Manchester Metropolitan University

e-space

Manchester Metropolitan University's Research Repository

Please cite the Published Version

Stevenson, AD and Holloway, J (2017) "Getting Participants' Voices Heard: using mobile, participant led, sound-based methods to explore place making". Area, 49 (1). pp. 85-93. ISSN 0004-0894

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12296

Publisher: Wiley/Royal Geographical Society (with the Institute of British Geographers).

Version: Accepted Version

Downloaded from: https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/617188/

Usage rights: © In Copyright

Additional Information: This is the author accepted manuscript of a paper published in Area, published by Wiley and copyright Royal Geographical Society (with the Institute of British Geographers).

Enquiries:
If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines)

Getting Participants' Voices Heard: Using mobile, participant led, sound-based methods to explore place making

Journal:	*Area*
Manuscript ID	AREA-RP-Oct-2015-0104.R2
Manuscript Type:	Regular Paper
Keywords:	Soundwalk, participatory, collaboration, dissemination, multisensory, Soundscape Composition
Abstract:	Varieties of sound-based research methods have been used for exploring participants' relations with environment, space and place. For example, soundwalking, field recording and audio guides have all been employed to help research participants become attuned to the sonic environment. Some of these have been used as participant-led approaches, enabling participants to devise walking routes and produce their own soundscape compositions. This paper explores these various uses and reports on two primary research collaborations that adopt mobile, participant-led approaches, in which participants negotiate the precise nature of the research collaboration. Furthermore, it examines diverse methods for disseminating soundscape recordings that emerge from such projects. The examples presented here reveal that sound-based research can be employed to do more than attune participants to sonic environments. This research highlights instances of productive, participant led research that reveal diverse strategies for disseminating this work. There are many channels and media through which sound work can be made available to a wider audience, across disciplines and beyond academia. Reflexively adopted, dissemination through web and social media, exhibition spaces and other public events offer researchers and their participants a performative complement to the publication of work via journal articles.

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Getting Participants' Voices Heard: Using mobile, participant led, sound-based methods to explore place making

Introductory vignette: *Groaning buses*

Whilst researching the acquisition of meaningful attachments to a newly encountered city, Alba (who is blind and from Barcelona) and Tori (her Labrador guide dog) led the researcher along their favourite walking route, Oxford Road, Manchester, England, one of Europe's busiest (and loudest) bus-routes.

> *Sound: GROANING BUSES.*
>
> Researcher: *"So you actually prefer it when there's more traffic because you can hear?"*
>
> Alba: *"Yeah, in open spaces you need those references. It's really more confusing in open space."*

Introduction: sight and sound

This paper deals with sonic approach to place making, and as such relates to how sound is part of the way in which place is brought into being, performed and known through both representational meaning-making practices and more multi-sensory processes and formations (Cresswell, 2004). As such, and as our brief introductory vignette shows, sound can play a central orienting role as we navigate, make sense of and experience space: in this paper the sonic and the aural will take precedence in the production of space and place. Indeed, the development of the field of sonic geographies and sound studies emphasises the aural alongside the visual (Drever 2002; Ingold 2000; Labelle 2010; Pink 2009; Anderson *et al.* 2005; Gallagher 2015; Kanngieser 2012; Rose 1993; Simpson 2009; Smith 1997, 2000). Back (2007: 22) argues, "listening is needed today in order to admit the excluded, the 'looked past', to allow the 'out of place' a sense of belonging." Furthermore, Carpenter & McLuhan (1960) point out that acoustic space, when compared with space that is considered from a visual perspective, eschews points of focus, fixed

For Peer Review

boundaries of delineation or containment. It is difficult to talk of a 'point of ear' in the same way we might think of a 'point of view': as Carlyle (2013:15) has it "rather than the discernible scene revealed in optical perspective, the sheer dynamism of sound somehow eludes such capture." Space is neither boxed in nor partitioned by this leaky thing called sound as it is by the pictorial, visual sense (Labelle 2010).

Meaningful environments are constructed from our sensory engagements with them, which includes listening. The relationship between sound and meaning are closely intertwined (Drever 2002). Sound is "part of people's way of navigating in time, space and in the social world…" (Garrioch 2003:6). Attending to sonic environments and making recordings are technologically mediated place-making activities that generate sound-based, emplaced meaning, or acoustemologies (Drever 2002).

