

# 1 Cultural Mapping as Cultural Inquiry

## Introduction to an Emerging Field of Practice

*Nancy Duxbury, W.F. Garrett-Petts,  
and David MacLennan*

The Amazon Conservation Team's manual on the *Methodology of Collaborative Cultural Mapping* (2008) speaks with a certainty of purpose that has become commonplace among proponents of community-led cultural mapping initiatives. "Mapping, managing, and protecting," says the Indigenous Brazilian research team, are the three interconnected processes required to safeguard the environment and strengthen culture, and each of these processes takes form through community leadership, collective discussion, and strategic collaboration (p. 4). Self-reflection and sharing, too, are central to the ethos of cultural mapping in Indigenous communities—for the impulse here is both political and pedagogical. The Team's manual on methodology argues eloquently that "when a community is able to systematically articulate and represent its knowledge of its lands, it gains the necessary tools to establish laws, manage productive systems, implement protection methodologies and improve its quality of life" (p. 4).

Mapmaking and the application of maps in territories have a long history, entangled with exploration, colonialism, and political control (see, e.g., Harley, 1989; Edney, 1997; Hostettler, 2001; Craib, 2004; Pickles, 2004; Santos, 2007), as well as pandisciplinary intellectual efforts to envision, understand, critique, and utilize various forms of information (see, e.g., Tutfe, 1983, 1990; Dalton and Thatcher, 2014). Maps have been used for many purposes: for wayfinding and navigation; for archiving and classifying geographic and ethnographic information; as aesthetic objects; to identify and manage social problems; in strategies of territorial management and control; and "for establishing various claims to truth and authority" (Cosgrove, 2008, p. 9).

In recent decades, the theoretical foundations of mapping and other forms of spatial representation have been repeatedly challenged, creating what some regard as a crisis of representation (see, e.g., Pickles, 2004). Contemporary critiques of cartographic theory and praxis are illuminating diverse relations among physical, conceived, represented, and lived social space (Lefebvre, 1991) and epistemological diversities and knowledges of

## 2 Nancy Duxbury, W. F. Garrett-Petts, and David MacLennan

place (e.g., Santos, 2007; Pearce and Louis, 2008). They are also influencing how mapmakers/users approach the work of community empowerment and governance processes and how they investigate the lived experience of space and place.

### WHAT IS CULTURAL MAPPING?

Cultural mapping, broadly conceived, promises new ways of describing, accounting for, and coming to terms with the cultural resources of communities and places. The Creative City Network of Canada's *Cultural Mapping Toolkit* (Stewart, 2007) defines cultural mapping pragmatically as "a process of collecting, recording, analyzing and synthesizing information in order to describe the cultural resources, networks, links and patterns of usage of a given community or group" (p. 8). From this perspective, cultural mapping is regarded as a systematic tool to involve communities in the identification and recording of local cultural assets, with the implication that this knowledge will then be used to inform collective strategies, planning processes, or other initiatives. These assets are both *tangible*, or quantitative (e.g., physical spaces, cultural organizations, public forms of promotion and self-representation, public art, cultural industries, natural and cultural heritage, architecture, people, artifacts, and other material resources) and *intangible*, or qualitative (e.g., values and norms, beliefs and philosophies, language, community narratives, histories and memories, relationships, rituals, traditions, identities, and shared sense of place). Together, these assets help define communities (and help communities define themselves) in terms of cultural identity, vitality, sense of place, and quality of life.

Cultural mapping is a practical, participatory planning and development tool, one endorsed by UNESCO (see "Indigenous Mapping" later in this chapter) and made both methodical and readily available through a growing number of manuals, handbooks, guides, and toolkits (see, e.g., Amazon Conservation Team, 2008; Teaiwa and Mercer, 2011; Pillai, 2013; and Evans, Chapter 2 in this volume, for additional examples). Cultural mapping has been used to create bridges of communication and has served as a catalyst in building (research and societal) relationships and collaborations. In the context of the contemporary "participation revolution" in governance internationally (Benhabib, 1996; Davidoff, 1996; Elster, 1998; Fung and Wright, 2003) and its central belief that a key measure of good governance is the extent and quality of public involvement in governance processes, cultural mapping's participatory dimension has heightened its attractiveness as a community engagement methodology.

Cultural mapping is also an emerging mode of research (an "alternative discourse") that can serve as a point of entry into theoretical debates about the nature of spatial knowledge and spatial representations. "A map" as Lynne Liben (2006) puts it, "has a dual existence: It *is* something and it

*stands for something*” (p. 216). The maps reproduced in this volume stand for cultural assets, memories, patterns, and processes, but they are also *things in themselves*, influenced by new technologies and by new levels of spatial awareness across many different fields of inquiry. Further, as Kitchin, Perkins, and Dodge (2009) point out, mapping is not only epistemological, it is also “deeply ontological”: mapping is “both a way of thinking about the world, offering a framework for knowledge, and a set of assertions about the world itself” (p. 2). Mapping as a mode of research, then, reflexively “affords the potential to be critically revealing of the processes of enclosure, partitioning, coding and ranking . . . of experience through the research process itself” (Mannion and Ivanič, 2007, p. 19).

Cultural mapping, an inherently interdisciplinary phenomenon, openly invites the study of alternative research methods and their evolving roles in intellectual and community-based work. Perhaps best described as *hybrid, mixed, multimodal, or alternative* discourse, this visual/verbal research mode (or combination of modes) uses the map and its associated texts as legitimate forms for academic and public inquiry, cultural advocacy, and knowledge mobilization. Cultural mapping may be seen both as a social practice and a methodological point of intersection informing academic research, local governance, and community empowerment and change—with mapping processes creating place-embedded symbolic tools and resources to both support and guide these processes.

The interdisciplinary and collaborative nature of this practice seems intimately connected to changing notions of authorship and agency, an increased interest in intercultural collaboration, the advent of new media technologies, the trend toward community–university research alliances, the spatial turn in social and critical theory,<sup>1</sup> the conceptual framework offered by theories of “situated literacies” (Barton, Hamilton, and Ivanič, 2000), and renewed interest in the rhetoric and practice of community engagement. Its underlying methodological foundations of working with data—creating, selecting, compiling, organizing, assessing, and presenting—are linked to a wide variety of social science, humanist, and cartographical approaches.

## ORIGINS, INFLUENCES, AND PATHWAYS

Although a comprehensive history of this emerging field seems premature, an interdisciplinary literature review allows us to observe the main approaches to cultural mapping and some of the forces that have shaped its development as an insightful form of cultural inquiry. The evolution of cultural mapping intertwines academic and artistic research with policy, planning, and advocacy imperatives and contexts. Five main trajectories of cultural mapping practice or “use-contexts” have influenced its current methodological contours and practices: community empowerment and

#### 4 *Nancy Duxbury, W. F. Garrett-Petts, and David MacLennan*

counter-mapping, cultural policy, municipal governance, mapping as artistic practice, and academic inquiry.

### **Community Empowerment/Counter-Mapping**

This trajectory intertwines cultural mapping in Indigenous communities and territories with broader community development and collective action traditions concerning subversive, radical, and counter-cartographies, or “alternative maps”; community mapping, place mapping, citizen cartographies, and people’s atlases; and mapping for change. All of these counter-mapping traditions generally seek to incorporate alternative knowledges and alternative senses of space and place into mapping processes. As Crawhall (2007) points out, the goal of these types of cultural maps is not only to oppose dominant perspectives but, potentially, to build bridges to them as well:

From its inception, cultural mapping has been understood to act as a bridge between subordinated or marginalised voices and those in a dominant position, usually those who have the power to make certain types of decisions, whether it be the State, influential ethnic groups or the private sector. Cultural mapping is the exercise of representing a previously unrepresented world view or knowledge system in a tangible and understandable geo-referenced medium. (p. 11)

These foundations have propelled practices of cultural mapping in contexts of uneven power relations and in the service of articulating marginalized voices and perspectives in society. They are considered to be part of the traditions of critical cartography (see Johnson, Louis, and Pramono, 2005; Crampton and Krygier, 2006)

### ***Indigenous Mapping***

While Indigenous peoples have long engaged in diverse forms of mapmaking (see, e.g., Johnson, Louis, and Pramono, 2005; Pearce and Louis, 2008), the practice of cultural mapping with Indigenous peoples is generally dated to the 1960s in the Canadian and Alaskan Arctic. These experiences were soon taken up by the Union of B.C. Indian Chiefs in British Columbia, Canada (Brody, 1981), by Aboriginal peoples in Australia, by Maya in Central America (see, e.g., Toledo Maya, 1977), by Indigenous peoples in the Philippines and of the rain forests of Brazil, and then spread to other areas of the planet (Crawhall, 2007). Collectively, these experiences form the basis for UNESCO’s interest in cultural mapping, which has been explicit for some time, primarily in the context of the cultural rights and cultural security of indigenous peoples<sup>2</sup> and, more recently, its 2005 Convention on Cultural Diversity and growing interest in intercultural dialogue.

In a 2003 report for UNESCO, Peter Poole pointed out that for Indigenous peoples, mapping has become a tool for recovering control of lost

territory, negotiating access rights to traditional resources, or defending recognized territories against indiscriminate resource extraction. Known as *tenure mapping*, such maps are “generated in the course of conversations within communities and travel over the territory” and typically show local names, traditional resources, seasonal movements and activities, and special places (p. 13). Poole views these tenure maps as cultural maps. The only distinction between tenure and cultural maps, he argues, is in the way they are used: The purpose of tenure maps is to focus on cultural connections that can be placed on a map to emphatically and precisely illustrate the historic and cultural linkages between Indigenous peoples and their ancestral territories, while cultural mapping is focused on *cultural vitalization*.

In the context of growing recognition that significant aspects of culture are contained in the intangible dimensions of cultural practices and knowledge systems, UNESCO views cultural mapping as a means to “transform the intangible and invisible into a medium that can be applied to heritage management, education and intercultural dialogue” (Crawhall, 2007, p. 6). As the example of the Amazon Conservation Team also attests, the general focus here is on cultural mapping as a tool in community empowerment through facilitating the recognition, safeguarding, and use of cultural resources—especially intangible cultural resources—in the context of development, planning, and, often, cultural tourism strategies. Practice has been advanced through the sharing of experiences among these cultural mapping projects. For example, in a 2006 UNESCO workshop entitled *Cultural Mapping as a Tool for Community Involvement in Shaping Future Development*, held in Havana, Cuba, participants discussed lessons learned and ethical guidelines that have arisen in cultural mapping projects among Indigenous and First Nation peoples in Canada, New Zealand, the Philippines, Fijian islands, and South Africa. This resulted in the *Havana Communiqué on Cultural Mapping* (UNESCO, 2006), which articulates ethical and process concerns and good practice guidelines.

UNESCO leadership in this area has influenced mapping initiatives by other development-related agencies and organizations. This is illustrated, for example, in the International Institute for Environment and Development’s 2006 publication “Mapping for Change” (Ashley, Kenton, and Milligan, 2006), a special issue of *Participatory Learning and Action* based on a conference in Nairobi, Kenya, which demonstrated the widespread practice of community mapping in development situations. Here *community mapping* is defined as a means to represent “a socially or culturally distinct understanding of landscape and include information that is excluded from mainstream maps” and therefore “pose alternatives to the languages and images of the existing power structures” (p. 7). Within this context, *cultural mapping* becomes a means for making intangible heritage and local indigenous knowledge systems more visible and understandable. The collective work argues that cultural mapping—contextualized, community-owned and controlled, and allowing communities (especially elders) to “reflect on their own knowledge and listen to each other”—can “reinforce a community’s

## 6 Nancy Duxbury, W. F. Garrett-Petts, and David MacLennan

consciousness of its specific traditions, resources and institutions, and also of land use practices, education, health, conflict prevention, etc.” and thus enable communities to be better prepared to express their rights, visions, and priorities, especially in the face of development pressures from outside parties (p. 7).<sup>3</sup>

**Counter-Mapping**

*Counter-mapping* refers to a mapmaking process in which “communities challenge the state’s formal maps, appropriate its official techniques of representation, and make their own alternative maps” (Manoff, 2014, no page). Nancy Peluso (1995) introduced the term in her work with Indigenous Indonesian communities, which used counter-maps to claim rights to natural resources and to contest existing state-run systems of management and control. Its recent reemergence as critical practice is linked to the rise of place-based social movements and the use of participatory research methods in the social sciences (Manoff, 2014). It is closely linked to practices of *alter mapping*, the creation of alternative maps, which has come to embrace “any effort that fundamentally questions the assumptions or biases of cartographic conventions, that challenges predominant power effects of mapping, or that engages in mapping in ways that upset power relations” (Harris and Hazen, 2005, p. 115). Both the alter mapping process itself and the visualized map itself are viewed as acts of resistance—“as an attempt to reinvest power at a local level” (Fraley, 2011, p. 426).

