



## UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

### Advancing Memory Methods

Drozdzewski, D.; Birdsall, C.

**DOI**

[10.1007/978-981-13-1411-7\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-1411-7_1)

**Publication date**

2019

**Document Version**

Final published version

**Published in**

Doing Memory Research

**License**

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act  
(<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/in-the-netherlands/you-share-we-take-care>)

[Link to publication](#)

**Citation for published version (APA):**

Drozdzewski, D., & Birdsall, C. (2019). Advancing Memory Methods. In D. Drozdzewski, & C. Birdsall (Eds.), *Doing Memory Research: New Methods and Approaches* (pp. 1-20). Palgrave Macmillan. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-1411-7\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-1411-7_1)

**General rights**

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

**Disclaimer/Complaints regulations**

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.



# 1

## Advancing Memory Methods

Danielle Drozdzewski and Carolyn Birdsall

### Introduction

The multidisciplinary field of memory studies continues to grow in size and significance. The Memory Studies Association conference in Copenhagen, held in December 2017, was certainly a testament to this growing interest, with 600 scholars from 58 countries spanning six different continents in attendance. A key discussion point at that conference was the interdisciplinarity of scholars engaged in memory research, which holds much pertinence to the works in this volume. This interdisciplinarity draws across, and functions within, well-established and sometimes fiercely defended disciplinary boundaries; it traverses the humanities, the social sciences, the arts, and the psychological sciences. It would be

---

D. Drozdzewski (✉)  
Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden  
e-mail: [danielle.drozdzewski@humangeo.su.se](mailto:danielle.drozdzewski@humangeo.su.se)

C. Birdsall  
University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands  
e-mail: [C.J.Birdsall@uva.nl](mailto:C.J.Birdsall@uva.nl)

disingenuous to suggest that we necessarily agree with or would replicate all the methodological approaches used by memory-studies colleagues in their respective fields. Yet this interdisciplinarity does engender an awareness *and* appreciation of how memory research is done, and done differently.

The scholars whose work appears in this collection all hail from diverse disciplinary backgrounds: cultural and human geography, media studies, digital ethnography, landscape archaeology, sociology, social anthropology, fine arts, literature studies, digital heritage, and public history. All of them also draw from an impressive array of qualitative investigative methods to do their memory research. Further, their engagements with memory demonstrate how many ways we have to define, delineate, think with/about, or practice, perform, maintain, enact, discuss, and (re)produce memory. In memory's varied meanings is the potential of 'memory work' to animate, energise, and inspire, and reveal new and different methodological approaches and methods. This innovation affords exciting opportunities to learn, practice, adopt, and adapt new methods and invites us to reflect on our different investigative and analytic skills.

For this volume, to foreground the methodological concerns of such research, we invited contributors to critically reflect on how they do their memory research, and to consider how they use and combine different tools, technologies, or bodies, for example. Recurrent themes in their accounts of memory work include encounter, emplacement, and the body, and engagement with memory's performativity, its affect, its visuality, and its sounds. How contributors 'do' their work contributes to scholarship, offering rich insights about memory and its links to place and identity. As Leder Mackley and Pink (2017: 123, original emphasis) recently contended, 'how we know' what we know, through what method, forms part of our responsible practice as researchers and bears on our research integrity and accountability to other scholars, our participants, 'and increasingly, to stakeholders and the wider public'. Yet, 'questions of method and methodology' related to memory studies are limited (Keightley and Pickering 2013: 2), so, too, targeted scholarship on how memory scholars draw from their disciplinary diversity to break new ground in method application and adaptation.

Keightley and Pickering's (2013) collection was the first to explicitly address research methods in memory studies, with a particular emphasis on oral history interviews and autobiography. The marked growth in memory work since that collection was published includes growth in the scope of research and the number and types of methods used by scholars and practitioners alike. That trend is evident in the flourishing of the Memory Studies Association, and the increasing recognition of memory studies as a distinct field of research (Roediger and Wertsch 2008; Kattago 2016; Olick et al. 2017). Drawing on such change, energy, and innovation, our focus here is on methods in memory studies and research based on memory work. Each chapter focuses in different ways on 'doing' research rather than on narrating a theoretical supposition or case study and results. We hope that a practical consequence of the collection provides useful and practical exemplars for other memory-studies scholars, as well as insights into how the contributors both frame and do memory research.

