It has been observed that many of the places that people frequent in their daily lives eventually become linked to memory. Places such as classrooms, family homes, cafes and stadiums, often hold meaning because of people's experiences that take place within them, other than only their physical location. Eventually, people may become attached with the relationships, routines and significant moments that occurred in those places. Therefore physical environments can become closely attached to memory, identity and a sense of belonging to a community.

The idea of collective memory offers a foundation for understanding the relationship between memory and the environment. The Sociologist Maurice Halbwachs argues that memory is not constructed individually, but is shaped through social contexts and shared experiences within groups. Halbwachs argues "it is in society that people normally acquire their memories" (Halbwachs.) This implies that people tend to remember events in connection with others in a specific environment, meaning that places play a crucial role in the creation of memories. When people have similar experiences in the same place, it becomes a shared memory, contributing to a community's identity.

In addition to collective memory, the concept of place attachment helps explain why certain places become emotionally significant to people. Environmental psychology studies have shown that people form emotional attachments to certain places after being exposed to them repeatedly and during meaningful experiences (Smith et al.). As a result, everyday places such as homes, schools, and social gathering areas become connected to their personal identity and sense of belonging, becoming meaningful based on the experiences people have in them.

Everyday places can also be significant because they provide a site of social interaction, which increases these places' contributions to the formation of collective memory. Sociological studies on third places, which include informal social places like cafes and community gathering

areas, shows that people tend to interact and form social connections in these places. According to Oldenburg, “third places are a place of refuge… where people can regularly visit and commute” (Mehta and Bosson.) These spaces provide a chance for individuals to interact with others and create shared experiences, through interactions, the spaces are associated with collective memories, making them significant beyond their physical purpose.

However, the impact of daily spaces on memory is not only limited to shared memories. Physical places can also be an emotional trigger. Steven M Smith and Edward Vela’s Psychological meta-analysis “Environmental context-dependent memory: A review and meta-analysis” suggests that memory is linked to context. This means that returning to a specific place can cause the recall of past experiences and feelings, making daily spaces responsible for evoking emotional responses. These evokings can be associated with feelings of nostalgia, warmth, sadness, or even grief. For some individuals these spaces are a way to reconnect to memories and past experiences. For others, these spaces may be associated with negative emotional responses, by triggering the remembrance of bad moments or the bittersweet feeling of the recall of good moments but the let go of those same memories.

Despite the significant connection between physical places and memory, it is important to consider the extent to which spaces impact memory. In today’s society, online communities and digital interactions are also becoming spaces for shared experiences and memory. This indicates that virtual spaces can provide people with the opportunity to connect, communicate and form relevant relationships even without physical proximity. Impling that even though physical spaces in daily life contribute to the development of collective memories, there are other environments now that can also contribute to collective memories as well. Therefore, everyday common spaces

contribute significantly to the formation of collective memory by providing environments for people to share experiences, become emotionally attached to each other, and interact socially.

A great example of how physical common places influences the community and eventually the collective memory of a community is local coffee shops, where the local community frequent in their daily lives, whether to grab a coffee and read a book, work, study, meetings, interviews or just hang out. A local coffee shop is one of the most common "third places" in modern society, most cities have at least one local coffee shop, either being a global brand coffee shop as Starbucks or even an independent small coffee shop. In the AP Capstone stimulus "Spaces of consumption, connection, and community: Exploring the role of coffee shops in urban lives" coffee shops are not seen as just commercial establishments, but rather as spaces that facilitate connection and interaction in the community. The stimulus describes them as spaces where people can "connect, communicate, and participate in the social life of the city" (Ferreira et al.) In these spaces, individuals can engage in personal and social activities, creating opportunities for repeated interactions within the people attending the coffee shop. This eventually also contributes to the formation of shared experiences that lead to a collective memory. The value of these spaces are in the consistent flow of people and the interactions formed in there.

