

## **Memories of family events and their resonance in a Lancashire park space**

Alex McDonagh, School of Arts and Media, University of Salford, UK

### **Author bio**

Alex McDonagh is a Lecturer in Critical and Contextual Studies at the University of Salford. His research interests include the production and representation of meaning in physical and digital heritage contexts, especially involving phenomenology and the narratives of everyday life.

### **Abstract**

Based on interviews and field visits with park users, this chapter explores how family events have been formed and deposited as memories that continue to resonate in a Lancashire park space. The chapter draws our attention to the importance of everyday family events and experiences, and how they have developed connections from the past to the future and through space. The research draws on approaches including phenomenology (Bender, Hamilton and Tilley, 2007; Merleau-Ponty, 2014), narrative (Riessman, 2008) and theories of space (Foucault, 1998; Massey, 2012) that help to articulate how family events are meaningfully produced and re-experienced. Despite the established historical and heritage values inherent within the park, the impacts of family events and experiences are demonstrated as dominant narratives powerful enough to override the longstanding traditional heritage meanings of the park space.

### **Introduction**

This research explores the experiences of park users at Towneley Park, which is situated next to countryside on the edge of Burnley, Lancashire, in North West England. The grounds are quite extensive and contain various sports facilities, several walking routes, rivers, woodlands and playgrounds. In the centre of the park, Towneley Hall stands as a historical stately home and functions as a museum and art gallery. The park is therefore, a popular destination for families, both young and old, enabling family events that range from the quotidian to the ‘grand day out’.

Through a series of interviews and visits to Towneley with park users, the research covered in this chapter aimed to explore personal and family narratives linked to heritage. This chapter provides an analysis of the narratives which surround family events in the park and explores the ways in which family events have been formed and deposited as memories in the park space. Firstly, the theoretical framework and methodology are outlined for research context. The chapter then goes on to discuss some examples of family event memories and the ways in which they are evoked. The next section provides an analysis of the ways in which the

park users engaged with the park space and how this is a significant aspect of understanding the formation and recall of family events.

The discussion demonstrates how memories continue to resonate and how family events produce heterotopic zones which enable this resonance. The participant narratives in this chapter demonstrate how family events can override official histories and heritages. In addition, the chapter makes the case that we can approach a fuller understanding of family events through an examination of our phenomenological link to park spaces.

### **Theoretical framework**

The qualitative data gathered during the research fit within a theoretical framework that helped to highlight the various meanings that were important to the park users. While some of these theoretical aspects helped to explore the wider nature of heritage and of Towneley, they also had close resonance with family memories and events within the park. In particular, the networked nature of the park experience closely aligned with the networked nature of family experience and memories of family events.

These family events were often associated with specific places in the park, while at the same time these events could be accessed by memories sparked in other parts of the park. Therefore, the experiences of the participants defied linear hierarchies of historical narrative as they extended in multiple directions, times and contexts. The rhizome (a network of multiple connections that do not stem from one dominant node) as theorised by Deleuze and Guattari (2013) represented a theoretical approach that provided alternatives to traditional hierarchical structures. Foucault's (1998) heterotopia, and Bourdieu's self-defining concept of the 'habitus' (1993), also correlate well as concepts defined by multiple connection. Together, these concepts formed part of a theoretical framework that helped to articulate the repeated experience of family events in Towneley Park.

Useful in theorising these multiple connections in the park was the concept of 'heterotopic spaces' and the emplacements that constitute them (Foucault 1998; Hetherington 2011), which also can be conceived as a network of connections. Foucault's heterotopia, or 'other place', helps us to consider how alternative discourses can be produced by individuals or groups in settings that challenge the rules or language of society. Such spaces are commonly associated with places like airports, museums and retirement homes where the rules of normal discourse are altered. Hetherington (2011) conceives of heterotopia as a 'diagram' which operationalises discourse by allowing our language to take on an imaginative quality and produce new ways of understanding. In this way, heterotopia resonates with the spaces and experiences within Towneley Park and the personal languages that each participant has developed to communicate their understanding of Towneley to others. Towneley was shown to be constructed of several heterotopic spaces or emplacements that contained or enabled family events, and their multiple connections resembled a rhizome, which Deleuze and Guattari (2013) describe as a network of multiple and equal connections such that they do not extend

from one dominant node. As such, the family events themselves can be described as forming a rhizomatic network of memory and experience.