## Doing Memory Research

### An Ethics of Care

Contributors to this volume demonstrate that doing memory studies requires sensitivity to, and awareness of, context because memory links people to space, place and identity, and to mobility/movement and time. Indeed, memories 'both inform and are informed by identities and these articulations take different forms in different places', and from different temporal viewpoints (Drozdowski et al. 2016: 3). As Donohoe (2014: xiii) argues, writing about the phenomenological relationship between place and memory, place 'identifies one with a certain community of people and shapes one's understanding of people and the world'. Because memory can play such a formative role in individual and collective notions of who we are (cf. Jones 2011), research must be sensitive in design. This caution does not necessarily relate to the potential of scholars and others to unwittingly engage in conversations about loss, disaster, or death (although these are common features of memory-studies research).

Rather, such caution serves as a reminder that questions of memory relate inextricably to identities in the present (Legg 2004, 2005). Till and Kuusisto-Arponen (2015: 302) state that scholars of memory 'have an ethical responsibility to try to understand why different social groups and individuals may wish to raise questions or stories about traumatic pasts at a particular place and moment in time, even if this means taking additional time to listen'.

Apprehending these requisites for sensitivity and respect, an ethics of care emerged as another strong theme across our contributors' discussions of doing memory research, especially when determining how an ethics of care informed practice and choice of method. For example, to navigate working at the interface of traumatic and contested memory, Halilovich and Fejzić use art praxis to 'point to multilayered dimensions of memories' of conflict in Bosnia (this volume). Evident in their work is a 'relational ethics of care [that] emphasizes the role of connection and feeling in the principles' in guiding research design, process and practice (Ellis 2017: 58). Halilovich and Fejzić have paid attention to how their own war experiences informed and influenced their data collection strategies and remained mindful of the rawness of their research narrative. In earlier work on wounded cities, Till (2012: 8) has discussed how a place-based ethics of care in memory-work encompasses 'practices of attending to, caring for, and making place' to constitute 'differentiated and active forms of belonging and political community'. Correspondingly, in this volume, Gensburger's approach to overhearing conversations about the Parisian terror attacks and interviews with people comprises another example of attuning research process to an ethics of care.

Thinking ethically about how to gather memory data from and/or in public spaces has also guided others' research design using digital platforms (Schuurman and Pratt 2002). For example, again in this volume, Arrigoni and Galani have used images already available in the public domain in their discussions about place memory, and they made their accumulated data set publicly accessible by constructing links to images in their original digital location. Mindful of existing stereotypes and community antagonism, Shea (this volume) has adopted a community-engaged research method with crowdsourcing and participant-led data collection to show how place-making reveals performances of memory.

That method enables Shea to recognise both individual and collective memory narratives. Shea's research exemplifies 'thinking about care as an activity, and as a kind of universal, arising out of a sense of responsibility toward others' (McEwan and Goodman 2010: 106). In turn, Sumartojo (this volume) distinguishes between doing research *with* participants and *on* them; she extends this attention to power differentials in research by using video 'to understand the complexity of multiple spacetimes of memory sites and research about them'. This intersection of participant memory and place is further highlighted by Osborne's research using the novel technology of a biosensor (this volume). Osborne shares how her research design was a deliberate strategy to safeguard participant identities by 'multi-layering' different methods such as go-along conversations, biosensing, and video-elicitation. In short, in such studies, an ethics of care is carried through to research design and implementation.

## Experiencing and Emplaced (Researcher) Bodies

By reference to experience, emplacement and embodiment, Pink (2009: 25) has argued that the 'researcher learns and knows through her or his whole experiencing body'. Knowledge gleaned by being aware of one's researcher body *and* being attentive to positionality is a practice-based knowledge, 'inseparable from our sensory and embodied relations with the world' (Stevenson 2014: 336). Memory, its sensations, feeling, conjured images, and movements, are 'intrinsic to the body, to its own ways of remembering: how we remember in and by and through the body' (Casey 2000: 147). Furthermore, 'we often think of memory as an individual mnemonic device, something that triggers thoughts, feelings and emotions in our minds and our body' (Drozdowski 2016: 20). These matters are perhaps best summarised as part of the 'affective turn' in memory studies (Waterton and Dittmer 2014; Witcomb 2016; Sumartojo 2016, 2017; Tolia-Kelly et al. 2017), which has been substantiated more generally in the social sciences and the humanities. Yet, Sather-Wagstaff (2017: 13) has cautioned that 'as an element of affect-in-action, [the senses] have rarely been explicitly discussed as part of the constellation of the interdependent sociocultural *and* biological phenomena that engen-

der emotion and memory'. In expanding such sensory-based research, new work such as that showcased in this volume has drawn on lively discussions about *emplaced* methods, the use of which assumes the importance of researchers actively engaging with and in research processes and contexts. As Waterton and Watson (2013: 551) have asked, a key question in such a research is 'what happens to our bodies' in these research encounters? Methods that privilege knowledge from and in bodily experience, as distinct from more traditional ideas that knowledge derives from the mind, parallel critical engagements with 'non-representational' and 'more-than-human' approaches (Anderson and Harrison 2010). In reflecting on the methodological import of their own works, contributors to this volume are clearly aware of their positionality and lived experiences in relation to the research processes they engaged with, and tapped into those. Of particular interest are methods related to walking (Vergunst and Ingold 2008; Degen and Rose 2012), and to feeling and sensing (Pink 2009; O'Neill and Hubbard 2010).

