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Abstract: Mobilities are considered to encapsulate a broad range of projects that establish a ‘moment-driven’ social science. I argue that it is this view of moment-driven research that needs to be in conversation with an ethical document that sanctions research. It is how the ethical landscape responds to this increasingly dynamic and radically open interaction while avoiding the excess dangers of institutionalised review that warrants more attention. Through the empirical lens of transient geographies, two research projects are drawn on, one based around relocated populations from post-disaster Christchurch and the other on sharemilkers in the Waikato. Transitory framings are salient as participants embodied varying levels of temporariness in their relationships to place. Both projects also held different ethical constraints and possibilities.
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Introduction/mobilities/ethics

In this paper, a claim is made that ethical consideration and indeed ethics applications have traditionally been framed by (im)mobilities. (Im)Mobilities here indicate the spatial fix of institutional documentation (ethics applications) that enables research mobilities (see Büsch & Urry 2009). Processes of ethical application, which are usually signed off by a committee before a project commences, can appear static and regulatory. The staticness of ethical agreements, therefore, presents a narrow operational space in which researchers engage on a daily basis. In the mobilities context, ethical regulations may become particularly restraining. Hannam et al. (2006, p. 12), for example, have considered that researchers are not dealing with ‘a single network, but with complex intersections of endless regimes of flow, which move at different speeds, scales and viscosities’. How the ethical landscape responds to this increasingly dynamic and radically open interaction while avoiding the ‘excess dangers of institutionalised review’ (Roth 2005) warrants more attention. By using two case studies from Aotearoa New Zealand, one with displaced earthquake survivors and one with transient farmers (sharemilkers), I outline how the mobile nature of both groups presented particular ethical challenges across the life of the projects and beyond.

In the past, mobile methods dealt poorly with the fleeting, distributed, multiple, non-causal, the chaotic, complex, time-space compressed outbursts and ‘pleasures and pains which follow the movement and displacement
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of people, objects, information and ideas’ (Law & Urry 2004; Büscher & Urry 2009, p. 103). Consequently, there has been a cascade of studies that engage with mobilised methodologies. Büscher et al. (2011) comprehensively outline the many approaches to which mobilities researchers share temporary, long-term, enjoyable, troublesome and dynamic moments with their participants. Research moments have been documented on trains, ships, bikes, horses, walking tracks, in cars and up climbing ropes. These experiences have been variously termed as ‘riding along’, ‘walking along’ and ‘going along with’ (Kusenbach 2003; Myers 2011). Furthermore, the capture of experiences has been facilitated through video, street ethnography and keeping time-space dairies, to mention just a few (Fincham et al. 2010; Büscher et al. 2011, pp. 8–9; D’Andrea et al. 2011). To accommodate these dynamic methods of data collection, the field has become more flexible, informal and context-dependent, partially mimicking mobile participants being studied in their own ‘supple’ environments (Stoller 1999, p. 704; D’Andrea 2006).

Appraising mobile methods, Büscher and Urry (2009, p. 103) consider that ‘by immersing themselves in the fleeting, multi-sensory, distributed, mobile and multiple, yet local, practical and ordered making of social and material realities, researchers have gained an understanding of movement’ (2009, pp. 103–104). However, Merriman (2014, p. 168) cautions that movement with research subjects and mobile methods themselves should not be measured against and promoted above more ‘conventional’ approaches, such as interviews, questionnaires or discourse analysis. Linking with both views, my focus in this paper is on how the mobile nature of respondents offers ethical challenges in the research.

Using the examples of two projects, particular ethical dilemmas occurred. The first example explores research with relocated earthquake survivors and explains how participants’ privacy was compromised when they met face to face during a public gathering. The second project with sharemilkers, who are in temporary contractual partnership with landowners, exposes problems with the public scrutiny of farming practices and consent in the context of land ownership. Both studies have posed a paradox, where data and its collection that is intrinsically moment-driven and ‘contingent, fluidic and metamorphic’ (D’Andrea 2006, p. 113) had to be encapsulated within the scientifically systematising phenomena of an ethical contract. I maintain that it is this view of moment-driven investigation (Büscher & Urry 2009) that needs to be in conversation with ethical documents that sanction research. Ethics is rarely described as moment-driven. In both cases presented here, ethical dilemmas were negotiated by the researcher and respondents in the moment, rather than pre-empted and/or retrospectively negotiated with the ethics committee, whilst adhering to moral guidelines and ethical principles, such as potential risk.

