

Labour, Violence and the Unfamiliar: Animals' Geographies of the More-than-Human Home

Abstract: Bringing the insights of feminist geographies of the home to the animals' geographies literature, this review posits the more-than-human home as a site of unevenly distributed violence and labour, for both humans and nonhumans alike. It expounds a holistic ecology of the more-than-human home that transcends a focus on companion animals, thereby raising questions of interspecies co-existence, autonomy, and control. Within this, it explores the work that pests do, understanding the domestic as a site of multiple contrary processes of social reproduction, recognising how one being's homemaking is another's unmaking.

Key words: feminist geography, queer geography, pets, pests, domestic

Introduction

The last twenty-five years has witnessed an abundance of animals' geographies scholarship (Buller 2014), particularly encompassing the domains of urban ecologies (Barua and Sinha 2019) wildlife conservation (Lorimer 2015) and laboratory environments (Greenhough and Roe 2011). Within this abundance, there are three distinct empirical and conceptual gaps that this review seeks to address. Firstly, it concentrates on the domestic as an interspecies 'contact zone' (Haraway 2008, 216), situating its importance within a wider historic neglect of the home by human geography. Secondly, the extant literature on the more-than-human home has privileged accounts of companion animals¹, but largely overlooks unwanted cohabitants such as pests² (Hodgetts and Fair 2024), as well as commensals that are neither generative nor detrimental to projects of human homemaking. Moreover, with some notable exceptions (Power 2009b), these categories have largely been considered in isolation of each other. A holistic ecology of the more-than-human home needs to embrace all these divergent human-nonhuman relations, not concentrating solely on the actively desired, nor relegating pests to a passing reference or footnote, as seen in Kaika (2004, 281) or Franklin (2006, 154). Thus, a comprehensive

¹ Following Labrecque and Walsh (2011, 80) and Irvine (2013b, 15-16) I use the terms 'pet' and 'companion animal' interchangeably, reflecting the prevalence of both terms within the literature.

² 'Pest' is employed as a relational and historically contingent term that defines a nonhuman animal as unwanted from an anthropocentric perspective, rather than reflecting an inherent quality of a lifeform.

understanding of animals' geographies of 'domestic' space must extend beyond a focus on 'domesticated' animals, thereby raising questions of interspecies co-existence, autonomy, and control. Thirdly, advances to our understanding of the more-than-human home need to not only empirically expand to encompass a greater diversity of taxa, but also stand to gain from the theoretical contributions of multiple waves of feminist geographies, to avoid romanticising, naturalising or essentialising the home. Such an intellectual dialogue would also extend the latter literature beyond its conventionally anthropocentric framing. Consequently, there is a need for more attention on the home as a site of unevenly distributed violence and labour, for both humans and nonhumans alike, as part of a broader project of defamiliarizing the family and the home.

To that end, Part One articulates the significance of further research into the more-than-human home. Part Two identifies three key analytics from feminist geographies that could inform analysis of the more-than-human home: the home as a site of labour, the home as a space of power and violence, and the project of defamiliarizing the home. Consequently, Part Three surveys the existing animals' geographies of the more-than-human home through these key analytics. Finally, Part Four concludes with further directions for research, including expanding beyond a focus on animals and the Global North, and the possibilities for queering domestic political ecologies as well as greater attention on nonhuman labour.

This article focuses on the domestic as a material and imaginative space (Blunt and Dowling 2006), rather than on domestication as a process, but critical geographical scholarship on the latter (Anderson 1997; Cassidy and Mullin 2007; Swanson, Lien, and Ween 2018) still has a bearing on analysis, given both the prevalence of domesticated animals in domestic spaces, and how historic and contemporary acts of domestication are entwined with labour and violence, the determining thematics of this piece. Moreover, understanding 'domesticated' as 'becoming accustomed to the household' (Cassidy 2007, 5) or the capacity 'to live familiarly or at home (with)' (Alaimo 2016, 19) suggests some of the fertile intersections between these concepts.

Part One: Entering the more-than-human home

The 'great indoors' (Biehler and Simon 2011) is a critical area of enquiry, especially given the growth of indoor spaces and the increasing proportion of time humans (Wakefield-Rann

2021) or ‘Homo indoorus’ (Dunn, 2018, 1) spends within them. Yet there has been a general exclusion of domestic space from political ecology (Kaika 2004; Biehler and Simon 2011) due to a treatment of indoor spaces as fixed and unnatural, or as sites of trivial, feminised or inauthentic natures compared with masculine wild natures (Anderson 1997; Cassidy 2007, 9), thereby mirroring the academic marginalisation of the home as a private and gendered space³. Feminist geographers have worked to legitimise the home as a site of geographical enquiry (Blunt and Varley 2004). Homes were previously ignored by geographers due to their association with the feminine and with ‘reactionary, stasis-bound, nostalgic notions of security and belonging’ (Gregson and Lowe 1995, 226). They were considered trivial compared to the public worlds of business and politics (Duncan and Lambert 2004).

Yet the more-than-human home is a crucial and timely site to analyse, particularly in light of the COVID-19 pandemic. Without homogenising the diversity of pandemic experiences, I contend that the enforcement of lockdowns produced a global and largely unprecedented time of interiority, one that was necessarily unevenly felt. This intramural confinement, occasioned by uncertainty, death, and suffering, and partially enabled by the rapid digitalisation of everyday life and mass expansion of home working, transformed the meaning, use and spatial requirements of the home, although the long-term impacts of that remain to be seen. Some scholars suggest that this recent period of interiorisation has also (perhaps temporarily) reshaped human-nonhuman relations. For instance, the ‘anthropause’ (Searle, Turnbull, and Lorimer 2021) altered rat rhythms and topologies, with rodents found to be more active in the day, engaging in novel nesting and feeding behaviours and pursuing wider territorial ranges. Occurring simultaneously with a lockdown expansion of pet-keeping, the pandemic can be seen as a time of both pet and pest abundance. Moreover, the domestic compression of everyday life, amid heightened anxieties over hygiene and contamination, may well have exacerbated the impacts of unwanted more-than-human entanglement and the willingness to convivially accommodate other species in our homes. These recent developments speak to the necessity of grappling with the contemporary more-than-human home, in its full multispecies complexity.

³ Due to this neglect of the indoors, this article explicitly focuses on intramural domestic space, while acknowledging that there has been substantive geographical work on gardens, exploring them as spaces for human-nature boundary making (Head and Muir 2006), the embodiment of paradoxical subjectivities (Longhurst 2006) and the production of disciplined subjects (Robbins 2012), as well as the violent displacement of awkward nonhuman others (Ginn 2014).

Finally, the more-than-human home brings into stark relief many of the major concerns of animals' geographies, and therefore has the potential to generate significant knowledge for this subdiscipline. The home is a critical site for understanding how animals exceed the literal and metaphorical places they are allocated by humans, their sanctioned 'animal spaces' (Philo and Wilbert 2000). Animals can thus be seen as matter out of place through their entry into the home and the expression of their own lived geographies or 'beastly places' (Philo and Wilbert 2000) that may be in contravention of human design. This raises the questions of for whom or for what domestic space constitute a home, and how can potentially contrary practices of more-than-human homemaking be brought into alignment? Allied to this is a concern for the co-constitution of space by nonhuman actors: analysis of how animals both shape and are shaped by processes of urbanisation (Hovorka 2008; Barua and Sinha 2019) can be scaled down to the more-than-human co-production of domesticities, and how humans and nonhumans are themselves transformed by those processes.

Part Two: Learning from feminist geographies of the home

Insights from existing feminist scholarship regarding geographies of the home are critical for interrogating this underexamined field of animals' geographies. In this I recognise the intellectual and political heterogeneity of geographic feminisms. This work, largely from the 1990s onwards, encompasses both socialist feminist perspectives that emphasise reproductive labour within the private space of the home (in contrast with often masculinised public productive labour) and work inspired by the cultural turn that recognises the home as both material and symbolic. Consequently, I am teasing two key threads from these different perspectives: a focus on reproductive labour and violence from the first, and a concern with meaning from the latter.

