

Roadside memorials; public places of private grief

Mirjam Klaassens, Peter Groote & Vincent Breen

Faculty of Spatial Sciences, University of Groningen

Paper presented at the All Souls Conference: Death & Beyond

ASCA, University of Amsterdam

Draft version: January 8, 2007

Abstract.....	1
Introduction.....	2
Location	3
Private versus public places.....	4
Sense of place	6
Roadside memorials versus other commemoration sites.....	8
Locale.....	10
Conclusions.....	11

Abstract

In the literature it is often suggested that place may play an important role in coping with death. In this paper, three interrelated elements of place (Agnew 1987), location, sense of place and locale, are applied to roadside memorials, to get more insight into the meaning of these deathscapes, which are increasingly visible in The Netherlands.

First of all, the *location* itself plays a crucial role within the placement. Almost all the establishers indicate in the interviews that their memorials are placed at the precise location of the accident, or in its close surroundings. It was not always possible to mark the exact spot, as unsafe situation had to be avoided. The importance of the location is confirmed by the notion that a general monument, in honor of all traffic victims, could not replace the individual monuments of the establishers.

Secondly, the location itself is strongly interrelated with the *sense of place* experienced by the memorial builders. They attach special, sometimes even sacred, meaning to the location where their loved one was last alive. The respondents' feelings at the memorials site range from anger and sadness to more positive feelings as the creation and maintenance make the respondents feel useful and give them the idea that they can do something for the deceased. We see roadside memorials as liminal places since the deceased, bereaved and the site itself undergo different transformations.

Thirdly, the roadside memorials are *locale*: settings for social interaction. We argue that the death markers do not only communicate about road trauma to the public, but that they are part of a wide communication network with different actors involved: the deceased, the bereaved and the public. The interviews indicate that the communication possibilities of the memorial as well as the establishment and visits play a huge role in the grief process.

Introduction

“Just stand still for a minute”¹ is the text at a commemoration stone at the side of a road in the South of The Netherlands. The stone contains the names of two young girls who have died at this spot in a car accident, on June 28 in 2002. This is an example of a roadside memorial, which mark the location of death, or perhaps more correctly the location where the deceased were last alive, instead of the place where the body is laid to rest. In this paper we stand still at the phenomenon of roadside memorials, which have become increasingly noticeable in The Netherlands (Yarden 2004, Stengs 2005) and other countries (Reid & Reid 2001, Collins & Rhine 2003, Ross 1998, Hartig & Dunn 1998, Clark & Franzmann 2006).

The appearance of roadside memorials is relatively new. Stengs (2005) demonstrates the recentness of the practice by looking at the appearance of the Dutch word for roadside memorial, *bermmonument*, in the Dutch press. The first appearance was in October 31, 2001 (De Telegraaf). The word, *bermmonument*, has been added to the Dutch dictionary (Van Dale, 14 edition) in October 2005. Why did death move out of the cemetery? The literature shows that the construction of roadside memorials indicates a desire to construct new forms of ritualized mourning, as traditional mourning rituals do not seem adequate. More than ever, people go beyond the management of mourning practices and spaces provided by the traditional authorities of the church and the state (Clark & Franzmann 2006). Especially nowadays, when modern societies are so successful at controlling death, there seems an increasing need for spontaneous memorialization to deal with those cases where control is lost and death occurs suddenly, unexpectedly and violently without warning and opportunity for closure. Beside the traumatic nature of fatal car accidents, another issue is the timing of death. Many young persons die in traffic accidents. Such deaths are personally and socially “unacceptable” (Collins & Rhine 2003). A way to ascribe meaning to an otherwise senseless death is to erect and maintain a memorial. It also represents the end of numbness and the start to take actions, to “do something” (Weisser 2002, Collins & Rhine 2003).

In the literature it is often suggested that place may play an important role in coping with death, both as the place where someone dies and as a place where the deceased are remembered. Roadside memorials are examples of such places. Agnew (1987) constituted a multidimensional concept of place, which contains of three elements.

1. Location: place located in geographical space.
2. Sense of place: the attachment between people and place.
3. Locale: place as setting for social interaction.