Walking methods appear to be particularly instructive elements of ethnographic approaches used in several contributions to this volume. Drozdowski and Birdsall, for instance, use walking to study the collective affects generated by war commemoration. Combined with attentive listening, watching, and feeling, walking offered an instructive way to participate in and observe a large 'silent march' across Amsterdam that takes place on 4 May each year. For Sharick, Smeltzer, and Trostel, walking is a key component to facilitate their interaction with the Venice Ghetto. Walking through and experiencing this place informed their 'reading in place' as they mapped selected literary accounts that have contributed to its rich cultural imagination and memories.

Several other contributions investigate the utility of walking to engage and 'be with' research participants. In this respect, Lee and Ingold (2006: 67) have argued that 'to participate is not to walk into but to walk with—where "with" implies not a face-to-face confrontation, but heading the same way, sharing the same vistas, and perhaps retreating from the same threats behind'. In this volume, De Nardi incorporates the go-along mode of interviewing (Kusenbach 2003), to support how people 'remember together' and to learn from community members, as co-researchers, how they positioned their memories in place. In Osborne's contribution

here, research participants' everyday acts of memory while walking in place are investigated—using biosensing technologies—to nuance understandings of the 'neurological/biological and social body and the environment'. In Gensburger's contribution, too, everyday memory practices are examined via a reflexive and emplaced method involving daily observations, conversations, and photography, as she herself responds to the experience of the research field that was emerging 'on my doorstep', following the 2015 terrorist attacks in her Paris neighbourhood.

Negotiating familiarity with research place and content is another recurrent theme across a number of the contributions, and frequently cited as a concern necessary in the conduct of participatory and engaged memory research. As Shea points out in her discussion of community-engaged methods, collaborative research methods for investigating place and memory necessarily de-emphasise the scholar in the process and offer an important intervention in how 'scholarship tends to reproduce unequal relationships between researchers and non-researchers, scholars and publics, universities and communities'. In reflecting on sensory ethnography's collaborative understanding of 'research participants as agents in memory process', Sumartojo (this volume) emphasises the importance of joining participants for initial engagements with memory sites and then reflecting with them on their experiences. Sumartojo does this work using photo elicitation and video interviews. Pointing to the limits of conventional ethnography, Halilovich and Fejzić outline how their art-related research approach relies on art exhibitions as both a method and a collaborative research result, and engages the documentary and fictional to capture places of pain in (post-)conflict contexts. Their work aligns with the contention that '*art gives form to human feeling*; it is the shape that is taken by our perception of the world' (Ingold 2000: 23, original emphasis). Acknowledging the imaginative and processual qualities of memory, and accounting for how its open-ended quality, necessarily influences the research process, the chapters in this collection highlight the significance of emplaced and participatory work for documenting memory and place. The value of collaboration is also asserted across the volume, with numerous contributions being products of collaboration between two or more scholars, in research teams, and in participatory co-researcher collaborations with participants.

## Places: Mapped and Digital

Pink (2009: 41) has contended that ‘place is central to our way of being in the world and that we are thus always participating in places’. Thus, a focus on place in this collection’s discussions on methods and practices strengthens existing conceptual and methodological threads related to position, context, and experience. The scope for memory research on, and in, places and spaces is extensive. (Re)productions of memory manifest in public and private places and require varied methodological approaches. As Hoelscher and Alderman (2004: 350) have pointed out ‘monuments, memorials and museums have proven to be fertile grounds for investigating places of memory’. Yet, in public places and spaces, memory can manifest in ways that reveal narratives about past places and peoples hidden, silenced, or forgotten. It can be part of the everyday landscapes and places of our daily routines (Muzaini 2015); it can be felt as a presence or absence (Mayerfeld Bell 2004; Till 2012); and it can also be incorporated into planning neighbourhoods and communities (Fenster and Misgav 2014). Method selection needs consideration both of how to read material representations of memory *and* of how we are looking, sensing, listening, and feeling for immaterial traces of memory. In this vein, Drozdowski et al. (2016: 9) have argued that ‘the role of place and the “body as place” have been pivotal heuristics for thinking through memory’. The scholarship in this collection advances this contention, showing that deep seams connecting memory, place, and the body are secured by astute method selection and application.

