

## Author's Preprint Version

Cook, S. (2020) Researching the run: methods for exploring mundane geographies. In: Holmes, H. and Marie-Hall, S. (eds) *Mundane Methods: Innovative ways to research the everyday*, Manchester University Press: Manchester.

<https://manchesteruniversitypress.co.uk/9781526139719/>

## Researching the run: methods for exploring mundane jographies

*Simon Cook*

*Faculty of Health, Education and Life Sciences, Birmingham City University*

*Department of Geography, Royal Holloway University of London*

[Simon.Cook@bcu.ac.uk](mailto:Simon.Cook@bcu.ac.uk)

[Simon.Cook.2013@live.rhul.ac.uk](mailto:Simon.Cook.2013@live.rhul.ac.uk)

This chapter introduces and evaluates two methods of exploring running geographies, or jographies as I like to call them. Jographies are interested broadly in running practices, their spatialities, meanings, cultures and experiences (Cook et al, 2016a). The importance of investigating running in such ways is becoming ever more important to contemporary society. Due to the accessible, convenient and physical nature of running, it is increasingly being positioned as a key practice in helping to resolve the public health epidemic of inactivity, as well as an example of mundane mobility. I consider running a unique way of inhabiting and being in the world. Considering it in this way focuses attention upon the textures and minutia of the everyday: how it happens; how it feels; the senses, sensations and emotions bound up with running; the relationship between runners and places; and the meanings attached to running. Grasping these aspects of running permits deeper insight into why people take up and sustain running, and therefore what can be done to encourage more people to start running.

The questions posed by my interest in jographies have guided my research for the last few years, during which I have conducted three different projects exploring running widely as a mobile practice and more specifically as a mode of transport (see Cook et al, 2016b; Cook 2016; 2017 for more details). When these projects began, there was little in the way of methodological precedence for understanding running from social science/humanities perspectives. Autoethnography had been very successfully used by Allen-Collinson and Hockey (2001) in their research into running as serious leisure, however, there was little guidance for engaging with the experiences of multiple, everyday runners. My research has, therefore, also involved an ongoing methodological experimentation in order to test out different methods for engaging with the mundane aspects of everyday running and the insights they offer into understanding the practice. In general, these experiments have been inspired by the recent advancements in mobile methods and I have been keen to test out their application to running.

There have been two main methods I have experimented with – the go-along interview (GAI) and mobile-video ethnography (MVE). These methods could be considered as part of the jographer's toolbox, well, *this jographer's* toolbox at least. My aim in this chapter is to introduce these methods to you, explore the case made for each method, and to evaluate their application within my own research, sharing some hints, tips and suggestions along the way. In order to do this, the chapter begins by exploring the background to the two methods, before explaining my use of them, and ending with the advice I have for others thinking about using similar methods.

## Methodological Background

My methodological experiments with running have been influenced by the wider development of mobile methods. Mobile methods are an innovation of the mobilities turn, albeit a contested one (Merriman, 2014). This turn refers to the increasing attention to and importance of mobility that has developed within the social sciences, arts and humanities over the last two decades. The mobilities turn challenges the previous assumption that movement was a black box, something serving only to produce geographies/sociologies at either end of a journey, and something devoid of its own effects. The mobilities turn, however, argues that mobility is an incredibly important social agent and is essential to our experience and understanding of the world (Cresswell and Merriman, 2011). Mobility is recognised as fundamental in mediating our relationships with each other, space, time, places, objects, and ourselves (Cook, 2018). Work within the mobilities turn has emphasised the practical action, embodiment, affect and context of mobilities, facilitating questions regarding the sensory, embodied, emotional, performative and fleeting experiences of movement (Büscher and Urry, 2009). The ability of traditional research methods to comprehend these textures of mobility have been questioned (Law and Urry, 2004) and associated with the mobilities turn is the rise of mobile methods, a suite of different methods, which invariably attempt to 'keep up' with the practices being studied through tracing, tracking, and moving-with. Inspired by the methodological developments of the mobilities turn, I have experimented with GAI and MVE as possible tools to access and engage with running practices *in situ*.

