
3rd Central & Eastern European LUMEN International Conference
New Approaches in Social and Humanistic Sciences | NASHS 2017 |
Chisinau, Republic of Moldova | June 8-10, 2017

New Approaches in Social and Humanistic Sciences

Social Construal Maps to Study Territories within Home Space

Cătălina-Ionela REZEANU

<https://doi.org/10.18662/lumproc.nashs2017.35>

How to cite: Rezeanu, C.-I. (2018). Social Construal Maps to Study Territories within Home Space. In V. Manolachi, C.M. Rus, S. Rusnac (eds.), *New Approaches in Social and Humanistic Sciences* (pp. 404-416). Iasi, Romania: LUMEN Proceedings. <https://doi.org/10.18662/lumproc.nashs2017.35>



Social Construal Maps to Study Territories within Home Space

Cătălina-Ionela REZEANU^{1*}

Abstract

Although space is ubiquitous in social life, for more than a century scholars are trying to establish a sociology of space field. In social sciences, the research of space focused on physical maps borrowed from geography, mental or cognitive maps from psychology, and, recently, deep maps from anthropology. From a socio-spatial perspective, geographical maps are representations of space (re)producing dominant politico-economic ideologies, while mental maps are representational spaces (re)producing cultural hegemony, both being disconnected from daily life spatial practices. The interconnection among the three dimensions of space might be reflected through deep maps, but they are too broadly defined and difficult to apply. Human ecologists from Chicago School theorized the patterns of urban residential zoning as a result of human territoriality. Later on, sociologists and anthropologists have been trying to persuade that space is not only a container of social interactions but also an active agent, influencing and being influenced by them. Also, the new ecologists theorized human territories as a social construct, with fluid borders, produced, contested, and negotiated in interactions. A decade ago, emotion maps were developed to study family affective territories within home, but they lacked the social construction of reality dimension. This discussion paper aims to nuance the knowledge of deep maps by arguing for introducing the concept of `social construal maps` as a research instrument derived from construal level theory from social psychology. It builds on my doctoral project, in which I used social construal maps to study the social construction of territories of couple intimacy within home space.

Keywords: *Sociology of space; ecology; human territoriality; cognitive maps; intimacy.*

¹ Transilvania University of Braşov, Romania, rezeanucatalina@gmail.com.

<https://doi.org/10.18662/lumproc.nashs2017.35>

Corresponding Author: Cătălina-Ionela REZEANU

Selection and peer-review under responsibility of the Organizing Committee of the conference



1. Introduction

Space is ubiquitous in social life because every social interaction has a spatial dimension. As Gieryn states: 'place matters for politics and identity, history and futures, inequality and community. Is there anything sociological not touched by place? Probably not' [1, p. 482]. Even so, in the social sciences, the study of space has been traditionally confined to geography and physical space. More than a century ago, sociologists, like Simmel, started to emphasize the need for a sociology of space as a phenomenology [2], moving the focus from material space to mental space [3]. Later on, in the 1960s and 1970s, the attempt to apply the symbolic interactionism paradigm in the study of space had little echo in the literature [4]. During the last century, the dominant perspective on space was a mix of geographical and political economy theories focused on physical space. Social scientists were more interested in researching space in relation to macro-social phenomena like urbanization, capitalist organization of production and technological development, than micro-social ones like daily life symbolic interactions and territorial appropriations. Social scientists presumed an absolute space, acting as a social force, constraining social actions. Despite sporadic sociological attempts, in the 1980s and 1990s, to introduce a phenomenology of space [5] or a spatial hermeneutics [6], there is still a need to understand how spaces are lived and how daily life spatial contexts become micro-foundations for social actions and social identities.

Nowadays, these perspectives are being criticized for reducing the complexity of space to an absolute space, understood as a simple 'container' of social action [7]. Although the absolute space, popularized by geographers, is different from the relative space, defined by sociologists the sociological understanding of space is still dominated by the absolutist perspective. The absolutist perspective presumes space is a contextual condition, independent of social actions and perceptions, while the relativist one considers space as defined by the positions of actors in the social structure, social actions, and social goods [8]. In a clearer conceptualization, absolute space is the tridimensional geometric Euclidian space characterized by length, width, and height; and relative space is produced by the relative positions of bodies performing social actions [7].

