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Introduction

The study of social relations within local territories is a traditional subject for qualitative research using field methods, referring us to the works of the Chicago school (Park, 1967; Wirth, 1928; Zorbaugh, 1929) and the classics of British social researchers (Booth, 1892-1897; Burgess, 1989). The study of material culture, the diversity of social practices, the identities of local territories and residents, and more often “urban neighbourhoods,” are becoming common subject of modern social research (Atkinson & Kintrea, 2001; Benson & Jackson, 2013; Martin, 2005, 2015).

During the Soviet period, industrial territories were at the centre of state interests, and have now become peripheral. Now these territories are being de-industrialized, and the demolition of plants are called “post-industrial” (Sadowy & Lisiecki, 2019). The analysis of
these neighbourhoods is particularly pivotal because the observation of new forms of urban government and socio-cultural change can reveal the consequences of global economic politics for daily lives. These places are experiencing significant changes and their study can be used for understanding the nature of transformational processes. Using a post-industrial neighbourhood as a field laboratory (Park, 1967), I understand this territory as a specific localized scene where the main social and transformational processes occur, and the social nature of these changes is exposed.

Such a study requires using the methodological tools for field research in urban localities to reveal what we can learn, the explication of similar experiences for the development of research practices, and opportunities for comparison in a global context. In the 20th century of industrialization, case-study research design was mainly related to organizations (Burawoy, 1998). However, in the 21st century of deindustrialization, post-industrial neighborhoods can serve as an indicator of neo-liberal policies. It is a reference space where transformational social processes occur, the social nature of these changes is exposed, and identities are constructed. Therefore, in this article, I share my research experience and the tailored research design, elaborated with my colleagues, for investigating post-industrial neighbourhoods (Polukhina et al., 2017).

The databases of the two examined neighbourhoods includes 43 interviews, detailed field diaries of more than hundred pages, several hundred photographs and videos and other visual materials, such as data from projective techniques as mental maps, social contacts map, and sketching. What tactics for accessing, collecting, and assembling data in the neighbourhoods were successful? How was the sample and “after-the-field” analysis built? What is the role of visual data? These questions structure the article.

**An Ethnographic Case-Study as a Research Design**

The framework for studying the culture of urban areas and the identity of its inhabitants is a special genre of field research – the ethnographic case-study – a type of research design focused on a consistent and detailed inquiry of an object(s), using multiple methods of data collection and intensive participant observation (Pilkington, 2017; Pollock, 2017; Ruan, 2019; Schnegg, 2009). Ethnography traditionally focused on the study of culture because of the dominant method of observation (Geertz, 1973). Ethnography and case-studies have much in common as a genre of qualitative field research and are often identified with each other. The *case* in this context is an empirical object, a separate fragment of social reality limited in space and time. A “case-study” is a research strategy aimed at a deep, intensive, and a complex analysis of a social phenomenon using an example of a separate empirical object (case), including multiple methods of data collection.

The research using the case-study design reveals the nature of deep processes by studying one or more cases in detail (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Burawoy, 1998; Stake, 1995, 2006; Yin, 1994, 2003). The tasks for the application of a case-study include the identification of common trends, typical practices, and the articulation of a “social diagnosis” (Burawoy, 1998; Kozina, 1995). This type of qualitative research is carried out in, for example, a certain community, a unique social phenomenon, the biography of an individual, but most often a specific location, organization, or territorial unit with an “emplaced” (Pink, 2009, p. 23) or “co-present” ethnographer (Pink, 2009, p. 370).

Earlier, the interest of 20th-century researchers in industrialization was related to the study of organizations (Pettigrew, 1985), however, in recent years there has been a “turn to urban ethnographies” (Wacquant, 2002) and “urban places as neighbourhood,” which have become a platform for studying the everyday life of inhabitants and related themes—class structure and symbols, housing inequalities (Polukhina, 2020, p. 139), consumer practices,
leisure, creative industries, and the issues of sociology of childhood and youth movements (Pilkington, 2017). Thus, the space of neighbourhood is a platform for the study of everyday life and related social phenomenon.