One of the best examples of how everyday spaces are attached in the lives and routines of individuals, and contributing directly to the formation of memory, is the concept of coffee shops. When attending the same coffee shop becomes a part of an individual's routine, they develop an attachment to the particular space, based on the memories they create there. So the coffee shop not only becomes a location for the individual but also it becomes an environment associated with memories. In addition, these spaces can also contribute to collective memory by bringing

individuals from different backgrounds together, sharing the same space. Even though interactions may be brief or indirect, only the action of occupying the same space can create a feeling of connection or association, making these individuals feel like they are part of a community. This shows that the construction of collective memory is not only built by significant events, but also through everyday interactions in shared spaces.

However, coffee shops and common spaces are important to build collective memory, the real significance of these kinds of places are based on the daily interactions within them. So if these spaces lose their significance in the daily routine, the collective memory weakens over time. Understanding that it is clear that it is not the space alone, but the interactions within the space that contribute to the construction of memory.

In the AP Capstone Stimulus “Dad, Ballpark will live on in shared memories” by Ann Killion, the story focuses on the emotional connection between a father and daughter and their experiences at the Candlestick Park. The author explains how they used to go to the ballpark together and attend games, how he would endure weather conditions, wait days to see the first world series in there, and listen to broadcasts of games taking place in the park. These activities became meaningful moments related to the stadium. Over time, this frequent association with the ballpark transformed the park into a symbol of connection between individuals, In this context, Killion explains that “the ballpark will live on in shared memories” (Killion.) This indicates that the importance of a physical location lies in the experiences that take place within that location.

The interesting thing about this particular example is how this experience is remembered after they are no longer occurring. The stadium is meaningful in remembrance, as memories gain more value over time. This brings up the idea that daily common places contribute to collective

memory not only during the moment of interaction, but also during remembering, where past experiences are given greater emotional value.

Furthermore, in this example, we can see how physical space can influence emotional responses in diverse ways. One space that once represented familiarity in the past, can come to represent a sense of absence and evoke feelings of grief when those moments are no longer available. Then we can see how the stadium becomes not only tied to memory, but also to the realization of change, where individuals are reminded of relationships, experiences, or periods of life that have passed. This shows us that not only do daily spaces influence community memory, but also how those memories are experienced in an emotional way over time, introducing the idea of nostalgia and grief in the creation of community memory.

Following this emotional aspect, the role of grief between memory and place becomes significant. Although everyday common spaces may hold significant memories, they can also intensify the experience of grief, depending on the way in which individuals relate to those memories over time. Places with significant emotional connections may not remain neutral, they can become tied to the presence or absence of people and experiences. As a result, returning or remaining in spaces after a turning point event might evoke various emotional responses, such as nostalgia or emotional pain. This suggests that the association between space and memory is not necessarily a positive experience, but it depends on the emotional experience of the individual. Making common everyday spaces also capable of influencing how memories are felt, particularly in moments of grief.

This emotional complexity can be seen in the cultural production “Hamnet”(Zhao.), which portrays a period in the life of William Shakespeare and his family after the loss of their son Hamnet. In the film, the family house becomes a space related to memory and grief. In the

mother's case, the house becomes a space in which the memory of her child continues to exist, increasing her emotional attachment to the space. In the case of Shakespeare, he cannot stay in the same space because it becomes a reminder of his loss. This contrast shows that the same space can cause opposite responses depending on how one handles their grief. The space becomes a reflection of their internal emotional states, reinforcing that a place can both preserve connection and intensify emotions, good or bad.

Physiological research supports the idea that grief can impact an individual's relationship with a place. Research on relocated persons has shown that the loss of a place can impact their emotional well-being. According to the research on Syrian immigrants "feelings of low self-esteem and self-efficacy [that] severely impact a displaced individual's ability to identify with their new neighborhood"(Alirhayim.) This supports that grief can impact a place because it is not only a physical loss, but an emotional and physical loss. Additionally, the loss of a place is associated with "sadness and despair"(Alirhayim.), which impacts the individual's ability to connect with new places. In this way, places become deeply tied to identity, specifically and when they are lost or associated with grief.