The aim of this paper is to contribute to the international body of knowledge on social space by introducing social construal maps to surpass the limits of using conventional cartography in social sciences. Its social relevancy derives from showing how social construal maps can be an useful projective technique to deepen the understanding of how people (re)produce

contextually their social reality to inform better social policies in the fields of housing, family, quality of life, gender or community development.

1.1. Scale: from sociology of space to sociology of home

Recent sociological developments have led to a renewed interest in defining a sociology of space field. Compared to the research of space, sociologists have privileged the research of time, studying it as a resource for the construction of reality and establishing biography as a conventional research method [7]. After a century, scholars are still pleading for a `space for place in sociology` [1], for a sociology of space centered on everyday life spatial practices [9], and even for a `sociology of home` [10]. The premise of these attempts is that the concept of space is still underdeveloped, missing from seminal sociological theories, dictionaries, or encyclopedias [7].

Nowadays, sociologists are making useful recommendations to alleviate these issues. First, Gieryn argues for surpassing the limiting tradition of studying space only using geographical scale variables: `Sociologists have given the appearance of not being interested in place perhaps preferring to leave the matter to specialists from geography, or fearing that environmental determinism would rob social and cultural variables of their explanatory oomph, or worrying that the particularities of discrete places might compromise the generalizing and abstracting ambitions of the discipline` [1, pp. 464]. He recommends studying how multiple dimensions of space (geographical location, material space, and symbolic space), involved in interactions, influence or are influenced by social structures. Second, Gans appreciates there is little research on how people appropriate and use space, emphasizing the need to understand how people live in their homes, how family members compete for home space, or how space use patterns are influenced by socio-economic status [9]. Thus, the author advocates overcoming the excessive use of concepts derived from the political economy of space by appealing to concepts derived from micro-social perspectives. Third, Löw makes a major contribution by theorizing space as a synthesis between physical and symbolic dimension, mediated by the embodiment of human actions and practices. [7]. Therefore, establishing a sociology of space needs more focus on the symbolic dimension of space and on scales derived from the lived space, involved in the social construction of everyday life (like home space, living space, intimate space, gender space, working space, community space, etc.).

This paper builds on Löw's ideas about the importance of developing a sociology of space field which could cover its symbolic and actional dimensions, revealed in small contexts [7]. It follows Gieryn's plea

to introduce maps into sociological studies: 'I am a victim, perhaps, of trained incompetence in a discipline that cultivates statistics and words as means to grasp the social. Sociologists could become more adept with maps, floor plans, photographic images, bricks and mortar, landscapes and cityscapes, so that interpreting a street or forest becomes as routine and as informative as computing a chi-square. That visualizing (I think) is the next step' [1, pp. 483-84].

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. *Socio-spatial perspective: the trialectics of space*

The socio-spatial approach was an answer to the reductionist perspectives of urban ecology and political economy of space by adding symbolic and cultural factors to biologic and politico-economic ones. As an exponent of this approach, Lefebvre presumes the study of space is fundamental to understand capitalism and modernity as every mode of production creates its own spaces [11]. In explaining the social production of space, the author defines three types of spaces: (1) representations of space (conceived space or mental-abstract space; e.g. maps, models, plans); (2) spatial practices (perceived space or how physical-material space is actively used; e.g. negotiating distances between locations, avoidable areas, daily routines); (3) representational spaces (passively lived space or symbolic space; e.g. ideas, theory, imagination, vision). These three components contribute in varying proportions to the social production of space, depending on the type of society, the mode of production, and the historical period. In capitalism, representations of space dominate representational spaces and spatial practices. The state produces space and citizens reproduce it in spatial practices, so that the greatest individual freedom manifests at the level of representational spaces and spatial practices from daily private life where representations of space can be contested and changed [11].

Representations of space are abstract conceptualizations of space, derived from dominant ideologies, made by specialists, like scientists, urbanists, architects, engineers, or geographers [11, pp. 38-39]. So, those who control how space is represented control how it is produced, organized, and used. Applied to this study, geographical maps are representations of space. They act as social forces, producing spaces derived from ideologies of the dominant elites and constraining common people's perceptions and actions.