Several researchers have sought to develop methods to examine "exchanges between environments and the people within them as registered through aural experience" (Labelle 2010:4). Beyond interviews mobile, sound-based methods enable an understanding of place making, we argue here. As part of this exploration of the innovative uses of sound for investigating place making, what Gallagher (2015) calls 'audio geographies', we present two specific examples of primary research in this paper. These two examples of primary research are presented to demonstrate how place making can emerge through sonic engagement with environments. We present them here to illustrate the production of emplaced meaning and understanding through listening, yielding what Drever (2002) has termed acoustemologies of place; emplaced knowledge arising through the ears. Arguably, acoustemologies of place have qualities that differ from those that are acquired through other senses like vision. They are likely to be more immersive (as we are engulfed in sound), and less objectifying (as sight tends towards a more a more distanced perspective; see Ingold, 2000). However, before we explore such questions in relation to our primary research, it is to an introductory review of varieties of mobile, sound-based methods for researching space and place that we turn.

For Peer Review

Mobile, sound-based explorations of place

Our review begins in the 1960s with the World Soundscape Project (Schafer 1994), wherein soundscapes from Canada and Europe were recorded and catalogued. This project fed into debates about the preservation of disappearing sounds, noise abatement and pollution (Adams 2009). Later, Fontana (1984) played 16 soundscapes of various Parisian sites from a platform above the Arc de Triomphe, asking passers-by to reconsider the sound contexts they normally encounter by re-placing them with unexpected ones. Other early projects included sound-based artistic interventions, wherein experiments directed attention to sounds that might otherwise have gone unheard. Sound artist Max Neuhaus stamped the hands of his collaborators with the word *'LISTEN!'* before walking them around his selection of sights/sites/sounds in Manhattan, New York (Neuhaus 1990), encouraging them to acoustically attend to city spaces. Other methods for enhancing audition include audio walking tours. Offering a guided tour of Brick Lane, London, Janet Cardiff played participants a narration through headphones, highlighting mobile, embodied, multisensory engagement (Schaud 2005). Ambulation complements audio walks (Butler 2006; Butler and Miller 2005; Butler 2007). The walker treads the narrator's footsteps and attunes to sonic elements of landscape that have hitherto gone unnoticed. One participant reflects: "Walking up a quiet lane I had failed to notice the bell tower of a nearby church on the horizon, until the recorded sound of the bell suddenly alerted me to it" (Butler 2007: 8).

Research into the apprehension of sonic environments should emphasise the differentiated nature of sonic experience itself. Participants have related experiences through diverse sensory configurations, sometimes sightlessly, from a wheelchair, even soundlessly (Thomas, 2005). Variations on sound-based research have extended the sampled age demographic. McCartney (2014) led a group of nine year-old German children along a street and riverside walk, with one child revealing surprise at how much noise one makes whilst walking. Sonic experiences of older participants have been explored in relation to reconstructing distant memories (Schine 2010).

For Peer Review

The primary research presented in this paper includes contributions from participants whose experience of urban listening offer differing degrees of sensory ability, preference and technological skill.

The above sound-based explorations cast participants as mobile agents, listening as they go. The term 'soundwalking' has been coined to refer to some of these mobile explorations (Adams 2009). Soundwalking has been defined as "A methodology for engaging city users in research investigating people's relationship with soundscapes and the built environment" (Adams 2009: 6). Some examples already reviewed here fall under these definitions. It is to a more participant-led mobile sound based research that we now turn.

Sound-based research as participant-led practice

As a practice combining "orientation, dialogue and composition" (McCartney 2002: 4), mobile, sound-based research can be regarded as a creative act with the potential for heightening the agency of participants (Westerkamp 1994), leaving field recordings and soundscape compositions in its wake (Paquette and McCartney 2012; Gallagher 2015). However, such work has often been organised with the researcher, sound artist or walk leader as guide; participants playing the role of 'the guided' (Paquette and McCartney 2012). Routes are often pre-planned, albeit with the aim of promoting sonic engagement (McCartney 2014), establishing a potentially asymmetric power relationship between researchers, artists, audio guides on the one hand, and participants on the other. It is the researcher who is at the helm, and whilst the aim is to "increase the sonic awareness of participants, [it] runs the risk of predetermining their supposed limited sonic knowledge and competence" (Paquette and McCartney, 2012: 138). A 'follow-the-leader' approach emerges, which, whilst inherently valuable, can be modified to 'turn up the volume' of participants' voices.

The problematic researcher-participant power relation in the 'follow-the-leader' model leaves the participant with little agency. "The impossibility for them to influence or modify the course of the soundwalk, or simply to comment "live" on their experience, may cause the walk to be

For Peer Review

perceived as outside the control of participants" (Paquette and McCartney 2012 139). Yet this dynamic can be reframed. We suggest a move towards participants creating the sound in sound-based research, rather than merely attending to it.