In the simplest sense, GAIs are interviews conducted on the move with participants. This often involves the researcher participating in the practice being studied and experiencing the places and spaces within which a practice may take place (Anderson, 2004). If seeking to engage with the mundane, GAIs offer a greater depth of insight compared to ordinary interviews due to the increased temporal and spatial proximity to the phenomena of interest. Much that falls within the mundane and everyday is taken-for-granted and can be difficult for participants to reflect upon and recall. However, interviewing participants about their thoughts, feelings, experiences and actions at the point at which they are taking place helps to overcome this barrier and can result in rich insights into these mundane experiences. The multi-sited nature of a GAI also means that the spaces and places encountered can act as stimuli, helping to conjure memories, prompt further reflection on issues discussed, and provide useful/surprising distractions. The deeper understanding garnered through this is strengthened further by the increased levels of rapport that can be developed between researcher and participants. In GAI, the researcher and participants are engaging in a joint activity, which enters the participant's world. In these instances, participants become the experts and a more familiar environment can increase the comfort of participants, resulting in more evocative, unfiltered and honest insights being gained. The opportunities to engage more purely with the experiences of runners in a way which could account for the varied attachments they feel with places/spaces and in a manner which is comfortable for them is what interested me in using GAIs to investigate running.

While another method of moving with a participant, MVE often does not require the physical presence of a researcher at the moment of movement. Mobile-video-ethnography is the use of videographic methods whilst on the move, capturing the events, occurrences, relations, interactions, places and practices of the mobile subject under study (Simpson, 2014). This can be a useful tool for researchers who have concerns about what impact their presence within the research site may have. Although cameras still affect a participant's thoughts, feelings and actions (Pink, 2014), this is a different influence to the presence of a researcher. Running is often a solitary practice within which intimate relationships and choreographies with place often develop (Hitchings and Latham, 2016). My interest in understanding and exploring these are likely to be affected more greatly by my presence and

therefore the use of a camera may permit access to more 'accurate' or 'true' data in this regard. The use of MVE also permits researchers access to places or activities that may not be possible or desirable to physically be in, which could definitely apply to running. Analysing material collected using MVE benefits hugely from the retention of context, which the video camera offers. Although other research material (such as interview transcripts, diary entries etc.) can enable the analysis and recalling of key moments, events and experiences, they are abstracts, isolated from the wider contexts within which they took place. Even the most detailed note taking is unlikely to be able to capture and retain the amount of contextual information a camera is able to. While arguably still a reduction in itself (more of that below), MVE is able to record the vast range of happenings that affect the experience under investigation, opening them up more clearly for researcher analysis.

Despite not being there, researchers can still see and hear what occurred and analyse that. Indeed, the camera often captures things the participant were unaware of due it is fixed and constant gaze. MVE is claimed to provide the opportunity for deepening our understandings of practices by bringing into focus previously blurred aspects of mobilities that explore the minutia and intricacies of such practices (Brown et al, 2008). These nuanced understandings are facilitated by 'seeing the doing': enabling the capture, replaying and slowing down of practices (Brown and Dilley, 2012). Again offering methods of exploring the taken-for-granted, the ability to use technology in such ways grants access to a level of detail which participants would struggle to discuss or even have an awareness of due to their scale or fleeting nature. As well as using the video as raw data, MVE can also be employed as a method in combination with interviews, with footage being used for elicitation and to prompt practitioner self-analysis, which is how I utilised this method.

### **Using Go-Along Interviews and Mobile-Video-Ethnography**

The above section outlined the methodological background to my use of GAI and MVE to explore the mundane experiences of running. In this section, I will draw on my own experiences of using these methods in research to discuss the various ways I have innovated with the methods and how I have applied them within my work. A heavy emphasis within this section will be on the logistical set-ups of the methods. These methods are not homogenous, for each practice and context the set-up can be very different (Laurier, 2014). To my knowledge, neither of these methods has been used before in running research, so much of my innovation has surrounded how to actually make these methods work in ways that did not disrupt the practices, did not place too much burden on participants, and yet were methodologically valuable for the researcher. The speed, physical exertion and delicate equilibrium of running made this quite challenging, for both researcher and participants, as any addition to the running body can have an exaggerated and intolerable effect. My set-ups have not been perfect but hopefully the advice I provide here can help anyone wanting to experiment with these methods further. I have further innovated by combining these two methods, something this section will end by exploring.

