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Abstract

Place is a tricky concept. On the surface it seems a relatively simple notion, yet underneath there are layers of contested meanings. At the same time, places face ‘wicked’ problems – issues difficult to solve by traditional methods and approaches. For these reasons there is a call from across disciplines, for flexibility and creativity in place research.

This thesis weaves together technology, art, spirituality and science to create a place practice inspired by tricksters. Tricksters appear in the narratives of most cultures as liminal, paradoxical and indeterminate figures. In this research they have new relevance at a time when the boundaries of life, including the lines between sacred and profane, are no longer clearly defined. They are an inspiration for a new form of place practice which creatively weaves together ubiquitous technologies, indigenous and speculative ontologies, and integral research methodologies.

The proposition is that geo-locative mobile technologies can support the work of those who work with spiritual sites, and also support the spirit or spirits of those places, when used within a trickster-inspired place practice. What are the opportunities and issues that arise from this approach?

Geo-locative mobile technologies augment physical spaces with digital content and can act as mediators between the self, the physical world, digital worlds and other worlds beyond. Technology is not usually associated with spirit. However, in this research technology paradoxically plays a role in supporting the spirit of place and contributes to a progressive understanding of that term.

The place practice that informed this study was situated around three spiritually significant sites: a cemetery, a marae and a public park. Within each case study, a bricolage of inter-, intra-, and transpersonal data collection methods was
enacted. Integral philosophies and trickster traits combined to create the unique methodology.

This research joins traditionally separate discourses: spirit of place, tricksters, and geo-locative mobile technology. It addresses the need for more creative ways of working in and with place, and raises legal, moral, cultural, and political issues in the use of mobile technologies in indigenous and/or sensitive contexts. Findings demonstrate that mobile technologies can shift perceptions of self and place, make institutional knowledge more accessible, and build connections in the third space where cultures, histories, peoples and realities meet. In these ways the practice supports the spirit of place.
Chapter 1 - Introduction

Places and spaces in 21st century are the gathering points for networks, media, cultures, codes, realities, intelligences, flora, fauna, and signals. In this context, the walls between theories “are becoming less sharply defined and less salient” (Bennett interviewed by Watson, 2013, p. 156). Indeed, as Spretnak (1997) notes: “The disintegration in recent years of so much that previously seemed stable is disconcerting to anyone who has been paying attention” (p. 1).

Adding to this instability, places across the planet face ‘wicked problems’ (Rittel & Webber, 1973) – issues that are difficult to solve using traditional approaches. As Hochachka and O'Brien (2010) note, old approaches produce solutions which address some outcomes but are blind to other areas (p. 2).

In this context, greater methodological flexibility and creativity has been called for from within academia (Cresswell, 2002; Entrikin, 1991; Gruenewald, 2003b; Kincheloe, McKinley, Lim, & Barton, 2006; Malpas, 2011; Robbert, 2011; Soja, 1996, 1999; Somerville, 2010; Stedman, 2003). There is also growing interest in alternative and speculative epistemologies and ontologies (Barad, 2007; Bennett, 2010; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008; Somerville, 2007, 2010) and in the third space that exists between dualities such as subjectivity and objectivity (Soja, 1996, 1999; Turnbull, 2000).

Computer scientists and cultural theorists are asking for greater exchange across disciplines given the ubiquity of computing today (Harper, Rodden, Rogers, & Sellen, 2008, p. 81). Urry (2007), for example, has expressed a wish for research to be more mobile, as a reflection of a need to “simulate in various ways the many and interdependent forms of intermittent movement of people, images, information and objects” (p. 39). He argues that “the mobility turn is post disciplinary” (p. 5).
My research responds to these calls for cross-disciplinary, creative and flexible methodologies. It creatively and inclusively weaves together technology, art, spirituality and science within a new type of place practice inspired by a reinvention and re-contextualisation of the trickster archetype. I inquire into the opportunities and issues that geo-locative mobile technologies generate when used on spiritual, set-aside, sites. Can these technologies support the work of individuals who actively engage with spiritual sites, and also support the spirit or spirits of those places – when used within a trickster-inspired place practice?

Tricksters

The trickster figure is an “archetype, myth, and life symbol” (Lundquist, 1991); a culture hero (Luomala, 1949); and an interstitial, hybrid being that is “neither a god nor a man, neither human nor animal” (Pelton, 1993, p. 137). Attempts to universally define these figures have been largely unsuccessful (Pelton, 1980, p. 7). This seems reasonable and natural given that tricksters embody “ambiguity and ambivalence, doubleness and duplicity, contradiction and paradox” (Hyde, 1998, p. 7).

Tricksters take female as well as male form (Jurich, 1999; Mills, 2001), and appear in the stories of peoples across the world. Famous tricksters include Māui, Raven, Hermes, Èṣù/Legba, Ananse, Trickster, and Coyote, among many others, representing a rich oral history of stories, songs, chants and rituals tied to the cultures from which they emerge.

Tricksters are mobile, shape shifting creatures that re-articulate themselves and their environments to suit their various hungers and desires. Pelton (1980) views the emergence of these figures as the result of humans imagining their world “in its daily joining of opposing experiences” (p. 271). He also proposes that, among other activities, tricksters reveal the portals to the sacred that exist in day-to-day life (1980, p. 3). Similarly Hyde (1998) sees tricksters as revealing
“the hidden pores that lead out of the mundane world, and the plenitude that lies beyond” (p. 293).

Radin (1972) notes that “every generation preoccupies itself with interpreting Trickster anew” (pp. 158-189). In this thesis, tricksters are reinterpreted as having new relevance for a generation where dichotomies of true versus false, real versus unreal, and sacred versus profane are now in flux. Tricksters are seen as a guiding metaphor, a presiding spirit, and as an inspirational figure for a place practice that reveals passages to the plenitude of the sacred, via profane (secular) technologies.

Like Hynes and Doty (1993b), I choose to steer a path, in my interpretation, between those:

who see the trickster as so universal a figure that all tricksters speak with essentially the same voice, and those that counsel that the tricksters that belong to individual societies are so culture-specific that no two of them articulate similar messages. (p. 2)

In this thesis, common traits, identified from across stories, and by a number of theorists, are rearticulated into a symbolic trickster figure reinvented for a contemporary audience.

**Place Practice**

I view place as a centre for practice, and those who work in and around it as place practitioners. This is a relational, processual, fundamentally embodied perspective that involves all one’s senses, experiences, histories, skills, tools and knowledges. My concept of place recognises that spiritual practice and day-to-day tools and activities are seamless, as are notions of self and other, self and spirit, theory, technology, practice and life.
Place practitioners are identified within this document as a diverse group of individuals whose work content and work location (and in the case of indigenous people, personal identity and spirituality) are entwined. They include, but are not limited to, local historians; mana whenua¹ [those with local tribal authority over a place], local environmental activists, educationalists, healers, site-specific artists, community workers, and marae employees.

Geo-locative Mobile Technology

Geo-locative mobile technologies insert different types of digital media at specific coordinates via mobile applications and devices. These technologies augment physical spaces with digital content, mediating between the self, the day-to-day world, virtual/digital worlds, and other worlds beyond. Technology is not normally viewed as sacred. However, I contend that geo-locative mobile technologies can paradoxically play a role in supporting the spirits of place.

The Spirit of Place

In an environment rich with media, code and signal, I envision an inclusive spirit of place that embraces ontologies where place is alive with sentient, multidimensional energies and beings. At the same time, places are also alive with signals, codes and artificial intelligences. This spirit of place is encountered and supported via methodologies and practices that include the spiritual and the technological. When spirit is allowed to exist as a sentient other, whether that be in all-encompassing energy of a place, in the form of those who reside there unseen, or digital intelligences virtually embedded in the landscape, there is greater possibility for innovation. This spirit of place inspires an emerging place practice that is at once personal, political, social and spiritual.

¹ Please check the Glossary of Māori Words at the back of this document for extended definitions and summaries of Māori words contained in this thesis. Please note that Māori words will appear in italics when presented for the first time with a definition immediately following. In a few rare cases, due to the formatting constraints of tables, the definition will be footnoted rather than bracketed.
Trickster’s Work

A trickster-inspired place practice reveals hidden life and shifts perceptions of places from inert objects to living and dynamic multidimensional systems. It embraces ontologies where humans play a small part in a larger whole, disrupting the notion that self is individual. In this trickster practice those who work with place become porous boundary dwellers, wayfinders, and multidimensional facilitators within heterotopic assemblages of voices, intelligences and realities.

Trickster practice recognises that in an environment where stories are embedded in day-to-day life, and information is increasingly localised (via mobile technologies) knowledge can no longer remain locked away behind physical walls and structures, and invisible frameworks of power. As ubiquitous technologies infiltrate the landscape, the sacred and profane are no longer so clearly demarcated. For Hyde (1998), rearticulating the joints of society is ‘artus work’—the work of tricksters.

Methodology

The methodological structure for this research was inclusive, emergent, flexible, creative and practice-based. There were two stages of data gathering. The first stage was explorative, involving semi-structured conversations with a diverse range of fifteen individuals who were identified as having a place-focused role or occupation. The purpose of this stage was to understand what the terms ‘spirit of place’ and ‘place practice’ meant to them, and to understand how they (or whether) they used mobile technologies in their work. I was also interested in potential opportunities and issues that could be associated with the use of these technologies in line with the central proposition.

---

2 According to Hyde (1998), in Latin *artus* is a term meaning a joint of the body—the same meaning in Greek is *arthron* (p. 254).
The second stage involved three case studies of practice located in the suburb of Papakura (Auckland New Zealand) the town where I grew up and currently live. Geo-locative mobile experiences were created on-sites with strong spiritual associations: a cemetery, a tapu [sacred/set-aside] suburban park, and a marae. The case studies were situated within a mixed method framework synthesised from two emerging methodologies: Integral Theory (Esbjörn-Hargens & Wilber, 2006; Wilber, 2000, 2006) and Integral Inquiry (Braud, 1998, 2011). I chose a practice-based, mixed methods approach over a purely quantitative or qualitative approach as it allowed for the creative incorporation of a diverse range of mental models and perspectives (Creswell & Clark, 2011). Within this framework I practised a bricolage of data collection methods spanning across the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and transpersonal spectrum – deliberately reflecting the multiple layers that make up places today.

Contribution

The trickster figure emerges from knowledge systems that “do not accept the separation between word and event, art and reality, made by our neo-Cartesian culture” (Pelton, 1993, p. 135). For many peoples the world is multidimensional: land, body, spirit, knowledge, tools, history and identity are entwined and the boundaries between the living and the dead, real and unreal are not so clearly delineated (Semali & Kincheloe, 1999, p. 42). In these cultures the spirit and spirits of place (sometimes known as genius loci, or kaitiāki [stewards/guardians]) are considered as real as trees, rocks, frogs, mountains, and people.

Centuries of religious and secular colonisation marginalised these world views so that in most colonised nations, body, mind, spirit, and practice have been separated, institutionalised, and abstracted from place (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Maurial, 1999; Semali & Kincheloe, 1999; L. T. Smith, 1999). The spirit of place now has a “mostly secular meaning”(Relph, 2007, p. 2) that is conflated with the
‘sense of place’ – a term used within geographic literature to describe a number of psychological, behavioural and material factors.

Within academia, place is a tricky concept made up of a multiplicity of knowledges. However, despite this diversity, place research largely exists on a continuum of objectivist or subjectivist discourses (Entrikin, 1991; Esbjörn-Hargens, 2010; Robbert, 2011). Research surrounding locative mobile and augmented reality technologies does not engage with spirit at all, and in both discourses (which cover a number of disciplinary areas) non-human-centric, inherently spiritual, ontologies remain marginal. At the same time, any holistic spirit of place research that does exist does not incorporate research into mobile technologies.

This thesis is part of a growing field of doctoral research that reconfigures, rather than reinforces boundaries between types of knowledge (Engels-Schwarzpaul, 2013). Rather than meeting a literature gap within one discourse, I contribute knowledge through bringing together disparate discourses: spirit of place, sense of place, tricksters, mobility, augmented reality and geo-locative mobile technology. I address gaps within and between mobility, spirit of place and place research and directly respond to calls for greater methodological, epistemological and ontological flexibility and inclusiveness in place studies and research in general. The topic and the way it was studied are designed to challenge conventional boundaries.

On a practical level I demonstrate how mobile technologies can be used in meaningful new ways. I present evidence that perceptions of self and place can be shifted when using these devices, and illustrate how different knowledges can be re-contextualised and made accessible. I also identify important political, ethical and legal issues that emerge from the use of these technologies in indigenous and/or spiritual contexts, and provide potential solutions to these dilemmas.
I do not intend this work as a prescriptive framework for individuals to replicate. People do not have to be tricksters to engage in place work, to engage in this particular form of practice, or use these tools and technologies. Instead, my research presents fellow place researchers with examples of how these technologies can support their work and the opportunities they generate. It illustrates the ways in which geo-locative mobile technologies can support the spirit and spirits of place, when contextualised within the place practice that is outlined in this document.

Structure

In the following chapter, ‘Placing Self’, I honour the land and my own ancestral history and respectfully acknowledge those currently living in and on the land (alive and in spirit). I present the raison d’être for this research, and illustrate why tricksters have emerged as a symbol within my own life. I also contextualise the places where I worked in a larger system of ‘wicked problems’.

In Chapter 3, ‘Context and Concepts’, I trace how concepts of place, and spirit of place, have shifted over time. I identify challenges that emerge when body, mind, spirit, and practice are separated, institutionalised, and abstracted from place. Following this, in Chapter 4, I review emerging literature surrounding new methodologies, ontologies, technologies, and understandings of spirit, technology and practice. I identify gaps between various fields of research and demonstrate how they can be brought together to reconceptualise engagement in place.

In Chapter 5, I re-interpret tricksters as having new relevance in a time of interstitial technologies, indeterminate boundaries, porous ontologies, and liminal, heterotopic environments. I explore common trickster traits, demonstrating their usefulness as a framework for engaging in place today.
Chapter 6 follows with an explanation of the trickster-inspired research design, and the specifications for the technologies I used in the case studies.

In Chapter 7, ‘Conversations and Cases’, I present two stages of primary research: an initial set of conversational interviews with place practitioners, followed by three interrelated, concurrently enacted cases of practice situated in and around the Auckland City suburb of Papakura. In Chapter 8, ‘Synthesis’, I pragmatically point out the opportunities and issues that have been identified as a result of the cases and set out in detail how the trickster practice ‘supported’ place.

In the final chapter, I provide a general summary of this thesis. I reflect on my original contributions to knowledge and on the limitations of, and issues with, the research content and structure. I discuss projects that have already emerged and further research that could be possible and deliver some concluding thoughts on the greater relevance of this work.
Chapter 2 - Placing Self

For me, when practicing place, there is no separation of researcher and the researched; place and person. In this context, the autobiography and philosophical assumptions of the researcher are as important as the topic of the research itself. The methodology\(^3\) of this research project reflects this and incorporates a first person perspective (including reflective and autobiographical accounts).

Indigenous scholars are increasingly concerned with the motivations behind research, particularly when it is undertaken in indigenous settings by non-indigenous researchers (e.g. L. T. Smith, 1999). In response, I transparently set out the reasons behind my choice of research topic. This is important given that the research sits within a community of colleagues, friends, neighbours and participants, many of whom are indigenous peoples.

In Māori culture, and my own worldview, emplacement through *mihi* [greetings] is critically important. There are different forms of mihi but they are often used to establish links (especially *whakapapa* [genealogical and ancestral ties]) with those present at a gathering. In this chapter I present my mihi\(^4\). I am offering an opportunity to understand who I am, and where and how I place myself. I honour the *whenua* [land] and my own ancestral history and respectfully acknowledge those currently living in and on the land (alive and in spirit). I present the raison d'être for this research, and illustrate why tricksters have emerged as a symbol within my own life. I also contextualise the heterotopic places where I worked in a larger system of ‘wicked problems’.

\(^3\) Described in more detail in Chapter 6

\(^4\) With advice from several of the Māori elders who assisted in supervising this research
I honour the land

I honour the ancestors of this land

I honour the ancestral house of this land – Te Ngira

I acknowledge the living of this land

I honour the gifts provided to me to complete this research and in turn gift this research back to the land.

I am the hybrid child of trickster-immigrants who escaped to New Zealand in the mid-1960s. My mother escaped post-war Crete and the patriarchy of the family olive orchard. My father escaped his sketchy past in Liverpool. My parents tricked their way out of their respective situations, leaving behind generations of adversity, constraint, and poverty. Neither knew anything about New Zealand, the exotic place they would call home for the rest of their lives. They eventually met in the catering department of a large, isolated, mental health institution called Kingseat Hospital.

Translated by Haare Williams (2014)
I was born in 1970, and grew up in a government housing settlement set up for the migrant families who had been (literally in the case of my mother) shipped in to work at the institution. My childhood home was within walking distance of the 58 hectare hospital compound. I would often jump on my blue Raleigh 20 bicycle and zoom down the road to visit my parents at work. Off I would go, past The Big Bush, past Mr McRobbie’s Farm, past The Dairy and The Big Doctor’s House, through the imposing white stoned entrance, and along the palm lined avenue to The Nurses Home at the back of the hospital. I would always cycle extra fast past The Morgue and past Villa 16 (where settlement kids understood the most dangerous psychopaths to be imprisoned).

My childhood was spent in stories: those that I read, those I made up in my head and those that emerged from actual adventures: The Day I Spent Exploring The Big Bush; The Time When A Patient Almost Attacked Me At The Dairy And The Owner’s Wife Chased Him Down The Road With A Broom; The Moment When I Saw A Wasp Nest On The Corner Of The Morgue, Thought it was Flies, Ran Home And Hid In A Cupboard. Kingseat was for me an enchanted place.

I was an only child with no extended relations, but from an early age I sensed that I was not alone. I knew that there were spirits surrounding and taking care of me. My dreams were as vivid as day-to-day life and sometimes premonitions. I kept this to myself lest I ended up locked in the ‘loony bin’ down the road. I grew up with a multiplicity of understandings of truth, fiction, real and unreal.

Kingseat was built in 1929 by those who were ‘in’ for those who were ‘out’ – a country club setting for the addicted, disabled, and insane. There we all were in the middle of nowhere: alcoholics, intellectually disabled children, geriatric dementia patients, schizophrenics, psychotics, depressives, social deviants, criminals, the medical and service staff and their families. The distinction between those inside and those outside was difficult to discern. It was a community of otherness, some of whose members were incarcerated by the
state, others by their families, and still others by poverty and lack of social capital. Kingseat was a place for migrants, the mentally marginal and the maladjusted.

By my reckoning, we lived in what Foucault (1986) describes as a ‘heterotopia’ – a place where those who do not fit within the boundaries of normality are sent (p. 26). According to Foucault (1986), heterotopias, are porous. They have a system of “opening and closing that both isolates them and makes them penetrable . . . the heterotopic site is not freely accessible like a public place” (p. 26). Indeed, in the 1970s the only escape for staff and patients was by meeting society’s standards for mental, financial, or social stability. Some made a break for it, sirens proclaiming their temporary relief. Others left in spirit, leaving their physical bodies behind the walls, hanging from the trees or languishing in the mangrove swamp next door.

In its heyday Kingseat could easily be mistaken for a luxury hotel complex in 1930s Bermuda. White-washed villas and palm tree-lined driveways sat uneasily next to swampy creeks, thick bush and overworked pastoral land. It was a magical place, and also an anomalous and marginal location. Marginal locations are defined by Shields (1991) as isolated geographic locations and the sites of disdained activities (p. 3). He notes that they are places that have been left behind in the modern race for progress, and are now sites for nostalgia and fascination. These places are intimately linked with the culture of the marginalised (pp. 4-5). In the terms of his description, Kingseat was, and still is, a quintessentially marginal place.6

6 Kingseat was abandoned in the early 1990s as result of progressive thinking in mental health treatment. It is currently home to ‘Spookers’ “the No. #1 Haunted Attraction Scream Park in the Southern Hemisphere” (Spookers, n.d.). ‘Spookers’ has converted the old Nursing Home (where my parents worked) into a horror-filled experience for local tourists, leveraging from its reputation as a
Hyde (1998) describes tricksters as being creatures of the margins. They are the spirit of the in-between, and, boundary crossing: “Every group has its edge, its sense of in and out and trickster is always there . . .” (p. 7). As I look back, it is no wonder I have always been attracted to marginal creatures and people. I spent my childhood in the liminal zone between wild kiwi bush and swampland and the scrupulously manicured lawns and garden beds of the hospital. During the day I journeyed through the worlds of my books, at night I journeyed through the land of dreams. I was occupied with stories, heterotopic places and mixed realities from an early age.

Polypotropic Schooling

School was challenging. I attempted to balance my family’s Greek/Scouse world with the glimpses of the ‘normal’ family life I knew vicariously through the eyes of kiwi children around me. Many children at our tiny rural school were settlement kids but many were born into rich, old farming stock. A small number of Māori children from the local marae also attended.

I craved the life of rich farm kids whose surnames were littered around the district on street signs. Their lunchboxes were small, clean and white with little compartments for their cleanly-cut white sandwiches, perfectly-formed raisin packets, and gold-wrapped cheese segments. My lunchbox was a bulbous orange plastic contraption filled with overly large amounts of foreigner’s food.

highly haunted site (Johnston, 2005, October 22). The grounds and buildings have fallen into disrepair, the former villas rented out to different groups, the bravest of which use them as personal dwellings. Abandoned, save for a macabre theme park, Kingseat has transformed into a parody of itself, an even more marginal location than when it was first built.

7 From the Greek ‘polytropos’ which can also mean ‘wily’, ‘versatile’, and ‘much travelled’ (Hyde, 1998, p. 52)
When I was 13 years old we moved out of Kingseat to Papakura so I could attend the main high school in the district. It was the same story, just more kids. I was a self-styled teenage activist with a side-line in the occult. I vacillated between Siouxsie and the Banshees and Duran Duran. I was the only Pākehā [non-Māori] in the Māori Studies class. I was perpetually marginal and socially doomed.

A few years ago I went to a conference where Dr Pi‘ikea Clark, a ‘kānaka maoli’ (native Hawaiian) artist and academic, described this situation very well. He told us a story of how his great-grandmother took him out to the reef where the muhe‘e (squid) reside:

> Standing on the edge of a deep blue opening in the reef, the waves swirling around her feet, my grandmother recited to me the words of an ‘olelo no‘eau’, an ancient proverb. “Ka muhe‘e, he i‘a hololua – Muhe‘e is a fish that can swim in two directions,” she said. “They can change their colour to match the rocks of the reef. When they swim, they move with the flow of currents yet they are able to quickly change direction in order to avoid the fisherman’s nets”. (Clark, 2009, p. 2)

Dr Clark recognised that the ‘muhe‘e’ story was a lesson in survival for him as an indigenous artist moving between the world of his own culture and the world of commercial art (p. 3). It rang true for me in a different way. As the child of immigrants I often felt the need to turn and twist in order to evade the capture of shame.

Hyde (1998, p. 53) describes tricksters as polytropic – turning in many different ways. There are as shifty as an octopus, colouring themselves to fit in surroundings, putting on a fresh face for each man or woman they meet (p. 53). He observes that tricksters have complex ways of relating to shame. They are often shameless in their speech – creating mischief by exposing the boundary between the worlds of the sacred and the profane. He also argues that children
of immigrant parents have an unusual relationship to shame, sitting as they do between the world of their parents, and that of the rest of society (p. 159).

The constant shame of not belonging and feeling ill at ease in normal society led me later in life to work with marginal and disenfranchised groups in society (the disabled, the young, the poor, and the indigenous). I was comparatively very privileged, but I knew what cultural shame felt like, and what it felt like to be an outsider in the place you grew up.

The Spirit of Place

In my early 20s I travelled from Nepal to western Turkey via the Middle East and North Africa. I was on a pilgrimage around the world’s sacred sites. I was trying desperately to make sense of my worldview which seemed so different than others. Swan (1990), in his writings on sacred sites, reports that many people have deep, transformative experiences while visiting certain places (p. 107). In my case this was certainly true and it was through these experiences that I first became interested in the concept of the spirit of place (or ‘genius loci’ as it is sometimes known).

Hughes (1991) describes the spirit of place as a power manifested in sacred space that may be experienced in different ways, positive or otherwise (p. 15). I saw the spirit of place as both a tangible, sentient entity and simultaneously an atmosphere and character of a location. I observed that local peoples still offered tributes to the local gods and ancestors whom they experienced as living alongside them. For me this was normal but I understood that in mainstream western culture this was considered primitive and superstitious.

Eventually, in my early 30s I moved close to the Findhorn Foundation Community in Scotland. Findhorn is a famous (in New Age circles) community focused on personal and planetary transformation. It was founded on a spiritual practice involving communication and environmental collaboration with earth
devas and God. It was a challenging and rewarding experience to be located near to a place so heavily enmeshed with spirit. It confirmed for me the importance of treating the spirit of place as a critical stakeholder when doing any kind of work in communities.

**Standing between Worlds**

Within the general Findhorn Community, some individuals perceived technology (computers, the internet, mobile phones etc.) negatively, as it smacked of business (i.e. capitalism), environmental destruction, and profanity. Instead they believed in communion with the sacredness of nature – facilitated firmly within a technology-free zone. In contrast, those that I worked with in the business community outside of Findhorn, and in academic circles, judged spiritual beliefs of any sort ‘flaky’ and those that promulgated them to be ‘hippies’. Each of these groups had their own way of solving issues such as environmental degradation, inequality and injustice. Each also promoted their own version of connection and community but only if it did not involve engaging with the beliefs of ‘the others’.

During time based at Findhorn, I travelled to a number of developing nations in order to act as an intermediary between different political, cultural and spiritual worlds. I experienced first-hand the damage that this kind of ‘otherness’ thinking had inflicted on vulnerable groups and societies. Indigenous peoples viewed the spirits of their place (ancestors, protective beings, gods), as a very powerful stakeholders in their own right but this was not always respected by large development agencies, private corporates, religious institutions and/or idealistic NGOs. Each had very different solutions to intractable issues such as poverty and environmental degradation and often these solutions were stuck within rigid boundaries of discipline or ideology. At the dawn of the 21st century they operated with mid-20th century tools and mind-sets. I became frustrated and started to look for ways to bring these worlds together.
Multiple Realities

In the mid-2000s I finished a Masters in Organisational Development. The lecturers had a strong focus on paradigmatic multiplicity and argued that engagement with organisations and communities required a number of different epistemological perspectives. It was at this time I was introduced to the writings of Wilber (1996, 2000, 2006) and Braud (1998, 2011) and other multi-paradigmatic, integrative theorists. This theoretical grounding helped me begin to make sense of the way in which I saw the world.

I was privileged, during this time, to have a research supervisor well versed in Buddhist spirituality and esoteric philosophy. He showed me how spirit could be integrated into academic research and community work in a way that was useful, engaging and supportive. I had a realisation during this time that my work in organisations and communities was a holistic form of practice.

Technologies and Tricksters

While working in Europe I met a group called Foam. Foam is “a cultural laboratory re-imagining possible futures, in the interstices of art, science, nature and the everyday life” (Foam, n.d.). It was through Foam that I finally began to integrate my experiences and interests.

At the time, Foam was actively interested in various trickster figures and in using the trickster archetype as an intrinsic part of its creative practice. I was provided with a European 2000 Cultural Grant to study trickster figures in the context of alternate reality games (a transmedia game format that uses multiple platforms to tell stories in both the digital and the ‘real’ world)(Buxton, 2008)). Tricksters move between different realities and so I could see the connection between these figures and these emerging 21st century transmedia game formats. I could also resonate with many of their characteristics on a personal level as my earlier history shows.
I started to see how using emerging tools could contribute to a new form of transformative community-based practice that used trickster figures as its inspiration. Tricksters helped me make sense of my childhood, and my choices in life. Trickster stories became a form of inspiration for my work.

Returning Home to AwhiWorld

After thirteen years of living overseas, I returned to Papakura for family reasons and volunteered as a community development consultant with local police on a project called ‘Awhi-Wraparound’. The ‘Awhi [embrace] Project’, as it became known, was located on the other side of my home town, and involved working intensively with a small part of that community to promote well-being and alleviate crime.

Papakura is a town with some wicked issues. 45,183 people live in the Papakura District, 28% are Māori (compared with 15% over the whole of NZ) (Statistics NZ, 2014). The town is split roughly in half, with affluence on one side and poverty on the other. 47% of Māori have an income of $20,000 or less per year in Papakura and are overly represented in areas associated with poverty, namely unemployment, single parent families, drug and alcohol abuse, crime and educational underachievement. Papakura has the highest substantiated rate of child abuse in NZ, (Wynd, 2013) and one of the highest rates of truancy (Counts, 2012). Over half of the schools in the area are categorised as ‘decile 1’ which means they have the greatest proportion of students from low-economic communities (Lees, 2011). No one agency or project has yet managed to resolve the social disparities which divide the town into those that have and those that have not.

I was originally not familiar with the area covered by the Awhi project as I lived in ‘the have’ part of town (albeit a working class version). I remember driving around in the Community Liaison Officer’s police car as he told me about the
notorious nature of the surrounding neighbourhood then known as ‘The Block’ due to its association with a number of gangs. As part of my ‘induction’, the officer showed me two locations: Smith’s Avenue Netball Courts and Te Kōiwi Park. I immediately felt a strong, bodily connection to the park. I felt that it was an area of supreme importance to the local area, as I sensed a strong presence about it. This was not a logical knowing, more an intuition, because at that time as I was not familiar with the history of the local area, or for that matter, Papakura District itself. I remember discussing with the officer the idea that if we focused on supporting these two sites then the greater area would benefit in some way.

We began by focussing on Smith’s Avenue Netball Courts, which I would later discover was part of Clark Smith’s original family farm. A community house was brought on to the decaying site and we worked intensively with some local youth to help them create a YouTube song celebrating what was good in the area.

Through this work I became attached to a small primary school nearby. The school’s curriculum advisor and head teacher were extremely open and visionary in their approach. I proceeded to work in partnership with them on a practical application of my Foam (Brussels) research. Over one semester I facilitated an integrated teaching experiment which connected traditionally disparate teaching elements (maths, social science, English) via an alternate reality game known as AwhiWorld. My vision within AwhiWorld was to embrace and holistically support (give assistance and encouragement to) the spirit of the area, through the narrative and game mechanisms.

Over the next three months, I worked closely with the local police and teachers, artists and other practitioners to bring this world to life (Buxton, 2008). Students learned about ‘gate keepers’, local individuals with positive qualities and values, as well as their own positive gate-keeping qualities. They used skills
developed in maths to map AwhiWorld and created art work and stories focused on the AwhiWorld theme. On one occasion the teachers created ‘C.S.I.’ kits and helped the students investigate portal activity around the school.⁸ One little girl found a magical crystal that was hidden under a tree. She and I together experienced the magic of seeing a broken piece of bottle turn into a powerful magical artefact.

AwhiWorld opened my eyes to the potential of using emerging tools and technologies to support traditional place-focused practices including local historical research, environmental education, and kaitiakitanga [stewardship/guardianship]. I imagined that this work could also support the spirits of places themselves. During AwhiWorld, I was introduced to geo-locative mobile applications and augmented reality technology. I immediately saw an opportunity to use these mobile technologies (to be described in more detail later in this document) to further my practices in and around place.

Heterotopic Places

As AwhiWorld wound down, I shifted my focus to Te Kōiwi Park and the Papakura Marae next to it. Later, I connected with the Papakura Museum who had started historic tours in the local cemetery. I was attracted to each of these places because they, like Kingseat, were heterotopias – liminal places of special spiritual and/or cultural status. They were also places of spirit.⁹

Foucault (1986) described heterotopias as an emerging type of place. For him, heterotopias are “counter sites” in which all other sites that are found within a culture are “simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted” (p. 24). As

⁸ Portals appeared and disappeared linking AwhiWorld with the school and connecting different parts of the neighbourhood. Portals also provided the narrative vehicle for real-life characters to mysteriously appear (dressed in costume) to provide guidance and teaching to students on different aspects of curriculum.

⁹ All these places will be described in more detail later in Chapter 7.
mentioned earlier, they have a kind of porosity that stops them being easily accessed except through special efforts and protocols. They are often sacred places and liminal spaces of ritual.

Heterotopias have unusual relationships to time, for example libraries, museums and cemeteries are where the dead still ‘live’. They are also places where deviants (the unproductive and marginal of society) reside: the mentally and physically ill (in asylums and hospitals); elderly (in ‘rest’ homes); criminals (in prisons); and dead (in cemeteries). I would also include minority cultural groups who deviate from dominant cultural rules.

‘Te Kōiwi Park’ (S 37 04.291 E 174 57.451)\(^{10}\) is a place of contestation and confiscation. It is considered by local Māori to be a tapu place (due to aspects of its history) that is open to the unknowing public, but ‘closed’ to those who know its true nature and wish to pay it due respect through ritual entry. Te Kōiwi is a place that sits in between zones: Māori, Pākehā; industrial, residential, gang and school. It is a simple green space but also a counter site hiding porous layers of difficult history and relationship and representing a number of challenging aspects of New Zealand’s colonial past.

The Papakura Marae (GPS: S 37 04.199 E 174 57.548) is also a heterotopia. It is an urban marae and, like others of its kind, was originally established in the latter part of the 20\(^{th}\) century. Its purpose was to preserve the history and culture of Māori within the suburban and urban environments to which they had migrated (Te Ara – The encyclopedia of New Zealand, 2013). Urban marae are ‘other’ places, marginal and contested zones representing a culture and identity displaced. They are simultaneously a focus for a community, but also a refuge from mainstream society. Marae are only entered for the first time

\(^{10}\) Enter these GPS coordinates into [http://netvicious.com/gps/](http://netvicious.com/gps/) or a similar website to locate the places on a map.
through a ritual – they are not public ‘open’ sites. They are zones where rituals and rites (such as tangi [funerals]) take place and where multiple realities and dimensions converge. They are sites where ancestors reside to protect and provide guidance and support.

The Papakura Old Cemetery (GPS: S 37 04.136 E 174 56.647) is a heterotopia that collects and exhibits multiple slices of time in the form of headstones which memorialise people who have departed their societies. Cemeteries juxtapose the old and young, liberal and conservative, gregarious and introspective. The dead are grouped together by foresight and familial connections, but often by civil bureaucracy and timing. Foucault (1986) viewed cemeteries as “strange heterotopia”, that have shifted over time from being the sacred hearts of cities, to being “other cities” filled with familial “dark resting places” (p. 25). The cemetery, like the other sites, is also a sacred place, in other words, a place set-aside from the everyday profane (Shackley, 2001). In this case, cultural perceptions and religious protocols associated with the dead and the afterlife create a degree of reverence and respect, even though the site is interdenominational.

Each place is liminal, existing between Pākehā and Māori; secular and sacred; the living and the dead; the past and the present. They all have a spirit that extends beyond what is visible and material. Perhaps it was a childhood of living in a heterotopia that attracted me to these locations, or perhaps the locations themselves invited me in. It may be that I seized opportunities when they were presented to me. Whatever the reason, each place, in its own particular way (described in more detail in Chapter 7), became a case study for the research in this PhD.
Weaving the Threads

The idea that geo-locative technologies can support the work of individuals who actively engage with spiritual sites, and the spirit or spirits of those places, has not been created to fulfil a purely academic end. I argue for an inclusive understanding of the spirit of place because I have learned through experience that marginalising either spirit or technology (or entire belief systems) reduces innovation, causes stagnation and conflict, and limits the potential for development.

While it would be easy to see practice, tricksters, the spirit of place, and emerging technology as disparate notions, in my life they have been reoccurring, interwoven themes. In this document I bring these themes together for like-minded peers who are also seeking ways to engage more effectively, inclusively, creatively and relevantly in a rapidly changing 21st century environment.
Chapter 3 - Place and Spirit

My research focusses on the opportunities and issues that geo-locative mobile
technologies generate when used on spiritual sites. The proposition is that these
technologies can support those who work with these areas, and can also
support the spirit or spirits of those places when used within a trickster-inspired
place practice. The current chapter sets the context for why a new kind of place
practice is required. It traces how notions of place, and spirit of place, have
shifted and changed over time. It identifies the challenges that have emerged as
a result of body, mind, spirit, and practice being separated, institutionalised,
and abstracted from place. I begin with an overview of the notion of place.

Place

Hayden (1995) describes place as one of the trickiest words in the English
language, “a suitcase so overfilled one can never shut the lid.” (p. 15). It is a
complex notion with a multiplicity of meanings (Agnew & Duncan, 1989;
Malpas, 1999). It is a concept that is slippery (Kincheloe et al., 2006), complex
and ambiguous (Devine-Wright & Clayton, 2010), and potentially messy in
nature (Trentelman, 2009). Suvantola (2002) notes that no “humanistic (or any
other) definitions can provide a conclusive definition of place” (p. 29).