These interrelated elements are applied in this paper to places marked by a roadside memorial. First, the issue of the *location* of roadside memorials is described. Followed by the notion that these places of private grief are located in public space. Second, the development of a *sense of place* at the memorials is mentioned, in order to understand the special, sometimes even sacred meaning, that bereaved attach to these deathscapes. This

¹ Own translation: “Sta even stil”.

importance is also indicated by the liminal character of these places. Thirdly, the death markers are viewed as *settings for social interaction*. We argue that the sites are part of a wide communication network with different actors involved. Finally, a brief conclusion will be given.

This paper is based on information from different data sources. First of all, seventeen in-depth interviews were conducted, with fifteen roadside memorial builders and in two cases with the parents of the deceased. The interviews capture the unique stories of the establishers, their motivation behind the erection and their meaning attached to it. The second source is a database, which consists information of more than 250 memorials in honor of almost 350 deceased, as more persons die in single car accidents. It contains information about the location of the memorial, the age and sex of the victim, the date of the accident, information about the design of the marker, the way the accident occurred and who constructed the memorial.

Location

The first element of place distinguished by Agnew (1987) refers to geographical location (see also Tuan 1996). “The issue of placement and place [of a roadside memorial] is absolutely critical to the bereaved ...” (Collins & Rhine 2003, p.239). How essential is the precise location by the placement of the roadside memorial? In some cases the exact location is crucial, otherwise the memorial would be useless and not have been placed.

Because it's about that place, not somewhere else. When it's located a kilometer further on, it doesn't make any sense. Then you can also remove it. I think that one must be able to place it at the exact spot. At that spot, they drove into the ditch (father).

In a few cases the local government did not agree at once with the bereaved about the location of the roadside memorial. The families discussed this strongly with the local government and eventually their wishes were heard, which shows the importance of the precise location to them. Safety issues concerning passersby and visitors play a role in the placement of the memorial. In one case, the local government prohibited the establishment of a memorial to avoid an unsafe situation, as it would distract passersby. As a result, the parents of the two victims designed a marker of plexiglas to make it almost invisible. This way the parents did get permission to establish the roadside memorial.

The importance of the exact location of the memorial can also be indicated by the placement of several roadside memorials which are for example situated at a dangerous location or at very public places. Therefore, the interviewees explain that they visit the roadside memorial not as often as they wanted to. In some cases the location of death could not be marked, nevertheless it remains special to the bereaved. One father places a flower out of a bouquet at the place of death, when he places flowers at the memorial a couple of meters further on.

What I do, when I'm there, I take one flower out of the bouquet and put it at the exact spot where he has died. After five, six cars the flower has been ruined, but that doesn't matter (father).

The motivation of establishment is also of influence of the location. One father, who erected the memorial to warn the public as his main motive, did not put much meaning to the exact location.

Even if the monument were to be located half a kilometer further on, because of circumstances, of course that is possible [...] as it doesn't change the incident. It is most often a different location (father).

Also the location of a roadside memorial, which is located eight meters from the road where the accident occurred, is not that important to the creators. The parents explain that they wanted to have a private place to remember their deceased daughter.

In sum, we can say that the majority of the interviewees did put much importance to the placement of the memorial at the spot or near the spot of the accident. This is confirmed by the notion that the respondents reject the idea of a general monument, in honor of traffic deaths, which would replace their personal roadside memorials.

I really don't like that. What is the use of a monument at one spot, while the accidents occur everywhere? [...] It should be in the area where it has happened. You can't say that: in Roden it has happened, but in Assen we place a memorial. What are we then thinking? (Friend.)

Some memorial builders in Apeldoorn do have plans to construct a general monument for traffic victims in the city or the region, beside their own private ones. The monument is seen as a good addition, not as a replacement for personal roadside monuments.

Private versus public places

Roadside memorials can be seen as private expressions of grief located in public place (Everett 2000). "Mourners assume the authority to construct a memorial for private purposes in a public place for as long as they need it there" (Clark & Franzmann 2006, p.588). The location of the private recommendation sites in public space may evoke tensions between private versus public interests (Kong 1999). It may even lead to conflicts between mourners and officials and/or the public. The majority of the memorial builders experience the place of the fatal accident as both private and public, which is illustrated by the next quotation:

Let me put it this way: it is a public place but in your heart it is private. [However], it can never become a private place, because it is owned by the municipality (friend).

A very small number consider the site as only private or only public. Again this can be explained by the motivation behind the establishment.

