



Walking with video

Sarah Pink

To cite this article: Sarah Pink (2007) Walking with video, *Visual Studies*, 22:3, 240-252, DOI: [10.1080/14725860701657142](https://doi.org/10.1080/14725860701657142)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14725860701657142>



Published online: 24 Apr 2008.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1911



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 120 View citing articles [↗](#)

Walking with video

SARAH PINK

In this article the author discusses the idea of 'walking with video' as a phenomenological research method that attends to sensorial elements of human experience and place-making. As a simple method this means walking with and video-recording research participants as they experience, tell and show their material, immaterial and social environments in personally, socially and culturally specific ways. Her aims are twofold. First, in relation to recent anthropological work on sensory experience and on walking, she articulates the theoretical and methodological basis for this idea; why is it that walking with another person should allow researchers to learn empathetically about their experiences? Second, in relation to established and recent work in visual anthropology, she discusses how the integration of video into this method can serve as a catalyst for creating ethnographic understandings of other people's experiences, and representing these experiences to a wider audience.

PROLOGUE

The third time I walked around the Green Lanes Community Garden site with David and his wife Anne, David and I had just viewed a DVD copy of our first walk in the garden on his television. He commented on how during our first visit it had been pouring with rain, comparing this with the burning sun that was now both baking us and drying up the garden. We were using our interpretations of the weather both to define our own sensory embodied experiences in the garden, and to understand the physical condition of the garden. For our first walk around the garden, several months before, Anne had lent me her jacket and umbrella, which I held over myself and my video camera as David guided me through the site. Although it was pouring with rain neither of us questioned the need for me to physically walk round the garden with David in order to understand the project that he and others had described to me verbally and through drawings, plans and photographs.

David pointed out to me the 'natural line' of the path that would go through the garden, with its 'natural bend and slight curve at the end'. However, we walked around

the edge of the garden with the longish wet grass underfoot, as David, who knew the terrain well, advised. As he explained, this haptic experience of the garden, of which I now had direct knowledge, did not appeal to many people and particularly deterred the mums with pushchairs from taking the short cut that a walk across the field would afford them on their way to town. The movements of his feet drew my camera to the ground several times as he used them to indicate the textures of the soil, sometimes to show me where I should or should not step to avoid a muddy patch.

This walk around the garden was an exercise in experiencing and imagining. The narrative that guided our walk through the material garden site referred to the garden as an imagined (and planned) place and involved continually comparing our present sensory embodied experiences of the garden with potential others: new textures under foot; new flower beds and aromas; lighting at the two ends of the planned path; the sociality of the mums with their pushchairs who might stop at the bench for a chat on their way back from town; and the physical comfort of an 89-year-old lady who, David told me, walked into town four times a week, but who, when it was wet, had to walk all the way round rather than taking the short cut through the garden.

Towards the end of our walk David asked me if I had thought the garden was as big as it was. By thinking (in this instance, using my prior knowledge to imagine what it would be like to be emplaced in the garden), I had not been able to know how big the garden would feel once I was in it. But perhaps more importantly, until I had walked round it with David who knew its detail well, I had only come to know the garden site as a representation, shown to me in maps and photographs and verbally described. Once I had 'been there' and walked the garden with someone who had already defined it as a place, I was able to gain – to invoke the complexities implied by an anthropological use of the phrase – 'a sense of place'; in Steven Feld's words: 'as place is sensed, senses are placed; as places make sense, senses make place' (Feld and Basso 1996, 91). One of the purposes of walking with David in the garden with my video camera had been to begin to learn about his

Sarah Pink is Reader in Social Anthropology in the Department of Social Sciences, Loughborough University. Her recent books include *Doing Visual Ethnography* (2007 [2001]), *The Future of Visual Anthropology* (2006) and *Visual Interventions* (ed.) (2007c).



FIGURE 1. 'Now of course these are the barriers we were talking about that day when you came to see us, when it was raining that day, when we were soaking wet, now today we're burning to a cinder ...' (David). Video still © Sarah Pink 2006.



FIGURE 2. The 'natural line' of the path across the field. Video still © Sarah Pink 2006.



FIGURE 3. My camera was drawn to the ground under foot. Video still © Sarah Pink 2006.



FIGURE 4. The first thing David showed me was the point where the new path would start. Video still © Sarah Pink 2006.

involvement in making place through the garden project. It also afforded me the opportunity to use my own sensory embodied experience as a basis from which to empathise with others who had walked through the as yet undeveloped garden in the pouring rain. As I shall discuss in more detail below, another way to interpret our walking with video would be to see the videomaking process as a form of place-making in itself. However, perhaps the most important thing I learned from the walk was the importance of the path. I should have already realised this since I knew that the residents had spent considerable time selecting the style of the path and considering how it would look, feel underfoot and cost. For the experiential qualities of this (as yet only imagined) path would play a crucial role in determining how the garden would be sensed.

Our next excursion, a few months later, felt quite different. I had already seen a photograph of the new brickweave path that the residents had chosen for the garden as Monica, who was providing administrative support for the project, had emailed me one of David's digital photographs, showing the new path in place that winter. This second walk, accompanied this time by Anne and my three-year-old son, involved sensing a quite different texture underfoot. The brickweave path, which followed the 'natural line' across the garden that David had pointed out to me on our previous visit, guided us from one entrance to another, past the aromatic bay tree and the partially prepared flower beds. It did not occur to any of us to diverge from the path as we progressed through the site. Indeed, one of the very points of our walk was as much to experience the path as to experience the garden through the medium of the path.