Gallagher (2015) recognised this move when creating sound work using research participants' contributions, interview fragments, field recordings and participant-led routes, yielding a sound portrait ('audio drift') of a Scottish landscape. The work stitches together a plurality of stories (Anderson and Moles 2008), forming a coherent, downloadable whole. In work such as that of Gallagher (2015), McCartney (2014) and Thomas (2005), as in that presented here, relationships between guides and guided can become mutual, reciprocal and shared (Macpherson 2011).

Another example of symmetric sound-based research is the 'commented walk' model (Thibaud 2001), an on-the-go interview (Clark and Emmel 2009) where the researcher accompanies a participant on a walking route with the latter taking the lead in describing and recording the landscape. Similarly, in the 'shadow-walk' method (Corringham 2015), after being guided along meaningful routes by a participant, the researcher re-walks the routes alone and develops remixed recordings or performances of place. Here, not only are participants' voices amplified, but the researcher becomes reflexively re-attuned and can further resonate with the place-making performances of the sounds, spaces and environments they walk.

One sound project, *Soundwalking Interactions,* overtly explores the creative role of participants (Paquette and McCartney 2012). Here, sound based walking routes are negotiated (between researchers and participants) and recorded usually by researchers. Negotiated, post walk editing of recordings are uploaded to a blog for the project. This collaborative process yields sound recordings that are produced through joint action (Shotter 2008).

Collaborative, participant-led approaches to mobile, sound based research see researchers hand over agency to participants. For example, Adams *et al.* (2008) engaged city centre residents in research into sustainability in urban space in an attempt to capture their perceptions of the experience of the 24-hour city. Residents of three cities were asked to identify ten-minute walks,

For Peer Review

which they proceeded to walk in silence, un-distracted by conversation, listening out for particular characteristics of the urban experience. Post-walk interviews were conducted, drawing on reflections from the walk. The importance of mutuality, and of routes that are devised by participants, was key here. The same author has used a form of soundwalking to explore the place-making potential of sound. Adams and Bruce (2008) accompanied participants (practitioners in urban design and planning) along pre-determined routes and asked them to tune in to the acoustic urban environment. Walking and listening together, researchers and participants built overlapping place-based knowledge, sharing experiences and adding new layers of knowledge en route.

As we have seen from these examples, participant-led mobile, sound-based research can be used to explore the development of sound based emplaced meaning. These examples raise the profile of participants, increasing their role in the negotiation of walking routes and sound recording in research. The primary research presented in this paper acknowledges the participatory contribution of such projects (Gershon 2013), and supplements it with the production of participant-researcher sound works that reflect more individualised acoustemologies and personalised audio geographies, using negotiated, participant-led, mobile, sound-based methods. In each case, arguably more so than in many previous research projects, the nature of the research emerges from exploring participants' sensory preferences and skills. Furthermore, each example yields a sound work (a soundscape composition with accompanying film, a field recording with accompanying text) that reflects individually crafted engagements with place. Collaboration 1 uses an on-the-go interview method as the basis for the subsequent making of a soundscape composition[1]. Collaboration 2 uses a preliminary qualitative interview as a prelude to a participant-led field recording, with accompanying narrative.

Collaboration 1: Alba and Tori

Alba (from Barcelona) and her guide dog led the lead researcher on a mile long walk that took in the University of Manchester and the famous Curry Mile (a concentration of South Asian

For Peer Review

eateries). Our walking interview (Jones *et al.* 2008) helped us to explore how Alba and Tori's emplaced knowledge was acquired through repetitive embodied and multisensory experience. Furthermore, this collaboration enabled a rediscovery of a seemingly well-known place to the researcher (a long-time resident of Manchester), through the sensory engagement of listening. A participatory mobile, sound-based approach had the capacity to re-orientate the researcher's own audio-geography, revealing further potential inherent to this methodology: familiar places, paths and spaces became recast and re-sensed through the sensory preferences of the participant and their participatory role in the research design's construction. Here, through allowing the collaboration to be organised through the individual skills and capacities of the respondent, new and reflexive ways were opened out for the researcher to apprehend their own urban geography. As the research already knew with this walking route, he was now led through familiar territory by someone with different sensory priorities, which, as shall be discussed later, facilitated an experiencing of a re-prioritisation of the senses.

Alba and Tori met at a training centre for guide dogs in Michigan, U.S. They have lived together in Spain, India and now in Manchester. They are what Michalko (1999), following his experiences with his guide dog Smokie, calls a 'two-in-one'; a working relationship based on leading and following, responding to each other's needs.

