

***Co-Producing Mobilities: negotiating geographical knowledge in a
conference session on the move***

Simon Cook*

Department of Geography
Royal Holloway, University of London
Egham Hill, Egham
Surrey TW20 0EX
UK
Simon.Cook.2013@live.rhul.ac.uk

Anna Davidson

School of Geography and the Environment
University of Oxford
South Parks Road
Oxford OX1 3QY
UK
anna.davidson@ouce.ox.ac.uk

Elaine Stratford

Geography and Environmental Studies
University of Tasmania
Private Bag 78, Hobart
Tasmania 7001
Australia
Elaine.Stratford@utas.edu.au

Jennie Middleton

Transport Studies Unit
School of Geography and the Environment

University of Oxford
South Parks Road
Oxford OX1 3QY
UK

jennie.middleton@ouce.ox.ac.uk

Anna Plyushteva

Department of Geography
University College London
Gower Street
London WC1E 6BT

a.plyushteva.11@ucl.ac.uk

Helen Fitt

Department of Geography
University of Canterbury
Private Bag 4800
Christchurch 8020
New Zealand

helen.fitt@pg.canterbury.ac.nz

Sophie Cranston

Department of Geography
Loughborough University
Loughborough
Leicestershire LE11 3TU
UK

S.Cranston@lboro.ac.uk

Paul Simpson

School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences

Plymouth University

Drake Circus

Plymouth PL4 8AA

UK

paul.simpson@plymouth.ac.uk

Hannah Delaney

Centre for Transport and Society

University of the West of England

Frenchay Campus, Coldharbour Lane

Bristol BS16 1QY

UK

Hannah2.Delaney@live.uwe.ac.uk

Kate Evans

Department of Geography

Swansea University

Singleton Park

Swansea, SA2 8PP

UK

k.r.evans@swansea.ac.uk

Amy Jones

Department of Geography

Swansea University

Singleton Park,

Swansea, SA2 8PP

445902@swansea.ac.uk

Jonathan Kershaw

Centre for Business in Society (CBiS)

Coventry University

Priory Street

Coventry CV1 5FB

UK

kershaw3@uni.coventry.ac.uk

Nina Williams

School of Geographical Sciences

University of Bristol

University Road, Clifton

Bristol BS8 1SS

UK

nina.williams@bristol.ac.uk

David Bissell

School of Sociology

The Australian National University

Canberra ACT 0200

Australia

david.bissell@anu.edu.au

Tara Duncan

Department of Tourism

University of Otago

PO Box 56

Dunedin 9054

New Zealand

tara.duncan@otago.ac.nz

Frans Sengers

Department of Industrial Engineering & Innovation Sciences

Eindhoven University of Technology

PO Box 513

Eindhoven 5600 MB

Netherlands

f.sengers@tue.nl

Joanna Elvy

Institute for Transport Studies

University of Leeds

34-40 University Road

Leeds LS2 9JT

UK

gy06jde@leeds.ac.uk

Clancy Wilmott

School of Environment, Education and Development

University of Manchester

Oxford Road

Manchester M13 9PL

UK

clancy.wilmott@manchester.ac.uk

*Corresponding author: Simon.Cook.2013@live.rhul.ac.uk

Funding

This work was supported by the Economic and Social Research Council under grant numbers: ES/J500112/1, ES/J500148/1; the Australian Research Council under grant number: DE120102279; and the Canterbury Branch of the Royal Society of New Zealand for supporting Helen Fitt's attendance at the conference.

Acknowledgements

Thanks are due to Gina Porter and Saurabh Arora who joined our journeys but were unable to contribute to the paper. We are also grateful to Stephanie Wyse and Rachel Taylor from the RGS-IBG who grappled with timetabling the unusual conference session from which this paper stems. Finally, thanks of the highest order are due to the editors of *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* David Higgett and Derek French as well as the anonymous reviewers. Firstly for even entertaining the notion of this paper but also for providing feedback which took seriously the paper's intentions and offered ways to refine our thoughts and structure to make this experiment more successful. We'll be forever grateful for your support and handling of this paper.

Co-Producing Mobilities: negotiating geographical knowledge in a conference session on the move

Abstract

In an experimental session entitled *Co-Producing Mobilities* held at the 2014 Royal Geographical Society-Institute of British Geographers Annual Conference, twenty mobility scholars travelled around London on foot, by bus and by Tube to investigate how mobilities could be considered co-produced. In this paper, eighteen participants reflect on this collaborative experiment and on how it influenced their thinking about mobilities, geographical knowledge and pedagogy. Contributions cast light on the function of conferences and the multiple forms of pedagogy they enable, and provide guiding resources for those now wanting to continue such experiments.

Keywords: mobility; knowledge co-production; pedagogy; transport; conference; London

Word Count: 17590 including boxes, figure captions, endnotes, and references.

1. Introduction: pedagogy, conferencing, mobilities

Simon Cook and Anna Davidson

Dislocation is the perfect context for free-flowing thought that lets us move beyond the restricted confines of a familiar social order (hooks, 2003, p.21).

Producing, reproducing and disseminating knowledge are the essences of academia. Funding bodies and institutions may commonly divide these activities into pillars of learning, teaching and research. However these are false divisions—learning and teaching comingle and occur in varied contexts among diverse actors in higher education. One such example is the conference, often placed under the banner of research dissemination, it is also a crucial space of peer-to-peer pedagogy. This is an angle on the conference less often considered, and one which we will take forward in this paper.

The conference has been described as a “managed occasion for community learning, supporting both knowledge sharing and knowledge building” (Jacobs & McFarlane, 2005, p.317) or as a “vital way of summarizing your work for others; positioning yourself ... in a particular field; and of receiving feedback” (Hay, Dunn, & Street, 2005, p.159). Conferences afford great opportunities for participants to learn from one another and to develop their profiles, research and teaching: many edited volumes, symposia, and published panels stem from proceedings. Yet, it is rare for conferences or their sessions to be subjects of such publications, although Elden (2013) and Jameson (1984) have written on the conference in relation to Westin Bonaventure in Los Angeles, and Perez (2005) considers how sessions can reflect and reinscribe racist power relations. Relatively little work critically assesses sessions as peer-to-peer pedagogic practices, beyond ‘how to’ guides aimed at students and early career academics (e.g. Hay *et al.*, 2005).

This paper specifically considers the potentials and limitations of an experimental conference session format. Drawing on bell hook’s phrasing we ask *what happens when the ‘familiar social order’ of sessions is ‘dislocated’ into a collaborative journey through London?* Twenty participants, ranging from postgraduate students to professors, attended the *Co-Producing Mobilities* session at the RGS-IBG Annual Conference in London in 2014. As the organisers, we sought to experiment with the format and functions of a traditional conference session by drawing on elements of field trips and active learning—the benefits of which are well established (Charles-Edwards, Bell, & Corcoran, 2014; Coe & Smyth, 2010; Hope, 2009; Kent, Gilbertson, & Hunt, 1997). We invited participants out of the conference hall; stripped away formality; foregrounded collaboration; and welcomed possibility and playfulness. We prepared for elements of chaos and unpredictability. This opportunity to do something different enabled reflection upon the *status quo*.

The session’s *raison d’être* was influenced by calls for more holistic discussions of mobility from more diverse fields of study (*c.f.* Bissell, Adey, & Laurier, 2011; Cresswell, 2010; Merriman, 2012; Schwanen, 2015; Shaw & Hesse, 2010; Shaw & Sidaway, 2011). Reflecting on these invitations for more and new kinds of work, we saw an opportunity to respond at the RGS-IBG conference, the theme of which was co-production. The notion of co-production invites a shift away from the overly-animated and individualised subjects of mobility studies toward understanding mobility practices as more-than-individual and more-

than-human (Merriman, 2014; Schwanen, Banister, & Anable, 2012). Thus, we reoriented the session away from an agenda privileging knowledge transfer symbolised by the traditional paper presentation and toward knowledge that was co-produced using active learning in the field.

Active learning methods and field trips are pedagogical tools that facilitate deeper learning; hone practical skills; apply theoretical knowledge; break down barriers between teachers and students; and strengthen the research/teaching nexus, all while being enjoyable (Boyle *et al.*, 2007; Charles-Edwards *et al.*, 2014; Kent *et al.*, 1997; Revell & Wainwright, 2009). We sought to harness these attributes when designing the session and simultaneously hoped to bring people from across and beyond mobilities studies into active conversation. In the following terms, we put out a ‘call for participants’ not papers:

[First] in ... the field, we will engage with and creatively record/‘follow’ different modes of urban travel through a range of methods, highlighting the means by which they can be understood as co-produced: how processes, ideas, inequalities, histories, things, people, policies, materials, spaces, representations, power, affects, and movements coalesce to co-produce mobile practices. [W]hat is entangled before, after and in-between the actual moments of movement? [Second], a roundtable discussion will be held to explore the ... understandings gained and the implications of these ... how may this lead to different ways of doing, reading, writing, collaborating and communicating mobilities?

The open, flexible nature of the session meant we were able to accept as participants everyone who expressed an interest in engaging. Based on the number of participants and consideration of practicalities we focused on walking, catching the bus, and riding the Tube (metro/subway/underground). In advance of the session, we conducted a poll among participants regarding preferred modes of journeying and sent out a briefing inviting participants to bring any tools for researching the journeys they wanted to trial. The finer details of the session were only divulged once all were assembled on the designated morning of conference in the session’s allocated room at Imperial College. There, we reiterated the session’s rationale before dividing the twenty participants into the three groups of walk, bus and Tube. The groups were asked to make their ways 2.5 miles to the London Transport Museum in Covent Garden (hereafter Museum). The assigned transport mode was to be used for the outbound journey during which group members could work in any way *en route*, and evidence of arrival at the Museum was to be captured by a group “selfie” (a photograph taken of ourselves—Figure 1). After approximately two and a half hours the whole group reconvened at Imperial College for a discussion on the experience.

[INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]

This process was experimental and as organisers we feared the session might be entirely ‘useless’. Thankfully the feedback was positive but its overriding utility seems to lay less in content and more in method: the session, it came to light, was a pedagogical tool, reflecting how ‘doing’ has been a defining characteristic of the mobilities turn. Both theoretical influences—such as non-representational theories—and methodological arguments about the promise of ‘mobile methods’ seem to incline scholars to place themselves within the movement they are studying¹. We are not suggesting that studying movement requires partaking in those movements, but contend that conversations and dialogues on mobility may

have interesting effects while done ‘on the move’ (Bissell & Overend, 2015; Oppezzo & Schwartz, 2014).

The remainder of the paper consists of fifteen reflections from eighteen participants in the session. Some reflections were co-written, some solo authored, but all were edited by the authorial collective. Each contribution experiments with different ways of telling the stories of our journeys (Lorimer & Parr, 2014). Co-authorship on this scale in human geography is uncommon and, as such, there was little to rely on for guidance. Diverse writing styles throughout the paper reflect both our editorial wish to retain the integrity of each contributors’ voice, and the breadth of the brief we provided. Specifically we asked contributors to reflect on the pedagogical aspects of the session and potential for other contexts in under 1000 words per person. We mean ‘pedagogical’ in a broad sense—exploring how learning was ‘done differently’ in this session as opposed to a standard conference session and considering the always political experience of learning (Castree *et al.*, 2008): how did this session relate to the domination of some knowledges, practices (for example, individualistic tendencies in academia), divisions (for example, research and teaching) and hierarchies over others?

Thus, the reflections below deal with the trips by Tube, foot and bus. Incorporating vignettes and embedded/hyperlinked media, they demonstrate the breadth of activities undertaken. Contributions are eclectic in subject, argument, style and can be read in any order. To aid engagement with the paper, each set of reflections begins with an overview paragraph detailing the practicalities of that mode (Tube, foot and bus) and the main themes explored. These are returned to in more detail in the conclusion, which can, if desired, be read first to find particular contributions of interest.

The common themes fleshed out in the conclusion cohere around the analytical crux of the paper: an assessment of the kinds of pedagogies enabled or restricted through the *Co-Producing Mobilities* session. These themes are explored in terms of 1) the bodily, spatial, material and semiotic specificities of each journey and the resulting contexts for/to learning that were produced; 2) the social contexts and power relations that formed as a result of travelling together; and 3) processes of learning through reflection and documentation of experiences using a range of tools and modes of sensing, recording, capturing, documenting and relaying. We return to these themes in the conclusion and consider what lessons were learned for future activities, think about what questions are left unanswered, and ask how our co-production may enable a ‘move beyond the restricted confines of a familiar social order’ of the academic conference.