Several months later, when we returned with the camera a third time, the garden was no longer simply an imagined place but a physical environment in which many memories and meanings were already invested. Its very textures, its plants, the consistency and distribution of its soil had all become containers for meaningful anecdotes through which a series of stories unfolded; narratives of different socialities, a neighbour who had passed away and the objects, practices and knowledge that had created the garden. By walking in the garden with video I invited David to engage with these textures by 'showing' me the garden, and providing me a route through which to experience it too. On video he picked one of the mushrooms that had grown in the apparently sterilized soil that had been used to fill one of the flower beds, breaking it open to show me the maggots inside and recounting the story of how he had cooked and

enjoyed the first crop before the maggots took them over. In this context video is not merely a method of audio-visually recording people and physical settings. Rather, as I shall elaborate in this article, walking with video provides ways of (to paraphrase Feld and Basso 1996, 91) sensing place, placing senses, sensorially making place and making sense of place.

When I have recently presented the idea of 'walking with video' in seminar and conference contexts, my audiences have nodded in apparent agreement. The method outlined above has 'made sense' to them. One of my motivations for writing this article has been to discuss this method in a text that will allow me to articulate a more detailed theoretical and methodological basis for its use. As such to comment on why I think it made sense to my audiences. A second motive has been to draw together the overlapping theoretical and substantive concerns of mainstream, visual and applied anthropologies. The idea of 'walking with' is indeed pertinent to each of these three (in my view actually inseparable) anthropological endeavours. These motives overlap with my aims, outlined in the abstract, to explore two questions related to 'walking with video' as an ethnographic research method. First, drawing from recent anthropological work on walking, to articulate the theoretical and methodological basis for this idea; why is it that walking with another person should allow researchers to learn empathetically about their experiences? Second, drawing from established and recent work in academic and applied visual anthropology, to discuss how the integration of video into this method can serve as a catalyst for creating ethnographic understandings of other people's experiences and communicating about these to a wider audience.¹

INTRODUCTION

Social anthropologists have long since advocated that researchers should generally join in, to the extent that their (locally defined) social status allows them to, with what their informants, or the people whose experienced realities they are trying to comprehend, are doing. Amongst the most evocative of the accounts of long-term fieldwork experiences to have emerged from around the mid-twentieth century is Colin Turnbull's (1961) *The Forest People*. Although Turnbull appears not to pretend that he is necessarily having the 'same' experiences as his Mbuti Pygmy informants, he was, however, intent on learning about them through his own corporeal experiences of, for instance, spending the night in a cold damp initiation camp, and becoming 'of

the forest' by having a series of slits cut into his forehead and having tree bark ashes rubbed into them. I will return to Turnbull's work shortly. More recently, following the development of more explicit theoretical agendas relating to corporeality and embodiment in the late twentieth century (e.g. Schilling 1991) and sensory perception (e.g. Ingold 2000, 2004, 2005), ethnographers have begun to reflect more systematically on the embodied² and sensorial nature of their research experiences. In some of the earlier literature of this kind, anthropologists often describe how they came to moments of realisation about other people's meanings and values serendipitously through their own seemingly 'same' sensory embodied experiences – for instance through eating (e.g. Okely 1994), sickness (Stoller 1997), or sexual intercourse (e.g. Kulick and Willson 1995). More recently, sensory approaches have begun to emerge as a more concrete form of research practice. Now researchers are beginning to seek out ways of joining the people they are doing their research with in a range of 'shared' corporeal experiences. For example, David Sutton (2001, 2) notes how during his research in Greece, *'In telling me to use the transitory and repetitive act of eating as a medium for the more enduring act of remembering, they were in fact telling me to act like a Kalmnian'* (original italics); and by setting out learning to see cattle as her Italian cattle breeder informants do, Cristina Grasseni suggests that 'participant observation ... means sharing a process of sensory apprenticeship in order to appreciate and, to some extent, even appropriate the "way of seeing" (Berger 1972) of the ethnographic subject' (2004, 16). Whether serendipitously or as part of an intentional research method, researchers who have 'shared' the sensory embodied experiences of their informants in these ways have variously claimed that this approach has led to heightened understandings of the identities, moralities, values, beliefs and concerns of the people they do their research with. They have also sought innovative ways to communicate them to their academic audiences. Sutton includes a recipe in his attempts to represent his fieldwork experiences (Sutton 2001, 156–58) and Grasseni has published two video clips online to accompany her (2004) discussion of how her informants 'see' cattle.³ More recently, anthropologists have begun to turn their attention to walking – another (almost) universal human activity which has, in the past, been neglected by researchers – as fundamental to the way that we both perceive and intervene in our environments (e.g. Ingold 2000, 2004; Gray 2003; Lee and Ingold 2006; Lund 2006).

An influential forerunner to the social anthropological study of walking is Michel de Certeau's attempt to theorise walking in the city as a 'practice of everyday life' that involves a 'process of *appropriation*' (1986, 97, original italics), a 'spatial acting out of place' and is 'a space of enunciation' (1986, 98) whereby through movements people enter into 'contracts' with others. De Certeau's approach is limited by his wider insistence on framing human behaviour with a model of power relations that sees walking as a form of potential tactical resistance of the weak to the (architectural and urban planning in this case) strategies of the powerful (cf. Lee and Ingold 2006, 76). Nevertheless, he provides a useful starting point. Of particular interest here is how the connections between walking and themes of place-making and sociality implied by de Certeau's theoretical suggestions have been engaged by social anthropologists. First, the idea of walking as a form of place-making has been stressed by John Gray, drawing from his ethnographic research with shepherds on the hill farms of the Scottish Borders. Gray notes how shepherds engage in 'place-making' in that rather than reflecting the place naming represented in existing maps, here 'meanings are open, established by shepherds in the act of going round the hill' (Gray 2003, 228). Later, Lee and Ingold have suggested that 'the locomotive (or getting around) aspect of walking allows for an understanding of places being created by routes' (Lee and Ingold 2006, 68). Social anthropologists are also increasingly seeing place itself as a sensory phenomenon (e.g. Feld and Basso 1996) and a focus on the phenomenological and sensorial aspects of place suggests that such constitution of place though walking is also a multi-sensory activity.