The first method I sought to harness for use in running research was GAIs. At the time, this had mostly been used within walking and cycling research, and although each presents their own challenges, they are arguably easier to practices within which set up a go-along environment. Running not only requires more effort, but is also more physically immersive, which affords fewer options for stuff to be carried whilst on the run. This lays down several challenges for using this method. The first (and arguably biggest) challenge for using GAI in running is the physical abilities needed to run alongside participants. I have always been a runner and luckily, when I first experimented with GAI, I was at my fittest. This meant that I could generally cope with the physical aspects of the GAI. Since this, however, I have used GAI when I have not been quite so fit (to put it nicely) and needed to follow a training plan leading up to the data collection period. This is not a typical step in a research project and highlights an embodied issue in using some mobile methods, posing an access barrier and inequality issue in regards to who

could use GAI and who could not. While such issues will also occur when researching other mobile forms (such as cycling – Spinney, 2006), they are rarely written in research outputs so not much is known about how researchers manage these. To combat some of these embodied issues, I also agreed with participants to undertake these GAIs at conversational pace. Conversational pace is simply a pace at which all parties can hold a conversation while running without become breathless.

Audio recording was the next challenge to overcome in using GAIs for running, which is far from simple. Not only is there the issue of somehow carrying an audio recording device whilst running, but ensuring that it can pick up all parties without being dominated by the noise of wind or passing vehicles can be difficult. So far, I have used two different set-ups for audio recording. One of my projects was based in Plymouth, UK. Plymouth is a smaller and quieter city, which afforded a simpler set-up. This involved strapping an audio recorder to my arm (I used a makeshift holster out of an old ankle support) and then ensuring this always remained between the two runners. This was mostly successful, although the swinging of the arm led to an inconsistent sound quality and if ever the two runners separated, then the participant was sometimes inaudible. I initially adopted this set-up for my next project using GAIs in London. It quickly became clear that this was not going to work in a busier city. Not only are there many more background noises/distractions, but the possibility of two runners staying side by side for the entirety of a run was almost zero. After a bit of experimentation, I settled on a set-up, which involved a separate microphone for each participant, meaning separation would not be a problem. This was a tie-clip microphone, attached to a runner's top, close to their mouth and plugged into individual audio recording devices stored in a pocket/backpack/bum-bag (depending on what suited the participant). Using a tie-clip microphone also meant that the less background noises were picked up due to the directionality of the microphone. After the GAI, I combined the two audio files (one from participant, one from researcher) into one track. Performing a loud clap before the run began allowed for simpler synchronisation of the tracks - the clap appeared as a spike, which can then be aligned. This set-up was very successful and produced the highest quality recording out of the two I have used so far. What I have learnt is invaluable in both of these set-ups however, is the use of a windjammer (a fuzzy, spongy hat) for the microphones to reduce wind noise, and to ensure the hold/lock function is selected on the audio recorders. To my detriment, I found out how easily the motion of running can accidentally knock the stop button before intended if the device is not locked!

The last big challenge I found with using GAIs for running was actually the act of interviewing. Many of the basics of interviewing can be difficult to accomplish whilst running. Even the fundamental element of talking can be tough at particular speeds or over particular topography. The interviews were very loosely structured. I had a broad list of themes that I hoped to cover in each interview but designed the interview order to be quite unruly and open to distractions, as many GAI attempt to do (DeLyser and Sui, 2013). I really wanted the running, the places and the participant to guide the conversation, for what happened, what participants felt and what we passed by to lead the discussions. This led to an interview which often jumped between topics only to return back to some again when they became pertinent once more, something characteristic of place-based and mobile interviewing (Holton and Riley, 2014; Evans and Jones, 2011). Listening carefully and being responsive to what the participants were saying was difficult at times. There is often an overwhelming torrent of stimuli to respond to, which needs to be done alongside trying to remember the rough interview schedule and concentrating on running itself. Physical and mental fatigue make this task even more difficult. In many ways though, this was okay. The free-form nature of the interview enables an openness to distractions and ideas that may have been outside the purview of a stricter interview schedule. It also proved very useful to not consider the interview as bounded, it often acted as the catalyst for ideas that ruminated for a few weeks or even months. Perhaps to be expected when discussing the mundane and other aspects of everyday life that we do not generally spend much time considering, these research interviews regularly catalysed a longer term reanalysing of participants' own practices. This led to the follow up communication from participants offering new ideas or

clarifications. Once the interviews were transcribed, I sent the transcriptions to the participants. This not only ensured they had a record of what we spoke about as well as an opportunity to revise, amend and add any points, but it also enabled me to ask further questions or clarifications I had not managed to, or thought to, in the original GAI.

