1: 28-52.

Mousseau, Timothy. 2016. "At Chornobyl and Fukushima, radioactivity has seriously harmed wildlife." *The Conversation*, Available from: https://theconversation.com/at-Chornobyl-and-fukushima-radioactivity-has-seriously-harmed-wildlife-57030.

Murrey, Amber, Hasnaa Mokhtar, Patricia Daley and Melanie Bush. 2017. "Decolonizing academic praxis with "words that remake life"." *Human Geography - A New Radical Journal, Blog*. Available from: https://hugeog.com/decolonizing-academic-praxis-with-words-that-remake-life/

Narayanan, Yamini. 2017. "Street dogs at the intersection of colonialism and informality: 'Subaltern animism' as a posthuman critique of Indian cities." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 35, no. 3: 475-494.

Oliver, Catherine. 2020. "Beyond-human research: Negotiating silence, anger and failure in multispecies worlds." *Emotion, Space and Society* 35, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2020.100686

Oliver, Catherine. 2021. "Beyond-human ethics: The animal question in institutional ethical reviews." *Area* 53, no. 4: 619-626.

Oriazola, Germán. 2019. "Chornobyl has become a refuge for wildlife 33 years after the nuclear accident." *The Conversation*, Available from: https://theconversation.com/Chornobyl-has-become-a-refuge-for-wildlife-33-years-after-the-nuclear-accident-116303.

Pachirat, Timothy. 2018. "Sanctuary." In *Critical Terms for Animal Studies*, edited by Lori Gruen,337–355. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Palmer, Alexandra, and Greenhough, Beth. 2021. "Out of the laboratory, into the field: perspectives on social, ethical and regulatory challenges in UK wildlife research." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 376, no. 1831: 1-10.

Pitt, Hannah. 2015 "On showing and being shown plants: A guide to methods for more-than-human geography." *Area* 47: 48-55.

Povinelli, Elizabeth A. 2011. "The governance of the prior." *Interventions*, 13, no. 1: 13-30.

Puig de La Bellacasa, Maria. 2017. *Matters of care: Speculative ethics in more than human worlds*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Radcliffe, Sarah A. 2017. "Decolonising geographical knowledges." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 42: 329-333.

Rutherford, Stephanie. 2018. "The Anthropocene's animal? Coywolves as feral cotravelers." *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space* 1, no. 1-2: 206-223.

Sampson, Lesley, and Lauren Van Patter. 2020. "Advancing best practices for aversion conditioning (humane hazing) to mitigate human–coyote conflicts in urban areas." *Human–Wildlife Interactions* 14, no. 2: 7.

Sandbrook, Chris, Rogelio Luque-Lora and William M. Adams. 2018. "Human bycatch: conservation surveillance and the social implications of camera traps." *Conservation and Society* 16, no. 4: 493-504.

Saville, Samantha M. 2021. "Towards humble geographies." *Area*. DOI: 10.1111/area.12664.

Sharp, Joanne. 2005. "Geography and gender: feminist methodologies in collaboration and in the field." *Progress in human geography* 29, no. 3: 304-309.

Srinivasan, Krithika. 2013. "The biopolitics of animal being and welfare: dog control and care in the UK and India." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 38, no. 1: 106-119.

Sundberg, Juanita. 2014. "Decolonizing posthumanist geographies." *Cultural geographies* 21, no. 1: 33-47.

Todd, James D. 2020. "Experiencing and embodying anxiety in spaces of academia and social research." *Gender, Place and Culture*, DOI: 10.1080/0966369X.2020.1727862

Tuck, Eve and Monique Guishard. 2013. "Uncollapsing ethics: Racialized sciencism, settler coloniality, and an ethical framework of decolonial participatory action research." In *Challenging status quo retrenchment: New directions in critical research*, edited by Tricia M. Kress, Curry Stephenson Malott, and Brad J. Porfilio, 3-27. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.

Tuck, Eve and K. Wayne Yang. 2014. "R-words: Refusing research." In *Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities*, edited by Django Paris, and Maisha T. Winn,223-247. New York: Sage Publications.

Turnbull, Jonathon. 2020. "Checkpoint dogs: Photovoicing canine companionship in the Chernobyl Exclusion Zone." *Anthropology Today* 36, no. 6: 21-24.

Twine, Richard. 2012. "Revealing the 'animal-industrial complex—A concept and method for critical animal studies." *Journal for Critical Animal Studies* 10, no. 1: 12-39.

Valentine, Gill. 2003. "Geography and ethics: in pursuit of social justice ethics and emotions in geographies of health and disability research." *Progress in Human Geography* 27, no. 3: 375-380.

Van Dooren, Thom. 2010. "Vultures and their people in India: equity and entanglement in a time of extinctions." *Manoa* 22, no. 2: 130-145.

Van Patter, Lauren E. 2021. "Individual animal geographies for the more-than-human city: Storying synanthropy and cynanthropy with urban coyotes." *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, 25148486211049441.

Van Patter, Lauren E., and Blattner, Charlotte. 2020. "Advancing Ethical Principles for Non-Invasive, Respectful Research with Nonhuman Animal Participants." S*ociety and Animals* 28, no. 2: 171-190.

Van Patter, Lauren E., Jonathon Turnbull, and Jennifer Dodsworth. Forthcoming. "Do-It-Together: 'More-than-human collaborations' for hacking the Anthropocene." *Feral Feminisms*.

Whitehead, Mark, Rachel Lilley, Rachel Howell, Rhys Jones and Jessica Pykett. 2016. "(Re) Inhabiting awareness: geography and mindfulness." *Social and Cultural Geography* 17, no. 4: 553-573.

Wilson, Helen F. 2016. "On geography and encounter: Bodies, borders, and difference." *Progress in Human Geography* 41, no. 4: 451-471.

Wolfe, Cary. 2009. *What is posthumanism?* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Zembylas, Michalinos. 2018. "The entanglement of decolonial and posthuman perspectives: Tensions and implications for curriculum and pedagogy in higher education." *Parallax* 24, no. 3: 254-267.