CHAPTER 9

GEOGRAPHY AND SOCIAL LOCATIONS

Positioning

An important idea in interactional sociolinguistics is that people use particular discourse strategies to align or oppose themselves to each other, or to articulate their relation to the information they are conveying. For example, do they articulate themselves as having a stake in what they're saying, or do they distance themselves from it, conveying the idea that they're "just the messenger"? A commonly used framework to analyze this kind of stance-taking is Erving Goffman's notion of *footing*. As Goffman explains it, footing is "the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance."[1]

Footing was a useful tool that I used to focus on the stances that people took towards each other the in face-to-face interactions I was studying. For example, in contentious town hall meetings about alcohol sales policies or trash cleanup, sometimes one member of a civic organization would take an aggressive stance that characterized all merchants as irresponsible, while another member of the same group would take a more conciliatory approach, averring that their group shared many of the same interests as many of the merchants and that they could work together. Using the concept of footing, I was able to examine how these divergent stances could work in tandem in a meeting to create an image of a civic group as pushing for radical change, but at the same time having the best interests of the community at heart. (Of course, discourse strategies don't work in a vacuum. These

strategies could only work to create an image of a group having a neighborhood's best interests at heart (rather than their own personal interests) as long as that was reflected in the projects that a group pursued. If they pursued projects that many in the community considered to be only in the interests of White, monied property owners, or against the interests of immigrant merchants, then those projects would trump any discourse strategies in creating an image of a civic group.)

While footing was a useful concept for analyzing face-to-face interaction, however, as I started analyzing the data I was collecting I found more and more that I was interested not in the stances that speakers themselves took up, but in the stances they constructed for other people they were talking about who were not present, as well as the ways that they aligned people to places. Rom Harré, Bronwyn Davies, and Luk van Langenhove's concept of *positioning* was well suited for investigating this kind of stance-taking.

These researchers' model of *positioning* views stances as positions that are dynamic and emergent in discourse, a perspective which fits well with a practice-based approach. Positioning develops the analysis of stance-taking in two other ways. First, it adds an explicitly moral framework. When we construct stances for ourselves and others, we articulate a moral aspect of that stance; we could say that creating stances is a way of positioning people along moral axes of, for example, goodness, or justness. Second, the concept of positioning allowed me to examine stances that speakers set up for other people or things that may or may not be present in the interaction at hand. It follows from this point that positioning is relational; the positioning of one person implicitly positions other people.[2] Furthermore, since positioning can be applied to entities other than humans, using the concept enabled me to talk about alignments and oppositions to *places*.

Harré and his colleagues' discussions of positioning relied to a great extent on spatial metaphors, but they were not interested in actual spatial relations. To use positioning fruitfully in a context where I wanted to analyze how people positioned themselves in relation to concrete spaces and places, I needed a way to ground a theory of positioning, as it were. It was here that Jane Hill's concept of moral geography became extremely useful. As I discussed in chapter 3, a moral geography is an interweaving of a moral framework with a geographical territory. In her essay "The Voices of Don Gabriel," Hill used the concept to analyze the connections between political

economy, morality, community boundaries, and space in a story that Don Gabriel, an elder in a Mexicano[3] (Nahuatl) peasant community near the city of Puebla, Mexico, told to Hill about his son's murder. In telling the story, Don Gabriel mapped positive values of community-mindedness, reciprocity, and kinship ties onto his home and village, while he linked negative values of greed, competitiveness, and individualism, as well as disorder and danger, with outlying areas and more urban places. Don Gabriel emphasized the distinctions between these parts of the moral landscape by mixing Spanish into his talk about outsiders and outlying areas, while his descriptions of home and village were all in Mexicano. These delineations added a moral layer to the political economic geography of the area, which distinguished the peasant village's collectivism from the capitalist system of the Spanish-speaking areas.

Before reading *Voices of Don Gabriel*, I had been thinking about Mt. Pleasant in a fairly insular way, only considering how talk of Mt. Pleasant related to goings-on in the neighborhood itself. Hill's framing of *moral geography* at first did not exactly seem to fit my case, because I was not contrasting different areas. But after reading this essay, I started to notice more and more that Mt. Pleasant discourse was full of references to other places, most noticeably "the suburbs," as well as other areas of the city. And just as Don Gabriel had done, people in Mt. Pleasant used negative characterizations of these other places to bolster the positive qualities of the place they associated themselves with. With Hill's concept of moral geography, I was able to *spatialize* the notion of social positioning – to think about how social positioning worked in relation to real geographical space – and to start theorizing about how social positioning was accomplished through the discursive strategy of contrast. It also seemed that the concept of moral geography could be productively applied to the kind of social and moral positioning that I was finding in discourse that was limited to the subject of Mt. Pleasant, where people interwove moral frameworks into their discussions of the neighborhood, applying those frameworks wholesale without differentiating between different spaces within the neighborhood.

Thinking about how Hill's work could geographically inform Harré and colleagues' conceptions of social positioning sparked a train of thought that led me to concentrate more systematically on sociolinguistic and linguistic anthropological investigations of how people take up stances in relation to particular places. There is very little work within these fields that has set out to investigate place identity as a central concern, and indeed, as Rudolf Gaudio notes,[4] spatial aspects of linguistic interaction have been virtually absent as components of sociolinguistic theories of language in use.[5] However, because many studies are situated within particular geographical communities, people's orientations to places invariably become part of many analyses at some level, even if implicitly. This is especially true in the branch of sociolinguistics called *variation analysis*.

Variation analysts study how variants of the same linguistic feature pattern in relation to other linguistic features and to social features. For example, the final sound in the word *writing* has two variants in American English – the final sound in *sin*, and the final sound in *sing*.[6] Which variant you get might depend on the part of speech of the word you're looking at (with the word *building*, you're more likely to hear the *sin* sound in "I'm building (verb) a house," than you are in "that's a big building" (noun)), or it might depend on what sound follows the *-ing* ("I'm building glass houses" vs. "I'm building steel houses.")[7] But the patterning of variants is more often than not likely to be influenced by all kinds of social factors. With verbs ending in -ing, for example, you're more likely to get (the sound represented by) "ng" than "n" in female speech, upper class speech, and formal situations.[8]

Variation analysis has a historical link with dialectology and dialect geography research, since regional variation is one kind of variation. Perhaps also because of this connection, variation analysts are often concerned, at least implicitly, with places. Most of these studies have focused on the connection between pronunciation and social features that are important in particular communities. Some researchers have studied how pronunciation patterns along social networks, or the friendship, work, or family circles that exist in a community. For example, Lesley Milroy[9] found that, in communities in the Belfast area in Northern Ireland, people who had dense networks that were concentrated in geographical spaces – having relatives in the same neighborhood, participating in neighborhood-based activities – had pronunciations that were considered more vernacular (that differed from what was considered the regional standard). And because networks often tended to be gender-based (either because men in some neighborhoods worked together while women worked at home, or

because friendships were built around same-gender relationships), pronunciations ended up patterning according to gender, too.