2. Tube

Having the quickest and most direct transport mode, the six participants in the Tube group—Elaine, Helen, Anna P, Jennie, Sophie and Simon—lingered longer in the conference room, sharing research interests; and pondering possible methods for bringing all these interests together. They settled upon an allotted time for each to lead the journey and explore a research agenda important to that leader. Each had fifteen minutes, letting routes and modes of engagement emerge as conditions changed or opportunities to discuss, learn and teach arose. Reaching the Museum, a selfie was taken, coffee sought and a bus found back to

Imperial College. In the conference room and before a larger discussion, the six spent time individually reflecting on their experiences, which form the basis of the contributions here. The reflections all touch upon the power of approaching things as a group—challenging one another to think and do differently (Simon), to push comfort zones (Sophie), change habits (Sophie, Helen, Jennie), and reveal new perspectives through movements and the stillnesses they contain (Elaine). The experiment of navigating the Tube whilst temporarily blindfolded elicited varying insights from several participants, such as Anna P’s consideration of empathy. The different angles each reported emphasises the pedagogic potential of getting out and doing with others.

2.1 Learning through our feet [and so much more]

Elaine Stratford

My iPhone diary tells me: Wednesday 27th August 2014, 0900–1200: Session—*Co-Producing Mobilities*. RGS-IBG. Imperial College London. I am looking forward to this.

Twenty gather to share experiences of moving in London, reflecting on how that movement is instructive for other elsewheres; a ludic geography is in the offing (Woodyer, 2012). Our hosts are organised and hospitable. Still though we seem during their introduction, ear drums vibrate, lungs expand and contract, blood courses, synapses fire. Then, when encouraged, lips, tongue, and facial and throat muscles move in conversation: connections are sought, differences politely delineated. For the rhythmanalyst, there is nothing still in the world (Lefebvre, 2004).

I elect to participate in the group which will catch the Tube to the Museum since, for some time, I have been undertaking a project which implicates the Circle Line (Stratford, 2015). Simon takes the lead from the seminar room to concrete, cobbles, bitumen. *Left* onto Exhibition Road—an unexpected turn down Kensington Road to Knightsbridge and not *right* to South Kensington. Not quite the *dérive* that Debord (1958) proposed, but a generous space of time nevertheless. Down a narrow lane onto Brompton Street, and down to the Tube. Jennie walks the station, eyes shut, guided by Anna P (Picture File 1 <http://tinyurl.com/JGHEPicture1>). Her research with the blind precipitated a suggestion from me that she does so ... my honours, completed an eon ago, asked how blind people perceive the environment, and I found the experience instructive. Jennie says her adrenalin has mobilized—protecting her from the disorientation she senses. I walk nearby, taping her words (Sound clip 1 <http://tinyurl.com/JGHESound1>). We think about the ethics of this exercise and about its translation to other settings and senses.

Changes in ambient temperature, into the train: clickety-clack, wind, echo, diesel smell, lurch, and wobble (Sound clip 2 <http://tinyurl.com/JGHESound2>). I ask the group to be mindful: commuting often makes us forget to dwell-in-motion (Edensor, 2011; Sheller & Urry, 2006). For me, being mindful honours the geographies, mobilities, and rhythms of our days, and the days of others. Sophie tells me she is finding it testing not to revert to her commuter-shell. I smile at a guy lip-syncing to whatever is on his iPhone.

Anna P suddenly announces “out at Piccadilly” and we plonk on platform benches. Listen, watch the yawning tunnel ... and return to the belly of the next train, popping our heads out

at Covent Garden—like moles. Transport for London is doing maintenance work on the station escalators, and the intercom voice says take either elevator or stairs—all 196 of them. Simon and I choose the latter: he is fit—a runner; I have 25 years on him and, while fit for my age, did squats this morning (Picture File 2 <http://tinyurl.com/JGHEPicture2>). By 140 steps I am stuffed; by 165 lungs burn; by 196, I feel light-headed—but pleased. Out to clear sunlight, stale air, flowers, trucks, and gap-toothed cobbles (Picture File 3 <http://tinyurl.com/JGHEPicture3>). Take-away coffee is a bonus as we plot our return journey, and gaze at my iPhone for the requisite selfie outside the Museum.

A brisk walk to the Strand enables access to the #9 to Aldwych (Picture File 4 <http://tinyurl.com/JGHEPicture4>). Sitting up front atop the double-decker, our talk is peppered with ideas about what it means to move, slow or hasten, enlist our senses, be predictable and spontaneous, anticipate and calibrate our actions. We convey our thinking in geographical terms—space, place, movement, scale, environs, relations. Gridlock ahead ... time running out ... the sclerosis clears only after Hyde Park. And then a ‘purposeful’ pace from Exhibition Road back to our room; we are the last to arrive. It is a journey of 6267 steps and transformative into the bargain.

* * * * *

Pondering the role of field experience in geographical education, Hovorka and Wolf (2009) note how, in 1956, cultural geographer Carl Sauer appealed to geographers to move in leisurely fashion, and take advantage of spaces and places where questions emerge. Their work reminds me that de Certeau (1984), Ingold (2004), and Lefebvre (2004) all waxed lyrical about the power of the feet in this regard. I think: “we *do* learn by enrolling the whole of our embodied selves, with all that these bundles of skin, and flesh, and experience bring with them”. Learning by doing is a powerful way to make meaning and, as long as we recall that mindful ‘stillness’ and thinking are forms of doing, I am comfortable with such propositions: they avoid descent into descriptive empiricist tendencies, and promote creative and interesting pedagogies and learning outcomes (see, for example, Anderson, 2004, 2013). Hovorka and Wolf see the classroom as a field too and argue learning is enriched when it is seen as such. One might say the same of the conference as field. Certainly, I have now enjoyed a new kind of conference experience organised by motivated and creative new scholars that prompted energetic, focused discussions about how we move through the world.

2.2 Journeying and peer-to-peer pedagogies

Jennie Middleton

Departure

Despite the growing literature on the pedagogical value of fieldwork (Herrick, 2010; Scott, Fuller, & Gaskin, 2006; Stokes, Magnier, & Weaver, 2011), similar ‘out of the classroom’ experiences have received comparatively little critical reflection in relation to peer-to-peer pedagogies. Sharing ideas with peers and colleagues in spaces beyond the university is a valuable aspect in my research development. In some ways the *Co-Producing Mobilities* session formalised a mode of engagement that, until that point, I have considered inherently organic. Would this experiment be too prescriptive, forced, or contrived?

Having lived in London for several years, I had a preconceived idea of how we would get to the Museum, and despite initial, internal resistance to the suggested route, it was liberating to relinquish responsibility and ‘go with the flow’. It allowed me to think about how we research, share, and learn about mobilities.

Interruptions

I was struck by how interruptions in the journey forced me to consider from different perspectives my work on the everyday mobility experiences of visually impaired young people, research I had described to the group before our venture. Elaine asked if I had ever travelled on the London Underground with my vision temporally impaired. I had not, so at Knightsbridge station I agreed to be blindfolded and led. The experiences that my sighted guide and I had in those moments are documented in the following transcript (see also Sound clip 1 and Picture file 1):

JM: *My god, this is so...*

AP: *How does it feel?*

JM: *I feel so vulnerable.*

AP: *You’re actually being recorded now by Elaine so you can describe your experience.*

JM: *I feel very vulnerable. I actually see what the benefit would be of having a stick. But then I guess there are other issues there about the stick in terms of it draws attention to you in a way that, particularly as a young person you might not want ... what was that?*

AP: *That’s just Elaine’s arm.*

JM: *Is it? Ok. Um, yeah, this is um ... I’m glad we are doing this but this is um ... I actually feel, I feel very hot.*

AP: *Do you have any sense of how many people there are around us, or what they’re doing?*

JM: *I can feel ... I can obviously hear the rest of the group behind me talking and I just feel like I’m about to drop off the side of something. Can you describe what’s coming up?*

AP: *It’s still flat and straight corridor, it’s about 20 metres towards the escalator down to the train.*

JM: *Oh god right, ok ...*

AP: *But don’t worry that’s still a few steps ahead and I’ll give you a warning.*

JM: *Isn’t it funny, I’m actually, I’m hot... and um, my sensory ...*

AP: *So we’re approaching the escalator and you can feel the surface changing, it’s just another five, six steps ... and I’ll let go of your hands so you can get your hand on the rail ...*

JM: *Oops.*

AP: *There you go, ok we’re on.*

JM: *When I jolted then I did actually quickly open my eyes.*

AP: *Was it that scary?*

JM: *That was my knee jerk reaction, isn't that funny.*

AP: *I think I'm going to ... it's quite strange for me as well because I'm finding it really, really difficult to describe what we're doing to make it safe.*

Feelings of vulnerability, heightened senses, and rushes of adrenaline were overwhelming during the time I was blindfolded. Strong desires emerged to use something to touch and feel my way. A minor interruption to the overall flow of the journey, I found these few moments an incredibly powerful experience providing a valuable insight into mobility challenges my research participants confront.

Arrival

Returning to the seminar room we began to write notes of our mobility experiences. While I have engaged research participants in such practices, I have rarely reflected upon my mobility experiences in the same way. These moments provided a rare and welcome opportunity to consider my own wayfinding practices in relation to everyday negotiations of urban space.

Participating in the session felt luxurious and with the time demands of everyday academic life, it seemed slightly indulgent to have a defined space and time to consider both how mobilities are co-produced and how we investigate, learn and teach from these experiences. However, since the conference, I have reflected upon how such an experience provides a space to think differently about one's own research (for during the session I solved several methodological problems associated with the ethics of a new research project); engage with others' research; and open up possibilities for co-production. As an alternative conference format, this kind of session should certainly be encouraged to facilitate peer-to-peer knowledge production and exchange.

2.3 Empathy, mobility, geography

Anna Plyushteva

Jennie is working on a new project with visually impaired young people and wants to experience what it is like to navigate the London Underground blindfolded. She puts on a blindfold and asks the group if anyone would want to act as her guide. I volunteer. She prepares to take her first step forward, and suddenly I am overwhelmed with all the visual information I have to take in, filter and translate into verbal instructions, which must be timely and meaningful. This new role seems to entail providing reassurance as much as directions: I feel I should be trying to help include Jennie in the activities of the group. I watch the group progress towards the platform and imagine not seeing them; I imagine how quickly their footsteps and voices would dissolve into the general hubbub of the station.

Several discussions and activities in the Tube group centred on empathy. Here, I reflect on two ways in which this collaborative session drew attention to the place of empathetic experiences in geographical research and learning. For me, acting as the seeing guide for a (temporarily) non-seeing member of the group created a space in which empathy could be experienced in ways that would be difficult to reproduce in a conference room. I had navigated the London Underground in many ways in the past: as a tourist; as a commuter; and, increasingly, as a researcher of transport geographies. Being a seeing guide reconfigured

the journey in unsettling ways and provided an opportunity to reflect on the importance of empathy in researching the diverse and often challenging spaces of urban mobility. While empathy is central to studying public transport and the co-produced movements of people, things and affects, it has not always been obvious to me how to foster it in and through my own research.

On our return to the conference room, another experience offered a glimpse of the role of empathy in the co-production of geographical teaching and learning. As we sat down, a member of the Tube group suggested we spend ten minutes writing rough notes about the journey we had undertaken. This was an excellent reflective peer learning exercise. For me, it elicited mixed emotions: enthusiasm, as the journey had been inspiring and pleasant; reluctance triggered by the absence of familiar writing rituals; concern over the prospect of sharing the products of this unconventional writing process. This process reminded me of undergraduate seminars as a novice teacher of geography in a higher education setting, where on countless occasions I have made similar demands on students and placed them in comparable situations. I have surprised them with ‘creative’ writing exercises, encouraged them to try different approaches, and discussed with them the value of immediacy and the self-discipline of writing.

In the quick and informal writing workshop at the end of the *Co-producing Mobilities* session, then, I could carefully consider the place of empathy in mobilities research and when working with students. There was a lot to be learned from it, in the same way that being a seeing guide for the first time was an entirely new perspective on the Tube. The role of empathy in fieldwork and researcher-participant relations has been explored in some depth in geography (Sharp, 2005). Clearly, such methods have relevance for mobile conferencing and learning, as well as their own distinctive emotional qualities and empathetic potential. Further engagement with mobile (peer) learning practices could offer productive openings on the co-production of knowledge and empathy.