The Project Background and the Development of Research Questions

The subject area of our projects was the multiplicity of social relations within a neighbourhood—the identities and daily practices of residents and the territorial identity of the studied areas. The research focus evolved from a more specific and concrete identity of the neighbourhood residents – industrial workers – to a general and more abstract identification of “other groups” in the area and their territorial identity. Thus, we expanded the research focus in our projects from identities of industrial workers to identities of post-industrial neighbourhoods.

In the Workers Project,¹ our key research question was: what is the daily life of contemporary industrial workers in the post-Soviet context? After the fieldwork, we focused on the transformation of industrial workers’ identities and temporally extended the question: How do they perceive themselves, the plant, and the neighbourhood, including the changes that have taken place? The research question of the Territorial Identities Project² was more urban oriented: what is happening in the territories that used to be factory-owned? This project studied the transformation of industrial neighbourhoods (Polukhina et al., 2017) and revealed the “habitus of territories” as lived experiences of limited spatial autonomy in the post-industrial areas (Fraser, 2013). The aim for Student Expeditions³ was the reconstruction of the multidimensional nature of everyday life in a post-industrial neighbourhood via the identities of “other groups” that differ from the worker-residents. In the expedition we had an “umbrella structure” - students were divided into groups and studied men’s and women’s daily practices, catering practices, and cultural production and consumption (see Table 1).

In the following section, I describe the main stages of our research practices, from design to analysis, and point out methodological patterns and insights from the projects.

Table 1
Descriptions of the Research Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Investigated Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workers Project, 1 month of field work in 2017</td>
<td>Uralmash neighbourhood in Yekaterinburg</td>
<td>What is the daily life of the contemporary industrial worker in the post-Soviet context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial Identities Project, regular field work in 2017-2019</td>
<td>Avtozavodsky neighbourhood around the ZIL plant in Moscow</td>
<td>What is happening in the territories that were factory-owned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Expeditions, 10 days field work in 2018³</td>
<td>Uralmash neighbourhood in Yekaterinburg</td>
<td>How daily life in the neighbourhood is organized and what “other identities” are present in the neighbourhood except industrial workers?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 1: Secondary Data Analysis and Neighbourhood Selection

At the first stage of the projects, we collected secondary and open data about industrial neighbourhoods and studied statistics, residential online forums, maps, and research papers.

¹More information http://field-notes.tilda.ws/byt-i-culture
² More information http://present-past.ru/
³More information http://field-notes.tilda.ws/expedition
We selected two comparable and accessible cases – one regional and one capital neighbourhood in Russia. For the theoretical assumptions, the neighbourhoods must be (1) significant and informative as a case, (2) comparable with each other, and (3) easily accessible for field study. Before making the final choice, we visited the neighbourhoods and asked our colleagues about opportunities for field access.

The cases in our projects were neighbourhoods surrounding the biggest Soviet factories with high significance for the Soviet economy. The first selected regional case is the Uralmash⁴ neighbourhood located in the northern part of Yekaterinburg, the city of my childhood and one of the main cities in Russia. The second case is the Avtozavodsky neighbourhood, the area around the ZIL plant, founded in 1916⁵ in Moscow, and where I worked at a research institute. Both neighbourhoods were constructed in the era of early Soviet industrialization, changed dramatically after the collapse of Soviet Union, and continued to exist in post-Soviet times. The selected cases were “representative” post-industrial neighbourhoods, rich sources of data, and they allowed the examination of key social process (Bryman, 2016, p. 64).

Stage 2: The Development of the Research Documentation

The development of research documentation is the translation of the project design into the research tools for data collection (Vanke, Polukhina, & Strelnikova, 2020). The main research tools for basic field study are (1) the interview guides, (2) the observation protocol (a form for fixing observations), and (3) the informed consent form for participants. To develop the tools, we first reviewed the information about the environment and potential informants. This was available at a distance from the object being studied, using online forums, social networks, maps, archives, and the literature.

As shown in Table 2, in the Workers Project the interviews were aimed to reconstruct daily life by describing their individual biographies, social practices, allowing us to understand how workers describe and perceive themselves and their daily lives. In discussing the informants’ childhood, work, and family history, we were interested in what capital (social, economic, cultural) the informants possess, and how they use it (Bourdieu, 1984; Savage et al., 2015).

