

there for us in many important ways, from the time we began the NSF proposal to the final stages of manuscript preparation.

Every edited volume is indebted to its contributors, but this one is especially so. From the workshop, to draft stage, to finished product, all helped to make the entire enterprise truly collaborative as well as memorable and enjoyable. We are especially pleased that this volume contains the work of every participant in the workshop.

Last, we want to point out that the alphabetical order of the editors of this book is just that, and in no way reflects a hierarchy of efforts. It is rare to find colleagues who not only enjoy each others' company (even after all is said and done), but who also, despite competing projects, genuinely commit similar amounts of time and energy to a long project such as this one. We feel now an almost nostalgic sadness as the completion of this book brings our lengthy, intense, and altogether satisfying engagements to a productive end.

Introduction

Thresholds in Feminist Geography: Difference, Methodology, Representation

John Paul Jones III, Heidi J. Nant, and Susan M. Roberts

The year 1982 witnessed the publication of arguably the most significant early article in what has become known as "feminist geography." In their essay, "On Not Excluding Half of the Human in Human Geography," Jan Monk and Susan Hanson provocatively traced a number of key silences within the discipline. They demonstrated how disciplinary theories elided difference among the persons and within the places these theories were developed to explain. They also exposed gender biases in traditional methodologies, particularly those influenced by positivism's assumption of the separation of subject and object and of fact and value; and they showed how mainstream geography's failure to tailor research questions toward the other "half" was a form of representation through nonrepresentation—silencing women by denying their presence. In short, Monk and Hanson's paper can be read (and reread) as an indication of the centrality that difference, methodology, and representation have long held in feminist geography.

Yet, while these issues resonated even in the early years of feminist geography, within the field there has not always been the same understandings of them or of the questions they prompt. Rather, how feminist geographers *think* about difference, methodology, and representation has been transformed in the fifteen-odd years since the publication of Monk and Hanson's essay. Our thinking about difference has been influenced by the rise of Black feminism, by postcolonial theory, and by gay and lesbian studies. Similarly, our thinking about methodology has been altered through increased scholarly attention paid to issues of reflexivity, by the widespread recognition that we cannot counter stale forms of objectivism with simplistic forms of relativism, and by the development of methods designed specifically for objects of investigation

not previously considered in geography—for example, film, the body, and other visual images. In addition, our thinking about representations has been profoundly altered by the linguistic turn in the social sciences, with all its attention to discourse, by the recognition that all representations, including those that we produce as researchers, merely represent rather than mirror reality, and by theories that call into question the long held separation between theories of representations and theories of the material conditions of social life. With each rethinking, feminist geographers have opened new paths to social investigation—crossed new *thresholds*, one might say—and hence continually refashioned not only how geographers study places and people, but also what constitutes geography as a discipline. This book aims to engage and produce still newer thresholds among difference, methodology, and representation, and, in the process, open additional doors for students and researchers alike.

Though we hope this volume offers insights into new research opportunities and disciplinary agendas, we would be remiss in not also asserting another goal of the book, one that is of course shared by all who claim the label “feminist” namely, the social and political transformation of the world that feminist theories aim to understand. Yet, “feminist” is a highly contentious signifier. Within feminism, for example, the very category “woman,” which initially served to crystallize both theory and politics, is now the site of productive debate. Nor can methodology provide the grounds for unifying “feminists,” for feminists cannot claim a distinctive set of methods in social research—no single method has the analytical breadth capable of making it the umbrella for the broad range of research questions that feminists ask. Finally, there are disagreements within feminist scholarship in the social sciences and humanities over the role played by representational processes in social life and over the appropriateness and adequacy of our own representations of it. Despite these differences within feminism, there is substantial agreement among feminists that the world and theory do not exist separate from one another. Rather, theories of the world are shaped by our embeddedness within it—even if feminists would disagree as to how to theorize embeddedness. Likewise, feminists recognize that the world is produced and reproduced through both thoughts and actions that are themselves embedded within, and partake of, theoretical constructs. The recognition of this dialectical relation (i.e., between theory and the world) places an important responsibility upon feminist researchers, namely, to derive theories and to conduct research that emancipates rather than contributes to subjugation. Of course, by virtue of their theoretical differences, feminists have and will continue to have disagreements as to how emancipation is defined and can be realized, but at the very least feminists remain cognizant that their theories are part-and-parcel of ongoing reshapings of social relations and identities, of places and spaces, and of thoughts and actions.

This book, then, offers geographical perspectives on difference, methodology, and representation, with the goals of reshaping research agendas within both feminism and geography and of using the knowledge that results to reshape the world. Such goals, however, still leave open a question, one un-

doubtedly foremost in the minds of most nongeographer readers: how can geography contribute to the project of feminism more generally? It is to this question that we now turn.

The Possibility of Feminist Geography

We began this essay with a marker in time—1982—and one might expect that we would proceed by offering a chronology of feminist geography since that date. We have chosen, however, to pursue a different line of analysis, not the least because of the fact that many overviews have been done, some of them recently. Moreover, to recount the feminist literature within even a single subfield in geography today—especially in economic or urban geography—requires more space than even one chapter can provide. Finally, given the fact that feminist theories, research questions, and methodologies are now found in every subfield of human geography, defining feminist geography’s boundaries has become increasingly problematic.

In place of a summative evaluation, we provide references to a number of key overviews of feminist geography in table I.1, each of which is tied to a specific research area. The list—a guide to guides—is suggestive rather than exhaustive. More important, although the left-hand side of the table shows research areas, feminism itself sees no clean separation between such spheres as “the economic” or “the political.” Rather, these terms are conceived as having their own history of construction and deployment within various social and disciplinary enterprises. While in everyday language such terms may prove useful in thinking about social reality, that *reality* is relational: economic spheres of social life are intertwined with political ones. To give another example, the processes that produce what is designated “urban” and “rural” are not contained within the spaces that carry those designations—they cross both types of places in ways that thwart any easy separation of the two. What is more, the authors listed in table I.1 often recognize these complications and interconnections, and refuse to limit their analyses to traditionally defined disciplinary categories. Hence, some authors may well reject our characterizations of their work. In spite of these caveats, the table provides new readers of feminist geography with a guide to a diverse, unfolding literature.