2.4 Incorporating interaction in conference learning

Helen Fitt

I tuck in my elbows and knees and clutch my bag on my lap. I am a little warmer than is comfortable; I can smell soap. Looking around I see blank faces. About half the people on the Tube are doing something, they have headphones in or newspapers open, but the other half show no external signs of activity. They may be deeply absorbed in thought, but from the apparent vacancy of their eyes it is hard to tell. Nobody speaks.

Change context.

I throw my arms out wide, raise my voice, and start my lunchtime seminar with a deliberately controversial exclamation to wake the audience from their slightly soporific post-lunch passivity. I see a fleeting glimmer of surprise in a few eyes, but then it is gone. Occasional flurries of scribbling in open notebooks suggest that my words may have triggered ... something. I try to work out which parts of my oration are having an impact and what that impact might be. No-one is telling.

Black and William (2001) are critical of educational policies that treat education as a black box: inputs are fed in and outputs are expected to come out, but no-one really knows what is happening inside the box. When I look at the people facing me as I speak, be they academics in a traditional conference session, or students in a lecture, I see a series of blank eyes ... and I have no more chance of deducing what is going on behind them than I do of correctly guessing the thoughts of the people facing me on the Tube (which as a researcher I would never dream of doing).

Change context.

I throw out a question to start a brainstorming exercise. I wait the obligatory seconds for the first brave soul to break the silence. A person speaks, I smile and nod. It does not take long for the first droplets of ideas to turn into a trickle, a flow, a torrent. Chairs begin to move out of lecture formation and towards a ragged circle as people turn to interact with one another. An argument starts. Everyone seems to want to talk at once.

When I was an undergraduate in the 1990s, the lectures I attended largely followed an established formula: the academic spoke, uninterrupted, to ranks of seated and passive students. Twenty years later, most of the lecturers in my current department intersperse their speaking with questions and exercises to engage students in ‘active learning’—strategies to minimise student somnolence and give lecturers valuable insights into what students are actually learning. Indeed, interactive teaching is often lauded as sound pedagogical practice (Lambert, 2012; Scheyvens, et al., 2008). Over the same time period, researchers have increasingly recognised the value of participatory, collaborative, or co-productive research (Durose, et al., 2011; Pain, 2004).

Despite increasing recognition of the value of interaction in teaching and research, it is rare to see academics incorporating interaction into their conference presentations. I can happily hypothesise about why that might be: most conference presentations are too short to say (or do) much; audiences are experienced and adept in critical listening; academic norms are hard to break; and preparation time is scarce. If we accept, however, that action and interaction facilitate learning (for both ‘class’ and ‘teacher’), we must ask whether traditional conference sessions could be improved.

So we change the context.

On the upper deck of a London bus the people in the front seat turn to face those behind as we discuss how to manage some of the different challenges being faced in our research. The conversation moves fluidly between reflections on the Tube journey just made, prior experiences, different literatures, and new ways to tackle problems. We reach a solution for a challenge in one person’s research and move, almost seamlessly, to another topic. We get to know one another (we could call it networking) as we navigate the London transport network. We discuss our respective research problems at appropriate moments in appropriate contexts. We set one another challenges (focusing variously on the cognitive, embodied, and affective elements of the journey), and reflect on and discuss how we each choose to meet those challenges. We leave the session with new perspectives, forged because we tried to engage actively with our surroundings and our peers in ways that we would not have done if we had taken turns to speak to a blank faced audience in a blank walled room.

Perhaps we should change the context more often.

2.5 Disorienting the conference format

Sophie Cranston

For thinking about mobilities, for exploring how, why and what happens on the move, habits often provide an appropriate lens of analysis (Dewsbury & Bissell, 2015; Grosz, 2013). Our habits are perhaps most successfully understood by doing things differently and *Co-Producing Mobilities* permitted such reflection upon conferences, upon how we understand knowledge dissemination and production in academic environments.

Habit played an interesting role in the journey we made. My turn as leader took place fifteen minutes into our journey whilst *en route* to the Tube Station. Till now, I had been on ‘auto-pilot’: following someone is easy; no real need to think or pay any attention. The usual routes we travel are easy: we know where we are going, how to get there. It often means we switch off to what is around us.

However, when I took on leadership, I had no idea where we were and no idea what direction to take. I really had to think about where we were going, and pay attention. My notes recall my discomfort at this process. Changing or challenging habits often means we experience negative emotions. When leading, I followed the path that we were already taking and, in meeting the main road, looked left and right and saw the Tube station sign. A wave of relief hit me. As the social psychologist Jack Katz (1999, p.26) suggests, emotions such as anger expressed in road rage are not directed toward other drivers, but express the perpetrator’s ‘own dumbness’—the disruption to their habitual journey. Not feeling anything like rage, nevertheless my notes show my discomfort, a disquiet which—upon reflection—illustrates my ‘own dumbness.’ At first, I thought my response reflected lack of experience navigating London: I was frustrated by an inability to undertake the task at hand. But this wasn’t it: my unease reflected my lack of knowledge about London, and sense of lacking expertise. I felt disoriented; a ‘dumbness’ caused by disruptions to habitual experiences of a conference.

The way in which we ‘do’ conferences is often habitual, part of the academic routine. We go to conferences, rifle through programmes, attend talks, engage in small-talk, fall back into friendship groups, present our work, network, try not to embarrass ourselves, ask questions, think, plan for the future. We understand the format of conferences: paper presentations, flashcards for time, PowerPoint slides, questions. After the first time, we know the drill, and different conference spaces feel reassuringly familiar.

Co-Producing Mobilities did not follow the standard, comfortable-because-we-know-it format. Organising us into groups and sending us out on a journey challenged usual conference habits. It was disorienting. Yet this disorientation was a main benefit and a catalyst to reflect upon our conference habits. In the standard paper and question session, speakers stand momentarily upon a pedestal, package up research, and hand it to the audience. Knowledge is something over which the speaker claims both possession and an expertise then subject to defence through questions. By journeying together in *Co-Producing Mobilities*, knowledge became applied—something that contributed to a wider goal. No expert positions were claimed; no claims made to authority over what we were producing.

We all contributed our experiences, backgrounds, and opinions and, in that way, my own (feelings of?) dumbness actually did not matter.

2.6 Encountering others, encountering phenomena, encountering learning

Simon Cook

Months have passed since Anna D and I seeded ideas for this session. Since then we have firmed our plans, grappled with a call for participants; agreed upon timings, routes and groups; and prepared the requisite PowerPoint. Looking out at the faces in Room 119, it is obvious that we are not the only ones standing on unfamiliar terrain. Expressions that we read as trepidation, confusion, excitement, conviviality, and 9am dreariness greet us from our co-conspirators as we provide structure and rationale to a session we designed to be indeterminate, organic and messy.

Our approaches to conferencing seem obdurate. Whilst fieldtrips, workshops, exhibitions and panels/roundtables are more frequent on conference programmes (Rogers, 2010), formal paper presentations hold clout; augmenting CVs and the research quanta universities need. As a postgraduate candidate, straddling the student/researcher/teacher boundaries, this all seems a bit strange. During my time at Plymouth (BA) and now at Royal Holloway (MA), I was encouraged to engage with ideas, materials, methods, and peers to develop my scholarship; interactivity made for the most valuable sessions (Revell & Wainwright, 2009). Yet we do not seem to uphold these principles when communicating our research. Why do we understand what makes teaching and learning effective but use more passive forms of communicating at conferences? A cursory scan of book acknowledgements reveals that conversations in coffee rooms, pubs and other spaces of collegiality prove most valuable in the development of scholarship. There are better ways of sharing our research.

Undertaking a collaborative Tube journey reinforced this opinion. It provided opportunity to share ideas, understand others' works, trial methods, troubleshoot problems and develop research connections. Changes in leadership agreed to beforehand became more highly absorbing versions of standard paper presentations. We were physically encountering the phenomena under scrutiny; looking at them from six different viewpoints; probing them from six different angles; and discussing six different sets of opinions, solutions, and ideas.

Eureka moments emerged during the trip that suggest the potential value of journeying together to my research and academic practice. The first occurred observing, as aforementioned, Jennie's blindfolded travels through Knightsbridge Underground Station. I had recently finished conducting ethnographic research about people running in train stations, which focused on the effect of the material site in encouraging or restricting such movements (after Jensen, 2013, 2014). Watching Jennie's foot, its tentative and cagey responses to surfaces, and witnessing her hesitant body using walls, barriers and her aide for balance and direction revealed much. Ideas and approaches I had developed were predicated on the affective materialities seen and witnessed. Observing this different way of moving through a similar space elicited new takes on these ideas, prompting me to question whether the approaches from the seeing-world can simply be placed onto non-seeing (or other sensory) worlds. Applying the ideas of mobility materialities to visually-impaired movement prompted

an appreciation that these are materialities *felt*, and served to strengthen arguments about the significance of inclusive mobilities design.

The second eureka moment came while on the Tube at Knightsbridge:

Elaine starts her term as group leader with the request for us to be mindful. I tried to remain relaxed, my body responding to the carriage's rhythm. My eyes are half-shut. I zone in. I become attuned to things that had previously passed me by; a kaleidoscope of sounds, smells, sights, textures, movements, rhythms and atmospheres begins to emerge.

My favoured research methods tend to involve activity—invariably I talk, note-take or run (I research running geographies). Yet here I was gifted a new method to add to the toolkit. Be mindful. Notice. Take it in. My accomplices were challenging me into different ways of seeing and doing. In a traditional conference space you can think about these other ways but you can rarely *do* them, which is where their potency often lies. I confronted such sentiments again during Anna P's instructions to be stationary once alighted at Piccadilly Circus. We sat for fifteen minutes, not moving in a space created almost solely for movement. Allowing the crowds to come and go we were grasping the flows of the underground; the surging of the trains, the rhythm of the announcements, the states of panic and of calm, the changing atmospheres and experiences of mobility and stillness. Bearing witness to the power these simple methods had was a treat.

These were, of course, context- and journey-specific revelations. Yet the session format is one that will continually gift new perspectives and teach new lessons. The opportunity to discuss and collaborate with others was perhaps the most rewarding aspect of travelling together. The space created by the session allowed for networking that went way beyond snatched conversations during breaks. Real engagement was had—with each other, our work and with mobilities. Our changing formations brought with them new opinions, insights and challenges, new colleagues and new friends.

3. Walk

Faced with the prospect of the slowest journey, the walkers were first to leave the conference room. Preparations were minimised; only a rough route agreed before departing. The seven—Paul, Hannah, Kate, Amy, Jonathan, Nina and Gina Porter—only got to know each other, and the focus of their journey, *en route*. After documenting their arrival at the Museum, the walkers opted to catch the Tube back to Imperial College, where reflections on the experience were shared. These experiences focussed on different manifestations of (in)attention and the (im)material and social dimensions of journeying brought forth by them. Atmospheres and affects (Paul, Jonathan), sounds and smells (Paul, Jonathan, Hannah) saturated the walkers' journey. Their reflections grapple with how these attentions were produced within particular socialities and relations of strangeness and familiarity (Hannah, Kate and Amy). Nina considers how these experiences can or cannot be expressed through different modes of telling and learning about mobilities.

3.1 Atmospheres Co-Producing Mobilities

Paul Simpson

Mobility is co-produced between and by people and materialities. Walking three miles from Imperial College in South Kensington to the Museum and largely sticking to green spaces such as Kensington Gardens, Hyde Park, and Green Park, entails encounters with various surfaces and objects, mediated by technologies. Gravel, tarmac, sand, grass, horse shit are moved across, on, or through. Shoes and clothing mediate contact, as do maps, navigation devices, and technologies generating data about such movements. Rubbing shoes ravage heels (Wylie, 2005); *Google Maps* orient the disoriented (Wilson, 2014); jackets keep bodies (too) warm or dry—encumbrances to movement when not needed. Shouldered bags fatigue (Bissell, 2009). Traffic and traffic management systems impede progress, disrupt the rhythm of foot falls, ensure eventual progress.

Walking with others, conversation draws attention away from shared surroundings, distracts from the unfolding scenery, fragments the group. Walking with others stops us noticing an approaching taxi as we cross a road. Walking with others requires stops both planned and *impromptu*. Sometimes stopping relates to things that only *some* find interesting: horses and riders being drilled, for example. For those who read these stops as interruptions to a purposeful and timed mobility, boredom impinges. Yet through this tedium possibilities for reorienting our bodies emerge. As frustrated bodies linger, thoughts and eyes wander. Looking up ...

