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Arrival Stories

How do newly arrived international students develop meaningful attachments to and emplaced knowledge of their new city?

Andrew Stevenson
Abstract

Psychological theory has traditionally yielded limited and predominantly cognitivist approaches to place and its perception. This thesis applies non-representational and phenomenological approaches to the study of place and space. It employs participatory sensory ethnography as a method for researching narratives of place-making and creative responses to a new city. Place and space theory portrays places as inseparable from meanings invested in them (Thrift, 2008), seeing cities as collections of stories, rather than as fixed locations. They are made by the performative engagements of those who move through them (Ingold, 2000). In researching place making with a cohort of collaborators that came from 16 internationally diverse new arrivals to Manchester and Salford I have curated a series of participatory collaborations from which diverse stories necessarily emerged. These collaborations are modeled on existing sensory modalities (Pink, 2009), creative and technological habits and preferred mobilities of the collaborators. Initially ascertaining the preferences of each collaborator, participants subsequently took the lead in designing creative responses to their new home city. Collaborations included engagements such as walking interviews, the recording of soundscape compositions, participatory photography and the generation of other artefacts. These works reflect an ethical relationship between researcher and participant wherein creativity emerges from a genuine willingness by all parties to use existing practices to respond to a new setting (Shotter, 2008). They yielded sensuous trails that go beyond mere academic reportage. The accumulation of excavated artefacts, maps, films, photographs and short stories supplement the conventional paraphernalia of academic enquiry. They illustrate joint actions (Shotter, 2008) that reflect genuine ethical collaborations. Using these of these collaborative works, I have constructed a critique of existing psychological theories of space and place, highlighting forms of performatively, corporeally, co-productively, relational and sensory place perception.
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Prelude: *Arrivals stories*

When I landed at Yoahuang the catholic mission there showed me much kindness. I waited for nine days on the riverbank for the carriers I had been promised. Next day was devoted to erecting my tent and persuading the Nuer to remove my abode to the vicinity of the shade and water, which they refused to do.

(E. E. Evans-Pritchard, 1940:5)

Ethnographic fieldwork typically generates arrival stories. As Evans-Pritchard’s irascible tone testifies in reporting his arrival in Nyasaland to begin work on his monograph *The Nuer* (1940), entering the field can be a disorientating experience for ethnographers. Points of concordance and difference are brought sharply into focus at first contact (Narayan, 1993). Arguably ethnographers, operating as outsiders in novel places are ideally misplaced to explore the phenomenon of arrival.

In her essay *Fieldwork in common places*, Pratt (1986) reviews some notable forays into the arrival story genre, mainly selected from the anthropological archive. She remarks on how many ethnographers eschew discourses of scientific reportage in favour of more personal, descriptive narratives, when conveying their sense of (arriving in a) place. Such a descriptive tone is used here by Firth (1936) to open *We, The Tikopia*, revealing first sight of Polynesia

> In the cool of the early morning, just before sunrise, the bow of the Southern Cross headed towards the eastern horizon, on which a tiny dark blue outline was faintly visible (1936:1)

This semi-poetic narrative can be traced further back, to the early travel literature of Louis de Bougainville, arriving in Tahiti in 1768

> When we moored I went on shore with several officers, to survey the watering place. An immense crowd of men and women received us there (Bougainville, 1967: 220)

Descriptive arrival narratives highlight the strangeness of novel places, exemplified here by Malinowski’s first setting down in the Trobriand Islands

> Imagine yourself suddenly set down surrounded by your gear, alone on a tropical beach close to a native village while the launch or dinghy, which has brought you, sails away out of sight (Malinowski, 1961:4)
Whilst anthropological arrival scenes are typically couched in description (Pratt, 1986), in other disciplines they are rare altogether. In psychological research relating to space, place, environment and culture, subjective accounts of the beginnings of research, be it written by researcher or researched, are seldom offered at all. It is unconventional for psychological researchers to lapse into personal narrative accounts of arrival in the field, the research space (what Brunswik [1943] calls the assessment context) as Malinowski and his counterparts did. Likewise, the voices of research participants, spoken in their own words, are absent from reports of psychological research into space related concepts like cognitive mapping (Golledge, 2002), acculturation (Berry et al, 2002), personal space (Hall, 1966) or environmental psychology (Steg et al, 2013).

This thesis is about arrival stories. During this project I have engaged with the stories of seven international arrivals who came to Manchester and Salford (England) from other nation states. Working in collaboration with Tasila (from Zambia), Febi (Indonesia), Andrada (Romania), Alyssa (Tunisia), Bina (Germany), Alba (Spain) and her dog Tori (U.S.), I employed a multidisciplinary approach to make sense of their construction of emplaced meaning during and after their arrival. I engaged with multisensory, personal narratives of arrival from the perspective of those who came from far afield to engage with their new city. When Bina told me “this is my Manchester” I recalled Firth’s assertion that his monograph We, The Tikopia offered stories of “his little Island” (1936:1).

Arrival though can be conceived of as more than just a physical act of getting somewhere new. It can also be an epistemological transition (Chawla, 2008). In coming to understand stories about the development of emplaced meaning, an ethnographer who newly arrives in the field might seek to bring it to life in forms that go beyond mere text. Like Chawla (2008) in her Indian fieldwork with women who were engaged in the practice of arranged marriage, during my fieldwork I asked

> How do I bring my field alive, as a living, breathing entity with vivid colors, sounds, smells, and tones? How can the stories we created—the lives I partook in, the women I keep returning to—be imagined with any organic reality? (Chawla, 2008:2)

Doing justice to others’ arrival stories demanded my own parallel arrival at alternate epistemological and methodological sites. I was obliged to develop an arrival story of my own; one that traces paths into alternate forms of reportage. Working alongside my collaborators, often physically following in their wake or walking alongside, I traced routes from conventional ethnographic narrative into collaborative storytelling (chapter 8), photography...
and other performative forms. My arrival into these discourses was not necessarily planned.

I did not seek a poetic performative form; rather it arrived in the midst of my field/home travels to enliven my field experience thereby returning to it a materiality that it had lost in previous representational modes (Chawla, 2008:3)

The psychological literature I read prior to my fieldwork prepared me poorly for my arrival in alternate narrative places. My entry into multisensory and performative storytelling came reflexively. It was not signaled by the literature on place that psychology had mustered. This thesis is written in response to a psychology that has been lacking in research about encounters with, and subjective experience of, peopled places.

Historically, psychology has let the emplaced subject out of sight, beyond earshot. Indeed, arguably the subject in psychology has traditionally been hard to discern. People have gone missing. Ever since the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition arrived in the Torres Strait in 1898 (Herle and Rouse, 1998), psychology has kept the subject in the background. Perhaps exceptionally, when F.C. Bartlett arrived in Swaziland to study the remarkable rote memory of its Bantu cattle-herders (and when he reported the remarkable memorial accuracy of child prodigy Sonia Kovalesky) [Bartlett, 1932], he acknowledged the social nature of memory itself, and told the stories of his participants (Ost & Costall, 2002). Yet in his later writing, following his repositioning as an applied psychologist and head of the Applied Psychology Research Unit in Cambridge, Bartlett’s contextual ideas on memory were superseded by a less populated version of events, characterized by a more experimental turn.

More generally, psychology experiments, whether conducted in far away islands or in laboratory settings, have stifled the subjectivities of their subjects, thus constituting a problem in their own right (Rosenzweig, 1933). Psychology has a long history of producing accounts of human action that appear to be somehow unpopulated (Billig, 2011). Writing in psychology has evolved a style that airbrushes out the subject with the use of technical terminology, prioritizing what are perceived as psychological processes above the human subject.

This thesis seeks to restore psychology’s emplaced subject. To do so it will be necessary to recruit and deploy theoretical ideas from Geography, and methodological approaches from Anthropology. First though, to convey the extent of the challenge our discipline faces, I will provide a review of psychology’s own historical encounters with place, such as they are.
Chapter 1

Psychology in its place
Reviewing psychological ventures into the field of space and place

A placeless discipline
Historically, psychological theory of place has fallen short of addressing the subjective experience of arrival and the construction of emplaced meaning; known as place making (Cresswell, 2004). Psychology, one could argue, has rendered itself relatively placeless. Place, where it has featured in psychology, has tended to be treated as an operationalised variable (Green, 1992), constructed for measurement (Rogers, 1989). Attempts to operationalise space or place arguably diminish our opportunities to consider it as a subjectively constructed phenomenon. Research into the measurable concept of personal space (Horner, 1982) exemplifies this operational trend. Elsewhere, space has been constructed as located internally, seeming to exist psychologically as a representation in the mind, an internally stored archive, or a mirror image of a landscape existing outside the individual subject. The phenomenon of the cognitive map (Golledge, 2002) illustrates this approach. In the following pages I will offer an overview of such notable, if flawed, attempts by psychology to engage with place and its perception, along with some critical comments on these flaws. This review will serve as a platform for a movement towards a less representational, more multidisciplinary psychology of place that forms the argument of my thesis.

Your space or mine (but not ours): the psychology of personal space

The area surrounding each person, which when entered by strangers causes discomfort (Steg et al, 2013:31)

Personal space, as defined above, is generally discussed within a discourse of individual safety and anxiety, often invoking the language of space invasion and encroachment. For social and environmental psychologists (Hall, 1966) personal space is regarded as a necessity for health, a mobile territory that is constantly under threat in social life and positively under siege amongst crowds (Steg et al, 2013). Personal space is generally portrayed as a discrete hula-hoop, from which interactions are managed (Horner, 1983); an extension of the discrete self, separating us from other selves. Burgoon and Jones (1976) emphasised personal space as a movable territory that surrounds individuals, an individualising, mobile buffer. Functionally, personal space is seen to protect us from others, a defensive zone for reducing anxiety (Sommer, 1959, Hall, 1966). The emphasis here is on the construction of the self through division and separation, and on personal
motivations towards and a desire for privacy. The operational nature of personal space, a comfort zone that can be measured in laboratory and field settings, has yielded a number of oft quoted research examples. Scenarios in which researchers and their confederates deliberately encroach into unsuspecting participants’ bubbles in libraries, public parks and cafes (Sommer, 2008), then report back on measureable zones of tolerance that vary across cultures, dominate the personal space literature. Out of such research, reified proximal demarcations have been staked out (Horner, 1983, Hall, 1966). Coining the term proxemics, Hall (1966) applied measurements to these comfort zones; an intimate zone for loved ones (18 inches), a personal zone for close friends (up to 4 feet), a social zone (up to 10 feet), and public zone (up to 25 feet).

These social psychological excursions into the phenomenon of personal space create an individualising legacy. Articulated in a discourse of a need for privacy, demonising gatherings and crowds, personal space is a mobile haven for the individual, rather than collective, self (Markus and Kityama, 1991). Personal space, according to Sommer (2008), Hall (1966) and others, may be dynamic, culturally relative and mobile, yet it is also a separating, rather than shared, phenomenon. The partitioning of space into individual allotments facilitates its operational measurement. Furthermore, this individualising of space into ‘your space or mine’ overlooks what more recent writers have termed the intercorporeal nature of space (Macpherson, 2011). Intercorporeal space, so much more difficult to allocate numerical value to, is created within relationships, between agents who negotiate the world together, and

have had a tendency to be overlooked by research which focuses on the individual body (Macpherson, 2011:2)

The notion of intercorporeal, rather than personal, space can be used to emphasize that the experience of being embodied is never a private affair, but is always already mediated by our continual interactions with other human and nonhuman bodies (Weis 1999:5)

Whilst personal space offers a convenient, measurable variable for monitoring our individualised actions, it offers little to our understanding of the collaborative, co-constructive nature of place perception.

*Crossing continents: acculturation*

Another area in which psychology has engaged with the phenomenon of place is cross-cultural psychology (Berry, 2005), a theory-based branch of the discipline in which researchers
transport their present hypotheses and findings to other cultural settings in order to test their validity and applicability in other - and eventually, in all - groups of human beings (Berry et al, 2002:3)

Cross-cultural psychology sets out to test established theories of mind across cultural settings, in the process investigating the extent to which various psychological concepts are culturally universal. Amongst the concepts cross-cultural research has engaged with is the psychological consequence of the movement of peoples to and from places; known as acculturation (Stevenson, 2009). Acculturation relates to the psychological effects of moving across cultural settings, especially where this requires negotiating novel societal norms, so there is a clear link to the subject of the present thesis. Here, Berry describes acculturation in the context of large populations

New waves of immigrants, sojourners, and refugees flow from these economic and political changes, and large ethnocultural populations become established in most countries. Of increasing concern is the acculturation that is taking place among the long-settled populations, as they strive to maintain their societies in the face of increasing cultural diversity in their midst (2005:700)

The experience of acculturation, for Berry (2005), involves encountering novel cultural situations, requiring adaptation. In discussing acculturation, as is the norm in cross-cultural psychology, the tendency is to focus on cultural universality in the experience of movement and encounter with newness. Here, Berry articulates the expectation that generalities in acculturation experience will hold sway

Evidence exists to show that the very concept of acculturation, the various strategies adopted by immigrants and members of the national society, and the nature of the problems that may occur are rather similar to those identified in the research in other countries (Berry, 2005:2)

Cross-cultural approaches to acculturation portray the phenomenon in the context of first or new contact with an alien cultural group (Berry, 2005), requiring adaptive changes in behaviour. This adaption on the part of the individual

is initiated by the conjunction of two or more autonomous cultural systems (Berry, 2005:701)
This formulation assumes cultural places to be bounded, whole systems that pre-exist contact with them. Culture, society and place are all seen as distinct realms, separate from the individual psyche, or internal mind, as Shweder’s critical definition of cross-culturalism suggests:

*Cross-cultural psychology is a sub-discipline of general psychology that shares with it the Platonic aim of characterising the inherent central processing mechanisms of mental life (Shweder, 1991:84)*

According to this view, acculturation is viewed as an interaction between pre-existing individuals, groups and places, wherein “either or both groups” are required to adapt (Graves, 1967). The cross-cultural discussion of acculturation is framed as a choice as to whether to adapt to a new way of life, or whether to revert to (again pre-existing) norms and values, as Berry explains here:

*Acculturation can be “reactive”; that is, by rejecting the cultural influence from the dominant group and changing back towards a more “traditional” way of life, rather than inevitably towards greater similarity with the dominant culture (2005:702)*

Problematically, there is little acknowledgement here that minds, cultures, and indeed places, are inseparable phenomena that are mutually constituted through experience (Shweder, 1991), that meaning is attached to culture and place through engagement with it (Ingold, 2000). Rather than seeing minds and cultures as inseparable, cross-culturalism constructs acculturation as a process that occurs at two levels; the individual and the cultural. Whilst adaptation takes place on arrival or encounter with a novel place, cultural and individual explanations are kept distinct:

*There are…reasons for keeping the cultural and psychological levels distinct. Cross-cultural psychology views individual human behavior as interacting with the cultural context within which it occurs. Given these two distinct levels of phenomena, separate conceptions and measurements are required (Berry, 2005:703)*

Acculturation models have addressed the new arrival as an individual who encounters pre-existing cultural settings at an individual psychological level, rather than constructs them phenomenologically. Arguably, there is a case for a more phenomenological approach to movement, arrival and place making. Borrowing more from cultural psychology (Shweder, 1991) and phenomenology (Marratto, 2012) than from cross-cultural psychology, subjectivities of movement and arrival might be explored by asking how meanings are bestowed, cultures and places constructed, co-constitutively,
on and by arrival. Such an approach, to be pursued in this thesis, amounts to an exploration of the making of cultures and places, rather than the mere crossing of borders between them.

_Cognition, place and memory: context-dependent recall_

In the cognitive psychological approach to the study of memory, the role of place, usually rephrased as environmental context, has been operationalised as a factor influencing the quality and quantity of recall. In other words, being in the right place (though, this being memory, not necessarily at the right time) can determine the accuracy of recall. Carr (1925) pioneered research into context dependent recall. He noticed the effect of environmental cues (places) on the powers of recall of maze running rats. Subsequently, the demonstrable influence of environmental features in cueing recall has been a mainstay of memory research with human participants (Smith & Vela, 2001). In the classic research scenario, word lists are learned and remembered in either contextually similar or contextually different conditions respectively (Unsworth et al, 2012). The former improves performance. The context reinstatement effect dictates that memory improves when testing conditions replicate learning conditions (Smith and Vela, 2001). Although the favoured scenario for this research involves the use of similar rooms for learning and recall, a notable and more naturalistic, ecological demonstration of context dependency saw scuba divers being asked to learn material underwater, then to recall it either underwater or on dry land. This variation has the appeal of modeling the research context on the everyday practice of participants, which is a rarity in experimental memory research. For the divers, a context reinstatement effect emerged (Godden and Baddeley, 1980). Although widely noted, the effect of environmental cueing on memory has not been universally reported, with some concern surfacing over the reliability of the experimental scenario. Eich (1980) found no context dependency effect in laboratory research, whilst field research in classroom learning environments was similarly inconclusive (Saufley et al, 1985).

Despite these mixed findings, the applicability of and motivations for studying emplaced, contextual memory is clear. Improving memory retrieval as a function of place and context has clear implications for educational practice, as well as for eyewitness testimony scenarios (Smith and Vela, 2001). Perhaps more problematically though, the context dependency literature research is underscored by an archival memory model, wherein a reified, internally located long-term memory facilitates a processes of remembering that follows a preordained process of registration, storage and retrieval (Atkinson and Shiffrin, 1968). In other words, learning of material is perceived (registration), archived (stored), then later retrieved (or not), depending on factors such as the reinstatement of environmental cues.
Such archival memory models depend on the reification of an internal realm of storage from which material can be retrieved. More recently, this assumption has been challenged (Brockmeier, 2010, Spackman & Yanchar, 2014). There has been a turn towards seeing memory more as an embodied practice, less an internal archive. Memories need not be regarded as residing in an internally located archive. Rather, we can see them as practices, or exercises in skilled, living thinking (Ingold, 2000, Thrift, 2008). Thus, remembering is a function of everyday practice, rather than mere storage. Memories might be seen as embodied, multi-sensory, material phenomena that are inseparable from emplaced practices that are practiced in the world (like walking, talking or underwater diving). Thus, the mind, the conceptual foundation stone of psychology itself, can be loaded into the senses and into practices (Clark, 2011) we hone as we move through landscapes. For example, the development of emplaced memory might manifests itself through muscle memory, a phenomenon that has been embraced by sports psychologists (Tomporowski et al, 1986).

During this research project the role of place in memory will be explored from a perspective wherein memory in particular, and cognition more generally, are regarded as phenomena that are distributed into places, rather than merely jogged by them.

**Mazes in the mind; cognitive mapping**
Research into cognitive mapping represents cognitive psychology’s most overt foray into the study of engagement with place and space. Cognitive maps are defined as “internal representations of environmental information” (Tolman, 1948:2) and are used to organise spatial behaviour and make decisions about route choices and wayfinding. As we move through landscapes we accumulate internal representations of our environments that help us to make future navigation decisions. Acquiring these representations is cumulative, varies between individuals and groups, and is influenced by travel mode and terrain (Mondschein et al, 2005). Cognitive mapping is an adaptive process, yet the maps themselves are open to distortion and idiosyncrasy (Kitchin & Blades, 2002). They are error-prone, rather than photographic (Golledge, 2002).

Research into cognitive maps dates back to the work of Tolman (1948), whose maze rats responded to landmarks, when learning routes, and to relations between routes and landmarks. Later research with humans has favoured the learning of routes around campuses, rather than mazes (Kitchin & Blades, 2002). Cognitive maps link behaviour in the field to internal beliefs and representations of place, with more concentrated approaches to route finding and mapping taking shape in the 1960s.
Neisser (1967) highlighted the role of experience on the development of cognitive maps. As active information processors, he argues, we use environmental information to aid decision-making, and to develop anticipatory schemas; everyday hypotheses guide future travel. Thus, our routes are constantly tinkered with in the light of experience. An ongoing process of reducing dissonance is played out in the maze, on the campus, in the street.

In one study newcomers to a city drew sketch maps at various intervals (2 weeks, 10 months) after their arrival (Evans et al, 1982). Though the number of key landmarks remained constant, networks between routes intensified over time. This suggests that easily identifiable focal or internally held anchor points often dictate the future shape of internal representations. Yet there is some dispute as to whether landmarks are learned before routes, or vice versa (Gärling and Golledge, 2000). Whatever the nature of these anchor points (roads, buildings, intersections) they are open to distortion, typified by over or underestimation of distance, especially where hills, walls, rivers provide intervening barriers (Kitchin & Blades, 2002). The extent to which such barriers affect estimation may be influenced by the mode of transport being used. Motorised travel is likely unaffected by physical barriers (hills), though more so by traffic, toll bridges and other notional obstacles to driving. More eventful, cluttered or densely populated (by buildings and people) spaces are also typically overestimated, as are those that are familiar (Kitchin & Blades, 2002).

It is widely recognised that at certain stages of development, sensory-motor engagement is key for environmental learning and the development of cognitive maps (Moore & Golledge 1976). Children’s active exploration yields more complex map production than purely visual experience (Feldman & Acredolo, 1979). Cognitive maps, it seems, arise out of embodied experience, not just observation (Golledge, 2002). Exploring vicinities actively, with the accumulation of sensorimotor experience, is arguably optimal for the learning of detailed cognitive maps (Moore & Golledge, 1976). More complete, detailed internal representations are produced following active, rather than passive, exploration. Children exploring their immediate indoor environment (Feldman & Acredolo, 1979), or exploring a route on foot, in a wheelchair, being guided, have all demonstrated the principle of the effectiveness of active exploration. Self-direction and activity were both shown to be positive factors for the formation of cognitive maps. The investment of physical effort and exploratory behaviour affects the kind of cognitive maps that are formed. Greater effort not only leads to more detailed cognitive mapping, but to the exaggeration of distances covered by effortful travel (Golledge, 2002).
How we feel about a place also affects our internal perceptions and judgements. Positive feelings, emotional attachment, enthusiasm or interest might all influence the kind of mapping we indulge in. Places we feel attached to or like are judged to be closer than they really are (Lundberg, 1973). Likewise, places that are newsworthy, notorious or important are judged to be closer (Lloyd, 1997). Lowery (1973) showed that ‘desirable’ places were typically judged as closer than those that are undesirable.

Internal constructions of place can also be influenced by culture. For example, for Jews and Arabs in a disputed territory, culturally relative ideas about possession and desirability were linked to the production of quite different cognitive maps of the same region (Golledge, 2002). There may be some cultural groups who are for one reason or another excluded from certain means of travel. In rural Leshoto, mobility, access and cognitive mapping were seen to be different in different cultural and gender groups, with implications for the introduction of new transport technologies (Vijjhala & Walker, 2009).

The field of cognitive mapping enlightens us about factors that influence how we perceive and estimate distances in landscapes we occupy and move through. Arguably though, like the internal storage archive employed by cue-dependency memory theory, the recruitment of an internal representation of place (the cognitive map) overrides the embodied, emplaced nature of thinking and decision making. Arguably, the learning of routes and emplaced knowledge can be explored equally well by distributing the burden of memory and cognition throughout the senses and the body itself, rather than within. The present thesis will explore the construction of emplaced meaning in new arrivals, yet without recourse to internal, representational models of cognition. Rather, the emphasis will be on the development of meaning through embodied, sensuous, collaborative practice.

Furthermore, theorising about cognitive mapping has rested on a quantitative operationalising of judged space. A predominant method for engaging with the phenomenon of meaning and idiosyncrasy in cognitive mapping and wayfinding research has been to ask participants to estimate distances between places, based on variables such as mobility, mode of transport, familiarity and culture. This approach exemplifies a wider tendency in psychology to operationalise (in the interests of measurement) behaviours that might otherwise be engaged with at a more subjective, storied level (Rogers, 1989).

In the present project, an approach to arrival and emplaced meaning will be adopted that will dispense with the measurement of meaning as judged
distance. Rather, emplaced meaning will be addressed at the level of subjectivity and phenomenology. This approach will strive to convey the meaning of places rather than the distances between them. If maps are used at all in this approach, they will have more in common with methodological innovations such as participatory mapping, a geographical or action research tool in which participants are asked to sketch their relationship with their locales and their social networks (Emmel, 2006).

The affordances of ecological psychology
JJ Gibson (1966) was critical of the cognitive approach to the psychology of place perception. Gibson’s work redefines the perceiving subject for psychologists who are interested in how we engage with environments. After studying aviation in WWII and the perceptual skills of pilots landing aircrafts in high pressure scenarios, Gibson rejected laboratory bound, experimental research into perceptual depth, preferring instead to address naturalistic engagement with landscapes and ecology.

Gibson’s grounded theory of perception rejects internally located mechanisms for the apprehension of objects in a world from which we are notionally separated. Rather, he focuses on how information in the surfaces upon which we walk integrates with our perceptual skills. In this relational approach, subject and object are inseparable. Characteristics of grounded information directly affect perception. The landscape here is seen as a vital resource; a surface with vitality. The human subject moves through this vital landscape, deriving meaning dynamically. Gibson’s subject is always in motion, head and body moving in relation to environment, the resulting image constantly changing; (more analogous to film than to still photography).

According to the ecological view of perception the space between perceiver and perceived world is bridged by the affordances of the latter (Greeno, 1994). These qualities are offered by the vitality of surfaces, landscapes and spaces, towards the perceiver. A grassy bank affords lying down to rest. A wall affords a hiding place. A pond affords a cooling dip. A garden affords a burial site. Affordances are emplaced meanings, offered towards observers who actively derive these meanings by exploring the places they move through. The affordances offered by environments facilitate perception.

In a critique of cognitivist approaches to psychology, Gibson describes this dynamic, ecological relationship between person and environmental affordances without any recourse to internal processing. His notion of direct perception excludes the requirement for internal information processing mechanisms, such as the archives that are so often erected for the purposes of studying memory. The action takes place at the interface...
between environment and perception, not deep in the mind

Space and other qualities of the environment are perceived directly, without the aid of an intervening mental process (Goldstein, 1981:193)

Such a grounded, perceptual, ecological, less psychological, model

eliminates, according to Gibson, the need for unconscious inference or any other intervening mental process. Perception is explained, according to Gibson, by considering the stimuli in the environment, rather than by considering what happens to these stimuli after they enter a person’s eyes (Goldstein, 1981:193)

Deriving meaning from the qualities of the visual world transcends mere attention to the physical qualities of walls, ponds and gardens. It encompasses knowing what these surfaces and qualities afford us, a knowledge that is derived directly an object appears in the light.

Whilst offering a welcome critique of cognitive approaches to the psychology of place, Gibson’s ecological theory has limitations. Problematically, affordances of objects cannot always be perceived merely through visual apprehension. The taste of a food, the temperature of a pool, he smell of the fresh bread, cannot be appreciated through direct visual perception (Goldstein, 1981). It may be that the affordances of objects have to be learned through a more multisensory perceptual process of meaning making, rather than merely through direct visual perception. The present research project into the perception of place will acknowledge Gibson’s dynamic, relational view of ecological perception. However meaning making, place making, will be regarded as a multisensory exercise, encompassing smell, sound and taste, as well as vision and movement.

Despite Gibson’s undoubted influence on how the psychological subject relates to places, his work has also been criticised for lacking in empirical grounding (Restle, 1980). First hand, field-based evidence for his ecological arguments was thin on the ground. He himself was aware of this weakness

The experiments I will report are mostly my own, and the evidence, therefore, is scanty. Other students of information based perception are at work, but the facts have not yet been accumulated (Gibson, 1979:3)

During this research project I will offer ethnographic fieldwork that will seek to empirically explore the dynamic, relational nature of the perception
of places and their transformative affordances.

Attachment, identity and dependence: the place of environmental psychology

The attachments we form with places have been discussed in the field of environmental psychology (Steg et al, 2013). Place attachments have been defined as

The affective bond developed by people with a place over time (Steg et al, 2013:105)

Proshansky (1978) elaborates on this, suggesting that the cognitive bonds that develop between people and environments are an integral part of the self. To describe this phenomenon he coins the term place identity, which he defines as

Those dimensions of self that define the individual’s personal identity in relation to the physical environment by means of a complex pattern of conscious and unconscious ideals, beliefs, preferences, feelings, values, goals, and behavioral tendencies and skills relevant to this environment (1978:155)

Thus expressed, environments facilitate the development of identities. Places endorse and extend selves. (You can take the boy out of the country, but you can’t take the country out of the boy, as the old proverb would have it). A more utilitarian view of the self-environment bond is to see places as serving specific psychological functions (Jorgensen & Stedman, 2001). Thus, we come to value a place, even to dependent upon it, to help us fulfill recreational, occupational or affective desires. This type of bond has been termed place dependence (Kyle et al, 2004). These two interrelated concepts, place attachment and place dependence, have been regarded as both valid and generalizable phenomena, commonly experienced across a variety of types of urban and rural settings (Williams & Vaske, 2003).

According to this environmental psychological model, the development of bonds with places through working in, living in or visiting them, incorporates cognitive, affective and conative strands. In other words, we orient ourselves towards places through our attitudes, emotions and motivations towards actions (Jorgensen and Stedman, 2001). In empirical terms, these cognitive, affective and conative components of attachments to or satisfaction with places have been operationalized and researched as discrete phenomena by environmental psychologists

Traditionally cognitive, emotional and behavioural components of residential satisfaction have been studied separately (Steg et al,
Environmental psychologists commonly embrace discourses of measurement when considering these constructions of place attachment. For example, respondents might be asked to report the degree to which a place satisfies functional needs, supports their social relationships, evokes positive feelings, or indeed negative ones (Steg, et al, 2013). Thus, places are constructed as spurning measurable phenomena, providing an operational independent variable for quantitative research (*How much does this place produce positive feelings?*). Concepts of place identity and place dependence are typically deployed as predictor variables with which to explore specific second order variables. For example, spending behavior or recreational choices have been examined as functions of place attachment (Kyle et al, 2004).

In other studies, place attachment has been used as a dependent (measurable) variable in relation to other supposed predictive factors such as pollution, greenery, disorder (Lewicka, 2011), length of stay, house size and crowding (Bonaiuto, 2004) (*How much are you attached to this place as a function of it’s level of its population density?*). In one study in Rome affective, attitudinal and behavioural indicators were all seen to predict residential satisfaction and attachment to place (Bonaiuto et al, 1999).

According to this positivist paradigm of environmental psychology, bonds with places are constructed either as measured (dependent) variables, or as a determinant (independent) of other measured, variables. In the current thesis, rather than using place perception or attachment as a manipulated or measurable variable, the intent is to convey a phenomenology of how places are constructed through lived engagement. Furthermore, rather than dissembling the phenomenon of place perception into cognitive, affective and behavioural components, the intent is to explore subjective narratives of place making as they emerge through combined and interrelated cognitive, sensory and embodied forms of practice.

Approaches to place attachment from environmental psychology have been instructive in drawing up a relational view of place attachment, in which the self has been studied in environmental context. However, it has been noted that the majority of research into place identity and place dependence has been carried out with participants with long histories in particular setting (Kyle et al, 2004), usually as residents. For example, it is commonplace to investigate the long-term development of a sense of community amongst residential groups (Hay, 1999). This approach conceives of place attachment as an indicator of rootedness (Relph, 1976, Tuan, 1980). Such approaches tend only to use new arrivals as comparison groups, against
whom to gauge the existence of long-term residents in terms of measured
sense of place. The present thesis will look more overtly at the experience
of new arrivals and the development of place perception as part of the
experience of travel from another place.

**Departures: the art of psycho-geography**

Psychogeography could set for itself the study of the precise law and
specific effects of the geographical environment, consciously
organized or not, on the emotions and behavior of individuals
(Debord, 1955:12)

A departure from positivist, cognitive or environmental psychological
approaches, the hybrid movement of psycho-geography is an umbrella
under which artists, philosophers and popular authors have congregated to
discuss the relations of people and places. Psychogeography hails from the
work of situationist writers whose intellectual heritage is traced back to Paris
in 1950 (Coverley, 2006). Reacting critically to the gentrification of Paris
and a perceived erosion of its history, a group of writers, led by Guy
Debord (1955), sought to challenge what they saw as an abhorrent,
corporate, nationalist transformation of their city. The situationists
developed a defiant methodology based on walking, writing and critical
reportage. They aimed to redefine human relations with place through
practice, poetry, pranks and purposive drifting. Their work is synonymous
with the walking method of the dérive (from the French to drift), and with
the persona of the flâneur, a sauntering observer of street level society
(Coverley, 2006)

They made walking a distinctly political act to disorientate
themselves, to study particular areas and to see how they were drawn
to particular areas of cities. The aims of these walks were to break
with habituated ways of walking through the city (Bridger, 2010:132)

During these ambulatory, disorienting reorientations of person and place

Chance encounters and uncanny resonances could disrupt dominant
ways of seeing and potentially reveal the marvelous buried within the
everyday (Pinder, 2005:404)

Valuing the potential of everyday experience as consumed through repetitive
footfall, situationist psychogeographers challenge us to redress our
consensual approach to the perception of place. In the practice of the
dérive the accent is on a fragmented, subjective, phenomenological
approach to making places up as we go along.
The emergence of and continued interest in psycho-geography and its distinctive walking method highlights a gap in the psychology of emplaced knowledge. Psychology in particular and social science as a whole has been reluctant to develop an epistemology of places and method for exploring how they are encountered and constructed at the level of everyday experience.

The social sciences have been slow in conducting research based on the study of place and how walking could be used as a radical method (Bridger, 2010:133).

Phenomenological explorations of how subjective experience is rooted in emplacement and situated activity have been addressed more frequently by geography than by psychology. Writing about the development of emplaced meanings has been most likely penned by cultural geographers (Casey, 1993, Tuan, 1974) who are the heirs to 20th century psychogeographical thought.

One manifestation of psycho-geographical practice that has made its way into the social scientific literature is the study of routine ambulation and its role in the development of place perception. For example, to be alone with one’s thoughts whilst walking to work can be seen as a site for exploration for the phenomenology of places and how we construct them for ourselves out of daily routinized practice (Highmore, 2005). Martin (1984) articulates routinized place making as

The mundane process by which meaning is created and maintained even in the face of the chronic flux and disturbance of experience (1984:23)

The incorporation of everyday mobile phenomena into our epistemology of place perception is a key contribution made by the hybrid, homeless, multi-disciplinary assemblage that is the art, geography and social science of psychogeography. The walking method, popularized by the Parisian flâneur who writes the city as he wanders (de Certeau, 1984), thrives on the scribbling down of the everyday, rather than on the recording of knowledge that is generated from experimental manipulations in the field.

During this thesis I will incorporate the multidisciplinary outlook of psychogeography, deriving my epistemology, ontology and methodology from cultural geographers, psychologists of place, and anthropologists. From psychogeography too I will incorporate walking and movement as methods for the generation and development of emplaced meaning; meanings that can be conveyed by means other than the traditional discourses of social scientific report writing.
Whilst embracing these aspects of psychogeography, I will also recognize some of its limitations. Problematically, psychogeography has tended to root its approach in the historical tropes of a lone mobile observer. The flâneur walks, sits, wanders and writes the city (de Certeau, 1984) from a singular, usually male, somewhat leisured perspective. (He is moving, although not obviously going anywhere). Arguably, such a methodological role model generates mono-vocal reportage of place (Bassett et al, 2004). A single, usually masculine, leisured, literary voice provides the default commentary of psychogeographical reportage. A limitation of psychogeography has been its disproportion of male contributors (Scalaway, 2002). Arguably, the male wanderer-writer has portrayed its subject, the city,

As something feminine, passively there for the taking, a wilderness-like space of adventure to be conquered or possessed (Bassett et al, 2004: 403)

Scalaway (2002) and Bassett et al (2004) et al appeal for a psychogeography that explores constructions of the city through women’s experience

Our research question was the extent to which the derive, as a psychogeographic tool, could be operationalised by women, whose time, and most usually, travels through space, were / are structured by the contingent demands of paid employment, and in some cases children and other dependent small animals (Bassett et al., 2004: 118)

In line with this critique, and with a call for the exploration of a psychogeographical place making that extends to diverse groups, my own fieldwork and walking method will engage with a contingent of female collaborators, who are not merely at their leisure, who are not merely engaged with ocular forms of place making, who are not exclusively sighted, who are not exclusively human. Whilst incorporating the reflexive, mobile method of psycho-geography, I will seek to explore perceptions of place that are less mono, more poly-vocal. During my own fieldwork, the walking method will yield a polyphony of voices that is not restricted to a single authorial account.

Route-map: the way forward

A survey of psychology’s ventures in the field of space and place exposes a fragmented, sparse landscape. Practitioners from central and far-flung limits of the discipline have contributed to our understanding of the psychology of space. Social psychologists (personal space), cross-cultural psychologists (acculturation), cognitive psychologists (mapping, memory, perception), environmental psychologists (attachment, dependence), as well as poets and
wanderers from the literary project of psychogeography, have all taught us something about the relationship between thoughts, feelings, actions, places and spaces. Yet this brief critical review reveals, at worst, a portfolio of flawed ventures into the psychology of space. At best, it shows us that there are questions about the psychology of place perception that have not been answered yet.

Thus far, psychology has struggled in helping us to understand how places are perceived anew, made meaningful on and after arrival. The discipline has provided little enlightenment as to how the subjective experience of arrival in a new place leads to the development of emplaced thought and meaning.

This thesis is about arrival stories. It will convey the stories of seven international arrivals who came to know their new city through a variety of multisensory engagements. Using a multidisciplinary approach, deploying theoretical ideas from cultural psychology and cultural geography and methodological innovations from cultural anthropology and collaborative art practice, I will try to show how these seven collaborators, bestowed meaning on, developed attachments to and emplaced cognitions about, their new city. In so doing I will pose the following research question

\textit{How do newly arrived internationals develop meaningful attachments to and emplaced knowledge of their new city?}

The subsequent ten chapters will trace a route towards addressing this question, as follows.

\textit{Chapter two} proposes a theoretical approach to addressing the research question by introducing concepts from the field of cultural geography. Specifically, it introduces theories of space, place (Creswell, 2004) and non-representational theory (Thrift, 2008). These will be used to augment psychological theory for the purposes of the present research project. The use of these ideas from cultural geography will be deployed to address shortcomings in the psychology of place that have been outlined in \textit{chapter one}.

\textit{Chapter three} integrates some of the ideas from \textit{chapter two} into a theoretical framework that uses concepts from cultural and post-cognitivist psychology in order to address the research question. Here, a multidisciplinary theoretical ground will be prepared to show how ideas from space and place theory, non-representational theory, cultural psychology (Shweder, 1991) and post-cognitive psychology (Clark, 2001) can be combined to address the research question.
Chapter four explores the history and nature of the methodological approach that is to be used for this project. Beginning with an outline of the classic ethnographic method from social anthropology, this chapter will show how and why its contemporary heir, the sensory ethnography method (Pink, 2009), is to be employed for the purposes of this project.

Chapters five to ten detail the empirical ethnographic fieldwork that has been undertaken for this project. These six chapters are devoted to ethnographic work I undertook with my respective collaborators (Chapter eleven charts work with two collaborators). This fieldwork forms the basis for my addressing of the research question.

Chapter eleven offers a series of answers to the research question, in the light of my empirical fieldwork, followed by a series of challenges to the discipline of psychology. These challenges are intended to propel the field towards the formation of a more phenomenological theory, less cognitivist, less representational of place.
Chapter 2

How the places we move through acquire meaning through daily living
Space, place, mobility, non-representation and the making of the city

A place for everything, everything emplaced
Places are more than mere sites indicated by co-ordinates on a map. Experience infuses mere locations with meanings and intentionality (Shweder, 1991). This view resonates with what is known as vitalist geography (Greenhough, 2010), which focuses on how humans apprehend the world through perception and sensation (Lash, 2006, Bergson, 2002) and in doing so make it meaningful. This phenomenological argument asserts that it is through our experience of place that the world is brought into being. Rather than an objective world being out there awaiting apprehension, we think it into being through perception and practice. As Deleuze puts it, “perception propels us at once into matter” (2002:25). Events in the world, such as encounters with others, materialise, actualise, our life-worlds (Deleuze, 2002). Spaces are not givens, not rigid containers of events (Greenhough, 2010). Rather, we chisel them out through embodied, subjective encounter. Small wonder my Manchester is nothing like yours.

As cultural geographers have asserted more fervently than psychologists, experience is an emplaced phenomenon. Chapter one showed us that psychologists have explored the link between place, mind and action. However, to in order to engage more fully with the question of how a city becomes meaningful and knowable through subjective experience, it is appropriate, necessary even, to call upon concepts of place that have primarily been the province of cultural geographers.

After all, we are not just conscious of events, we are conscious of them in their place. We infuse every meeting, event, incident we are part of with place-based, intentional meaning. We think them into being and associate them irrevocably with place (Cresswell, 2004). Yet the place-based narratives we use to make our experiences cohere vary. Some are sedentary, with the emphasis on home, dwelling or being in a place (Relph, 1976). In chapter one we saw how environmental psychology has emphasized this sedentary aspect of belonging to a single place, especially in its explorations of the concepts of place attachment and place dependence (Steg et al, 2013). More recent placed based narratives from cultural geography have eschewed sedentary approaches in favour of those that focus on movement through landscapes for meaning to accrue (Spinney, 2003). For geographers who take this more dynamic approach, the act of infusing space with meanings and intentions is precisely that; an act. The mundane, sometimes repetitive
routines that punctuate our lives are mobile rituals that allow us to walk, ride or pedal ourselves into meaningful places. They are rituals with residual vitality, in our consciousness and in the material world. One thinks here of paths worn across quadrangles (Seamon, 1993). These paths are, by their very nature, forever unfinished. Vitalist geography urges us to recognise the ever-becoming nature of things in the world, the indeterminacy, incompleteness of places and organisms (Fraser, Kember and Lury, 2005). This vitalist approach resonates with Gibson’s (1950) notion of affordances; surfaces facilitating meaning through visual engagement (see chapter one).

Conceived this way place-making is wrought through movement (Gibson, 1950), through doing, instead of simply being or dwelling in a place. The emphasis here is on routes, not roots (Clifford, 1992). Mobile place-making narratives enable us to infuse spaces that may be absent from tourist itineraries with acute meaning. There is no objective monopoly on what counts as a meaningful place. Many a desolate archway is beloved or feared by some, whilst to others they may be no more than as stepping-stones between other places, intermediate places that Auge (1995) terms ‘non-places’.

Turning to non-representation

We know poorly the types of operations at stake in ordinary practices, their registers and their combinations, because our instruments of analysis, modelling and formalization were constructed for other objects and with other aims (de Certeau et al, 1998:256 cited in Highmore, 2002)

The infusion of meaning that rushes out from everyday experience is notoriously difficult to document. The everyday has been called the last great frontier for cultural geography (Latham, 2004). We face some fascinating choices as we strive to engage with place making at street level. The gulf between method and experience to which de Certeau (above) alludes may be down to how we choose to communicate about life at the great frontier. The objectifying discourse of psychology and much of social science has tended to operationalize places as variables to be measured (see chapter one). Traditional methodological tools (questionnaires, experiments, interviews) may flounder in the territory of place making and may advisably be replaced or combined with others (Thrift 2008). Alternative approaches may embrace more subjective, creative discourses wherein the voices of those who participate in research are clearly audible. Should informants be encouraged to tell stories in registers with which they are familiar there may no longer be reason to see everyday life as an elusive domain which lies out
or sight, beyond earshot and out of reach, of the social researcher (Latham, 2004).

Rarely does the eye light on a thing, and then only when it has recognised that thing as a sign of another thing (Calvino, 1974:11)

As Calvino implies here, there may be value in turning our attention away from knowledge that is somehow meant to stand for or represent the knowledge we are in pursuit of. The roots of epistemological and methodological conservatism may be found in what has been described as a wrongheaded tendency towards representational theory (Thrift 2008). Thrift laments a reliance on representation, which is characterised by searches for underlying explanation (unconscious motives, cognitive maps, internal memory stores) for action. Arguably, a preoccupation with representation leads us to overlook the sensuous, creative, immediate, embodied nature of social life. Thrift recommends a focus on performative practice, a turn to what is known as non-representational theory, when studying place making. The cross-disciplinary clutch of ideas that constitutes non-representational theory arrests our preconceptions about the nature of identity, the impact of technologies on action and the importance of flow and mobility in everyday practice. It offers a critique of traditional psychological theories of person and place. Thrift (2007) outlines several core tenets that drive non-representational theory, all of which inform this investigation into the development of emplaced knowledge and meaning. These tenets are flow, corporeality, anti-biography, relational materialism, and anti-positivism respectively.

(i) Flow and dynamism of everyday life are valued ahead of more static portrayals. Materially as well as subjectively, places are fluid, unfinished and intentionally brought into being through embodied practice (a clear point of agreement with vitalist geography, [Bergson, 2002], and a point of disagreement with the bounded notions of place that feature cross-cultural psychology [Berry, 2005, and see chapter one]).

(ii) Disclosures and dispatches from the places we encounter are inseparable from action and performance. Constructions of place are performed into being pre-cognitively, through sensorial narratives. The meanings we attach to places are thus inseparable from corporeality. Pre-cognitive knowledge highlights the pre-eminence of performativity, practice and routine (Seamon, 1979) in place perception. Methodologically, this emphasis on performativity invites mobile, sensuous accounts of place-based attachments to become integral to ethnographic practice (Pink, 2009).
(iii) Individualising narratives of biography are eschewed. The bounded construct of the individual with internalized mental capacities is regarded as introducing a spurious wholeness and predictability into the portrayal of humans. Rather, boundaries of personhood are seen as blurred, porous and indivisibly entangled with our surroundings and the technologies we use to apprehend them (a critique of the cognitivist approaches to mapping and context dependent memory we saw in chapter one).

(iv) The status of material objects rises above that of mere props. Rather, they are constitutive of hybrid assemblages that incorporate biological, cultural and technological fragments of identity. This notion of relational materialism (us and stuff indivisibly fused) posits a distributed personhood, wherein bodies cooperate (evolve in tandem) with technologies. When constructing emplaced meanings we do so as fragmented, part-technical, tool-beings. This relational, vitalist view emphasises interstices between organisms, material objects and places. Intelligence is continually generated at the interface between these interleaved elements.

(v) Anti-positivism means there is no onus on researchers to look beyond action in order to uncover neat, once and for all explanations for action. The search for objective meaning in hidden places (like the unconscious, or the long-term memory) is regarded as spurious. Sensual, subjective, expressive, poly-vocal accounts are valued beyond the objective and authorial accounts that seek to operationalized emplaced phenomena in the interests of measurement, as in the case of environmental psychology and personal space (see chapter one).

Non-representational theory critiques mainstream psychological research paradigms that put participants on the spot, often out of context. When struggling to come up with responses to questionnaire items, bewildered respondents are invited to trawl their feelings about events that may have occurred elsewhere at different times, long ago and far away from the present. These uncomfortable moments disrupt the flow of performative practice in order to answer questions which (i) often did not arise at the time of the event, (ii) are posed out of context, or (iii) which may just seem plain incongruous. It is as though life has been interrupted in order to study it. We may reflect that research itself should never be seen as external to phenomena that are being studied. As Greenbough (2010) reminds us

In seeking to explore and understand events and phenomena in the world, social scientists also intervene in the world (2010:40).
Non-representational theory generates sensuous, subjective, practice-based accounts that retain a fidelity to action (Latham, 2004, Pink, 2009) that goes on in the moment. They engage with us in situ, along our routes through the world, at levels which are more immediate than merely textual accounts allow. Explanations for action are not sought inside the mind. Responses may be less complete, yet this reflects the fluid nature of place-making. They are textural, contextual, embodied, multi-sensory missives, wired in from the outposts of everyday life, from places between places. For such approaches to make good on their commitments, the research methods they employ need to transcend representational, academic, explanatory, purely linguistic forms and engage with creative, idiosyncratic practice. This requires forays into other disciplines, not all of which are steeped in academia. Hence, Thrift (2008) calls for non-representational practitioners and theorists to straddle the arts and sciences.

Performing places into being
Non-representational research constitutes multi-sensory, embodied engagements in which participants negotiate their own routes through and ply their own discourses out of everyday practice. This is an emplaced epistemology wherein knowledge is generated through everyday action and expressed in often fragmented, pre-cognitive ways. Though making no claims for completeness, the immediacy of these accounts brings us closer to answering research questions relating to the construction of meaningful attachments to and knowledge of places.

In research that adopts a non-representational approach, dynamic participants can generate embodied accounts through mediums such as photo-elicited interviews (Stedman et al, 2004), audio-diaries (Hall et al, 2008), auto-ethnographies (Ellis, 2004), experience sampling (Haworth, 2010), or time-space budget diaries (Latham, 2004). Responses are elicited through the lens, voice or keyboard of participants who may then be further questioned about their work. Relationships with place are transparently performed into being through embodied practice. Emergent constructions of place are works in progress. They are neither bounded, nor static, nor permanent. Freed from the obligations of writing in an academic register, participants are empowered to couch their idiosyncratic outlooks in the form of performative reportage, borne of enactment (Latham, 2004) and corporeality. Using mobile reportage, perhaps borrowing from photojournalism or diary making, the participant is encouraged, empowered, to produce partial, situated accounts that thrive on plurality of voice and intuitively intelligible, familiar narrative forms.
Mobile methods yield place making on the go. Children photographing their journeys to and from school from the backs of cars, then being interviewed afterwards, conveys feelings that make sense to them at the time, in that place (Barker, 2009). These emerging portable, technologically aided travelogues show how constructions of place are generated through the wearing away of grooves, paths and channels in everyday bodily practice (Seamon, 1979). To anyone who asks when these constructions will be finished, when these places will be complete, the answer must be ‘never’ (Cresswell, 2001). They are always becoming (Deleuze, 2002).

People always say to me, ‘What’s London going to be like when it’s finished?’ I say, well, dead. A finished city is a dead city (Peter Rees, City Planning Officer, in Taylor, 2011:143)

In search of the anti-psychological, non-representational subject
Whoever or whatever is the subject is in non-representational place-making research, we can assert that s/he/it is always constructing the place s/he/it moves through, and that s/he/it is both more than and less than human. S/he/it is something other than a discrete individual who merely thinks thoughts privately, then says them out loud. More likely, s/he/it is a collection of identities, made of biological and material fragments. S/he/it is de-individual. S/he/it is an anti-psychological, part-tool being who cannot be accounted for in mere biography. Her performed thoughts are trudged from corporeal, pre-cognitive enactments. Thrift (2008) argues that knowledge derives embodied, pre-cognitive routines, much like the psycho-geographical walking method (see chapter one). Kinaesthetic intelligence dictates that actions we perform can be in motion before we consciously decide to perform them (Thrift, 2007). Responsibility for corporeal intelligence does not rest solely with the person. Technology is implicated (Thrift, 1994). Thinking is performed by part-human, part-material actors, with fragmented agency and distributed identity (Hayles, 1999). Thought is indivisible from action. Historical developments in technology (maps, pagers, GPS) introduced cognitive assists into our performative repertoire. We can do thoughts that used to be beyond us. They remain beyond us, and we can do them.

Of time and the cities: the emergence of the tool being
Thrift (2007) sees historical developments in technology as indivisible from corporeal practice, yielding new forms of composite intelligence that have deepened and altered our constructions of time and the cities we move through. Never mind the glibly accepted view that ‘modernity speeds up our lives’ (international travel, information superhighways), Thrift (2007) suggests that certain technological, cultural, corporeal trends facilitate our slowing down, to heighten kinaesthetic and
present-awareness. Stop for a moment and consider this incomplete list of perhaps seemingly unrelated practices

...yogic meditation, prayer, the science of ergonomics, time and motion studies, photography, CCTV, walking as a leisure time activity, social psychology, discourse analysis...

Arguably, each of these practices has enhanced our ability to document, freeze and elongate embodied experience. Furthermore, some of them are directly implicated in performative place making (photography, walking), and are part of ethnographic practice. These embodied practices constitute performative spaces in themselves, where embodied, sometimes repetitive (walking) practice feeds the construction of emplaced knowledge. They are time altering, pre-cognitive practices that deepen our apprehension of, and relationship with, nature and cities. They immersively, intentionally deepen the grooves through which we perform ourselves into places on arrival by the intensification of meaning, knowledge and present-awareness. During this project, it is by engaging in practices such as these that materially augmented human assemblages construct places, bring them into being through embodied experience.