Inherent in de Certeau's idea of the city as a space of enunciation is the point that walking in a space where there are other walkers inevitably involves social encounters, of a variety of different kinds. Lee and Ingold have also stressed the sociality of walking, but focus in on 'the sociability that is engendered by walking *with others*' involving a 'physical co-presence, emphasised by common movements, [which] is also important in ethnography as we attempt to live and move as others do' (Lee and Ingold 2006, 69, original italics). Like recent ethnographic studies that have emphasised the sensory nature of sociality (e.g. Brenneis and Bendix 2006), for instance through sharing meals and tastes (e.g. Walmsley 2006), Lee and Ingold's analysis sets the ground for understanding walking as a multisensory human activity that can potentially be shared and empathetically comprehended.

Of specific interest for this discussion of 'walking with video' are the links that have been made between the anthropology of walking and the currently burgeoning field of the anthropology of the senses. Criticising the emphasis on vision in much existing modern western academic work on how we perceive our environments, Ingold has argued that 'it is surely through our feet, in contact with the ground (albeit mediated by footwear), that we are more fundamentally and continually "in touch" with our surroundings' (Ingold 2004, 330) thus suggesting that 'Locomotion, not cognition, must be the starting point for the study of perceptual activity' (Ingold 2004, 331; 2000, 166). Subsequent and concurrent ethnographic studies have reinforced this idea by emphasising the importance of studying not simply how others 'see' their worlds. Rather, as Katrin Lund, reflecting on her own ethnography that involved walking the Scottish hills with fellow mountaineers, puts it: 'the sense of vision and the mountaineer's gaze cannot be separated from examining the body that moves and touches the ground' (2006, 40). Lund thus argues for a focus on 'the moving body' because this 'may provide us with a scope for looking at the body that senses – sees, touches, smells, hears and tastes – and how all these senses are integrated by the way in which the living body moves' (2006, 41).

In this article, taking heed of these calls for a focus on the moving body, I shall discuss their implications for the researchers' body and the modes and media that they use to produce knowledge about the ways in which others perceive their environments. To do this, I will first discuss recent existing literature that reveals the forms of empathetic and embodied learning that ethnographers have engaged in when they have walked with their informants. However, the practice of walking with others is actually well established as a technique in visual anthropology. In the following section I shall examine how ethnographic documentary filmmakers have walked with their research subjects in an attempt to better understand and represent their experiences and embodied knowledge. In doing so, I shall also suggest that they might become involved in processes that can themselves be defined as 'place-making'. Visual anthropology nevertheless does not stop at ethnographic documentary production, and following this I shall analyse how more recent uses of the camera have entailed the researcher and informant 'walking with video', using the camera as a tool through which to explore informants' experiences of and engagements with the environment. Finally, I shall conclude by suggesting not that video necessarily enhances our ability to learn about other people's multisensory forms

of experience of and engagement with the physical, social and cultural contexts in which they live. Rather, I shall propose that 'walking with' audiovisual methods of research and presentation offer (at least) two ways of exploring and communicating about people's relationships with their environments. First, video provides us with a tool that can enable embodied communication about, empathetic understandings of and representations of other people's perceptions of their environments. Second, I will suggest that anthropological film/video that represents people 'walking with' the camera person/anthropologist also stands as film about place as it is made, in the sense that the film/videomaking context serves as a process through which people, things and sensory experiences are drawn together.

Central to these discussions will be the concept of 'place'. De Certeau (1986), Gray (2003) and Lee and Ingold (2006) suggest that place-making is a central product of walking. Here my understanding of walking as a place-making practice draws from the work of the philosopher Edward Casey, who suggests that of the 'essential structures that pervade places as we know them', two are of particular importance: first, the centrality of the experiencing body to place; second, 'the gathering power of place itself' (Casey 1996, 44), meaning its ability to draw together bodies and things, and time and space. Casey argues that place should be seen as 'event' and therefore 'far from being static sites, [places] are themselves continually changing in accordance with their own proper dynamism' (1996, 44). As such, place can be created in a variety of contexts, including determined physical locations (e.g. in a house, a garden), in a public space (e.g. a town square or street) or in movement (e.g. by walking through a path, or on a trip overseas). My interest in walking as a place-making practice here draws from both of Casey's points. First, the experiencing body is central to the production of place as it determines place through its movement in and physical multisensorial engagement with the environment: in modern western terms, seeing, smelling, touching, hearing, *and* simultaneously creating the texture of the environment, through footprints, breathing air out into it, producing sound. Second, seeing place as a form of gathering provides us with a metaphor for understanding how, by making place through the creation of a route, things, persons, social encounters experiences, discourses, reflections and more are gathered together as components of that place-as-route. As such the route can be seen as place-as-event.

'WALKING WITH' IN ETHNOGRAPHIC FIELDWORK

Njobo was there to greet us, and the first thing he asked was whether I had been able to keep up with the others, or if I had 'walked like the BaNgwana'. He then turned to the others with an obvious, 'I told you so' air and said, 'You see, it's alright, he knows how to walk.' This apparently slight compliment was, in fact, a very real one, because to the pygmy it is one of the most important differences between the people of the forest and the people of the village that the latter do *not* know 'how to walk'. (Turnbull 1961, 75-6, original italics)

Writing over 45 years ago, Colin Turnbull was well aware of how both knowledge of the terrain and walking in the right way was bound up with certain forms of being and experiencing. Since then, countless ethnographers have walked to and from different places with their informants. However, like academics working in other disciplines, they have tended to pay more attention to the 'places' of departure and arrival, than to the idea of the route as 'place' in itself. Critiques of this neglect of routes and pathways have begun to spring up in disciplines that are concerned with the way we experience our physical environment. For example, the design theorists Joy Monice Malnar and Frank Vodvarka see paths as 'generative elements of spatial design' (Malnar and Vodvarka 2004, 118). They note how although 'transition through a structured space is surely familiar to all human beings ... yet the generative role of the path, and its sensory character, has seldom been given much consideration by architectural theorists' (2004, 119). Paths and routes are not simply functional routes that connect one place to another, but are meaningful sensory and imaginative places their own right that interact with and are contextualised by the sensescapes of which they form a part (Pink 2007a).