Attentiveness to place and space also echo loudly through the collection. As key spatial devices, the cartographic was variously employed to map memory (Chaps. 4, 7, 8, 9, and 10), reveal long-standing attachments (Chaps. 9 and 10), facilitate emplacement (Chaps. 3, 4, 7, and 10), and chart places of remembrance (Chaps. 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 10). De Nardi has used collaborative memory mapping to elicit memories of the domestic buildings constructed in Kibblesworth, United Kingdom, during the 1950s and more recently transplanted to a nearby open-air museum. Shea describes her participatory deep mapping, showing as she argues that ‘memory is social and very much tethered to place’. For her,

as a community-based and crowd-sourced map the ‘Places Project’ connects memories and stories to place identity and attachment in diverse communities around the Cumberland Plateau in Tennessee. In turn, Sharick, Smeltzer, and Trostel use the map as the centre point of their emplaced readings of the Venice Ghetto. Those readings enliven places on the map; indeed, their mapping exercises overlay the map’s existing information with new knowledges gleaned in those places of memory. Similarly, Osborne has mapped the results generated from using biosensing technologies to measure physiological responses in bodies as research participants move around familiar places on the map. In combination, biosensing data, video elicitation, and dialogue revealed deeper understandings of participants as ‘body-subject(s)’ and documented their memories. Her work exemplifies methodological innovation linking memory, place, and identity.

Osborne’s research also highlights a nexus between place and digital technologies in doing memory research. In the introduction to his recent volume, Hoskins (2018: 10) contends that the digital ‘transforms the very character of memory, its meaning, its uses, its potential and its risks’ because the digital has potential to ‘disrupt existing memory ecologies’. Arrigoni’s and Galani’s contribution to this volume, for instance, demonstrates the sharing of digital media and memory that Hoskins (2018) and Tilton (2014) refer to. Their methods capitalise on digital data from this ‘connective turn’ (cf. Hoskins 2011, 2018) to elicit examples of place-making in photo-sharing platforms such as Flickr. They use the data mining tool Geostream to aggregate images based on location, and investigate the images and their metadata for connections between past histories of a place and present-day lived experience. Sharick, Smeltzer, and Trostel’s investigation of the Venice Ghetto uses thick mapping to design interactive digital maps. With Esri’s Story Maps platform they ‘explore the intersection of geographic data and literary analysis [that] rendered new insights into the ways literature defines space and memory’. For Sumartojo, research participants engaged existing skills in the use of digital smartphone photography in the Camp des Milles memory site and she considers how sensory triggers in this site activated personal memories, thinking about how this layering also works in memory processes during and after the visit.

Place(s) provide memory prompts. In Sumartojo's work, the activation of personal memories may have been sparked by the experience of having been in a physical place before, or by sensory encounters in that place, or those sensory encounters may have spurred remembrances of different places and different times. That the connections between place and memory are so powerful predisposes them to be 'used' in ways that align within strategic politics of memory. Memory landscapes are (re)produced and maintained with purpose, as Till (1999: 255) has reasoned: 'public memory is where and how groups struggle to gain cultural authority to selectively represent and narrate their past'. For example, Drozdzewski and Birdsall's chapter on doing memory research on Dutch national war commemoration considers how the route chosen for the Silent March (*Stille Tocht*) purposefully traverses and embeds in the commemorative performances that take place in the streetscapes of central Amsterdam. In Gensburger's account, too, informal memory practices take place in a neighbourhood context. The everydayness of these conversations demarcates an official politics of memory that does not necessarily 'fit' with the traumatic framework envisioned in national memory discourse and policy frameworks. In Halilovich and Fejzić's contribution, art-related research produced memorials to places of pain, including those erased as a result of genocide and 'ethnic cleansings' in Bosnia and Herzegovina; the presentation of the resulting artworks to audiences elicited new memory narratives and re-appropriations that fed into an ongoing, iterative process of the research.

## Chapter Outline

The volume is structured around two guiding thematic parts: multisensorial and emplaced memory (Part I); and, memory places: maps and digital media (Part II). In each part, the chapters maintain focus on the doing of memory research, and also highlight innovation and application across a range of memory sites and contexts. While chosen methods converge in such a way that we have two themed parts, each chapter presents a particular interdisciplinary take on approach and application. For example, while Osborne and Gensburger both utilise emplacement, Osborne

focuses on placing her participants in familiar environments, while Gensburger uses an auto-ethnographic approach, placing herself in the field. Similarly, authors whose works are in Part II converge in their use of the map as a concept and material object yet their data generation techniques contrast by context and discipline. A salient feature of the volume is that the methods-based focus provides accessible pathways for scholars from other disciplinary fields. That is, by concentrating on how research is undertaken rather than solely on the results of the research, we editors felt as though we learned about new methods and about memory work from different perspectives. Certainly, we affirmed that ‘remembering is dynamic, imaginative, and directed in and from the present. And this holds across the spectrum of strata of memories, of the individual or the multitude’ (Hoskins 2018: 9).