The contrast of a private memorial in public space may cause an unexpected riptide of emotion and debate (Schmidt 2000). Ross (1998) argues that “in probably no other area of public life does public practice diverge so dramatically from official policy” (p.50). Policies regarding roadside memorials differ within The Netherlands. In one province the practice is forbidden, while in some other provinces it is encouraged. Different parties are involved in the activity: local authorities, municipalities, provinces and Rijkswaterstaat (Dutch Directorate for Public Works and Water Management), as they all own parts of roadsides. Many interviewees did not know which authority to approach. In one case the local government forced the family to remove their memorial. When the father of this family drives through The Netherlands he is confronted with the differences in policy.

I drive through the whole country. You see monuments everywhere. And that particularly yours is not allowed, hurts very much. Then I'm thinking: why does the municipality have to be so stern? (Father.)

In some parts, roadside memorials are restricted by regulations, while in others this is not the case. In other words, the location of the traffic accident influences the opportunity to erect a commemoration site in honor of the deceased and the directions that should be followed. Sometimes memorial builders experience support, because they were the first in that area², while others experience troubles as there were no prescribed rules. In 2004 an official national policy to regulate the practice of establishing roadside memorials was introduced. One father explains that he was happy that a policy was formulated. He believed that his position had become stronger, because he felt that the municipality should have strong reasons to reject his request. It is in the sphere of the Dutch issuing for rules; you can only perform a ritual if you stick to certain criteria. This stands opposite to the character of a ritual, which cannot be regulated (Trouw, October 4 2006). The strict policies of some governments were known by some interviewees. A large number of the roadside memorials erected by the respondents are illegal. One mother did not ask for permission as she was afraid for rejection.

Yes, that is what I'm told by other people: “Don't ask for permission, because they will say no. Just do it, then it will be tolerated” (mother).

She feels that the local authorities tolerate it:

Even the municipality, who takes care of the grass, mows around the stone. Then I have the idea that they even take care of it (mother).

Another memorial builder asked permission, pretending being a stepbrother instead of a close friend, to improve his chances for success.

As these sites are located in public places, not all the members of the community may recognize it as sacred ground (Everett 2002, Tuan 1974). It can even be vandalized or destroyed (Everett 2002), which is only experienced by a very small number of the

² In some cases, the memorial builders were the first established in their area, which underlines the recentness of the phenomenon in The Netherlands.

respondents. We expect that vandalism partly depend on the location of the memorial, for example in higher populated areas and sites with easy access. One mother recalls the additional emotional pain she experience when the local government cleaned the place. She feels that it is a desecration of the site. Most of the respondents did not experience vandalism and could hardly image that it would happen.

At ours, something has disappeared once, but I assume that it has been blown away. I can't believe that someone would take it away from there (mother).

Some respondents also argue that the victim was very well known and therefore they do not expect to experience vandalism. However, some establishers expressed concerns regarding possible damage. One mother was very afraid that the memorial would be damaged, therefore she tried to insure the memorial, which was not possible.

Not only officials caused conflict, but sometimes neighbors and passersby also complained. One family received complaints of drivers via the local authority because the sun was reflected on the glass of the memorial. They assume that the complaints were from family members of the old lady that was responsible for the accident.

Sense of place

Sense of place is another element of Agnew (1987), which is defined as a place where sentiment is attached to (Tuan 1996). This is a crucial concept in understanding the special meaning, even sacred significance, that roadside memorial builders attach to the place where a loved one died or, perhaps more correctly, where they were last alive (Collins & Rhine 2003). This is indicated very strongly by all of the respondents. The feelings experienced at the site differ. In many cases emotions as anger, sadness and pain are experienced. The source for these emotions lies in the traumatic nature of the accidents and the unacceptable victims who have died. The interviewees explain that loosing your child is one of the most awful things that can happen to you³. In some cases the accident is described as unnecessary. As the establishment and the maintenance of the memorial are part of the grief process, also positive associations are made with this site as it gives the opportunity to take actions, to “do something” for the deceased.

Roadside memorials as sacred places

The establishment of roadside memorials is a type of popular religious activity (Larson-Miller 2005). For the mourners “it is a way to express their grief and transform the roadside into their own sacred space” (Clark & Franzmann 2006, p.579). More than ever, people go beyond the management of mourning practices and spaces provided by the traditional authorities of the church and the state and start to take religion and meaning making in their own hands. The meaning of church-based rituals is decreasing and the establishers see their memorials either as an alternative or even as a replacement of traditional religion (Clark & Franzmann 2006). A roadside memorial can be seen as “an

³ Numbers of Rijkswaterstaat 2005) show that most victims of traffic accidents are in their twenties. If teens or young adults die in a fatal accident, the location has a greater probability of being memorialized (Klaassens, Groote & Huigen 2007). This means that many roadside memorials mark the spot where parents have lost their child.

expression in concrete of what might otherwise be expressed in religious practice [...]” (Auster 1997, p.221).