In the following section I begin by outlining the projects that inform this paper and provide the empirical context to the dialogue on mobilities and the evolving ethics among these. The second section presents a brief sketch of the historical background of ethical review in New Zealand. The paper then traces discussion of the challenges and possibilities of information and communication technologies (ICT) use within contemporary mobilities research. Using research data in the latter sections, the concept of fluid project timelines and immutable ethical contracts is formed along with conceptualising research as an event space, one that is viewed as a complex assemblage and the ethical challenges this presents.

**Methods: Earthquake and farming projects**

The projects that are utilised for this paper are framed by what I term as the transient geographies of post-disaster Christchurch relocates and sharemilkers in the Waikato region. Transitory and mobile framings were salient for both studies as participants embodied varying levels of temporariness in their relationships to place. The methods used included semi-structured interviews, participant-observation, a focus group and discourse analysis. Furthermore, in-depth and mobile interviews on farms and before, during and after a farm move were also elicited in the sharemilking project.
which was similar to ‘going-along with’ participants outlined by Kusenbach (2003) and Ponto (2015).

The first project that explored the emotional and affective experiences of relocated Cantabrians is linked to PhD research that was conducted from 2011 to 2014. The study involved 19 families who had left Christchurch after living through a multitude of earthquakes and aftershocks. With a commitment to accomplishing moral and ethical research on a sensitive topic (surviving earthquakes), it did not take long before research terrains dynamically shifted (see Hutcheson 2013). The investigation became mobile in location, shifting from private homes to public memorial gatherings. Research spaces spilled out beyond private homes to include a visit to a hospital bed side, the Botanical Gardens in Hamilton City and suburb cafes, among others. Many of these spaces appear in the thesis and beyond; however, few of them were considered in the ethical application.

The second project conducted throughout 2016 examined the mobile experiences of sharemilkers who have a contractual relationship with landowners. Sharemilking is an arrangement between a farm owner and sharemilker(s), who combine their resources such as land, labour, capital and expertise, toward the production of milk. In this case, the resulting profit is then shared 50/50. A farm owner, however, holds power in the relationship. Landowners initiate the contract and decide its duration, as well as the percentage of profit-share, which can be renegotiated annually (Pepper 2013, p. 14). Under the 50/50 agreement, the sharemilker owns the herd of cows, plant and mobile equipment, while the farmer owns the land on which the milk production occurs and provides accommodation for sharemilkers (see Blunden et al. 1997). Contract completion requires the sharemilkers to move farms on a single day, the 1st of June, often colloquially referred to as ‘Gypsy Day’, on which the entire farming operation resettles at a new location. On Gypsy Day, all livestock, house possessions, farming equipment (large and small) and medical supplies have to be moved by midday. Sharemilkers, and importantly their herds, are considered to be hyper-mobile and vulnerable to economic fluctuations due to the lack of land ownership. Of the 10 sharemilkers interviewed, the average move from one farm to another was three times in 10 years. In both studies, ethical decisions had to be made beyond guideline principles some months and years after document completion. The following section explores the New Zealand context of ethical governance.