## Part I: Multisensorial and Emplaced Memory

In Part I, five contributors engage various multisensorial tactics—sound, touch/feeling, sight, and smell—in combination with other methods to access and consider ways of knowing about memory. Their works also coalesce around emplaced activities: researcher bodies are positioned with, or as (co)participants in the same context / performance / projection of memory. This positioning is a deliberate part of method, enabling researchers to encounter and experience; these encounters and experiences form part of the ways in which the contributors sought to understand the ‘how’ of memory, and extend memory work beyond description. Doing emplaced ethnography is itself a learning process; Leder Mackley and Pink (2017: 124) have reasoned that sensory-based ethnographies cannot be ‘implanted from a textbook or from one project to another’, rather they evolve in use. In Chap. 2, Sumartojo’s emplacement with the participants at the Camp des Milles museum site enabled knowledge (co) production; she was able to talk through, and with the visitation experience in the follow-up interviews. Further, the videographic component allowed a reliving of the sensory experiences of the visit. For example, Sumartojo discusses her participant, Ben’s, recollection of smelling rust and how it prompted a familiar memory. Employing an empathetic

visuality through the whole research process meant her analyses of video data required attunement to, for example, gestures, accents, intonation, and vocal intonation—and not solely to the transcription of what was said. Following a similar strategy in tuning to the more-than-verbal attributions of memory (re)production, in Chap. 3, Drozdzewski and Birdsall record their multisensorial encounters at two commemorative events in Amsterdam, 4 and 5 May. Their method was designed to experience the staging and performance of war memory and how it is linked to Dutch national identity at the key commemorative events. Walking and listening were distinctive methods within their wider sensory ethnography approach. Attuning to the soundscapes of commemoration and moving with its ‘spectacle’ events, Drozdzewski and Birdsall reveal the importance of the ‘collective’ and the placing of the urban locale to those performances of commemoration, and the nation. Walking also formed part of Osborne’s multi-method approach to registering memory intensities in situ. Participants walked through familiar neighbourhood, their sensory encounters, and emotional intensities—indicative of attachments and affinity with places *of/in* memory—were recorded by biosensors and mounted GoPro cameras, then discussed and mapped. Her chapter affirms the efficacy of method innovation and of boldly thinking about how to do memory research differently. Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches, in Chap. 4, Osborne calls for more memory research to cross-disciplinary boundaries and for a more ‘viscerally-aware’ methods (cf. Sexton et al. 2017).

The contributions from Halilovich and Fejzić and Gensburger approach memory by exercising an ethics of care. Each chapter engages methods for doing research on traumatic memory, trauma also known to the authors. The authors’ intuitive and situated knowledges demonstrate the importance of critical self-reflexivity—Halilovich and Fejzić employ a ‘process of iterative (re)considerations’ in reimagining different aspects of memory as the art of memory; Gensburger uses the concept of everyday place as a strategy to talk through the intersection of trauma into those everyday places. Her intimate knowledge of place and of the trauma informed how she researched memory on her doorstep. Understanding trauma, especially its immaterial traces and its affect, is in itself a sensory involvement in research process. In their chapter (Chap. 5), Halilovich

and Fejzić explain how their combination of arts practice and anthropology (field data, interview transcripts, documents, photos, and videos) was applied in the production of a multimedia exhibition of Bosnian war memory. Far from only ‘end products’ of a research process, the exhibitions themselves engaged participants’ narratives in the place of the exhibition and the places of memory exhibited. In Gensburger’s chapter (Chap. 6), the places of memory of the Paris terror attacks were also the places of her everyday locale. Her account of emplaced auto ethnography tussles with her knowledge of established sociological methods for gathering data on the memory of the attacks, and her realisation that her personal, familial, and everyday intersections into those material and immaterial spaces of memory also mattered, and required different nuanced approaches. Cumulatively, the chapters in this first part seek method-based tools to think beyond discussing the representation of memory, in and via its many media. In advancing memory research, they turn to methods that explicate the sensorial capacity of memory and remembering, asking not just how something made them and their participants feel and what those feelings meant, but they sought to experience the ‘ontology of connection’ (cf. Waterton and Watson 2015: 100) and feeling, to tap into the encounter through walking, listening, sensing, and being in place.