Representational spaces are mental constructs that create new meanings or opportunities for spatial practices, manifested through codes,

signs, spatial discourses, utopian plans, imaginary landscapes, and even material spaces with a strong symbolic load, like museums, paintings or iconic buildings [11, pp. 218-19]. Unlike representations of space that are ideologically controlled, representational spaces are lived in everyday interactions and, therefore, susceptible to interpretations, rationalizations, encodings, and contestations. In everyday life, they express through aspects such as: attraction-repulsion, free access - restricted access, familiar - unfamiliar, closed - open, public – private [11 cited by 12, p. 75]. So, mental maps could be interpreted as representational spaces, where the hegemony of the political economy ideologies can be challenged.

Spatial practices result from interactions between daily routines and their spatial contexts. They refer to the physical and material flows of individuals, groups and commodities, transfers and interactions that occur in space and ensure the social production and reproduction of life [11 cited by 12, pp. 72-74]. As regards to maps, spatial practices are either reflected through geographical maps reproducing dominant ideologies or implied by deep maps, being too abstract and difficult to apply.

Therefore, geographical maps produce spatial practices, which legitimize the politico-economic hegemony, while mental maps, the cultural hegemony. There is a need for a new type of maps, similar to deep maps and closer to daily life spatial practices from the private sphere.

2.2. Ecological perspective: human territoriality

Human territoriality is much more complex and nuanced as theorized by ecologists from Chicago School. Lyman and Scott drew attention that territoriality, understood by defining borders, managing space invasion, and deprivation of territory, is a neglected sociological phenomenon [13]. Urban ecologists have popularized it but have deprived it of phenomenological and symbolic-interaction analysis, to the detriment of the economic and biological ones. The authors theorize three types of territorial encroachment [13]: (1) violation, (2) invasion, and (3) contamination. Violation of the territory occurs when people, although forbidden to use a space, intentionally or accidentally violate this prohibition. Applied to home space, its violation represents undesirable home visits or unwanted entering in gender or intimate spaces. The invasion of territory implies denying the meaning of the territory, while contamination of territory, changing its original meaning or erasing it. To keep invaders away, linguistic collisions may be used, that is the naming of a given place and the labelling of the invader as an intruder. The authors

consider that home space territories allow the best exercise of freedom and control, due to the intimacy among residents [13].

Thus, housing and domestic space might be a proper context to study human territoriality, which does not reduce to claiming a material space with fixed borders. It involves symbolic and interactional contestations and negotiations of fluid borders. This means human territoriality within the living space is different from national territoriality as the aggression manifests as symbolic violence, exercised through linguistic tactics.

2.3. Socio-psychological perspective: construal level theory

Referring to how people perceive, comprehend, and interpret the world, the concept of construal is central to social psychology. Therefore, construal level theory has been receiving much attention during the last decade. The theory postulates that the distance (spatial, temporal, social, etc.) of an object from the individual influences how the object is thought or act upon [14]. More exactly, spatially distant objects are abstracted into high-level construals (ignoring details, focusing on the bigger picture, and on the 'why') while closer ones concretized into low-level construals (focusing on details and on the 'how').

The main contribution of this article is to nuance the concept of 'construal' by considering it as 'social construal' to emphasize its interactional and constructivist dimensions. Hence, one could expect domestic space territories to produce low-level social construals, closer to the social construction of daily life experiences, and implicitly, maps rich in details, revealing particularities, and answering 'how' questions; which resembles ethnographic attempts and deep maps' aim. On the other hand, one should expect high-level construals produced by home territories inscribed with memories or imaginary ones projected in the future. Mapping these high-level social construals could help scholars evidence socially constructed causes and essential characteristics of domesticity, or even socially reproduced ideologies (political, economic, cultural).

3. Argument of the paper

This discussion paper aims to extend the knowledge of deep maps, by arguing for introducing and illustrating the concept of 'social construal maps' as a research instrument with multiple epistemological and ontological implications. Popular culture taught us that space might be 'the final frontier' voyaged 'to explore strange new worlds to seek out new life and

new civilizations, to boldly go where no man has gone before`. If we take it as a metaphor, this study argues that the frontier might not be only in the psychical space as geographers presume, or in the mental space as psychologists suggest, but also in the deep space of the social construal constituted in social interactions in particular cultural contexts. In other words, understanding space would mean searching not only outside or inside ourselves but also in the social relations among us and between us and space. It asserts the frontier might not be a material one, as the territory can be a social construal with fluid, contested and negotiated borders.