Table 2
Main Themes for the Interviews in the Workers Project

| 1. | Introduction to research and informal consent signing |
| 2. | Childhood and education of workers: parents, school, social surroundings and significant events |
| 3. | Professional education and career paths |
| 4. | Self-perception and identity |
| 5. | Current social surroundings with a projective map of main contacts |
| 6. | Daily life in working days and weekends (including wardrobe) |
| 7. | Family and gender practices |
| 8. | Housing practices and home culture |
| 9. | Neighbourhood and mental map |
| 10. | Go-along interviews in the neighbourhood (optional) |
| 11. | Closing and appreciation |

⁴ The Ural heavy machinery plant (UZTM, Uralmashzavod) started in 1933 and was the largest plant in the USSR. In post-Soviet Russia, this plant and area have undergone changes, but continue to function.

⁵ It was known in the Soviet Union for trucks and cars. The plant was painfully closed in 2013, and now the ZIL plant is almost dismantled, its areas have been cleared for residential housing areas.
As illustrated in Table 3 we developed a form of observation based on which, we
describe the practices and spaces of the research area and the contexts of the interviews
collected.

Table 3
The Main Themes from Observations from the Post-Industrial Neighbourhood

| 1. Everyday practices of residents: communications, places to visit, rhythms of movements, etc. |
| 2. Infrastructure of the neighbourhood: architecture, places, and social borders |
| 3. Collective actions: events, participants, rituals, and conflicts |
| 4. Private life and housing: spaces, habits, and symbols |

In contemporary Russia, ethical principles for conducting social research are just being
institutionalized and are based on local law on personal data6. For some projects, recorded
verbal consent suffices, but gradually it is becoming the norm to sign official documents of
informed consent. For our projects, special forms were developed, detailing the project’s
objectives and ways of working with the data. Most part of the documents I sent to the Ethics
Committee of the HSE University, and it grants permission to conduct the research, issuing a
decision that the documents meet the requirements of the Ethics Committee.

We can distinguish between a “detailed” (1) and a “simple” (2) informed consent form.
A simple consent form provides information about the research and explains to the informant
how the data will be used (e.g., guaranteeing anonymity), but also informs them that by signing,
they are agreeing to participate in the research. A simple informed consent form usually fits on
one sheet of paper, which is convenient for later archiving and for scanning. In an itemized
form, the basic information and signature are also placed on the first sheet, which is used in the
archive, and additional information is placed on subsequent sheets. In fact, in the field, we
simply updated the first sheet of the form for each new interview.

“The detailed form” clarifies preferences about the distribution of visual personalized
data (distribution locations, facial pixelation, etc.) in more detail. A detailed consent form is
necessary for a large project, with a specific group of informants, for whom it is important to
understand in detail the course of research and how and where the data will be used. The
detailed consent form contains a list of possible options for using interview notes and visual
data and is accompanied by a project summary indicating the purpose of the research, criteria
for selecting participants, how the data will be used and the contact details of the supervisor.

The form can be sent in advance to the future informant online or discussed when an
interview is arranged. But usually a paper form, signed by the informant (and more rarely, the
researcher), is filled out just before the interview begins. It is quite common for a snippet of
the form to also be audio-recorded, by prior agreement. But the interview is transcribed without
a specific consent form. Research participants usually treat signing informed consent as a
formality and are willing to do so as quickly as possible and without careful reading. Trust in
the researcher and a desire to participate are usually stronger than the “paperwork.” Here is an
example of some excerpts where an informant is asked to choose to put their initials next to
those judgments with which they agree, and to put a dash next to those with which they
disagree: I agree that the research can collect photos/videos/surveys of me and my place of
residence. I agree that photos/videos of me and my residence may be used for public

presentations/publicity in the following ways: After pixelation (or other procedure that will not identify me); Without pixelation (i.e., my face will be recognizable in photos and videos)

**Stage 3: Field Access**

A situation of “difficult access” was the Workers Project, where our first attempt with official letters to the industrial plant failed. The plant was not interested in this kind of research and was not an open public place, despite a person from the plant administration contributing to our project. The workers were a narrow “closed group” for our study. As a result, we turned to our sociologist colleagues from a local research agency, which provided personal contacts and generally helped us with the recruitment of participants for the project. As we stayed in the territory of the investigated neighbourhood, it was easy to get to the place and arrange contact with the next “snowball” informants.