Words fail us
Embodied experience is a means of physically writing the city. It is a corporeal affirmation of being in the world. When de Certeau (1987) wrote of walking the city he envisaged a legible text, etched by pedestrian practitioners, writing with their feet. Their place ballets were corporeal texts to be deciphered by reading meaning into them. De Certeau’s emphasis on embodied, playful perambulation and flow amid an everyday life that bursts with meanings, histories and trajectories, foresaw some aspects of non-representational theory. There are echoes too of Thomas Pynchon’s account of Los Angeles in The Crying of Lot 49 (1966)

The city is endless text always promising meaning but ultimately only offering hints and signs…like a printed circuit (Davis, 2006:67)

Excavating for meaning beneath the surface of practice suggests a hidden vitality beneath the surface of the city. For Thrift (2008) though, meaning is not concealed behind the text of mobile performance, or inside the mind, stored in an archive. A phenomenology of place is manifest in embodied, performed, multisensory worlds. Language is but one means of communicating embodied experience. Words alone will fail us. Performatively writing the city amounts to something other than pure text, concealing true meaning, to be interpreted as though a city itself lay upon the couch, awaiting its diagnostic fate. In using participatory sensory
ethnography (Pink, 2009) to investigate embodied constructions of place, mobile practitioners and their collaborative informants may use descriptive, fragmentary language, but they also embrace performance in sound (Hall et al, 2008), image (Worth et al, 1972, Stedman et al, 2004) and other corporeal experience (Spinney, 2007, Latham, 2004). Beyond reporting pure sensuous experience (bare life), material objects are increasingly being recruited into the practice of place making. Through machine-aided, mobile, multi-sensory practice the mobile place-maker uses on-the-go gadgetry (cars, bikes, cameras, postcards, thermometers, audio recording, pedometers, mobile phones, pagers) that extends the physical reach of practice beyond mere bodies, minds and text. Mobile actants introduce an anti-psychological, sensuous ontology of personhood into the everyday business of constructing the city whilst roving through it with prosthetic devices. Technological developments enable the extended reach of corporeal knowledge into material objects that might almost have sprouted from fingers and toes (Wilson, 1998). Katz (2006) sees cars as body extensions. Spinney (2007) notes the embodied experience of cyclists who apprehend nature on two wheels. Composite, fragmentary tool beings purvey performative reportage, dispatches from the frontier of everyday life. Like the actor on stage whose work transcends individual achievement and is traced back to the influence an audience, playwright, prompt, director and other actors, the tool being is post-biographical, beyond mere psychology.

S/h/e/it is an actor-network (Latour, 2005) whose fragmentary existence reveals the distributed nature of identity. In a post-biographical, non-representational discourse, explanations for action are not sought within the individual, in hidden, mind-like places (Latour, 2005). They lie in part beyond the individual, in the realm of fragmented agency, with social and material origins. Latour (2005) eschews the idea of mysterious, internal, individualised forces when seeking figuration (a tangible, responsible source) for action. When asking who is responsible for action, fingers cannot be pointed at individual suspects, organisations (UN, BMI, TUC), at territories (US), or at doctrines (colonialism, racism). Instead, agency is dispersed amongst aggregated networks of actants (Latour, 2005). An individual is only one incarnation of an actant and for non-representational theory it alone is unlikely to be sufficiently agentic. Zizek (2004) concurs, seeing humans as inconceivable as mere biological entities without their tools, developed and constituted in complex networks. Humans are fusions of technology and organic life, constituting intelligent assemblages that, for Thrift (2008), have neither unitary consciousness nor bounded identity. Fragments of multiple identities are bound into them. Thus, intelligence is extended in space, beyond boundaries of physiology, psychology, reaching beyond personhood and propelled further into multiple places through digital media environments. These technologically facilitated environments
can be seen as modified external physiologies (Moores and Metykova, 2010), serving as both accessory organs and means of communication. The blurred, dynamic, intelligent body-environment interface constitutes an assemblage that constructs itself in response to different spatialities and geographies. The biological and the technical are inexorably linked in the person-thing network that we might call tool being.

*People who look like, act like, and co-operate with, things*

Figure 1 People who look like things (*The Simpsons*)

In the *The Simpsons* people resemble inanimate objects. In non-representational theory this resemblance encompasses practice, not just appearance. Tool being is extended, mimetic and co-operative (Thrift, 2008). It mimics and replicates human capacities. Technology co-operates with humans to form new hybrid intelligences and identities. This surrender to things (Bataille, 1988) has us possessed by things as much as we by them. Tools are increasingly sentient and integral to the formation of intelligent networks (Thrift, 2008). Distributed networks mean we can no longer claim knowing as the sole domain of human practice. We might instead acknowledge an amorphous state in which there are flecks of identity (distributed) in wider categories of intelligence made up of many things (Thrift, 2008:162).

This relational approach allows intelligence to reside in beings that are no longer regarded as discretely intelligent. Intelligent components are loaded into one another (Latour, 2005). In concert, people and things are mutually sentient, responsive to and constitutive of, environments. Stuff and us are place-makers in tandem. Technologically enabled, emplaced media environments and tool-beings are mutually constitutive of one another. These relational networks, for non-representational theory, are more interesting than the discrete individuals that figure in them. Vitalist geography, like non-representational theory, recognises that our understandings of which organisms are sentient must be flexible. Life forms are subject to flow and metamorphosis, having changing relationships with materiality and their surroundings (Greenough (2010). Developments in
cybernetics, computer technology and prosthetic science have all led to a reinvention of mind as a phenomenon that is extended out into the world (Fraser, Kember and Lury, 2005, Clark, 2011). This relational approach erodes distinctions between natural intelligence and technological intelligence (Thrift, 2008). Intelligent hybrid entities cut across bodies, things and spaces, and are more intelligent in concert than in separation. Augmented by technologies, previously difficult forms of sensing, perceiving and apprehending nature are now possible. Echoing another of non-representational theory’s tenets, these new intelligences are largely pre-cognitive. They thrive on sensory, corporeal practice, rather than on the internal accumulation of emplaced knowledge in the form of cognitive archives or maps. Mobile, mybrid purveyors of sensuous reportage are “laying down systems of distributed pre-cognition” (Thrift, 2007: 164), by whatever technological means necessary.

She/he/it/they roam through environments that have become machine readable, thanks to cognitive assists brought about by reticulation (the assembling of mobile networks, such as CCTV). Environments offer affordances (Gibson, 1950) that enable meaning to be churned during movement, by assemblages that yield emplaced knowledge. Machine assisted reportage apprehends the world via networks that are mobile, pre-cognitive and practice based. A newly perceptible layer of not quite life (Thrift, 1994) is being introduced to the human encounter with the world. Bare life, that biologically and culturally constituted realm of pre-cognitive sub-routines, is increasingly coming under the governance of technologically propelled intelligence (Agamben, 2004). These developments are an added surface for perceiving, an extra umwelt (perceptual environment), an enlivened realm of corporeal habit. At street level, pre-thought is garnered from linguistic fragments (overheard utterances, litter, discarded text), sounds (recorded in soundscapes), images (photographed, filmed), juxtaositions and embodied sensations (enacted by repetition).

Environments gain vitality. They impinge on a newly enabled human-machine consciousness. They are more active, articulate and redolent with expressive opportunity. They talk to us out loud, if we will only listen (look, feel, and so forth).

In the wake of previous mobile place-making researchers
This research project constitutes six collaborations with mobile place makers who are new arrivals to the city of Salford-Manchester. Each collaboration yields mobile reportage, reflecting the infusion of spaces with meaning. This empirical work builds on that of several previous mobile place-making projects from the field of cultural geography. Three noteworthy examples (Spinney, 2007, Massey, 1993, 2008, Moores and Metykova, 2010) are reviewed in detail below. These demonstrate
performative approaches to place-making research that resonate with the tenets of non-representational theory. They offer insight on how place making is forged from mobile sensory reportage.

Spinney (2007): Cycling the city into being
A two-wheeled ethnographic approach was adopted by Spinney (2007) to show how varieties of mobility affect the meanings we ascribe to place. Spinney identifies a tendency to regard some places as meaningful (destinations) with others often cast as meaningless because they are typically experienced in transit (Jain and Lyons, 2008). Yet in-between places that escape the attentions of Lonely Planet guides are potentially meaningful to those who traverse them, especially when experienced performatively, sensuously (on foot, wheelchair, space-hopper, stilts or bicycle). Ingold (2000) notes that meaning derived from such places arises from fleeting experience and may be heightened by embodied engagement. This resonates with Thrift’s (2008) argument that repetitive, embodied apprehension of environments yields corporeal, pre-cognitive intelligence that does not necessarily manifest itself in the formation if internal representations, such as cognitive maps. Apprehending nature gains vitality from the fusion of body and kinaesthetic technology. The equipment through which places are experienced matters. In the case of some forms of travel, where sensory engagement with place is limited to a journey’s ends (planes, trains and automobiles), destinations and start points perceptually gain greater status than places of transience. In the travel industry, origins and destinations are constructed in a distorted form in comparison to more transient sites (Cresswell, 2004). Distinctions are made here between places and non-places (Augé, 1995). The former are lived in, marketable, staked out areas that also serve as meeting points. Non-places are often experienced in attenuated fashion, with a sense of separation, some sense modes blocked out, through windows, in transit, fragmentarily or in panorama (Gandy, 2002). These effects are accentuated by technology.

Being open to the senses and embodied, the cyclist is unconstrained in constructing meanings from transient places. The construction of place accrues from embodied practice, the environment documented by a mobile assemblage of human, bicycle and GPS computer. The resulting portrait of place exceeds individual interpretation. Using a hybrid of participatory photography and textual narrative Spinney’s two-wheeled informants composed performative reportage about and along their routes. These are partial, situated, embodied, incomplete narratives about places between places.
Karen picks periwinkle and buddleia alone beneath Wandsworth underpass (Spinney, 2007:7)

The appeal of sites that may seem visually unremarkable, empty and devoid of commerce is considerable when experienced corporeally, safely, away from noise and traffic. Embodied experience reminds us that to some (walkers, cyclists, wheelchair users, jockeys), places are constructed through all senses, not just as visual panoramas, as was Gibson’s (1950) focus. Pre-cognitive knowledge is acquired through repetition and performance. Spinney’s (2007) collaborative accounts of daily commutes along London’s less celebrated routes remind us that the construction of place is a multi-sensory, ongoing, embodied process.

_Massey (1993, 2008): A global sense of place_

Massey (1993) contributes to our understanding of place construction by emphasising transience, fluidity and mobility over dwelling, boundedness and stasis; doing, rather than being. In cultural geography, contemporary understandings of place have outgrown portrayals of homogenous, bounded, insular entities, where homogenous cultures reside. Inward looking constructions of place have been superseded by those recognising them as fluid phenomena into and out of which goods, people and information flow. To illustrate, Massey (1993) accompanies us on an exploration of global discourses, texts and influences that radiate out of London’s Kilburn High Road. She articulates the multiple connections (multisensory, culinary, sartorial, linguistic) between this and other global locations. A place with outward orientation, this road is oriented along trajectories that radiate globally. Places, Massey argues, gain their meanings from where they are oriented to, rather than from elements contained within them. Networks of social relations and belonging meet at various loci, revealing vectors of meaning for new arrivals, inhabitants and visitors. Portrayed this way a globally oriented place is an extroverted phenomenon, not a bounded container. Without boundaries, identity itself becomes fluid, adaptive and reticular. Place is constructed through mobile trajectories. Identities of people and place are loaded into one another. In keeping with the relational view of non-representational theory, we might best understand how meaning is derived from extroverted places by working the interstices, by gathering accounts of meaningful links with other places, rather than looking at static, bounded biographies of places and people. Massey’s work resonates with another London street ethnography in which participants’ stories are explored in terms of
links with other global locations (*On Brick Lane*, Lichtenstein, 2009). In both works, place making is examined through narratives linking places.

*Moore and Metykova (2010): I didn’t realise how attached I am*

To view place making as dissolving boundaries between individuals, technologies and spatialities reflects a growing appetite within cultural geography to abolish divisions between nature and culture, and between human and non-human agency (Anderson and Harrison, 2010). Migrant workers’ narratives encapsulate this process. As new arrivals to a city they strenuously construct places, accumulating corporeal knowledge through routine perambulation in novel territories. They do the knowledge on the hoof. Whilst performatively developing new attachments, remnants of old places linger, sometimes even materially. The carrying of mementos, photographs and other reminders from back home is common. Moyer and Metykova (2010) interviewed Eastern European arrivals to an English city to explore experiential, corporeal and material trajectories linking arrivals to places old and new, with the help of cognitive assists sustained by media environments. Rather than dwelling on biographical stories, the research focused on how novel environments were performed into being and gathered meaning through embodied practice. The development of emerging, pre-reflective, embodied knowledge, acquired through mobility, illustrates how the body subject learns through repetition and becomes attached to the movement it knows (Seamon, 1979, p.48-9)

There’s an old saying that you don’t realise how much you know (intelligence) and like (affect) a place until you leave it. For these arrivals, whilst novel attachments through routine mobility forged, retrospective attachments to distant places emerged. Just like the forming of new attachments through mobility, old attachments were rekindled through repetitive activities in media environments. Non-representational approaches to the dynamics of place-making urge us to take the technology of virtual travel into account (Greenbough, 2010). The 21st century migrant is a technologically assisted assemblage who can, on an hourly basis, use distributed identities to transcend mere physiology. With the help of technology s/he hangs around habitually in imaginatively habitable locations (internet cafes). Humans in flow hook up with material objects and repetitively construct performative attachments to media environments (*This is my facebook site, I come here three or four times a day*). Intelligent networks are
employed performatively to gather meaning around real and technological places past (‘there’s my flat back in Bratislava’) and present (‘click the home key to see where I work’). Mobile experience cries out for a safe place to be. Imaginatively habitable locations provide electronic havens for the displaced. Media environments are especially meaningful (familiar places, frequented often) for migrant workers. They are a well-trodden refuge in an unfamiliar physical place. Moore and Metykova’s correspondents etched out corporeal knowledge of the city and gained a deepening familiarity with a media environment that enabled them to stay familiar with a distant homeland. Both processes were incremental, involving the development of kinaesthetic knowing, sensual familiarisation (‘I got to know the squeaky floor’, one informant reported). Both processes were also conducted within intelligent networks of people and things. Cameras, personal computers and phones extended their reach, added vitality to environments. Repetitive, mobile practice was bound up in the construction of places using postcards, photographs, diaries and phones. Trajectories were established between old and new times and places. Media environments are imaginatively inhabited, frequently visited places in which to do research, modeled on everyday experience and embodied practice.

A turn to mobility
The literature reviewed here reflects a desire to examine embodied constructions of place with narratives of mobility, rather than dwelling and rootedness. An emphasis on flow (Massey, 1993), mobility and always becoming reveals the emergence of a nomadic metaphysics, challenging the dwelling-based sedentary metaphysics (Cresswell, 2006). This emphasis on flow and rejection of stasis is reflected in a recent reluctance, in geography, to write of discrete, bounded, territorialized cultures, as has been the case, for example, in cross-cultural models of acculturation (Berry, 2005, see chapter one). In social anthropology too, Clifford (1992) urged practitioners to turn their attention to the formation of identities through transition, travel and mobility, rather than delving deep into bounded cultures, which would yield more monographs of seemingly isolated peoples (‘The Azande’, ‘The Nuer’, ‘The Kwakiutl’). Auge (1995) too accepts the turn to mobility, generating an interest in the study of fleeting, temporary, in-between worlds, the non-places such as airport lounges, freeways, flyovers and concrete islands that have been so celebrated by students of flow from beyond academia (Ballard, 2008). An interest in spatial transience has also been popularised by mobile psycho-geographical travel writers such as Sinclair’s (2002) walk around the M25 and Self’s (2008) attempt to enter and leave majors international airports on foot. Within a nomadic discourse, exiles, refugees, tourists are arguably the emblematic subjects of our age (Massey,
The normalisation of mobility is matched by a proliferation of places of transitory congregation. Besides real life transitional non-places, Auge’s (1995) airport lounges, internet cafes, wifi zones and social networking sites all reflect a burgeoning nomadic discourse (Moore and Metykova, 2010). The multiplying media and virtual environments that are constituted through repetitive and multisensory practice offer increased opportunities for studying networks of distributed intelligence and the multilayered construction of place attachments. The rise of the nomadic metaphysics brings with it new metaphors of flow and distributed identity. The nomad is an historic figure whose trajectories of vagabondage are constituted as lines of travel, not points between, dwelling (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987). Perpetual, nomadic flight distributes subjects across smooth (desert like) surfaces, against the containing instincts of nation states that still champion a sedentary metaphysics. For Thrift (2007), rhizomic identity is the epitome of anti-biography. Organisms are portrayed as fragmented, assemblage-like and multiply rooted.

What is place in this “in-between world? The short answer is, compromised: permanently in a state of enunciation, between addresses, always deferred. Places are “stages of intensity”…traces of movement, speed and circulation

(Thrift, 1994:193)

Technologies and tool networks have now been developed that can fuse with humans and harness attributes such as speed, light and power to the extent that mobility is no longer a state of resistance against dominant ideologies (de Certeau, 1984, Deleuze and Guattari, 1987), but a normal set of practices for apprehending the world. Operating within networks of people and things (rhizomes), 21st century nomads are always becoming, feeding off an increasingly vital world, sending trajectories. The collaborators who feature in this research are 21st century nomads.

**Mobility as a structure of feeling**

Mobility is a natural early 21st century state, or structure of feeling (Williams, 1981); a cultural style of the period. For Thrift (1994), a structure of feeling is never fixed, yet sets limits on patterns of action. All cultural periods reflect characteristic structures of feeling. In the 21st century western world, mobility is to the fore. Mobility manifests itself in a world that is populated by fragmented, unbounded agents that defy individualism and emerge instead as life forms in transit, in-between (Haraway, 1997, Latour, 2005). The onset of mobility as a structure of feeling came gradually and was foreshadowed by several key cultural developments (Thrift, 1994). For example, since the 19th century humanity has gravitated towards a more manufactured environment, having made a decision to
unbind itself from the soil – not to return to a nomadic existence but
to bind itself instead to a predominantly technological environment
(Williams, 1990:2)

This uprooting and opening up to technologically-aided flow plays into the
hands of a mobile cyborg culture, inhabited and driven by machine aided
humans. A second cultural development was a greater acceptance of
commonalities between humans, animals, machines and plant organisms
(Thrift, 1994). It is recognised more widely now that these all share mutual
reliance on the vicissitudes of nature (Greenhough, 2010). Again this
reflects an acceptance of blurring boundaries of identity, and of the
distributed intelligences we invest in non-humans (computers, implants,
guide dogs). Human societies have perhaps reached such an advanced stage
of mutuality that we can barely function normally unaided. Much of the so-
called natural world (rare and endangered species) cannot survive without
humans (Strathern, 1992). Camels, it is reported, cannot have sex without
our intervention (Reader, 1997). Machines are no longer seen as mere
slaves, threats or mimics, but as valued companions, parts of actant
networks (Haraway, 1997). Historical developments in technology have
delivered us to a place where our ability to apprehend nature, to perceive,
record and conduct research in the everyday, have been enhanced by gradual
scientific advances, such as the spread of speedy travel (Thrift, 1994). Since
the 19th century bicycles, stagecoaches, railways, all provided platforms for
mobile capacities and outlooks. Formerly static populations could now
operate between destinations, apprehend nature on the go, often
panoramically. The annihilation of space through travel, hastening the
development of newspapers, postcards, telegrams and telephones,
accentuated a mobile structure of feeling, even providing vehicles for
writing about it. Bodies themselves became parcels to be shipped around, a
novel embodied experience providing a rich seam of plunder for travel
writers of the day. 20th century mobility became so common that face-to-
face scenarios were no longer necessary for communication. Another
change in our perception of place that grew from the development of travel
and speed was tourism, bringing with it the commodification of landscape
(Urry, 1990). Places could now be visited at a price. Overall this slow leap
forward in accelerated travel has invited mobility into our repertoire, along
with a host of culturally endorsed, value-laden (movement good, stasis bad)
linguistic tics to go with it (‘we’re rolling this out over the next few months’, ‘I’ve been
out of circulation lately’, ‘now we’re getting somewhere’, ‘things have come to a virtual
standstill’).

Contemporary partnerships with non-humans facilitate capacities that
exceed those of the human component. In the visual field, infra-red
cameras, MRI, CCTV and X-ray all separate vision from the human observer, revealing intelligent networks that are perceptually more capable than bare life allows (Thrift, 1994). Mobile cyborgs place humans alongside gadgets that cooperate with humans, sometimes beyond the physiological boundary, sometimes within it (implants). As apprehenders of nature, those who constitute place bring it into being performatively, exploiting the novel machine readability that technology brings. Rather than bemoaning machine networks we are now more likely to mimic their mannerisms (Thrift, 1994). It is increasingly common to adapt our written style to fall in with technological requirements (140 characters or less, please, 'the grammar-check won’t like this').

**Mobile reportage**

A new ontology is amongst us, wherein becoming supersedes being. Mobility in all its forms has almost become a primary activity. Most of our interlocutors are passers-by. Average residence in places more likely to be months than years (Virilio, 1990). Nomadic thought is par for the course. Our means for constructing and apprehending place ostensibly are mobile and embodied, gathering up multisensory, corporeal intelligence. The modern day accumulator of mobile reportage is on the go, tooled up, submerged in the flow of a mobile structure of feeling. S/he/it

(i) Performs places into being with technologically aided methods that no longer assume communication with others to be a face-to-face phenomenon

(ii) Has a fractured identity, a “parliament of things” (Thrift, 1994:193), trusting in gadgets to see or hear things that lie beyond bare life’s sensory receptors

(iii) Resides along vectors, in place-between-places, rather than being of fixed abode, so place constructions are brought about through the wearing away of routes and grooves

(iv) Constructs places that are always becoming, so that reporting is an embodied process of creating places which are traces of movement (Kolb, 1990)

Tactics that are employed by these mobile correspondents to make places from space create legible paths through space (de Certeau, 1987). These tactics are the raw material of performative reportage and constitute a clutch of practices such as walking, picture making, the excavation of found objects, the recording of soundscape compositions. Spoken in the voices and seen through the eyes of mobile correspondents, these emplaced tactics are narratives conveyed through a heteroglossia of discourses; some
academic, some not. They steer a course away from objective truth (Thrift, 2008), along intellectual itineraries where multiple voices are tolerated, where science and fiction are admissible (de Certeau, 1987). For this research project, reporting the newly perceived city through pictures, sounds and embodied practice constitutes a multisensory method for communicating the everyday hum of human traffic.

*New arrivals and other strangers*

As mobile operators with a heightened eye, ear, nose and feel for the new, a city’s new arrivals are no strangers to the experiences of displacement and estrangement. They are on bewildering journeys through vital landscapes (Greenhough, 2010), enhanced by environmental affordances and embodied networks of distributed intelligence. Their new cities are comings together of strangers (Young, 1990). As new arrivals they may seek acceptance and hospitality, although this so-called hospitable cosmopolis model (Iveson, 2006) arguably bolsters the erroneous binary between hosts (insiders) and new arrivals (outsiders) (Iveson, 2006) that cross-cultural psychology too adheres too (see chapter one). A more inclusive portrayal of arrival in a city recognises a common experience of urban estrangement (for residents and newcomers alike). In a city of strangers, new arrivals insert themselves into an entanglement of estranged persons (Iveson, 2006). Territory is common, public and shared. A city of the estranged is a fluid, cacophonous, riot of sensuousness, as bewildering as De Sica’s Rome in *Bicycle Thieves* (Grimshaw and Ravetz, 2009). It is an unfinished place that challenges the new arrival to join in, make sense of it, to make it up as they go along. It bids them to gather meaning and do the knowledge on the hoof. Amid the cacophony and the walking and glad-handing, the city throws up questions to the rest of us

How do newly arrived international students develop meaningful attachments to and emplaced knowledge of their new city?
Chapter 3

Living thinking, extended minds
Cognition, culture and place making

Think non-representation
Besides offering a distinct view on cultural geographical concepts relating to
dynamic constructions of meaningful places (see chapter two), non-
representational theory can also be used to provide a unique perspective on
psychological questions about place perception (the construction of place)
as a form of thought. Although non-representational theory has hitherto
not been expressly deployed in the service of the psychology of place, it has
the potential to extend the remit of the discipline in this regard, as this
chapter will seek to show.

Using non-representational theory we can begin to see the construction of
place as a form of emplaced thinking or situated knowledge gathering.
Specifically, in relation to the place making activities that are the subject of
this research project, a non-representational approach can help us address
questions about whom or what is doing the thinking (our subject), whom or
what counts as an knowledgeable agent (a newly arrived accumulator of
emplaced knowledge), and what counts as thought in the first place. We can
thus see cognition as an emplaced concept, one that can is constitutive of
place, rather than as an internal, psychological activity (see chapter one). Post-
cognitive approaches relating to cognition as an extended, distributed
practice will be considered in theoretical and historical contexts in this
chapter, as will the implications of these approaches for the place making
research project.

Non-psychological, pre-cognitive, living thinking
For Thrift (2001), thought and theory are modest supplements to practice.
From this starting position he suggests that our cognitive relations with the
world might be redefined by bringing out into the light a form of practice-
based thought called living-thinking (Thrift & Crang, 2001), by which we
might develop knowledgeable constructions of and attachments to places.
When thoughts are conceived of as performances they become
demonstrable. They take their place amongst other skills and forms of
expertise that are freely learned by all newcomers to a place. Once newly
arrived, all of us develop emplaced expertise, simply to get around.

A non-representational discourse of place making is more multiverse than
universe. Learning and making places occurs trans-individually, with
gadgets, with the help of dogs, maps and other people. Thrift & Crang
(2001) find respite from monological thinking in modes of emplaced
learning that emanate from co-productive encounters between people and things. Co-productive thought thrives on walking, talking, listening; collaborative encounters are bound into everyday practice. These encounters may be ongoing, inconclusive, yet within them non-exhaustive seams of knowledge and disclosure are tapped. The concept of co-produced knowledge keys into key non-representational tenets (see chapter two) that see life as (i) dynamic and emergent, (ii) pre-cognitive; embodied knowledge overriding internalised modes that to ignore lived, bodily experience, (iii) a domain where everyday practice and the material, vital world (increasingly perceptible using technology) are intertwined.

Performed, non-representational thinking is demonstrable (in practice), relational (encountered between actants), dynamic (acquired through mobility) and ecological (the sensed world is always drowned in the noise of the everyday [Serres & Latour, 2005, Whatmore, 2006]). Living thinking is borne of the co-production of extended organisms, always constructing potentials through the practices, poetics and potentials of everyday life. Arguably this conception of thought is the antithesis of established psychological understandings of scholasticism and cognition (see chapter one), wherein theorising about the world is conducted internally, perhaps demonstrated in laboratorial settings. It is the antithesis of Platonic, psychological depictions of thought as internal information processing.

Living, thinking, dynamic bodies effuse pre-cognitive knowledge. They occupy trajectories through places, sensing and making the world in the present, springing into action often before cognition is complete (Thrift & Crang, 2001). Practice-based knowing outgrows physiological bounds and extends into a wideware (Clark, 2001) through performatively contact with a vital ethology. Beyond the confines of internal representation it extends out into (and is constitutive of) a world that is full with possibility, enhanced by other agents and technologies of mobility, beyond the phenomenology of bare life, into new space-times. Technologies enhance the construction of new platforms for thinking out loud, between co-productive actants whose voices are heard and noted

Transport and interplay between space-times, using technology, invite more possibilities for constructing environments. Modern societies are characterised by an unparalleled density and richness of space-times that have thickened the past, present and future in ways that provide unparalleled opportunities to boost virtuality and promote heterogenesis (Thrift, 2001:91).

The creation of new space-times illustrates the potential of collaborative living thinking for staking out new territories, making new places, doing
knowledge on the hoof. Walking and talking in pairs is a place making activity in itself. ‘Doing the knowledge’, ‘exercising judgment’ are everyday linguistic tics that give the game away. They play into the hands of non-representational portrayals thinking as practical, living, collaborative, situated cognition. Judgment, for Thrift (2001), is always exercised, acted out in the lived world. Not only is it cab drivers who do the knowledge. We’re all doing it. Eschewing forms of monological thought that emanate from internal information processing (as in cognitive mapping, archival memory, see chapter one), Thrift suggests a more performative brand of thought; ethical coping, based on pre-theoretical everyday convictions, facilitating practical judgments. This process involves the cultivation of knowledge and meaning on the ground, attuned to ethological events. Real experts, he asserts, are those of us (all of us) who act on inclination, respond to situations flexibly, rather than apply pre-ordained ethical codes (Varela, 1999). This flexible, intelligent action model sees expertise growing out of embodied spontaneity, bypassing established codes and deliberation, getting smart on the hoof, as well all do when confronted with a new place. This is thought as an appropriate response to a new situation. It takes place at the tattered subject-environment boundary. Improvisation is cultivated through practice and requires openness to and engagement in a vital world.

Living thinking is not just about emplacing cognition in an otherwise inert subject-world. The liveliness of situated cognition flourishes in an already living world that has a vitalism of its own (Whatmore, 2006). The vitality of the world is not conditional on our interactions with it. There is no dead, flat world waiting to be brought to life through human encounter (Massey, 2003). Rather, environments of affordances are active and capable of intruding on us. The development of co-productive knowing enables us to come to know the lively material world through embodied experience, rather than passive observation. The full-bodied ethnographic research that features in this project explores active engagement with, rather than passive classifying, describing and mapping of, or acculturating to, existing territories.

Whom or what is thinking?
In the field of cultural geography several writers highlight the agency of non-human life (Whatmore, 2006, Thrift, 2001), so excusing humanity from responsibility as sentient, decision-making being. When cyborgs and part-machine assemblages prevail, questions about whom or what is capable of thought arise. As do questions about whom, in an age of knowledge production by co-operative humans and non-humans (Haraway, 1997), are considered as expert problem-solvers. A reluctance to hold humans as separate from other life forms (Thrift, 2004) is part of a re-mapping of relations between human, non-humans and material that has taken hold in
relational, non-representational thought. Rather than asking about characteristics of human or non-human thought, a non-representational, relational view brings into sharp focus questions about how mobile actants interrelate with one another to construct knowledge and meaning about places; thinking them into being as it were (Greenhough, 2010). If humans do this in tandem with other agents, we might ask – *who or what is doing the thinking?*

In a fluid, relational world, thinkers are absolved of static form. Being off the hook of sole responsibility, they hot-desk and hook-up with other agents to get the job done. Greenhough (2010) argues that our understandings of which organisms are sentient acknowledges that life forms are subject to flow and metamorphosis. They have fluid relations with materiality and their surroundings. They are nascent in form, always becoming in composition. Nothing illustrates this better than developments in cybernetics (Warwick et al, 2010), computer technology, companion species and prosthetic science (Haraway, 2003) that have led to a reinvention of the mind. They distribute cognition into the world (Fraser, Kember and Lury, 2005, Clark 2011). No longer can thought be regarded as internal contemplation or the assumed workings of internal information processors.

The distributing of thought through relational agents reflects ancient debates about the proximity of the mind to the outside, lived world, or culture. These debates have smouldered at the boundaries of disparate philosophical and psychological traditions.

**History, culture and distributed minds**

A definition of culture encompassing “knowledge, belief, art, law and custom” (Tylor, 1874 cited in Cole, 1996:13) reveals an early fusion of knowing and doing, of thought and action. Tylor was amongst 19th century thinkers who placed sociocultural and mental development cheek by jowl in a notional (national) correlation of the capacities of cultural groups. Albeit within this strain of evolutionary thinking we can see an early manifestation of the projection of mental processes into the external world.

The condition of culture amongst various societies of mankind is a subject apt for the study of laws of human thought and action (Tylor, 1874:1)

Herbert Spencer (1886) too saw social and mental advancement striding together. Underlying this assumption was one that saw European cultural life as identifiable with advanced mentality. According to this view the state of ones mental life is bound into the evolution of culture. Even in the 19th
century, intimate links between culture and mind were being forged. We can go back further.

Rousseau (1755) argued that far from occupying a privileged stage of advancement, European thought lagged behind that of so-called ‘primitives’ who adhered more closely to an unspoiled, compassionate, less artificial state of being. Vico (1724) too cast doubt on the search for a universal, rational human mind (earlier proposed by David Hume [1711-1766]), arguing that thought manifests itself differently in different socio-historical contexts. Herder (1744-1803) endorsed the view that shared language and history would likely correlate with degrees of similarity in mental processes. The dispute between universalists and relativists that has scarcely abated.

Proponents of *völkerpsychologie* took it as read that psychological capacity might vary from place to place (Jahoda, 1992). Wundt (1832-1920) embarked on a bifurcation of the discipline (Kalmar, 1987), wherein research gleaned from anthropology and linguistics would parallel natural science oriented psychological approaches (Jahoda, 1992). Dilthey (1938) echoed a need for the historically contingent study of human thinking, with mental life inextricable from cultural variation. Presently Wundt set out his plans for a dualistic discipline (Cole, 1996), incorporating a second psychology, projecting mental life out into culture; mentality lying beyond the scope of mere introspection. *Völkerpsychologie*, stated Wundt

relates to those mental products which are created by a community of human life and are, therefore inexplicable in terms merely of individual consciousness, since they presuppose the reciprocal action of many. Individual consciousness is wholly incapable of giving us a history of the development of human thought - (1921:3)

Wundt was committed to a study of the social and the cultural in psychology

Wundt invested such a large proportion of his energies in problems of “ethnic” or cultural psychology because he believed that here one dealt, not with a different subject, but with another side of mental activity that had to complement individual psychology if one was ever to achieve an understanding of mental life as it truly existed

(Danziger, 1979:221)

For many, Wundt’s vision for a culturally and socially oriented psychology would presently be repudiated as part of the rise and adoption by psychological discourses of positivism (Danziger, 1979). Nevertheless, like others in the evolutionist cohort of his era, Wundt connected European cultures with high level intellectual endowment, which he explained by what
he perceived as the greater range of experiences available closer to (his European) home. Yet this new movement in purposive psychology foretold of a turn to phenomenology. Meanings attached to everyday events would supersede events themselves as a focus of study. Intentional states of mind would be projected into the outside world (Shweder, 1991). In the birth of volkerpsychologie psychological processes became situated, grounded in everyday activity, rather than Platonically confined to remote regions of the inner psyche. Ultimately, for some at least, the study of thought would lose its mind altogether.

The coming of cultural psychology and the emplaced mind
Platonic proposals of a universal capacity for reason illustrate psychic unity (Shweder, 1991). This concealed bedrock for positivist proclamations on the mind, seeing it as an internal protectorate, proposes that any cultural differences in psychological functioning (personality traits, performance on cognitive tests) are limited by internal, universal psychological capacities. This formulation developed into what we know today as cross-cultural psychology, offering us concepts such as acculturation to demonstrate cultural variation, bedded onto universal inner consciousness (Berry, 2005, see chapter one). Diverse practices are rendered as local difference; no real challenge to the conviction that deep down, all humans have an internal, global intellect. The doctrine of psychic unity asserts that underlying cultural variation is a set of psychic structures (mind, memory, perceptual processes) that all humans share. This assumes a remote relationship between the mind and the outside world (Shweder, 1991).

Railing against the Cartesian premise of a universal grammar of mental functioning to underly the minor vicissitudes of practice and culture, Shweder proposes the “infusion of conscious and pure spirit into the material world” (1991:9). This portrayal erodes the boundaries between mind and culture. Rather than relying on internal, pristine logic to make sense of the world, Shweder sees human imagination as projected, distributed, into external material reality. Existence is best understood experientially, artfully, steeped in colour and local variation.

Endorsement of this relationship between mind and culture is evident in the work of those who see thought as mediated through materiality and cultural artefacts (tools, number systems, maps, toys, art, alphabets, language). Mediated thus, thought is practice, not internal process (Cole, 1996, Spackman and Yanchar, 2013). Human minds and cultures develop co-constitutively through contingent tool-mediated activity. Reacting to the 1970s cognitive revolution in psychology (information processing, thought as internal), Shweder (1991) reinvigorates the role of socio-cultural context as an inseparable constituent of mentality (Jahoda & Krewer, 1996).
Specifically, he argues that cultural contexts do not exist independently of human seizure of intentional meanings

Every human being has their subjectivity and mental life altered through the process of seizing meanings (1991:2).

Shweder echoes the views of Bruner (1979), who saw the emergence of Wundt’s second psychology as evidence of a shift towards a focus on meaning making as central in psychology. Inheriting many of the views associated with second psychology, Cole (1996) too places thought out in the world, mediated through culture. For Cole, psychological processes (thought, learning) emerge through doing and are distributed through materiality. By using and modifying material objects, mind emerges and endlessly becomes. Language (perhaps the most sophisticated cultural artefact of all), tools and other technologies are transformative devices, mutually constitutive of mentality. As Luria (1978) once argued, tools effect changes in psychic conditions. Tools, technology and language mediate thought in a two-way constitutive process (Cole, 1996). Cultural artefacts (maps, images, words, gadgets) form the third point in a triangle which casts them as intermediaries between people and places which make each other up on a daily basis.

Culture, in this equation, amounts to the accumulated achievements of social groups; the worldly, tangible evidence and catalyst of thought itself. To analyse the accumulation of culture, research is best grounded in everyday life, modeled on everyday practice. Mind, consciousness and knowledge are contingent on, embedded in, diverse meaning systems that emerge through practice in culture (Shweder, 1991).

Cultural psychology is the study of the cultural mediation of the human psyche. Freed of Platonism it eschews psychic unity in favour of divergences of the mind. It is a discipline devoted to questions about how psyche and culture, people and places, make each other up. It relies on intentional conceptions of constituted worlds, where practice/practitioner, human/environment, people/place dichotomies fuse and cannot be wrenched apart (Thrift, 1998).

For research projects such as the present one, investigating how we invest materiality and place with meaning, cultural psychology is oriented towards diverse functioning of mindless minds. With no such thing as context-less, internal thought, individuals articulate their relations to nature with situated cognition, strung out across tooled environments. Artefacts, action and cognition are interwoven with places, to form distributed networks of intelligence (Latour, 2005).
Situated, collaborative cognition

Culture is a human cognitive process that takes place both inside and outside the minds of people. It is a process in which our everyday cultural practices are enacted (Hutchins, 1995:354).

Cole (1996) locates thought on both sides of the skin-line, as indeed Bartlett (1932) did in his early conceptions of memory as a social, collective practice in his fieldwork amongst expert Swazi cattle herders. Other contemporary writings about culture and cognition promote thought as artifact-based practice. D’Andrade (1995) urges us to take seriously what he terms the cultural part of cognition. He describes culture as a pool of programs for action and understanding, passed down through generations and encompassing at once habits thought and practice. Like Geertz (1973), D’Andrade, a cognitive anthropologist, locates problem solving in the visible, tangible arena of lived thought, enacted in the social world.

In Bali it was Geertz who referred to cultures as ‘recipes for living’, modes of active, collaborative thought, shared by groups of actors, rooted not in their heads but in the social, public spheres of street and market. Like proponents of cultural psychology, Geertz the fieldworker abandoned the psychological tradition in which “human beings are divided into inner states and outer appearances” (Inglis, 2000:3). D’Andrade illustrates his argument for grounded, co-productive cognition by citing an experiment in which participants developed winning strategies in the games of Go and Gomoku (Eisenstadt and Kareev, 1975). These strategies were least successful for those who worked alone, as atoms abstracting knowledge for themselves. Others, working and talking together during and between play, abstracted viable strategies for beating artificially intelligent opponents. Able to tap into and generate cultural knowledge programs, social thinkers became collaborative experts, whilst individual information processors struggled. D’Andrade uses such scenarios, where knowledge is constituted through practice and is derived from mutuality, to scold Schank and Abelson’s (1977) for their “otherwise notable” (1981:186) theory of internal scripts, reminiscent of cognitive maps (Golledge, 2002, see chapter one), which, he argues, ignore elements of thought which involve the guided discovery of cultural knowledge, rather than individual problem solving.

If thought and culture are so entwined, so practically co-constituted, this propels us towards local, on-the-go, content-driven portrayals of cognition. It has been noted that performance on cognitive tasks is greatly affected as much by contextual properties of those tasks as by formal levels of ability (Deregowski, 1972, Cole, 1996). For example, children who excel in
mathematical puzzles presented on-the-job, whilst selling coconuts in Brazilian streets, struggled with formally equivalent tasks when they were presented in the rarefied atmosphere of the schoolroom, minus everyday practice (Carraher et al, 1986). Humans, it appears, can find it hard to transfer formally taught abilities easily between local environments. D’Andrade (1981) extrapolates from this that two types of abstraction may be at play in human problem solving. One, so-called content-based abstraction, involves developing solutions to specific types of problem whilst in situ, learning on the hoof; in the act of taxi-driving, playing chess or selling coconuts. Here, tools for thought are developed contextually, without recourse to separate memory systems or stores, as though bodies themselves were doing the thinking. Grounded cognitions generate naturally occurring, situated solutions (Lave, 1977) that emerge from apprenticeship. They do not though successfully feed into formal language abstraction based knowledge, which emerges from unnatural, explicit instruction. For D’Andrade, content-based abstraction epitomises situated, collaborative cognition; experiencing and knowing are mutually constitutive processes.

Hutchins (1995) sees culture as accumulated meaning-infused artefacts and practices, revealing adaptive, purposive processes for solving problems. Hutchins (2008) coins the term cognitive ecology to invoke these processes of contextualized problem solving. This view shifts cognitive theory towards the study of embodied, situated, distributed cognition (Spackman and Yanchar, 2013). It reconfigures the unit of study away from phenomena that are defined by their inherent properties (minds, information processors), towards dynamic, inter-related, emplaced entities. We have seen analogous shifts in neighbouring fields such as cultural geography, where links between and trajectories through places have superseded places in themselves as objects for analysis, at least in non-representational theory (Thrift, 1994, Massey, 2008 and see chapter two).

**Extending the mind**

The epistemological consequences of the delineation of the preferred unit of study are considerable (Hutchins, 2008). The sanctioning of connectivity between units as a prime focus facilitates the envisioning of thought as something that arises co-productively, from networks of interdependent entities, human, non-human and material (Bateson, 1972), in line with the relational tenets of non-representative theory (Thrift, 2008). Within such cognitive eco-systems, thought is a process that can only be apprehended amid a contextual understanding of the environmental conditions, and of the collaborators, technologies and cultural artefacts by which it is mediated and practised. This extended cognitive ecology is the nub of Bateson’s
(1972) thought experiment in which he asks where the mental system of a blind man ends

Is it bounded by the skin? Does it start half way to the tip of the stick? If what you are trying to explain is a given piece of behaviour, then for this purpose you will need the street, the stick, the man (1972:459)

Clark & Chalmers (1998) illustrate this with what they refer to as EXTENDED and BRAINBOUND cognition (Clark, 2011). The former evokes modes of thought that are extended into the world. The latter recalls information processing models of cognition (see chapter one). Active externalism imbues environments with affordances (Gibson, 1950) that vitally complement human thought. Clark and Chalmers present thought experiments to make the argument for extending the mind. Here, three participants strive to solve a problem by one of three methods

1. Mental rotation: a person in front of a computer screen is asked to ‘mentally’ fit images of shapes into appropriate holes on the screen

2. Physical or mental rotation: a person has the same task as in 1, but with the added choice of physically manipulating a ‘rotate’ button to fit the shapes into the appropriate holes

3. A neural implant enables a person to complete a task similar to those in 1 and 2. Alternately, s/he can use old fashioned internal mental rotation to complete the task

The aim of this thought experiment is to show that uniquely, Problem Solver 2 uses a form of distributed cognition that extends our understanding of thinking out into the world, beyond the boundary of skin and skull. Thus, this boundary cannot be said to set the limits for cognition. This alerts us to everyday extended cognition, where problem solvers lean on environmental supports in order to solve problems; calculators, mobile phones, nautical slide-rules, dogs, each other (Hutchins, 1995). Clark’s (2011) notion of active externalism suggests a coupling between an organism and any number of externally located components, whose withdrawal from the resulting network would reduce the overall effectiveness of problem solving (I’m lost without my slide-rule).

As several researchers into the related fields of situated cognition (Suchman, 1987), robotics (Beer, 1987), companion species (Haraway, 2003) and intelligent networks (Hutchins, 1995) have shown, the turn towards external
cognition loops affects preferences for research methods in cognitive science. Many studies of thought are carried out in everyday, mobile settings that are active, portable components of cognition. Perhaps partly as a consequence of the portability of cognitive appendages, mobile problem solving assemblages have taken on parasitical qualities (Clark & Chalmers, 1998). In an argument that resonates with those of vitalist geographers such as Greenough (2010), and with Gibson’s (1950) notion of direct perception, it is suggested that situated intelligence involves more than just a smart organism negotiating a flat, dead, lifeless environment. Rather, it evolves means of factoring in features of the social and physical environment and culturally derived artefacts, effectively recruiting them as part of the solution; going with the flow, as it were (Clark, 2011). Language, writing, talking are all examples of participatory cognitive strategies that are devices for learning, rather than simply means for communicating learning. Thus, the nervous system can be seen to develop in ways that complement and anticipate these active strategies. A recent preponderance of educational research in the field of ‘writing to learn’ exemplifies the use of a culturally derived process (writing) as a means of accelerating learning, rather than simply its product (Wood, 2002). Triantafyllou and Triantafyllou (1995) use the analogy of fish as machines for swimming to illustrate how human organisms adapt to external practices to enhance thought. As fish propel themselves using aquatic energies, human thought is propelled on a sea of words and practices that are inseparable from thought.

The extraordinary efficiency of the fish as a swimming device is partly due to an evolved capacity to couple its swimming behaviours to the pools and external kinetic energy found as swirls, eddies and vortices in its watery environment. The fish swims by building these externally occurring processes into the very heart of its locomotion routines (cited in Clark, 2011:225)

Erecting physiological boundaries between the thought about world and the inner psyche rides roughshod over the ecological system’s identity as a network (Hutchins, 2008). Information processing theories (Atkinson & Shiffrin, 1968 and see chapter one) ring-fenced thought within a notional digital computer analogy, reducing it to rumbling, flickering, internal representations. Meanwhile cybernetic, relational and cultural models enable informational networks to extend into, even constitute, the external world (Bateson, 1972, Barrett-Leonard, 2013).

Cognition in the streets; on the job, living thinking
The field of cognitive ecology reflects a renewed appetite for situated cognition (Clark, 2011), whose theoretical roots are visible in the now well-
established cultural psychology movement (Cole, 1996, Shweder, 1991). One strand of cultural psychology in particular, cognitive-historical activity theory (CHAT) (Cole, 1978, Lave, 1984, Cole, 1996, Greiffenhagen and Sharrock, 2008), takes culture seriously as a constitutive component of the active, thinking mind. Thought itself oozes from problem-focused, on-the-job, mobile practice. The origins of practical thinking here resonate with Vygotsky’s (1978) notion of internal cognition emerging first from exploratory, infantile encounters with other children in shared activities. If we take this process one phenomenological step further we might say that as part of this practical thought process, environments, places, cultures, are not pre-existing at all. They are created by the activities of purposive organisms (Hutchins, 2008). Knowledge and meaning are ascribed to them through repetitive engagement with them.

Cultural activity theory and cultural psychology support these arguments with numerous domain specific demonstrations of the development of everyday expertise; amongst Liberian tailors (Lave, 1984, Greiffenhagen and Sharrock, 2008), North American waitresses (Stevens, 1992, Rose, 2001), Brazilian street vendors (Carraher et al, 1986) and Pacific body-counters (Saxe, 1984). In the case of the latter, Saxe epitomises cultural psychology’s commitment to breaking the barrier between culture and cognition, between embodiment and thought. Drawing on fieldwork in Papua New Guinea (Saxe, 1982), he highlights relationships between cultural change and cognitive development amongst the Oksapmin community, who employ body counting as a cultural form for economic exchange. Following Vygotsky (1978), Saxe notes how the development of cognitive strategies for solving real world problems emerges from cultural practices. Cole (1996) too notes the interrelated and mutually constitutive nature of thought and culturally endorsed forms. For the Oksapmin the socially organised activities that permeate daily interaction and economic exchange can be seen as extended loops, feeding back into cognition. Saxe shows how reciprocal relations between cognition and cultural practice play out at the level of microgenesis: wherein incremental changes in cognitive expertise accrue from everyday employment of embodied problem solving. It is worth noting here that the accumulation of emplaced knowledge for a new arrival conforms to this idea of microgenesis.

For the Oksapmin, as practice keeps pace with increasingly complex trading patterns as links with other communities thrive, cognitive problem solving strategies divide and multiply. Schemas proliferate in partnership with increased involvement with new methods of commerce and exchange. Cognition is mediated through a culturally endorsed practice, in this case an embodied numbering system which can be seen as an extension of the more culturally universal practice of counting on fingers (Cole, 1996).
Such street-level demonstrations of situated cognition illustrate ways in which thinking and everyday practices construct one another in dynamic transformative engagements. Engagement with everyday cognition illustrates a non-representational approach to thinking (Brooks, 1991). The embodied mind (Rowlands, 2006) is distributed and mediated through cultural artefacts and practice. Thought, according to this model, is something to do (Noe, 2004). It is ground out into the grooves of practice and the routes we etch into through the material world. It is not internally orchestrated.

The boundaries of psychology’s unit of study are extended. Increasingly, cognitive theorists define their subject relationally. Brain, body, world are inseparable. Mind and culture too. Whatever the mind is, it is present in between cognitive, embodied and environmental phenomena. When attending to the everyday, living thinking, cultural psychologists, cultural geographers and cognitive anthropologists might reflect how far we have come since thought was conceived of as a solitary, studious, private, disembodied, static, sedentary, internal pursuit.

Place making as situated cognition
Our pursuit of the nature of thought as an extended, embodied phenomenon leads us to consider how this non-representational approach to cognition might inform the central meaning-making activity of this project; the making of places, the bringing of meaning to a city through mobile daily living. During this project place making, the perception of place (Ingold, 2000), is construed as a practice of collaborative, extended cognition. The development of emplaced knowledge and everyday expertise, (a form of local knowledge) will be explored through varieties of sensory modalities and material artefacts.

Several researchers with an interest in place making have posed questions that occupy this space between cultural psychology and cultural geography. The field of situated cognition has generated research in which attachments
to and knowledge of places are regarded as exercises in skilled, living thinking (Thrift, 2008). Here, expertise is not equated with inner psychological capacity, but with domain-specific knowledge gained through the repetitious, everyday mastery of culturally mediated tools (Stigler et al., 1986), such was walking, writing, listening, photographing. Using the practical tools for thought, thinking is wrestled from the grasp of central processing. Mind is loaded into cultural artefacts, such as routes, photographs and stories (Clark, 2011). People, places and the means for developing knowledge are inseparable, each constitutive of the other.

Many who have pursued emplaced cognition in intentional worlds have embraced situated, collaborative, mobile methods like sensory ethnography as a method of choice (Pink, 2009, see chapter four). This enables the exploration of attachments to and knowledge of places as a form of situated cognition, or co-productive expertise (coming to know a new place) using the full array of senses. Embodied, sensuous meanings are attached to places, which in turn become known through routine familiarity. Tuzin (2006) and Cohen (2006), studied the acquisition of olfactory meanings during collaborative fieldwork in Papua New Guinea (among the Arapesh) and Thailand (in a Bangkok slum) respectively. Tuzin noted how his own uniform reaction to bad smells produced by poor personal hygiene and environmental cues (dead kittens) were not matched by his fellow participants. Yet the Arapesh were much less tolerant of personal hygiene transgressions, since ‘personal smells’ were inextricably linked to judgments (thoughts) about moral character. Crucially, these findings only emerged following prolonged, shared sensory practice. Cohen too drew on (sometimes unpleasant) sensuous participation in routines of garbage disposal in order to learn how to resolve his misunderstanding of Bangkok residents’ tolerance of the notorious Soi Lane stench. Again, long-term participation enabled Cohen to relate histories of migration and flow to a local tolerance of smell, which harked back to previous, familiar practices of waste decomposition in rural Thailand.

In both of these cases the ethnographer’s extensive embodied engagement facilitated the dismantling of entrenched thought processes (schemas) by a process of ethical coping (Thrift, 2001), or living thinking. This constitutes a schematizing response to a present, lived, sensed dilemma; a development of emplaced expertise, or local knowledge.