4. Arguments to support the thesis

4.1. Cartography: geographical maps might not be the territory

The widespread use of geographical maps reflects the everyday life pervasiveness of the absolutist and Euclidian conception of space. It postulates space is the same for everybody, exists outside the human mind, and is physical, continuous, static, visual, and tridimensional. Löw launches the provocative idea that the Euclidian conception of space, predominantly mathematical and geographical, translated into straight and parallel lines, angles, and coordinates, is an acquisition in the process of socialization (from formal education, daily life practical relevance, and cultural heritage) [7]. She shows that preschool children have a different conception of space, more associative than logic, with multiple perspectives similar to Picasso's representations, discontinuous and multi-layered. In her view, in daily life we conceive spaces from multisensory information (not only visually as represented in maps) associating them with particular atmospheres (how they smell, move, exude noise, humidity, etc.). Also, we connect them with memories, actualizing spaces from the past that have lost their material form in the present or we imagine future spaces and we invest them with cultural meanings hard to conceive for people from other cultures.

On the one hand, behavioral geographers understood this complexity of space and attempted to surpass the limits of conventional geographical maps. In the 1960s and 1970s, they borrowed from psychologists the concept of `cognitive maps`, in order to define mental geographies [15-17], later on, developed into `psychogeographies` [18]. Starting from making sketches of cities from memory, going through visualizing urban textures of residential desires, mental maps evolved into localizing perceptions of fear, stress or safety in metropolitan areas. The main limitation of these approaches is their psychological essentialism, as

they focus on individual cognitive processes and give little attention to social interactions and cultural processes.

On the other hand, in urban sociology, human ecologists from Chicago School marked a revolution in spatial studies. To establish the concept of 'urban morphology', they sketched different models of urban zoning [19-22]. Urban sociologists started from the premise that residential areas are similar to animal habitats. When new species (social classes) invade an urban territory, the ecological balance is threatened, and the strongest species (with access to limited resources) occupy the best zones [19]. Human ecologists inspired social ecologists to introduce mapping methods for social phenomena and processes, advocating the importance of connecting social phenomena through spatial patterns [23, pp. 71-72]. Building on cartographical descriptive studies, factorial ecologists developed, in the 1950s and 1960s, factorial maps to evidence that location of urban and suburban residences depend on economic status, family status, and social status of residents [23]. These studies have laid the foundations of urban ecology paradigm, which studies the ecological structure of urban areas, focusing on segregation and residential disparities within different ethnic, occupational or religious groups [23]. Despite the classical ecologists' seminal contribution to sociology, their mapping techniques were tributary to the traditional absolutist and Euclidian conception of space.

Urban ecologists have popularized the study of human territoriality, but have not focus on its of phenomenological and interactional dimension [13]. Gubbert showed that the intensity of territory attachment decreases as the surface of territory units increases [24]. In his study, respondents who stated that they were attached to a certain territory, when asked to describe that territory, described the living space and its adjacent areas, ignoring the national territory. Citing other studies, the same author argued the most important territorial attachments relate to areas of daily life where the residence is longer and where affective social relationships are stronger. The author's conclusion was that nowadays the boundaries of the territories to which people feel attached are less clear and less material, being conceived as diffuse areas rather than clearly bounded ones. So, human territoriality is a relevant research topic. It does not reduce to conventional geographical units, is more of a fluid relative space than a static absolute one with clear boundaries, emotionally associated with residential and domestic space.

4.2. Interdisciplinarity: deep maps could be the territory

Nowadays, more and more social scientists agree the study of space should be interdisciplinary. Urban anthropologists seem to have understood

that they might minimize the limits of geographical, cognitive and factorial maps, and maximize the opportunity to understand the symbolic dimensions of space and to nuance its scales by taking an interdisciplinary approach. Therefore, they introduced the concept of 'deep mapping', defined as thick descriptions based on ethnographic, lyrical, and literary analysis [25]. Deep maps include spatial narratives, multi-layered and multi-scalar spatial structures, multimedia navigability, spatial intertextual hermeneutics, spatial experience and embodiment, performativity, spatiotemporal contingency, processual and open spatial sensitivity, reflexivity on the unmappable character of space [25]. According to the same source, in deep mapping, 'structures, forms, affects, energies, narratives, connections, memories, imaginaries, mythologies, voices, identities, temporalities, images, and textualities starts to provisionally take shape' [25 p14]. Although these maps could be a better illustration of a relative conception of space than cognitive maps, their disparate multi-dimensions make them difficult to apply in reproducible empirical studies.