Another version of this tradition can be found in Common Ground’s influential *Parish Maps Project* in the U.K. (launched in 1987), which aimed to encourage communities to “chart the familiar things which they value in their own surroundings, and give active expression to their affection for the everyday and commonplace” (Crouch and Matless, 1996, p. 236). The project commissioned artists to lead shared processes of mapmaking and exhibited the maps as a catalyst for community initiatives. Mapping was presented as “a process of self-alerting, putting people on their toes against unwanted change and producing an active sense of community” (p. 236). The project formed part of a wider reworking of mapping that was emerging both within and outside academia at the time (Nash, 1993) and that continues to be influential. Over a decade later, this approach directly inspired the Islands in the Salish Sea Community Atlas project, which took place in 17 island communities on British Columbia’s southwest coast between 1999 and 2003 (Harrington and Stevenson, 2005). As Sheila Harrington, one of the project coordinators, explained:

Maps like these express the interior of a place, rather than the exterior boundaries of territoriality, surveillance and control. They offer an outward portrait of a local intimacy, providing an opportunity to share, to empathize, to know and to care. They are a collective portrait of

a community—a face—expressed beautifully and lovingly, with all the lines and marks of experience and age. (p. 19)

The Islands in the Salish Sea initiative can be considered a case where both rural gentrification and resource extraction projects threatened to privilege a certain development trajectory over others, and counter-mapping was used to define and assert a “counter-vision.”

### Cultural Policy

Influenced by these community-empowerment traditions, Tony Bennett and Colin Mercer (1997), in a background report for UNESCO’s Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development in 1998, identified *cultural mapping* as one of two key vectors for research (the other was cultural industry intelligence) toward improving international cooperation in cultural policy research. Cultural mapping, with its incorporation of both qualitative and quantitative mapping of cultures—“their resources, their values and their uses” (p. 22)—was seen as a catalyst and vehicle for bringing together the academic, community, industry, and government sectors, as well as a fruitful context for the convergence of skills, knowledge, and interests. Following a definition advanced by Maria Langdon, the Indigenous author of a report by Australia’s Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation (1994), cultural mapping was viewed as an activity pursued by communities and their constituent interest groups to identify and record an area’s indigenous cultural practices and resources, as well as other intangibles such as their sense of place and social value. Langdon notes that “subjective experiences, varied social values and multiple readings and interpretations can be accommodated in cultural maps, as can more utilitarian ‘cultural inventories’” (pp. 19–20). The “identified values of culture and place” (p. 20) would then provide the foundation for various strategies and plans in areas such as cultural tourism and eco-tourism, thematic architecture planning, and cultural industries development.

Bennett and Mercer argue that, on one hand, this process would help enhance traditional cultural resources and values and their development in the context of the “copyright industries”; on the other hand, it responds to a place-defining agenda in the context of powerful global information flows. As Manuel Castells (1991) has observed,

local societies . . . must preserve their identities, and build upon their historical roots, regardless of their economic and functional dependence on the space of flows. The symbolic marking of places, the preservation of symbols of recognition, the expression of collective memory in actual practices of communication, are fundamental means by which places may continue to exist as such. (pp. 350–351)

8 *Nancy Duxbury, W. F. Garrett-Petts, and David MacLennan*

In this context, Bennett and Mercer maintain, cultural mapping is “more than a methodology for the sake of it”; they define it instead as an approach to research in a “transformed cultural terrain” that responds to “urgent new and integrally connected issues in the global cultural and communications economy,” which require us “to broaden our purview of the place of local cultural resources in that context, both recognising and enhancing the relations between the ‘local’ and the ‘global’” (pp. 22, 24). This cultural mapping research agenda would require a new relationship between “local knowledge” and tactics and the “larger and strategic prerogatives of cultural policy and service delivery” (p. 25). In turn, this would necessitate a new conceptual paradigm or “theoretical horizon” within which broad and inclusive approaches to forms and modalities of both cultural production and cultural consumption are reconciled with particular attention to three issues: (1) the existence of a resilient “cartography of taste” that, managed by key cultural gatekeepers, obscures many features of the cultural domain; (2) the need to build a broad, inclusive, active, and “use-oriented” approach to cultural resources that recognizes they are not only commodities but also sets of relations and systems of classification; and (3) the importance of developing methodologies that not only identify these resources but that also assess “how people interact with them and how, at the local and community level, they ‘hang together’ and become meaningful in fields of interaction, negotiation and consumption” (p. 25). This integrated and inclusive research approach, Bennett and Mercer note, could also help reconcile “the inherent connectedness of the cultural domain with others such as the nature of our ‘lifestyles’ and quality of life, the quality of our built and natural environments, our capacities for creativity and innovation (our ‘soft’ and ‘creative infrastructure’), and our ability to educate and train for diversity” (p. 25).

While UNESCO’s interest in mapping initiatives with Indigenous communities continued (as previously described), within broader cultural policy, the rising prominence of so-called creative industries internationally at the turn of the millennium meant cultural policy agencies and related research tended to focus increasingly on defining and measuring the economic dimensions of cultural and creative industries and on mapping the presence and development of these desirable sectors, as Redaelli (Chapter 4 in this volume) points out. The scope of these initiatives was primarily national, gradually forming an international web of studies and sector mappings. From a local perspective, we can observe that this cultural/creative industries trajectory and the statistical knowledge base and policy frameworks that developed with it have been adapted at subnational levels and that innovative approaches to examining local creative sectors and dynamics are emerging (see, e.g., Gibson, Brennan-Horley, and Warren, 2010, as well as Redaelli, Chapter 4, and Comunian and Alexiou, Chapter 14 in this volume). A second trajectory, featuring more holistic inquiries about local culture and place development, can also be observed, as reflected, for example,



in the chapters in this volume by Roberts and Cohen (Chapter 9), Jeannotte (Chapter 5), Evans (Chapter 2), and Knudsen McAusland and Kotska (Chapter 7). In different ways, both contemporary trajectories address the core issues laid out by Bennett and Mercer, expanding the scope of cultural inquiry and widening the ways in which we understand cultural resources within broader community systems, relationships, and fields of meaningful interaction.

### **Cultural Mapping and Municipal Governance**

From an urban management and governance perspective, the need to take stock of a city's or a town's assets and to ensure that those assets are adequate has a long history. So too has the belief that adequate provision of certain kinds of assets, like cultural assets, will not be produced by market forces alone. Consequently, cultural provision and infrastructure provision have long been concerns shared by governments and citizens. Early governance concerns typically focused on cultural infrastructure provision and the support of selected cultural institutions (Duxbury, 2008). Over time, cultural concerns (and aspirations) and planning for them have encompassed an ever widening scope, recognizing diverse cultural expressions and modes; involving innovative interventions, new approaches, and cross-sectoral partnerships; and being guided by more informed and professionalized practices (see, e.g., Young and Stevenson, 2013; Evans, Chapter 2 in this volume). In this context, and especially as culture became more integrated within broader strategic development and planning initiatives, there has been growing pressure to identify, quantify, and geographically locate cultural assets (such as facilities, organizations, public art, heritage, and so forth) so that they could be considered in multisectoral decision-making and planning contexts in which statistics and maps were standard "tools" (Duxbury, 2005). This "pressure" was reinforced by the widespread adoption of asset-based community development and planning in the 1990s—practices that also championed community participation in planning processes.

While these aspects can be seen as dimensions of "internal management," a further external influence is also notable: the rising attention to place promotion in the context of tourism and the (often related) attraction of investors and skilled workers. Within this latter frame, often influenced by or in concert with economic and urban revitalization initiatives, growing numbers of cultural mapping processes have been undertaken to identify and articulate the uniqueness or "cultural DNA" of a place from which a variety of initiatives may coalesce and develop (see, e.g., Bianchini and Ghilardi, 2007; Ghilardi, 2013). Communities have traditionally focused on mapping tangible and "locate-able" assets and features but have increasingly found that important intangible dimensions of place must also be included in cultural mapping exercises (see Chiesi and Costa, Chapter 3, and Jeannotte, Chapter 5 in this volume).

## 10 Nancy Duxbury, W. F. Garrett-Petts, and David MacLennan

Altogether, these considerations have given rise to a municipal cultural mapping framework with a threefold purpose: to build a knowledge base, to mobilize community collaboration, and to strategize or make decisions. In a nutshell: As cultural development emerged more robustly as an area of public governance, data collection, organization, and visualization were recognized as important underlying tools for building collective awareness, knowledge, and appreciation of cultural resources in order to inform and support more effective planning and governance. The processes frequently revealed little known activities, unexpected relationships, new cultural actors, and “visibilized” patterns, overlaps, and gaps. At the same time, cultural mapping became recognized as a community engagement catalyst that could mobilize collaboration among community actors (see Knudsen McAusland and Kotska, Chapter 7 in this volume), build cross-sectoral networks, and communicate across community sectors and (internally) across city departments. (Participatory) mapping processes were developed in numerous communities to support this. On the basis of the information and networks developed through these processes, the cultural mapping “results” became background resources upon which cultural strategies and plans have been developed. However, as Evans (in this volume) and others have pointed out, cultural resources and access still tend not to be systematically reflected in local planning systems. Thus, while increasingly widespread, cultural mapping initiatives often seem to be “one-time” or “occasionally updated” projects, and although some important initiatives do follow from them, there is seldom a sense of an ongoing monitoring or governance process surrounding them (see Jeannotte, Chapter 5 in this volume).

### Artistic Approaches to Cultural Mapping

Mapping has long informed the work of artists, particularly those involved in public works and socially engaged art practices. Examples of artistic approaches to mapping in Western history span from the celebration of place found in Renaissance maps to the map art and diagram art of the Surrealists and the Situationists (see, e.g., Cosgrove, 2008). (The latter tradition has also been influential in architectural and urban design contexts; see Providência, Chapter 11 in this volume.) The engagement of artists in cultural mapping (or cultural mapping–like practices) of the kind addressed in this book, however, is a more recent development, one linked closely with the rise of a new genre of socially engaged/public art practices during the 1990s (see Bishop, 2012; Bourriaud, 1998/2002; Crawford, 2008; Kester, 2011).

In 1995, Suzanne Lacy’s collection of essays, *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art* (arising from a lecture program entitled City Sites: Artists and Urban Strategies) identified the emergence of a new genre—one embodying “engaged, caring public art”—and explicitly acknowledged the requirement of “radically different working methods” (p. 11). A few years later,

the theoretical debate about the role of artists in community cultural development and site-oriented practice coalesced, in particular around Nicolas Bourriaud's concept of "relational aesthetics" (1998/2002), which famously redefined artwork as a "social interstice" and situated the interest in mapping social relationships as part of an "upsurge in social exchanges" precipitated by the growth of towns and cities (p. 14). The subject of art became, more and more, according to Bourriaud (1998/2002), an interest in human relations, in relationships between humans and space, and in what he called "a growing *urbanisation* of the artistic experiment" (p. 15). As art historian Claire Bishop (2012) observes, this social turn among many contemporary artists is

now a near global phenomenon—reaching across the Americas to South East Asia and Russia, but flourishing most intensively in European countries with a strong tradition of public funding for the arts. . . . Up until the early 1990s, community-based art was confined to the periphery of the art world; today it has become a genre in its own right, with MFA courses on social practice and two dedicated prizes. (pp. 2–3)

Drawn to this area of practice, a wide variety of artists internationally have demonstrated critical and creative interest in maps, mapping, relational aesthetics, issues of urbanization, and social engagement—and have participated extensively in cultural mapping initiatives. Some examples of artistic approaches to cultural mapping include the map art and diagram art of contemporary artists such as Adelheid Mers; Jake Barton's performance maps; the Folkvine project in Florida (and the work of the Florida Research Ensemble generally); the work of "artists as cartographers" documented by artist and critic Karen O'Rourke; the memory mapping and family story work of Rebecca Cooper, Marlene Creates, and Ernie Kroeger; the vernacular and found mapping documented by the Hand Drawn Map Association; and the story mapping of First Nations experiences in small cities documented by the Small Cities Community–University Research Alliance.<sup>4</sup> Such approaches are represented in this volume most directly by Abby Suckle and Seetha Raghupathy's collaborative curatorial work on the cultural mapping of New York and Boston (Chapter 13); by Roberta Comunian and Katerina Alexiou's study of artists and their environment (Chapter 14); by Glen Lowry, M. Simon Levin, and Henry Tsang's collaborative art/research comparing the urban waterfront developments of Vancouver and Dubai (Chapter 16); and by the first-person artistic narratives of Sara Giddens and Simon Jones (Chapter 15). More indirectly, the focus on art and artistic intervention is addressed by Liverpool's film and popular music geographies, as described by Les Roberts and Sara Cohen (Chapter 9).