Oxford Online Dictionary (2013c) defines place as “particular position, point, or
area in space” and also “a portion of space designated for or being used by
someone.” Place is therefore autonomous but also defined by its relationship to
people. Place can be a “position in a sequence, typically ordered on merit”, the
act of ‘placing’ someone, or something in position directly next to something
else (e.g. placing a coffee next to a newspaper). It has temporal aspect and can
create or reflect dynamics of power and rank. Place can also involve connecting
with a home i.e. placing a call, placing a child with foster parents.
The multiplicity of definitions reflects the evolution of a number of different, often conflicted, philosophies. Post enlightenment, the notion of absolute space emerged as a “straightforwardly empirical, objective and mapable “notion where space was an “empty container filled in by human activity” (Hubbard & Kitchin, 2011). Within this paradigm, if acknowledged at all, place was a subordinate notion to space – it was positioned within space (Casey, 1996; 2009, p. 324).

In late 20th century, globalisation brought issues of place and ‘the local’ into sharper focus (Daniels, 1992). As Harvey (1993) notes, “we worry about the meaning of place in general when the security of actual places is threatened” (p. 7). Around this time, place emerged as a concept worthy of its own research and inquiry, albeit from different philosophical frames. For social constructionists, place emerges out of a co-constructed territory of interwoven dynamics (e.g. Stokowski, 2002) and for phenomenologists it is an internal experience intrinsically tied to humanity (e.g Relph, 1976; Tuan, 1977). For critical theorists (e.g. Massey, 1999), place is rooted in a number of structural societal issues symbolised through differences in power, while for post-structuralists and post-modernists (Baudrillard, 1983; Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Foucault, 1986), place is negotiated territory of symbols and heterogeneous assemblages. In these later traditions, place was not constructed out of space, instead people constructed and engaged with space as a subset of a lived experience of place (Casey, 2009, p. 321).

Within these philosophies a number of sub-themes emerged: the relationship between identity, meaning, and behaviour (such as attachment and pro-environmental sentiment); the role and relative importance of modernisation, globalisation and localisation; the relationship between physical structure and human agency; and the purity, and type, of methodological approach to place research (Stedman & Beckley, 2007; D. R. Williams & Patterson, 2007), to name
just a few. Robbert (2011) points out an overarching ‘three-fold’ pattern within place research with self, socio-cultural aspects and the general environment (or ecology) being the core, interacting, domains of research (p. 5). Places are, as Rodman (1992) puts it, “politicized, culturally relative, historically specific, local and multiple constructions” (p. 641).

However, despite its apparent diversity, place research today is a continuum of objectivist and subjectivist epistemologies and ontologies (Entrikin, 1991; Esbjörn-Hargens, 2010; Robbert, 2011). Non-human centric, spiritual, ontologies remain marginalised as the result of several hundred years of societal change where knowledge has been decontextualised, place abstracted and segmented, and boundaries between real and unreal, truth and fiction, sacred and profane demarcated. This process is ongoing.

Placing Spirit

Indigenous peoples around the world “have produced knowledges, epistemologies, ontologies, and cosmologies that construct ways of being and seeing in relationship to their physical surroundings” (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008, p. 136). This is usually the result of a long term occupancy of a certain place (Dei, Hall, & Rosenberg, 2000). In fact, as Meyer (2008) proclaims, “indigenous people are all about place” (p. 219). That said it is difficult to write about the knowledge of indigenous peoples as a Pākehā New Zealander. If I avoid it I potentially marginalise and render invisible a host of voices. If I describe different ways of understanding the world (via the written, displaced work of other academic authors) I reduce complex, multidimensional realities into the surface symbols of sentences, and citations (see Battiste, 2005; Bradley, 2011).

In this context, I present the accounts of indigenous scholars knowing that a multitude of indigenous knowledge systems exist and that each is complex and
multi-layered in nature and inextricably linked with the place (Abram, 1996; Battiste, 2005; Bradley, 2011; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008; Peat, 1994; Semali & Kincheloe, 1999). I also acknowledge that indigenous peoples are in a constant process of evolution, and therefore their knowledges are not quaint ‘folk theories’ (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p. 6) to be fixed and essentialised, but are instead dynamic, growing living, complex bodies of knowledge (Dei et al., 2000, p. 5). These knowledges represent different, equally valid, realities. However, I note that common themes are acknowledged to exist as useful contrasts to ‘other’ systems such as scientific rationalism.

Bradley (2011), discussing his relationship with the Yunyuwa people in Australia, notes that indigenous words are “multi-layered and not easily reduced to the language of objectivism where object and subject, language and speech, place and people exist as separate, and autonomous entities” (p. 49). In the case of first nation Mi’kmaq, for example, Metallic & Seiler (2009) point out that the word for land/territory (g’mitginu) means that people are part of the land not separate from it. In Māori language whenua is the term for natural earth but also for after-birth/placenta, which is buried in the ground after birth. This is a reminder that Māori were born from the womb of the primeval earth mother Papatūānuku (Marsden, 2003). Tangata whenua [people of the land] is a literal translation in Māori and represents a worldview where the umbilical cord connects foetus to placenta, and represents humanity’s tie to the earth (Mead, 2003, p. 70).

According to critical indigenous scholars Semali and Kincheloe (1999), “many indigenous peoples have traditionally seen all life on the planet as so multi-dimensionally entwined that they have not been quick to distinguish the living from the non-living” (p. 42). Semali and Kincheloe generalise from their own traditions and study of other indigenous knowledges that: “In many indigenous
knowledges, all aspects of the universe are interrelated; knowledge is in this context holistic, relational, and even spiritual” (p. 151).

Marker (2006) working with the North-West American Makah people, talks of identity as “connected to the land and their ancestors’ relationships to the ecology of that land; it is intimate, mythic, and sacred without being abstract” (p. 491). Similarly Cajete (1994), speaking of the Tewa people of South-West America, comments that “nature is a sacred reality for American Indians” (p. 74). Metallic and Seiler (2009), writing from the perspective of the first nation Mi’gmaq culture, argue that honouring the worldviews of indigenous students means honouring the spirits of everything surrounding them; and embracing the idea that everything is interrelated and interconnected (p. 124). Rose (1996) contrasts the experiences of early Europeans with different Aboriginal tribes of Australia. Where Europeans saw desolation, Aboriginal peoples see a country bursting with life. She invokes a vibrant world where:

> everything in the world is alive; animals, trees, rains, sun, moon, some rocks and hills, and people are all conscious. So too are all other beings such as the Rainbow snake, the Hairy People and the Stumpy Men. All have a right to exist, all have their own places of belonging, all have their own Law and culture. . . . They are powerful and unpredictable beings and are often associated with particular places where people ought not to go. (p. 23)

Not only is the world ‘alive’ with other dimensional beings but also the spirits of departed ancestors:

> Variously known as spirits, dead bodies, the old people, or the ancestors, the people who belonged to country in life continue to belong to it in death . . . Old people are a part of the life of the country; their involvement keeps the country productive, and also assists living people (their descendants) in their own use of the country. (Rose, 1996, p. 71)
These ideas resonate with those of many Māori iwi [tribes] although like all indigenous realities Māori ways of engaging in the world are unique and fundamentally born from a relationship with their own place and places. In New Zealand “in all cases, Māori knowledge involves an inseparable relationship between the worlds of matter and spirit” (Murton, 2012, p. 92). Morgan (2006) places this idea in a cosmological context:

as the world evolved a physical and spiritual element was created when Ranginui (the sky father) and Papatūānuku (the earth mother) were separated by their children, specifically Tāne Māhuta the god of the forests. Once the parents were separated their children occupied and flourished in the various realms created, Tāne Māhuta covering the land, Tangaroa the oceans, Tutewehiwehi the fresh water rivers and lakes, and Tawhirimatea the air space between their separated parents. (p. 129)

This quote interlinks spirit and land and the notion of whakapapa. Murton (2012) explains that whakapapa (genealogy) is the cognitive template by which Māori “know” the world. He explains that by “transcending this world and connecting all things on earth to the gods, the universe, and ultimately the Creator, it provides the framework for an all-encompassing knowledge system” (p. 92). According to Murton:

To “know” one’s self is to know one’s genealogy. To “know” about a tree, a rock, the wind, or the fishes in the sea, is to know their respective genealogies. In its literal translation, whakapapa means “to place layers, one upon another”. (p. 92)

Abram (1996) describes a “radically interdependent” relationship between story and landscape (p. 177); he observes that “in the absence of formal writing systems, human communities come to know themselves primarily as they are reflected back by the animals and the animate landscapes with which they directly engaged” (1996, p. 123). The relationship with place is intrinsic and
totally connected to one’s identity as told and defined through story. O’Reilly (2008) contends that “indigenous notions of place connect self and history to land, spirit to geography, and narratives to navigation in complex, highly diverse spatial practices” (p. 35).

Stories form the basis for navigation traditions. Pacific navigation, for example, is a holistic process of analogue reckoning, story-telling and creating a pattern that connects but does not abstract complex elements (Turnbull, 2000, pp. 135-136). In the case of the Micronesians, navigation is intrinsic to their way of knowing the world and “everyone makes a contribution to navigation because it is an intimate part of their social and economic activities and is inextricably linked with meaning and power” (Turnbull, 1991, pp. 19, 32).

In traditional societies navigational and communication systems are used for people to not only find their way from place to place, but also find out valuable information about locations. Mapping is fundamentally embodied, and references not only physical attributes in the land and sea, but also what is seen through visions and dreams. The body knows where it is and directs people where to go.

**Mauri**

All Māori tribal traditions know of *mauri*, the “unifying, infinite life force inherent within all animate and inanimate living things connecting everything with each other, the universe and creation” (Te Taiwhenua o Tamatea & Te Taiwhenua o Heretaunga, 2012, p. 28). Mauri was:

> passed from Ranginui and Papatūānuku, to their progeny Tāne Māhuta, Tangaroa and others, and down to all living things through whakapapa in the Māori notion of creation. Mauri is considered to be the essence or life force that provides life to all living things. (Morgan, 2006, p. 130)
But as Marsden (1992) cautions, “for Māori, there was a clear distinction between the essence (mauri) of a person or object and the distinct realm of the spirit which stood over the realm of the natural order and was indwelt by spiritual beings” (p. 121). As he explains:

Gods placed guardian spirits over places or things to watch over the property dedicated to them. These guardian spirits (kaitiaki) manifested themselves by appearing in the form (aria) of animals, birds or other natural objects as a warning against transgression, or to effect punishment for breach of tapu. (Marsden, 1992, p. 120)

According to Marsden (2003), tapu:

has both religious and legal connotations . . . a person, place or thing is dedicated to a deity. The person or object is thus removed from the sphere of the profane and put into a sphere of the scared. It is no longer to be put to common use . . . the object is sacred and any profane use is sacrilege, breaking of the law of tapu. (p. 5)

The word ‘profane’ actually means “not relating to that which is sacred or religious; secular” (Oxford Online Dictionary, 2013d). Thus, a wāhi tapu ['sacred site'] within Māoridom, is a location that has been set-aside for divine purpose, “removing it from ordinary secular association and use” (Marsden, 2003, p. 40). These include burial sites, altars, whare wānanga [places of learning], and special springs. The place where a marae stands is also wāhi tapu (more so at times of ritual and ceremony such as tangi as it is rich in memories and presents the bonding link with the land, a ‘tūrangawaewae’ a place for feet to stand, a place fundamental to identity (Mead, 2003, p. 96).

In Māoridom, a deity resides over a location, acting as a guardian of that location – the kaitiaki. Kaitiaki can take many forms. They can be dragon or lizard-like taniwha, other worldly people such as patupaiarehe, and creatures of
the sea and land (dogs, whales, porpoise) (Barlow, 1991). They may be the atua
[god/goddess] of that tribe, or other beings supporting the atua with their work.
Kaitiakitanga refers to the general notion of guardianship and protection. This
indigenous ‘place practice’ is a way of engaging with places that involves
stewardship and support of all its elements, including its spiritual dimensions.

**Indigenous Europeans**

My own ancestors, the indigenous peoples of Europe, also knew places
spiritually. According to Jackson (1995), in classical times it was believed that
places, the structures built on them, and the communities that surrounded
them were directly influenced by guardianship from supernatural spirits and
entities – the ‘genius loci’. Rites and rituals were dedicated to these deities and
due reverence paid by both visitors and residents. The peoples of ancient
Greece held that spirits guarded, “streams, mountains, sacred groves of trees,
rock outcrops, and other distinctive features of the landscape” (R. J. Green,
2009, p. 18). The world was made up of sacred places occupied by a variety of
beings who gave identity to places through their essence (Relph, 2007).

This idea of enchanted nature was also known to the Celtic peoples, the Anglo-
Saxon and the Norse. They understood the world to have a life force and to be
inhabited by other-dimensional and supernatural creatures. So clearly did they
understand this that they marked their maps with the lairs of these creatures,
placing their names alongside other landmarks such as hills and waterways
(Bates, 2003, 2005). They also believed that individual lives were inextricably
linked with all other people, beings and events (Bates, 2003, p. 10).

These peoples were indigenous to the regions in which they lived. Any form of
mobility was a privilege due to not only the lack of transport, but also the
overwhelmingly strong ties to the land on which they depended for their lives
and livelihood (Cresswell, 2006, p. 10). Indeed in pre 16th century Europe, one’s
craft or ‘practice’ was completely tied to the land as identity, livelihood and sustenance. Spirituality and knowledge were also intertwined (as they currently are for indigenous peoples around the world today).

At that time, people lived in an interconnected, fundamentally emplaced world. A world where those that were mobile were considered marginal (e.g. pilgrims, vagabonds, minstrels, gypsies and persecuted Jewish peoples) (Cresswell, 2006, p. 11). What distinguished these early European civilizations was their sedentary nature, attachment to place, and their belief that the “the meaning of life lay in another, separate kind of reality – in the Otherworld of spirits, beings, and greater forces” (Bates, 2003, p. 79).

As Berman (1981) notes: “a member of the cosmos was not an alienated observer of it but a direct participant in its drama . . . personal destiny was bound up in its destiny” (p. 16). He also described their world as being “a garment they wore rather than a collection of discrete objects they confronted” (p. 73). Of course, if the earth is a living organism, “one does not readily slay a mother, dig into her entrails for gold or mutilate her body . . .” (Merchant, 1980, p. 3).

So, from ancient history up to the present day, different peoples of the world have known places as living, multidimensional entities that embrace spiritual practice, knowledge, craft, creativity, communication and all other aspects of life. By the end of the 20th century the word ‘spirit’ had become absent from the index of most mainstream academic books on any aspect of place (geography, philosophy etc.). Over the process of a few hundred years spirit had been displaced.

Removing Spirit from Place

With the arrival of Christianity, the magical, living earth inhabited by dragons cracked at the edges. According to White (1969) the anthropocentric nature of
Christianity disavowed the idea of the ‘genius loci’ or guardian spirits which are too unlike men (and therefore God) in their nature. Indeed, Christianity, like Judaism, didn’t like creation confused with creator and promoted the idea that the natural world “was the province of the devil” – in this context churches became the most appropriate sites for worship (Hughes, 1991, p. 20) and pagan sacred sites were destroyed. Churches were then placed on these sites to show victory over those powers and divert ‘pagan’ worship to Christianity (Hughes, 1991, p. 22). Ironically the sacred places associated with the biblical stories and/or Jesus became points for pilgrimage.

Later, as the Protestant Reformation took hold, Protestant theologians distanced their beliefs from what they saw as the mysticism and ‘Popishness’ of medieval Catholicism (Tambiah, 1990, p. 18). Within Protestantism, Catholic practices (such as transmogrification) were disavowed, and the spirit or soul was separated from the earthly nature of the body. Protestantism “affirmed spirit, but denied its connection with place” with God transcending physical creation (Hughes, 1991, p. 23).

The connection between spirit and Earth was irrevocably changed by the 16th century when mercantile capitalism up-rooted feudal society (Cresswell, 2006, p. 12). People were on the move. Increased mobility led to exposure to other cultures and exchanges of new ideas – it also led to a shift in wealth from church to state and civilian. The progression from a religious to a secular society had begun.

Enlightenment philosophers both reflected and also promoted the movement of people and ideas and the transition to secular and scientific thinking. Hobbes, for example, saw mobility tied to human liberty (Cresswell, 2006, p. 14). With the publication of Descartes’, ‘Meditations on First Philosophy’ in 1641, the construction of truth became a fundamentally human activity of the mind, rather than the result of an action by God. Later, in ‘Description of the Human
Body’ (1647), Descartes promoted the idea that the immaterial soul and material (mechanistic) body were set as polarities. He set out a system where on one side lay an internal world of sensation, and on the other an objective world of natural phenomena (Semali & Kincheloe, 1999, p. 26). Within his framework, nature and mind were fundamentally separated.

Francis Bacon’s philosophy of scientific experimentation placed nature ‘under duress’ through technological experimentation within a mechanical mindset (Berman, 1981, p. 31). Sir Isaac Newton\textsuperscript{11} believed in a mechanical, predictable universe where time and space existed absolutely and objectively in reality and universal laws were predicted via scientific method.

By the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century the Scientific Revolution spawned the Industrial Revolution. In this mechanical universe there was no place for spirit, and no spirit of place. Western reality, “with its focus on material surface, no longer had room for spirits, angels, flea’s souls, or the inner nature of apples” (Peat, 1994, p. 277).

**De-contextualising Knowledge**

By the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, New Zealand was a colonised nation, and Māori experienced all that came with this status: disease, political subjugation, and the systematic marginalisation and destruction of their beliefs and values (Tse, Lloyd, Petchkovsky, & Manaia, 2005, p. 182; Walker, 1996). Māori children were physically separated from their places through the creation of mission schools where they were sent to avoid the supposedly negative influences of their home villages. They were metaphysically separated through first biblical instruction, then secularised Christian instruction via newly formed ‘native schools’. Māori

\textsuperscript{11} Based on the mechanical universe of Robert Boyle
language was banned from being spoken and enforced through physical beatings (Walker, 1996).

Colonisers ‘educated’ indigenous peoples about their bodies, their land, their systems for knowing, and their ways of ‘being’ (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Maurial, 1999; Semali & Kincheloe, 1999; L. T. Smith, 1999). Described by Semali and Kincheloe (1999) as a form of ‘epistemological tyranny’, the reality constructed by Descartes and Newton became the only reality worth discussing in academic settings and taught within educational institutions (p. 31).

When inquiry became the prerogative of rational science, there was no space for indigenous knowledges (Ingold, 2013). Conflations of body, spirit, land and identity were no longer ‘valid’ in a world where materialist-reductionist scientific methods produced universal histories, defined civilization and determined reality” (Semali & Kincheloe, 1999, p. 29). All that was not measureable or visible was relegated to the imagination of ‘others’ and the spirits of place became figments of imagination and the folk legends of primitive peoples.

Abstracting Place

The Scientific Revolution led to a new emphasis on cartography. Surveyors measured land by “approximating its areas as minutely as possible to such simple abstract figures as triangles, squares and circles” (Watts, 1958, p. 59). Cartography was incredibly helpful to the growing mercantile class who ‘discovered’ previously ‘unknown’ lands in order to reap resources. Navigation using maps and calculations represented a very different way of knowing and travelling the sea.

Taught within the scientific paradigm, indigenous students, including Māori were made to understand notions of place through a reductionist-rationalist viewpoint. In a reality that is experienced through seeing and touching
(supported via scientific method) conversations with spirits residing in the land are considered abnormal, bizarre and ‘irrational’ (Peat, 1994). In this context Māori ways of knowing were seen as superstitious and inferior to scientific reasoning.

Moving from active lived story-filled environment, to disconnected, conceptually-represented realities, created a knowledge system that is dislocated and segmented, and through our schooling processes, confined to the four walls of educational facilities. This is problematic not only for indigenous peoples, but also for society in general. Spretnak (1997) argues that using concepts to know our world is “exceedingly odd and more than a little pathological to traditional native peoples” (p. 27).

Segregating Sacred from Profane

I noted earlier that early Europe was characterised by a sedentary people whose work was intrinsically tied to place. This work was place based with a complex set of interrelated skills and activities woven together through an embodied practice. Ironmongers, for example, would need to source materials, design their work, execute it and then sell the work or trade it with others.

Today, in many indigenous societies around the world, work is still fundamentally embedded in place and the tools and physical processes associated with it are considered sacred. In the case of the Māori, creative practises such as whakairo [carving practice], special karakia [prayers] are said to allow this tapu practice to be completed and made safe in order to enter the public domain (Mead, 2003, p. 72).

In western societies, including many colonised nations, there has been a movement to a mechanistic, technologically separate society where people and body are removed from process, and work displaced. Practice or craft became
replaced by segmented and separated functions in a larger system focused around machines.

The term ‘technology’ came into general use in the 19th century. However, it was first coined in the early 17th century by Johan Beckmann who proposed that the importance of ‘useful arts’ needed systematic teaching. In this context he wrote a textbook called ‘Guide to Technology’ (Kelly, 2010, p. 8). His prescriptive approach to integrating practices such as mathematics and stonemasonry eventually evolved into a mechanical execution of scientific laws and principles – the practical application of scientific theory via technology. This meaning demoted the skilled, embodied craftsperson (Ingold, 2000, p. 295).

Ingold (2000) explains that the word technology is originally derived from the classical Greek words ‘tekhne’, which is closely associated with craftsmanship, and ‘logos’, which is roughly a set of principles associated with the application of reason (p. 295). He argues that ‘tekhne’ (skilled making), and ‘mekhane’ (manual devices) were conflated after the Enlightenment. Tekhne became technology, and the tools of one’s craft became machines. Ingold argues that ‘technique’ relates to the skills of particular human subjects, while technology is instead a generalised set of knowledge. He sees these terms as being separate again from the concept of a ‘tool’ which is “an object that extends the capacity of an agent to operate within a given environment” (p. 317). According to Ingold, you do not need to have a tool in order to have a technique, and techniques (being inseparable from human agency) are not automatically associated with technology which is a concept that involves “independence of production from human subjectivity” (p. 315).

Ingold (2000) argues that as skilled, personal, work with tools gave way to operative work on mechanised systems, the knowledge and practice of craftspeople (tekhne), was devalued. By the end of the 16th century, technology was irrevocably linked to production and the economy and the mind began to
think in mechanical terms and see mechanism in nature (p. 59). Nature was there to be interrogated, controlled and mastered using machinery and technology. Within this paradigm technology was a secular activity and, according to a strict definition of the word, profane.

By the late 19th century the professions (medicine, law, engineering) had become “vehicles for the application of the new sciences to the achievement of human progress” (Schön, 1983, p. 31). In an environment of positivist instrumentalism, “craft and artistry had no place in rigorous practical knowledge” (Schön, 1983, p. 34). Later, research and practice were separated as higher and lower schools of knowledge were created. Professional practice now had a purely technical focus, and ‘higher’ learning occurred almost exclusively within formal academic institutions. “It would be the business of university-based scientists and scholars to create the fundamental theory which professionals and technicians would apply to practice” (Schön, 1983, p. 36).

From Spirit to Sense of Place

Up until the mid-20th century absolute space, rather than place, was studied within the newly formed discipline of geography. With its early foundations in supporting Enlightenment navigation and then exploration, physical geography was concerned with quantifying and measuring the natural world by increasingly rigorous scientific means (Heffernan, 2003).

Towards the end of the 20th century, human geographers filled spaces with people and emphasised experience and meaning as important points of inquiry (Entrikin, 1991, p. 18). Relph (1976) for example described places as “profound centres of human existence to which people have deep emotional and psychological ties” (p. 8). In a similar vein, Tuan (1977) saw reality as a “construct of experience, a creation of feeling and thought” (p. 9) and place as “a type of object” which defines space (p. 17). Tuan relegates the ways of
knowing of indigenous peoples to myths about the world that satisfy “intellectual and psychological needs; . . . saves appearances and explains events.” From his particular phenomenological perspective, mythical space is an “intellectual construct” which can be “very elaborate”. It is simply a “response of feeling and imagination to fundamental human needs” (Tuan, 1977, p. 99).

Norberg-Schulz (1980), writing within the discipline of architecture, argued for the need for humans to come to terms with the genius loci of the places in which they live (p. 18). He noted that survival in the past was based on a good relationship to a place not just physically, but also psychically. However, he also argued that it is only through an investigation of how the spirit is “made concrete” that a full grasp of the genius loci can be attained (Norberg-Schulz, 1980, p. 10). He argued that it was the architect’s job to fully visualise the genius loci and create structural forms from this inspiration – a typically modernist view in which spirit is only meaningfully engaged with when translated into a more material (visible) form. Norberg-Schulz remains influential within the architecture community, spurring a multitude of publications that promote the notion of the ‘genius loci’ as a process of ‘relating architecture and urban planning to the history of a given place (Hahn & Simonis, 1991, p. 15).

Relph, Tuan, and Norberg-Schulz’s experiential understandings of place, paved the way for a wave of writings in which the ‘sense of place’ was conflated with the ‘spirit of place’. Dictionary definitions of the term reflect these two different understandings: in the Oxford Online Dictionary (2013a) the following entry appears for the term ‘genius loci’:

noun:

the prevailing character or atmosphere of a place

• the presiding god or spirit of a place.
In this extract, the original meaning of the term has been relegated to a bullet point within a description discussing ‘character’ and ‘atmosphere’.

Relph (2007), in his later writings, spoke of the ‘spirit of place’ and a ‘sense of place’ being inextricably linked, with the ‘spirit’ of place now having a “mostly secular meaning . . . mostly to do with natural landmarks or remarkable built forms” (p. 2). Relph describes the spirit of place as an “inherent and an emergent property”, lying within natural and human-made structures but also created through the “accumulation of physical changes and associations that come from somewhere being lived in for a long time” (ibid). He notes that the ‘sense of place’ is often confused with ‘spirit of place’, but is actually about “grasping and appreciating the distinctive qualities of place”. As mentioned earlier, Relph describes the spirits of place as having “lost their powers” with the “progress of civilisation” (ibid).

Sense of place relates to the ideas of place character (the ‘feel’, ‘ambience’ or ‘atmosphere’ of a place (R. J. Green, 2009)), place meaning (e.g. Davenport & Anderson, 2005; Gustafson, 2001; Manzo, 2005) and place attachment (e.g. Brown & Raymond, 2007; Payton, Fulton, & Anderson, 2005; Trentelman, 2009), place identity and place dependence. These concepts have a number of sub-aspects which are often confused: ‘sense of place’ is used to describe a person’s overall relationship with a place (including behaviours, emotions, cognition, etc.) but is often confused with the term ‘place attachment’ which is a more specific bond based on thoughts and emotions (Smaldone, Harris, & Sanyal, 2005, p. 398). Place attachment is based, in part, on the meaning that is made of a location (descriptive beliefs and cognition) as an emotional bond develops between person and place over time, but is more concerned with the strength of the connection (i.e. how much does a place mean rather than what it means) (ibid).
Place attachment is further divided into research on identity, and the degree of dependence and interdependence between individuals and places. Place meaning also has sub-fields of study which focus on the processual, meaning-making experiences that connect people to place. Within this complex array of sub-discourses there is disagreement over whether these concepts are investigated using a positivist (objective) or a phenomenological (subjective) methodology (Stedman, 2002).

Over time, the ‘spirit of place’ has become a notion as complex, dynamic and multi-layered as that of place (Jive’n & Larkham, 2003, p. 71), and the genius loci has become an ambiguous awkward term (Jackson, 1995). What was first marginalised by traditional scientists was later invalidated by social scientists and philosophers writing from human-centric (humanist) subjectivist positions. The spirits of place were demoted to the internally generated imaginings of primitive, uncivilised peoples – the holy and sacred reduced to a subjective category of experience rather than objective reality (Deloria, 1991).

The Legacy and the Challenge

21st century New Zealand is a nation undergoing dramatic social and economic shifts (Jutel, 2004). Within this unstable territory, government institutions are making an effort to engage with indigenous knowledge and multidimensional notions of place, and place based practices (such as kaitiakitanga – guardianship or stewardship).

Recent environmental management initiatives demonstrate a more inclusive approach to Māori world views (e.g. Te Taiwhenua o Tamatea & Te Taiwhenua o Heretaunga, 2012). New Zealand local councils are making efforts to engage with local iwi in order to have greater representation and consultation in decision making. This represents a movement away from discipline- and culture-specific approaches. However, formal institutions, cultures, disciplines and
discourses remain fragmented and siloed. Archaeologists, water scientists, geologists, kaumātua [Māori elders], tohunga [experts\textsuperscript{12}], local historians, healers, geographers, sociologists, community police, development workers and other individuals and groups working in and around place remain largely confined to engagement within their own boundaries. Although these groups sometimes come together in multidisciplinary committees, they remain within their own disciplines and domains.

Traditional indigenous place practices sit firmly outside most academic institutions. Embodied ‘lived practice’ is seen as inferior to ‘higher learning’ as it is “too situational, contingent and particular” (Weber, 2013, p. 55). As for ‘technology’ (as a general term and specific to certain objects) it is been deemed by both Māori and European as inherently profane i.e. the world of the day-to-day rather than that which is set-aside and sacred.

This is problematic when places across the planet are increasingly challenged by what Rittel and Webber (1973) have called ‘wicked’ problems – issues that are incredibly complex and difficult to solve. Rittel and Webber (1973) argue that occupational styles, professionalisms and practices developed over the last few hundred years are not well adapted to contemporary situations. Traditional responses “developed within disciplinary ‘silos’ often end up producing piecemeal solutions — solutions that address specific outcomes, but are blind to other equally important areas” (Hochachka & O’Brien, p. 2).

Indeed, Zajonc (2010a) views higher education’s view of the world as partial, and attempting to solve complex issues with only partial truth as problematic. For him:

\textsuperscript{12} e.g. priests, healers, navigators, carvers, and teachers (sometimes a combination of many fields).
A diminished ontology is a powerful distorting lens that obscures the true multidimensional reality of our world, hiding the full scope of our humanity and the deeper complexity of our world. Genuine solutions, adequate to our problems — personal, societal, and environmental — will only arise from an expanded ontology that embraces the richness that is the universe.” (p. 65)

Relatedly, Shahjahan (2005) sees the knowledge generated within academia as anthropocentric – with other beings subordinate or non-existent. He notes that dominant scientific theories do not accept arguments involving “people’s spiritual relationships to the universe, to the landscape, rocks, rivers, mountains and other things, seen and unseen” (p. 696). He argues for a multidimensional gaze, so that today’s “issues and questions are not seen in two-dimensional level or through mainstream triangulation but rather are seen in its depth and at different levels of consciousness” (pp. 697-698). Palmer (2010) sees religion and spirituality as drivers of day-to-day life and excluding these aspects as a stunning act of irrationality in of itself (p. 47).

As noted previously, I have worked with individuals and groups who each believed that they alone had the answers to solve the world’s problems. My work brought these groups together but this was often a challenging experience limited by the discipline and culture-centric frameworks that were available and viable at the time.

In the last decade in particular, there has been a number of philosophical and technological developments within academia and other sectors of society. Interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary frameworks have evolved, as have new technologies. In academia there is a greater openness to ‘alternative’ ontologies either those of indigenous peoples or those developed via continental philosophy. In the following chapter I examine some of these, and other
emerging ideas and tools in more detail and set out how they can come
together to create a new way of conceptualising and engaging in place.
Chapter 4 - Practice, Technology and Spirit

As mentioned in the introduction, there is a call from across disciplines, for flexibility creativity, and inclusivity in place research, and academic research in general in order to generate more effective solutions to the issues that face society and our planet. At the very least, academics have noted that the complex nature of place calls for a greater sophistication in research approach.

In this chapter I review emerging methodologies, ontologies, technologies, and understandings of spirit, technology and practice. I point out the gaps within and between these discourses. I demonstrate how they can come together to create a new, more inclusive and sophisticated, way of conceptualising and engaging in place. This sets the stage for the tricksters’ return.

Emerging Research Paradigms

There are a number of academics concerned with how places may be studied more inclusively and relevantly. Gruenewald (2003b), an educationalist, promotes the idea of place-consciousness: a framework where place is the focus for multidisciplinary, intergenerational education. For him, places are “profoundly pedagogical” and for this reason it is difficult “to accept institutional discourses, structures, pedagogies, and curriculums that neglect them” (p. 621). Gruenewald (2003a) espouses a critical pedagogy of place that “encourages teachers and students to re-inhabit their places, that is, to pursue the kind of social action that improves the social and ecological life of places, near and far, now and in the future” (p. 7). Grunewald’s view then is not only pedagogical put also political.

Similarly, Somerville (2010) views the bridging of disciplinary and subject areas as critical to dealing with the difficult and complex issues that occur in spaces and places today (p. 331). She theorises that places are contact zones, where:
specific local places offer a material and metaphysical in-between space for the intersection of multiple and contested stories. This characteristic of place . . . is especially significant in the relationship between indigenous, and other subjugated knowledges, and Western academic thought. (Somerville, 2010, p. 338)

In other words, for her, places are crossroads for different voices and cultural paradigms to meet. Malpas (1999) also sees place as a nexus point where temporality, subjectivity and objectivity, self and other all come together to make up notions of place (p. 163).

More prosaically, Stedman (2003), a geographer, argues that understanding the true complexity of place is a multidisciplinary exercise because place is a multidimensional concept that depends on meanings, which in turn are based on experiences – and sense-making experiences are variable from person to person (p. 824). These views reflect my own experiences of engaging not only with the material reality of places, but also the storied, spiritual, historical, social and political realities that I encounter. In developing and/or colonised nations the juxtaposition of many different realities in the same place creates a contested field of relationships where the only commonality is the ground underneath people’s feet.

In the literature surrounding place, the terms *multidisciplinary* and *interdisciplinary*, are often used interchangeably. However, there are differences. Multidisciplinary projects bring together disparate disciplines to study and engage with one concept, topic or issue while maintaining individual disciplinary boundaries (Petts, Owens, & Bulkeley, 2008). On the other hand, interdisciplinary approaches involve a cross-boundary synthesis; an expansion of disciplinary knowledge, and movement of knowledge from one discipline to another (Nicolescu, 1999; Petts et al., 2008). Interdisciplinary research is sometimes described as operating on a spectrum ranging from building bridges
between disciplines, through to forming new disciplines (Klein, 2007; Nicolescu, 1999). Interdisciplinary research involves researchers meeting and exchanging knowledge from within their respective disciplinary practices and/or situations where “the analytical frames of more than one discipline are employed by the researcher” (Kincheloe, 2001, p. 685).

Transdisciplinary approaches push beyond disciplinary boundaries, becoming something that is more than the sum of its individual disciplinary parts (Petts et al., 2008). Transdisciplinarity is, according to Nicolescu (2005), “between the disciplines, across the different disciplines, and beyond all disciplines.” Nicolescu is one of the few transdisciplinary theorists who openly discusses and promotes both trans-religious and trans-cultural practices. He sees transdisciplinary practice as having a spiritual dimension (Nicolescu, 2008). Nicolescu’s vision of transdisciplinary practice is for me the most inclusive.

**Integral Methodologies**

Integral Inquiry and Integral Theory are transdisciplinary methodologies. Integral Inquiry, as proposed by William Braud (1998, 2011) is described as being part of a group of transpersonal research methods (Anderson & Braud, 2011). Integral Inquiry argues that research not only provides an original contribution to academic knowledge, but also “psycho-spiritual growth and the possibility of transformative change for the researcher” as well as research participants and the readers of the final published work (Braud, 2011).

Integral Theory, originally proposed by Wilber (2000, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2003d, 2006) has been described as a holistic way of making sense of the world represented as a complex framework of quadrants, lines, levels, states and types. It has strong similarities to Braud’s Integral Inquiry but is perhaps wider and more detailed in its scope.
Inspired by the work of Alfred North Whitehead (who conceived the world as a many-faceted, prismatic, organic whole (Rescher, 1996)), Wilber sees no divides between culture and society, environment and culture, culture and nature. He describes nature as having a big ‘N’, ‘N’ being Spirit, which is all encompassing and transcendent (Wilber, 1996). Wilber’s framework is based around ‘holons’ which are “an expression of the absolute and also a relative whole/part. Each holon has its own relative wholeness, and its own relative partness (Wilber, 1996, p. 303). For Wilber, the solution to ‘Gaia’s’ issues include interior (personal) growth and transcendence – which includes forms of spiritual practice. Wilber (1996) argues that the real issue facing places today is not “industrialisation, ozone depletion, overpopulation, or resource depletion . . .” but a lack of mutual understanding and agreement about how to resolve these issues (p. 285). He proposes his framework as a solution to this issue.

**Embodiment, Representation, and Performance**

A number of writers have argued for considering embodiment as an integral aspect of any place engagement (Hubbard & Kitchin, 2011, p. 7). This is particularly important given that millions of indigenous people have this concept at the core of their knowledge systems.

Rose (2002) discusses the ‘ecological self’ which is “materially embedded in specific places, as well as being co-substantive with the universe. The emplaced ecological self is permeable: place penetrates the body, and the body slips into place” (p. 312). She sees this relationship as profoundly dialogical, and reciprocal, with place belonging to body and vice versa. For her, getting back into place is “the very way in which we are always already there, through our own lived body” (p. 324).

Somerville (2007, 2010) proposes ‘an ontology of emergence’ focused around the notion of ‘self-becoming-other’. She discusses ‘becoming-other’ as a
processual, fundamentally embodied, relational concept “born of the space in-between” (2007, p. 234). She argues that this way of being in place is a condition for generating new knowledges through a research engagement that is at once messy, open-ended, liminal, and irrational (2007, p. 235). Learning in places happens through “embodied connections in particular local places” (Somerville, 2010).