## Part II: Memory Places: Maps and Digital Media

Spatialising connections of memory—to site, space, landscape and place—has constituted a fundamental research concern in past decades, especially in terms of identifying representations of memory and their linkages to key theoretical concepts (Halbwachs 1980; Nora 1984–1992; Said 2000). Embracing more recent forays with the more-than-representational and more-than-human in memory work, Till and Kuusisto-Arponen (2015: 294) attest that memory is ‘never only “located” in Cartesian [and material] space ... [it is also] ... communicated across and through spaces and places, and travel[s] through and with personal and shared emotions, memories, and affects’. Furthermore, changing pathways in the communication and storage of memory, through digital

and mobile media (Özkul and Humphreys 2015; Birdsall and Drozdzewski 2018) have compelled scholars to think differently about doing research focused on connections between place and memory. What we think is especially interesting in this Part is that each of the four contributors have combined the map—something we consider as a traditional method-based tool for determining spatial location—with other digital, sensory, participatory, and collaborative methods. Their work towards advancing methods for memory research shows, as Fenster and Misgav (2014: 365) have argued, that combining ‘spatial memory representations as visual, cognitive and more-than-representational’ provides ‘knowledge [about place] richer than that provided by professional expressions (e.g. documents, maps, air photos)’.

In Chap. 7, Sharick, Smeltzer, and Trostel use digital mapping and reading in place to investigate the palimpsestic memories and stories attached to the Venice Ghetto, on the occasion of its 500th anniversary. As literary scholars, using digital mapping reached beyond their usual methodological scope; yet they explain how working with the Esri Story Maps platform enabled an activation of memory and place and to find new methods to explain ‘overlapping memory-dynamics, temporalities, fiction, and site-based observations’. Through critical and self-reflection on method, they also concede that the digital mapping exercise was at times, messy and unwieldy in size. Where Sharick, Smeltzer, and Trostel seek to connect investigate the storying of the Ghetto across time and space, Arrigoni and Galani’s chapter (Chap. 8) also pursues a ‘geolocate perspective’ to examine how everyday memory practices aggregate around particular sites (squares) in contemporary cities. In acknowledging people’s use of ‘mobile media to create an archive of the places while making memories of those places on the go’ (Özkul and Humphreys 2015: 354), Arrigoni and Galani demonstrate how these online repositories for photosharing and tagging, such as Flickr, can reveal bottom-up understandings of heritage, place, and memory. Using Geostream to mine social media images of chosen places facilitated an opportunity to understand ‘time and space as multiple, embodied, practised and lived’ (Waterton and Watson 2015: 101). This temporal perspective of memory and place shows how social media and digital platforms provide novel tools for memory research and drive net-ethnography further.

In Shea's contribution (Chap. 9), participatory deep mapping formed a crucial part of an effort to establish a means of 'collaborative interpretation and community creation' for the Places Project. Taking the research data gathered by the project team, researchers sorted the information by coding participant narratives according to geographical location, place, age, and relationship to the Cumberland Plateau region in Tennessee. The maps emerged via a process of tagging using selected themes identified across the data (e.g. family, community, race, history, and religion/faith). As Shea notes, the digital tools 'facilitated the creation of maps, and allowed places around which stories and memories accreted to be highlighted'. Her use of a collaborative and participatory approach shows how memory is both 'mediated' (van Dijck 2007) and 'connective' (Hoskins 2011a, b), and that when digital tools are employed to elicit both location-based and qualitative information, research methods must attune to community context (van Doorn 2013; Frith and Kalin 2016). While Shea notes how collaborative and community-engaged memory research requires the researcher's role to be de-emphasised, she also sketches out the role and responsibility of the researcher *curation* as part of the exploration of the research data.

Incorporating a similar ethics of care in her engagement in curating and 'editing' of participants' memories, De Nardi's contribution highlights the value of a collaborative and vernacular 'memory mapping'. In Chap. 10, De Nardi reflects on the methodological process of working with community members, and as *co-researchers*, mapped 'memories of playful spaces and lived experiences'. De Nardi's research also involved overlaying methods—collaborative mapping, focus groups, walking, emplacement, and sensory ethnography. These techniques provided different data, which she and the co-researchers sifted through to construct a memory map of the Kibblesworth community. This sifting was in itself part of the collaborative method; it involved encountering feelings of loss and frustration and talking through contestation. As Muzaini (2016) has shown, the imposition of memoryscapes designed to invoke the past in a certain way rarely reveal congruence with the formalised narrative. In both De Nardi and Shea's chapters 'exploring the polyphony of different voices in the studied area' (Bulkens et al. 2015: 2311) required methods

strategies that recognised multiplicity and dissent among participants' stories about place, memory and identity.