Malcolm Miles' *Art, Space, and the City: Public Art and Urban Futures* (1997), although written before cultural mapping *per se* became a topic of note outside municipal planning and international cultural development

## 12 Nancy Duxbury, W. F. Garrett-Petts, and David MacLennan

literature, anticipates possible roles for artists in participatory urban planning and mapping processes. Miles recognizes that two key fields—“urban planning and design, and art—are beginning to construct a dynamic in which each contextualizes and interrogates the other” (p. 188). He sees two roles for artists to play: They can integrate their skills and methods in collaboration with planners, organizers, and social advocates, adapting their practices in a manner that both delights and instructs, or they can intervene in the public sphere by resisting conventions and employing methods that emphasize cultural critique. Chapters 3 and 11 in this volume (Chiesi and Costa, Providência, respectively) offer an academic introduction to the planning and urban design aspect of this dynamic; Chapters 15 and 16 in this volume (Giddens and Jones, and Lowry, Levin, and Tsang, respectively) offer highly personal narratives, describing from the inside out how this dynamic works for practicing artists.

As Shannon Jackson (2011) notes, those artists (and their collaborators) who consciously engage “the social” in their work must negotiate a “language of critique” within an ethos of consensus and community building. We also see the need to explore “whether an artistic vision enables or neutralizes community voices” (Jackson, 2011, p. 44) and to encourage readers of this book to consider how creative research practices and the language of artists might broaden our understanding of this new visual/verbal interface of cultural mapping (an emerging alternative discourse of collaborative, community-based, and interdisciplinary inquiry).

The role of artists and the arts as agents for enhancing community self-knowledge and sustainable community development has emerged as a significant area of interest—especially among those working in community literacy development and social planning, where a parallel rhetoric of social engagement is emerging. Social engagement work ostensibly embraces artists, artistic practices, and genres and acknowledges the multimodal rhetoric of public discourse that includes “stories, artwork, and arguments” as key elements of cultural and community mapping (Flower, 2008). In such community contexts, artists are cast frequently as illustrators, animators, and facilitators (see Evans, Chapter 2 in this volume); artists and artistic practices, however, are seldom examined as rhetorical agents and agencies with their own disciplinary orientations, theories, methods, and histories. Remarkably little attention has been paid to the potential impact of artists and artist-researchers on new literacies, pedagogies, or collaborative and sustainable practices in community settings—despite the widespread observation that, during the last two decades, an increasing number of artists have been drawn to collaborative or collective modes of research and production (Kester, 2011).

Artistic approaches to mapping and, especially, the involvement of artists in cultural mapping give contemporary urgency to Marshall McLuhan’s notion that it is “the artist’s job to try to *dislocate* older media into postures that permit attention to the new” (1964, p. 254). This dislocation or disruption, along with the resultant alternative academic and public discourse,

introduces issues of aesthetic presentation and knowledge production, a rhetoric of visual and verbal display, the need to accommodate alternative traditions of inquiry, and modes of invention that permit increased attention to personal experience and a hands-on (“qualitative”) exploration of material culture. In *Cultural Mapping as Cultural Inquiry*, a number of authors explore directly and indirectly how the involvement of artists and artistic methods extends and complicates our understanding of collective action and civic engagement, particularly as it relates to interdisciplinary research, collaborative practice, cultural sustainability, and social activism. They teach us how cultural maps embody a significant and emerging discourse that is interdisciplinary, multimodal, and rhetorical—offering “essentially propositional . . . arguments about existence” (Roberts, 2012, p. 13). Here we find the prospect of a common ground among those researchers—artists and nonartists alike—who seek to document, understand, and represent the intangible dimensions of culture.

### Academic Inquiry

In this introduction to an emerging interdisciplinary field, we have opted to keep our discussion of academic inquiry closely tied to mapping and map production, all the while recognizing its intimate connection to the much more comprehensive and wide-ranging literature on spatiality, which we can only touch upon here. The so-called spatial turn has influenced almost every area of academic work and marks a turn away from the modernist fascination with time and history to what Michel Foucault (1986) called “the epoch of space.” Foucault (1986) saw “our experience of the world [as] less that of a long life developing through time than that of a network that connects points and intersects with its own skein” (p. 22). By the middle of the 20th century, the grand narratives of history seemed inadequate, variously silenced by a postwar experience of displacement, urban alienation, population mobility, and the cultivation of the homeless mind (see Berger, Berger, and Kellner, 1973; Jameson, 1991; Soja, 1989; Westphal, 2011). By the mid-1970s, the large urban metropolis had become for many a place of alienation, ironic association, and transience, where individuals learned to define themselves not in relation to their local history, but through identification with imagined or distant spaces, with imported rituals, fashions, and ideals (Garrett-Petts and Lawrence, 2005). The question “Where are you from?” replaced “How long have you lived here?”

Significantly, this early postmodern preoccupation with space, place, and spatiality—while an unlikely precursor to the socially engaged cartographies we have reviewed thus far—nonetheless laid the groundwork for the practice of contemporary cultural mapping. Where the spatial turn in theory fueled a sense of ironic distance and *placelessness*—defined by Edward Relph (1976) as “the casual eradication of distinctive places and the making of standardized landscapes that results from an insensitivity to the

## 14 Nancy Duxbury, W. F. Garrett-Petts, and David MacLennan

significance of place” (Preface)—the same body of theory identified *mapping* as its principal trope, imbuing maps with narrative potential.

Traditionally, cartography has been guided by scientific quests for ever greater accuracy and precision in capturing physical features and their spatial relationships and for representing or communicating this “truth”: The focus was on map *production*. In the late 1960s, congruent with a shift toward humanist geography, maps and mapmaking resurfaced as sites for critical investigation (Manoff, 2014). The idea of viewing maps as texts, discourses, or practices emerged in the late 1980s, with these new theoretical approaches emphasizing “the discursive power of the medium” and “the social and cultural work that cartography achieves” (Kitchin, Perkins, and Dodge, 2009, p. 5).

In 1989, J. Brian Harley, drawing on the ideas of Foucault and others, argued that the process of mapping *creates*, rather than *reveals*, information. As Harley and others (e.g., Farinelli, 1992) pointed out, cartography embodies “cultural complexities” (Cosgrove, 2008, 8). The process of creation includes decisions about what to include and what a map is seeking to communicate, and maps are thus imbued with the values and judgments of the (subjective) map creators, factors that are “undeniably a reflection of the culture in which those individuals live” (Kitchin, Perkins, and Dodge, 2009, p. 12). Harley called for “a greater pluralism of cartographic expression . . . a narrative cartography that tells a story and portrays a process at the same time as it is revealing the interconnectedness of humanity in space” (1989, pp. 87–88). From this point, maps were increasingly viewed as “products of culture reflecting the worldviews of the cartographers or the map-makers” (Soini, 2001, p. 225; see also Dorling and Fairbairn, 1997; Cosgrove, 1999). Methodologies emphasized deconstruction and semiotic approaches (see, e.g., Jacob, 1993), with the cultural turn in geography also leading to growing attention toward the social and performative roles of the map as an object (Cosgrove, 2008), the contexts in which maps operate, and how they are “consumed.”

Meanwhile, a parallel series of studies on mental and cognitive maps was exploring the psychological and subjectivities of mapping behavior, embedded within the fields of behavioral geography, then humanistic geography (incorporating subjective experiences and senses of place), then cultural geography. Cultural geography highlighted the meaning of *culture* as a “spatially pluralistic and dynamic process, which is an important part of social signifying systems” (Soini, 2001, p. 228). Some scholars, such as Lilley (2000), came to view mapmaking as a creative process, like writing a text, providing “a way of exploring what is ‘out there’ as well as what is ‘inside us’” (Soini, 2001, p. 225).

As digital mapping technologies advanced, enabling user-directed design and animation as well as wide accessibility via the Internet, mapping became increasingly understood as a process. The distinction between *map-maker* and *map user* became blurred with the changing technology, broader

access to map data, and more widespread mapping and mapmaking literacy. Scientific cartographic understanding became represented as “cartography cubed,” repositioned by “the dimensions of interactivity, the kind of knowledge, and the social nature of the process” (Kitchin, Perkins, and Dodge, 2009, p. 11).

In recent years, academic interest in community-based cultural mapping has also been linked to the wider movement to “re-engage our theoretical notions of space itself” in ways that “acknowledge space as socially constructed and contested” (Fraley, 2011, p. 423; cf. Rodman 2003) and recognize “the organization, use and meaning of space [as] a product of social translation, transformation and experience” (Soja, 1980, p. 210). From this perspective, *place* is viewed as a contested site of representation. As Crouch and Matless (1996) note, there are as many different places as there are individuals and groups effectively cohabitating an area, so “any sense that a map may easily trace one place-bound community is problematized” (p. 238).

In the humanities, the spatial turn has also been acutely felt, where the new fields of New Rhetoric and New Literacy Studies are contributing to what Roberts (2012) describes as “a discursive zone of convergence in which ideas of ‘maps’ and ‘mapping’ are increasingly called to act as rhetorical devices to address sociocultural concerns that are in some way deemed to be ‘spatial’ (or vice versa)” (p. 12). The New Rhetoric emphasizes notions of invention, *kairos*, and, in particular, “the rhetorical situation” (Bitzer, 1968; Vatz, 2009); it views language as symbolic action, seeing process as trumping product and recognizing images and texts as forms of social action (Burke, 1945).<sup>5</sup> Within New Literacy Studies, the theory of *situated literacies* (Barton, Hamilton, and Ivanič, 2000) insists that literacies are always situated social practices informed by multiple relational contexts (both tangible and intangible) that shape experience, understanding, and creation. The interest here is in literacy not as a basic skill but as the ability to use and derive meaning from a broad range of symbolic forms—including maps and map-like objects, but also including other descriptive, expository, persuasive, and narrative forms that can be used to deepen spatial and place-based understandings of culture and cultural relations.

Significantly, situated literacies theory distinguishes between “literacy events” and “literacy practices.” *Events* are defined as visible and tangible—“observable episodes which arise from practices and are shaped by them” (Barton, Hamilton, and Ivanič, 2000, p. 8), with participants, settings, artifacts, and activities such as mapping. *Practices* are defined as nonvisible and intangible—“cultural ways of utilising literacy” (Barton, Hamilton, and Ivanič, 2000, p. 8), with relationships, purposes, values, understandings, feelings, structured routines, and “pathways that facilitate or regulate actions” (Hamilton, 2000, p. 17). Conceptualizing cultural mapping as encompassing both literacy events and practices questions the popular assumption that cultural assets are not only place-based but also “readily

16 *Nancy Duxbury, W. F. Garrett-Petts, and David MacLennan*

and materially apparent” (Leander, 2002, no page). *New Literacy Studies* seeks to explain how less visible social practices, including the multiple situated literacies that inform those practices, produce locations. For, as Kevin Leander (2002) points out, “people do not simply participate in situations . . . [;] they produce and relate discourses about those situations” (n.p.). These fields of inquiry promise fruitful alignments with the many social science (and artistic) practices jointly exploring and mapping the multiple cultural dimensions of communities and place.

In closing, we see the flip from “the cultural nature or embeddedness of maps” to “maps as agents of cultural inquiry” as propelled and influenced by a variety of academic discourses and critiques, including those about the subjectivity of mapmaking, the use of maps to better understand human–environment relations, the nature of space, place as a contested site of representation, and mapmaking as both symbolic and social action. Further, as Cosgrove (2008) observes, as artists have taken up mapping projects focused on “researching, documenting and representing in challenging ways [the world’s] environmental and social conditions,” when coupled with the continuing revolution in cartographic techniques, practices, and digital capabilities, this has led to “a significant opening towards the roles of creativity and imagination in making and communicating geographical knowledge” within academic inquiry, as well as “an active and intensely practical engagement with everyday cultural life” (§26). Increasingly, as in the tradition of deep mapping (see Scherf, Chapter 17 in this volume), we find hybrid projects and collaborative arrangements that use cultural mapping as a platform for traversing domains and coalescing these conceptual and contextually situated inspirations.

## METHODOLOGICAL INFLUENCES AND CHOICES

Thus far we have been looking primarily at cultural mapping’s contexts, motives, and uses—for it is these factors that help identify the site and problem to be researched or the social action to be advocated. Guides and toolkits (especially if well constructed and field tested) can be helpful in initiating community and cultural mapping. In practice and from a methodological perspective, however, cultural mapping tends to function like an ongoing field experiment adopting selectively or opportunistically or promiscuously its methods in response to the problems posed, the expertise available, and the exigencies of the moment—including the working assumptions of the participants, the declared purposes, the less obvious agendas, the politics and power relations present, the prior knowledge and understanding of the available research models and approaches, the time and resources available, and so on. Such a state of affairs leaves us to wonder whether what we have is an array of methodologies in search of a field or an emerging field in search of appropriate methodologies. In community-based and collaborative



contexts, cultural mapping may proceed (and even succeed) without extensive self-reflection on how the methods employed impose *a priori* perspectives on the physical and social realities being mapped. Academic rigor and the application of spatial theory, after all, may not be the priority.

The emerging field of cultural mapping, with its pragmatic origins rooted in Indigenous communities and municipal planning—and motivated by a commitment to social action, community engagement, citizen participation, and identity formation—tends to emphasize praxis over theory, action over reflection. Nonetheless, it is only through self-reflection guided by theory that cultural mapping's developing assumptions and methodologies will be effectively reinforced, reconsidered, revised, and/or refined. Increasingly, cultural mapping is being informed by theory and conducted with careful attention to the methods employed.