For Somerville, ‘becoming-other’ is:

an ontology founded in the bodies of things which are dynamic, existing in relation to each other, and it is in the dynamic of this relationship that subjectivities are formed and transformed. And within this there is the relationship with inanimate objects and technologies, that we, in the process of becoming-other, can intentionally manipulate — stone, wood and clay, pencils, crayons, brushes and paints, computers, words and paper, cloth, thread and scissors — among the myriad other things that we humans have chosen to use to create. This becoming-other begins with the assumption that as humans we are in a continual process of becoming. (2007, p. 234)

For her, the ‘bodies of things’ includes digital technologies which “allow the assembling and re-assembling of different representations combining different modalities such as the text, visual images and sound” (2010, p. 340). This fits within Somerville’s “new theory of representation” in which multiple methods and practices: “stories, song, dance and paintings, as well as interviews, academic prose and so on”, are incorporated (2007, p. 239). In this form of representation, “the focus is on the “creation of meaning from the relationship between the parts” (ibid).

Kincheloe and Steinberg (2008) also promote an arts-based approach which “provides an alternative epistemology, a way of knowing that moves beyond declarative forms of knowledge” (p. 140). They encourage a performance-based
pedagogical approach which is *respectful towards spiritual views*\(^{13}\) and “demands a politics of hope, of loving, of caring nonviolence grounded in inclusive moral and spiritual terms” (p. 13).

Approaching place research or engagement from an arts or performance focus is not new. Indigenous peoples’ cultural and artistic practices arise directly out of their deep connection to the land. However, within academia arts-based approaches are mainly confined within the humanities disciplines of architecture, design and fine art. Within these ‘public’ art practices, “the site is not simply a geographic location or architectural setting but a network of social relations, a community”, with the artist seeing the work as an “integral extension of the community rather than an intrusive contribution from elsewhere” (Kwon, 2002, p. 6).\(^{14}\)

Stern (2013) is one of a number of new media artists bringing together embodiment with digital performance. His notions of permeability and the inter-relatability of multiple disparate objects through performance have resonance with Somerville’s, Rose’s and my own view of practice in place. He encourages artists to not focus on technology but instead study the “encounters it creates . . . .We must look with, and feel, the body” (p. 21). Stern, like other fine artists, operates from a practice orientation. It is to that notion I now turn.

**Practice**

The concept of practice has become increasingly popular among scholars across a number of disciplines including (but not limited to) organisational development and management (Nicolini, 2012); sociology (MacIntyre, 1981;  

\(^{13}\) My emphasis

\(^{14}\) Early site-specific works, from the 1960s onwards “demanded the physical presence of the viewer for the work’s completion” (Kwon, 2000, p. 39). Site-specific art has ranged from physical sculptures (e.g. Robert Smithson, Patricia Johanson, Marko Pogačnik) as well as ‘interventions’ and ‘happenings’ occurring in communities and involving a number of divergent outcomes and activities (e.g. Suzanne Lacey).
Schatzki, 2001); media and computing philosophy (Brewer & Dourish, 2008; Thrift & French, 2002); visual arts (Frayling, 1993; Sullivan, 2010); education (Fitzmaurice, 2010; Hagar, 2011); and theorists discussing mobility (Cresswell, 2002). Although many of these views of practice have different applications, what is common to them is that practice is seen to be made up of many ‘parts,’ ‘artefacts’, ‘objects’, and ‘hybrids’ enacted via the body’ (Nicolini, 2012; Schatzki, 2001).

Nicolini (2012) describes the appeal of a practice lens lying in its capacity “to describe important features of the world we inhabit as something that is routinely made and re-made in practice using tools, discourse, and our bodies” (p. 2). He argues that practice offers a solution to dualism because practice-based approaches are fundamentally processual and relational, and the body (and the objects/tools enacted through the body) are critical to engaging in activities. Practice approaches view knowledge as fundamentally enacted and social. Practices put people, and things, in place and therefore express and reflect the power differentials of those places (rank and physical locations) (p. 6).

Schön (1983), describes a practitioner as someone who encounters certain types of situations or contexts over and over again. As the practitioner engages with a variety of ‘cases’, or bounded experiences, they develop their “repertoire of expectations, images and techniques.” (p. 60). According to Schön, practice needs to be integrated with research not separated from it. The problems confronted in society are complex, messy and uncertain and exist in “swampy lowlands”, not in the “high hard ground” of research and ‘technique’ (p. 42). He notes that those working in the swampy lowlands “involve themselves in messy but crucially important problems and, when asked to describe their methods of inquiry, they speak of experience, trial and error, intuition, and muddling through” (p. 43). He argues that modern practitioners of any kind need to
choose between multiple approaches and find their own way to combine them together. Reflecting on their decisions and actions in this process is a form of practice in action.

Cresswell (2002) sees place as the porous interchange of a number of performances, meetings and happenings, and is both the context for, and product of, practice. Places are not fixed, but formed through “constant, reiterative practice” (2004, p. 38). He sees this as practicing place. In this way, places become hubs for both theory and day-to-day action. This echoes Kogl’s (2008) notion that places shape the practices of everyday life, but that they are also, in turn, shaped by them (p. 5). These theorists resonate with my own experience of working in place. Like Massey (2005), I see places as always being in a “process of being made” and space as a product of “relations embedded in material practices” (p. 9).

Sumara and Carson (1997) put forward the notion of ‘lived practice’, which is a way of conceptualising a processual, performative and intrinsically natural form of research engagement. Writing in the context of action research, they argue for a blurring between the worlds of research and of living, work and practice. They strive to eliminate the theory-practice divide. These writings inform and support one of my key underpinning assumptions - that place work necessarily involves a degree of porosity between researcher and researched, place and person, theory and practice. Any engagement is literally enacted in the place where one stands and an embodied act of holistic engagement.

**Spirit and Practice**

MacIntyre (1981) describes practice:

> as any coherent and complex form of socially established cooperative human activity through which goods internal to that form of activity are realised in the course of trying to
achieve those standards of excellence which are appropriate to, and partially definitive of, that form of activity, with the result that human powers to achieve excellence, and human conceptions of the ends and goods involved, are systematically extended. (p. 187)

For MacIntyre, virtues are human qualities or values that enable the achievement of ‘internal goods’ or intrinsic goods (e.g. happiness, self-worth, cultural appreciation) that are part of practice (p. 191). As Fitzmaurice (2010) explains, practice not only “gives due importance to methods and techniques, but also draws attention to the qualities and disposition of the practitioner” (p. 46).

Wuthnow (2001) describes spiritual practice as:

a cluster of intentional activities concerned with relating to the sacred. It may result in extraordinary experiences, but it generally takes place in ordinary life. (p. 312)

He argues that the difference between spirituality and spiritual practice is that spiritual practice refers to activities that people engage in in order to understand their own spirituality or grow their spiritual lives. Spirituality on the other hand, “indicates a transcendent state of being or an ineffable aspect of reality”. Spiritual practice is therefore a more “active or intentional form of behaviour” (p. 309).

Wuthnow (following MacIntyre) notes that spiritual practice involves: intrinsic rewards (e.g. the joy of connection to the divine); intentionality (a deliberate effort is made to connect); a sense of embeddedness (in an institution, or discourse of some sort); a moral responsibility (to adhere to a set of principles); a degree of interpretation (through telling and interpreting our stories of practice); historical elements (as one connects to others and the past); and
finally, an interconnectedness or interlacedness with other types of practices and other people practising (p. 317).

Zajonc (2010b) views spirituality as a practice which leads to knowledge based in experience, and therefore has some kinship with science. He also notes that spirituality is concerned with values, meaning and purpose, and therefore has commonality with religion. In this way spirituality occupies the space between the dichotomies of faith and knowledge, science and discussion (p. 121). Zajonc’s writing creates a useful bridge between practice, spirituality and mainstream paradigms of education which has been an influence on my research design.

There are a multitude of spiritual practices (associated most commonly with religions), many of which are explicitly tied to place (via the vehicle of ‘nature’ or ‘earth’ itself as a system), or through deities tied to specific places (or types of places, (e.g. shrines)), and deities representing the Earth itself (e.g. Gaia). As an example of the latter, transpersonal eco-psychologist J. Davis (1998) promotes an earth-centred spiritual path that understands that contact with nature (whether it be backyard, wilderness or body) “expands and develops one’s ultimate concerns and moves one toward self-transcendence”. This kind of practice “recognizes spirit in all forms, including the natural, the built, the wounded, and the toxic. Environmental problems become an arena for selfless service, and the phenomenal world becomes an arena for transpersonal experiences and non-dual awareness” (p. 92).

Starhawk (1989), among others, has been active in promoting an ecologically based spiritual practice associated with Goddess Religion and ‘modern’ witchcraft (p. 25). In a similar vein, but without explicitly feminist political underpinnings, there are neo-shamanistic practices espoused within New Age literature based around a bricolage of quasi-indigenous appropriations, synthesised with modern pagan and/or wiccan writings (Audlin, 2006; Conway,
1997). Pagan, shamanistic, wiccan, and Goddess religions tend to promote ritual engagements of different types, and inner practices (such as spirit journeys) which work on the psyche and soul in relation to the natural world.

Within Wuthnow’s (2001) perspective, practice is a concept to help orient thinking to the fact that spirituality exists in the complex and fragmented arena of contemporary society (p. 313). It is an activity of the world with a number of elements and processes, often using whatever is to hand. In the world today whatever is to hand often means computing technology. McSherry (2002), for example, describes how pagans use the internet to engage with each other and the way that the ‘net’ replicates the non-dualistic sense of interconnection underpinning their spiritual beliefs. For him “there is no tidy, rational way to move through Cyberspace. It is an environment of loops and links where everything is connected in a seemingly infinite network or web (p. 5).

Holloway (2003), views spiritual practice as inhabiting the everyday world (of which technology is just one object). His has a vision of the “enchanted everyday” (p. 1963), where notions of sacred and profane, space and place, theory and practice are dissolved. For Holloway, practice is of the world as a whole, and it is the body that makes sense of sacredness, often bringing together the profane (i.e. everyday objects and places) in this enactment (ibid).

Each of these discourses represents an opportunity to engage differently in place, and place research. Most are influenced by the knowledges of indigenous peoples that already engage in integrated, interstitial, embodied, performative and inspired practices. In this way they are attempting to bridge between mainstream and so-called alternative epistemologies and ontologies. Key themes emerge from these various discourses: the permeability of many different kinds of boundaries; an emphasis on practicality and using what is to hand; the promotion of performance- and arts-based approaches, the
fundamental place of embodiment in any work, and openness to transpersonal elements.

Emerging Technology

Academics writing on emerging mobile technologies (and mobility in general) (Deuze, 2012; S. Graham, 1998; Thrift, 1996; Urry, 2007) do not generally cite authors such as Rose (2002) or Somerville (2007, 2010) in their work – however many of these themes are the same i.e. embodiment, practice, interconnection and permeability. Today’s technologies bridge between worlds using the body and screens (portals) as points of connection. While this has shamanic overtones, as I will demonstrate, the literature surrounding these technologies actively avoids any mention of the sacred or the spiritual.

Smart Mobile Society

Society in the second decade of the 21st century is fundamentally networked (Castells, 2001), arguably resulting in shifts in how space and time are experienced (Harvey, 1990, 1993). This is due to advances in technology (more recently mobile technologies) which have occurred within a milieu which for Miller (2014) consists of ‘neoliberal deregulatory and privatization policies’, ‘marketing dependent consumer economies’ and the ‘rise of international culture industries’ (p. 213).

The development of the World Wide Web was one of the most significant developments in the digital age. Its power to catalyse change lies in its lack of central power, proliferation of media forms, and the lateral links it creates between “various networks, autonomous programs, and genres of expression” (E. Davis, 1998, p. 387). Mobile computing and smart mobile devices brought the internet out into the street, and into everyday places. These technologies are reshaping, reforming, and disrupting the way that lives are led and places are understood.
Smart mobile devices are multi-purpose hybrid objects operating at the nexus point of a number of different technologies. These devices, are usually ‘on’, and on us, at all times, and have ushered us into an age of ubiquitous, pervasive computing (Romero, 2010). Individuals across the world can now access a wide variety of information and engage in a multiplicity of activities whilst on the move.

Today’s smart mobile phones trace back to IBM’s 1993 phone called ‘Simon’ which had a calendar, calculator and could send emails and faxes. Subsequent developments by Nokia, Erickson, RIM all added greater functionality and power to the phones and reduced them in size. After 2001, when GPS signals became more accurate, their incorporation in mobile devices opened up a new level of usability. Information and different forms of media could be located in specific places (de Souza e Silva & Firth, 2010, p. 486) – hence the term locative mobile.

In 2007 the launch of the Apple iPhone set a new standard in smartphone development, redefining the user interface through a multi-touch screen and creating a market for ‘apps’ (Romero, 2010). Today increasingly powerful, portable computing devices (which include Apple iPhones, Android phones, and tablets) provide a number of interactive, autonomous, location-based services via the internet using a number of different protocols (e.g. Wi-Fi, 3G or 4G) and their own operating systems (iOS, Android OS, Windows, HPOS, Blackberry OS). Smartphones today can be compared to laptops from ten years ago, and year by year they are closing the gap (C. Arthur, 2011)

The worldwide uptake of smartphones has been exponential. The most recent report from The International Telecommunication Union (2014) states that

---

15 This development was in itself the product of a number of other computing milestones too numerous to name.
mobile-broadband subscriptions will reach 2.3 billion by the end of 2014, 55% of them in developing nations. The report also notes that “Mobile-broadband penetration rates stand at 36% globally; 21% in developed countries; and 84% in developing countries”, and mobile subscriptions generally are now at 7 billion worldwide (with developing nations making up three-quarters of this figure) (International Telecommunication Union, 2014). In New Zealand, Statistics NZ has reported that more than half of New Zealanders are now accessing the internet via a mobile phone and the total number of internet connections via smartphones increased by a third to more than 2.5 million in 2012 (H. Hill, 2012). In 2013, it has been reported that over 60% of New Zealanders have smartphones, and 19% have tablets (TNS, 2013).

Smart mobile devices have been described as “partly technological, partly psychological and partly cultural” with multiple modes of usage (Huhtamo, 2004, p. 36). Users can take pictures and make movies, record and create music, play games, shop, network, critique, communicate in a variety of forms, create interactive art, recognise faces, monitor their health, organise their lives and keep track of others’ movements via ‘apps’ – software applications which are downloaded onto the devices. These devices are simultaneously a telephone, radio, television, navigation system, camera, remote control, game console, spirit level, sensor (for temperature and humidity), price checker, electronic wallet, departure card, medical device and portal to an invisible world of visual and auditory material existing around us. Geo-locative mobile technologies have also been shown to have significant effects in supporting environmental initiatives such as species recognition and mapping (Pimm et al., 2014) and climate change apps are raising awareness and participation among everyday citizens (Peach, 2012).

---

16 i.e. internet accessed via phones
Geo-Locative, Augmenting Reality, Mobile Technologies

Augmented reality, mixed reality and hybrid reality technologies were initially created in the mid-20th century, when, in 1962, Morton Heilig built a motorcycle simulator entitled the ‘Sensorama’ – a multi-sensory extravaganza of smells, movements, sounds and visuals (Carmigniani & Furht, 2011, p. 4). Later in the decade, Ivan Sutherland created a head-mounted ‘virtual reality’ display system, followed in the 1970s by Myron Krueger who created a room (‘Video Place’) which allowed viewers to interact with virtual objects (Kipper & Rampolla, 2012, p. 8). Caudell and Mizell from Boeing are credited with using the term ‘augmented reality’ in their work in aircraft building (ibid).

By 1994, Milgram and Kishino had set up the first taxonomy of ‘mixed reality’, proposing a continuum of reality with the completely real environment on one side, and the virtual environment on the other. In between, are digitally enhanced physical spaces and physically enhanced digital spaces (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1: ‘Virtuality Continuum’: Milgram and Kishino (1994, p.3)]

Towards the side of ‘real’ was ‘augmented reality’, where a digital overlay was placed over, or into, a real space. Towards the ‘virtual’ end, ‘augmented virtuality’ involved a user interface where the person moved and engaged bodily in the real world, but they were visually present in the virtual world, usually using some kind of full body or visual prosthetic (Milgram & Kishino, 1994, p. 3). The continuum, which is widely cited, reflected a general shift from
purely virtual or purely physical realities. In fact it redefined the boundaries between physical and virtual space.

Later, Milgram and Colquhoun (1999) better defined this continuum, allowing augmented reality to not only involve a head-mounted display unit, but also refer to a case in which an otherwise real environment is ‘augmented’ by means of virtual (computer graphic) objects. In situations where there is any mixture of real and virtual environments (i.e. anywhere along Milgram’s original continuum in Figure 1) they prefer to use the general term ‘mixed reality’ (p. 12).

Augmented Reality (AR) exists in the place between real and virtual spaces. Originally AR comprised of large backpacks filled with different technologies or desktop devices (including early tablets). However, today’s augmented reality technologies represent a nexus point of several developmental strands: the trend toward smaller and more powerful portable computing devices; the creation of global satellite positioning technologies; the exponentially growing market for mobile software applications; the release of third generation mobile telecommunications tools and the development of cloud-based data storage systems. Thanks to these developments, AR applications are now delivered via mobile devices such as phones and tablets.

In these contexts, the strict definition of augmented reality is one where a display (phone, tablet or glasses) combines real and virtual content in 3D, interactively and in real-time (Liao & Humphreys, 2014, p. 4). It is the sense of reality achieved by superimposing virtual objects and cues upon the real world in real time (Carmigniani & Furht, 2011) either directly through a viewing window (‘look through’ view) or indirectly (e.g. via video) i.e. ‘heads down’ view”. Some authors take exception to the idea that augmented reality automatically enhances surroundings as this is subjectively based on user experience. For this reason the more general term ‘mixed reality’ is preferred instead (Champion, 2011).
Recent theorists have moved away from device-driven definitions, and are instead creating definitions centred on user experience, and the perceived impact on space and place. One theorist, de Souza e Silva (2006) for example, positions *hybrid reality* as something aside from mixed, augmented, and virtual reality. For her, hybrid reality is a ‘conceptual space’ where mobile technologies merge the borders between the physical and digital. She describes this as a ‘hybrid space’ which is “built by the connection of mobility and communication and materialized by social networks”. For de Souza e Silva, the term hybrid defines a situation in which the borders between remote and contiguous contexts, relationships and social activities can no longer be clearly defined (p. 269). This social, connective element is argued to be missing from other definitions.

Rieser (2004) sees ‘locative technologies’ as “redefining the concept of the virtual from that of simulation to that of augmentation” (p. 4). In this context, the term *geo-reality* is emerging, alongside *geo-location*. The ‘geo’ aspect allows for digital information to appear only on certain GPS coordinates and, with some applications, further targeted to specific categories of user. These ‘geo-points’ can be enabled to have a kind of intelligence that senses individual identities and sorts data according to who is there and at what time.

Manovich (2006) is focused on the experience of *augmented space*, that is the notion of physical space overlaid with dynamically changing, localised, personalised multimedia information (p. 220). He presents a continuum between immersive and augmenting experiences with scale being the determinant in the categorisation of experience. For Manovich, you are either adding new material to a current experience, what he would define as augmentation, or adding a completely different experience (i.e. immersion) (p. 225). He argues that movie screens and game consoles create an immersive experience where the user is “hardly aware” of their physical surroundings,
while a smartphone size screen (used in the palm of a hand), “adds to your overall phenomenological experience, it does not take over” (ibid). It is debatable whether the idea that the size of the screen is the direct determinant of awareness, as anyone who has sat in a movie with a crying child, or engaged in a particularly interesting game via their mobile phones can testify. Nonetheless, the shift towards user experience playing a key role in definition is important.

M. Graham, Zook, and Boulton (2012) offer an even broader “socio-spatially nuanced concept of augmented realities” which “emphasises the potent ways in which virtual information – in particular, geographically referenced content – intersects and helps shape the relationships that undergird our lived geographies.” They argue that a variety of technologies (including code embedded in everyday objects) are creating profoundly new ways of engaging with place (p. 465). For them, augmented reality is:

indeterminate, unstable, context dependent and multiple realities brought into being through the subjective coming-togthers in time and space of material and virtual experiences. In other words: augmented reality is the material/virtual nexus mediated through technology, information and code, and enacted in specific and individualised space/time configurations. (M. Graham et al., 2012, p. 465)

In this quote they point to the future of augmentation where device, display, information and digital content fade into a larger milieu that actively augments our collective reality. In this future, technologies are immersive, ubiquitous and pervasive and the boundaries between what is real or is not real become very hazy indeed. This latter definition points to a future where augmenting mobile (probably wearable) devices continually interact and add to the real environment. In this way, the real is no longer a hybrid of digital and physical, but a reality made up of a variety of materialities.
This has implications for how the spirit of place is understood, or even just place itself. When mixed, hybrid and augmented reality simply become reality, and set-aside sites are infiltrated by day-to-day sensors, signals and geo-located media, the boundaries between space and place are disrupted.

In this thesis I used a geo-locative, augmenting reality software application created by Imersia Group for my study. I chose the verb augmenting to describe these tools, following the lead of writers such as Manovich (2006), Aurigi (2008b), and M. Graham et al. (2012). I am interested in a more expansive understanding of mobile tools which ‘insert’ and interweave media in the environment, and am focused on their impacts rather than strict definitions based on functionality.

**Space, Place and Practice**

Places are, more than ever, multiplicitous. They are a rich interplay between people, things, information, ideas, code, memories and interactions. The exponential uptake of smartphones and their applications has had implications for place at a fundamental level, for, as E. Davis (1998) argues, “when a culture’s technical structure of communication mutates quickly and significantly, both social and individual ‘reality’ is in for a bit of a ride” (p. 310).

Squire (2009) views individuals as “neither entirely here nor there but in multiple, occasionally hybrid, places” of their own choice (p. 78). He describes how online and offline activity is reshaping how place is experienced, creating a multiplicity of place. He argues that there is an inability to unplug or get away as we now have the ability to be in multiple places at once (ibid). Similarly, for Turkle (2011) mobile technologies enable humanity to be connected continuously in a way where being alone is a prerequisite for being together because it is “easier to communicate if you can focus, without interruption, on your screen” (p. 155). For her, places are no longer communal spaces but are
instead assemblies where “people come together but do not speak to each other. Each is tethered to a mobile device and to the people and places to which that device serves as a portal” (ibid).

The notion that place is subsumed within the empty, absolute nature of space is being increasingly challenged. S. Graham (1998), for example, argues that new technologies actively construct space and place, and ‘material’ space and digital-electronic spaces are increasingly being produced together. He argues that the “power to function economically and link socially increasingly relies on constructed, place based, material spaces intimately woven into complex telematic infrastructures linking them to other places and spaces” (p. 174).

For Brewer and Dourish (2008) place and space are both products of different kinds of 21st century social practices (p. 965). They argue that our ideas of space and place are mediated by technologies and the representations they produce with each having its own set of logics (ibid). Place, if anything, comes first – with ‘spaces’ emerging out of the interactions, collective social activities and practices that occur in and around place. Casey (2009) also argues for an inversion of the status of place. For him, places are not constructed out of space. Instead he argues that people construct and engage with space as a subset of a lived experience of place (p. 321).

Related to these discourses is Urry’s (2007) notion that spaces are comprised of “various materials, of objects and environments, that are intermittently in motion” which are then “assembled and reassembled in changing configurations and rearticulated meanings” (p. 34). Similarly, Casey (2009) argues that places are gathering points of experiences, histories, languages and thoughts, they ‘hold together’, and ‘hold in and hold out’, “old things and new things, the familiar and the strange, and much more besides” (p. 327).
So, while ubiquitous computing systems entwine people, place and software in complex ways (Crang & Graham, 2007, p. 5), spaces are also “increasingly powerful conveyors of information, whilst information – materialising into them – becomes more and more spatially-related” (Aurigi, 2008a, p. 5). Many technological theorists refer to the notion of practice in their work. Thrift and French (2002) predict that the internet of things will be made up of appliances which are 'practice-aware’, “responding to and aware of the context in which they are used through an array of wireless and other sensors, continuous locational information read from Global Positioning System (GPS) references” (p. 315). Relatedly, S. Graham (2004), describes a world where traditional and emerging practice, and media have become interdependent and interconnected within a maelstrom of societal change (p. 19). And Brewer and Dourish (2008), put forward the idea that new forms of practice are emerging through the mediation of technology, that operate in the everyday world and support and reflect new forms of “environmental knowing” (p. 969), and they notice an emerging “reconfiguration of the conceptual relationships between place, space, technology, and practice” (p. 970).

Coyne (2010) proposes that pervasive digital devices, and the networks that support them, are a way of making incremental adjustments within spaces – of tuning places. For him, the tuning of place is a set of practices by which people use devices, wilfully or unwittingly, to influence their interactions with one another in places (pp. ix, xvi). Like many cultural theorists, Coyne does not reference the spirit of place at all in his work although much of his writing can be read as a metaphor for a digitised spiritual practice.

What I draw from these discussions is that, in ubiquitous computing environments, places and spaces, people and objects, technology and media, are combining in complex ways and are no longer solid and stable concepts. This is reflected in the notion of ‘third space’.
Soja (1996) proposes a ‘third space’ where everything comes together:

subjectivity and objectivity, the abstract and the concrete, the
real and the imagined, the knowable and the unimaginable, the
repetitive and the differential, structure and agency, mind and
body, consciousness and unconsciousness, the disciplined and
the transdisciplinary, everyday life and unending history.
Anything that fragments thirdspace into separate specialised
knowledges or exclusive domains – even on the pretext of
handling its infinite complexity – destroys its meaning and
openness. (Soja, 1996, pp. 56-57)

While criticised for its ‘slipperiness’ and ‘over-abstraction’ (Hubbard & Kitchin, 2011, p. 384), Soja’s work at a simple level argues for movement beyond
traditionally dualistic approaches and mainstream epistemological and
ontological frames.

Bhabha (2004) views third space from a intercultural frame, seeing it as existing
beyond traditional boundaries of race, gender and class as an in-between,
liminal space of translation, negotiation and hybridity that represents
individuals and groups today (pp. 2-3, 218). Although his focus was discourse
and language, the metaphor of negotiation and hybridity fits in the context of
the colonisation of places in New Zealand.

Similarly Turnbull (2000) proposes that a third space “would be an interstitial
space, a space that is created through negotiation between spaces, where
contrasting rationalities can work together but without the notion of a single
transcendent rationality” (p. 234). He discusses an interdisciplinary or
transdisciplinary stance that moves beyond traditional divides between
indigenous and scientific knowledge. He sees all knowledge as inherently local
and emplaced:

Though knowledge systems may differ in their epistemologies,
methodologies, logics, cognitive structures or in their socio-
economic contexts, a characteristic that they all share is their localness. However, knowledge is not simply local, it is located. It is both situated and situating. It has place and creates a space. (Turnbull, 2000, p. 19)

Turnbull points to an opportunity for ‘local knowledges’ to engage together and for those engaging in place-focused work to perhaps act as a messenger between these different realities.

Cultural theorist Thrift (1996), writing about the impact of technology and globalisation, finds it unsurprising that the notion of ‘third’ spaces has arisen. These are “the spaces of in-between here and there, to margins and centres, to convergences and overlaps, to exiles and evicts which can all provide some ground for meeting and dialogue – the creation of ‘a speaking and signifying space large enough to accommodate difference. In this environment, the middle, mediator and hybrid are ok” (p. 294).

**Heterotopia**

These ways of knowing place, and more generally society, align to the writings of Deleuze and Guattari (1987), who described ‘smooth spaces’ as heterogeneous, “nonmetric, a-centred, rhizomatic multiplicities that occupy space without ‘counting it’ and can be explored only by legwork” (p. 371). For them, this kind of space counters ‘striated’ space which is clearly demarcated, planned and homogenous i.e. traditional notions of space in modernity. I think Foucault, more distinctly, describes new types of place and space in his work on heterotopia – a concept introduced in Chapter 2.

Foucault (1986) viewed ‘modern’ society to be in an ‘epoch of simultaneity, an epoch of juxtaposition, the epoch of the near and far, of the side-by-side, of the dispersed” (p. 22). He saw a reality made up of assemblages, a bricolage of time and space and object. Heterotopia are a symptom and symbol emerging out of
this era in that they are “capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible” (p. 25).

Hetherington (1997) explains that Foucault has two ways of viewing ordering – resemblance and similitude. Similitude is created via an unexpected bricolage – a collection and juxtaposition of cultural indicators and signs and that do not culturally go together. These signs have unexpected and novel relationships that transgress social order and traditional sense-making. He defines heterotopia as spaces of an alternate ordering which “organise a bit of the social world in a way different to that which surrounds them. That alternate ordering marks them out as the Other, and allows them to be seen as an example of an alternative way of doing things” (p. vii).

Barnes (2004) contends that heterotopias are “always in the process of being made, ordering rather than order. Through their very dynamic, they create themselves as new kinds of places that may later become (at least for a period) obligatory passage points for other places” (p. 576). Barnes also notes that heterotopias point to new possibilities through re-ordering: “the stuff of life: it is bodies, it is machines, it is buildings, it is ink marks on paper. It is materiality” (ibid).

Foucault (1986) contrasts heterotopia with utopia – “fundamentally unreal places” that present a perfected version of society or a society turned upside down. He inserts between these two ideas (heterotopia and utopia) the idea of a mirror a sort of “mixed, joint experience” (p. 24). He describes the mirror, as a “place that is an unreal, virtual space that opens up behind the surface”. Through the glass everything is utopian in so far as it is a “placeless place” but also a heterotopia as it is also “absolutely real, connected with all the space that surrounds it, and absolutely unreal, since in order to be perceived it has to pass through this virtual point which is over there” (p. 24). I can imagine that in
today’s society this ‘mirror’ is a mobile device, perhaps one loaded with an augmenting reality application.

There are some criticisms of Foucault’s concept of heterotopia, most notably by Casey (1997), who ironically (given Foucault’s status as a preeminent postmodern philosopher), chastises the work for un-reflexive use of language and claims to universalism. While acknowledging these challenges, this work aligns with Relph (1991) who sees heterotopia as a mark of our age:

that is to say it is pluralistic, chaotic, designed in detail yet lacking universal foundations of principles, continually changing, linked by centreless flows of information; it is artificial and marked by deep social inequalities...Perhaps the best that can be done is to re-describe places and inquire into the myriad sources of diversity, a task that will require good powers of observation, nimble minds, and methodological agility. (p. 104)

Relph’s last sentence is important. Much of the theory so far in this chapter has argued for the need to re-describe and re-represent places using methodological, as well as ontological, agility. Ideas of third-space and becoming-other represent alternative ontological frames – speculative ontologies add another ingredient to this mix.

**Thing-Scapes**

Different forms of ‘invisible’ technologies (such as Wi-Fi and GPS) are shifting people’s relationship to spaces and places (Rieser, 2004). Society is moving from a view of space as ‘static’ and ‘dead’, to one where it is ‘fluid’, ‘dynamic’ and inherently interactive (Haque, 2004, p. 245), and where technology has disappeared into the background as media become infused with the environment (Deuze, 2012).

For some theoreticians, ontological understandings are fundamentally changing as a result of a number of these developments. Thrift (2011), for example, sees the
shift to a society of ‘flow and movement’; the emergence of seamless user interfaces; a new focus on technological locativeness; a rise in importance of instant feedback, and finally, a relational change to engaging with ‘things’ that have agency, rather than imagining agency to lie only within humanity.

In this context, thing-scapes, thought ecologies, and assemblages of interactive objects have become of particular interest for cultural theorists and philosophers, who are loosely, and variously, described as ‘speculative realists’, ‘neo-vitalists’, ‘agential realists’, and ‘neo-animists’. There no space in this document to engage with these ideas in great depth but it is important to note that there is an assortment of similar, but different, emerging philosophers and cultural theorists which includes (but is by no means limited to) Ingold (2000, 2013), Harman (2011), Morton (2010b, 2013); Bennett (2004, 2010), Barad (2007), Hornborg (2001, 2006) and Bird-David (1999).

These writers, among a number of others not named, represent a set of metaphysical and ontological discourses which position humanity as just one part within a much larger ecosystem, or assemblage, of objects which have greater or lesser degrees of agency and relationship with each other. Although the theorists view themselves as distinct from each other, traditional boundaries between what is real and unreal, dead and alive, and here and there – and the relative importance of humans in relation to other ‘things’ and ‘objects’ on the planet – are disrupted to some greater or lesser extent within all of their writings.

Morton (2010b), and Harman (2010, 2011) are primarily interested in the interactivity between objects – thus their work is often referred to as Object Oriented Ontology. Harman describes objects as having inherent agency, arguing that tools, for example, exist without necessarily being attached to human use (2002, p. 16). Similarly, Morton (2010b), promotes a non-human centric account of the world which allows for traditional dichotomies to be
destabilised, including those related to place. He describes situations where “Here is shot through with there”, and “our sense of place includes a sense of difference”. He also describes ‘uncanny places’ “where we arrive at strangely familiar locations – anywhere (italics from original) (p. 52). This is very similar in nature to Foucault’s heterotopic environments, but emerges from what he names ‘ecological thinking’ which has no ‘within or outside’, no ‘centre’ or ‘edge’, where scale is beyond comprehension and where ‘the uncanny’ has an equal place alongside that which is predicted and ‘normal’ (Morton, 2010b).

Bennett (2004), while also focused on objects or ‘things’, is primarily interested in the relationships that occur between them. Bennett’s world is not one “of subjects and objects, but of various materialities constantly engaged in a network of relations” (p. 354). She describes a world of ‘vibrant materiality’ where human and non-humans equally have agency, force and tendencies. She argues this against what she considers to be “dead or thoroughly instrumentalized matter” which “feeds human hubris and our earth-destroying fantasies of conquest and consumption” (p. ix).

Neo-animists such as Bird-David (1999) and Hornborg (2006) likewise see reality as profoundly relational and knowledge emerging through relationship. Bird-David (1999), for example, compares the Cartesian notion of ‘I think, therefore I am’, with those in indigenous cultures: “I relate, therefore I am”, and “I know as I relate” (p. 78). Hornborg (2006) sees long immersion in place as “yielding conditions conducive to ‘relatedness’ — vis-à-vis irreplaceable persons, localities, and things.

Relatedly, Barad (2007), a physicist, is also interested in relationships and ‘interactivity’, but the fundamental interest for her is ‘matter’. In her ‘agential realist’ account, matter is not stable but instead is a “stabilising and destabilising process of iterative interactivity” (p. 151) – a relational force rather than a stable entity. In Barad’s world traditional boundaries are blurry, so, like
Somerville (2007, 2010) and Rose (2002), she sees no firm ‘body-other’ boundary existing, and instead views the body as being ‘of the world’ instead of ‘in the world’. In other words, ‘environments’ and ‘bodies’ are intra-actively co-constituted as parts of a bigger ‘what is’ (p. 171). For her, like Hornborg, and Bird-David, knowledge comes from being of the world and part of its ‘becoming’ (p. 185).

Ingold’s (2013) view has some similarities to all of these authors, but is again slightly different. As an anthropologist (like Hornborg and Bird-David) he is interested in relationships between entities within cultures, but for him, the evolution of perception is of great interest. One of his key contributions (other than his work on ‘tools and technology mentioned earlier in this thesis) is his writing on supernatural phenomena. He argues that with the Enlightenment came taxonomy and categorisation, and a relegation of all kinds of ‘creatures’ to the category of imagination as they could not be corroborated through evidence based inquiry. Therefore, creatures once ‘known’ through tradition (and oral story) no longer existed. As he notes:

> there are no dragons or Thunder Birds in scientific taxonomies. It is not just that they do not exist in the new book of nature; they cannot, since their story-bound constitution is fundamentally at odds with the project of classification. (p. 743).

For Ingold (2000), like many of the other authors in this chapter, sees life as emerging out of a ‘field of relations’. Life, in his view, does not involve realising pre-decided categories, but instead is, “the process wherein forms are generated and held in place (p. 19).

From the outside, it is difficult to see major differences between these ideas. The metaphysics of moving from an anthropocentric viewpoint to one that is ‘thing’ or ‘object’ based, or fundamentally relational, is essentially, for me, the
same shift. However, I understand that between their related theories there are heated arguments over the ‘real’ underlying nature of the world, ‘the essence’ of what may or may not exist in this world of things and whether objects or relationships are preeminent (for example see Bennett, 2012).

Between Technology and Spirit

Looking through the work of many of these theorists and nearly all writing on mobility and technology, the word ‘spirit’ is completely absent. Hornborg and Bird-David are exceptions but their writing directly references indigenous ways of knowing. There are also blog posts by Morton (2010a) discussing tangential similarities with Buddhism. However, most of these writers in their assemblages, ecologies, strata, heterotopias and rhizomic networks avoid associating their work with anything religious or spiritual. There is no acknowledgement of the spirit of place in any understanding of that phrase.