If feminist geography cannot be maintained within a separate sphere of human geography, but is instead appropriate to all of human geography, and if feminist geography is critical of subdisciplinary divisions, then readers might ask, What is (the possibility of) feminist geography? For us, this question cannot be answered by asserting that the field combines feminist theory and research with geographical theory and research. Such easy addition is unhelpful given significant differences within feminist and geographic theory and research, both of which are dynamic literatures whose contours remain under debate. For example, some ten years ago it might have been sufficient to state that feminist geographers document and explain the spatial dimensions of

TABLE I.1
Feminist Geography: A Selective Guide to Recent Overviews.

<i>Childcare and Children</i>	Aitken (1994), England (1996), Fincher (1996), Rose, D. (1993)
<i>Crime</i>	Pain (1991), Valentine (1991), Wekerle and Rutherford (1994)
<i>Built Environment/Landscape</i>	Bowlby (1991), Bondi (1992b), Domosh (1995), Monk (1992), Nash (1996)
<i>Development</i>	Holcomb and Rothenberg (1993), Momsen (1991), Momsen and Kinnaird (1993)
<i>Directions in Feminist Geography</i>	Bondi (1990a, 1992a, 1993a), Bowlby, et al. (1989), Domosh (1996), Grunfest (1989), Johnson (1994), <i>Journal of Geography in Higher Education</i> (1989), McDowell (1989, 1993a, 1993b), Monk (1994, 1996b), Penrose, et al. (1992), Pratt (1992, 1993), Rose, G. (1993b), Women and Geography Study Group (1984)
<i>Disciplinary Critiques</i>	Christopherson (1989), Domosh (1991), Hanson (1992), Massey (1994), Rose, G. (1993a)
<i>Economic Geography</i>	Gregson and Lowe (1994), Hanson and Pratt (1995), Kobayashi, et al. (1994), Massey (1989)
<i>Environmental Geography</i>	Nesmith and Radcliffe (1993)
<i>Historical Geography</i>	Rose and Ogborn (1988)
<i>Housing and the Home</i>	Dowling and Pratt (1993), Munroe and Smith (1989)
<i>Identity</i>	Bondi (1993b), Chouinard and Grant (1995), McDowell (1991), Pratt and Hanson (1994)
<i>Methodology</i>	<i>Antipode</i> (1995), <i>Canadian Geographer</i> (1993), Hanson (1993), Herod (1993), Katz (1995), Lawson and Staeheli (1995), McDowell (1992c), <i>Professional Geographer</i> (1994, 1995)
<i>Pedagogy</i>	Bowlby (1992), Johnson (1990), LeVasseur (1993), Mayer (1989), McDowell (1992b), Monk (1988, 1996a)

<i>Planning</i>	Little (1994)
<i>Political Geography</i>	Kofman and Peake (1990)
<i>Postcolonialism</i>	Blunt and Rose (1994), Mills (1996)
<i>Postmodernism</i>	Bondi (1990b), Bondi and Domosh (1992), McDowell (1992a)
<i>Race</i>	Kobayashi and Peake (1994), Peake (1993), Sanders (1990)
<i>Rural Geography</i>	Little (1986), Wharmore (1994)
<i>Sexuality</i>	Bell (1991), Bell et al. (1994), Bell and Valentine (1995)
<i>Urban Geography</i>	Fincher (1990), Hanson and Pratt (1988), Mackenzie (1989), Pratt (1989, 1990), Pratt and Hanson (1988), Winchester (1992)

NB: Ongoing sources of interest to feminist geographers include the journal, *Gender, Place and Culture*, and the regularly appearing reviews of the subfield published in *Progress in Human Geography*. An online Feminism in Geography bibliography is maintained through the Department of Geography at the University of California at Berkeley. For information, contact: <http://www-geography.berkeley.edu/WomenBiblio/geography+gender.html>. In addition, the Department of Geography at the University of Kentucky maintains an active feminist geography internet discussion group. To subscribe, send a message to geogfem@lsv.uky.edu.

women's daily lives. Although this characterization remains central to the field, today's feminist geographer might question equating "women" with "feminist," believing this to elide important differences between the two while failing to problematize the term "woman"; analogously, s/he might note that the way in which "space" is defined and deployed in research is highly variable and contested, and is in no sense limited to the project of mapping. Perhaps a better strategy is to resist rigid categorizations of feminist geography. In so doing, feminist geographers can continue both to rework other disciplinary endeavors in human geography and to enhance connections with allied disciplines, thereby developing more novel subject matters and lines of analysis.

Our unwillingness to fix the borders of feminist geography should not be taken as a reluctance to insist upon the importance of *geography*—of space and place, of borders and transgressions, of the local and the global, of environments both built and "natural"—in contributing to feminist research more generally. Indeed, nearly twenty years of feminist geography has demonstrated that to ignore space in feminist research is to impoverish one's understandings and explanations, proving that feminist researchers outside geography would do well to consider spatiality—in all its forms—as one of *their* primary thresholds. We examine some of the questions posed by spatiality below, and in the

process tentatively respond to the question "What is (the possibility of) feminist geography?"