An example of “easy access” was our Territorial Identities Project and the Student Expedition. In these projects, the fields of studies were neighbourhoods – a public, accessible place, which does not require special permission, and the types of informants were broader than in the Workers Project. The tactic of inviting informants in the neighbourhood and telling them about the research on the street was used. This tactic proved to be most effective in the “open group” when participants in the Students Expedition distributed “invitation-flyers” about our project. The text started with “Do you live in the Uralmash neighbourhood? Please tell us about your neighborhood.” The main strength of these flyers was the invitation to communicate. We distributed flyers in the park and in other focal places in the neighbourhood. We mostly gave the flyers directly to residents and people took them with interest and started asking questions about the project. The interviews were conducted on a bench in the street, and we call them “bench interviews.” There was sometimes a queue of people waiting to take part in the study and talk about their neighbourhood.

The experts we invited for the interviews were partly familiar with the research practice and they only needed a link to the project’s website or a short introduction to study for agreement to an interview. We quickly found cultural activists through online social networks and personal contacts who formed a pool of experts for our projects. We had a similar situation in all our projects with the ready agreement to participate from informant-experts (the head of the neighbourhood, museum workers, social researchers, an urbanist photographer, representatives of initiative groups in the neighbourhood).

Generally, we used different strategies to recruit informants; the main strategy was snowball sampling. The sample of our interviews is made up of two groups: “the working-class sample” which includes mainly former or current industrial workers living or working in the neighborhood and “the creative class sample” which includes scientists, artists, teachers of higher educational institutions, museum workers, cultural and urban activists. As a rule, they have higher education and are involved in the public sphere and media. There was no special quota for our sampling and the second group appeared mainly through personal contacts and our identities as social researchers. The people from creative industries took part in our study as field providers and based their activities on neighborhood life. As a team of mostly three researchers, we stayed in Yekaterinburg or made regular visits to the Moscow neighborhood, interacting daily with workers, observing, and participating in various kinds of social practices (leisure, consumer, etc.) We obtained data enriched by our personal understanding of their lifestyles. We participated in cultural events in the areas (exhibitions, excursions), and shared the results of our fieldwork at a conference in the neighborhood in July 2017 in Yekaterinburg, where other social scholars and representatives of related disciplines also spoke.

At the final stage of field access, as I understood, there is “empathic cooperation” with informants and a dynamic snowball develops that provides a set of participants. This stage was
characterized by a situation when the researcher is no longer surprised by anything encountered at the field-sites, s/he is more a participant than an observer is with the feeling that “the field is already inside of her/him, and s/he is in the field.” Dynamic snowball recruitment indicates the trust and acceptance of the researcher’s informants.

**Stage 4: Collection of Multi-Site Data**

The multidimensional everyday world of post-industrial neighbourhoods required diversified tools and “mixing methods in a qualitatively driven way” (Mason, 2006, 2011). To get more “historical context” about the area and plant under study, we observed local excursions, museums, community centres, and the cemetery and conducted “expert interviews” with plant administrators, activists, researchers, representatives of creative industries, and the administrators of the neighbourhood. About 1/3 of the sample were expert interviews covering the themes of the neighbourhood and/or the plant. The focus of the expert interviews depended on the professional profile of the informant—in some cases it was mostly about the plant and the workers, but in most cases, it was more about the neighbourhood because this topic was more public and easier to discuss.

“Expert interviews” helped us in the interpretation and historical reconstruction of the history of the plant and the neighbourhood. They differ from interviews with ordinary residents as they did not describe their daily life but their professional experience. Interviews with such individuals were shorter than those with ordinary informants. The guide for expert interviews is shorter, and the questions and structure of the interview varied depending on the expert's profile. Experts often speak fluently, as many of them are used to speaking publicly. One of my interviews could be described as an interview-guided-tour, when they carefully listened to my introduction to the interview with research questions and then began a 1-hour narrative about “Moscow as a factory city.”