Some of the mapping undertaken in the context of municipal governance, for example, was guided methodologically by conventional social scientific ideas, as when Evans (this volume) alludes to the need for more standardized and rigorous approaches to data collection, which would support comparative analysis across communities. For this work, researchers must be confident that categories for classifying data have some consistency—for example, that what counts as a cultural hub or incubator in one city will count as a cultural hub or incubator in another city (see Bain, 2014). At a more macro level, Redaelli (Chapter 4 in this volume) points to international flows of influence within the Anglosphere that gradually consolidate “standard” categories of cultural and creative industries, although ongoing issues with comparability are endemic to international comparative research in the area of culture. At the local level, the grassroots and locally focused nature of much of the cultural mapping activity to date has meant that while procedural guidance has been shared among communities, the high emphasis on local specificities has limited attention to data standardization across communities.

For those community-engaged researchers who aspire to test and refine their methodologies, conventional ideas about what counts as methodological progress remain influential. Progress unfolds incrementally as standardized methods of data collection and classification are more widely accepted, and more accurate maps can be produced. But as the chapters in this volume illustrate, many of those engaged in cultural mapping take a very different perspective on method and methodological progress. Sometimes new views on method have emerged out of political and practical concerns, such as the desire to increase citizen participation in the planning process. Theoretical and aesthetic concerns, such as the desire to recognize and represent both the tangible and intangible dimensions of culture, have been particularly influential.

A renewed emphasis on the tangible *and* intangible dimensions of culture represents an important moment in the development of cultural mapping as a method and field of interdisciplinary inquiry. This is related to a range of

basic theoretical issues concerning how culture is defined and represented—and to extensive traditions of scholarship that have sought to reconcile the tangible with the intangible, the objective with the subjective, and the material with the immaterial. Methodologically, if one accepts that the intangible, the subjective, and the immaterial are important to what culture is as an object of study, then quantitative methods alone are inadequate. This interest in making the intangible visible heightens the importance of drawing on cultural research traditions that are primarily qualitative in nature and, in some cases, drawing on ethnographic and artistic traditions of inquiry.

Methods have consequences: The methods we use determine what we see and how we see it. Choosing to count objects or people or other tangible resources, for example, emphasizes evidence that can be quantified, while choosing to focus on questions of context, human perceptions, and social relations emphasizes evidence that cannot be easily measured or described numerically. When the focus is on an understanding of *both* the tangible and the intangible, an interdisciplinary mixed-methods strategy is called for. Typically, in interdisciplinary studies *triangulation*, a term commonly associated with surveying and mapmaking, is used to help focus on a site or problem from multiple perspectives, coordinating sight lines, and helping reconcile discrepancies. By triangulating several disciplinary viewpoints, says interdisciplinary theorist Alan Repko (2008), “researchers can produce an integrated picture of the problem and have more ways to verify theoretical concepts” (p. 209). Further research to systematically bring together, compare, and assess the range of methodological approaches used in cultural mapping processes would provide a useful grounding to such triangulation efforts.

Chiesi and Costa (Chapter 3 in this volume) offer a more specific form of conceptual triangulation, situating cultural mapping in a pragmatic conjectural space defined by three axes: identity vs. knowledge, past vs. future, and inside vs. outside. The axis emphasizing identity and knowledge seeks to place each cultural mapping project along a continuum, with those seeking to map the intangibles of community identity placed closer to the *identity* end and those seeking to map tangible resources closer to the *knowledge* end. This first axis intersects with a second that situates mapping projects in terms of their relative focus on the past (heritage and history and loss) and the future (emerging resources, potential networks, and shared vision for the built and natural environment). The third axis charts the relative emphasis on internal community insight and development or on place promotion to those external to the community. We see such three-dimensional modeling as providing an important tool for critical analysis and a heuristic for practice and planning.

The importance of qualitative data and ethnographic or artistic methods for many of our contributors is clear, and it is worth noting that many of them have sought to make use of a kind of place-centered ethnography similar to that advocated by anthropologist Keith Basso. Basso (1996) suggests

that people express their sense of place through “ordinary talk” as well as “the agencies of myth, prayer, music, dance, art, architecture, and, in many communities, recurrent forms of religious and political ritual” (p. 57). The ethnographer’s task, therefore, is to understand what all these forms of expression tell us about why places matter to people and how places are constituted as meaningful locations by local inhabitants (and perhaps by visitors). In this tradition, many of the contributors to this volume engage in mapping strategies that are acutely sensitive to the vernacular and seek to recognize and make visible the ways locals use various symbolic vehicles—including locally produced maps or mental maps—to define and defend place identity and relationships (e.g., Chiesi and Costa, Chapter 3; Pillai, Chapter 8; Suckle and Raghupathy, Chapter 13).

## THE CHAPTERS

This book provides an introduction to the emerging interdisciplinary field of cultural mapping, offering a range of interdisciplinary views that are international in scope and addressing themes, processes, approaches, and research methodologies and patterns drawn from examples in Australia, Canada, Estonia, the United Kingdom, Egypt, Italy, Malaysia, Malta, Palestine, Portugal, Singapore, Sweden, Syria, the United Arab Emirates, the United States, and the Ukraine. The chapters are organized into three sections: Mapping the Contours of an Emerging Field; Platforms for Engagement and Knowledge Through Mapping; and Inquiry, Expression, and Deepening Understanding of Place.

### I. Mapping the Contours of an Emerging Field

Chapters 2–5 introduce an array of viewpoints that are helpful in defining the contours of this emerging interdisciplinary field. In sequence, they offer us, first, a review of cultural mapping methodologies, toolkits, and case studies drawn primarily from current cultural mapping initiatives in the United Kingdom; next, a conceptual framework for classifying and analyzing mapping projects (applied to four case studies located in Palestine, Syria, and Malta); then, a review from the United States of how the term *mapping* is used in cultural policy reports internationally; and, finally, a detailed comparative analysis of a variety of Canadian cultural mapping projects, focusing on the success factors and barriers affecting the projects examined (and considering the implications of this work for cultural mapping generally).

Graeme Evans’ chapter, “Cultural Mapping and Planning for Sustainable Communities,” situates the practice of cultural mapping in the context of sustainable development and community agendas. Offering a review of international cultural mapping and planning toolkits, he focuses on the underlying methods associated with the mapping of cultural assets and

## 20 Nancy Duxbury, W. F. Garrett-Petts, and David MacLennan

amenities for subsequent cultural planning formulation—describing what he calls the “evolution of cultural mapping as both a methodology and a set of techniques.” These methods and techniques—including systematic cultural audits, consultative planning, and the use of visualization models—are then illustrated and elaborated through descriptions of cultural mapping exercises, classification systems, and annotated maps drawn from case studies and toolkits developed in the U.K. Throughout his discussion, Evans reminds us that cultural mapping does not draw upon a single model and that the methods chosen must be appropriate and adaptable to both purpose and situation.

Evans, a professor of urban cultures and design at Middlesex University, argues forcefully that culture and cultural development are too often overlooked by urban planners, public administrators, and policy-makers; he asks pointedly, “how can culture and sustainable development be interpreted at a local/regional level with national governance and planning systems?” His chapter speaks to the need for a new “equilibrium,” where amenable and well-informed planning processes position culture and participatory governance as the “mediating forces” between the three more prominent pillars of sustainable development.

Leonardo Chiesi and Paolo Costa are sociologists with the School of Architecture, University of Florence, Italy. Their chapter, “One Strategy, Many Purposes: A Classification for Cultural Mapping Projects,” provides an overview of several collaborative research projects where cultural mapping is used to investigate local place identity, often with an emphasis on buildings and spaces with significant heritage value. Significantly, their chapter presents a conceptual framework showing how mapping can be placed in a three-dimensional space of attributes defined by three continua: knowledge vs. identity, inside vs. outside, and past vs. future. They suggest that approaches to cultural mapping must vary in relation to intended audience: Maps produced to help a community engage with outsiders will differ from maps produced for insiders. Other sources of variation include whether the maps are used to generate knowledge or to enhance local identity and whether the maps are used to reflect on historical realities or to envision future possibilities.

Their use of various symbolic tools in the action–research process is particularly instructive. To engage local residents in the mapping process, Chiesi and Costa use children’s maps and drawings, fact sheets filled out by residents, designer-produced sketches, and various kinds of photographs. One of the effects of these mapping tools is to make explicit to the participants their own knowledge of place that had previously been implicit. While cultural mapping may involve the development of new knowledge of place, in many instances the “mapping effect” described by the authors is more accurately characterized as a kind of *translation*, where embodied knowledge and the lived experiences of place are more fully articulated. This particular version of knowledge mobilization, a kind of consciousness

raising and implicit knowledge articulation, seems to be a defining feature of many approaches to cultural mapping.

In “Cultural Mapping: Analyzing Its Meanings in Policy Documents,” Eleanora Redaelli, an assistant professor at the University of Oregon, United States, outlines how, in the context of globalization and digitization during the last decade, national and international efforts to define and classify the contemporary cultural/creative sector have led to a variety of mapping initiatives. Her chapter provides a state-of-the-art portrait of the use of how the term *mapping* is used in an array of influential cultural policy reports (primarily from Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States). What emerges is that cultural mapping entails at least three different approaches that display three different features of the cultural sector: economy, location, and networks.

Redaelli finds that cultural mapping has been used to mean *economic measurement*, such as employment, firm activity, gross value added, and exports (in the majority of documents reviewed, typically national-level, and led by initial U.K. practices in this area); *geographic visualization*, with maps displaying the location of the cultural sector on the territory (led by Canadian initiatives in cultural mapping at a local level); and *network analysis*, to track activities and relationships among firms and to look for concentrations and “clusters” (led by Australian and U.K. research, with a local focus). She notes that while the cultural policy literature is characterized by inconsistent definitions and a lack of standard classifications for data collections, in these mapping studies the definitions have become clearer and better articulated over the years, reflecting an incremental process of international policy transfer and research standardization to improve comparability in this area.

In regard to geographic visualization, Redaelli outlines different types of maps and comments on the purposes that have been suggested for each approach: hand-drawn or sketch maps for bottom-up processes concerning internal community issues, artist-drawn maps as “an effort to depict the values of a local community,” and web-based maps for inventorying, for mapping, and as a communication vehicle for both residents and tourism audiences. In the policy documents, network analysis was the least developed of the approaches; however, in other fields it has been generating interesting studies. and she recommends further attention to it in cultural sector policy analysis (for one approach to network analysis, see Comunian and Alexiou, Chapter 14 in this volume). Ideally, Redaelli argues, the three methodologies should be integrated, and these three aspects of the cultural sector should be captured together.

M. Sharon Jeannotte is a senior research fellow at the Centre for Governance, University of Ottawa, Canada. Her chapter, “Cultural Mapping in Ontario: The Big Picture,” details a comparative analysis of 64 cultural mapping initiatives in the Province of Ontario, Canada’s most populous province. The chapter examines incentives provided by the province to

22 Nancy Duxbury, W. F. Garrett-Petts, and David MacLennan

encourage cultural mapping in its communities and compares the types of assets mapped, the stated reasons for undertaking mapping exercises, whether public consultations were carried out, and whether an actual map was produced. Positioning cultural mapping as providing the evidence to support a cultural “turn” in planning, Jeannotte notes that instead of this broader perspective, the cultural map often becomes an end in itself, dictating what resources are considered, collected, and analyzed. Distinguishing between *resource mapping*, the identification and recording of physical or tangible cultural resources, and *identity mapping*, or intangible cultural resources, such as histories, values, traditions, and stories, Jeannotte observes that as cultural mapping processes become increasingly standardized and primarily focused on tangible assets, municipalities “tend to depict the tangible cultural ecosystem in some detail, but treat the intangible one as a somewhat hazy and indistinct background.”

Jeannotte’s analysis finds that clear strategic purposes (such as increasing heritage tourism or profiling the community’s quality of life to attract people or investments) and committed leadership underpin the successful development of maps of tangible cultural assets. However, methodological limitations still hamper efforts to capture intangible cultural resources on maps. She observes that the “codified definitions of culture” in cultural mapping guides are not broad enough to capture “what communities value in their cultural ecosystems” with many cases, especially in smaller communities, where “culture [is] as much a way of life as it was a means of expression or a heritage artefact.” In conclusion, Jeannotte recommends further investigation of alternative methodological tools developed in the field of environmental management to codify cultural intangibles and to measure and understand the ecological value of culture. They include (1) *articulation*, or narrative expressions of experience and meaning; (2) *open-ended classification* based on categories defined by the community; (3) *assignment of relative importance*, or what matters most to the community; and (4) *spatial relevance*, or the recognition of the place-based nature of intangible cultural values (Satterfield, Gregory, Klain, Roberts, and Chan, 2013).