This emotional connection between grief and place is further supported by research on memorial spaces, showing the role of space in individual and collective grief. Memorials have been identified as spaces that "establish sites for collective grief and ritual commemoration".(de Luna and Wagoner.) This highlights how these physical locations are used in favor of process loss and emotional experience. In this context a place is not just a location, but a place where individuals can reflect on the past, feel the absence and give a meaning to loss. This helps to reinforce the argument that a place's emotional responses are shaped through an individual's experiences. Similar to the contrast seen in Hamnet (Zhao.), where the same space creates

different responses, memorial spaces also make individuals interact with loss differently from each other, based on their personal experiences with loss. Therefore, places do not only preserve memory, but they also influence grief, loss, nostalgia, identity, belonging, sadness is expressed, and shared within a community.

Overall, it can be said that everyday spaces have a major role in the formation of collective memory, but the outcome of their influence is not constant. Because, even though daily common spaces offer a foundation for shared experiences and emotional attachment, the way individuals relate with these places evolve based on their individual experiences. As demonstrated, the same place can offer comfort, identity, association, absence or loss. This variety highlights that the role of everyday common spaces in the creation and development of collective memory is always influenced by emotional contexts. Additionally, the rise of digital communities suggests that physical spaces are no longer the only environment where shared experiences occur. Therefore, while common daily spaces play a major role in shaping collective memory, their impact is shaped by emotional experiences, personal context, and multiple forms of social interaction.

In conclusion, everyday common spaces play an important role and have a great impact on collective memory, creating spaces for shared experiences, social interactions and emotional connections. However, the impact of everyday spaces on collective memory is not limited to the creation of memory, as they also affect people’s emotional reaction and interpretation of their memories over time. The coffee shops, stadiums, and personal environments examples make it clear that the meaning of a place is not determined by its physical structure, but by people's experiences and emotional connections with the space. Making everyday spaces contribute to collective memory to a great extent.

Works Cited

Alirhayim, Rashad. “Full article: Place attachment in the context of loss and displacement: The case of Syrian immigrants in Esenyurt, Istanbul.” *Journal of Urban Affairs*, vol. 42, no. 2, 2023, pp. 381–403. *Taylor & Francis online*, https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2023.2180378. Accessed 26 March 2026.

de Luna, Ignacio Brescó, and Brady Wagoner. “The psychology of memorial sites: Space, design and visitor experience.” *Current Opinion in Psychology*, vol. 66, 2025. *ScienceDirect*, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352250X25001575. Accessed 26 March 2026.

Ferreira, Jennifer, et al. “Spaces of consumption, connection, and community: Exploring the role of the coffee shop in urban lives.” *Geoforum*, vol. 119, 2021, pp. 21-29. Accessed 23 February 2026.

Halbwachs, Maurice. *The Social Frameworks of Memory*. 1st ed., Paris, Librairie Félix Alcan, 1925, https://www.willbrehm.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Halbwachs-1952.pdf. 1 vols. Accessed 22 March 2026.

Killion, Ann. “Dad, Ballpark Will Live on in Shared Memories.” *SF Gate*, 2013. Accessed 23 February 2026.

Mehta, Vikas, and Jennifer K. Bosson. “Third Places and the Social Life of Streets.” *ArticleEnvironment and Behavior*, vol. 46, no. 6, 2010, pp. 779-805. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249624412_Third_Places_and_the_Social_Life_of_Streets. Accessed 21 March 2026.

Smith, Steven M., et al. “Environmental context-dependent memory: A review and meta-analysis.” *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2001, pp. 203-220. Accessed 22 March 2026

Zhao, Chloé, director. *Hamnet*. Hera Pictures, 2025. Accessed 26 March 2026.