In Territorial Identities Project and Student Expedition, interviews were conducted with residents of the neighbourhood and employees of the territory with the goal of explicating their territorial experiences, social meanings and belonging. The research diaries and visual data allowed us to understand the material culture, the social practices of the residents, and to illuminate the types of local identities. The resident interview guides contained projective techniques and mental maps of the neighbourhood and a map of social contacts (Strelnikova & Vanke, 2017).

**Tandem Interviews as a “Reliable” Field Practice**

The practice of tandem interviews is quite rare but has already been investigated by researchers (Bechhofer et al., 1984; Kincaid & Bright, 1957; Turchik, 2010). For instance, pioneers of similar tandem field work with visual materials were the academic couple Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson (Jacknis, 1988). In this type of interview, in comparison to dyads with two informants (Morgan, 2016), two “researchers collected the data.” The first one led the conversation and asked questions, and the second organized the technical support – taking notes, monitoring the voice recorder, recording video, taking photos, and offering support. Tandem interviews are a convenient practice in modern field sites and provide “security” in an unknown space and convenience in photo and video recording.

Discussion between the two researchers after the interviews gives a consistent interpretation of the collected data. Researchers can switch roles, and this allowed us to improve the quality of the collected data (Turchik, 2010, pp. 106-122). The two of us were comfortable participating in the interviews, stimulating the narratives with questions from two
participants, coordinating the interpretation, and taking photos and videos during the interviews. The specifics and advantages of tandem interviews are summarized below.

(1) The interviewer's duality and multifunctionality. It is possible to get more information over the same period than if an interviewer works alone (Kincaid & Bright, 1957, p. 305). The communicative actions of the second interviewer can contribute to obtaining richer data (Turchik, 2010, p. 122). When informants have limited time for interviews, tandem interviews can be more productive. The further specifics of the interviews in this format are the consequences of having two interviewers.

(2) The social differences of the interviewers as rich experience for understanding the participants. The fact that two interviewers bring different personal qualities, experience, and interests provides certain advantages (Kincaid & Bright, 1957, p. 306). Tandem interviews are especially useful when one of the participants is more familiar with the informant's experience based on gender, experience of living in a city or neighbourhood, etc. For example, if the participant reacts negatively to the interviewer due to personal preferences or the interview questions, the second interviewer may be able to correct the situation. If the question is not understood, it is likely that one of the interviewers will be able to explain it more clearly (Turchik, 2010, p. 113).

(3) The comfort of the interview situation for participants. One informant and two interviewers are situations perceived by the participant as resembling an ordinary meeting (Bechhofer et al., 1984, p. 98). It is perceived as “not private” (as in a one-to-one situation) and “not public” (as with many participants). Surprisingly, some of my students noted that consent to participate in interviews (i.e., accessibility) is higher when two interviewers invite people to participate in the study on the street. Two people stimulate communication since it seems close to everyday interaction and is an organic field solution. This practice of tandem interviews helps to improve the quality and reliability of the data collected.

**Ethnographic Interviews and Neighbourhood**

The ethnographic interview (Spradley, 1979) assumes that the conversation is accompanied by intensive observation of the informant's daily life, immerses the researcher in their life and is supplemented with detailed diary entries and visual data. The 15 interview locations were distributed as follows: house (11), garden (1), work (1), café (1), courtyard (1). Comparing these situations, I understood that the home context gives you rich visual information and the ability to understand how individuals live. However, the role of ‘hospitable host’ often conflicts with the role of “informant”: the participant can be distracted, thinking about how to treat the researchers, the cleanliness of the house, and fusses. Home interviews were mostly conducted with women, while men prefer a neutral meeting place—a café or a courtyard. Those men who were interviewed at home, mostly refused to be photographed.

At the end of the interview, informants were asked to draw a mental map of the neighborhood (Lynch, 1960). The task was phrased as follows: “Please draw X neighborhood as you see it.” In some interviews, one of the researchers videotaped the informant drawing the neighborhood. This allowed us to later reconstruct the process of making a mental map. Through video recording, we can fill in many important details, such as where each map begins, how it is gradually filled in with elements, which elements are drawn last, what causes difficulties, and so forth. After completing this task (see Fig. 1), we asked the informants to explain what they had drawn. The mental maps in our understanding represent the image of the neighborhood in the socialized imagination of the informant, they represent, to some extent, the experience of everyday life (Strelnikova & Vanke, 2017, pp. 62-63).
In some cases, it was worthwhile “making sketches” (Heath & Chapman, 2018) of the research situation. Sketches can also help in situations where the informant is not ready to be photographed, or when it is important to depict people, but you have not received consent to publicly reproduce their images or personal data. Some interviews with women include a part with “wardrobe-based interviews” (Klepp & Bjerk, 2014; Woodward, 2019, p. 90). At home, there are often interruptions or other participants such as relatives or pets which distract from the narratives.