There was also a close resonance between the perception of heritage values of the park itself and the perception of family events and family histories. Stephens (2014) theorises heritage nostalgia by describing two versions, whereby 'restorative nostalgia' is the desire to have a past place or event restored to its former state and 'reflective nostalgia' is the awareness of a past place or event without the need for that to be restored. Some participants in this study communicated their family events as written into the fabric of the park and others communicated their family events as reasons why the park's fabric needs to be restored to a perceived former glory. As such, Stephens' approach helped to explore some of the different ways that family events are experienced and how their continued experience can be linked to the physical fabric of the park space. It is here that approaches to spatial narrative (Tilley, 1994; Riessman, 2008) and phenomenology (Bender, Hamilton and Tilley, 2007; Merleau-Ponty, 2014) also resonated. When telling me about family events, the space and physical matter of the park were clearly defined as significant for the participants. Heritage is what we make of it, and for many of the participants the heritage of the park was bound tightly to the family events that occurred in the park space and became embedded in their narratives of Towneley. This framework helps to articulate the family events communicated by the participants and draw significance from their context as being experienced within the park. The framework has been useful to articulate how memories of family events become embedded in the landscape of the park and it helps to map out the ways in which those events are rekindled and retold.

## **Methodology**

An important aim of this project was to explore the heritage meanings found within Towneley Park. Laurajane Smith (2006) has identified and described the Authorised Heritage Discourse (AHD) as the meanings which are attached to elicited power and privilege (see also Hewison, 1987). Towneley Park has much in the way of elicited features (e.g., landscaped grounds, grand stately home, museum and art gallery). While the project aimed to include these AHD meanings, I also wanted to embrace the meanings that are generated by the park users themselves and how they perceived the park. To this end, I adopted a multi-methods approach (Hunter and Brewer, 2015) that involved the co-production of knowledge and narrative with the participants. Phenomenological and affective observations of the participants and myself were inspired by the work of Bender, Hamilton and Tilley (2007) which embraced the multiple and subjective ways that we create meaning in landscapes. In addition, the approaches of Waterton (2005) and Reissman (2008) have helped me to engage with participants on their own terms and engage with the resulting narratives as a source of data.

To begin with I interviewed 25 participants who ranged in age from their 20s to their 80s and included parents and grandparents. For the interviews I took a semi-structured narrative approach (Hollway and Jefferson, 2000) with an open-ended discussion about the park. Interviews were transcribed and subjected to meaning condensation (Kvale, 1996) before being thematically coded. In the second part of the project, 19 participants returned either individually

or in pairs to walk through the park with me and show me what they found most important. I conducted this field research through participant observation in a participant-as-observer role (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 2007). These park visits were recorded photographically and in handwritten notes which were later transcribed into prose. These data were thematically coded and cross-referenced with the initial interviews to identify significant themes raised by the participants. A final open-ended interview was carried out that provided participants with the opportunity to discuss the impact of the research project; 12 participants engaged with this last aspect. In addition, the project involved the development of a digital interpretation of the participants' stories and experiences of the park ('Digital Towneley'). While some of the digital interpretation included narratives of family events, this chapter focuses on the narratives themselves rather than impacts of digital representation.

### **Family events at Towneley Park**

Early on in this research it became clear that some of the most important meanings associated with the park were produced from family events in various forms. Family memories were particularly strong for Chris and Kirsty (pseudonyms are used throughout). For Chris (mid 50s, married) family meanings were linked strongly to family events in the past, while for Kirsty (late 70s, married, grandparent) family associations were both from the past and into the present. For both participants Towneley Park was shown to be a crucial aspect of their family life, if not an actual member of their family:

Chris: Towneley's in my blood.

Kirsty: [my] son and daughter grew up and we used to come in when they were children and now, as adults, whenever they come over [...] we often meet in the park [...] it's a meeting point, it's a focal point.

Chris grew up very close to the park and he walked the whole of it with his grandfather from about six years old. His strong feelings for both his family and the park are demonstrated by the trees he had planted in memorial to his parents:

... And quite often I'll walk through with the dogs and just have a wander down and just make sure they're alright and make sure nobody's abusing them because if there was, woe betide them [...] It overlooks the farm, so that's one of the reasons why we picked the place, because it's memories for them as well as for us.