Our collaboration proceeded in three phases. The first was the walking interview (Jones *et al.* 2008) along a habitual, participant-led route. Walking as a three ushered in a reprioritization of the senses, reminding the researcher that the primacy of the visual is not a given (Howes 2005). Sound occupied primacy in the sensory hierarchy. What follows here is a description of the walk made with Alba and Tori, with reference to notable sounds (and quotes) en route.

> *Sound: GROANING BUSES. We set out from the University International Society café, a favourite stop-off for Alba and Tori. As we walked we were dependent on sound, smell and proprioception for navigation and sense making.*

For Peer Review

Outside Alba's former hall of residence (her old flat from a couple of years back), I was directed to the sound screeching and squealing.

Sound: CREAKING GATE. Alba: "They haven't oiled it properly, and boom, same thing people with the keys, same noise. It's funny how those sounds stay the same."

Sound: CREAKING DOORS. Inside the hall, I was directed to the sound of our feet. Sound: NOISY FOOTSTEPS ON WOODEN FLOORS. Alba: "I love the stairs in England because they're so noisy. I love to make as much noise as possible, especially going downstairs. I love this noise, ever since I was a little girl. In Spain we don't have this because it's really warm, so we have tiles". Sound: STAMPS ON THE WOODEN FLOOR.

Sound: TRAFFIC AT THE PEDESTRIAN CROSSING. Once we have crossed the road and moved into Rusholme I am directed to changes in the sensory landscape; the so-called Curry Mile, famous for its plethora of Indian and Pakistani restaurants. Alba: "This is Rusholme. We've crossed the border." Researcher: "What's so different about it?" Alba: "It's the smell, though not so much, but it's like much more busy, the smell is different, the people, the language they speak, is different. A lot of music, a lot of colours, I guess."

Sound: INDIAN MUSIC FROM A SUPERMARKET. Alba: "They have fruits and everything. I go in there because they have the most strange veggies ever. They have lychees. I used to come here and just listen to the music. It smells different from any supermarket. And they have these massive bags with spices. I love this place. And I used to come and just listen to the music when I was sad."

Our walk concluded as we left the supermarket and we went our separate ways.

For Peer Review

Phase two of our collaboration involved re-recording and editing. A few days after the walk the researcher returned to the walking route and retraced the steps of the interview, this time with a condenser microphone[2] to record the sounds that Alba had emphasised during the walk. Recording after the event, with the transcript of the interview as a guide, allowed for the maximizing of the quality of the recordings without conducting an interview, recalling the 'shadow-walk' method (Corringham 2015). However, whilst Corringham's shadow walks involved returning to the walking route and responding through vocal performances by Corrigham, the present application sought to record the key environmental sounds that were originally encountered during the walk.

Recordings were edited into a soundscape composition for broader dissemination. Using professional standard editing software, the key sounds along the walk were brought together as a three-minute recording, featuring sounds that were referred to, shared, and commented on by Alba during the walk. The recording was shared with and approved by Alba during the process of editing. This participant-led walking interview and post-editing consultation resonates and further develops previous collaborative methods (Paquette and McCartney 2012; Corringham 2015). However, whereas Pacquette and McCartney invited participants to take part in (largely group) soundwalks, in the present collaboration the emphasis on sound arose from the participant's suggestion, largely due to Alba's sensory preferences. Furthermore, this mode of mobile, sound-based method aligns well with the move toward participatory geographies developed in human geography (Askins and Pain 2011; Pain 2004; Pain and Francis 2003; Vélez-Torres 2013). Therefore, the research sought to "destabilise traditional barriers between 'expert researchers' and 'researched communities' to enable spaces for collaboration, negotiation and the co-construction of knowledge" (Wynne-Jones *et al.* 2015: 218). Given Alba's skills, preferences and suggestions, the research sought to be collaborative and participatory in its design and implementation, and hence was "an attempt to break down the unequal power relations between researcher and researched, by bringing 'research participants' into the process of designing research, collecting data and drawing conclusions" (Nayak and Jeffrey 2011: 144).

For Peer Review

A textual narrative was added to the piece, derived from Alba's interview quotes. Phase three of the research project involved dissemination of the work to a broader audience using an online platform[3], which we will return to.

Collaboration 2: Febi

Febi was studying Acoustics at the University of Salford, Manchester (UK), and had recently arrived from Banding, Indonesia, keen to tell the story of her arrival through the medium of sound. Febi is a skilled acoustician with a sensory preference for sound, rather than visual methods, as she explains: "I am trying to look at the ear side of Manchester, rather than through photographs." Febi produced a series of field recordings to reflect her place making experience. By drawing on her technical skills as an acoustician she sought to reflect her relationship with the city through sound-based knowledge (Drever 2002).