[INSERT FIGURE 2]

... there are varied materialities that, until recently, have occupied the background of studies of mobility and practice, and so of geography's frame of interest (Anderson & Wylie, 2009; Jackson & Fannin, 2011). Reorienting our attentions toward this ubiquitous background allows for the realization that certain 'immaterial' materialities bear down on our movements. As Ingold (2007, S28) notes:

To understand how people can inhabit this world means attending to the dynamic processes of world-formation in which both perceivers and the phenomena they perceive are necessarily immersed. And to achieve this we must shift our attention from the congealed substances of the world, and the solid surfaces they present, to the media in which they take shape, and in which they may also be dissolved.

We are always already *amid* a co-produced, although easily forgotten, environment. More felt than seen, this voluminous atmosphere becomes entangled in the co-production of mobility and provides the conditions for mobility's very taking place. We do not walk across the world, we walk through its atmospheres (Ingold, 2007), both literal-meteorological (that is, the 'air') and more metaphorical—a shared feeling (McCormack, 2008). To understand the co-production of mobilities, we need to do more than look. We need to think beyond the solid, the 'thingly'. We need to think more about what surrounds us, unseen.

Co-production happens between and by people and sounds (Simpson, 2009); smells (Corbin, 1986); and atmospheres (Adey *et al.*, 2013; Anderson, 2009; McCormack, 2008). On our journey, the sound of horses' hooves and instructions from riders echo. Drums bang. Vehicles roar past. Snippets of conversation are heard in passing from within the group and amongst others. Unexpected sunshine—contradicting forecasts—peaks through leaves. Tree pollen irritates sinuses and fumes from vehicle exhausts choke lungs. The smell of horse-shit

affects memories of agricultural scenes (Henshaw, 2014). Air quality (that is, particle content) comes to generate a sense of air qualities—a feeling. Air saturated with particles—from plants in the form of pollen but also the man-made matter of exhaust fumes—literally permeates the mobile body.

Moving again, on this walk, walking and interacting with others amid such materialities, brought about a fleeting shared feeling of insouciance (Bissell, 2010). Another day, another walk, perhaps something different. A solo walk may have led to the perception (and co-production) of a different collective affective atmosphere entirely. There is no teleology here. Such shared feelings are not stable and do not last. They are liable to change moment-by-moment as the scene unfolds. Less finished products, more processes of perpetual re-production. Atmospheres co-producing mobilities.

3.2 Sensory geographies of being ‘mobile with’

Hannah Delaney

My journeying experiences were shaped by myriad interactions and conversations with other participants during the *Co-Producing Mobilities*. As Jensen (2010, p.393) notes: while “individuals navigate and interact on their way through the city” they are constantly “slipping in and out of different ‘mobile withs’”. This concept seems pertinent to draw on in exploring the pedagogical value of this exercise, as my journey was certainly punctuated by several such different ‘mobile withs’. At times, I was ‘mobile-with’ others in my group through engagement and conversation; at others I was more passively ‘mobile with’. These interactions brought to the fore new ways of examining and understanding walking. Encounters beyond the journey also proved insightful in such endeavours. Being ‘static-with’ the group during the post-walk reflection added depth and complexity to the practice, highlighting differentiated experiences group members had of the same journey.

The first aspect of being ‘mobile with’ meant directly engaging with individual group members in the co-production of a unique mobile experience. Discussions moved from the current journey through London streets and parks to research interests and universities, during which surroundings shifted out of focus. In turn, memories of sections of the journey are now marked with images of faces and conversations rather than imagery of the route itself. Here was a ‘mobile with’ that decreased attentiveness to the physical surroundings, an experience in contrast to the literature on sharing mobile spaces. This suggests that when individuals interact, they disrupt their mobile rhythms and temporarily inhabit place (Edensor, 2011).

The second aspect of being ‘mobile with’ was that, on particular sections of the walk, the presence of the group as a whole came into clearer consciousness as I overheard and observed other group members’ discussions. These discussions provided an alternative way of engaging with the journey. For instance, one member commented as we walked through the park; “... *there are so many different textures ... oh, I’m going back to get a picture of that*”. From this point on I became more sensitive to the feeling of the cobbles and then the gravel under my feet. Smell dominated a portion of my journey; the stuffy smell of the underpass, the fumes from the cars and the fresh park air. My experience was altered and enhanced in such a manner. Drifting along a section of the journey in the city centre I overheard another group member discussing crossing the road; “*I hate having to stop in the middle and cross twice*”. This point echoes aspects of the mobilities literature which focus on

the corporeal experience of movement; the desire that mobile individuals often have to move in a constant forward fluid motion (for example Jones, 2005; Spinney, 2011; Taylor, 2003). From this point, a wider view of the journey space came to my attention; the rhythm of the traffic and the patterns of pedestrians moving on mass through the city. Thus, at times, even though I was not directly engaging with the group, my sensory experience of the walking journey was shaped by it.

However, during the post-walk group reflection it became evident that even though my sensory experiences had been influenced by real time responses from others to the space, these experiences actually developed in different ways. For others, awareness of different textures underfoot progressed into awareness of sounds and the capture of audio recordings, whereas sense of smell dominated my journey. Approaching mobile journeys in a shared way ‘*can be a rich and heightened sensory experience*’ (McIlvenny, 2015, p.56). It encourages deeper insights into sensory geographies and the many forms through which walking can be experienced. Pedagogical value exists in being ‘mobile with’ and sharing sensory experiences, as well as being ‘static with’ and reflecting on these experiences as a group. Awareness grows of how others sense differently; acceptance of varied perspectives and knowledge increases.

3.3 Recollections of the walking journey

Kate Evans and Amy Jones

Our walking group was confronted by the onslaught of loud, bustling traffic and impatient drivers. I felt we were at the mercy of the road and traffic. We could only cross when signalled by traffic lights, and as soon as engines started to stir we were pressured into making our way quickly to the other side of the road. We felt and were out of place ... a hindrance in the realm of the road.

On our walk through London, the dual processes of walking and being attentive meant we could re-cognise overlooked and taken-for-granted aspects of everyday life (and conference attendance). Early, it became apparent that actively engaging with that attentiveness—by pausing or straying from the path to look at something, take photographs, or record sounds—one risked falling out of step with the group: the imperative to reach our destination conflicting with the desire to chat, share observations, and enjoy journeying together.

Walking offered a context for various forms of concentration to emerge. Individuals within the group more familiar with London led the way. Their prior knowledge of the destination and the route required to reach it meant that their attention was focussed differently from those of us with little knowledge of our location. Leaders naturally gravitated to the front of the group, setting a pace to be followed and enabling the rest to focus wholeheartedly on the experience of journeying. In a sense, the session offered contrasting perspectives on ‘being mobile’: ‘*I had no bearings as to where we were and realised that I had put a great deal of trust in those who [would] navigate us towards our intended destination*’.

The group spread apart and regrouped at various points along the route according to surroundings and obstacles encountered along the way. Conversations could be few and far between as we concentrated on navigating busy streets or accommodating ambient noise

levels. Such periods offered opportunities to reshuffle and speak to different people within the group, or resume conversations afresh. In parks, the pace slowed and, unhindered by traffic, we took in the surroundings as well as each other. The duration of the journey, and the shared rhythms of walking presented opportunities for conversation with others walking at a similar pace. Neither the usual snatched chats between sessions, nor the self-conscious public question-and-answer exchanges that follow papers, these were intimate discussions about each other's research and interests, occasionally prompted by things observed along the journey (Picture file 5 <http://tinyurl.com/JGHEPicture5>). Freed from conventional conference roles of presenter, chair, audience and so on, we overcame certain academic hierarchies that—as an early career researcher and PhD student respectively—we may find constraining. Taking this session onto the street, or at least out of the formal conference room, helped open the way for knowledge to be negotiated collaboratively across conventional role distinctions.

It emerged, too, that the two of us only ever converse together in Welsh, (indeed, as we write this together, we are discussing our thoughts in Welsh, whilst writing in English!). On the walk, we drifted back to speaking Welsh between ourselves before realising that others alongside us might not understand, or might feel excluded, prompting us to change to English. In both methodological and pedagogical terms, this was a useful reminder of the need to consider language as a factor in conversations and exchanges in sessions such as this, in conferences generally, and in classrooms. Recent experiences interviewing people walking the Wales Coast Path, collecting their thoughts, feelings and experiences of the path, has also highlighted to us that language—as a concept, and a vehicle of communication—is key to gaining trust and stimulating conversation. The lack of opportunity for multilingual dialogue in conferences could therefore represent an important, yet often overlooked, omission and serve as a potential barrier to equality in knowledge sharing.

During the *Co-producing Mobilities* session, then, rather than a conscious decision to speak in Welsh, ours was a habituated response. We spoke in Welsh because we were walking alongside each other; we walked alongside each other because we already knew something of each other and introductions (and associated chit chat) were unnecessary. This ability to converse in a familiar language can foster feelings of connection and confidence, and presages opening oneself to new encounters. Our use of Welsh only became a factor conscious to us when the walk was underway and we began to fall in to step with others in the group where a form of mobile connection began to emerge: '*amongst the calming atmosphere of the park I felt confident and had freedom to explore, to wander and to happily converse with others*'. Having a friendly face and the connection of a shared language gave each of us confidence which, in turn, encouraged us to speak with others in the group who we did not already know. In a way, changing to English was also a tacit way of becoming open to engaging in conversation with others.

As we neared the exit of another park, nameless to us, we experienced a shared moment of uncanny familiarity. In the distance we observed a large crowd of people, and wondered between ourselves whether this gathering was a protest or an event—and what was the building nearby? It was only when we came to stand in a particular spot, that we recognised it as Buckingham Palace. One of our strongest memories from the walk was our shared surprise and amusement that we could fail to recognise something so large and familiar by stumbling upon it from an unconventional direction. The experience was a useful reminder of a fact that permeated our entire journey, namely, that approaching from an alternative perspective what

we think we know—be it a conceptual idea, well known place, or the simplest of acts—can produce surprising insights and inform new understandings.

The *Co-Producing Mobilities* session provoked a pedagogic issue here regarding whether conferences are intended as places for presenting conclusive research ‘outcomes’ or an opportunity for facilitating new trajectories into on-going research. We suspect that (by necessity or habit) the former has come to be the dominant narrative, and feel that there is scope to challenge this *status quo*. Perhaps what is needed is a revisiting of the conference format, and a move away from the vastness of the showcase ‘annual conference’ with its focus on summarising a given field, and a turn towards smaller scale, more frequent events throughout the year which support more active, participatory sessions and inclusive forms of knowledge sharing. We could do worse than incorporate our own research methodologies and bodily practices into our academic dissemination practices.

3.4 Pedestrian pedagogies, ambulatory affects

Jonathan Kershaw

In previous visits to the UK capital, it occurred to me how there is somehow a sense of difference in the London milieu: walking and being in London feel different from walking or being anywhere else. Even walking down an ordinary street there, devoid of landmarks, seems different somehow—different from a street in Rochdale or Manchester or Coventry. London somehow possesses an extra, almost tangible ‘something’; its own ‘affect’.

My own sphere of research concerns automobility and, though a sensory mobility itself, we can miss the sights, the smells, the sounds, the experiences of our surroundings when cocooned in metal and plastic carapaces that are our cars. Walking is similarly a sensual activity, though possessed of its own sensory experiences and, as such, is an activity that provides much opportunity for the potentiality of affect (Stewart, 2007). Geographies of co-production are intrinsically linked to geographies of affect, as affectual flows (*ibid*) between ourselves and other people, objects, spaces inevitably combine to co-produce feelings, emotions, reactions thereon and therein and, following Thrift (2004), allow us to reconcile our unique, individual “dynamics of encounter” (Tolia-Kelly, 2006, p.214).

Different parts of our walk elicited different feelings. Eschewing the direct route to our destination, we enjoyed a peaceful, greener, and perhaps more pleasant start to our walk than otherwise would have been the case. Indeed, the sound of relaxed recreational activities such as football kick-about on one side, and muted traffic on the other, lent a peaceable air. The sight of the Household Cavalry practising riding routines was an unexpected spectacle, lending a sense of ‘London-ness’ to this pedestrian at least. Other aspects of London as theatre emerged *en route*: mounted police, guardsmen and tourists all players on the stages of Buckingham Palace, Admiralty Arch and St James’ Park.