Literature on Technology and Spirit of Place

While there has been much speculation by cultural theorists, empirical studies on the applied use of geo-locative, augmented reality (and/or mixed and hybrid reality) technology remain in short supply. Meaningful, holistic engagement with the spirit of place in any sense of that word is completely missing from current published research. However, there have been recent examinations of how these technologies may influence the way in which people make sense of place (Liao & Humphreys, 2014, p. 6). As Hofmann and Mosemghvdlishvili (2014) note, it remains the case that research into the potential impacts of an increasingly “augmented” world is relatively rare (p. 265). While there are studies of interest, many remain limited by frames of reference drawn exclusively from within the discipline of geography.

Speed (2010) and his colleagues, for example, explored the relationship between people, environment and network by assisting people to
collaboratively map spaces using locative devices. However, the criteria and process involved in this mapping process was an adaption of spatial measurement and drawing using traditional grid maps. S. Turner and Turner (2006) have explored the perception of virtual spaces – but used narrowly interpreted understandings of the sense of place (e.g. physical structures, activities). They concluded that existing place theories did not relate well to virtual spaces which are only encountered briefly.

Hofmann and Mosemghvdlishvili (2014) have researched whether users of augmented reality apps are more aware of their surroundings than non-augmented reality app users, and whether regular usage of these applications positively influences a person’s familiarity with their surroundings. They found in their study that those using the applications the most became more unfamiliar with their surroundings and casual users had only a minimal change in their awareness. Navigational and display issues with the (still new) technology decreased trust in heavy use participants. A number of participants also felt uncomfortable about how they were perceived as they were using augmented reality apps (p. 278).

Hofmann and Mosemghvdlishvili’s research was largely around the provision of unprocessed information to users from multiple databases via commercial AR applications. This seems to be a very superficial understanding of the ways people become aware of their environment. Nonetheless it was interesting how the technology made users more unfamiliar than familiar with their surroundings. As media theorist Coyne (2010) notes, “ubiquitous devices do not only meld invisibly into walking and navigational practices. Sometimes they also present as alien and alienating artefacts, rendering the environment unfamiliar” (p. 185).

Liao and Humphreys (2014) have attempted to understand how people act in space and how they utilise technology to render that place meaningful to them.
They demonstrate that “mobile AR affects not only the space that is augmented but also the users/creators of the technology and how they think about space” (p. 13). Those who participated noticed a stronger awareness about places even when they were not using the technology . . . they were thinking about the possibilities for augmenting that space. This indicates a change in “attitude and perception” (ibid).

Liao and Humphreys (2014) put forward the notion that mobile augmented reality, in particular, allows people to change the way they ‘see’ spaces and places as users actively modify the world around them. Digital material appears at the moment of requirement to specific individuals in specific places and therefore creates quite different types of ‘invisible’ communications. Further, content is ‘non-exclusive’ in that one augmentation does not exclude another from being in the same space (p. 13).

There have also been a number of studies of the use of these technologies in the context of learning and education (see Ardito et al., 2008; Cook, 2010; Squire, 2010). However, the focus has been mainly on the effectiveness of the learning experience, rather than the interaction and impact on the learners’ sense of place or sensing of the spirit of place.

**Literature on Spirit of Place and Technology**

It was not possible to find any published material that related the use of these technologies to multidimensional notions of the ‘spirit of place’. In fact reference to spirit was almost completely absent – with one exception. Favre-Brun, Jacquemin, and Caye (2012) attempted an interdisciplinary engagement, of sorts, with the ‘genius loci’ of a church. Described as a ‘technologically mediated art project’, they brought together historical aspects (through re-enacting and recreating aspects of the building from the past), scientific aspects (through using a traditional form of augmented reality), and an artistic
dimension (via a narrative drama based on a mysterious monk who floats towards the audience). In their words, they were attempting to “immerse completely visitors into the ‘place spirit’, i.e. the invisible, the history and the sensitive, by the use of audio-visual processes” (p. 107). In a later article, Jacquemin, Caye, Luca, and Favre–Brun (2014) described the process of the church becoming “a living organism’, a ghost of an almost supernatural power. The ubiquity of the technical system used for this revelation offers the audience a vision of an ungraspable magic” (p. 229).

For me, while their commitment to working in an interdisciplinary fashion is admirable, the project strikes me as overly literal in its understanding of ‘the genius loci’. There is no reference at all to the complex ideologies and histories that surround this term, and it seems that a floating ghost monk is the key representative for this notion. However, I found it interesting to see how they brought together different aspects to create an ‘atmosphere’ for the audience in a way that allowed that place to be re-seen in a different way.

There is some literature (not from a critical indigenous or post-colonial perspective) examining relatively alternative ontologies of ‘spirit of place’ and/or the ‘genius loci’. Markevičienė (2012), for example, writing in the context of heritage preservation, refers to the ‘genius loci’ as an intangible character that is perceived “both physically and spiritually” (p. 80). He sets out a number of characteristics of ‘genius loci’ sites, which include being a reality and an entity (i.e. existing subjectively and objectively simultaneously) and being both media and mediator (i.e. a place is filtered through the genius loci, but it is not a permanent fixture – it can disappear) (p. 11). He also notes that genius loci places have a touch of ‘eternity’ about them; they have a sense of ‘integrity’, or wholeness; are ‘complementary’ (systemic in nature); need to be supported to have ‘continuity’; are often ‘invisible’ and are marked by ‘non-evidence’ of their physical existence; and rhizomatousness in that they are “non-linear and
multiplicitous... connected to many other lines of thinking, acting, and being” (p. 13). For Markevičienė, working in and around such sites is a process of revealing and enhancing rather than recreating historic information.

Loukaki (1997) describes genius loci as either being a static or very dynamic concept depending on the cultural backgrounds and perspectives of those translating it (p. 309). The context for her writing, the ‘sacred rock of the Acropolis’, has seen multiple interventions over time, with each taking different views on what constitutes a ‘genius loci’. She argues that spirituality, and deeply thoughtful, respectful, and imaginative approaches seem indispensable to the interpretive task of defining ‘the essential qualities of the genius loci’ (p. 326).

Within the last decade, the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) set out a set of guidelines for preserving the spirit of place. For them, the spirit of place is defined as the:

- tangible (buildings, sites, landscapes, routes, objects) and the intangible elements (memories, narratives, written documents, rituals, festivals, traditional knowledge, values, textures, colors, odors, etc.), that is to say the physical and the spiritual elements that give meaning, value, emotion and mystery to place. (ICOMOS, 2008, p. 394)

ICOMOS propose not to remove spirit from place, or consider the concepts in opposition. They are instead interested in how the two mutually construct one another. They see the spirit of place as fundamentally relational, dynamic, plural in nature, “capable of possessing multiple meanings and singularities, of changing through time, and of belonging to different groups” (p. 394) For ICOMOS, this approach is more relevant to today’s work which is fundamentally multiplicitous (ibid).

More poetically, the cultural theorist, Bell (1997), conceives of the idea of the ‘ghosts of place’, which are not only actual beings, but also memories,
responses, impressions and fragments from our inner and relational lives. He writes that ghosts have good reason to haunt places whether they be: “sacred or profane, individual or collective, dead or alive, mine or yours, human or animal, past or present or future” (p. 831). For him, places are multidimensional with a multitude of ghosts co-habiting and co-creating our encounters in locations. These ghosts are not made visible through current scientific method:

No laboratory instrument, no metered machine, no photographic negative will ever detect them. But we should have no doubt that they are, still, very real. Despite the mechanized aloofness of the modern mind . . . despite the cool distance of the bourgeois self – despite all these, the world as yet remains an enchanted place. (p. 832)

Bell’s writing is interesting in that it uses the metaphor of a ghost to bridge between ontological divides – for him ghosts are both subjective and objective entities. As I read Loukaki and Markevičienė this idea also emerges from their writing. In effect, they see the spirit of place as a bridge between different ways of knowing.

Writing outside the academy, other writers engage more directly and relationally with an ontologically separate and sentient spirit of place. Swan (1990, 1991), a strong proponent of multidimensional notions of the spirit of place, discusses the profound experiences that individuals can have in locations – experiences that are potentially transformative in nature. He advocates for direct consultation with the spirit of the place to determine what is best done there (1991, p. 2). This is exemplified by ‘geomantic’ art practitioner Marko Pogacnik (1997), who stages different kinds of physical, social and psychospiritual artistic interventions in places to support what he calls ‘gea-consciousness’ in its multiplicity of dimensions.
J. Davis (1998), a transpersonal eco-psychologist, has been engaging his students in place-bonding exercises, where they engage with particular places over extended periods of time and get to know it “through listening for ways to take care of it, and letting it listen to them” (p. 92). Davis has noticed that for many of his students, a sense of separate self gives way to non-dualistic dimensions (ibid).

Relatedly, Patterson (2005) promotes a process that he calls “the art of conversation with the Genius Loci” (p. 6) which is fundamentally dialogical and deeply relational. Patterson views genius loci as inherently sentient i.e. “a vague presence that seems to respond to you . . . a subtle being who lives there . . . an ecosystem with feelings”. He views the study of places like this (via hard or soft sciences) as very important to forming a “genuine relationship with the Spirit of Place” (pp. 8-9), and this study also extends to frequent, observant visits to a place to foster familiarity and give a person’s relationship to a place “a chance to stabilise and deepen in an uncontrolled way” (p. 37).

In part inspired by Patterson, Graves and Poraj-Wilczynska (2009) have undertaken work in place (at Belas Knapp) that uses four distinct modes of perception: “Artist”, “Mystic”, “Scientist,” and “Magician.” These perceptive modes allowed them to engage and investigate a place using a variety of methods they coin as ‘archeography’. While their work showed promise in promoting transdisciplinary practice, for example by using subjective and objective modes, artistic content, and unconventional methods (e.g. dowsing) together, the way they described the Mystical/Artistic elements of their ‘conversations’ with the location, for me, lacked conviction.

They point out, for example, that they didn’t actually believe in a ‘spirit of place’ but instead acted ‘as if’ the notion were true for the sake of their work. They also point out that these conversations were [merely?] an “adjunct to the formal science, never a substitute for it”. That said, they describe, albeit in
quotation marks, their experience of feeling “guided”, or “prevented” from entering certain places at certain times which apparently felt “distinct, explicit and “real,” and “particularly clear, almost as if spoken by the place”. This for them was “undoubtedly subjective” [my own italics]. Diffidence aside, their work is an interesting example of bringing different forms of practice into play with at least some engagement with ‘uncanny’ elements.

So, while spirit remains firmly outside the academy generally, there are emerging areas, even within traditional disciplines such as geography, that are beginning to break these last barriers down – albeit tentatively and slowly. That said, there are no references to the theories surrounding mobility, and there are none that engage with any literature on the use of geo-locative mobile technologies in places and spaces.

A Progressive Spirit of Place and a New Place Practice

There are criticisms of mobile, media infused environments. As ‘electronic media’ have become more prevalent and mobility has increased across the planet, there have been arguments that technology is akin to an addiction consuming the world (Glendinning, 1995), and places are in decline.

As early as the 1970s, Relph (1976), set out an extended taxonomy of ‘modern’ examples of placelessness including ‘other-directedness’ (e.g. landscapes made for tourists; entertainment districts; ‘Disneyfied’ places, ‘museumed’ places, commercial strips); uniformity and standardisation; formlessness and lack of human scale and order in places; place destruction; and the impermanence and instability of places (p. 119). Later, Meyrowitz (1985) cautioned that the relationships between social situations and physical settings, between public and private social activities and between adulthood and childhood are all undermined by ‘electronic media’ – leading to a relatively ‘placeless’ world.
Baudrillard (1983) famously argued that reality itself had become a ‘simulacra’, consumed by the signs generated by contemporary popular culture and media. Signs had become direct substitutions for the ‘real’, destabilising notions of what is an abstraction, symbol, or reality itself. Echoing Baudrillard, Augé (1995), declared that humanity was living in a realm of ‘non-places’ i.e. spaces of circulation (e.g. airports), consumption (e.g. shopping malls), and communication (e.g. telephones) where people coexist but do not live together, and or form any ‘organic’ society. In a similar vein, Hill (2006) proposed that while the 20th century “was the first century without a frontier” perhaps the 21st century “is the century of placelessness?” (p. 3).

Massey (1994) has commented that discourses on placelessness are reactionary, self-enclosing, essentialising, and defensive (p. 149). Harvey (1990) has also noted that notions of authenticity and rootedness are problematically nostalgic, particularly in their association with nationalist and capitalist ideals. And for Cresswell (2002), arguments against mobility (and for the salvation of ‘authentic place’) create a notion of place that is “essentialist and exclusionary” and founded on the idea that authenticity can only be achieved through ‘rootedness’ (p. 14). Too often, he argues, mobility has negative connotations, especially for critical theorists who question generalist notions like ‘place’ that are obscurants for race and gender issues (p. 15).

However, Cresswell sees postmodern analyses of place as equally problematic, as they romanticise mobility as a kind of ‘nomadic metaphysics’ where the concept of place becomes marginal and mobility is overly celebrated (2002, p. 18). Cresswell asserts that places should instead be seen as a synthesis of locatedness and motion, rather than a point where one or the other triumphs (2002, p. 26).

Other more recent critics such as Carr (2008, 2010), have argued that the internet (and search engines like Google) are changing the way humans think,
much for the worse. Likewise, Bauerlein (2009) sees the internet as stupefying young Americans and undermining the future of humanity. These views are not unfamiliar to me as an educator struggling to encourage young adults to engage in forms of research other than Google and Wikipedia. However, declaring any kind of technology as inherently good, bad, or even neutral is problematic without fully understanding the context in which it is used. As S. Graham (1998) notes, adopting ‘deterministic technological models’ that engage with the ‘impact’ of technologies, implies “simple, linear, technological cause and societal effect” (p. 181). This is not necessarily useful or relevant in a world made up of interactive, fundamentally intertwined networks.

I agree with Spretnak (1997) who notes that “technology is neither a force unto itself, dragging us along in its wake, nor merely an aggregate of neutral, value free tools. The purpose and design of every technology reflects our culture” (p. 124). Indeed for transdisciplinary practitioners such as Ascott (2003) the ‘Net’ is a key mechanism to seed, disseminate and evolve new cultural forms (p. 255).

Cultural theorists and sociologists in the mid-20th century saw technologies such as television and radio as extensions of the body. Hall (1976) saw extensions as ways that humans solve problems – by creating an extension outside of oneself there is an ability to examine it from a distance and learn from it (p. 29). McLuhan (1964a) viewed electronic telecommunications as a “live model of the central nervous system itself” and technology as something humans perpetually modified and were modified by in return (p. 68). He also argued that technologies amplified, rendered obsolete, retrieved and reversed different aspects of self and society – in this way technology was not a neutral but a mediating force (McLuhan, 1975).

Ihde (1979), drawing on McLuhan’s writing, sees every technological development as a form of amplification of self, but also a reduction. If a technology is very good the reductions to self are not noticed as easily (p. 21).
Ihde views technology as a way of being in the world that brings “into presence that which was previously undetected and even invisible” in doing so, it transforms “the way in which the phenomenon may appear” (p. 49). For him, technologies are not a partial extension of self but a quasi-other and are mediators and transformers of experience and in no way neutral. His work follows that of Heidegger (1954/1977) who views technology as a form of ontology, a way of knowing the world that “is a mode of revealing”. Heidegger views technology coming to “presence in the realm where revealing and unconcealment take place, where aletheia, truth, happens” (Heidegger, 1954/1977, p. 13).

More recently, Kelly (2010), building on these earlier authors, views technological outputs as “extrapolations of the bodies that our genes build . . . extended bodies . . . not an extension of our genes but of our minds. Technology is therefore the extended body of ideas” (p. 44). Kelly argues against notions that technology is a series of gadgets for sale, all of which are responsible for environmental degradation. Instead, he views technology as a “dynamic, holistic system” (p. 198). Some theorists go as far as Levinson (1999) who sees the Earth as best cared for by a “maximum not a minimum of information technology” (p. 61).

This is a step too far for me but as computing becomes more integrated with body it is increasingly problematic to continue to try to easily demarcate what is self and what is other; what is profane and what is sacred. Rather than fulfilling the agenda of eco-humanists such as Berry (1988, p. 65) who wish for a ‘reintegration’ of technology back with planet earth, I presume that technology is a fundamental aspect of planet earth already.

This view is not new. Cobb (1998) advocates for computers particularly (and technology generally) to be integrated into a “coherent, comprehensive worldview that includes who we are materially, intellectually, emotionally, and
spiritsually” (p. 19). When this doesn’t happen, Cobb argues that dualisms such as “self and other, mind and body, nature and culture” are perpetuated. Cobb sees these dualisms (as many other theorists already mentioned) as incredibly damaging. For her, humanity lives in:

a vast chasm of our own creation, located between the organic and the made, the sacred and the profane. When all around us is split into pieces, there is no center that holds. We are aliens in the very world we have constructed. (p. 19)

Cobb asks us to “rethink our world, to expand our horizons and enlarge our wisdom”. In this framework, we then “bring this enlarged wisdom back to the tools and guide them to their next stage of development.” (p. 20). Cobb (1998), sees cyberspace as a:

messy and complex world of experience, both objective and subjective. It has the potential for opening us to a new way of experiencing the world, a way that relies on a divine reality to give it meaning and substance. (p. 9)

Ascott (2003) points out that paradoxically technology and science are now “foregrounding issues of consciousness, mind and spirit” through our immersion in interactive, transformative, and ubiquitously connective environments (p. 344). This harks back to the writings of Teilhard de Chardin (1964) who saw electronic media creating a network linking the world etherically as a form of universal consciousness (p. 167).

The Opportunity

Massey (1994) argues for a progressive understanding of place, particularly within the sense of place literature. She argues for a deeper understanding of the ‘power geometries’ that exist within the mobility of different social groups and individuals where “some initiate flows and movements, others don’t; some are more on the receiving end of it than others; some are effectively imprisoned
by it” (p. 149). Her interest is not in the synthesis between locatedness and motion, but deeper understandings of the relationship between power and flow.

I argue for a progressive understanding of the spirit of place within both mobility and place literature. A progressive understanding of the spirit of place includes qualitative and quantitative sense of place discourses, and also includes ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies that understand there to be sentient, vibrant, multidimensional, and yet often invisible, energies in places. A progressive spirit of place acknowledges the tools, technologies, codes, signals and artificial intelligences that make up the ecosystem of places of today. It also acknowledges the political issues that emerge in this environment. When spirit is allowed to be understood in all its manifestations (including through the digital intelligences virtually embedded in the landscape) I see greater possibility for innovation.

My thesis is that place is a centre for practice, and those who work in and around it are place practitioners. This encompasses a relational, but also processual, notion of place which is fundamentally embodied in so far as it involves all one’s senses, experiences, histories and knowledge, and is enacted in the place where one stands using mobile devices. In this philosophy, spiritual practice is enacted in the day-to-day and place is the centre of seamless political, social, digital, spiritual, technological, personal, local and global activity.

Geo-locative mobile technologies localise knowledge while simultaneously globalising it through cloud servers. Knowledge then becomes situated in the third space between the physical and digital realms via hand held device. In using these devices one is embodied in spaces while also being in other places at once, and there is also the opportunity to engage in performance and re-representation of places through the juxtaposition of a number of different
materialities. Using these technologies enables engagement not only in third spaces but also in thing-scapes where data is sourced from clouds, land, signal, intuition, spirits and trees.

Emerging out of this philosophical framework, place practitioners are identified as any individuals whose work content and work location (and the case of indigenous people personal identity and spirituality) are inextricably entwined. They include but are not limited to local historians; kaitiaki stewards/guardians; local environmental activists; educationalists; healers; site-specific artists, community workers, and marae employees. In this thesis, practice can bring many aspects of these roles together.

It is ironic and perhaps even paradoxical that technologies largely originating within military settings¹⁷ are argued to be able to support the spirit of place. This however represents an opportunity. Hyde (1998) likens opportunities to pores, portals and doorways, a “nick in time, a gap in the screen, a looseness in the weave – these are all opportunities in the ancient sense” (p. 46). In this thesis, the emergence of new technologies, epistemologies, ontologies, methodologies, and practices represent an opportunity to address the need for greater methodological flexibility and creativity within academia.

The trickster re-enters at this point, as, according to Hyde (1998), tricksters are pore seekers. They are always on the lookout for naturally occurring opportunities and “create them ad hoc when they do not occur themselves” (p. 47). They are born of knowledge systems that “do not accept the separation between word and event, art and reality, made by our neo-Cartesian culture” (Pelton, 1993, p. 135). I argue in the next chapter that they have new relevance in a wired world where the boundaries of all areas of life have become blurred and slippery.

¹⁷ The internet and GPS, among a number of other technologies, resulted from military research.
Chapter 5 - Reinventing Trickster

In this chapter I demonstrate how trickster figures have new relevance at a time of interstitial technologies, indeterminate boundaries, porous ontologies, and liminal, heterotopic environments. In this thesis they are reinvented as a guiding metaphor, as a presiding spirit and as an inspirational notion for a place practice that emerges out of a progressive understanding of the spirit of place.

It has been argued that tricksters have a number of traits in common (Hyde, 1998; Hynes & Doty, 1993b; Radin, 1972), and in this section I will examine some of these in more detail. However, this potentially essentialises what are extremely complex cultural figures, which is problematic in the context of trying to engage ethically with indigenous knowledges. I agree with Radin (1972) who argues that “the symbol that trickster embodies is not a static one . . . .For this reason every generation preoccupies itself with interpreting trickster anew. No generation understands him fully, but no generation can do without him” (pp. 168-169). I am rearticulating the archetypical trickster figure for a new audience and supporting new stories to emerge.

In many cultures these figures are gods of magic, divination, travellers, spies, messengers, thieves, merchants, innovation, commerce, opportunity and communication. They practise their arts in the spaces between places – the porous zones between the realities of humans and gods, death and life. They are associated with all that is liminal, interstitial, and indeterminate and therefore have new relevance at a time where boundaries in all aspects of life are no longer so clearly defined. Indeed, Trickster, according to Hynes (1993):

pulverizes the univocal and symbolizes the multivalence of life. Embodying this multivocality, the trickster himself eludes univocality by escaping from any restrictive definition: the trickster is always more than can be glimpsed in any one place
or in any one embodiment. . . . The trickster disorders and disassembles. Hynes (1993, p. 35)

E. Davis (1998) (writing about the Greek trickster Hermes), sees the trickster as being at home in a “wired world”, “with his mischievous combination of speed, trickery, and profitable mediation. He can be seen as an archaic mascot of the information age” (p. 19). Neville and Dalmau (2008), also writing about Hermes, point out that the connection between this trickster god and today’s culture is not particularly original and perhaps a little obvious. In my case, rather than re-contextualising an existing trickster such as Hermes (a god resonant with my own cultural background), I am interested in what trickster traits (and emerging trickster practices and figures) are specifically suited to today’s wired epoch.

Polytropic\textsuperscript{18} Shape Shifter

*Trickster now took an elk’s liver and made a vulva from it. Then he took some elk’s kidneys and made breasts from them. Finally he put on a woman’s dress. In this dress his friends enclosed him very firmly . . . he now stood there transformed into a very pretty woman indeed. Then he let the fox have intercourse with him, and make him pregnant, then the jaybird, and finally, the nit. After that he proceeded toward the village.*

Radin (1972) p. 23

Tricksters are as shifty as an octopus, colouring themselves to fit their surroundings, and putting on a fresh face for each man or woman they meet (Hyde, 1998, p. 53). This fluidity of form occurs again and again in trickster stories (Peat, 1994, p. 284) where (as can be seen in the story above) “not even the boundaries of species or sexuality are safe, for they can be readily dissolved by the trickster’s disguises and transmorphisms” (Doty, 1993, p. 36).

\textsuperscript{18} As noted earlier, this comes from the Greek word ‘polytropos’ which also means ‘wily’, ‘versatile’, and ‘much travelled’ (Hyde, 1998, p. 52)
The ability to shape-shift is highly relevant to today’s society where it is possible to experiment with one’s identity through avatars and social media profiles (Turkle, 2011, p. 169), and ‘augment’ one’s body using mixed reality applications. Goffman (1959) uses the metaphor of the stage in his dramaturgical analogies of human identity and interaction. There are now multiple ‘stages’ and the boundary between ‘on’ and ‘off’ stage has been blurred.

Tricksters are hybrids, being “neither a god nor a man, neither human nor animal” but all of these at once (Pelton, 1993, p. 137). For example the Polynesian trickster figure, Māui, is described as “a supernatural being and wonder-working trickster who is half-human and half-god, a demi-god, or a superman” (Luomala, 1949, p. 125). Radin’s (1972) Winnebago trickster is an ‘inchoate’ being of underdetermined proportions and no well-defined and fixed form (p. xxiv). The ‘kapua’ of Hawaiian myths are demi-gods with a hybrid-shape shifting nature, and African deities such as Legba are themselves portals, i.e. mediating figures standing at the gateway between worlds.

This ‘porosity of self’ presents opportunities for trickery, but also for illumination and salvation for the different figures they encounter. For example by shifting into the form of different birds (often seen as mediators between the spirit and mundane worlds) Māui is able to travel to visit his dead father, and to spy on his brothers at sea before fishing up Te ika a Māui.

Thanks to their fluidity, tricksters are polytropic. They can twist and turn to fit the needs of each situation so that contradiction and opposition can be understood and celebrated. The West African story of the trickster Èṣù, illustrates this point:

Èṣù puts on a cloth cap that is black on one side and white on the other; He rides into a field in between two dear friends who
are working; Afterwards the friends are set to fighting as they proclaim that the rider they each saw had either a black, or a white cap on; Èṣù turns up again and points out that they were both right (Gates, 1988, pp. 33-35).

Working in place, particularly places that have a history of colonisation and indigenous oppression, requires individuals to engage in different forms of polytropism as they explore the shifting territories of oppressor and oppressed; insider and outsider; subject and object of study. This harks back to the role of trickster as messenger and interpreter – moving between worlds to foster innovation and learning.

Rodman (1992) argues for a ‘multi-local’ view of place which not only involves looking at places from the view of others (“realising there are no others”) but also seeing places from systemic, reflexive, and multi-vocal perspectives which understand even single places as multiple, simultaneous localities (p. 647). If places are multiple then those that work in them need to foster the ability to see these different worlds and reflexively interpret the many layers that they encounter.

**Bricoleur**

*The prankish Māui stole fire, snared the sun, raised the sky, trapped winds, fished up lands, altered landscapes, founded dynasties, made useful inventions, and killed fabulous monsters who plagued women and terrified men . . . Māui-tinihanga, Māui-of-a-thousand-tricks.*

Luomala (1949) p. 3

The juxtaposition of different viewpoints can be seen as a form of tinkering, or bricolage. Lévi-Strauss (1966) described the bricoleur as someone who works with whatever heterogeneous objects are to hand, and, “speaks not only with things, but also through the medium of things: giving an account of his
personality and life by the choices he makes between the limited possibilities” (p. 21).

Tricksters are tinkerers – “transforming anything at hand into a creative solution” (Hyde, 1998, p. 42). Tricksters do not recognize any limited aspect of reality (Combs & Holland, 1996, p. 91) and blur the distinctions between the natural, supernatural and un-natural. For example, the Winnebago Trickster piles his enormously long penis on his back, sending it out to fornicate on far shores; Anansi climbs a ladder to the Gods with a pot full of wisdom on her back; and Māui snares the sun and hooks up entire landmasses. Moving between over and underworlds these ambiguous figures play with materiality and reality. In fact Trickster stories show us that the task of imagining the real is an exercise in sacred irony (Pelton, 1993, p. 135). The subversion of the status quo and the utilisation of material to hand make tricksters who they are i.e. tinkerers of a cosmic order.

Bricolage, or ‘tinkering’, is a cross-disciplinary concept. Turkle (1995), uses the term ‘soft mastery’ for a modern form of bricolage involving computing. She sees this style as tinkering – a “flexible, non-hierarchical style, one that allows a close connection with one’s objects of study” (p. 56). In her view, tinkering has been flourishing as modern forms of computing allow for greater flexibility of approach away from a standard, formal, boundaried style of interaction.

Kincheloe (2010) promotes bricolage as an opportunity for innovation. According to him, “bricoleurs move beyond the blinders of particular disciplines and peer through a conceptual window to a new world of research and knowledge production” (p. 1). Kincheloe (2001) advocates a form of methodological bricolage which deploys a diversity of methodologies and methods as they are needed for particular research processes. He argues that when different rationalities are placed next to each other that generates a degree of insight that is greater than the sum of its parts (2010, p. 6). He
suggests that “hypertextual projects that provide conceptual matrices for bringing together diverse literatures, examples of data produced by different research methods, connective insights, and bibliographic compilations can be undertaken by bricoleurs with the help of information professionals” (2001, p. 690).

Kincheloe notes that this work “demands a new level of research self-consciousness and awareness of the numerous contexts in which any researcher is operating…the bricolage highlights the relationship between a researcher’s ways of seeing and the social location of his or her personal history” (2010, p. 2). Bricoleurs are always looking for new perspectives on a particular issue and, “as opposed to many mainstream Cartesian-Newtonian scholars, bricoleurs value the voices of the subjugated and marginalized” (2010, p. 5). For him, bricolage emerges out of a “scholarly world with faded disciplinary boundary lines” (2001, p. 683).

It is clear for me that bricolage and practice are linked. Schön (1983) argues that modern practitioners of any kind need to choose between a multiplicity of approaches but find their own way to combine them together, reflecting on their decisions and actions as a form of practice in action (p. 43).

Engaging in bricolage should be seen as a core part of any practice, particularly one which is situated in and around the multiplicity of place today. Through tinkering with epistemological and ontological boundaries, particularly using augmenting reality technologies which blur the line between digital and physical, real and unreal there is an opportunity for multiple notions of the spirit of place to coalesce and complement each other, rather than compete for prominence or validity.
**Wayfinder**

*Trickster stayed at the village for a long time and raised many children. One day he said, ‘Well, this is about as long as I will stay here. I have been here a long time. Now I am going to go around the earth and visit different people for my children are all grown up. I was not created for what I am doing here.*

Radin (1972) p. 92

This extract points to the inherent mobility of tricksters who tend to wander “aimlessly on roads that lead from one place to another” (Hyde, 1998, p. 39). They are gods ‘of the road’ – the spirit road, as well as a road in fact (ibid, p.6). The Ancient Greeks saw tricksters as a type of genius loci – the guardian spirit of crossroads, roads, markers, and of liminal and marginal zones. As a manifestation of this in practice, the Greek trickster Hermes lent his name (and often his image) to ‘herms’, which were boundary markers and directional pointers to towns, springs and markets which supported trade and communication across a variety of peoples (E. Davis, 1998, p. 21; Doty, 1993, p. 53).

Turnbull explains that stone markers were used as part of another ancient communication system – that of the Inca. Coded knotted strings (*quipus*), runners (*chasquis*), and radial lines that marked out small shrines (*huacas*) and stone markers (*ceques*), were each used in complex ways to organise and direct their large and disbursed civilisation through providing complicated bundles of information (Turnbull, 2000, pp. 27,29). Ceques not only integrated religious and astronomical knowledge but also provided the basis for the kind of precision calendar. This calendar was required by a state bureaucracy that had to record and cross-reference information about a number of political and
financial elements all of which operated in complex system of relations and
demographical information (Turnbull, 2000, p. 27).\(^ {19}\)

Geo-locative apps are a modern form of marker. Each GPS point has data about
that specific location – stories, links to other media, commentary and
information on services, creative expressions. These markers resituate
knowledge back onto the site from which it was inspired or sourced, and allow
average citizens without research knowledge, literacy, confidence or resources
(e.g. transport) to access data which is normally inaccessible. They are part of an
emerging form of wayfinding.

Ingold (2000) describes wayfinding as more closely resembling storytelling than
map using (p. 221). For him, wayfinding is not following a course from one
spatial location to another as one would with traditional abstracted mapping
systems, but is closer to playing music or storytelling (p. 238). According to
Ingold, ‘knowing’ takes place along pathways of observation, you ‘know as you
go’ (p. 229). Instead of relying on symbols and a bare minimum of information,
the richer and more varied the texture of the environment the easier it should
be to navigate one’s way around a place (p. 242).

is supplanting narration.” The huge variety of combinations and routes available
means that this experience is often unique and individuals are becoming
“authors of their own text” (p. 23). Arthur sees a convergence of online
resources occurring, and a decontextualizing of information (for example
historical information) as the collections of multiple institutions are able to be
navigated at once (pp. 9-10). I see, however, a re-contextualisation of

\(^ {19}\) See Bauer (1992) for further information on ceques.
information occurring, where stories, histories and data of any sort are re-situated back into their original contexts using mobile applications. This data is then navigated via a form of way-finding that exists in, and mediates between, virtual and physical realms.

Redistributor

Sky God asked Ananse the Trickster Spider to collect all wisdom in the world, if Ananse did this he would be called ‘Sage of All Time.’ Ananse had already collected all the wisdom and secretly hid it all in a great, big pot. So Ananse quickly took his pot and started climbing up to the Sky God to earn his reward. When he had almost reached the top, the crowd below, following his amazing antics, let out a great cheer. Ananse was filled with pride and waved all his eight arms at them in response. He promptly fell to earth as his pot shattered. At this point wisdom scattered left and right, to the very ends of the earth and every fool had a little bit of wisdom. Ananse could not claim that wisdom was his alone. Then the Sky God whispered in his ear, “I gave you eight arms Ananse. If you really had all wisdom, you would not have waved them all.”


Ananse the trickster spider, a hoarder and secretor of knowledge, re-distributes wisdom ‘to every fool’ in the world through his pride and ironic stupidity. What was horded in a hidden cache is now easily accessible to the masses. This parable, on a very simplistic level, parallels the redistribution of knowledge that has occurred with the emergence of locative mobile computing.

Thanks to the power of these devices to communicate a diverse range of digital media at high speed, citizens in nearly all parts of the world are now producing and directly distributing entertainment products; monitoring and reporting human rights and environmental abuse; and directly influencing political opinion and action through online lobbying. This constitutes what some
commentators call ‘the fifth estate’, an alternative source of authority to professional expertise and institutional power driven by the enhanced communicative power of citizens (Dutton, 2009). In this milieu there has been a re-distribution of knowledge and power, from corporate and state institutions and mainstream media, to citizens operating on socially networked sites such as Tumblr, Twitter, Facebook, YouTube and Instagram, on niche forums, and on the plethora of legal and non-legal file-sharing sites.

This has led to a loosening of boundaries between memory, culture and knowledge institutions (such as universities and museums) and general society. ‘Citizen science’ initiatives which involve crowd-sourcing (grass roots networked information sharing) are gaining momentum and achieving success around the world in both collecting data, and supporting actual breakthroughs in various scientific disciplines (see Gura, 2013; Hand, 2010). In museums, mediatisation is occurring where the emphasis is now on enabling active participation rather than passive gazing on exhibits (Simon, 2010; Urry, 2002). And in the education sector there is an increased emphasis on re-situating learning back in communities where “learning is an integral part of generative social practice in the lived-in world” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 35).

The cultural shift has affected all disciplines. As Relph (2007) notes, there has been a move away from the objective, rational perspective that seeks a uniform account of the world, to a view that acknowledges the validity of many different perspectives (p. 3). According to Turkle (2011), technology has shifted traditional demarcations, the “helpful lines in the sand” (pp. 161-162). Levinson (1999) argues that traditional arts subjects are becoming obsolescent, and traditional academia is undermined, through the Web’s creation of a malleable curriculum for living (p. 194).

By placing information back into the locations from which it was originally sourced (or inspired) there is an opportunity to shift knowledge out of the
exclusive domain of traditional institutions (museums, archives, libraries) allowing it to be more easily accessed in the community. These tools also allow knowledge to be gathered and placed in location by communities themselves – enabling grass roots research and archiving to occur of stories previously held by only a few individuals. Ascott (2003) has a vision of replacing museum buildings with “knowledge landscapes”, “laid out in the interspace between virtual and the actual”, with museums “museumized’ as a record of how knowledge was once understood. Rather than this total annihilation, I can see how these technologies can re-articulate our understandings of knowledge institutions, making them more relevant as they place information back into its original context.

Transformer

he happened to look in the water and much to his surprise he saw many plums there. He surveyed them very carefully and then he dived down into the water to get some. But only small stones did he bring back in his hands. Again he dived into the water. But this time he knocked himself unconscious against a rock at the bottom. After a while he floated up and gradually came to. He was lying on the water, flat on his back, and when he came to and, as he opened his eyes, there on the top of the bank he saw many plums. What he had seen in the water was only the reflection. Then he realized what he had done. ‘Oh my, what a stupid fellow I must be! I should have recognised this. Here I have caused myself a great deal of pain’.

Radin (1972) p. 28

This extract of the Winnebago Trickster, retold by Radin, describes Trickster’s experience of viewing himself as an object in the water, but also as an object expressing certain non-useful behaviours – a liminal moment. Tricksters, in general, are marginal figures, liminal entities, and symbols of liminality itself
According to V. W. Turner (1969) liminality can be both an individual or collective state (p. 83). It is easy, given the complex nature of today’s society, to imagine this as a liminal time where previous structures are disintegrating and new structures are yet to clearly form themselves.