Another illustration of practical, kinaesthetic, embodied engagement facilitating situated cognition shows how on-the-job participatory research in a healthcare setting facilitated several epiphanies relating to workers’ informal uses of space (Edvardsson and Street, 2007). In the daily working (hospital corridor walking) routine, unplanned face-to-face encounters were
integral to the development of treatment strategies. Effectively, situated problem solving was on the go and co-productive. These practices emerged from time-pressured everyday practice. These “sudden intuitive realisations” (cited in Pink, 2009:67) reported by Edvardsson & Street (2007) resonate with Thrift’s notion of ethical coping, a pre-theoretical cognition, rather than pre-ordained legislative codes of conduct (thinking, then doing). This style of collaborative problem solving recalls D’Andrade’s (1981) notion of content-based abstraction. Non-representational solutions are devised between collaborators working in situ.

Adams and Bruce’s (2008) experiments in sound-walking further exemplify mobility and sensing as a place making, knowledge generating process, yielding technologically aided emplaced knowledge and meaning. Sound-walking exemplifies distributed cognition, wherein embodied, emplaced thought is investigable through sensory ethnography. Incorporating acoustic recording into a mixed methods approach the authors accompanied participants along pre-determined and newly encountered routes in Manchester (England), as defined by the personal experiences of the participants. Their method tunes into the existing experiences of participants and acoustic properties of urban environment. Sound-walking as an ethnographic, collaborative research tool, is used by ethnographers with an interest in entering the sensory world of urban dwellers. Investigating technologically assisted assemblages of microphones, sound recorders and cameras, Semidor (2006) also sound-walked in an auto-ethnography designed to generate practice-based evaluations of positive and negative urban design. Urban design was approached from the point of view of etching out design solutions from lived, trudged thought. Collaborating with urban dwellers of Manchester, Adams and Bruce (2008) extended the sound-walking method towards Ingold’s (2000) notion of systems of cognitive apprenticeship, and Lave’s (1991) concept of legitimate peripheral participation. In line with Lave’s idea of learning through practice, the acquisition of place-making expertise (local knowledge, affective meanings) was acquired and acted out through shared social situations. Adams and Bruce oriented the generation of knowledge borne of encounter as a form of place-making (attaching meanings to mere spaces, Cresswell, 2001). Their Positive Soundscapes (Adams & Bruce, 2008) project enabled entry into the sensuous world of participants by walking and listening to ambient acoustics and generating positive as well as negative responses to the environment. Mobile participants and researchers acted as assemblages of recording equipment, supplementing the walks with qualitative interviews.

It was possible for the researchers and the participants to have a shared sensory experience of the urban environments under
investigation, thus enabling a deeper and more meaningful semi-structured interview to take place. Walking through the city and listening to it focused attention on what was being heard and was significant in enabling a more far-reaching exploration of the responses made about spatiality and the relationship between the built environment, the urban infrastructure, the design of the city, and its soundscapes.

(Adams and Bruce, 2008:7)

This method can be seen as a participatory progression from the solitary, single authorial walking method of early psychogeographical walkers (see chapter one).

Insights into ways in which ethnographic learning ekes expertise out of co-productive embodied practices such as walking (Butler, 2006), counting (Saxe, 1982), working (Edvardsson and Street, 2006), listening (Adams & Bruce, 2008), eating and smelling (Cohen, 2006) have been gained by ethnographers who take the role of sensory apprentice (Lave, 1976, Pink, 2009). They learn the knowledge and meanings of others by ‘doing the knowledge’, by dredging their capacity to know as others know. Stoller’s (1997) embodied accumulation of a sorcerer’s expertise and Downey’s (2005) apprenticeship in hearing (in order to develop appreciations of musical aspects of Capoeira) further exemplify this approach. Embodied, sensory engagements arising from apprenticeship (Ingold, 2000) are invaluable to the construction of place. They afford an ongoing (unfinished) sense of dwelling through movement in the world. Through endlessly unfinished mobile, shared practice of participants and researchers, places are constructed until they are once again incomplete. They are sites of learning to learn. They are never entirely known.

Places are made through people’s embodied multi-sensorial participation in their environments (Pink, 2009:77)

Sensuous, participatory ethnographic methods have been employed to investigate place making as a form of living thinking, situated expertise, and distributed cognition. Thoughts have occurred, attachments made, lessons learned, knowledge ‘done’, places made through fusions between minds, technologies and cultural practice; by transformative processes that are dynamic, anti-biographical, pre-cognitive, corporeal, relationally materialist, anti-positivist (in the tradition of non-representational theory), relativist, situated (in the tradition of cultural psychology). We have seen that the development of technologically assisted, emplaced knowing through repetitive living illustrates a theoretical fusion of culture and mind which has its roots in cultural psychology (Cole, 2000), non-representational theory (Thrift, 1998)
and distributed cognition (Clark, 2011), using on-the-go ethnographic research methods modeled on everyday sensuous practice (Pink, 2009). The collaborations that feature in this research project explore the formation of emplaced attachments and local knowledge as examples of multi-sensory, extended cognition. In the next chapter the sensory ethnographic method that is adopted for developing these collaborations will be further explored.
Chapter 4

Methodological considerations
Using participatory sensory ethnographies to explore place making in newcomers to a city

The classic ethnographer as participant observer
When Malinowski set down his luggage in the Trobriand Islands in 1931 he was entering a classic ethnographic predicament. This photograph (see fig) expresses, more acutely than words can, the displacement of the new arrival. The predicament of the person who is in the field, yet out of place, is laid bare.

Figure 3: An anthropologist in the field

The classic ethnographic method provides the methodological heritage for this project. Traditionally, ethnography has been used as a method for collecting data for descriptive and interpretive purposes, focusing on a particular culture or setting (Stevenson, 2009). The term was coined by the linguist August Ludwig Schlözer (1777), the method was subsequently adopted by cultural anthropologists. During the twentieth century several anthropological pioneers explored their subject and developed regional knowledge through the use of the ethnographic method.

Along the coast of British Columbia Franz Boas (1911) recorded linguistic and cultural practices. His method superseded the casual observation and impressionistic writing that dominated the work of 19th century missionaries and explorers. He saw the notion of culture as instrumental in shaping the psychological worlds of those who comprised them (Barfield, 1997). Margaret Mead (1928) was a student of Boas, yet ultimately she outstripped him in the popular imagination. Her 1928 fieldtrip to Samoa made her one of the first women to conduct prolonged ethnographic research (Kuper, 1994). Like Boas she stressed the importance of culture as a formative influence on development. She argued for the cultural construction of gender roles, and of adolescence. After her death, her work was criticised for lacking objectivity (Freeman, 1983). In Swaziland (Africa’s smallest nation state) Frederic Bartlett (1932) did innovative research to contest that remembering is not just a cognitive concept, but a cultural one too. He attributed memorial ability to the distinct values, beliefs and temperament of the social groups we belong to. For his Swazi participants, material relating
to their livelihoods (which revolved around cattle) was remembered more efficiently than other, less pertinent material.

Classic ethnographic fieldwork is a considerable personal commitment (Munroe and Munroe, 1986), usually involving leaving behind the comfort and security of home

The fieldworker as sojourner experiences acculturation, and may also experience acculturative stress in which self-doubt, loss of motivation, depression and other problems may become great enough to hinder the work (Berry et al, 2002: 234)

Psychologists who use traditional ethnographic methods are less concerned with understanding entire living communities. They tend to use fieldwork as a means of gathering data about how a selected issue figures in the lives of a community; memory among the Swazi of East Africa (Bartlett, 1932), communal childrearing amongst the Efe of Zaire (Tronick, 1992).

On the ground, fieldwork involves actively observing and taking part in the behaviours and experiences that are being studied; hence the term participant observation. Ideally, behaviours and experiences that are studied by ethnographers barely depart from the way people routinely act and feel (Banister and Burman, 1997). As participants in the social transactions under scrutiny, ethnographers do not just observe life objectively. They interpret it with subjectivity. The ethnographic combination of participation, reportage and interpretation has been termed thick description (Geertz, 1973).

Whilst acknowledging the methodological heritage of ethnography, the present thesis incorporates two departures from its classic form. First, in line with a recent contemporary trend in the anthropological literature (Hartman, 2007), my research will take place in a geographically familiar territory, not an exotic, far off land that provided the field for 20th century pioneers. The notion of flipping the telescope (Denskus, 2007) to conduct fieldwork in familiar places (my own city, in the present case) facilitates the exploration of overlapping life worlds between researcher and researched. Second, my fieldwork will acknowledge those who have criticized classic ethnographic work for dwelling too heavily on observational data (Pink, 2009) at the expense of multisensory engagements in behavior and experience.

These twin notions, (i) the overlapping experience of ethnographer and participants and (ii) multisensory ethnographic practice will be explored during the remainder of this chapter.
Sensory ethnographer as multisensory, embodied apprentice

Participatory sensory ethnography is a contemporary descendent and reinventing of the classic ethnographic method that defines cultural anthropology (Pink, 2009). The participatory sensory ethnographer strives to engage with the multi-sensory, overlapping experiences of his or her collaborators. When this method is used to investigate place making, novel media, often selected by collaborators, are used to communicate multisensory experiences and to convey constructions of place (Stoller, 1997, Vokes, 2007). Varieties of experience that are conveyed in sensory ethnographies recall a distinction made by Turner & Brunner (1986), between mere experience (sensed amid the flow of events) and experience reflected upon retrospectively, introspectively (with a processed beginning, middle, end). The more non-representationally oriented, embedded, on-the-go nature of the former implies corporeal practice that characterizes sensory ethnography. Embodied practice incites researchers to regard enactment, not just observation, as a means of knowing, rather than requiring later contemplation in order to become knowledge (Pink, 2009, Noe, 2004). The body is a source of knowledge (see chapter three, and Thrift, 2007, Ingold, 2000). Through embodied participation sensory ethnographers enact processes of knowing environments through co-productive, overlapping engagement with those who move through them. Doing ethnography is a means by which these environments are constructed (Ingold, 2000) during the everyday commerce of collaborative encounter (Desjarlais, 2003). As co-constructors of emplaced knowledge, researcher and collaborator work shoulder to shoulder, forging knowledge from corporeal, multi-sensory experience (Downey, 2007). This extends the relationship from the classic ethnographic encounter in which researcher observers and draws knowledge from ‘the other’.

To appreciate the defining aspirations of sensory ethnography, attention must be paid to the physical emplacement of the fieldworker and the multisensory nature of the work (Coffey, 1999). It is a corporeal, multisensory, participatory enterprise. Knowledge deepens the more the exertions and co-productive experiences of the ethnographer overlap with those of collaborators. Learning at their elbow, the ethnographer is a sensory apprentice (Lave, 1977, Pink, 2010), not mere observer. During the apprenticeship the body has an integrative role, connecting the senses. Visual, auditory, tactile sensations combine and overlap (Ingold, 2000). Perception is not the responsibility of a mind within a body, but of the whole organism, engaged with and exploring its material environment in the company of others, in combination with things (Hutchins, 2008, Latour, 1995). For the aspiring sensory ethnographer whose experiences overlap
with collaborators, the field is a place where bodies morph as they do the
knowledge, through exertion and shared experience.

*Sensory ethnography and the making of places*

As Ingold reflects here, the field itself is part of a wider, yet never complete
environment that is continually being etched out through active,
collaborative processes of dwelling

The final form is but a fleeting moment in the life of any feature. It is
in the very process of dwelling that we build (2000:188)

Ethnographers and collaborators actively forge constitutive links between
themselves and their material environments. Cities are built from
movement and corporeality. Always incomplete, these cities are not static,
bounded, fixed containers of culture (Gupta and Ferguson, 1997). Rather
than paying attention to happenings that take place within (bounded) places,
they are constituted by the routes that lead to/through them, by their
connections with other places (Cresswell, 2004). Environments neither
surround nor contain us, if anything it is the other way about (Ingold, 2000).
Elements combine and overflow with meaning by dint of their
connectedness. Through meaningful activity land is transformed into
landscape, space into place (Ingold, 2000).

For the new arrivals to a city that constitute the cohort for this research the
identities of places are subject to dynamics laid down by connections with
elsewhere; places travelled from and to. Ethnographers and collaborators
are implicated in this outgoing process of place-construction. This dynamic,
collective process is especially evident when collaborators are drawn from
diverse global settings, as is the case in the present sensory ethnography.

*The senses in sensory ethnography*

In sensory ethnography, the senses themselves are not the objects of study.
Rather, they are a means for understanding experience. They offer routes to
knowing that are restricted in conventional, observational ethnography.
Once opened up they yield understandings of how places and identities are
constituted. When research collaborators are drawn from so many different
places one would expect their means of constituting place, sensory
preferences, to be diverse. Alternative sensory models (Howes & Classen,
1991), culturally relative sensory categories, are to the fore in culturally
diverse gatherings. When working with people from so many cultural
backgrounds it is useful to reflect that not all cultural groups divide the
sensory spectrum into five realms (Howes & Classen, 1991). It is even
common for North Americans and Europeans to speak of a sixth sense.
Western models of sensory spectra, like all others, can be regarded as folk
models (Geurts, 2002). Awareness of alternative sensory categories is a reflexive practice that develops in the sensory ethnographer, highlighting the importance of recognising alternative means of perception. It involves more than simply being open to the idea that for some, certain objects can be experienced through alternate sensory frameworks. The sensorium is culturally constructed (Howes, 2003).

This argument extends to consider that non-representational, pre-cognitive means of apprehending environment (Ingold, 2008, Thrift, 2007) are themselves alternatives to western models of internally located cognitive processing (see chapter one). Awareness of relativist sensory models, non-representational means of perceiving the environment and of alternate means of sensory prioritization, forms part of the reflexive preparation for this fieldwork, partly because of the culturally diverse nature of the group from which my collaborators were drawn.

**Collaborating, not informing**

Classic anthropological models of the ethnographic method cast those who were being researched as informants, spilling knowledge about their (other) cultures’ (Barfield, 1997). These relatively muted, observed people (studied in their familiar contexts by a displaced observer) were revealers of knowledge that was noted down, gathered and transported home by the participant observer. Meanwhile the relationship between sensory ethnographer and those who participate in the research is one of mutuality, wherein knowledge is constructed collaboratively, rather than simply discovered and retrieved. According to the tenets of phenomenology (Ingold, 2000) and non-representational theory (Thrift, 2008), knowledge is co-created between actants (research collaborators) rather than transferred from one individual to another in existing, pristine form.

**Collaborators: the International 16 (I16)**

This research project is based on an eighteen-month collaboration with members of an existing group of 16 international students who were newly arrived in Manchester-Salford. Although culturally diverse, one experience they all had in common was that they were newly acquainted with the city. Based at the International Society, University of Salford, the so-called *International 16 (I16)* is an annually renewed cohort that holds weekly meetings (Wednesday evenings, term time) where they share their experiences of arrival.

I attended these meetings for one academic year (2011-12) and continued to work with volunteer collaborators from the group thereafter. The I16, comprising representatives of 16 nations, is a supportive community of practice, funded and provided by the University of Salford. Membership of
the I16 is selective, by interview, at the beginning of the academic year. Membership carries the obligation of regular weekly attendance at meetings and unpaid participation in outreach work in local schools, with the aim of promoting global awareness and raising the profile of the International Society.

During the year the community becomes a unique collection of stories that originate in diverse global locations. Many of these stories are told face to face, to the group, often in the form of multimedia presentations, delivered by a different member each week. My attendance at these weekly meetings was initially negotiated with the two gatekeepers of the group, S and H, who are employed by the university to run the group. These weekly Wednesday evening meetings constituted my introduction to the field. The I16 is managed and facilitated by S and H.

*International students in wider context*

International university students are a distinct group who hold citizenship from countries other than those where they study. Typically they pay higher tuition fees than indigenous (home) students (Fincher, 2011). In the UK 16% of university students are from overseas. This figure is increasing incrementally each year, with China and India being the most common countries of origin and the University of Manchester the top choice for international students in the UK; 9,910 in 2009-10; 25% of its overall number of students enrolled (UK Council for International Student Affairs, 2011).

Existing research into the international student experience proliferates. Fincher (2011) conducted qualitative research on the experience of international students in Australia, where 13% of universities’ income is derived from the international student contribution. In some universities this figure rises to 20% (Marginson, 2007). Fincher (2011) examined the role played by universities and their affiliated groups in the formation of stable identities, feelings of belonging and adaptations to new social lives. She noted how universities act as mediating agents between individuals and their novel surroundings. Prayer groups, international societies and other welfare groups can operate as communities of practice, softening the landing of the newly arrived. Writing about the experiences of international students newly arrived in Australia, Fincher (2011) discusses how cosmopolitan expectations are often placed upon international students by university international offices, which may in turn impact how they engage in place making. Whatever expectations are placed on the newly arrived inhabitant of a city, place attachments and expertise develop partly through collaborative practice between participants, especially where there is a supportive community of practice in which to operate. These groups may
be sponsored by the university, or be dedicated groups operating within the university environment, such as churches or sports societies (Fincher, 2011). There are discernable echoes of Valentine’s (2000) narrative approach to identity and place-making here, in which individuals, groups and institutions constitute places and social identities in endlessly fluid situations. According to this approach, the construction of place arises out of habituated relations with social, physical and virtual agencies. Peake (2010) refers to the importance of the constitutive outside, of relational engagement, in identity formation.

Supportive communities of practice such as the I16 are part of the context that forms the constitutive outside (Peake, 2010) for newly arrived students in Salford-Manchester. Besides ultimately establishing individual working relationships with collaborators from the group, my engagement with the field initially took place at the level of the group, the I16 itself, through my weekly attendance at their meetings. Weekly contact provided an invaluable level of proximity and overlap in experience for me as an ethnographer. An ethnographer’s proximity to and degree of overlap with collaborators are both crucial to the effectiveness of the enterprise of making the lives of his collaborators intelligible. As Pink (2010) puts it

The sensory ethnographer is trying to access areas of embodied, emplaced knowing and to use these as a basis from which to understand human perception, experience, action and meaning (2010:47)

First contact
Questions of proximity loom large in the decision making process of any ethnographer. Levels of proximity are guided firstly by the requirements of the research question (Pink, 2010). In the present instance, they were also influenced by my participatory aim to model the research method around the everyday practice of collaborators at the individual and group levels. In terms of the group, this involved participating in the existing meetings of the I16.

Having initially negotiated attendance at a meeting of the I16 with the S and H, gatekeepers of the group, I presented my project, offering the opportunity for becoming involved. I did this by using an information sheet (APPX 1) and a short slide presentation (see figure 3). My initial contact took place at one of their regular Wednesday evening I16 sessions, late in December 2011. I introduced my research project, using the information sheet (APPX 1). I invited I16 members to consider how they might habitually record and convey their new experience of a city.
I also made arrangements to interview each interested member of the group in order to discover their preferred method of participation (photography, story-telling, film-making etc.), should they wish to participate.

![Manchester - 16 Stories](image)

**How would you like to participate?**
- A map/picture board of your journey to/through Manchester
- Themed collection photos with your narrative
- Walking interview through your route
- A short story with a sense of your place in Manchester
- Audio-diary or soundscape recording with your narrative
- Themed diary or diary a day or event
- Podcast on a Mancunian theme

What would you like to write/talk/make pictures about?
- What do you like? What do you dislike? How did you become familiar? How is it different from home? How is I unlike home?
- What do you miss? Where do you feel safe? What worries you? What do you want to happen?

![Manchester - 16 Stories](image)

**Figure 4. Suggestions for methods of participation, designed to inform the decisions of the 16 on how they might take part**

After my presentation I left my contact details, intending that those I16 members who were interested would email me to arrange a preliminary, object-elicited interview (Pink, 2010) with potential collaborators, to settle upon a mutually agreed method of reportage.

A central objective of my participatory approach was that each collaboration would be led by collaborators’ preferred mobilities and sensory and creative preferences. Thus it would be modeled on existing practice. Sensory and creative preferences would dictate that each collaborator would prefer different forms of reportage and engagement, depending on existing preferences and interests. The object elicitation element would involve potential collaborators bringing an object to the preliminary interview. The aim of this exercise was to enable each collaborator to show me something that would tell me about their country, their journey, or their new city.

**The I6 and I: overlapping proximities**

A contributing factor to establishing appropriate levels of proximity when practising ethnography is the degree of overlap between the experiences of researchers and researched. To varying extents, ethnographers have historically operated as outsiders, seeking to gain entry into participant groups (Malinowski, 1931, Downey, 2005). Others meanwhile have operated as relative insiders, studying people with whom they already occupy common ground. This is known as the native ethnography model (Rudolph, 1997).
In the present study, whilst I operated from outside the I16. I was not a bona fide member, though I was fortunate enough to participate. In time though the inside-outside distinction became increasingly blurred. There was some degree of overlap between my own life-space and that of the group. Regular attendance at meetings, familiarity with an academic context, a shared city of residence, familiarity with the preferred technologies of the group, all constituted shared, overlapping life experiences. To an extent I researched practices that are part of my own life.

My own ideas about place and how it is constructed via my own sensory and technological subjectivities would also be interrogated during the research project. This fluid, reflexive state of affairs resonates with Ingold’s (2000) dwelling perspective. Places are not regarded as complete before inhabitants arrive and start living in them. Rather, they are constituted through practice. For ethnographers whose life-space overlaps with those of their collaborators, a sensory approach constitutes a rethinking of the established participant observation method. More so than in the classic ethnographic method, the emphasis is on shared, multisensory, embodied nature of experience. The enterprise is an empathetic engagement in co-productive place making (Lash, 2006, Varela, 1999, Ingold, 2000), rather than one of observation of the other.

Engaging with the senses
When a group of culturally diverse persons who converge on a city, diverse sensory preferences emerge (Atkinson, Delamont & Housley, 2007). To come to terms with these diversities, a classic ethnographer may try to gain understandings of underlying, cognitive or structural cultural codes that underpin them. A sensory ethnographer adopts a more non-representational approach (Thrift, 2008). To this end emplaced, sensuous, parallel engagement (Moles, 2008) with place comes to the fore. Situated knowledge, beyond language (Okely, 1994), is sought. Steps are taken to access others’ worlds multi-sensorially (Stoller, 1997), through embodiment and mobility. The participatory sensory researcher is obliged to be situated in places and along routes occupied by participants, whilst

Co-participating in practices through which place is constituted with those who simultaneously participate in her or his research, and as such might become similarly emplaced. She or he becomes at the same time a constituent of place and an agent in its production (Pink, 2009:64)

The sensory ethnographer uses overlapping experience to reflexively produce anthropological knowledge. S/he negotiates routes through experience and acquires empathetic understanding, rather than merely
documenting the knowledge of others. Previous examples of overlapping, proximate sensory participation from the annals of sensory ethnography have focused on practices such as eating (Pink, 2009), listening (Adams & Bruce, 2008) and walking (Moles, 2008). Eating food that has been prepared by participants is one means of participating in everyday worlds, producing an

exchange of sensory memories and emotions and of substances and objects incarnating remembrance and feeling (Seremetakis, 1994:37).

As this excerpt from my research diary shows, at one of my first meetings of the I16, eating was a shared means of deriving embodied, sensuous knowing

Research Diary except: eating with the I16
I attended a meeting with the I16 during which G, a student from Bulgaria, delivered a slideshow about her life back home. To deepen our sensory appreciation, G brought a box of home made pastries, with cheese, made to her favourite Bulgarian recipe. Eating these pastries together helped deepened sensory understanding of the experiences being conveyed.

The investment of eating with meaning is further illustrated by Pink’s (2010) work with the Slow Food Movement in Suffolk, England. She ate slow breakfasts with collaborators in the town of Aylsham. At these events counter-cultural values of sharing, slowness and the promotion of local food production were chewed over in collaborative, embodied practice. Throughout my time with the I16, overlapping sensory engagements extended to eating food, watching slideshows and movies, listening to and playing music, as well as just talking and hanging around.

Engaging with the body
20th century anthropological pioneers recognised the value of embodied practice. Turnbull (1961) walked with Mbuti pygmies. When Clifford Geertz (1973) famously fled a police raid of a Balinise cockfight with informants his relationship with them achieved an embodied statement of togetherness. In cases such as these, walking and running were stumbled upon as collaborative methods.

More recently, walking has gained stature as a deliberate method of ethnographic engagement (Moles, 2008, Sinclair, 2005, Ingold & Vergunst, 2004), as has cycling (Spinney, 2007). Participatory mobilities, based on collaborators’ preferences, enable ethnographers to learn how others make places. Shared mobility facilitates engagement in processes by which places are made by participants and ethnographers co-productively, by sharing paths and overlapping practice. As routes, walks and rides intersect the
places we move through are constructed. Mobile, participatory methodologies (walking, riding, photographing, film-making) appeal because they are democratic, widely available practices that can be shared with participants, and because they are instigated by collaborators’ existing habits (Ingold and Vergunst, 2008). By path-crossing, route sharing and strenuous learning, apprentice researchers participate in forms of engagement that are place constitutive

walking rhythms we share with others will always be shared by steps we have taken in the past (Pink, 2009:76).

Walking, riding and moving through Salford-Manchester, I sought to explore the co-construction of the city.

Being there in body and sense
During my ethnographic apprenticeship I sought to draw up close to the multisensory, embodied experience of arriving in a city for the first time. My situated-ness paralleled that of my collaborators. It was inextricable from the ethnographic apprenticeship of coming to know as others know (Wenger, 1998), or constitutive dwelling Ingold (2000).

This form of knowledge is inseparable from being there, alongside all concerned (Harris, 2007). The ethnographic process involves drawing close to the sensory, corporeal and imaginative experiences and categories of meaning, of collaborators in context. Imagination, so integral to the quotidian realm of ordinary people, is central to this ethnographic project (Latham, 2004). The place of imaginative practice in academic discourse in general (and sensory ethnography in particular) has been called for elsewhere (Pink, 2010, Hawkins, 2013). The anthropological literature reveals several examples of the integration of imaginative work into the ethnographic method (Edwards, 1999, Latham, 2004, Hawkins, 2013, see chapter two). I sought to establish imaginative, co-productive, participatory engagements that would be driven by the existing place-making imaginations of those members of the I16 who volunteered to take part. I came to know their stories at close proximity. Depending upon the existing practice of those involved, modest products of these collaboration would emerge in the form of words, pictures, sound-scape compositions or other artefacts. These stories are explored in detail in chapters 5-10 of this thesis.

Remaining open and reflexive
Gaining insights into my collaborators’ preferred means of participation (film, photography, soundscape) would require a reflexive, multi-sensory approach. Research methods that dovetail with such approaches include photo or object-elicited interviews (Pink, 2010, Bridger, 2013), on-the-go
interviews (Moles, 2007), audio diaries and sound-walks (Adams and Bruce, 2008). A mixture of methods aligns bodies, quotidian rhythms, routes, tastes and places into mutually constitutive trajectories (Massey, 1994). They yield mobile reportage that amounts to participant led, creative correspondences (Okely, 1994) wherein knowledge is generated in motion. For these new arrivals to Manchester-Salford, our work offered opportunities to reimagine the city from a variety of mobile practices. It offered opportunities for imaginative place making (Stoller, 2007) constituted as a response to the research question.

Yet the nature and scope of these responses would only emerge as events unfolded, often serendipitously. Like the routes we walked, the methodological course of the project would meander in the wake of unanticipated moments of realisation that were experienced in the field (Pink, 2010). Whilst as the researcher I could not prepare in advance for such revelatory moments, I did my best to remain open to them. By virtue of my proximity, sensory, embodied learning emerged in moments of unplanned insight. Pink (2010) refers to this serendipitous process thus

The ethnographer undergoes a series of unplanned everyday life experiences, joining in with whatever is going on in order to become further involved in the practices of the research participants (2010:67)

My long-term, weekly involvement with the I16 afforded me the methodological luxury of holding out for these moments. As in Edvardsson & Street's (2007) mobile research into problem solving in a healthcare setting, these moments were often mundane ones, involving eating, walking or listening to music. This research diary excerpt illustrates such a moment

Research Diary excerpt: Indonesian music at the I16
The meeting this week featured a presentation by F, from Indonesia, who gave us the opportunity to play Anklung music, with instruments made from bamboo. Everyone present in the meeting had the opportunity to play this communal form of music using bamboo instruments, provided by F

Serendipitous experiences in sound, cuisine and other sensory modalities informed the nature of the collaborations we later instigated. Indonesian musical traditions would play a prominent part in my collaboration with Febi (see chapter 6).

A sensory apprentice learns by reflexively engaging in multi-sensory experience first hand. Over a period of embodied, sensuous engagement, one does not simply learn the skills they learn; one learns how they are learned (Goody, 1989). With the I16 I set out not just to find out what they
knew about Salford-Manchester, but how they came to know. The sensory ethnographer comes to know how places are learned by others by sharing habitual activities of walking, filming, listening, playing, cooking, photographing. The ethnographer learns to navigate others’ routes to knowing, along paths that imbue spaces with meaning (Harris, 2007), often by literally by accompanying them along those routes. Seen this way, emplaced knowledge and meaning are eked out of embodied apprenticeship (Lave, 1977), where those with more and less experience collaborate in constituting knowledge.

The novice hunter learns by accompanying more experienced hands in the woods (Ingold, 2000:37)

For the ethnographic apprentice, knowing what to attend to only makes sense in the context where the learning takes place (the woods, the street, the workshop) (Lave, 1990). In her research with Italian Alpine cattle masters, Grasseni (2007) reported learning to see how the master saw, by engaging in visual cosmologies that were both developed through practice. Rice (2005) reported learning to hear as doctors heard using a stethoscope. Downey (2005) explored the embodied world of Capoeira practitioners. By entering into master-apprentice relationships, ethnographers explore the development of emplaced knowledge by participating in practices that imbue places with meanings. I sought to explore the development of emplaced knowledge as it was acquired through daily living, by moving alongside my collaborators, not merely by observing them, but by forming co-productive, creative correspondences that were informed by their own sensory preferences and shared mobile, sensuous experience.

Preliminary interviews
Having pitched the idea of the research project to the I16 and participated in the group for over a month, the individual-level research began. I booked preliminary interviews with twelve members of the group who had expressed an interest in becoming fully-fledged collaborators. The nature of the interviews was informed by the work of Fincher (2011), who interviewed international students (recent arrivals to Melbourne from Malaysia and Singapore), about their feelings of belonging in the city. Here Fincher describes the first exchanges with her cohort. Using object elicitation (McCarthy, 2013) Fincher initiated mapping sessions

Students were invited to sketch on a map those places they frequented, liked or disliked; these maps were used as prompts in the interviews conducted later, in which students were also encouraged to bring photographs of their most and least favoured places (2011:909)
Fincher’s method was partly participant-led. Students indicated iconic places in their past, as well as present places of residence; their important city locations. They were interviewed about their responses to the city, to the differing expectations of the university and the groups to which they are enrolled. Juxtapositions between their new lives and how they lived in their homelands were also explored. My own preliminary interviews followed a similar course. They were exploratory forerunners to more prolonged, emplaced, embodied collaborations. From these conversations I wanted to establish collaborators’ preferred methods of engagement, and whether they wanted to engage at all.

Past writing on the interview method has distinguished between realist (accounts try to reflect as closely as possible the realities of the world) and idealist (accounts represent one of many versions of the world) approaches (Seale, 1998). For both, the social event of the conversation is commonly portrayed as one where two relative strangers sit and talk (Rapley, 2004). The face-to-face method has been described as the in-depth method par excellence (Okely, 2000). Pink sees interviews as more than just a conversation, being encounters that are “emplaced and productive of place” (2009:62), with profound multi-sensory dimensions. Gesture, smell, visual aids, images, media, ambulation and food sharing might all be part of emplaced interviewing.

Material objects can elicit responses and evoke memories and meaning (Vokes, 2007, McCarthy, 2013). In elicitation interviews participants are invited to provide objects, or the interviewer presents participants with evocative objects. Alternatively, an intersection of subjectivities is established using elicitation. For example (Vokes, 2007) talked with rural Ugandans as they listened to the radio as part of their everyday practice. They were later invited to listen to pre-recorded clips, songs, news items, then discuss intersected subjectivities and exchange ideas around them. Elicitation interviews using objects, maps, music, food, are a response to an overemphasis on words in traditional interviewing (Pink, 2009). Kress and Leeuwen (2001) encourage multi-modality in human communication as a diverse process of meaning making. Pictures, maps, music, food can all help ethnographers to surpass the limited mono-modality of mere talk.

Reflexively drawing on a range of interview styles and sensory modes is key to the participatory sensory interview (O’Reilly, 2005). Atkinson and Coffey (2005) stress a continuum between actions and talk, with interviews cast as performative events that are at once enacted, embodied, emplaced, co-productive of place itself. Tilley (2006), working with gardeners, realised the necessity of situating conversations amid the sensory onslaught of soil, plant and air. During interviews protagonists co-participate in the construction of
past and present emplacement. Using object, sound, gesture and movement they can fully construct the ‘Here’s were I am, here’s where I came from, here’s what I like, here’s where I like to be’ that constitutes meaning laden place making. Interviews are part of an embodied ethnographic method that is situated where experience is constituted. They are place constitutive phenomenological events in themselves. Places are made in interviews, through narrative and movement. During the interview, whether sitting, standing, riding or walking, interviewers actively produce environments. This has been known for a long while

My experience is that direct questioning of the native about a custom or belief never discloses their attitude of mind as thoroughly as the discussion of facts connected with direct observation of a custom or within a concrete occurrence (Malinowski, 1915:652)

Our preliminary interviews were forerunners to more embodied, deeper place making experiences. It was important for my initial interviews to take place in an environment that my prospective collaborators were familiar with. They were held in a place that was resonant with the membership of the existing community of practice, the I16.

During the interview, methods of participatory mapping (Emmel, 2008), object (Pink, 2009) or photo (Jorgensen and Sullivan, 2010) elicitation were employed. I invited potential collaborators to bring along an object that reflected their relationship with Salford-Manchester; or a favourite object from their place of origin; to indicate their global trajectory on a world map (APPX 2); and to indicate a favourite place or route on a larger map of Manchester (APPX 3). During these conversations my collaborators also completed an ethical consent form¹ (APPX 4), to ensure that they had understood the information sheet (APPX 1), that their participation would be voluntary and that they were free to withdraw at any time. I was keen to ensure that the nature of collaborators’ engagement was not just voluntary, but designed and led by them. How we would engage with place during our collaborative work emerged out of conversational realities, rather than being handed down from researcher to passive participant (Shotter, 2008). These collaborations, taking shape as they did during conversations in the home space of the I16, were co-constructed, emergent methods. From the twelve preliminary interviews, six fully formed collaborations would hatch.

Collaborations
Following preliminary interviews with twelve members of the I16, a series of planned exercises in imaginative reportage and co-productive collaboration emerged. These yielded co-productive, creative engagements with Manchester-Salford that were modeled on a variety of sensory preferences,
preferred mobilities and existing creative practices. They involved walking, listening, picture making and other playful practices. Ultimately, six of these collaborations grew into prolonged co-productive projects. Others were more limited in content or were subject to processes of attrition (see chapter 11).

Five collaborations involved mobile interviews around the cities of Manchester-Salford, with one collaborator (F) preferring to operate alone, then meet to discuss her work subsequently. My collaborations with T (from Zambia), F (Indonesia), An (Romania), Al (Tunisia), B (Germany) and Aa (Spain) and her dog, Tori (U.S.), constitute the main body of this thesis. They yielded a diverse crop of stories and a multisensory array of artefacts. These stories are told in the following six chapters

Notes
1. A second consent form, requesting permission to use photographs of research participants in the final thesis, was also presented during preliminary interview. However, due to the participatory, non-biographical nature of the project, no such photographs were ever included in this project
Chapter 5

Walking it over
A first journey into Manchester

The sense in walking
In the popular travel discourse it is commonplace to elevate arrival above approach, being there above getting there. Yet, as ethnographers increasingly acknowledge, “destinations are not the only places” (Spinney, 2007:1).

Thus, for a new arrival to a city, coming to know a place owes as much to the experience of moving through it as it does to that of coming to rest. Mobility, as Ingold (2000) has argued, generates place making. For Ingold the meanings we accumulate when moving through and between places arise from fleeting experience and are stamped in by the embodied encounter. Furthermore, the stamping is largely carried out on foot (Ingold & Vergunst, 2008). The body, a technology for encountering places, contributes strenuously to our bringing them into being. Increasingly, ethnographers who subscribe to this so-called dwelling perspective (Ingold 2000) put approach routes on an equal footing with destinations. They do their ethnographies on the hoof. Rhys-Taylor’s (2010) offers an example. He used a mobile sensory ethnographic method to explore performative and olfactory constructions of class and multicultural identity in East London’s seafood markets. Rather like a promenade theatre performance, the resulting monograph has the reader wandering on foot between focal sites, as well as hanging around them. The author explicitly presents a narrative wherein meanings accumulate at acutely sensuous sites, amid the stench of whelk, jellied eel, cockle, mussel and herring stalls on the Petticoat Lane, Goulston Street, Ridley Road triangle. This multi-sited approach dwells on set-piece dramas that are enacted in set places. Encounters between stallholders, customers and passers-by provide the main interview material. Additionally, the ethnographer goes out of his way to walk participant (and, by extension, reader) between these static points, to reveal how mobility contributes to place-making and identity construction. ‘Between’ and ‘at’ have equal status. The ethnographer self-consciously promotes walking as a meaning-making activity, equal in importance to the mundane ‘hanging around’ that grants access to much of the ethnographic material.

While the time spent with traders was often quite static, walking – both through and between the key ethnographic sites of this study – provided a lot more than a way of connecting separate bouts of hanging around. In fact, beyond hanging around, sampling various foods and ruminating with study participants in cafes and shops, walking often proved to be the most productive of ethnographic methods, providing spatial sources of elicitation during walking.
interviews (Rhys-Taylor, 2010:28)

_Dwelling in walking_

In exploring place making for T, an undergraduate international student, member of the _II6_, recent arrival to Manchester from Zambia and habitual urban walker, like Rhys-Taylor I drew on Ingold’s (2000) dwelling perspective. Ingold contrasts ‘dwelling’ with ‘building’ in his analysis of environmental perception. The dwelling approach recalls Geertz statement that

> Man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun
> (1973: 5)

According to this phenomenological view places gain their significance by dint of the life activity, or _umwelt_, of those who inhabit them. They are literally brought (thought and acted) into being by the doings of their inhabitants (see _chapter_ 2). Contrastingly, the building perspective casts reality as a pre-existing, natural realm, suspended beneath human percepts. Geertz again can be recruited to illustrate this. He states that the construction of meaning involves

> the imposition of an arbitrary framework of symbolic meaning upon reality (1964:39).

In contrast to the dwelling perspective, here reality is seen as pre-existing, part of nature, awaiting discovery and independent of the senses. The building perspective evokes a separation between nature and culture, between mind and matter. It posits a separation between perceiver of the environment and world itself, in contrast to the tenets of non-representational theory (Thrift, 2000). Culture is superimposed upon environments, which are given in advance of occupation. Effectively, they contain living. Meanwhile the dwelling perspective eschews separations between ready-made environmental containers of living and their mere occupation. Instead, for a space to become a place, for a house to become a home, it has to be subjected to dwelling, which amounts to the whole manner in which one lives life. So for Ingold (2000) the imaginative or meaningful construction of place is inseparable from practical engagement with it. Knowledge about places is not imported ready-made. Neither is it derived from internal representations, official maps or guidebooks. It emerges in situ, through co-productive engagement with people, things and a world that Merleau-Ponty (1962) called the very homeland of thought. Meaning is forged out of mobile engagement.
Walking it over

Prior to exploring T’s construction of her new ‘home’ city environment in a mobile context, as with all the participants for this research project, I conducted a preliminary interview in an office space at the University of Salford, home of the I16. The aim of this meeting was to establish T’s preferred mode of participation. This would depend on her preferred methods of mobility, habitual technologies and sensory preferences.

Originally from Kitwe, Zambia, and after a spell living in Derby, T had lived in Salford for three months prior to our first interview, so still had very clear memories about how she came to know her favoured sections of the city. During this meeting T’s liking for walking as a means of getting around, of exploring, and of becoming acquainted and informed about her new surroundings, emerged.

A: How would you get involved in this project? What kind of method do you think you might use?

T: I think walking. I usually walk to many places actually. I love walking. The main time I go walking is when I go to church.

In view of T’s liking for walking, and especially of the number of times she had made one particular walk over the last three months, we decided that our second meeting should be a walking interview (Edensor, 2005, Ingold and Vergunst, 2008, Rhys-Taylor, 2011). Rather than staging a wilfully aimless dérive we decided to re-walk a specific route that T had used to appropriate Manchester as her new home city. The route itself is an indirect and, to me, novel wiggle from Salford University to Manchester City Centre. This two or three mile walk has a prominent role in T’s construction of place, thanks to a community of practice she is involved with. During our walk T told me that when she first arrived at the University of Salford she felt isolated in her new location. These comments evoke a time before she had actively engaged with Manchester. She had landed, come to rest, but was yet to become fully mobile.

T: I was quite scared. I didn’t know what to do. I had no friends. It was just me in my room. Er, I think I stayed in. I arrived at around 4 o’clock then I stayed in and unpacked everything. Stayed in that night and the following day I went out to different events during fresher’s week.

Our walking interview focused on T’s increasingly outwardly mobile engagement with her environment. Our conversation was not set in any particular location, but along a route, selected and led by T. Our walk derived from episodes in T’s recent past as a newcomer to the city. After all, as Ingold (2000) argues, places do not have locations. They have
Bound together by the itineraries of their inhabitants, places exist not in space but as nodes in a matrix of movement (Ingold, 2000:219)

The mobile meeting we embarked upon was part of a mapping exercise. Mapping here is understood as the narrative re-enactment of the experience of moving from place to place (Ingold, 2000). Through the mobility embodied in this process, strangers can become inhabitants and places can be made. T’s first experience of mobility in her new city came courtesy of her involvement with her newly discovered colleagues at Audacious Church, William Street, Salford. T led me there during our walk. Our general discussion about T’s first few days in Manchester was contextualized, interrupted even, as we turned into William Street.

T: That’s the church I was telling you about. It’s called Audacious Church.

Though a relative newcomer to Salford and Manchester, T was well acquainted with streets that I had never come across during my two decade long residence in the city. Initially hesitant at the beginning of our walk, she took me into the enormous, warehouse-like Audacious auditorium, a place that had played a large part in her initiation into Manchester. The church as a community of practice had acted here as a mediator between T and the city on her arrival. Fincher (2011) highlights the role of churches and other agencies in the construction of place for International Students, following her work in New Zealand (see chapter 4). Such agencies can assume the role of mediators between new arrivals and new places, even providing respite from the demands of university life. T and I discussed this (and the role of the organization in familiarizing her with the wider city) as we entered the church itself.

A: Wow, I had no idea how big it was. It’s like a big concert hall, isn’t it?
T: Yes, I think they’re putting a balcony in here as well
A: Really, wow, so it’s obviously quite a popular church
T: It is quite popular, yes. There’s loads of people that come
A: Were you surprised when you first came, how big it was?
T: Yes, I wasn’t expecting this
A: In fact, how did you know this kind of was a church in the first place?
T: How did I know? Somebody brought me here

T was brought to Audacious Church in the first week of her life in Manchester. Through her involvement with the church she would come to learn new routes through the city on regular, weekly church walks. As we traced the route of these weekly walks she told me stories of how she found
her way through her slice of Manchester in the first weeks following her arrival. Her story took place along a particular route, and was told as we walked it over. During a café stop T related how she came to know her part of Manchester by doing the knowledge on foot in the company of her community of practice.

A: Can you just say a little bit more about the first walk into Manchester?
T: OK the first time I ever went to church, there was this guy, part of the youth team. He used to do the pick-ups, for other students as well, for the walk to church. We used the Trinity Way road. That one we used today. And we did that for about 3 or 4 weeks. Then after that I still wasn’t confident with going to church on my own, so there’s=
A: =Is that because you thought you might, you didn’t know so many people?
T: Yeah, I didn’t know so many people and I wasn’t confident about the way, and there was so much traffic. Then while at church I met this guy. He’s from Nigeria. He didn’t know the way to church as well, so we got up one Sunday and said right we’ll go to church without the help of the others. They thought we knew the way but we didn’t. So we did that for about three or four weeks.

During this informal, weekly, walking induction, knowledge of a new environment was being constructed on a ‘know-as-you-go’ basis (Ingold and Vergunst, 2008). Whatever emplaced knowledge T accumulated she did so along the way, not by reading maps and guidebooks before setting out. As a mobile storyteller she had no pre-prepared map to inform her. The mapping of place accrued though continual dwelling. Embodied knowledge accumulates between footfall and landscape

the forms or patterns that arise from this mapping process, whether in the imagination or materialised as artifacts, are but stepping stones along the way, punctuating the process rather than initiating it or bringing it to a close (Ingold, 2000:231)

Rundstrom (1991) coins the term process cartography to describe the mobile, never complete mapping exercise that intentional place-makers habitually indulge in. A little like speaking (though unlike writing) process cartography draws meaning from its performative context. It is not just the rolling out of pre-existing thought. It is the formulation of emplaced narratives, often through the re-telling of journeys previously made, or the re-walking of stories previously told. Life stories and long walks intermingle in forms of performative cartography that Ingold calls wayfinding; “the life-historical process of getting around” (2000:232).

Although a re-walking of a familiar route for T, this was less a re-enactment of a completed walk than just another chapter in its enactment. En route
the mapping of T’s city was developing as more co-productive knowledge was being churned out between us. Using mobile narrative enactment T told and showed me how she made the first steps in her transition from stranger to inhabitant. She did this by walking me through her introductory route, all the time generating new knowledge by process cartography. She described her city performatively, dispensing with route maps, guidebooks and other fixed-location representations. As we walked, T’s city was performed into being.

You had to be there
The mapping of T’s City was a performative answer to the Where am I? question. In showing, telling, constructing our whereabouts, T located herself by relating emplaced stories to me and generating stories with me:

As someone who has lived in a country, and is used to its ways, knowing where you are lies not in the establishment of a point-to-point correspondence between the world and its representation, but in the remembering of journeys previously made (Ingold, 2000:237)

Several times during our walk, places were located according to stories that had taken place there. Landmarks were identified in relation narratives they evoked:

A: Ok, so we’re going to go under this bridge. Is this the way you went with your colleagues?
T: Yes
A: Have you stayed friends with many of the people from the church then, who you met at the start?
T: Yes, and some of them are at Salford, and I see them during the week as well so, we need to cross over to the other side

Places were inseparable from their mobile narratives they grew out of:

T: I wasn’t expecting Manchester to be, well, I’ve seen it on TV but to see it live was just amazing
A: Yeah, right. So I guess you didn’t really get a full overview of it when you were first there
T: No, just the shop parts, the Arndale and the restaurants that are close to Arndale

As a relative newcomer (though no longer a stranger) to the city, T was gaining the emplaced knowledge that is only available to those who have actually been there. Other writers have noted the resonant value of knowledge that gains value from proximity, presence, embodiment and
sensory engagement. Legat (2008) walked with T'cho hunter-gatherers in North West Canada and noted how this activity is more than just a way of getting around. It is a form of pensive (thoughtful) mobility

Someone who has walked knows the ways of the world (Legat, 2008:5)

For the T'cho, oral traditions of storytelling are central to knowledge-exchange. Yet stories are not regarded as comprehensible outside practice. The sense of stories can only be conveyed, argues Legat, in the context of lived experience. Simply hearing stories is not enough. To fully comprehend them you have to travel the trails and visit the places they tell of. Ideally, this should happen in the company of the knowledgeable, who have trodden these paths before. Thus for the transmission of knowledge, for example between generations, expertise is mutually constitutive of the experience of walking the land. Walking is the means by which experience is converted into knowledge (Legat, 2008). This dynamic resonates with the knowledge conveyed by T in her walk with me. Her stories of first arrival became knowledge through the physical effort and shared experience of walking. Answering where am I questions has the walker consulting narratives of past movement. Emplaced knowledge emerges from co-productive journeys along which steps are traced/retraced, stories told/retold, places made/remade. In the case of our walk, new knowledge was generated for both parties. Walking and talking on William Street, I learned

A: Now this is gonna sound ignorant but to me it doesn’t look like a church.
T: It used to be a warehouse
A: Did it? OK
T: They moved in recently, maybe a few months before I came to Uni, maybe September, October, something like that
A: Oh, right.

Walking, talking and taking photographs on Bury Street, we learned

A: I’ll take one of you if you want. I can see where we’re heading here. Can you see the Arndale in the distance?
T: Yes

Train rushes past close by
A: So we are going in the right direction. I’ll take one with each camera. Cool.
Train as well=
T: =Oh, I didn’t notice that that was=
A: =No, that must be the, that’s on the way to Salford Central
T: Oh, right
A: Which is the train station, I saw a sign for that. There’s a route. There’s a train line that goes from Victoria to Salford and I think that must be it
T: Oh, right, I didn’t know that trains or rail=
A: Yes I know. So can I take the same one with this one?

Setting out
T’s first steps along this route were not solitary ones. A little like toddling, first journeys are often made in the company of others (Ingold and Vergunst, 2008). Indeed, walking in cities is usually a social activity. For new arrivals, whether it be for work, study, even tourism, it is common to be chaperoned by agents who are charged with the task of mediating between newcomer and their novel environment (Fincher, 2011). For T, this process was undertaken by representatives from Audacious Church. Introductions to the city were made during T’s Sunday afternoon ambles along what became her most familiar route. As we walked this route over she explained to me how she came by these first steps towards learning her way around

T: I think the first time was when I went, when I came to church, when I came to this church
A: Alright, so you made the walk we just made
T: Yes, with somebody

Traffic noise
and we walked down to the church
A: So in a way the walk we’ve just done is the first walk you ever did
T: Yes
T: And after the service they have a

Traffic noise
 student lunch in Manchester City
A: Oh do they? So you went for lunch with people from the church. And you went into town
T: Yes
A: And how did you get there?
T: How did we get there?
A: Yeah, how did you get from here to there?
T: We walked

Specialist knowledge about Manchester, about locations for food and shopping, was gathered along these social walks. This on-the-go knowledge superseded any existing prior knowledge that T had gained from television pictures, which rather fell short of first-hand experience

A: Yes and so how did it feel to go into town for the first time, what kind of=
T: It was amazing, amazing. It was an amazing experience. I wasn’t expecting Manchester to be, well, I’ve seen it on TV but to see it live was just amazing.

Gathering emplaced knowledge and skill by ambulation has been noted by other authors. Curtis (2008) explores the use of walking as a means of learning in her work with schoolchildren in Aberdeen. Here, by extension, the streets are transformed into a classroom, walking into a means of learning about the environment. Mobile, situated learning erodes divisions between knowing and doing, recalling the approach of ecological psychologists who reject the separation of the mind from intentional worlds (Cole, 1996, Shweder, 1991, see chapter three). Tuck-Po (2008) endorses this erosion of boundaries in her fieldwork in Malaysia, amongst the Batek. Facing a multisensory environment in the forests where these hunter-gatherers live, Tuck-Po engages with the slime-ridden, knotty entanglements of the jungle environment. Children learn about these environments for the first time as youngsters through active, sensory, walking engagement, not formal instruction.

Walking comprises a suite of bodily performances that include observing, monitoring, remembering, listening, touching, crouching and climbing. And it through these performances, along the way, that knowledge is formed (2008:5).

Similarly, it became clear during our walk that the tactile and sensory properties associated with T’s route, as well as her own embodied, sensory preferences, were not just cues for, but part of, the accumulation of emplaced knowledge. The motion of walking becomes a way of knowing in itself, not just an aid to learning. As with the Batek, engagement with visual and tactile properties of landscape is inseparable from the accumulation of embodied knowing.

A: This is an old fashioned cobbled street.
T: This kind of reminds me that we’re going the right way, the tower.

Going to church, going to town, walking the walk, were repetitive means by which place-based knowing was stamped in.

A: Weekly?
T: Weekly, yes. So we kind of got up one Sunday and said we’re going to church, and along the way we sort of look out for things that reminded us. We remembered about mainly, I don’t know how to explain it.
A: Things that helped you=
T: Things that stood out for us. I think that as you go along, before Trinity Way, there are two churches, the Catholic Church and the church just around the corner.
Those are the two things that told us that we were going the right way. So we did that for a few weeks and I was confident to go to church on my own

The mobile, repetitive, sensuous, social nature of knowledge production is highlighted here, illustrating T’s initial experiences of acquiring muscular knowledge through repeated movement with her community of practice at Audacious Church.