Chris's memorial trees and his strong feelings about them demonstrate the importance of his own family history within the park. In this way, Chris expressed the power that such objects can have in retaining meanings and memories, with specific concern about the welfare of the trees as though they were the family members themselves. By overlooking the family farm, Chris explained the trees are able to impart memories 'for them', seeming to mean that his parents are still able to engage with the park on some level. Chris described his parents as being able to have memories through the trees' viewpoint. As such, Chris appeared to be engaging in a simulation of his parents, much as we simulate everyday social phenomena (Gordon, 1986; Bandura, 2001). Moreover, it suggests a need to preserve a state of being (i.e., the existence of

Chris's parents) and in this way, Chris appears to have been expressing a form of restorative nostalgia (Stephens, 2014). This is a harking-back to family events in the park, while also attempting to restore those events. Visiting the trees, as embodiments of his parents, could itself be seen as a simulated family event.

In contrast, Fred, who is in his 80s and has been involved with the park all his life, also has a tree in the park, specifically chosen in order to address the act of memorial, but his motivation was quite different:

Yes I did have a tree planted there, it's still there. It's a Ginkgo Biloba [...] A Ginkgo Biloba tree is the oldest species of tree in the world [...] and the other word [for it] is the memory tree and I got it in memory of my wife.

Fred's tree has a plaque and is in a public place near the central pond area of the park (Figure 1). This area is identified as important through the family narrative that Fred offered in his interview. The pond acted as a focal point for regular and everyday family events with his wife and young child; feeding bread to the ducks and looking out for the terrapin that had been a one-time occupant of the pond. The tree, however, does not feature as a character in the narrative. Narratively speaking, in contrast to Chris' 'parental' trees, Fred's tree does not embody his wife. Rather, the tree acts as a sign that represents cherished family memories and appears to be part of a sense of reflective nostalgia, which Stephens (2014) describes as a positive view on the past that does not seek to restore or reinstate that past.

FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

Figure 1: Fred's Ginkgo Biloba tree

Irrespective of their underpinning story, the trees and their locations are meaningful phenomena. Their monumentality can be described by Nora's (1989) 'lieux de memoire' wherein memories and meanings are deposited in physical objects. These two participants highlighted the potential for memories to become physically manifested within the park. This memorial practice is also noted by Elizabeth (late 50s and visits the park regularly with her grandchildren) and Phil (mid 50s and works in the park). They told me stories about people who regularly visit memorial benches, and the various unauthorised scatterings of human ashes that happen in the park. Thus, the role of the park as a landscape for memorialising family experiences and relationships is demonstrated.

Not everybody felt that the park was an appropriate space for memorialising loved ones. Kirsty, who has visited the park with her children and grandchildren over the decades, expressed a strong view that the park should not be a memorial garden and rejected the notion of trees or flowerbeds with plaques to loved ones. Nonetheless, Kirsty's sense of memory and family attachment to the park is very strong. Her family associations are clearly linked to her own home, as well as her use of the park now and into the future. She described how her brother

feels compelled to see the park when he visits her and she talked about having taken her grandchildren to the park for picnics, playing in the woods and building dams in the rivers:

My brother's coming to visit next weekend and he insists that he must come in the park each morning he's here; we've got to come in the park ... I mean, I've brought my grandchildren here for six or seven hours in the summer.

Elsewhere, Kirsty described how her brother views a visit to the park as a 'pilgrimage', which identified the deep spiritual and personal importance of the park to her brother. The narrative tells us that her brother's visits are significant, but also that the family event of the visit spills over into a family event involving multiple people going to the park. There is, of course, a ritual element described here and there is also a repetition of this interaction with the park ("he must come to the park each morning"). Kirsty's own relationship with the park involves a strong familiarity with its space; meaning is generated and perpetuated with repeated visits. As we walked together around Towneley, Kirsty was reminded of family times in the park and she told me about how evocative the park space is for her. In particular, the specific streams and areas we passed on our walk evoked memories of dam building and picnics with her children and, latterly, her grandchildren.