## II. Platforms for Engagement and Knowledge Through Mapping

With an accent on engagement, the six chapters presented in Part II demonstrate different ways in which cultural mapping has been used as a platform for engagement as well as inquiry. The first three chapters show us how the implementation of cultural mapping projects can serve as valuable instruments for engaging local communities (variously defined) while enhancing knowledge of and attachment to a place. Projects in Wedjemup Country, Western Australia; in eight cities across Ukraine; and in Malaysia demonstrate the international spread of cultural mapping and some of the diverse circumstances in which it is applied: to recognize, honor, and address

histories and knowledges embedded in an Indigenous territory imbued with troubled histories and to support intercultural possibilities for an ecological site for healing, regeneration, and well-being; to identify cultural resources and build a base for local cultural development and community leadership in a post-Soviet context; and to involve local site users in the design process of a heritage market redevelopment and in a documentation and interpretation project to conserve intangible heritage.

In their chapter entitled “Wedjemup Wangkiny Koora, Yeye and Mila Boorda (Wedjemup Talking from the Past, Today, and the Future) An Ex-modern Way of Thinking and Mapping Landscape into Country?” Len Collard and Grant Revell, both from the School of Indigenous Studies at The University of Western Australia, tell a story about an extraordinary place, “an ‘island’ where the past, present, and future are no longer navigable,” a landscape in need of reimagining. Their map is also a story of Wedjemup (Rottneest Island), Western Australia.

Collard and Revell critically review the Island’s current progress with (re)conciliation programming, drawing on their training as landscape research collaborators, designers, mappers, and storytellers to refine culturally appropriate methodologies for cultural mapping. Two specific projects receive particular attention in their chapter: the creation of a new International Indigenous Knowledge Centre (IIKC) and the creation of a guided walk. Reflecting on the significance of these two projects, Collard and Revell suggest that the IIKC and the guided walk will contribute to a deeper understanding of colonial injustice and create possibilities for reconciliation between Indigenous peoples and the other residents of Australia.

But many challenges remain. These challenges have a narrative form, and Collard and Revell suggest that the challenges might be viewed as stories—that is, as open-ended, placed-based accounts of Wedjemup. In alluding to the importance of narrative inquiry, Collard and Revell are drawing on the theme that stories can play an important role in design projects. Elaborating, with reference to the IIKC, they argue against a rushed approach to the design process. They also argue against a design outcome that would reflect Western biases toward the compartmentalization of knowledge, including the housing of knowledge in static shrines or galleries. In their words: “The IIKC should be a popular place acknowledging the dynamic natures of Indigenous cultures where knowledge exists in a whole variety of places—homes, families, communities, suburbs, offices, factories, churches, academies, in the bush, etc.” They conclude: “A new mapped and navigable Wedjemup and its outspoken IIKC will test the time of a sustained global consciousness of successful Indigenous empowerment and shared cultural reconciliation, one that all citizens of the world will hopefully endure, commit to, care for and be justly proud of.”

Linda Knudsen McAusland and Olha Kotska’s chapter, “Understanding the Full Impact of Cultural Mapping in Ukraine,” is based on a groundbreaking cultural mapping initiative that began in 2007–2008 in L’viv,

## 24 Nancy Duxbury, W. F. Garrett-Petts, and David MacLennan

followed in 2012–2013 by initiatives in seven additional cities—Luhansk, Lutsk, Mykolaiv, Odesa, Dnipropetrovs'k, Kherson, and Melitopol. The authors codirected this project: Knudsen McAusland is an independent consultant with extensive experience in cultural mapping, cultural planning, and community development; Kotska coordinates the Ukraine Culture Network program at the Centre for Cultural Management, L'viv. With overall coordination by the Centre for Cultural Management in L'viv (and with funding support from the European Cultural Foundation), the cultural mapping projects were intended to identify cultural resources in each city and provide both a catalyst for change and a model for engagement. The initial L'viv process was an opportunity to test the applicability of established cultural mapping methodology within a Ukrainian context, providing a first glimpse into both the opportunities and the challenges for engaging community conversations within Ukraine. The *Cultural Mapping Toolkit* published by the Creative City Network of Canada was the primary methodological guide and was adjusted, step-by-step, to a post-Soviet reality. The lessons learned in this first initiative guided development of the second.

During the second phase, individual local teams (six nongovernmental organizations [NGOs] and one cross-sector team of an NGO working in tandem with the local Department of Culture) spearheaded cultural mapping initiatives in their home cities with methodological and consulting support from the CCM team (and a small grant). In Chapter 7, Knudsen McAusland and Kotska outline the overall project objectives and thoughtfully reflect upon how they all represented a “break from tradition” and the consequent challenges the teams faced, from gathering information to encouraging participation. They also discuss the lessons learned through this initiative and the importance of finding ways to introduce the new while maintaining respect for current context. Project outcomes included seven cultural maps and databases, significant press coverage, and the creation of a network of colleagues interested in further cooperation and partnership. Through the cultural mapping process, the leaders of these initiatives are redefining their roles within their respective communities and have brought about community understanding of the role for such a process in community development. As the authors note, “These processes gathered information, but in Ukraine they also have planted seeds for future change.”

Janet Pillai is a cultural practitioner and action-researcher who was formerly associate professor at the School of Arts, University Sains Malaysia. Her chapter, “Engaging Public, Professionals, and Policy-Makers in the Mapping Process,” describes two case studies of participatory cultural mapping projects in George Town where the primary goal was to elicit local residents' views on place identity in the context of daily life. Her research is similar in some respects to that of an ethnographer seeking to find out how residents experience place and construct meaningful locations, but the projects she describes also embed this articulated knowledge within active community dynamics: she uses cultural mapping methods to involve market



sellers in the redevelopment of a heritage public market, as well as individual and shared memories of a major street to reinvigorate local residents' connections to this place and to each other and to build a richer identity for the area. What is especially innovative in her approach is the emphasis on interdisciplinarity and the range of symbolic tools she employs. The involvement of artists is crucial to this latter point, and the artists' contribution is reflected in the curatorial processes used, in the nature of visualization strategies (noted by Redaelli as a strategy for making community values visible), and in the quality of the objects those strategies generate.

Another aspect of Pillai's work that differentiates it from conventional ethnography is her emphasis on the relation between research and design. Like Providência, Pillai devotes special attention to the "design thinking process" and provides a clear account of what she calls a "human-centered design experience." Pillai also describes the different ways the outcomes of cultural mapping can be exhibited. Whether they take the form of a web-based archive of stories or a street gallery display, such exhibits contribute to the social learning that is associated with some approaches to cultural mapping. Pillai's work highlights how the concepts of creativity and collaboration can be embedded in participatory mapping and how involvement in the process can engage and transform stakeholders and the public in a shared understanding of a cultural site.

The latter three chapters in this section focus on mapping as "reading the city," embedded in societal contexts ranging from tourism and urban place-marketing strategies, to projects on the spatial historiography of music and cinematographic geographies, to pedagogical contexts of architecture and urban design, public history, and heritage. With cases in the U.K., Portugal, Sweden, and Estonia, the various processes of inquiry and "reading the city" presented in these chapters demonstrate how through cultural mapping and closely reading the traces and patterns of a city's built environment, its history, its "temporal storylines" and other narratives, and its contemporary activities, the agents of inquiry (students, visitors, or residents) also become more actively engaged with the place being mapped. In this way, mapping can act as "a tool for engaged socio-spatial democracy" (Roberts and Cohen) as well as aesthetic and intellectual enjoyment.

In these chapters we hear echoes of the pioneering work of Kevin Lynch (1960), whose classic *Image of the City* provided a fresh perspective on how the city becomes "legible" to its inhabitants. For Lynch, legibility, or "the ease with which its parts can be recognized and can be organized in a coherent pattern" (pp. 2–3), is regarded as a property of well designed places; but it is more than an attribute, a "thing in itself," for we must also consider the way the city is "perceived by its inhabitants" (p. 3). This focus on perception and legibility, on "reading the city" as Stuart Burch and Paulo Providência see it, or on recognizing embedded "storylines" and "narratives" as Les Roberts and Sara Cohen describe it, informs much recent cultural mapping methodology—and acknowledges its pedagogical impulse by positioning

cultural mapping in the company of other situated literacy practices. While the three chapters offer quite different approaches to reading the city, each extends in some way the insights of Lynch's work.

Les Roberts and Sara Cohen both teach in the School of Arts at the University of Liverpool, U.K. Their chapter, "Mapping Cultures: Spatial Anthropology and Popular Cultural Memory," draws on research conducted into the cultural and historical geographies of film and popular music in the city of Liverpool, and the role of maps and mapping practices in shaping ideas of place, identity, and cultural memory. The first part of the chapter considers examples of "official" cultural mappings as developed around film and popular music geographies in Liverpool. The chapter then goes on to discuss the ways maps and mapping practices might productively inform alternative cartographies of place and memory and to argue the case for the development of a *spatial anthropology* of film and popular music cultures. Particular attention is devoted to what they call "musicscapes." Starting from the assumption that cities have both material and symbolic dimensions, they explore how both dimensions are captured in the notion of a musicscape. Their goal is to explore the musicscapes of Liverpool, using what they call a spatial ethnography. Mapping is crucial to ethnography as they practice it, and they are careful to distinguish their approach to mapping from approaches whose primary concern is place-marketing. For Roberts and Cohen, mapping is a critical tool: It can be used to counteract the drift toward placelessness and "to anchor, re-locate and re-assert spaces of identity."

The potential of ethnographic mapmaking is evident in their research on Liverpool. Concerned to provide an historical perspective on musicscapes, the authors use ethnographic techniques—including sketch maps drawn by musicians—and archival research. A key outcome of their research, an installation allowing visitors access to six digital maps, is described in the chapter. The maps are organized thematically, each layered with different kinds of data: photographs, video clips, films, and audio files of interviews and songs. The chapter demonstrates how the many layers of meaning and memory associated with a particular cultural form (in this case, music) can influence how the city is experienced and understood. However, the methodological reflections of the authors are also significant. Particularly valuable are their comments on the role of mapping in critical inquiry, where they highlight the role of maps in evoking memories and telling stories. This, they maintain, is the anthropological value of maps. As they explain: "[I]t is as much the anthropological value of maps that underpins their utility and effectiveness as it is the cartographic and geographic insights they offer in terms of where, how and when popular music geographies and histories are located in Liverpool."

Can cities be read? And, if so, what stories do they tell? In "Reading the City: Cultural Mapping as Pedagogic Inquiry," Stuart Burch, who teaches courses in public history and heritage management at Nottingham Trent University, U.K., situates his discussion in a pedagogical narrative. Burch's

theoretical inspiration, drawn from a review of literature on “landscape as text,” is perhaps more Lefebvre than Lynch, but the core idea is one both Lefebvre and Lynch share: that built forms and spaces of the city constitute a kind of language and that they can therefore be read. Burch offers imaginative and engaging readings of cities in England, Sweden, and Estonia, and it is clear from the content and the tone of these readings that he has a lesson to impart to his students. Be sure, he seems to be saying, that your readings are informed by theory and grounded in the material forms of the locations you are trying to understand. But be willing to take a chance and to use your imaginations to tease out the stories of the city and its spaces. In developing his readings of the city, Burch demonstrates an awareness of the economic and political forces that operate in cities; at the same time, he does not downplay the fact that reading the city can be a source of aesthetic pleasure. In this he is like Lynch, who believed that one of the reasons legibility was worth pursuing was that it enriched the aesthetic pleasures that the city could, but rarely did, provide for its citizens.

In “City Readings and Urban Mappings: The City as Didactic Instrument,” Paulo Providência, an architect and a Design Studio teacher in the Department of Architecture at the University of Coimbra in Coimbra, Portugal, provides a detailed account of how cultural mapping figures in the urban design process. His intention as a teacher is to merge the analytical and proposal phases of design studio exercises, phases conventionally separated in pedagogical settings. Especially interesting from a methodological standpoint is how Providência’s students use maps in a process of exploration and discovery to provide visual information, to support design decisions, and to facilitate learning by reading the city in the context of its landscape and history. Working individually and in groups, the students look for key spatial patterns in target locations: the narrative pathway, the block as an urban unit, the public space, and the functions of everyday life. These spatial aspects and patterns are mapped, and the students engage in critical dialogue about what they mean and how they reflect or inform the social uses of space. This is a particular approach to reading the city. It reflects not only an interest in legibility but also an awareness of local design challenges, such as finding ways to reconnect the upper and lower parts of the city where Providência teaches. Also important to this chapter are Providência’s reflections on cartographic theory. Drawing on the work of James Corner, Providência notes how maps “record” existing spatial patterns (describing actual worlds) but also, in some instances, how they project images of alternative patterns (imagining possible worlds).