Ethical context in New Zealand

Ethical guidelines and research governance in the social sciences have been influenced significantly by statements of ethical principles and standards for medical research put in place following WWII and the horrors of Nazi experiments on human subjects. Ethical considerations arose from a number of stimuli, those being developments in medical research, the appalling experiments carried out by Nazi doctors on people in institutions and concentration camps in WWII (the Nuremberg Code 1947). Ethics regulation in New Zealand is largely (in)formed by two scandals, the ‘Tuskegee project’ in the USA involving untreated syphilis in African American men and the experiment at National Women’s Hospital in New Zealand. In 1932, the US Public Health Service began a study of syphilis and its effect on African American men in Tuskegee, Alabama, which lasted 40 years, ending in 1972 via a news media leak. The men were never told they had syphilis; instead, they were told they had ‘bad blood’ and would receive treatment (penicillin), which was never applied. Even as men began to die, go blind or insane, penicillin was withheld. Tuskegee became a moniker for medical and cultural oppression of innocent, illiterate and unwitting participants representing a specific gender, ethnicity and socio-economic population’ (Tolich 2001; Tolich & Smith 2015, p. 31). In New Zealand, between 1966 and 1982, Associate Professor Herbert Green at National Women’s Hospital in Auckland conducted an experiment on women who had shown a positive reading for carcinoma in situ, which was widely accepted as a precursor to cervical cancer. Going against the predominant findings in existing literature, Green sought to advance his view that carcinoma in situ is not a pre-malignant...
disease. Not only was Green’s project fundamentally flawed, the women involved were not fully informed that their test results indicated precancerous tissue, which should be removed as was standard practice at the time. Shockingly, 22% of these women developed invasive cancer of the cervix. Green seriously endangered and ‘in some cases led to the premature death of a number of patients at the Hospital’ (Tolich 2001; Kindon & Latham 2002, pp. 14–15; Tolich & Smith 2015). The Tuskegee and the New Zealand scandals carry unfortunate similarities. Sadly, both trials negated autonomy to consent and terminate involvement, and both were medical experiments with trust placed in the hands of the medical profession. Even worse, ‘in 1947, penicillin became available as a cure for syphilis but researchers withheld this information from (Tuskegee) men’ (Tolich & Smith 2015, p. 32). Likewise, in 1966, the standard treatment for carcinoma in situ was a hysterectomy, yet this treatment was withheld from many women.

In most of New Zealand’s universities and research institutes, ethical codes were re-examined in the wake of the National Women’s Hospital experiment and the ensuing public outrage. Also important for the New Zealand context is the attention to the ethics of bi-cultural research (see Dyck & Kearns 1995; Tolich & Smith 2015). Mitigation of harm, however, has linked relatively conservative ethical responses to constrictive ideas focused on the mitigation of harm (to the researched) – and considering the National Women’s Hospital scandal, this is rightly so. However, as Kindon and Latham (2002, p. 15) explain, ‘a broader consideration of how ethics are negotiated through research can help open new horizons of possibility for research practice’.

While debates arose around the appropriateness of biomedical ethics regulation for the social sciences (Dingwall 2006; Aldred 2008), the tide of regulatory activities has not abated (see also Miller et al. 2012). Instead, there has been a rapid increase in regulatory frameworks and governing bodies. There was a move from a collegial and retrospective application of professional associations’ ethics codes to a managerial-inspired prospective review by research ethics committees. The mandatory nature of the new system of ethical committee consideration and the co-mingling with funding regimes is concerning in light of ethical review boards tending to employ ‘anticipatory regulatory regimes’ (Murphy & Dingwall 2007, p. 2224). The mismatch between biomedical and experimental psychology regulatory procedures and qualitative research has not been overlooked (Murphy & Dingwall 2007; Dyer & Demeritt 2009; McCormack et al. 2012; Staller 2012; Tolich 2016). In contrast to biomedical models, qualitative research data collection is rarely conducted in researcher-controlled environments. More often than not, qualitative research is based in contingent and dynamically open research environments. The mismatch is not often directly addressed in ethical agreements, but the introduction of marginal flexibility into regulation has largely been the response (Murphy & Dingwall 2007; McCormack et al. 2012). In the following section, empirical material is drawn on. I begin with outlining the time scale of research and ethical involvement with participants in the Christchurch example.

**Expanded research timelines**

Qualitative research often takes place in a hybrid of natural and cultural settings, over which researchers have little control. Therefore, it is difficult to anticipate what contingencies might arise at various stages of the research process. The earthquake participants were a mobile group who were in the process of settling into Waikato, a region away from the post-disaster city of Christchurch. Many respondents had yet to find more than temporary rental homes at the time of interviewing and desired connections with other earthquake survivors. Creating a support group called *Cantabrians in Waikato*, based on my research database of individual interviewees, was not anticipated in the project’s beginning and posed ethical challenges, such as maintaining privacy. In this setting, the emotional needs of participants took precedence; hence, the mobility embedded in disaster relocation shifted the research into unexpectedly collective social gatherings in public spaces.