Repeated visits to these places in the park re-inform the participants of their family events. Bourdieu's habitus (1993) resonates here. The habitus is an entity within us that is formed by our interactions with the world and then informs subsequent interactions. This concept is useful in modelling experiences like Kirsty's, whereby the habitus formed around Towneley includes the significant experience of family events as a process through time, from days out with her own young children all the way through to the present. These events have been lived, are lived and then are *relived*. They are brought to life as a result of being in the park space and so we can see that the physical matter of the park retains meaning. Indeed, more than simply retaining meaning, the physical park is involved in the creation of meanings for the park users. In order to relive these meanings, connection or interaction with the places and spaces of the park are, at the very least, strong catalysts. We can therefore, see how family events can be performed in the park and then re-performed by memory while in its spaces.

Like Kirsty, several other participants referred to bringing their grandchildren to the park, mentioning picnics, scooter riding and visiting the play areas. Other participants talked about the park in terms of walking during pregnancy or with new-borns in prams and pushchairs. These events were not limited to a mother and their child, but involved more complex family connections; the time was shared with family members (mothers, fathers and sisters) and they were opportunities to reinforce and, in some cases, repair family relationships. In one example, Chloe (30s, married with young child) explained how the park repaired a relationship with her estranged father as they walked together during her maternity.

A clear theme that arose from the interviews and visits was a continuity of park use that spanned multiple generations; a 'circle of life' theme. Many of the discussions that I had with the participants were of course about memories and so necessitated looking back into the participants' own lives. Examples of this include Leo, who is in his mid 60s and has been heavily involved with football groups in the park. Leo recounted his personal history of football

within the park space, which is linked also to the history and heritage of the Towneley family. The team he played for as a child was called 'Butterfly' which he explained was named after a famous prize bull of the Towneley family, 'Royal Butterfly'. The key aspect for Leo, however, was how his lifetime of playing football in the park had come full-circle as his granddaughter now plays organised football in the park. His involvement here has strong family meaning, watching his granddaughter play and being in the space at the same time. His narrative told of nostalgia and meaning embedded within the fabric of the park, but also of support and togetherness with his family.

The notion of seeing things come full circle was present for other park users, too. Karen (20s, mother of one) discussed her own time visiting the park as a child at family events and explained some of the links between her past experiences and the creation of family events in the present. Her childhood memories of Towneley included the hot air balloon shows that used to be held in the park, but also visiting the hall as a museum, a gallery and as a historic building. More recently, Karen has taken her daughter and husband to the park, making a family day out, motivated by her own experience of the historic nature of Towneley. These visits are attached to abstract notions of 'history' as Karen described the age of the building being one of the reasons to take her daughter.

...it is the history really though in't it, even though you might not read into it much it's nice to think this has been here a long time and just understanding that somebody looks after it the way they do and that it's been there so long, just that really in't it?

Heritage places are marketed as loci of learning and wholesome family experiences. Karen's vague explanation of the building's importance may suggest a superficial acceptance of the socially constructed way in which heritage places are valued for family events. However, while she may have felt societal pressure to seek out and enact legitimate 'family' events, Karen's own happy childhood has given her the agency here to recreate a family event for her daughter. The aim was to construct and pass on similar happy memories. This example helps to identify how Smith's AHD (2006) may exist as a factor of Towneley Hall or Park, but is not the overriding factor. Rather, the park facilitates the construction and performance of an authentic family event. As Umberto Eco (1996) identifies, an experience can be authentic even in the face of the hyperreal and simulated. As such, we see that interactions, like family events, are what provide heritage places with meanings that can transcend and override authorised heritage discourses.

These notions of family events, recreated or continued, are not limited to the past and present. For the participants, conceptions of family use of the park spread across a spectrum of past and future. For example, a crocodile wood carving in the forest inspired memories in many participants, but Mark (early 60s, new grandfather) imagined future family events there. At this place, Mark told me how he is looking forward to his grandson being able to ride a bicycle so that they can visit the crocodile together. Also looking to the future, Elizabeth, who visits often with her grandchildren, considered her contribution to this research project as providing a legacy for her grandchildren. Similar sentiments were expressed by Claire and Chris, a couple in their mid 50s, who discussed their satisfaction that distant relatives and descendants might

see their comments about the park. These prospective concepts of family meaning can lay the groundwork for family events in the future.