Overall, MVE has been a slightly simpler method to set up. The biggest challenge involved attaching a camera to participants in a way that was comfortable for them yet still provided a good view and a stable shot. After a bit of experimentation with various different positions and straps, a head-camera seemed to offer the best option (Brown et al, 2008). In my case, the camera was attached to a headband and worn roughly in the centre of the forehead. Participants generally found this a tolerable set-up. Most spoke of a brief adjustment period, after which they were no longer affected by the camera. It posed a bigger problem in hot weather however (thermoception is an important element of running experience - Allen-Collinson et al, 2018) and in one instance, a participant did opt to remove the camera after an hour or so. Participants also remarked that the camera did not affect them as much socially as they thought it may. Many forgot they were wearing one once in their flow and on one occasion, a participant even took an impromptu visit to the toilet mid-run. Machoism was perhaps the only common impact of the camera, with participants saying that they ran quicker than they may have otherwise, aware that someone else would be watching it. To record a run, participants were given the camera and shown how to operate it. The choice of route was entirely of the participants' choosing, I only asked that the recorded run be one they would have still taken if they had not been in the study – I wanted to enter their running world and be taken on their journeys. Participants would then complete a run wearing the head camera and return it to me. After this, I conducted rudimentary video analysis for the purposes of developing a specific interview schedule. This involved simply playing back the footage at half-speed and noting the time and a description of any events I wished to ask about (inspired by Spinney, 2011). A few days later, I met with the participants and conducted an interview, which involved re-watching the video in full, whilst pausing and slowing down sections of particular interest. Participants were asked to elaborate on what they were thinking, feeling, doing during the run and how the film evoked further insights (inspired by Simpson, 2014). These elicitation interviews proved really interesting with participants often surprised how many things they were unaware of, or thought were different, which lead to some incredibly discussions around running mundanities.

Beyond figuring out feasible ways of using GAI and MVE within running research, there is a further innovation I have made with these methods. This innovation is more by luck than design in honesty. In my first project experimenting with these methods, I was keen to figure out what the different methods could bring to the interrogation of running practices. In doing so, I lucked upon these two as being very powerful in combination and it is something I have sought to replicate in other projects since. Both GAI and MVE get at different aspects of running practices and complement each other well. This is a combination that can be harnessed for other research projects too.

Combining GAI and MVE can offer researchers ways of meshing together different ways of knowing a practice, providing a means to attend to the micro and the macro, to what we are aware of and what we are not, and to explore how in-the-moment understandings, feelings and thoughts correlate with a more detailed scrutiny of what actually happened. This is nicely illustrated in my first experiments with these methods, where I took an interest in the mundane events of when runners pass pedestrians (and reported more fully in Cook et al, 2016a; 2016b). Through GAIs I was able to understand how runners felt about such encounters, and who they thought should take responsibility for ensuring they pass successfully. This managed to unearth the meanings, values and judgements runners ascribe to running/walking, and discovered how these entangle with embodied desires of running to indicate how these passing encounters should occur. However, combining this with MVE enables a detailed scrutiny of these passing encounters. This not only demonstrated what actually happens when runners

pass pedestrians and the various spatial strategies used but also demonstrated a value-action gap between what runners say and what they do, which was very interesting to explore further with participants. This reveals the value in combing GAI and MVE in helping to interrogate mundane practices from different angles, and is an innovation whose benefits could be applied more widely to other settings.

Both GAI and MVE are well developed and well used within the mobilities field and were some of the first methods innovated within mobile methods (D'Andrea et al, 2011). My experiments with these represent the first time they have been used in combination, and to research running. As with all methods, both GAI and MVE increase the visibility of some things while decreasing the visibility of others. In combination, they offer a means to illuminate more aspects of practices and phenomena, offering researchers means of analysing mobile practices in a more holistic manner.