We begin with "location," an apparently innocent concept at face value. Location specifies the place of a *thing* (a factory or home, a book or a film, a piece of clothing or machinery), *practice* (whether working or relaxing, reading or writing, or listening or speaking), or *person* (or group of persons). In the language of methodology, these are *objects of analysis*, all of which have locations. By providing a basis for mapping these objects of analysis, the concept of location permits feminist researchers to specify the place-based character of objects and to examine the spatial relationships (distance, connectivity, presence/absence) between them. These relations can be interrogated in concrete, material ways (thus, the question "Who works *where*?" helps to better ground feminist inquiry than the question "Who works?"). With this understanding of location, geographers contribute to feminist research by raising "where" questions about things, practices, and persons; by interrogating the spatial relationships among these objects of analysis; and by investigating how the different mappings of and relations among these objects affect the places within which they are located.

These projects, though based on a fairly straightforward conceptualization of location, already suggest how a geographic perspective may enrich feminist study. To further complicate matters, we can raise questions that fracture location's face-value conceptualization. We can ask, for example, whether objects of analysis exist as discretely bounded entities independent of space-as-location, thus making interrelationships among them specifiable only in terms of simple causality, one object impacting and changing another? Or, should we conceive of things, practices, and persons as woven into places, and places as woven into things, practices, and persons, such that their separation cannot be maintained? In addressing this second question from a dialectical understanding of space, one would hold that things, practices, and persons are constitutive of places *and* constituted by them. A co-constitutive understanding rejects the view that objects and locations exist as separate entities, even though we may find it easier to adopt such conceptions in everyday language. It asserts instead relational, process-oriented conceptions of places, things, practices, and persons. In this sense, places exist in and through things, practices, and persons, while things, practices, and persons exist in and through space. In discarding simplistic notions of location and static mappings of objects of analysis, the research task becomes much more complicated. One now needs ways of understanding the constitutive processes within which things, practices, persons, and places are all embedded.

We can reserve the term "context" for the interrelationships among things, practices, persons, and places. To the extent that feminist geographers call attention to the gendered and sexed spatial interrelationships in this array, they can be said to offer a *feminist contextual* approach to research. When attention to gender and sexuality is integrated with the study of other social relations of power with which they are codeterminant, such as "race" and class, researchers

construct ever more complex and concrete understandings of how context is defined and how it matters. Although researchers will often disagree as to how such social relations should be theorized, at a minimum a feminist contextual approach will seek to understand how these relations work differently across space, as well as how space is produced and reproduced as a gendered and sexed context that mediates these relations (differently, we would add).

Such an understanding of context not only augments space-as-location (and hence mapping), it also allows feminist geographers to raise questions concerning the universality of research findings derived outside of a contextual approach. In this way, feminist geographers grapple with the contextual character of the very theories and concepts they bring to bear on their objects of analysis. They do so for two reasons. First, if contextuality is constitutive of the objects of feminist research, then our theories and concepts must be modified to take context into account. For example, a feminist contextual analysis of patriarchy would be "spatialized" by understanding how patriarchal practices and discourses are differentially embedded in and work through different spaces and cultural settings. Second, in recognizing that researchers are also embedded in contexts, feminist geographers make positionality geographic by understanding how the spaces of our lives influence the knowledges we have of places, things, practices, and persons.

These complexities, when applied to the person of a researcher, are related to discussions of "reflexivity," a term used by feminists to mark their own contexts in relation to those they research. Here we are made aware of our gendered, sexed, and emplaced positions as researchers, and of the resulting contextuality of our thinking, reading, writing, and speaking about the world we research. In summary, we can map two relations of feminist contextuality: those that exist between gendered/sexed objects of analysis and the places within which they are found, and those that exist between our own thoughts and practices as researchers and the complex gendered/sexed geographies within which we live and work.

These movements toward relational geographies come with the recognition that contextuality cannot be contained *within* any particular space. Rather, interrelations among places, things, practices, and persons cut across place; processes always work through space to exceed any "local." Hence, objects of analysis in feminist research are not simply constituted by and constitutive of their "own" space. Instead, they are contextually embedded in other spaces by virtue of constitutive relations they share with other places, things, practices, and persons. The extension of these relations is of course uneven: objects of feminist geography share contextuality to different degrees with contexts that are, and are not, their "own." Take for example the global fashion industry. It is dependent upon and reproductive of gender relations across the globe, from the fashionable Park Avenue shops where consumption (and identities) take place, to the *barrios* of Manila where production (and identities) are made. By recognizing the uncontainability of context, feminist geographers can "deconstruct" space so as to comprehend the interconnectedness and difference that

weave together and separate—both socially and spatially—all objects of their analysis.

Difference

In the above discussion we indicated that one “object of analysis” in feminist research is the “person,” but we left unexamined the range of different identities this “object” takes, as well as the social processes by which identities are constructed. We begin this volume with the topic of difference precisely because identity is central to feminist research. The “person” raises questions concerning how the social relations of gender and sexuality operate and intersect with (or, “map onto”) class, “race,” ethnicity, nationality, and so on. By understanding identities as socially constructed out of these relations, and in recognizing that their intersections can produce a complex map of identification positions, the researcher concerned with difference faces the task of investigating how, when, and where—that is, in what contexts—difference matters.

Much of feminism’s critical development can be traced to the above issue. In responding to the complex matrix of social relations within which women’s experiences are structured, feminists have been led to examine an ever increasing proliferation of identity positions within the category “woman.” Radical and socialist feminists have focused attention on the intersections of class and gender; researchers in lesbian studies have decentered the presumptive heterosexuality that exists in some feminist theory and empirical research; Black, Latina, and other feminists of color have theorized how “race” underpins normative social constructions of gender and sexuality and how racism permeate all social life; and Third World and postcolonial feminists have challenged the cultural biases and presumed centeredness of the “West” in “White” feminist writings and research. In so complicating women’s lives in both theoretical and empirical terms, researchers have become cognizant of multiple, intersecting experiences and consciousnesses.