Home interviews gave the researchers rich general data about “identities in special and material contexts.” After the biographical part of the interview, we invited some participants to take a final walk around the neighborhood. “Walking interviews” (De Leon & Cohen, 2005; Kusenbach, 2003) can reveal daily routes and residents’ perceptions of the urban spaces. However, such walking can only partially be equated with the method interview, as “InterView” (Kvale, 1996) constantly switches to the surroundings. The communicative agents of a walking interview in the neighbourhood can be described as follows: “informant–neighbourhood environment–researcher.”

The practice of field photography as social interaction helps to reveal facets of the informant's identity. The process of co-creating a visual narrative during the interviews –
selecting angles, subjects for images – informs us about the sites of identity and their perception of the studied space. Through the articulation of some photographic practices, we learned about the experience of photographing, the limits of publicity, the perception of living spaces, observed and recorded body language, and their changes while taking photographs. Thus, photo data in the field study is not only factual, but a documentary reflection of social reality and dynamic, the “spoken” version (Pink, 2005).

Taking photographs co-constructs trust between participants in the research situation, it can also be a stimulus for the articulation of sites during the interaction “informant(s)–researcher(s)–camera–habitat.” Generally, I feel that our tandem tactics of interviewing and the rich visual techniques help generate “empathetic encounters” (Pink et al., 2017, p. 371) and emphatic cooperation. In a situation of empathic cooperation, the informant and the researcher are “co-workers” with “mutual trust” (Spradley, 1979) and they can discuss photos, the composition of a picture, and the possibility of sharing images on the Internet.

After the interview, the researcher had the following empirical materials: audio recordings, photo and video materials, signed consent forms, visuals of projective techniques, etc. These materials are digitized and placed in our online research archive. Information about the participant (gender, age, professional affiliation, education, etc.) is included in the list of project informants. Audio recordings are transcribed, and the materials can be supplemented with the researcher's diary entries about the interview situation, its results, and sketches.

**Observations and Visual Data**

Our research practices include multi-site participant observation sessions (Brockmann, 2011). Due to the publicity of neighbourhood spaces, the participation in area practices and their fixation was a manageable task. Our field position can be described as “resident / guest of the areas,” because now the inhabitants of these neighbourhoods are diverse, therefore we fit in. As a result, the materials for each of the studied neighbourhood included more than 30 observation sessions with regular diary entries and hundreds of photos.

In the Worker Project, the observation allowed us to understand that the identity of the contemporary worker is becoming “invisible” in the neighbourhood space and most representations refer to the past (i.e., monuments, and the names of streets and plants). We conducted all the interviews in the context of the informant's daily life and in significant and comfortable places for them: in their homes, courtyards, cafes, and workplaces, and, if possible, we supplemented them with video and photography. The photos, videos, and other visual data from projective techniques we collected were archived online and used for the research diary.

For exploring the identities of residents and neighbourhoods we collect data about the “material context” of the area, mostly housing. Generally, the material culture reveals the interactions between the material and social worlds (i.e., the dynamic relationship between things and individuals; Appadurai, 1986; Miller, 1998; Tilley, 2012). Based on Latour (1993), material configurations not only shape social relations, but also make material objects subjects (Latour, 1993). The material object communicating with individuals produced such elements of culture as social meanings, symbols, practices, and habits.