As I noted above, anthropologists are beginning to make a case for attending to routes as walked. Indeed, Lee and Ingold have suggested that there are a series of resonances between walking and a phenomenological approach to ethnographic fieldwork. First, the attunement (Ingold 2000, 22; Grasseni 2004, 27)⁴ with the environment that one feels through walking is likened to the form of 'being there' that anthropologists need to achieve in order to 'perceive the multi-sensory environment' to the fullest. Second, the idea that places are created as we walk routes through them indicates that anthropologists need to understand the 'routes and mobilities of others' (Lee and Ingold 2006, 68). Third,

the distinctiveness of the 'sociability that is engendered by walking *with* others' (original italics) resonates with ethnography where 'we attempt to live and move as others do' (Lee and Ingold 2006, 69). Although of course ethnographic practice cannot be reduced to its comparison with walking, Lee and Ingold's points suggest that as a phenomenological research practice, 'walking with' can bring us closer to understanding how other people perceive their multisensory environments, constitute place through everyday practice and live 'in their bodies'.

A good example of this is Katrin Lund and Hayden Lorimer's fieldwork with mountaineers in Scotland. In her research, Lund used a range of methods to understand how 'views and vistas of the mountains are created alongside the physical activity of walking and climbing'. During her twelve months of fieldwork she both 'followed walkers and mountaineers on the hikes into the mountains' and interviewed them (Lund 2006, 28). Of particular interest here is the use of walking as a method, which Lorimer and Lund note had a practical element, as it enabled them to cope with a mobile research subject, but also 'provide[d] the opportunity for an unhurried observation of the interplay between sensual and objectifying modes of performance as actual happenings on the mountainside'. They claim that, 'Ultimately, by moving and interacting with hill-walkers, we ensured that our ideas emerged out of, and were re-worked and enriched through direct embodied experience' (Lorimer and Lund 2003, 131-2). In writing about her experiences of walking, Lund shows how through her own experience of the same routes and practices as the mountaineers she did research which supported her subsequent understandings of the relations between visual and tactile perception in mountaineering. The article opens with a descriptive passage of Lund's experience of climbing a mountain (Lund 2006, 27-8). In this narrative she emphasises the concentration involved and the corporal and tactile aspects of her experience of climbing, which were combined with her visual sensing of views in different ways at different points in the climb. Lund's point is that the question of 'how the eyes perceive the surroundings' needs to 'be examined in relation to the moving body' and because this movement is characterised by tactility, the 'vistas appreciated by the mountaineer' cannot be comprehended without recognition of their inseparability from the tactile sense (Lund 2006, 28). Like Turnbull almost half a century before, Lund had learned to 'walk' like those she was 'walking with', which opens up the possibility of understanding how

people constitute both their self identities and place through their multisensory embodied experience.

'WALKING WITH' IN ETHNOGRAPHIC FILM

It has not been only what Metje Postma and Peter Crawford have called 'writing anthropologists' (Postma and Crawford 2006, 5) who have walked with the participants in their research. The researcher/filmmaker following people about their everyday business and their ritual routes has also been a practice in observational ethnographic filmmaking that involves long-term engagements with the everyday experiences of people in ways that are parallel with the long-term participant observation undertaken by 'writing anthropologists'. Ethnographic documentaries also often feature scenes in which their protagonists take the filmmaker on a tour of their material environments. In fact the respective work of Crawford and Postma provide precise examples. Postma, who urges us to explore further how film can communicate 'experiential' or 'body-to-body-knowledge' (Postma 2006, 328), included in her film *Of Men and Mares* (1998) a sequence of less than one minute during which she walks alongside a Zeeland farmer, filming him as he works the land with a horse-drawn plough. As they walk, one becomes aware of the rhythm of their movement. As the farmer verbalises his thoughts about the condition of the soil they walk over, Postma's camera (like my own, as I noted above) is drawn to his feet as they touch the ground. This kind of 'walking with' can be seen as parallel to the routine place-making activities of the Scottish Border shepherds that Gray (2003) writes about. Crawford, in contrast, is taken on a purposeful and expository tour of the lands of the Reef Islands by 'Big Man' Alfred Melotu, who protagonises his film *Alfred Melotu – the funeral of a paramount chief* (Crawford and Scott 2003). As Crawford, his colleague Jens Pinholt and Alfred Melotu walk through Alfred's territory, we see how the pace set by Alfred dominates the film sequence as not only the filmmakers, but also a group of local children, fall into step with him. However, as a place-making exercise this is not simply an object for anthropological theorising, but also a quite practical activity, since, as Crawford notes, 'there is no doubt that Alfred wants the film to document that this is "his" land, despite communal ownership' (Crawford 2006, 306).⁵ In this article, my main interest is in this type of 'tour' narrative. To reflect further on this, I now discuss a scene from the film *Lorang's Way* by David and Judith MacDougall (MacDougall and MacDougall 1979).