Roadside memorials are also known as micro sacred sites (Weisser 2004). For some roadside memorial builders the ground where a loved one died or where they were fatal injured has become sacred to them and function as holy ground (Clark & Franzmann 2006, Everett 2000, Larson-Miller 2005). It is a place “for purposes other than those of daily practical use” (Larson-Miller 2005, p.13). This can be illustrated by interviewees who called the monument an altar and a pilgrimage site, the latest referring to all the flowers and many visitors, just after the accident took place. Also other stories indicate the emotional and spiritual significance of these micro sacred sites.

When I'm with [him] something happens all the time. When it rains everywhere, the sun shines over there and often a feather lies next to his stone. I see that as a sign of [him] (mother, ESTA).

Every time we pass by, we use our horn as a way to greet. We are not religious, but sometimes you hear that spirits keep wondering around, where people have deceased. That is why I do it. Friends of ours do it as well, others flash their lights (father, ESTA).

The roadside memorials are not only sacred sites for family and friends but also for others, for example in one case a foreign neighbor, that is hardly known, stops and prays when he passes the site. Not all members of the community acknowledge the importance of roadside memorials.

People were complaining: “when will the attraction go away [...]?” “When will the henhouse be removed?” We were there every night and they thought it was disturbance. I was really angry. Very disrespectful (mother).

There are other indications that underline the holiness character. The memorial itself and personal objects and mementos placed at the sites are physical evidence of sacredness, because it distinguish the locations from profane space (Richardson 2001). Almost all the respondents' memorials include personal items, beside a limited number which are visited less often. The interviewees told that it is important that the site is a personalized place in honor of the deceased. Often a ceremony introduces and disassociates the place from profane space (Foote 1997). At almost all the sites, established by the respondents, there was a kind of ceremony, ranging from private commemoration with only family member, to a more public event. In one case the site was visit by more than hundred persons for a commemoration.

Cleaning, mowing and maintaining the site is another way to disassociate the ordinary landscape of the roadside, furthermore it suggests a sense of sacredness (Clark & Franzmann 2006). Almost all the establishers visited the sites regularly partly for maintenance. This way, some mothers explain, they are able to “do something” for the deceased. In one case, a memorial, which was erected by parents, is maintained by the best friend of their deceased son. This friend was driving the car in which the victim and he were involved in an accident. He survived the accident, but unfortunately his best friend died. To take care of the site is a way to do something for his dead friend.

Religious pilgrimage, the movement of individuals away from their everyday life, is seen by Turner (1974) as a liminal phenomena. He perceives pilgrimage landscape as liminal landscapes. Every roadside memorial marks the location where someone died usually in an automobile accident (Weisser 2004) and is a reminder of a transformative event (Leimer 1998). This event is linked with the concept of liminality which is used in anthropology to indicate an intermediate state that a person could be in when going through a transition with significant personal rites de passages (Van Gennep 1908). Classically, “liminality occurs when people are in transition from one culturally defined stage in the life-cycle to another” (Shields 1991, p.83). The passage from life to death is an extreme interpretation of the liminal and deathscapes may also be considered as liminal places where this ultimate passage occurred. Beside this transformation, the micro sacred sites are also liminal for the bereaved, as the interviewees indicate that their lives are irreparably changed by the death of the person they love. Many liminal spaces inherent qualities of transformation and rites de passage (Winchester, Kong & Dunn 2003). The stories of the memorial builders indicate that the establishment and the visits are part of the grief process, which we see as part of a personal transformation.

The accident site itself can also be seen as a liminal space. As the fatal accident has occurred, the site transforms from ordinary space, to a place to which individuals attach special (sacred) meaning. The place can turn back to ordinary space again when the location is cleaned. Nevertheless this will not prevent the bereaved from attaching special meaning to the location as their loved one died at that spot.

According to Collins & Rhine (2003), repeated visits to roadside memorials are related to site-sacredness and can be considered as ‘pilgrimage-like’. This can be illustrated by several sites where candles were kept burning every day; sometimes for several years. In some cases the candles were replaced by lamps working on solar energy. by the girlfriend and the mother of the deceased. Therefore they need to visit the site every day. A large majority of the respondents indicate that they visit the site regularly. Sometimes the visits are organized, at the date of the accident or birthday of the victim.