### **Advice for others: evaluations**

Having explored above how I actually employed these methods, I now wish to evaluate their effectiveness and provide some practical advice for anyone wanting to experiment with similar methods in the future. I have used the term experiment throughout this chapter purposefully. These have been experiments with methods that came with the associated successes and failures you may expect. My 'best to date' presented here are by no means perfect and these are methods that can be tweaked and tailored to fit different research setting and scenarios. I certainly encourage such experimentation. As several options were experimented with before settling on what I have introduced here, I will outline the equipment and software I used, as at least it may give you a head start for your own experiments.

If I could only choose one of the two methods discussed in this chapter, it would be GAI. The rapport developed with the participant is quite incredible, which resulted in extremely insightful interviews. There was a real sense that I was being taken into their world and they were doing their utmost to explain it to me - it was an immersive, multisensory tour of their running practices. Accomplishing something together (a run in this case), undoubtedly helped to develop this rapport, especially as I was also an insider to the practice. Rather than feeling like a research interview, participants often commented that it just felt like talking to another runner as they normally would on a run. However, the design of the interaction between participant and researcher also helps to build this rapport. Despite any efforts we make to avoid it, traditional interviews can feel a bit intimidating, alien or even clinical to participants, which can hinder some of the answers given. However, in GAI, there is a method, which encourages a less-filtered and more personal discussion of things that may traditionally be difficult to talk about. These conversations are further encouraged by the vast amount of stimuli offered by doing an activity together and moving through places. Many mobile methods seek to use place and practice in this way, acting to elicit more in depth discussions around phenomena (Holton and Riley, 2014). These enable in-the-moment reactions and reflections to be offered, allowing potentially more authentic insights to be gained. The temporal and spatial proximity to the phenomena of interest not only removes layers of analysis which remembering of an incident may be filtered through, but it also enables participants to discuss in more depth and with more ease some of the aspects of mundane research which can be difficult to contemplate and articulate, such as feelings, experience and emotions. In GAIs, these benefits combine to offer a powerful method for considering and discussing mundane and mobile aspects of practices.

That said, GAIs can come with some logistical/technical problems which make them difficult to use in all instances. Achieving a comfortable set-up that results in audio files with enough quality can be difficult, when needing to contend with multiple moving bodies and a constantly changing background context. The set-up I found most successful is provided in the textbox below, but whatever you use,

ensuring it is comfortable for you and the participant is essential. As with any technology, there is also a financial implication of using such equipment. While not too prohibitive, if your research budget is minimal, then GAIs may not be feasible. Beyond the logistics, actually conducting an interview on the run is difficult. Firstly, personal fitness becomes an important factor in the viability of this method. A training plan may be required to help implement this method, and conversely, injury may mean it becomes impossible to use GAIs. Even if you can make the start line, so to speak, having to remember an interview schedule (rather than having it to hand), and responding to what participants are saying, whilst being open to passing stimuli and focussing on actually running, can often lead to things being missed or not explored fully. In such cases, post-interview communication can help to respond to these.

Despite this, many mundane phenomena fall below the radar of GAIs, for which other methods may be better suited to attending to. When interviewing on the move, there are many things to respond to and concentrate on, which inevitably results in many incidents not being explored. Some may have passed-by before the opportunity to speak about them arises and others may be too small in scale to be properly noticed. In such scenarios, methods capable of capturing mundanities in all their glory may be preferable. There is also the unknown question of what impact the presence of a researcher has on the interview and responses participants are giving. The immediacy of a GAI is argued to lead to more authentic answers due to the removal of multiple filtering processes involved in remembering an event. However, if the presence of a researcher is impacting that experience, is this immediacy still as useful? While overall, I think the benefits of GAIs outweigh any influencing affects the researcher has, it is certainly something worth considering when analysing the material gained from GAIs.

Despite not being my favoured method of the two, there are many benefits MVE also brings to the

#### Equipment used for Go-Along Interviews

For each person the following equipment was used to record the interviews:

- Tie/Lapel Clip Microphone
- Windjammer on the microphone
- Audio-recording device to plug microphone into
- Bum-bag to hold the audio-recording device in whilst running.