For readers unfamiliar with the work of the MacDougalls, they practise (and indeed have played a key role in promoting) a participatory and reflexive form of observational filmmaking (see MacDougall 1998; Taylor 1998). *Lorang's Way*, described by Lucien Taylor as 'a subtle portrait of a self-possessed but vulnerable man who reflects on his life and the fragile future of his culture' (Taylor 1998, 8), is already well known among visual anthropologists for containing a sequence of approximately ten minutes in which the film's protagonist Lorang shows the filmmakers around his compound. My reason for selecting this film for discussion here is because it is both well known amongst visual anthropologists and has already been identified by Jayasingha Jhala as a key scene that links methodologically with Jhala's work, which I discuss below. Here, building on Jhala's work, I develop two points – first, that this sequence can be interpreted as a filmic representation of how place is made precisely by walking. It alerts us to the routes that others take, but also to aspects of their embodied experience of this, since, as Taylor puts it 'ethnographic film explores lived experience through its inscription in bodies, gestures and looks' (1998, 17). Second, I suggest that 'walking with film' of this kind is itself a place-making practice, since the filmmaking process gathers embodied experiences, things, persons, relationships and so on. It creates what Casey (1996) calls a place-event.

In this sequence from *Lorang's Way* the filmmakers take an approach that Jhala (2007) refers to as 'processing through landscape to narrate story'. Comparing this to wide-shot 'bird's eye views' of other people's worlds, Jhala points out how because the camera 'makes a virtual circle, meandering along paths' it creates a very different experience and encounter to that which would be produced by 'a camera floating on high'. This is important for the way the film represents Lorang and his world, since 'Walking alongside or behind the subject also allows for the maintenance of a human scale and transferable proximity between subject and viewer' (Jhala 2007). As Jhala's comments highlight, walking with one's film subject can create a sense of closeness to their experience. It also involves hearing their definitions of the places and persons that make up the route, following the same 'meandering' routes taken by the film subject and a form of sociality between filmmaker and subject as they walk and pause, alongside or behind.

Some anthropological filmmakers have argued that film can communicate pre-culturally by transcending cultural boundaries, in that it 'reveals not only the

intersubjective field of consciousness linking Self and Other, but also the gradual modulations and commonalities of experience between different cultural groups' (MacDougall 1998; Taylor 1998, 19). While, in common with some other social and visual anthropologists (e.g. Heider 2006), I think there are limits to the extent experience can be pre-cultural, a point is to be taken from this argument. Filmic representations of other people's experiences (which are simultaneously imprints of the corporeal intersubjectivity between filmmaker and film subject) can invoke in us responses that enable us to empathetically comprehend the embodied experiences of those represented, even though we do so on our own personal and cultural terms. Perhaps more informative than suggesting that these understandings or responses transcend culture, is to see them in terms of different ways of experiencing, that involve using specific degrees and kinds of cultural and individual reflection and knowledge in different ways. Jason Throop has suggested that we understand human experience in terms of a 'definitional range' that encompasses 'the indeterminate, the fluid, the incoherent, the internal, the disjunctive, the fragmentary, the coherent, the intersubjective, the determinate, the rigid, the external, the cohesive, the conjunctive *and* the unitary' (Throop 2003, 227). He argues for a phenomenological model of experience that works to integrate the 'immediacy of temporal flux and the mediacy of reflective assessment' (Throop 2003, 233). Some types of 'indeterminate' experience generated through viewing the embodied experience of another represented in ethnographic film would not necessarily transcend culture, but would allow us to make culturally framed reflections based on our empathetic responses to filmic representations of others' experiences. The sorts of reflection that we engage in in order to make experience meaningful – what Victor Turner (1986) would have called 'an experience', and that are indeed required if we are to achieve a self-conscious attunement to the way others move in, experience and perceive their environments, are inevitably cultural practices themselves. My own experience of viewing the 'tour' or 'walking with' sequence of *Lorang's Way* is that I initially found it hard to fall into Lorang's pace, it is so different culturally and personally from the speed at which I had been moving through my own world (although the pace of the film had already prepared me for it to some extent). However, as the sequence continued I felt more attuned to Lorang's way of moving in his environment – I almost started to feel I had a sense of what it might feel like to walk through the compound. Compared with

Lund's (2006) days out walking in the mountains with her informants, ten minutes seems a very short time and I would not expect to gain the same sense of corporeal empathy or to learn the same embodied and sensory ways of navigating an environment that Lund discusses though empathetically viewing a film. However, ten minutes on film is a long time; indeed, a ten-minute sequence is a rarity in many contemporary documentary genres. My first point is that film has given visual anthropologists opportunities to represent other people's experiences in movement; indeed, it is often movement that makes other people's experiences both visually interesting to watch and corporally engaging. It is perhaps the continuing lack of attention that writing anthropologists pay to ethnographic documentary that has resulted in a situation where none of those who are now walking and writing about it have delved into the ethnographic film record to investigate how the experience of walking and the relationship between people and their environments is already embedded in ethnographic film narratives.

My second point concerns how a film-place-event is created through the filmmaking process. Although it would be naive to suggest that film can simply provide an objective representation of how people go about making place in their everyday lives, there is on one level a sense in which an ethnographic film sequence in which the filmmaker and subject share a walk, while the former films the latter, *is* a representation of how place is made through walking. However, the concept of place is perhaps more usefully used to provide an understanding of how this whole process in itself is a place-making process, and at the same time creates a filmic representation of place as made through film. To understand this I suggest there are some parallels between Casey's theory of place outlined above, which stresses the centrality of the experiencing body to place, and the 'gathering power of place' (Casey 1996, 44). I propose that an ethnographic film focus on the walking (i.e. experiencing) body as it moves through space and time, and encounters things and persons, can be interpreted as productive of place-as-event, *and* creates a filmic representation of place in which it gathers together bodies and things, and time and space through its focus on experiencing sensing body(ies). Taking *Lorang's Way* as a case study, as he walks through his compound, the camera focuses on Lorang himself and the elements of his physical environment that he points out, directing the camera to them. Lorang's experiencing body and self engages socially, visually, verbally and through his haptic experience of the ground of his route under foot. The film narrative 'gathers' these persons,

things, experiences (e.g. the haptic 'walking with' of the camera person, the sociality between Lorang and the filmmakers, vistas pointed out by Lorang, different wives' compounds, a goat kral, people who pass by or whom Lorang passes, 'Lorang's gate') and draws them together in one place – a filmic place. This place-event can be re-staged in each new screening since it is in relation to its viewers that its meanings are (re)negotiated.