4.3. Social construal maps: from emotion maps to territory maps

Gabb made a major methodological contribution to the study of home territoriality by developing a participatory method to cartography family life through 'emotion maps' [26]. The author collected data as follows: 'A floor plan of the family home was produced and given to each participant, along with a set of coloured emoticon stickers, representing happiness, sadness, anger and love/affection. Each family member (broadly defined) was designated a coloured sticker to represent them and participants placed these stickers on their floor plan when emotion exchanges occurred. Data were collected from the graphic material produced and through interviews with participants' [26 p44]. The limit of this method is its psychological essentialism, being mainly focused on emotions. It does not deepen the idea that reality is a social construct, based not only on individual perception of emotions but also on accounts, vocabularies of motives, cultural symbols or embodied gender or class practices, constantly reinforced, contested, negotiated, or changed in social interactions.

In my doctoral research project 'Couple living space in the metropolitan area of Brasov', I attempted to surpass these limits by developing a constructivist method to study couple's intimacy through home territories' maps. The data were collected as follows: the partners were asked to sketch together a map of their domestic space and to choose from a list specific territories and place them on the sketch: gender or couple practice territories, personal or couple impression management territories

(territories for guests or with denied access guests, personal territories with denied access between partners), personal or couple territories inscribed with individual or common memories, gender appropriation territories, contested territories between partners, panoptic territories, etc. Participants were given one week to discuss and negotiate their answers in the absence of the researcher, and to make pictures of the identified territories. Based on their pictures, four rounds of in-depth couple interviews were conducted at participants' homes. For every territory, data on four themes were collected: material space, symbolic space, spatial practices, and couple relationship.

5. Arguments to argue the thesis and their dismantling

The most powerful argument against adopting social construal maps is the dominant cartography tradition of physical or political maps to represent the geographical localization of social phenomena. These types of maps are used expansively to visualize the results of quantitative studies, from the most frequently used, like census and (cross)national opinion polls, to local and regional surveys. For instance, in Europe, most of Eurostat data analysis results are geographically mapped, and cohesion programs are developed based on these maps. Despite the positive effects of social policies derived from these programs, they subtly impose a reductionist way of seeing and interpreting the world, reproducing European Union's politico-economic ideologies, which might not be compatible with locals' construction of reality. In housing studies, various segregation indexes are mapped to display social exclusion. They are calculated based on residential density of specific ethnic or income groups in a political-administrative defined area. Although these studies are meant to reduce residential inequality, they only impose top-down measures, which replace old representations of space with new ones. This type of housing studies is disconnected from local social construals of neighborhoods territories and does not address the residents' construction of the relation between physical distance and social distance.

Another counterargument comes from scholars supporting the view that sociologists should abandon the conceptualization of space as territory. According to Löw, the territory confines space to geographical scales (residential areas, cities, regions, countries, etc.), ignoring its social dimension, and adopting an absolutist conception of space instead of a relativistic one [7]. In her view, territory presumes space as given (a clearly defined zone by its physical borders, surface, and human density) and does not explain how space is socially constituted. The author rightly states that

space must not be reduced to its physical dimension but, by reducing territory to its common sense definition, she fails to acknowledge that human territoriality involves symbolic appropriations and negotiations. The same physical space can be the object of multiple territorial appropriations because territory is a complex social construction not a simple partitioning of an uniform material space [for further ideas see 13, 24]. Human territoriality is a spatial discontinuity produced by power relations, in which symbolic associations legitimize particular spatial actions. This means the study of daily life human territories, not confined to an Euclidian perspective on space, can extend the sociological knowledge of how space is constituted in social interactions.

6. Conclusions

The famous phrase `the map is not the territory` was said by Alfred Korzybski in 1931 at a meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He meant to suggest scientists should not confound models derived from reality with reality itself. As argued before, geographical physical and mental maps might not be the territory while deep maps could be the territory. Hence, social construal maps built upon deep maps have the potential to be the territory, on condition that they are applied to small everyday life contexts, like home space, and human territoriality is understood as a processual social construct with fluid borders, constantly produced and reproduced in social interactions.