After recording, the two audio files were aligned using:

- Audacity digital audio editing software (free)

researching the mundane. Although not a method at the point of movement itself, MVE affords researchers a way of 'seeing there' by proxy (Laurier, 2010). The resulting video files, therefore, retain the context of the practices, which is extremely useful for researchers, and in particular can permit phenomena to be studied where it may not be possible or desirable to actually be there. The fixed position of the camera offers an unwavering, albeit limited, view of the events, places, happenings and phenomena of a practice. This is a view that does not blink, that does not struggle to remember, and that does not recall through various filters of memory and perspective. It provides researchers with a matter of fact account of what happened, which can then be analysed. This analysis is greatly aided by the ability to technologically manipulate the video file. The use of video software to freeze, zoom in, slow down, rewind, and repeat enables a scrutiny of practices simply not possible in real-life, in-the-moment ethnography (Pink, 2014). MVE actually opens up movement for analysis in ways which would be impossible from simply 'being there' (Spinney, 2011). The use of video provides the chance to reveal unseen or unnoticed experiences of the run, producing a new understanding of the practice. It provides the possibility to go beyond the spectacular aspects of being on the move and to



assess the importance of the smaller scale and potentially unconscious or habitual happening of running (Simpson, 2014). By ‘stretching out’ movements and allowing for more analytical detail than in observation alone (Spinney, 2011), it is possible to render visible some of the skills, movements and encounters that are often taken for granted, and in doing so, understand running practices more deeply. This is incredibly useful in studying mundanity, and MVE invites attention to be focused on micro-movements more greatly than in GAs, offering extra detail and insights to researchers.

Despite the potential to reveal new levels of analysis and comprehension, MVE also comes with some limitations and practical difficulties that researchers wishing to use this method should be wary of. The biggest criticism often made of MVE, or indeed much video-based research, is that it privileges what can be seen as the basis for analysis. In providing an unwavering fixed gaze, full of detail and context, there is a muffling of other senses, as well as affective and felt relations within MVE, which can be significant in understanding practices. While sound is captured to some degree, many other senses are simply not possible to attend to by using video. For understanding the mundanities of running practices, MVE offers no opportunities to explore how the changing topography *feels* underfoot, how the dripping of sweat into the mouth *tastes*, how movement itself feels (*kinaesthesia*), how the parts of the body relate to one another (*proprioception*), or how heat affects the running experience (*thermoception*). Indeed this is a criticism noted by Simpson (2011) and Spinney (2011), so wariness should be apparent about claims that MVE can mine the embodied, sensory, emotional and kinaesthetic – they can certainly be hinted at and discussed but MVE will never fully encapsulate them. Spinney (2011) has remarked that when using video, the researcher is basically creating a reduction - stripping away other ways of experiencing mobility and highlighting the body-in-action, making some aspects visible and others invisible in doing so. For such a highly textured and deeply embodied practice like running, this is a big disadvantage for the use of MVE.

Furthermore, the priority MVE does give to what can be seen is not complete. The fixed gaze of the camera fails to provide the full panorama the participants themselves will be aware of. When re-watching the video in the post-run interviews, participants often commented on things that were happening off-screen, so to speak. While attaching the camera to the runner’s head will show the changing direction of attention to the researcher, it does not track the focus of the eyes. MVE cannot show you what the runner themselves were paying attention to and the significant aspects of their experience to them. While in some ways this is not a problem, as a major advantage of MVE is the ability to reveal things beyond cognition, there is a concern that such focus on the mundane is placing artificial importance on the minutiae at the expense of the phenomena participants hold integral to

#### Equipment used for Mobile-Video-Ethnography

Runs were recorded using:

- Go-Pro Session Action Camera
- Head band attachment for Go-Pro

Analysis of the video was aided using the following:

- VLC Media Player (free).

their practices and to understanding them.

Practically, there are other important considerations to make when using MVE. Most importantly within this, is the question of what camera to use? Placing a camera on a runner can result in an uncomfortable experience and it is something that needs to be balanced with the quality of the video gained from MVE. The rhythm of a runner’s body results in a video which appears to bob, something which can be quite painful to watch through if the camera quality is too low, or if the camera is not

fastened securely. High quality, lightweight action cameras offer a good solution here (see the equipment box below) and although they are becoming cheaper, their cost could be a barrier for adopting MVE. However, the smaller and more lightweight cameras compromise battery-life and on a few of the longer runs participants recorded (generally over 90 minutes), the camera died before the end of the run. Generally, a thorough trialling and testing of the equipment and set-up for MVE to optimise it for the practice you are studied is heavily advised.