Another way to distinguish and personalize these spaces at the side of the road is through decorations. The roadside memorials are decorated through the year, but especially at particular days. The date of the accident and the birthday of the victim are most important, although some bereaved decorate the marker at Christmas or with Easter also. In one case the expected birthday of the unborn baby of a deceased daughter is of special meaning.

Roadside memorials versus other commemoration sites

Roadside memorials do not stand on their own, but are part of a dynamic memory network (Everett 2000). This network of commemoration sites, which may include a grave, urn, former bedroom, differ for individuals and also the meaning attached to it. The bereaved perceive the site of the roadside memorial as the last place where their loved one was alive and the grave as the place where the body is laid to rest. However, the attachment of meaning differs, which is illustrated by the next quotation.

To [his] friends, this is the place where he was last alive. But to me, it fully symbolizes his death. Therefore I never drive that road. And I never visit the monument (mother, ESTA).

The majority of the respondents buried the deceased, and a slightly larger number value this commemoration site more than the roadside memorial. There are different reasons behind the preference in favor of the cemetery instead of the roadside memorial. First, the mourners are confronted with the accident and death at the site of the roadside memorial. A widow explains in an interview that she hardly visits the roadside memorial, because that is the site where her husband was last alive. She experiences the cemetery as a place of calmness, without negative associations. The location of the roadside memorial influences the establishers' sense of place. Several mothers explained that they do not prefer the roadside memorial as main commemoration site, as it is situated in public space, in some cases along a busy dangerous road, without any privacy. This illustrates the interrelation of Agnew's concepts of place: location and sense of place.

However, not all the respondents attached more meaning to the cemetery compared with the roadside memorial. In some cases the connection with the deceased is experienced stronger at the roadside memorial. There death is displayed in the heart of social life and deceased individuals are placed back into everyday life as it is being lived (Santino 2004). The next interviewee illustrates this:

But this is the last place where [he] was alive, where he has been. I don't know if it has to do with the fact that he cycled and walked here for all those years. Just a part that belongs to you; a part of his life (mother).

A mother explains that she prefers the roadside memorial, as she experiences negative feelings at the graveyard. It reminds her of her dead son lying in a casket. Hartig & Dunn (1998) argue that the rules, regulation and strict requirements of cemeteries, which actually hinder the process of grief (Petersson 2006), may additionally have caused the increase of roadside memorials. One father, who prefers the memorial over the cemetery, talks about the institutional character of the burial ground.

That is an official place [cemetery], where he is supposed to lay. In fact what is assigned, here he should lay. The monument has more to do with [him]. At the cemetery, his body may be, but that is not the way he was (father).

A friend explains that the openings hours of the cemetery make him visit the roadside memorial more often. In the literature much is written about the rules and regulations at the cemeteries versus the personal non-institutionalized space of the roadside markers. However, the stories of the roadside memorial builders indicate rules and regulations concerning the establishment of the marker itself and ultimately the size and shape of it. Also regulations can be given after the establishment, for example not to burn candles at the site to avoid forest-fires. On the other hand, one family placed a large grave monument in the shape of a castle, which does not correspond with the strong regulations that were expected at cemeteries from the literature. The importance of the roadside memorial may also be connected with the recent and current popularity of cremation in the West. If the ashes are spread out, the family has no longer a personalized space to visit (Hartig & Dunn 1998, Collins & Rhine 2003). The roadside memorial may be a replacement (Hartig & Dunn 1998). A respondent whose friend is cremated agrees with this.

Of course, that has everything to do with it. That is, let I put it this way, everyone wants to go to a place to let things go. Well if you don't have such a place, where can you go? You can go to the cemetery, but you won't find anything there (friend).

One establisher, whose son died in a car accident with his friend, acknowledges that the site has more importance for the parents of the friend who was cremated. However, our study points out that cremation does not immediately mean that there is no personalized space to visit. The parents of two cremated sisters bought a grave to place the ash, so they could have a place to visit. In two other cases the urn had been placed at a cemetery.

Although, a majority of the interviewees indicates that one commemoration site might be more important than another, each site serves its own purpose. The meaning attached to the different sites are not static, but may change over time.

