

Methods of Dialoguing

My first conversation around Sonic Drifting was with Laura Knight. I approached her because I recognised a shared interest in psychogeography and in the ways we experience and navigate place. While she responded positively to the project, she questioned whether the maps I had produced were able to communicate the complexity of that experience. Even with the additional layer of “drifting”, they remained relatively two-dimensional; a trace of one journey, made by one person, at one particular moment in time. Her response made me begin to question what was absent from the work. A route could document movement through a place, but could it really communicate a relationship with that place? This idea of dimensionality resurfaced in a conversation with my tutor. We discussed the project as something resembling a first chapter, an enquiry that had reached a point of resolution, but which had also produced questions that could lead elsewhere. I began to see Sonic Drifting less as something I needed to continue formally and more as a method that had allowed another interest to emerge. The maps had initially been concerned with sound, movement and graphic notation, but underneath these experiments I was becoming increasingly interested in place itself, and particularly in the different ways people become attached to, recognise themselves within, or feel disconnected from particular environments.

Over the summer, following Laura’s recommendation, I explored Observe, Collect, Draw! by the creators of Dear Data. Their approach to developing visual languages for intangible and subjective information appeared closely connected to questions within my own practice. I experimented with similar ideas of notation, attempting to find visual systems through which experiences could be recorded. However, I increasingly found myself moving in circles. Rather than opening the enquiry further, the search for a graphic language began to feel like a limitation. This became the basis of my second dialogue, with CSM alumna Cicely Pilkington, whose degree-show work questioned the diagram as a method of sharing and producing knowledge. I was particularly interested in our shared use of the line; not simply as information, but as the trace of a gesture, action or experience. Our conversation helped me articulate that I had reached a crossroads. One direction could continue

into graphic notation and visual systems while the other could investigate space, place and the relationships people form with them.

In discussing what attracted me to each direction, I realised that my strongest interest was not in notation itself but in questions of “untetheredness”, identification and belonging. This shifted the role of graphic communication within my enquiry. Rather than asking primarily how an experience of place might be mapped, I became interested in how a place might be understood through the multiple relationships, memories, languages, images and experiences that accumulate around it. I am therefore approaching my next stage of work through the idea of “layers of place”. A place does not exist only as geography or architecture; it may also exist through memory, language, photography, personal histories, routines and associations. These dialogues have moved my enquiry away from attempting to produce a singular representation of place and towards questioning whether such a representation is possible at all.

How do you portray the full picture of a place?

What is the full picture of a place?

What is the idea of common knowledge around a space?