The proliferation of identity positions has enriched feminism at the same time that it has prompted other questions concerning the possibility and desirability of constructing a unified political movement across a diverse spectrum of differences. Is the political potential of feminism at risk of dissolution given the number of potential coordinates around which social action might be structured? How does one link together diverse feminist struggles? Can we acknowledge the futility of defining an “essential” woman, while nonetheless holding on to a strategic form of essentialism in order to ground politics? Or should all identity positions and the categorical imperatives they rely upon be recognized as constructions of social power and resisted accordingly, and if so, then how does one avoid the dissipation of political power that might inhere in these positions? These are by no means simple questions, but as Audrey Kobayashi argues in her introduction to Part I, it may be more productive to deconstruct oppositions based on rigid, binary categories of *difference* (for

example, White/Black or straight/lesbian) so as to focus on linking across categories the tangential connections of *diversity* that characterize subjects.

In different ways, each of the chapters in this section of the book raise spatial questions concerning difference. The authors show that identities are not only social constructions, but spatial ones as well. Difference is constituted by (and constitutive of) the concrete contexts within which bodies and identities are located, as well as the contexts with which they are coextensive. Thus, in Laura Pulido’s research (chapter 1) on/with environmental activists in South Central and East Los Angeles, we see how both the spatiality of racism and the social relations constituting these particular places work to marginalize and crystallize identities. While White feminists may represent these activists as “women,” the activists choose instead to prioritize other aspects of their identities (as mothers, as African Americans) in representing themselves. Representations of poor people that link essentialized notions of “race,” gender, and poverty to particular places (e.g., the inner city) are challenged by Melissa Gilbert in chapter 2. Her research on poor women’s survival strategies demonstrates that while the intertwined processes of women’s economic and racialized marginalization are spatial, that spatiality can also provide the basis for networks of mutual support. Glenda Laws (chapter 3) takes up an often neglected category of difference, that of age, and interrogates how public policies variously affect the mobility of women of different ages. In addition to showing how the state controls the spatial mobility of gendered and aged bodies, she argues that the regulation of mobility is part and parcel of the construction of social identities. In chapter 4, Gill Valentine explores the ways in which some lesbians, in establishing separatist, nonheteropatriarchal communities, have sought to maximize their identity as lesbians. However, she also demonstrates that the spatial strategy of separation can give rise to tensions among community members over subsumed but significant differences in identity that exist along lines of sexuality, class, and “race.” That space and identity are related but not homologous, is further considered by Sherry Ahrentzen (chapter 5) whose study of the diversity of meanings of the home takes into account the variety and fluidity of women’s experiences. Through her study of middle class homeworkers, she links work, home/place, and identity, showing how these meanings are mutually constitutive. This section ends with Karen Nairn (chapter 6) examination of space and identity in the classroom. In her investigation of why many female students remain quiet, she examines the subtle interplays of power geometries in the classroom, including the room’s physical layout, the juxtaposition of students, and the structure and content of lessons.

Methodology

As we have emphasized, feminist theory is not monolithic: instead of stasis we find dynamism; in place of fixity we find flux; and rather than imposed system of understanding we find feminist theory continually producing new under-

standings. Debates within feminist theory—over various ontological, epistemological, and substantive-conceptual issues—undermine in turn any attempt to specify a distinctly “feminist” methodology. This is so because of methodology’s position in the linked chain of “theory-methodology-method.” Inasmuch as methodology links theoretical concerns to method’s technical, “how to” ones, the middle link in the chain remains as dynamic and contested an area of inquiry as feminist theory itself. And given that different theoretical positions underpin different methodological stances, it follows that both in turn influence how specific methods are used in concrete research.

Despite these caveats, it is possible to think through some general coordinates of feminist theory in an effort to derive a set of expectations about what feminist methodology should *be able to do*. We expect first that, whatever its form, feminist methodology should be able to understand and explain a gendered and sexed social world. It should be flexible enough to adapt to the range of objects in that world, guiding investigations of how gender and sex categories infuse our norms and expectations, our thoughts and fantasies, our practices and performances, our books and films, and our architecture and language. In adopting a relational, interdependent understanding of a world represented in starkly binary (and, some would add, masculinist) terms such as male/female, heterosexual/homosexual, White/Black, feminist methodology should be able to grasp how processes of exclusion normalize binary relations as well as how those relations work in everyday life. In light of various feminists’ concern to elucidate difference, feminist methodology should help recover specificity among, rather than impose generality upon, research subjects. And, given feminist theory’s critique of the separation of theory and practice, feminist methodology should strive to make everyday life both a politically and practically important site of research. Though our understanding of positionality makes impossible the construction of a level field of power between researcher and researched, to the extent that it is possible we can expect that feminist methodology work toward creating nonhierarchical methods that break down barriers between researcher and researched, barriers constructed through differential power relations. Feminist methodology should empower research subjects by providing forms of knowledge that can help subvert processes of oppression. At the same time, we should expect that feminist methodology resist imposing the researchers’ “created” knowledges upon the research subjects.

Importantly, these expectations of feminist methodology crisscross through a wide range of “techniques” in social research. Though most feminists tend not to use quantitative approaches precisely because of the difficulties involved in applying them in ways that are consistent with the above expectations, this reluctance should be understood as a contingent rather than a necessary condition: counting, classification, descriptive statistics, and more advanced methods of data analysis are far too powerful (in both the research and social senses) to leave in the hands of nonfeminists. As decades of research using interviews, surveys, ethnographies, interpretative and participatory methods of social re-

search have demonstrated, not all uses of qualitative methods are consistent with feminism. Rather than view techniques as “quantitative” versus “qualitative” and then judge their applicability on this basis alone, feminist researchers would do well to determine whether or not the methods under consideration have the capacity to understand a gendered and sexed world in relational terms; whether or not the complexities of difference in everyday life can be elucidated; and whether or not the hierarchical and oppositional forms of power (between researcher/researched and theory/practice) in research can be subverted.