From these examples, we can see that the participants are doing more than recalling events that have happened or performing new family events; they are also simulating and anticipating family events yet to happen. The physical reality of the park is important for family events and their remembrance (as demonstrated by the trees for Chris and Fred), but it is also important in the simulation of future events. As such, we can see the nuances within family events, whereby they exist in multiple spaces, places and times as we conceive them.

The complexity of the connections become evident here, as family events are tied to notions of established history and personal memories, but also the fabric of the park. This network, and the importance of family events, as experienced by our bodies in the park's time and space, is covered in the next section.

### **Phenomenology and family events**

Clearly, time is an important factor in the perception of past, present and future family events. It is also linked strongly to our concept of space, since one cannot be conceived without the other (Massey, 2012; Lefebvre, 2014). This next section explores in more detail the significance of our experience of space and family events at Towneley Park. For example, Margaret, who is in her late sixties and visits the park often with her partner, remembered visiting with her father and identified a link with both a close family member and the space of the park:

My dad used to bring me up here when I was from probably about 7 onwards I think. We used to come up on Sunday. I can't remember what we did but I remember it was a long walk from the bus stop. I remember it was a long walk up and a long walk back.

Margaret's memory of walking in the park with her father conveys an abstract notion of distance that is an important part of her experience. The experience is common to several participants who referred to the road that meanders through the park from the gates, and they specifically described the distance from the entrance to the central area of the park (Figure 2). This journey is part of the ritual of a visit to the park, the effort of visiting the park seeming to add a level of significance. Such narratives fit with de Certeau's (1984) discussions of writing our own stories through the use of space (also see Tilley, 1994; Riessman, 2008). Indeed, there is a disruptive action, or violence, in the process of travelling this distance as it requires an effort. For Lefebvre (2014), this violence is an important part of the production of space; it breaks existing space in order to produce new spaces. A boundary must be crossed for the participants to enter a space that they call 'park'. Energy must be exerted and actions performed within the resultant space to (re)create meanings. Having produced these new spaces, the participants have been able to perform and construct their family events within. The result is a place which has partly come about as a space enhanced by the value of a family event or events.

For these participants, even the abstract magnitude of the long roadway is enough to evoke their family memories. In addition to recall, there is a potential here to relive the

memories as each encounter with the park's environment informs a visitor's habitus and so re-informs their recollection; even if we are the author of a story, returning to it can allow us to find new meanings and re-imagine the story anew (Hawthorn, 1997).

## FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

Figure 2: Part of the roadway from entrance gates to hall

Other spatial aspects of the park are more discrete and function as places within the park that enable family events or store them. The memorial trees discussed above are, in part, examples of this stored meaning and correlate with Nora's (1989) ideas of monumental and topographical lieux de memoire. However, other aspects of meaning linked to family events are more nebulous, even though they may be associated with physical objects or places. As we walked through the park, Margaret, whose memories of walking with her father were still resonant, was able to point out flora and fauna:

Margaret tells me that she finds she knows things but doesn't really know how she knows them. "I'll see a flower and think 'I know that's a mayflower' but I don't know why; it's probably from my Dad". [Fieldnotes]

Margaret has acquired knowledge of the natural world and this is narratively attributed to her father. Chris, whose parental trees were discussed earlier, had similar knowledge of the park that was inextricably linked to time spent with his grandfather. This included knowledge of the bowling green and the historic rose bushes near the tennis courts, which are understood in terms of family time together with his grandfather. For Margaret and Chris, these everyday family events have embedded meaning into places and objects. In the case of Margaret, these objects can be in multiple places at any time, creating a series of zones of family memories. In terms of Nora's (1989) lieux de memoire, this bears a similarity to the portable lieux whereby meanings can travel with objects. With the flowers, these meanings are portable insofar as they are linked to the seasonal appearance or disappearance of flora.

For other participants, the memory of family events is more permanently topographical. As an example, Dennis (late 50s, married, two grown children) recounted a time when he was playing football with his wife in front of the Hall, linking it directly to the onset of his wife's labour and the birth of his son the following day. The physicality of the park is important as it functions as a scene in an important family event. Indeed, the link for Dennis was so strong that he identified a connection to his unborn son: "So our son knew Towneley Park before he were even born!". Dennis indicates that Towneley Park has had a significant role all through his life. His is a relationship with the park itself. It resonates with Chris's bequeathal of his parents to the park and Kirsty's family ties to the streams and woodland. These emotional attachments have precedent in the way we can develop relationships with parks, rural landscapes and heritage places (Dwyer, Schroeder and Gobster, 1991; Schroeder, 1996; Kirschenblatt-Gimblett, 2004; Harvey and Riley, 2005). The park plays a significant part in the

lives of many of the participants, almost as if it were a family member. The physical and spatial nature of the park is a crucial element in the creation and recreation of family events.