## Conclusion

We hope that this collection's explorations of 'doing of memory research' are a motivating force to think differently and advance the practice of memory-related scholarship. Drawing from a multidisciplinary base offers a range in perspectives of how memory is understood, but as exhibited here, it also highlights the central role of fieldwork to the practice of our scholarship—regardless of discipline. It is through method then, we argue, that we can find the in-between points of our different disciplines, the points where they 'spark and meld' (Leder Mackley and Pink 2017: 136). For us, these sparks were evident in the diversity of contributions (many featured herein) at our conference sessions on doing memory methods differently in Boston, 2017—they were ignition points for this volume. Looking across the chapters, our final provocation is to suggest that one of the most valuable consequences of the affective turn in researching memory has been its encouragement to us, as scholars and practitioners of memory, to get out there, to do, to experience, to encounter, to be in the places and spaces that we talk about.

## References

- Anderson, B., & Harrison, P. (2010). *Taking-place: Non-representational theories and geography*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Birdsall, C. J., & Drozdzewski, D. (2018). Capturing commemoration: Using mobile recordings within memory research. *Mobile Media & Communication*, 6(1), 266–284.
- Bulkens, M., Minca, C., & Muzaini, H. (2015). Storytelling as method in spatial planning. *European Planning Studies*, 23(11), 2310–2326.
- Casey, E. (2000). *Remembering*. Bloomington/Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Degen, M. M., & Rose, G. (2012). The sensory experiencing of urban design: The role of walking and perceptual memory. *Urban Studies*, 49, 3271–3287.

- Donohoe, J. (2014). *Remembering places: A phenomenological study of the relationship between memory and place*. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Drozdzewski, D. (2016). Encountering memory in the everyday city. In D. Drozdzewski, S. D. Nardi, & E. Waterton (Eds.), *Memory, place and identity: Commemoration and remembrance of war and conflict* (pp. 19–37). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Drozdzewski, D., De Nardi, S., & Waterton, E. (2016). The significance of memory in the present. In D. Drozdzewski, S. De Nardi, & E. Waterton (Eds.), *Memory, place and identity: Commemoration and remembrance of war and conflict* (pp. 1–16). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ellis, C. (2017). Manifesting compassionate autoethnographic research: Focusing on others. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, 10(1), 54–61.
- Fenster, T., & Misgav, C. (2014). Memory and place in participatory planning. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 15(3), 349–369.
- Frith, J., & Kalin, J. (2016). Here, I used to be: Mobile media and practices of place-based digital memory. *Space and Culture*, 19(1), 43–55.
- Halbwachs, M. (1980). *The collective memory (with an original introduction by M Douglas)*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Hoelscher, S., & Alderman, D. (2004). Memory and place: Geographies of a critical relationship. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 5(3), 347–355.
- Hoskins, A. (2011a). Media, memory, metaphor: Remembering and the connective turn. *Parallax*, 17(4), 19–31.
- Hoskins, A. (2011b). 7/7 and connective memory: Interactional trajectories of remembering in post-scarcity culture. *Memory Studies*, 4(3), 269–280.
- Hoskins, A. (2018). The restless past: An introduction to digital memory and media. In A. Hoskins (Ed.), *Digital memory studies: Media pasts in transition* (pp. 1–23). New York: Routledge.
- Ingold, T. (2000). *The perception of the environment: Essays on livelihood, dwelling and skill*. London: Routledge.
- Jones, O. (2011). Geography, memory and non-representational geographies. *Geography Compass*, 5(12), 875–885.
- Kattago, S. (2016). *The Ashgate research companion to memory studies*. London: Routledge.
- Keightley, E., & Pickering, M. (2013). *Research methods for memory studies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Kusenbach, M. (2003). Street phenomenology: The go-along as ethnographic research tool. *Ethnography*, 4(3), 455–485.