This paper launches a conversation, by theorizing the option of adding social construal maps to compensate for the limits of conventional cartography. It suggests social construal maps can be an useful projective technique to mirror how people produce and reproduce contextually their social reality. In this way, the sociological study of space could increase its interpretive power not only by reproducing representations of space and representational spaces derived from dominant ideologies but also by attempting to show how space is lived (contested, negotiated, changed) in everyday life.

References

- [1] Gieryn T. F. A space for place in sociology. *Annu Rev of Sociol.* 2000;26(1): 463-96. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.463.
- [2] Simmel G. The Sociology of Space. In: Frisby D, Featherstone M, editors. *Simmel on Culture: Selected Writings*. London: Sage; 1997 [1903]. p. 137-70.

- [3] Simmel G. The metropolis and mental life. In: Frisby D, ibidem. p. 174-85.
- [4] Perry WE, Abbott JR, Hutter M. The Symbolic Interactionism Paradigm and Urban Sociology. *Research in Urban Sociology: New Directions in Urban Sociology*. 1997;4: 59-92.
- [5] de Certeau M. *The Practice of Every Day Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press; 1984
- [6] Glaeser A. Placed selves: the spatial hermeneutics of self and other in the postunification Berlin Police. *Soc Ident*. 1998. 4(1). pp. 7-38.
doi:10.1080/13504639851870
- [7] Faist T. Social space. In: Ritzer G, editor. *Encyclopedia of social theory*. London: Sage Publications. 2005. p. 760-763
- [8] Löw M. *The Sociology of Space. Materiality, Social Structures, and Action*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 2016
- [9] Gans HJ. The sociology of space: a use-centered view. *City Community*. 2002; 1(4):329-39. doi:10.1111/1540-6040.00027.
- [10] Kasinitz P. Toward a Sociology of Home. *Sociol Forum*. 2013; 28(4). pp. 881-884. doi:10.1111/socf.12062
- [11] Lefebvre H. *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell. 1991
- [12] Zieleniec AJ. *Space and Social Theory*. London: Sage. 2007
- [13] Lyman SM, Scott MB. Territoriality: A neglected sociological dimension. *Soc Probl*. 1967. 15(2). pp. 236-249. doi:10.2307/799516
- [14] Trope YL. Construal Level Theory. In: van Lange PK, editor. *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology*. Washington DC: Sage Publications. 2012. pp. 118-134
- [15] Lynch K. *The Image of the City*. Cambridge: MIT Press. 1960
- [16] Gould P, White R. *Mental maps*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books. 1974
- [17] Downs R, Stea, D. *Maps in Minds. Reflections on Cognitive mapping*. New York: Harper and Row. 1977
- [18] Richardson T. *Walking inside out: Contemporary British psychogeography*. London: Rowman and Littlefield International. 2015
- [19] Park R. The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behavior in an Urban Environment. *Am J Sociol*. 1915; 20(5):577–612. doi:10.1086/212433.
- [20] Burgess E. The Growth of the City: An Introduction to a Research Project. In: Park R, Burgess E, McKenzie R, editors. *The City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1925. p. 47–62
- [21] Hoyt H. The structure and growth of residential neighborhoods in American cities. *Prog Human Geogr*. 1939. 29(3). pp. 321-25
doi:10.1191/0309132505ph552xx
- [22] Harris C. D., & Ullman E. L. The nature of cities. *Ann Am Acad Pol Soc Sci*. 1945. 242(1). pp. 7-17. doi:10.1177/000271624524200103.
- [23] Gottdiener M, Hutchison R. *The new urban sociology*, 4th. Ed. Boulder: Westview Press. 2011

- [24] Gubert R. Territorial belonging. In: Borgatta EF, Montgomery RJV, editors. Encyclopedia of Sociology, 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan Reference; 2000. vol. 5, p. 3128-3700
- [25] Roberts L. Deep Mapping and Spatial Anthropology. Humanities [Internet]. 2016; 5(1). doi:10.3390/h5010005
- [26] Gabb J. Researching Intimacy in Families. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan-2008