In her research on Jocks and Burnouts in a suburban Detroit high school in the early 1980s,[10] Penelope Eckert found a similar correlation between social groups, gender, relationships to places, and pronunciation. For the purposes of my own research, what interested me about Eckert's work was the importance of geography for the pronunciations she was studying. Detroit is an area undergoing a change in vowel pronunciation called the *Northern Cities Chain Shift*.[11] (The sounds associated with the shift are sometimes what people think of as a Chicago accent.) As is common of many sound changes, the Northern Cities Chain Shift jumped first to urban centers, and then spread from those areas to the suburbs. Eckert found that the *burnout* students, a group of working-class students who opposed themselves to school activities and thought of themselves as more related to Detroit, pronounced the newer parts of the sound shift at higher rates than the jocks, a group of middle-class students who were more invested in school activities such as (but not limited to) sports. These newer changes were more commonly heard in Detroit, so using the newer vowel pronunciations was a way to show one's connection to Detroit – a way for these suburban kids to create an urban identity. What was even more interesting was that the burnout girls used the new vowels at even higher rates than the burnout boys. Boys were also able to align themselves with urbanness through activities, like driving to Detroit and spending time there, but girls were more constrained by their parents – they were not allowed to go to Detroit alone. To explain the distinction between boys' and girls' pronunciations, Eckert reasoned that, since the girls were more limited in participating in activities that could give them an urban status, they used "urban" vowel pronunciations as the symbolic capital that gave them an air of Detroitness.

Although she didn't frame it this way, I found Eckert's work to be important in thinking about how people articulate relationships between cities and outlying areas, and their own relationships to both. These questions are also relevant for variation research in places where economic incentives have impelled people to leave their hometowns for higher-paid work in more metropolitan areas. For example, in a study of vowel pronunciation in Martha's Vineyard, an island off the coast of Massachusetts, William Labov[12] found that speakers with positive attitudes about the island pronounced words like *house* and *kind* with a vowel sound somewhere between the broadcast news pronunciation of these sounds and the vowel in the stereotype of the New York pronunciation of "bird." This pronunciation was common among older people on the island, and a strong marker of the local accent. But it was also indicative of a particular orientation to the island – among young people, this pronunciation was highest among those who had left the island and then decided to return. And the pronunciation was highest among fishermen, who were dedicated to a traditional way of life and opposed themselves to summer tourists.[13] Similarly, in a study of dialect variation in Thyborøn, Denmark, Lisa Lane[14] found that it was women who worked outside of the village who had the most traditional, Thyborøn-identified accents. Lane's analysis of this phenomenon was that it was *because* of their ties outside of the village that these women needed to create a Thyborøn identity linguistically.

Conversely, in her work in Valladolid, Mexico, Julie Solomon[15] found that Spanish speakers in rural Yucatan in Mexico who had what she called a *cosmopolitan orientation* pronounced the sound represented by 'll' in words like *silla* (chair) more similarly to the way it was pronounced in nearby urban areas.[16] For people in the village where Solomon worked, the pronunciations of the city also invoked the economic opportunities of the city, while people associated the more local, older pronunciation with poverty, rurality, and lack of education. What these studies showed, if implicitly, is that place-identity is part and parcel of linguistic variation.

The connection between people's pronunciations and their affiliations with certain places is often under speakers' level of consciousness. However, particular pronunciations sometimes become emblematic of local identity in the popular mind, and this view can even propel a particular pronunciation to become the most common variant in a community. Barbara Johnstone, Neeta Bhasin, and Denise Wittkofski[17] argue that this is exactly what happened with the 'ah' sound in words like "downtown/dahntahn" in Pittsburgh. The "ah" pronunciation is an older variant that dialectologists might predict would be likely to fade away and be replaced by the more widespread "ow" pronunciation. Johnstone and her colleagues argue

that the "ah" sound has stayed around *because* it is such a strong symbol of being a Pittsburgh person, and that's something that many Pittsburghers are invested in.

The variationist work that deals with place identity is important because it highlights that people's connections to places are communicated in even the smallest details of their day-to-day interactions. Particularly because most of these studies (with the exception of Johnstone, Bhasin, and Wittkofski) did not set out to investigate place identity per se, this body of research makes clear that place identity is one of the major criteria by which people categorize the world and articulate their place in it; as these studies found, place plays as much of a role in people's relations to their social worlds as categories like gender and class. Seeing the role that place identity played in the findings of these studies made me feel that I was onto something. But I couldn't apply these studies in any direct sense, because to do variationist research that looks at such micro-level linguistic features, you have to be working with people who are part of the same speech community in the narrow sense. In a community like Mt. Pleasant where people don't share the same dialect (let alone the same language), people will not share the same set of options of pronouncing certain sounds. I wanted to study how place identity emerged at a larger linguistic level, so I next turned to research on discourse (in the sense of language above the sentence-level) to see how discourse analysts had grappled with place identity.

It turned out that place identity was salient at every level of linguistic analysis. At the most macro level of *language variety*, for example, linguistic anthropologist Norma Mendoza-Denton has found that choice of language gets filtered through alliances to various places.[18] Mendoza-Denton studied two groups of Latina gang girls in Northern California, the Norteñas and the Sureñas. Although girls in these groups had similar family backgrounds, linguistic repertoires, and immigration histories, and they lived in the same neighborhoods, at the macro level the groups had quite different linguistic practices: Norteñas spoke predominantly English and code-switched into Spanish, while Sureñas spoke predominantly Spanish and code-switched into English.[19] As the groups' names might suggest (*norte* translates as *north* and *sur* as *south*), these linguistic practices were tied up in the ways that the two groups aligned to particular places: Norteñas considered themselves to be from the North and constructed a US Chicana identity

for themselves, while Sureñas identified with the South and Mexico. For these girls, the politics of language had everything to do with the politics of place.

At the discourse level, deixis[20] seemed like an obvious place to look for place identity, since place identity is related to locations and to how places are located in relation to other places, and those relationships are encoded in deictics; we create closeness or distance by referring to something *here* or *there*, as *this* or *that*.