**Traces**

Knowledge generated along walking routes leaves residual traces that might be conceived of as something akin to footprints (Ingold and Vergunst, 2008). Repetitive walking converts stories into knowledge that is conserved, sometimes literally, as marks in the dirt. The Thcho of North West Canada take this idea one step further when speaking of footprints as though they are knowledge itself (Legat, 2008), stamped into the (knowledge generating) routes they mark out. This discourse challenges the separation (popular in mainstream psychology) that regards knowledge as a property of the mind, rather than being indivisible from the intentional world (Thrift, 2008, see *chapter two*, Cole, 1996, see *chapter three*). Farley and Simmons (2011) articulate this erosion of the boundary between landscape and human narrative

> We know that a long and complex interaction between constant natural processes and more recent human activity has largely formed in all the landscapes we can see today, and that landscape is indivisible from the human world (2011:112)

Similarly, my walk with T generated and deepened existing knowledge through mobility and materiality, not just mentality. As we walked, we didn’t just talk about things we knew, we generated them. In so doing, like others who walk the land, we left traces of ourselves along the way. Our footprints may have been invisible, non-existent even, but other material artifacts were left behind to denote the generation of knowledge. Besides interview transcriptions, a few photographs, another tangible remnant of our mapping exercise was our walking map (APPX 5). But what are maps, asks Ingold (2000)? Alfred Gell defined a map as

> any system of spatial knowledge and/or beliefs which takes the form of non-token-indexical statement about the spatial locations of places and objects (1985: 278-9)

According to this formulation the knowledge and beliefs held in maps holds constant irrespective of the changing location of their mobile users. Yet this
quality of ‘non-token indexicality’ (Ingold, 2000) does not necessarily divorce maps from the points of view of those who originally construct them. Like much of the landscape they aspire to depict, maps are not natural occurrences. The knowledge found in them is subject to the interests and practices of those who construct them (Turnbull, 1989). They are embedded in life. Likewise, the map (co)-constructed out of our walk illustrates this embedding. It is more a partial, walker’s eye view than an overview of the city. In keeping with Gibson’s (1979) idea that visual perception reflects motion through the world, this personalized map denotes an itinerary of mobile place making, not a series discrete points in space. To paraphrase Ingold (2000), it conveys a history, not a place. Focal episodes are indicated as points along a trajectory. Narrative episodes from places along our route keep the map real, grounded in mobile experience. It reveals instances of learning and place making that are inseparable from ambulatory networks (Casey, 1996). The construction of a personalized map to illustrate the narrative journey T and I made recalls Munn’s (1973) work amongst the Walibiri of Western Australia, who refer to their landscape (their country) as networks linked by pathways that were originally laid down by their ancestors. These ancient trajectories, linking focal points of ancestral reference, are narrative lines, not points. For the Walibiri, as for newcomers to a city, the retracing, re-walking and re-telling of walked stories keep the place renewed. For the Walibiri, remnants of these narratives are decipherable as drawings in the sand. For T and I, pink highlighter pen scrawled our story across a page.

How to compare T’s personalized map with the tourist map it defaces? Turnbull (1996) can help us here, in noting that official cartographers’ maps are presented in ways that erase the processes by which the knowledge that led to them actually contributed to their making. Arguably they are trumped up scientific artifacts. De Certeau agrees

*The map, a totalising stage on which elements of diverse origin are brought together to form a tableau of a state of geographical knowledge, pushes away into its prehistory…as if into the wings, the operations of which it is the result (1984:121)*

Ingold (2000) concurs, arguing that these attempts at geographic fact-making transform lived places that are originally constructed through movement back into spaces viewed from above. This cartographic sleight of hand is analogous of the conceptions of cognitive mapping (Golledge, 1999), producing a static mental analogue. The final map is presented as a definitive version. This leads to the assumption that the map itself is made before it is used. T’s personalized map goes some way to undoing this work. It is a token effort to reinstate these situating processes, to
undermine the claims of cartography to produce geographic facts (Edney, 1993).

Besides interview transcriptions, a few photographs and a personalized map (APPX 5), this mobile interview along a first walk into Manchester has left still more traces, in the form of this written account. T’s place-making walk has been talked about, photographed, walked over and, finally, written up. Writing ethnographic texts enables the tracking of those who have gone before. Now we can follow (on foot and on the page) the narrative footsteps of T’s first journey. In so much as I have retraced these steps, laid them out in a form of words, joined up individual paces into a continuous narrative, added elements of my own place making, my authorial interventions recall the words of John Berger

Stories walk, like animals and men. And their steps are not only between narrated events, but between each sentence, sometimes each word. Every step is a stride over something not said (1972:284-5)

Yet when seeking to capture the multi-sensoriality of a walk, narrative writing is limited (Edensor, 2005). Rhys-Taylor (2011) endorses Edensor’s pessimism in his sensory ethnography of East London. Agreeing with Pink (2009) about the importance of conveying the multi-sensory nature of the ethnographic moment, he argues that purely narrative writing conveys only a proportion of embodied experience. Arguably then, the use of pictures, artifacts, descriptive and evocative writing that can convey a little more of the embodied nature of place making, yields a form of reportage that is in itself a performative gesture. Gestures like these may go some way to prevent some of the lived experience of walking from falling through the gaps in the narrative (Ingold, 2000).

Postscript: the low point

Our walk ended with a ride of The Wheel of Manchester1; a first for both of us. Even though this was the only part of the afternoon that bore no relation to previous walks, experiences, routes, The Wheel afforded us an overview of Manchester. As the operator took our photograph and ushered us into the cabin, the prerecorded in-cab commentary prohibited further attempts at conversation. After two hours walking and talking, we came to rest, fell-silent, mute. Presiding over the grey Mancunian skyline, we both agreed later that this was the low point of the afternoon

---

1 The Wheel of Manchester, a Ferris wheel, was installed in 2004. Shortly after T and I’s ride, it was dismantled and moved to Edinburgh
A: I feel like a tourist in my own town
T: That’s a good one. Have you not been?
A: I’ve never been, no, never been on this

Inside the cabin on the Big Wheel a pre-recorded commentary played out as we looked out over Manchester, a little underwhelmed. Local DJs Rob Ellis and Rachel now described the scene, with T and I sitting more or less in silence for three revolutions and seven minutes

“This is exchange Square, this is the part of Manchester that was affected by the 1996 IRA bombing…”
Chapter Six

Manchester through the ears

Three soundscape compositions by a newcomer from Bandung

Sounds of the city

At the orchestral premier of John Cage’s musical piece *Four Minutes Thirty-Three Seconds* in New York in 1952 the audience’s was attention drawn beyond the musicians who sat and stood silently before them. Cage’s so-called *Silent Piece* invites us to attend to the ambient sound beyond that which is traditionally labeled musical performance. The boundary between background sound and music is heightened by gestures such as these. The nature of sound itself is brought to our attention. On a day to day basis it is commonplace, either by intention or in the natural course of events, for our engagement with places to be focused towards a particular sensory mode, be it sound, vision or otherwise. For instance, someone who deliberately sets out to photograph a town inevitably engages with its frames, colours, foregrounds, backgrounds, lights and darks. More serendipitously, my own chance encounter with an object in the street whilst cycling sent my attention rushing towards the ambient sounds of the city

Research diary excerpt: Stretford, Manchester, 2012

*Lying in the road, wireless, alone and silent, is a black landline telephone receiver from the early 1980s*

My encounter with the receiver heightened my auditory engagement with place. Provoked by the de-contextualized appearance of a dead, forgotten handset I listened intently to Stretford, for a moment at least.

Perceptions of urban sound have long been explored by artists and researchers. The history of sound art and performatice social science yields experiments in which practitioners have sought to direct collaborators’ attention to what might otherwise rumble by as lost urban soundtracks. For example, percussionist and sound artist Max Neuhaus (1976) stamped the heads of his collaborators with the word *LISTEN!* before walking them around acoustically interesting sights/sites/sounds in Manhattan. Fontana (1984) played 16 soundscapes of various sites in Paris 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. Experiments like these recall the extent to which developments in mobile and digital recording have unshackled ambient sound from fixed locations.

---

2 An abridged version has been Published in *The Senses and Society* (2013)
Technology renders displaced field recordings a commonplace of urban experience, as this recent example shows

Research diary excerpt: Whitworth Park, Rusholme, Manchester, 2012

Speakers tied to trees play low level street sounds from Lagos, Manchester as part of We Face Forward, a celebration of West Africa across Manchester

In another experiment Adams & Bruce (2008 and chapter two) explored the place-making potential of sound, using a soundwalking method, also in Manchester. Soundwalks are defined as “walks in the outside world guided by recorded sound and voice, usually using a personal stereo” (Butler, 2006:89). These Mancunian soundwalks exemplify listening as a knowledge generating process, yielding technologically aided, emplaced expertise. Incorporating acoustic recording into a mixed methods approach, participants were accompanied along pre-determined Mancunian routes, derived from their own personal experience. They were asked to tune in to their acoustic urban environment, acting as technologically assisted assemblages of microphones, sound recorders and cameras (Semidor, 2006). Such collaborations (Adams and Bruce, 2008) recall Lave’s (1991) idea of learning through practice. By repetitively walking, listening and recording, emplaced expertise (route knowledge, memories, emotive meanings) is walked/worked out through shared listening apprenticeships (Lave, 1991). Walking and listening together, researchers and participants build on overlapping place-based knowledge, sharing experiences and adding new layers of knowledge en route. We saw how overlapping embodied experience precipitated new knowledge co-productively in my collaboration with T (see chapter five). Correspondingly, the Positive Soundscapes project (Adams & Bruce, 2008) enabled entry into the sensuous worlds of participants by walking and listening to ambient sound and generating positive and negative responses to the environment. On-the-go participants and researchers act as assemblages of recording equipment, supplementing walks with qualitative interviews

It was possible for the researchers and the participants to have a shared sensory experience of the urban environments under investigation, thus enabling a deeper and more meaningful semi-structured interview to take place. Walking through the city and listening to it focused attention on what was being heard and was significant in enabling a more far-reaching exploration of the responses made about spatiality and the relationship between the built environment, the urban infrastructure, the design of the city, and its soundscapes (Adams and Bruce, 2008:7)
Like these participants, F, a post-graduate student of Acoustics and recent arrival from the Bandung, Indonesia, contributed to my project by engaging, as she put it, with “Manchester through the ears”. Her response to the city showed how she constructed her new home by the accumulation of sensuous, sound-based knowledge and meanings. By degree she developed what has been termed her emplaced ‘acoustemology’ (Drever, 2002) of the city. Yet unlike in the soundwalking method used by Adams & Bruce, F chose to take more of a lead in generating her soundscapes. During our preliminary interview, which aimed to establish F’s preferred mode of contribution, I learned about her favoured methods of mobility, habitual technologies and sensory preferences. It was apparent from the outset that her sensuous engagement with the city was different from those of her fellows.

F: As you know most people take pictures, just pictures, but it’s just one of our senses, but it’s not complete without hearing as well. We do have nose and skin, but to record place we do have eyes and ears and I am trying to look at the ear side of Manchester, it’s like Manchester through the ears, rather than through photographs.

During this first interview F told me she wanted to generate sound compositions of three meaningful Mancunian sites. Furthermore, she preferred to walk them over herself rather than being led by a researcher. Her proactive offer dovetailed with my participatory methodology. It fitted too with my keenness to model the method on existing expertise, which F, a post-graduate practitioner in Acoustics with easy access to the necessary equipment, is steeped in. Thus, F strode out alone to make soundscape compositions of her Manchester and write accompanying narratives to share with me at a second interview.

**Sounds of a city (not the city)**

As F talked about her acoustemology of Manchester it was clear that she was happy to discuss the characteristics of her sonic environment and those she ascribed to herself interchangeably. Using a discourse that is reminiscent of Thrift’s (2004) notion of relational materialism (where boundaries of personhood are porous and persons are indivisible from their surroundings, see chapter two), F reveals the interdependent, relational nature of the emplaced person. Explaining her choices of soundscape locations she invokes personal qualities that seep out into the landscape.

F: Yeah, at first I wanted to record just quiet places, but I did record a park and Salford Quays, but then, they don’t represent the whole me. I like peacefulness but I’m not that peaceful myself. I mean there are times when I have to rush and I have to think hard about something when I am in chaotic conditions so I
recorded, I decided to record Piccadilly Gardens as well because it’s like at the centre of offices, shops and you know buses, trams, so it can represent my chaotic-ness, that kind of thing.

Here F introduces the narrative texts that accompany her soundscapes as though they are accounts of her own personhood dissolving into the city itself, as she later puts it, ‘blending’ with her environment.

F: Well I wrote, I did write things, because it represents myself and three of the places. It’s about me and Manchester and a representative place in Manchester.

F’s positioning of herself as interconnected with her environment resonates not only with Thrift’s (2007) work, but also with more psychological portraits of the so-called meta-personal self (DeCicco and Stroink, 2007). This model of self-construal suggests that in terms of consciousness, distributed cognition (Clark, 2011) and interpersonal relations, persons are not discrete entities, but mutually constitutive of environmental contexts. DeCicci & Stroink formulate a mode of self-construal that extends individualism, beyond mere feelings of collective identity with other social groups that are (known as collectivist construal, Markus & Kityama, 1990). It extends towards a deeper awareness that the consequences of actions and the nature of cognition resonate into the material as well as social world. This relational, distributed, meta-personal discourse of self-construal is illustrated in F’s interests in and passion for Indonesian music. Besides being a student of Acoustics she is also an experienced practitioner of Indonesian Gamelan and Angklung. During a meeting I attended at the I16 early in the year she facilitated a workshop in which all of us participated in a lively practical demonstration of Angklung. F’s dual interest in music and more technical applications of acoustics informs her porous relationship with her environment and with her perceptions of the sounds she notices there. Interestingly she explicitly distinguishes sound, which she loves and seeks out, from noise, which she is repelled by.

F: Well, I don’t like noises, whether it’s hard noises, traffic. It’s just, I like calm and quiet environment, places, so I can think straight. I am a Muslim, and I cannot do, like, drinking or partying, because it’s just forbidden. So I am used to being in quiet places, quiet environments.

---

3 Gamelan is the music of Indonesia. Gamelan orchestras are usually percussion oriented, but some varieties may feature flutes, bowed and plucked strings, or vocalists in a prominent role.

4 Angklung is a musical instrument made of two bamboo tubes attached to a bamboo frame. The tubes are carved to have a resonant pitch when struck, and are of differing sizes, producing differing sounds. Each of three or more performers in an Angklung ensemble play just one note or more, but altogether complete melodies are produced.
F’s relational, meta-personal discourse of self-construal also permeates the practices of Gamelan and Angklung. During our collaboration F and I had several conversations about the ethos of Indonesian music and Wayang (puppetry). Following F’s Angklung workshop at the II6, together F and I attended a one-day Gamelan symposium at Manchester Metropolitan University. This involved practical sessions, films, demonstrations and discussions on Indonesian music, puppetry and ethnomusicology. During these conversations it was clear that themes consonant with meta-personal self-construal (DeCicco and Stroink, 2007), relational materialism (Thrift, 2004) and vitalist geographies (Greenhough, 2010, see chapter two) pervade a style of musical practice that eschews individualism and virtuoso performance. Gamelan is less about individual virtuosity and solo expertise, more about a collective of players partaking in musical and social processes. Here F elaborates on the egalitarianism of Gamelan

F: As you know Indonesia is not a rich country, it’s still developing, and we have many poor people there, and obviously they can’t afford to buy musical instruments because it’s too expensive for them. And so our traditional music is used to gather all the people, so that we can come and play together, the music. And it’s really easy, the music, that’s why I like it and I want to get close to the people

F: It’s not whether you are skilful in the music itself, but if we are together we can make music together, no matter how stupid we are, it’s like, no matter how skillful we are, it’s just, equality.

In Indonesian society Gamelan is something to take part in with others, rather than watch experts perform. Yet as well as being more collectivist than individualist in this sense (Markus and Kityama, 1991), it is also positioned on the borders of musical performance and natural, ambient sound. In a statement that recalls the experiments of John Cage, in which he implicitly urged listeners to dissolve their assumptions about the difference between music and ambient sound, here F salutes the natural properties of Gamelan

A: It’s good to see it in front of you but it’s also good to hear it from a distance, if you see what I mean
F: Sometimes when we listen in the distance it’s better=
A: =Yes, it’s funny that. It’s not a criticism it’s just a really good sound, a little bit like birdsong or something like that from a distance
F: Yes, it’s natural.
A: So that the music itself almost sounds natural, almost sounds like it’s being made by the environment, doesn’t it?
F: Yeah
Here F has more to say about the interface between performed music and the natural sonic environment. She speculates on how difficult it is for most forms of music to replicate the sounds of nature.

F: It’s so natural. The thing is, you know when we can make, we can synthesize sounds from any instruments we have, any instruments, like traditional instruments, or just violin or piano, we can synthesize it with computer. But white noise, if you know, the flowing river, or waterfalls, no computers can generate it. It’s just there. It’s just natural

A: So in the world of acoustics there’s a big difference between=

F: =Yeah the hardest thing to make is not the sound of the orchestra but rather the sound of nature

F: Yeah. This kind of nature

F’s allusions recall the work of Feld (1994), who worked with the Kaluli of Papua New Guinea, exploring in particular ways sound links environment, language, musical experience and expression (Feld 1994: 2)

In particular Feld noted how ritualised uses of vocals in the rainforest mimicked the native birds there. For the Kaluli, birds represent spirits, so the mimicking of them recalls and evokes the presence of these spirits. Again, as with F’s discussions of Gamelan, we see here the blurring of the musical, natural (and in this case the spiritual) worlds. The texts of Kaluli songs sequentially name places and corresponding environmental features such as vegetation, light and sound (Feld,1994:2). Feld parallels the ecology of natural sounds and local musical ecology. Eroded boundaries between natural sound and music appear here to dissolve the Kaluli into their environs through acoustic engagement, much as F herself describes her own blending with the city.

Like so many sound artists before her, as a musician and acoustician F’s engagement with the sound environment is stimulated by more than just musical performance. It may incorporate some of the musical qualities of Indonesian music, yet it extends into the ambient sounds of the city, a city, her city, which, as the phenomenologist theorists who are cited below would argue, she herself is playing a part in constructing through the creative practice of soundscape composition.

*The meaning of soundscapes*

Soundscapes have been defined relationally as
an environment of sound (or sonic environment) with emphasis on the way it is perceived and understood by the individual, or by a society (Traux, 1999:7)

For Traux (1999) too, a soundscape composition is no objective recording of a place, but a partial construction whose characteristics depend on the relationship between the individual and any such environment (cited in Drever, 2002:21)

What is striking in these definitions is their bi-directionality (Diaz, 2007), or relationality. They portray person and environment as indiscrete. This resonates with phenomenological and non-representational models of the environmental perception (see chapter one), wherein environments are made from our engagement with them, and are mediated through technologies that extend organisms into those environments (Cresswell, 2004, Thrift, 2008). The making of soundscape compositions as a technologically mediated place-making activity is nothing new. It arose when advances in audio recording precipitated a heyday of sound art in the late 20th century (Butler, 2006, Semidor, 2006). Indeed, the influence of the sonic environment in constituting our relationship with places, and with each other, dates back still further. For centuries sound has been part of people’s way of navigating in time, space and in the social world in the city (Garrioch, 2003:6).

Chronology, respect, status and other power-laden social phenomena have long been signaled in urban settings by bells, whistles, sirens, rattles and drums that have variously disciplined us (school bells), enhanced feelings of belonging (church bells), fear (sirens) or evoked sensuous memories of place (insert your own place evoking personal sound cue here) (Diaz, 2007). Throughout the life cycle the sonic environment is entangled with our perceptions of place. Auditory engagements with environments generate and perpetuate embodied sensuous knowledge (acoustemology). Soundscape compositions are audible and mutually constitutive of emplaced knowledge. We make them with our ears to the ground. They provide a welcome complement to the purely written or linguistic accounts that so often accrue from ethnographic research (Ingold, 2000, Thrift, 2004). As with the subjective cartographies that emerged from my collaboration with with T (see chapter five) and Al (see chapter eight), F produced three field recordings (see APPX 6) that materially convey the combining of person, technology and environment and the performative production of knowledge. In the following section F tells how she moved through her environment, generating acoustic knowledge in combination with
equipment she bonded with during her postgraduate studies. Her account highlights interdependence between person and machine that facilitates environmental perception through distributed forms of cognition (Thrift, 2007, Clark, 2011). She suggests that the very use of digital recording equipment alters her perception of the environment. In effect, the environment itself is altered, perceived differently, in accord with the technologies she uses to apprehend it.

F: when I record this I just stay in one place just sitting still or else my ear will, because the microphone is in the ear so rather than an earphone it’s an in-ear microphone

F: It’s just, at first I had this sound filled microphone. It’s really complicated. I have to decode it. I have many microphones and many channels, I have to decode one by one the channels and I thought it was too much. I mean we don’t have to replay this in some sort of theatre or anything, so in the end I just decided to use an in-ear microphone, so you just record it based on what you hear and you can listen to it exactly as what it recorded

In line with non-representational approach of Thrift (2004) these technologically augmented accounts are unapologetically partial. They are not recordings of the city, but of a city, F’s city. They are replete with subjective, sensuous, mobile engagement. Her compositions are sound messages from the borders of person and place. They are transformative accounts of an environment. They make it into something (Traux, 1999). Indeed, F was not the only collaborator in this project who roamed the streets of Manchester hooked up to sound recording equipment, actively generating her own acoustemology of place. An, a Romanian documentary film-maker (see chapter seven), speaks here about the constitutive, transformative, place-making impact that recording sound can have. During the making of her film about the mobility of older bus users, she explains how moving through the city with a recording tool changes the way she got to know the place.

A: Did you get to know Piccadilly and these bits through making the movie? An: I was directing, director-editor in the team, so I wasn’t actually holding the camera, but I was the boom operator. I was doing the sound. So even with the sound, when you have your headphones on and the microphone, you get to hear so many things that you general don’t hear, like, a woman was passing by with a buggy and she was talking on the phone and she was only a few meters away from me and I could hear what she was talking about and random people and small samples of conversations they were having and you don’t really hear that when people pass by you and you get to know a place much more when you have this tool.
If the practice of recording sound is transformative of place perception, the subsequent sharing of these compositions with an audience adds another layer of co-productivity. As they are heard, shared, soundscapes yield collaborative knowledge. At our second interview F played her recordings to me, an audience of one with my own experience of the places she had recorded. Whilst listening, my own psychological context fused with that of the composer. Fittingly, Traux (2000) reminds us of the collaborative characteristics of soundscape compositions, wherein

(i) The listener’s recognisability of the source material is maintained, yet altered
(ii) The composer’s knowledge of the environmental and psychological context of the soundscape material dissolves into the composition and is inseparable from the reality depicted there
(iii) The composition itself enhances the listeners’ and composers’ understandings of the world (Truax 2000)

This latter feature was accentuated as F and I discussed her compositions. Sharing recorded sounds of known places cemented an overlap in experience between two people with comparable stakes in the collaboration as a whole (Pink, 2010). Both of us were engaged in an act of place making. As Traux (1999) has argued, the full potential of soundscape composition as a knowledge generating practice is only realized when an audience provides a complementary psychological context. All stories need a listener’s input to fully render their meaning. Likewise, all sound artists require an interlocutor to add value to the meaning that is generated (Traux, 1999). In an office space at the University of Salford, a few hundred yards from where these recordings were made, we sat together, listening to F’s compositions.

To the sound of Peel Park
A: Yeah I see, so in a way this is the sound that you hear everyday but I suppose the sound will change at different times of year
F: Yes
A: This is spring
F: This spring
A: So how long does it take you to do this walk everyday?
F: What do you mean how long?
A: This is the walk that you make to=
F: =It’s just ten minutes
A: So erm, this location, is this part of your journey to catch the bus to Salford?
We talked them over. We talked over them. We co-productively reinvented our perceptions and understandings of three places we inconclusively knew. In so doing we came to know them differently. We made them all over again. The compositions we talked about/over and listened to are cultural artifacts. They are inseparable from the intentionality of composer and listener as interlocutors. Their knowledge generating potential highlights the inseparability of cultures, the artifacts that make them and are made by them, and the minds that conceive of them through their practice (Shweder, 1996, Cole, 2000, and see chapter three). The inseparability of F from the environment speaks through the following excerpts. It is clear that these compositions are not just soundtracks of Manchester, but Manchester through the ears of F. On reading these narratives one is unsure where Manchester ends and F begins

**Textual narrative to accompany soundscape of Peel Park**

Peel Park is my favourite spot to spend my daily spare time, either before class or after finished all my activities in the university. Everyday I walked past the park with different kind of sensations—be it after exhaustion from a whole day-long activity, excitement after experiencing something new, or simply boredom. The park is pretty much representing my daily life in Manchester—simple, quiet, sometimes unexpected, and yet pretty intense. 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.

**Textual narrative to accompany soundscape of Salford Quays**

Unlike Peel Park, 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 favourite 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.

**Textual narrative to accompany soundscape of Piccadilly Gardens**

The garden is located at the centre of the busiest streets, shops, and offices in Manchester. Piccadilly Gardens is always the first connection for every people coming to Manchester—due to the nearby train station and main bus stops. I always come to this place, either to wait for friends coming from different cities or to wait for my own departures to another city and another parts of Greater Manchester. This place represents the busy sides of life in Manchester—when we’re busy chasing our dreams, working, catching things or people or places on time, or even busy trying to have fun!

The soundscape sounds bizarrely busy: never ending footsteps, buses, trams, metal clanging (there were road works), quick chat, conversations, and even the sound of flapping wings of pigeons!
The sound of music, memory and Manchester

Sound’s capacity to evoke emplaced memories has already been noted (Diaz, 2007). For a newcomer to a city, who is perhaps especially alive to its novel soundscape, hearing a familiar sound can evoke places elsewhere. Traux (1999) refers to sounds that are culturally evocative and meaningful for certain groups of people as sound marks. Elsewhere Traux (2001) refers to sound symbols, which are analogous to Jung’s (1970) archetypes, accruing through repetitive practice where patterns of sounds and their contexts become meaningfully associated. Although Diaz (2007) portrays these as psychological phenomena that are analogous to (Jungian) shared memories that reside within us, arguably these symbols emerge out of repetitive movement through a place, so inviting a non-representational interpretation. This performative notion of memory is endorsed by Brockmeier (2010) who sees no reason to recruit metaphors of internal storage, such as the unconscious mind, into discussions about how we remember. He questions a western tendency, so typical of mainstream cognitive psychology, to envisage a manifest entity called memory, replete with a biological, internal, spatial identity

For many, memory (or a memory) is located in the mind or brain of an individual, an island of the past with a clear coastline in a sea of oblivion or different mental states (2010:6)

Brockmeier prefers a non-representational psychological interpretation of remembering. If memory is manifest at all, he argues, it resides in the collective practices and artifacts that cultures accumulate through daily mobile living. If it is to be located, it can be found between us, materially, socially, trans-individually, not within us. The metaphor of the archive is the one most fervently rejected by Brockmeier, along with the assumption that the mind, the head, and what they contain, are the primary domains of the memory researcher. The hypothesized non-representational memory researcher would instead turn attention to memorial practices, not hypothetical archives

localizing them instead within a broader framework of social and cultural practices and artifacts, which are themselves subject to historical change (2010:9)

This proposed cultural shift in memory research is reflected in the work of practitioners from disciplines other than psychology. Young (2008) highlights culturally diverse constructions of Holocaust memories, mediated through ideological disputes and cultural traditions. The cultural plasticity of memory is also evident in Erll’s (2008) assertion that the past, like any
other time or place, must be continually reconstructed through narrative. The reconstructive imagination of those who recall the past operates in tandem with the sensuous experience of the emplaced individual. Arguably, this imagination is especially keenly stimulated in one who is newly emplaced, such as a newcomer to a city. For the new arrival imaginative remembering involves drawing connections between newly experienced places and places already known. This is a dynamic memorial practice that is inseparable from senses, places, and senses of place. In other words, remembering is bound up with contexts, sites of memory (Nora 1989, Johnston and Longhurst, 2010). These sites, often personally poignant locations, can be understood as situated, emotionally saturated points of reference through which wanderers move and imaginatively reconstruct those places and their connections with others from their pasts. Indeed, another of my participants, Al, draws heavily on sites of memory during her construction Manchester and Tunis (see chapter eight). Thus memories, far from being units of knowledge stored in an internal archive, are dynamic practices for fashioning narratives from other times and places. Furthermore, Brockmeier (2010) notes that these narratives are not merely played out between people, places and other people, but also via technologies which enhance them and bring them into being (and perhaps even distort them)

The extensive digitalization of memories surely has drawn sharper attention to the inextricable interconnections between acts of remembrance and the specific mediated objects through which these acts materialize (Dijck, 2007, p. 16)

Memorial content is manifest in all manner of cultural trails and artifacts. For Al, this was achieved through the construction of memorial postcards (see chapter eight) that drew comparisons between lives experienced in two cities. For F too, memories of Indonesia were related through comparisons with life in Manchester

F: When I arrived here I had a cultural shock of course. It was, quite, because, like, everything is so organized here, like the timetable for buses, for trains. Everything, even in the college, in Indonesia it’s really chaotic and spontaneous, but here all things are scheduled

In line with F’s own sensory preferences, her memories were mediated through soundscape compositions. In terms of Thrift’s (2004) non-representational thesis, digital, emplaced memories emerge here as trans-individual, mental-technical-cultural practices (Dijck, 2007). They are borne of walking the streets, listening, remembering with the ears and laying down the product in an audible format for others to share. Trans-individual,
tangible, materialized memories are ideal for sharing, and the act of sharing exposes their content to further transformative dialogues, wherein new layers of co-productive knowledge are added. As F and I listened to her compositions our conversation drifted towards evocations of Bandung, Indonesia. Likenesses, dissimilarities and dissonances between past and present rose to the surface.

To the sound of water at Salford Quays
A: So is there something about that kind of soundscape that brings Indonesia back?
F: Yes
A: What, the place where you’re from in Indonesia?
F: It’s in Bandung. We don’t have any rivers or bridges nearby but I do love bridges and, you know, sea, and I can find it in Indonesia. It’s really easy to find it.

To the sound of Piccadilly Gardens
A: Yeah, I suppose that this is the one with most people compared to the other two locations
F: Yeah, it’s the busiest one. The sound of the tram.
A: And dare I say this is the one you like less than the other two, or?
F: Yeah, less than the other two (laughs)
A: Is this the one that’s most different from where you’re from in Bandung?
F: In fact I live in a really busy region in Bandung so I used to hear the sound of traffic as well and you know but I just like it personally if I can stay away from that place. But I live there, you know.

The work that F produced during for our collaboration conveyed a city transformed. She constructed Manchester through the ears to the tune of three soundscape compositions, three accompanying narratives and a series of conversations that gave voice to a city from which F herself had become inseparable. Her acoustemology of Manchester incorporated her own perceptions of meaningful locations that are bound up with memories of Bandung. Her construction of Manchester through the ears not only made the city into something to listen to through the ears of a recent arrival from Indonesia, it also appears to have changed the way in which F herself constructs her relationship with it.

A: Is there anything new you’ve learned about the city or your experience of it?
F: Well, er, I learned to, recognize what I experienced, because I usually just experience things just like that, but you made me think what I really get in Manchester, what I really experience in Manchester, that kind of, it makes me blend with the city maybe, yes.
Post-script: Listening in the field

The prioritizing of sound in an ethnographic collaboration alters the methodological dynamic, some would say for the better. Several authors have called for ethnographic research to eschew the label of participant observation and its visual hegemony, in favour of multisensory modes of immersion (Ingold, 2000, Pink, 2010). Drever (2002) pursues the matter, lamenting the tendency for ethnographers to present the visual field as the whole field. Historically, he argues, ethnography has developed a number of characteristics that have tainted it as a method. For example, whilst the ethnographer inhabits others’ worlds and shares their practices, reports are seldom written, collaboratively, with the audible voice of the contributors (Clifford, 1986). Drever suggests that these problems of distancing owe much to a visual bias. Conquergood (1991) and Drever (2002) suggest a rethinking of the ethnographer as a collaborative communicator, rather than as a scrutinizing scientist, bent on truth production. Fieldwork, they argue, should be co-experienced time, generating co-productive knowledge, rather than simply one researcher observing, reporting, yet somehow having no effect on the knowledge that is produced. The audible, conversing ethnographer is one who speaks and hears stories, rather than one who observes actions and rituals. Ingold (2000) too notes that observation evokes surveillance, spatial removal and silent watching. Clifford (1986) further questions the mere representation of others in the forms of texts that sit on the page waiting to be read, with or without pictures. He invites us develop more multi-sensory, ‘artifactual’ methods of documenting experience.

It could be argued that ‘translating’ an alien form of life, another culture, is not always done best through the representational discourse of ethnography, that under certain conditions a dramatic performance, the execution of a dance, or the playing of a piece of music might be more apt (Clifford 1986:156).

Arguably, conversational, non-representational ethnographic practice signals a shift from purely visual, textual to more broadly sensuous methods; from mono-vocal to poly-vocal, from monologue to dialogue. Hitched to these critiques of classical ethnography, it is useful to reflect on the rich vein of work that F produced in our collaboration. Her initiation of her own method of listening to the city offered rich complement to her textual reflections, and vice versa. Subsequently, her willingness to generate knowledge in conversation offered an opportunity for immersive, collaborative production of emplaced meaning in the spirit of call and response. Indeed, F’s insistence on molding the nature of her contribution around her own areas of skilled technological practice and sensory preferences produced a collaboration in which participant and researcher...
(labels becoming less and less appropriate by the minute) could share equal status in the production of knowledge. Indeed, this egalitarian dynamic was reminiscent of Gamelan musical style that I heard and learned so much of during this collaboration.
Chapter Seven

The Making of Twearlies
Manchester and Salford in pictures, poems and on buses

Prelude: Greater Manchester travel about to unravel (part 1)

A: Is this the stop for the 9?
An: Yeah this is where we interviewed Alan, the guy with the glasses, the managing director
A: Can you just tell me about the first scene in the film?
An: The one where he recites the poem?
A: Isn’t that one of the first scenes in the film? Can you remember what he was talking about?
An: I might, I edited it for so long. I might be able to remember it off by heart. Er, we asked him to write a poem about traveling because we wanted to=

=Very loud screeching and popping sound=
An: Wow – what was that?
A: It was that car but I don’t know how it did it
An: High speed

Laughs
An: So we asked him to write a poem about travel and buses because we wanted to connect poetry and buses even more. It was a bit artificial but we wanted to give him the opportunity and he enjoyed it. I mean he wouldn’t have had the idea but he did it for us and I think it went

Greater Manchester travel about to unravel

Traffic noise
An: I really new this

To be continued

Sight and sound
F’s construction of her city using soundscape composition revealed a porous relationship between person and city. At times they dissolved into one another. But what of someone who engages with the city predominantly with their eyes rather than their ears? When photography and film are the principle vehicles for mobile reportage and place making the nature of the relationship with place is rather different. Firstly (obviously) it is more likely to be geared towards sights than sounds. Secondly (less obviously) the relationship may be a less porous one. Ingold (2000) addresses this second question by presenting a thought experiment. He considers the differing characteristics of two modes of sensory
apprehension of place, sight and sound. To illustrate the different ways in which environments can be constructed through eyes and ears he asks us to imagine (a) hearing a train pass whilst blindfolded and (b) seeing it pass soundlessly, and to consider the difference between these two normally entangled apprehensions. Rather like F might (see chapter six), Ingold argues that experience (a) may be more involving than (b), which might be rather more distancing. Sound, he suggests, reverberates and reaches into the soul, whilst soundless sight casts one in the role of outsider, bystander, observer and spectator. Arguably, vision objectifies, sound emplaces. Yet there is a paradox built into this suggestion. If vision affords a relative distancing of the perceived world it can also engender a belief that we have witnessed the world objectively, as it really is, rather than just a representation of it. As a consequence, in everyday discourse although we are likely to report seeing a train (itself) there is a tendency to report hearing the sound of a train, the slamming of a door, the crack of thunder, the voices of noisy neighbours (Ingold, 2000). In raising this paradox Ingold alerts us to an everyday discourse in which absolute truth appears to be out of earshot, yet within sight. This proposed uneven relationship between sight, sound and truth bolsters the view that vision, untainted by subjectivities, yields rational, analytical forms of knowledge. These sentiments resonate in the history of empirical thought, throughout which positivists are most likely to apprehend the world through the visual sense (Ingold, 2000). Participant observation is the classic method of early anthropology (Kuper, 1996). Yet this perceived over-reliance on the visual has raised criticism. Ocular-centrism can lead us to objectify environments, which come to resemble containers of things, separate from us, seized by our gaze, analysed and brought under our power (Levin, 1993). This objectifying gaze yields representational bodies of knowledge, stored within the person. Inner representations of mental states are constructed on the basis of observation and appearance. Through sound meanwhile, which penetrates the soul and is experienced through porous boundaries of skin (Ingold, 2000), a more discursive, dialogic knowledge accrues. Voices, rather than images, establish inter-subjective, participatory constructions of selves and places. According to this epistemological model, knowing emerges from conversation, not silent observation (Shotter, 2008).

Vision, in this conception, defines the self individually in opposition to others; hearing defines the self socially in relation to others (Ingold, 2000:246)

The aural blending of F with her environment (see chapter six) chimes with Ingold’s (2000) idea that ‘vision objectifies, sound emplaces and connects’. This mantra (‘vision objectifies, sound connects’) occupied me during my collaboration with An, a documentary filmmaking student from Baia Mare,
Maramures, (north-western Romania, close to the border with Ukraine) and a recent arrival in Manchester. We encountered An briefly in chapter six, talking about her role in the sound recording of one of her films. Nevertheless An’s predominant sensory mode of addressing her new city is far more visual than that of F’s. During the first few weeks of her stay in Manchester An made a short documentary, *Twearlies*, about older peoples’ use of bus-passes in and around the city. She travelled the environs of Manchester on foot and by bus, getting to know a small group of older bus-pass users, many of whom, it transpired, just happened to also write poetry. An interviewed them about the mobility afforded to them by the bus-pass and about the poetry they wrote. The bus-pass, issued to older bus users, bestows the freedom of the city, so long as it is used after 9am. Here P, one of An’s collaborators, explains the origins of the word *Twearly*:

P: Where I live they call us *Twearlies*. The reason they call us *Twearlies* is, we’re usually getting on the bus in the morning about nine o’clock and saying “Am I too early?”

The embodied, multi-sensory nature of this project, which involved much walking, talking, waiting, riding and filming, ensured that An’s engagement with Manchester and Salford during those introductory weeks was more than merely observational. During the making of *Twearlies* the shooting, place-making process entangled all of An’s senses. She came to know places by listening:

An: I was doing the sound. I was recording the sound. So, even with the sound, when you have your headphones on and the microphone, you get to hear so many things that you generally don’t hear, like, a woman was passing by with a buggy and she was talking in the phone and she was only a few meters away from me and I could hear what she was talking about and random people and small samples of conversations they were having and you don’t really hear that when people pass by you and you get to know a place much more when you have this tool, obviously because you just hear

By walking

An: Usually when I go to a new place, and I did not know anyone when I came here as well, I like to just go for walks in the city. I had the map with me and it was the first week, when I didn’t really have classes to do for school, so I went to Manchester city centre and I was just walking and it was actually nice because it was warm and sunny and I realized that I was actually alone in a new place. So I was trying to get know it for a bit to make me feel a bit more at home

---

5 [http://vimeo.com/34577240](http://vimeo.com/34577240) [password: Buspass]
A: So you did that by walking
An: Yeah, I just walked because first of all I didn’t know which buses I had to take and second because I like walking around cities because that’s a very good way of getting to know a place, walking

By hanging around

An: I think I spend so much time waiting for the bus in England
A: Yes, can I ask you about hanging around?

**Bus noises**

A: We’ve talked a lot about moving about but obviously part of the culture of bus travel is standing about, doing nothing
An: O yes=
A:= and kind of waiting. So what do you tend to do?

**Sounds of another conversation about a spider**

A: How do you spend time, what do people do when they’re waiting for buses?
An: Well most people are on their smartphones I think, that’s generally. Rarely, very rarely, people start talking to you but that’s mostly when, late at night and they’re drunk. I’m not very happy with that sometimes

And by observing

A: So then we just came up with this idea about making a documentary about the bus pass and how it affects old peoples’ lives and how it changes their lifestyle. This bus pass gives them chance to go around the city and socialize basically, so we just decided to follow them even though we had not contributors yet. So we decided to go around the city and find bus stops and just observe people

Despite working in a visual medium An’s construction of Manchester and Salford through a lens was neither (a) commensurate with vision as a sovereign, objectifying discourse nor (b) separate from her embodied, multisensory engagement. Working with An (and F), I sought distance from accounts of place making which assumed the exclusivity of vision in the sensorial pecking order. The anthropological archive is replete with examples of sensory engagements that do not subscribe to ocular-centrism. Pink (2007) urges ethnographers to explore visual ethnography in relation to other senses, rather than as a singular mode of engagement, on the grounds that pure images and/or pure words are not viable methods for the construction of knowledge (Crawford, 1992). Seeger (1987) notes that for the Suya of Brazil, the word *ku-mba* translates as both to hear, to know and to understand, illustrating the elevated status of hearing in the sensory hierarchy. Suya also talk of memories lodged in the ear rather than represented as visual images in the mind (Seeger, 1987). The pre-eminence of hearing is also noted by Gell (1979) following field-work among the Umeda, Papua New Guinea, residents of forest regions where seeing is
limited, hearing at distance more valued. Just as the dominance of vision
cannot be assumed, neither can it’s distancing, objectifying nature. Any rule
of thumb stating that

The more a society emphasises the eye, the less communal it will be.
The more it emphasises the ear, the less individualistic it will be
(Howes, 1991:177)

is prone to simplification. There is evidence that vision a can be a
penetrating, rather than, distancing, sense. An Inuit shaman is reputedly
more seer, less mere spectator (Ingold, 2000). Among the Yup’ik Eskimos,
shamanic vision is no objectifying gaze. It has the power to penetrate
parallel worlds of animal and spirit among the (Fienup-Riordan, 1994).
Seeing is instrumental in the construction and gaining of knowledge. It is a
creative and by no means objectifying act. In an interesting parallel with
documentary filmmaking Oosten (1992) notes that for the Inuit, seeing and
hunting are inseparable. Through vision the hunter initiates the encounter,
yet the hunted animal is neither objectified, nor framed, nor merely
observed. Rather, true to an inter-subjective dynamic, it actively offers itself
into an interaction. Arguably then it is possible to enter diverse life-worlds
through visual means whilst remaining outside the constraints of taken for
granted oppositions between vision and hearing (that mantra again, ‘vision
distances, sound connects’). The primacy of vision, for those who use it in their
engagement with others’ life worlds, cannot be held synonymous with their
objectification. Neither can the use of visual methods for making places be
considered to the exclusion of other senses (Ingold, 2000). Merleau-Ponty
(1962) eschews the separation of vision and hearing in terms of how they
position us in relation to the world. For him, senses are not distinct
registers but are bound up with embodiment, movement through (Gibson,
1962) and engagement with the world

My gaze, my touch, and all my other senses are together the powers
of one and the same body integrated into one and the same action
(Merleau-Ponty, 1962:317)

Neither eyes nor ears are bound to the production of discrete internal
representations of the world. Both are engaged in bringing it into being
performatively. There is an active, call and response type relationship
between perceiver and perceived world. We operate in situ, on the go,
inhabitants of a world ever being brought into being. We consult the world
for orientation, gain cues from our surroundings (Gibson, 1962), rather than
consulting internal pictures. From this phenomenological perspective our
involvement in, movement through and engagement with the world are
precisely what bring it about. Prior to acknowledging a world of objects out there, we have to acknowledge our active perception of them.

Opening scenes
An came upon the idea for Twearlies during her early engagements with her adopted twin cities of Manchester and Salford. Whilst walking the streets, overhearing conversations and taking pictures she made places whilst simultaneously searching for something to film. When we met on a bank holiday afternoong in Piccadilly Gardens, fittingly Manchester’s busiest bus station, she explained to me that during those first few weeks the walking around, looking around and looking for a film, were inseparable

An: I arrived in September and we started shooting in November-December I think.
A: So this might have been the first time you engaged with these particular locations, was it?
An: I had been into Manchester centre but not to Bury market, never, and in Salford, yes. That was one of the things that was striking for me because I’m always in Salford but I never really got to talk to people because I just go there, do my shopping and I go home. But because I was there with the purpose of shooting I have to talk to people and it was very new for me, so I discovered a few things=
A: did you get to know Piccadilly and these bits through making the movie?
An: Er, I did.

As we wandered through Piccadilly, pausing at the bus stops from Twearlies, An explained how, as a filmmaker her view of the city was informed by aesthetic values that emerged co-productively from working with her crew. These values are also mediated by the technologies being used. Mobile persons and machines combine to make places what they are

A: As a filmmaker in a place like this you must decide where to shoot according to certain frames
An: Yeah, it’s geometries, lines in the frames, that mostly. I mean myself as a director I tell the cameraman what I’m interested in. I tell him I want to see that bus in the background with people waiting or I want to see people getting on and off and sure I could tell him how to frame it but I don’t really do that because I want to give them freedom and creativity because I’m also learning, so I’m learning from them

---

6 We checked beforehand that the buses were still running, since they played a crucial part in our mobile interview
The film-crew is a mobile assemblage of people and things, gathering and constructing knowledge on the go

A: *What kind of things do you carry around normally to make sense of things?*
An: *When we were shooting it was a camera, sound kit, tripod and boom pole. Basically a stick that helps you hold the microphone closer to the contributor but above the camera so that you don’t see it in the frame.*

It is striking how entangled the film becomes in the routes, itineraries and mobilities that, for An, are habitually learned through practice. Is she getting to know cities whilst making a film there or is she making a film whilst getting to know cities? Both

A: *So you were saying that your film project almost became embedded in the bus routes, in the bus journeys*
An: *Yeah and the movements that I make somehow because even though I didn’t plan it I am always around Salford and Media City and Piccadilly because every time I go there I go to the city centre. I go to Piccadilly so somehow the film became embedded in my own personal itinerary.*

*In location*
Piccadilly Gardens to Salford on the number 9. Salford Shopping City to Media City on the 59. Media City to Piccadilly Gardens on the 50. A golden triangle of filmed locations connected by bus routes. We did the rip on foot and bus. I learned about numbered routes from An as we talked, walked, waited and rode the bank holiday services, revisiting the sights and sounds of *Twearlies*. She guided me between locations, telling stories along the way. I learned, as I had with my other collaborators T, about new forms of sensorial engagement with a city I thought I already knew. This time it was Manchester’s buses I realised I knew nothing about, somewhat to An’s surprise

A: *I’m a bit out of my comfort zone with buses. I never use buses*
An: *You don’t?*

As well as timetable information and route planning, An also taught me the nuanced pre-cognitive knowledge (Thrift and Crang, 2001 and see chapter three) that is part and parcel of bus travel, like the delicate, acquired skill of alighting in installments. This exchange, recorded on the 59, captures the embodied, multisensory experience of bus life

An: *I think we’re gonna have to get off at the next stop*
A: *Ok, shall we*=
Me making to get up

Aa: =Er, yeah, soon. I kind of know the time that we need to get up

Laughs

Me sitting back down

A: Yes, I guess you learn, this is a regular route for you
Aa: Yeah, I've done it many times. Yeah I think we can start to get off

A bell rings

Both of us getting up

A: It's all about the timing isn't it?
Aa: It is. What I'm not very good at yet is knowing what time the buses get in the bus stop, so I'm always a bit early or a bit late

Alighting to the sound of screeching from the bus

A child repeating the phrase “Mummy I can’t hear you, Mummy I can’t hear you”

By riding, walking, waiting, listening, filming and talking with her colleagues and fellow bus travellers (me latest in a long line of these) An brought to life cities that hadn’t existed before in this form. Cities (indeed all places) need not be regarded as pre-given realities upon which detached observers impose meaning, forming representations as though picturing them internally (Merleau-Ponty, 1962, Wylie, 2006). Rather, from a relational, dwelling perspective (Ingold, 2000) place transcends the separation of observer (subject) and environment (object). Embodied involvement in cities, places, landscapes, characterizes this portrayal of the co-constitutive relation between subject and object

The landscape, in short, is not a totality that you or anyone else can look at, it is rather the world in which we stand in, taking up a point of view on our surroundings. And it is within the context of this attentive involvement in the landscape that the human imagination gets to work in fashioning ideas about it’ (Ingold, 2001;207)

The making of Twearties was not an observation of Manchester and Salford by an outsider who gazed through an objectifying lens. In the making of the film, distance between filmmaker and filmed, between subject and object, eroded. It was no fly on the wall exercise, but a film made about bus users, by bus users, on and around the buses. Twearties celebrates the mobility afforded by cheap bus travel and is told in part in the poetic voices of those who feel the benefit. Stories are delivered en route, by travellers who follow subsidised, scheduled routes. Here An conveys embodied, mobile experience of filming-cum-place-making

An From here you can take the number 9 bus to Salford Quays which is where we’re based, where the Lowry is. So because it’s free anyway we just decided to take
the number 9 and see if there were any old people on it and where they go and it turned out that they go to the shopping city, which is right behind my accommodation and I always go there to get groceries myself. And so we said, alright lets for once go and observe; not go there as, for shopping, let’s go there as film makers

Route by route, journey by journey, An’s landscape acquired meaning through the actualization of relations between persons, things and place (Hetherington, 1997). For actor-network theory, this mobile, networked vision of spatial relations concerns itself with the topological textures which arise as relations configure spaces and times (Murdoch, 1998:359)

Whilst shooting, An and her crew were doing the knowledge through film, though not merely through observation. They were not so much on location as in location, making places by doing, talking, riding, looking and learning on the go. To illustrate this shift from traditional, Cartesian engagements with place to a more phenomenological, mobile approach Wylie (2006) uses the concept of visual depth. Depth, like perspective and gradient, has, in psychological literature, previously signified spectatorial approaches to the perception of environments (Deregowski, 1972). It has been conceived of as a visual cue, used by gazing, detached subjects, to add meaning to existing landscape. Contemporary phenomenological approaches to environmental perception have grown increasingly suspicious of these narratives of inspection. Far from precluding constitutive involvement in the visual world, depth is arguably commensurate with being in the world (Merleau-Ponty, 1968). It is a medium through which our very being there is announced. Viewing, walking, hanging around and listening brings depth into lived, multi-sensory worlds, revealing the corporeality of the embodied spectator. The embodied actor-observer operates in the visual thick of it where all knowledge, albeit partly visually construed, is emplaced, situated and tangled with the full array of senses

The irreducible facticity of embodiment means that we cannot regard visible depth as the product of a consciousness divorced from the visible world (Wylie, 2006:524)

Perception need not be regarded as something happening at a distance. It enfolds mobile, embodied actants (Wylie, 2006). Non-representational theory does not separate perception (mind) from sensation (body), nor does it separate the generation of knowledge from places where it emerges (Cresswell, 2004). In a process that unites senses, bodies and worlds, depth prevails throughout the process of embodied thought. Depth is present by virtue of our being there, in location, making places, using processes that are inseparable from all our senses and technologies. Depth cues, angles,
framing and perspective are, to paraphrase Wylie (2006), released from their detention as accomplices of the Cartesian rationalism of the observing subject. Depth belongs neither to body nor to world, but to the connectivity existing between them.

**Overlapping projects: ethnography, film, photography and poems**

I’ve seen it all. I’ve seen it all through the yellow windows of the evening train  

Tom Waits (*9th and Hennepin*)

A man is doing ethnography about a woman who is shooting film. The characters in the film are writing poetry. The man, the woman and the characters in the film are all riding on buses, making up stories about Manchester and Salford. The connectivity between bodies and worlds in place making is analogous to the connecting intentionalites of those who feature in these various place-making projects. The methodological and epistemological similarities connecting my ethnography to An’s documentary were not lost on us. For example we both remarked on the mobile nature of our collaborators. Others too have noted the increasing dynamism of the contemporary ethnographic field.