V. W. Turner (1969) describes liminal entities or ‘threshold people’ (e.g. court jesters, prophets and artists) as being betwixt and between the positions assigned or arrayed by society. This condition of ‘in-betweenness’ (porousness), allows them to escape a network of classifications that normally locate entities in cultural space (p. 81). As Hyde (1998) notes, “every group has its edge, its sense of in and out and trickster is always there... Trickster is neither god of the door leading out or the door leading in – he is the god of the hinge (Hyde, 1998, p. 9).

V. W. Turner (1969) views liminality as a threshold state where an individual is no longer of their old world (structures, ways of knowing and being), but also not yet initiated into the place or state beyond (1969, p. 3). Tricksters are liminal not just due to their status in society, but also because their stories often show these key points of transition in life (e.g. the end of childhood, the transition into death, endings and beginnings). It is at these times that transformation of self occurs (Combs & Holland, 1996, p. 84). Trickster “symbolises humankind’s self-transcending mind and the quest for knowledge and the power that knowledge brings” (Ricketts, 1993, p. 87).

Tricksters are also renowned for playing games with perspective, for example the trickster Èṣù is the master of crossed purposes – hence offerings are made at cross-roads for this god (Davis, 2010, p. 141). Through playing tricks (like his black and white hat game) Èṣù allows his people to become more sophisticated in their understanding of concepts like truth and falsehood. Māui also plays with perspective (literally) in the fable of the magical fishhook:
When they got well out to sea Māui crept out of his hiding place. As soon as his brothers saw him, they said, “We had better get back to the shore again as fast as we can since this fellow is on board.” But Māui, by his enchantments, stretched out the sea so that the shore instantly became very distant from them. By the time they could turn themselves round to look for it, it was out of view (Sir George Grey (original sources: Te Rangikaheke & Te Whiwhi) cited in Luomala, 1949, p. 46).

There are several definitions of the word ‘perspective’ given by the Online Oxford Dictionary: a) “a particular attitude towards or way of regarding something; a point of view”, and b) “the appearance of viewed objects with regard to their relative position and distance from the viewer; having a true understanding of the relative importance of things; a sense of proportion” (Oxford Online Dictionary, 2013b)

The first definition (‘a’) describes a basic mindset. The second definition (‘b’) positions the object more distantly from the viewer and allows the object a given dimension in space, with relative importance and a proportion in relation to everything else. Transitional zones – liminal points in our lives – are perhaps best expressed by this latter definition, where one moves between what is subject, and what is object to oneself placing it in ‘perspective’.

L. Green (2012), in his writing on transformative learning, describes liminality as the experience in a crisis situation where:

one moves from being a "subject" to being an "agent". One realises that "following the rules" will not do it; one must respond with action or behaviour that addresses the crisis. Only later will one be able to systematically work out the new meanings that were implicit in that existential move. (p. 211)

These types of shifts can be seen as ‘second order’ perspective shifts, ones where some fundamental transformation has occurred. This description of
deeper shifts in understanding can be likened to shifts in the order of consciousness and to experiences of ‘transformative’ learning.

Based on the work of Jean Piaget (1896-1980), educationalist and developmental psychologist Robert Kegan (1982, 1994) argues that humans spiral up in ever-increasing degrees of complexity and reflexivity. He formulates five orders of consciousness, with the movement between these levels being the process of transformational learning. Informative learning is focused on the acquisition of skills, but transformational learning is a “leading out” from a habit of mind, i.e., the capacity to ‘meta-reflect’ (1994, p. 232). As people grow, they expand their awareness of self and increase their capacity to make more sophisticated sense of the world through subject-object shifts.

‘Object’ refers to those elements of individual knowing or organizing that are sufficiently distinct from individual consciousness that they appear as points of clear awareness; ‘Subject’ refers to those elements of our knowing or organizing with which individuals are identified or embedded. We have object, we are subject. At each order of consciousness, what was formerly considered to be subject, and an embedded part of one’s identity, now becomes object, and can be viewed from the outside. These increasing degrees of reflexivity transform the individual, and allow for emancipation and a degree of choice that was not previously present. When moving to the fifth order of consciousness, individuals are no longer subject to their own system or ideology. Individuals become conscious of, and can reflect upon their own system and epistemological position (Rosen, 1996, p. 41).

Transformative learning involves “transforming taken-for-granted frames of reference (meaning perspectives, habits of mind, mind sets) to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, emotionally capable of change, and reflective” (Mezirow, 2000, p. 8). It is inherently emancipatory – with a focus on finding key triggers and conditions that may expand the consciousness of adults and release
them from the bonds of unexamined, unconscious belief systems. Disorientation and disruption are included in the range of conditions that need to be in place for sustainable transformation to occur. Mezirow discusses a range of disorienting dilemmas, from small ‘aha’ moments to epochal dilemmas such as death, illness, divorce, material loss and betrayal.

Cranton (2006) notes that transformation occurs when something unexpected happens. When an individual encounters a situation that doesn’t fit in with their assumptions and expectations of how things should be, they either reject the situation or question their assumptions and expand their frame of reference to include this new point of view. “When people critically examine their habitual expectations, revise them, and act on the revised point of view, transformative learning occurs” (Cranton, 2006, p. 19).

Trickster stories, as examples of disruption and disorientation, and movement between states of unknowing and knowing, are fables for transformative learning. Tricksters, due to their hinge-dwelling existence and boundary crossing antics, challenge humans to examine what is deemed to be on the outside with what is on the inside (Pelton, 1980, p. 234). Through this process, they shift the patterns that create individuals and societies, they are therefore described by Hyde as ‘second order articulators’ (1998, p. 257).

Hermes’ actions allow humans to move to a higher level of awareness or insight (Doty, 1993, p. 55). Māui represents the inner tugs between ‘me’ and ‘we’, and is a kind of divine scapegoat where Oceanic peoples can escape rigid protocols between the sacred and profane (Luomala, 1949, p. 29), and in so doing can reflect on these societal rules from a distance. Simply by existing between the bounds of conventions tricksters undermine underpinning assumptions and frameworks. They re-articulate ways of knowing the world.
Kincheloe (2001) associates bricolage with liminality. He argues that the “bricolage [sic: bricoleur] understands that the frontiers of knowledge work rest in the liminal zones where disciplines collide. In the deep interdisciplinarity of the bricolage, researchers learn to engage in a form of boundary work (p. 689). I believe that Turkle and Papert (1990) also talk of bricolage as a liminal act – but not explicitly. They discuss bricolage within a technological-computational context, and note that “recent technological developments, in interfaces, programming philosophy, and artificial intelligence, have created an opening for epistemological pluralism” (p. 156). This ‘opening’, I would argue, is a liminal zone, a portal of opportunity whereby individuals can move from traditional ways of engaging to more sophisticated, ‘pluralistic’ understandings and can make previous ways of knowing ‘object’ to them.

Also, as the ultimate reflective practitioners, tricksters embody theories of engaging in action and then reflecting on that action (Schön, 1983; Schön & Argyris, 1974). In the case of tricksters this does not lead to new levels of learning as they often repeat the same mistakes over and over again. However in place practice I believe one can experience self-development through engaging in place work and engaging in constant, iterative reflection. Tricksters have the power to ‘undo’ and to also remake humanity. They reflect the spirit of the in-between, the liminal elements of society. And I believe that place practice as it creates, fosters and draws attention to liminal zones of interaction and engagement, has the possibility to create the conditions for both first and second order perspective shifts to occur.

**Portal Revealer**

*Two things the prophetic trickster reveals, the hidden pores that lead out of the mundane world, and the plenitude that lies beyond.*

Hyde (1998) p. 293
Thrift (1996) has argued that a new ontology of mobility is emerging, one which now positions borders as highly significant. He sees borders as processes: “living pedagogies which force us to reconsider here and there, margins and centres, convergences and overlaps, exiles and evicts” (p. 294). In this environment tricksters have new relevance as interstitial creatures that inhabit borderlands, crossroads and the portals that exist between worlds. Hyde (1998) notes that “tricksters like to hang around doorways, that being one of the places where deep-change accidents occur” (p. 125).

Trickster stories are the artefacts of cultures where doorways and portals are important symbols. It is common to see tricksters play with the idea of the porous and the non-porous in a number of their stories (Hyde, 1998, p. 48). For example, Māui utilises one kind of pore to cross between worlds to seek his mother:

Then he flew, until he came to the cave where his mother had run down into, and lifted up the tuft of rushes. Then down he went, and disappeared into the cave, and shut up its mouth again so as to hide the entrance (Sir George Grey (original source: Te Rangikaheke & Te Whiwhi) cited in Luomala, 1949, p. 42).

Māui’s journey into HineNuiTePō’s vagina (where he is eventually crushed to death – thwarted by mortality) is another example of portal travel in trickster epics.

In other traditions, the Winnebago trickster uses cracks in the ice to fool minks, and holes in hills to fool women. In Hawaiian narratives the pore is sometimes a weakness in an aspect of chiefly lore, protocol or knowledge that the underdog

---

20 According to Bates (2003), in Ancient England, crossroads were places where human paths intersected, and also entrances-or exits for realm of the dead. He makes the point that crossroads were unsuitable places to linger (p. 86).
in the story is able to step through in order to win a challenge and claim a throne (see The Riddling Chief of Puna as an example (Thompson, 1969)). Legba, a trickster of the Fon religious tradition creates ruptures through planes of existence which are often social in nature, to create society (Pelton, 1980, p. 82), while Èṣù uses divination as the doorway across worlds (Pelton, 1980, p. 146).

Trickster figures represent a way of thinking that is multidimensional – where truth and fiction, technology and spirit, alive and dead, self and other are no longer so clearly demarcated. They also represent a way of being that is porous (likened to the experience Somerville (2007, 2010) and Rose (2002) describe as ‘becoming-other’). In a tricksters world the spirit of a location has the possibility to become an active stakeholder in any intervention or interaction.

Several theorists have pointed to the similarities between portals, porousness and today’s technologies. For example, Turkle (2011) comments that we used to simply sit in front of a screen to engage with virtual space but “now, with a mobile device as portal, one moves into the virtual with fluidity and on the go” (p. 160). Meyrowitz (2008) comments that the world is ‘porous’, with the “relatively segregated systems that once defined distinct roles, nations, industries, products, services, and channels of communication...now leaking into each other” (p. 27). And, Relph (2007), in his discussions of ‘virtual’ worlds, warns that “The border between real and digital virtual worlds is already porous and the designers of virtual places have a responsibility to be alert to the consequences of this” (p. 4). He may not have been aware at the time of augmenting reality apps which, perhaps more than virtual worlds (which are purely online) are more insidiously blurring the border between what is considered real and what is not.

According to MacDonald, Cove, and Laughlin and McManus (1989), portals manifest across cultures in a number of different ways. The most obvious are
doorways into houses [including the wharenui [meeting house] with its depictions of ancestors guarding the entryway], fire holes, chimneys and caves. They also point out that water vessels and mirrors are used as portalling devices by shamans in indigenous societies as they act as a junction between ordinary and non-ordinary realities (p. 40).

When turned off, the black, glass mirror of a smartphone resembles a shamanic tool; when turned on, the device comes alive with knowledge accessing from transmitters located in high places, and data sourced from The Cloud. It also sends knowledge back into the ether as the user transmits data to others around the world. This resembles the tales of tricksters who visit the gods on behalf of humanity, bringing (stealing), knowledge for use in the human world.

Using a smartphone device, users can access other worlds, and cross numerous borders and boundaries. They can engage with different fantasy landscapes; cultural realities (ethnic, political, religious, moral etc.); and individual life-worlds (through comprehensive personal social media sites). They can ‘fly’ up into the sky and back down again (using Google Earth) and make purchases, smuggle money, and connect with loved ones, without any official border checks. They can talk to people thousands of miles away by converting into digital packets and streaming through satellites and down into the homes of friends. Smartphone users perhaps (at least superficially), mirror the actions of ancient shamans.

Mobile devices are able to shape shift. Different skins are downloaded to change both function and perspective, while gadgets such as microscopes, SLR camera interfaces, and microphones can be attached to augment their box-like shapes. Geo-locative mobile technologies are tools of creatures that reveal,

_____________________

21 Similar to the shiny black obsidian disks apparently used by shamans in Mexico and Peru (see Keleman 1956, cited in MacDonald et al., 1989).
reflect and also create heterotopias – the places of our age. I believe that they are the mirrors that Foucault (1986) predicted in his work, ‘Of Other Places’, i.e. a “mixed, joint experience” that is both utopian and heterotopian and a thing of itself. And it is through using these tools, as part of a trickster-informed place practice, that new opportunities, pores, can be opened to new ways of engaging in place.

According to Relph (2007), “the precise, sacred sense of the genius loci cannot be simulated in virtual worlds any more than it can be created in real ones, because humans do not create gods and spirits” (p. 5). Though instead of simulating the genius loci, perhaps it can be revealed, and supported.

**Artus Worker**

*He went all over the earth, and one day he came to a place where he found a large waterfall, ‘Remove yourself to some other location for the people are going to inhabit this place and you will annoy them.’*

*Then the waterfall said, ‘I will not go away. I chose this place and I am going to stay here. ‘I tell you, you are going to some other place,’ said Trickster. The waterfall, however, refused to do it. ‘I am telling you that the earth was made for man to live on and you will annoy him if you stay here. I came to this earth to rearrange it. If you don’t do what I tell you, I will not use you gently.’ Then the waterfall said, ‘I told you when I first spoke to you that I would not move and I am not going to.’ Then Trickster cut a stick for himself and shot it into the falls and pushed the falls on to the land.*

Radin (1972) p. 52

The role of trickster figures, in many stories (like the one above) is to make or remake the articulated world (Hyde, 1998, p. 261) – they are transformers. They transform by attacking the joints of societies and cultures in order to completely
destroy or to change the fundamental nature of ideas and conventions. Destruction and reconstruction: “are the first two senses in which tricksters are artus (joint) workers, and their creations works of artus” (Hyde, 1998, p. 258).

Tricksters reveal the “hidden joints holding the old world together, the hidden pores leading out” (Hyde, 1998, p. 292). In other words, they reveal the contradictions and challenges that exist in static systems, and despite their seemingly crazy behaviours, contribute substantially to both the creation and evolution of culture (Hynes & Doty, 1993a, p. 22).

Tricksters find openings (portals of opportunity) and use these to destabilise normalities and overly strict boundaries within societies (Garrison, 2009). These openings are the places where traditional dichotomies and rules do not apply, or should not apply. True and false, real and illusory, clean and dirty – tricksters disrupt these dualities and disturb the webs of signification that tie these notions together in societies (Hyde, 1998). They do not always destroy or fundamentally change these joints, they simply provide interpretations and translations between different situations, and support engagement within existing boundaries – inner artus work (Hyde, 1998, p. 261).

Tricksters also build connections between humans, and connections between humans and gods (Doty, 1993, p. 51). The trickster god Hermes organises the social cosmos, working out the interconnections among people, boundaries between nations, and realignments of military political power (Doty, 1993, p. 56). He re-aligns political, social and spiritual relationships. As Hyde (1998) notes, cultures need figures whose purpose is to reveal and disrupt the very things that cultures are based on – that is how cultures maintain their liveliness and durability (p. 9).

It should be noted that change is not always revolutionary, nor inventions brand new. For example, Westervelt (1913) noted that Māui was not famous for inventing new tools in Polynesian stories, instead he improved what was already
in existence. He improved bird and fish spears, improved the design of eel baskets, refashioned stone implements, made and flew kites. “Little things that others did not think about were the foundation of Māui’s fame. Upon these little things he built his courage to snare the sun and seek fire for mankind” (pp. 80-84). In another story, Māui ‘improves’ newly made humans themselves:

These new [human] beings stood erect, but had jointless arms and limbs. A web of skin connected and fastened tightly the arms to the body and the legs to each other. Māui was apparently angry at this motionless statue, and so took the newly formed human and broke its legs at ankle, knee and hip and then, tearing them and the arms from the body, destroyed the web. He then broke the arms at the elbow and shoulder. Then humans could move from place to place, but had neither fingers nor toes. Hunger then impelled humans to seek food in the mountains where toes were cut out by the brambles in climbing, and fingers were formed by the sharp splinters of the bamboo while searching for food on the ground. (Westervelt, 1913, p. 132)

For tricksters like Māui, their role is to bridge the worlds of gods and humans in the way they represent the opportunities to see beyond the mundane visible, to the invisible opportunities beyond. They are the ultimate messengers not just connecting people and things but also transforming relationships at the same time.

Tricksters are re-negotiators within the worlds they inhabit. Hynes (1993) describes them as being able to “overturn any person, place, or belief, no matter how prestigious . . . No order is too rooted, no taboo too sacred, no god too high, no profanity too scatological that it cannot be broached or inverted” (p. 37). For him, they are “bricoleurs of the sacred and lewd” transforming lewd acts and objects into “occasions of insight, vitality, and new inventive creations” (p. 42). Hynes notes that the strict definition of ‘lewd’ is ‘lay’ i.e. not clerical
(ibid). As mentioned earlier in this document, ‘profane’ is a term that refers to that which is secular, “not sacred or religious” (Oxford Online Dictionary, 2013d).

The work of trickster then is to move that which is set outside the realm of everyday life – the sacred (or ‘tapu’) – into the world of the profane i.e. the secular world. Also to take that which exists in the world of the lewd, ‘the lay person’, and make it sacred. This is particularly relevant to technology (‘profane’ objects used by ‘lewd’ people) and its use to support traditional notions of the spirit of place.

For Cobb (1998) the connection between humans and tools is:

> a complex dance of becoming. We shape our tools and in turn they shape us. This process, which has been termed “co-evolutionary” by some, is manifesting today in our relationship with computer technology. We create our tools. These tools in turn ask us to rethink our world, to expand our horizons and enlarge our wisdom. Ideally we then bring this enlarged wisdom back to the tools and guide them to their next stage of development. (p. 20).

Tools such as mobile apps therefore, are not profane, but also perhaps not completely sacred in their own right. They are not *only* tools that are extensions of a place practice, but intrinsic elements of a holistic, interconnected understanding of place that is made up of a network of relationships between a variety of objects (including apps, human beings, spiritual beings, code, insects, signals, clouds, trees and devices). These technologies make it possible to overlay and insert landscapes with other worlds. Karakia can be inserted into locations to be triggered at different points of need and conversely, sacred locations can be denigrated with the swish of a finger across the screen. The role of place practitioners using these tools is to find a place in the greater
assemblage and engage with objects (such as mobile apps) in a way that supports the spirit of place rather than co-creating a system of denigration.

A Trickster-Inspired Place Practice

In this thesis, places are seen as heterotopic gathering points for realities, objects, relationships and intelligences. Tricksters are newly relevant in this environment and embody all that is contradictory, contested, multivarious and interstitial about place, and places today.

I have described in this chapter how place practitioners are polytropic shape shifters who celebrate and facilitate the contradiction and opposition present in place engagement. They are also bricoleurs – creatively and innovatively weaving together methodologies and methods that support innovation. Bricolage is a particularly synergistic term when matched with the notion of practice – which is inherently embodied, uses whatever is to hand and is creative, processual, and relational in nature.

When the landscape becomes a rich environment of code, spirit, frog, tree, sound sample and text file, practitioners of place become wayfinders and path creators, rather than abstract map makers and disconnected observers. In this context, there is an opportunity to transform the way people see places, creating liminal moments of transformation as new meanings emerge in the interlacing of digital, physical, social and spiritual worlds. Place practice then becomes a portal of opportunity, where not only devices, but also experiences open doorways to other worlds, and other ways of knowing and being. At the same time, self becomes porous as self as individual moves to self as other, and to self as all, and the spirit of place includes the researcher as part of its assemblage of objects, entities and realities.

Media are pervasive, and technology is increasingly ubiquitous – almost to the point where it is disappearing completely into everyday reality. In this context
the sacred and profane are no longer easily demarcated. Working with these tools in sacred places has the potential to catalyse dynamic dialogues on protocol and traditions. This process of opening up, transforming, and reflecting on self, place, practice, technology, truth, sacredness and reality may best be described as working at the joints of place – artus work.

In an environment rich with media, code and signal, the concept of the spirit of place needs to evolve, or perhaps revolve to an understanding embracing both old and emerging wisdoms. When the spirit of place encompasses all including ourselves, it makes it difficult to study it as a detached observer. Instead it makes it more sense to practise it – to live it as a day-to-day emerging experience of expanded knowing. When spirit is allowed to exist as a sentient other, whether that be in the form of the all-encompassing energy of a place, in the form of those who reside there unseen, or the digital intelligences virtually embedded in the landscape, there is greater possibility for innovation.

This way of being embraces methodologies that include the uncanny, the synchronicitous, the irrational and the transpersonal. It is also emergent, organic, embodied and holistic. Tricksters bridge the emerging future of ubiquitous technologies and the ageless histories of indigenous peoples. Tricksters represent ontologies where humans play just one part in a bigger whole, where the land tells stories and the dead walk among the living. In my work they are seen as a guiding metaphor, presiding spirit, and inspirational figure for a new form of place practice that reveals passages to the sacred, via profane, day-to-day, ubiquitous technologies – particularly smartphone devices and geo-locative mobile apps. In the next chapter, I examine how I put these trickster traits into practice, necessarily adapting them for an academic context.
Chapter 6 - Trickster in Practice

In this chapter, I set out my research design. It is inspired by tricksters and encapsulates a number of emerging methodologies, philosophies and technologies discussed earlier in this document. It also emerges out of my relationship with the locations and a deep understanding of the complexities involved in all three sites, and also the town in which they are all situated.

This chapter may give the impression of a cohesive, planned framework, but day-to-day practice was organic, operating on the basis of emerging intentions and ideas rather than detailed strategies. This is because, as Somerville (2007) argues, new knowledge generation in place happens through research engagement that is at once “messy, open-ended, liminal, and irrational” (p. 235). For Somerville, “emergence is an important and under-recognized quality in all research that aims to generate new knowledge” (p. 240).

Somerville’s (2007, 2010) writing on postmodern emergence, place pedagogy and transdisciplinarity gave me the confidence to work in a way that was perhaps outside of traditional research streams. I, for example, do not use trickster traits prescriptively as this would be overly ironic given tricksters’ unpredictable, rule-breaking nature. Tricksters are bricoleurs, and so my trickster-inspired place practice necessarily involves working with a bricolage of tools, objects, activities, relationships and conceptualisations. Tricksters are also liminal creatures who meander from adventure to adventure. A place practice enacted in their name therefore involves trial and error and muddling through, rather than just pre-planned narrowly executed engagements.

---

22 See also (Beck & Somerville, 2005; Somerville, Davies, Power, Gannon, & de Carteret, 2011; Somerville, Power, & De Carteret, 2009; Somerville & Rapport, 2000)
The structure is analogous to approaches which are cross-disciplinary, operate in a third space, are in some way performance oriented, and necessarily personal, embodied and experiential. The research creatively used technology to not only collect data but also create new meanings from this data and share it with others. It also utilised methods and practices which build meaning from the relationship between their parts, and between the parts and the whole.

Overview

My research explores the relationship between geo-locative mobile technologies and the spirit of place, and focusses on the opportunities and issues that are generated when these technologies are used on-sites with strong spiritual associations. The two key points of inquiry are whether these technologies can support the work of existing ‘place practitioners’ working in and around these types of places and whether they can support the ‘spirit’ or ‘spirits’ of place when used within new cross-boundary, spiritually informed, ‘place practice’.

This research project was carried out in two stages. The first stage involved explorative interviews of experts in place work, the second stage involved practical explorations in the field.

Stage One

I began by conducting semi-structured, explorative ‘conversations’ with 15 individuals who were identified as having place-focused roles or occupations. The diverse group were purposely identified as having roles (familial, cultural, career and/or work) that are place-focused in some way; i.e. their work content (and sometimes also location) involved supporting, researching, and/or protecting a particular place. The group included local historians, kaumātua, archaeologists (focused on the Auckland region), earth healers, and Māori
educationalists. A technologist working for a commercial augmented reality company was also included in order to understand that aspect more fully.

Participants were recruited using a snowball sampling technique (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994), i.e. networking in and around Papakura and Auckland and one other site in the North Island. Snowball sampling allowed me to select and identify individuals in an organic, connected way which fitted well with my spiritual philosophy of allowing some degree of flexibility and synchronicity to be part of the process. It was also the most feasible way of working where there were limited ‘place practitioners’ in given locations and in a philosophical context where places are seen as points of interrelationship.

The participants were a mix of Māori and Pākehā (non-Māori), male and female and most lived in and around the local region, although a small pocket was based at a rural marae in the lower North Island (a location that might have been a ‘fourth’ case but, for a number of practical reasons, did not go ahead). This ‘original’ list of participants is outlined in the following table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>Place Related Practice</th>
<th>Background Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Participant 1</td>
<td>Tohunga-Kaumatua – Rural Marae, Lower North Island</td>
<td>Māori, Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Participant 2</td>
<td>Urban Marae Leader</td>
<td>Māori, Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Participant 3</td>
<td>Māori Educationalist</td>
<td>Māori, Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Participant 4</td>
<td>Local Historian/Researcher</td>
<td>Pākehā, Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Participant 5</td>
<td>Kaumatua, Tohunga-Whakairo – Rural Marae Auckland Region</td>
<td>Māori, Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Participant 6</td>
<td>Earth Energy Worker/Channeller</td>
<td>Pākehā, Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Participant 6b</td>
<td>Channelled Entity of Participant 6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Participant 7</td>
<td>Commercial Manager: Mobile AR Company</td>
<td>Pākehā, Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Participant 8</td>
<td>Archaeologist</td>
<td>Pākehā, Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Participant 9</td>
<td>Marae Associate – Rural Marae, Lower North Island</td>
<td>Pākehā, Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Participant 10</td>
<td>Marae Associate – Rural Marae, Lower North Island</td>
<td>Pākehā -Māori, Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Participant 11</td>
<td>Principal – Lead Educator</td>
<td>Māori, Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Participant 12</td>
<td>Earth Energy Worker</td>
<td>Pākehā, Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Participant 13</td>
<td>Earth Energy Worker</td>
<td>[Unidentified], Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Participant 14</td>
<td>Kuia²³-Kaumatua, Mana Whenua - Rural Marae Papakura Region</td>
<td>Māori, Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Participant 15</td>
<td>Kuia-Kaumatua – Urban Marae Founder</td>
<td>Māori, Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These initial semi-structured conversations assisted me to better understand those who were currently working in place and gain some perspective on their current use of technology and what opportunities and issues they could see, or imagined. I was also interested in orientating myself to the different worldviews of the participants and understanding how they viewed ‘the spirit of place’, and

²³ Female elder
viewed ‘place practice’ as a describing term. A copy of the indicative themes can be found at Appendix 1.

As the interviews progressed, it became clear that hardly any of the practitioners were engaging with technology as part of their practice, and that some form of ‘demonstration’ could prove very useful. I had, by this time, also felt an intuitive pull to work with certain local places due to either a connection with the spirit of place, and/or a connection with certain participants who were interviewed in the first stage. Stage two then emerged naturally as an outcome of being in and around certain places, and engaging actively with those who worked there.

**Stage Two**

This stage involved three different ‘cases’ of practice on three sites which can best be described as having strong spiritual associations: a suburban cemetery, a marae and a historically significant public park that was a wāhi tapu site for local iwi. My work at each of these places was to collaboratively create a geo-locative, augmenting reality-based mobile user experience which supported the spirit of that place, and the work of those associated with it.

The experiences, in the case of the marae and the cemetery, involved using smartphones to access geo-located stories and information placed around the site at significant spots (e.g. carvings, buildings, gravestones). In the case of the park the material was much more playfully and artistically presented in a layered, non-linear format across a trail of points around the site. In this latter case it was contextualised within an exhibition that occurred simultaneously at a local public gallery (with consolidated material presented via a monitor hung on the wall) and also on-site using the audience’s mobile phones.  

All

24 Greater detail is given in each case study in Chapter 7
demonstrations of these experiences took place over the same three week period (after six months of active practice on the sites).

These cases in practice directly contributed to my inquiry as to whether technologies like geo-locative mobile technologies can be used within the adopted approach to support the ‘spirit’ or ‘spirits’ of place of particular locations, and help me more directly experience the opportunities and issues that this may generate. It also allowed practitioners to experience first-hand how these technologies did, or might, augment (add value) and support their work.

The case studies involved different types of participants.25 There were collaborators who worked with me to create the experiences. These participants ranged from partners in managing each case study project (at the decision-making level), through to those who provided content for the demonstration ‘experiences’ (in the form of stories and artefacts); advice on data collection methods; spiritual and cultural advice; or joined me in particular data collection methods on-site. Some of the collaborators were sourced from the stage one conversations.

A second category of participant was invited, through a purposeful selection process, to simply experience the demonstrations. These individuals were associated with a particular case site in some way. Most of these were fresh to the project, but one or two had also participated in Stage One. (Originally I attempted to have all of the participants for the demonstrations sourced from Stage One but this proved impracticable due to availability and logistics issues.)

A bricolage of methods was used on case study sites to both create content for the experiences (i.e. information, images, sounds and stories about the places),

25 To ensure clarity and cohesion these individuals are detailed within the context of each case study rather than in this section.
as well as to gather data on the process of working on the sites and understand
the experience of those who encountered the technology for the first time. The
research therefore involved researching the place itself while simultaneously
reflecting on this process through my blogging practice. It involved generating
content, but also reflecting on how this content was experienced when re-
constituted within the portal of a mobile phone. In this way the research
structure reflected the trickster’s need to blur traditional boundaries of subject
and object and support liminal moments of reflection.

Assumptions

**Place is Practice; Practice is Place**

Earlier in this thesis I noted that the notion of practice has provoked a great deal
of interest across a number of disciplines in recent years. Viewing place as a
practice, and those who work in and around it as place practitioners, allows for
a relational, but also processual notion of place as one *practises* place or simply
*lives* place. It necessarily involves working with a bricolage of objects, activities,
relationships and conceptualisations as the inherent multiplicity of place
requires skills in trial and error and muddling through, rather than just pre-
planned narrowly executed engagements. My work took place in my home town
– it was literally a lived activity.

My own trickster-inspired practice was emergent in nature (i.e. events and
interventions would be allowed to unfold rather than be strictly planned). I also
saw the work as inherently practical and visualised it working across boundaries
of different kinds. I also understood the work to be a form of spiritual practice.
For me this involved not only opening myself to aspects greater than myself
‘assisting’ or providing ‘guidance’ for my work (through different channels such
as signs, intuitions, dreams, spoken word), but also engaging in a number of
practices such as entering altered states of awareness through meditation and conscious visualisations.

My worldview allowed me to engage with the spirit of the places, and the entities (or spirits) that resided there as existing, external, real entities. I did not, therefore, believe them to be subjective figments of my imagination that I projected onto the location. I am aware, that others, from their own worldviews will make sense of this in their own way and I respect these views as valid in their own contexts. I see myself as assuming a multi-ontological, multi-epistemological and multi-methodological stance.

**Multi-Methodological**

This thesis argues for a progressive understanding of the spirit of place which incorporates a number of different ideologies, methodologies, ontologies and epistemologies. I argue that a trickster-informed practice needs to in some way be polytropic in order to engage across these different knowledges and employ a bricolage of understandings, approaches, and methods. For this reason I chose to synthesise the two integral methodological frameworks mentioned in Chapter 4 to underpin my work in place.

Braud’s Integral Inquiry (1998, 2011) assumes multiple ways of knowing and an emergent, organic research process; and that research is inherently personal in its nature. It also promotes the idea of fun as a core ingredient of good research (Anderson & Braud, 2011, p. 5). Integral Inquiry presents a continuum of qualitative and quantitative methods which are both mainstream and avant-garde and pragmatically encourages researchers to mix methods according to the needs of their research (ibid). I am interested in this approach due to its inherent flexibility, but also because it is particularly suited to topics that have great personal meaning for the researcher, are highly experiential, and involve spiritual experiences (Braud, 2011, p. 74).
Research based on Integral Inquiry inclusively utilises multiple ways of knowing which include not only intellectual forms but also “feeling-based, body-based, imagery-based, and intuitional modes that usually are less appreciated in disciplined inquiry” (Braud, 2011, p. 117). This includes what Braud calls direct forms of knowing that occurs through empathic identification, parapsychological processes (telepathy, clairvoyance etc.) and intuition (p. 118). In direct knowing there is identification with the object of knowing in a first person manner – the subject/object boundary is blurred. This kind of knowing resonates with spiritual practices that call for deep empathy and transpersonal connection.

Integral Inquiry has been mainly used within transpersonal psychology, however I feel it is appropriate when dealing with engagements with place that include the spirit of place, or wairua. It allows for the notion of ‘becoming other’, and a processual, participative way of engaging in place research. It also provides a number of experiential exercises that allow researchers to access transpersonal elements within the research process and enact creative, playful interactions with the subject at hand. I used several of these (admittedly without reading the book first) as part of my research process.

Wilber’s work on Integral Theory (2000, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2003d, 2006) has until recently been marginalised by academia. His lack of critical engagement with issues such as colonisation, and his overly generalised developmental models have left him open to criticism (see for example Kremer, 1998; Taylor, 2003). That said, others working within the integral field are evolving this framework and applying it to ecological and place based issues such as climate change (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2005, 2010; Hochachka, 2005; Hochachka & O'Brien, 2010).

Important among them is Esbjörn-Hargens who actively promotes the research applications of Wilber’s ‘Integral Methodological Pluralism’ (IMP). IMP has as its
key principles the idea that truth is valid within its own paradigm and should not be excluded if it does not fit validation principles of other paradigms; some sets of practices are more inclusive, holistic, and comprehensive than others and this is accepted; and that different types of inquiry will describe and produce different types of phenomena (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2009).

Using this approach, different methodologies representing subjective (first person), inter-subjective (second person) and objective (third person) perspectives can be utilised within one research project to provide a more ‘integral’ view on an issue. Esbjörn-Hargens (2006) sets forth a comprehensive framework for implementing integral research, involving a complex combination of different perspectives and levels of engagement. I have created a diagram outlining this framework (see Figure 2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Left: Self and Consciousness</th>
<th>Upper Right: Brain and Organism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interior-individual experiences</td>
<td>exterior-individual behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjective e.g. Phenomenology</td>
<td>objective e.g. neurophysiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Left: Culture and Worldview</th>
<th>Lower Right: Social System and Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interior-collective cultures</td>
<td>exterior-collective systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inter-subjective e.g. Hermeneutics</td>
<td>inter-objective e.g. systems theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>ITS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Integral Framework: adapted from Esbjörn-Hargens (2006, p. 83)

Within this framework, subjective (first person), inter-subjective (second person) and objective (third person) perspectives are all utilised in some way, with each ‘perspective’ associated with particular ‘families’ of methodologies (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2006). In more complex versions, a researcher can engage with the ‘interior’ or ‘exterior’ of a given part of the quadrant and involve
‘levels’, ‘lines’ and more detailed aspects of Wilber’s original theory. However, in simpler versions, it is simply the perspective or ‘zone’ (first, second, third) that is useful, and a researcher selects which ‘view’ within that is most useful for an issue.

Hedlund (2010) has noted that adopting integral research comprehensively is difficult as it is potentially too complex and cumbersome for the average practitioner, and overly resource-intensive. He instead proposes a spectrum of engagement with IMP, allowing practitioners to interpret the theory in very basic, to very sophisticated and comprehensive ways (p. 10) (see Figure 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflexively situated and informed at all major phases of the research process by the IMP map and (some of) its principles</td>
<td>Reflexively situated and informed at all major phases of the research process by the IMP map and (some of) its principles</td>
<td>Reflexively situated and informed at all major phases of the research process by the IMP map and (some of) its principles</td>
<td>Reflexively situated and informed at all major phases of the research process by the IMP map and (some of) its principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least some reflexive disclosure of aspects of the epistemological and methodological conditions of enactment</td>
<td>Reflexive disclosure of aspects of the epistemological and methodological conditions of enactment</td>
<td>Reflexive disclosure of aspects of the epistemological and methodological conditions of enactment</td>
<td>Substantive reflexive disclosure of aspects of the epistemological and methodological conditions of enactment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes use of qualitative or quantitative methodologies</td>
<td>Makes use of at least one qualitative and one quantitative methodology</td>
<td>Makes use of multiple first, second, and third-person methodologies</td>
<td>Makes use of multiple first, second, and third-person methodologies (zones 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematically integrates data sets</td>
<td>Systematically integrates data sets</td>
<td>Systematically integrates data sets</td>
<td>Systematically integrates data sets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Table of Integral Research: Hedlund (2010, p. 10)

After several discussions with Hedlund directly, I enacted the equivalent of ‘Level 3’ research, proactively aiming to have first, second, and third person perspectives in my data collection methods. In practice this evolved into simultaneously adopting characteristics of autoethnography, hermeneutics and elements of empiricism (detailed later in the methods area of this chapter).
Mixed methods

These integral frameworks can be seen as particular forms of ‘mixed methods’ research. This type of mixed methods framework is not troubled by issues of incompatible philosophical assumptions at the level of methodology – it instead asserts its own internal coherence and integrity (Greene, 2007). Indeed, Greene (2007), views mixed methods as a way of inviting:

multiple mental models into the same inquiry space for purposes of respectful conversation, dialogue, and learning one from the other, toward a collective generation of better understanding of the phenomena being studied. By definition, then, mixed methods social inquiry involves a plurality of philosophical paradigms, theoretical assumptions, methodological traditions, data-gathering and analysis techniques, and personalized understandings and value commitments – because these are the stuff of mental models. (p. 13)

I find this particular definition very helpful, as Greene moves above the operational level of ‘methods’ and also out of the polarizing qualitative versus quantitative framework. She instead promotes the idea of inclusive research that takes account of a diverse range of multiple mental models (subjective realities). This point of view is echoed by Creswell and Clark (2011) who note that mixed methods is about: “multiple worldviews, or paradigms (i.e. beliefs and values), rather than the typical association of certain paradigms with quantitative research and others for qualitative research” (p. 13).