These insights can also be contextualised as critical responses to the work of humanist geographers of the 1970s and 1980s. Epitomised by the work of Yi-Fu Tuan home was understood as a place of 'security, familiarity and nurture' (2004, 164), as a 'shelter or a haven' (2004, 164) and as 'a bounded space' (2004, 165). Such an analysis gave some recognition to the gendered division of labour, and to the danger of boredom as emerging from familiarity, but also fundamentally denied the more-than-human nature of the home, defining home as a 'thoroughly

humanized, socially constructed world' (2004, 165). Feminist geographers critiqued Tuan for adopting a mode of aesthetic masculinity in opposition to the feminist other of place itself (Rose 1993), his lack of an analysis of power, and his universalising claims that utilise man as a baseline (Sibley 1995). They have refuted humanist geography's idealisation of the home as a masculinist space of refuge and leisure on three grounds. Firstly, they have highlighted that the home is also a space of exploitation and work, particularly social reproductive labour (Dalla Costa and James 2017), performed predominately by women and is thus integral to the functioning of capitalism. Even if socially reproductive labour is externalised beyond the family to a paid employee (i.e., a nanny) it is often still preferentially home-based due to a culture of domesticity that prescribes the home as the primary site for childcare (Gregson and Lowe 1995).

Secondly feminist geographers have shattered the image of home as a refuge through revealing the home as a potential place of violence and danger, as well as a site for the reproduction of uneven gendered power relations (Gregson and Lowe 1995, 226) that perpetuate the oppression of women (Bowlby, Gregory, and McKie 1997). Understandings of home as a space of privacy where one has the capacity to be oneself (Somerville 1992) have been contested by scholars who recognise how families can engage in their own practices of discipline and surveillance (Madigan, Munro, and Smith 1990; Johnston and Valentine 1995), particularly exacted upon women, children, and queer members of the home.

Building upon this, feminist geographers have highlighted the heterogeneity of experiences of the home, further disaggregating the power relations that striate domestic space and transcending critiques of masculine refuge to also challenge the presumed universalism of white middle-class womanhood. Black feminist writers such as hooks (1990) have countered existing excoriations of domestic life by arguing that the home can be a space of renewal, subversion, liberation, and resistance to the brutality of racism (although such calls have been tempered by calls that this should not place oppressions that occur within Black families as beyond reproach (Lewis 2022)).

Queer scholars have also addressed the marginalisation and exclusion of LGBT+ individuals from the heteronormative family home and their inability to experience the home as a source of identity or as an ideal space, due to the need to conceal non-heterosexual identities (Johnston and Valentine 1995), occasioning an increased focus on public spaces of queer encounter. However, this framing of home as inherently heterosexist, oppressive and exclusionary has also been

nuanced, both by scholars detailing heterosexual family acceptance and affirmation of LGBT identities (Gorman-Murray 2008) and exploring the home itself as a site for the conscious production of queer life. Moreover, heterosexuality itself must not be taken as a naturalised given within domestic space. Instead, scholars argue that it is actively co-constituted through embodied, sensual, and sexual interactions within the space of the home (Morrison 2012).

Recent scholarship of the home has encompassed a greater diversity of modes of domestic life. There has been a push to conceptualise home beyond a suburban middle-class ideal and instead explore homemaking in the context of disaster, including forms of home-unmaking and domicide (Nowicki 2014), as well as thinking about the production of home transnationally and its role in reproducing colonial relations (Blunt 1999). Attention has turned to those on the margins of home, thinking about extreme geographies of the loss of home and the emotional and sensory dimensions of them (Brickell 2012). This move to reckon with a greater diversity of experiences of home is critical to the project of defamiliarizing the home, in the sense of challenging the taken-for-granted nature of the home as an institution and normative ideal, and instead recognising it as geographically, socially and historically contingent and mutable. In rendering the home 'unfamiliar', its ambivalent, uncanny and discomfiting qualities are brought into view.

Humanist constructions of home as a 'bounded place' have also been thoroughly refuted by scholarship that highlights how domestic spaces are always connected to public spaces and institutions (Rose 2003) and that home is constituted by social relations that extend well beyond the immediate locale (Massey 2018). The home is understood as traversing multiple scales, from the individual to the local to the national and transnational (Blunt and Dowling 2006). Homes are no more emotionally and discursively fixed and static than the identities of those who inhabit and co-produce them (Bowlby, Gregory, and McKie 1997), and can engender complex and contradictory emotions (Blunt and Varley 2004). Moreover, one can distinguish between home as a 'material and symbolic' place (Blunt and Varley 2004, 3) and the house as a physical structure, as one can be physically unhoused but retain a conception of home, and vice versa (Somerville 1992). I argue that the domestic is the muddying of the two, and that the family as a malleable affective and ideological structure is forever at arm's length from the domestic.

So, in bringing these different literatures together, from feminist geographies of the home I am embracing the domestic as a legitimate field of enquiry and critically reckoning with the

uneven power relations at play. Simultaneously, through drawing from the animals' geographies literature, I am contesting the anthropocentrism and human exceptionalism found within some of the feminist geography literature, by bringing the animals back indoors. In light of this scholarship, I contend there are three key feminist thematics through which to understand animals' geographies of the more-than-human home: the home as a site of (reproductive) labour, the home as a space of power and violence, and the project of defamiliarizing the home, both in terms of contesting the home and the family as natural and given, and in terms of rendering the home unhomely or uncanny.

Part Three: Critically interrogating the more-than-human home

A) Labour

A focus on labour brings a fresh analytical perspective to debates regarding the novelty of current human-companion animal relations. Many scholars contend that there has been a recent shift in the status of pets in the West, in terms of the intensity of human affection bestowed upon them, and a spatial shift in their everyday geographies, bringing them into the intimacy of the home, including spaces such as the bedroom (Franklin 2006). This highlights pet-keeping as a historically and geographically contingent phenomenon, rather than a natural or inevitable process (Irvine 2004). However, this novelty is counterpointed by recognition of longer histories of multispecies co-habitation (Howell 2002; Charles 2016; Irvine and Cilia 2017) bolstering arguments that the home has always been a site of multispecies relations (Cudworth 2019). Using the insights of feminist geography, the specificity of this shift towards a new era of pet love (Nast 2006a) can be grasped via the changes in reproductive labour it has engendered. Nast (2006b) interprets the rise of new elite pet-centred consumption patterns as a reflection of rampant consumerism and post-industrial alienation that displaces a concern for human suffering. But I argue that this can also be understood as an expansion of the reproductive labour required to maintain companion animals, and a consequent displacement of some of that labour to professionalised services beyond the home: an expanded mode of reproduction that begets capital accumulation, from dog yoga (Nast 2006a) to expensive canine food trucks in affluent areas (Hubbard and Brooks 2021). The care work required keenly parallels the reproductive

labour of childcare, in terms of the time demands, the balancing of multiple responsibilities and the feminisation of much of this labour (Cudworth 2022). This is exemplified by contemporary Chinese ‘pet slaves’ (Tan et al. 2021), a self-identification utilised by professional women whose personal lives and housing decisions were centred on meeting the needs of their companion animals. Moreover, the rise in post-lockdown animal abandonment (Wollaston 2021) as well as increasing demands for dog walkers and trainers suggests a crisis of care and reproductive labour orientated towards the nonhuman.

Yet thinking critically about the role of labour in the more-than-human household requires a recognition of animal agency and the work that nonhumans do (Barua 2019; Besky and Blanchette 2019; Welden 2023). Pets cannot be reduced to simple recipients of care. Instead, the value of pets can be understood in terms of encounter value (Haraway 2008) and nonhuman emotional labour (Collard 2020): companion animals are shifting from being enrolled in productive labour to both receiving and enacting forms of reproductive labour. Dogs can be understood as interspecies care workers, due to their provision of comforting tactile encounters, and their corresponding yet costly emotional regulation (Coulter 2016; Cudworth 2022).

This further highlights the question of what work nonhumans do to construct and maintain the more-than-human home. Working on the fringes of Khulna city, Bangladesh, Alam et al argue that an array of nonhuman agencies are integral to securing home via ‘spontaneous multi-species exchanges’ (2020, 1132), from the feeding of stray birds and dogs who then guard the home, to the collection of cow dung to create fuel sticks. Alam et al’s work extends beyond companion animals, embracing a holistic ecology of the more-than-human home, and encompasses the economic, aesthetic, and spiritual dimensions of making home. It also addresses a broader shortcoming of the more-than-human home literature: a lack of engagement with sites in the Global South (with notable exceptions such as Shillington (2008)), and consequently a failure to provincialize the Western more-than-human home, as well as a need to challenge imaginaries of domestic fixity through engaging with homes in more informal settings that may engender different human-nature relations.