The people who they are likely to study are increasingly likely to be as mobile if not more so than the ethnographers who are trying to keep up with them (Amit, 2000:12)

Nowadays ethnographers are less likely to move from A to B, collect information and return with it intact (Pink, 2007). Such gold digging, ‘It’s all out there, I just need to go and get it’ approaches are critiqued by visions of fieldwork as mobile knowledge creation (Shotter, 2008). Entangled with collaborators’ life-spaces the ethnographer, like the documentary filmmaker, need not be an undercover fly-on-the-wall. Knowledge is created, places made, from inter-subjectivities. The knowledge itself, churned out co-productively, comes in many material forms, textual and otherwise. Walking maps (see *chapter five*), soundscape compositions (*chapter six*), collaborative short stories (*chapter nine*), photographs, poetry and film (this chapter) are the legitimate output of collaborative place-making projects. They show how joint action (Shotter, 2008) can

account not only for the observable, recordable realities that may be translated into written notes and texts, but also for objects, visual images, the immaterial and the sensory nature of human experience and knowledge (Pink, 2007:22)

The material residue of my encounter with An includes her film (made before our interview), photographs she took with my camera during our
walk (see figures 5-9), poems written by bus-pass users from Twearlies (see prelude, post-script and APPX 7), interview transcripts and ethnographic accounts. Visual materials such as film, photography and postcards have long-been recognized as vehicles for research participants to convey experiences of mobile place making. There are many examples of and variations on visual participatory research methods in the place-making literature (Hall et al, 2008, Pink, 2009, Stedman et al, 2004, Edwards, 1999, Banks and Morphy, 1999, Barker, 2009, Radley, Hodgetts & Cullen, 2005, and see chapter two). In a project that has particular resonances here the photographer John Perivolaris (2005) presents visual accounts of migrants’ recent arrivals in Spain. Photographing themselves and being photographed his collaborators were simultaneously migrants, new arrivals and hosts in a novel environment, constructing places anew for the viewer. Likewise in her use of moving and still images during our conversations An told stories of her new cities whilst showing me around the living set of Twearlies. This ambiguity between newcomer and host is a recurring theme in a number of my collaborations for this project. Collaborators repeatedly generated new (to me, with me) knowledge about my home city. In all these cases co-productive knowledge emerged from equal status participatory collaborations. As the lead is taken by the ‘collaborator formerly known as subject/participant’ the richness of their construction of place can flourish. In visual collaborative partnerships an integral moment in the formation of equal status collaborative partnerships comes when the camera is handed over by the researcher (Pink, 2007). Giving up my camera to An during our routes enhanced her status in the project, and her influence over the process of knowledge generation (Hyde, 2005). As in the work of Goopy & Lloyd’s (2006), in which aging Italian Australian residents of a care home were to asked photograph their living space, the exercise taught me about

Places, people, objects and situations that lend [them] identity and express or add to [their] quality of place and self (cited in Pink, 2007:88)

The photographic assignment I implicitly set An was to produce a “spatial discourse of place and self” (Pink, 2007:88). The strategy adhered to another common theme in this project, which is to encourage collaborators to model their contributions on their existing expertise. In chapter six F’s skills as an acoustician enhanced the work. Here, An’s skills as an image maker were invaluable. The development of these strategies require considerable investments of time in developing co-productive relationships with collaborators, not least to uncover their enthusiasms and skills. In another methodological overlap with my project Goopy and Lloyd’s (2006) also began their collaborations with preliminary interviews to explore the motivations of their participants and the aims of the research. Second
interviews were then held with the photographs present. My own second interviews took place on the go, after I had viewed *Twearlies* and during the making of the photographic record (figures 5-8). As in chapter five established, meaningful cross-city routes were being retraced with fresh knowledge being generated co-productively, in words and pictures. Our journey marked the making of new images, the telling of new stories, along these (scheduled) bus and walking routes. We revisited bus stops, malls and landmarks that featured in *Twearlies*. We took shots and churned out further furrows of embodied knowledge. Like Goopy and Lloyd, An and I selected photographic scenes from our walk, effectively producing a composite set of photographs that spoke to us about places we were constructing as we moved through them (Ingold, 2000).

These composite images contribute to the research process by giving the participants the opportunity to select and emphasise aspects of their [domestic] environments (Pink, 2007:88)

As we t/walked our conversations took meandering paths, guided by shared observations and recollections of previous conversations. As we t/walked, selected snapshots of Manchester and Salford mapped onto our shared preoccupations about the landscape, such as the preponderance of lost or abandoned objects, clothes and buildings. We retraced the steps of conversations and films that had already been made, creating new scenes along the way.

*Sounds of traffic noise as we walk and of the camera shutter as A takes pictures*

An: It’s quite sad when you see clothing on the walls like this. It makes me think of what happened. Did they just lose it? You can’t just lose a jacket like that.

A: Well, what do you think about gloves? Have we talked about this before?

An: Yes, we talked about gloves. Well, with gloves it’s easier, you can lose them more easily than a jacket.
Whilst the images in Goopy and Lloyd’s (2006) study were taken in domestic spaces with restricted access for the researcher, as in my project Radley and Taylor (2001) accompanied their hosts into the photographic field. Hospitalized patients were asked to photograph twelve places in hospital that they found most significant with the aim of capturing key moments of recovery after surgery. The meaning of these pictures was made, they argue, as patients spoke about the pictures in situ, as they talked around their practice. Similarly An talked animatedly about images and
scenes from *Twearlies*, and those she was producing en route. Talking and shooting were subsumed under the place-making process.

**Signage: ‘Scrap Cars Wanted’**

A: Look, ‘Scrap Cars Wanted’. There’s a theme developing here.

An: There’s a lot of them. There are so many abandoned buildings here in Salford.

Being there as photographs were being taken, accompanying a filmmaker through familiar, filmed locations, took me close to An’s construction of place. Proximity enhanced my understanding of how she had constructed Manchester and Salford out of embodied, inter-subjective, multi-sensory engagement. Had I merely seen end products, film and photographs, I could not have grasped this processual understanding. Here, An explains how complex inter-subjectivities and aesthetic considerations had a bearing on the images that made the final cut.

An: People weren’t very keen on talking to us at first and so we decided to just ask them without the camera and then it became easier. And then because we were here with the camera we just started filming cutaways and random bus movements.

A: =What’s a cutaway?

An: What’s a cutaway? Well you know when people talk about something and you have an interview like in a film? And you use a shot to just like cover a cut between, erm, yeah, you don’t want to use a sentence so you just make a cut, if you leave that on it will look a bit weird.

A: Yeah, too abrupt.

An: It’s a jump cut because it’s abrupt and you can see the difference between one frame and the other so in order to hide that you just use a cut-away like a bus moving.

A: Oh, I see, I’ve got you, you are very good at those sort of continuity things.

An: Yeah, it’s basically continuity.

These exchanges remind us how the knowledge produced by ethnographer-documenters, whether in the form of monograph (me), photograph (me/An) or film (An), is compromised by complex inter-subjectivities with collaborators. Places are made, realities produced, as an index of the quality and degree of proximity between researcher and collaborator. Here An and I discuss the parallels between the inter-subjectivities we constructed our stories out of.

A: When you were interviewing people about travelling on the buses were you a bus user as well?
An: Well we used the buses to get here and we decided to use the bus even though the tram was sometimes cheaper, we decided to use the bus because you wanted to see the people who were using the bus and who were using this route

A: Anthropologically that makes your position a bit easier because, you know, people do feel a bit more comfortable if you’re doing the same thing because you’re not an outsider

An: Well that’s one of the things, the main things, in documentary. You have to build up a relationship with your contributors. One of the people we interviewed told us we should try to go to Bury Market, which is a bit further away, but we decided to go there

*Twearlies* was shot exclusively in public, on buses, in queues, malls and out on the street. Shared spaces literally placed collaborators at their ease. As I did, An toughed it out, engaging with her collaborators in some places where she was familiar, others where she wasn’t. In one instance, an interview was cut short by the arrival of a bus

A: When you did your shoot with Alan was he here already or did you bring him here?

An: Yeah, we chose to hang around here because there are a lot of people coming for shopping here and I found him here and I liked him. He was just smoking, waiting for the bus and again I just, when you’re directing you just look at people and you think yeah I like that guy. I thought yeah I think he has things to say and so I started talking to him

A: Little did you know how much he had to say

An: Yeah sometimes I’m amazed how right I am. He told us about the fact that he’s a poet and how he uses the bus pass to run his business and I thought wow this is good and he read one of his poems. We did not expect that at a bus stop. So yes we ran into him here and we talked to him for a bit and then he had to leave because his bus came.

In the following extract An explains the lengths she went to enter her collaborators’ own (albeit public) spaces. At Bury Shopping Mall she interviewed four ladies who came to see their favourite coffee shop as an extension of their own domestic space (see figure 9)

A: Did you frame the interview to them as though it was going to be about the bus pass mainly?

An: Yes, because we were interested in that and actually we had to go back to next week because...we did not have enough microphones because they were 4 ladies and we only had 2 microphones. So they invited us to go there the next week

A: Oh really?
An: And the next week they had the Xmas party, the hats and the lights around their necks
A: It’s interesting that they invited you there to a space that was actually a public space
An: Yeah but it was also their own private space. I mean they have a special relationship with the owner of the coffee shop. That very special table is booked, is reserved for them every Friday

Figure 9: “That very special table is booked, is reserved for them every Friday” (film still by A. Popan Dorca)

Being interviewed in familiar spaces can yield material prompts, helping collaborators reflect on their relationships with places. Recording these scenes reveals the embodied nature of such realities, realities that lay beyond mere talk. For example, children’s photographic accounts of the school run (shot from backseat points of vantage), supplemented by follow-up interviews, can yield angles on place-making which make most sense to them at the time, in that place (Barker, 2009). This principle of emplacing research in collaborators’ comfort zones revealed common ground between An’s project and mine. Here An reflects on the ethical responsibilities placed on the ethnographer-documenter who is invited into spaces that might normally be beyond limits

An: Sometimes I just feel it’s such an honour to be part of these people’s lives and they share things with me that they wouldn’t share with me normally. I think the most striking was when I was shooting a documentary with a drag queen in Romania, and sure Romania is a more conservative country and he cannot say officially that he’s doing this, but he allowed me to record while he was dressing up, while talking about his family and how they didn’t accept him and how in the end
Close encounters like these are often hard earned, for ethnographers and filmmakers alike. They are fraught with ethical obligations.

**Conversational ethics**

Documenters and ethnographers operate within close, often nuanced, relationships. They are collaborative researchers who do not soar over places and people, studying them without playing a part. Grounded, mobile engagement in worlds that are continually being brought into being requires the formation of ethical relationships that are built around mutually beneficial collaboration. All parties get something from the work. The construction of reality that emerges from such collaborations is inseparable from the relationships that form them. From within these ethical relationships, these conversational realities (Shotter, 2008), constructions of place emerge

> It is from this relationally responsive, two-way flow of living, embodied, sensuously channelled, activities and practices occurring between self and others that...all the other dimensions of the person-world polarity that are significant for us originate and are formed (Shotter, 2008:34)

My encounter with An rested on the co-construction of places in which we both had a stake. Our mobile conversations unearthed shared sensory engagements that fed on overlapping orientations for addressing the world. As co-constructive documenters, researchers, place-makers, image-makers, our methodological consonances exemplified what Shotter (2008) calls joint action. This occurs when productive activities become intertwined. It has much in common with the idea of co-productive knowledge (Thrift & Crang, 2001, see chapter three). Protagonists in joint action mutually influence one another and their surroundings. In its wake neither party, nor the environment they are making, are quite the same again. Besides reconfiguring relationships, persons and environments, joint action is implicated in the development of practical knowledge about being, what Shotter (2008) terms ontological skills. These are moral skills for being with one another and are bound into our preferred modes of engagement with our environment; be it as painters, walkers or poets. For An and I, our ontological skills fed into our overlapping engagements as ethnographer-documenters of the cities we moved through (Ingold, 2000). For An and her collaborators, their joint action gained energy from their overlapping engagements as filmmakers and poets. The poetic engagements that An stumbled across in her collaborators were serendipitous. Inspired by their...
bus-pass propelled engagement with Greater Manchester, An’s interviewees just happened to write poetry. Their poetic engagements entered the fabric of *Twearlies*, revealing inseparable creative engagements between collaborators. An’s serendipitous discovery resonates with my own discovery of the diverse creativities of so many of my collaborators, which has come to propel my project. Such discoveries highlight the overlapping reflexive instincts of ethnographers and documentary filmmakers. We build places in response to ontological skills we have developed in relationships with people we have been fortunate enough to encounter whilst just looking around, waiting for things to happen, hoping for people to make them happen. From the top deck of the 59 An describes how she absorbed her serendipitous discoveries into *Twearlies*

An: One of our contributors, he was saying that he takes the bus for inspiration for his poetry. It was interesting because we never even thought that this would be a topic on our film. You remember the one who told us the poem about the snail (APPX 7)? He’s a poet and he told us that he just takes the bus from time to time to just give him inspiration. And that was actually the connection for us between buses and poetry because poetry just seemed to pop up every time we were trying to shoot, every time we found a new contributor

A: That’s so weird isn’t it?

An: Yeah, poetry just became part of our film. We never aimed for that but apparently all of them seemed to be interested in poetry.

A: So how did that just pop up?

An: The first person who told us about poetry was the one with glasses (see prelude and post-script) and we asked him what he uses the bus pass for and he said well to run my business and we said ok what’s your business about and he was like well I write poems on postcards and I move around the city to sell my postcards …And the next contributor, he just mentioned that he writes poetry from time to time and then we just realized that wait a minute this could be a sub-plot. Then we just asked the four ladies about poetry and one of them just started reciting this random poem about the little swallow

A: To me that’s what gives the film this sort of surprising quality

An: For us it was as surprising as it was for you because we never really thought of that

The joint action in my collaboration with An is multi-layered. Overlapping intentionalities between myself, An and her collaborators, are rife. Ethnographic place making, documentary filmmaking and poetry are inseparable emplaced engagements, built out of conversational realities. These recurring consonances illustrate several characteristics of joint action (Shotter, 2008). As we perform actions together we override the skin-bound identities of self. Our intentions are subsumed into the collective, unintended, unpredictable aspirations of others. Whatever material
outcomes transpire (films, poems, photographs) cannot simply be traced back to individuals. These works belong to relationships between people. Here An talks movingly about relationships she developed with collaborators on another film she showed me, about an elderly neighbour, teacher and filmmaker from Romania.

A: Where did you find that guy?
An: He's actually pretty close to where I live. And last time I talked to him, last year...it was like 6 months and I hadn't talked to him and I decided to call him and he told me that his wife, that's also in the film, had died. And he was sad and he was alone and he's taking care of his sick mother and he was, I could tell that he was sad and after he hung up I cried for 15 minutes. And seriously I develop a relationship with people. I call them from time to time. I just want to know how they are...And even the dog died some time after that. I found out that the dog, the one on the chain, I found out that the dog died as well and I thought oh my god, and they're in my film and they died, even though I only saw them a few times they were in my film. They don’t exist anymore. It's very, I don’t know I felt empty for a while.

Close encounters in the third space
The development of collaborative relationships in which joint action yields creative residue fuses intentionalities. These fusions assume the development of ontological skills. This is a moral, as well as merely practical enterprise. It goes beyond individuals merely interacting with each other for their own sakes. Making realities out of ethically responsible relationships, known as relational constructivism (Shotter, 2008), joint action flourishes in spaces between people and things that possess a detectable vitalism of their own (Whatmore, 2006). Spaces between us are fertile grounds for conversational realities (Shotter, 2008). Dialogic space, where relations with the world are forged, constitutes a third space for activity beyond individual mentality. It yields embodied, non-representational forms of knowing that are as much felt as thought. The workings of joint action are, serendipitous, unplanned, disordered. We stumble across conversations and get inside them, without recourse to existing, internally stored, representational guidelines. They are encountered in the field by negotiating practical, moral, inter-subjectivities. The places we jointly act out (perform) are moral settings because they are inseparable from the continual obligations that unfold in conversation (Shotter, 2008). They are moral places that offer us feelings of belonging that emanate out of ethical ways in which collaborators respond to one another with reflexive openness, rather than merely proffering already (internally) held opinions. This relational view of self jettisons the idea of persons as self-contained entities (Shotter, 2008, Thrift, 2008 and see chapter two). Persons in environments organize thoughts not as internal tools for negotiating outside worlds, but on a moment to
moment, back and forth, relational basis. Living thinking constitutes formative procedures that take place at the borders of identities, during dialogues with others. They are inseparable from ethical matters concerning how we relate to those around us and present ourselves to them. Working and thinking jointly, we develop perceptions of the environment by accumulating ontological skills and embodied knowledge. These shared skills, shared semiotic procedures, have been termed ethno-methods (Garfinkel, 1967). These ethno-methods, whether ethnographic, cinematic or poetic, involve accruing communicative strategies that respond to different addressees and circumstances. Their development is a form of cognition in practice, of thinking in the space between us. It is a “socio-practical-ethical movement” (Shotter, 2008:48) of growing into the lives of those around us. Places are made and held dear because of the conversational realities that are experienced there (Oh, this is that place where we talked about…). Places are recalled because of the obligations they set between joint actors. At the end of our walking and riding tour An told me of the emplaced memories that she will take away from her twin cities, of how firmly rooted they are in her engaged actions with others

A: In years to come when people ask you about Manchester you’ll be telling them about the film
An: I won’t be telling them about the pubs and clubs I went to, I will probably tell them about the four ladies that had a Christmas party in Bury Market because that was just different. Nobody else had that apart from me and my teammates and we discovered that and that’s just unique. I talked a lot. I’m just going to shut up for the next few days and watch movies

Post-script: Greater Manchester travel about to unravel (part 2)
An: I really knew this

A: I thought this place might bring it back. Where was be standing?
An: I think be was standing right here

A: Greater Manchester travel about to unravel
An: Traveling throughout Greater Manchester is quite free
If you have a bus pass thanks to the GMPTE
Even if even if you’re not
Even if you’ve not

Sound of road works

An: Greater Manchester travel about to unravel
Traveling throughout Greater Manchester is quite free
If you have a bus thanks to the GMPTE
Even if even if you’re not
With a bus, train or tram
It's really easy for a mother pushing a pram

laughs

An: That was it. My God it's been like six months since I finished that film
Chapter Eight

Material Memories
Postcards from the imagined city of Man-Tunis

Prelude: Where are you from?

Al: I was born in Chevy Chase, Maryland, USA
I then moved to Makati, Manila, Philippines
I then moved to Bethesda, Maryland, USA
I then moved to Marsa l'stad, then Marsa Cube, then Sidi Bou Said, Tunis, Tunisia
I then moved to St. Donats Castle, Llantwit Major, Wales
Then finally to Manchester, England
I hope you can make sense of this, I know I struggle!

Where you from again?

The experience of living in so many places invites an accumulation of diverse, emplaced memories. Courtesy of these memories, narratives of place making are continually revisited and rewritten. As emplaced memories are evoked and retold, constructions of place making are extended. For Al, an undergraduate student and frequent visitor to the U.S., Tunisia, Wales, (and Abuja, Nigeria, which she left out of her resume) there is a temptation to answer the Where are you from question by configuring space as what Doreen Massey terms “a simultaneity of stories to far” (2005:9). As Massey’s own experience of Mancinuan living suggests, there is a temptation for all of us to marvel at the simultaneity of places we have experienced, or perhaps just imagined

When I was a child I used to play a game, spinning a globe or flicking through an atlas and jabbing down my finger without looking where. If it landed on a land I tried to imagine what was going on there, then. How people lived, the landscape, what time of day it was. I was completely fascinated by the fact that all these things were going on whole I was in Manchester, in bed (Massey, 2005:15)

Imaginings of simultaneity in place making are especially vivid for the global citizen with no fixed nation and memorable experience of living in multiple locations. For the globally nomadic holder of multiple passports (Al has three) answering a simple question (Where did you say you’re from again?) prompts recourse to places, memories, stories that are forever being
reconfigured. Places, after all, are not discrete, pristine sites that exist independently of our relations with and memories of them (Ingold, 2000, Creswell, 2004). They are intertwined with multiple spatial identities (nationalities, place-attachments, emplaced memories). They are replete with the mutual, relational constitutivity of those identities. They are parallel, unfinished stories that are constituted performatively, relationally, between people, other places and things.

*Simultaneous cities*

Now resident in Manchester, Al frequently revisits and speaks fondly of her former homes, her stories so far, especially Tunis

Al: *My family lived in Tunis for five years. I myself only lived there continuously for six and a half months and then I moved over to Wales but I continue to go back every holiday and spend about three to four months there a year*

During a preliminary interview in a Mancunian café we both know well, I asked her where she was from (again). In response she recounted memories of life in Tunis and told of how life as a temporary Mancunian compares. She frequently evoked specific, contemporaneous tales of Manchester and Tunis, notably with reference to similarities between personally meaningful sites in the two cities, as these two examples exemplify

Al: *I was thinking about the Palace Hotel and the doors to it. As I recall it they're wrought iron on the outside. They just look really old, and there's a house in Tunis and the door's massive. It's a very overly sized door for the actual building, and the one in front of the Palace is very similar because you walk up to it and it all looks a bit ostentatious because it's just so large and that evokes a bit of a similar feeling because it's almost like a door to a house*

Al: *There's a place on Deansgate called Dmitris. It's a Greek restaurant. They have a back bit which is sort of a, dare I say, alleyway? And you feel like you're outside because one wall of it has a door that sort of stops, a wrought iron door, and then the rest of it is just free flowing air. And one of the places I was talking to you about before, Decana, the place that makes the really nice bread, that place has the same kind of feel, because the floor in there is paved and cobbled and all the furniture is wrought iron. It has a sort of Mediterranean feel, even though it's a Greek restaurant, but it reminds me of Tunis in that way because we have a lot of the same natural materials*
These comparisons emerged spontaneously in conversation. I decided to pursue them and ask her to identify more similarities. A few days later during a walking interview, Al compared a local Mancunian fruit market with a Tunisian souk

Al: *Well it reminds me of the place in the old bit of the city, the souk. We call them Medinas. In Arabic it just basically means old market within the old city. Actually riad al medina means within the old walls, and the souk there is ancient and you just have stands upon stands of all different sorts of foods. You also get furniture and jewellery in there and you can just bargain your head off.*

These comparative constructions of two cities, based on recent and distant memories, suggest a relationship between heterogeneity and simultaneity in place making (Massey, 2005). Narratives of place are partial stories that are informed by experiences that emerge from trajectories between places we construct in simultaneity. We make connections between places both by physically traveling between them and by imaginatively connecting experiences in one place with those in another. So often, these connections are spurred by multisensory experience, as these were, at *Dmitris* restaurant

Al: *My flat mate is originally Greek and her mother is from a place called Haikidiki, and when she was here, she came because it’s a Greek restaurant, she wanted to eat Greek food, but she also noticed that it had this sort of obscure location, but moreover the place being Greek and her liking the food, she was reminded of Tunis when she came here, because of the ambience and she smelt of pitta when she first came in, so she took me here and that was my first reaction, I feel like I’m in the Mediterranean.*

Emplaced narratives like these do not aspire to be truths (*this is what Tunis is like*), but subjective constructions (*this is how I remember it*). As places are carved from lived, imagined experience, hegemonic (authorial) discourses of truth recede into multiple subjectivities. The diversity of multiple narratives reminds us of the contemporaneity of place, of the simultaneous coexistence of others with their own trajectories and their own stories to tell (Massey, 2005:11)

Acknowledgement of simultaneity and heterogeneity in place making narratives critiques social Darwinist accounts of history that prophesy a future that is written, societies inexorably clamouring towards prescribed forms of civilization (Massey, 2005). It allows an open-ended view of history (Laclau, 1990) and place. The making of places can be open-ended, with multiple, relational voices, identities, trajectories and emplaced
memories all co-constitutive. The places that emerge from relations and trajectories are not closed, static, ring-fenced wholes (Deleuze, 1993). They are unfinished stories with “loose ends and missing links” (Massey, 2005:13). For Massey place making narratives are always heard in the presence of other stories, space a sphere of contemporaneous multiplicities. She challenges ocularcentric accounts that present places as somehow frozen in time, captured on film, or put to death by still photography (Edwards, 1999, see chapter two). Others too highlight tendencies of photography in general (and postcards in particular) to mute the subject (Banks and Morphy, 1999) in an objectifying discourse. In the process, places and peoples have harmfully been portrayed as knowable in pictures (Clifford, 1992, Edwards, 1999). Like Banks and Morphy (1999), Massey (2005) eschews these narratives of containment. She contrives spaces as multisensory, lively, socially constructed through our relations in and with them. We should, says Massey, replace the grand narrative of European anthropocentrism with poly-vocal narratives of simultaneity. These sentiments are echoed in the following extract, in which B, another of my collaborators (see chapter nine), voices her view of history as a cacophony of simultaneous narratives. Fittingly in this extract my own voice gives way to the (italicised) voice of B

“She talked a lot about history and I interrupted her and said when you say history do you mean your history or history in general and she said there’s no such thing as history in general and that ‘Every city is just a conglomerate of lives and this conglomerate of lives develops the place and then the place is changed by the people who live in it’ “

This acknowledgement of simultaneous histories echoes Hall’s argument that

“This re-narrativisation displaces the “story” of capitalist modernity from its European centring to its dispersed global “peripheries”” (1996:250)

Amid the cacophony of simultaneity, space, no longer a linear, smooth surface, is reconfigured as a “sphere of coexistence of a multiple of trajectories” (Massey, 2005:63). The fragmentation and decentring of narrative recasts stories as heterogeneous, emplaced phenomena. Al’s initially spontaneous accounts of Manchester and Tunis were characteristically grounded in her memories of two places, in the simultaneous cities of Manchester and Tunis. Her stories of personally meaningful sites connecting two places, established a trajectory. They were told from the ground, replete with connections that
were evoked by sensuous experience integrating ambulation, olfaction, sight and sound. Here, at Pop Boutique in Manchester’s Northern Quarter, Al enlists an array of senses, and her own embodied experience, to evoke the byzantine feel of a Tunisian souk

Al: Pop Boutique, which is, for the lack of a better word, an eclectic vintage shop in Manchester in the Northern Quarter, reminds me of the marketplace in Tunis. It’s called the souk. As you go into it the doors get smaller and smaller, and you can go into shops that are sort of within a shop, within a market. So you sort of walk into something and it becomes more. And Pop Boutique is like that as well. As you first walk in you see clothes. Then you go further into it and you realize there’s actually a barbershop through the back door. Again there’s a shop within a shop. They sell lots of leather bags here. And there’s a specific shop in the medina that this reminds me of. There’s a guy who sells camel leather, like camel leather bags, and slippers. And there’s that musty smell of old, cured leather and you smell that when you walk down these stairs, and it just sort of takes you back in time. Because not only what you’re looking at is old, like the paintings in here are also vintage, and the lights in here are also old, as are the clothes, but also the wallpaper if you notice, and the lamps and the lampshades

The making of Man-Tunis

Inspired by Al’s initial, spontaneous, memorial connecting of two cities, we planned a series of walks around what we called the simultaneous city of Man-Tunis. Half-Man, half Tunis, this reimagined “place between two places” (a favourite phrase of Al’s) would be conjured through the hard yards of mobile engagement. Methodologically, it would be walked and constructed according to the following steps

Research diary excerpt:

1. During our preliminary interview I asked Al to make a rough shortlist of Mancunian places that evoked memorable sites in Tunis (eg Dmitris and The Palace Hotel)
2. Al responded a by email few days later (see APPX 8)
3. Using Al’s preliminary non-prescriptive itinerary we conducted a series of walking interviews, visiting a selection of evocative sites, to further explore Al’s emplaced, multisensory, embodied memories of the two cities
We took to the field to deepen a process that began spontaneously with Al’s off the cuff recollections of similar locations in two cities. Environments and identities would interweave as we moved through places with personal significance for Al. This process of mobile meaning making would draw upon the evocation of sensuous, embodied, material memory (Schine, 2010). Al led the walks, which spilled into two days. I accompanied, listened, talked and recorded. We visited places, memories and unfinished stories from her lives past and present in Manchester and Tunis. Hulme Market, Dmitris, Rollers Coffee Shop, Pop Boutique, The Palace Theatre and Cornerhouse Cafe were the Mancunian locations we joined up on foot, stopping along the way as emplaced, embodied, sensuous memories from Tunis established connections. The method was contrived (Al knew beforehand which locations she wanted to visit), yet spontaneous (the evocativeness, sensuousness and detail of these emplaced memories could not have been achieved without our being there). For example our arrival at Hulme Market prompted a revisiting of a Tunisian souk with multisensory evocations

Al: The market is huge. In its entirety I think it’s about one and half, two miles, maybe even a bit larger. There’s three major alleyways. At the beginning of it there’s port du France, which is like this old French door at the beginning of where the port used to be. And there you buy Tunisian and Arabic clothing, prayer mats, sculptures, things made all of wood, like cutlery, that kind if thing. And then the middle one has old, old, ancient jewellery, much more expensive, much more rustic, Bedouin jewellery, wedding material, beaded dresses and all the paraphernalia that you would use to make the invitations. And then the third one is the food market. So I was telling you about the rustic one earlier because it reminds me of the bottom of that shop in the Northern Quarter, with the age and the smell. But depending on which alleyway you take, depends on what you want to buy, but in between there’s all these cross-sections and cross alleyways, some of them you see from the outside, some of them you can only access once you’re in a shop, so it’s this woven network in the middle of this bustling and bustling, beautiful European city with this architecture from when the Romans came over. It’s very European, but then in the middle of the city there’s this ancient Arabic market, where you can still act in the old ways
A: It has a very Mediterranean feel to it, and the hanging baskets…even the colourings are really, like the red and white tablecloths, and the greyish blue of the floor, and the smell of the pizza bread

The multisensory nature of emplaced memories contrasts with traditional visual methods for recalling places, which often heap the burden on photography (Bäckman et al, 2000). Tourists are far more inclined to gather images than sound recordings. On revisiting emotive spots, the physical act of moving through meaningful environments brings the senses together (Schine, 2010). Embodiment and mobility harmonise the local, distant, past and present in a process of place making (Schine, 2010) that is characterised by simultaneity. The memory walk method recruits the past in a reimagining of the present through emplaced, multisensory engagement

Walking can be understood as a personal biography: the body moves, in part, due to its links between past, present and future in a life (Lee 2004:4)

The perceptual apprehension (construction) of places by movement through them is well documented in cultural geography (see chapter two and Ingold, 2000) and ecological psychology (see chapter three and Gibson, 1989). The effect of walking on memory has been explored by health psychologists and gerontologists (Stones & Dawe, 1993); revealing positive memorial repercussions for those with dementia. There is psychological evidence for a link between exercise and memory (Eisner 2004), with walking shown to improve learning and recall (Eisner 2004). Embodied cognition facilitates recall through ambulation, with memory distributed through the musculature (Chaiklin & Wengrower 2009), rather than hidden away in internal archival stores (Brockmeier, 2010). Such findings erode distinctions between mind, body and place. The emplaced nature of walking and remembering (Pink, 2009) illustrates the integration of embodiment, cognition and environments (Howes, 2005). Memory is activated through embodied engagement with the multisensory environments

The body relays information - our emotional history - that remains stored in our musculature and other physiological systems…manifested in the individual’s postures, gestures, use of space, and movements, large and small (Chaiklin & Wengrower 2009:4)
Walking can meditatively bring forth personal biographies that lay beyond mere sensory evidence (Lee 2004), mobility exceeding mere sensory memory. The effect is heightened by our walking through routes that are coloured with meaning that has been accrued in the past.

It is extremely evocative to walk along a path from childhood; we draw together aspects of place and biography through the walk and walking, itself, even if we have not visited the route for decades (Schine, 2010:4).

Roaming the streets of Man-Tunis liberated emplaced memories and forged meaningful connections between past, present, near and far. Al and I are not the first to discover this phenomenon. There is precedent for exploring the evocativeness of contextual memory by reuniting participants with memorable places. Järviuluoma et al (2009) revisited Scottish villages that were used in a sound-scape project 30 years before to explore sensory, embodied memory, nostalgia and social remembering. A town clerk in the village of Dollar was interviewed twice, 30 (years apart) in a meaningful place where personal memories were prompted. He held forth about the past sense-scape with exceptional sensory detail. The level of detail of Al’s memories was similarly impressive. Returning on foot evokes memory with gusto, as the title of a relevant paper suggests; “I’m walking, therefore I’m remembering” (Järviuluoma, 2009). In another study, this time in France, Järviuluoma explored memories of elderly women in the fishing village of Lesconil. Using a participatory method similar to my own, participants identified meaningful sites, then led other members of the group through the landscape, facilitating the mutual prompting of memories. The co-productive yielding of knowledge and meaning ‘on-the-go’ resonates with my own collaborations in this project. New knowledge emerges collaboratively as we engage with places together, making them on the go, not just visiting them as though they were somehow complete already.

Emplaced dialogues occur at the intersection of past and present (Schine, 2010). As we walk meaningful routes we effect a fusion of movement, memory and place making. Memories are evoked by sights, smells, taste, architecture, sometimes even by mere spatial configurations of elements in an environment, as Al alludes to here in describing similarities in vantage points between The Palace Hotel and the nearby Cornerhouse Café.

Al: Another funny thing between the two of them is that this reminds me of the
baron de’Langer’s house, which is in the same bit of town where the café is, and from the top floor of the café...from that level when you’re sitting you can see the tip of the dome of the baron de’Langer’s house, and when you’re on the second level of this café at the Cornerhouse you can see the tip of this one, so, they’re actually, proximity wise

A: Just to get an idea of this how vivid is=
Al: =I’m seeing it right now

Acts of embodied revisiting connect us to certain parts of stories that we have left elsewhere. To gain access to these stories the sensory ethnographer is well placed on the shoulder of a collaborator, accompanying her into, rather than merely entering, her world. As Lee and Ingold (2006) point out, there is an important distinction here. To merely enter another’s world implies that such a place is complete; accompanying them there facilitates participation in its construction. The following passage (a continuation of the previous one) illustrates the on-going co-construction of place, knowledge being generated as it happens. Here, outside Palace Hotel, coproduced, emplaced knowledge is processual. Man-Tunis is not merely being surveyed. It is a city under construction

A: So you can see something I can’t see
Al: Yeah, I wish you could see it. But another funny thing about it is, I was always going to show you these two places because they remind me of those other two places, but I’ve actually only just realized, because you asked me how I noticed the entrance way, and I was thinking I noticed from the Cornerhouse. But what’s more relevant is that I noticed from the second level of Cornerhouse, which is how you can see the other one. I never would have thought of that until just now. Why would I?
A: It only really comes to you from being here
Al: Yeah because the two places are so close together but you can also see one from the other
A: And when you originally had the idea of using these two places=
Al:=I didn’t even think they were on the same street. I mean they are on the same street but=
A: They’re literally a stone’s throw aren’t they?
Al: And you can literally see one from the top of the other. I just made that distinction now

Here again knowledge is co-produced in Pop Boutique
Al: Mm, I’m definitely remembering more now that I’m in here. Not only did I not fully make the connection but I don’t think I fully appreciated how much I enjoy it either, until coming back in here and almost rediscovering it

Tastes of two cities

The multisensory nature of place making implicates smell and taste in establishing connections between the past, present, far and near. The roles of smell, taste and other senses in the making of places and evocation of emplaced memory are well documented. Stoller and Olkes (1989) have urged fieldworkers to
describe with literary vividness the smells, tastes and textures of the land, the people, and the food (1989:29)

Seremetakis (1994) evokes tastes in her analysis of the relationship between the senses, memory and emplaced knowledge. Sensory, emplaced memories occupy a space beyond individual, internal consciousness

The sensory is not only encapsulated within the body as an internal capacity or power, but is also dispersed out there on the surface of things as the latter’s autonomous characteristics, which then can invade the body as perceptual experience (Seremetakis 1994:6).

As we wandered, Al’s sensory engagement with aspects of her environment relating to food and its preparation literally brought home much of the simultaneity that characterises the imagined, hybrid city of Man-Tunis. Mancunian smells, tastes and sights of food prompted memories of Tunisia to surface again and again

At Hulme Market connections were made between shopping habits, colours, fruits we could see - and those we couldn’t

A: What colour’s that melon again?
Al: It’s a bright yellow on the outside, like a saturated yellow. It’s not as big as a watermelon, but it’s much bigger than a British cantaloupe would be. And then on the inside it’s like a fierce green, but the middle at the top of it=
A: =We don’t get that
Al: No, you don’t get them here. Here you get the kind of orange inside
Dmitri’s menu provided food for thoughts about dishes that were served, plus some that weren’t

A1: Yeah, sure. That’s sort of similar to baba ganoush, which is made really similarly. Again a lot of Mediterranean food borrows from each other. The way they do the lamb, the skewered, marinated lamb, is quite similar to Tunis. They even have tagine here, which is sort of a Tunisian national dish
A: So this menu could almost be =
A1: =if it was written in French or Arabic it could almost be in Tunis

At Pop Boutique Tunisian olfaction hung in the air

A1: There’s that musty smell of old, cured leather and you smell that when you walk down these stairs, and it just sort of takes you back in time

Up in Cornerhouse Café, within view the house of the baron d’Elanger (The Palace Hotel), that’s where the smell hits you

A1: Inside there all the seating is on the ground and you have like rugs and carpets and little stools made out of the camel leather and it smells very musty and there’s just aroma everywhere you go, and Cornerhouse is a little bit like that too, because once you come up that’s when you smell the food, coffee, yeah
A: It sounds like again you could almost be there now

Laughs
A1: As soon as I came in I was like, mm, it’s like walking into the café, but different smelling foods

The term acoustemology (Feld, 2000) refers to sound’s role in organising and constructing knowledge (see chapter six). Gustemology (on the other hand, in another sense) refers to ways in which emplaced knowledge, memory and cultural epistemologies relate to the tastes and smells of food. The place making potential of food is noted by several authors. Trubek (2008) explored the commodification of places that are imagined through food related practice. Ethnographic fieldwork in France revealed local foodies (writers, chefs, artisans) to be instrumental in defining places along the tourist trail, for example in wine growing regions of French Burgundy. Elsewhere, researching the slow food movement in Wales (Cittaslow), Pink (2008) explores the role of eating and everyday commerce in food in constructing places. Pink shared the tastes and smells of local coffee shops
and farmers’ markets that she and her collaborators regarded as “constitutive of place” (2008:181). In New York Marte (2007) explored the emplaced practice of food mapping amongst Mexican migrants. Their maps reveal favourite dishes, past and present kitchen spaces and routes taken in search of particular ingredients conveys the multisensory nature of emplaced food experiences. Such maps are artefacts of food related place making experience, material trails of memory and gustemology.

The beauty and productiveness of food maps resides in this capacity to encompass so many experiential, representational and geopolitical layers (Marte, 2007:283)

All of this work highlights the centrality of food related, sensory, embodied experience in the construction of places and the knowledge and memories that our immersion in them yields. So many of Al’s evocations of Tunisian experience in Manchester, her drawing of sensory simultaneities, had food, it’s production, consumption, it’s everyday tastes and smells, at its heart. Again and again, food related visual, gustatory, olfactory memory forged connections that afforded Man-Tunis its imaginative content.

Melons at Hulme Market sparked an anecdote from a Tunisian market

Al: You get like lorries and in the back of them, instead of having whatever you’d have in the back of a lorry, you’d have sort of open back and you’d get mounds and mounds of melons, and there’s a guy standing in the middle of it and it’s quite funny to see because he’s in the middle of mounds of melon and you don’t really know how he’s manoeuvring, and you can actually just go up and just choose the one you want, so you point to that one there and he’s sort of running around in this melon van

Hulme lemons prompted vivid memories of harissa

Al: It’s funny you mention that, you always get lemons on your table. Lemons and harissa
A: What’s that
Al: Harissa? Ah harissa it’s, erm, I guess people here might use chilli sauce or Tabasco, as a flavouring, but in Tunis you use harissa. It’s basically, essentially it’s ground, really, really hot chilli, mixed with olive oil. Ah, it’s like you’d use ketchup.

Boquerones at Dmitris revealed a clue to the gustemology of sharing
Al: They have a dish here called boquerones, which is a Spanish dish, but I think it’s originally Moorish, because in Tunis you have it too, it’s, essentially anchovies and oil. So a lot of these places have shared foods. And shared ways of eating those foods. It’s quite a communal thing, you don’t order one for yourself, you order for the table

At Rollers the mere thought of eating Tunisian pastries was a messy, embodied experience

Al: It’s what I fiend for I guess and there’s a place like that in Tunis, where you can get Doughnuts, but Tunisian doughnuts, it’s not really, they’re much more pastry oriented. And yeah they don’t really have doughnuts in Tunis. They’re quite thin, almost like the size of like the big pretzels you get sometimes. And they’re covered in sugar like the British ones are. They’re very greasy and there’s so much sugar that you actually have to dust it off you and you’re sort of like wiping your hands for the next half hour.

In each example here, emplaced, embodied, sensuous memory is rendered active in the presence (or even absence) of the edible. This resonates with a recent surge in research into the sensory aspects of place, space, much of which has food as its centerpiece (Holtzman, 2006, Pink, 2010). For example, Greek islanders of Kalimnos frequently recalled far off events through food related practice. Apricots eaten while exploring an abandoned synagogue evoked similar meals during the Nazi occupation. Seasonal food provoked cycles of memory with participants remembering into the future (we’ll have pears in August, like we did last year). Repetitious everyday habits (like morning coffee) similarly can recreate past times of sociality and belonging (Sutton, 2001). Food related recall highlights non-representational constructions of memory, less a purely cognitive, more a sensuous, emplaced, embodied phenomenon (Stoller, 1995). Food is implicated in reliving intense bodily memories, in the reimagining of places, in the revisiting of simultaneous stories of place, for Al and I in the making of Man-Tunis. Wandering amid evocative smells of elsewhere, food memories brought home embodied, pre-cognitive thoughts of two cities, merging them into a whole new/new whole place. The simultaneous city of Man-Tunis is modeled on somewhere else. If Gotham City is Chicago re-imagined, Man-Tunis carries the influence of two places. It is a place under construction, fashioned on a solid base of nostalgia. It’s sites, sights, sounds and smells are woven into connecting sensations from a previous home. Nostalgia is frequently evoked in displaced individuals by the smells and
tastes of a lost homeland (Sutton, 2001). Taste transports one to simultaneous places. Yet the sensory experience of simultaneity can also inspire creativity. It can yield the production of artifacts that record those feelings of displacement, drawing upon those memories, as in the case of souvenirs, travel photography, food maps (Marte, 2007), or even recipe books. Appadurai (1988) has called Indian cookbooks the literature of exile. The popular Book of Middle Eastern Food (Rodon, 1974) includes recipes and stories from displaced persons. It is both cookbook and work of nostalgia. Gustatory nostalgia surfaces in the displaced person who visits evocative sectors of a new town (Mankekar, 2002). When Indians visit the markets of San Francisco’s Bay they go there to remember. Shops evoke sensory cues. Shopping habits recall practices and stories from back home. Similarly here, amongst the utensils of Hulme Market, Al describes simultaneous, changing uses of the tagine – and its nearest British equivalent

Al: That’s one type of tagine and you normally do a fish tagine, lamb tagine, sometimes vegetarian tagine. But there’s another type of tagine in Tunis, because again the Arabic in Tunis they’ve, er, they’ve changed things to adapt to their culture. So whereas tagine in Egypt and Morocco would simply be that type of dish, in Tunis it also means a different thing, and it’s a bit, like I guess like a British quiche but there’s no pastry on the bottom

Throughout the imaginative project of Al’s all round construction of Man-Tunis, her relational, place-making practices exceeded mere observation. The walking, talking, smelling, hearing and seeing that brought Man-Tunis into being was a full-bodied, multisensory experiment in synaesthesia, uniting the senses in the process of place making. As in chapter seven, Manchester became meaningful through a process of engagement with the full array of body and senses, not just by close scrutiny. Multisensory engagement in ethnographic practice highlights the active role of more than one sensory modality in constructions of knowledge and reality, and as such it challenges ocularcentrism (Sutton, 2010). It reveals place making as to be part of an active, sensuous, co-productive phenomenology. As we walk, talk, smell, listen and eat, reality is co-constructed

“From colour, steam rising, gloss and texture, we infer taste, smell and feel. Our eyes let us ‘taste’ food at a distance by activating the sense memories of taste and smell” (Kirsenblendt-Gimblett, 1999:3).
Visiting Dmitri’s evoked spatial, embodied, sensuous and olfactory memory. It was an all-round multisensory Man-Tunisian experience in what Al liked to call a “place between two places”

Al: I first came to Dmitri’s the winter before last. It was quite cold and they had these lamps on and you felt like you were in the Med because you were eating outdoors and you were hot. It was so warm in this little alleyway, which is another thing that is very Mediterranean, inbetween buildings. It’s literally a place between two places, like that making use of space, all cobbled alleyways. You get tons of those in Tunis. Places that you walk through to get somewhere else, and in the meantime you can stop in them.

Multisensory meaning making and perception are less internal phenomena, more socially cultivated skills (Sutton, 2010), emerging from practices between people. Young (2005) too recognizes the relational location of multisensory, place-making practice. Amongst the Pitjantjatjara of the Western Desert, Australia, socially cultivated, simultaneous engagement with taste-smell-colour similarly emerged.

Women ask one another, as relatives, holding out an open palm, for a piece of the kaputu, the quid or ball of chewed mingkulpa, and the quid or part of it passes from mouth to mouth in a mutuality of greenness-taste-odour (2005: 61).

These anthropological morsels remind us of the importance of transcending visual methods, of upgrading to multi-sensory, mobile ethnographic practice, when investigating mobile place-making practice.

Material memories

Man-Tunis will not easily be forgotten. Like Gotham City, its memory extends into the material domain of artefact and memorabilia. Memory is manifest in materials we accrue though mobile living (Brockmeier, 2010). Material memory evidences ongoing, reconstructive, co-productive imaginings of people who revisit meaningful places, known as sites of memory (Nora, 1989). More than mere archives, these memories are events in themselves (Brockmeier, 2005). They are discursively negotiated, not just retrieved (Hirst & Echterhoff, 2008, Shotter, 2008). They reside at the border of the personal and co-productive, undermining the individualizing notion of autobiography. Always establishing connections between times and places,
material memories yield evidence of distributed, networked selves. Their “creative and affective potential” (Dijck, 2007:162) can be realized in projects that “allow users to operate on autobiographical memory documents, mixing and remixing them” (Brockmeier, 2010:14). These collaborative projects commemorate (co-memorize) inter-subjective experiences, producing the stuff of mementos. Their co-productivity cooks, constructs and distorts memories, places, memories of places, in ongoing flows of performativity and materiality, drawing us towards

inextricable interconnections between acts of remembrance and the specific mediated objects through which these acts materialize (Dijck, 2007:16)

*Man-Tunis* will be remembered beyond these pages, in a series of “*social and cultural practices and artefacts*” (Brockmeier 2010:9) that Al and I co-produced whilst walking (see figures 10-14). As we moved through the imagined city, material memories emerged out of sensory engagements with emotionally charged sites (Johnston and Longhurst, 2010). Along routes that led to the making of *Man-Tunis*, constitutive connections between past and present, near and far, solidified. Memorial practice connected us to places, and places to other places. The whole process left residual, material traces. Al took pictures, we both talked, later I transcribed and wrote text. Through these creative, memorial practices we reaffirmed, as others have throughout this project, the simultaneity of places, and of the narratives that constitute them

Every city a conglomerate of lives and this conglomerate of lives
develops the place

- B (*chapter nine*)

In each of my collaborative engagements, memory itself has been situated along routes, conjured from simultaneous stories, in places between places, rather than in them. These collaborative reconstructions of place, these events in themselves, have left residual, material, memorial trails in the form of maps (see *chapter five*), soundscapes (see *chapter six*), photographs (*chapter seven*), a short story (see *chapter nine*), buried artefacts (*chapter nine*), and here in the form of the series of commemorative postcards (see figures 10-14) that are saturated with the sensory residue of two cities. The co-produced postcards from Man-Tunis deliberately confuse memories and conflate stories. Manchester and Tunis co-exist in pictures, words and multisensory (olfactory, gustatory) evocations from the sites of memory along our
journey. They are mobile and participatory in nature; the pictures taken by Al during our walks, her words featuring on the reverse side of the cards. They are a co-productive reimagining of two cities as one, produced in the form of a commodity that evokes journeys to, from and between them. They are an enigmatic response to the where are you from? question.

Figure 10: Postcard, Hulme Market, Man-Tunis
I first came to Dmitris the winter before last. It was quite cold and they had these lamps on and you felt like you were in the Mediterranean because you were eating outdoors and you were hot. It was so warm in this little alleyway, which is another thing that is very Mediterranean. In between buildings, it's literally a place between two places, all cobbled alleyways. You get tons of those in Tunis. Places that you walk through to get somewhere else, and in the meantime you can stop in them. You don't get this a lot here. Places are very much separate. This is this shop. This is this thing. You don't get the making use of the alleyways.

Figure 11: Postcard, Dmitris, Man-Tunis

Pop Boutique, an eclectic vintage shop in the Northern Quarter, reminds me of the market place in Tunis. It's called the souk, it's right by the Port du France, which is where trade began in Tunis. It's in the middle of the city and when you go into it there's these massive doors and as you go into it the doors get smaller and smaller and you can go into shops that are within a shop, within a market. So you sort of walk into something and it becomes more. Pop Boutique is like that as well. As you first walk in you see clothes. Then you go further into it and you realise there's a barbershop through the back door. Again there's a shop within a shop. And you go downstairs and you realise they sell furniture and that it's another level, it's just layered, a layered process. And as soon as you walk in, the smell of old and mothballs and maybe even dust, and leather as well. They sell lots of leather bags here. There's a specific shop in the medina that this reminds me of. There's a guy who sells camel leather, camel leather bags.
I think the thing that reminds me most of a house in Tunis in comparison to the Palace Hotel isn’t so much the gates as the size of the doorway, because the size of the doorway is so pronounced. It’s almost a little ironic because other buildings on this street have, well, normal passageways. This one has a massive arch. Even the gate itself is so much higher than anyone could probably be able to climb. The baron d’Erlanger’s house in Tunis, given that it’s a massive property, the actual entrance doesn’t give away the size at all. The entrance is very unassuming but for the door, that takes up like three quarters of the wall.
Figure 14: Postcard, Cornerhouse, Man-Tunis

**Interlude: A Burial**

March 2012

I first met B in January 2012. Since then we have had several conversations, some of which concerned her plans for a burial in a public park in Bloomsbury, London, just a short walk from Euston Station.

Our first conversation was at the International Society, Oxford Road, Manchester, where she began working as an intern in September 2011. Six months, one burial and two hours of recorded conversations later I was on my hands and knees in Russell Square Gardens in Bloomsbury, London, at seven in the morning, just a short walk from Euston Station, rummaging around under plant pots.

Our second conversation was on a Wednesday evening in Salford, in February 2012, after a meeting of the International 16. Even then it was clear to me that B’s ideas about how to use the postal system were unconventional. During this conversation I told her the story of a paper plate that I had inadvertently bought a year or so earlier in Tavistock Square, Bloomsbury, London, just a short walk from Euston Station.

In April 2011 I bought a slice of mediocre cheesecake from a vendor in Tavistock Square, just a stone’s throw from the famous statue of Mahatma Gandhi. The cake was disappointing, but it’s packaging gave B an idea when I mentioned it to her a year or so later. She told me that this white, rectangular, molded plate with serrated edges would
make an excellent postcard

Our third conversation was on a Friday evening in March 2012 at the International Society, Oxford Road. By this time I knew that none of the objects, litter, photos and detritus that B routinely introduced into the postal system were conventionally designed for that purpose. So it was no surprise that when I handed her the paper plate she decided that she would mail it back to me when she left Manchester for Germany a few weeks later. This is still to happen.

During our fourth conversation in late March 2012 B warned me that none of the photos she had taken in Manchester over the last six months were conventional. None of the shots she showed me, of floodlit litter, bubble-gum splats on paving stones, manhole covers, cigarette ends, banana skins and other detritus, were typical tourist images. She also told me that she was going to London the following week, en route to Germany, and that she would bury something in a public park in Bloomsbury, London, just a short walk from a statue of Mahatma Gandhi.

I spoke to B on the day before she left for London, where she would be spending a few days, visiting friends, sightseeing and seeing to the burial arrangements. Ten days later I received a message from Germany with a cryptic clue and four photographs. The photographs were unconventional. They traced a paving stone path through Bloomsbury, from Russell Square tube station to Russell Square Gardens, where something from Manchester was buried. One week, two hours on a train and a short walk from Euston Station later I was on my hands and knees at seven in the morning, rummaging around under plant pots.

The first photograph shows the green and white livery of Russell Square Underground Station; the second, a man-hole cover with bubble-gum splats; the third, B’s feet, a paving stone and bubble-gum splats; the fourth photograph shows a paving stone, a thick red line, two red blobs and bubble gum splats. The cryptic clue reads ‘sheltered by a foreign companion, under one of two close friends’.

Concealed under a plant pot, bundled up in cellophane, sticky tape, bubble-wrap and cardboard, was a message written from Manchester. On graph paper, in blue handwriting, in plain English, in Bloomsbury, under a plant pot, not very far from Mahatma Gandhi, a list of things that are still to do on the curry mile, in the Northern Quarter, at the office of the International Society on Oxford Road, and in large green letters a final word of warning.