Within the Christchurch project, transforming fieldwork from interviews to a support
group encompassed particular ethical challenges around anonymity in multi-located public spaces. The mobile existence of participants meant they wished to meet others with similar experiences of both enduring earthquakes and aftershocks as well as moving to a new and unfamiliar part of New Zealand. I was faced with an ethical dilemma; prior participants in the research who had signed consent forms for individual interviews wanted to gather together, bring their families and meet in the Hamilton Botanical Gardens for a picnic lunch and mutual support. I was the sole conduit and was asked to attend and provide introductions. Another purpose of the picnic was gathering opinions from the group on whether survivors wished to memorialise 1 year since the deadly quake had hit (22 February 2011), a particularly raw emotional time for survivors. This evolving situation was far beyond my original ethical document; however, supporting relocated people was deemed personally important. To solve the privacy dilemma, I did not conduct research during any of the public meetings, neither myself nor the research was mentioned in newspaper articles discussing the picnic and memorial gatherings, and participants in individual interviews were advised that anonymity could no longer be guaranteed. My personal politics and following a feminist ethics of care determined my decision to put respondents before PhD goals. As such, Hopkins (2007) outlines that there is disjuncture between negotiation of ethics in practice and the process of receiving ethical approval. He contemplates that many complex aspects of a researcher’s identity, life experience and positionalities are overlooked in the ethical process (Hopkins 2007), including personal integrity, commitment to one’s participants and the emotional impacts of putting respondents first (Meth & Malaza 2003). Putting respondents first, however, may then lead to an expanded timeline where the researcher does not entirely leave a project.

The complexity of time and space in research relations are integral geographical concepts that are not always applied to ethical agreements in the same way. For example, PhD study periods are usually conceptualised as a bounded period that finishes upon thesis marking and submission. Research, however, can sometimes evolve into something more mobile, such as continuing friendships that spill over into multiple spaces and places at different times. The literature around the interrogation of research relationships is large and implies a sense of unboundedness with participants. Recent work on the interrogation of research relationships has begun to broach some of the more difficult and challenging ethical terrain of projects, including sexual desire (Cuppies 2002; Diprose et al. 2013), emotional risk (Chiswell & Wheeler 2016) and suicide (Adams-Hutcheson & Longhurst forthcoming). A year after my thesis was published, I was asked to visit and sit with a severely ill participant in Waikato hospital’s oncology ward several times. Being relocated from Christchurch meant the elderly couple only knew their close neighbours and the research support group Cantabrians in Waikato. Through my personal politics of care and empathetic listening, the couple considered me to be more-than a researcher, and I felt different levels of emotional responsibility to my respondents. It was very difficult to untangle researcher from friend or to think about terminating contact since the thesis had been completed (for discussion on research friendships, see Crick 1992; Newton 1993; Browne 2003). Indeed, many projects have encompassed much more than the interview moments, but less is said about the evolving ethical and situational dynamics in which these continued relationships take place. The key question revolves around addressing concerns on the level of involvement, consultation and participation afforded to the different groups involved in research (Hopkins 2007) and the costs involved. Ethics are assumed to ‘police or reinforce the boundaries of what really matters’ (McCormack 2003, p. 502) rather than evolve to include the expansion of those boundaries that are constantly being re-drawn, expanded and contracted in the messiness of qualitative praxis. In the following section, I describe public outcry on the ethics of the New Zealand dairy industry facilitated through ICT use and its impact on the sharemilking project.
Ethics creeping into the public domain

On a frequent basis, ICT platforms – for example, mobile phones, tablets and laptops – through applications such as Facebook and news websites expose corporate greed and politician spending. In response, the public often demands transparency and accountability (Hansen & Flyverbom 2015) in order to ‘lay bare’ ethical motivations. Currently, due to advances in technologies, living, thinking and behaving ethically is far closer to the surface than in the past. People’s lives have never had as much potential to be as public as they currently are. The impact of new information and apparently borderless digital technologies on our daily lives links this time and place to a more transformational and ethically complex period (Miller et al. 2012). Abuses of power and unethical actions seem to be unearthed on a daily basis at many scales. The internet and social media dictates an increased scrutiny of, and dissemination of, everyday life. Using the sharemilking project as an example, I explain the impact of public scrutiny on research.