First I hated that road along the canal. Now, I've started to see it as his place (mother).

In one case the father of the deceased attaches the same meaning to the grave and the memorial. He said: "they belong together". Everett (2000) indicates "a strong connection between activity at a death-site memorial and at the site of interment" (p.91). This is also found in our study, where the visits to the burial ground and the memorial are frequently combined. In one case the design of the roadside memorial and the grave were both in the same 'fantasy' style, because the deceased loved fantasy games.

Beside these commemoration sites, also additional places are part of the dynamic memory network of the respondents. For example an urn in the living room, a bench at the cemetery, a home memorial and a bedroom. The parents of a deceased boy explain that they attach different meanings to the roadside memorial, urn at the cemetery and the home memorial. Feelings of anger and sadness dominate at the memorial, the cemetery evokes feelings of calmness, and the home memorial is especially for the mother of great importance. Another father, who also lost his son, explains the meaning of his son's bedroom and roadside memorial in comparison with the cemetery:

For example, I'm rather at his bedroom, surrounded by his things. Then I feel close to him. That's also what I feel at that place [roadside memorial]. That's not what I feel at the cemetery (father).

Locale

Agnew (1987) also consider place as a setting for social interaction. In this paper we argue that roadside memorials are part of a wide communication network with different 'actors' involved, for example the deceased, the bereaved and the public. Roadside memorials are places where communication between the dead and the living may occur (Santino 2004), which enable a personal transformation of the bereaved and makes the site liminal. The communication possibility between the living and dead is illustrated by

the next quotation.

I go there regularly to talk to [him] for a short while (father, ESTA).

The memorial is also a way to communicate with other bereaved through the placement of personal items at the site or by maintaining it. In some cases this contact with other bereaved occurs in a very practical way. One mother wants to place a note at the memorial to get in contact with an old classmate of her daughter who had placed a butterfly and note at the site before. The note of the classmate is a way to communicate with the deceased. Another interviewee received an invitation to attend the national day of remembrance for road traffic victims at the memorial.

When passersby are confronted with a roadside memorial, a marker of death, it communicates to them, that something terrible has happened at that spot. This way, the memorial builders send a message out into the world and enable to communicate about the deceased (Reid & Reid 2001). The establishment can also be erected to communicate anger and reverence to the person who caused the accident. One case is known, where the bereaved have build a memorial next to the farm where their young daughter was killed in a tractor accident. The farmer, who lives at this farm, had driven the tractor and is confronted with the death marker every day.

The memorials, which are situated in public space, invite “participation from others, even from strangers. They are open to the public” (Santino 2004, p.369). Some bereaved have been approached by strangers, while they were cleaning and maintaining the roadside memorial, or in their daily life, for example at work. This way of communication is experienced as very positive by the builders as they do not want the deceased to be forgotten.

When I’m there, it occurs that cyclist or pedestrians approach you and ask: “What is your relationship with him, I mean we come here often”. “I am the mother”. Then you have a whole conversation with them. And that feels really good. It’s a way to start a conversation, about what happened. And I like to talk about [him], preferably day and night.

Even the media, newspapers and documentary makers, or researchers approached the memorial builders in a number of cases.

Conclusions

The last conference we attended, we were asked why geographers are interested in roadside memorials. We answered that geographers are concerned with places and people’s emotional attachment to it. This paper provides an answer to this question as three interrelated concepts of place, distinguished by Angnew, are applied to the phenomenon of roadside memorials. We were able to do so, however our study shows, some clear interrelations between the different concepts of place. The concepts of location and sense of place could almost not exist without each other. One’s *sense of place* is strongly related with the *location* of the accident. In this paper we argue that

roadside memorials are part of wide communication network. The monuments are not static markers that inform passersby of the tragedy that has happened at that place, but they are *locale*: settings for social interaction.

Not all our findings correspond with international studies of roadside memorials. It is written that the increase of non-institutionalized roadside memorials can be explained by the strict regulations at cemeteries. This is not confirmed by our study. On the contrary, regulations for the establishment of the roadside memorial itself are discussed mainly by the interviewees, while regulations at cemeteries are never mentioned.

In the literature it is also mentioned that the recent and current popularity of cremation in the West can be an explanation of the increase of roadside memorials. When the ashes are spread out, the family has no place to visit. This argument is partly confirmed by the respondents. However cremation does not immediately mean that there is no place to visit. The ashes can be placed in a grave or in a wall at the cemetery.