### III. Inquiry, Expression, and Deepening Understanding of Place

The final six chapters introduce us to a creative range of new technologies and ethnographic techniques, including the innovative use of two- and

three-dimensional mapping and the incorporation of narrative and artistic modes of inquiry. The projects represented are located in Egypt; New York and Boston; Medway, England; Singapore and the British seaside town of Skegness; Vancouver and Dubai; and a small mountain resort in British Columbia; collectively, they provide avenues leading us toward a deepening understanding of place. The first two chapters provide an elegant integration of technological capacities with both archival and curatorial practices and sensibilities, suggesting possibilities for new methodologies—and for new approaches to cultural mapping and “mapping culturally.” The next three chapters offer us an in-depth, even intimate insight into the perspectives and concerns of artists, shedding light in particular on notions of community engagement and networking, the challenges of collaboration, and the possibilities for creative expression within cultural mapping. The final chapter presents a personal narrative of deep mapping.

In “Time, Aggregation, and Analysis: Designing Effective Digital Cultural Mapping Projects,” Elaine Sullivan and Willeke Wendrich provide an insightful introduction to a different kind of cultural mapping: the range of possibilities created by both two- and three-dimensional computer-generated maps and models. Sullivan is an assistant professor of history at the University of California, Santa Cruz, and Wendrich is a professor of Egyptian archaeology at the University of California, Los Angeles. Both are Egyptologists, and this research specialization, in addition to their connections to UCLA’s Institute for Digital Research and Education, is reflected in their approach to cultural mapping as instruments of academic research. Their chapter offers readers a glimpse of the new mapping and rendering capabilities associated with the digital revolution in mapping technology. Computer-generated digital maps allow mapmakers to layer, aggregate, and integrate data. They also allow mapmakers to depict change over time in the location and distribution of various kinds of phenomena. In the context of archaeological research, such layering and temporal functions are crucial—they support the forms of reasoning that archaeologists use to make inferences about the societies they are investigating—but they also have a broad range of applications in understanding more contemporary developments, such as the various uses of the HyperCities platform presented in the chapter.

Sullivan and Wendrich’s account of computer-generated immersive environments suggests an especially intriguing direction for cultural mapping projects. While we are accustomed to thinking about immersive environments with reference to the gaming industry, where the main goals are amusement and entertainment, Sullivan and Wendrich provide an example of how such immersive environments—in this case, a model of built spaces in ancient Egypt—could lead students to a deeper appreciation of how sacred meanings were (and continue to be) expressed in material forms and how human behaviors were influenced by these built surroundings. In this particular application, the computer-generated immersive environment also

supports the students' capacity to imagine the lived experiences of culturally different others.

In "Beyond Paper Maps: Archeologies of Place," Abby Suckle and Seetha Raghupathy show how creative cultural mapping methods are adapted to both situation and purpose. Trained as architects and in the principles of urban design, Suckle and Raghupathy offer an expansive, highly collaborative curatorial approach to cultural mapping. Their method is a form of social practice—a process of iterative exhibition linked to a series of issue-based academic, artistic, and social planning events—closely aligned with Freire's theory and practice of *conscientização*, that is, invoking a rhetoric of public engagement based on a commitment to dialogue, social change, and community empowerment. They speak of mapping as "an empowering vehicle" for social understanding, cohesion, and action. By employing and exhibiting a mix of historically significant physical maps and newly created, site-specific cultural maps, they begin by situating and provoking public dialogue, eliciting cultural storytelling, and fostering an enhanced understanding of community and sense of place. Research, key findings, and interpretations are displayed in the spirit of contemporary museum practice, one open to coproduction and improvisation, including a willingness to adapt each exhibition to the exigencies and narrative impulses of the place and the moment.

When working on BostonNOW, for example, they begin not with the collecting of objects (the maps and "assets" to be selected or created and displayed) but with the collecting of firsthand observations and stories. Like good ethnographers, they review the city's past planning discussions and documents; they identify and review the recent history of social and cultural issues affecting the built environment, including individual buildings, neighborhoods, roadways, and urban renewal sites; and, above all, they engage the community by "listening to people talk about their experiences," determined to "paint a picture of the city through their voices." This is also an iterative practice, where the researchers apply lessons learned from their prior exhibitions: Unlike their experiences of mapping Harlem and Lower Manhattan, they find that they cannot simply scale up their approach and "view Boston as a bigger neighborhood." Eschewing what they call "traditional cultural mapping" ("focusing on a single neighborhood or cultural event and drilling down deeply to explore its cultural history ~~in depth~~"), they opt to map the city holistically as a collection of thematically connected narratives anchored to milestones of cultural history and places of recognized cultural significance. They display these maps via conventional and online methods, in gallery and gallery-like spaces, through cultural performances and events, interactive mapping websites, and smartphone apps. Their overarching aim is to create a "museum without walls" and to describe stories of place "in a manner that transcends pure documentation."

Extending from such a curatorship approach, the role of artists and the arts in sustainable community development has emerged as a significant area

30 *Nancy Duxbury, W. F. Garrett-Petts, and David MacLennan*

of interest inside and outside the academy, as already mentioned. In the context of community mapping, artists are frequently referenced as catalysts for community creativity; however, their methods and perspectives are seldom remarked upon. Three chapters in this cluster are particularly interested in deepening our understanding of how the contributions of artists extend and perhaps complicate collaborative practice, collective action, and civic engagement. The chapters address both directly and obliquely the special opportunities, benefits, limitations, pressures, and obligations that involvement in cultural mapping offers artists. The chapters also raise important questions about what happens to community engagement, community voices, cultural mapping, cultural sustainability, policy development, and research when artistic modes of inquiry (the strategies, assumptions, traditions, and practices of artists) are introduced.

Adopting a complexity theory perspective, Roberta Comunian and Katerina Alexiou's chapter, "Mapping the Complexity of Creative Practice: Using Cognitive Maps to Follow Creative Ideas and Collaborations," looks at the role of collaboration and the impact that place, audiences, and activities have on the artistic projects presented at a street art festival in U.K. (Fuse Festival, Medway). Using cognitive maps, the authors—Comunian, a lecturer in cultural and creative industries at King's College London, and Alexiou, a lecturer in design at The Open University—explore changes, difficulties, unexpected collaborations, audiences, types of feedback, and a variety of external influences. The results highlight how artists evolve, change, and learn while creating and presenting their work. Especially important to the practice of cultural mapping, they argue, is how an understanding of the process and the factors that influence creative practice can help unearth and map intangible cultural assets. Toward that end, Comunian and Alexiou initiate a mixed methods approach to cultural mapping, using cognitive maps and interviews to explore how we can culturally map the artistic creative process and reveal the factors and interactions that influence it. They map not only the roles played by individuals but also the artists' interactions, networks, and the nature of their locations and collaborations.

Cognitive mapping techniques are used to gather self-reflection on practice, allowing Comunian and Alexiou to record visually systematic observations and comparisons of the artists' interactions, aspirations, assumptions, processes, and contributions. Their draw-talk protocol (mapping activities followed by a series of semistructured interviews) focuses on interactions with people, places, audiences, and other external influences, and they offer their method of network analysis as a useful means of documenting systemic connections and understanding the social dynamics informing public events and the contributing projects. As noted in their conclusion, "[a]lthough informed by theory," the authors describe their methodology "as an inductive process, employing cognitive mapping techniques and qualitative interviews to help artists reflect on their practice and unearth some of the processes and exchanges which too often remain hidden from researchers."

Using a performance-walk *Dream-work* (2009–2013) as their case study, Sara Giddens and Simon Jones, the codirectors of U.K.-based theater company *Bodies in Flight*, explore a form of embodied cultural mapping. In “From Work to Play: Making *Bodies in Flight*’s Performance Walk *Dream-work*,” through a reflective dialogue, they detail how their recent practice has involved a progressively more complex engagement with communities, resulting in deeper investigations into the artist’s role when sited among communities that are not their home, questions that themselves challenge conceptions of performance as an art form that can provide a meeting ground for communities of place. Speaking in the first person, Giddens and Jones address directly some of the processes and exchanges referenced by the artists in Comunian and Alexiou’s study. Giddens and Jones’ methods, while influenced by previous research on walking and urban movement, are developed inductively and sequentially, honoring the space and time of each performance-event but then considering each as part of a longer critical-creative narrative. The focus here is on dialogue, what they describe as a “duet” between performer and audience.

The nature of that duet, however, characterizes a very different strategy for community engagement than that usually assumed or associated with participatory art and social action. In their words, they interact with communities not as “socially or politically engaged artists or creative facilitators” but “from the point of view of this long-term and evolving aesthetic strategy . . . in increasing degrees of exchange, with specific communities and their localities, beginning first as tourist-visitors, and then progressively involving the voices of local participants, while always remaining outsiders.” Theirs is an indirect but potentially profound contribution to cultural mapping, revealing a depth of engagement in practice over time—a practice that, when viewed through a cultural mapping lens, might suggest how intense artistic immersions like *Dream-work* can challenge familiar assumptions about the nature of engagement. Although it may not have been an intended outcome of their performance, their chapter looks back and “offers a narrative of an evolving methodology, which unintentionally drew out the potentially conflicting *willfulnesses* of agents involved in any cultural mapping process, through notions of identity, collaboration, performance, the public and the corporate, the official and the vernacular histories.” The willfulness of artists is a topic often overlooked or misunderstood by those engaged in cultural mapping.

“Maraya as Visual Research: Mapping Urban Displacement and Narrating Artistic Inquiry” is a collaboratively written chapter (part essay, part artist statement) by two Vancouver-based artists, Glen Lowry and Henry Tsang, and one Dubai-based artist, M. Simon Levin. They offer an insider’s view of the intersections among artistic practice, community engagement, and academic research, seeking “to work a space between the power of the map and the mapping of power.” Their creative point of departure begins with their discovery of a full-scale replica of Vancouver’s False Creek, a tidal



32 Nancy Duxbury, W. F. Garrett-Petts, and David MacLennan

flat in the center of Vancouver, that had been created as Dubai Marina, an artificial canal city situated along the Persian Gulf shoreline. Their extended art project, called Maraya, fuses art making and academic research, seeking to explore the social, aesthetic, personal, and political significance of finding such an unlikely urban doppelgänger. They find themselves troubled by this gesture toward mass production and branding, effecting a kind of displacement of the familiar; and they ask themselves, “What role do artists play in the context of a global urbanism?”

Theirs is a project about mapping urban and cultural transformation; it is also about a transformation of artistic intention as the artists find themselves moving between theory and practice, between a detached aesthetic fascination and a pull toward public dialogue and civic engagement. At points in the chapter, they are remarkably candid, confessing “a growing awareness of the difficulty of truly understanding or engaging the public of a city [Dubai] where we had no real (personal) stake.” A little later they note how they “have struggled to find social contexts for the work and to gain participants and supporters for whom the project might be meaningful.” The short-term artistic intervention loses its appeal, at least for a while, when it finds itself “homeless.”

Like Giddens and Jones, the Maraya artist collective employs an inductive method, thinking with and through materials and working out their social and artistic positions *in the process* of making art objects. This is a very different methodological approach from the prescribed “design thinking” detailed by Pillai and Providência, and the art produced seems designed more for the gallery and the academy than the street. Still, they express an overarching, even ambitious desire to “to use contemporary art as a forum for or foray into civic engagement—in a sense, to reverse the dominant approach in which art functions as an addendum or added value to a well-honed urban plan.” Although working in collaboration with planners, municipal leaders, and architects, the project makes its statements indirectly, working at the periphery of social and cultural development planning. Yet there is much to admire and learn from here, as the artists hold up a mirror of sorts and map their journey across two cultures.

*Cultural Mapping as Cultural Inquiry* concludes with a lively but intense reflection on a classroom-based deep mapping exercise. In 2013, Kathleen Scherf, a professor of communications and tourism studies at Thompson Rivers University, Canada, taught an interdisciplinary senior seminar in which students examined alternative concepts of mapping and compiled a deep map of the mountain village and resort Sun Peaks, in British Columbia, Canada. “Beyond the Brochure: An Unmapped Journey into Deep Mapping” describes and contextualizes that process and offers suggestions for other academics who are thinking of employing deep mapping as a pedagogical approach. Scherf takes us on a journey, an erudite survey of deep mapping approaches, from Deleuze and Guattari to Rodaway to Stegner to Least Heat-Moon—ending up at McLucas’s recipe for deep mapping,



“There are ten things that I can say about these deep maps.” Deep mapping, we are told, is “a conversation and not a statement,” and Scherf’s chapter embodies this dictum, addressing and engaging the reader in dialogue, in a kind of engaged thick description of process and method.

A literature review is followed by an examination of ready geographical, topographical, historical, and place-based data—including a close reading of the discourse of promotional brochures as maps. Scherf is especially interested in how the techniques of deep mapping might be used in the interests of place promotion; indeed, she is forthright about viewing deep mapping “from the perspective of tourism studies” and her desire to represent an inviting place for visitors:

For me, keeping the end user in mind helps sort out what kind of content should be in the deep map: I want to create a map for someone interested in a trip to a mountain resort in the interior of British Columbia who seeks to gain a sense of the place ~~—s/he is considering as the destination.~~ That’s the practical side. But I am also intrigued with the more conceptual challenge of using a map, or a post-map, to convey the spirit of a particular place.