To me, our walking exercise echoed the difference—the London-ness—mentioned above, but this time it was a different ‘different’. Why should this be? Perhaps it was the excellent company of my walking companions. Acting as co-productions in themselves, the varied and mobile nature of conversations within our group extended beyond the matter in hand and perhaps meant that some of the more ephemeral aspects of the walk were missed. Or perhaps

not. After all, such conversations meant that the mobilities thus co-produced within our walk were authentic and innate to it—they were intrinsic constituents of ‘the walk’—and the ephemeral potentiality of affect suggests that even if the exercise were repeated with the same route, the same participants, even the same weather, it would not be the same: it could be recreated, but not reproduced. The moment—our walk—has gone, its co-produced mobilities unique. Certainly, walking this route alone would have been a very different experience with other opportunities for co-production.

Walking, like driving a car, is something that many regard as just a means of transport—a thing to *do* to get from one place to another. Courtesy of the conversations and co-mobilities that constituted our particular, necessarily unique journey, this vignette and its companions have provided a sense of how walking can be a thing or an event, a space and place to experience, to *be*.

3.5 *A postcard from Paul*

Nina Williams

Navigating a walk through central London was an unfamiliar and intriguing start to an academic conference; a lull in the otherwise anxious space of a conference. I was drawn to the walking group, a proclivity based upon my research and personal interests. An ignorant guide, I found myself in the lead and yet the choice to follow parks *en route* to our destination ensured a relaxed disposition: treading different surfaces, the urban timbre muted, vivid pigment enriched produced for me a journey of respite rather than one of expedition. I was not without alertness however. Rather, this alertness was expressed more through the varied connections between one material body and the next, as they move and are moved—the way in which a military parade interrupted conversation, or the heat of the sun forced a slowing in speed—constituent parts of the journey.

The simple act of getting outside can engender wonderful moments in research: journeying that takes us out into the world, refreshes perspective, and reminds us of the atmospheres, affects and ambiances that compose experience. Although such practices are not unknown to academia—geographers traditionally work ‘in the field’—*Co-Producing Mobilities* demonstrated how such journeying engages us differently in the world, and in turn illustrated how engagement opens up new modes of recording academic research. Befitting then, that our journey began at a conference organised by the Royal Geographical Society, the home of cartography in the geographic tradition, the heart of geographical exploration and the coding of space. Whilst we gave some thought to our own ‘mappings’ of the journey, for me the process demanded more critical attention to how we might document our mobility in ways not tied to a disciplinary tradition of accurately representing the environment, but paralleling the experimental nature of our practice. I hope such forms of mobility will direct us to the proliferation of different forms of documentation able to express the many differences of a journey.

I have approached this question of documentation in the past using the postcard—perhaps the epitome of journey reflection. These postcards are intended for fragmentary recordings of a journey—open to sketches, bus tickets, photographs, diagrams—completed either *in situ* or on reflection. I think of the postcards as maps, yet their blankness demands an open approach

in line with an idea of journeying off the map in that they are not depicting a prewritten route but are a catalyst to experience it in a new way. Completed in the momentum of a journey, they are snapshots and make no claims to document the whole. While we cannot capture lived experience in representation, we can hope that documentation puts into motion and into reflection the complex entanglements of a journey: processes connecting the mobile body with other bodies in the world—things often disregarded in their banality, but that undoubtedly constitute everyday experience.

A postcard from Paul hints at this entanglement (Figure 3). A photograph immersed in the sky, a walker looking up and taking in another view. It captures that bodily alertness that was part of our walk on the day, and reminds us for future walks to look away from our feet, of the diverse material and immaterial components of a journey that are often so difficult to record. Paul expresses the intrinsic difficulty in representing the ambiances and atmospheres that composed his experience of the walk. As he rightly states, ‘it’s hard to draw atmospheres and things you can’t see’, but using the postcard he explores another aesthetic mode and is able to express an atmospheric resonance not easily put into lines, or perhaps words. The postcard offers a glimpse into another experience, captures a moment rather than tells a story, and through its vacantness, allows a journey to continue, rather than finish and be told.

[INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE]

As a form of documentation this postcard does not render the value of a journey according to its significance after the event but captures part of what we gain in such journeying—getting out and into the midst. Yet it also denotes the difficulties that a morning of collective journeying raised for me, which is precisely the ways in which we might produce documentations without deadening the journey, and that are not after the fact. From *Co-Producing Mobilities* then, we can turn to experiments with the documentation of our journeys that offer a different canvas onto the world that both captures one experience and enables another.

4. Bus

The bus group—David, Tara, Frans, Jo, Anna D, Clancy and Saurabh Aurora—tackled the *Co-Producing Mobilities* session by exploring one theme—technology and ‘wayfinding’. Dividing themselves into three sub-groups, each adopted a particular relationship to the theme: one wayfinding without phones, the second getting lost purposefully, and the third using a range of technology to reach the Museum. The contributions below explore varying ‘technologies’ of memory and learning in their relation to journeying together, temporality and attentiveness. They consider memory (in a phone, a camera and/or mind) as a form of technology— a mode of capture – that stretches the temporalities of a journey from the ‘present’ into the past and future (Tara and David), and ask what ‘data’ is privileged by different forms of capture (Clancy and Anna D). Getting lost, one group found, draws attention to the mundane everyday details of travel and the benefits of travelling together (Frans), while also highlighting different wayfinding capacities (memory?) in a group: Who has the power and/or responsibility to ‘lead’ when required – and to what dynamics and pedagogical impacts does that lead (Jo)?

4.1 Learning capacities, orientations, traces

David Bissell and Tara Duncan

Learning to travel together

We started with coffee. Our habitual everyday rhythms disrupted by the early conference start, having a coffee together allowed us to talk through the idea behind the session and gave us time to attune ourselves to what we would be doing. Our journey was, in some senses, already ‘planned’. We knew we were using the bus and not using our mobile phones.

The value of a clear rationale for the task provided by the session organisers proved important. Indeed as we undertook our journey, the initial brief was an orienting yardstick, conditioning our attention, narrating the unfolding journey. Unlike many fieldwork teaching exercises, in this instance the session organisers provided the rationale for the exercise months in advance, allowing its aims and objectives to ‘take root’. Several times we drifted to this task before we came to it. Each time, it took new form, shaped expectations, highlighted the delicate balance between openness and prescription provided by the organisers. Too little direction and we imagined that our journeying, whilst still enjoyable, would have been beset by anxieties over the rationale of the task, attention becoming too fixated on this absence of orientation. Too much prescription and the outcomes were decided in advance.

The two of us were also many: conference delegates; participants in *Co-Producing Mobilities*; mobilities academics; tourists in a country where neither of us now lives; commuters heading to Covent Garden; colleagues; and friends. These dimensions of our identities each came to prominence during parts of the trip, inflecting how we related to each other, and giving effect to what we attended to and to the sorts of evaluation we made during the journey about other people and the identities that we found ourselves ascribing to them.

The journey began with a mixture of emulation and experimentation. We had mobile phones with us that we could use for orientation, but did not. Instead, our experiment heightened attunement to wayfinding cues in the streetscape, particularly at bus stops. Travelling together and talking about these processes, we became (increasingly) aware of what each other was being attentive to, a kind of ‘joint accomplishment’ (Allen-Collinson, 2008).

Learning to record traces

During our journey, we discovered our own varied capacities and incapacities related to London’s transport, and mobilised certain tendencies pertaining to orientation. We experimented with ways to record traces of our experience of doing this journey to feed back to the group, and although we were not using smartphones for wayfinding purposes, they were useful recording devices. We used a ‘notes’ app on the mobile phone to make quick, rough notes as a memory prompt about things that came to prominence: ‘Panoptic-flâneur looking down on people. No bins on buses. Rushing upstairs anticipating acceleration’. From a practical point of view, this method was less cumbersome and much quicker than using notepad and pen. Scribbling on a phone made the experience of recording less conspicuous, given the ubiquity of these devices in these spaces. It was also quicker to share the notes and pictures between us.

Doing the journey also made us aware that many other ‘recorded’ traces were already archived within us. Traces of other times and journeys became perceptible during the journey itself. Objects and places called memories to the fore—traces of experience archived by our bodies. For David, passing Green Park on the right gathered in memories of spending time there with a friend during undergraduate days. For Tara, memories of standing in a packed Trafalgar Square whilst the England Rugby team trundled around in an open double decker bus celebrated a World Cup victory. Choosing which traces to incorporate in a presentation to the rest of the group forced us to evaluate what mattered.

The exercise demonstrated the value of evaluating other forms of capture and presentation. David used his smartphone as a camera, and we shared the images between us once we had arrived home knowing, as many geographers have argued, that such images can work as a powerful *aide memoire* when analysing experiences, heightening the force of particular moments of the journey (Rose, 2012). There is an important time-critical dimension to this process. At each stage of capture and presentation, different relations are sculpting experience, not least in anticipation of the slightly nervy post-exercise session, where, between many participants, unfamiliarity (but also familiarity!) and the pressure to say something definitive, heightened nerves. Here, the speed needed to formalise the inchoateness of the journey engendered specific ways to present ideas, helped by Tara’s annotation of key words on a flipchart back in the conference room.

The memory and sculpting of this journey is quick to meld with other journeys and experiences. David first typed this paragraph on a Friday afternoon bus from Zetland to Bondi Junction in New South Wales, and edited it on a bus from Castle Hill to St Leonards. His current bus journey is blurring with the journey in London. Those elements that were so uncomfortable or unfamiliar in London are no longer tinged with uncertainty or wariness now that he is back on a bus in a more familiar locale. Tara, on the other hand, was sitting in a hotel room in Wellington, New Zealand, as this paper took shape, thinking about recent bus experiences in San Francisco and reflecting on how the journeys had produced small eddies of anxiety that David had felt in London. These reflections show two things. First, writing about such experiences is not somehow better or more genuine when done straight away—although the discussions we had with the larger group after our walk were useful. Rather we need ways of thinking about how the production of knowledges is always already caught up with the onflow of experience. Second, it is this onflow of experience that puts our fieldwork experiences into context, allowing for points of comparison that now enrich our memories and reflections of that bus journey. This insight means that the next time we sit on a bus, these realisations, memories and reflections, will, however subtly, inflect our experience, thereby extending the session’s effects and helping us re-evaluate how we produce and re-produce knowledge.

4.2 Those who wander are never really lost

Frans Sengers

The three of us embarked on a wandering, detoured bus journey. Instead of going to the museum directly, we sought to more fully experience bus-based mobility by getting lost together. We would board the first random red double-decker we would see and share stories of our experiences along the way. Hopping onto the top deck of a bus in South Kensington,

our conversation centred on what we could observe on the street. Glancing at some of the signs, I could not stop wondering whether we were going ‘the right way’ despite our best efforts. Getting lost proved a difficult task for the two of us who had very vague familiarity with London’s layout and, as the third group member attested, especially difficult for somebody who knows London intimately. Boarding the second red double-decker—this time with the intention to get to the museum—we decided to sit downstairs at the back, two of us facing backwards. Our conversation centred on the bus rather than the happening on the street outside: The seats were uncomfortably hot; was it because of the engine? Why did London have double-decker buses? How did the experience of riding the bus change when we moved from front to back, from upstairs to downstairs, from forward-facing position to backward-facing position?

As a PhD candidate studying transitions to sustainable transport systems, two points of reflection on the value of this type of participatory conference session stand out. First, it is refreshing to make explicit and thoroughly discuss the mundane activities of ‘lived’ everyday mobilities. The type of knowledge generated by reflecting on one’s own experiences is different from—but no less valuable—than research engaging transport engineers and planning professionals. For a more complete understanding of systemic shifts in mobility patterns, we should look beyond ‘the brute fact’ of movement (Cresswell, 2006) and instead shift part of our gaze to the intricacies of the other elements that shape the practice of bus travel. How does bus-based mobility reshape other mobilities in the city? Do people perceive these big red double-deckers as proud symbols of London or, alternatively, as inferior ‘loser cruisers’? These are examples of questions that pop to mind on cross-fertilizations between ‘hard’ transport geography and the ‘soft’ new mobilities paradigm in the social sciences (see Shaw & Docherty, 2014).