“Don’t waste time hanging around Salford”
Chapter Nine

Human Don’t Get Angry
Trailing placed, performed memories from Manchester to Mainz

A burial

The performative turn in qualitative social research focuses on the exercise of verbal, bodily and multi-modal performances of artistic or social practices (Dirksmeier & Helbrecht 2008:1)

Recent social science writing on performativity (Shechner, 2006) has ensured that our appreciation of what counts as performance has outgrown places of sanctioned entertainment like the theatre, comedy club, dancehall and bullring. Defined by Goffman (1969) as activity which takes place before a particular set of observers and which has some influence on the observers (1969: 19)

and by Grimes (2003) as a “showing of a doing” (2003:35), performance, it seems, is a mundane reality now, pervading every corner of our daily practice, including cooking, socializing, the arts, sport, play, sex and other rituals (Shechner 2006). Three characteristics are identified and differentiated (Dirksmeier & Helbrecht, 2008) as characterizing
performance. First, it generally involves showing before an audience, as in sport or entertainment. Second, it consciously taps into a culturally sanctioned ritualized trope or discourse; a car chase, a flirtation, a kangaroo court, or a fistfight, such as the one observed below in the American midwest, wherein

Originally violent and unforeseen fights between bar visitors were normalised into a semi-violent form of semi-theatrical bar-performance (Dirksmeier & Helbrecht 2008:5)

Third, it requires competence above a common standard and for this to be acknowledged by the audience, an equal partner in the scenario. Very often, this competence is merely achieved through repetitious everyday practice. Thus, collective, practised practice transcends that of the everyday, as in the case of the quintessentially (on all three counts) performative English foxhunt

The performer transfers the decision about the evaluation of the event to the audience, mostly rural and conservative people of the villages who participate by watching the slaughter. They act as audience and participants who immerse themselves in the brouhaha, the disenchantment and sometimes the boredom foxhunting creates (Carlson, 2004:14)

In an effective performance, culturally sanctioned discourses (car chase, flirtation, kangaroo court, fist-fight) are enacted and understood by performers and audiences, almost as though a mutually understood script is being adhered to. Everyday performers translate well-known narratives into meaningful experience for the well versed. Performance works because all parties ‘get’ what is being shown and done.

My collaboration with B, a politics student from the Mainz, Germany, was infused with performativity. I interviewed her on the day before she left Manchester, where she had been living, studying and working as an intern at the International Society for six months. Although her study program required her to leave Manchester earlier than the other members of the I16 (of which she was also a member), B was keen to be involved in my project and after several conversations she decided she would like to work retrospectively, as it were. She decided that she would ‘craft’ (her word) a series of memorial constructions of Manchester and would send these to (or leave them for) me after her departure. I had interviewed B several times at the I16 but it was during this final Mancunian conversation, the day before she was due to leave for Mainz, via London, that the performative nature of her contribution started to take shape. When she learned that I too would be visiting London a week later (by which time she would be back in Mainz)
she struck on an idea for a burial. She told me she intended to bury some of her recent memories of Manchester somewhere in Bloomsbury, London. We both understood that this performance carried connotations of a treasure hunt.

B: The first item I’m going to give you is going to be buried in Manchester near the Gandhi statue.
A: Sorry, in London?
B: In London, sorry, as I’m going to leave tomorrow to go to London to visit my friend there, and then I’m going to go to Germany. So when I’m in London I’m going to bury the first item, near the Gandhi statue. It’s sort of a treasure hunt.
You are trying to find the item of Manchester
A: Yes, because I’m going the week after.
B: And I’m going to document me having buried or hiding this item, then you’re going to document how you’re going to find it.
A: Yes, and your memories will be bundled up into these objects
B: Yeah

According to the treasure hunt script, she would provide clues in the form of pictures and words to guide me to the burial site. For the purpose of this performative place making gesture, a small part of Bloomsbury would temporarily be constructed as a burial ground, a place of bounty, an archive of material memory (Sheringham, 2010). By designing and enacting a playful intervention wherein retrospective constructions of Manchester would be buried en route to her home city, B conformed to another characteristic of performativity (Thrift, 2000). Her performance enacted the ongoing, never ending construction of places that are encountered along trajectories. Thanks to her performance, Russell Square would be lively with possibility, becoming a liminal site of transgression (Turner, 1977), no longer just a public space. By distributing her thoughts of Manchester into the landscape B embarked on an amplification of everyday action, another characteristic of performance (Thrift, 2000). Rather than just remembering Manchester whilst being in London, B physically placed her memories there. Memories, so often thought of as emplaced phenomena (Nora, 1989, Brockmeier, 2010, Hirst and Echterhoff, 2008), were literally turned into the soil. They were placed into a journey. By virtue of her performative gesture, her intervention transformed a park into a burial site, a space into a place.

7 The statue of Mahatma Gandhi in Tavistock Square, Bloomsbury, although B’s burial took place in the nearby Russell Square Gardens
Reporting playful interventions such as these arguably requires equally playful forms of reportage (Latham, 2003). The remit of performative social science exceeds the borders of mere text. Beyond textually reporting events, performative social science affords forms of reporting that are events in themselves. This ‘life as a performance’ approach (Thrift, 2000) reflects growing frustration with traditional social science’s portrayal of practices in representational discourses. The idea here is to eschew representations of practice, abandon searches for underlying meaning and instead value relational practices as co-creative constructions of reality. Social, embodied events are complex and inconclusive phenomena, so our means of reporting them might aspire to be equally diverse and inconclusive (Urry, 2005)

Categorisations and unanimity must yield to an understanding of openness, reflexivity and recursiveness during the research process, in order to provide qualitative research that approximates the complexity of social reality (Dirksmeier & Helbrecht 2008:7)

Various participatory, co-productive, performative methods were recruited for reporting the burial, and the other interventions B enacted during our collaboration. Rather than trying to retrospectively explain her constructions of Manchester, our co-productive response yielded further performativity in the form of artefacts, pictures and fictions. One such collaborative product was *A Burial* (see Prelude), my own narrative account of the burial event that was devised and enacted by B. *A Burial* is my response to B’s intervention. Yet it is a collaboration. Whilst B was entirely responsible for the initial event, I responded by producing a narrative event to try and capture its spirit of playfulness and performativity. Taken as a whole B’s burial, her photographic clues and my narrative response constitute events in themselves, and the latter are examples of performative reportage. As means of documenting ways in which places acquire meaning, playful, performative collaborations such as these critique a methodological conservatism that is evident in much of social science (Latham 2003). Here Latham urges researchers to absorb notions of performance into creative, experimental research methods

I seek to articulate an understanding of everyday urban public culture as embodied practice – a practice that is creative (Latham, 2003:1994)

Latham advocates addressing research questions in discourses that evoke the playfulness and creativity of everyday practice, a reflexive practice that is
Full of art and humour, it is explored in literature, art song, film and comic strips (2003:1996)

In seeking to document place-making playfully, Latham recognizes the importance of taking into account collaborators’ own “established frames of self-reference” (2003:2004) when setting out the terms of relational, collaborative practice. Working with actors and fashion publishers in his exploration of their daily place making in New Zealand, Latham built upon their multisensory preferences and existing expertise. Urging his collaborators to produce something performative and artifactual, such as pictorial diaries, he added intelligibility to their task, pulling it closer to their mundane practice. These creative responses are arguably more intuitively intelligible than mere reflective answers to interview questions about everyday routines. The playful remit reaches out to established frames of reference and takes away the obligation to extract some form of (perhaps unattainable) truth from everyday social life. For Latham (2003), combining the freedom of performative diaries, (incorporating photography, poly-vocality, embodiment) with accompanying interviews provides a methodological counterweight. The balance of the structure imposed by the interview is complemented by the scope for creativity in the diary, to which each collaborator responds uniquely

Joseph produced a diary that was pithy and concise…Paul produced a surreal series of diary entries and photographs. Borrowing from James Bond films, film noir and detective novel noir, new journalism, comic books, Paul self-consciously turns himself into a character in his diary (2003:2004)

Similarly, when B and I devised the terms of our collaboration during our early conversations at the I16, I sought to model our practice on some of the technological and creative habits that I had noticed in her, as this extract illustrates

A: When I first met you, you seemed to be the kind of person who records things a lot. You make cards and you write about places, don’t you? You write messages and take pictures, so you didn’t start doing that for this project. I just kind of tapped into something that was happening anyway I think. Is that right?
B: Yeah, sort of yeah
A: Because I always remember you at the table surrounded by a little semi-circle of post-its and cards

Laughs
B: Yeah, because I’m scared of losing my memories of places I like. Or I’m scared of them changing when I go back in a negative way that. Your memories change, not by purpose but the brain just forgets and by taking pictures or having,
even thinking lot about it, or writing notes at this moment, at this exact moment you sort of capture it
A: Your technologies of recording and creating are quite low-tech aren’t they?
B: No, true, true

Laughs
B: I’m into the traditional stuff of writing, myself; writing, my own handwriting. But then I like pictures, but if I could draw as good as the result of a picture I would prefer to draw

Our conversations took place at the I16, at the offices of the International Society (where she worked) and subsequently in Mainz (where she now lives), when I visited her a few months after she left Manchester. The events and materialities that accrued from these meetings constituted a productive collaboration through which B retrospectively constructed her Manchester using a playful, co-creative, performative mode of reportage that resonates with Latham’s (2003) work. The following conversation, in which B and I discuss the paper plate which features in A Burial, illustrates the playful nature of B’s documentary style of memorializing and constructing place. During such conversations B hatched and designed interventions that gave content to our collaboration, and to which I responded as performative narrator

B: I told you about me not liking most postcards and crafting them myself, sometimes drawing something on the other side to make my view of the city. So you’re going to give me this blank postcard and I’m going to craft something or draw something or make something out of it showing my view of Manchester. And I thought because this is all about the creative way of showing stuff, sending it by post, letting the item travel, what I want to do is to send that postcard, not take it but send it to the place I’m going and I want to keep the envelope in which it was sent, so in the end the item is packed in every envelope. So in the end you’ll have maybe seven envelopes in each other showing where this item has been and in the end you have to de-pack the envelope and then the second and then the third and you see where this item has been, before it has reached you

B’s idea to document her stay in Manchester using her own crafted messages, sometimes left behind (buried), sometimes posted or conveyed in other creative ways or in the form of other crafted objects, recalls Thrift’s (1996) acknowledgement that everyday practices routinely generate subjectivities and co-produced narratives (‘my view of the city’) through which the world is experienced and places are made. These narratives are co-produced through enjoinders between human, technological and material agencies and are invested with productive possibility (Thrift, 1996). Correspondingly, B and I formed a productive collaboration that yielded a trail of material, mnemonic and narrative evidence. The objects,
photographs, performative writings and artefacts that constitute such material products are, argues Latham (2003), as legitimate as any representational form of reportage that might be used to evidence the construction of place. Arguably, established methodologies fall short of equipping themselves with tools for engaging with the sensuous, embodied, creative nature of everyday experience. There has been a reluctance to go beyond ocularcentric, observational, interview formats. In searching for creative means of reportage Thrift (2000) encourages the incorporation of cross-disciplinary methods from the humanities and arts, where performance is second nature. Street theatre, performance art, collaborative writing (Wyatt et al, 2011), can all be drafted as methods for emphasizing relational, co-productive place making as creative practice. Performative writing too is an eligible medium for stressing the interactive possibilities of narrative as a knowledge-generating event in itself (Thrift and Dewsbury, 2000, Wyatt et al, 2011). As Latham seeks to imbue established research methods with adaptations that apprehend the relational, performative creativity of everyday encounters, the co-productive collaboration B and I entered into produced a series performances that encompassed collaborative writing, crafted artefacts, one off pranks and other performances.

As I shook the dirt from the padded envelope that contained the buried memories that lay at the end of the photographic trail that led me to the plant pot in Russell Square Gardens, I thought about the collection of artefacts that was beginning to accumulate around me. B’s memorial construction of Manchester already extended to a performance in the form of a burial, a response in the form of A Burial, and now, concealed under a plant pot, bundled up in cellophane, a message written from Manchester, on graph paper in blue handwriting

A list of things that are still to do
Things to do again
What to do next time
Walk through the city
Sightseeing in Metro Shuttle
Buy Indian sweets

I loved traveling around the UK and exploring cities but sometimes I felt sad because I saw a wonderful place alone

I normally write these things on a postcard bought in this area but as I spent more time in Manchester
I had more to note

And a final word of warning

Don’t waste time hanging around Salford
Our products are not retrospective reports, but performances in themselves (Ingold, 2000). Our artefacts, narratives and photographs are co-produced residua. The materialities through which we make sense of encounters and places are interventions that generate new knowledge (Thrift & Dewsbury, 2000). Throughout this project, co-producing and re-encountering events and places has habitually yielded further knowledge. Existing knowledge has been transformed and supplemented in re-encounter and conversation (Shotter, 2008). As F and I listened to her soundscapes, we co-produced further knowledge of Manchester through the ears (see chapter six). As An and I revisited the filmed locations of Twearlies, new images and knowledge emerged (see chapter six). As Al and I co-created a set of hybrid postcards we co-produced a third city of Man-Tunis (see chapter seven). When Latham’s (2003) collaborators reflexively produced a combination of diary-interview reportage of their everyday experiences on Ponsonby Road, where his fieldwork was enacted, these multisensory diaries and the subsequent interview constitute two performances which spurned new, co-created knowledge.

The diary becomes a kind of performance or reportage, the interview a re-performance (2003:2003)

The multi-modal residues of productive performativity are always unfinished, partial, moment-by-moment affairs, not summings-up. Definitive accounts of places are not to be expected. Using this mixed method (performance, interview, collaborative writing) takes us away from seeing the interview as a definitive exercise that somehow takes us closer to a single, unified truth. Indeed, the creation of more pluralistic accounts can explicitly be explored by experimenting with more diverse and experimental modes of writing places. Performative approaches to reporting on a burial, or any place-making practice, bring the reader’s attention to its own performativity (this is a story), and to the plurality of reporting in general (not
Latham (2003) presents a mode of writing that recognizes both the productivity and partiality of accounts of place making

if the final research text is itself considered as a kind of performance, it is possible to imagine ways of working with narrative devices that...recognize both their productiveness and partiality (2003:2009)

Latham’s own experiments in collaboratively writing places, which borrow from the time-space graph (Hagerstrand, 1982), use a bricolage of participant’s text, their photographs, and commentary from the author. The method that was cooked up between B and myself is similarly collaborative. There is a call and response feel to the work we have co-produced. B’s performative interventions and images, my own narrative responses, as well as our further knowledge-creating conversations, are bundled into polyvocal, multi-sensory, embodied ethnographic performances that are always ongoing. This one was only just getting started.

A planned non-appearance at a railway station

After the burial things went quiet for a while. No calls, no mail, no plates. A few weeks later an unrelated research trip to Lahr, Germany, (two hours by train from Mainz) offered me an opportunity to gather more Mancunian memories. B and I agreed to meet up with a view to materializing some more retrospective thoughts on her time in Manchester. We set a date, although not a place or a time. She knew when I would arrive in Mainz, but beyond this the arrangement was loose. She preferred it this way. I boarded a train bound for Mainz, in the dark, suspecting another performative intervention, keen for B to organize things

“Although she knew my train was due to arrive into Mainz at 16.15, she hadn’t actually said she would be there to meet me, so when I didn’t see her on the platform, on the escalator, in the subway, in the station forecourt or by the meeting point under the destination board, I wasn’t surprised” (Mensch Argere Dich Nicht!)

In the spirit of performative collaboration I elected to move away from a model wherein the researcher sets the parameters for the research encounter and acts as sole provider of a definitive account (Thrift & Dewsbury, 2000). Abdicating responsibility for designing co-productive encounters had proved productive previously (see chapters five-eight), so I decided to persist, leaving space for B to formulate the means of exploring her own place making (Latham, 2003). This way, playfulness and creativity would drive the encounter. To use Thrift & Dewsbury’s (2000) phrase, ‘dead geographies’ might be brought to life creatively, using means that would be modeled on
my collaborator’s everyday practice. Prioritizing collaborative creativity in performative place making acknowledges the gathering of emplaced meaning through the potential for

the becoming other of something that, though real, has not yet been' (Speaks, 1995:xiv)

For the creative ethos to be allowed into proceedings, my relinquishing of control was key. Instead an element of chance, of unexpectedness, came into play. The place-making potential of relinquishing individual control, of legislating for chance, unplanned interventions into the research method, was explored by Nathan (2010) in her ambulatory project, *Seven Walks In a Holy City*. Using a combination of cards picked from a pack and dice cast in the street, Nathan embarked on seven increasingly long walks through her native city of Jerusalem, thus disrupting her own habitual routes through sites of conflict, and recording the experience photographically. As she explains here, the experiment explores the tension between planned, individualized movement, chance encounters and the restrictions that are laid down by outside agencies

The First walk is one hour long. The card says Lion’s Gate and the subject for the walk is ‘Colours’. The ‘directions’ dice says left only and the ‘time’ dice is the ‘joker’ so I decide on 7 minutes. Little did I know how the number 7 will be celebrated in this short walk. As soon as I reach the gate I am told that I cannot go in unless I am Muslim. A soldier comes towards me and this time tells me to come back at tourist visiting time (Nathan, 2010:1)

I approached my arrival in Mainz in a similar spirit of deliberate, contrived unknowing. I wanted events beyond my control, outside my design. I wanted them to unfold collaboratively, co-productively. The role of creative, playful, trans-individual performativity in the apprehension of environments resonates with non-representational theory (Thrift, 2008), wherein place perception and memory reside beyond the confines of individual information processing (Brockmeier, 2010). Rather, cognitions are distributed into performative, unfolding actions-in-context (Thrift and Dewsbury, 2000). Environments that are created performatively are not passive settings. They are integral to mutually constitutive networks of places, people and things. Minds extend into land and vice versa, the two making one another. Landscapes, streets, cities, are archives of human experience where memories and other material residues of encounters are left lying around as tangible trails

One of the city’s archives is its detritus: hieroglyphic blobs of gum splattered on the sidewalk, runic streaks and crevices on pavements
or blank facades (Sheringham, 2010:1)

This non-representational approach to place invokes the materializing, productive potential of our movements through (engagement with) landscape. Places acquire meaning not as static representations or fixed locations, but from our movement between and through them (Deleuze, 1991). The construction of place happens along trajectories, amid intersections, connections, movements, relations and encounters, not at static locations, policed by sedentary agents who are rooted to spots. Creative interventions that constitute and memorialise place tend to be connecting events that happen along routes, not set down with roots (Thrift and Dewsbury, 2000). The performative interventions B and I set in motion had fluidity ingrained from the outset, back in London, where emplaced memories were buried en route. Fittingly, the setting for B’s next intervention was also a culturally designated place of human traffic, flux, fluffed meetings, chance encounters and non-appearances; a railway station façade. As sites of memory (Nora, 1989), railway stations have culturally sanctioned narrative power that disposes them towards performativity. They are an example of a performative space that memorializes, legitimizes, certain practices and affects (chance meetings, tearful goodbyes)

the grand boulevard, the market place, the theatre district, the square, the burial ground where the gravitational pull of social necessity brings audiences together and produces performers (Thrift and Dewsbury, 2000:421)

They are ludic places that habitually make us all performers, inviting playfulness and the playing out of dramas

Into such maelstroms, the magnetic forces of commerce and pleasure suck the willing and unwilling alike (Thrift and Dewsbury, 2000:421)

These are places where playfulness is meant to happen. More than mere contexts for performativity, they vitally play their part in events that live on, that become memorialized, that are long talked about. Vortices like these (Thrift and Dewsbury, 2000), or sites of memory (Nora, 1989), facilitate transitions from everyday practice into performativity

I stood at the main entrance to the station, as disoriented as any new arrival to a city might be, looking out onto Bahnhof-Platz for the first time, when a voice over my left shoulder said “Excuse me, this is for you” (Mensch Argere Dich Nicht!)

True to the metaphor of the city as an archive (Sheringham, 2010), B was sticking to her theme. Once again, her memories of Manchester were
deposited in her wake. The first was buried in transit, back in London; the was second delivered by hand by a stranger whose performance was swift, surgical and fluid. He didn’t hang around

The messenger turned and dissolved into the crowd so swiftly that he probably never heard me thank him, although I am fairly certain that I did (Mensch Argere Dich Nicht!)

B’s orchestrated non-appearance was dynamic and theatrical. It was a performance of a memory and a memorable performance. Whoever that man was, he enacted the recollection by proxy to perfection. He delivered an embodied insight into B’s apprehension of place, and it did so as it was apprehended, amid creative, corporeal activity (Thrift and Dewsbury, 2000).

He delivered a memory in the embodied form that it was experienced, not as mere text. There was more to it than the envelope, more to it than what it contained

A tourist style street map of Mainz, produced for a general audience, covering an area from Bahnoff-Platz to the west, Rhine to the east, Zitadelle to the south, Christuskirche to the north; a miniature yellow post-it note stuck just below the flap of the envelope on the inside, bearing, in a neat, black, handwritten, capital scrawl, a single word

ANNABATTERIE (Mensch Argere Dich Nicht!)

As significant as the message in the envelope was, the real delivery was of an affect, an embodied memory of arriving in a new city. As B explained later

She told me how confused and disorientated she had been on arriving in Manchester for the first time and that the only way I could really understand how this felt was to experience it for myself (Mensch Argere Dich Nicht!)

Figure 17: “Excuse me, this is for you”

The affective, embodied engagement with B’s own feelings of arriving in a new city exemplified the notion of parallel, embodied experience that epitomises the apprenticeship of the sensory ethnographer (Pink, 2009).
Arriving in a new city, bewildered and lost, I was privy to (forced to embody, forced to perform) the overlapping, corporeal, pre-cognitive knowledge of the new arrival. By relinquishing control of the research encounter and leaving it up to B, I had gained insider knowledge into the flow of felt experience, and it lay beyond mere retrospective cognition. Shared embodiment reveals overlapping corporeality, rather than post-hoc reflection. The situated ethnographer of the senses aspires towards shared embodiment, as we have learned from other ethnographers who gained knowledge in the field through shared embodied participation in practices such as capoeira (Downey, 2007), cycling, (Spinney, 2007), distance running, (Allen-Collinson, 2012) and yoga (Buckingham and Degen, 2012).

A report of a planned non-appearance a railway station

As in the case of A Burial, my response to B’s latest performative intervention came in the form of collaborative, performative reportage. Once again, whilst B (and her still unnamed accomplice) instigated the event itself, I responded by producing a narrative account that maintained the ludic spirit of her intervention. Mensch Argere Dich Nicht! (see Interlude), a collaborative short story, conveys the events surrounding B’s non-appearance, including my own embodied experience of her memory of arriving in a new city, as well as my discovery of her third memory of Manchester in a café called ANNABATTERIE. Mensch Argere Dich Nicht! employs a playful, fictional discourse to convey real events, but is also performative reportage, an event in itself. It is collaborative since B orchestrated the events that are told, and yet poly-vocal, since her verbatim dialogue, taken from interview transcripts, appears in the story. Like the photographs, packages and other artefacts that are collected here, it contributes to the burgeoning materiality that memorializes our collaboration.

The affective power of placed things

Accumulations of materiality have characterised all of the collaborations in this project. These residual trails, strewn with, maps (chapter five), sound recordings (chapter six), pictures (chapter seven), commemorative postcards (chapter eight) and other detritus reflect an ethnographic productivity that goes beyond the use of text to record encounters. There is a growing tendency to produce artefacts to supplement text and talk in ethnographic research (Pink, 2009, Bissell, 2009, Sheridan and Chamberlain, 2011). The growing use of vital things reminds us that like the rest of us, objects have trajectories and dynamisms of their own (Bissell, 2009), being bought, sold, given, lent, taken, lost and found.
The meanings things have are inscribed in their form, their use and their trajectory (Appadurai, 1986:5)

It has been noted that the use of crafted objects to supplement ethnographic text often sees them serving purposes other than those for which they were originally designed (Appadurai, 1986). Performative contexts often alter the purposes of objects in the interests of helping narratives along. Thus, a tourist map might be used as a clue in a treasure hunt, a postcard might be used as an aide memoir (chapter eight). The use of things to deepen talk in go-along interviews (Brown and Durrheim, 2009), and of home crafted, personalized objects to supplement conversations (Gauntlett, 2007) is becoming more commonplace in social research. Arguably, the production of artefacts during research encounters raises the methodological status of things still more. Objects produced in ethnographic practice are material evidence of co-productive, collaborative performance (Morgan & Pritchard, 2005). Products do not merely evoke past events, but serve as productive, vital landmarks along ongoing narratives. Having their own journeys or careers, they “bear witness to the participant’s feat” (Sheridan and Chamberlan, 2011:319). Adding materiality to collaborators’ shared experiences, they tell journeys along the way. Sheridan and Chamberlain (2011) exemplified the idea of marking progression through materiality by asking participants to document their weight loss by making photo-journals. By recording their weight loss narratives artefactually, material memories were accumulated. Personal journeys were manifest in crafted objects. Similarly, B’s used crafted artefacts in narrating her journey out of Manchester through the medium of material memories secreted en route, buried, embodied, delivered by hand, hidden. For B the importance of materiality, of crafted, lost, found, objects that were evocative of place, was clear throughout our collaboration. The prominence of objects in B’s construction of Manchester is manifest in her unconventional accumulation of photographic mementos of the city, as this excerpt from one of our conversations shows

A: Can you tell me a bit about the ones you will associate most with the last few days here?
B: My pictures I associate most
A: Some of your favourites
B: The till, here in the office
A: That’s my favourite picture that you’ve taken, I think
B: It’s a really old till and next to the numbers that it has on every key it has bigger keys with letters on, like ‘language’, or ‘membership’, and you have to press one of these connecting to the price you charge. So I’ve just made a photo of these words so you don’t really see what these keys are connected to. But it shows my office work and it shows part of my life. I am a member and I’ve pressed the
button for myself as well. So it’s my daily work and it’s part of my memories that are captured in a picture and an item.

Figure 18: “It’s a really old till”

B records, accumulates, photographs and crafts personal objects, capturing memories materially. Her affective response to her personal effects and to abandoned items she encounters and pictures whilst walking the streets resonates with that of An, whose affectation for lost clothing has already been discussed in these pages (see chapter seven). Here B talks about her pictures of Mancunian litter:

B: Manchester has great rubbish. It sounds very odd but the rubbish is very different to the rubbish you see in Germany. First of all you don’t have a lot of waste bins, litter bins, here. I once asked somebody why, a service person, and he said it’s because it’s cheaper to get somebody to pick it up than having a waste bin somewhere, and if someone puts a bomb there and lights it. So first of all you would find more stuff lying around. Like the pictures I’ve shown you. Piles of waste. You don’t know how they get there. You don’t know why they’re there. You don’t even know who left that, or whether that’s mean to be there because there was somebody working, putting it in piles and having just forgotten it.

Playful, affective responses to litter and abandoned objects evokes Bissell’s (2009) writings on materiality which begin, coincidentally, with an encounter with a lost glove in Salford:

It was dark, about two in the morning, walking along a seemingly never-ending concrete path next to the dual carriageway that slices through Salford. A tiny grey mitten in the middle of the path, illuminated by the sodium lights above. Suddenly I was struck by one of the most intense affectual responses I have ever experienced. This mitten resonated through my entire body. I turned to the person I was walking with, “Look! There’s a little hand that’s getting cold somewhere out there (Bissell, 2009:96)
This affective response to materiality resonates with the extremes of affect I experienced on discovering the objects B placed along her route. On finding a package under a plant pot in Russell Square Gardens, on receiving an envelope from a stranger at Mainz railway station, I shared the sentiments Bissell describes here:

The overwhelming affectivity of the mitten eschews the normalizing and condensing conventions of narrative. This particular event has left a sustained mark on my body, and I have not been able to shake it off (2009:96).

Encounters with lost jackets, gloves and buried packages affect us in part because they disrupt the sanctioned flow of things. Abandoned, left, lost and found objects flow independently of the accepted commodity chains of buying, selling, borrowing and gifting. The affective power of these disruptions highlights the vitality of things (Bissell, 2009). Bissell argues that when objects follow trajectories outside of sanctioned channels they do so predominantly beyond the remit of human agency, as in case of misplaced clothing. For B however, I would suggest that the objects she orchestrated during our collaboration were neither lost nor misplaced. Rather, they were placed, performatively. They were deliberately put in places to be found. These performative placements were under her control, albeit outside the sanctioned, market led flow of objects of which Bissell writes. Here, B playfully discusses her views about litter being somehow within the control of those who leave it lying around, as though rubbish itself is strategically organized to provoke an aesthetic reaction.

B: I have this awesome picture, like structured waste
A: Structured waste, did you say?
B: Yeah, it’s sort of structured
A: Built, you mean? Designed?
B: It was, it looked like it was meant to be there on purpose, and the way it was structured. There was a lot of cigarette stuff, cigarette ends, and there was this banana
A: I remember that picture
B: It was sort of structured, like having the ends here, and the banana skin here, and yet it was just waste
A: So that looked like it had been composed
B: Mm, sort of picturesque
In the case of B’s placement of objects en route to Germany, their affective power arose from the performativity of her placing them outside sanctioned flows. She provoked an affect by using the established narrative scripts of burial, excavation, treasure hunt and hand-over, and by exploiting the narratively charged vortex of the railway station (Thrift and Dewsbury, 2000) subversively, to evoke materialized and embodied memories. Cognitions here (her memories, my place perceptions) were distributed relationally, between ourselves, into materialities and into the land (Hetherington & Law, 2000). Affect here relies on the power of playfully placed things being encountered in places of flow. Objects that are left along others’ routes, disrupting accepted means of giving and receiving, are well placed to change hands in dynamic spaces; on paths, in public parks, at points of egress, entrances to railway stations. Places like these are designed to facilitate the channeling of people, information and things (Bissell, 2009). They are ideal for the enactment of performances of passage and exchange (hand-overs, treasure hunts, burials). Through them, certain classes of things flow as a matter of course (pedestrians, animals, vehicles, rain, leaves, litter, information). Meanwhile other immovable things stay put (walls, buildings, monuments), acting as moorings (Urry, 2003) against the mobility of their fluid counterparts (Adey, 2006). Arguably though, besides these naturally flowing and the naturally static things there are unexpectedly, unlegislated for, moving things; the lost, the misplaced, the mischievously placed, flowing outside sanctioned routes of climate and commerce. These are the lost gloves (sometimes alone, sometimes in pairs), the lone playing cards, the playfully placed packages that lie along known routes, perhaps awaiting someone in particular, or in the hope that someone will lay claim to them.

Mobile diary excerpt: Stretford,

*A pram is left by the side of the road, accompanied by a sign “Please take me”*

Disorderly objects are inflow, and, for some, in the way. They often warrant expulsion or disposal (Hawkins, 2006), amid authoritarian threats made by those who police the spaces they occupy.
“Unexpected item in bagging area” (automated checkout)

“Unattended objects will be disposed of or destroyed by security staff” (railway station announcement)

Unanchored mobile materialities serve to disrupt the engineered and controlled aspects of the urban environment, they can be mobilized in ways that are both unpredictable and sometimes threatening (Bissell, 2009:101)

Disorderly, placed and misplaced things challenge accepted values of order and ownership (Hetherington, 2004). Lost clothing and unofficially flowing, clandestinely passed-on items (envelopes, prams) are radical juxtapositions to the debris that is deliberately moved around by the market. Lost clothing, buried packages and hand delivered envelopes are temporarily disowned, beyond ownership, incongruous. They have worked themselves free from sanctioned, stable networks of exchange and commerce. They fall between the categories of obdurate moorings and transient detritus (Urry, 2003). Their affective power is evidence of a vital world that extends beyond the confines of the human subject (Latham and McCormack, 2004). According to this non-representational view, affect interweaves the properties of object, landscape and human subject inseparably, yielding corporeal, pre-cognitive responses that

play out before the reflective event of thought kicks in (Latham & McCormack, 2004:706).

Ontologically, individual, thing and place are relationally entwined (Law, 2004). Thus, my response to a buried package and hand-delivered envelope, B’s response to the banana and the cigarette ends, An’s response to the jacket (see chapter seven), Bissell’s (2009) response to the glove, all stem from a relational apprehension of thing, place and narrative. Encountering placed or misplaced objects invokes webs of relations that go beyond the here and now

A lost mitten might serve to momentarily make present a larger assemblage of other objects, places, feelings, and people: perhaps the sadness of the cold hand or the of a disappointment experienced by the saddened body of its previous owner (Bissell, 2009:104)

Affective responses to placed and misplaced objects are bound into extrapolations and narratives of how they arrived there, of distant memories of elsewhere (Manchester, London, Mainz), of simultaneities of cities experienced in the past (Massey, 2005). A mitten evokes a cold, unseen hand. A package buried in Bloomsbury evokes a memory of Manchester.
The handing over of an envelope at a German railway station evokes other arrivals in other cities. Each encounter with materiality invokes an affecting narrative. It is, to paraphrase Bissell (2009), as though these objects themselves seek us out.

*B's egg bee*

Using the map and the clues from the envelope I was handed at the station I tracked B down in *ANNABATTERIE*, one of her favourite cafes. As we conversed during the course of the afternoon we accumulated still more objects that played some part in B's making of Manchester. We looked at the objects, passed them between us and talked about her construction of the city, what she called 'her history of Manchester'. Researchers who favour object elicitation have noted how looking through things with interviewees reduces physical and emotional distance. Objects act as third parties, as bridges of communication (Collier & Collier, 1986). Looking and touching is a shared sensorial experience (Pink, 2009). Incorporating objects into research challenges purely ocularcentric methods of participant observation. The performatve, embodied, tactile (digging, handing over, hiding, seeking, finding) apprehension of objects supplements talk and heightens the multisensory, overlapping experiences of researcher and researched (Pink, 2009). The participatory, collaborative aspect to engagement with objects is accentuated when they are chosen, crafted, buried or placed by a research collaborator, and when their choosing, crafting, burying or placing materializes their place making narrative (Noble, 2004). The objects on the table were party to our conversations about how B constructed Manchester through memories of and movement through it and how, in turn, these experiences affected her

B: *This conglomerate of lives develops a place like Manchester and then the place is changed by the people who live in it, so it's a circle*
A: *Maybe by you living in it as well a little bit*
B: *Yeah, exactly, this is something we will find out, that actually it's a circle, starting with my impressions I got from Manchester, then how this Manchester I saw changed me and my life here, something you're going to see as well, and then how I am going to change Manchester, or I changed Manchester, just by leaving something somewhere or forgetting something somewhere or doing something there, or saying hello or giving a smile*
A: *Do you think you helped to create Manchester?*
B: *Yeah, exactly, everyone who lives there creates it, but Manchester for oneself and for somebody else*

Objects relating to this place making narrative enabled B and I to once again perform Manchester into being by collaboratively recording, photographing,
crafting, writing and enacting our own narrative of the city. We used emplaced, material memories and overlapping embodiment to co-produce Manchester again. As we did so our accumulated detritus fed back into our narrative. On the table in front of us, into the story went my photograph of the package containing the memories I had found in Bloomsbury; a clump of Mancunian moss I had brought with me to Germany at B’s request (see Post-script to chapter 10); the envelope, map and post-it from the railway station handover; a board game, Human Don’t Get Angry (aka Mensch Argere Dich Nicht!, the English call it Ludo) which I had stumbled across earlier that day on the outskirts of Mainz and which by chance we found on a shelf in the ANNABATTERRJE; and a small parcel, wrapped in brown paper, that B had hidden in the café and which I at length had managed to track down (in a cupboard), containing

*The lower section of a grey, cardboard egg-box that had been cut into a cross-section so that only four of its compartments remained. In one of the compartments was a brightly decorated egg that had been painted with yellow and black hoops to make it look like a bee. There were two eyes painted on, a little red smile and a hole in the top where the contents of the egg had been blown out to preserve the shell before painting (Mensch Argere Dich Nicht!)*

![Egg bee](image)

The egg bee was the third memory of Manchester that B had placed on her route to Mainz, for me to recover. Like the written memories buried in Bloomsbury and the embodied memories at Mainz station, its crafting, concealing, seeking and finding performed Manchester into being memorialy. Indeed, by their very concealment objects can sometimes have a heightened performative effect

They are often out of view, quietly hiding in boxes or wardrobes or avoiding attention. Sometimes they have been lost, discarded or destroyed and cannot be produced. However, their very absence can demand attention. This need not result in lost opportunities but can
encourage reflection on the absent object and on the research process (Sheridan and Chamberlain, 2011:330)

The bee, a symbol of Manchester’s industrial history, was perhaps the happiest of the three memories that B had placed en route from Manchester. She told me that now that she was away from the Manchester, distancing herself from the city enabled her to construct her own, more positive history of Manchester

B: This is Manchester. The bee stands for Manchester because of the history
A: Your history or the history?
B: No, the thing is that there’s not just one history. Everybody has his or her own history for something or about something, so my history of Manchester is my, marked by the buildings I’ve seen, which stands for, maybe, progress, but then poverty as well. And standing up changing what you had, something like that, so the bee stands for Manchester, how Manchester progressed and got to an industrialised city and the habit of living there I think is something that you still breathe

As with all my collaborators, conversations with B yielded co-produced knowledge that added to my own knowledge of Manchester. The Manchester bee was news to me, despite having lived in the city for over twenty years. B had discovered it on the hoof, walking between and amongst the bollards, benches and posts upon which its image is emblazoned in gold. Here, B explains her acquaintance with the bee and, with some difficulty, gives me a lesson on the industrialization of Manchester

A: So there’s one thing you haven’t explained and that’s the bee in the road
B: On my way to International Society on Oxford Road and back to Salford where I lived I was always standing at the one traffic lights, with this black pole, I don’t know how you call it
A: Is this on your walk?
B: They just have that on the pedestrian part to prevent the cars to park there
A: Oh so it’s in the road? Like a railing?
B: I’m going to Google it. So it’s small and it’s black and it’s some sort of, it’s a pole, and it’s black and it just prevents cars to go there
A: And is it in the road?
B: It’s on the pavement to prevent cars to park there, and it’s black, and then there was this small bee on it
A: A real bee?
B: No, it’s drawn
A: The letter B?
B: No a bee, like an insect
A: And it looks like this?

**Pointing to the egg**

B: No, mine is like a cartoon, it’s just

A: So why did they put a bee on it do you think?

B: Because of Manchester, the history of Manchester. It’s something that was already printed on it

A: Ok. How does it? Sorry, I might be being stupid here but

B: It stands for the industrialization of Manchester, like the way people worked there

A: Busy bees?

B: Yeah

Walking the same route over and over again from her flat in Salford to the International Society office in Manchester, B accumulating embodied knowledge, dissolving her own history into the history of the city, making her own Manchester along the way

A: You’re going back to your history just from a few months ago but the bee itself=

B: =Stands for the history of Manchester, which left an impression of my history of Manchester

A: So it’s not going back to the history it’s going back to your history of Manchester

B: Because there is no the history of Manchester

A: No there isn’t. There’s not ‘the’ history of anything really

B: My history of Manchester is influenced by the impression I get of the history of Manchester itself, the people who live there and what they did to create Manchester

A little like T (see chapter five), B did the knowledge on foot, bringing dead geographies to life through ambulation (Rhys-Taylor’s, 2010), accumulating memories on-the-go. Thus, Manchester gains its significance, its *umwelt*, by dint of the life activities of those like B who move through it, creating it. According to the so-called dwelling perspective (Ingold, 2000) divisions between ready-made environments (cities as containers) and those who occupy them are spurious. Rather, for a space to become a place it must be subjected to dwelling, to the playful, co-creative, meaningful construction of place through the performative engagements that bring them to life

A: Do you think you can still continue to create it even now you’ve left?

B: By the things I left there or maybe buy the things I am going to send there, or by having done something that will end in something else

The playful performativity that B used to bring Manchester to life was retrospective, materialistic and embodied. Unlike the work of my other
collaborators, B’s place making collaboration with me happened after the event, yet it constituted a series of events. The playful performances in London and Mainz and the objects they invested with meaning remade Manchester in real time, not in hindsight. The package in the park, the envelope at the station, the parcel in the café, *A Burial, Mensch Argere Dich Nicht!,* all yielded knowledge, made a city and were co-productive at the time they were experienced and performed. They were freestanding, non-referential, non-representational, collaborative knowledge making events. They taught us knowledge we didn’t have before, about Manchester’s bees, about what it is like to arrive in a new city, about our own histories of Manchester. The haul of materialities we produced during these collaborative happenings yields knowledge, meaning and relationally that resides in the spaces that lie between us, in the objects themselves, and in the land. The events surrounding the package, the envelope, the parcel, the egg, a burial, *A Burial* and *Mensch Argere Dich Nicht!* are inseparable constituents of performances that implicate people, places and things in co-constitutive showings and doings.

Post-script: Jonas Gutenberg (1395-1468)

After leaving ANNABATTERIE B walked me around some of her favourite places in Mainz and told me about one of its most famous citizens

*B:* So he is known as Johannes Gutenberg, who invented the printing machine with the letters you could put in the big frame and then ink and press it and then you were able to produce books and the first book he printed was the bible and that was the time that people started to read the bible themselves, because before that it was not possible to have your own copy for yourself.

*A:* So he was one of Mainz most famous citizens=

*B:* =citizens, yeah. But it’s sad that the house that he lived in, and he died poor. He died poor. But he’s a very famous person and obviously Mainz is very proud of having him

*A:* I know you’ve been a bit critical of Germany but you sound quite proud of Mainz quite attached to it

*B:* I wouldn’t say I’m proud of it but I like it. It’s part of my life and it’s filled with emotions, so I like it

*B:* It’s good for you to be able to tell me about it and us be here. Because you told me about the place a bit when we were in Manchester but it didn’t make a lot of sense to me then

Gutenberg’s method of mechanical, movable type was revolutionary. It allowed the large-scale production of reading matter and brought literature and religion to the populace. Thanks to Gutenberg, the transfer of knowledge no longer relied on laboriously handwritten script and word of mouth. Thanks to Gutenberg thoughts, ideas, playful schemes and
memories could now be set down, distributed, materialized, left lying around in certain places, with the intention that someone else might one day stumble across them.

Interlude: *Mensch Argere Dich Nicht!*

Although she knew my train was due to arrive into Mainz at four-fifteen she hadn’t actually said she would be there to meet me, so when I didn’t see her on the platform, on the escalator, in the subway, in the station forecourt or by the meeting point under the destination board, I wasn’t surprised. I stood at the main entrance to the station, as disoriented as any new arrival to a city might be, looking out onto *Bahnhof-Platz* for the first time, when a voice over my left shoulder said

“*Excuse me, this is for you*”

As I turned around a young man handed me a brown envelope with a scruffy hole burned through it and three or four char marks around its edges, which, I remember thinking at the time, had perhaps been fashioned to give it the appearance of age. The messenger turned and dissolved into the crowd so swiftly that he probably never heard me thank him, although I am fairly certain that I did. Not knowing what else to do I edged out into the afternoon sun, crouched down on my heels against the station façade, laid the envelope next to a dead cigarette butt on the cobbles and took a photograph of it, perhaps to convince myself that what had just happened
had just happened, as though actual possession of the envelope itself, and of what it contained, were not evidence enough.

What it contained

An apology for not being at the station to meet me; a sum of money to cover my fare back to my lodgings in Lahr to reimburse me for a wasted journey; some suggestions for how best to spend an afternoon alone in Mainz, Germany’s fifth largest city, home to Johannes Gutenberg, inventor of mechanical moveable type printing and capital of the federal state of Rhineland-Palatinate?

All of these possibilities crossed my mind but rather than tear open the envelope I found myself delaying, crouching and staring at the burn that passed through the middle of it and at the dead butt on the cobbles, until I was overcome by an urge to laugh out loud. I was doubled-up in sheer admiration at the brilliance of the performance of the young messenger whom I had barely glimpsed but who had played his role to perfection. I crouched and laughed some more at the gall of this real-life extra who had timed his intervention to a tee, delivered his line without nerves and effected his own disappearance before I had had time to react. I crouched and laughed and thought about this until it occurred to me that he, or maybe even she, might be watching me from a vantage point somewhere in Bahnhof-Platz. It crossed my mind that from a distance, a man who is crouching and laughing might easily be mistaken for a man who is crouching and crying, distressed or distraught. I pulled myself together and began to think seriously about what was in the envelope.

What it contained

A tourist style street map of Mainz produced for a general audience, covering an area from Bahnhof-Platz to the west, Rhine to the east, Zitadelle to the south, Christuskirche to the north; a miniature yellow post-it note stuck just below the flap of the envelope on the inside, bearing, in a neat, black, handwritten, capital scrawl, a single word

ANNABATTERIE

What would you do? You arrive in a city you’ve never visited before, someone hands you a burned, charred envelope with a street map and a word you’ve never seen before stuck to the inside and you haven’t a clue what it means

ANNABATTERIE

What it means
A woman’s name; an anagram of a word that is perhaps a clue to where I should go or what I should do next; the name of a coffee-shop or some other type of establishment; the name of an initiation rite or power game in which two or more players invoke feelings of bewilderment in a third player who may be a newcomer to a city?

All of these possibilities ran through my mind as I studied the map. As an alternative to doing nothing I began walking around the perimeter of Bahnhoff-Platz, slowly but with no real aim or destination. Partly to escape the heat, partly because I was concerned that he, or possibly even she, might be watching me from somewhere near the station, I pushed through the revolving door of the mid-range Hotel Stadhaus, whose upper balconies preside over the Bahnhoff. In the air-conditioned lobby a man clutching a colorful cardboard box, whose lid was held secure with a piece of string, was checking in in English. The box lid, which the man now placed on the reception desk as he dealt with the mundane business of becoming an official guest of the hotel, depicted the blue, red, green and yellow pieces of a board game that was invented in Germany and later gained popularity elsewhere under various names such as Parcheesi, Sorry and Trouble. The English call it Ludo. As I hovered behind the man, who was by now busy writing, bending over the receptionist’s desk, I noticed that the lid of the box was emblazoned with upper case, yellow italicized letters, bearing the slogan

Mensch argere dich nicht!

What it means

However bad things get, however bewildered or disoriented you feel, however seriously your plans are sabotaged, no matter how tense, frustrated or lost for ideas you are, don’t give in. Whoever you are, don’t despair. Dude, try to keep calm. Woman, do not panic. Human, don’t get angry

HUMAN DON’T GET ANGRY!

Having written out his name, dates of birth and departure and his car registration details, the man picked up the box and the rest of his belongings and made his way up to his room. Knowing that the receptionist, who was entirely bald and in his middle years, spoke excellent English, I began to feel calmer. I was hopeful that a helping of his local knowledge might ease my predicament. I stepped forward, took the burned, charred envelope from my pocket, laid it on the receptionist’s desk, opened the inner flap and showed him the post-it and the word that was written there. He took off his spectacles, which until that point I had not noticed he was wearing,
shook his head and said that he didn’t know of such a thing and that as far as he was concerned

“A battery is just a battery”

Thinking of him as my only option I persisted until, perhaps confident that this further concession would bring an end to my enquiry once and for all, he agreed to type the unknown word into his search engine. This changed everything. Although I couldn’t see his screen or what was written there, his softening features and more conciliatory demeanor were enough to tell me that yes, there was something, someone, somewhere whose name was

ANNABATTERIE

“Yes”, he conceded, “there is such a thing after all”

I took the map of Mainz from the burned, charred envelope and the receptionist took his pencil, drew two crosses on it and advised me on the best route for walking between them. I thanked him for his help and as I left the building I remember thinking how much he looked like Gene Hackman, only without hair. Back in the heat of Bahnhoff-Platz I studied the map once more. I estimated that the crosses the receptionist had made were no more than three or four blocks apart. I turned left, then left again, feeling more purposeful now, less concerned by the thought of being under surveillance. At least now I felt that I looked like I knew where I was going.

On Bop-Strasse as I stood waiting for the traffic to subside so that I could cross to the other side I noticed of a series of small colorful objects that had seemingly been emptied out into the gutter. Amongst the detritus were two dice, some counters, two miniature yellow cards bearing the words KUNFT and UN respectively and the red, blue, green and yellow pieces of a popular German board game in which two or more players try to sabotage or frustrate the efforts of a third player to complete a journey from one point to another. The English call it Ludo. The lights changed to red, the traffic came to a halt and the half-dozen or so people who had assembled on the kerb beside me set off to cross the road. I bent down to look more closely at the pieces of the game. I photographed them and thought about how they got there. I consulted my map and wondered whether by any chance they were lying on a point that fell along a direct route between the two crosses that the reception had drawn.

How they got there
They had spilled out from a box that was being carried by a pedestrian, perhaps because he had failed to secure the lid tightly enough; they had been flung from a passing streetcar in the middle of a game, perhaps after one of the players had been frustrated in his attempts to move from one point to another; knowing which route I would take across the city he, or maybe even she, had placed them there to try and delay or derail my journey between the two crosses that the receptionist had drawn on the map.

All of these possibilities went through my mind as I wrestled with the idea of getting down on my hands and knees, picking up the pieces, putting them in my pockets and spending the rest of the afternoon reassembling the game. Perhaps I was just about to do this when I noticed that two women who were now standing beside me on the kerb, waiting for the traffic to subside, were speaking in perfect English. I showed them the photograph of the pieces of the game on the floor and pointed out the words on the yellow cards and one of them told me that as far as she knew KUNFT did not really mean anything in German, so there wouldn’t be any direct translation for it in English, or in any other language for that matter. I showed them the envelope and pointed out the word on the yellow post-it and one of them said yes, she knew ANNABATTERRIE, that it was just a couple of blocks away, that they were going past it and that I was very welcome to walk with them. The lights changed to red, the traffic stopped and the three of us set off across the road together. We crossed Bopp-Strasse, turned left, then left again. As we walked I told them about the station, the young man, the map, the receptionist and the two crosses and they both said how exciting it was and that they were originally from Oxford and by this time we were on the corner of Gartenfeld-Strasse and Adam Karrillon so I stopped walking and they said goodbye and kept on going and wished me luck and I looked up and there it was written in big letters

**ANNABATTERRIE**

*What it is*

The name of a coffee shop or some other type of establishment; the name of a depository for lost and found objects; a place where people go to drink coffee and deposit objects they have found in the hope that one day they will be reclaimed; a place where people go to drink coffee or look for things they have lost in the hope that other people will have brought them there; a place where people go in search of lost things; a place where lost people go in search of things; a place where people in search of people and things that are lost go; a place where lost people go; a place where people with nowhere to go-go. Lose yourself in ANNABATTERRIE. Sip coffee or elderflower tea amongst countless other people and things who are losing themselves, who are already lost, or whose journey between two points has somehow been derailed or interrupted.
Partly to get out of the heat, I opened door and walked in. Somewhere a bell rang. Inside, the place was polished, light and spick. Along the shelves, behind the counter, fastened to the walls and hanging from the ceiling were countless objects that had been lost, found and then brought there in the hope that they might be reunited with their original owners. Most of the objects were old but perhaps because they had been rescued and displayed so carefully they seemed somehow desirable. As I stood there in the doorway I thought about how attractive these objects were in comparison to all the ones that still lay abandoned or lost around the city of Mainz; books left on trains, items of clothing left in the street, toys left on buses, board games scattered by the side of the road. I remember thinking about all of these abandoned objects and wondering how many of them would eventually wash up here in ANNABATTERRIE. Along the shelves, fastened to walls, hanging from the ceiling were pictures, games, books, records, gadgets, back copies of magazines, toys, utensils, gloves, hats, outmoded electrical appliances and sundry paraphernalia. There were painted signs, some of whose messages were quite humdrum or functional, like

**THAT WAY**

Others were more thoughtful or profound, like the one behind the counter that proclaimed in red letters

**GUNS DON’T KILL PEOPLE**

**KILL PEOPLE**

There were people sitting at tables. Some of them were alone, writing, reading or looking out of windows. She was there, but he wasn’t. I would have recognized him. I only saw him for a second or two amongst the crowds of people at the entrance to the station. Admittedly I was distracted by the handing over of the envelope and by the envelope itself, but I am certain I would have recognized him

*She was there*

She was smiling and sitting at a table. I walked over, showed her the envelope and pointed out the word on the yellow post-it and she said yes, I had come to the right place. I pulled up a chair and joined her and thanked her for the map. I told her how well everything had gone and how grateful I was to her for organizing the whole thing. I placed my satchel on the table, took out my voice recorder and reassured her that the young messenger at the station had done everything that had been asked of him and had played his part to perfection. I slid the microphone across the table

174
and told her she didn’t need tell me who he was and she said she wasn’t going to anyway. I said I noticed that he wasn’t here and that if he had been I would have recognized him and she said

“That’s right. He isn’t here”

And we just left it at that.