The work of linguistic anthropologists on deixis provided examples of the ways that deictics encode social relations among people and between people and spaces, and how these social relations consequently construct places. For instance, Alessandro Duranti[21] analyzed how Samoan parents in suburban Los Angeles use the deictic directive "sit down" with their children, which is meant to be interpreted specifically as "sit on the floor." This command recalls behavior appropriate within houses in Samoa, and in doing so it constructs a Samoan place within a suburban American built environment.

The sociolinguist Deborah Tannen's work also sheds light on how the ways that people talk about places shape the identities that they convey to others in conversations. In her study on conversational style and miscommunication,[22] she found that, when Jewish New Yorkers living in California talked about geography in Manhattan and events that took place in New York, they used a high level of cooperative overlapping speech[23] and other features that were characteristic of New York Jewish conversational style. Tannen herself did not frame her investigation as being about identity and place alignments, but her analysis makes clear that sharing stories about New York and using New York Jewish conversational style to tell those stories enabled these participants to create and bond around a shared New York identity.

People also create identities in relation to multiple places. Linguistic anthropologist Rudolf Gaudio's study of Nigerian Hausa 'yan daudu (men who act "like women")[24] is a case in point. In the Hausa language, verbs can take suffixes that indicate motion towards a particular location (or *deictic center*).[25] Motion away, however, is not indicated by any suffix; in linguistic terms, motion away is *unmarked*. The 'yan daudu who Gaudio spent time with frequently traveled from one place to another, to find work or avoid persecution. In the stories they told about these journeys, Gaudio found that speakers alternated between

using verbs with "motion-towards" suffixes and verbs without, thereby creating stories that had a strong sense of movement. With this verbal system, 'yan daudu created cosmopolitan identities based on travel to and alignments with *multiple* places at the same time. Although English does not have the same grammatical resources that Hausa has, this work helped me hone in on the way that Boaz, the Israeli merchant in chapter 3, was creating similar multiple alignments in a story told in English to create a transnational identity.

I found that these studies helped me in thinking through how to investigate the ways that people constructed their identities through alignments to place, but they didn't provide a model for systematically investigating place identity itself. In the mid-1990s, most of the discourse studies out there tended to look at the identity of a place as already existing, and as a backdrop against which people created their own identities. When I started my research there was very little work within sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology that focused on the identities of places as a central concern, and since that time there hasn't been much more. Among the earliest work to investigate place identity as a central theme was Keith Basso's research on Western Apache place names and stories about particular places.[26] By assigning place names that invoked past events and keeping those events alive through storytelling, the speakers Basso studied imbued the landscape with cultural meaning; places served as markers of community history, and as symbols of community values that were embedded in local evaluations of events that were associated with those places. Because places were laden with values, the invocation of place *names* could recall those values, and be used to socialize community members into appropriate behavior. Like Hill's work, what was key for me in Basso's research was that it highlighted the link between places, morality, and social action.

Other work on place names illustrated the way that people use discourses of place to promote particular points of view in community disputes over rights to space, something that became more important in my research as I started comparing the views expressed in the sociolinguistic interviews I was conducting. For example, linguistic anthropologist Karen Blu[27] found that Blacks, Whites, and Lumbee Indians in Robeson County, North Carolina used different town names and names for geographical features. She also described how, in storytelling, Whites tended to focus on physical, visually observable aspects of space, whereas Blacks and Indians focused more on social space (for instance, areas where a high proportion of group members lived). These North Carolinians used these various discourse orientations to space to reinforce or contest views of their own and other ethnic groups' connections to the landscape.

Even though studies like Basso's and Blu's focused more explicitly on the identity of places themselves, they tended to frame the discourses of place that they were analyzing as *reflecting* a given group's or speaker's notion of place, rather than actively *constructing* it. I was more interested in focusing on the active construction, and there was not a lot out there within discourse analysis. Some exceptions, however, were William Leap's and Barbara Johnstone's work.

Leap's research on intersections of place and ethnoracial identity[28] was useful in thinking about how different people constructed community boundaries. Leap asked White and Black gay men to draw and discuss maps of Gay DC, and he found that the two groups drew maps which highlighted different parts of the city, and talked about Gay DC in quite different ways.

Barbara Johnstone[29] was also interested in the active construction of place identity. Focusing on intertextuality (the way that textual elements travel across multiple texts), Johnstone revealed how residents of Fort Wayne, Indiana, picked up parts of newspaper stories about a local flood in their conversations and other writings. Her work was important to me for thinking about how discourses in a community circulate and build up to create a public community story and a shared identity – in the case of these Fort Wayne residents, a particularly "heartland" identity.

You may have noticed that I've been using the term *place* in a somewhat loose, undefined way. This is because, by and large, sociolinguistic and linguistic anthropological literature does not take pains to operationalize or define what *place* means. Although the literature in my field had helped to articulate the relationships between person and place identity, even the work that explicitly focused on place generally did not analyze or theorize just how place construction happened.

It was somewhat randomly that I would stumble upon research which would lead me to conceptualize *place* as an analytical concept, and to think more systematically about the process of place identity construction.

From Matt Groening to Cultural Geography (Procrastination Pays Off)

Before Matt Groening created the TV show *The Simpsons*, he was busy with two rabbit-like characters jumping into and out of all kinds of hellish situations. When I was in graduate school, the one that really spoke to me was his book, *School is Hell*. My favorite installment was, of course, "Lesson 19: Grad school (Some People Never Learn)" (Figure 9.1).

Figure 9.1   Reprinted from *School is Hell* published by Pantheon Books, a division of Random House, Inc. New York © 1987 Matt Groening Productions, Inc. All Rights Reserved. The Simpsons © and ™ Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation. All Rights Reserved.

It was the middle of spring, I had a conference presentation to write, and I had already laid in bed long enough for my snooze alarm to go off three times. Finally I dragged myself into the dining room to turn on my computer, and proceeded to write a sentence, make some tea, rewrite the sentence, get some potato chips, delete the sentence – twice – and rewrite it in its original form. Before getting some more potato chips.

At 11:30 a.m. I wasn't quite ready to call it a day, however, so I decided to follow Matt Groening's advice and READ ANOTHER BOOK. Which meant a slow, meandering walk down to Adams Morgan, where I could browse at my leisure in Idle Times Books, and still feel like I was working.

It was here that I came across a copy of cultural geographers James Duncan and David Ley's edited volume *place/culture/representation*. Shaking me out of my procrastinatory haze, this book gave me a whole new insight into the interactions I'd been analyzing in Mt. Pleasant. It awakened me to the world of cultural geography, and inspired me to see all kinds of connections between that field and the discourse analysis work that I was engaged in.