We photographed and videoed “the material context” of the area (Fig. 3): symbols, the architecture, monuments, types of housing, residential courtyards, blocks of flats, the interiors of the homes and workplaces of factory workers. Initially, these visual data were not central to our projects and played a secondary and contextual role. However, in the analysis after the field stage, this visual evidence proved to be important and served as the basis for writing several papers about the material culture of the neighbourhoods and how this allows us to reveal the changes in the social life and identities of residents.
The concept of “identity” as something that manifests itself in interaction and suggests a sense of belonging to one's group did not emerge immediately in our first Workers Project, but in our first discussions during data collection. Our team often read field diaries to each other and discussed how we could move from a description of everyday culture and daily practices to a more general theoretical concept. We realized that the concept of “identity” includes the multiplicity of everyday experiences, cultures, and practices.

Stage 5: The “After-the-Field” Analysis

Our “data landscape” (Friese, 2019, p. 111) was digitalized and sorted by neighbourhood, the types of informants, and the sources of data. Photographs, mental maps, and quotes from interviews were used for the research exhibit in the investigated area (see Fig. 2). Video materials formed the basis of the films (see Fig. 3).

To analyze the mental maps, we applied a ranking strategy with the determination of significant places in the neighborhood by counting the structural elements of the image of the industrial neighborhood (Lynch, 1960). The element “factory” is found 13 times out of 15 mental maps, from which we conclude that the core of the workers' identity is the factory, around which the district was formed in the late 1920s (Strelnikova & Vanke, 2017, pp. 61-70).

Figure 2
Exhibition and Residents of the Uralmash Neighbourhood. 2018, Yekaterinburg. Photo by Students of the Yekaterinburg Academy of Contemporary Art (EACI)
I applied “remembering” — “a multi-sensory process through which you use the data to resituate yourselves in the research contexts whether you were observing, talking to, or experiencing and reanimate your data” (Woodward, 2019, p. 141). Before the analysis, I looked through field photos and “animated data,” thinking about the contexts in which I produced it and what excited me about the research when I was doing it (Woodward, 2019, p. 141). Sometimes metaphors and meanings appeared after viewing the photos. “Brutalism is everywhere! Why didn't I notice it in the field?!!” arose when I viewed the pictures of the industrial areas. Thus, the photo data are an incentive for analysis and the generation of ideas, as well as a separate data source. For more detailed data analysis, we studied the photos as a source of information about the material culture of the neighbourhoods, spatial practices, identities, and the emotions of informants.

Doing thematic analysis after the fieldwork in “Workers Project,” we divided the themes for analysis among researchers. We understood that to demonstrate the multiple experiences of the factory workers we would need to show the prior transformational process of the factory and the neighborhood, including key periods - the Soviet period (1), the collapse of the USSR and the changes of the 1990s (2), and the current time (3). These periods were clearly articulated as key frontiers of change in factory life. To our surprise, themes about the past turned out to be no less rich than those about the present. The themes of the past were dominant in the visual images of the districts (Soviet architecture, etc.), toponymic names, and narratives of informants - factory workers, who mostly belonged to the older generation. Therefore, “the temporal logic of dividing the theme” of identity into three stages was implemented, (i.e., the key theme was essentially “the transformation of identity”). Each of the three time periods analyzed were developed and interpreted through reading and viewing the project materials, highlighting, and describing persistent or recurring subthemes and/or codes.
We used Bryman's thematic analysis algorithm (Bryman, 2016, pp. 588-589). Essentially, our post-field analysis consisted of reading the project materials, looking for patterns in the data, and creating a coherent narrative on the topic being analyzed. For example, when analyzing the topic “the identity of the worker during the reforms of the 1990s,” I turned to the transcripts of the richest interviews on this topic, reconstructed based on interviews, photos, additional facts, and changes at the factory and the district during this period. The result was a text with quotations and photos, which was further intensively abridged. However, I did not have a clear list of codes, but individual "stable" subtopics, which I described in the paragraphs of my text, occasionally illustrated with quotations.

Thus, we discovered how working class identities transformed in the to three periods: (1) Soviet “consistent” working-class identity, where the plant and working spirits were the centers of their lives; (2) in 1990s workers perceived themselves as “victims of circumstances” with “collapsing” worker identity; (3) today’s “mixing” worker identity includes the Soviet past which still continues to be an important “sense-making resource” (Polukhina et al., 2017, p. 2). After completing the analysis, we each had a detailed reconstructed narrative of the identity of the worker in a particular period from the data. As shown in Table 4, the identity of the worker during the Soviet period was presented as “crystallized” whole/consistent. During this period, collectivism, stability, and everyday life in a homogeneous environment were relevant to workers as a priority at the time. In the 1990s, workers' identity was subjected to collective trauma, which is described through feelings of workers as “victims” of change and feelings of injustice. In the current time, the identity of factory workers acquires multiple and fragmented features, which is represented in the self-descriptions and practices of the group.