I pressed the green button and asked her to tell me about ANNABATTERIE. She told me that people come there to drink coffee and look for things they might have left lying around somewhere in the city, like on buses, trains, in other cafes or in the street. She said there was even something here for me, something she had made herself and hidden amongst all the other things and that I should have a look around to see if I could find it.

_Amongst countless other people and things who are losing themselves, who are already lost, or whose journey between two points has somehow been derailed or interrupted_

I pressed the red button and thanked her for going to all this trouble. I panned my gaze along the shelves, behind the counter, across the walls, ceiling and floor. Now and again I pointed to things that I thought she might have left there for me. There were pictures, games, books, records and gadgets. There were back copies of magazines, toys, utensils, gloves, hats, outmoded electrical appliances and sundry paraphernalia. I got up and walked around. From time to time I pointed at or held up things that I thought she might have hidden for me and she shook her head.

_A single, black, child’s glove; she shook her head. An old magazine with a young couple in matching sweaters, striding across a field; she shook her head. A cardboard box on a shelf whose lid depicted the red, blue, green and yellow pieces of a popular German board game in which two or more players try to sabotage or frustrate others’ attempts to complete a journey from one point to another; she shook her head. A small, cube-shaped, brown-paper package, about the size of a miniature carriage clock, which had been placed in a tiny wooden cupboard by a table where a man was sitting looking out of a window. The doors of the cupboard were slightly ajar so you could see inside._

I looked at the man. She shook her head.

_It wasn’t him_

I pointed to the package. She smiled. I walked over, reached into the cupboard and carefully took out the package without disturbing the man.
He wasn’t there

He carried on looking out of the window

I would have recognized him

I brought the package over, laid it on the table between us and slid the microphone closer to her so that she could tell me about it

She smiled

I undid the brown paper and fiddled with the recording levels so that she could tell me about what was inside

What it contained

The lower section of a grey, cardboard egg-box that had been cut into a cross-section so that only four of its compartments remained. In one of the compartments was a brightly decorated egg that had been painted with yellow and black hoops to make it look like a bee. There were two eyes painted on, a little red smile and a hole in the top where the contents of the egg had been blown out to preserve the shell before painting

I pressed the green button and asked her to explain what this was all about. She slid the microphone closer to her so I could hear what she was going to say. She told me about the things she had been doing since we last met, which was just a few months ago when she was living and working in Manchester, my own home city. I asked her what she remembered about Manchester and about how she was adjusting to life back in Mainz, which is where she was from was originally. She told me about some of the journeys she had made in the last few months, about her walks around Manchester, about traveling back to Germany, about the places she liked to visit now that she was living in Mainz. She said that since we last met she had been walking around and thinking a lot about these journeys, about Manchester, Mainz and about history. She talked a lot about history and I interrupted her and said when you say history do you mean your history or history in general and she said there’s no such thing as history in general and that

“Everybody has his or her own history for something or about something so my history of Manchester is marked by the buildings I’ve seen”

She told me how confused and disorientated she had been on arriving in Manchester for the first time and that the only way I could really understand how this felt was to experience it for myself. She told me that all cities have people in them who are lost or disorientated and that the way they
overcome these feelings is by walking around, up and down, in circles, sometimes hardly knowing where they’re going or with no particular destination, yet all time the time they’re piecing the place together, building it up by walking through it she said

“Every city is just a conglomeration of lives and this conglomeration of lives develops the place and then the place is changed by the people who live in it. It’s a circle, starting with my impressions I got from Manchester, what I expected and what I saw and then how this Manchester I saw changed me and my life here”

She said that all of us change cities just by living in them, by walking around in circles, piecing them together and that the history of every city is made by people who work their entire their lives building them up from nothing, walking around them, changing them, constructing them, working them out, shaping them like busy bees she said

“The bee stands for Manchester, the industrialization and how people worked there, how Manchester progressed and the habit of living there”

She said all of us who walk around the places we live in play a part in creating them, changing them by moving in circles, up and down, sometimes hardly knowing where we’re going or with no particular destination, leaving trails behind us, dropping objects, bits of ourselves, finding things, moving things from place to place, losing things, leaving them on buses, in the street, or bringing things to places like these she said

“I changed Manchester just by leaving something somewhere or forgetting something somewhere or doing something there, or saying hello, or giving a smile, everyone who lives there creates Manchester, Manchester for oneself and Manchester for somebody else, by the things I left there or maybe by the things I’m going to send there, or maybe by having done something that will result in something else”

She said that as long as there are people like us walking around, leaving trails, finding things and bringing them to places like these the cities we live in will never stay the same and neither will we she said

“Most of the city is just lives being narrowed down to small space and the small space is narrowed down and created by the people and then the space develops and creates something new and forms characters”

I pressed the red button and thanked her for taking the trouble to explain everything. I turned off my voice recorder and told her that until today I hadn’t realized that the bee was the symbol of the history of Manchester. I put the voice recorder into my satchel and told her how grateful I was to her
for organizing everything. I especially thanked her for making the egg. I
told her I would take great care of it on my journey back to England. I rose
to leave and picked up the egg and as I did so I noticed there was something
inside

She smiled

I shook it a little and heard something rattling around. I sat down again,
looked at her, looked at the egg and thought about what was inside

What it contained

An messga of some sort that had been written on a small piece of paper, wrapped around a
needle and slid into the egg after she had blown out its contents to preserve the shelle for
painting; more revelations about the history of Manchester or Mainz or some other place
she had visited on her travels; the identity of the messenger at the station who had played
his part so perfectly; another map of Mainz with instructions on how to find my way back
to the station in time for my train; details of when and where our next meeting might take
place?

All of these possibilities crossed my mind as it dawned on me that whatever
it was that she had put in there could only be retrieved by breaking the egg

She smiled

I told her I really wanted to know what was inside but it wasn’t in my nature
to be destructive. She said it was up to me to decide. I told her I was dying
to know what it was but I couldn’t imagine actually breaking the egg. She
said she didn’t mind one way or the other. I told her I would probably carry
the egg all the way back to Manchester, place it in my room and stare at it
from time to time without ever finding out what was inside and she said

“You can break it if you want but it doesn’t really matter if you don’t”

She said

“Sometimes it’s better to wait a while or be patient or leave things as they are”

She said

“Stories like these don’t always have neat and tidy endings”

She said
“We don’t always need to know every single detail about every single thing”

She said

“You can break it if you want to, it’s up to you, I don’t mind”

And we just left it at that.
Chapter Ten
Walking in intercorporeal space: 8
Border crossings in Whitworth Park and Rusholme

Prelude: A sandwich on the pavement

*Ab, her dog guide To, and I are walking together through Rusholme. P, a man who is sitting in a shop doorway, calls out to Ab*

P: Hey, how are you?
Ab: Hey, how are you? It’s my friend
A: Cold isn’t it?
P: A little bit
Ab: What’s she smelling now?
A: Some sandwich wrapper. It’s his sandwich
Ab: P, take that out of the way
P: Yeah, don’t you feed him at all?
Ab: I tell you all the time. I do feed her
P: Babababa. Babababa
Ab: There you go, Christmas present

*Ab gives P a cake from her bag*

P: Thank you very much love
Ab: Cold isn’t it?
P: Not as bad as some days we’ve had
Ab: Are you sure?
P: Babababa
Ab: Do you have gloves?
P: I have some gloves
Ab: Put them on

*A voice from nearby shouts ‘I’m gorgeous’*

P: I will do when I’ve had this to eat that I’m eating

*The rhythmic tapping sound of a blind man’s cane gets louder as it moves closer*

*As he walks along the blind man shouts ‘I’m beautiful’*

P: And I’m David Cameron. He’s a character him you know
Ab: You’re a character too you know

*Again the blind man shouts ‘I’m beautiful’*

Ab: Ok P, see you later
P: Ok and thank you very much love

*We move on, leaving P in the doorway*

The tapping sound fades as it moves further away

---

8 An abridged version if this chapter has been accepted for publication in the journal *Disability and Society*
Some introductions

This vignette, enacted on a cold afternoon in December, features a handful of Rusholme regulars. Ab, a young woman from Barcelona, and To, her dog guide, introduce me to some characters who populate their favourite Mancunian route, the so called curry mile, which is lined with Pakistani, Indian, Middle Eastern restaurants and Hookah bars. P puts a brave face on a frozen afternoon. He is only thinking about wearing gloves as he babbles away to us, and himself, alternately (’Babababa’). To, a longhaired Labrador, sniffs at Paddy’s sandwich. S, a loudmouth with a cane, proclaims ‘I’m beautiful, I’m gorgeous’ as he walks past us (tap tap tap). Ab and To know these characters well and bring me up to speed as we walk

A: How did you meet these people?
Ab: I once came out of the hospital and I had had an operation and I was alone and P, he always scared me a lot because he went ‘Babababa’ and at some point I thought ok I might as well talk to him. So we talked and I got him a coffee. And if I have some food I always give it to him. He’s always drunk.
A: He seemed ok
Ab: Yeah he’s ok now, but he gets drunk he can get a bit aggressive
A: And the other guy?
Ab: I don’t know, he goes around talking and shouting and I shout him back. We don’t talk much we, always shout at each other. You’ve met two of the most important characters in Rusholme

Laughs

Ab and To are Rusholme characters too. They have been companions for five years now and are ex-members of the I16. Although not inseparable, they are rarely seen apart. When I first met them at the International Society a few weeks before our walk Ab told me that the two-mile stretch from the society to Platt Fields, incorporating the curry mile, was her favourite Mancunian route

A: Which bits of Manchester would you say you know best?
Ab: Well this area round the university I know quite a lot because I used to study there, and then I live in Rusholme so I know Rusholme quite well
A: What are your best known routes or walks?
Ab: I love the Oxford Road, to walk along the Oxford Road, and the curry mile

Ab and To were introduced to one another at a training centre for dog guides in Michigan, U.S., five years ago. Since then they have lived together in Barcelona, in India (during two years volunteering with visually impaired children) and now in Manchester. Each re-location has brought a new set of walks, new routes and places to be learned together
A: When you move to a new city she also has to learn these new walks doesn’t she?
Ab: Of course, yeah. I learn them, then I take her with me

Ab and To have developed a transformative working relationship that is forged on engaged, mobile, multi-sensory experience

Ab: She gave me all the freedom and it’s because of her that I’m here, it’s because of her that I moved out of my parents, everything

Although skeptical initially, Ab’s first outing with To, in a public park in Michigan, left her in no doubt that the two of them would become a working team

A: What was the moment like when you first met her?
Ab: I was still sort of, you know
A: Skeptical?
Ab: Yeah, skeptical, I would love her of course, but the moment when I felt ‘wow this is crazy’ is when we were in a park, in the training, in Michigan, and there’s a park and it goes along for two kilometers, and they said we’re just gonna leave you here and you’re gonna go round the park, because the dog is not gonna go on the grass, it’s trained to go around the park so you’re gonna be alright, we’re gonna be watching you. So I’m walking with To, I am alone, no-one’s watching and I feel so free and we started running and I was running with no-one next to me, like just totally alone with To, but it felt already part of me so I felt like I’m free. It was so good and we started running, it’s mad and I was crying and I can’t believe this is happening. That was the moment I thought yeah, maybe those people are right about the dogs

Operating as place-making companions Ab and To have become what Michalko (1999) has called a dog-guide team. Michalko uses the term ‘alone-together’ to depict his relationship with his own dog guide, Smokie. There is, he says, as much unity with each other as there is separateness from each other, a sentiment that resonates with Ab

A: I presume you’ve never lost her
Ab: Oh yeah, I’ve lost her many times, because you know we’re not so attached, we’re kind of independent. She’s really independent. When I’m not there she’s alright. Sometimes I go out at night and I don’t want to take her, with other people, like if it’s in a club. Sometimes I take her to the club, but if it’s really noisy the security man will ask if I want to put her in the back room, so I will just put her in the back room, have a dance and then come back
Questions of distinctness are vexed ones for dog-guide teams, reflecting the many ways there are to construct blindness (Michalko, 1999). Some see it as a tragic event that befalls an individual who is left to cope alone (MacPherson, 2011). Michalko prefers a more relational construction. He has made the decision to enter into this world as a two-in-one, as part of a dog team. Relational constructions such as these rely on our constructing working dogs like Smokie and To as cultured, trained animals, not just creatures of nature. Dog guides are separated from nature by virtue of their training (Michalko, 1999). In their work, they are connected to their companions in a reciprocal relationship of giving, taking, leading and following. In this mutuality, ownership and leadership constantly change hands within the dog guide team, like a baton in a relay. As Michalko (1999) explains here, moving through the world as companions enables places to be generated through mobile engagement

Smokie and I move through the world alone together, focusing on one another in the midst of the plurality of our world and its many blindesses. I experience my blindness together with Smokie in this plurality. The world we generate springs from our communication in the midst of the world and from our movement through it (1999:198)

Likewise, Ab and To generate their world by moving through it, repetitively learning routes, meeting characters, creating knowledge

A: You came to Manchester together, so you both had to learn a new place
Ab: Yes
A: It’s through repetition that you learn these things
Ab: This is how Tori and me learn, of course, yeah

Animal turns

Animals are roaming the Groves of Academe. They bark and paw at the threshold of the Ivory Tower (Stewart, 2007:272)

Over the past twenty or thirty years in the fields of environmental studies, psychology, cultural geography and anthropology, there has been greater emphasis on the importance of animal-centred research (Ingold, 2000, Swart, 2007). Narratives about early hunting and gathering practices, domestication and husbandry, have become more common (Haraway, 2003, Smith, 2002). So-called ‘animal studies’ is growth area in academia. It has its own journals, publishing work on topics such as, for example, the role of animals in the construction of identities. These developments tempt us towards a relational rethinking of the self as we consider human-animal interactions; issues relating to the sensitive issues of how ‘natural kinds’ and
‘cultured kinds’ differ and interact as nature-cultures (Haraway, 2003). There is also a reconsideration of prevailing cognitive hierarchies and certainties, which facilitates the opening up of psychological subject matters. All of which reflects a move towards a deeper understanding of animals and their roles in human history and practices. It was in the context of these developments that I approached my work with Ab and To. Specifically, our collaboration offers an opportunity to explore a human-animal collaborative practice that fuses bodies and generates emplaced knowledge through walking and place making.

**Cultured dogs**

When To sniffs P’s lunch and arrests our progress momentarily I am reminded of the precarious line she treads between working, trained, cultured companion and natural animal who is subject to her natural instincts. In that moment the nature-culture border is breached. Around this border conversations habitually take place about the nature of animal and the culture of domesticated companionship. Donna Haraway, in *A Companion Species Manifesto* (2003), argues that we are mistaken to regard dogs, our primary companion species, as natural beings at all. Since their emergence as human companions around 15,000 years ago in Asia, dogs and wolves have pursued humans relentlessly, living where we live, scavenging our waste, forming ongoing, reciprocal co-evolutionary relationships. Throughout this shared history certain breeds have been selected by humans and dogs themselves have adapted to our lifestyles (Haraway, 2003). Thus, humanity has contributed to the kinds of dogs that have become domesticated. Dogs have become cultured. Through such processes of coevolution the porous distinction between natural and cultural beings is revealed. Through domestication and cohabitation humans and animals have co-evolved, emerged with mutual benefits, rather than one species shaping the other. According to this argument it is mistaken to see changes and adaptations in dogs’ bodies and minds as biological and those of humans as cultural. For Haraway (2003) there is no line drawn between biology and culture. Co-constitutive companion species and coevolution are the rule, not the exception.

Although still likely to sniff at the odd sandwich on the pavement, To generally tows the line of the cultured, working dog. She is pretty well trained. On duty she observes the behavioural repertoire that helps to constitute her relationship with Ab. She follows rules that have been drilled into her, into both of them, through five years of repetition and shared practice. This culturing process is not merely a case of a human training a dog. It revolves around cultivating a working and living relationship, producing a two-in-one (Michalko, 1999). Here, Ab explains how she too had plenty to learn about being a dog companion.
Ab: Yeah, I met To when I was 19. I went to America to get training, for a guide dog. You have to apply for a guide dog first. They have tests, like strength in your hand, how much can you hear, orientation, psychology, are you gonna be responsible
A: So apparently not everyone would be suitable
Ab: People might not be able to take care of them

The reciprocity of the training regime, the culturing of a two-in-one, the forming of a single unit, requires learning for both parties

A: How do they train the guide dogs to make them so skilled, from when they were just ordinary dogs?
Ab: It’s a lot of training, you know like using obstacles and crossroads. That’s quite easy because it’s really mechanical anyway, but it’s also about what you do afterwards, because once you get her she’s gonna try and push you to edges, like, because you’re a new person, so if you let her do something she’s gonna do it, like if you let her jump on the bed, or nor stop on the crossroads she’s not gonna do it. So you have to work a lot, she’s not gonna give it to you. There’s a lot of work that you have to do, it’s probably like a year to get adjusted to the dog and adjusted to you

In dog we trust
Training and domestication is a two-way street, rather than an exercise in obedience training. Historically, argues Ingold (2000), animality has been painted as something wild, natural, to be overcome. Central to this construction is a perceived inability of animals to overcome their instincts (‘What’s she sniffing now?). Domestication thus emerges as the exertion of control over animals. These narratives of domestication imply a dualism of humanity and nature. Animals inhabit a natural world that humans exceptionally transcend. In this context we can see domestication of animals as a feat of engineering extending into husbandry, breeding and the training of companion species (Haraway, 2003). Arguably, the evolution of dogs is a chapter in the history of biotechnology (Russell, 2011), with dogs cast as engineered technologies of companionship, defense, mobility and entertainment. Yet Ingold prefers a more relational portrayal of human-animal relations. This relational portrayal is shared by Smith (2002), who invited rescued rabbits into her home in order to co-enact their hitherto misunderstood relationship with domestic space

For many years I lived with the incomprehensibility of rabbit interior decorating. Rabbits insisted on creating specific kinds of space. Because I did not understand them, rabbit behaviour seemed mindless. Once I gathered the now obvious point that they enacted a
desire for safe spaces, they suddenly became much smarter (2002:193)

For Ingold (2000), a relational dynamic between humans and animals relies on a principle of trust, defined as a mixture of autonomy and dependency. In trusting relationships both parties act with the other in mind and hope that this will be reciprocated, yet without any overt intention of curbing their autonomy. Thus, animals in companionable relationships do not act independently, but in (trusting) relation with a human. In return they are not dominated or captured. They present themselves as part of an ongoing mutuality. In such working, trusting relationships, the animal is empowered to bail out if coercion is sensed. The level of trust that facilitates such autonomy depends upon accruing knowledge of how the other will react in given situations, sensitivity to another’s tastes, moods, limits and idiosyncrasies, which is acquired by sharing and companionship. It is knowledge, not power, that provides the means by which the world is opened up and constructed by a human-animal team.

Accumulated knowledge, mutuality and reciprocity are written into Ab-To, the dog-guide team Ab and To have formed over five years of mobile engagement. They know each other’s limits

A: You have to have boundaries and limits
Ab: You have to have rules and the dog has to know you
A: Because you’re looking after her as well aren’t you?
Ab: Of course yeah, you look after her, you have to make sure that she’s fine
A: Is she demanding?
Ab: No
A: Is that because of the way that you’ve trained her?
Ab: Yeah, we adjust to each other so much. She knows when I need help I know when she needs help

Choices they make regarding where they go and how they spend time have nothing to do with power and domination, everything to do with relationality. This is evident here in Ab’s explanation for their attachment to the International Society, a haven where both are known and feel at home

A: But once I’m in here I feel so much at home. When I was doing my Erasmus I used to spend all my time here, so it’s just like a feeling of home, getting in there and then suddenly boom, you feel at home. To does never want to leave; she always likes pushes in, she doesn’t want to leave

Ingold (2000) argues that the re-writing of relations between animals and humans, from a narrative of domination to one of trust, might best be written by those who share their time most meaningfully with animal
While both humans and animals have histories of their mutual relations, only humans narrate such histories. But to construct a narrative, one must already dwell in the world and, in the dwelling, enter into relationships with its constituents, both human and non-human (2000:76)

**Knots in motion**

Ab-To walks together, a six-legged assemblage for navigating and accruing emplaced knowledge. Dog-guide teams, cyborgs and other cross-species assemblages are boundary-crossing comings together of human/non-human, organic/technological and nature/culture (Haraway, 2003). In their constitutive acts of prehension (grasping), the resulting nature-cultures are enacted and embodied. These assemblages do not pre-exist their relating. There is no Ab-To prior to their relational engagement. Nature-cultures are the product of relating. They are “knots in motion” (Haraway, 2003:6). For non-representation theory where relational materialism is the norm, where as a matter of course we are fused into technologies and other actants (Thrift, 2007), there are no discrete, pre-existing subjects and objects. There are only varieties of intensities of relating. The practice of bringing one another into being through practice, mobility and prehension is an ontological choreography (Haraway, 2003) that sees people, animals and things hook up to define each other and conjure worlds they move through. The variety of intensity of relating that constitutes Ab-To is fairly all pervading. They are together most of the time. When they encounter a new place, arrive in a new city, together they walk and learn

Ab: *She would know where home is and she would just take me home. And she would know where my uni is so she would, I would do the route with her and once we had done it two or three times she would learn it straight away*

Doing the knowledge as a two-in-one, routes are stamped in through mobile repetition. Like a phantom limb, when T isn’t around Ab imagines here there

A: *You’re almost part of the same person who’s moving around and coming to know a new place, does it feel like that?*
Ab: *Yeah, it does, like when she’s not with me I feel she’s there all the time, like when I go to sleep she’s there*

An insight into how Ab-To operates struck me as we were walking through Whitworth Park to Rusholme. I asked Ab if the two of them were walking differently as a unit because I was with them. When she answered with their
bodies, it was clear I was holding them back

A: So do you normally walk quite fast or quite slow?
Ab: Fast, very fast
A: Because you’ve probably noticed I’m quite a slow walker
Ab: That’s ok
A: Do you think To’s thinking ‘god these people are so slow?’
Ab: Come on, no, she’s very adjustable
A: So just tell me how she is different when she walks with someone else?
Ab: You see how she is now, not paying attention, smelling in the floor?
A: So if I wasn’t here what would she be doing?
Ab: She would walk…

To and Ab walk ahead off into the distance, at their normal pace, leaving me behind
A: Come back! She’s trotting. I get it

It’s just a dog
Being outpaced in Whitworth Park taught me that accompanying a team that habitually walks the streets as a two-in-one affects their dynamic. Now that we were eight legs my presence interfered with the normal, working routine. I was privileged to be invited along and, for an afternoon at least, to become their third member. Walking in close proximity, linking arms with Ab, staying on the shoulder of To, taught me more about the nature of the dog-guide relationship. When I first met Ab I was struck by what I construed as her dispassionate attitude towards To. She was unsentimental, but always respectful. It was clear that her feelings for her companion were based in trust and mutuality, rather than mere animal loving affection

Ab: I don’t like it when people goes too crazy about animals, because, because you have it here in England, ‘Oh, soooo, cuuute’, and you know I have friends who will cry about a dog, like they’ll see a dog with a jumper, ‘Oh, soooo, cuuute’, and then they have a friend who is in trouble, and you know=
A: =Yes it’s hypocritical isn’t it?
Ab: Yeah, yeah, they have this thing about animals, they just go crazy and at the end of the day yeah they’re lovely and amazing but, I don’t know, I didn’t understand this
A: I am a bit of a soft person with animals
Ab: I don’t know, I am from the countryside, animals are for working or eating, Or they can give you company. But of course I loved animals, of course, but I wasn’t too crazy about them, and when I heard people saying ‘Oh, it’s going to be so amazing to be with this dog and she’s gonna be with you all the time and you’re just gonna lover be so much’, well yeah but it’s just a dog in the end
As we left the International Society and negotiated our first pelican crossing as a three-in-one we began to attract attention, a common occurrence for Ab-To. At the crossing, a stranger intervened

**Traffic noises**

S: May I ask is he a working dog or a guide dog?
Ab: Yeah, she’s a guide dog
S: Oh right, well it’s nice to meet you
Ab: Yeah, nice to meet you too
S: What is your dog called?
Ab: To
S: Oh how lovely

**Beeping sound**

‘Oh how lovely’. On hearing this parting comment I was reminded of my own first reaction to To, which was to stroke her and say how cute she was. Now, out in the street, To’s workplace, I remembered Haraway’s (2003) remarks about our habitual portrayals of domesticated animals as providers of unconditional love. The image of a cuddly, cute, all-loving creature is, she argues, demeaning. After interviewing dog breeders and trainers of working dogs in the Pyrenees, she calls for a reexamination of the meaning of dog-love. For her, love is not about directing or receiving unconditional affection to or from specific creatures. It is more relational than this. Companion love constitutes a respectful regard for the work that goes on between animal and human. In a non-representational sense, these sentiments transcend individuality and are oriented towards (emerge from) relational practice (Thrift, 2007). As such the value, respect or love we ascribe to dog guides, based as it is on mutuality, trumps mere affection. The situating of affect in the space between individuals is appropriate, since during the course of a working journey the effectiveness of the team so often depends on judgments and decisions that are made by one party (sometimes the dog, sometimes the human) for the good both (dog and human). This form of distributed cognition (thinking for two) was illustrated on our walk when Ab-To were re-acquainted with their former hall of residence after three years absence. After some deliberation To led them back to their former home

A: Let’s see how good her memory is
Ab: I haven’t been here for so long
A: Can you remember how long it was since you came?
Ab: Three years. Now she’s confused. She doesn’t know where she’s going. I don’t remember anything. It was the ground floor I used to live. Yeah it was here wasn’t it? I’m not really sure. Don’t go in front of her. Where is this now? Which one is this?
A: Well, it says Flat 10
Ab: Mine was Flat 13 and it had a big bamboo bush
A: Did you say it was 13?
Ab: Yeah
A: I think we went past it
Ab: Did we?
A: I think so
Ab: Where? She doesn’t remember
A: I think it might have been where she tried to go
Ab: Yeah, I think so. Ab I haven’t been here for so long. Wow
A: So I think she did know
Ab: I’m sure she did.

This episode shows that in a dual-species relationship the primary demand on the human is one of relationality, where one is required to be ever sensitive, to

see who the dogs are and to hear what the are telling us, not in bloodless abstraction, but one-to-one relationship, in otherness-in-connection (Haraway, 2003:45)

Dog-guide teams are a relational practice, not just a training exercise (Haraway, 2003). Out of practice and conversation, co-productive cognition emerges. Solutions are worked out through processes of relating, guiding and following. Although precise methods of training may vary, what matters is the effectiveness of communication across difference (Haraway, 2003). Emplaced cognition and relational problem solving happen within ethical, productive relationships, out of joint action (Shotter, 2008) that is built on respect, not just the disciplining of one by the other. Whilst communication across difference may never lead us to entirely know another’s mind (or even one’s own), relational practice can yield knowledge of what emerges between us. The emergence of knowledge in spaces between collaborators is a recurring theme throughout this project. The modest productivity of collaborative practice has emerged in diverse, multisensorial forms, including maps (chapter five), soundscape compositions (chapter six), photographs (chapter seven), hybrid postcards (chapter eight), artefacts and short stories (chapter nine). In each of these encounters, collaborators, companions, have brought each other and their places into being through mutuality, trust and mobile engagement

I believe that all ethical relating, within or between species, is knit from the silk-strong thread of ongoing alertness to otherness-in-relation. We are not one, and being depends on getting on together.
The obligation is to ask who are present and who are emergent (Haraway, 2003:50)

In their work together Ab and To have constructed an ethical relationship, a place making team that enables them to make sense of, bring meaning to, the routes they have engaged with together. The ethics that inhabit Ab-To are not afforded by individuals. Rather, they are relational ethics that have been generated from respect, attention and responsiveness. Much like places themselves, in a phenomenological sense (Cresswell, 2004), these ethics do not pre-exist relationality and engagement; they emerge from them.

Border crossings
As Ab, To and I progressed from Whitworth Park to Rusholme we crossed several borders simultaneously. Together we went over ontological, sensory and geographical lines. As I grew accustomed to moving as a three-in-one my perceptions of the world were accustoming themselves to a more pronounced relationality. I was not walking; we were walking. We were operating at the borders of individual ontology, as a metamorphosing being (Bennett, 2001). Like cat-women, cloned sheep and chess-playing computers, we were in an ongoing state of transgression and always becoming. For Bennett (2001), the dynamic power of the trans-individual lies in a mobile capacity to travel, morph, transform and cross borders of ontology. Cyborgs, Turing machines, eight-legged assemblages and other hybrids are transformations of mind and body. Their resonant, dynamic power, their capacity for enchantment (Bennett, 2001), owes much to their mobility. Examples from myth and literature illustrate these restless states of ontological, mobile transgression (Bennett, 2001). Andoar, a human-goat hybrid in Michel Tournier’s novel, Friday (1967), descends from the joyful eponymous hero and a dour, fearless goat. Combining the characteristics of its constituents, Andoar extends the limits of individual embodiment. Similarly, Kafka’s Rotpeter (in A Report to the Academy, 1917) passes from ape-being to human-being, becoming simultaneously both and neither. An ape, captured and caged, Rotpeter finds his way into humanity, a second enclosure, with all the restrictions this affords. Such networked, restless beings are constitutive alliances of the non-human, inorganic and human (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987). Their assembled, extended bodies outgrow individuality. As they do so they inhabit fluid inter-subjectivities. Besides these mythical, fictional assemblages, the more mundane practices of dressage, cohabiting with rabbits (Smith, 2002) and robotics (Clark, 2008), satisfy similar criteria (see chapter three). For Bennett (2001) these experiments in inter-subjectivity share a constitutive relation to movement. A desire for some form of mobility haunts all these assemblages. Be it an urge to enter humanity, escape animality, develop intelligence, to transcend
individuality or merely to roam and construct places, restlessness lies at the
duplicitive heart of these assembled beings.

_A re prioritization of the senses_

For one who habitually walks alone, being enlisted into a three-in-one sent
me over more than just one kind of border. Besides experimenting with
inter-subjectivities, the visually compromised nature of our threesome
heralded an alternate sensory order of things. Walking with Ab-To I
experienced first hand what has been stated by several authors; that the
primacy of the visual sense is not a universal given (Gell, 1985, Ingold, 2000,
Howes, 2004 and see chapter seven). As I walked arm in arm with Ab-To, I
walked too with Umida forest dwellers of Papua New Guinea whose vision
is a secondarily important sense; sound occupying the primary place in their
sensory hierarchy (Gell, 1985). As for the Umida, so dependent on sound,
smell and proprioception for navigation and sense making, my own place
making thrived on an alternate sensory hierarchy. Courtesy of mobilities I
experiences in a team that thrived on listening, feeling and smelling, I
experienced a rearrangement of the senses that recalled some of the
re prioritizations of previous collaborations. With F, my attention was drawn
to audition (chapter six). With Al, it was drawn to olfaction (chapter eight).
Here, within earshot of the Rusholme border, as a co-dependent, physically
linked member of a three-in-one, co-experiencing the alternate sensory
engagements of Ab-To, I was encouraged to engage with places I thought I
already new in novel, multi-sensory ways

At the steps of the Students’ Union I felt something new underfoot

_A: So do you know the Student Union?  
Ab: Yeah, I know because in front of the union there is the lines  
A: Ah yeah, so why are those lines there?  
Ab: To know that there are steps  
A: Right. That’s so weird I’ve never noticed that before

Inside Ab’s former hall of residence I was directed to the sound of our feet

_A: The floor used to be wooden. It used to go clop clop. Is it here the wooden floor?  
A: It’s Carpeted. Do you think To remembers? So what there is here is=

_Sound footsteps on a wooden floor_

_A: =That’s it  
A: Did you feel it?  
A: Yeah, that’s what I remember  
A: But it has carpet on it  
A: I know but
A: I know what you mean; it went hollow didn’t it?
Ab: Exactly, I remember that noise

In the Whitworth Park halls the importance of floor noise came home to me

**Sound of footsteps on a wooden floor**
Ab: 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 the stairs
A: I know what you mean about noisy floors
Ab: 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. I used to watch American movies and whenever they moved about they made…

**Ab Stamps on wooden floor**
Ab: I love that noise

In McCoys mini-market a new soundscape revealed itself

**Approaching the door**
Ab: It opens alone. And when you get in you can here the fridge ‘zzzzzzzzzzz’ sound
Can you hear? And the smell is quite particular. And you can hear the fridge. Because sometimes I’m not sure which building I’m in, so I remember this sound

Outside Gregg’s bakery a mysterious rustling sound was explained

Ab: This is the Greggs, can you hear?

**Sounds of rustlings and traffic**
A: I can yeah, is that just people with like crinkly=
Ab: =Exactly
A: I didn’t know what you meant by that, but=
Ab: =That’s what I mean. And you can smell it
A: You used to go here?
Ab: I couldn’t help it. It smelled to good. I used to go and buy Muffins
A: It must be tempting being so close

**Sounds of rustling**
Laughter
Ab: Everybody loves this place, making this sound
A: I guess it’s because they put them in a bag and by the time they get to the door they’re making the rustling sound because they’re starting to open the bag
Ab: I do the same

At the pedestrian crossing, the border between Whitworth Park and Rusholme, I experienced a revelatory tactile experience
A: So here we go, up to the traffic lights, here

Ab: You will see it. Just touch here, down here. Touch it and wait

My hand is directed underneath the small yellow box at the pedestrian crossing, where I can feel a small cone (out of sight) protruding

A: The cone, oh yeah, what is it?
Ab: Now wait, until it goes green
A: Ok, is this instead of sound? Oh my God

The lights change, the traffic stops and the cone begins to revolve in my fingers

Ab: It's green right?
A: Yeah, oh my god, how did you find out about that?
Ab: The guide dogs people told me. It's the best system ever
A: It's unbelievable. Can I do it again? Did you find out from=
Ab: =I found out from the guide dog people, we don't have that in Spain. Most people don't know about it

On entering Rusholme I am directed to changes in the sensory landscape

Ab: So this is like another world now, going to the other world
A: Why do you say that?
Ab: Because this is Rusholme. It's the other world. We've crossed the border.
For me like that traffic lights, they mark the border
A: What's so different about this new world?
Ab: It's very different. 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. They way they talk is different. They sometimes, most of the times, they talk on the phone really loudly and loads of them walk with plastic bags, with schk-schk
A: Also we've just come out of the park where it was quiet
Ab: Yeah, the smell of shisha most of the time, especially in the evening. A lot of music, a lot of colours, I guess

Walking in intercorporeal space

My experience of crossing multiple borders (individual/inter-subjective, primarily visual/multi-sensory, Whitworth Park/Rusholme) was an exercise in the exploration of inter-corporeal space (MacPherson, 2011). As I engaged with place in novel ways I grew sensitive to the spaces between Ab, To and myself. The reciprocal practice of guiding and being guided highlights the importance of inter-corporeal space. MacPherson (2011) demonstrates this in her work with visually impaired walking groups in the Peak District National Park (England). For her, inter-corporeal spaces are those that emerge (open up) between volunteer guides and guided walkers. For Ab-To and I, whilst these spaces are equally relevant, our identities as
guides and guided were more dynamic. Sometimes I guided

**Sound of footsteps climbing stairs in Whitworth Park halls**

A: Right, we’re probably better going one at a time because it’s quite narrow.
Shall I go first or do you want to go?
Ab: You go
A: It’s quite narrow

More often, I was guided, as in this exchange, outside the Gemini Take Away, where the role of the guide was passed (like a baton again) mid-conversation

A: Shall we keep going? This is a cycle path here
Ab: I know and sometimes I stand there as well and the cycles will go past and I get scared. The Gemini is here too?
A: Oh Gemini, yes that’s a bit further on
Ab: No the Gemini Take-Away, we just passed it?
A: Oh sorry, yes, no you’re right
Ab: Yes because I can feel that there’s open space here, and you can smell it
A: Sorry my mistake
Ab: I used to go there to get my pizza all the time
A: Did you? I’d forgotten about that. I’m thinking of another one
Ab: Yes, but this one is the take away in the corner. See it?
A: Do you know until you said that I had no idea there were two Geminis

Guide-walker relationships are often glossed as ones where worthy, selfless individuals lead unsighted dependents. Arguably a synchronous, relational, dance-like construction takes us closer to understanding the inter-corporeal space Ab-To and I walked in. Our synchrony was based on pre-reflective movements emerging from a coupling (or tripling) of body-schemas that render visual content less important. Out of the emergent inter-corporeality emerges a sensing for two or three, a movement as one (MacPherson, 2011). This conception takes seriously the coupled (tripled) nature of bodies that transcend individual bounded selves (see chapter two and Thrift, 2008). Together, mobile, distributed assemblages bring into being both the inter-corporeal space between components and the places they move through as a whole (Ingold, 2000). These notions of distributed identity and inter-corporeality are evident too in Merleau-Ponty’s (1962) extension of human perception into a blind person’s cane. Non-representational, multi-sensory apprehensions of visual impairment are detectable too in Hetherington’s (2003) study of a visually impaired person’s movement through a museum. Macpherson (2011) extends this idea by exploring not just the blind person’s immersion into material technology, but into others’ bodily movements. Exploring emergent inter-corporeality, Macpherson seeks to
attend to how people with blindness are also involved in a co-emergent world involving joint ways in which they orientate and attune themselves (2011:4)

Writing in 1908, here Helen Keller speaks volumes for my own experience of a co-emergent world that thrives on sensory reprioritization and the co-productivity of a three-in-one

It might seem that the five senses would work intelligently together only when resident in the same body. Yet when two or three are left unaided, they reach out for their compliments in another body, and find that they yoke easily with the borrowed team. When my mind lags, wearied with the strain of forcing out thoughts about dark, music-less, colorless, detached substance, it recovers its elasticity as soon as I resort to the powers of another mind which commands light, harmony, color (Keller, 1908: 58)

Michalko (1999) concurs in his description of leaving the training school where he was first united with Smokie

I had arrived at the school as simply “me” but I was leaving as “we,” as part of a dog guide team (1999:82)

Macpherson (2011) relates her experiences of inter-corporeality as a sighted guide moving through new routes for the visually impaired. My work with Ab-To has similarities with this, although arguably the relationships in our guide team were more reciprocal and interchangeable. The three of us were sometimes guiding, sometimes being guided, through known routes that were under construction even as we moved through them. Here Charidi (2009) captures something of the reciprocity of the guide team relationship

The blind and the sighted try to move in a coordinated way, let’s say schematically as one body. This draws the practice of guidance out of its authoritative use of ‘showing the way’ and puts together blind and sighted in the world of sight’s absence. On the one hand, I had to move in the space ‘like’ him and see ‘instead’ of him. He had to “lean on” my eyes and perceive through my body what I see. Thus, moving “as one body” entails a mutual motion towards the other (2009:4)

The reciprocity of guiding is acknowledged too by Macpherson (2011). She notes how the guided person teaches the guide how to do the job of being effective guide. In my own venture into inter-corporeality with Ab-To, I learned that in the reciprocal practice of guiding, knowledge is constantly being exchanged and created on the move.
The generosity of the guided

Inter-corporeal spaces are generous places. The mutuality of guiding and being guided elicits generosity in all directions. Not merely the altruistic generosity of one individual helping another. Rather, a form of definitive generosity that inevitably emerges within trusting companionships (Macpherson, 2011). Within the relational entity of guided and guide, the practised, habitual, synchronized movement of guiding engenders a form of corporeal generosity (Diprose, 2002) that is borne of the erosion of the individuals’ boundaries.

Generosity is an openness to others that not only precedes and establishes communal relations, but constitutes the self as open to otherness. Moreover, generosity, so understood, happens at a pre-reflective level, at the level of corporeality and sensibility, and so eschews the calculation characteristic of an economy of exchange. Generosity is being given to others without deliberation in a field of inter-corporeality (2002:4-5)

The concept of inter-corporeal generosity jars against discourses of individual tragedy (Diprose, 2002) that often prevail in discussions of visual impairment; the guided partner cast as grateful recipient of assistance. In relationships that are built on mutuality, the guided gives the gift of trust to their guides (MacPherson, 2011). This is the generosity of the guided. In our three-in-one where the role of guide is shared and rotated, between Ab, To an myself, the generosity of the guided permeated our exchanges. Ab-To were generous enough to allow me into their alternate sensory world (even though I slowed them down). They were generous enough to lead me over ontological and multisensory borders that I would not have otherwise found.

A: I’ve learned so much this afternoon about how you negotiate places with her

Gratifyingly, I was pleased to find that the inclusion of Ab-To in my research project was also considered to be an act of generosity. For Ab, it offered an opportunity articulate a relationship with the places the two of them move habitually through

A: Has it been an interesting experience for you?
Ab: You realize things, like the wooden floor thing, I’ve never thought about it before. And, I don’t know, the smells and all, I kind of feel them but I never say this, I never talk about it.

Walking with Ab-To afforded me a reprioritization of the senses and a first-hand experience of inter-subjectivity. We crossed into and co-constructed
the oft-unexplored inter-corporeal spaces that lie between people, animals, things and places. These emergent, in-between spaces have featured in several collaborations in this project; for example in the creative spaces between myself An (chapter seven), Al (chapter eight) and B (chapter nine). Yet in the case of Ab-To, because we worked so close to the borders of inter-subjectivity, as a physically connected three in one, it was even more evident to me that inter-corporeal spaces are ones that join us together, rather than separate us out.

Post-script: Off the leash
The experience of walking as a three-in-one through inter-corporeal space came unnaturally to me. I had to learn to pay attention to different sensory modalities, to attend to perceptual practices of two others. Macpherson (2011) underwent a similar learning process in her countryside walks as a volunteer guide. We both had to learn to use touch, taps on the arm, as well as our voices. At times though, a little like To sniffing at P's lunch on the pavement, it was possible to lose concentration and fall back into our old ways of ‘looking after yourself’

On the grass at Plass Fields
Ab: I'm going to release her now.

Ab lets To off the leash
Ab: What's this here?
A: This is that little fence and this is a wall that you're probably familiar with
Ab: It's better if we walk now and then she follows us

I make my way into the park, alone
A: You ok?
Ab: No, you have to help me
A: Sorry, I forgot about you. We've just got to get around this barrier. Sorry,
Ab: A she's back. Ok let's go. Oh she's excited

To runs around
Ab: She's a different dog now. She's off work.
Chapter Eleven

Towards an emplaced psychology
Answers, appeals, reflections

In researching the ongoing, always becoming process of place making, it would be inappropriate to end my thesis with definitive conclusions. The processual notion of making space meaningful necessarily invites always becoming, inconclusive sentiments (‘inconclusions’). Nevertheless, during this final chapter I can be more strident in offering three strands of enlightenment following my period in the field. I am confident that I can offer up some enlightening answers, some heartfelt appeals and some personal reflections. My answers are a response to my original research question

How do newly arrived internationals develop meaningful attachments to and emplaced knowledge of their new city?

They have emerged as a result of the collaborations I have curated. My appeals are contributions to knowledge in the interdisciplinary field into which I have positioned myself, between psychology, cultural geography, cultural anthropology and collaborative arts practice. Specifically, these appeals are directed towards psychology. They are appeals for a more non-representational, multidisciplinary engagement with the concept of place. These appeals are serious challenges, laid down to practitioners who study place perception, to reconsider some elements of their practice. My personal reflections are more personal ruminations, gathered whilst conducting this collaborative sensory ethnography, and can be regarded as evaluations of the limits of my chosen, crafted, research method.

1. Answers
The impetus for this project came from a desire to question about how newly encountered space becomes meaningful by being invested with meaning through the practice of routine living.

In pursuit of answers to this question, during my ethnographic practice I established a series of partnerships with collaborators who were all new arrivals to a city; Manchester-Salford. My research question addresses ways in which these internationally diverse collaborators developed meaningful constructions of their new city. Having worked over a period of eighteen months with these collaborators I would now like to offer some answers to my initial research question. In conveying these answers I will synthesise the emergent stories and knowledge that grew from our work together with
the theoretical positions and approaches that I have explored throughout the project.

In prefacing these answers I would like to suggest, somewhat facetiously perhaps, that the work I have curated during the this project has taught me that my original research question, the one I began asking all those months ago before I knew anything about the 116, the one that seemed so elusive when I first inherited it from the work of Latham (2004), might actually provoke a polyphony of responses. This might conceivably come about in a conversation that goes something like this

Q: How do newly arrived internationals develop meaningful attachments to and emplaced knowledge of their new city?

A: With all of their senses
A: With their bodies
A: Relationally voiced simultaneously
A: From movement
A: Through performances

We should be unconcerned that these responses are spoken simultaneously. Indeed, a non-representational approach to place perception would predict there to be no single answer to any question that forms the basis of empirical investigation. A reflexive research project with this kind of anti-positivist stance would expect to uncover cacophonous responses, rather than a single, neat, underlying answer to any question posed (Thrift, 2007). It is therefore admissible to read these multiple responses in any order, or to hop from one to the other. They are neither consequential, chronological, linear, nor mutually exclusive. I will however, for the sake of coherence, present them one after the other. Let us then take each one of these simultaneously voiced, compatible and non-contradictory answers in turn, listen to them back in isolation and assess them as responses to my research question.

With all of their senses
Meanings invested in newly encountered places cannot, phenomenologically speaking, be separated from the sensory engagements. Arguably, the immediacy afforded by multisensory constructions of meaning overrides

---

* During this section I will illustrate these answers with collaborators’ quotes, most of which have not previously appeared in this thesis
more reflective, post-hoc, cognitivist models of perception. Sensory apprehensions of place are examples of pre-cognition, or living thinking (Thrift and Crang, 2001). Sensory apprehensions of the world, living thinking, is a critique of cognitivist portrayals of thought as internal information processing, such as Atkinson and Shiffrin’s (1968) multi-store model of memory, featuring internal stores such as short and long term memory (Miller, 1991), later to morph into the equally internalised notion of working memory (Baddeley, 2003). In opposition the internal location of cognition, living thinking hails practice based processes of developing emplaced knowledge. Literally, sense is made of places through multisensory engagements that beat centralized cognition to the punch. Thus, the task of the new arrival to a city becomes one of using their preferred sensory modalities to become practised makers of meaning.

The practice of sensuous place-making has been exemplified throughout my collaborative work for this project. The multisensory subjectivities of arrival have been a common thread. 

Whilst each of my collaborations for this project resonate with sensuous approaches to place making, I will offer examples from my work with F (chapter six), An (chapter seven), and Al (chapter eight) to illustrate the accumulation of meaning and knowledge through the senses. Each of these collaborators constructed Salford-Manchester from practice that drew on preferred sensory modalities.

F’s new city was invested with cacophonous meaning. Narratives of acoustic consonance and dissonance between Manchester-Salford and Bandung (Indonesia) drove her sensory narratives. By listening to the city, F made sense of Peel Park, Piccadilly Gardens and Salford Quays in relation to the sounds of Indonesia. Her relational acoustemology derived from amplified encounters in the field, not from mere introspection.

F: The park is pretty much representing my daily life in Manchester—simple, quiet, sometimes unexpected, and yet pretty intense. 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.

For An, Salford-Manchester was constructed during the making of her film Twearlies, for which she acted as sound operator and visual director. During her introduction to her new city, obliged as she was to find an idea for a film as a study requirement, An engaged visually with frames, angles, cutaways, acoustically overhead dialogue and ambient urban soundtracks. An’s new city was filled with meanings that were pregnant with cinematic possibilities.
An: I can’t really disconnect my view on Manchester from my view as a filmmaker.

Al’s Manchester was constructed largely from gustemological and olfactory engagement. The third-city of *Man-Tunis* is an emplaced fiction, hewn from transferable, pre-reflective sensations that transported Al between cities by virtue of taste and smell. Memories of Tunis, evoked in Manchester, resided in the immediacy of senses, rather than as internally stored units of knowledge. Al articulates this here, in Pop Boutique (Manchester), so reminiscent of the Medina.

*Al:* As soon as you walk, in the smell of old and mothballs and maybe even dust, and leather as well.

With their bodies
There is an embodied core to the on-going, often repetitive process of place making. Knowledge is acquired through strenuous practice. When investigating the embodied construction of meaning there is an obligation on the researcher to establish relationships that facilitate an enhanced alertness to this everyday practice. This requires the forging of overlapping (Pink, 2009), habitual experience of researcher and researched. Arguably, the emergent embodied intelligence has an immediacy that overrides internalised, contemplative cognition (Thrift and Crang, 2001). Practised knowledge derives from lived experience and is exemplified by the development of varieties of engagement with a newly encountered world. This relies on on-the-job intuiting rather than internally located knowledge stores (Varela, 1999).

All six of my collaborations taught me about the embodied construction of knowledge and the acquisition of emplaced meaning through strenuous, embodied engagement. Here, I will present examples from my work with T (chapter five), An (chapter seven), and B (chapter nine) to illustrate the link between emplaced meanings and corporeality.

For T, Salford-Manchester was brought into being through the repetitive, embodied practice of walking. Place gained significance through activity (Ingold, 2000). T’s weekly, church organised walks enabled her to morph from rather hesitant newcomer to knowledgeable city-dweller with routes under her belt. She mapped her city on the hoof, walking it over until it became a form of muscle-memory.

*T:* I think that as you go along, before Trinity Way, there are two churches, the Catholic Church and the church just around the corner. Those are the two things
that told us that we were going the right way. So we did that for a few weeks and I was confident to go to church on my own.

For An, filmmaking was more than mere visualisation of the city. My own overlapping, embodied experience of walking through the living set of *Twearlies* physically initiated me into the corporeal experience of film/place-making (MacDougall, 2006). Far from objectifying or ‘stilling’ her city through her lenses, she demonstrated to me how she had brought it to life corporeally through the making of her film. And then she did so again by leading me through the corporeal process by which she derived emplaced meaning amid embodied, social activity.

An: You have to build up a relationship with your contributors. One of the people we interviewed told us we should try to go to Bury Market, which is a bit further away, but we decided to go there, and we took the bus and we met an old couple on the bus and when we got off they saw us. It turned out that they were going to the market as well and we went with them. And they became the contributors in our film they were actually the old couple who reconnected after 60 years, if you remember.

B’s deployment of an embodied memory of arriving in Manchester-Salford was ingenious, not least because it precipitated my own overlapping embodied experience of arriving in a city for the first time. By setting (standing) me up in *Banhoff-Platz*, B did more than merely retrieve a memory from her own internal archive, she did more than merely convey in words her experience of arrival, she contrived for me to experience arrival and bewilderment corporeally and viscerally. She enacted disorientation vicariously.

I edged out into the afternoon sun, crouched down on my heels against the station façade, laid the envelope next to a dead cigarette butt on the cobbles and took a photograph of it...Rather than tear open the envelope I found myself delaying, crouching and staring at the burn that passed through the middle of it...doubled-up in sheer admiration (*Mensch Argere Dich Nicht!*)

Relationally
Places are constructed by actants that are indivisible from the environments they co-constitute. Furthermore, these actants are comprised of distributed, inter-related components (human, non-human, technological) that are indivisible from each other. The relationality at the fulcrum of these ideas manifested itself in various ways as I researched the construction of place amongst new arrivals to a city. Firstly, when emplaced knowledge emerged collaboratively (between researchers and researched), this knowledge was co-produced, rather than the product of individuals in places. Secondly,
emplaced knowledge emerged from humans’ relational practice with non-humans, other humans and their preferred technologies. Thirdly, the place-making narratives that new arrivals generated owed much to their relations (similarities, differences, simultaneities) with other, already known places (previously known places).

Whilst relationality (between people, places and technologies) played a part in all of my collaborations, I will present examples from my work with F (chapter six), Al (chapter eight), and Ab-To (chapter ten) all illustrate the relational nature of constructions of place.

F and I co-produced Salford-Manchester as she shared her recordings with me (Stevenson, 2013). As we listened to her soundscape compositions, our understandings of Salford Quays, Piccadilly Gardens and Peel Park were transformed in the act of sharing (Traux, 2000). Knowledge that had been produced by one person, coupled with her sound recording technologies, was constructed anew as we listened, sharing stories, co-producing new knowledge about place, for example about F’s relationship with Salford.