Overall, I would advocate using both methods together. It is certainly an instance where the whole is more than the sum of its parts, and for those interested in the mundane and everyday, they offer a powerful suite of methods to interrogate any practice with. The two methods complement each other's strengths and weaknesses, and provide two different perspectives on the same phenomena, resulting in very insightful research. However, the mobile nature of these methods raises challenges for researching in ethical and safe ways. For example, most ethical procedures and forms are generally based upon a static and single location in which any research encounter will be conducted and I have found a mobile research site to be incongruous at times with such processes. Furthermore, a core principle of ethical research is informed consent. While I gained informed consent from those designated as participants, the same was not possible for those passed by, and therefore recorded, in the public spaces in which these runs took place. Arguably, these passing strangers were as integral to the research as the runners themselves, yet they have no idea they were even involved. Taking methods on the move poses challenges to ethical processes, and while these have not restricted my research so far, they have required greater consideration and may suggest that ethical approval processes need to catch up with the variety of methods being used in contemporary research.

## **Conclusions**

This chapter has introduced and interrogated the use of GAI and MVE as methods for researching the mobile mundane. My experiments with these methods developed from an interest in the mundanities of running practices and the recent development of mobile methods, which invites methodological innovation to find ways of keeping up with mobile phenomena. Throughout my research, GAI and MVE have been the methods I have used most often. In the case of running, GAIs involved joining runners on their run, conducting an interview on the go, while MVE involved runners using a head camera to record an unaccompanied run, which was then used as the basis for a post-run interview. Neither of these methods had been used within the context of running before, so many of my experiments with them concerned innovating with set-ups that were feasible and held methodological value, accounts of which are given throughout the chapter. Using GAI and MVE as methodological counterparts, however, was an accidental innovation on my part. Evaluating the methodological effectiveness of these methods demonstrated the complementing features they offer, providing a way for researchers to interrogate practices from multiple perspectives. GAIs offer excellent researcher-participant rapport and in-the-moment reflection to passing stimuli/experiences, improving participant's ability to talk about the mundane. However, there are still many aspects of jogography, which fall under the radar of cognition, and MVE, can be used to make visible and analysable the minutiae of running practices. Together, they offer a powerful suite of methods to interrogate everyday mobile practices. That is not to say there are no limitations to these methods. The evaluation offered in the chapter demonstrated many logistical and ethical difficulties that accompany these methods, as well as the privileging each gives to particular aspects of everyday experiences at the expense of those they make less visible. Despite these, the strengths of the methods entail that further experimentation is warranted. There are many contexts within which the methods of doing with (GAI)

and seeing with (MVE) can prove valuable additions to researchers of the mundane and I certainly urge further experimentation.

#### Key readings on Go-Along Interviews and Mobile-Video-Ethnography

Merriman, P. (2014) 'Rethinking Mobile Methods' *Mobilities*, 9(2): pp.167-187.

Spinney, J. (2011) 'A Chance to Catch a Breath: Using Mobile Video Ethnography in Cycling Research' *Mobilities*, 6(2): pp.161-182.

Kinney, P. (2017) 'Walking Interviews' *Social Research Update*, 67: pp.1-4.

#### References

Allen-Collinson, J. and Hockey, J. (2001) 'Runners' tales: autoethnography, injury and narrative' *Auto/Biography*, IX(1-2): pp.95-106.

Allen-Collinson, J., Vaittinen, A., Jennings, G. and Owton, H. (2018) 'Exploring Lived Heat, "Temperature Work," and Embodiment: Novel Auto/Ethnographic Insights from Physical Cultures' *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 47(3): pp.283-305.

Anderson, J. (2004) 'Talking whilst walking: a geographical archaeology of knowledge' *Area*, 36(3): pp. 254 – 261.

Brown, K.M. and Dilley, R. (2012) 'Ways of knowing for "response-ability" in more-than-human encounters: the role of anticipatory knowledges in outdoor access with dogs' *Area*, 44(1): pp.37-45.