The writers in Duncan and Ley's book took a *hermeneutic approach* to studying geography – an approach that "recognizes that [scholarly] interpretation is a dialogue between one's data – other places and other people – and the researcher who is embedded within a particular intellectual and institutional context."[30] These authors were not interested in simply describing or mapping a geographical terrain, but rather sought to interrogate such descriptive and mapping practices. The contributors to Duncan and Ley's volume understood *place* as coming into being through (among other factors) people's perceptions, and those perceptions as shaped by the production and reproduction of symbolic systems such as maps, photographs, discourse. In this view, places were entities that were struggled over; they were contested terrains that were shaped by and reflected unequal power relations and the (multiple and sometimes contradictory) interests of some people or groups over others. This approach fit very well with the tenets of ethnographic discourse analysis, as well as the goals of critical discourse analysis. What it added was a systematic investigation of the history, interests, and symbolic processes that contributed both to the ways that environments got built or changed, and the mentalities that shaped those choices.[31]

The theorizings of urban anthropologists on connections between culture and the built environment also held great interest for me. Margaret Rodman argued that a separation between the cultural and the physical precludes a complete analysis of place. Using as an example her work in housing cooperatives in Toronto, she showed that one could only understand the geography of the cooperative if one analyzed the actual physical space, the ways people used the spaces for purposes both intended and unintended, and the meanings that they attributed to the spaces.[32] Similarly, Setha Low pointed out the problems of a theoretical framework that regards physical spaces as being distinct from the way that people experience them. The form that a given space takes tells stories of the people who have shaped and interacted with it, just as a space's form contributes to the future experiences that people will have there:

> Explaining built form in its relation to culture provides us with clues to meaning encoded in historically generated spatial forms. The built environment not only reflects sociocultural concerns but also shapes behavior and social action; thus, embedded in these design forms is a living history of cultural meanings and intentions.[33]

Although geographers and urban anthropologists rarely analyze discourse at the *little d* level, these scholars' focus on the connections between form, use, and meaning[34] resonated with me as a discourse analyst.

Finding the Scaffolding

Conducting research is somewhat like a scavenger hunt – you have a conversation with someone or you pick up a book in a library or bookstore, and your interest gets sparked in a certain topic. You learn of a researcher working on that topic, and you read their work. In their book or article or essay, they have a "literature review" section, where they talk about other people who have shaped their ideas. So you turn to the work of those people, and then in turn you find out about the theorists who have shaped these scholars' thinking. As I started reading more and more cultural geographers and urban

anthropologists, what kept coming up again and again were the theories of Henri Lefebvre from his book, *The Social Production of Space*.[35] Lefebvre's work has been enormously influential in the interdisciplinary field that's come to be called *Space and Place Theory*. Theorists of space and place explore, from multiple perspectives, how space and culture/society mutually constitute each other. Another way to articulate this interest is as an interest in the *social construction of place*.

Lefebvre's theory of social space considers what he calls *social spaces* (roughly the same thing as what I've been referring to as *places*) to be amalgamations of the social, the mental, and the material (i.e., physical). He considers these components to be inseparable, making up an indivisible social whole. However, for the purposes of understanding how social space works, he devised an approach that does in fact separate them out for heuristic purposes.[36] This approach consists of three elements: *spatial practice, representations of space*, and *spaces of representation*.[37]

Spatial practice

Lefebvre defines spatial practice as

> a projection onto a (spatial) field of all aspects, elements and moments of social practice.[38]

Spatial practices are the everyday practices that people perform in any given area; these will be considered by some as appropriate for that place, and by others as inappropriate. In other words, actions are evaluated based (in part) on where they occur, and places are evaluated in part through the actions which are carried out there.[39] Over time, the concert of spatial practices that people perform and evaluate in a particular place constructs sets of assumptions about what constitutes normative behavior for that place. As Lefebvre explains it,

> Spatial practice ensures continuity and some degree of cohesion. In terms of social space, and of each member of a given society's relationship to that space, this cohesion implies a guaranteed level of *competence* and a specific level of *performance*.[40]

In using the notions of *competence* and *performance* (loosely borrowed from the linguist Noam Chomsky, as Lefebvre points out), Lefebvre points to the importance of both action and interpretation in people's constructions of places. We can consider *performance-based spatial practices* to be activities, events, and interactions that either occur within a geographical area (such as playing soccer in a park or drinking beer at a bus stop) or outside of it (such as deciding at a city council meeting to rezone a neighborhood street for commercial uses). *Competence-based spatial practices* involve being able to "read" a place – for example to know if a place is safe or unsafe, or what kinds of activities are appropriate there.

Although in some senses it's useful to make a distinction between action and interpretation for the purpose of analysis, it is important to keep in mind that – as the linguistic anthropologist Dell Hymes[41] points out in his discussion of linguistic performance and competence, and as Lefebvre implies with his emphasis on the unity of space – performance and competence are integrated with one another, since a person's performance of a given action – boarding a bus through the front door, asking for a bus transfer when getting on rather than when getting off – is a demonstration of that person's linguistic and socio-geographic competence. By demonstrating through your actions that you have competence in knowing how to "read" a particular place, you are also (re)constructing ideas about normative, appropriate behavior.

The cultural geographer Tim Cresswell illustrates this point nicely in his example of behavior in a church:

> Our actions in places are evidence of our preferred reading. Kneeling in church is an interpretation of what the church means; it also reinforces the meaning of the church.[42]

Even spatial practices that contest dominant ideas about how to use a space – such as drinking beer on a street corner – may reconstruct normativity in a given place by highlighting the spatial norms that are being transgressed. If such practices continue over time, they may change the dominant orders. (This is a model of spatial order that has much in common with Butler's notion of performativity, discussed earlier.)

Of course, spatial practices do not in and of themselves constitute places. The practices themselves are mediated by cultural interpretations and judgments,[43] as well as the symbolic means – discourse, maps, policy documents, paintings – that we use to represent those interpretations and judgments. When we add interpretation and representation to the mix, we arrive at the second and third elements in Lefebvre's triad: *representations of space* and *spaces of representation*.

Representations of space and spaces of representation

Representations of space are a society's dominant systems of knowledge about spaces and dominant ways of conceiving of and evaluating spaces. For Lefebvre, representations of space are those representations conceived and put forth by the people that a society endows with professional power over space – urban planners, architects, policy makers, engineers, surveyors, etc. These "professionals" have the power to translate their representations into actual built form by, for instance, designing a city land parcel.[44] An important concern of Lefebvre's was how representations of space promoted capitalist interests.[45] He considered the interests that representations of space represented as opposed to conceptions rooted in *lived space* – which he called *spaces of representation*.