This dual purpose informs her methodology when she secures support from the Sun Peaks Resort Corporation (owned by Nippon Cable of Japan) and access to an electronic base map with data layers that indicate topography, vertical relief, roads, trails, buildings, and so on. Scherf is aware that this gift comes with strings: Sun Peaks Resort sits on unceded Aboriginal land and thus remains a contested site; not surprisingly, the sponsoring corporation does not want the issue of land claims featured on what it sees as a promotional cultural map. Scherf’s chapter explores the complications and constraints of working with a corporate community partner, the immediate pedagogical focus of working with a tourism class, the ethical questions of representing contested spaces, and the attraction of working with deep mapping techniques and ideals.

## CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

In a recent blog post, media theorist David Gauntlett was asked, provocatively, “What kinds of knowledge do we need now?” (2014). He responded by identifying three key kinds of knowledge in ascending order of importance:

- How things work (technical and economic knowledge)
- How things feel and fit (emotional and embodied knowledge)
- How things make a difference (creative and political knowledge)

The first two bodies of knowledge speak to the tangible and intangible as we encounter them in the world; the third body of knowledge is about

34 Nancy Duxbury, W. F. Garrett-Petts, and David MacLennan

“knowing how to make things, and to make things happen.” Cultural mapping seems to be a ready-made exemplar of the kind of new knowledge needed, for it is about understanding and making and making things happen. It is a form of social action designed to inform, preserve, plan, and persuade. Cultural mapping *argues*, in the classic sense of the word, for mapping is never innocent; it is a rhetorical device, a way of doing things in the world. It is also *performative* (as defined by J.L. Austin’s Speech Act Theory, 1962) in that a map represents and acts at the same time (Wood, 2012). By analogy, cultural mapping represents cultural assets, and in the process it also contributes to those cultural assets. As cultural mappers are fond of saying, *the process is as important as the product*.

Drawing on the examples provided by our contributing authors and by our survey of the field, we propose that cultural mapping *and the maps produced* may be usefully conceptualized in terms of their motives and rhetorical situation as a mode of “social action.” We want to look at cultural mapping in terms of a prevailing commitment to community participation; to inclusivity; to revealing the private and the public and drawing out intrinsic community values, history, and sense of place; to intensive consultation; and so on (Freitas, 2014). Such a consideration of cultural mapping as social action should also include the role and impact of artists as researchers, recognizing that the entanglement of artists is likely to complicate and unsettle our temptation to define cultural mapping in terms of neat binary frames.

Arguably, either/or thinking seems an inevitable part of any emerging field, especially one intent on mapping a diverse array of objects and processes, institutions and social relations—and where the locus of power and authorship remains a contested site of practice. Thus, some of the dimensions of advancing cultural mapping may well include the development of a binary theoretical matrix, considering cultural mapping in terms of tangible vs. intangible assets or outputs vs. impacts; or in terms of top-down vs. bottom-up approaches that are expert-led vs. community-driven, quantitative vs. qualitative, design oriented vs. process oriented. Within this conceptual web, we are attracted to those theories and methods that posit a continuum between binaries—in particular, those that conceptualize our options for mapping the tangible and the intangible together.

Revisiting Chiesi and Costa’s triangulation thesis, for instance, allows us to reconsider mapping the intangible in terms of how the past–future axis might fit into a model of cultural mapping as a “situated literacy” (Barton, Hamilton, and Ivanič, 2000). If patterns of heritage, history, and loss are always already implicated in the places and spaces we “read,” then cultural mapping becomes, in part, a matter of looking back in order to look closely—of drawing out and interpreting meaning in a present moment informed by our understanding of past contexts, references, and objects. If the motives for cultural mapping are in part to preserve and protect (looking back) but also to imagine, design, and propose (looking forward) based

upon patterns of emerging consensus, then cultural mapping becomes an indicator of communities wanting to inscribe elements of a new future. What both views share is an implicit interest in *emergence*, in the sense that both past and future are immanent, in a state of becoming.<sup>6</sup>

Cultural mapping entails a form of social action and knowledge production invoking a repertoire of methods that identify and account for both tangible and intangible assets. Cultural mapping also aims to recognize and make visible the ways in which local stories, practices, relationships, memories, and rituals constitute places as meaningful locations. In this chapter, we have aimed to sketch out a framework for situating an emerging, very interdisciplinary field of activity that intertwines trajectories of both research and practice. Looking forward, we wish to close with a few notes on two key factors that will influence the contours of this field—technological advancements and potentially expanded use-contexts—and a list of ten things we still need to know about cultural mapping.

First, the technological capabilities being invented and advanced through projects such as those presented by Sullivan and Wendrich and by Suckle and Raghupathy in this volume provide insightful perspectives into the possibilities of powerful new 2D and 3D mapping and rendering technologies, harnessed both to intellectual inquiry and to changing societal needs. Technological innovations are ever advancing in the areas of *creating data* (e.g., compilation of distributed electronic inputs, such as Tweets, and on-site inputs from “crowd-sourced” or other dynamic data streams), *analyzing data* (e.g., data aggregation, layering, mash-ups, modeling, etc.), *displaying data* (e.g., map layers, dynamic interactivity, ever improving graphical renderings), and *mobile usability* (e.g., on-site demand, manipulation, and customized uses)—all will influence the evolution of cultural mapping.

Coupled with the possibilities of the new technologies, we must remain vigilant and wary of the potential widening of inequities. This calls for heightened attention to questions of access and skills/capacity, as well as to the social and political consequences of the societal uses of these technologies. These concerns relate also to issues of relations between outsiders bringing specialized knowledge and cartographic skills into a community-engaged mapmaking process and to the importance of building cartographic literacy within communities—as is the focus of many counter-mapping and Indigenous mapping initiatives in recent years (see, e.g., Johnson, Louis, and Pramono, 2005). In addition, it is important to recognize that the process of making implicit knowledge explicit, as well as mobilizing the symbolic forms through which local residents understand and communicate their sense of place, also have ethical and political dimensions.

Social and territorial justice is emerging to be a central axis of future urban transformations (Duxbury, Moniz, Barca, Grigolo, Allegretti, and Sgueo, 2013). In the face of diversifying forms of social exclusion, new

36 Nancy Duxbury, W. F. Garrett-Petts, and David MacLennan

approaches to citizen empowerment, citizen participation, and social inclusion are developing around ideas, knowledge(s), experiences, resources and capacities that are “(dis)located across an array of arenas and distributed among different actors” (p. 10). Many initiatives reaffirm relationships between inhabitants and “the meaning of and quality of their living spaces” (p. 14). Cultural mapping seems to be ideally situated as a potentially useful tool in this context.

We would like to see cultural mapping evolve away from one-time projects to more dynamic and cyclical processes embedded in the life patterns and development dynamics of community and place. Along these lines, cultural mapping processes could be better integrated into mechanisms of planning, policy, and participatory governance such as community quality-of-life indicator systems (see, e.g., Badham, 2011) and community-based monitoring (see Allegretti, Duxbury, Serapioni, and Pereira, 2013). At the same time, we look forward to seeing a continual bubbling-up of new and alternate cultural mapping approaches, perspectives, and critiques building more diverse and deeper understandings of the places in which we live and care for. And we eagerly anticipate the sharing of further research into cultural mapping, for as much as we know already, there is much we still need to know.

#### Ten things we still need to know about cultural mapping:

1. We need more histories of cultural mapping, more globally distributed, situating the practice locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally.
2. We need further comparative analyses of case studies, toolkits, and good practices—especially analyses involving international viewpoints and giving due consideration to community scale.
3. We need to study and learn more from examples and practices of Indigenous mapping, with knowledge systems made visible and the politics, history, heritage, and power relations more fully shared and understood.
4. We need even stronger theories of cultural mapping, informed by spatial theory and praxis but also well grounded in the rhetoric and practice of social action.
5. We need to consider further what it means to think of cultural mapping not only as an urban or community planning tool but as a situated literacy.
6. We need to develop cultural mapping practices that recognize, value, and represent *both* the tangible and intangible dimensions of culture.
7. We need to develop and refine better methods for cultural mapping generally—ones field-tested *and* tailored for or adopted by (or even created by) local interests.
8. We need to explore further the implications of new technologies for cultural mapping.

9. We need know more about and encourage the engagement of art and artists in key aspects of cultural mapping processes.
10. We need to know how to achieve the kind of “equilibrium” that Evans and others speak of, where amenable cultural planning processes position culture and participatory governance as the “mediating forces” between the three more prominent pillars of sustainable development.

## NOTES

1. Les Roberts (2012) offers a comprehensive literature review attesting to an increased interdisciplinary interest in spatial relations and spatial theory. He calls the spatial turn “something of a dominant paradigm” with *the map* taking a central position as the paradigm’s “defining trope” (pp. 14–15).
2. Within the framework of the UN’s First International Decade of the World’s Indigenous Peoples (1995–2004), UNESCO articulated a specific program of cultural mapping with Indigenous peoples.
3. In Canada, a recent Supreme Court ruling on Aboriginal land title has given ongoing cultural mapping initiatives sudden notoriety. One such initiative involves the Stz’uminus First Nation, in the Salish Sea area off the south coast of British Columbia. Working in collaboration with faculty from the University of Victoria and supported by Google Earth Outreach, the cultural mapping project began as way to help Aboriginal youth locate (and map) their heritage and customs in relation to their immediate environment. More recently, Robert Morales, the chief negotiator for the Hul’qumi’num Treaty Group, is reported to have said that “the maps can be used in court to assert the Stz’uminus First Nations territorial claims” (Hunter, 2014, p. S4).
4. For a catalogue of map artists, see Wood and Krygier (2006).
5. Building on the seminal work of Kenneth Burke (1945) on rhetoric as social action and of Carolyn Miller on *genre* (Miller, 1984), consideration of *spatial rhetoric* has informed work on “spatial form” (McNeil, 1980); the “arts of the contact zone” (Pratt, 1991); “remapping writing” and “opening spaces” for new writing technologies (Sullivan and Porter, 1993, 1997); “visual-spatial thinking” (Johnson-Sheehan and Baehr, 2001); “geographic rhetorics” (Reynolds, 2004); “rhetoric and space in the age of the network” (Rice, 2012); and “urban motives and rhetorical approaches to spatial orientation” (Smolarski, 2014).
6. *Emergence* is defined by Jeffrey Goldstein (1999) as “the arising of novel and coherent structures, patterns, and properties during the process of self-organization in complex systems” (p. 49).

## REFERENCES

- Allegretti, G., Duxbury, N., Serapioni, M., and Pereira, M. S. (2013). *Community-based monitoring and a possible new dialogue with local governments: An overview of international experiences*. Report for United Cities and Local Governments’ International Observatory on Participatory Democracy and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ). Barcelona: UCLG.

- Amazon Conservation Team. (2008). *Methodology of collaborative cultural mapping*. Brasília: Equipe de Conservação da Amazônia Edições. Retrieved from [http://www.equipe.org.br/publicacoes\\_dentro.php?tipoid=1](http://www.equipe.org.br/publicacoes_dentro.php?tipoid=1)
- Ashley, H., Kenton, N., and Milligan, A. (Eds.). (2006). Mapping for change: Practice, technologies and communication. Special issue of *Participatory Learning and Action*, 54 (April). Retrieved from <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/14507IIED.pdf>
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Badham, M. (2011). *Port Phillip, Australia: The Community Pulse—Measuring what matters*. Case study in United Cities and Local Governments' Inclusive Cities Observatory. Retrieved from [http://www.uclg-cisd.org/sites/default/files/Port%20Phillip\\_2010\\_en\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.uclg-cisd.org/sites/default/files/Port%20Phillip_2010_en_FINAL.pdf)
- Bain, A. (2014). *Creative margins: Cultural production in Canadian suburbs*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Barton, D., Hamilton, M. and Ivanič, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context*. New York: Routledge.
- Basso, K. (1996). Wisdom sits in places: Notes on Western Apache landscape. In S. Feld and K. Basso (Eds.), *Senses of place* (pp. 53–90). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research.
- Benhabib, S. (Ed.). (1996). *Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bennett, T., and Mercer, C. (1997). *Improving research and international cooperation for cultural policy*. Report commissioned by UNESCO Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development, Stockholm, Sweden, March 30–April 2, 1998. Retrieved from <http://www.ericarts.org/web/files/86/en/bennet-mercer.pdf>
- Berger, P., Berger, B., and Kellner, H. (1973). *The homeless mind: Modernization and consciousness*. New York: Random House.
- Bianchini, F., and Ghilardi, L. (2007). Thinking culturally about place. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 3(4), 280–286.
- Bishop, C. (2012). *Artificial hells: Participatory art and the politics of spectatorship*. London and New York: Verso.
- Bitzer, L. (1968). The rhetorical situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 1(1), 1–14.
- Bourriaud, N. (2002). *Relational aesthetics* (S. Pleasance and F. Woods, Trans.). Dijon: Les Presses du Réel. (Original work published 1998.)
- Brody, H. (1981). *Maps and dreams*. Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre.
- Burke, K. (1945). *A grammar of motives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Castells, M. (1991). *The informational city*. London: Macmillan.
- Cosgrove, D. (1999). Introduction: Mapping meaning. In D. Cosgrove (Ed.), *Mappings* (pp. 1–23). London: Reaction Books.
- Cosgrove, D. (2008). Cultural cartography: Maps and mapping in cultural geography. *Annales de Géographie*, 2008/2–3(660–661), 159–178. Retrieved from [http://www.cairn.info/article.php?ID\\_ARTICLE=AG\\_660\\_0159#re21no81](http://www.cairn.info/article.php?ID_ARTICLE=AG_660_0159#re21no81)
- Craib, R.B. (2004). *Cartographic Mexico: A history of state fixations and fugitive landscapes*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Crampton, J.W., and Krygier, J. (2006). An introduction to critical cartography. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 4(1), 11–33.
- Crawford, H. (2008). *Artistic bedfellows: Histories, theories, and conversations in collaborative art practices*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Crawhall, N. (2007). The role of participatory cultural mapping in promoting intercultural dialogue—'We are not hyenas.' Concept paper prepared for UNESCO Division of Cultural Policies and Intercultural Dialogue.
- Crouch, D., and Matless, D. (1996). Refiguring geography: Parish Maps of Common Ground. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 21(1), 236–255.