Meanwhile, the labour of managing, removing, and preventing unwanted nonhuman cohabitants can be seen as an integral mode of social reproduction. Drawing on Gregson and Lowe's (1995) typology, the structural upkeep of the household (including pest removal) is the only form of social reproduction that must by necessity be performed within domestic space

(although not necessarily by its inhabitants). And increases in the prevalence of specific domestic infestations can be linked to changes in social reproductive habits, particularly hygienic and sartorial practices. In the UK, rising clothes moth populations can be traced back to shifts in cleaning practices and an increase in the quantity of clothing owned by individuals, reducing the labour expended on maintaining garments and protecting them from infestation (Brimblecombe and Lankester 2013). Similarly, Hollin and Giraud (2021) highlight how the resurgence of bedbugs in Europe and North America, following their near extirpation, can be attributed to increased geographical mobility, a reduction in use of certain cleaning chemicals (due to changing attitudes towards individual ecological impacts), and increase in the acquiring of second-hand furniture. This speaks to ideas of feral proliferations in the Anthropocene (Tsing, Mathews, and Bubandt 2019) and Giraud et al's (2019) work on reckoning with the Anthropocene not only as a time of loss and extinction but unwelcome and uneven abundance.

Infestations are often shamefully concealed by those who experience them, as they convey the stigma of dirty homes and by association dirty people, that can be attached to ideas of race, class and migration status (Kraus 2009; Raffles 2011; Lynch 2019). Thus, there is a need for an intersectional analysis that disaggregates this dimension of the more-than-human home. Moreover, the multi-billion-dollar pest control industry is integral to public health and mired in everyday animal death and suffering yet is disconcertingly absent from social science literature. This externalised and professionalised management of the more-than-human home can also be understood as a significant form of productive labour and 'dirty work'. Dirty work, as identified by psychologist Everett Hughes (1962) refers to devalued forms of labour that can provoke disgust and lead to the stigmatising of those that perform it. Ashforth and Kreiner (1999) identify three axes of dirty work: social, physical, and moral. Pest control is situated at the intersection of the latter two points, as its unglamorous labour carries the stigma of engaging with squalid environments as well as the moral taint of animal execution. This leaves pest controllers as an underexamined category of 'dirty workers', a neglect that may be emerging from a methodological squeamishness. There is a need to grapple with the international economics and technics of professional pest management and address the embodied expertise and epistemologies of professional pest controllers as an overlooked mode of natural history knowledge. Moreover, how responsibility for undertaking this dirty work is delegated is a critical matter of socio-ecological justice. Biehler (2009) charts the changing relationships with bedbugs

and cockroaches in public housing in New York, as these infestations shift from being considered a public and collective concern to being a privatised affair, consequently shaping the management solutions applied. Biehler contends that effective pest management needs to challenge the presumed boundedness of domestic space, speaking directly to the insights of geographies of the home.

While some theorists comprehend animal labour as an intersubjective relation orientated towards human ends (Porcher 2017), others contend that we need to recognise animals' own social reproduction: their production of use values in their species interest (Collard 2020, Fair and McMullen 2023) and the intra-species care work animals undertake, which is often met with repression (Coulter 2016). Consequently, thinking holistically about the more-than-human home also raises questions about the work that pests do, and how we can understand the domestic as a site of multiple conflicting projects of homemaking, or how one's homemaking is another's unmaking. The reproductive labour of pests can materially and symbolically undermine human domestic infrastructures, just as humans seek to undermine those of their unwanted cohabitants. Understanding these acts of labour and worldmaking is congruent with animal geographies' wider project of grappling with animals' own topologies (Hinchliffe et al. 2005; Barua and Sinha 2019)—their 'beastly places'—defined on their own terms, rather than in relation to the human. This poses methodological challenges, given the ongoing and incongruous reliance on humanist approaches in more-than-human geography (Hodgetts and Lorimer 2015), but also ethical ones. How can these competing claims to space be adjudicated and by whom, whether they be animal rights to the city (Hubbard and Brooks 2021; Shingne 2021) or claims to home within our own (Alaimo 2016, 22)? This highlights issues of power within the home, another key analytic drawn from feminist geography, and a central concern of the latest wave of animal geography scholarship (Hovorka, McCubbin, and Patter 2021).

B) Power and Violence

Another key question suffusing animals' geographies is the extent to which everyday domestic relations across species difference either de-stabilise or reinforce human exceptionalism. Is the loving of pets a temporary extension of the privileged categories of humanism, or is animal alterity embraced? And consequently, to what extent is the figure of the

human decentred or transformed by its relation to companion animals? Considering this literature in light of feminist contributions on power, violence and heterogenous experiences of the home brings new insights, which can be explored via three main themes: domestication; status and permanence within the household; and control over domestic space.

Domestication: Questions of power, autonomy and control in domestic space form a palpable intersection between domestic animal geographies and critical feminist geographies of the home, and curiously the work of humanist geographer Yi-Fu Tuan is centrally derided in both, yet for contrary reasons. Within the literature on pets there is a clear retaliation against Tuan's (2003) formulation of domestication as a relationship between dominance and affection, with affection understood as only possible in relations of inequality. Couched within Tuan's humanism is an abhorrence of the denigration of people to the level of pets, and there is also a concern for animal suffering that may be inflicted through these practices of domination, for instance centred on the denial of animal sexual autonomy through regular acts of castration or the malformation of bodies through acts of selective breeding. While Tuan explicitly refuses to reach a clear analytical standpoint—advocating instead for a richly descriptive mode of geography—he seemingly concedes that the domination of the nonhuman world is of a qualitatively different nature to the domination of other humans, and to some extent is unavoidable. Many ensuing animal geographers take umbrage with Tuan's conception of domestication, both in terms of his normative anthropocentrism, but also to the extent to which he understands the imposition of power and production of pets as a unilateral and solely human endeavour (Smith 2003; Cassidy 2007), rather than as a process of mutual interspecies co-constitution. Thus, while Tuan's romanticisation of home was critiqued due to his failure to recognise the operations of power and domination, the critique of his work on pets largely decries his over-emphasis on these forces. The dissonance in these parallel critiques suggests the extent to which these two bodies of literature have henceforth failed to be in dialogue with each other.

Haraway's (2007) work acts as a critical counterpoint to Tuan's, as she theorises domestication as a relational process of co-constitution, co-habitation and co-evolution of humans and dogs, a messy encounter with the other, albeit one that is always riven with uneven power relations. Similarly, Swanson et al (2018) argue for domestication as a mutualistic, gradual and far from unidirectional multispecies affair. A key site for interrogating these

different understandings of domestication is the everyday lived practices of multispecies households.

Status and permanence: A significant geographical literature has highlighted how companion animals are incorporated into the intimacy of domestic life (Fox 2006; Charles 2016). Pets have been identified as ‘minded individuals’ (Sanders 1993, 215) who are actively included in domestic rituals and shape household routines (Irvine and Cilia 2017). Companion animals may be viewed as integral members of the family particularly by young children, suggesting there are also age variations in the meanings and practices of pet-keeping (Tipper 2011). Franklin (2006) argues that relations with companion animals are working to hybridise the family, evident in shared residence, joint activities and emotional interdependence. The very presence of animals previously excluded from domestic space being included in the home can unsettle human-nonhuman boundaries. Yet feminist geographies of the home highlight how inclusion within domestic space is not antithetical to relations of power and violence and a loss of freedom. Inclusion of pets within the family unit can even provide a rationale for harm, as they commonly act as proxies for abused partners in the context of domestic violence (Flynn 2000) .

Moreover, the position of animals within the more-than-human home can be seen as precarious and malleable due to the fungibility, disposability and replaceability of pets, what Shir-Vertesh (2012, 420) refers to as ‘flexible personhood’, explicitly inspired by Ong’s (1999) concept of ‘flexible citizenship’. Boundaries of the family and of the home are often symbolically and spatially redrawn with the arrival of a human child, excluding animals from spaces such as the bedroom, redesignating the pet as property rather than person, and sometimes terminating all relations with the previously loved pet. Shir-Vertesh contends that ultimately ‘the presence of pets actually strengthens and preserves conceptions of humanity by demarcating those boundaries that we are not ready or willing to cross’ (2012, 429). Even the privileged treatment of pets as practice ‘pre-children’ for imminently reproductive families denies the animals their alterity, and is directly at odds with Haraway’s critique of treating dogs as ‘surrogacy and substitutes’ for human children (2007, 96). Due to a moral skittishness (Horowitz 2019) about the potential for our 'fur babies' (Greenebaum 2004) to exhibit sexual urges, the childlike status of pets often goes in tandem with the denial of their reproductive autonomy (Fraser 2024). The discarding of pets due to the demands of international labour mobility also

highlights the ambiguous status of pets as belongings and the pragmatic limits to their membership of the household (Fox and Walsh 2011).