References

- Agnew, J. A., 1987, *Place and politics: the geographical mediation of state and society*, Boston and London, Allen and Unwin.
- Auster, M. 1997, "Monument in a landscape: the question of 'meaning'", *Australian Geographer*, vol. 28, no. 2.
- Clark, J. & Franzmann, M. 2006, "Authority from grief, presence and place in the making of roadside memorials", *Death Studies*, vol. 30, pp. 579-599.
- Collins, C. O. & Rhine, C. D. 2003, "Roadside memorials", *Omega*, vol. 47, pp. 221-244.
- Everett, H. 2000, "Roadside crosses and memorial complexes in Texas", *Folklore*, vol. 111, no. 1, pp. 91-102.
- Foote, K. E., 1997, *Shadowed ground: America's landscape of violence and tragedy*, Austin, Texas, University of Texas Press.
- Hartig, K. V. & Dunn, K. M. 1998, "Roadside memorials: interpreting new deathscapes in Newcastle, New South Wales", *Australian Geographical Studies*, vol. 36, pp. 5-21.
- Klaassens, M., Groote, P. D., & Huigen, P. P. P. 2007, *Interrupted journeys: roadside memorials in The Netherlands*, Paper presented at the 8th DDD conference, Bath, UK, September 12-15 2007.
- Kong, L. 1999, "Cemeteries and columbaria, memorials and mausoleums: narrative and interpretation in the study of deathscapes in Geography", *Australian Geographical Studies*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 1-10.
- Larson-Miller, L. 2005, "Holy ground: roadside shrines and sacred space", *America*, vol. 192, no. 18, p. 11.
- Leimer, C., 1998, *Roadside memorials: marking journeys never completed*, The Tombstone Traveller's Guide.
- Petersson, A. 2006, *A proper place of death?*, Paper presented at the annual symposium of the Nordic Association for Architectural Research 2006: Architects, agents of change in the 21st century?
- Reid, J. & Reid, C. 2001, "A cross marks the spot: a study of roadside death memorials in Texas and Oklahoma", *Death Studies*, vol. 25, pp. 341-356.

- Richardson, M. 2001, "The gift of presence: the act of leaving artifacts at shrines, memorials and other tragedies," in *Textures of Place: Exploring Humanist Geographies*, S. Hoelscher, P. C. Adams, & K. E. Till, eds., Minneapolis, University of Minneapolis Press, pp. 257-272.
- Rijkswaterstaat 2005, *Veiligheidsbalans 2005*, Ministerie van Verkeer en Waterstaat.
- Ross, C. 1998, "Roadside memorials: public policy vs. private expression", *American City & county*, vol. 113, pp. 50-53.
- Santino, J. 2004, "Performative commemoratives, the personal, and the public: spontaneous shrines, emergent ritual, and the field of folklore", *Journal of American Folklore*, vol. 117, no. 466, pp. 363-372.
- Schmidt, K. 2000, "Roadside memorials spark religious freedom dispute", *Christianity Today*, vol. 44, no. 4, p. 20.
- Shields, R., 1991, *Places on the margin: alternative geographies of modernity*, London, Routledge.
- Stengs, I. 2005, *Individual and collective memorials: different strategies in mourning traffic victims in The Netherlands*, Paper presented at the 7th DDD conference, Bath, UK, September 15-18, 2005.
- Tuan, Y.-F. 1996, "Space and place: humanistic perspective.," in *Human Geography: An Essential Anthology*, J. Agnew, D. N. Livingstone, & A. Rogers, eds., Oxford, Blackwell Publisher's Inc, pp. 84-99.
- Turner, V., 1974, *Dramas, fields and metaphors*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Van Gennep, 1908, *Rites de passage*, Paris, Nourry.
- Weisser, J. 2004, *Micro sacred sites: the spatial pattern of roadside memorials in Warren County, Ohio*, University of Cincinnati.
- Winchester, H. P. M., Kong, L., & Dunn, K., 2003, *Landscapes; ways of imagining the world*, Harlow, Pearson Education Limited.
- ESTA, February 12 – February 25, 2007. "Berm-monumenten".
- De Telegraaf*, October 31, 2001. "Brabantse Bladel honoreert voortaan verzoeken nabestaanden van verkeersdoden - bermmonument eindelijk welkom".
- Trouw*, October 4, 2006. "Een beetje klungelen met nieuwe rituelen; Religiewetenschap".