What then of geography and feminist methodology? As a discipline that has both laid claim to a unique “spatial perspective” and claimed as its own various objects of analysis (for example, cultural landscapes, built environments, nature-society relations, spatial variations, regions/places/localities, etc.), geography has witnessed considerable debate over how to draw its own methodological contours. Though most geographic debate over methodology has taken place outside of feminist geography, more recently feminists within the field have begun to engage feminist methodology more directly. As Susan Hanson argues in her introduction to the methodology section, they have done so both in an attempt to tailor feminist methodology in general to the types of questions geographers ask, and in an attempt to foreground feminist research questions within geographic methodology in particular. The result is, on the one hand, a “spatialization” of some of the central issues under discussion in feminist methodology. For example, with positionality understood as both a spatial and social location, issues of reflexivity take on a specific geographic character. On the other hand, feminism itself has proven useful within geography by cultivating methodological questions that previously laid fallow. Thus, we find the gender and sex constitution of places, landscapes, and built environments to be an especially rich area of contemporary research.

The authors in the methodology section of the volume are reflective of all of the diversity raised in the above discussion. Giving weight to the claim that a feminist perspective can be used to enrich quantitative methods, we first find Vidyamali Samarasinghe (chapter 7) arguing that the standard economic models of large development institutions such as the World Bank need to be rethought—from the ground up—to better account for the contribution that women make to the aggregate social product. The result, she argues, would transform both the results from and the policy uses of much applied research in development studies. In chapter 8, Karen Falconer Al-Hindi shows how feminists can harness the analytic power of critical realism while avoiding some of its tendencies to engage in rational abstractions that might have us lose sight of women’s daily lives. She illustrates her arguments with an example drawn from her research on women engaged in telecommuting. Like Karen, in chapter 9 Ann Oberhauser pushes us to think about the intersection of the economy and home, and of methodological implications arising from the interpellation of the two in contemporary capitalism. Her empirical example demonstrates the special role of the home as a “field” site for feminist research,

one that is both a site of power for her subjects and a node in a regional-to-national economic network. Similarly, Isabel Dyck examines the power invested in research sites (e.g., doctor's offices), which concretize and complicate researcher and researched interactions in her study of the delivery of health care to immigrants in Canada (chapter 10). She negotiates an anti-essentialist perspective with a recognition that difference cannot be assumed away as a "mere" social construction; such constructions must instead be accounted for in any study of the concrete socio-spatial contexts within which "raced" women live their lives. Richa Nagar, in chapter 11, puts additional light on the socio-spatial complexities of positionality, and on her own reflexive negotiation of these in her study of the Asian community of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. In her ethnographic fieldwork, difference proliferates into a complex matrix of social spaces, each with its own space/identity configuration. Finally, Mona Domosh, in chapter 12, provides us with an example of how to read a traditional object of geographic inquiry—a cultural landscape—from a feminist perspective. Adopting an anti-essentialist perspective informed by the work of historian Joan Scott, Mona derives new ways of reading material landscapes that will be of interest to geographers and nongeographers alike.

Representation

Representation has long been of central concern to feminists, especially in the humanities and particularly with respect to the gendered and sexed codes deployed in literature, language, and the visual arts, including film, television, painting, sculpture, and photography. The textual and intertextual character of these codes have implications for the production of meaning within "representations." Textual or representational analyses are predicated on the understanding that, as social products, literature, language, and the products of the visual arts are both reflective and generative of the wider social contexts (including other texts) within which they are produced and received. From such a frame of reference, one that recognizes the mutual interpellation of text and context, there arise three key questions concerning representations: (1) who has the (social) power to represent?; (2) what is the form and content of the representation?; and (3) what are the reception contexts—or "readings"—of the representation, including the intended and unintended social outcomes? It is in all three questions that we find that feminist scholars do not simply analyze texts for their intrinsic value as "art," but understand them as sites through which gendered and sexed social relations are produced and reproduced within society at large.

In recognizing that the production of meaning in texts is inherently political and fraught with implications beyond the text "itself," feminist social scientists have come to place significant attention on representations and representational processes in their research. Feminist researchers interested in such diverse issues as gender divisions of labor in a factory, the organizational

strategies of a women's social movement, and the funding of research on AIDS can incorporate into their analyses the study of advertising, political discourse, and photographic imagery, to use just three examples. These researchers could be interested in examining how gender and sex are textually coded in these objects, and how this coding enters into the wider social sphere under investigation.

Related to questions of representation are theoretical issues, often expressed within feminism as the differences among socialist/radical feminists, materialist feminists, and poststructuralist feminists, over the still prevalent epistemological and ontological dualisms of representation/nonrepresentation and discursive/nondiscursive. Some feminists fear that an emphasis on issues of textuality and discourse may cause us to lose sight of the coordinates of oppression grounded in material life; others are concerned to elucidate the interconnections between the objects and processes that comprise the dualisms; while still others work to deconstruct the oppositions so as to draw attention to the always intertextual and mediated (through representation and discourse) character of all objects of feminist analysis (from landscapes and houses to bodies and their performances). Whatever the theoretical and substantive impulses, feminists who examine "texts" are in agreement that, to the extent that representation is a social process, it is a gendered and sexed process as well.