The capacity to expel pets from the household and consequently devalue their status speaks to a broader potential shortcoming of the existing more-than-human home literature. In the refutation of Tuan's focus upon domination, there has at points been perhaps an overly celebratory emphasis upon co-becoming. Here again Nast's (2005) work is instructive, with her critique of Haraway's (2007) work for not recognising the elitist and eugenic relations that underlie dog agility training. This troubles the ethics that pervade these relations, reminding us of the histories of violence that existing relations of animal obedience are premised upon (Giraud and Hollin 2016). This critical stance has been furthered by work that recognises relationships between elite geographies of pet-keeping and gentrification as well as the role of pets in processes of social and racial stratification (Hubbard and Brooks 2021). By contrast, Power's (2017) research highlights the impediments to making home produced by rental precarity and landlords' refusals to accommodate companion animals. Such rental restrictions and limited access to canine-friendly facilities (e.g. dog parks, veterinary services) were found to be more prevalent in predominately African-American areas (Rose, McMillian, and Carter 2023), suggesting a racialisation of such inequalities. This occasions other forms of violence, including the often traumatic forced separation from pets in order to access safe and appropriate accommodation, or pet owners—including economically vulnerable older adults (Toohey and Rock 2019), unhoused pet owners (Irvine 2013b) and survivors of domestic violence (Flynn 2000; Labrecque and Walsh 2011)—sacrificing their own wellbeing in favour of their ongoing multispecies cohabitation. Altogether this challenges a simple equation of pet-keeping with elite consumerism, but still further highlights the power dynamics that striate the more-than-human home as well as aligning with feminist claims that the domestic cannot be isolated from wider sociopolitical dynamics (Rose 2003).

As Cudworth (2019) highlights, the posthuman possibilities of pet-keeping do not eliminate its inherent power asymmetries. Drawing upon the work of hooks, Cudworth contends that homes can act as a space of 'anthroparchal resistance' (2019, 428). Pets themselves can provide a sense of home, in terms of comfort and security, even in contexts of domestic violence (Flynn 2000) or displacement in temporary shelters (Labrecque and Walsh 2011) or even act as 'lifesavers' for homeless people (Irvine 2013a). Yet homes simultaneously continue to be sites of

interspecies violence, in light of wider debates regarding the moral justifiability of pet-keeping (Irvine 2004) and reduction of animals to property, or what Collard (2020, 6) conceptualises as ‘object life’.

The exercise of power and the violence of expulsion is more acute in the case of unchosen and unwanted cohabitants. Power (2007) discusses representations of pests in 20th century Australian home-maker magazines as nonhumans that disrupt the security and contained nature of the home, rupturing its material and conceptual borders. Through a focus on domestic infestation the home becomes a locale for the biopolitical governance of unruly nonhuman life. This raises questions of how different technologies and knowledges promote and maintain particular hierarchies of nonhuman life, and render some beings killable, and how these acts are shaped by their occurrence within domestic spaces. What I have framed as reproductive labour in the previous section can also be seen as routinised acts of extermination, or what Reis-Castro understands as the deliberate production of ‘nonencounter value’ (2021, 323), or the generation of ‘hoped-for-absence’ (Ginn 2014, 538). Yet what could nonhuman resistance to these exercises of power and violence entail, given extant research into modes of animal refusal (Hribal 2003; Wadiwel 2018; Dave 2019)?

Spatial control: Consequently, a third dimension to the power relations of the more-than-human home is the extent to which animals can enact their own agency and exert their own meanings upon the space, extending the previous discussion of nonhuman homemaking. Can the home be a ‘beastly place’? And what does it mean for the house’s human inhabitants when we start to recognise home as a multispecies accomplishment? The latter question is exemplified by Smith’s (2003) work with members of the House Rabbit Society, who permit their homes and furniture to be physically restructured by adopted bunnies in order to be more amendable to leporidae topologies, as for instance the rabbits concentrate all items in the centre of the room (allowing clear runs at the side) or transform mattresses into sites of excavation. The actions of the House Rabbit Society can be understood as open and experimental attempts to facilitate animal agency and meet the needs of both co-existing species while recognising the inevitability of power imbalances in human-animal relationships. It can be seen as a form of ‘muddied living’ (Cudworth 2019), a nonhuman breaching of domestic order and consequent acceptance of greater levels of dirt. Even with the House Rabbit Society there are still limits to animal autonomy within the space, with the rabbits always neutered. This re-ordering of domestic space

through animal agency is often socially condemned, as observed in Holmberg's (2014) work on the policing of animal hoarders, with the presence of large numbers of cats deemed to undermine the homeliness of home. The housing decisions of Tan et al's (2021) previously discussed 'pet slaves'—such as moving to more expensive apartments with garden access to benefit their dogs—also indicate the ways in which nonhumans as actors shape the spatialities of the home, and with the language indicating relations of power and affection that exceed and complicate a unilateral pattern of domination.

Yet an acceptance of animal placemaking doesn't necessarily trouble broader power relations. Indeed, an insistence upon animal alterity can reinforce human-animal dualisms. Charles (2016) concludes that the more-than-human home is messy but not truly posthuman due to the efforts made to assert human superiority and resist anthropomorphism. This tension is captured by pet owners' attempts to accept 'dogs-as-dogs', for instance through framing the household as a 'pack' (Power 2008). Such an approach is biologically essentialising and fails to comprehend the animals as individuals but also does not make them simply conform to human family form. Yet dog owners' everyday practices did attempt to contain and mould their companions' caninity where it created excessive disorder, in terms of hair and smells. Again, as with Shir-Vertesh's (2012) work, a failure to manage animal alterity can lead to the pet being let go. Similarly, Fox (2006) concurs that while pet-keeping has posthuman elements, with pets as liminal figures who disrupt the categories of human and nonhuman, there is an underlying retention of humanity as a reference point.

Consequently, a focus on power highlights the violence of domestication and of securing the home from unwanted nonhuman others, but also recognises that nonhumans exert their own agency within the home, shaping the spatial configurations of the domestic and attaining positions of status within the household (albeit ones that are precarious and contingent). The containment of animal alterity also suggests resistance to challenging the anthropocentrism of the home. But as a final lens, I consider whether the more-than-human home could be otherwise: how can a multispecies approach further the feminist geographic project of defamiliarizing the home?

C) Defamiliarizing the home

Here I draw on feminist scholarship that contests the home as a uniform, homogenously experienced and naturalised given, as well as a long history of utopian imaginaries of how domestic life could be otherwise. I consider the defamiliarizing of the home through two key strands: the potential for domestic animals to transform the family, and the welcoming in of the other and the uncanny. Beginning with the first concern, and drawing on a new wave of critical transfeminism that is reimagining the family as free from capitalist heteropatriarchal norms (Lewis 2022), I ask: rather than being essential appendages to the maintenance of bourgeois life, what role can pets play in queering and refiguring the family? Can the active presence of companion animals within the home constitute new kin relations that challenge heteronormative practices, ideals and definitions of the family, or does the easy assimilation of pets within a nuclear family form entrench such ideals? These questions are pertinent in light of the COVID-19 pandemic, with the lockdowns resulting in a pause on family-making for some, and a doubling down on the family as the world for others, leaving many isolated, with no recourse beyond the familial unit.

The rise of pet keeping has been linked to smaller family sizes and an increase in individuals living alone (Franklin 2006), suggesting pets may pose a challenge to conventional family forms. Nast (2006) argues that pets are superseding children, because they are more convenient, mobile, and amenable to human narcissism: we can project what we like onto a pet. However, there is a need for geographic and cultural specificities regarding these phenomena. For instance, Franklin's (2006) Australian-based work notes a whiteness to certain pet-keeping practices that deserves greater interrogation, as well as class inflections. Meanwhile, Irvine and Cilia (2017) have identified the highest degree of pet ownership among households with children, and Shir-Vertesh's (2012) identification of pets as practice 'pre-children' suggests that pets are securing rather than transforming the family. In their role as child proxies, pets may also be fortifying heteronormative divisions of reproductive labour, with men seen as 'playmates' or as 'leaders of the pack', while women were expected bear the brunt of every day care work and the enforcement of household rules (Greenebaum 2004).