Driving to my first interview with a sharemilker, I was listening to the car radio and later noted in the research diary:

The radio was broadcasting farmers’ views on the issue of the abuse of ‘bobby-calves’ by stock truck drivers and their ill treatment on farms by owners/staff. Hans Kriek, animal rights activist and executive director of SAFE (Save Animals from Exploitation) was threatening to release shocking footage of a truck driver mistreating the unwanted male calves which are sent to slaughter. Farmers felt singled out and that the public at large did not understand their commitment to animal health and welfare. I drove in and parked next to the little brick home, the herd grazing over the fence. The farmer I had been listening to on the radio now stood before me in person and in high agitation. He launched into, ‘We’re all being tarred with the same brush! It’s just not right to call into question the whole ethics of the dairy industry. There’s so many good people out there who love their animals and are trying their best – I feel like the urban world hates me, and ‘farmer’ has become a dirty word’ (Research diary 24 November 2015).

This outburst was not the best way to start an interview. The bobby calves’ plight highlighted ethical sensitivity around animal welfare in the New Zealand dairy industry, which had unfortunate timing for the research. Public outcry on issues such as animal welfare was facilitated through social media. Furious Facebook conversations ensued, and several mass media outlets followed the trial of the bobby calf ‘abuser’ (Wilson 2016). Suddenly, the ethics of dairy farming in New Zealand was under public scrutiny, and farming practices were called into question. The transformation of dairy farming practices and the ethical treatment of livestock received an official industry response in the wake of SAFE New Zealand whistleblowing. Ethically speaking, information from the sharemilker interviews and its dissemination shifted to far more sensitive territory than I had originally anticipated. The result was that potential respondents for the sharemilking project were ‘cagy’ and protective at best, and some withdrew.

The mobile and transient nature of the sharemilkers also meant that, at times, they lacked community support and/or a ‘voice’ in the industry. Landowners, the more sedentary and powerful group (see Pepper 2013), became vigilant towards outsiders accessing their land. Conducting interviews with the sharemilkers turned out to be impossible in some instances because I could not reduce the potential risk to participants who had not gained landowner consent for me to visit the farm to conduct an interview.

Conversely, ICTs also carry the potential to transform the consent practices of research. ICT use is linked well with mobilities research in practice. Technology of any kind, however, is rarely mentioned in the informed consent process. Parsons (2015) has carefully outlined the potential for digital technologies in aiding participation in research with children; young adults; and people with disabilities, learning difficulties or lack of literacy, for example, by using symbols and pictures on screen. Her ideas could also be usefully extended to mobilities research, which aims to capture festivals, hikoi, parades, protests, demonstrations and events while moving along with, among other things. Having consent forms on screen as a ‘living’ document in which potential
participants instantly read and engage could avoid some of the contradictory pitfalls outlined by Parsons (2015, pp. 57–58), such as cultural aversion to signing forms or lack of literacy. Online informed consent may actually prove to be more inclusive and adaptable without negating protection for either participants or researchers. In the sharemilker project, changing interviews to a digitally based format may have allowed more engagement with respondents without needing to physically access the farm owned by other parties. In the next section, I discuss ideas of research as an event space where there can be multiple shifting dynamics when interviewing, and the borders are considered to be radically open and mobile.

**Research as an ‘event space’**

Research is conceptualised in this paper as an event space, which is a ‘collective accomplishment’ (after Popke 2008, p. 4). The ethical application, however, does not consider events to be a collective accomplishment, but rather, it is bounded to specific investigator(s) and participants. The ethical contract is often considered within tight institutionalised framings, which are fragmented between public and private spaces in the field. As the transient geographies of the two projects unfolded in hyper-mobile moments, I ask what the contingencies are of quasi-public/private spaces, other people, other events and happenings, the complexities of encounters, the back-grounds and the peripheral that cannot be anticipated when drawing up institutionalised documentation. I give two examples of momentary ‘happenings’ in the projects that required immediate responses reflecting both personal politics and ethical responsibility.