The chapters in this section of the book work to demonstrate how feminist geography can bring a *spatial* imaginary to the study of representations. In general terms, this imaginary can take many forms. For example, in recognizing that power is always grounded in and emanative from geography—including the context of social relations, the surveillance and maintenance of borders, and the disciplining of practices and persons in space—geography helps concretize the question "Who has the (socio-spatial) power to represent?" Feminist geographers can also direct interpretive strategies toward the "spaces" represented, thereby adding a geographic dimension to questions of the form, content, and intertextuality of "texts." In re/coding the spatialities of representation, researchers can explore the concealed, revealed, withdrawn, juxtaposed, and interposed geographies that inhere in "texts" of all sorts. Finally, feminist geographers can examine the geographies of reception, demonstrating that it is not just a social process (that is, with "readers" who are classed, "raced," gendered, and sexed), but a spatial one as well ("readers" are *positioned* in and across spatial contexts and simultaneously *relocated* through their engagements in a representational world).

Such are the concerns traced by the contributors in the final section of the book, which deals with representation. In her introduction to this section on representation, which is itself an experiment in new forms of representation, Jan Monk reflects upon the social and scholarly practices of feminist geographers and explores the representational politics of those practices. She raises numerous concerns over the disciplinary regulation of representation, including problems related to claims to authority and the process of gatekeeping; the Anglocentric character of much feminist geography; and the appropriate

representational forms for feminist geography's diverse audiences. In chapter 13, Nikolas Hufham offers a critique of mapping as a traditionally masculinist representational practice. He then argues for an explicitly feminist theory and practice of cartographic visualization: a theory/practice that situates mapping within wider social practices and that re-claims and redefines the cartographic enterprise in a much expanded and transformative manner. Reflecting upon her research on Galways Mountain, a former plantation site in Montserrat, Lydia Pulsipher (chapter 14) considers the question "Who has the sociospatial power to represent?". For example, in discussing issues of representational authority surrounding a Smithsonian exhibit on Galways, she demonstrates how, at various phases of the project, different bodily scriptings (of Montserratians, and of herself) in terms of "race," gender, and location, disrupted or reproduced dominant representational orders. Continuing the analysis of bodily practices, Patricia Meoño-Picado (chapter 15) traces the praxis of Las Buenas Amigas, a Latina lesbian group in New York City, which, in concert with other organizations, protested against a Spanish-language radio station for its homophobic and racist broadcasts. Patricia, in drawing a distinction between the liberal bourgeois and oppositional public spheres, shows not only the territorial dimension of the protests, but also how body/space tactics redefine the spaces of the city. Turning to the contextuality of representation, Bronwen Walter, in chapter 16, focuses on how the Irish have been, and continue to be, depicted in the United States and Britain. Through an examination of representations and discourses, she shows how Irish identity has been generated and racialized differently across national contexts, provoking racialized assimilation in one country and continued racialization-as-difference in another. In chapter 17, Jeanne Kay challenges us to think differently about representations of nature, in particular about the alignment of Nature/Woman, which feminists have variously valorized and interpreted as hegemonic. From an analysis of the diaries of Mormon women in the nineteenth century, she explores a different, and possibly agendered way of thinking about the Nature/Woman linkage, one that revolves around how Nature is scripted as a stage for, or arm of, God's will—mapping its godly presence onto women's bodies. In the concluding chapter to this section (chapter 18), Francine Watkins examines how idyllic representations of the English rural village within one particular village work to define difference through practices of exclusion. Using data from interviews with a variety of village women, she shows how representations of the village that bind it to ideals of femininity and home serve to marginalize or exclude men and women defined as different.

Conclusion

Our discussion of difference, methodology, and representation has pointed to only a few of the ways that geography can contribute to feminist research and, in the chapters that follow, the authors examine many more geographies

among the three thresholds. We leave it to readers to interrogate these "spatialities" and to judge their usefulness in constructing their own research and political practices. Before we end this introduction, however, we want to follow up on two points, the first theoretical, and the second organizational.

First, readers would do well to keep in mind that none of the three thresholds that we used to organize the book are in practice separable. Rather, questions of difference, methodology, and representation all intersect with one another in complex ways—sometimes contradictory, sometimes reinforcing; issues of difference overlap with those of representation, and both in turn hold implications for methodology. A single example will suffice to make this point: as Richa Nagar (chapter 11) explores how to tailor her research strategies to account for the variety of social differences existing in Dar es Salaam, she also faces ethical issues about how to represent her subjects; at the same time, she realizes that she is being "textualized" by those she interviews, her own body being the representational material through which her subjects engage her difference. Thus, readers should keep in mind that the thresholds examined here lead to interconnected pathways, ones that can be explored by reading across thresholds.

Second, note that the introductions to the sections do not include point-by-point reviews of the chapters within them. Instead, Audrey Kobayashi, Susan Hanson, and Jan Monk were asked to raise what for them are significant issues surrounding the section's topic. It is to our conclusion that the reader can look for further contextualization of the chapters. There, perhaps uncharacteristically, we re-cover the ground traveled in individual chapters by reading *across* the original conceptual divisions of the book to tease out new conceptual terrains or thresholds. We hope our conclusion helps to subvert readings of the chapters predetermined by the book's formal divisions, while also demonstrating how still *other* thresholds might be recovered in the chapters.

Acknowledgment

We would like to thank Susan Hanson, Audrey Kobayashi, Susan Mains, and Jan Monk for their help with this chapter.

References

- Aitken, S. 1994. *Putting children in their place*. Washington, DC: Association of American Geographers Resource Publication.
- Antipode*. 1995. Symposium on feminist participatory research. 27: 71–101.
- Bell, D. J. 1991. Insignificant others: Lesbian and gay geographies. *Ann* 23: 323–29.
- Bell, D. J., and Valentine, G., eds. 1995. Introduction: Orientations. In *Mapping desire*.
- D. Bell and G. Valentine, eds., pp. 1–27. London: Routledge.
- Bell, D. J.; Binnie, J.; Crean, J.; and Valentine, G. 1994. All hyped up and no place to go. *Gender, Place and Culture* 1: 31–47.