The collaboration with Febi also involved three phases. It began with a preliminary interview (at the University of Salford) during which Febi communicated her idea for producing a series of field recordings to reflect her engagement with Manchester. The sites for these recordings were chosen because they evoked, for Febi, the sounds of Bandung, Indonesia, her place of origin. The second phase involved Febi recording and narrating the environment and spaces that she engaged with; three sites from Manchester and neighbouring Salford. Preferring to visit them alone, rather than with a researcher, Febi walked alone to the sites where she made her recordings. She subsequently wrote accompanying textual narratives. What follows are excerpts from Febi's textual reflections of her three selected sites, along with reference to the most notable sounds from her recordings[4]:

> **At Peel Park, Salford.** *Sound: BIRDSONG AND BREEZE. The park is pretty much representing my daily life in Manchester – simple, quiet, sometimes unexpected, and yet pretty intense.*

For Peer Review

Like the sound mixture in Peel Park in spring: the sound of natural wind, birds singing, footsteps, people chattering, and just a bit of passing automobile engines.

At Salford Quays waterfront. *Sound: FLOWING WATER AND OCCASIONAL TRAMS. Salford Quays is special not because I pass it in my everyday walk but rather because of my own intentional doings. Its highly calming sound of flowing river always brings me inner peace and clearness of mind – this is my favorite place for thinking, reflecting, and even dreaming/planning on something new. The soundscape consists of rather monotonic sources: flowing river, birds singing, and a slight hint of tram engines.*

The two examples of primary research presented here illustrate the participant-led potential of mobile, sound-based research, in relation to route choices, the making of field recording and soundscape compositions. Both participants drove the precise nature of the method that was employed. For Alba, a soundscape composition emerged from a walking interview. For Febi, field recordings and their accompanying narratives emerged from a solitary mobile recording session, following a qualitative interview. These differing approaches demonstrate the potential of participant led research as a negotiated practice, modelled on the sensory preferences and skills of participants: Alba, being blind, habitually and skilfully listens as she goes. Febi is a skilled sound recorder. Furthermore, these reciprocally designed audio-geographies had and have the potential to re-order the researcher's own sonic apprehension of seemingly familiar space, underlining their utility further. For example, it may be useful for a researcher to experience such a reordering for three reasons. First, on a personal level, by engaging with place making practices that utilise the primacy of a sense that the researcher may not be accustomed to prioritising, she or he draws closer to the mundane, overlapping practice of the ethnographic subject on their terms (Pink, 2010). Second, on a critical level, this reordering (from vision, towards sound) enables the researcher to counteract the prevailing historical trend towards the ocular in ethnographic fieldwork (Sutton, 2010). Third, in terms of designing future research, awareness of such a reordering of sensory priorities may allow the researcher to plan and carry out research

For Peer Review

designs with future participants that incorporate more sensory strategies which take other place making practices alongside or beyond more observational or visual encounters.

Disseminating voices

For researchers publishing in academic journals, participants' voices are traditionally heard through interview transcripts, with authorial commentaries. Adams (2009: 8) alludes to the potential for disseminating sound based research findings through channels other than the textual:

> "Whilst the researchers listen again to the in-situ recordings, it is ultimately the transcript, the written word, which is being worked with. This raises many questions about how we use aural approaches and what can be gained from them."

Journal publications spread the word about method and underlying theory, but arguably miss something of the texture of the sounds produced. The challenge of amplifying participants' voices can be addressed using alternate media and methods. There have been diverse means for disseminating research participants' voices in scholarly work. Voices have been liberated from the page using theatre, dramatization, film, audio files and hyperlinks (Keen & Todres 2007; Markle *et al.* 2011). One notable innovation used audio recordings from a four-year ethnography on songwriting as means for overcoming gender and race inequalities in science education in urban schools (Gershon 2013). At the Akron Art Museum in Ohio, Gershon used four pairs of speakers, one for each of the four classrooms recorded, in order to convey the voices and sounds recorded, disseminating participants' recordings in an immersive, political and affective manner:

> "Museum-goers experienced these sounds of classrooms, bringing interactions from the school to the broader community... this sound/installation can be understood as a means

For Peer Review

> for an audience to come to "be" with and know [sound] research, a vibrational affect that effected emerging conceptualizations of city kids' understanding of science" (Gershon 2013: 260).