However, we can see glimpses of multispecies 'family abolition' (Lewis 2022) in McKeithen's (2017) reading of the cultural trope of the 'crazy cat lady' as a figure of queer excess, in light of her refusal to prioritise her romantic and procreative relationships in favour of

her affective connections with nonhuman life. The ‘crazy cat lady’ stands not just for the failures of heteronormativity, but as a total loss of human governance over domestic space, due to the ascension of feline topologies, as well as disorder and dirt and the significance of access to the bed. This is further contextualised by Wilkinson’s (2014, 2020) work on the happily non-reproductive female singleton of childbearing age as herself a figure of queerness, in her refusal of compulsory coupledness, with single individuals at odds with heteronormative nuclear family forms (Oswin 2010). Again there are resonances with Tan et al’s (2021) ‘pet slaves’, as women actively prioritise their relationships with animals as opposed to romantic love as the former does not compromise their autonomy and identity as workers.

The debate, as discussed within the previous section, of whether the incorporation of other species into the household challenges or re-entrenches anthropocentrism needs to expand to consider more discomfiting organisms. While it may be possible to assimilate companion animals within the category of ‘furry children’ (Power 2008), the alterity of many pests poses a far more radical challenge to more-than-human homemaking. There is a need to turn to the ‘unloved’ (Rose and Van Dooren 2011) and ‘unloving others’ (Chao 2018) of the home: nonhumans that we are unwillingly entangled with that can also cause us significant harm. In this Kaika’s (2004, 273) work on the ‘selective porosity’ of the home is instructive. She describes how the production of ‘good nature’ (e.g. the piping in of potable water) and metabolism of ‘bad nature’ (the flushing away of sewage) are integral to the discursive construction of the home as secure, hygienic, and self-contained. Within this framework nature is produced as the other of the bourgeois home. Thus, the domestic functions through an alienation from the social and natural relations that materially sustain it and spatially connect it but are ideologically othered and visually concealed. Yet such functions can break down, revealing these material interconnections, as a manifestation of the ‘domestic uncanny’ (2004, 266), transforming the house into an unpredictable space. Pests can be seen as a key manifestation of the domestic uncanny, rendering the house unhomey, and thus the management of pests can be seen as integral (rather than incidental) to the material and discursive production of the home. As Power notes ‘Border practices separating home from ‘outside’, wildness, nature and dirt are central to the material and conceptual construction of western homes as safe, secure, autonomous, human spaces’ (2009a, 29), mirrored by Alaimo’s analysis that ‘the home, both literally and figuratively, has been erected as the spatial definition of the human’ (2016, 20). Pests challenge

ideas of containment, fixity, improvement, and familiarity and reveal an unruly wildness within our own homes, one that exceeds human governance. They highlight matters of dirt, purification, and material and psychological boundary maintenance as central to the production of home (Sibley 1995; Gurney 2000; Ozaki and Lewis 2006). They disrupt the idealisation of home as a moral and civil space where ‘uncivil’ nature is excluded (Hinchliffe 1997, 201). Looking to Somerville’s (1992) typology of the signifiers of home, domestic infestations can be seen as a transgression of territorial security (unwanted others are not successfully excluded) and ontological security (impacting upon one’s sense of identity as modern and hygienic), as well as emotional security (distress) and physiological security (infection and diseases), thereby troubling the idealisation of home. Pests can be read through a lens of ‘queer ambivalence’ (Crysler et al. 2024, 259), both in the sense that their presence in the home reflects a non-binary ecological understanding (one that rejects a nature/culture spatial dualism) and because they chafe against a narrative of heroic human mastery, instead demanding a mode of uncertainty and contingency germane to a queer ecological approach.

Yet Kaika (2004) also proposes that the domestic uncanny is liberating, in that it reveals everyday individualised alienation from social and natural processes. Consequently, in embracing the discomfiting and queer presence of unwanted nonhuman others and the loss of human control, is there a route to liberation? Power’s work on brushtail possums in Australia suggests such a possibility. Contrary to Kaika, Power (2009a) argues that the ruptures in the borders of the home (and the conceptual borders between nature and culture) can engender rather than unsettle feelings of homeliness. She highlights how the porosity of the home is negotiated through everyday practices of homemaking in the case of brushtail possums in Sydney. Through their nocturnal sounds, nauseating smells and inhabiting of liminal wall voids, the possums unmake the borders of the home, yet they also forge a connection to Australian nationhood. The presence of native marsupials helps settler colonial subjects feel at home at the scale of the nation. But even with this case, there are hierarchies of nonhuman life at play. Power notes that there is no redemption for the parallel presence of the common rat. Meanwhile Lynch’s (2019, 364) research into experiences of living with bedbugs in a low-income neighbourhood in Glasgow highlights the possibility for multispecies co-existence despite the discomfort this can engender, as participants shifted from an attempt at immunisation (itself carrying risks from toxicity) to one of ‘shared vulnerability’, and therefore loosened the boundaries of the home,

aligning with a cosmopolitical approach to sharing urban space (McKiernan and Instone 2016). However, Lynch's work is constrained by its very limited empirical basis (interviews with three individuals) and does not fully reconcile the ambivalent relationships between structural inequality and bedbug exposure, raising questions about which bodies and homes bear the weight of unwanted entanglements. Domestic infestations raise challenging questions of multispecies ethics. With itching skin, gnawed wires, disturbed sleep, and soiled food they put to the test the extent to which we can and want to stay with the trouble (Haraway 2016). These conundrums are even more striking when we consider the intersection between domestic infestations, rental precarity and housing inequality, and recognise that these infestations are not evenly felt. In response Kane (2023) conceives of the 'violent uncanny' as encapsulating the discomforting proximity of outdoor earthly matter within domestic space. While explicitly focused on mould, Kane also makes passing reference to rats, and understands both as the material manifestations of the everyday violence of austerity in privately rented and social housing. Meanwhile Biehler and Simon highlight how 'indoor pest control exemplifies the inequitable embodiment of indoor ecologies, as low-income children are disproportionately exposed to opposing risks from roaches and roach-killers' (2011, 185), consequently rendering pest control a matter of socio-environmental (in)justice. As enticing as Kaika's vision of uncanny liberation may be, the ethical dilemmas posed by pest exterminations and removals suggest a potential limit to how welcoming, lively, and flourishing people desire their homes to be. Thus, while both pets and pests via different avenues work to reconfigure, queer and defamiliarize the family and the home, such transformations should not be necessarily celebrated nor romanticised.

Part Four: Towards future geographies of the more-than-human home

As indicated and modelled by the approach of this review, geographies of the more-than-human home need to attend to a greater diversity of life forms, expanding beyond a companion animal focus. Looking at the existing literature, we can still note a bias within animal geography—albeit one that is being slowly rectified—towards species that are 'big like us' (Hird 2010, 36) reflecting a wider prioritisation of mammalian and bird species over invertebrates (Owens and Wolch 2014). Moreover, a singular focus on animals' geographies does not embrace the full complexity of the more-than-human home, as domestic space is also a

key interface for vegetal geographies (Seymour 2022) and microbial life (Lorimer et al. 2019; Wakefield-Rann 2021). There are further dimensions of the more-than-human home to be reckoned with—particularly changing relationships with water use (Waitt and Nowroozipour 2020) or energy use (Hinchliffe 1997), from fuel poverty (Angel 2017) to embodied experiences of thermal comfort (Hitchings 2011). Understandings of the more-than-human home—in tandem with the wider project of globalising, politicising and decolonising animals’ geographies (Hovorka 2017)—also need to expand beyond a focus on the Global North, and consequently reckon with a greater diversity of ecologies and domesticities, understanding how the cultural, architectural and bio-geographical specificities of different dwellings shape varied configurations of the more-than-human home.

Secondly, resisting the potentially depoliticised nature of animal geographies (Giraud 2019), this review has married existing literature with insights from feminist geographies of the home. As a further avenue, only briefly touched on here, there is a need to queer the more-than-human home. We see this in McKeithen’s (2017) work on the ‘crazy cat lady’, and the potential to radically rethink the form and boundaries of the family through companion animals. But the queering of the home is not exclusively a concern with chosen more-than-human kin. There needs also be an engagement with all forms of oddkin (Haraway 2016), including the discomfiting, ambivalent and awkward (Ginn, Beisel, and Barua 2014), and insights from queer ecology as an emergent discipline here could be critical.