There are other, more familiar justifications for choosing a mixed methods approach including the argument that mixed methods approaches are better able to deal with complex questions (Morse & Niehaus, 2009) and help understand complex phenomena (Greene, 2007). Such approaches also offer the possibility of convergence and corroboration of results, while also allowing
the potential for conflicting results that may in turn generate new ideas and concerns.

Criticisms and controversies around adopting a mixed methods framework include the danger of losing sight of the research question in the complexity of the research, and confusion over designs chosen and issues with the language that is chosen to discuss research outcomes (Creswell, 2011). Researchers may not be trained adequately in the data collection and analysis methods associated with each paradigm and cannot, due to lack of resources and training, fully do justice to each type of perspective (Hedlund, 2010).

My particular, integrally informed, interpretation of mixed method research will never address ongoing, general controversies with either mixed methods or integral research. However I have worked hard to mitigate the potential complexity of approach by setting out a very clear framework from within which data is gathered and maintaining a reflexive stance throughout the process. I am also experienced in a number of different types of research, and in managing very complex projects with diverse stakeholder groups. Without these generic skills, managing the research process practically, and psychologically, would be challenging.

Case Study Approach

For stage two of the process, I used a case study approach as this fitted well with the notion of developing a practice-based approach to place. Schön (1983) notes that a practitioner is someone who encounters certain types of situations or contexts over and over again. As the practitioner engages with a variety of ‘cases’, or bounded experiences, they develop their “repertoire of expectations, images and techniques.” (p. 60).

The three cases emerged organically. I did not deliberately or predictably set out to engage in a case-based approach at the start the research. However,
given that boundaries of cases are formed in a variety of ways: theory, time, event, but also place (Luck, Jackson, & Usher, 2006, p. 104), this made taking a case study approach natural given the content was about place practice.

Case study strategies have been argued to be ‘paradigm bridging’ due to their ability to mix methods according to the particular context of the case (Luck et al., 2006). Case studies can act as bridges between qualitative and quantitative methods, allowing each to remain valid (Luck et al., 2006). In this way I feel the case study approach complements the integral framework mentioned earlier. Case studies are also very useful in exploratory situations when there is no single set of outcomes, where investigation takes place within ‘real life contexts’, when boundaries between different content areas are generally blurred and where a variety of data collection methods need to be employed (Yin, 2003, p. 23).

As noted in Chapter 2, my research was conducted in my hometown of Papakura, an outlying suburb of Auckland City, New Zealand. It was located there for practical reasons (there would be multiple site visits), but also because it provided me with an opportunity to connect with the history of my own community – a community, and history, from which I was disconnected both as the child of migrants and also as someone who lived a significant amount of her adult life overseas. It also allowed me an opportunity to make a difference to an area that has a number of wicked issues (outlined in Chapter 2) which detract from the spirit of the place (in any sense of that phrase).

Each case study location has its own story of how I came to be working on it, and these are recounted in detail within each narrative. It was only once they had all emerged, as loci for my practice that I began to see that they had a common thread: they were all sites with spiritual significance and could all be viewed as heterotopias i.e. liminal spaces where the porous boundaries
between the sacred and profane were noticeably visible, and multiple histories, times, spaces and realities converged.

The choice to engage in three (i.e. multiple) case studies versus a single case study was a difficult one for me. Yin (2003) argues that multiple case studies support generalisation and allow for replication (within an empirical, positivist paradigm), but this was not the reason that I chose to undertake multiple cases. The three sites each represented a different kind of opportunity: to engage deeply with local European history and culture at the cemetery site, to work with a completely different culture at the marae, and to be playful, tricksterish and creative without bounds at the park. Rather than allow for generalisation, the use of multiple cases demonstrates the underlying need to adapt a particular methodology on a case-by-case basis rather than prescriptively follow a particular approach.

Methods

Place practice necessarily involves working with a bricolage of objects, activities, relationships and conceptualisations as the inherent multiplicity of place requires skills in trial and error and muddling through, rather than just pre-planned narrowly executed engagements. In terms of research methods, this means some were selected before data collection began while others emerge during the process. As mentioned earlier, the data collection generally fell into categories of first, second and third person perspectives and, in keeping with the spiritually informed approach, encompassed a wide range of experience that was intrapersonal, interpersonal and transpersonal in nature.

First Person

In Chapter 2, I reflected autobiographically on the rationale for this work. This examination of my journey and relationship to trickster figures reflexively revealed my motivations for investigating place and also revealed my underlying
belief that place research has a strong personal element. It is a response to Somerville’s (2007) call for place research to include autobiographical material from the past (p. 234) alongside other material.

From the beginning of my research, I reflectively blogged on a private site I named ‘Entangled Worlds’. This blog recorded my reflections on day-to-day practice at the three sites and reflections on the secondary research into the theories that informed my practice. I also used my blog to comment on the process of undertaking research within the university system. The blogging involved writing about events, conversations and milestones as they occurred, and then, later, reflecting on this writing. Each blog post had several types of entry: original post; comment on that post at a later date (sometimes twice); and tags\(^{26}\) which coded the posts into themes (which was another type of reflective action and assisted with analysing the material later).

As part of my reflective process I engaged in meditation to provide insight into my feelings and experiences at the sites. I also engaged in personal ‘divinatory’ practices such as dowsing. I recorded dreams and visions that came to me during the research process, and also noted synchronicities when I perceived that they occurred.

The autobiographical reflection and reflective blogging fall within the general realms of autoethnography – an approach often associated with phenomenology, a subjective philosophy/approach/methodology that focusses on how humans make sense of experience-phenomenon (Cohen, Kahn, & Steeves, 2000). Patton (2002) describes autoethnography as an approach where a researcher’s own experiences are used to gain insights into a culture in which their research is situated (p. 86). Chang (2008) argues that the benefits of

\(^{26}\) A name for an index entry (usually a key word) which is logged next to a blog post in order to better order the content.
autoethnography are its user-friendly nature, its ability to build both self-awareness and also deeper awareness of the culture in which one is situated and the potential to catalyse transformation through the meta-reflective process (pp. 52-53).

In addition to these methods, I engaged the Knowledge Engineering and Discovery Research Institute (KEDRI) to assist me to record my brainwaves while engaging in meditative encounters at the site. While not an auto ethnographic method, it provided an external view on an internal process using a scientific tool within an empirical process.

**Second Person**

I was interested in how collaborators interpreted our work together and so I engaged them in reflective conversations (unstructured interviews) at the end of each of the cases which were recorded and then transcribed.

In both the park and the marae case studies I engaged in a number of oral history interviews (some of which were recorded on video) with place descendants that allowed me to understand those locations in more depth, and also enabled me to collect information for the mobile experiences I was creating. The individuals shared stories of their own experiences and relationships with those locations.

In each case study, but particularly in the case of the park, I used my phone, and various other electronic devices, to understand the sites in new ways. I undertook photography (e.g. aerial, macro, underwater, time lapse) and audio sampling (using contact, zoom and underwater microphones) at the park, and used my phone to take images and record sounds (more pragmatically) at each of the other sites. Essentially I augmented my normal senses using tools and devices as part of my bricolage of methods.
At the park, I used a ‘gallery book’ to record public feedback. I also invited those involved in that case to an ‘artist talk’ where I facilitated a group discussion where the public and collaborators made sense of the project together.

As another part of my Park Case Study, I engaged in shared transpersonal experiences. I went on a psychic walk with a local resident and psychic medium, which involved investigating the unseen, other dimensional aspects of a particular location. I also engaged in a day long earth healing session, which again provided a different perspective on that particular site via a direct participative, deeply spiritual encounter.

As part of my work at all three sites I engaged in archival research and document analysis of key texts associated with the locations (e.g. old newspapers; diary entries of past residents; letters to civil authorities).

At each place I directly encountered the spirit of each location through ongoing conversations and meditative encounters. These encounters involved entering an altered state of awareness or at least quietly centring before either asking questions, or simply ‘being’ with particular entities, or the general spirit that was present. These were forms of direct knowing, and I place them in the second person section (rather than the first) because my encounters in these instances involved dialogue or at least interplay between myself and the place (and beings that resided there).

I see all of these second person perspective activities as falling within a **hermeneutic** approach. Hermeneutics is derived from the Greek word *hermeneuein* (meaning to interpret) and is associated with the trickster figure Hermes, the messenger and interpreter between the worlds of the gods and the worlds of humans (Lachman, 2011, p. 115). This approach is traditionally associated with the interpretation of texts, but has expanded to include situations (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009, p. 93). In this research I have applied
this interpretive approach to my work in places using a number of different methods to not only make sense of the locations themselves, but also make sense of how others experience these sites when utilising certain technologies (in their roles as place practitioners).

The hermeneutic circle is a core component of this methodology, and sets out a process where the meanings of parts be applied to a whole and vice versa (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009). In the case of places, this is particularly relevant for me, as places have many parts that make up their whole.

The hermeneutic approach could, of course, be abstractly applied to the action of interpreting trickster figures and their stories to a modern setting – an act of re-contextualisation and re-invention for a new generation.

**Third Person**

Within the third person perspectives I adopted an empirical research approach. By this I mean that I adopted an objective, positivist stance to record facts about the sites and gather quantifiable statistics.

I used a self-administered questionnaire to survey a number of place practitioners associated with each location and who were ‘fresh’ to the mobile technologies. At the park I surveyed the members of the public who attended the park exhibition.

I utilised demographical information sourced from government institutions to understand the locations, as well as research that others had published on these locations.

---

27 I used questionnaires that were similar in structure on each place to allow me to generally compare responses and notice emergent themes. The questionnaires are discussed in more detail within each of the case studies in Chapter 7.
I engaged in scientific processes which microscopically analysed soil and water samples from the site. I also sourced user analytics of those accessing the sites via their phones (with assistance from the software company that provided me with the technology).

**Reflexivity**

In order to engage across all of these perspectives I needed to constantly be aware of my own judgements and assumptions. For example, I found it difficult to balance my time between interviewing others and reflecting on my own process until I realised that I was unconsciously favouring ‘other’ viewpoints as I was worried my own views would not be seen as ‘valid’ comparatively.

It also took me a long time to acknowledge that photographic and sound gathering processes were a valid form of inquiry – rather than fun flourishes. It was only through engaging in constant reflection on my work, and the epistemologies and ontologies that informed it, that I could make sense of the emerging framework within which I was working.

**Visual Summary**

The research design is relatively complex – see Figures 4 and 5 for a visual summary.
Figure 4: Overview of Stages of Research and Data Collection Methods

Stage One
- conversations/semi-structured interviews
- private reflective blogging

Stage Two
First Person Perspective:
- autobiographical reflection
- private reflective blogging
- meditation
- dowsing
- brain wave scan

Second Person Perspective:
- reflective conversations/informal interviews
- oral history interviews
- encounters and conversations with the spirit of place
- photo documentation and sound sampling
- public feedback book within gallery exhibition
- psychic walk
- collaborative earth healings
- archival document analysis

Third Person Perspective:
- survey of place practitioners after demonstrations
- demographic information and secondary research
- scientific site analysis: microscopy, soil sampling
- user analytics

Figure 5: Research Framework
Data Analysis

Patton (2002) argues that while there is guidance for how to transform data into findings, there is no formula that exists – processes are ultimately unique to each researcher (p. 432). In my case, and in keeping with the integral approach, the data were systematically analysed using a range of intra-, inter- and transpersonal approaches. Of course the word analysis denotes a certain kind of analytical process. In my case the processes engaged different aspects of self not just the mind.

In the first instance it should be noted that analysis occurred as data was collected. During stage one, patterns emerged by the third or fourth conversation. During stage two, each new layer of information was synthesised and merged with others and insights began to occur during the process. There were no discrete stages of meaning making – each iterative stage of gathering and processing data allowed new meanings to emerge.

There were two kinds of data collected: data about the sites themselves and meta-data about the experience of those engaging with the sites as collaborators or experiencers of the technology. In the case of the first kind of data (about the sites) converting it into digital material to be used via phones was a data processing and meaning making system in of itself. This conversion process allowed the material to synthesise together to hermeneutically form a whole from the parts. In the Park Case Study, visual performance (VJ) software was employed to live-mix multiple kinds of material on the site itself. This formed new layers of meaning from information that had been collected. Somerville (2010) discusses how digital technologies can be used in between representations and artefacts of place, in so far as they “allow the assembling and re-assembling of different representations combining different modalities such as the text, visual images and sound” (p. 340). This expresses my
experience of working with the data that was sourced about all the case study locations.

In terms of the meta-data, which were focused on the overall process of working on the site and feedback from those who encountered the mobile experiences, this was also reflected on at multiple times (as mentioned earlier) and in multiple ways. At the completion of the bulk of the case study activities, I reread a number of trickster stories and looked back over the traits identified in the earlier part of this thesis. I also meditated on these as well as the research inquiry points. Within this emergent and intuitive process I began to notice general themes and patterns from within the data. I then put this material aside for several weeks.

Next, with relatively fresh eyes, I created spreadsheets of all types of participant feedback and engaged in a content analysis process, sorting for key words and reoccurring patterns of response. I enacted the same process within my blog, this time using the keyword tag system built into the blog itself to code key words within each entry. I then re-sorted the posts according to the tags that were used and analysed this subset of data.

Finally, the process of writing multiple drafts of this document (months after these initial processes took place) allowed for another layer of interpretation to occur. In fact, each new version allowed me to interpret the data in new ways. Feedback from others reading the case studies with fresh eyes was also useful in reinterpreting material. This process of making sense from different angles, in inductive and deductive ways, feels cohesive in the context of enacting an integral bricolage of methodologies.

Technology

The application I used was based on a ‘heads-down’ ‘geo-reality’ system created by Imersia Group. The ‘geo’ aspect relates to the Global Positioning System
GPS) technology which it incorporates, which allows users who have mobile devices to locate themselves in space anywhere on the planet using a complex set of satellites and receivers. The software allows users to ‘mark’ their location (via their mobile device) and thereby create ‘smart points’ which are essentially points in space that hold many different kinds of media (text, sound, moving image files, 3D objects and animations etc.).

Users insert the material they chose into the ‘smart point’ they have created (using a computing device connected to the internet and World Wide Web) so that it can then be accessed on a mobile device when moving around a location. The information is actually stored in a ‘cloud-based’ system, a network of servers located around the world and accessed via a ‘companion’, which is a unique cluster of identifiers linked to an individual user (Davies, 2013).

The material that has been loaded onto the smart point pops up visually, or plays automatically (or flashes a button asking if the user would like to play the material) when the user reaches each designated smart point and the internal GPS of their phone alerts them that they are at that particular location. The material that is viewed becomes part of the reality of the place in which they are encountering a layer of sound, text or moving image. Hence the second part of the name geo-reality.

Within the construction of software, the ‘smart points’ are grouped together in ‘smart layers’ which are layers of different kinds of information that can be associated with either a particular place or multiple places within a general project or theme. In my case, it was the latter; with each ‘layer’ being a different case study. Each ‘smart layer’ (refer to Figure 6) has multiple ‘smart points’ each holding multiple kinds of data (Davies, 2013). The data held will be described in more detail when discussing the individual cases.
Software

When I started my research in 2011 there were very few mobile applications that were accessible, ‘user ready’ and financially feasible at that time (I am reasonably tech savvy but not an expert in software development or programming). After scoping what was commercially available and accessible to me, what was within my skill range, and what had suitable Intellectual Property (IP) agreements, Imersia Group’s software was the most obvious choice.

Primary in my decision making process was the issue of Intellectual Property (IP). It was clear from my research that other products did not offer enough protection for participants and collaborators, and that I had no firm control over how the data would be used in the future once loaded onto their systems. Imersia Group had an IP policy that meant that all content remained the responsibility and the property of the user not the software owner. They also had strict privacy controls in place which meant that data was not automatically publically available. One of the directors of the company became an adjunct supervisor of my PhD and this also created some further privacy controls and protection for the information.
Other systems also required more skilled input and time to develop than I had available, given the complex degree of logistics involved in running three cases simultaneously. In the final year of this research project locative mobile and AR products began flooding the market. Many are suitable for someone with my skill level. However, many free applications do not provide the high degree of security that is needed to protect IP and often place inappropriate advertisements next to content. Control over where information is held, who has access to it, and who owns it are contentious aspects of this technology.

**Issues and Challenges**

There are two choices for how users may access this software – as a downloadable application onto their mobile device (an app), or through a web browser and link. I chose the latter version as there was limited time and funds to create a bespoke app for each site on which I was working. While the web-based system functions almost identically to an app version, the internal GPS system of the phone is not as easily accessible and therefore is much less accurate. It was essentially a ‘clunkier’ version of a product that would normally have a little more functionality and accuracy. Nonetheless, it was workable and provided a solid demonstration of what was needed, albeit with a few glitches and issues as a result of its ‘cut-down’ nature.

Because the software system I used was web-based (rather than a downloadable application) there was no issue with general compatibility with different ‘smart’ mobile devices (e.g. Android versus iOS). However, due to the need to access GPS technology, and play visual and audio material, the smart devices it ran on needed to be reasonably powerful smartphone models (e.g. iPhone 4 and upward) that recognised MP4 and MP3 file formats.
Phone Specifications

For my work I used a Samsung Note 1, Model Number GT-N7000 which has an Android operating system. This smartphone measures 146.9 x 83 x 9.7 mm (5.78 x 3.27 x 0.38 in), and weighs 178 g (6.28 oz.). The larger screen and powerful computing capacity worked well with the material that I was processing on-site. I chose an Android phone as a personal preference due to its relative screen size compared to similar Apple based devices available at the time.

Ethical Considerations

It is ironic to conduct research in the spirit of the trickster given that they indulge in rule-breaking and the most base and dirty of all activities. However, I have interpreted tricksters in a way that doesn’t sanitise them, but instead allows tricksters to work creatively within an academic context where unnatural sexual relationships, dismemberment and cannibalism tend to be discouraged.

I sought general approval for my work through a formal ethics process in the university. The emergent nature of my research structure meant that iterative applications and amendments needed to be submitted as issues arose and new types of participants were added to the framework. While the first formal approval for the research was provided by the AUT Ethics Committee on 12 July 2012 (Application Number 12/134), there were a number of later amendments to allow for surveying and videoing participants during the second stage of research.

Ethically there were a number of issues that needed to be addressed – working with indigenous peoples as a non-indigenous researcher; working within my own community; managing confidentiality in locations with high levels of interconnection; and protection of intellectual property.
Indigenous Research

I was mindful that my research involves Māori, Māori knowledge, and taonga [prized things] including stories and wāhi tapu sites and it was therefore important to me that my research was undertaken within guidelines set by Māori themselves. To this end, I worked within the guidelines recommended by the Māori Research Ethics document ‘Te Ara Tiki – The Right Path’ (The Pūtaiora Writing Group, 2010). It sets out a number of different levels of engagement and practice – from basic to best practice. I have aimed, in my work in place, towards the best practice. To this end I have been supervised in my research by mana whenua and kaumātua of the marae and local areas that I have been working in. I have taken part in hui [meetings] to consult regarding my work and ensured that material collected (where ethically possible) is gifted to local marae for educational purposes. I have also volunteered my time to ensure that research for this PhD has been turned into practical longer term initiatives, educative and political.

I also worked closely with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi as interpreted within AUT University’s ethics committee: partnership, protection and participation. Partnership, to ensure that there is reciprocity and mutual understanding; protection, for the taonga of the stories and gifts participants (and the places) shared with me; and participation to support a collaborative form of enquiry that supported mutual ownership of the research and the practices engaged with at the locations.

Insider/Outsider

As a practitioner with a history of standing on the boundaries of inside and outside groups it was not unusual to find myself in the same position again – this time as a polytropic participant-observer working within sub-groups of my own community. Hume and Mulcock (2004) have commented on the tensions that occur from being both inside and outside of social interactions – of
belonging and not belonging, engaging as a participant and an observer and blurring the distinction between subject and object (p. xix).

Hume and Mulcock (2004) see awkwardness, self-criticism and feelings of inadequacy as natural in this arena, noting that fostering a strong reflexive process is a productive way of dealing with these uncomfortable feelings (p. xxiii). In my case there were instances in which I felt inadequate and wrong in the environments but it was my reflective blogging practice and constant vigilance to remain meta-reflective at all times that assisted me in the most awkward moments. It should also be noted that working in my own town afforded me rich opportunities for growth in knowledge and strengthened my ties and attachment to my place.

Confidentiality

Due to the interconnected nature of the places used in the case studies only partial confidentiality was offered to participants, with efforts made to disguise identities where requested. Only those who agreed to these terms were interviewed, but none declined. See Appendix 2 for the variety of information sheets and consent forms that were used.

There was an option on the consent form for participants to waive confidentiality completely. In these cases the names of the participants have been included in this document. Certain participants chose this option as they wanted to stand behind their contribution. This was particularly the case with collaborators in Stage Two of the research process. The names of the places have been revealed in the spirit of allowing the place itself to be visible and have its own voice. It would have been incredibly difficult to present the rich amount of information in a context of anonymity.
Intellectual Property

It was important to me, given that the material collected for the digitally based experiences included indigenous oral history, that there was protection for this taonga. As has been noted, I sourced a software company that had strong intellectual property ethics and ensured that various written agreements were in place to provide maximum protection. Ideally, if infrastructure and resources had allowed, I would have placed information on a local server at each site to further contextualise and protect precious information.

There is recognition within the mobile film-making and story-telling community that mobile learning has its own set of ethical issues – among them the inadvertent exposure of participants to inappropriate material via the internet, and problematic issues related to content ownership (Traxler & Bridges, 2005). In any research situation, whether using emerging technologies or not, risk-assessment needs to take place to ensure that many of these issues identified and mitigated.

A Framework for Practice

This chapter sets out a framework informed by emerging methodologies, philosophies and technologies and informed by tricksters. While giving the impression of planned execution it was emergent and organic in nature. It represents a practice that evolved through trial and error, bricolage and deep engagement with sites.

The design is cross-disciplinary, operating in a third space between different ways of knowing and being in place. It embraces that which is uncanny and transpersonal in nature. In this way it embraces a number of emergent philosophies and ideas noted in the previous chapter. In the next chapter this unique methodology is explored in more detail as it is enacted in practice with place practitioners and in three case study locations.
Chapter 7 - Conversations and Cases

My research consisted of two stages: an initial set of conversational interviews with place practitioners, and the three interrelated, concurrently enacted cases of practice. Each stage and each case is described in this chapter in depth with general results summarised at the end. In Chapter 8, I synthesise these results with theories and trickster frameworks presented earlier in the document. For now I have chosen to use a narrative style to immerse the reader in the practices, the views of the practitioners, and the places as much as possible.

Part I: Contextual Conversations

As mentioned in the last chapter, I conducted semi-structured, explorative ‘conversations’ with 15 individuals who were identified as having a place-focused role or occupation. The purpose of these conversations was to identify whether these individuals identified with the notion of place practice and to understand if, and how, they viewed the spirit of place. I was also interested in finding out whether they used any form of mobile technology in their current work and whether they saw potential for use of geo-locative and augmented reality apps in the future.

Key Themes

Place Practitioner Identification

I began by inquiring into each participant’s background and the nature of their current work. Participants were asked whether they identified with the term ‘place practitioner’. While many said they didn’t know, a reasonable number, 9, did identify with this term but for differing reasons.

One participant, while not using the term herself, could identify with it in terms of her current work in a cultural institution:
I have heard of it before, I haven’t really used it myself I suppose. But then again . . . when we revamped the museum it was all about the place and people identifying with the place. (Original Participant 4)

Another participant (the kaumatua of a rural marae), seemed to instantly relate the label to his own work [item in brackets is my own]:

Oh yes. I couldn’t do it in any other region of the country. I can only do it here, in my place of birth and growing up – a linergy [lineage] sort of thing. I couldn’t do it over the other side of the harbour bridge unless I changed my identity. (Original Participant 5)

It is interesting that in this quote that he has expressed that his work, his place and his identity are inextricably linked. This reflects my own view that place practice is a continuum ranging from short term and/or superficial engagements through to lifelong missions that involve deep identification.

Original Participant 14, a kuia kaumatua at the same marae, also related strongly to this term. In the following quote she provides evidence for why she relates to that term in her own role at that location, which is a role of boundary keeper and guardian of culture and history:

Yeah, Yep. I take care of all the tikanga [customs and practices] that happens on this marae. When we have things like when visitors come to this marae the first faces they are going to see anyway are [Original Participant 5] and myself. And I guess we lay down the foundation of what is right and what is wrong on the marae.

A similar strong sense of affirmation for this term came from a primary school principal (Original Participant 11):

Well, I don’t see it any other way, because of where I am and what we are doing here. It has to be that if my understanding of
the terminology is correct and you are so focused on where you
are at. Absolutely and categorically, without any option really. It
is what I am doing. It is all work based in a community – in a
school in a community.

One participant did not relate to the term at all and pointed out that academia
was quite divorced from her own experience.

The responses clearly showed that most participants both understood, and in
some cases identified with the term ‘place practitioner’. Of course, I am placing
my own label on their work, but the responses to this question show that they
are not completely averse (except in the case of one individual) to being
addressed in this way.

**Spirit of Place**

Next, I asked the participants about the spirit of place, questioning whether
they thought there was such a thing as a spirit of place and if so, what the term
meant to them. I was interested in how people viewed the places in which they
worked. Most participants responded affirmatively to this question whether
they were Māori or Pākehā. Many of the responses were so eloquent and
informative that I have kept them in their extended form. This is the case with
this first response from a Māori participant talking about their work leading a
local marae:

I think there is spirit everywhere. I don’t call it a spirit of place, I
call it wāhi tapu or a wairua connection This wairua is depicted
in my relationship with Papatūānuku – Earth Mother and the
wharenui – meeting house and the many whakairo or as I refer
to them my ancestors. These carvings are very much alive to
me. They have a spirit, we talk to them and they talk back to us.
To the average person that might be a carving or a piece of
wood chipped out but to me they have a spirit, they have a
connection to my whakapapa/my genealogy and they are very
much alive! So I probably don’t call it that sense of place but it is
significant because it connects me back to my whenua, back to my ancestors, back to Papatūānuku and Ranginui. We do that through symbolism, through our carvings, our tukutuku panels – so the spirit is very much alive. As the CEO I always refer to these whakairo – carvings as my FTE’s\textsuperscript{28} staff members, always here to welcome and greet visitors and people to this marae. It’s funny, you see people come here and they will stop about halfway up the pathway even if there is no one calling them on, as if someone was. They know the protocol they acknowledge the \textit{tūpuna} [ancestors], of this place – the ancestors that are still here, very much with us. So there is a spiritual connection, we call it ‘te taha wairua’. We acknowledge our tūpuna not only in hard times, but often in good times as well. We defer to our ancestors to guide us in our thinking. Some people call it prayer, some people call it karakia. In terms of our people trying to manage pain, manage hurt, or manage even a joyful situation we will acknowledge and appreciate our ancestors for allowing us to be here and to help guide us through. So very spiritual in terms of this place, and the significance of it. Some people might look at it as a swamp as it was 60 years ago, and it was. It absolutely was. But we bring our ancestors with us. But it is not just this place – wherever I go in the car my ancestors are with me. Quite often we have tohunga that can see – be looking at you right now and see your genealogy right back – they have the ability to connect. I am not a disbeliever, I say why not? If that is how they think. I believe in the spiritual world. It helps me.” (Original Participant 2)

Three other participants had similar viewpoints, all were Māori:

It is something that you are mindful of . . . (Original Participant 3)

We have been brought up to have that regard in mind all the time, everything we are part of has its own wairua, has its own

\textsuperscript{28} Full Time Equivalent
mauri recognition to a living thing. Everything we have been taught is that every living thing has its own wairua, has its own spirit. We always have had it in our mind that the land, the water, the air is in the same regard. It has feelings, has a wairua, and I guess I have to pass that thinking onto the next generation. (Original Participant 5)

I absolutely believe that it is something that through our cultural ways of doing things and the rules that govern the way we operate, that that is something that is very much a part of who we are and where we are. For us we call it wairua, hinengaro – we have our terms, it is our connection to the land, it is not only that but our connection to our ancestors. It is our connection to the links that bring us together and all those dimensions that make us who we are. Māori are very spiritual and I am no different. I have been surrounded by it all my life, it is part of who I am. (Original Participant 11)

Another participant (Original Participant 4), originally from the UK, commented on the relationship between the spirit of place here, and her own place of origin and commented on how her own work contributes to that:

Absolutely, absolutely. There is something about it, and I suppose that coming from another country and another place I certainly feel that, you know, there is a pull there, there is an essence. And to me that is what I identify with over there, and I also identify with here, as well. But I certainly think there is something around the place and I think it is the history and the people and the culture, I mean certainly we have got a very strong, well I always think there is a strong link to Māori history. And I do think we do try and foster some of that at the museum in some of the research that is being done so yeah.

It seemed from my discussions, that for many of these practitioners the idea of a ‘spirit of place’ existing independently was credible and within their way of knowing a location. Of course, they did not use the words ‘spirit of place’. They
had their own terminology for this phenomenon. It was the wairua of a location, which also included the kaitiaki or guardian spirits.

Potential Opportunities
No participants used mobile technology in their work, except to make phone calls and plan their day. When asked to speculate on whether this kind of technology could be useful in the future most answered affirmatively.

A leader at a local marae (Original Participant 2) spoke of the use of technology being something that was “inevitable” and went on to say the idea of using this kind of mobile technology on the marae was “absolutely fantastic”. He explained that he saw it as:

a way of the future. So I think it is inevitable, it is about how we feel in control, so my philosophies around tino rangatiratanga – absolute sovereignty – around self-determination are quite key in this. We should try and control that pace and the pitch, and be aware of what is coming – as opposed to being ignorant of it. So I think it is evolving as we speak and just the fact you are recording this now is evolution. And it is about being in control. So I don’t discount the fact that it is happening, I’m not afraid of it, but like any change it would be nice to be a part of it as opposed to being controlled by it.

Later in that same interview he spoke a little more about this issue of power and control within a shifting and changing environment and emphasised that it was the intent behind it that was critical:

I think if the intent is right, it’s fine – it’s how you control that so people can’t then download it and see it or abuse it and that’s the bit that I am not sure how we maintain the control. But however the positive side of that is when you are new to this marae and you don’t know what the protocol is, wouldn’t it be great that you would have some kind of IT information at the entrance of the marae. So when one arrives to the marae you
can instantly access information on the kawa – protocols of the marae, its history, the do’s and don’ts etc. This must only add to people’s knowledge and when you are knowledgeable about something you are more informed, and more capable. I think it is hugely advantageous. We have run into trouble when it has been bastardised, or ripped off or abused. But that is the bit about being in control of this technological advancement – to the best of our ability. But I think our tikanga is evolving, our protocols, the sacredness around some of that, as long as the intent has sound rationale and is of good intent, we should embrace the change. . . . There might be a stage where we have a hologram, into the future, of someone doing a mihi, you know uncle [name omitted] in 50 or 100 years’ time, he could be up there telling the history of the place. I think that is great. You know we have those visions through technology now of people telling these stories and I think that it’s awesome. You know, as long as the intent is right and it is not there to be negative or damaging. And whether that is then sponsored by McDonalds or sponsored by somebody else is probably the wider threat and if we can limit that kind of stuff maybe this will be great. I don’t know.

Some participants were very excited and positive in their response to the idea of using these kinds of tools. For example (Original Participant 3):

I think it is really exciting. I think the possibilities are infinite but really exciting. I see it as a means of really bringing history alive for kids – really bringing that alive. We know that we can look at historical landmarks and that they tell a story, archaeology tells a story. What you are talking about brings another immediate almost dimension to kids learning and I think that is really exciting and has the potential to further enhance learning for our kids.

While other participants had a more mixed response:
Even now the Waikato tribe have audio stuff that they are collating in regards to all the marae. To know what the buildings look like, etc. There has still been hesitance in passing over that historic stuff. Because what has been drummed into their heads that this is for you to pass on through word of mouth. Here we are luckier, we are a little more open – even though we disagree – we allow our young to participate in conversation. They are not afraid to ask those kinds of questions. (Original Participant 14)

A respected leader (Original Participant 16) was quite clear in her response to my question “Do you think mobile phones should be used on the marae?”

No I don’t agree with it. You must be going there for a purpose. That’s my opinion. Full stop. Full stop.

In the case of the participant who was a ‘channel’ (in addition to her energy work in place) the entity she was channelling was very positive:

Oh yes definitely, definitely. It is a tool that can be used for great good, for great good . . . technology is a transition . . . it will aid the development of the human spirit. Without it the humans cannot make the changes that are necessary. It is critical in order to be able to understand the changes that need to be made but it is only a transition until the humans themselves become the technology. (Original Participant 6b)

But the participant (Original Participant 6) said she was not keen:

No, no. The only things that we use as part of our practice are the technologies of the planet, stones for example – the natural things but not technologies, no.

Potential Issues

Further along the interview I asked participants to speculate on whether there were any potential issues that they saw with using this kind of technology as part of their work. The responses varied.
Some said no, as long as the right consultation had taken place:

I don’t think so. Provided things are done in a respectful manner. Provided that the necessary permissions are sought and that you have the blessings of mana whenua and that they are informed – the necessary consultations happen – prior then I don’t potentially see any issues with it. (Original Participant 3)

A respected expert in protocol did not see issues except for the de-emphasis on face-to-face contact and the inorganic nature of the device (Original Participant 5):

I think it is good. I mean, we as people always try and adapt to something to make the work flow and make it easier for us in the past. So we don’t know what is going to be the future and this technology is going to help us be able to share the knowledge out to our people – that sounds good. The only negative part of it is, I guess, is that the *kanohi* thing [a face-to-face *korero* i.e. talk] it is a machine sort of thing and you haven’t got that living aspect of what the information is going to allow you to hear I suppose. Well if that’s a negative, that’s the only part I can see.

Original Participant 7 had a number of responses to potential issues. She spoke of a fear that attention spans are shortening thanks to technology and this kind of technology perhaps contributed to this:

There are these kids going around this archaeological site with a backpack on with speakers on the back of it – they are given two mobile phones and they wander around picking up clues and that enables them to reconstruct what this place looks like. And this article was about this was about the way kids learn. And I thought this was really sad actually because I thought there was demonstrated evidence now to show that our attention spans are reducing because of the use of web and
computers and everything else so all you are doing is accelerating.

She also spoke of the potential divide in accessibility:

The downsides I see to things like that are that they are age discriminating, that old people don’t have smart phones, or for people like myself whose eyesight is deteriorating and for whom it is really difficult to see the digital screens outside in the daylight.

I was interested in the impact of accessing multiple viewpoints on a location, and accessing information that was traditionally held in a number of institutions, cultural frameworks, physical locations and material formats. I specifically quizzed participants for their thoughts on this potential issue.

One participant likened this situation to that of current claims within the Waitangi Tribunal, and noted that control of the information was a key issue:

I am ok with it. That’s happening right now. A whole lot of the Treaty claims are based on that theory at the moment. There are different versions of the truth and it is about evidencing those stories or written documents that bequeath such and such to this and all of that. So it is the evolution of collecting all of that data. I think it is a jigsaw puzzle at the moment, and we just need to piece all of those pieces together. Yes, I’m open to it, I’m absolutely comfortable with that being part of the melting pot. We should celebrate difference and embrace it. Nobody is forcing you to speak te reo Māori or for me to speak your language, the point being that we should embrace the difference. I think it can only add value. But again, it’s got to be in controlled – you control the mauri, you control the pace, and the pitch and what you want to believe in. But that is how history is developed aye, that is how history is made. (Original Participant 2)
On the other hand, Original Participant 11 talked about the lack of control in this kind of multiplicitous situation:

Well the availability of information and what people do with it you do not have any control over. You know it is like the media you can either believe or not believe what you read. What can you do about that? What can you do about people’s personal interpretation of it all? Maybe you can talk to them, maybe teach, put another point of view – if it is required. But other than that really what power do you have, and should you have any anyway? It is more about developing the ability for participants to be critically analytical.

While one participant (Original Participant 15) talked about no opinion being better than another:

naturally you will get two different opinions anyway. And that’s ok. But one opinion is not better than other. You have to allow that opinion to happen – they are never going to be the same. And that is important. That is important. For people to know the Māori point of view and people to know the European point of view because history gets mixed up.

This theme of multiple viewpoints was echoed by Original Participant 7, a manager within a technology company:

The idea of concurrent histories that are all different yet valid is pretty exciting – kind of mind boggling. It is something what we intuitively know. And I can think back to a family Christmas and everyone would have a different view of what went on that day and yet we all have a shared concept of what went on. Isn’t that a lot of human experience? It’s not simple. There wasn’t one thing that happened. There were multiple things that happened from multiple points of view and we all viewed them slightly differently because of our psychological state, and our context and what we bring to it and what we want to take away from it
so for history to be as simple as one narrative maybe that is fallacy in of itself.