WALKING WITH VIDEO

Above I introduced Jhala's analysis of *Lorang's Way*. Jhala links this to a discussion of his own development of a method of 'walking with video' to collaboratively document earthquake damage in India. In this research process, Jhala first sat with household heads to discuss the purpose of his video recording and then, with his or her agreement, proceeded on a walk similar to that of *Lorang's Way*. He describes the pattern that emerged as follows:

the property owners would stand up saying, 'Let me show you.' They would then walk from point A to point B, talking as they went, describing what happened on the fateful day. At each point of demonstrable damage they would turn around and face the camera while continuing to speak. Once the report was made, we would proceed to the next stop. Finally, we would either return to the site of our initial conversation or to an exit spot from where we would part company. (Jhala 2007)

Like the *Lorang's Way* sequence discussed above, Jhala's video work can be interpreted as a place-making practice. As his video subjects walked and talked around their damaged homes they temporarily made them into particular places with a specific purpose. Both the presence of Jhala with his video camera and the movement of walking were essential to this as a mapping process, punctuated by pauses to discuss the damage. As Jhala notes, these video walks mapped the earthquake damage 'on the ground' in ways that had an applied import since they contested other 'bird's eye view' approaches of mapping the damage from above. As place-making processes, Jhala's video walks were corporeal and gathering processes, as they moved on the ground through damaged terrain, gathering along the way examples of physical damage, verbal knowledge and sensory embodied experience. On reading Jhala's essay,⁶ I realised that what he was writing about was very similar to a method that I had used in a rather different context. As part of an applied visual anthropology

project about people's relationships to their 'sensory homes', I used a method I have called the 'video tour' (Pink 2004, 2005),⁷ whereby I walked around their homes with my research participants, video recording them while they 'showed', performed and discussed with me their material environments, the meanings these had for them, and the practices they engaged in in them. These video tours moved through time and space, gathered things and were multi-sensory experiences which served to define each home as a particular type of place. Moreover, this research self-consciously sought to make the experiencing body and the sensory body central to the video-making process as I probed about the sensorial aspects of the experience of home and everyday domestic practices.

Building on the video tour method, most recently I have been walking with video with David and Anne, who are participants in a community garden project which is part of my current research about the development of the Italian-based Slow City (Cittàslow) movement in its British member-towns.⁸ In the opening section of this article I reflected on how I have been developing this method. As I show there, these walks with video can be seen as forms of place-making that have similarities to those I suggest for ethnographic film. The community garden example also raises another point about walking with video. Because I have returned, to date, three times to walk through the garden with video, at different times of the year and at different stages in the development of the garden, I have experienced the garden in different ways. In the opening section of this article I described these in terms of the garden as an imagined place, as a material place, and in terms of the weather. This involves thinking about place in terms of our multisensory experiences both on the ground and 'in the air'. In the first sentence of this article I described the role the weather had played in the way we experienced and defined the garden. If we follow Ingold's suggestion that 'The inhabited world would be constituted in the first place by the aerial flux of weather rather than the grounded fixities of landscape' (Ingold 2005, 3), the idea of walking with video implies also engaging with a world in progress, as it is continuously reshaped, not only in the imagination and by human action, but by the weather. Ingold's ideas, along with David's comments about the weather and Jhala's focus on earthquake damage, draw our attention to the question of how the weather and what might be called 'natural disasters' are implicated in the method of walking with video. I suggest walking with video should also be seen as medium for representing people's experiences of how changing immaterial elements of our environments

become engraved in our material environments. It can thus be seen as a way of making place in relationship with these immaterial elements at any one moment in time, in a world that is constantly in flux. As such it is useful to keep in mind that walking with video, like any ethnographic text, cannot be situated in the ethnographic present, but in fact always produces a historical text.

CONCLUSION: MAKING PLACE AND EMBODIED SENSING

Above, in relation to existing work in mainstream and visual anthropology, I have suggested that walking with video is a research method that: can produce empathetic and sensory embodied (emplaced) understandings of another's experience; is itself productive of place in any one moment in time; produces audiovisual texts that define and represent place at particular moments in time; and communicates a sense of other person's emplaced experiences that might be interpreted empathetically by its audiences.

Although the method of 'walking with' in both writing and visual anthropologies is informed by some common theoretical and methodological principles, there are inevitable differences between practices and uses of 'walking with' amongst 'writing anthropologists' and 'visual anthropologists'. Some of these are related to the practicalities of using the camera for extended periods of time during a long walk, of for example a day or more, although this also differs between film and video. The approximately ten-minute sequence from *Lorang's Way* discussed in the previous section could have been no longer as a continuous narrative as it would have been broken to load a new reel of film into the camera. Video does not limit us in the same way; my video tours in the home were all of up to an hour long, but my three video walks in the community garden site were all of about ten minutes simply because that was how long it took. Other differences are connected to the precise forms of collaboration that emerge when one is working with research participants with a video camera (see Pink 2007b for an extended discussion of this). In particular, the people one is video-recording use their own understandings of how video can communicate to inform how they both actually experience and perform (using their whole bodies) their experiences for the video. However, I am not suggesting a distinction between walking with and walking without video as different research methods. Rather, I am more interested in suggesting links between 'visual' and mainstream anthropologies by exploring what using a video camera

can add to the method of walking with. I consider myself to be both an image-producing and a 'writing' anthropologist, and in fact find the distinction to be problematic. Instead I suggest an approach to ethnography that uses visual methods and media when they appear to be appropriate to generating knowledge about the questions one is exploring. My approach is to use the camera when I think I will be able to learn more or learn differently about the particular questions that I am interested in. I switch on the camera when I feel it will help me to invite my research participants to define and represent their own embodied experiences and knowledge in ways that will benefit our collaborative explorations. I also use the camera when my own attention has been caught by particular aspects of the materiality of the collaborations I am engaged in with my informants, that I believe can be better represented audiovisually than in written field notes, interview transcriptions and ethnographic writing.