Where representations of space were conceived somewhere in an office by people who did not have intimate, lived knowledge of geographical areas, spaces of representation in contrast were the conceptions of space that were born out of people's day-to-day experiences in and with those areas. For Lefebvre, people experienced spaces of representation through the symbolic systems and images that they used or saw in interpersonal interactions; spaces of representation were connected to real life in a more direct way than the dominant representations of space, and for Lefebvre they could be used to oppose the representations of space that served the interests of the powerful in society at the expense of the people whom the representations of space necessarily marginalized. But spaces of representation themselves are also shaped by representations of space, and both are shaped by – and in turn shape – spatial practices. The three points of Lefebvre's conceptual triangle are always active, influencing and influenced by each other, and combining to produce social spaces (or what I have been calling *places*). This process of back-and-forth influence implies a tension among the elements that together make up social space,

and that tension means that social space is not static; at some times spaces of representation might be more prominent in a community's vision of its common space, at other times spatial practices might be more prominent. It's important to keep in mind, however, that the usefulness of thinking of these elements separately is in that it can help to build an analytical understanding for theorizing how space works. As Lefebvre emphasizes, in practice, in daily life, these elements are mutually constitutive and cannot be so easily separated.

The tension that binds the three elements of the triad together seemed to describe well the ebbs and flows in the ongoing process of place-making in Mt. Pleasant. As a discourse analyst my attention, not surprisingly, was drawn to the role that discourse played in the triad. It was by reading Lefebvre[46] that I came to think about my neighbors' use of discourse as not just a form of *social* practice, but more specifically as a form of *spatial* practice.

It's important to keep in mind that discourse *itself* is not a practice; rather, *use* of discourse is a practice, and discourse is a symbolic system. Symbolic systems are systems in which the parts of the system stand for, or represent, something else – an object,[47] an idea, etc. As a symbolic system, then, discourse is a form of representation. It is, in fact, one of the key forms of representation in Lefebvre's representations of space. Although Lefebvre does not focus on discourse per se in his explanation of spaces of representation, he does include as a key element "complex symbols and images of [a space's] 'inhabitants' and 'users'."[48] Discourse must surely fall under this rubric, as it is a system made up of complex symbols and used by inhabitants of spaces. This means that discourse is located in two of the three components of Lefebvre's model. From a discourse analytic perspective, a different way to think about these components might be to consider both spaces of representation and representations of space as subsets of a larger category of *representation*, with the subsets being distinguished by who uses the representations – those with power over a space vs. those who live in or use a space (in other words, dominant discourses vs. counter-discourses). Let me explain why I think this particular configuration might be beneficial for an ethnographic discourse analysis of place-making.

The urban sociologist Manuel Castells has noted that Lefebvre theorized from a purely philosophical perspective, rather than one growing out of empirical investigation. Castells explained that the reality of place-making down on the ground was much more complex than the world predicted by theories like Lefebvre's, and argued for theory-building that was grounded in and in conversation with empirical research of actual people and places.[49]

Along the same lines, from an ethnographic perspective, the distinction that Lefebvre's triad implies between the discourse of planners (generally empowered) and the discourse of city inhabitants (often in marginalized positions) is not likely to be so cut and dried. Take for example the case of a neighbor of mine in Mt. Pleasant. Anna was an urban planner who worked at a local community development corporation, or CDC. She was also an immigrant who had lived in Mt. Pleasant (with the exception of her time in college and graduate school) since she had moved to the US at age 15. In her work, the way that she represented the neighborhood was informed by the tools and discourses of urban planning, as well by her experiences as an immigrant teenager and adult in the neighborhood. In one of the projects that Anna worked on, she conducted participatory planning workshops with local teenagers in which they drew and then discussed maps of the neighborhood. The CDC could then use the teenagers' visions to shape future neighborhood projects.[50]

Shortly after one of these workshops, a group of the teenagers involved gave a presentation on their summer activities to a community development funder that had contributed a large sum of money to the youth center the teenagers attended.[51] They decided to organize their presentation around mapmaking: They used their maps to explain the circumstances of local youth and the reasons behind youth center program initiatives. Then they themselves conducted a mapping workshop: They directed the funders to draw maps of the neighborhood where the funding office was, as a way to get the funders to reflect on their own lived, daily experiences in that neighborhood.

In these examples, Anna's contributions to her employer's community development initiatives are firmly grounded in both the science of urban planning and her personal history in the neighborhood;[52] the teenagers' maps use the technology of planning and geographical sciences and the vernacular artforms of the street (graffiti, Old English lettering); and the community development funders drew on their personal, day-to-day interactions in participating in the funding follow-up meeting structured by the youth. Are what are created in these interactions representations of space, or spaces of representation?

Once you start to analyze real-life examples of place-making, it becomes harder to tease these apart. I would also argue that it's also not necessarily a worthwhile endeavor per se, although in some cases it might be beneficial. For example, if one was interested in how children learned to represent space, it might be useful to investigate the relative influences of formal education in reading maps (representations of space) vs. informal socialization listening to their relatives give directions (spaces of representation).

What I *do* think worth teasing apart, however, are psychological experiences and other interpretations of space (ideologies, attitudes, etc.) that exist in the mind, as opposed to both representations (including discourse) and physical characteristics of an area. Lefebvre seems to combine and conflate these under the category of *spaces of representation*. As he explains, a space of representation is

> space as directly *lived* through its associated images and symbols, and hence the space of "inhabitants" and "users", but also of some artists and perhaps of those, such as a few writers and philosophers, who *describe* and aspire to do no more than describe. This is the dominated – and hence passively experienced – space which the imagination seeks to change and appropriate. It overlays physical space, making symbolic use of its objects.[53]

In this description, a space of representation includes the qualitatively different phenomena of experiences and imagination, physical objects, and the symbols and images (including symbolic uses of the physical objects).

From the earlier discussion of discourse it should be clear that discourse is closely linked to ideologies, and that ideologies are formed through lived experiences. However, discourse and ideology are not inseparable, as is illustrated by the fact that a given stretch of discourse can have multiple meanings based on the knowledge and value systems that an individual brings to an interpretation of that discourse. Take, for example, the term *representations of space*. For someone well versed in Lefebvrian analysis, this term is closely connected with the dominant forces in a society, as well as with capital. To some people, a scholar's use of this term might signal a Marxist analysis. People not familiar with Lefebvre, on the other hand, would have no reason to think that the term conveyed anything about social or power relations.