Another participant (Original Participant 3), a Māori education specialist, emphasised the importance of a Māori point of view when teaching material with Māori content:

First and foremost I would be prioritising mana whenua histories – from a tikanga perspective, they are the ones from the rohe [area], they know their histories – it is for them to talk their histories. Full stop. It is not for me, if I am non-mana whenua, to come up with my stories and give them priority. It doesn’t work like that – mā ratou te kōrero – “It is for them to talk”. Throughout the history of education in this country Māori knowledge has tended to be subjugated by western knowledge. There is a huge ignorance of Māori history which still prevails to a great degree in education.

. . . As Māori we have been subjected to Pākehā versions of our history that have been told from a Euro centric value system and negates our own cultural values. A child is a living representative of their tūpuna down through the generations tama-a-ariki – children of God – so they come with that whakapapa and so to deny that and subjugate that identity with a foreign value system amounts to cultural genocide evidenced in the fact that many of our children do not know their iwi let alone history.

Technology and the Spirit of Place

I moved from general issues, to specifically asking if participants thought that the technology could have any sort of effect on the spirit of place. Participants responded in a number of interesting ways.

The leader of the marae (Original Participant 2) talked about the intent again, something that was a clear theme in our conversation as can be seen from his earlier responses:
It probably does actually, it probably will affect the wairua of it and people might think that it is kind of a little bit more plastic – I suppose. Things are just evolving. As kaitiaki of the marae we simply have to ensure that the intent is right and everything we do is embedded in tikanga – doing the right thing. Change is inevitable but sometimes it’s about the pace of change so that everyone is also comfortable. But what we shouldn’t fear is that change will happen – technology included – so absolutely it may impact on the wairua but I think if the intent is right first and we can kind of manage that and be in control of that – technology is not a thing to be frightened of. Let’s embrace it, determine what we think is good, and helpful and with the right intent.

This theme of ‘intent’ emerged in the latter part of this comment by Original Participant 3 (the Māori educationalist):

It is a difficult one. First and foremost I think that increasing the accessibility of people to hear stories, kōrero of kuia kaumātua, ngā tūpuna, is a good thing. It is all about knowledge and sharing knowledge and if we are going to continue to bridge cultural differences, and have a greater understanding of each other, then anything that helps to do that is a good thing. In addition, there is so much wisdom and knowledge inherent in those kōrero it is wonderful to be able to share. I think that this is depended precisely on the type of activity. And as I said early, and if due respects are paid first and foremost and any potential concerns that you have are raised with mana whenua then I think that kind of smooths the way.

This point of view was echoed by Original Participant 11:

I think the mere presence of somebody in a particular place absolutely has an effect, what that would be I do not know. For example if you go into a very sacred place, and were not respectful, of course it is going to affect. But if everything is done from a respect point of view I don’t think – and it is about
if you never intend to harm, if your intentions are always good I believe that protects everything and everyone, including spirit.

The channelled entity of the earth energy worker had a number of points related to technology and spirituality. They saw there being a number of layers to reality and layers to ‘being’. For them, the augmenting reality technology was only a ‘transition’:

**Reflections on Stage One**

In these first interviews several key themes emerged. First of all while the term ‘place practitioner’ may not have been a term the participants had heard of before, they did understand (and in many cases related to) its meaning. This is interesting as it indicates that they place themselves in a wider field of work and see the deeper connection between their work and the places that they interact with as part of their various roles. It also illustrates that the term ‘practitioner’ and the notions of practice are not completely foreign ideas.

Secondly, most participants understood there to be a spirit of place, in the traditional sense of the words which imply an actual spirit rather than simply a felt internal sense. Of course, this is a group of people that have been selected by myself or through networking around sites – it is not a random sample of the general population. However, the results show that those working in and around places (particularly Māori participants) do have a perspective that it is not often represented by mainstream research and academia.

Third, most participants were not utilising any mobile technologies on a day-to-day basis but could see potential for their use in supporting their work if appropriate. This openness was surprising, and indicates the potential for these kinds of tools to be introduced into a variety of place based work. And finally, participants could not necessarily see any impacts on the spirit of place - the technology was not seen as inherently bad or inappropriate – it was how it was
used. These points will be returned to in the last part of this chapter and in Chapter 8.

Given that there was little actual experience of using these kinds of mobile technologies, I became interested in creating mobile experiences. I was also interested in working on certain sites and engaging in actual practice in place. This led to stage two of the research process.
Part II: Case Studies of Practice

This stage involved three different ‘cases’ of practice on three sites which can best be described as having strong spiritual associations: a suburban cemetery, a marae and a historically significant public park that was a wāhi tapu site for local iwi. My work at each of these places was to collaboratively create a mobile based user experience which supported the spirit of that place, and the work of those associated with it. I used my trickster research design and traits as the guiding framework for these activities.

These cases contributed to my inquiry as to whether technologies like geolocative, augmenting reality, mobile technologies can be used within the adopted approach to support the spirit or spirits of place of particular locations. They helped me to directly experience the opportunities and issues that this may generate and allowed practitioners to experience firsthand how these technologies could support their work.

The following narrative accounts include extracts from my blogging practice as well as material from different types of participant. Each case outlines how the experiences were created as well as setting out results of interviews post-experience.

The Cemetery

  We are taking the history to you – you don’t always have to come to us.

  Dr Michelle Smith, Curator, Papakura Museum

Overview

This case study turned a group cemetery tour into a mobile phone-based individual experience. By partnering with the original tour creator, a historian (now curator) at a local museum, an oral storytelling tour and paper brochure was converted to a GPS based system viewed via a mobile phone. Could the
geo-locative mobile technology and the way it was used support the spirit of that very spiritual site?

While much of the work was undertaken by me (inputting data; editing sound etc.), the historian, Dr Michelle Smith, partnered in key decision making, sourced new content, gathered permissions, and re-recorded her stories for the mobile version (with my technical assistance). Once the ‘experience’ had been created, individuals associated with the site and/or the museum, were selected to try out the experience and provide feedback. Dr Smith and I then debriefed the whole experience together in order to generate learning for the future.

**About the Cemetery**

The origins of Papakura Old Cemetery are relatively unknown. It is thought that the original land was gifted to settlers by local Māori and it was then used as an informal burial site from approximately 1863 (although it was officially designated as a cemetery in 1887) (M. Smith, 2013). Unusually, it was not situated next to a church as most other cemeteries were at the time.

Multiple denominations are represented, with Methodists, Presbyterians, Anglicans and Roman Catholics each having their own section (M. Smith, 2013). It is no longer active as a burial site as it reached capacity in the early 1990s but the historic gravestones remain as markers for the many generations buried there.

**Background and Details**

**Initial Meetings**

I met Dr Smith (historian/researcher) at Papakura Museum and learned that she was researching the Papakura Cemetery. Her vision was to create a brochure-based tour for those wishing to engage in self-guided explorations of the site. She was also interested in carrying out group tours of the location.
I proposed that I assist Dr Smith to turn her brochure and face-to-face tours into a mobile-device based experience. She would gain exposure to a leading edge technology, and hopefully learn some skills from the experience, and I could implement my research theories into practice. She agreed. As I noted in my blog: “She has had a very positive response and looks forward to experimenting with the AR stuff” (Entangled Worlds Blog: 23/01/13).

As I walked home after meeting her I had a feeling to visit the cemetery and ask permission from the residents and the site itself. I wrote later: “As soon as I asked if it was ok to do it [I heard in my head] lots of different types of voices saying: "teach the children", "help the dead talk". It was quite eerie” (Entangled Worlds Blog: 23/01/2013). After this encounter, supernatural or otherwise, I felt happy to go ahead with the project.

**Gathering Material**

By early March 2013 the Papakura Museum Management Committee had given permission for the project to go ahead in principle. Two weeks later I attended a cemetery tour with Dr Smith and provided her with a digital recording device so we could record her conducting the tour. This could then be given to the museum for posterity and used to provide the audio material for the mobile experience.

The tour was approximately 1.5 hours long and was informative and engaging. Dr Smith had chosen an interesting, diverse cross-section of residents who included founding families, unsung heroes (particularly women), and colourful and/or tragic characters. I noticed that through telling each of their stories, Papakura was contextualised within a larger story. Civil and world wars, tragedies and accidents, epidemics, national disasters – all were personalised through their connection to an individual interred in the cemetery and were anchored by the artefact of the headstone.
I observed that Dr Smith demonstrated a great deal of integrity in the creation and delivery of the tour. At the start of the tour she provided us with a metacommentary about her choices and decisions which were focused on ensuring the appropriateness of material. She had not, for example, selected stories that could cause embarrassment to living relatives in the town – focusing only on those who had passed away before 1950. In her delivery, she maintained an upbeat, engaging demeanour without sensationalising or joking inappropriately about the content.

Dr Smith also shared anecdotes from her research process which supplemented the material in the booklet provided at the beginning of the tour. This brought the booklet to life, allowing her research story, combined with her obvious enthusiasm for the material, to make the location appear more interesting and vibrant than may otherwise have been the case. I noted in the blog entry that I wanted to “convince Michelle to do the talking for it [the mobile experience] so it can really come alive and her version [of the tour] can be kept for posterity” (Entangled Worlds Blog: 19/03/13).

During the tour I marked the GPS point for each grave site we visited. I also took photos of headstones to use as visual markers. While I attended to this process, I was also attempting to take notes of Dr Smith’s dialogue in order to discern which cemetery residents would make the most interesting examples (Dr Smith and I had decided together in one of our earlier meetings that attempting to completely replicate the booklet was going to take too much time – and that a selection of key residents would be more appropriate for a ‘demonstration version’).

I noticed that during the tour I felt very awkward taking out my phone. Dr Smith had told participants that I would be doing this, but I was cautious of disrespecting either her or the spirit (and spirits) of that place. As the tour went along I ended up tagging behind the group as they were leaving from one spot
to another and doing all of my work out of clear sight – this meant that I often missed the first few minutes of a story but I felt more comfortable with the process. I reflected on this, and wondered if it was the place itself that generated this response (and notions of sanctity), or it was the risk of offending other people. I decided that in my case it was the latter.

A week or so after the tour was completed I started to gather written text from Dr Smith. I set up a document that allowed us to track whether a particular point had textual, visual, video and/or auditory commentary and to note whether permissions had been given for using the material. Dr Smith had initially only obtained permission to use the material in a brochure format, not online, so separate permissions had to be sought from private and public archives around New Zealand.

Key decisions were made at this time regarding what and how much external media we were using. For example, I had found some engaging educational video footage on YouTube related to the Waikato Wars29 and wanted to geolocate this footage on one of the ‘Unknown Soldier’ graves at the cemetery. The video was edited and narrated from a Māori viewpoint and was highly critical of European actions in the conflict. For this reason I was cautious of locating it near the grave of European individuals (lest this cause offence to their spirit, or those who visited them). I checked with Dr Smith about this and she felt that it was a very interesting video that they would probably be used in an upcoming exhibition on the Waikato Wars. She also suggested ‘placing’ the clip over the grave of a European captain who had died in very contentious circumstances and about whom a number of conflicting and contested stories had been written. In this way, this contentious video would add to the multiplicity of controversial viewpoints on the circumstances of his death.

---

29 Part of a series of wars and skirmishes in New Zealand between Māori and Pākehā
At this time, I began to edit the recording of the ‘live’ tour that I had captured a few weeks earlier. I had no previous experience of using sound editing software and endeavoured to teach myself an open source software package called Audacity (Audacity, n.d.). Personally, editing the sound was in keeping with my philosophy to fully engage with the location on all levels and to see my practice on each site as a point of personal development (among many other things). However, because I knew nothing about producing quality soundtracks for mobile apps, the process was a source of slow and frustrated learning.

First of all, I discovered that editing 1.5 hours of ‘live’ commentary was extremely difficult for a beginner. It would have been helpful if I had asked Dr Smith to stop and start the recording each time she moved to a new gravestone as anecdotes from other stories, conversations with tour participants and random noise (e.g. wind and trucks) made it challenging to segment easily. I had made a novice mistake that was embarrassing in retrospect.

Next, I realised that while recording her ‘live’ tour was great for authenticity, vibrancy and informality, it was terrible for sound quality. Dr Smith had conducted the tour ‘off the cuff’, touching on her notes only very briefly. This made it very engaging, but also meant that ‘ums’, ‘ahs’ and hesitations were scattered throughout each gravestone story. Trying to edit these out proved impossible for me and made the track sound highly unnatural to my ears. I felt that I could not use the tour material as the audio soundtrack as Dr Smith and I had first intended. Divorced from the person and context of that particular tour, the material was unclear and sounded ‘unprofessional’ in technical quality.

Dr Smith didn’t seem to mind either the unedited version or my ham-fisted edited version when I played them to her. She said that the edited version sounded fine to her. I explained that in order to get that one story (of two minutes) I had spent almost two days of editing. My skills were not up to the job. I proposed that one solution was to record her in her office at the museum.
(to minimise background noise), and then to add in some sounds from the environment as a separate layer. Dr Smith felt very strongly that we needed to re-record the material at the site itself, while she made an effort to minimise ‘ums’ etc. This would allow us to do several takes of each story so that it could be as professional, but also as authentic, as possible. As I noted in my blog:

Michelle felt strongly that she didn’t want some sort of 'produced' fake version which mixed her voice in room with sound taken from the site. It was a really nice moment of thinking through what real place based practice is about – i.e. authenticity and integrity rather than a sort of ‘entertainment’ over produced version. Also the importance of Michelle connecting with the site in person to really do justice to the people and histories present there. (Entangled Worlds Blog, 19/04/13)

After this decision, Dr Smith and I met a couple of times to record material at the cemetery. By taking each person and their story in turn, I was able to make the task of editing more manageable. While there were still hesitations and ‘mis-takes’, they were much reduced from the ‘live’ tour version, and therefore more able to be managed in the editing process. However, what was lost in the re-record process was the vibrant and engaged informal tone in Dr Smith’s voice – as she was now mainly reading the material, and focused on me (and the recorder) only, rather than a larger group.30

Another important issue related to the lack of Māori content. Dr Smith had spoken several times of her struggle, and strong wish, to find good Māori content and Māori collaborators. While her exhibitions have generally attempted to tell a balanced and highly informed story, sometimes through lack

30 The decision to locate the story at the site when recording, and to refer mainly to written notes rather than speak it off the cuff, proved to be a key learning point when Dr Smith and I debriefed the completed experience later.
of good operational level contacts in the community, she was concerned there was not enough input from a purely Māori perspective. This was the case with the cemetery project where, although there were a few Māori graves in the cemetery, there were no stories on record about the individuals interred, only their European contemporaries. Dr Smith did her best to find written material but to no avail in the case of Māori individuals, and so their stories were not told as part of the cemetery tour or brochure walk, and subsequently the mobile experience.

**Testing and Technical Issues**

By early June the collection of material was completed and main testing had begun in earnest. There were a lot of technical challenges. First, because the cemetery is very large (approx. 7 acres), and the gravestones all look remarkably similar, cemetery explorers need a great deal of help orientating themselves to the location and finding individual graves. In the museum’s physical brochure, a complex system of numbers and codes is provided to help readers find graves. However it is not easily understood. Of course, during Dr Smith’s tour she physically guides individuals around the cemetery herself. The mobile experience was intended to take the best of these tours and use the internal GPS of the phone to guide users around a very complex array of gravestones, markers and unmarked locations. This, however, was not the case in practice.

Because (as mentioned earlier in this chapter) the decision was made to use a web-based system and not an internal application downloaded into the phone, the internal compass of the phone was not accessible. This meant that users could not orientate themselves (north, south etc.) and had to rely solely on GPS technology which orientated by putting them in proximity to objects. Unfortunately, the GPS varied in accuracy for a number of reasons (including poor phone specification) so one could be within 4 metres of accuracy one minute and 1500 metres another. Also, a recurring glitch meant that material on
the screen was not refreshing as dynamically as it should. This meant individuals could walk a number of steps and still see information on graves that were now further away from them. Obviously this was a major issue, given that the point of the system was to locate a person in place and provide information pertinent to that specific location.

Also, at the beginning of the project I had hoped that Dr Smith’s audio would play automatically as the participants arrived at each grave. However, during testing it became clear that the inaccurate GPS, and poor dynamism, meant automatic audio was not possible because stories were popping up and playing on unrelated grave sites. A ‘Listen’ feature was installed by the developers so that users could click when they came to a site. At the same time it was discovered that audio files were not playing on the web-based version as they should, even when the ‘Listen’ button was pushed. This meant a separate play button had to be manually pushed on a separate page which popped up. This was very clunky and often, due to phone specifications, took extended amounts of time to work.

As a result of these technical issues I checked with Dr Smith about the possibility of the cemetery tour including some game-like features to make the challenge of finding particular gravestones a feature rather than a detracting element of the experience. I didn’t feel this was appropriate (it just felt ‘wrong’ in that environment) but I wanted to see what Dr Smith said. Surprisingly she said that she would consider it in the future, particularly if it were aimed at school children. However, for this process she believed it wasn’t appropriate for the intended (adult) audience and also not in line with the other elements she had created (brochure and tour).
Final Stages

Once I had edited all of the material, I sat with Dr Smith and showed her the online system and went through many of the entries to see if she was happy with what had been done at that point. I also, at a later session, took her to the cemetery and showed her how the system worked. Dr Smith did not like hearing the sound of her own voice on the application – not due to quality, just because it sounded ‘odd’ for her to hear herself. Dr Smith did not particularly notice the technological issues regarding finding graves, but she also knew the cemetery more than any other person in the region.

At this time Dr Smith and I had a conversation discussing the ‘commemorative’ nature of this work. I wrote in my blog that Dr Smith saw her own research on place as:

> commemorative and acknowledging. Her goal is to move history out of the confines of the museum, into the public space of the community, using the graves as a way to share stories of Papakura’s past and to contextualise the town with local and global events of the time. She also sees the graveyard as a mechanism to allow the marginal to have a voice as it is often male founders who are most acknowledged. (Entangled Worlds Blog, 19/04/2013)

Overview of the Final Material

There were twenty graves featured in the final cemetery walk. The stories represented a variety of key events, individuals, and families from Papakura’s European past, for example founding families, casualties from the NZ Wars, victims of diseases and epidemics such as the Spanish Flu, a hero of the Tarawera eruption and one of the many tragic deaths associated with the 1953 Tangiwai disaster. The stories were all told via text, and, in most cases, audio. In some cases there were also supplementary website links and online video for background historical information (see screenshots in Figure 7).
Figure 7: Clockwise From Top Left: Map View of Cemetery Markers; Example Grave Point; Example of Grave Point Showing Hyperlink; List View of Points with Extracts of Brochure Material Courtesy of M. Smith (2013)
Reflections, Comments and Feedback

Participant Feedback

Dr Smith and I worked together to purposefully identify the participants for the demonstrations. I wanted her to be a part of the decision making process as she knew the community surrounding the museum better than myself and could provide introductions to our work. It also felt appropriate given that we had partnered together on the project. She picked a number of names, introduced me in a mass email to them, and then stepped out of the process. I then followed up and sent further details to those who were interested. This process ensured that Dr Smith did not know the final list of participants. As mentioned earlier, only partial confidentiality was offered due to these interconnections and intimate relationships.

First and foremost we wanted people associated with the museum, so they could experience this kind of technology and see whether it was something they wanted to incorporate into their future communication and learning strategies. We were also happy to have any kind of ‘place practitioners’ so that I could learn how they experienced this technology in practice on-site. In the end, we had seven participants try out the mobile version (four sourced directly via the Papakura Museum, two from a large cultural institution and one a place practitioner from the local area). Table 2 below shows the participants who were selected to engage in the experience.
Table 2: Participant List Cemetery Case Study Demonstrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Ethnicity/Gender</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Participant 1</td>
<td>Community Constable</td>
<td>Pākehā, Male</td>
<td>36-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Participant 2</td>
<td>Local Historical Society Member</td>
<td>Pākehā, Male</td>
<td>66-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Participant 3</td>
<td>Local Historical Society Member</td>
<td>Pākehā, Male</td>
<td>66-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Participant 4</td>
<td>Local Historical Society Member</td>
<td>Pākehā, Female</td>
<td>66-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Participant 5</td>
<td>Local Historian/Local Museum Employee</td>
<td>Pākehā, Female</td>
<td>46-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Participant 6</td>
<td>City Museum–Consultant</td>
<td>Pākehā, Male</td>
<td>26-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Participant 7</td>
<td>City Museum–Manager</td>
<td>Pākehā, Male</td>
<td>26-35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were invited to experience the mobile experience individually or in groups of no more than three. They would then complete a questionnaire (see Appendix 3) that I had drafted and Dr Smith had approved. If they seemed to have difficulties I would assist them to fill in the questionnaire – otherwise participants were asked to fill in responses themselves.

I asked several Māori individuals to be part of the demonstration. All declined. While they were happy to try out the technology on their marae, they explained that visiting a cemetery was a step too far out of the bounds of their culture. In Māori culture, *urupā* [burial grounds] are more tapu than in most European societies. They are visited for special reasons only, and often with a great deal of protocol attached.

**General Experience**

The first question inquired as to whether participants had enjoyed the experience of touring the site using a mobile device. A rating scale of ‘1’ (disappointed) to ‘5’ (enjoyable) was used. The responses were mixed.
Of those who participated, 4 scored ‘3’ or less, and 3 scored ‘4’ or ‘5’. Those that scored lower cited technological issues as a key frustration in the process. This was expected. During the demonstrations the lack of dynamism, and lack of access to the internal compass of the phone, meant that it was difficult to navigate the maze of graves. It also meant that individuals had to use their phones much more than should have been the case.

For example Cemetery Participant 1 rated the experience a ‘2’, stating the reason as the:

awkwardness of using it – direction finding, point of reference not working

Participants who scored in the higher range of ‘4’ and ‘5’ commented on the vividness of the experience and the fact that they were exposed to new technologies e.g.:

Exciting just thinking of possibilities . . . Learning what is out there – as in technology – being cellphone-disabled myself – finding out possibilities. (Cemetery Participant 4)

Most interesting and easy way to learn more about the people buried in the cemetery – all fascinating stories. This is a great way for tech-savvy people to explore history. (Cemetery Participant 2)

It enlivened the experience for me. What would have been a static experience otherwise became a living and vivid experience. I loved it. (Cemetery Participant 6)

Shift in Perspective

With the next question (another scaled response) I was interested to see whether participants experienced the place differently as a result of the

31 It should be noted that the technology has vastly improved since these first trials.
technology. That is, if the work had in some way changed the meaning they made of the location. It seemed that the degree to which participants experienced a shift depended on the degree to which they were already familiar with the site.

At least two participants were very familiar with the cemetery before visiting. They did not experience any shift of perspective or perception at all, rating a ‘1’ or a ‘2’ on the scale. Others scored higher (‘3’ or above), for a variety of reasons. One indicated that it gave them an insight into the lives of individuals at the site that would not have been possible without large amounts of research. Another commented on the fact that it brought the past to life on the site:

It brought to life the history, events and people and the connections they have to place in new and interesting ways. I loved it. (Cemetery Participant 6)

Those who had never visited the cemetery before, Participants 6 and 7, showed the strongest shift, scoring ‘5’ and ‘4’ respectively. With one noting that it was:

Great to hear the stories, makes the place come alive even to someone who hasn’t a personal connection. (Cemetery Participant 7)

**Spirit of the Place Supported**

When asked if the technology supported the spirit of the place most participants responded with a ‘4’ or ‘5’, and were generally affirming in the comments they provided, although each provided slightly different reasons. For some it was the story and the connection to the individuals residing there and the fact that it respects and does justice to the history of people from the past:

Yes because it tells the story of the individuals. It gives meaning to what you are seeing and reading in the cemetery...brings home that you are not just wandering through a public park. There are real people, real lives. There is a one to one
relationship with the story you are hearing – not just using a phone to call your friends in auditory range of loved ones. (Cemetery Participant 5)

The more information that is freely available the more justice it does to the people profiled. (Cemetery Participant 2)

For another, it was increasing the visibility of, respect for, and perceived value of the location:

Yes, anything that makes the cemetery more relevant and well-known in the community is desirable. Greater interest will lead to more security, less vandalism etc. (Cemetery Participant 3)

For others it was the way that the material was ‘handled’ and the intent behind its use:

Dealt with the lives of those mentioned in the database in a sensitive, unobtrusive manner. (Cemetery Participant 4)

The technology is clearly designed to offer users with different perspectives on the cemetery and is handled sensitively and respectfully. (Cemetery Participant 6)

Those that scored lower had differing reasons for their responses:

Cemetery Participant 7 had some frustrations with technical aspects of the experience but still scored a ‘4’. He felt that the technology, with its cumbersome workings, caused distraction rather than supported connection to the spirit of the location:

Fiddling around with a phone works against the experience of the place. Ideally the experience should not involve touching your phone at all on the tour.

Cemetery Participant 1 scored in the low range (a ‘2’) but it was clear, from conversations and comments during the demonstrations, that they were
uncomfortable with the idea that cemeteries could be used for anything other than burying the dead:

Old fashioned I guess – I don’t know. I think it has to be up to the individual – am a bit torn on that issue – nice for people to be acknowledged.

Use for own work

I enquired as to whether participants would use the technology for their own work or recommend it to others to use. Generally participants responded positively to this question but some participants were more qualifying in their support scoring ‘3’s in response:

It would need to be a process of being selective over what was put out there, you would need discretion in choosing material. (Cemetery Participant 5)

If working in a suitable environment could see the advantages and use of the technology. (Cemetery Participant 3)

Other participants were more positive in their responses – scoring a ‘4’ or ‘5’ and identifying specific areas where it could be of use to them:

The technology has huge potential to offer visitors with a rich and immersive experience of a historic site.” (Cemetery Participant 6)

Very high potential to use this technology in a museum context if indoor location is supported and the user experience is optimized. Audio forms a good way to add another layer without detracting from the physical experience. Also like the ability to dig deeper into a story through additional resources. (Cemetery Participant 7)
General Comments

In the general comments section of the questionnaire most participants tended to provide recommendations for improvement (particularly focused around technological issues) and comments about potential issues:

Anything you put online would needs some thought over the consequences. Make it interesting but not for titillation purposes. The true benefit is that it gets people interested, it gets people aware of vandalism and decay – that has to be a plus. (Cemetery Participant 5)

Joint Reflections

After the demonstration-based interviews had taken place, Dr Smith and I met for a final debrief of the process to find out how she, as a place based practitioner, found the experience of engaging with this project. I have extracted some key points from this discussion.

Dr Smith was positive about her experience:

It stretched my boundaries and horizons and made me dip my toe somewhere else which I probably wouldn’t have done if I hadn’t met you really. It has been really interesting. And I think too for the museum as a whole it has been a really interesting project.

We both noted that there was an important learning point gained from the project related to how one records or gathers material. It became clear during the audio recording process that material needed to be recorded on-site:

Dr Smith: I was really determined to do it at the cemetery because sitting in a room that had nothing to do with it and recording. I don’t know it is a different feel when you get down there. It is. We had to be there to do it justice. I know there was background noise, but if people know that we recorded it there it keeps it, not contained, but it keeps it where it should be.
Maggie Buxton: Do you think it is more authentic?

Dr Smith: I think so. For me personally talking about the people who were there, I had to be there.

The importance of being on-site was emphasised again by Dr Smith a little later in the interview when she was asked to give advice to someone doing a project like this in the future:

Dr Smith: You have to be passionate and believe in what you are doing otherwise it is just like reading a radio advert.

In general, both Dr Smith, and myself, felt that this kind of technology was something for the future use of the museum, rather than the present time. Dr Smith noted, perhaps the audience for it was not quite there yet:

I see it as something for the future where generations coming through are so tech savvy that standing there and flicking through it will be momentary. We are still in a society where there is a huge continuum where there are some people really tech savvy and others who are not and most people sit in the middle.

But Dr Smith also noted the way that this kind of technology could support her general vision for the Museum:

I think there is a place for it, I really do. Again, it is just that next layer of saying to the community – here are three different ways you can experience this place. Pick which one you would you prefer. And that is what I see happening in the future. Not everyone wants to come in here [points to museum entrance] but it is again trying to say to the community we are taking the history to you, you don’t always have to come to us.

Around the time of this interview, individuals that I knew at a large cultural institution in the city had met with Dr Smith and other staff at the museum and had offered opportunities for future collaboration. I had created the original
connection for this to occur and Dr Smith mentioned her gratitude during her final interview. Immediately after our meeting I met the CEO of my Marae Case Study for a similar debrief and brokered an opportunity for the staff of the museum, and a member of the committee, to come to the Papakura Marae to meet the staff there and begin to build connections between the two institutions.

Overall, I spent approximately 40 hours in total (including all communication, editing, testing etc.) on this project which, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, was completed concurrently with the other two case studies.

**Personal Reflections**

This project was in some ways the most frustrating technologically. I felt that it would have been much more beneficial for the site to have a ‘look through’ version of augmented reality, one that allowed the user to see markers hovering over graves via the screen of the phone (making it a lot easier to navigate!). My observation of the demonstration process was that nearly all participants became disoriented easily, and needed assistance to use the, at times clunky, audio set-up. Those that were new to smartphones struggled with the different stages needed to access audio and video, those who were very tech savvy became frustrated when the system did not seem to respond as quickly or as intuitively as they expected.

I wished at times, while watching this process, that I was a developer myself and struggled with my inability to code, and therefore make the system as I wanted it. Despite the intention to be academically neutral (and my comments to participants that they were to be as honest and critical as they needed to be), deep inside I really wanted them to enjoy the experience.

This particular project reminded me that working with technology is unpredictable, and place practitioners need to be aware of this, particularly
when working on a site that is sacred, tapu, or is strongly associated with
spiritual aspects. The presence of technology in those places is already a
potential issue, due to cultural sensitivities, when it doesn’t work seamlessly it
becomes even more problematic.

All that said it was surprising for me to see how participants managed to see
past the technical issues to the potential of the technology for both the place
and their own practices. I noticed a physical sense of relief when I analysed the
results of the demonstrations and found that participants were generally
affirming as to whether the ‘spirit’ of the place had been ‘supported’ and
‘respected’. I was particularly worried about this aspect, as for me supporting
the spirit of the location was paramount.

While at times it felt strange to simply input another person’s content into the
mobile application (in comparison to other cases where I had a much higher
degree of creative input), it was a much easier and quicker process. The
Cemetery Case Study took much less time than the others mainly due to this
aspect, and the fact that I was only dealing with Dr Smith rather than a series of
stakeholders of different sorts.

During this project I learnt my first (of what was to be many) creative software
packages i.e. ‘Audacity’. While this caused some sleepless nights, there was a
sense of satisfaction of achieving a relatively clean edit of Dr Smith’s recordings
and this confidence set me up to tackle much more difficult digital manipulation
needed for the park project in particular.

As someone who has lived in this town from the age of 12 (almost 30 years), I
had never learnt the European history of the district. Through working with the
cemetery material (more than the other sites with which I was engaged) I
somehow felt more bodily grounded in my own place. As I write this I wonder if
this was related to the material being from a European perspective, and being
located near to my home in a place that I visited a number of times for other reasons. It was familiar but foreign and unknown in many ways. As a child of immigrants the lives of city founders seemed irrelevant to me. However, I now see how relevant they are as I walk around the city and recognise the origin of certain street names, and walk past shops while visualising their very early occupants.

In this project I opened portals between the dead and the living, between the past and the present. On the physical markers of headstones I laid invisible markers filled with digital stories. I revealed and revelled in the heterotopic nature of this place where the dead were no longer exiled to an ‘other place’ but instead were reconnected to the living that heard their stories. In this way the work demonstrated trickster practice.
The Marae

Kotahi te kōhao o te ngira e kuhuna ai te miro mā, te miro pango, te miro whero. I muri, kia mau ki te aroha, ki te ture, ki te whakapono.

Through the one eye of the needle pass the white threads, the black threads, and the red threads. After I am gone, hold fast to love, to justice, and to the great spirit.

Pōtatau Te Wherowhero in 1858

(Website of the Kingitanga, n.d.)

Overview

This aspect of practice created a mobile augmenting reality based experience in and around an urban marae. Stories were compiled from booklets, old photographs and video images contributed by marae kaumātua and founding trustees. The marae CEO (Mr Tony Kake) assisted with all networking, consulting and communication about the project, ensuring that all parties involved were informed and approving. All video content was also checked by a kaumatua to ensure the editing, and selection of key stories, was respectful. Content was distributed on particular GPS points around the marae related to either carvings or buildings.

Once the mobile experience had been created, place practitioners were invited to try it out. After being talked through a number of online layers of protection they were able to walk around the site encountering the different stories. A map showed them where they were in space in relation to the different taonga and the online instructions allowed them to view video content, hear stories, and click on hyperlinks where appropriate. After this process was completed, Mr Kake and I then reflected on the process together in order to harvest key lessons for the future.
About the Marae

The Papakura Marae was first conceived in the late 1960s by a handful of Māori families living in the area. They wished to have a place to keep their traditions alive as many of them now lived far from their traditional tribal areas. The group began with only $38 in the bank, and eventually the first buildings were erected in 1973. By 1990 the main marae buildings, including the wharenui, had been built, and were officially opened by Dame Te AtairangiKaahu (the now deceased Māori Queen) on the 8th December of that year.

The name chosen by her for the meeting house, (the principal building on a marae) was Te Ngira, reflecting the words of the first Māori King, Pōtatau Te Wherowhero in 1858 (noted in the extract at the beginning of this case study).

Today the Papakura Marae is a large and thriving site set upon several acres. It supports a number of different formal and informal services including a health clinic and pharmacy, social welfare and early childhood centre. The marae is a centre for events such as tangi [funerals], weddings, celebrations (e.g. Matariki32), and for a number of learning, health, cultural and welfare initiatives (including classes in everything from Zumba to traditional crafts and te reo).

Background and Details

Early Consultation

As mentioned in the introduction, I first connected with Papakura Marae several years ago when I was engaged in a community development project in conjunction with a local school and with support from local police. While I knew of the Papakura Marae’s activities peripherally, I did not know its history, and did not have strong connections with anyone in the organisation. When it

32 In New Zealand, Matariki is a celebration of seasonal change that is strongly associated with the Pleiades Star cluster and the Winter Solstice. The festival has been rejuvenated in recent years and signals a liminal, one month time zone where there is respect and commemoration for the newly passed and ancestors, and also a celebration of the harvests that have taken place (Meredith, 2012).
became clear that I was very drawn to Te Kōiwi Park as a focus for my place research (see the Park Case Study for further details) a key representative of the local iwi, recommended that I contact the CEO of the Papakura Marae, Mr Tony Kake. I met with him several times to talk about my research and explore whether he would be interested in having me work in the local area to build a mobile experience.

As part of my consultation process with Mr Kake, and mana whenua in the area, I was invited to a dawn hikoi [walk/journey] up the local mountain Puke-O-Kiwiriki Pā - a site of great significance in the area. Discussion and prayer took place during that walk. I talked through my ideas and vision for the project and received feedback that I had a blessing to go ahead on the condition that Mr Kake would be monitoring and supporting the process, and that the benefit would be mutual. This was confirmed again back on marae grounds when we were eating together to assist in the transition to a state of noa [free from tapu restrictions/ordinary].

A few weeks later I arranged to more formally interview Mr Kake at the marae to begin gathering material for the project. The timing of my visit coincided with a very special tangi occurring on the site that day. As noted in my blog:

Today I had my meeting with Tony at the Papakura Marae. I was struck at how open he was to change. In his view technology is inevitable and it is important to go with the times. However he noted that taking account of tino rangatiratanga was critical in so far as ownership and control of a process had to stay with the marae group. He took me into a tangi that was occurring on the marae at the time. He had told me they were using a digital photo display and that this was the first time it had happened on the marae. We went in and listened to whānau [extended family] kōrero about the deceased and about tikanga associated with death. A kaumatua talked about the use of technology and saw this as a positive thing. He noted that 'te ao hurihuri', the
world revolves or changes (the changing world) and the importance of going with the times.

Fantastic coincidence (?) and very timely. Interesting to notice the juxtaposition of the deceased body in a casket with the digital display at the foot of the coffin in a traditional marae setting. Old and new together. Very symbolic. But I also saw the shell of a human body (the deceased having moved on in spirit), with the digital non material flashes of his life remaining – it made me think of different dimensions of spirit and materiality coinciding and life occurring still even if it is in an artificial digital form. (Entangled Worlds Blog, 16/08/2012)

This encounter stayed with me a long time and has remained one of the more significant moments of my PhD research. I took the synchronicity of this very special situation (the first time that it occurred on the marae was the day of my first interview), as a sign that I was on the right track and that the spirits of the marae were in support of my work.