Another alternative dissemination strategy is Butler's (2007) use of audio trails along the banks of London's River Thames. Combining go-along interviews and field recordings, these recordings documented lives of locals who worked and lived along the river and were packaged as CDs and MP3 downloads. One user remarked how "Creating these connections, or links to place, seems to have had led to a feeling of closeness, or rootedness" (Butler 2007: 14). The sense of physicality of sensation of walking was remarked upon as a quality of these recorded audio trails, since they, "helped people to imagine the episodes in the past that were described and feel that they were physically participating in the experience" (Butler 2007: 14).

Butler's memory-scape walks have been disseminated to listeners and walkers beyond academia. The recordings have been enjoyed by groups of partially sighted walkers during Thames riverbank walks (Butler 2007). Other examples of broad dissemination from sound based projects include the global *Cities and Memory* project (2015), wherein over 150 sound artists and contributors worldwide are recording and remixing field recordings from their chosen sites, to produce an evolving international sound map. [5]

Used collaboratively, these methods of dissemination take us beyond expert-led discourses and place the voice and ear of research participants to the fore: as Butler (2007: 15) states "there is also tremendous potential for participative work with student and community groups to co-author complex, multi-vocal experiences that can quite literally give people a voice." Techniques such as these facilitate 'active archives' of place (Lorimer 2003), using a variety of sound based methods, with choices about walking routes and recordings devolved. In pursuing our aim of using negotiated, participatory methods for amplifying participants' voices, the final phase of our empirical work therefore involved dissemination. In the case of Alba and Tori, our resulting soundscape composition (entitled *Walking in Whitworth Park*), with accompanying titles was

For Peer Review

disseminated in collaboration with *Kinokophone* an international sound art collective.[6] *Kinokophone* offers an open call for evocative recordings from around the world, which are showcased at a biannual, public event ('Kinokophone Night') in different global locations. *Walking in Whitworth Park* was showcased (following peer review) in September 2014 at Kinokphone Night, The Library of Performing Arts, New York City. Febi's recordings were disseminated through a multimedia exhibition at University College (UCL), London (2013). This annual, public event (*Cities Methodologies*) showcases innovative methodological explorations of urban experience. Febi's recordings were also selected via a peer review[7], with her permission [8]. Here, again, the participatory strategy for reciprocity and mutuality was a guiding force in the research design, its implementation and realisation.

Conclusions: getting participants' voices heard

The collaborations presented here demonstrate the potential of participant-led sound-based research methods for amplifying research participants' voices. Arguably these collaborations complement and extend existing work in several ways.

First, they illustrate participant-led sound-based work as a methodologically negotiated process in relation to participants' sensory preferences and technological skills. Unlike some existing examples of research (Butler 2007; Adams and Bruce 2008; McCartney 2014; Corringham 2015; Gallagher 2015;) these sonic explorations of place arose from participants' sensory preferences and technical aptitudes. Our collaborations used neither standardised soundwalks, nor routine walking interviews, but negotiated methodological permutations derived from a preference for walking, talking and listening (Alba) and an aptitude for solitary recording (Febi).

Second, these collaborations extend current literature by yielding participant-led compositions and field recordings that reflect individually crafted narratives of place, rather than collective works of the sort that have originated from previous, very noteworthy projects (Gershon 2013; Gallagher, 2015). Arguably individualised, participatory, mobile, sound-based methods

For Peer Review

complement more collective projects by allowing the research design to enhance and draw upon individual participants' preferences and abilities that may get lost in collective work. Indeed, this personalised strategy can lead to valuable, unforeseen consequences, such as here when the researcher's own habitualised and familiar sonic geography was recast. For example, during the work conducted with both Febi and with Alba, the researcher noted an awareness of sounds that he habitually missed during lone walks. Sounds were brought into earshot, into sensory awareness, during the fieldwork that were missed before: for example, groaning buses, hollow sounds of footfall wooden floors, culturally diverse chatter and supermarket music. And crucially, this heightened awareness of the sonic landscape is a necessary reminder of the importance of gathering data in the field that works alongside the textual and observational.

Third, these collaborations demonstrate the researcher's role in disseminating participants' sound-works. This researcher as curator model (see Foster and Lorimer 2007; Dwyer and Davies 2010) sees participants encouraged to concentrate on making the work, designing walking routes, selecting sounds for recording, whilst the researcher brings the work to a wider audience. However, still more collaborative, reciprocal, participatory practices would the means, locations, form and extent of dissemination to be mutually constructed and developed.

Participant-led work may be limited by the nature of the participants to whom it might appeal - auditory learners, musicians, those who are blind or partially sighted. That said, this limitation is no more profound than those that apply to research which appeals to visually engaged participants; for example, participatory photography (Pink 2009). Future collaborative projects might see participants and researchers taking more equal roles in both making and disseminating the work.