When arriving to a prearranged interview on a farm, the house was locked, but cattle were in the yards of the milking shed. I received a text to meet at the shed and conducted the interview there instead. The farmer was more than happy to continue; ‘Come on down’, he texted (Interview 29 June 2016). The interview shifted dynamically from being a sit-down in a house to standing as quietly as possible in a milking-shed. I was not standing quietly for long before physically intervening when a heifer attempted to jump out of the yards and had her back leg caught on the railing. ‘Quick! Grab her head so she moves back’, the farmer shouted at me (Interview 29 June 2016). Worker health and safety standards for farm visitors are grey in this area (Worksafe New Zealand 2014, p. 20), research ethics even more so. I ran to help and held the cow’s head in my arms, instantly deciding that pain and damage to her hind leg should be minimised and that the farmer would not be liable if I was accidently injured in the process. Ethical dilemmas around health and safety compliance came up several times across the project. In one case, on a ‘farming with’ experience, I was asked to join the sharemilker on a quad motorbike to feed the calves, but there was no provision of helmets as is requirement by law (see Worksafe New Zealand 2016). If caught without a helmet, all parties, that is, myself, the University, the landowner and the sharemilker, would be implicated and liable for hefty fines. Unforeseeable ethical problems can develop quickly when interviewing is mobile (Ponto 2015), and on this farm, I declined.

For the Christchurch earthquake relocated participants, the picnic in the Botanical Gardens was a wonderful day. A joyous photo was taken with the intention of providing it, along with a write-up for the local paper, to celebrate the support offered for earthquake survivors by Waikato people. One of the participants present in the photo, however, had an ongoing case with the family court and wished their location to remain secret until the case was complete. The respondent rang me in a panic, ‘You can’t use the photo, my ex might see it and find us! I don’t want the other Cantabrians to know, you’ll have to tell [deleted] the media can’t use the photo’ (Research diary 30 January 2012). Ethical regulation of harm and anonymity extend beyond the research and, in this case, included commitment to ethical principles because I was present at the social event, although not as a researcher. A modified photo was provided to the press. The presumption is, as Dyer and Demeritt (2009, p. 48) state, ‘individual researchers are responsible for interrogating their own research as an ongoing and integrated aspect of the research process’. It is up to the researcher to conduct best practice and assess research moments for...
potential harm, including harm to non-human animals (above). Processes of professional self-regulation are often informal and uncodified and are highly subjective; they also stress an ethical orientation beyond projects. Such an approach acknowledges common vulnerabilities of the researcher, the researched (human or otherwise) and everything the field encompasses and their co-dependencies, in which caring (ethically) ‘binds us all’ (Williams 2002, p. 59).

**Conclusion: Reframing ethics through mobility**

The main crux of the argument is aligned to a sense of ambiguity within and between ethical codes and individual projects, which cannot be anticipated in advance. What has been reflected on here is not just a question of what should be regulated but what can be regulated in mobile research terrains. And what do we do with events that are considered to be beyond regulation?Ethically, I consider there is movement and ‘play’ in the power residing with the researcher to decide (in the moment) and the power held by the institutional committee, which often loops back and forth between the two. In this article, ethical challenges were refracted through personal politics and a feminist ethics of care. Interestingly, Myers (2011) deliberates that research is a collective process of knowledge production in which ‘participant and analyst engage in a dialogic process including questioning, rule breaking and unstable normalisation’ of research, ‘which ultimately leads to a new aesthetics of spatial mobility’ (emphasis added, cited in D’Andrea et al. 2011, p. 152). I have highlighted the idea of rule breaking in her quote as a means to convey the messiness of qualitative research and that one size does not fit all projects.