From a discourse perspective, it is useful to distinguish symbolic systems from ideologies or perceptions of lived experiences. Separating out analytical categories for symbolic systems, mental apparatus (ideologies, interpretations, imagination), and physical characteristics of space can help to focus on how these interact with each other. If these elements of place-making are collapsed into one category, we run the risk of not paying attention to each of them individually. To go back to a previous example, making these separate categories can help us understand how it comes to be that the utterance "Hey Baby, want a ride" can take on different meanings and shape or reinforce the status of an area as a place of neighborly concern or of gendered intimidation depending on, for example, the accent that it's uttered in (part of the form of the symbolic system), the location from which it's uttered (physical space), or the ideas that a listener has about what constitutes aggressive behavior in public space (the mental realm).

In his Lefebvrian analysis of street protests sparked by a police officer's shooting of an African American teenager in Lexington, Kentucky,[54] the urban geographer Eugene McCann emphasizes that Lefebvre's theory of the production of social space is deeply concerned with the details of everyday life. McCann cautions that, in order for an analyst to really engage lived experience as an integral part of an investigation of place-making, the model "must be transported from one context to another with care and sensitivity,"[55] contextualized within the social and political relations of the area under study.[56] Somewhat along the same lines, I want to argue that a researcher's methodology and focus of analysis will necessarily also shape how she or he uses Lefebvre's approach to examine a particular place. Overall the elements of the model provide a very fruitful framework for analyzing how discourse (and its use) interacts with other representational systems and spatial practices, as well as with interpretations and attitudes towards spaces. However, for an analysis that focuses on discourse, I find it more useful to chunk the pieces of the model somewhat differently.

We all organize the world in different ways; we break it up into different categories, and decide what goes into which category based on the backgrounds and the experiences that we bring to any interpretation of the world. This is as true for scholars as it is for inhabitants of a neighborhood. For someone like Lefebvre, who had

such a strong interest in the interaction of space as conceived from above (by officials and professionals) with space as lived on the ground (by inhabitants and users), it made sense to draw the line between the categories *representations of space* and *spaces of representation* based on the relationship of spatial actors to a given space (distant or intimate) and the power which society vested in them over the space. For me, because my training conditioned me to hone in on the interaction of *discourse* with other social phenomena, it made sense to have a unified category of discourse, which was separate from categories of other social phenomena.

So rather than separate the two types of discourse based on their users, it made more sense to me to have a unified category in which discourse and other symbolic systems could be grouped – a category that we could call *representations*. And rather than combine symbolic systems with the mental components that contribute to the production of social space, it worked better for me to make that a separate category, which in this study I've referred to as *ideologies of place*. I recognize that Lefebvre's notions of imagination and (interpretations of) lived experience are not exactly the same as ideologies. However, because they are all *ideas* about space that contribute to the production of social space, I've found it logical to group them together. I chose to label this group *ideologies* because my neighbors' ideologies about places played such a key role in shaping both the ways that they used space and the ways that they talked or wrote about spaces.

It was clear that the way my neighbors represented the neighborhood were deeply connected with their ideologies about places. I was keenly aware in my fieldwork that my neighbors were using the ideologies underlying local discourses about urban living to classify, interpret, and lay the groundwork for actions that they and others witnessed and performed in various spaces within the neighborhood. For example, ideologies about home as refuge or as place of community-building informed how my neighbors responded to kids playing in apartment building halls, or whether they criticized others for not engaging in conversation while doing laundry in the laundry room. Through such examples, I came to see that spaces become certain kinds of places through the combination of people's spatial practices (including discursive practices, like yelling at kids in the hall or chatting with them in the laundry room) and the

ideological systems that they use to evaluate the practices that they and others perform.

To sum up, then: as social actors, we choose our spatial practices and interpret our own and others' spatial practices based on ideologies of place,[57] i.e., evaluative belief systems about what should or should not occur in a particular locale. Through these actions, the ideologies that support or oppose them, the symbolic systems used to represent those ideologies, and the actual physical contours and contents of spaces (another example of the combination of use, meaning, and form) we construct what Lefebvre called *social space*. In this study I chose to use the term *place* rather than space, however, for two reasons.[58] First, because it is the more common use,[59] and second, to distinguish my work from linguistic work that focuses more narrowly on how language encodes spatial relations per se (e.g., When giving directions from one place to another, do people use cardinal directions (north, south) or relative directions (left, right)? How do languages signify the distance between a speaker and an object? Does a language just have *this thing* (for an object close-by) and *that thing* (for something farther away) like English, or *kore* (*this thing close*), *sore* (*that thing far from me and close to you*), and *are* (*that thing far from both of us*) like Japanese[60]?).

Space, Place, and Discourse

Many theorists interested in what can be called the *social construction of place* have focused on discourse as an object of analysis. Of particular relevance to my work is discourse research in gentrification studies. For example, cultural geographers Caroline Mills[61] and David Ley[62] have examined texts like real estate advertisements and interviews with residents in Vancouver and other urban Canadian locations. The work of both of these theorists showed how market-oriented real estate and commerce constructed images of urbane and sophisticated neighborhoods, images which new or prospective residents could use to construct identities for themselves as sophisticated cosmopolitans.

Ley brought a political economic angle to such analysis; by tracing the patterns of occupational tenure in gentrified or gentrifying

neighborhoods – the order that people with different professions moved into gentrifying neighborhoods (artists, social workers, teachers, lawyers, etc.) – Ley argued that gentrification in many urban neighborhoods in the US and Canada has its roots in the aesthetics of the college-educated counter-culture young people (such as artists or students) who moved into rundown but vibrant city neighborhoods instead of the suburbs that they disdained as homogeneous, sanitized, and soul-killing. Ley argued that each occupational wave made a neighborhood seem more appealing to the next wave, and that current residents' aesthetics could be commodified and co-opted to sell a "lifestyle" to prospective residents. This described exactly the history of Mt. Pleasant since the early 1970s, and propelled me to think about the economic consequences of the discursive images that people constructed of Mt. Pleasant as a bohemian, activist, or hip neighborhood.

Sociologist Christopher Mele made a similar argument in his historical analysis of the images that residents, the real estate industry, and media outlets presented of New York's Lower East Side from 1880 to 2000. He found that, while residents often promoted an image of the neighborhood as tough or artsy or alternative, real estate executives commodified that image in order to sell up-market residential and retail space.