Sound work challenges and complements the dominance of the visual. Through such work, we come to know "how sound comes to circulate, lend meaning and give shape to social processes" (Labelle 2010: 155). This paper has introduced mobile, sound-based methods that highlight their negotiated potential. As well as listening and walking, the participants featured here are engaged in a productive, negotiated practice from which routes, stories and recordings emerge. There is a

For Peer Review

diversity of channels through which such work can be disseminated, across disciplines and beyond academia. Such platforms are an ideal complement to text, but we must seek further innovative ways of collaborating, creating, curating and getting participant's voices heard.

References

Askins K and Pain R 2011 Contact zones: participation, materiality, and the messiness of interaction *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 29 803–21

Adams M 2009 Hearing the city: reflections on soundwalking. *Qualitative Researcher,* 10, 6-9.

Adams M, Moore G, Cox T, Croxford B, Refaee M, and Sharples, S 2008 Environmental quality, housing and city residents: a sensory urbanism approach. In Maginn P, Thompson S., Tonts M. (Eds.) *Qualitative Housing Analysis: an International Perspective*. Emerald, Bingley 185-208

Adams M and Bruce N 2008 Soundwalking as a methodology for understanding soundscapes *Proceedings of the Institute of Acoustics* 30 552-8

Anderson B, Morton F and Revill G 2005 Practices of music and sound *Social and Cultural Geography* 6 639-644.

Anderson J and Moles K 2008 Walking into Coincident Places *Qualitative Researcher* 9

Back L 2007 *The Art of Listening* Berg, London.

Butler T 2006 A Walk of Art: The potential of the sound walk as practice in cultural geography *Social and Cultural Geography* 7 889-908

Butler T 2007 Memoryscape: How audio walks can deepen our sense of place by integrating art, oral history and cultural geography *Geography Compass* 1 360–372

Butler T and Miller G 2005 Linked: A landmark in sound, a public walk of art *Cultural Geographies* 12 77-88

Carlyle A 2013 Introduction: listening Perspectives in **Carlyle A and Lane C** eds *On Listening* Uniformbooks, Axminster 15-16

Carpenter E and McLuhan M eds 1960 *Explorations in Communication* Beacon Press, Boston

Clark A and Emmel N 2009 Connected lives: methodological challenges for researching networks, neighbourhoods and communities *Qualitative Researcher* 11 9-11

Corringham V 2015 Shadow-walks. www.vivcorringham.org/shadow-walks, Accessed 21/3/16

Cresswell T 2006 *On the move: mobility in the modern western world* Routledge, London

Dicks B and Hurdley R 2009 Using unconventional media to disseminate qualitative research *Qualitative Researcher* 10 2-5

For Peer Review

Drever J 2002 Soundscape composition: the convergence of ethnography and acousmatic music *Organised Sound* 7 21–27

Dwyer C and Davies G 2010 Qualitative methods III: animating archives, artful interventions and online environments *Progress in Human Geography* 34 88–97

Fleming M 2005 A large slow river in Schaud M ed *Janet Cardiff: The walkbook*. Koening, Koln

Foreman I 2010 Vertiginous spaces, phantasmagorical geographies: Soundscape composition after Sebald *Soundscape: The Journal of Acoustic Ecology* 10 7-10

Foster K and Lorimer H 2007 Cultural geographies in practice: some reflections on art-geography as collaboration *Cultural Geographies* 14 425–32

Gallagher M 2015 Sounding ruins: reflections on the production of an 'audio drift'. *Cultural Geographies* 22 467-485

Gallagher M and Prior J 2014 Sonic geographies: exploring phonographic methods *Progress in Human Geography* 38 267-284

Gershon W S 2013 Vibrational affect: sound theory and practice in qualitative research *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 13 257-262

Howes D 2005 *Empire of the senses* Berg, Oxford

Ingold T 2000 *The perception of the environment* Routledge, London

Jones P, Bunce G, Evans J, Gibbs H and Ricketts H. 2008 Exploring space and place with walking interviews. *Journal of Research Practice* 4 Article D2 http://jrp.icaap.org/index.php/jrp/article/view/150/161, Accessed 21/3/16

Kanngieser A 2012 A sonic geography of voice: Towards an affective politics. *Progress in Human Geography* 36 336-353

Keen S and Todres L 2007 Strategies for disseminating qualitative research findings: three exemplars *Forum Qualitative Social Research* 8 http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/285/625 Accessed 21/3/16

Labelle B 2010 *Acoustic territories: sound, culture and everyday life* Continuum, London

Lorimer H 2003 The geographical field course as active archive *Cultural Geographies* 10 278-308

MacPherson H 2011 Guiding visually impaired walking groups: inter-corporeal experience and ethical sensibilities in **Paterson M and Dodge M** eds *Touching place: placing touch* Ashgate, Aldershot.