The experiences of the participants may reveal some of the impact of the ‘thingness’ of phenomena within the park; the trees, the flowers, the Hall courtyard. This can be theorised with Nora’s (1989) observation of meanings attached to ‘monuments’, but also by considering the performative actions we may associate with objects and places. Tilley (1994) and Riessman (2008) respectively identify that we are able to view movement as a narrative process. For Tilley, the movement across landscape can be a narrative which is constructed as we travel. For Riessman, the image of a landscape within a picture can precipitate this sense of spatial narrative. Massey (2012) expresses the same notion as she describes how an image of space necessarily conjures the notion of time required to traverse it. Merleau-Ponty (2014) and Shepherd (2008), too, describe the ways in which we can travel across a landscape using our vision and our ability to focus on details or take in larger landscape aspects.

Therefore, these spaces alone, the apprehension of them, can bring meaning to the experiences and memories of family events. Clearly, participants expressed meaning in both the interviews and field visits, but what this research project highlights is that being in the park revealed these family meanings more than the initial interview. This supports the idea that it is engagement with the space of the park that can unlock the memories of family events. From this we can move towards understanding the ways that family events are *formed, experienced* and *re-experienced* by park users.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter has highlighted the multiple contexts that bring meaning to family events. These events can be varied, ranging from quotidian visits for feeding the ducks, to more significant events such as the birth of children or family reunions. What the narration of these family events reveals, however, is the complexity of their connections to the past, future and space. Such events are networks in themselves, and part of the network that is Towneley Park. The meanings that are generated from these family events are imparted to the park’s places and spaces, creating heterotopic emplacements (Foucault, 1998; Hetherington, 2011) which act as nodes for participants to access their memories. Nora’s (1989) lieux de memoire already provides a way of exploring how memories may be deposited and experienced in a landscape. By combining Bourdieu’s (1993) habitus with Foucault’s (1998) heterotopia and Deleuze & Guattari’s (2013) rhizome, this research enables us to model experiences, like family events, as part of a dynamic network. This, in turn, can help us to identify the nodes in those networks and how they can bring meaning to family events and our lives.

Field visits were crucial to understanding participants’ experiences of family events in the park. The research approach embraced the affective lived experiences of the participants. Exploration of their phenomenological link with the park was a key aspect here, and it was through visiting the park with participants that the participants were able to communicate to me in their own terms. They let me into their heterotopic diagrams so that I could enable a

similar discourse. This helped me to gain a greater understanding of their experiences at Towneley Park than had I conducted interviews alone. The physical importance of a park space is no surprise, but it was important to develop a way of exploring this physicality. The approach of the Leskernick project (Bender, Hamilton and Tilley, 2007) was influential for this project, but important also were other discussions of our use of space, including those of de Certeau (1984), Massey (2012) and Merleau-Ponty (2014). The initial interviews with participants already contained rich descriptions of sights, sounds and sensations that are part of the experience of outdoor environments. However, engagement with the participants within the park space itself proved to be more than simple confirmation of interview contents.

The kinds of narratives that came out from the participants during this project involved the use of their bodies as perceiving the park, as well as their emotions about the park. Such knowledge is often overlooked as ‘amateur’ and set against traditional heritage and historical knowledge (Samuel, 2012). The initial interviews with the participants had more focus on traditional historical values of the park and so resonated more with AHD (Smith, 2006) associated with the park. In contrast, the visits to the park brought out narratives that were affective and personal; this is where the family events were really fleshed out. It is clear from this research that field visits are an effective tool in uncovering important detail linked to family events. We can see, therefore, that direct engagement with a heritage site and its visitors can illuminate a range of heritage meanings that include both AHD and personal, family-constructed heritage experiences.