Geographer Neil Smith has also made connections between investment and disinvestment patterns and discourse in the Lower East Side.[63] Smith generally takes a materialist approach to gentrification, focusing on gentrification as rooted in urban economic and political restructuring. However, in two essays which are a somewhat uncharacteristic departure from his overall approach, Smith analyzed studies of texts like real estate advertisements, apartment building and retail shop names, and media discussions of gentrification. His analysis showed that metaphors of wilderness, the frontier, and the wild west fostered an image of gentrifiers bravely setting down camp in barren and unknown territory, thereby giving gentrifiers a "cutting edge" identity as cultural trailblazers.[64] At the same time, it rendered invisible the people who were already living in gentrifying neighborhoods and whose housing tenure was severely threatened by the growing real estate increases brought about in no small part by the cachet that came with the ostensible excitement of that untamed frontier.[65]

Placing People on the Margins – Geographic Themes in Exclusionary Talk

Another area of research in which discourse has been a central data source is that of processes of social and geographic marginalization. This was a major trend that I found in my own data, and scholars across different disciplines noted the phenomenon in a multitude of different settings. Reading studies from different fields, conducted in different places and with different research focuses and goals, I found that talking about geography turns out to be a very common way to set up a moral and deictic center and then distance other people from that center. A case in point is the story that Don Gabriel told to Jane Hill, where, as Hill showed, he mapped positive values onto areas that he aligned with himself – for example his home and village – and linked negative values associated with outsiders with outlying areas and urban places.

The prevalence of this phenomenon can even be seen in the spatial metaphors that analysts themselves use to describe it – a moral center, the periphery, marginalization, distancing.[66] And space itself can be used as a metaphor, as linguistic anthropologists Elizabeth Keating and Alessandro Duranti have shown. In their work in the Polynesian islands of Pohnpei and Samoa, respectively, these analysts found that, in public and ritual events, people with high-status social positions (again, note the spatial metaphor *high*) physically occupy spatially higher positions (sitting on a platform, for example) in the spaces in which events occur. So through practices like sitting on a platform while others sit on the floor, people imbue spaces with meaning.

The work on geographic marginalization highlights two tactics that speakers take. In the first type of marginalization, speakers compare places to each other without talking explicitly about the people who inhabit those places. Instead, attitudes about inhabitants are often subtly conveyed through an *implicit* connection between the place and the people who live there. One study where this phenomenon can be seen[67] is geographer John Dixon and colleagues' analysis of newspaper articles and letters to the editor about a squatter camp in the Cape area of South Africa.[68] The writers of these texts presented the squatter camp as an "alien place," a disordered and dirty built environment which did not fit in with the writers' constructions of the

surrounding area as a site of "natural beauty." Although the writers did not explicitly mention the race of people living in the squatter camp, they used discourses that had strong associations with apartheid-era ways of talking about Blacks; through this strategy, they implicitly racialized the squatter-camp debate – but, like the writers in the Mt. Pleasant public toilets grant, in an off-record way.

While many researchers have analyzed marginalizing discourses of place within a particular locale, others have examined this type of discourse across national boundaries. The discourse analyst Shi-xu, for example, examined contemporary Dutch writing on traveling in China,[69] and found that the authors in question used descriptions of 19th-century Europe to describe Chinese cities. Shi-xu argued that this approach constructed China as a sort of backwards and primitive Europe.

The second tactic that speakers use to geographically marginalize others is to explicitly invoke and critique people in their talk about places. Many researchers have noted the use of geographical themes, particularly in media writing, to label people who perform frowned-upon acts as people who come from somewhere else. For instance, the geographer Tim Cresswell noted that, in stories by New York City newspaper writers,

> graffiti and its creators were associated with other places in order to present them as aberrant and deviant. Graffiti was associated with the third world in order to emphasize its apparent disorder.[70]

Cresswell also found this guilt-by-association-with-other-places in British media accounts critical of a group of nuclear weapons protesters who had organized as the *Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp*. Media writers and pundits related the women's actions to ties to the Soviet Union, thus calling into question their allegiance to Britain. Similarly, the geographer Susan Ruddick found that media accounts of a shooting in an upscale Toronto coffee-shop focused on the Jamaican identity of the shooter. Ruddick noted that this characterization of the event and its participants led to the event becoming a lightning rod that brought to public discussion Toronto residents' tensions and disagreements about immigration policy, race relations, and the contested image of Canada as a multicultural nation.[71]

In the present study I have strived to bring together the *big D* discursive-construction-of-place concerns of urban anthropologists and cultural geographers, with the *little d* sociolinguistic and linguistic anthropological interest in connections between language structure, meaning, and use, and to combine these approaches with an ethnographic attention to the ways that specific interactions, occurring within particular spaces and times, influence and are influenced by the larger sociopolitical world. The linguistic, anthropological, and geographical research on place identity shows not only the critical role that language has in shaping place identities, but also the extent to which your words can have an impact when you have the power to broadcast them and the authority to make people pay attention to you.

Places are not neutral, and their meanings are not fixed. Rather, place identities are created through social – and linguistic – interaction. Place meanings are contested, and they serve the interests and agendas of those who create them. If we want to create communities that serve the interests of justice and equality, then we need to consider what's at stake in the ways we talk about places, and find discourses that can sustain the kind of society that we want to live in. It's my hope that this study of Mt. Pleasant has brought that point home.

Notes

1 Goffman (1981)
2 Said (1978) made this point in his theorizing of *orientalism* and the *Other*. In an analysis of colonial attitudes towards the Middle East and Asia, Said illustrated how Western lawmakers, writers, artists, scientists, and others constructed images of colonial subjects as exotic, emotional, dangerous, etc. By means of contrast, these images allowed people in the Imperial centers to construct Westerners as civilized, rational, self-controlled, etc. and worked to create a rationale for Western colonial endeavors.
3 Hill (1995)
4 Gaudio (2003)
5 Notable exceptions are ethnography of communication and work on deixis and linguistic encoding of spatial relations.
6 Although using the "sin" variant is sometimes referred to as "dropping your g's," it's worth pointing out that for the majority of English speakers there is no actual "g" sound in words like "sing." The sound

is similar to a "g" in that the tongue touches the back of the roof of the mouth, but it's a nasal sound like an "n," because when you make it air goes through your nose and not your mouth.

7 The final sound in *sing* (rather than the one in *sin*) is more likely to occur in "building glass," because the "g" in glass is similar to the sound of "ng" than it is to the sound of "n." It's the other way around in "building steel," because the "s" sound is more similar to the "n" sound than to the "ng" sound.

8 See Fischer (1958), Trudgill (1974), Kiesling (1998).

9 Milroy (1987)

10 Eckert (2000, 1989)

11 At the time of this writing, the American *Public Broadcasting System's* webpage with supplementary materials for the documentary *Do You Speak American* has an activity where visitors to the site can hear the sounds of the Northern Cities Chain Shift. Of the five examples in the activity, the first four represent the Chain Shift. http://www.pbs.org/speak/ahead/change/vowelpower/vowel.html

12 Labov (1972)

13 A follow-up study by Renée Blake and Meredith Josey in 2003 found that the vowel in *kind* was moving away from the traditional pronunciation. They attributed this to rising economic status among Islanders, and more positive attitudes towards tourists and the mainland, which young people saw as a place of economic opportunity.