Based on the results of our analysis, we discussed that we could visualize identity transformations in the three periods under study (wholeness -> split -> multiple fragments). The resulting narrative of the worker's identity transformation was framed in papers (Polukhina et al., 2017; Polukhina & Vanke, 2019). Our next level analysis revealed “multiple territorial identities that are represented in the exercise of class-differentiated Soviet and post-Soviet cultural practices and the reproduction of old and new lifestyles’” (Vanke & Polukhina, 2018, p. 32).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme (deductive) in Temporal logic</th>
<th>Key Subthemes (codes)</th>
<th>Theme Interpretation (inductive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity in the Soviet Period</td>
<td>Collectivism, stability, emotional excitement, homogeneity of the environment</td>
<td>Crystallized/consistent identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity during the reforms of the 1990s</td>
<td>Victims of change, trauma, loss, external perpetrator of change, sense of injustice, neighborhood of ‘their’ bandits, survival, rift</td>
<td>Fractured/traumatized identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity in the current Post-Soviet Period</td>
<td>“Soviet,” post-Soviet practices and values, ordinary people, good man, personal qualities and values of honesty, diligence, sociability, dignity, and simplicity, private life identities, outside the work sphere (“family man,” “retiree,” “gardener”), representatives of the older generation are aware of themselves as people ‘living in the past’</td>
<td>Multiple (fragmented) identities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To reconstruct the main elements of identities we use visual data as well as other sources for “revealing historical, special and material changes” in neighbourhoods (see Figure 5). We applied “semiotic interpretations” for the visuals and materiality (Keane, 2003). In my later analysis, I split the groups of informants based on the type of housing and applied cultural analysis of classes as a general framework (Savage et al., 2015).

Conclusion

The analysis of neighbourhoods as a field laboratory (Park, 1967) is appropriate because (1) upcoming forms of urban government and socio-cultural change can help to reveal the consequences of economic policies and (2) it is a convenient platform for a detailed study of the everyday life of citizens and related social processes.

The ethnographic case-study of neighbourhoods with thematically broad interviews, participant observations data, and multiple visual and contextual materials reveals the multilayered investigated area and the diversity of residents’ experiences. Our research was initially focused on the “identities of ‘rooted’ residents – industrial workers, but we extended our focus to broad groups of locals – newcomer residents” from creative industries, office workers, etc. The core data about identities of residential groups includes tandem ethnographic interviews with diversity of projective techniques, bench interviews, observations in neighbourhood. The practice of tandem interviews, where two field researchers collected the data, is close to everyday habits, and convenient for field work. Two interviewers and the consequent multifunctionality improve the variety and reliability of the collected materials.

Photographs and videos exposed the rigidity of changes in the capital case (the demolition of the factory, the redevelopment of the territory), and the actualized the issues of inequalities (the transformation of resident-workers into an “invisible” group, displaced by groups of new, more resourceful residents). The analysis of the mental maps of the regional
neighborhood demonstrates the mosaic of this space perception by different social groups. But the workers still see the studied areas as a factory space (the factory is the central element of the mental maps of the workers' area), which shows their belonging to factory. Thus, the visual materials expose multiple layers of identities and new aspects of inequalities. The visual data also formed the basis for a research exhibition and a film that show the ambivalence of post-industrial processes and the multivoicedness of neighborhood residents to different publics.

Data from different sources in “historical, material, and special contexts” give opportunities for a multidimensional analysis and triangulation. Due to the abundance of materials, the development of new sub-samples and themes for analysis was productive, and the research archive has the potential for secondary analysis (Hammersley, 1997; Heaton, 2004). For subsequent data collection in these neighbourhoods, such a study may transform into a qualitative longitudinal study (Bryman, 2016, pp. 64-65; Neale, 2019) to analyze the dynamics of recent social processes and the transformations of identities.
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