Thirdly, if we are to take seriously questions of flourishing and the role of nonhuman labour in producing value for capital (Besky and Blanchette 2019), we must grapple with nonhuman social reproduction and the multiplicity of homes found within domestic space. Thinking with pests alongside pets does not just expand the categories of creatures under consideration. To borrow Cudworth’s phrase (2019), it makes ‘muddied’ living even muddier, as it demonstrates that the multispecies co-constitution of domestic space can simultaneously be a process of interspecies antagonism and mutual harm. It defamiliarizes the home through decentring the human, illuminating processes of homemaking that are indifferent to or in opposition to anthropocentric design. More attention must be given to the distribution of the labour of making home, within and beyond the household, and across human and nonhuman residents, and how that work becomes enrolled in systems of power, violence, and exclusion. What social reproductive labour is necessitated by the more-than-human home, in terms of embracing or

excluding nonhuman others, and who is performing it? And what labour do nonhumans undertake to produce multispecies homes, both in accordance and at odds with human intentions? Through these questions, future research can interrogate the limits of conviviality and of human control, critical tensions at the heart of the more-than-human home.

References

- Alaimo, Stacy. 2016. *Exposed: Environmental Politics and Pleasures in Posthuman Times*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Alam, Ashraful, Andrew McGregor, and Donna Houston. 2020. "Neither Sensibly Homed nor Homeless: Re- Imagining Migrant Homes Through More-Than-Human Relations." *Social & Cultural Geography* 21 (8): 1122–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2018.1541245>.
- Anderson, Kay. 1997. "A Walk on the Wild Side: A Critical Geography of Domestication." *Progress in Human Geography* 21 (4): 463–85. <https://doi.org/10.1191/030913297673999021>.
- Angel, James. 2017. "Towards an Energy Politics in-Against-and-Beyond the State: Berlin's Struggle for Energy Democracy." *Antipode* 49 (3): 557–76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12289>.
- Ashforth, Blake E., and Glen E. Kreiner. 1999. "'How Can You Do It?': Dirty Work and the Challenge of Constructing a Positive Identity." *The Academy of Management Review* 24 (3): 413–34. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.2202129>.
- Barua, Maan. 2019. "Animating Capital: Work, Commodities, Circulation." *Progress in Human Geography* 43 (4): 650–69. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132518819057>.
- Barua, Maan, and Anindya Sinha. 2019. "Animating the Urban: An Ethological and Geographical Conversation." *Social & Cultural Geography* 20 (8): 1160–80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2017.1409908>.
- Besky, Sarah, and Alex Blanchette. 2019. *How Nature Works: Rethinking Labor on a Troubled Planet*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Biehler, Dawn Day. 2009. "Permeable Homes: A Historical Political Ecology of Insects and Pesticides in US Public Housing." *Geoforum* 40 (6): 1014–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2009.08.004>.
- Biehler, Dawn Day, and Gregory L. Simon. 2011. "The Great Indoors: Research Frontiers on Indoor Environments as Active Political-Ecological Spaces." *Progress in Human Geography* 35 (2): 172–92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132510376851>.
- Blunt, Alison. 1999. "Imperial Geographies of Home: British Domesticity in India, 1886–1925." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 24 (4): 421–40. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0020-2754.1999.00421.x>.
- Blunt, Alison, and Robyn Dowling. 2006. *Home*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203401354>.
- Blunt, Alison, and Ann Varley. 2004. "Geographies of Home." *Cultural Geographies* 11 (1): 3–6. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1474474004eu289xx>.
- Bowlby, Sophie, Susan Gregory, and Linda McKie. 1997. "'Doing Home': Patriarchy, Caring, and Space." *Women's Studies International Forum* 20 (3): 343–50. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-5395\(97\)00018-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-5395(97)00018-6).

Brickell, Katherine. 2012. "'Mapping' and 'Doing' Critical Geographies of Home." *Progress in Human Geography* 36 (2): 225–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132511418708>.

Brimblecombe, Peter, and Paul Lankester. 2013. "Long-Term Changes in Climate and Insect Damage in Historic Houses." *Studies in Conservation* 58 (1): 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.1179/2047058412Y.0000000051>.

Buller, Henry. 2014. "Animal Geographies I." *Progress in Human Geography* 38 (2): 308–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132513479295>.

Cassidy, Rebecca. 2020. "Introduction: Domestication Reconsidered." In: *Where the Wild Things Are Now*, edited by Rebecca Cassidy, and Molly Mullin, 1–26. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Cassidy, Rebecca, and Molly Mullin. 2020. *Where the Wild Things Are Now: Domestication Reconsidered*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Chao, Sophie. 2018. "In the Shadow of the Palm: Dispersed Ontologies among Marind, West Papua." *Cultural Anthropology* 33 (4): 621–49. <https://doi.org/10.14506/ca33.4.08>.

Charles, Nickie. 2016. "Post-Human Families? Dog-Human Relations in the Domestic Sphere." *Sociological Research Online* 21 (3): 83–94. <https://doi.org/10.5153/sro.3975>.

Collard, Rosemary-Claire. 2020. *Animal Traffic: Lively Capital in the Global Exotic Pet Trade*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Coulter, Kendra. 2016. "Beyond Human to Humane: A Multispecies Analysis of Care Work, Its Repression, and Its Potential." *Studies in Social Justice* 10 (2): 199–219. <https://doi.org/10.26522/ssj.v10i2.1350>.

Cryslar, C. Greig, Yanin Kramsky, Chandra M. Laborde, et al. 2024. "Spatializing Queer Ecologies." In: *The Routledge Handbook of Architecture, Urban Space and Politics, Volume II: Ecology, Social Participation and Marginalities*, edited by Nikolina Bobic, and Farzaneh Haghighi, 1st ed, 259–74. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Cudworth, Erika. 2019. "Muddied Living: Making Home with Dog Companions." *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 41 (3/4): 424–39. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSSP-08-2019-0165>.

Cudworth, Erika. 2022. "Labors of Love: Work, Labor, and Care in Dog–Human Relations." *Gender, Work & Organization* 29 (3): 830–44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12814>.

Dalla Costa, Mariarosa, and Selma James. 2017. "The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community." In *Class: The Anthology*, edited by Stanley Aronowitz, and Michael J. Roberts, 79–86. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Dave, Naisargi N. 2019. "'Kamadhenu's Last Stand: On Animal Refusal to Work'." In *How Nature Works: Rethinking Labor on a Troubled Planet*, edited by Sarah Besky, and Alex Blanchette, 211–224. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

Duncan, James S., and David Lambert. 2004. "Landscapes of Home." In *A Companion to Cultural Geography*, 382–403. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996515.ch25>.

Dunn, Rob. 2018. *Never Home Alone: From Microbes to Millipedes, Camel Crickets, and Honeybees, the Natural History of Where We Live*. New York: Basic Books.

Fair, Hannah, and Matthew McMullen (2023) Toward a Theory of Nonhuman Species-Being. *Environmental Humanities* 15 (2): 195–214. <https://doi.org/10.1215/22011919-10422366>.

Flynn, Clifton. 2000. “Battered Women and Their Animal Companions: Symbolic Interaction Between Human and Nonhuman Animals.” *Society & Animals* 8 (2): 99–127. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853000511032>.

Fox, Rebekah. 2006. “Animal Behaviours, Post-Human Lives: Everyday Negotiations of the Animal–Human Divide in Pet-Keeping.” *Social & Cultural Geography* 7 (4): 525–37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649360600825679>.

Fox, Rebekah, and Katie Walsh. 2011. “Furry Belongings: Pets, Migration and Home.” In *Animal Movements, Moving Animals: Essays on Direction, Velocity and Agency in Humanimal Encounters*, edited by Jacob Bull, 97–117. Uppsala: University Printers, Uppsala University.

Franklin, Adrian. 2006. ““Be[a]Ware of the Dog”: A Post-Humanist Approach to Housing.” *Housing, Theory and Society* 23 (3): 137–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14036090600813760>.

Fraser, Mariam Motamedi (2024) *Dog Politics: Species stories and the animal sciences*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Ginn, Franklin. 2014. “Sticky Lives: Slugs, Detachment and More-Than-Human Ethics in the Garden.” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 39 (4): 532–44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12043>.

Ginn, Franklin, Uli Beisel, and Maan Barua. 2014. “Flourishing with Awkward Creatures: Togetherness, Vulnerability, Killing.” *Environmental Humanities* 4 (1): 113–23. <https://doi.org/10.1215/22011919-3614953>.

Giraud, E., E. Hadley Kershaw, R. Helliwell, et al. 2019. “Abundance in the Anthropocene.” *The Sociological Review* 67 (2): 357–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026119830907>.