Brown, K.M., Dilley, R. and Marshall, K. (2008) 'Using a head-mounted video camera to understand social worlds and experiences' *Sociological Research Online*, 13(6): p.1-10.

Büscher, M. and Urry, J. (2009) 'Mobile methods and the empirical' *European Journal of Social Theory*, 12(1): pp.99-116.

Cook, S. (2016) 'Run-commuting' in: Sultana, S. and Weber, J. (eds) *Minicars, Maglevs, and Mopeds: Modern Modes of Transportation Around the World*, ABC-CLIO/Greenwood Press, Santa Barbara, California: pp.255-258.

Cook, S. (2017) 'Rushing, dashing, scrambling: The role of the train station in producing the reluctant runner' in: Spinney, J., Reimer, S. and Pinch, P. (eds) *Mobilising Design*, Routledge, Abingdon: pp.62-75.

Cook, S. (2018) 'Geographies of Mobility: A Brief Introduction' *Geography*, 103(3): pp.137-145.

Cook, S., Shaw, J., and Simpson, P. (2016a) 'Jogra-phy: Exploring Meanings, Experiences and Spatialities of Recreational Road-running' *Mobilities*, 11(5): pp.744-769.

- Cook, S., Shaw, J., and Simpson, P. (2016b) 'Running Order: Urban Public Space, Everyday Citizenship and Sporting Subjectivities' in: Koch, N. (ed.) *Critical Geographies of Sport: Space, Power and Sport in Global Perspective*, Routledge, Abingdon: pp.157-172.
- Cresswell, T. and Merriman, P. (2011) 'Introduction: Geographies of Mobilities – Practices, Spaces, Subjects' in: Cresswell, T. and Merriman, P. (eds) *Geographies of Mobilities: Practices, Spaces, Subjects*, Ashgate, Farnham: pp. 1 – 18.
- D'Andrea, A., Ciolfi, L. and Gray, B. (2011) 'Methodological Challenges and Innovations in Mobilities Research' *Mobilities*, 6(2): pp.149–160.
- DeLyser, D. and Sui, D. (2013) 'Crossing the qualitative-quantitative divide II: Inventive approaches to big data, mobile methods, and rhythmanalysis' *Progress in Human Geography*, 37(2): pp.293-305.
- Evans, J. and Jones, P. (2011) 'The walking interview: Methodology, mobility and place' *Applied Geography*, 31(2): pp.849–858.
- Hitchings, R. and Latham, A. (2016) 'Indoor versus outdoor running: understanding how recreational exercise comes to inhabit environments through practitioner talk' *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 41(4): pp.503-514.
- Holton, M., and Riley, M. (2014) 'Talking on the Move: Place-based Interviewing with Undergraduate Students' *Area*, 46 (1): pp.59–65.
- Laurier, E. (2010) 'Being there/seeing there' in: Fincham, B., McGuinness, M. and Murray, L. (eds) *Mobile Methodologies*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke: pp. 103-177.
- Laurier, E. (2014) 'Capturing motion: video set-ups for driving, cycling and walking' in: Adey, P., Bissell, D., Hannam, K., Merriman, P. and Sheller, M. (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Mobilities*, Routledge, Abingdon: pp.493-502.
- Law, J. and Urry, J. (2004) 'Enacting the Social' *Economy and Society*, 33(3): pp.390-410.
- Merriman, P. (2014) 'Rethinking Mobile Methods' *Mobilities*, 9(2): pp.167-187
- Pink, S. (2014) *Doing Visual Ethnography*, Sage, London.
- Simpson, P. (2011) "'So, as you can see . . .": some reflections on the utility of video methodologies in the study of embodied practices' *Area*, 43(3): pp.343–352.
- Simpson, P. (2014) 'Video' in: Adey, P., Bissell, D., Hannam, K., Merriman, P. and Sheller, M. (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Mobilities*, Routledge, Abingdon: pp. 542 – 552.
- Spinney, J. (2006) 'A place of sense: a kinaesthetic ethnography of cyclists on Mont Ventoux' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 24(5): pp.709 – 732.
- Spinney, J. (2011) 'A Chance to Catch a Breath: Using Mobile Video Ethnography in Cycling Research' *Mobilities*, 6(2): pp.161-182.