Second, the very act of getting together, sharing everyday practices of travel with other conference participants, can serve as a good way to get to know each other. Connecting to people in one’s community of scholarly practice is, after all, a key part of a conference. So in this sense “contra much transport research ... the time spent travelling is not dead time that people always seek to minimize” (Hannam, Sheller, & Urry, 2006, p.12).

4.3 Lost and found: responsibilities and power relationships

Joanna Elvy

Journeying together was intellectually stimulating and personally challenging. To journey through London with a group afforded the opportunity to see the world from beyond my own viewpoint—from the perspectives of fellow group members. In turn, this empathetic engagement enabled us to appreciate and discuss aspects of mobilities reaching beyond the simple fact of travelling from A to B. Along the route, shifting power relations between group members proved significant in how our mobilities were constructed and negotiated, informed our awareness of our surroundings, and facilitated pedagogical engagement with the exercise in ways described below.

Our group's approach was to explore the importance of understanding our relationship with the physical world around us rather than engaging with the more virtual world of mobilities driven by technology. We nominated to travel by bus from South Kensington to Covent Garden without aid of any geolocation devices. Getting 'lost' gave us opportunities to think about how we 'read' urban landscapes, one we would not otherwise have experienced. In my research, I have often asked participants to observe the world around them. Getting lost required engaging our entire bodies and senses, it generated richer interactions with the physical environment and, as such, could benefit urban fieldwork pedagogy more generally.

However our freedom to get 'lost' was limited by the need to be in Covent Garden by a set time. Initially we travelled in the wrong direction and while I was aware of this I had promised not to give any indication. Our focus was on trying to spot familiar road signs, place names or landmarks. In spite of being technically 'lost' it felt as if we were learning much more about the areas we were travelling through than if our focus had purely been on reaching our destination. After some time we passed a road-sign pointing towards Brighton, at which point we agreed to abandon our bus and find our way back towards Covent Garden—something I assumed a leading role in.

My wayfinding leadership led to a change in focus for other group members. Instead of engaging with their surroundings and the 'journey' they focused instead on conversations about career experiences. Considering the performance aspects of everyday mobilities, this more passive approach to the exercise still retained pedagogical value. It gave space to learn about each other rather than just about our relationships with urban landscapes. Yet it also highlighted issues of trust and power associated with such an exercise. The pedagogical impact of the exercise could be severely reduced if the emasculation of those lacking necessary wayfinding knowledge led to involuntary disengagement. It also became apparent that my decision making was being trusted without question; in other hands or under different circumstances that might lead to an abuse of power. Such reliance demonstrated to me the value of immersing oneself in and knowing one's surroundings; otherwise unhealthy dependence may ensue. This insight also applies to our relationships with technology, which drives so much decision making on 'real-time' journey planning. These insights were reinforced in the whole-group reflection when the links between passivity and mobilities were discussed. That said, disconnection from one's surroundings is not necessarily a 'bad thing'. Mobilities are about more than just movement and such 'other' aspects of mobility—such as opportunities for conversation—also provide meaningful learning and teaching opportunities.

The positive utility of mundane journeys has been the subject of extensive research in the mobilities literature (see Jain & Lyons, 2008; Mokhtarian, Salomon, & Redmond, 2001). Assessing the value of 'journeying-together' as an exercise depends on what we value and what we count as pedagogical. If one just focuses on 'simple' acts of getting from A to B via a given mode of transport and reflects on how that act is carried out, then perhaps we miss some of the most valuable elements that constitute the complex, contested and multi-dimensional nature of mobilities and indeed of pedagogy itself.

4.4 Cyborg bus bubbles and other journeys through capitalism's mobilities

Anna (A, henceforth): How do you feel this bus trip differed, if at all, from a more traditional session? In what ways did the materialities and technologies of the pavement, the bus, the air, differ from how we feel, act and interact in a conference room.

Clancy (C, henceforth): It was as if the rhythm of our bus-mobility was orchestrating our discussion. Faster at times of traffic flow, and awkwardly halting at bus stop intervals, as we checked our location and were brought back into the city and journey. We were at once part of the urban space, and sheltered from it. The bus-space formed a barrier between the relative stillness of learning space and the quixotic frenzy of London—calm enough to allow for reflection, and still stimulating.

A: I wonder how the bus's rhythm affected the knowledges shared? Perhaps the range of our conversation would be impossible in the structure of a 'standard' conference. Instead of presenting our work to each other in fifteen-minute papers and then asking questions, we were learning collaboratively and in relation to the bus and street worlds around us.

C: The changing environment of the bus-space, and sense of *going somewhere* was inspirational and productive. Physical momentum begat intellectual momentum, and the stimulus of the world around provided cues for conversation. This movement created a *conversation* 'space'—a *learning* 'space' derived from the interaction between us. This space was not fixed but a mobile space produced between two actors—and it moved from the street to the bus and back onto the street, and beyond the experiment itself.

A: But in some senses, in the bus our bodies were relatively immobile, facing forward, as in a more traditional presentation. It is ironic, because as co-convenor I hoped the session would explore how we might exchange knowledge or learn differently if our bodies are engaged in movement. Blood flow, muscle activity, multiple and unexpected sensory stimuli surely matter? The other aspect—one arguably closed down by having a destination for our journey—was maintaining an open-ended session. I hoped to create a space open for play and unexpectedness, respite from the oppressive instrumentalisation of everything, the need for thought/journeys/work to *go somewhere*. These thoughts on instrumentality bring me to another kind of instrumentation: what difference do you feel our use of technologies (the GoPro camera, your phone) made to this learning together?

C: The technology allowed for distraction—because we were neither note-taking nor way-marking, and, thanks to the GoPro and the phone, our experience of mobility became less analytical and more visceral—the lurching bus and the heat of the conversation flowed into the rhythm of the bus and of London more generally. In hindsight, the hard data—elevation, distance, average speed, and the path itself—seem at odds with the experience of mobility as we produced it. Our production of mobility was steeped in the presentness of experience, as it flowed from one moment to the next.

As a pedagogic and mobile space, our journey presented a different kind of learning. Arguably, it was more interactive, engaging and creative than the formalised conference space. But, could it be argued that it was also less productive—opening up more lines of inquiry than it answered?

A: To your points on technology: Were we producing a kind of cyborg journey together? Our group was the ‘technology’ group (but this delineation, I feel, was itself false, as all humans and journeys are necessarily part(taking) technology, in the broadest sense). When we returned from our trip, someone used the term ‘cyborg’ to describe us. Drawn to the concept in many ways, I was uneasy with this quick diagnosis of our condition. As Haraway (2000, para. 2) puts it; the cyborg has been used “to mean almost anything about the join between human and machine, in some kind of deeply ahistorical way that I find maddening”

To your thoughts on creativity and what constitutes a ‘productive’ session: At the time of writing this passage, I am in the midst of ‘fieldwork’— a geographical term I find fraught: What is this ‘field’ and why does it have to be *other* than commuting, classes, conferences? Where do we make the cut of what counts as fieldwork, knowledges and truths that are ‘worth’ teaching, quoting, reading? Linked to our journey: what do we value as productive ‘learning’, ‘teaching’ and ‘research’ and what relations of power help define and maintain these delineations and value judgements? In this roundabout way, I am getting to the notion of productivity you raised earlier. Or as Castree *et al.* (2008) highlight—and Neil Smith (2000) provocatively argued in *Who Rules This Sausage Factory* (the university)—how we measure productivity in education is bound up in the commoditisation of education and notions of functionalism. Perhaps, as you suggest, our journey was less productive of answers, and more of fruitful distractions and questions.

C: In many ways we were all cyborgs—being whisked along by buses and trains and traffic lights, governed by a barely perceptible technological infrastructure, reminiscent of the kinds of automated urbanism described by Thrift and French (2002) and the code-spaces espoused by Kitchin and Dodge (2011).

And this thinking leads on to your second point about ‘the field’? Exactly as you highlighted, there is a tendency to forget the spatial and temporal (geographic and historical) interrelations that exist prior to our conceptualisation of ‘the field’. Reflecting on our journey, were we in ‘the field’? Was it really a space apart from ‘ordinary spaces’ simply because we named it thus? Considering this question, perhaps it was too easy to assume that we were ‘the cyborg group’, merely because we had knowingly designed the relationship between ourselves and the technology without considering how this relationship may unfold outside of ‘the field’.

A: I suppose what niggles me still are the effects of specific systems and institutions that govern these practices—of fieldwork, of a conference? Who and what benefits? What rules, violence and exclusions are re-created? What cuts does it reinscribe? What knowledges does it (re)produce and at what costs? Does it prejudice the experience, the presen(t)ces, over the ‘historical’, the geographically and temporally dispersed exploitations and labours that make possible certain journeys over others, for some and not others? Perhaps it is too much to ask of one session that it *both* inhabit the bodily experience of the journey *and* allow for recognition of these larger geopolitical systems, these other temporally, spatially, bodily exploitations and labours that make possible certain journeys over others, for some and not others? Does the technology we employed distract us from critiquing the kinds of mobile subjects (or *sausages*) we are becoming: using video, data, calorie counting and screen-time, do we become the producers of data for machineries of profit and surveillance? (Figure 4)

[INSERT FIGURE 4 HERE]

C: The data are at once a distraction and canaries in the mine, they are largely meaningless – they tell us how far we went and how high we climbed – but they do not account for our experiences. There is an affective and emotional politics bound up with mobility, which remains (presently) beyond the reach of formalised categorisation. Both the camera and the phone are a materialisation of larger geopolitical systems and hegemonies, and the data which are supposed to make it all worth it – the map, the video – are realised as abstractions of a past experience impossible to relive, making the whole process ludicrously macabre.

The concept of a co-production of mobility—that we produce mobility in the very act of researching it—has augured a further set of questions: in producing mobilities research, how can we map global economic, social and political phenomena as they appear in everyday settings? In some ways, I hope our discussion here has started to answer some of these questions. And perhaps, for the rest that remain inconclusive and unanswered, we need more sessions like this one, in different places and with different people, reformatted and rearranged, so that future sessions may be equally as enlightening.

5 Conclusion: Peer-to-peer pedagogies beyond the familiar social order of a conference?

Anna Davidson and Simon Cook

What happens pedagogically when you move the conference out of conference rooms and take a journey together into ‘the field’ of London’s moving worlds? Do we experience, feel, exchange, and learn *differently*, and if so, how might those affects and outcomes matter for pedagogic interventions, and what might they mean for future collaborative sessions? These are some of the questions raised through the *Co-Producing Mobilities* session at the RGS-IBG 2014. The preceding fifteen reflections have grappled with these in diverse, creative, and insightful ways. In these concluding remarks we reflect critically on the pedagogic value of the session, drawing out three main thematic threads running through the contributions: the (im)material and embodied spaces of peer-to-peer pedagogy; the altered social contexts and their relations of power; and the impacts of reflecting on and documenting these experiences. Once more, we interpret pedagogy broadly, taking our lead from the diverse conceptions demonstrated in the contributions. Pedagogy (peer-to-peer or otherwise) is about the creation, exchange and reproduction of knowledge. Thus, pedagogic interventions are inherently political and—in line with bell hooks’ sentiment, which opened the paper—need to be considered critically, as we do now.

Material, spatial and bodily contexts of learning

Although we hoped to explore what *difference* mobility makes in peer-to-peer pedagogy, it is important not to reify the mobile aspects of the session. As Stratford (this paper²) reminded us, recalling Lefebvre, “there is nothing still in the world”. We were interested in a mobile session, not from an assumption that mobile methods hold a privileged access to the “truth” about mobility, but because, to one degree or another, we are all mobility scholars. It was the fact that we were doing and encountering what we studied that was so important (Cook). As the reflections highlighted, by leaving the conference room and encountering our research topics (rather than representing them in words and PowerPoint) our journeys by foot, bus and Tube comprised different bodily, spatial, (im)material and semiotic specificities and modes of

attention that produced their own particular contexts to/for learning: For example, the bus riders reflected on experimentations with technology, with sensations of facing backwards, and looking down from ‘up high’. The perspectives of the Tube patrons were focused on the train rhythms, on their experiments in leading and blind-folding and the 196 steps. The walkers’ bodies were also exposed to the wider open spaces, effluvia, skies and atmospheres (Simpson) of London’s parks. Common to all the modes, however, was the fact that our affective journeys went far beyond the immediacy of, ‘here’ and ‘now’ and were always already refracted through—and simultaneous to—the ‘elsewheres’ of bodily, spatial and material memory, comparison, conversation and history. Getting out and encountering the phenomena under investigation allowed for such specificities, affective experiences and contexts of/for learning. The recounting of these, seemingly mundane happenings throughout this paper, emphasises this and provides detailed insight into the workings of such a session.