- Leder Mackley, K., & Pink, S. (2017). From emplaced knowledge to interdisciplinary knowledge. In S. Pink, V. Fors, & T. O'Dell (Eds.), *Theoretical scholarship and applied practice* (pp. 121–141). New York: Berghahn Books.
- Lee, J., & Ingold, T. (2006). Fieldwork on foot: Perceiving, routing, socializing. In P. Collins & S. Coleman (Eds.), *Locating the field. Space, place and context in anthropology* (pp. 67–86). Oxford: Berg.
- Legg, S. (2004). Memory and nostalgia. *Cultural Geographies*, 11, 99–107.
- Legg, S. (2005). Sites of counter-memory: The refusal to forget and the nationalist struggle in colonial Delhi. *Historical Geography*, 33, 180–201.
- Mayerfeld Bell, M. (2004). *An invitation to environmental sociology* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- McEwan, C., & Goodman, M. K. (2010). Place geography and the ethics of care: Introductory remarks on the geographies of ethics, responsibility and care. *Ethics, Place & Environment*, 13(2), 103–112.
- Muzaini, H. (2015). On the matter of forgetting and 'memory returns'. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 40(1), 102–112.
- Muzaini, H. (2016). Personal reflections on formal second world war memories/memorials in everyday spaces. In D. Drozdowski, S. De Nardi, & E. Waterton (Eds.), *Memory, place and identity: Commemoration and remembrance of war and conflict* (pp. 38–55). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: Les lieux de memoire. *Representations*, 26, 7–24.
- Olick, J. K., Sierp, A., & Wüstenberg, J. (2017). The memory studies association: Ambitions and an invitation. *Memory Studies*, 10(4), 490–494.
- O'Neill, M., & Hubbard, P. (2010). Walking, sensing, belonging: Ethnomimesis as performative praxis. *Visual Studies*, 25(1), 46–58.
- Özkul, D., & Humphreys, L. (2015). Record and remember: Memory and meaning-making practices through mobile media. *Mobile Media & Communication*, 3(3), 351–365.
- Pink, S. (2009). *Doing sensory ethnography*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Roediger III, H. L., & Wertsch, J. V. (2008). Creating a new discipline of memory studies. *Memory Studies*, 1(1), 9–22.
- Said, E. W. (2000). Invention, memory and place. *Critical Inquiry*, 26, 175–192.
- Sather-Wagstaff, J. (2017). Making polysense of the world: Affect, memory, heritage. In D. P. Tolia-Kelly, E. Waterton, & S. Watson (Eds.), *Heritage, affect and emotion: Politics, practices and infrastructures*, Abingdon (pp. 12–29). Routledge.

- Schuurman, N., & Pratt, G. (2002). Care of the subject: Feminism and critiques of GIS. *Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography*, 9(3), 291–299.
- Sexton, A. E., Hayes-Conroy, A., Sweet, E. L., Miele, M., & Ash, J. (2017). Better than text? Critical reflections on the practices of visceral methodologies in human geography. *Geoforum*, 82, 200–201.
- Stevenson, A. (2014). We came here to remember: Using participatory sensory ethnography to explore memory as emplaced, embodied practice. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 11(4), 335–349.
- Sumartojo, S. (2016). Commemorative atmospheres: Memorial sites, collective events and the experience of national identity. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 41(4), 541–553.
- Sumartojo, S. (2017). Tweeting from the past: Commemorating the Anzac centenary @ABCNews1915. *Memory Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698017709873>.
- Till, K. E. (1999). Staging the past: Landscape designs, cultural identity and *Erinnerungspolitik* at Berlin's *Neue Wache*. *Ecumene*, 6(3), 251–283.
- Till, K. E. (2012). Wounded cities: Memory-work and a place-based ethics of care. *Political Geography*, 31(1), 3–14.
- Till, K. E., & Kuusisto-Arponen, A. K. (2015). Towards responsible geographies of memory: Complexities of place and the ethics of remembering. *Erdkunde*, 69(4), 291–306.
- Tilton, S. (2014). Mobile public memory: The (digital/physical) (artifacts/souvenirs) of the (archiver/tourist). *SAGE Open*, 4(3), 1–9.
- Tolia-Kelly, D. P., Waterton, E., & Watson, S. (2017). *Heritage, affect and emotion: Politics, Practices and infrastructures*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- van Dijck, J. (2007). *Mediated memories in the digital age*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- van Doorn, N. (2013). Assembling the affective field: How smartphone technology impacts ethnographic research practice. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 19(5), 385–396.
- Vergunst, J. L., & Ingold, T. (2008). *Ways of walking: Ethnography and practice on foot*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Waterton, E., & Dittmer, J. (2014). The museum as assemblage: Bringing forth affect at the Australian war Memorial. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 29(2), 122–139.

- Waterton, E., & Watson, S. (2013). Framing theory: Towards a critical imagination in heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 19(6), 546–561.
- Waterton, E., & Watson, S. (2015). A war long forgotten: Feeling the past in an English country village. *Angelaki*, 20(3), 89–103.
- Witcomb, A. (2016). Beyond sentimentality and glorification: Using a history of emotions to deal with the horrors of war. In D. Drozdzewski, S. De Nardi, & E. Waterton (Eds.), *Memory, place and identity: Commemoration and remembrance of war and conflict* (pp. 205–220). Abingdon: Routledge.