A: They’re recordings of you in Manchester. You very much see this as part of yourself
F: Yes. How I adapt with this city maybe

Al and I co-produced the third city of Man-Tunis, a relational place par excellence, using a memory-walking method that plays on relations between people and places (Schine, 2010). Through walking and talking in evocative Mancunian places, simultaneities between two cities were talked out between us. Our conversations yielded a fictional third place that was built from the perceived relations between Manchester and Tunis. At times, in certain evocative places, simultaneities were co-constructed in situ, in mid-conversation, rather than being retrieved or planned

Al: I never would have thought of that until just now. Why would I?
A: It only really comes to you from being here, again
Al: Yeah because the two places are so close together
A: And when you originally had the idea of using these two places=
Al:=I didn’t even think they were on the same street
A: They’re literally a stone’s throw aren’t they?
Al: And you can literally see one from the top of the other. I just made that distinction now

Ab-To constructed Manchester from a position of relationality that was extended when I was invited to join them (Stevenson, 2013). As a dog guide team, they constructed routes through the city by operating as a two-
in-one composite. A relational narrative of blindness was constructed, in which a process of mutual culturing (training) enabled Ab and To offer guidance to one another. Emplaced perceptions, affects and fears of one are distributed into the other, rather than being experienced individually.

\[ Ab: \text{ Are we in the park already? } \]
\[ A:\text{ We're just coming to it } \]
\[ Ab: \text{ So T always tries to go into the park, but at night she knows that it's dodgy so she doesn't do it, it's so cool } \]

From movement
Places are not fixed, bounded locations (Relph, 1976) or containers. Rather, they are constructed from trajectory-like engagements (Cresswell, 2004). They acquire meaning by dint of routes etched through them, or routes drawn from one place to another. Arguably then, new arrivals to a city develop emplaced meanings by virtue of connections made as they move through and between locations (Massey, 2008).

All of the collaborators I worked with during this project were dynamic by nature. All had very recently made life-changing decisions to move to the UK. Since their cohort of the I16 was disbanded (in April 2012), many have moved overseas once again, or at least are no longer living in Salford-Manchester. During the time when they did reside in Salford-Manchester their place making practice was unerringly dynamic. Their cities were made as they moved through, rather than lived in, them. Here I will use examples from my work with T (chapter five), Al (chapter eight) and B (chapter nine) to illustrate this dynamism.

T’s familiarity with Salford-Manchester was hard worn, and grew from repetitive walking. She did the knowledge by establishing familiar routes, rather than learning an overview, as she gained connections in local churches. Her route-by-route scouting took her along locations, rather than to them, yielding knowledge and meaning that often outstripped my own.

\[ A: \text{ Oh we're going this way? } \]
\[ T: =\text{This is another church} \]
\[ A: \text{ Is this one of the ones that you tried? } \]
\[ T: \text{ No} \]
\[ A: \text{ I really haven't been down here before. So we're going this way} \]
\[ T: \text{ Yeah we're going that way then we're going to cross over there, then over there, then we're going to take, er, that route} \]

Al’s construction of Manchester is oriented to another city she knows well. During her walks she gained street-by-street knowledge that made sense on
a global trajectory to Tunis. Connections she made between her two cities were largely made from mobile engagement within Manchester, walking streets, learning routes

A: You were telling me how you got to know some of the places we went to visit
Al: I was never scared of where I was but I would take the long way round places. I didn’t know the short cuts, and would kind of take a different route each day. It took me ages to finally get these things down pat
A: On foot?
Al: Yeah, all this is on foot. Because I told myself ‘Oh if I go on foot I’ll learn the city, if I go by bus, you know, I’ll never get it’

B also acquired meaningful knowledge on the hoof, walking herself into familiar city, repetitively moving from her flat to her work place and back again. After she left Manchester her memorial constructions of the city were intimately staked along a trajectory back to Germany. As she explained to me in Mainz, her feelings for the city are bound into her movements

B: I might have the images of Manchester of Mainz to take back to Manchester again, to see it in different view. I wonder about people who live in great cities, they don’t see what I see when I go there. I go back then and sometimes they see what I see because I am a traveller and they are people, the see just a different view

Through performances
Performatice place making practice eschews a requirement to explain attachments to place or provide definitive, underlying place knowledge. Performance condones unfinished, partial, fragmented accounts. Performed places are productions of partial knowledge, rather than reports on knowledge. Performance is skilled practice that demonstrates expertise and is appreciated by those who witness it (Dirksmeier & Helbrecht, 2008). In the context of place making as a skilled practice, levels of expertise should be understood as the accumulation of emplaced knowledge and meaning through repetitive daily living. This is comparable to the repetitive rehearsal that generates all manner of skilled practice, from tying shoelaces to playing King Lear. Anyone who routinely engages with a route or journey on foot, on two wheels, or even by navigating its soundscape, develops expertise in the form of emplaced knowledge and meaning. Learning a shortcut would be an example of such an expertise. Thus, in the context of place making, performances are skilled (learned through engagement) enactments of relationships with place. Being so diverse and multisensory in nature, these performances (enactments) of place are manifest in diverse media and cannot merely be served by traditional social scientific reportage (Latham, 2004).
In the context of this project, these learned performances of place making, these little acts of perfectionism that teach us the routes we work out as newcomers to a city, the shortcuts, the photographs, the stories, were crafted reports from a new city (Sennett, 2009). Owing to their repetitious engagements with Salford-Manchester through a variety of means (such as walking, filming, listening), the forms of crafted, practised knowledge and meaning displayed by my collaborators in this project were heterogeneous, precisely because these participatory collaborations were overtly modeled on their everyday practice and sensory preferences. In each case, they yielded a series of surprising, if not explanatory, eventful, if not definitive, reports that were manifest through a variety of performative enactments (such as walking, filming, listening). Here I will present examples from my work with F (chapter six), An (chapter seven), and B (chapter nine) as examples of performative reportage.

F produced three soundscape compositions of her favourite sites in Salford-Manchester that revealed levels of technical expertise that had been acquired through her routine engagement with the required technologies during her studies of acoustics in Salford. Her compositions, accompanied by her own textual narratives, were partial accounts of F’s Manchester and were not intended to be an objective representation of the city. Their partiality conveyed F’s own relational blending into Manchester and Salford.

The photographs An produced during our walking interview also conveyed partial, fragmentary commentaries on her own pre-occupations with Salford-Manchester. These were not photographs that sought to represent Manchester or give an overview. They reflect An’s preference for the visual modality, her developing skill as a photographer (again acquired through routine engagement with the technologies she was using during her studies into film at Salford) and her interest in stories of loss (an abandoned glove), inexplicable juxtapositions (an outsized ketchup bottle at a bus-stop) and tragic histories (a child’s jacket on single yellow lines).

B’s memorial accounts of Salford-Manchester were derived from events that had already taken place there, but they were not merely references to or memories of those events. They were new events in themselves that are shot through with vitality, ingenuity and the production of new knowledge and experience. The performative placing and excavating of her material, memorial trail of package, envelope and parcel all deepened her appreciation of Manchester, and ours too, as her audience.
2. Appeals
My experience of conducting research from a phenomenological, non-representational standpoint, using a reflexive, collaborative method, leads me to reflect on my discipline, psychology, to reconsider the preconceptions that prefigure much of the work that is practised in the field of inquiry relating to place perception. I would like to frame these reflections and reconsiderations as a series of strident appeals to my discipline. None of these appeals could have been formulated without the intelligence and experiences that have been gathered during this extended fieldwork. I therefore offer them up as genuine contributions to our knowledge of the psychology of place making and place perception.

An appeal to situated kaleidaesthesia (and against ocular-centrism)

Affordances are not simply phenomenal qualities of subjective experience. They are not simply the physical properties of things as now conceived by physical science. Instead, they are ecological, in the sense that they are properties of the environment relative to an animal (JJ Gibson, 1982:404)

JJ Gibson’s ecological approach to visual perception captures something of the challenge to ocular-centric thought that I want to mount here. Much of Gibson’s (1966) ire is directed at approaches to perception that assume the subject to be a detached agent who is engaged in an act of observation from a point of standstill. This position misses the possibility that our visual apprehensions of the world (of the places we move through) are bound into motion. Vision, in short, is integrated into embodiment and dynamism.

This dynamic construction of place perception is evident both in my research question and in the modes of engagement that my collaborators adopted. I would like to join with the likes of Greeno (1994) who, following JJ Gibson (1966), appeals to us to conceive of perception as a situated activity, as something we do whilst trafficking through places. I want to contest that in actively constructing their new cities, my collaborators constructed them from whole-body engagements, as more than mere static observers. Taking this further, it is consonant with my position of situativity (Turvey, 1992) that perception is not only partly embodied (Ingold, 2000), but multi-sensory too (Pink, 2009).

It is my contention that as T, F, An, Al, B and Ab-To moved through Salford-Manchester, their meaning making rested on a mode of place perception that I want to call situated kaleidaesthesia. Moving through places and bestowing meaning through situated kaleidaesthesia, engagement enfolds all the senses (not just vision, as Gibson emphasized) and the body
into a roaming knot of affordances (JJ Gibson, 1966). Operating in transit, kaleidoscopically, my collaborators displayed affordances that allowed them to continually shift from one set of relations (to their environment and materials) to another. In their engagements with their new city they were able to deploy one, two or more senses, combined with their embodied skill sets, to bring meaning to places they proceeded through and perceived. Using the senses, tangled into embodied proprioception, the mobile actant effects a style of cognition that is not reliant on the work of discrete internal processes, or single, dominant senses, but on dynamic cognitions that occupy relations between agents, places and materialities (Greeno, 1994).

Situated kaleidaesthesia sets thought into contextual engagements. It overrides static notions of cognition as encoding, wherein sense is made, meaning is attached, via the analysis of purportedly incoming visual information using internal processing mechanisms. Situated, ecological (kaleidoscopic) approaches to place perception require a symbiotic relationship between indivisible minds and bodies that can engage with worlds in a multitude of sensory and embodied forms. Perception, multi-sensoriality and action are mutually constitutive. We cannot seriously study place perception without recognising the integrated, situated, sensory, embodied movement of the subject.

An appeal to situated kaleidaesthesia is an appeal against ocular-centrism, though not against vision itself (MacPherson, 2010). Rather, it is a critique of the hegemony of the eye. I have already argued (see chapter four and chapter seven) that the history of social science has erred disproportionately towards observational methods (Pink, 2009) that have had the effect of stilling the subject, objectifying and distancing action (Ingold, 2000, MacDougall, 2006), effecting a death by still photography on some anthropological subjects (Edwards, 1999). More recently a welcome turn towards sensory studies (Pink, 2009), multi-sensory engagement and embodiment has partially satisfied a need for a reprioritization of the senses in knowledge construction (Sutton, 2010) and for more diverse epistemologies and methodologies. Howes (2005) has been outspoken in reminding us that constructions of the sensorium are culturally relative and have often been limited to the five senses of the western tradition; often underplaying the role of embodiment and proprioception in our apprehension of the world; often overplaying the primacy of vision.

The reference to Russian textbooks treating touch first, in contrast to American psychology textbooks which always begin with sight, is confirmed by other observers and serves to highlight how the hierarchization of the senses can vary significantly even between cultures belonging to the same general tradition (Howes, 2003:12-13).
These debates about ocular-centrism, along with those about the relative (and relativist) merits of vision and audition (vision objectifies, sound connects) were explored in detail in chapter seven, so I will not revisit them here.

Rather than a mere appeal against the dominance of vision, my call for situated kaleideasthesia rails against the separation out of phenomena that are both integral and integrated in our appreciation of place perception in particular, and knowledge construction in general. I refer here for example to psychological processes (memory, perception, attention, in the realm of cognitive psychology), the senses (vision, acoustic studies, olfaction, in sensory studies) and indeed embodiment itself. The tendency to factor out these processes, to treat them as discrete phenomena, arguably provides fertile ground for ocular-centrism to thrive, since it invites us to compare the senses with one another, to prioritise one over another (so often vision). It understates our capacity to perceive kaleidoscopically (with shifting and merging patterns and styles of engagement). Furthermore, I contest that this factoring tendency leads us astray, away from the kinds of ecological, relational research that I consider to be both desirable and empirically evidenced in this project.

Situated, ecological research poses questions about actants who engage all at once in cognition, action and co-productivity. They are knots in motion (Haraway, 2003) whose attributes cannot be separated, any more than a cake can be unbaked, by those who seek to appreciate their effectiveness. A more concerted, situated, kaleidoscopic conception of place perception would draw us alongside actants as they go along, as their collaborators and co-producers of knowledge, in dynamic situations requiring multisensory engagement and action all at once. The ecological approach that I appeal for here conceives of place perception as multi-sensory, whole-body activity (Gibson, 1991), wherein

The land, together with our own embodiment, means that interpretations of landscape are dynamic, but finite and ‘woven’ into the landscape (MacPherson, 2005: 100)

The body plays a sense unifying, orienting role in situated kaleidaesthesia. This orienting role helps us to cohere distance, sensuousness and offers us a sense of holism as we move through the landscape. Thus, emplaced experience is not bestowed by the internal encoding of incoming messages in sight and sound, but through our coordinating accumulated bodily experiences. Bodies cohere the formation of meaning from places (MacPherson, 2005).
The practising of places into being draws on affordances of place as they tangle with our own aptitudes, abilities, sensory preferences, as well as with technological extensions to these. Our situated kaleidaesthesia implicates bodies, senses and the affordances of place. Here, Massey (2001) articulates these combined efforts at place making.

On a wheelchair walk around the grounds of the nursing home, smells can signal where you are. A sudden whiff of something in the air can carry your thoughts away, to other times and other places. The changing texture of the path reverberates through the wheelchair into your body; the movement from ruckly gravel to the smooth passage of asphalt brings relief (Massey 2001:462).

For Massey, as it was for my own collaborators, place making was not just visual, not even just sensory. It was active and embodied too. It was mediated by technologies and inter-subjectivities. It was bound into practice and situatedness.

My appeal for situated kaleidaesthesia is a challenge to practitioners to immerse themselves in action packed, all-body engagements with place. It is an alert to the co-constitutive nature of the environments’ affordances and the multi-sensory aptitudes and abilities we can develop in collaboration with others. The relational study of place-making actants demands that we as psychologists of place attend to the conditions in which those interrelations thrive and conjure emplaced knowledge in all its forms.

I contest that T, F, An, Al, B and Ab-To are role models for the call I am making for a more integrative, ecological psychology of place. It was through their multi-sensory and embodied engagement that places came into being. An, for example, made films and photographs with her body, ears and her co-producers, of which I was one (in the case of her still work). When Al and I co-produced places on the hoof we combined ambulation, olfaction and situated knowledge from simultaneous places. B’s interpretations of Salford-Manchester were, to paraphrase Macpherson (2005), literally driven into the landscape. These exemplary cases of collaborative place-making illustrate the productive capacities of affordances and aptitudes. Together, between ourselves, we engaged in places with combined bodies and minds to produce soundscapes, pictures and stories that emerged out of all-round, situated, kaleidaesthetic, multi-sensory and embodied practice. As Gibson would argue, and as I have demonstrated in this project, research into perception that does not take account of motion can only hamper the production of ecological knowledge. I urge the psychology of place perception to demure from factoring out phenomena such as olfaction, audition, embodiment and vision.
An appeal to material cognition (and against representation)

Objects vivify, they are a way of making life and experience real
(Sheridan and Chamberlain, 2011:318)

This project has yielded material products as well as mere text. This productivity was facilitated by the flow of situated kaleidaesthesia that constituted my collaborators’ working conditions. During eighteen months of collaboration these materialities were generated painstakingly. They are perhaps a modest showing for our endeavour. Arguably an individual, squirreling away alone, might have been more productive. Nevertheless, from the hours of interviewing, the miles of walking, riding and all the hanging around, T, F, An, Al, B, Ab-To and I produced a selection of residual paraphernalia that is typical of academic social research, such as transcripts and research reports. However, it is upon the modest productivity that transcends regular academic discourse that I base this appeal to my fellow researchers.

During this project eight of us, mainly working in technologically enhanced pairs, churned out a map (APPX 5), three soundscape compositions (APPX 6), four photographs (see figures 5-8, chapter seven), five hybrid postcards (see figures 10-15, chapter eight), a short story (see Interlude) and a trail of ‘placed’, materialised, memorial artefacts (chapter nine). It doesn’t sound like much, but the means by which we produced these objects, as well as the nature of the space from which they emerged, are of primary importance for the appeal I want to make to my fellow practitioners in psychology.

Our products grew from the inter-corporeal space (Macpherson, 2010) that cemented us in emergent, co-creative practice. They constitute material residua that have facilitated engagement in discourses that are associated with the arts, as well as psychology (and geography). So it is from the borders of these disciplines that I want to suggest a turn to productivity in research into place perception. Latham (2003) and Thrift (2008) have already called for place-making research to explore modes of expression that extend from social science into the arts. I have already noted (chapter two and chapter eight) forms of reporting on everyday place perception that are multi-sensory, performative, expressive events in themselves (Laham, 2003, Thrift and Dewsbury, 2000). A growing turn to the arts in geography is in the offing, with practitioners feeling increasingly comfortable at the intersection of these nominal disciplinary boundaries (Nathan, 2010). Hawkins (2013), in a paper entitled Geography and Art: an expanding field recognises the erosion of these boundaries and the expanding field of art as a laboratory for exploring emplaced, multi-sensory experience.
Art’s expanding field of practices has extended the long-standing role of art as a ‘lab’ for sensory exploration, with the picture, the gallery and the installation all forming spaces in which the body and its senses have been made present for study (2013:60).

I want to contest that artworks and co-produced artefacts can no longer be merely treated as things to spectate at, or as objects to be detained in gallery spaces for our passive consumption. Rather, I contest that they can become sites for the exploration of embodied practice and emplaced knowledge co-production in psychology. As such they have the potential to develop into the stuff of place-making research in the discipline of psychology, rather than merely remaining in the artistic domain. It is my suggestion that the role of materiality in multisensory place making should be explored expressly at the intersections of art, geography and psychology.

A deal of the theory that has informed this project emerged from cultural geography (Thrift (2008). Following my empirical work, I argue that there is an opportunity here for this non-representational approach to be explicitly extended across disciplinary borders and into psychology. My appeal is for a greater recognition of productivity and materiality in the psychology of place perception. This is a call for a move towards a non-representational, emplaced psychology. Using the co-produced objects from this project as evidence to support this suggestion, I want to propose a turn to expressive productivity that casts geography, psychology and the arts into the same collaborative, multi-disciplinary space.

In my fieldwork I have shown how, on arrival in new places, emplaced knowledge and meaning can be constructed at the interface of ‘us and things’. The work that emerged from the field also showed how these meanings extended into the residual artefacts we produced. These products (‘look at these postcards’, ‘listen to these recordings’, ‘open this envelope’) are vital with meaning generated from dynamic, emplaced experience.

This relational materialism, this vitality of the material world, further reflects a type of embodied thought (living thinking), wherein place perception is regarded as a corporeal practice, bound into embodied engagements in the vital world (Clark, 2001, Whatmore, 2006). I want to suggest that my fieldwork reveals these concepts, relational materialism and embodied cognition, to be joined at the hip. Thus, I have shown how embodied cognition (‘thinking on your feet’, ‘doing the knowledge’) can be extended beyond the body, into materiality. The practice of place perception can be extended into our bodies and senses, into our technological extensions, but also into
the residual, material trails we produce as we make sense of the places we move through.

From cognitions of the mind, through embodied cognition (Thrift and Crang, 2001), through cognition extended into technology (Clark, 2011), it is only a short epistemological step to what I would like to call material cognition; the notion of thinking through (co)-produced materialities, for example in the form of artworks, artefacts or other residual objects. The outcomes of my own collaborations exemplify (indeed generate) such materialities.

This call to material cognition rails against traditions in cognitive psychology that lean towards emplacing (encasing, encapsulating) knowledge and knowledge generating processes within the psyche or mind (see chapter one). For example, models featuring working memory (Baddeley, 2003), or filters for managing selective attention (Broadbent, 1987), and, in the field of place perception, cognitive maps (Golledge, 2002), all reify cognition to the extent that thought becomes an internal representation, rather than lived practice. For representational, cognitivist proponents of place perception, the cognitive map is constructed as an internal store for emplaced knowledge, situated in a recess that is apart from lived, sensed world.

Humans travel by virtue of the knowledge stored in their long-term memory or cognitive map (Golledge & Garling, 2003:2)

Essentially, cognitive mapping involves sensing, encoding, and storing experienced information in the mind (Golledge & Garling, 2003:3)

The non-representational psychological approach to place making that I call for here would dispense with these Cartesian models that reify place perception within. Rather, the lived practice of material cognition enables the self to be constructed as a non-representational, meta-personal phenomenon (De Cicco and Stroink, 2007) that extends into the production of things. Material cognition resonates with an ontology wherein agents, objects and places are considered relationally (Law, 2004), where encountered, emplaced and co-created things are fused with meaning and intentionality (see chapter nine). The idea that thought resides not just in the mind, but non-representationally in “social and cultural practices and artefacts” (Brockmeier 2010:9) is nascent in the pioneering work of Saxe (1984, see chapter three), whose informants distributed their mathematical cognitions into their bodies, which were effectively used as objects (abacuses).
In my own collaborations for this project, thought was not just embodied and emplaced. It was literally materialised. My collaborators’ place-making cognitions were not just emergent from embodied engagement, though they were. They were not just emergent from technological engagement, though they were. More than this, their meaning making and place perception were residual to and emergent from the co-production of artefacts and materialities that fed into discourses of the arts.

Though modest in volume (sound recordings, photographic stills, postcards, a short story), our products have been exhibited at arts-based events at both the University of Lyon\textsuperscript{10} and University College London\textsuperscript{11}. Operating as pairs (and a trio), eight of us distributed the thoughts and meanings we conjured from our arrivals and engagements with Salford-Manchester into modest productivities, into expressive residual materialities. Our productivity may not look, smell, taste, sound or feel much, but for non-representational psychologists of place perception the process by which they emerged outstrips their value as things. They evidence co-productive, pre-cognitive thought. They evidence forms of material cognition that can challenge representational (cognitivist) psychological depictions of knowledge as an individually produced, internally located phenomenon.

It is gratifying to know that material outcomes from this project have occupied gallery space. More importantly, the concept of material cognition reflects the importance of the relational space between co-producers of knowledge. Material cognition also occupies relational space between geographical, psychological and artistic practice. In the wake of our modest productivity I urge more practitioners in the psychology of place perception to explore material cognition as a practice that reflects the cognitive potential of the objects we extend ourselves into.

An appeal to a reciprocally generous method-space (and against personal space)

Generosity is not the expenditure of one’s possessions but the dispossession of oneself, the being given to others that undercuts any self-contained ego

(Diprose, 2002:4-5)

Social research often takes place in interrupted, ungenerous space. Completing questionnaires, taking part in structured interviews or

\textsuperscript{10} Art and Geography, Aesthetics and Practices of Spatial Knowledges, University of Lyon, France, February 11-13, 2013

\textsuperscript{11} Cities Methodologies 2013; innovations in urban research methods, Slade Research Centre, UCL, London, April 23-26, 2013

215
experiments in unfamiliar settings requires an interruption of mundane practice (Thrift, 2008). Interview respondents are asked to recall experiences that remove them from the everyday flow of events. Arguably, such interruptions are a counterproductive distraction from the quotidian realm (Greenbough, 2010).

This research project eschews research methods that require us to look beyond the present for meaning in everyday action. Rather, there is a preference for generating practice-based research scenarios that resonate with quotidian flows of sociality (Latham, 2004, Pink, 2009). I have striven to do this by forming collaborations that unfolded in situ, along familiar routes through collaborators’ lifeworlds. Using the sensory ethnography method I sought not only to engage with everyday experience at the sensory level, (which in any case is a tautology), but also to engage with sensory habits and existing practices that were chosen by my collaborators. I draw an important methodological distinction here between merely doing sensory research, such as visual ethnographies (Pink, 2009), sound-walks (Neuhaus, 1976), investigations into taste and place (Trubek, 2008) or participatory photography (Banks, 2001), and adopting a more reflexive, responsive, reciprocally generous approach to researching the senses.

The form of sensory ethnography around which I base my appeal is the more generous form of collaborator led sensory ethnography. The researcher is generous enough to give away decisions about how ethnography might proceed. Equally, the collaborator is generous enough to lead the researcher into and through their life-world. In the reciprocally generous method that I want to lay claim to here, in the light of evidence gained from this project, the everyday practice and sensory preferences of the collaborators, be they visual, olfactory, auditory or kinaesthetic, inform the shape that the work ultimately takes. My suggestion is for ethnographers of the senses, including psychologists who wish to engage with subjective experiences of place, to strive towards constructing a reciprocally generous method-space, a fertile zone between collaborative partners, in which to conduct participatory fieldwork.

The spirit of this generous method-space can be found in the work of a group of cultural psychologists (Lave, 1978, Scribner and Cole, 1981, Cole, 1996, Greiffenhagen and Sharrock, 2008 and see chapter three) who have developed a method known as the located experiment. Whilst engaging with emic (participant-led), qualitative research into mainly cognitive based psychological topics such as literacy, numeracy and concept formation, these researchers designed experimental scenarios whose defining feature was their modeling on the everyday practice of participants. For example, research into literacy in Liberia was grounded in the existing letter writing
practices of the Vai community (Scribner and Cole, 1981), studies of numeracy were variously modeled on work-based calculations made by North American short-order waiting staff (Stevens, 1993), Liberian tailors (Lave, 1978, Greiffenhagen and Sharrock, 2008) or Brazilian coconut vendors (Carraher et al, 1985). In the majority of these experiments participants’ cognitive performance was stronger in these everyday settings than in unfamiliar or formal settings, such as schools.

Influenced by the participatory nature of the located experiment method, wherein participants’ abilities thrived in familiar practice, I reflexively decided to model my own research on the everyday practice of my collaborators. In effect, I deployed this emic approach into the field method of sensory ethnography. During my period in the field my decision to give away the method emerged from a prolonged period of probing, prompting and preliminarily questioning about the preferred sensory, creative and technological habits of members of the I16.

The process by which I adopted this method was serendipitous. It came about as I became increasingly aware of the diverse preferences in the group. During this exploratory period I frequently asked my collaborators questions about the methods they habitually used to engage with their new city. From these exploratory conversations I found out, for example, that T loved to walk (chapter five), that F disliked photography but loved sound recording (chapter six), that An was a keen photographer (chapter seven), that Al had a prominent sense of smell and taste (chapter eight), and that B regularly took pictures of rubbish and liked to circumvent the postal service whenever possible by placing and sending missives by unorthodox means (chapter nine). Giving away the choice of methods of engagement to my collaborators fostered a generous method-space where commitment, reciprocity, and creativity were able to flourish, an effect that is analogous to the one that saw enhanced performance amongst participants in located experiments.

Giving away the method facilitated in my collaborators an enthusiasm for the projects we co-produced that is rarely achieved in social research. On several occasions, my collaborators spoke of what they themselves had gained from participating in my project. Here, F and Ab both respond to my question about how they felt about our collaborations

F: If you didn’t ask me to do this I wouldn’t even have realized that I have represented these places of me in Manchester, but when I thought about it, when I told you that I wanted to do this project, and then it kept me thinking
The experience of cultivating a reciprocally generous method space leads me to appeal to qualitative researchers to effect a turn to reciprocal generosity, wherein research designs might become more emergent from the quotidian habits and preferences of research collaborators.

These emergent methods grow in spaces that are created by conversation and joint action (Shotter, 2008), rather than being imposed by the researcher. This appeal for a reciprocally generous method-space is a turn away from the notion of personal space (Hall, 1966, see chapter one) that often dominates social psychological discourses of interpersonal relations and environmental psychology (see chapter one). Personal space is a region of exclusion, delineating my territory from yours. Encroachments into personal hula-hoops of privacy and individualism are regarded as transgressions.

Arguably, the imposition of sensory research methods (‘we are going to use a visual method’, ‘we are going to go for a walking interview’) resonates with notions of personal space, rather than generous, inter-corporeal space. Generous method-space, on the other hand, is fertile ground for reciprocal collaboration and sharing. Throughout this project my generosity has been reciprocated. As each of our unique collaborations emerged from conversation and overlapping experience, I was guided through constructions of Salford-Manchester that reflected the quotidian preferences and life-space of my collaborators. Along the way I went into alternate sensory worlds on journeys that were variously inspired by ambulation (chapter five), sound (chapter six), taste and smell (chapter eight), performativity (chapter nine), touch and sound (chapter ten), with each individual journey resonating with sensuousness and embodiment. Our journeys took place in a generous method-space that is a manifestation of what I have already referred to as the generosity of the guided (MacPherson, 2011 and see chapter ten).

Within this generous space, the role of guide and guided is passed from collaborator to researcher like a baton. The overarching project was initiated by me. Decisions about modes of engagement were collaborator led. The modest products of our work were co-produced. My reflexive methodological generosity was a gesture of trust towards my collaborators, made in the belief that they would guide me into an understanding of how their city became meaningful to them on their arrival. The reciprocated generosity of my collaborators emerged from their enthusiasms, preferences, skills and habitual mobilities.
The generous method-space I am appealing for is an inter-corporeal, shared, co-produced, intersubjective field, rather than a personal territory that separates us from each other. Within the relational entity of guided researcher and guide collaborator, meaningful places are constructed out of trust, relationality and generosity. In inter-corporeal method-space, the air between us is a shared zone in which the mutuality and co-productivity of place making thrives. I urge those psychologists who want to explore the perception of place to become more generous, to adorn their methodological relationships with mutuality and co-productivity, to open themselves to the generosity of their collaborators. I urge them to become neo-environmental psychologists.

3. Reflections
I walked a very long way. I met people from all over the world. I walked a very long way with people from all over the world.

En route we talked a lot and shared stories and routes about Salford, Manchester, Tunis, Barcelona, Mainz and many other places. We talked, walked, shared and invented stories about places by moving through them. But now most of the people I walked and talked with have left the city, gone home or moved on. I am still here, thinking about the stories, routes and cities we invented. After all the sharing and walking and co-producing, now that everyone else has gone, I have some thoughts of my own. For the first time in these pages I am speaking only for myself. These are my own personal reflections, about the events of the past eighteen months, about how they turned out, about how it could all have been so different, about the becoming disorientated in my own city, and about still being here when everyone else has gone, and about passing on the methods I have used in this project

It could all have been so different
In February 2013 at the University of Lyon I delivered a twenty-minute presentation entitled ‘The collaborative potential of the sensory ethnographic method for the investigation of place-making among new arrivals to a city’. During my talk I celebrated the range of multi-sensory artefacts that have been generated during this project (‘look at these pictures, listen to these soundscapes’). I enthused about the enthusiasm and commitment of my collaborators and about the quality of the work they have produced. At the end of my talk a man in a pair of attractive white-rimmed spectacles raised his hand and took the wind from my sails by asking me about failed relationships

“We are all the collaborations in this project as productive as the ones you have described, or were there any failures?”
As I reflect on his question now I think about how different this project might have been if all my collaborations had been productive ones. I would like to track down the man in the white-rimmed spectacles and answer him more competently than I did a few weeks ago. If I could find him I would say ‘As a matter of fact they weren’t all equally productive. But to call any of these collaborations failures would not be appropriate either’.

Looking back on my early days in the field, to those exploratory interviews with the I16, I remember several conversations and recorded interviews about collaborations that were never to be fully manifest, productively speaking, as part of my project. I am talking about collaborations that did not run their full course as part of my research. I am referring to routes for walks that were never taken. I remember vivid descriptions of artefacts that never materialised, at least to my knowledge, as part of this project. I can still see some of these artefacts now.

R, from Tanzania, never did work with me on his photo-journal about watching football in Manchester and Dar es Salaam. Ax, from Romania, never did send me the link to her city centre people-watching blog. S, from England, never did send me the music videos he made on his commute to work in Salford (although he showed them to me quite recently so I know they were finished). H, from Australia, never did show me her imaginative account of how Charlotte Bronte journeyed through Manchester before sitting down to write Jane Eyre in the Salutation public house in Hulme. P, from Thailand, never did send me her A-Z guide to Chinatown. K, from India, never did send me the edits of the film he made on his mobile phone during our midnight walk through Manchester’s gay village.

Other projects that were hatched in preliminary meetings with me, but somehow they never found their way into this thesis. Like the lost film music of Sven Libaek (2006) these unrealised, unfinished, undocumented (by me, at least), projects are, in their own way, arguably as important and memorable as the ones that did transpire. Whilst they were never completed for this project, perhaps they were crafted in some other form. Perhaps they were completed and disseminated elsewhere. Doubtless they contributed in their own way to their authors’ arrival stories of Manchester and Salford.

These projects are important because they draw our attention to the limits, or more accurately to the unpredictable nature, of a participatory methodology in which the researcher generously gives away the means for building the work. This catalogue of untraced (though not necessarily incomplete) projects reminds me of the awkwardness of fieldwork, of the
energy that goes into placing trust in others, and of the hoping that all this energy will bear fruit. Each of these untraced collaborations illustrates the risks of collaborative, participatory research.

To the man in the white-rimmed spectacles, I would say that for a generous ethnographer who pins his hopes on the enthusiasm, trust and sensory preferences of others, who trusts others to guide him to answers to his research question in ways that they are free to devise, a high percentage of untraced (though not failed) relationships is par for the course.

For the record, six of the twelve collaborations that were begun, came to material fruition in the context of my research. Had the intercorporeal space between myself and my other collaborators been of a different order, had our interests been more overlapping, had there been more time, things might all have been different.

_Disorien_tation begins at home_
Although I always knew that this project would be about disorientation and bewilderment, I was surprised at how much of this disorientation has been my own. I set out to explore feelings of newness and adaptation in newcomers to a city. In doing so, after working on the shoulder of my collaborators for eighteen months, walking their routes, hearing their stories, I have undergone my own process of unanticipated defamiliarisation. During my repetitious revisiting of these cities, disorientation has become my default state. Looking back, my sense of bewilderment reached its zenith as I stood, clueless and sweating, before the railway station façade in Mainz, clutching a burnt out envelope and watching an unknown messenger dissolve into human traffic. But mostly disorientation visited me in my home city as I trailed along on walks into unfamiliar sensory and phenomenological worlds. I have lived in Manchester for twenty years. These days I am a relatively stranger here.

I am not the first ethnographer to undergo feelings of disorientation in the field. Bewilderment goes with the fieldwork territory. Ethnography is an expression of an overt desire to get lost and feel out of place (Sontag, 1994). Fieldwork is a place where deliberate disorientation in the presence of otherness has an unsettling, yet appealing effect. In choosing to walk the routes of others and experience the city through their senses, I willfully staged my own alienation from a city I thought I knew. Or else, I came to know it in unfamiliar ways. Every new sensation, route or tactile experience had me uprooting my assumptions about the sensory landscape of the city. Arguably, as with any fieldworker entering an unfamiliar world, my willful alienation in pursuit of knowledge can be considered an act of anthropological heroism (Hartman, 2007). Or does the ethnographer only
become heroic when he leaves town and goes into something geographically different called ‘the field’; a place riddled with exotica and difference?

Nowadays, travel is not a prerequisite for ethnographic heroism. The ethnographic landscape has changed somewhat since the days of Claude Levi-Strauss, E. E. Evans-Pritchard and Margaret Mead. There is no longer any need to up sticks in search of otherness. The buzz of disorientation is proximate, as I found in the streets of the globalized city of Salford-Manchester.

It is specifically this lack of geographical displacement on the part of the anthropologist that now comes to constitute a sign of heroic dedication. What better way to demonstrate one’s commitment to one’s project than to follow it not to the exotic, but to the mundane, to the known? (Hartman, 2007:8)

Opportunities to experience the bewilderment of the local abound. I found them easy to come by as I worked and walked alongside collaborators whose backgrounds were very other than my own, yet whose ongoing process of place making overlapped with mine. In discovering Manchester, like me they were making up cities as they went along.

I want to lay claim to the status of anthropological hero, despite my lack of air miles. I have walked a very long way, albeit locally. People from all over the world have led me around in Mancunian circles. En route I entered their unfamiliar sensuous, embodied and technical worlds. I trusted them to lead me astray, into places I had never been and would not ordinarily dream of going; Audacious Church, The Palace Hotel, Salford Shopping City, The Wheel of Manchester, Greggs Bakery. I was generous enough to allow myself to be guided by people and dogs I barely knew, sometimes on strange forms of transport; the Wheel of Manchester, Deutsche Bahn, buses. I was drawn into extraordinary global practices; Gamelan, Angklung, donut eating, early morning excavations in public parks, clandestine hand-overs at railway stations. With every alien experience my de-familiarization went deeper. After eighteen months of bewilderment Salford-Manchester became an exotic, undiscovered city. It takes a brave, heroic soul to re-enter your own city as a stranger. To the strangers who are just arriving, to the visitors from abroad, to the tourists, migrants, stowaways, deserters, exiles, anthropologists, refugees, fugitives and international students who are just arriving in my city I say

'Welcome to Manchester, I used to know it quite well'

After my experiences of disorientation, brought to me by those who were new to the city, I might reflect on whether the phenomenon of the new
arrival, the very subject of my thesis, exists at all. Arguably, all of us who go out and walk, ride and construct the streets anew everyday, are constructing and experiencing the city in novel ways. We are all new arrivals now.

**Being here is the new being there**

I have experienced disorientation, bewilderment, de-familiarization and the reprioritisation of the senses. Most of those with whom I shared these experiences have left the city now. Ab and To are still here. T is in Zambia. F is in Singapore. An is in South Korea. B is in Germany. Al is in London.

I hear from some of them more frequently than I do from others. An and I are writing an academic paper together. F has invited me to her wedding in Indonesia. Al has requested my advice on becoming an anthropologist. B recently sent me a picture of a German board game, by air mail. We all exchange sporadic emails, pictures and anecdotes. I have sent sections of my thesis to each one of my collaborators for feedback and editing. We are still in contact, but our walking is over. They have gone from the field. I am still here.

The ending of fieldwork is rarely neat and tidy. Although the requirements of a research project may be fulfilled (a word limit reached, a deadline met) the relationships upon which the work is based are not necessarily terminated

> Many of the potential plusses of ethnographic field methods, such as intensivity, extensivity and relational embeddedness, can make getting out more complex

> (Iverson, 2009:14)

For classical anthropologists who travelled out into the field, a distant and perhaps remote place, concluding matters merely equated to the geographical disengagement of coming home or getting out (Iverson, 2009). Nowadays the fieldwork experience has worked itself free from the notion of travel to far off places as a condition of practice.

For this project, most of my travelling was along Mancunian routes. For those who have conducted fieldwork in familiar places (Erikson, 1976, Iverson, 2009), leaving the field is a more inconclusive process than it once was, closure more difficult to establish. When the field is local there is no getting out, in the geographical sense. Home ethnography leaves unfinished business (Erikson, 1976). In the final phases of this project, my relationships with collaborators are attenuated, but my continued ‘being here’ and our continued contact make for a fuzzy ending, a fading out rather than a crescendo. The door remains open for future enquiry. The ethical relationships I worked so hard to establish preclude the abrupt termination
of relations. There is no motivation or urgency for ending. Endings, like beginnings, have to be mutually negotiated in collaborative work.

The discursive evolution of the ‘researched’ from ‘subject’ to ‘informant’ to ‘respondent’ and for some to ‘collaborator’ and other forms of relational mutuality, necessitates full attention not only to how ethnographic research begins and is conducted, but also to how contact ends such that disengagement is mutual as well.

(Iversen, 2009:23)

Because I am still here, because we are all still in contact, because I am surrounded by places and stories we made together, my departure from the field is forced to be protracted. It is going to be a long journey.

These days I move about the city under my own steam, or with other people, conjuring new meanings, making the city all over again, always arriving. Yet at every turn there are reminders of the places we once made here. Around every corner, remnants from conversations delay my departure from the field. The bees on the bollards, the iron gates of the Palace Hotel, the aroma of leather in a street market summon the shadows, echoes and ghosts of our walking. The bubble-gum splats on the pavement, the screaming brakes on the buses, the prong under the box at the pedestrian crossing, testify to my relearning of Salford-Manchester. I am still here, surrounded by stories and reminders that stall my departure, that keep me in the city we once constructed here. I am not leaving the field and the field is only leaving me very, very slowly.

Passing the methodological baton
I would now like to offer some points of orientation for practitioners who are interested in adapting the methods I have used in this project for their own research. What follows are not meant as guidelines, but orienting principles for those wishing to embrace participatory, sensory, collaborative methods in order to access the life worlds of those who construct places as they travel through and between them.

The methods I have used during this project are diverse, rather than uniform. They were not selected off the peg. They emerged from, and were tailored to, the diverse forms of engagement that my collaborators made places out of. They were fashioned in part by these very collaborators. Because of the diverse origins, sensory preferences, habits of mobility, expertises and expressive styles of my collaborators, the methods that emerged from our work together were never going to be of a 'one size fits all' order. In these concluding paragraphs I want to offer some thoughts for practitioners who are drawn to the assemblage of emergent methods.
that I have gathered under the umbrella term of “collaborative, participatory sensory ethnography”. These orienting remarks for the sensory ethnographer wishing to collaborate with place making others might be used to light the way towards future research projects.

(1) First, I would recommend sensory ethnographers to consider the senses as naturally entangled, rather than discrete. Sensory ethnographic methods, by their nature, orient towards collaborators’ sensory preferences. The collaborative work that emerges from encounters between researchers and collaborators draws upon the habitual modes of expression of those involved. Work with a picture maker is likely to yield images. Mixing with a musician is likely to produce sound. Yet we should steer clear from assuming that preferences for a particular sensory mode are exclusive. As we have learned during this project, filmmaking is a corporeal art that requires an attuned ear and a willing body, as well as a keen eye for composition. The participatory sensory ethnographer should eschew orientations towards the senses that essentialize collaborators as being primarily visual, auditory or embodied. Thus, my first orienting remark for other practitioners is to treat sensory preferences as fluid and multiple, rather than static and singular.

(2) Second, I would recommend that sensory ethnographers pay attention to listening and following, rather than speaking and leading, when setting up collaborative, participatory projects. The collaborative work that emerges between participatory sensory ethnographer and collaborator is fragile by nature, especially in its early stages. It is better that preliminary exchanges about how collaborators might wish to articulate their constructions of place, about what forms of work they might want to engage in, are not predicated on concrete examples and ‘helpful’ suggestions from the researcher. A degree of ambiguity, vagueness, even awkward silence, is likely to provide fertile ground for the initiation of ideas in the nascent collaborative encounter. From these ambiguous moments, original ideas for expressive work are likely to emerge from the collaborator. The expressive essence of participatory sensory ethnography requires the collaborator to initiate the work based on their own expressive preferences and habitual modes of engagement with place, not on those of the researcher. Thus, my second orienting remark is to refrain from taking the lead in collaborative work.

(3) Third, I would urge the participatory sensory ethnographer to have the courage to pursue unfamiliar embodied routes and practices. Abdicating one’s own responsibility for emergent place making projects carries with it the promise of unforeseen circumstances and unfamiliar embodied experience provided to one by one’s collaborators. The participatory
sensory ethnographer who expressly invites methods of engagement that are initiated by the other is committed to following him/her/them into the unfamiliar (if not the unknown). I have, during this project, been led through performative practices ranging from Indonesian folk music, urban burials, walking with guide dogs and being left stranded outside German railway station facades. The participatory sensory ethnographer is obliged to explore and construct places according to unfamiliar embodied practices that she may not relish. S/he is committed to entering others’ lifeworlds in order to explore their diverse embodied constructions of place. Thus, my third orienting remark would be to embrace the initial bewilderment that novel embodied experience brings.

(4) Fourth, I would urge the participatory sensory ethnographer to aspire towards descriptive accounts of place making, rather than post hoc explanations. In line with the non-representational orientation that has characterised this thesis, accounts of place construction can be performative events in themselves, rather than explanations of prior events. A performative turn not only invites the use of diverse, expressive, descriptive modes of reportage, but can also arouse in others action guiding anticipations (Shotter, 2008). Productive, performative collaborations can yield diverse materialities, encompassing collaborative writing, artefacts, poetry, pictures and soundscapes. All such descriptive accounts are ‘moving’ events in themselves, rather than representations, explanations or generalisable phenomena that tell us how places are constructed as a rule. These descriptive accounts contribute fresh, orienting knowledge about the construction of emplaced life worlds. Like the places that emerge through them, these accounts are always becoming, never conclusive. My fourth orienting remark is, thus, to aspire towards the realm of the inconclusive and performative, rather than the conclusive or explanatory, for this is where results of a practically useful kind can be found.

Post-script: Moss
A few weeks ago I received word from Germany that I should go to an address in Fallowfield, South Manchester, and ask for V, who had something to give me. I bicycled to Fallowfield immediately, found the address and rang the doorbell. A young woman came to the door in a blue housecoat and greeted me with a German accent. She said she was called V. I told her my name and said I was here to collect something. She smiled, went back into the house and emerged a minute later with a small plastic box that was wrapped in cellophane. It was the kind of box that is often used for transporting food. However, as I would discover later that day, this box contained a quantity of German moss that had been sent to England from Mainz and delivered for my collection. Because it was looking rather sorry for itself, and because I didn’t know what else to do
with it, I planted the moss in my garden. As I did so I remembered the moss that I had been requested to take to Germany with me a year or so ago, and I felt some small satisfaction in the knowledge that these mosses had now been exchanged. A small part of the Manchester is lying in the ground in Mainz. A small part of Mainz is lying in my garden. The exchanging of moss is not an ending or conclusion or closure, nor an explanation for past events. Rather, it is another event in itself, performed in the spirit of playful sharing that has enlivened this whole project. This same spirit of inconclusive playfulness can also be heard in the conversation I had with V in her doorway as she handed over the box

A: Thank you. Are you from Mainz?
V: No I am from Frankfurt
A: How did you get this box?
V: A friend of B’s who was visiting England gave it to a friend of mine, who brought it here and asked me to look after it
A: Do you know B?
A: No, but I saw her once
YOU AND MANCHESTER

Do you know Manchester?
How well do you know it? How did you get to know it? Are you learning new parts of the city? Are you attached to the place? How is Manchester different from your place of origin?

How do you know Manchester?
Do you make films, take photographs, go for long walks, ride a bike, use FACEBOOK, keep a diary, write e-mails, make sound recordings or audio diaries?

What am I doing here?
I am a senior lecturer in Psychology at Manchester Metropolitan University. I have lived here for 20 years and have been learning about it ever since. As part of my PhD I am conducting research into how new arrivals to the city develop attachments to and knowledge of Manchester.

Why am I here?
I would like to invite the International Society 16 to work with me over the coming months to help us all get to know Manchester better. Using photography, film, walking, riding, writing, reading, talking, listening and social networking I would like to invite you to make a collection of accounts of you and Manchester.

A.STEVENSON@MMU.AC.UK
APPX 2: World map, used during preliminary interviews

APPX 3: Manchester map, used during preliminary interviews
APPX 4a: Ethics consent form, completed during preliminary interview

CONSENT FORM

Title of Project:

Name of researcher:

Please initial box

1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet dated……….. for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have had these answered satisfactorily. I acknowledge the risks associated with the study and they have been explained to me.

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason, without my medical care or legal rights being affected.

3. I agree to take part in the study.

_______________________  ______________  __________________
Name of participant          Date          Signature

_______________________  ______________  __________________
Name of person taking consent Date          Signature


APPX 5: A personalised walking map of T’s first walk into Manchester
APPX 6
Dropbox links to three Soundscape Compositions, recorded by F (see *chapter 6*)

1. Peel Park, Salford
   [https://www.dropbox.com/s/dc53e5kebcxbiub/PeelPark1_Amplified.wav](https://www.dropbox.com/s/dc53e5kebcxbiub/PeelPark1_Amplified.wav)
2. Piccadilly Gardens, Manchester
   [https://www.dropbox.com/s/5zp7ld9f3wpp4ui/Piccadilly_Amplified.wav](https://www.dropbox.com/s/5zp7ld9f3wpp4ui/Piccadilly_Amplified.wav)
3. Salford Quays
   [https://www.dropbox.com/s/snkni4rylc0sbaa/SalfordQuays1_Amplified.mp3](https://www.dropbox.com/s/snkni4rylc0sbaa/SalfordQuays1_Amplified.mp3)
APPX 7 A poem about a snail, written on a bus

I can't salt a slug
I'm just not a thug
And snails I can't stand the crunch
But when I'm in bed
These pests all get fed
My garden's just a free lunch

Well I started to think:
I'll lead 'em to drink,
I'll put down a dishful of ale
When they gulp it down
They'll fall in and drown
Which is not a bad end for a snail

Early next day
A bird chirped away
Coaxing me out of my sleep
To check of my ale
Had been drunk by a snail
I nipped outside for a peek:

I found nothing there
My trap it laid bare
No sign of no slugs and no ale
Then I noticed the birds'
Singing was slurred
Through feasting on fresh pickled snail
pictures when i have more favourites. i need to find the names, and write decent captions, or poems to go along with them, and make wonderful breads and thin crusted pizzas all made fresh there on their counters and baked in clay ovens. doing so well, they even make pizza now! also a restaurant called doukhana, it means counter in arabic. they place called las palmas that sells the best gelato, an italian family runs it, they.

you, and you realise how massive it is. it is at least half a mile in every direction from its centre. oh! there is a live on various hidden floors over them) all the way upstairs to the rooftops, where you can see the medina below you, and you realise how massive it is. it is at least half a mile in every direction from its centre. oh! there is a place called las palmas that sells the best gelato, an italian family runs it, they have recently relocated since they are doing so well, they even make pizzas now! also a restaurant called doukhana, it means counter in arabic, they make wonderful breads and thin crusted pizzas all made fresh there on their counters and baked in clay ovens. it is in la marina in a place called mars beach (mars beach) right near where i used to live in marsa cube. i am sure i have more favourites. i need to find the names, and write decent captions, or poems to go along with them, and pictures when i have no words. this is a brief insight, i hope this is helpful, and can aid you in giving me pointers as to which types of information are relevant, or lacking.
One: From Maxwell Building to Audacious Church

1. A: So you said that you’d taken this route before, into, into Manchester
2. T: Yes, to church, then from church to Manchester
3. A: OK, yeah, cool - so is this the church?
4. T: No
5. A: It’s another one, ok. That’s fine
6. T: It’s off Trinity Way
7. A: OK, cool, alright. So, erm, how often do you go to the church?
8. T: Every Sunday
9. A: Ok, with friends or is it=
10. T: =I usually go on my own and then meet my friends in church because most of them have different accommodation
11. A: OK
12. T: Most of them live in Bramhall [hall] which is close to the church, so they go to the church straight=
13. A: =And did you start, erm, visiting the church as soon as you arrived in Manchester or did you not know about it then?
14. T: No, I didn’t know about it at the beginning but there were people, during fresher’s week there were people giving out leaflets; information about different churches and so on. So I chose to, I went to a few, but I chose to stick to this one
15. A: So you went to a few different ones to, ok, what was it that attracted you to this one? What did you like about it?
16. T: It was the music
17. A: O yeah
18. T: Some of the other churches I went to where things were (.)
19. A: Somber, sometimes aren’t they?
20. T: Somber sometimes. Was like, planned. Things were supposed to happen in a certain way. But for this one it’s just, things just happen and the music is really good as well, so I really enjoyed that part.
21. A: And are there very many people from this church who are from Zambia, or from Africa?
22. T: No, I’m the only one from Zambia, but there are quite a few from countries like Nigeria. It’s diverse, people from Asia, people from Africa, from Australia. Most of them are from Australia. And, er, the people who started the church came from Australia
23. A: Did they?
24. T: Yes, so there are loads of people from Australia
25. A: So what kind of church is it? What denomination is it?
26. T: Protestant
27. A: OK, right
28. T: It’s a Pentecostal church
29. A: So there’s a lot of music
30. T: Yes, music. It’s lively, and I think the age group is usually, I’d say, early fifties, up to early 50s. You find that many older people come to the church, usually youths, teenagers
31. A: OK, so you’ve made some friends there as well. So, er, I’m leaving the route to you, so I’m just gonna turn wherever you turn, alright?
32. T: OK
33. A: Can I just ask you to think about, can you remember the first few days when you arrived in Manchester? When you arrived at Uni, that was the first time you came was it?
34. T: Yes, that was the first time
35. A: You hadn’t visited before university started, no, and er, ok, turning left into Stephen St., Stephen Street, yes. We’re in new territory now. There are some great sounds around aren’t there? What do you think that is?
36. T: It might be somebody drilling
37. A: Drilling, yes
38. T: Yes, somebody’s drilling into a wall
39. A: Oh, somebody’s drilling over there. Great. It’s a noisy place, Salford. Oh we’re going this way?
40. T: =This is another church
41. A: Is this one of the ones that you tried?
42. T: No
43. A: I really haven’t been down here before. So we’re going this way
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