Clearly the opportunity to encounter the topic of study during a conference session ‘in the field’ is not limited to mobilities research. As Fitt outlined above, regardless of the discipline, interactive modes of conferencing help her develop more interactive teaching. However, the particularities of different fields will create different learning contexts and opportunities. In the case of mobility, “being in motion” proffers different kinds of interactions with the world, forming different kinds of identities and knowledges (Ricketts Hein, Evans, & Jones, 2008, p.1268; see also Coe & Smyth, 2010). Similarly, Anderson (2004) has pointed out that talking whilst walking allows place(s) to serve as active triggers to generate new ways of producing and disseminating knowledge. While participants reflected on such processes in their comments (Kershaw), the diversity of reflections brings out an important point: The places the journeys traversed, were not simply backdrops to experience or ‘triggers’ for knowledge. As active inhabitants of buses, Tubes, atmospheres, shoes and pavements we were constantly (co)producing these spaces, and hence subjectivities, *differently* through these myriad relations (Simpson). The ways in which various actors and actants cohered in these journeys, offered points of distraction, interruption, cues, confusion, comparison, conversation-starters and novelty.

Taking seriously the kinds of bodily knowledge and learning explored by Serres in *Variations on the Body*³ we might ask: What bodies, bodily knowledge and bodies of knowledge were produced in this session? Contributions reflected on sore feet, fatigue, but also ideas, connections, modes of attention, energy and motivation. Although it is impossible to capture the dispersed effects of ‘energised’ or ‘enthusiastic’ bodies—it might be interesting to consider further what difference such bodily, material, and spatial states might make to conferences and their (learning) outcomes.

Learning together and power relations

The collaborative reflections (that is, those by Bissell & Duncan; Wilmott & Davidson; and Evans & Jones) in particular, highlighted the different worlds produced by different bodies journeying together. Exposure to others’ perceptions, interpretations and abilities, widened their perspectives on how journeys are (re-) produced differently and can be understood in different ways (for example, Delaney, and Fitt). Whether through engaged discussion, an overheard sentiment or observed behaviour, simply journeying with others seemed to spark off new appreciations, perspectives and knowledge (Cook). Empathy here was brought up as an important way of gaining some insight into others’ affective worlds and enhancing

teaching and research (Middleton; Plyushteva). Acknowledging the value of those we journeyed with and their insights, however, also points towards some of the limitations posed by our session's relative lack of diversity. Participants were not deaf or blind, were able to walk, were predominantly white and from academic institutions in Europe, Australia and New Zealand, and all were students and academics versed in academic geography. The incorporation of absent perspectives would only serve to strengthen insights into mobility, but particularly the questions of social justice bound up in it.

Despite these partial perspectives, participants brought to the session a range of methodological tools, research expertise and familiarity with London and different mobilities. These capacities brought to the fore interesting experiments in (micro) relations of power: In what ways do we rely on leaders (Middleton), experts (on London, see Elvy), habit or technology (Bissell & Duncan; Elvy; Sengers; Wilmott & Davidson) to carry and process knowledge? How might this leave us vulnerable to being lost, manipulated or led astray, or perhaps allow for distractions, experiences, conversations, daydreams and experiments? The Tube group in particular—by rotating who led the journey—experimented more overtly with power relations within the group. In this way, journeying together was not only an opportunity to meet others in the academic community—as Sengers and Kershaw point out—but perhaps also—as Plyushteva highlights—to do so in ways that are less hierarchical and less focused on individualised work, learning and ‘achievement’ than conventional academic contexts.

Unending journeys – reflection and documentation

The production of knowledge does not end after you come ‘home’ from a fieldwork experience, rather, it is “always already caught up with the onflow of experience” (Bissell & Duncan). Similarly, as Simpson emphasises, our journeys are “processes of perpetual reproduction”. Editing and concluding this multi-authored paper represents part of this reproduction. It also represents a pedagogic experiment—it was an opportunity for us as graduate students to plan, run—and reflect on—a conference session in novel ways⁴. In many papers on fieldwork experiences with students, academic staff author the reflections on pedagogic approaches used (for example, Burgess & Jackson, 1992). Keen to maintain the “co-“ in ‘co-production’ we found it important to co-author these reflections. Given the diversity of approaches used by participants, these contributions reveal the effects of different tools and modes of sensing, recording, capturing, documenting and relaying the learning journeys. We hope that reading these pieces emphasises the unsettled awareness of how different ways of narrating (or gathering data, or learning) do not just produce different ‘stories’, but produced different journeys themselves.

These journeys were staged. Participants were asked to record and analyse journeys in whatever way they saw fit, and then reflect on the pedagogy of the experience. Did, as Bissell and Duncan point out, this self-conscious ‘gathering together’ of experiences afterwards force an unnecessary fixity of interpretation—propelled by the need to have something to say? In a similar vein, Williams addresses the difficulty of being able to put into words things that evade articulation. How might different methods attempt to record moments that cannot be easily captured and communicate that which cannot be spoken. How might the postcard (or sound file and selfie) share the experiences of the journeys differently than say the geo-tracked self-quantification which Wilmott and Davidson discussed? How do different

methods tell the stories of our journeys differently, and in turn, help to co-produce the journeys themselves?

Turning to the unspoken—or the left-unheard—Wilmott and Davidson reflect on what knowledges were suppressed by privileging the spatial-temporal “presences” of our experiences. What exploitative co-productions ‘elsewhere’ were we too distracted to apprehend—for example, in oil extraction, in the production of our phones, in the unequal effects of climate change? Perhaps, as Wilmott points out, the opportunity to reflect critically on the session, allowed us at least to bring these omissions to light. In these ways, our learning journeys defy spatial and temporal boundaries, beginnings and endings, and the packaging into defined ‘ends’ and answers. They defy capture, and closure, and open up more than they conclude.

Assessing success and wider questions

How then do we come to a close and attempt to assess this session’s ‘success’, when posing this very question is problematic (see Simpson; Elvy) and deeply political? We could simply draw on our eighteen contributions and stamp the session a success based on a sense of enthusiasm expressed in the reflections, and the interesting forms of peer-to-peer pedagogy they outline. Each contribution did highlight virtues of the session and some of these points are highlighted in Box 1, below, to provide a framework for anyone wishing to plan similar sessions in a future conference, workshop, seminar, fieldtrip or lecture.

[INSERT BOX 1 HERE]

Another interesting output of the session is not one easily labelled as “success”, “utility” or “repeatability”. Planning, participating in and reflecting on this session has helped us explore the oft taken-for-granted or ‘organic’ (Middleton) role of academic conferences: are they a ‘learning community’ (Jacobs & McFarlane, 2005), or spaces of competition and career progression? Do conferences aid large-scale transfer of research findings or engagement with works in progress and emerging ideas (Evans & Jones)? What kind of academics do we want them to reproduce and sustain? Does their measure of success lie in how ‘good’ (or more radically, how uncomfortable) participants feel afterwards; in the number of publishable outputs produced; or in how we collectively move thought-practices out of unjust ‘familiar social orders’ and towards reimagining other ways of being, moving and researching? It was perhaps the context of experimentation, a dislocation and disruption of habits (Cranston) itself that enabled such questioning of the *status quo* of conferencing and its ‘familiar social order’.

It is clear that simply by having the luxury of experimenting with collaborative mobilities (Middleton), the *Co-Producing Mobilities* session could not subvert structures of dominance—racial, sexual, gendered, ableist—in the ‘familiar social order’ bell hooks refers to. Our experiences were necessarily limited by the privileges that allow us to be present at such conferences, and the structures of inequality we keep in motion. However in small ways, the *Co-Producing Mobilities* session allowed for collaborative experimentation, a move away from predetermined agendas and learning, a blurring of academic hierarchies and the boundaries between fieldwork, dissemination and pedagogy. In this way, it opened up some possibilities for doing conferences and their peer-to-peer learning ‘otherwise’, and these warrant further experimentation.

Endnotes

- ¹ The necessity of these so called ‘mobile methods’ are disputed however (see Merriman, 2014)
- ² Further undated references will pertain to contributions within this paper.
- ³ “Go, run, faith will come to you, the body will sort things out. Knowledge sinks into it and from it re-emerges. Hidden in the shadow, the body slowly assimilates the simulated.” (Serres, 2011, p.26)
- ⁴ For more on the value of student led-initiatives see (Hawthorne & Fyfe, 2015)

References

- Adey, P., Brayer, L., Masson, D., Murphy, P., Simpson, P., & Tixier, N. (2013). ‘Pour votre tranquillité’: ambiance, atmosphere, and surveillance. *Geoforum*, 49, 299-309. doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2013.04.028
- Allen-Collinson, J. (2008). Running the Routes Together: Corunning and Knowledge in Action. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 37(1), 38-61. doi: 10.1177/0891241607303724
- Anderson, B. (2009). Affective atmospheres. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 2(2), 77-81. doi:10.1016/j.emospa.2009.08.005
- Anderson, B. & Wylie, J. (2009). On geography and materiality. *Environment and Planning A*, 41(2), 318–335. doi:10.1068/a3940
- Anderson, J. (2004). Talking whilst walking: a geographical archaeology of knowledge. *Area*, 36(3), 254–261. doi: 10.1111/j.0004-0894.2004.00222.x
- Anderson, J. (2013). Evaluating student-generated film as a learning tool for qualitative methods: geographical “drifts” and the city. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 37(1), 136-146. doi:10.1080/03098265.2012.694070
- Bissell, D. (2009). Conceptualizing differently-mobile passengers: geographies of everyday encumbrance in the railway station. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 10(2), 173-195. doi:10.1080/14649360802652137
- Bissell, D. (2010). Passenger mobilities: affective atmospheres and the sociality of public transport. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 28(2), 270-289. doi:10.1068/d3909
- Bissell, D., Adey, P., & Laurier, E. (2011). Guest Editorial: Introduction to the Special Issue on Geographies of the Passenger. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 19(5), 1007 – 1009. doi:10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2011.06.002
- Bissell, L., & Overend, D. (2015). Reflections on a mobile train conference from Helsinki to Rovaniemi. *Cultural Geographies*, 22(4), 731 - 735. doi: 10.1177/1474474015569979
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2001). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment (pp. 14). London: Kings College London School of Education. Retrieved from: <http://weaeducation.typepad.co.uk/files/blackbox-1.pdf>.
- Boyle, A., Maguire, S., Martin, A., Milson, C., Nash, R., Rawlinson, S.,...Conchie, S. (2007). Fieldwork is good: the student perception and the affective domain. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 31(2), 299–317. doi:10.1080/03098260601063628
- Burgess, J., & Jackson, P. (1992). Streetwork—an encounter with place. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 16(2), 151-157. doi: 10.1080/03098269208709188