Giraud, Eva H. 2019. *What Comes After Entanglement?: Activism, Anthropocentrism, and an Ethics of Exclusion*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Giraud, Eva H., and Gregory Hollin. 2016. “Care, Laboratory Beagles and Affective Utopia.” *Theory, Culture & Society* 33 (4): 27–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276415619685>.

Gorman-Murray, Andrew. 2008. “Queering the Family Home: Narratives from Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Youth Coming out in Supportive Family Homes in Australia.” *Gender, Place & Culture* 15 (1): 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09663690701817501>.

Greenebaum, Jessica. 2004. “It’s a Dog’s Life: Elevating Status from Pet to ‘Fur Baby’ at Yappy Hour.” *Society & Animals* 12 (2): 117–35. <https://doi.org/10.1163/1568530041446544>.

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 (1): 47–66. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d17109>.

Gregson, Nicky, and Michelle Lowe. 1995. “‘Home’- Making: On the Spatiality of Daily Social Reproduction in Contemporary Middle-Class Britain’.” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 20 (2): 224–35. <https://doi.org/10.2307/622433>.

Gurney, Craig M (2000) “Accommodating Bodies: The Organization of Corporeal Dirt in the Embodied Home”. In *Organizing Bodies Policy, Institutions and Work*, edited by Linda McKie, and Nick Watson, 55– 80. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Haraway, Donna J. 2007. *The Companion Species Manifesto: Dogs, People, and Significant Otherness*. Chicago, IL: Prickly Paradigm Press.

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

Haraway, Donna J. 2016. *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Head, Lesley, and Pat Muir. 2006. “Suburban Life and the Boundaries of Nature: Resilience and Rupture in Australian Backyard Gardens.” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 31 (4): 505–24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2006.00228.x>.

Hinchliffe, Steve. 1997. “Locating Risk: Energy Use, the “Ideal” Home and the Non-Ideal World.” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 22 (2): 197–209. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/622309>.

Hinchliffe, Steve, Matthew B Kearnes, Monica Degen, and Sarah Whatmore. 2005. “Urban Wild Things: A Cosmopolitical Experiment.” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 23 (5): 643–58. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d351t>.

Hird, Myra J. 2010. “Meeting with the Microcosmos.” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28 (1): 36–9. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d2706wsc>.

Hitchings, Russell. 2011. “Researching Air-Conditioning Addiction and Ways of Puncturing Practice: Professional Office Workers and the Decision to Go Outside.” *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 43 (12): 2838–56. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a43574>.

Hodgetts, Timothy, and Hannah Fair. 2024. *Animal Geographies*. In *The Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, edited by Barney Wharf. Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-25900-5_203-1

Hodgetts, Timothy, and Jamie Lorimer. 2015. ““Methodologies for Animals’ Geographies: Cultures, Communication and Genomics’.” *Cultural Geographies* 22 (2): 285–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474014525114>.

Hollin, Gregory JS, and Eva Haifa Giraud. 2022. “Estranged Companions: Bed Bugs, Biologies, and Affective Histories.” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 40 (1): 80–98. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02637758211050936>.

Holmberg, Tora. 2014. ““Sensuous Governance: Assessing Urban Animal Hoarding.” *Housing, Theory and Society* 31 (4): 464–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2014.928650>.

hooks, bell. 2015. *Yearning : Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Horowitz, Alexandra. 2019. “Opinion | Dogs Are Not Here for Our Convenience.” *The New York Times*, 3 September 2019, sec. Opinion. <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/09/03/opinion/dogs-spaying-neutering.html>

Hovorka, Alice. 2008. “Transspecies Urban Theory: Chickens in an African City.” *Cultural Geographies* 15 (1): 95–117. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474007085784>.

- Hovorka, Alice. 2017. "Animal Geographies I: Globalising and Decolonising." *Progress in Human Geography* 41 (3): 308–318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132516646291>.
- Hovorka, Alice, Sandra McCubbin, and Lauren Van Patter. 2021. "Introduction to A Research Agenda for Animal Geographies: Visioning Amidst Socio-Ecological Crises." In *A Research Agenda for Animal Geographies*, 1–20. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Howell, Philip. 2002. "A Place for the Animal Dead: Pets, Pet Cemeteries and Animal Ethics in Late Victorian Britain." *Ethics, Place & Environment* 5 (1): 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668790220146401>.
- Hribal, Jason. 2003. "'Animals Are Part of the Working Class': A Challenge to Labor History." *Labor History* 44 (4): 435–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0023656032000170069>.
- Hubbard, Phil, and Andrew Brooks. 2021. "Animals and Urban Gentrification: Displacement and Injustice in the Trans-Species City." *Progress in Human Geography* 45 (6): 1490–511. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132520986221>.
- Hughes, Everett C. 1962. "Good People and Dirty Work." *Social Problems* 10 (1): 3–11. <https://doi.org/10.2307/799402>.
- Irvine, Leslie. 2004. "Pampered or Enslaved? The Moral Dilemmas of Pets." *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 24 (9): 5–17. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443330410790740>.
- Irvine, Leslie. 2013a. "Animals as Lifechangers and Lifesavers: Pets in the Redemption Narratives of Homeless People." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 42 (1): 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241612456550>.
- Irvine, Leslie. 2013b. *My Dog Always Eats First: Homeless People and Their Animals*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781626370883>.
- Irvine, Leslie, and Laurent Cilia. 2017. "More-than-Human Families: Pets, People, and Practices in Multispecies Households." *Sociology Compass* 11 (2): e12455. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12455>.
- Johnston, Lynda, and Gill Valentine. 1995. "Wherever I Lay My Girlfriend, That's My Home: The Performance and Surveillance of Lesbian Identities in Domestic Environments". In *Mapping Desire: Geographies of Sexualities*, edited by David Bell, and Gill Valentine, 88–103. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Kaika, Maria. 2004. "Interrogating the Geographies of the Familiar: Domesticating Nature and Constructing the Autonomy of the Modern Home." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28 (2): 265–86. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0309-1317.2004.00519.x>.
- Kane, Megan. 2023. "The Violent Uncanny: Exploring the Material Politics of Austerity." *Political Geography* 102 (April): 102843. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2023.102843>.
- Kraus, Carolyn (2013) *Metamorphosis in Detroit*. In *Trash Animals: How We Live with Nature's Filthy, Feral, Invasive, and Unwanted Species*, edited by Kelsi Nagy, and Phillip David Johnson II, 201–13. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Labrecque, Jennifer, and Christine A. Walsh. 2011. "Homeless Women's Voices on Incorporating Companion Animals into Shelter Services." *Anthrozoös* 24 (1): 79–95. <https://doi.org/10.2752/175303711X12923300467447>.

- Lewis, Sophie. 2022. *Abolish the Family: A Manifesto for Care and Liberation*. London: Verso Books.
- Longhurst, Robyn. 2006. "Plots, Plants and Paradoxes: Contemporary Domestic Gardens in Aotearoa/New Zealand." *Social & Cultural Geography* 7 (4): 581–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649360600825729>.
- Lorimer, Jamie. 2015. *Wildlife in the Anthropocene: Conservation after Nature*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lorimer, Jamie, Timothy Hodgetts, Richard Grenyer, Beth Greenhough, Carmen McLeod, and Andrew Dwyer. 2019. "Making the Microbiome Public: Participatory Experiments with DNA Sequencing in Domestic Kitchens." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 44 (3): 524–41. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12289>.
- Lynch, Heather. 2019. "Esposito's Affirmative Biopolitics in Multispecies Homes." *European Journal of Social Theory* 22 (3): 364–81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431018804156>.
- Madigan, Ruth, Moria Munro, and Susan J. Smith. 1990. "Gender and the Meaning of the Home." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 14 (4): 635–47. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.1990.tb00160.x>.
- Massey, Doreen. 2018. "A Place Called Home? (1992)." In *The Doreen Massey Reader*, edited by Brett Christophers, Rebecca Lave, Jamie Peck, et al. 159–74. Newcastle, UK: Agenda Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv5cg7pq.16>.
- McKeithen, Will. 2017. "Queer Ecologies of Home: Heteronormativity, Speciesism, and the Strange Intimacies of Crazy Cat Ladies." *Gender, Place & Culture* 24 (1): 122–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2016.1276888>.
- McKiernan, Shaun, and Lesley Instone. 2016. "From Pest to Partner: Rethinking the Australian White Ibis in the More-than-Human City." *Cultural Geographies* 23 (3): 475–94. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474015609159>.
- Morrison, Carey-Ann. 2012. "Heterosexuality and Home: Intimacies of Space and Spaces of Touch." *Emotion, Space and Society* 5 (1): 10–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2010.09.001>.
- Nast, Heidi J. 2005. "Book Review: The Companion Species Manifesto: Dogs, People, and Significant Otherness." *Cultural Geographies* 12 (1): 118–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/147447400501200113>.
- Nast, Heidi J. 2006a. "Critical Pet Studies?" *Antipode* 38 (5): 894–906. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2006.00484.x>.
- Nast, Heidi J. 2006b. "Loving.... Whatever: Alienation, Neoliberalism and Pet-Love in the Twenty-First Century." *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies* 5 (2): 300–27. <https://doi.org/10.14288/acme.v5i2.761>.
- Nowicki, Mel. 2014. "Rethinking Domicide: Towards an Expanded Critical Geography of Home." *Geography Compass* 8 (11): 785–95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12178>.
- Ong, Aihwa. 1999. *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Oswin, Natalie. 2010. "The Modern Model Family at Home in Singapore: A Queer Geography." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 35 (2): 256–68. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2009.00379.x>.