- Blunt, A., and Rose, G. 1994. Introduction: Women's colonial and postcolonial geographies. In *Writing women and space: Colonial and postcolonial geographies*, eds. A. Blunt and G. Rose, pp. 1-25. New York: Guilford.
- Bondi, L. 1990a. Progress in geography and gender: Feminism and difference. *Progress in Human Geography* 14: 438-45.
- Bondi, L. 1990b. Feminism, postmodernism, and geography: Space for women? *Antipode* 22: 156-67.
- Bondi, L. 1992a. Gender and dichotomy. *Progress in Human Geography* 16: 98-104.
- Bondi, L. 1992b. Gender symbols and urban landscapes. *Progress in Human Geography* 16: 157-70.
- Bondi, L. 1993a. Gender and geography: Crossing boundaries. *Progress in Human Geography* 17: 241-46.
- Bondi, L. 1993b. Locating identity politics. In *Place and the politics of identity*, eds. M. Keith and S. Pile, pp. 84-101. London: Routledge.
- Bondi, L., and M. Domosh. 1992. Other figures in other places: On feminism, postmodernism and geography. *Society and Space* 10: 199-213.
- Bowlby, S., guest editor. 1991. Women and the designed environment. *Built Environment* 16.
- Bowlby, S. 1992. Feminist geography and the curriculum. *Geography* 78: 349-60.
- Bowlby, S.; Lewis, J.; McDowell, L.; and Foord, J. 1989. The geography of gender. In *New models in geography*, Volume 2, eds. R. Peet and N. Thrift, pp. 157-75. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Cannadon, G. 1993. Feminism as method. 37: 48-61.
- Chounard, V., and Grant, A. 1995. On being not even anywhere near "the project": Ways of putting ourselves in the picture. *Antipode* 27: 137-66.
- Christopherson, S. 1989. On being outside "the project." *Antipode* 21: 83-89.
- Domosh, M. 1991. Toward a feminist historiography of geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 16: 95-106.
- Domosh, M. 1995. Feminism and urban imagery. *Urban Geography* 16: 643-48.
- Domosh, M. 1996. Feminism and human geography. In *Concepts in human geography*, C. Earle, K. Mathewson, and M. S. Kenzer, eds., pp. 411-27. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Dowling, R., and Pratt, G. 1993. Home truths: Recent feminist constructions. *Urban Geography* 14: 464-75.
- England, K. 1996. Introduction: Who will mind the baby? In *Who will mind the baby? Geographies of childcare and working mothers*, K. England, ed., pp. 3-19. London: Routledge.
- Fincher, R. 1990. Women in the city. *Australian geographical studies* 28: 29-37.
- Fincher, R. 1996. The state and childcare: An international review from a geographical perspective. In *Who will mind the baby? Geographies of childcare and working mothers*, K. England, ed., pp. 143-66. London: Routledge.
- Gregson, N., and Lowe, M. 1994. *Servicing the middle classes: Class, gender, and waged domestic in contemporary Britain*. New York: Routledge.
- Grunfest, E. 1989. Geographic perspectives on women. In *Geography in America*, eds. G. L. Gable and C. Willmott, pp. 673-83. Columbia, MD: Merril.
- Hanson, S. 1992. Geography and feminism: Worlds in collision? *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 82: 569-86.
- Hanson, S. 1993. "Never question the assumptions" and other scenes from the quantitative revolution. *Urban Geography* 14: 552-56.
- Hanson, S., and Pratt, G. 1988. Reconceptualizing the links between home and work in urban geography. *Economic Geography* 64: 299-321.
- Hanson, S., and Pratt, G. 1995. *Gender, work and space*. London: Routledge.
- Herd, A. 1993. Gender issues in the use of interviewing as a research method. *The Professional Geographer* 45: 305-16.
- Holcomb, B., and Rothenberg, T. 1993. Women's work and urban household economy in developing areas. In *Women's lives and public policy: The international experience*, eds. M. Thushen and B. Holcomb, pp. 51-68. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Johnson, L. C. 1990. New courses for a gendered geography. *Australian Geographical Studies* 28: 16-28.
- Johnson, L. C. 1994. What future for feminist geography? *Gender, Place and Culture* 1: 103-13.
- Journal of Geography in Higher Education. 1989. The challenge of feminist geography. 13: 85-121.
- Katz, C. 1995. The expeditions of conjurers: Ethnography, power, and pretense. In *Feminist itineraries in fieldwork*, D. L. Wolf, ed., pp. 170-84. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Kobayashi, A., and Peake, L. 1994. Unnatural discourse: "Race" and gender in geography. *Gender, Place and Culture* 1: 225-43.
- Kobayashi, A., Peake, L., Benson, H., and Pickles, K. 1994. Introduction: Placing women and work. In *Women, work, and place*, A. Kobayashi, ed. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Kofman, E., and Peake, L. 1990. Into the 1990s: A gendered agenda for political geography. *Political Geography* 9: 313-36.
- Lawson, V., and Stachel, L. 1995. Feminism, praxis and human geography. *Geographical Analysis* 27: 321-38.
- LeVasseur, M. 1993. *Finding a way: Encouraging underrepresented groups in geography—An annotated bibliography*. Indiana, PA: National Council for Geographic Education.
- Little, J. 1986. Feminist perspectives in rural geography. *Journal of Rural Studies* 2: 1-8.
- Little, J. 1994. *Gender, planning and the policy process*. London: Pergamon Press.
- Mackenzie, S. 1989. Women in the city. In *New models in geography*, Volume 2, eds. R. Peet and N. Thrift, pp. 109-26. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Massey, D. 1989. Spatial divisions of labour in practice: Reflections on the debate: Thoughts on feminism, Marxism, and theory. *Environment and Planning*, A 21: 692-97.
- Massey, D. 1994. *Space, place, and gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mayer, T. 1989. Consensus and invisibility: The representation of women in human geography textbooks. *The Professional Geographer* 41: 397-409.
- McDowell, L. 1989. Women, gender and the organization of space. In *Horizons in human geography*, eds. D. Gregory and R. Walford, pp. 136-51. Toronto, NJ: Barnes and Noble.
- McDowell, L. 1991. The baby and the bath water: Diversity, deconstruction and feminist theory in geography. *Geoforum* 22: 123-33.