Markle T, West R and Rich P 2011 Beyond transcription: technology, change, and refinement of method *Forum Qualitative Social Research* 12 www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1564/3249 Accessed 21/3/16

McCartney A 2002 Circumscribed journeys through soundscape composition *Organised Sound* 7 1-3

McCartney, A 2014 Soundwalking: creating moving environmental sound narratives in **Gopinath S and Stanyek J** eds *The Oxford handbook of mobile music studies* Oxford University Press,

For Peer Review

Oxford.

Michalko R 1999 *Two in one: walking with Smokie, walking with blindness* Temple University Press, Philadelphia

Nayak A and Jeffrey A 2011 *Geographical thought: an introduction to ideas in human geography* Routledge, London

Neuhaus M. 1990 *Listen: Elusive Sources and Like Spaces* Persano, Turin

Paquette D and McCartney A 2012 Soundwalking and the bodily exploration of places *Canadian Journal of Communication* 37 135-145

Pain R 2004 Social geography: participatory research *Progress in Human Geography* 28 1-12

Pain R and Francis P 2003 Reflections on participatory research *Area* 35 46-54

Perec G 2010 *An Attempt at Exhausting a Place in Paris.* Wakefield Press, Cambridge, MA

Pinder D 2001 Ghostly footsteps: voice, memories and walks in the city *Ecumene* 8 1-19

Pink S 2009 *Doing Sensory Ethnography* Sage, London
Schafer R 1994 *The Soundscape: our sonic environment and the tuning of the world.* Destiny Books, Rochester

Rivoal I and Salazar N 2013 Contemporary ethnographic practice and the value of serendipity *Social Anthropology* 21 178–185

Rose G 1993 *Feminism & geography: the limits of geographical knowledge* Polity, Cambridge

Schine J 2010 Movement, memory and the senses in soundscape studies, *Sensory Studies,* http://www.sensorystudies.org/sensorial-investigations/movement-memory-the-senses-in-soundscape-studies Accessed 21/3/16

Semidor C 2006 Listening to a city with the soundwalk method *Acta Acustica United With Acustica* 92 959-964

Schaud M ed 2005 *Janet Cardiff: the walkbook*. Koening, Cologne.

Shotter J 2008 *Conversational Realities Revisited* Taos, New York

Simpson P 2009 'Falling on deaf ears': A postphenomenology of sonorous presence *Environment and Planning A* 41 2556-2575

Smith S J 1997 Beyond Geography's visible worlds: a cultural politics of music *Progress in Human Geography* 21 502-529.

Smith S J 2000 Performing the (sound)world *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18 615-637

Sutton D 2010, Food and the senses, *Annual Revue of Anthropology,* 39, 209-223

Thibaud J 2001 La méthodologie des parcours commentés in **Grosjean M and Thibaud J** eds *L'espace urbain en methods* Parenthèses, Marseille 79-100

For Peer Review

Thomas R 2005 *Les trajectoires de l'accessibilité* À la Croisée, Bernin

Vélez-Torres I 2013 Reflections on a participatory documentary process: constructing territorial histories of dispossession among Afro-descendant youth in Colombia *Area* 45 299–306

Weaver A and Atkinson P 1994 *Microcomputing and qualitative data analysis* Avebury, Aldershot

ENDNOTES

[1] The soundscapes presented from the present primary research were unprocessed. The compositional process includes selection, editing and organizing, but no synthetic sounds or effects.
[2] The condenser microphone used for this recording is a lightweight model that is designed for recording with video. This kind of condenser microphone is adept at capturing audio at long range. A diaphragm (which converts mechanical vibrations to sounds) serves as a single plate of a capacitor, and the vibrations produce changes in the distance between the plates.
[3] See https://vimeo.com/130695784
[4] See https://vimeo.com/130695784
[5] See http://citiesandmemory.com. 'Remixing' is defined here as 'a reworking, a processing or an interpretation that imagines that place and time as somewhere else, somewhere new.'
[6] Seehttp://www.kinokophone.com
[7] Seehttp://www.ucl.ac.uk/urbanlab/latest/events/cities-methodologies/#andrew
[8] Seewww.vimeo.com/guardcannotopen

For Peer Review