- Dalton, C., and Thatcher, J. (2014). What does a critical data studies look like, and why do we care? Seven points for a critical approach to 'big data.' *Society and Space open site (of Society and Space: Environment and Planning D)*. Retrieved from: <http://societyandspace.com/material/commentaries/craig-dalton-and-jim-thatcher-what-does-a-critical-data-studies-look-like-and-why-do-we-care-seven-points-for-a-critical-approach-to-big-data/>
- Davidoff, P. (1996). Advocacy and pluralism in planning. In R. LeGates and F. Stout (Eds.), *The city reader* (pp. 422–432). London and New York: Routledge.
- Dorling, D., and Fairbairn, D. (1997). *Mapping: Ways of representing the world*. London: Longman, Harlow.
- Duxbury, N. (2005). Cultural indicators and benchmarks in community indicator projects. In C. Andrew, M. Gattinger, M.S. Jeannotte, and W. Straw (Eds.), *Accounting for culture: Thinking through cultural citizenship*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Duxbury, N. (2008). *Under construction: The state of cultural infrastructure in Canada*. Vancouver: Centre of Expertise on Culture and Communities, Simon Fraser University.
- Duxbury, N., Moniz, G.C., Barca, S., Grigolo, M., Allegratti, G., and Sgueo, G. (2013). Introduction. In N. Duxbury, G. C. Moniz, and G. Sgueo (Eds.), *Rethinking urban inclusion: Spaces, mobilizations, interventions*. CEScontextos, no. 2 (pp. 10–14). Coimbra: Centre for Social Studies.
- Edney, M.H. (1997). *Mapping an empire: The geographical construction of British India, 1765–1843*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Elster, J. (Ed.). (1998). *Deliberative democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Farinelli, F. (1992). I segni del mondo. Immagine cartografica e discorso geografico in età moderna. Scandicci: La Nuova Italia.
- Flower, L. (2008). *Community literacy and the rhetoric of public engagement*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1986). Of other places: Utopias and heterotopias (J. Miskowiec, Trans.). *Diacritics*, 16(1), 22–27.
- Fraleigh, J.M. (2011). Images of force: The power of maps in community development. *Community Development Journal*, 46(4), 421–435.
- Freitas, R. (2014). Cultural mapping as a development tool. Paper presented at the Mapping Culture: Communities, Sites, and Stories International Conference, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal, May 28–30.
- Fung, A., and Wright, O. E. (2003). *Deepening democracy: Institutional innovations in empowered participatory governance (the real Utopias Project IV)*. London and New York: Verso.
- Garrett-Petts, W.F., and Lawrence, D. (2005). Vernacular landscapes II: Relocating the homeless mind. In W.F. Garrett-Petts (Ed.), *The small cities book: On the cultural future of small cities* (pp. 167–177). Vancouver: New Star Books.
- Gauntlett, D. (2014, July 16). Making media studies: What kinds of knowledge do we need now? [blog]. Retrieved from <http://davidgauntlett.com/making-media-studies/what-kinds-of-knowledge/>
- Ghilardi, L. (2013). Mapping local urban and cultural DNA for sustainable place making. *SURF Magazine* (Summer) (published by SURE, Scotland's Independent Regeneration Network). Retrieved from <http://www.scotregen.co.uk/scotregen/mapping-local-urban-and-cultural-dna-for-sustainable-place-making/>
- Gibson, C., Brennan-Horley, C., and Warren, A. (2010). Geographic Information Technologies for cultural research: Cultural mapping and the prospects of colliding epistemologies. *Cultural Trends*, 19(4), 325–348.
- Goldstein, J. (1999). Emergence as a construct: History and issues. *Emergence: Complexity and Organization*, 1(1), 49–72.

40 Nancy Duxbury, W. F. Garrett-Petts, and David MacLennan

- Hamilton, M. (2000). Expanding the new literacy studies: Using photographs to explore literacy as social practice. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton, and R. Ivanič (Eds.), *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context* (pp. 16–34). New York: Routledge.
- Harley, J.B. (1989). Deconstructing the map. *Cartographica: The International Journal for Geographic Information and Geovisualization*, 26(2), 1–20.
- Harrington, S., and Stevenson, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Islands in the Salish Sea: A community atlas*. Victoria: TouchWood Editions.
- Harris, L.M., and Hazen, H.D. (2005). Power of maps: (Counter) mapping for conservation. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 4(1), 99–13.
- Hostettler, L. (2001). *Quing colonial enterprise: Ethnography and cartography in early modern China*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hunter, J. (2014). Google history lesson. *The Globe and Mail* (British Columbia section) (July 12), pp. S1, S4.
- Jackson, S. (2011). *Social works: Performing art, supporting publics*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Jacob, C. (1993). *L'empire des cartes*. Paris: Albin Michel.
- Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or, the cultural logic of late capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Johnson, J. T., Louis, R. P., and Pramono, A. H. (2005). Facing the future: Encouraging critical cartographic literacies in Indigenous communities. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 4(1), 80–98.
- Johnson-Sheehan, R., and Baehr, C. (2001). Visual-spatial thinking in hypertexts. *Technical Communication*, 48(1), 22–30.
- Kester, G.H. (2011). *The one and the many*. Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press.
- Kitchin, R., Perkins, C., and Dodge, M. (2009). Thinking about maps. In M. Dodge, R. Kitchin, and C. Perkins (Eds.), *Rethinking maps: New frontiers in cartographic theory* (pp. 1–25). London: Routledge.
- Lacy, S. (1995). *Mapping the terrain: New genre public art*. Seattle: Bay Press.
- Langdon, M. (1994). *Valuing cultures: Recognising Indigenous cultures as a valued part of Australian heritage*. Issues paper, Australian Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation. Canberra: Australian Government Public Service.
- Leander, K.M. (2002). Situated literacies, digital practices, and the constitution of space-time. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference 52nd Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida, United States, December 2002.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Maiden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Liben, L. (2006). Education for spatial thinking. In W. Damon, R.M. Lerner, K.A. Renninger, and I.E. Sigel (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology, Vol. 4: Child psychology in practice*, 6th ed. (pp. 197–247). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Lilley, K.D. (2000). Landscape meaning and symbolic form: Drawing as a creative medium in cultural geography. In I. Cook (Ed.), *Cultural turns, geographical turns: Perspectives on cultural geography* (pp. 370–438). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lynch, K. (1960). *The image of the city*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Mannion, G., Ivanič, R., and the Literacies for Learning in Further Education (LlFE) Research Group. (2007). Mapping literacy practices: Theory, methodology, methods. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 20(1), 15–30.
- Manoff, E. (2014). Destabilizing the map through critical cartography and resistance. *The people, place, and space reader* [book website]. Retrieved from



- <http://peopleplacespace.org/fr/destabilizing-the-map-through-critical-cartography-and-resistance/>
- McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McNeil, L.D. (1980). Toward a rhetoric of spatial form: Some implications of Frank's theory. *Comparative Literature Studies*, 17(4), 355–367.
- Miles, M. (1997). *Art, space and the city: Public art and urban futures*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Miller, C.R. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70, 151–167.
- Nash, C. (1993). Remapping and renaming: New cartographies of gender, landscape and identity in Ireland. *Feminist Review*, 44, 39–57.
- Pearce, M.W., and Louis, R.P. (2008). Mapping indigenous depth of place. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 32(3), 107–126.
- Peluso, N.L. (1995). Whose woods are these? Counter-mapping forest territories in Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Antipode*, 27(4), 383–406.
- Pickles, J. (2004). *A history of spaces: Cartographic reason, mapping, and the geocoded world*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Pillai, J. (2013). *Cultural mapping: A guide to understanding place, community and continuity*. Petaling Jaya, Malaysia: Strategic Information and Research Development Centre.
- Poole, P. (2003). *Cultural mapping and indigenous peoples*. Report prepared for UNESCO (March). Retrieved from [http://www.iapad.org/publications/ppgis/cultural\\_mapping.pdf](http://www.iapad.org/publications/ppgis/cultural_mapping.pdf)
- Pratt, M.L. (1991). Arts of the contact zone. *Profession*, 91, 33–40.
- Relf, E. (1976). *Place and placelessness*. London: Pion.
- Repko, A. (2008). *Interdisciplinary research: Process and theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Reynolds, N. (2004). *Geographies of writing: Inhabiting places and encountering difference*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Rice, J. (2012). *Digital Detroit: Rhetoric and space in the age of the network*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Roberts, L. (2012). *Mapping cultures: Place, practice, performance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rodman, M. (2003). Empowering place: Multilocality and multivocality. In S.M. Low and D. Lawrence-Zuniga (Eds.), *The anthropology of space and place: Locating culture* (pp. 204–223). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Santos, B. de Sousa. (2007). Beyond abyssal thinking: From global lines to ecologies of knowledges. *Eurozine* (June 29). Retrieved from <http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2007-06-29-santos-en.html>
- Satterfield, T., Gregory, R., Klain, S., Roberts, M., and Chan, K.M. (2013). Culture, intangibles and metrics in environmental management. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 117, 103–114.
- Smolarski, P. (2014). Urban motives—Rhetorical approaches to spatial orientation, Burke on Lynch's "The Image of the City." *KB Journal*, 10(1). Retrieved from [http://kbjournal.org/smolarski\\_urban\\_motives](http://kbjournal.org/smolarski_urban_motives)
- Soini, K. (2001). Exploring human dimensions of multifunctional landscapes through mapping and map-making. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 57(3–4), 225–239.
- Soja, E.W. (1980). The socio-spatial dialectic. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 70, 207–225.
- Soja, E.W. (1989). *Postmodern geographies: The reassertion of space in critical social theory*. London and New York: Verso.

42 Nancy Duxbury, W. F. Garrett-Petts, and David MacLennan

- Stewart, S. (2007). *Cultural mapping toolkit*. Vancouver: Creative City Network of Canada and 2010 Legacies Now.
- Sullivan, P.A., and Porter, J.E. (1993). Remapping curricular geography: Professional writing in/and English. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 7, 389–422.
- Sullivan, P.A., and Porter, J.E. (1997). *Opening spaces: Writing technologies and critical research practices*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Teaiwa, K., and Mercer, C. (2011). *Pacific cultural mapping, planning and policy toolkit*. Fiji: Secretariat of the Pacific Community.
- Toledo Maya Cultural Council and Toledo Alcaldes Association. (1977). *Maya atlas: The struggle to preserve Maya land in southern Belize*. Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books.
- Tufte, E.R. (1983). *Visual display of quantitative information*. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.
- Tufte, E.R. (1990). *Envisioning information*. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.
- UNESCO. (2006). *Havana communiqué on cultural mapping*. Produced at the UNESCO conference New Perspectives on Cultural Diversity: The Role of Communities, Havana, Cuba, February 7–10. Retrieved from [http://www.spore-subs.org/pla54/docs/hav/havcom\\_en\\_acfb67.pdf](http://www.spore-subs.org/pla54/docs/hav/havcom_en_acfb67.pdf)
- Vatz, R.E. (2009). The mythical status of situational rhetoric: Implications for rhetorical critics' relevance in the public arena. *The Review of Communication*, 9(1), 1–5.
- Westphal, B. (2011). *Geocriticism: Real and fictional spaces* (R. Tally, Trans.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wood, D. (2012). The anthropology of cartography. In L. Roberts (Ed.), *Mapping cultures: Place, practice, performance* (pp. 280–303). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wood, D., and Krygier, J. (Eds.). (2006). Cartographic Perspectives, 53 (Winter), special issue on Art and Mapping.
- Young, G., and Stevenson, D. (Eds.). (2013). *The Ashgate research companion to planning and culture*. London: Ashgate.