My reference to the use of video to represent research, however, does not only imply its employment to represent my work to other academics. As in Rouch's 'shared anthropology' (Rouch 2003 [1973]), the primary audience for my video tapes are the people who are in them. For example, I give or post DVDs of our walks with video to David and Anne and others who have collaborated in them. This in turn can generate commentary as we view them together (as explored by Nijland 2006). My second audience is myself as I (re)view the videos to try (as I have done in this article) to understand how persons, senses and place are intertwined in the garden project. Walking with video, I suggest, can generate a more involved approach to the question of how place and identities are constituted. This is partly because, since the video process itself can be seen as an instance of place-making, it demands a reflexive engagement on the part of the ethnographer concerning that process itself. It is also because walking with video brings the corporeality of 'walking with' to the fore. It engages a form of walking sociality that includes the ethnographer, camera and the video subject. But it also makes this sociality part of the place-making process of video.

The remaining question is how the integration of video into a 'walking with' method can serve as a catalyst for communicating about other people's sensory embodied experiences of place and place-making to a third audience: of academics and those who are interested in applying ethnographic knowledge outside academia.⁹ The advantage of film or video is that they invite empathetic engagements with the sensorial and

experiencing body of the film subjects in their viewers. Their danger, however, is that the viewers will not have the right cultural knowledge needed to be able to interpret these experiences (cf. Heider 2006). My recommendation, and a future task for my own practice, is to develop ways of integrating visual and written texts in multimedia hypermedia projects that might communicate both in ways that MacDougall (1998) suggests are 'transcultural' and in others that provide the deep cultural and analytical contextualisation that make communication about other people's experiences possible (see Pink 2006, 2007b).

NOTES

- [1] It is not my purpose to discuss the place of video in ethnographic representation here; however, I should note that the sorts of uses that I envisage such video materials being put to in representation include their use both in presentations and in combination with written texts, still images and other forms of representation as part of multimedia hypermedia projects.
- [2] Walking is also bound up with the full range of elements of our embodied identities – gendered, sexual, ethnic, class and so on. I do not elaborate on how these aspects of identity might intersect in walking or in the intersubjective or social aspects of 'walking with video' in this article, since my specific intention here is to set the ground for a definition of walking with video as a place-making practice. Neither are they discussed in depth in any of the existing literature I have encountered on walking in social anthropology. However, these are areas that should be accounted for in future theoretical work, as well as in the analysis of specific cases of 'walking with video'.
- [3] See <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/ss/workingimagesbook/ch2.htm>; INTERNET.
- [4] The term 'attunement' is a deliberate reference to uses by Tim Ingold and Cristina Grasseni's work on the 'education of attention'. Ingold (following Gibson) proposes it is through the 'fine-tuning of perceptual skills, [that] meanings immanent in the environment ... are not so much constructed as discovered' (2000, 22). Grasseni, writing about the acquisition of what she calls 'skilled vision', proposes actively using 'the camera both as a testimony and a reminder and also as a catalyst of attention for those continuous processes of apprenticeship and of attuning that are required, on the one hand of the apprentice and the newcomer and on the other hand, of the anthropologist seeking access and understanding' (2004, 27).
- [5] The clips referred to here from both Postma's and Crawford and Scott's films can be viewed on the DVD that accompanies their edited volume (Crawford and Postma 2006).
- [6] I encountered Jhala's work when I edited a special issue of the journal *Visual Anthropology* on applied visual

anthropology, published in 2004. The version of the text discussed here is from a subsequent publication in which Jhala's work is also included, an edited volume called *Visual Interventions* on the same theme (Pink 2007c).

- [7] The video tour was part of a research design developed in collaboration with Dr Katie Deverell.
- [8] Cittaslow is a transnational movement originating from Italy. Its aim is to promote 'the use of technology oriented to improving the quality of the environment and of the urban fabric, and in addition the safe-guarding of the production of unique foods and wine ... [that] ... contribute to the character of the region'. The movement's website outlines how 'Slow Cities [themselves] seek to promote dialog and communication between local producers and consumers. With the overarching ideas of environmental conservation, the promotion of sustainable development, and the improvement of the urban life, Slow Cities provide incentives to food production using natural and environmentally-friendly techniques'. It achieves this through indirect activism in that the movement's principles are put into practice in the form of policies, projects, activities and events in its member towns (see www.cittaslow.net for more details; website accessed 8 March 2007).
- [9] Although there are no doubt others, the obvious applied audiences for such ethnographic knowledge lie in consumer, design and architecture research. Above I have noted the interest in sensorial experiences of walking expressed by design theorists Malnar and Vodvarka (2004) and the architect and theorist Pallasmaa (2005, 1999), as well as my own consumer ethnography of the sensory home (Pink 2004). There is a widespread interest outside academia in the multisensory aspects of humans' relationships with and perceptions of their environments.