Although the AHD of Towneley’s histories are important elements of a Towneley experience, such values are not overwhelming. Traditional and elicited values can have the potential to marginalise everyday heritages (Smith, 2006), but we can see from the examples discussed in this chapter that Authorised Heritage Discourses are malleable and that the agency of individuals and families enables the production of their own meanings. Such agency includes the heterotopia-producing process of family events and this research helps to show how these family event heterotopias may be constituted of phenomenological diagrams that must be encountered in order for their meanings to be operationalised, or narrated. As these heterotopias provide us with new language and discourse, by acknowledging them we can further understand how elicited narratives can be resisted or overridden by everyday family events.

Overall, the narratives of the park users in this research demonstrated that family events form a significant part of their connection with the park. Indeed, the park appears to retain the memories of these family events and so the relationships between person and park allow memories to resonate. More than this, though, the heterotopic zones that are produced enable the reliving of family events and the possibility of future events.

## References

Bandura, A. (2001) Social Cognitive Theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52: 1-26.

- Bender, B., Hamilton, S. and Tilley, C. (2007) *Stone worlds: Narrative and reflexivity in landscape archaeology*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993) Outline of a sociological theory of art perception. In R. Johnson (ed.), *The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature*. Cambridge: Polity, pp. 215-237.
- de Certeau, M. (1988) *The practice of everyday life*. London: University of California Press.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (2013) *A thousand plateaus*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Dwyer, J.F., Schroeder, H.W. and Gobster, P.H. (1991) The significance of urban trees and forests: Toward a deeper understanding of values. *Journal of Arboriculture*, 17(10): 276-284.
- Eco, U. (1996) *Faith in fakes: Travels in hyperreality*. Reading: Minerva.
- Foucault, M. (1998) Different spaces. In J.D. Faubion (ed.), *Michel Foucault: Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984: Volume 2 aesthetics*. New York: The New Press, pp.175-185.
- Frankfort-Nachmias, C. and Nachmias, D. (2007) *Research methods in the social sciences* (7<sup>th</sup> Edition). New York: Worth.
- Gordon, R. (1986) Folk psychology as simulation. *Mind and language*, 1(2): 158-171.
- Harvey, D.C. and Riley, M. (2005) Country stories: the use of oral histories of the countryside to challenge the sciences of the past and future. *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, 30(1): 19-32.
- Hawthorn, J. (1997) *Studying the novel: An introduction* (3rd edition). London: Hodder Education.
- Hetherington, K. (2011) Foucault, the museum and the diagram. *The Sociological Review*, 59(3): 457-475.
- Hewison, R. (1987) *The heritage industry: Britain in a climate of decline*. London: Methuen.
- Hollway, W. and Jefferson, T. (2000) *Doing qualitative research differently: Free association, narrative and the interview method*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hunter, A. and Brewer, J. (2015) Designing multimethod research. In S. Hesse-Biber and R.B. Johnson (eds), *The Oxford handbook of multimethod and mixed methods research inquiry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.185-205.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (2004) Intangible heritage as metacultural production. *Museum International*, 56(1-2): 52-65.
- Kvale, S. (1996) *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. London: Sage.
- Lefebvre, H. (2014) *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Massey, D. (2012) *For space*. London: Sage.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2014) *Phenomenology of perception*. London: Routledge.

- Nora, P. (1989) Between memory and history: Les lieux de mémoire. *Representations*, 26: 7-24.
- Riessman, C.K. (2008) *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. London: Sage.
- Samuel, R. (2012) *Theatres of memory: Past and present in contemporary culture*. London: Verso.
- Schroeder, H.W. (1996) Ecology of the heart: Understanding how people experience natural environments. In A.W. Ewert (ed.), *Natural resource management: The human dimension*. Boulder: Westview Press, pp.13-27.
- Shepherd, N. (2008) *The living mountain: A celebration of the Cairngorm mountains of Scotland*. London: Canongate.
- Smith, L. (2006) *The uses of heritage*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Stephens, J. (2014) 'Fifty-two doors': Identifying cultural significance through narrative and nostalgia in Lakhnu village. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 20(4): 415-431.
- Tilley, C. (1994) *A phenomenology of landscape: Places, paths and monuments*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Waterton, E. (2005) Whose sense of place? Reconciling archaeological perspectives with community values: Cultural landscapes in England. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 11(4): 309-325.