- McDowell, L. 1992a. Multiple voices: Speaking from inside and outside "the project." *Antipode* 24: 56-72.
- McDowell, L. 1992b. Engendering change: Curriculum transformation in human geography. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 16: 185-97.
- McDowell, L. 1992c. Doing gender: Feminism, feminists and research methods in human geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 17: 399-416.
- McDowell, L. 1993a. Space, place and gender relations: Part I. Feminist empiricism and the geography of social relations. *Progress in Human Geography* 17: 157-79.
- McDowell, L. 1993b. Space, place and gender relations: Part II. Identity, difference, feminist geometries and geographies. *Progress in Human Geography* 17: 305-18.
- Mills, S. 1996. Gender and colonial space. *Gender, Place and Culture* 3: 125-47.
- Monsen, J. 1991. *Women and development in the Third World*. London: Routledge.
- Monsen, J., and Kinnaird, V., eds. 1993. *Different places, different voices*. London: Routledge.
- Monk, J. 1988. Engendering a new geographic vision. In *Teaching geography for a better world*, J. Fein and R. Gerber, eds. pp. 92-103. 114-96. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.
- Monk, J. 1992. Gender in the landscape: Expressions of power and meaning. In *Inventing places: Studies in cultural geography*, eds. K. Anderson and F. Gale, pp. 123-38. New York: Wiley.
- Monk, J. 1994. Place matters: Comparative international perspectives on feminist geography. *Professional Geographer* 46: 277-88.
- Monk, J. 1996a. Partial truths: Feminist perspectives on ends and means. In *Understanding geographical and environmental education: The role of research*, ed. M. Williams, pp. 274-86. London: Cassell Education.
- Monk, J. 1996b. Challenging the boundaries: Survival and change in a gendered world. In *Companion encyclopedia of human geography: The environment and humankind*, L. Douglas, R. Huggert, and M. Robinson, eds., pp. 888-905. London: Routledge.
- Monk, J., and Hanson, S. 1982. On not excluding half of the human in human geography. *The Professional Geographer* 34: 11-23.
- Munroe, M., and Smith, S. 1989. Gender and housing: Broadening the debate. *Housing Studies* 4: 3-17.
- Nash, C. 1996. Reclaiming vision: Looking at landscape and the body. *Gender, Place and Culture* 3: 149-69.
- Nesmith, C. and Radcliffe, S. A. 1993. (Re)mapping Mother Earth: A geographical perspective on environmental feminisms. *Society and Space* 11: 379-94.
- Pain, R. 1991. Space, sexual violence and social control: Integrating geographical and feminist analyses of women's fear of crime. *Progress in Human Geography* 15: 415-31.
- Peake, L. 1993. "Race" and sexuality: Challenging the patriarchal structuring of urban social space. *Society and Space* 11: 415-32.
- Pemrose, J.; Bondi, L.; Kofman, E.; McDowell, L.; Rose, G.; and Whatmore, S. 1992. Feminists and feminism in the academy. *Antipode* 24: 218-37.
- Pratt, G. 1989. Reproduction, class and the spatial structure of the city. In *New models in geography*, Volume 2, eds. R. Peet and N. Thrift, pp. 84-108. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Pratt, G. 1990. Feminist analyses of the restructuring of urban life. *Urban Geography* 11: 594-605.
- Pratt, G. 1992. Feminist geography. *Urban Geography* 13: 385-91.
- Pratt, G. 1993. Reflections on poststructuralism and feminist empirics, theory and practice. *Antipode* 25: 51-63.
- Pratt, G., and Hanson, S. 1988. Gender, class and space. *Society and Space* 6: 15-35.
- Pratt, G., and Hanson, S. 1994. Geography and the construction of difference. *Gender, Place and Culture* 1: 5-30.
- Professional Geographer*. 1994. Women in the field: Critical feminist methodologies and theoretical perspectives. 46: 54-102.
- Professional Geographer*. 1995. Should women count? The role of quantitative methodology in feminist geographic research. 47: 426-66.
- Rose, D. 1993. Local childcare strategies in Montréal, Québec. In *Full circles: Geographies of women over the life course*, C. Katz and J. Monk, eds., pp. 188-207. London: Routledge.
- Rose, G. 1993a. *Feminism and geography: The limits of geographical knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rose, G. 1993b. Progress in geography and gender: Or something else. *Progress in Human Geography* 17: 531-37.
- Rose, G. and Ogborn, M. 1988. Feminism and historical geography. *Journal of Historical Geography* 14: 405-9.
- Sanders, R. 1990. Integrating race and ethnicity into geographic gender studies. *The Professional Geographer* 24: 228-30.
- Valentine, G. 1991. Women's fear and the design of public space. *Built Environment* 16: 288-303.
- Wekerle, G. R., and Rutherford, B., eds. 1994. *Safe cities*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Whatmore, S. ed. 1994. *Gender and Rurality*. London: D. Fulton.
- Winchester, H. P. M. 1992. The construction and deconstruction of women's roles in the urban landscape. In *Inventing places: Studies in cultural geography*, eds. K. Anderson and F. Gale, pp. 139-56. New York: Wiley.
- Women and Geography Study Group of the IBG. 1984. *Geography and gender: An introduction to feminist geography*. London: Hutchinson.