- Castree, N., Fuller, D., Kent, A., Kobayashi, A., Merrett, C. D., Pulido, L., & Barraclough, L. (2008). Geography, pedagogy and politics. *Progress in Human Geography*, 32(5), 680-718. doi: 10.1177/0309132508095081
- Charles-Edwards, E., Bell, M., & Corcoran, J. (2014). Integrating Undergraduate Fieldwork into the Study of Human Mobility. *Australian Geographer*, 45(4), 505–19. doi:10.1080/00049182.2014.953734.
- Coe, N.M., & Smyth, F.M. (2010). Students as Tour Guides: Innovation in Fieldwork Assessment. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 34(1), 125–39. doi:10.1080/03098260902954095.
- Corbin, A. (1986). *The Foul and the Fragrant*. London: Papermac.
- Cresswell, T. (2006). *On the Move: Mobility in the Modern Western World*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Cresswell, T. (2010). Towards a politics of mobility. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 28(1), 17–31. doi:10.1068/d11407
- de Certeau, M. (1984). *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Debord, G. (1958). Theory of the dérive [K. Knabb, Trans.]. *Internationale Situationniste*, 2, 62-66. Retrieved from <http://www.cddc.vt.edu/sionline/si/theory.html>, (Original work published in 1956).
- Dewsbury, J.D. & Bissell, D. (2015). Habit Geographies: the perilous zone in the life of the individual. *Cultural Geographies*, 22(1), 21-28. doi: 10.1177/1474474014561172
- Durose, C., Beebeejaun, Y., Rees, J., Richardson, J., & Richardson, L. (2011). Towards co-production in research with communities. Swindon: AHRC Connected Communities. Retrieved from https://www.dur.ac.uk/resources/geography/reframing_state/CCDiscussionPaperDurose2etal.pdf.
- Edensor, T. (2011). Commuter: mobility, rhythm and commuting. In T. Cresswell & P. Merriman, P (Eds), *Geographies of Mobilities: Practices, Spaces, Subjects* (pp.189-203). Ashgate: Aldershot.
- Elden, S. (2013). The AAG meeting. Progressive Geographies [Blog]. Retrieved from <http://progressivegeographies.com/2013/04/13/the-aag-meeting/>
- Grosz, E. (2013). Habit Today: Ravaissan, Bergson, Deleuze and Us. *Body & Society*, 19(2&3), 217-239. doi: 10.1177/1357034X12472544.
- Hannam, K., Sheller, M. & Urry, J. (2006). Editorial: Mobilities, Immobilities and Moorings. *Mobilities*, 1(1), 1-22. doi:10.1080/174501005000489189
- Haraway, D. (2000). Birth of the Kennel [Lecture]. Retrieved from <http://www.egs.edu/faculty/donna-haraway/articles/birth-of-the-kennel/>
- Hawthorne, T. L., & Fyfe, D. (2015). The Importance of Student-Led Initiatives in Rethinking the Ph.D. *GeoJournal*, 80(2), 175 – 179. doi:10.1007/s10708-014-9584-4.
- Hay, I., Dunn, K., & Street, A. (2005). Making the Most of Your Conference Journey. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 29(1), 159-171. doi: 10.1080/03098260500030546
- Henshaw, V. (2014). *Urban Smellscapes: Understanding and Designing City Smell Environments*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Herrick, C. (2010). Lost in the field: ensuring student learning in the 'threatened' geography fieldtrip. *Area*, 42(1), 108 – 116. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-4762.2009.00892.x
- hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching Community: A Pedagogy of Hope*. New York: Routledge.
- Hope, M. (2009). The importance of direct experience: a philosophical defence of fieldwork in human geography. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 33(2), 169–182. doi: 10.1080/03098260802276698

- Hovorka, A.J. & Wolf, P.A. (2009). Activating the classroom: geographical fieldwork as pedagogical practice. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 33(1), 89-102. doi: 10.1080/03098260802276383
- Ingold, T. (2004). Culture on the ground: the world perceived through the feet. *Journal of Material Culture*, 9(3), 315–340. doi: 10.1177/1359183504046896
- Ingold, T. (2007). Earth, sky, wind, and weather. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (N.S.), 19-38. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9655.2007.00401.x
- Jackson, M. & Fannin, M. (2011). Guest editorial: Letting geography fall where it may - aerographies address the elemental. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 29(3), 435-444. doi:10.1068/d2903ed
- Jacobs, N., & McFarlane, A. (2005). Conferences as learning communities: some early lessons in using ‘back-channel’ technologies at an academic conference – distributed intelligence or divided attention? *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 21(5), 317-329. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2729.2005.00142.x
- Jain, J., & Lyons, G. (2008). The gift of travel time. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 16(2), 81-89. doi:10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2007.05.001
- Jameson, F. (1984). Postmodernism, or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism. *New Left Review*, 146, 53-92. Retrieved from: <http://newleftreview.org/I/146/fredric-jameson-postmodernism-or-the-cultural-logic-of-late-capitalism>
- Jensen, O. B. (2010). Negotiation in Motion: Unpacking a Geography of Mobility. *Space and Culture*. 13(4), 389-402. doi: 10.1177/1206331210374149
- Jensen, O.B. (2013). *Staging Mobilities*. London: Routledge.
- Jensen, O.B. (2014). *Designing Mobilities*. Aalborg: Aalborg University Press.
- Jones, P. (2005). Performing the City: a Body and a Bicycle Take On Birmingham, UK. *Social & Cultural Geography*. 6 (6), 813-830. doi: 10.1080/14649360500353046
- Katz, J. (1999). *How Emotions Work*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kent, M., Gilbertson, D. & Hunt, C. (1997). Fieldwork in geography teaching: a critical review of the literature and approaches. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 21(3), 313–332. doi: 10.1080/03098269708725439
- Kitchin, R., & Dodge, M. (2011). *Code/Space: Software and Everyday Life*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lambert, C. (2012). Twilight of the lecture: The trend toward "active learning" may overthrow the style of teaching that has ruled universities for 600 years. *Harvard Magazine*, March-April 2012. Retrieved from <http://harvardmagazine.com/2012/03/twilight-of-the-lecture>.
- Lefebvre, H. (2004). *Rhythmanalysis: Space, Time, and Everyday Life*. New York: Continuum.
- Lorimer, H., & Parr, H. (2014). Excursions – Telling Stories and Journeys. *Cultural Geographies*, 21(4), 543–47. doi:10.1177/1474474014547326.
- McCormack, D. (2008). Engineering affective atmospheres on the moving geographies of the 1897 Andree expedition. *Cultural Geographies*, 15(4), 413-430. doi: 10.1177/1474474008094314
- Merriman, P. (2012). *Mobility, Space, and Culture*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Merriman, P. (2014). Rethinking Mobile Methods. *Mobilities*, 9(2), 167-187. doi: 10.1080/17450101.2013.784540
- McIlvenny, P. (2015). The Joy of Biking Together: Sharing Everyday Experiences of Vélomobility. *Mobilities*, 10(1), 55-82. doi: 10.1080/17450101.2013.844950

- Mokhtarian, P.L., Salomon, I., & Redmond, L.S. (2001). Understanding the demand for travel: It's not purely 'derived'. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 14(4), 355-380. doi: 10.1080/13511610120106147
- Opezzo, M. & Schwartz, D.L. (2014). Give your ideas some legs: The positive effect of walking on creative thinking. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 40(4), 1142-1452. doi: 10.1037/a0036577
- Pain, R. (2004). Social geography: participatory research. *Progress in Human Geography*, 28(5), 652-663. doi:10.1191/0309132504ph511pr
- Perez, H. (2005). You Can Have My Brown Body and Eat It, Too! *Social Text*, 23(3-4), 171-191. doi: 10.1215/01642472-23-3-4_84-85-171
- Revell, A. & Wainwright, E. (2009). What Makes Lectures 'Unmissable'? Insights into Teaching Excellence and Active Learning. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 33(2), 209-223. doi: 10.1080/03098260802276771
- Ricketts Hein, J., Evans, J. & Jones, P. (2008). Mobile Methodologies: Theory, Technology and Practice. *Geography Compass*, 2(5), pp. 1266-1285. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-8198.2008.00139.x
- Rogers, A. (2010). The need for practical workshops. *Area*, 42(1), 127-131. doi:10.1111/j.1475-4762.2009.00897.x
- Rose, G. (2012). *Doing family photography: the domestic, the public and the politics of sentiment*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Scheyvens, R., Griffin, A.L., Jocoy, C.L., Liu, Y., & Bradford, M. (2008). Experimenting with Active Learning in Geography: Dispelling the Myths that Perpetuate Resistance. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 32(1), 51-69. doi: 10.1080/03098260701731496.
- Schwanen, T. (2015). Geographies of Transport I: Reinventing a field?. *Progress in Human Geography*. Advanced online publication. doi: 10.1177/0309132514565725
- Schwanen, T., Banister, D., & Anable, J. (2012). Rethinking habits and their role in behaviour change: the case of low-carbon mobility. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 24, 522-532. doi: 10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2012.06.003
- Scott, I., Fuller, I., & Gaskin, S. (2006). Life without Fieldwork: Some Lecturers' Perceptions of Geography and Environmental Science Fieldwork. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 30(1), 161 – 171. doi: 10.1080/03098260500499832
- Serres, M. (2011). *Variations on the Body*. (R. Burkes, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: Univocal Publishing.
- Sharp, J. (2005). Geography and gender: feminist methodologies in collaboration and in the field. *Progress in Human Geography*, 29(3), 304-309. doi: 10.1191/0309132505ph550pr
- Shaw, J., & Docherty, I. (2014). *The Transport Debate*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Shaw, J. & Hesse, M. (2010). Transport, geography and the "new" mobilities. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 35(3), 305–312. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-5661.2010.00382.
- Shaw, J. & Sidaway, J. (2011). Making links: On (re)engaging with transport and transport geography. *Progress in Human Geography*, 35(4), 502-520. doi:10.1177/0309132510385740
- Sheller, M. & Urry, J. (2006). The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A*, 38(2), 207–226. doi:10.1068/a37268
- Simpson, P. (2009). 'Falling on deaf ears': a post-phenomenology of sonorous presence. *Environment and Planning A*, 41(11), 2556-2575. doi:10.1068/a41247
- Smith, N. (2000). Who Rules This Sausage Factory? *Antipode*, 32(3), 330-339. doi: 10.1111/1467-8330.00138

- Spinney, J. (2011). A Chance to Catch a Breath: Using Mobile Video Ethnography in Cycling Research. *Mobilities*, 6(2), 161-182. doi: 10.1080/17450101.2011.552771
- Stewart, K. (2007). *Ordinary Affects*. Durham NC: Duke University Press.
- Stokes, A., Magnier, K. & Weaver, R. (2011). What is the Use of Fieldwork? Conceptions of Students and Staff in Geography and Geology. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 35(1), 121-141. doi: 10.1080/03098265.2010.487203
- Stratford, E. (2015). *Geographies, Mobilities, and Rhythms Over the Life Course: Adventures in the Interval*. London: Routledge.
- Taylor, N. (2003). The Aesthetic Experience of Traffic in the Modern City. *Urban Studies*, 40 (8), 1609-1625. doi: 10.1080/0042098032000094450
- Tolia-Kelly, D.P. (2006). Affect – an ethnocentric encounter? Exploring the ‘universalist’ imperative of emotional/affectual geographies. *Area*, 38(2), 213-217. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-4762.2006.00682.x
- Thrift, N. (2004). Intensities of feeling: towards a spatial politics of affect. *Geografiska Annaler B*, 86(1), 57-78. doi: 10.1111/j.0435-3684.2004.00154.x
- Thrift, N., & French, S. (2002). The Automatic Production of Space. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 27(3), 309-335. doi: 10.1111/1475-5661.00057.
- Wilson, M. W. (2014). Continuous connectivity, handheld computers, and mobile spatial knowledge. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 32 (3), 535-555. doi:10.1068/d14112
- Woodyer, T. (2012). Ludic geographies: not merely child’s play. *Geography Compass*, 6(6), 313-326. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-8198.2012.00477.x
- Wylie, J. (2005). A single day's walking: narrating self and landscape on the South West Coast Path. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 30, 234-247. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-5661.2005.00163.x

Boxes

Box 1. Session Framework

1. Students encouraged and supported in experimenting with chairing conference session.
2. Open call for participants (not papers), requiring minimal preparation.
3. No division between 'presenters' and 'audience' – so session is more relaxed and dynamic.
4. Session acceptance as inclusive as possible (given space, room size, feasibility) including participants from all levels of academic hierarchy.
5. Briefing, rationale and general activity of the session provided well in advance to allow for ideas to begin to formulate.
6. A loose session structure to frame and guide discussion without being prescriptive.
7. Flexible timing allowing for distraction, exchange, spontaneity within the activity. Questions of: "so what?" "what does it matter?" "what difference does it make?" at the forefront of activities.
8. Time for reflection during and after the session built in.
9. Risk taking: session organised in such a way that organisers had no idea whether it would 'work' – allowing for a form of 'coproduction' and flexibility.

Figures, Sound clips and captions

In text

Figure 1	Group selfies. Photo credits – Elaine Stratford, Kate Evans, and Clancy Wilmott
Figure 2	Look up. Photo credit – Paul Simpson.
Figure 3	A postcard from Paul. Photo credits – Nina Williams.
Figure 4	Journey data on Endomondo.

External- not in text

Picture file 1	Walking blind and guided. Photo credit – Elaine Stratford..
Picture file 2	196 steps. Photo credit – Elaine Stratford.
Picture file 3	Gap-toothed cobbles. Photo credit – Elaine Stratford.
Picture file 4	Waiting for the #9. Photo credit – Elaine Stratford.
Picture file 5	Being prompted by things on the journey. Photo credit – Kate Evans.

External – not in text

Sound clip 1	Experience of walking blindfolded. Sound credit – Elaine Stratford.
Sound clip 2	Sounds of the Underground. Sound credit – Elaine Stratford.