Owens, Marcus, and Jennifer Wolch. 2014. "Lively Cities: People, Animals, and Urban Ecosystems." In *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Studies*, edited by Linda Kalof, 542–70. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ozaki, Ritsuko, and John Rees Lewis. 2006. "Boundaries and the Meaning of Social Space: A Study of Japanese House Plans." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 24 (1): 91–104. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d62j>.

Philo, Chris, and Chris Wilbert. 2000. *Animal Spaces, Beastly Places: New Geographies of Human-Animal Relations*. London: Routledge.

Porcher, Jocelyne. 2017. *The Ethics of Animal Labor: A Collaborative Utopia*. Cham: Springer.

Power, Emma R. 2007. "Pests and Home-Making: Depictions of Pests in Homemaker Magazines." *Home Cultures* 4 (3): 213–36. <https://doi.org/10.2752/174063107X247233>.

Power, Emma R. 2008. "Furry Families: Making a Human–Dog Family Through Home." *Social & Cultural Geography* 9 (5): 535–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649360802217790>.

Power, Emma R. 2009a. "Border-Processes and Homemaking: Encounters with Possums in Suburban Australian Homes." *Cultural Geographies* 16 (1): 29–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474008097979>.

Power, Emma R. 2009b. "Domestic Temporalities: Nature Times in the House-as-Home." *Geoforum* 40 (6): 1024–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2009.07.005>.

Power, Emma R. 2017. "Renting with Pets: A Pathway to Housing Insecurity?" *Housing Studies* 32 (3): 336–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2016.1210095>.

Raffles, Hugh. 2011. *Insectopedia*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Reis-Castro, Luísa. 2021. "Becoming without: Making Transgenic Mosquitoes and Disease Control in Brazil." *Environmental Humanities* 13 (2): 323–47. <https://doi.org/10.1215/22011919-9320178>.

Robbins, Paul. 2012. *Lawn People: How Grasses, Weeds, and Chemicals Make Us Who We Are*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Rose, Daniel, Courtney McMillian, and Onneya Carter. 2023. "Pet-Friendly Rental Housing: Racial and Spatial Inequalities." *Space and Culture* 26 (1): 116–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1206331220956539>.

Rose, Deborah Bird, and Thom Van Dooren. 2011. "Introduction: Unloved Others: Death of the Disregarded in the Time of Extinctions." *Australian Humanities Review* 50 (Special Issue): 1–4. <http://doi.org/10.22459/AHR.50.2011>.

Rose, Gillian. 1993. *Feminism & Geography: The Limits of Geographical Knowledge*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Rose, Gillian. 2003. "Family Photographs and Domestic Spacings: A Case Study." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 28 (1): 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-5661.00074>.

Sanders, Clinton R. 1993. "'Understanding Dogs: Caretakers' Attributions of Mindedness in Canine- Human Relationships'." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 22 (2): 205–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124193022002003>.

- Searle, Adam, Jonathon Turnbull, and Jamie Lorimer. 2021. "After the Anthropause: Lockdown Lessons for More-than-Human Geographies." *The Geographical Journal* 187 (1): 69–77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12373>.
- Seymour, Nicole. 2022. "The Greenhouse in the Bathhouse: Ecosexuality and the Legacy of Libertine Botany." *L'Esprit Créateur* 62 (4): 160–75. <https://doi.org/10.1353/esp.2022.0050>.
- Shillington, Laura. 2008. "Being(s) in Relation at Home: Socio-Natures of Patio "Gardens" in Managua, Nicaragua." *Social & Cultural Geography* 9 (7): 755–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649360802382560>.
- Shingne, Marie Carmen. 2021. "'The More-Than-Human Right to the City: A Multispecies Reevaluation'." In *Animals in the City*, edited by Laura A. Reese. 30–55. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Shir-Vertesh, Dafna. 2012. "'Flexible Personhood': Loving Animals as Family Members in Israel." *American Anthropologist* 114 (3): 420–32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1433.2012.01443.x>.
- Sibley, David. 1995. "Geographies of Exclusion: Society and Difference in the West." London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203430545>.
- Smith, Julie Ann. 2003. "Beyond Dominance and Affection: Living with Rabbits in Post-Humanist Households." *Society & Animals* 11 (2): 181–97. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853003769233379>.
- Somerville, Peter. 1992. "'Homelessness and the Meaning of Home: Rooflessness or Rootlessness?'" *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 16 (4): 529–39. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.1992.tb00194.x>.
- Swanson, Heather Anne, Marianne Elisabeth Lien, and Gro B. Ween. 2018. *Domestication Gone Wild: Politics and Practices of Multispecies Relations*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Tan, Chris KK, Tingting Liu, and Xiaojun Gao. 2021. "Becoming "Pet Slaves" in Urban China: Transspecies Urban Theory, Single Professional Women and Their Companion Animals." *Urban Studies* 58 (16): 3371–87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098021991721>.
- Tipper, Becky. 2011. "'A Dog Who I Know Quite Well': Everyday Relationships between Children and Animals." *Children's Geographies* 9 (2): 145–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2011.562378>.
- Toohey, Ann M, and Melanie J Rock. 2019. "'Disruptive Solidarity or Solidarity Disrupted? A Dialogical Narrative Analysis of Economically Vulnerable Older Adults' Efforts to Age in Place with Pets'." *Public Health Ethics* 12 (1): 15–29. <https://doi.org/10.1093/phe/phy009>.
- Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt, Andrew S. Mathews, and Nils Bubandt. 2019. "Patchy Anthropocene: Landscape Structure, Multispecies History, and the Retooling of Anthropology: An Introduction to Supplement 20." *Current Anthropology* 60 (S20): S186–97. <https://doi.org/10.1086/703391>.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu (2003) *Dominance and Affection: The Making of Pets*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu. 2004. "Home." In *Patterned Ground: Entanglements of Nature and Culture*, edited by Stephan Harrison, Steve Pile, and N. J. Thrift, 164–165. London: Reaktion Books.

Wadiwel, Dinesh. 2018. "Chicken Harvesting Machine: Animal Labor, Resistance, and the Time of Production." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 117 (3): 527–49. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00382876-6942135>.

Waite, Gordon, and Fatemeh (Samira) Nowroozpour. 2020. "Embodied Geographies of Domesticated Water: Transcorporeality, Translocality and Moral Terrains." *Social & Cultural Geography* 21 (9): 1268–86. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2018.1550582>.

Wakefield-Rann, Rachael. 2021. *Life Indoors: How Our Homes Are Shaping Our Bodies and Our Planet*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Welden, E. A. 2023. "Conceptualising Multispecies Collaboration: Work, Animal Labour, and Nature-Based Solutions." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 48: 541–55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12593>.

Wilkinson, Eleanor. 2014. "'Single People's Geographies of Home: Intimacy and Friendship beyond 'the Family'.'" *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 46 (10): 2452–68. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a130069p>.

Wilkinson, Eleanor. 2020. "'Never After? Queer Temporalities and the Politics of Non-Reproduction.'" *Gender, Place & Culture* 27 (5): 660–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2019.1598941>.

Wollaston, Sam. 2021. "Rescue Me: Why Britain's Beautiful Lockdown Pets Are Being Abandoned." *The Guardian*, 1 December 2021, sec. Life and style. <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2021/dec/01/rescue-me-why-britains-beautiful-lockdown-pets-are-being-abandoned>.