Researchers have considered that mobile methods do carry ethical demands. This argument, however, has been extended by outlining how the mobility of participants has created ethical dilemmas and challenges. For sharemilkers, their lack of land ownership highlighted problems with access and Health and Safety issues where ultimate power (to grant access) and responsibility (for Health and Safety) often rests with landowners even if they are not physically present. In a different sense, relocated Cantabrians’ mobility required the project to move from private interviews in houses to public social gatherings, effectively shifting research spaces and researcher involvement. Timelines of the research continued long after research completion, entangling the original ethical document with a highly mobile and evolving situational dynamics, where ethical principals were needed to be kept intact. Furthermore, ICTs could offer researchers an opportunity to create a ‘live’ document, which in both cases could have aided the researcher with consent at the picnic in the Botanical Gardens and moving to a digital format of interviewing with sharemilkers, thus negating farm access if necessary.

By pairing (im)mobile ethical documentation to mobilities research and ethics to geographies, non-human bodies, landscapes and fleeting moments that are held within space and place are captured as integral parts of the research process. The strength of geographies lies in an approach to research that foregrounds context; accounts are descriptive, inclusive and action-oriented, based on well-being and caring for (more-than) researchers and the researched. In a way, the power remains with the researcher to select material and participants whose dialogues are disseminated to be made available or public. I consider that care for the researcher’s health and well-being across the life of a project is important, and this requires more discussion from both ethical committees and researchers across New Zealand and beyond. I put forward that (im)mobilities research that promotes a ‘supple’ framing also requires ethical processes to become responsive and supple.

**Endnotes**

1 I acknowledge the politics of naming when stating Aotearoa New Zealand as the full term and continue for the sake of brevity with simply New Zealand for an international audience, reflecting my pākehā identity (see Berg & Kearns 1996).
2 Christchurch City is located in the South Island of New Zealand, in the Canterbury region. People from Christchurch and surrounding areas refer to themselves as Cantabrians, as did the participants in the PhD research.

3 Sharemilkers can be either variable-order sharemilkers (who do not own livestock and who earn less than 40% profit share) and herd-owning sharemilkers, also known as 50/50 sharemilkers; 50/50 sharemilkers were selected for this study due to the mobility of livestock as well as the sharemilkers.

4 In this dynamic context research, interviews were conducted in multiple locations and with an amalgamation of actors who moved fluidly across the project. Actors included, for example, children, partners, livestock, working dogs, staff, milk-tanker drivers, veterinary staff, stock agents and farm supply company staff, not simply the sharemilker.

5 Memorial days began with remembering 22 February 2011 and started in 2012, 1 year since the devastating earthquake and aftershocks in Christchurch that killed 185 people. Memorialising the 22nd of February continued in subsequent years, with 2016 being a large, national media-covered event remembering 5 years since the deadly quakes.

6 In response to multiple media coverage, the dairy industry has drawn up good practice guidelines in bobby calf welfare (see http://www.dairynz.co.nz/media/3250098/welfare-of-bobby-calves.pdf).

7 Hikoi is a term in the Maori language of New Zealand generally meaning a protest march or parade, usually implying a long journey taking days or weeks. One of the most famous Hikoi travelled the length of the North Island of New Zealand in 1975 protesting Maori land rights.
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   - Type instruction on what should be changed regarding the text into the yellow box that appears.

4. **Add sticky note Tool** – for making notes at specific points in the text.
   
   *Marks a point in the proof where a comment needs to be highlighted.*
   
   **How to use it**
   
   - Click on the Add sticky note icon in the Annotations section.
   - Click at the point in the proof where the comment should be inserted.
   - Type the comment into the yellow box that appears.
5. **Attach File Tool** – for inserting large amounts of text or replacement figures.

   Inserts an icon linking to the attached file in the appropriate place in the text.

   **How to use it**
   - Click on the Attach File icon in the Annotations section.
   - Click on the proof to where you’d like the attached file to be linked.
   - Select the file to be attached from your computer or network.
   - Select the colour and type of icon that will appear in the proof. Click OK.

6. **Drawing Markups Tools** – for drawing shapes, lines and freeform annotations on proofs and commenting on these marks. Allows shapes, lines and freeform annotations to be drawn on proofs and for comment to be made on these marks.

   **How to use it**
   - Click on one of the shapes in the Drawing Markups section.
   - Click on the proof at the relevant point and draw the selected shape with the cursor.
   - To add a comment to the drawn shape, move the cursor over the shape until an arrowhead appears.
   - Double click on the shape and type any text in the red box that appears.