14 Lane (1998)

15 Solomon (2000)

16 A sound somewhere between "y" and the sound represented by "s" in *measure*. Community members with a more local orientation pronounced this sound more like a "y."

17 Johnstone, Bhasin, and Wittkofski (2002)

18 Mendoza-Denton (1999)

19 At the more micro level, however, Mendoza-Denton found that the variation in the girls' speech cut across groups; when it came to English vowel pronunciation, the core gang girls in each group sounded like each other, and different from the more peripheral, *wannabe* girls in their same group.

20 Deixis is discussed in the analysis of the grant proposal in chapter 4.

21 Duranti (1997)

22 Tannen (1984)

23 Specifically, she refers to the strategy these speakers use as *cooperative overlap*. Tannen considers both interruption and cooperative overlap to be subsets of the neutral category of *overlap*. She distinguishes between interruption and cooperative overlap to make the point that when the speakers in her study overlapped each other, they evaluated it positively as a show of involvement and interest. Tannen emphasizes that this is not the same as the notion of *interruption*, which she defines as a bid to take the floor, and which in popular conceptions is often considered to be a negative, non-cooperative discourse feature.

24 Gaudio (1997)

25 In Hausa, virtually any verb can take the "towards" suffix, not just "motion" verbs like "walk" or "run."

26 Basso (1996)

27 Blu (1996)

28 Leap (1996)

29 Johnstone (1990)

30 Duncan and Ley (1993:3)

31 See also Lees (2004), Beauregard (1993).

32 Rodman (1993:126)

33 Low (1993:75)

34 The geographer Edward Soja also promotes the idea of lived, experienced place, with a focus on practice, in his influential concept of "thirdspace." See Soja (1996).

35 Although Lefebvre wrote this book (in French) in 1974 and a few scholars writing in English engaged his ideas (most notably Manuel Castells and David Harvey), the book's greatest impact in the Anglophone world occurred after it was translated into English in 1991.

36 I'm thankful to Eugene McCann and Annemarie Bodaar for emphasizing that, despite his triad, Lefebvre strongly believed that that space cannot be divided up into smaller segments, or separated from society.

37 Although Lefebvre's translator Donald Nicholson-Smith translates Lefebvre's original term *espaces de la représentation* as *representational spaces*, I adopt Rob Shields's translation *spaces of representation* because it is less confusing when comparing with *representations of space*. (See Shields 1998.)

38 Lefebvre (1991:31)

39 Cresswell (1996) also makes this point.

40 Lefebvre (1991:33)

41 Hymes (1974)

42 Cresswell (1996:16)

43 It's worth pointing out that our sensual experiences in space – what we hear, smell, or feel – also influence how we perceive that space as a particular kind of place.

44 cf. Shields (1991)

45 One of Lefebvre's main goals was to emphasize that relations of production had a strong spatial component, at a time when Marxist theorists were not paying a lot of attention to space.

46 along with the cultural geographers Tim Cresswell and David Sibley, and urban sociologist Rob Shields

47 From the perspective of the linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, a symbol more specifically conveys the mental representation stored in our minds of an object, rather than the object itself.

48 Lefebvre (1991:39)

49 Castells (1978, 1997). Other critiques that Castells makes of Lefebvre's work, as well as Lefebvre's responses, can be found in Castells (1977) and Lefebvre (1987). For further discussion of these scholars, see also Merrifield (2002).

50 See Schaller and Modan (2005).

51 The youth center had been a partner in the participatory planning project, and the workshops had taken place there.

52 The conceptions of some civic group members provide another example of the interrelatedness of these categories. Some of these community members' lived experiences of place were closely connected with dominant discourses. For instance, their notions of the borders of the neighborhood corresponded with the official borders decreed by the city. However, no one saw the space as ahistorical or homogeneous, features of *abstract space* that Lefebvre notes are common for representations of space. Also, generally even for the members of what would otherwise be thought of as the bourgeois class, the struggles over space were not primarily about property values. Finally, even those in more powerful and connected positions constructed their notions of place just as much through their lived experience on the streets of Mt. Pleasant as those in marginalized positions. The situation has changed somewhat since 2000, however, with new residents who do voice explicit concerns about property values and economic investments. These concerns are characteristic of the concerns of capital that Lefebvre notes are part and parcel of abstract space, and in that sense some of the more recent constructions of place in Mt. Pleasant may fit more closely with the concept of *representations of space*.

53 Lefebvre (1991:39). Lefebvre also remarks here that spaces of representation "tend towards more or less coherent systems of non-verbal symbols and signs." However, since so many representations of space contain both verbal and non-verbal elements – take for example the grafitti'd wall on the front cover of this book – it seems fruitful to consider fully how these work in tandem, rather than focusing on images and non-verbal symbols.

54 McCann (1999)

55 McCann (1999:164)

56 Specifically, McCann argues that any complete analysis of place-making in US cities must address the role of race and race relations, even though this is an aspect of urban organization that Lefebvre ignored.

57 along with other ideologies, such as ideologies of gender

58 It's important to note that both the definition of the term *place* and philosophies about what the study of place should include are contested. For a comprehensive discussion of theory of place, see Cresswell (2004).

59 For a fuller discussion of how theorists have used the term *space* and what problems the term presents, see Shields (1991:30–31).

60 This is a simplified explanation of Japanese demonstratives. For a more comprehensive discussion, see Hamaguchi (2001).

61 Mills (1993)

62 Ley (1996, 2003)

63 Smith (1986, 1992)

64 This terminology is mine, not Smith's.

65 Although Smith and Ley both examine the role of discourse in gentrification processes, they differ in terms of what they believe drives gentrification. While Smith focuses on real estate speculation and investment that combines with real estate discourse to create new real estate markets, Ley is interested in the cultural as well as economic processes that drive gentrification, including gentrifiers' desires for a certain kind of lifestyle or identity, which gentrifying neighborhoods tap into. See Bourassa (1993), Lees (1994), Ley (1987, 1996), Smith (1979, 1987, 1996).

66 See Mitchell (2000) for a discussion of geography metaphors.

67 This is not an exhaustive list, but rather some key examples to convey a sense of the kinds of research that people have conducted on this topic.

68 Dixon, Reicher, and Foster (1997)

69 Shi-xu (2005)

70 Cresswell (1996:154)

71 Ruddick (1996)