REFERENCES

- Bendix, R., and D. Brenneis, eds. 2006. *Senses*, Guest edited issue of *Etnofoor. Anthropological Journal*.
- Berger, J. 1972. *Ways of seeing*. London: Penguin Books.
- Casey, E. 1996. How to get from space to place in a fairly short stretch of time: phenomenological prolegomena. In *Senses of place*, edited by S. Feld and K. Basso. Santa Fe, New Mexico: School of American Research Press.
- Crawford, P. I. 2006. 'Big men' and the representation of local communities on film. In *Reflecting visual ethnography*, edited by P. I. Crawford and M. Postma. Leiden and Højberg: CNWS Publications and Intervention Press.
- , and M. Postma, eds. 2006. *Reflecting visual ethnography*. Leiden and Højberg: CNWS Publications and Intervention Press.
- De Certeau, M. 1986. *The practice of everyday life*. London: University of California Press.
- Feld, S, and K. Basso, eds. 1996. *Senses of place*, Santa fe, New Mexico: School of American Research Press.

- Grasseni, C. 2004. Video and ethnographic knowledge: Skilled vision and the practice of breeding. In *Working images*, edited by S. Pink, L. Kürti and A. I. Afonso. London: Routledge.
- Gray, J. 2003. Open spaces and dwelling places: Being at home on hill farms in the Scottish Borders' places. In *The anthropology of space and place: Locating culture*, edited by Setha M. Low and Lawrence-Zuniga. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Heider, K. 2006. A dialogue with *Sacrifice of Serpents*. In *Reflecting visual ethnography*, edited by P. I. Crawford and M. Postma. Leiden and Højberg: CNWS Publications and Intervention Press.
- Ingold, T. 2000. *The perception of the environment*. London: Routledge.
- . 2004. Culture on the ground: The world perceived through the feet. *Journal of Material Culture* 9(3): 315–40.
- . 2005. The eye of the storm: Visual perception and the weather. *Visual Studies* 20(2): 97–104.
- Jhala, J. 2007. Emergency agents: A birthing of incipient applied visual anthropology in the 'media invisible' villages of Western India. In *Visual interventions*, edited by S. Pink. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Kulick, D., and M. Willson, eds. 1995. *Taboo: Sex, identity and erotic subjectivity in anthropological fieldwork*. London: Routledge.
- Lee, J., and T. Ingold. 2006. Fieldwork on foot: Perceiving, routing, socializing. In *Locating the Field. Space, Place and Context in Anthropology*, edited by S. Coleman and P. Collins. Oxford: Berg, 67–86.
- Lorimer, H., and K. Lund. 2003. Performing facts: Finding a way over Scotland's mountains. *The Sociological Review* 51(2): 130–44.
- Lund, K. 2006. Seeing in motion and the touching eye: Walking over Scotland's mountains. In *Senses*, guest edited by R. Bendix and D. Brenneis, *Etnofoor. Anthropological Journal* 18(1): 27–42.
- MacDougall, D. 1998. *Transcultural cinema*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Malnar, J., and F. Vodvarka. 2004. *Sensory design*. Minneapolis, MI: University of Minnesota Press.
- Nijland, D. 2006. Film and non-verbal expression of culture amongst the Tolebo. In *Reflecting visual ethnography*, edited by P. I. Crawford and M. Postma. Leiden and Højberg: CNWS Publications and Intervention Press.
- Okely, J. 1994. Vicarious and sensory knowledge of chronology and change: Ageing in rural France. In *Social experience and anthropological knowledge*, edited by K. Hastrup and P. Hervik. London: Routledge.
- Pallasmaa, J. 2005. (1999). Lived space: Embodied experience and sensory thought. In *Encounters: Architectural essays*, edited by P. MacKeith. Hämeenlinna, Finland: Rakennustieto Oy.
- Pink, S. 2004. *Home truths: Gender, domestic objects and everyday life*. Oxford: Berg.
- . 2006. *The future of visual anthropology: Engaging the senses*. London: Routledge.
- . 2007a. Sensing citta'slow: Slow living and the constitution of the sensory city. *Sense and Society* 2(1): 59–78.
- . 2007b. *Doing visual ethnography: Images, media and representation in research* (rev. and expanded 2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- ed. 2007c. *Visual interventions*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Postma, M. 2006. From description to narrative: What's left of ethnography. In *Reflecting visual ethnography*, edited by P. I. Crawford and M. Postma. Leiden and Højberg: CNWS Publications and Intervention Press.
- , and P. I. Crawford. 2006. Introduction: Visual ethnography and anthropology. In *Reflecting visual ethnography*, edited by P. I. Crawford and M. Postma. Leiden and Højberg: CNWS Publications and Intervention Press.
- Rouch, J. 2003. (1973). The camera and man. In *Cine-ethnography: Jean Rouch*, edited by S. Feld. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Schilling, C. 1991. *The body and social theory*. London: Sage.
- Stoller, P. 1997. *Sensuous scholarship*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Sutton, D. 2001. *Remembrance of repasts*. Oxford: Berg.
- Taylor, L. 1998. Introduction. In *Transcultural cinema*, D. MacDougall. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Throop, Jason. 2003. Articulating experience. *Anthropological Theory* 3(2): 219–41.
- Turnbull, C. 1961. *The forest people*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Turner, Victor. 1986. Dewey, Dilthey and drama: An essay in the anthropology of experience. In *The anthropology of experience*, edited by V. Turner and E. Brunner. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Walmsley, E. 2006. Race, place, taste: Making identities through sensory experience. In *Senses*, guest edited by R. Bendix and D. Brenneis, *Etnofoor. Anthropological Journal* 18(1): 43–60.

FILMOGRAPHY

- Crawford, P. I., and R. Scott (anthropologist J. Pinholt). 2003. *Alfred Melotu – the funeral of a paramount chief*. Distributed by Intervention Press, Højberg, Denmark.
- MacDougall, D., and J. MacDougall. 1979. *Lorang's way*. Distributed in the UK by the Royal Anthropological Institute.
- Postma, M. 1998. *Of men and mares*. Distributed by Metje Postma, Leiden.