Very shortly after this visit I attended a workshop at the marae taken by a first nation representative from Canada. In the context of his talk he relayed some of the atrocities that had occurred to his people which left me distressed and unable to attend the post-lunch session. That night I had a significant dream which seems related to my research. I recounted it the next morning in my blog:

Some Pākehā individuals are gathering turtles and placing them around a grassed paddock away from the sea from which they were sourced. It is ambiguous as to whether I am helping them in this task. I try to rescue the turtles and take them back to the water where they 'should be'. As I approach each turtle it is clear that they gasping for water and most are dying. I feed some dribbles of water into their mouths, but I find that many are dead. I am too late. I take some to the water and then come across a very large turtle that it is hard for me to move. I struggle and can barely lift it. I am worried it is being hurt in its
transportation back to the sea. As I look around there are many, many turtles lying on the grass. (Entangled Worlds Blog, 01/12/12)

After the dream I researched the symbolic meaning of turtles and found that in some indigenous cultures they represent Mother Earth. Something about these turtles being dislocated by the Pākehā people in the dream, made to be ‘matter out of place’, was very important to me. The water represented spiritual sustenance – as if I was dribbling something temporarily into their mouths so they could make do until finally reunited with the great ocean. The re-location of the turtles was critical. I wondered if their dislocation was both spiritual and physical dislocation from their spiritual source. I viewed this as a representation of one aspect of my practice – the relocation of knowledge back onto the land.

**Ethics, *Mana*[^1] and Mauri**

I met with Mr Kake to discuss the types of information he would like to be included as part of a mobile experience, and walked with him around the marae to identify sites of interest and significance. We decided to have a mix of information about cultural aspects, commercial services and historical stories aimed at those who were new to the marae, and/or those in the community who wanted to learn more. It was at the end of this meeting that he reminded me about the spirit of place, and wanted to make sure that the process of building the experience did not detract from my focus:

> At the end Tony asked how is this related to the spirit of place. I thought about karakia and karanga, and realised that audio at least was critical. Said we would start process then each of us would know at a certain point when we actually arrived at something that supported the mana of location. Mr Kake said spirit of marae is based around manākitanga

[^1]: [power, prestige]
[welcoming/hosting], about supporting whānau, about bringing people together. So I need to think about this. (Entangled Worlds Blog, 15/02/13)

With that reminder I began work to compile information from documents already in existence, primarily an old booklet that had been published about the marae. Mr Kake had recommended speaking to a number of people to get information, but at this point I realised that I did not have the correct approval from the university ethics committee to allow me to gather stories in digital form and use them via a web based process (my original official approval was for standard interviews). At the same time, one of my supervisors (the developer of the software I was intending to use), had formed a commercial organisation separate from my university. Although I trusted him, I felt strongly that I needed to do my best to protect the taonga I would receive from kaumātua, and also from the other case studies I was undertaking in the area. I therefore halted all proceedings until inter-organisational protocols were signed off.

It was important that my work protect the mana of the marae, and at the very least did not damage or interfere with the spirit of the marae or ‘mauri’. So, during the wait for all protocols to be signed I used the time to connect with kaumātua associated with the marae and discuss with them the possibility of being involved. Each recommended new people who would love to be involved in the process. Through this snowball networking process I felt in a better, more resourced position to engage with the material – supported by a larger community of people.

**Gathering the Stories**

As a result of my networking, and with Mr Kake’s support, I arranged a day of filming with two founding kaumātua of the marae. A Māori cameraman came to the marae, was welcomed in a low-key ceremony and, after karakia (prayer)
from the men present, began the filming process. The cameraperson, who spoke fluent Māori, asked the gentlemen what language they wanted to speak. They both wanted to speak English. I will reflect on this key moment later, but can say that I was personally glad to have most (not all) the material in English so I could direct the footage to ensure it could be edited easily later.

The gentlemen present were two very fine orators. Each could speak eloquently on a topic, without verbal hesitation or mis-take, for several minutes at a time. They were a joy to listen to and the stories they inspired me to tears and laughter throughout the day.

I was particularly struck by the deeper cultural-historical content of the stories related to the history of carvings, and of the buildings around the site. The stories of Māui, the trickster, resonated with me. As I wrote in my blog:

> There were several points of reflection within this process. First of all [name omitted] spoke of Māui first and the deep significance of the figure to him, Māori etc. He told the story of Māui fishing up the North Island and this was spell-binding. The meaning of the story was about land being sacred, eternal boundariless i.e. communal. Also about the idea that fact and fiction are not separated in Māori stories. He noted that there are layers of stories, layers of whakapapa of the land. We spoke a little about octopus that was on the mural on the wharenui’s wall and other animals that fitted into the Trickster mythology. (Entangled Worlds Blog, 17/04/2013)

It was after hearing these stories layering together that I realised that the marae experience was not just a ‘walk’ but a commemoration of the past and celebration of the present.

At the end of the session the gentlemen sang a waiata [song] for me and wished me well. We ended with prayers. After the men had left, I want to see Mr Kake and noted in my blog:
I talked through the idea of a commemorative walk, and the feeling that the spirit of the marae finally arrived in some form. (I did feel some ancestors present there). At the end of the conversation I said to Mr Kake that he probably thought I was mad, he said no – enthusiastic – but also that everything I did was in the spirit of reciprocity which was really good. I told him that was really important to me. I left feeling like my 'contribution' was clear. (Entangled Worlds Blog, 17/04/2013)

I went home with my heart bursting, knowing that even if the mobile application was not successful, I could at least hand over this footage (having gained their prior permission) to the marae for future generations to learn from. As I understand it this was the first time that these stories had been recorded in this way, if at all.

Other Contributions

Very soon after this session I visited a woman who was a founding trustee. After a further visit, and deeper discussions, she offered to contribute photographs to my project from her vast archive of marae material which she had stored for decades. She gave me a picture of the original trustee group to use as an image for a specific point, and selected the door outside the wharekai [kitchen-dining area of the marae] as the best place for the point. In this way, the digital photo would replace the physical photo that used to hang over the doorway but had now disappeared.

Another person consulted during my information gathering process was a younger woman who had been involved in the original woven panels for the meeting house – the tukutuku work. She was extremely supportive and told me that each panel had a proverb hidden underneath it with the signatures of those who had woven them. In my blog at the time I noted that:

I am interested in the theme of revelation popping up. The hidden proverbs behind the woven material – I wonder if this is
a metaphor I can use later. (Entangled Worlds Blog, 27/02/2013)

Each of these contributions was valuable, and alongside my own research, formed the basis for the text, video and images that were eventually loaded onto the application.

**Checking, Approving and Communicating**

Finally, when all of the video editing had been completed, I presented it to a kaumātua who had been interviewed (Marae Participant 6). Given his background, and his involvement in the process, I felt that he would provide valuable feedback and could verify whether the editing had been completed appropriately.

During the course of our meeting we decided that a couple of clips were not quite appropriate as they needed more information or dialogue to do the topic justice. We also removed other material that was perhaps not appropriate for a general audience as the humour required greater contextualisation. Otherwise he was happy. He was also very grateful that I had taken the time to ask his opinion and consult with him.

After approving of my marae case study material, I discussed my Park Case Study with him. I showed him samples of material to ensure I was engaging in a culturally safe way with the location. During the conversation, I showed him one picture I had collected which included a very unusual image of the sky with a number of faces appearing in it (see Figure 30 page 233). He was extremely interested in the photo, and was, in his words, “blown away” by it. He took this as a sign that my work was in line with the wairua of the location.

34 I also showed this photograph to Mr Kake as part of my Park Case study who was also quite taken with it (and would mention it in our final debrief together).
A few days after this meeting, I met again with Mr Kake at the marae to get feedback on the material. He was happy with most items but he wanted other items completely changed. Two key issues emerged out of this process: a) he felt that the material was too ‘exposed’ i.e. in a marae one would normally go through a ritual or special process in order to hear these kinds of stories and cultural information and b) the cultural protocol information was not really appropriate for him to write without due consultation with kaumātua.

The former issue was resolved by allowing only those who had been through the protocols and entry process of the marae to have access to the material. In relation to the first issue, I worked with the developers to come up with a set of layers and barriers before the main information was accessible. First the user would come to a layer called Te Kuaha – The Doorway (which required a password). Only then would the pōwhiri [welcome] point appear which had a link to say ‘Enter Marae’. It was only at this point that individuals would be able to see information. There was also some discussion with Mr Kake about adding a karakia onto the entrance material, but the person who would perform this was not available at that time and the consultation process to allow this would be quite involved for the timeframe available.35

After looking through the material, Mr Kake noticed that there was material about the past and present, but nothing about the future. He proposed setting up a ‘future’ oriented ‘point’ onto which could be loaded 3D renderings of a local architect’s plans for future marae buildings. This was implemented as part of the wider range of material (see Figure 8).

35 This was eventually added later.
Figure 8: Clockwise From Top Left: Range of Marae Points; Future Point; Pōwhiri Point; Range of Marae Points.

Once the material was completed, Mr Kake invited me to a meeting organised by the current trustees. This was a regular meeting for trustees to present issues and decisions to the community to whom they were formally
accountable. I knew many in the room thanks to prior work in the community and other activities I had attended on the marae.

Thanks to some prior coaching from Mr Kake I kept the material short and to the point with lots of good images to illustrate. For these reasons, I think the response was overwhelmingly positive, with expressions of excitement in the room. I then invited members of the marae family to try out the experience and, if they wished, answer some questions for research afterwards. At the end of the meeting I was inundated by people wishing to volunteer.

Participant Feedback

Over the following weeks, 8 participants tried out the experience individually or in groups of no more than 2. Of these 8 participants, 1 was an original participant from the original study. A table of participants follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marae Participant 1</td>
<td>Mana Whenua Representative/Māori Educationalists</td>
<td>Māori, Male</td>
<td>46-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae Participant 2</td>
<td>Marae Manager-Health and Social Services Area</td>
<td>Māori, Female</td>
<td>46-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae Participant 3</td>
<td>Marae Worker</td>
<td>Māori, Female</td>
<td>26-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae Participant 4</td>
<td>Kaitiaki of Marae/Former Community Constable for Area</td>
<td>Māori, Male</td>
<td>46-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae Participant 5</td>
<td>Founder/Original Trustee</td>
<td>Māori, Female</td>
<td>66-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Participant 6</td>
<td>Founder/Original Trustee</td>
<td>Māori, Male</td>
<td>66-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae Participant 7</td>
<td>Marae Manager Services Area</td>
<td>Māori, Female</td>
<td>26-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Participant 5</td>
<td>Mana Whenua/Tohunga Whakairo</td>
<td>Māori, Male</td>
<td>56-65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants answered a similar questionnaire to that of the Cemetery Case Study (see Appendix 4), the key differences being a) the substitution of the words ‘wairua’ and ‘mana’ for the words ‘spirit of place’ and b) a slight change
of wording to from ‘the use of this technology’ to ‘this experience’. These changes made sure the questionnaire was more appropriate, and relevant within a Māori cultural context. The wairua, and the mana of the marae, are like all Māori concepts, intertwined, with the mana representing the sense of strength, spiritual power and prestige and wairua the interconnective binding, spiritual force of the site. The experience of the use of the technology included the protocols surrounding its use as well as the technology itself.

Participants experienced the demonstration via their own mobile devices. They were then invited to fill in the questionnaire, or answer questions verbally if they preferred. It is important to note that the same technical issues that occurred at the cemetery site existed with the marae experience, as they were intrinsic to the software. However, the key differences were that a) the marae was a much smaller site of only a few acres, and so easily navigable as all the points were within a few metres of each other and b) all the points were very easily differentiated from each other by their online images, and c) participants were able to link into a high speed Wi-Fi connection that sped up the download of data, and d) most participants at the marae had very high specification smartphones and were highly tech savvy. This meant that technical glitches had much less impact on the appreciation of the material – as will be seen by the results.

**General Experience**

The response to this question was overwhelmingly positive with 7 participants rating the experience as a ‘5’, ‘enjoyable’, and the remaining participant scoring it no lower than a ‘4’.

When asked why it was enjoyable, participant responses ranged from connection to spiritual aspects, to simply hearing the stories of elders and receiving that knowledge:
Supports spiritual connection to the land, water, trees, sky and ancestors. Sensitivity with which project has been handled. Intrinsic value to future generations. (Marae Participant 6)

How else could you get this info. Great! (Original Participant 5)

The concept of understanding the tikanga, knowledge of the carvings, history, future direction of the marae. Connection through local knowledge to the wider region, kingitanga, Māori ethos and values. Good to see local well respected elders speaking. Bilingual. Can move and engage at one’s own time. (Marae Participant 1)

I really enjoyed the stories attached to each area. (Marae Participant 2)

I enjoyed the simplicity of the set up through watching each video snippet. Absolutely engaging, relevant and moving. It’s a great tool for locals and visitors to learn about their urban marae. The historians were the founders of the marae so it’s only fair that they recall the actual events. (Marae Participant 3)

Liked the content, capturing old people telling stories of yesteryear – immortalising themselves and furthering history through digital technology so it is not lost. As time goes on this will make it easier for those who are not so tech savvy. (Marae Participant 4)

Only one participant scored slightly less, a ‘4’, siting technical issues as the key factor:

GPS needed for it to work properly so could get full impact of material. (Marae Participant 7)

**Shift in Perspective**

Most participants (5 out of 8) rated a ‘1’ on the scale – no shift. It is important to remember with this result that the participants were all linked to the marae
either by work, family or history. There was no individual in the demonstration that was brand new to the site.

That said several saw some shift, perhaps associated with the marae itself, rather than personal to them:

Strengthens and enlarges perception of this marae and all other marae – potentiality of using technology to put together information for greater publicity and potentiality. (Marae Participant 6)

I have real respect for the marae, history, people here. This uplifts the place like new paint work for the area, or planting new plants in the garden. (Original Participant 5)

Those that did experience a shift gave differing reasons for this. One, scoring a ‘4’, noted that they saw the marae as a:

marae on the move with ambition and aspiration. Serving and providing an interactive tool to engage 'all' people. Aligns to the proverb of Tāwhiao and the name of the wharenui: ‘Te Ngira’. (Marae Participant 1)

This proverb had been of great inspiration to me in the design of this experience, and so it was gratifying for me to have a participant notice the link.

Yes, taken it into digital technology world. Open minded still learning material on each side. (Marae Participant 4)

And the participant scoring a ‘5’ commented:

That it has such a strong history behind it and carrying through the stories really works. (Marae Participant 3)

Spirit of the Place Supported

In response to this question 6 participants scored a ‘5’, 1 participant scored a ‘3’, and a single participant did not score at all (but had some very interesting
comments as to the reason why). While many of the scores were identical, the reasons behind positively affirming this statement were varied.

Marae Participant 6 focused on my attitude and actions, and some of the signs that he knew about that had occurred during the project. He particularly refers to the ‘cloud formations’, which are the faces in the photographs described earlier in this chapter. In his words:

Responsiveness of researcher. Manner in which things happened without logic e.g. cloud formations. Sensitive manner in which interviews were collated and interpreted.

Another participant gave relationship, connection and the sense of importance as the key reasons for her positive response:

Makes marae feel important. It is something we can connect to in the community. It brings all races together. Fosters a connection between Māori and other groups. The more people get to know about it through technology the more people can connect to it – through carvings for example. It is the connecting of people. (Marae Participant 5)

Related to this point Marae Participant 1 also talked about connection but in the metaphor of a bridge:

Enhances the mana. Provides an opportunity to gain an understanding as to who, what, how and why. The tool provides a bridge to the IP of the marae.

Marae Participant 2 focused on the capturing and sharing of stories:

It records the stories so that they can be shared for a long time.

As did Marae Participant 3:

Many locals that are not from Papakura are able to retell the kōrero to their mokopuna [grandchild/children].
Two other participants focused on the consultation process I had undertaken with the marae, as justification that the final work was in support of the mana and wairua. In both these cases the integrity of the information, and the process that generated this information was the critical factor:

Because protocols involved getting in touch with old and new. Because worked with people – to determine if viewable or not. And where crossover is to make sure it is not offensive. If just did it without consultation then not validated – in my mind it is validated because gone through the right people. (Marae Participant 4)

Yes, integrity of information has gone through a process otherwise kaumātua wouldn't have supported it. If not facilitated in the right way could inadvertently breach protocol. (Marae Participant 7).

But, in the case of the latter participant (who scored a ‘3’ for her response rather than a ‘5’) the response also included a number of reasons of how the technologically based experience could easily breach protocols. Her response included a number of very relevant issues that needed to be considered for example:

If a person has no knowledge at all then need to have some basic warnings about coming on the marae – we take some of these simple mechanisms for granted. If this is used at a lot of marae then a link can be created that all of them can use with basic information. Cultural safety needs to be taken into account. (Marae Participant 7)

Original Participant 5 is a respected representative of the local iwi and an expert in the area of protocols. While extremely supportive of the process, and the experience that was created, he was also reluctant to ‘score’ this area. His comments were that it would support the mana and wairua only once the
protocols, the tikanga have been added in. A karakia (prayer) needs to be added so people clicking into it can be comfortable. We should try and do what we do in the physical. [My question to this was: So you are ok with putting karakia on the phone?] No objections – needs to be the right person doing it. The kaumātua need to see and discuss the options and come up with the right option. This marae has a lot of visitors and so that they can use this in the downtime (Original Participant 5).

So in this case, the mobile experience did not yet fully support the mana and wairua, as it did not fully replicate the physical experience that one had when entering a marae ‘in real life’. Until a karakia was included, it was not fully compliant with tikanga.

**Use for Own Work**

In terms of usage, all except one (retired) participant answered ‘5’ (very much so) on the scale. The general consensus was that they saw value in this kind of system for the marae, and for other contexts – even if, in the case of the first two participants (below), they did not set it up themselves:

Encourage staff and *rangatahi* [youth] to use tech to increase understanding and power of our culture, no good trying to get me to do it. (Marae Participant 6)

Would encourage others to use it – everything is done online now isn't it. Who would think that we would be using GPS? (Marae Participant 5)

Everyone has a phone. Everyone wants to know and understand. The individual is empowered and in control of what he or she wants to engage with. (Marae Participant 1)

Yes for our *kura* [school] visits and *manuhiri* [guests] to the marae. (Marae Participant 3)
One of the participants discussed a number of very specific applications, issues, and potential improvements:

Induction – orientation of new staff . . . this can support this process. Can support cultural supervision for employees – could add some depth and integrity to process so that employees don't have to run around researching they have it to hand. School groups and events – this may allow physical capacity to be released as don't need as many man hours. Fits current evolution of the marae – it engages the age group we want to target. New hire assistance. But difficult if cannot afford access for staff, and updating material may be an issue. Need other input than just the kaumātua represented. (Marae Participant 7)

General Comments

Some interesting supplementary material appeared in the comments area. First of all there was a sub-theme-issue related to te reo, and the fact that the material had been recorded and presented mainly in English. This first participant, while incredibly supportive of the project, notes the importance of supporting Māori language and the potential for this type of technology to do that:

The challenge is to not close minds to the potentiality of technology for using te reo, understanding tikanga and embracing the future. I commend this strategy to our youth to empower various iwi in the revival, archiving, and publication of taonga and in bringing the two worlds together: Māori and Pākehā. Primacy of the Māori language of great importance – we are not doing enough to ensure language doesn't fade away but this needs to work alongside English as the dominant language (but not subsume Māori), but they need to be seen as equals in the transmission of knowledge and info (Marae Participant 6).
He also goes on to note that it would have been beneficial to have translated all of the material into Māori:

If this project had been done in te reo the exercise to translate it would have been an important exercise. (Marae Participant 6)

Another participant, a respected leader of another local iwi, and Māori educationalist, felt very strongly that the material should be in Māori:

Should be in Māori with options to access other languages (keeps essence of kōrero intact) . . . everything wraps around speaking Māori . . . need to minimise compromise but find other ways for languages to access it . . . can’t express the importance of telling location stories in Māori. (Marae Participant 1)

He also commented on the potential impact of this kind of technology on Māori culture and the importance of ensuring it was developed in line with the tikanga of the marae:

This has huge potential – wāhi tapu, events, any place and space e.g. museums etc. It is about understanding and demystifying elements of Māori and aligns to the Te Ngira – encompassing all people . . . Can do it at your leisure – you are in control. What is the tikanga about? To support people. When going onto a marae need to allow protocol to assist people. Need to make sure that people are safe when going onto a marae – I am ok with karakia on the device – cultural safety needs to be intact. Mechanisms need to support people to come in. Raises consciousness of Māori to really debate and rationalise this work in terms of tikanga and protocol. (Marae Participant 1)

This was echoed by another local iwi representative, another expert in protocol who compared this use of technology in terms of his own work as a carver:
Has to be a willingness to get it right – a patience. As a carver we cordon off an area because we are protecting an identity – when light falls on it, when blessings are done then it becomes something, a living thing. Need to think of a name for this thing – this work. It involves learning from it [the phone], not teaching one to one. (Original Participant 5)

Issues of protection were raised by another participant in the comments section of the questionnaire:

Make sure that names are carefully protected, if not to be mentioned, don’t mention them. There are many layers of connection in a marae with links between carvings, images, kōwhaiwhai it may be good to capture this depth of connection, and these layers, but also maybe not this requires careful consultation and discussion. Should kōrero of those who have now passed away be included for example? (Marae Participant 7)

This same participant had earlier commented on what they believed to be the difference between the system that had been demonstrated and a purely online approach to storing oral histories and stories. A crucial point in terms of the themes of my research proposition:

Walking around helps you be in the environment – you can tap into the wairua. You can smell the grass after it is mown, feel sorrow at a tangi. If just online then no way to really connect to the marae spirit (Marae Participant 7)

Joint Reflections

After the majority of the demonstrations had taken place Mr Kake and I met to debrief the process. I expressed my resolve to assist him in the future if they wished to turn the demonstration into a more extensive bespoke application. I also reemphasised that a copy of the material from the marae, and archival
material from the Park would be given to the marae for educational purposes. Some interesting themes emerged.

First of all it was clear that Mr Kake felt that he had not supported me enough and given enough attention to the project. I emphasised to him the critical nature of his role as a protective agent, a mentor and a connector within the community:

You have supported me by connecting me to all the people and information that I needed to do my work. In a funny way it worked well. I had the freedom to do my work, but I knew that I had to answer to you and you were there for that. So that helped me and I appreciate that. I couldn’t have done this project if I didn’t know that if I had a question that you would help me and otherwise I could have been in big trouble interdimensionally let alone with the personalities.

We discussed possible next steps for the ‘tool’ that was created. Mr Kake wanted to ensure that the technological experience was still in support of the wairua and the place. I noted that:

for me the wairua and spirit was always at the forefront of the work. The technology was one way of exploring this – seeing whether it supports or doesn’t support it. It is a subset of a bigger thing to do with spirit. I was concerned that people are using this technology in many places and just shoving it in without much thought. The biggest learning I have had is that it is not about the tool, it is about the intent behind the tool, and the way you go about using the tool. These things are only as good as the person behind it. That is the biggest learning for me from this project and process.

Mr Kake replied: “That is absolutely right. If done with the right intent and respect it should be right.”
Later Mr Kake expressed envy at the access I had gained during the case study and the challenge of being able to do that on a larger scale financially themselves:

Not envious – that’s too harsh, but when you filmed [name omitted] and [name omitted] I get bits of that but that was fantastic that you could sit down with them and just record. I wish we had so much more of that stuff – where people like [name omitted] and my parents, they all have their own versions, their own chapters of this place. Video footage can be done basically or expensively – we don’t have the capacity to do that.

I replied that:

I always felt it was a privilege. It was never taken for granted. On that day it was amazing for me – felt like the spirits were really among us! I always thought that gathering this material was not a gift for me, but about me being a conduit for other people to receive a gift – information for me to pass on for others – like being a channel for something through the phone to something else – like the phone is an extension of me.

Towards the end of the interview Mr Kake shared his internal criteria for judging whether I and the project had integrity:

I have always had indicators of whether something feels right or not. So the day that you accepted the hikoi up the hill was one of them, the little photos you brought back from Te Kōiwi Park was another one, the day you came into the tangi and they had technology in front of the body, and the fact you participated in that is a good indicator – in terms of your legitimacy, your genuineness, your willingness to awhi mai – awhi atu – to give and to receive. To give is the emphasis as well as. It was a good balance, a good balance. Also the Accountability Evening – I read the crowd and they weren’t threatened by it, and if they
were they had the ability to say so or to come and test it. That was the other indicator.

At the very end of the interview Mr Kake pointed out that this project needed to be taken forward in some way so that expectations that were raised will be met in some way. At this point I reemphasised my commitment to ensuring that the material, if not converted into a bespoke application, was turned over to the marae in a form that could be used for educational purposes.

Overall, I spent approximately 50 hours on this project. There was less technical work involved as the editing of the video was undertaken for me by the cameraman on the day, and there was much less audio to edit compared to the Cemetery Project. However, there were many more hours of consultation and communication carried out due to the complex layers of stakeholders involved. This relationship building work felt very much more important to me than the technical aspects of this project and will be discussed in the next area when I reflect on my own process.

**Personal Reflections**

Throughout this project I felt inner conflict, about my position of being a white female non-Māori speaker working in a Māori context. I was challenged by working in an environment where the core language was not my mother tongue. In other settings internationally, I have always worked with a translator (which has its own set of issues) but here, the language was not completely foreign, just not known to me. I was also not a foreigner visiting a foreign nation. I was in my own country working with familiar people in a relatively familiar setting. This familiar/unfamiliar tension was problematic for me as I existed on the edge of being not quite in, and definitely not completely out of, a complex and multi-layered cultural system.
I remember offering, very early in the consultation process, to mentor individuals from the marae who wanted to learn this kind of technology but the systems for this, and relevant individuals who could make themselves available in a very busy organisation, were absent. I was the only one who had the time, interest, focus, skill level and resources to create this demonstration.

My compromise was to ensure that all the public information I gathered for this project, and for the park project, and video footage (once arranged with the contributors) was gifted back to the marae in the spirit of partnership and reciprocity. Much of this material was either unknown to the marae, locked in institutions around Auckland, or, in the case of the kaumātua stories of the founding of the marae, unrecorded.

I also ensured that Mr Kake participated to the extent that he was able (given he is a CEO and extremely busy) and deferred to his guidance on all key decisions regarding choice, and situation, of material, all participant access, and all communication about the project to anyone other than my supervisors. I did my upmost to protect the stories and information provided by ensuring proper procedures were carried out, contracts and agreements signed, and individuals clearly informed of the risks of submitting material. I put the project on hold when I felt that protection was not as full as it could be, and personally pushed to ensure that the university covered perceived gaps. I never took my position of privilege for granted, and in moments of deep joy (the video recording day was one of them), I always felt a strong sense of responsibility and moral guilt over just being there and not being Māori. I felt, because of these actions, that I at least adhered in principle to the Treaty of Waitangi, even if I could have always done more.

I felt physically comfortable at the marae and felt happy every time I ventured onto the grounds, often having a feeling of being home. I would sometimes sit
inside the wharenui and look up at the photos of tūpuna on the walls and check with them to make sure I was engaging with integrity.

Overall, the marae project was the most challenging for me emotionally. And, while I experienced a great deal of positive affirmation, and I have an inner sense (and outer evidence and affirmation) that I did ‘no wrong’ (and have even left a positive educational legacy for the future of the marae), I feel discomfort. For me as a researcher, I learned a great deal about how little I know about power, rank and privilege dynamics despite many years of learning and teaching in this area as an organisational and community development consultant. I also found out (through being immersed in material, and engaging with many different aspects of cultural protocol) how very different Māori ways of engaging with the world actually are compared to Pākehā viewpoints. For me the process was a form of polytropia in action. I twisted and turned to find ways to meet the complexity of the environment around me, moving between software developers, kaumatua and the ancestors who resided in that place. My artus work reconfigured what was sacred and profane on that site – creating virtual boundaries within the software to ensure that cultural safety was intact.

In many ways I felt more spiritually at home with the values and principles that I felt and experienced around the marae, than I did in other settings, and in other ways I felt as if I was a foreign visitor from a distant land. In the end it was worth carrying out this work not only because of the discomfort that comes with awareness, but also because stories were captured and placed in the land for future generations.

Postscript
In the months since the case study took place I worked with the software provider Imersia Group to turn the material that was collected for the
demonstration web-based mobile experience into a fully functioning (‘look through’) mobile application (see Figure 9).

Figure 9: Screenshots of Marae Application

Creating the application involved several months of work and negotiation so that, for example, karakia could be appropriately added to the app to ensure cultural safety. Poems and oratory were also composed specifically for the application to ensure that tikanga was fully respected. Existing material has been translated into Māori (so it is now a fully bilingual experience).
Marae management have taken ownership of the project and funding is now coming in to improve the breadth and depth of the material on the current app. A marae community focus group has been created to provide input into this next stage, which will be as carefully and considerately managed as the original case study.
The Park

He marae whakehirahira pupuri i te wairua o Te Kōiwi, ā ko Matariki te tīmatanga o te oranga wairua, oranga hinengaro, oranga tinana mō ngā reanga kei te haere. Taku aroha ki a koutou.

This work is dedicated to the wairua of Te Kōiwi Park. May this Matariki exhibition contribute to your health and vibrancy so that future generations may continue to love you as I do.

Preface to ‘Place’ (Buxton, 2013)

Overview

This project was an exploration of a local suburban park: a tapu site of great historical and cultural significance. Material gathered during this exploration contributed to an exhibition which took place during the Matariki Festival in June 2013. The exhibition was delivered inside a traditional gallery space via a television monitor and simultaneously on-site at the park using the audience’s mobile phones to access geo-located material.

Over three seasons (summer, autumn and winter) I gathered material at seven different points. These were named ‘pores’, reflecting their interstitial nature and evoking the metaphor of earth’s skin. I used a mobile phone as my primary investigation device alongside other tools old and new. I invited individuals and groups across a variety of different disciplines, perspectives, and belief systems to collaborate. They provided their own images, stories, technologies and investigative tools to the process. I also undertook extensive research and image capture of documents at a number of different archival and research institutions across Auckland.

After the audio-visual material was collated, I sorted and re-allocated material according to the ‘pore’ to which it was related. The sound material was layered
using a software program, while the visual material was mixed ‘live’ on-site (using a laptop and mixing set) in a ‘VJ’ (live visual mixing) software program. When edited, the material formed seven different audio-visual clips which were placed at the GPS coordinates of the seven corresponding points around the park site. The material was compiled into one long DVD to be shown via a television monitor on the wall of the Gallery. A booklet called ‘Place’ was published by the Auckland Council for the exhibition.

I gave two talks during the week-long exhibition. The first was an artist talk where I invited all the collaborators together to share their experiences and view the work. The second was a walk through the park where I shared my information gathering process.

**About the Park: Te Kōiwi Park**

The place now known as Te Kōiwi Park has a rich and complex history. Originally linked to nearby Pukekiwiriki Pā, it was a site of an abundant spring fed swamp which fed the surrounding settlements. Multiple iwi (tribes) identify with this area and/or have a history of occupation on the site including Ngāti Paoa, Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngā Tai, Te Aakitai and Ngāti Te Ata. There has been intertribal bloodshed associated with the site – most recently through raids by Ngā Puhi in the mid 1800s. At the time of early European settlement in the area it was occupied by Te Aatikai, led by Chief Ihaka Takanini.

During the Waikato War of 1863, Chief Takanini and his family were wrongfully accused of being rebels and imprisoned by Governor Sir George Grey. He and his family were eventually exiled to Hurakia Island in the Hauraki Gulf where Chief Takanini died shortly afterwards, followed by 16 members of his family. Only six survived (Mangnall, 2011, May 6)
All of his land (known as KiriKiri) was confiscated and, while monetary compensation was eventually given to Chief Takanini’s whānau, the land itself was not returned (Compensation Amounts, 1866, April 30). Instead it was parcelled into blocks and granted to European settlers as part of the NZ Settlements Act of 1863. A number of settlers, largely oblivious to this process, were allocated the land on the Kirikiri Block. This included Clark Smith, a new arrival from Ireland on the ship ‘Viola’. While many could not handle the difficult, swampy conditions, Clark Smith thrived and, in addition to his own allocation, purchased a number of blocks to eventually form a substantial land holding.

His grandson, James Alexander Smith, eventually sold the land in the early 1960s to the local district council who turned a portion of it into a reserve for public use. This land eventually became Te Kōiwi Park (it was originally titled ‘Parker Street Reserve’) and the site for Papakura Marae.

In the mid-1970s the name of the park was changed at the request of the local Māori Committee to ‘Te Kōiwi’, meaning ‘of the bones’. This re-linked the location to Pukekiwiriki Pā (which was originally named ‘Puke-o-Kōiwi-Riki’) and referred to the bones of tribes buried in close proximity to the location, and also to the descendants of the original peoples. The committee proclaimed that Te Kōiwi should be interpreted as:

The New Generations, appropriate to the new generations of New Zealanders growing up with the perception and sensitivity to take the social and spiritual wells of their dual heritage so that they can live more fully as Tangata Whenua, People of the Land. (Papakura Māori Committee, 1976)

Te Kōiwi Park has been used intensively by sports and hobby groups and local families. The park is now a beautiful, manicured, undulating site with a variety of exotic (non-native) trees, and an abundance of birdlife. As mentioned
previously it is bordered on one side by Papakura Marae, but on the other two sides there is intensive industrial activity generated by car-part and house demolition companies, engineering firms and a welding school. The park’s previous history as a rich historical site and abundant food source are now hidden under layers of clay and reconstituted earth, and the noises of birdsong are interspersed with the sounds of heavy machinery.

Background and Details

Early Introductions

As mentioned earlier, I first encountered Te Kōiwi Park while working as a volunteer on a community development project initiated by the local police. The park was in and out of my mind over the next year or so, and I knew that I would undertake some activities on the site but I knew not what. I was having dreams that felt related to this particular site and my research. As I noted in my blog:

had a dream that I was in the body of an elderly woman called Te Aroha. She was a Māori woman with a top knot and I saw her when I looked in the mirror. Something to do with embodying my PhD or the people from the PhD I think. (Entangled Worlds Blog, 13/02/12)

I was intrigued by the fact that the park seemed to have an invisible barrier around it that prevented me from entering it.36 I would drive to the park but when I tried to set foot on the park site I felt a physical sense of wrong inside myself, and an almost tangible hand repelling me away. One of these occasions was recorded in detail on my blog entry for 16 September 2012:

I arrived and sat in the car. As I was sitting there a large hawk flew very close to the car, and a shag landed in a tree very close

36 Much like the experience of those working at Belas Knapp (mentioned on page 81).
by and began to dry its wings. I took some photos then moved the car to another spot. I dropped into a semi-meditative state and allowed myself to experience all of the energies of the park. As I did so I noticed a very quick bodily shift that shifted energy from my heart (which was still singing from the conversation with [name omitted]) down to my stomach which suddenly started churning with unpleasant, and unexpected, feelings of fear and nerves. I suddenly felt a strong feeling of being watched, as if someone was peering into the car. I noticed these changes for a while then willed some good energy into the situation – suddenly the fear left and I was left with a comfortable feeling again. (Entangled Worlds Blog, 16/09/12)

As the next few weeks turned into months, I continued to drive to the park, but did not feel able to enter. In the meantime I had a series of dreams and some waking visions relevant to my work. I had a dream, for example, about Indian people making cowpats for fuel and placing them on a wall that was alive with digital streamed information.

Around this time I introduced myself to the town’s gallery curator who loved my idea of bringing the unrevealed aspects to life using mobile phones. She agreed to support me to have me do a show in her gallery – we would just need to negotiate a time. Now I knew that I was doing an exhibition but I was unclear exactly what would be exhibited. I trusted that my evolving relationship with the park would eventually reveal the way forward.

I Ideas, Theories and Explorations

By the turn of 2013, I had already undertaken some archival research through the local museum but wanted to begin my investigations and explorations at the park in earnest. This was difficult given that I still could not find a way to pierce through the veil of the park to enter the site in a physical way.
I asked a member of the mana whenua about the issue. He suggested that because the site was tapu (something I had intuitively felt but not officially had confirmed before this point), it was important to protect me and my work and to do a small blessing and karakia with me at the location. In my blog that evening I felt excited and relieved that maybe a solution was in sight for the long standing ‘stand-off’ between me and the park, noting, “hope that it allows me to enter park and pass through the veil that shrouds it.” (Entangled Worlds Blog, 16/01/13).

On 29th January 2013, Mr Kake, the mana whenua representative and his son, a kaumatua of the marae, and I, walked next door to the park. A blessing ceremony was then carried out:

[name omitted] led the karakia, walking us down unto the flat part of the park. Through his prayers he lifted the tapu on me working there, asking the spirits that there be no impediments over my work. He then blessed me with water. As I walked I felt a shift inside me – something lifted and my intuitive hesitation about working at the park changed to excitement. (Entangled Worlds Blog, 29/01/13)

A few days later I visited the park again. I wrote in my blog afterwards about the very large shift that I felt had taken place:

It was amazing what a difference it made to walk around after the blessing, it physically felt like I was 'allowed' to walk around the site – whereas before there was an invisible barrier. I ended up going to some parts of the park I hadn't seen before and noticed the amazing sounds around me. Am looking forward to doing some sound recordings there. I put down my first GPS point. It felt good. (Entangled Worlds Blog, 31/01/13)

From this point forward I began practising place in earnest.
Initial Investigations

I was interested in choosing some key points around the park which would become foci for my investigations. I devoted several days to walking around the site ‘feeling out’ which areas could be markers for the walk around the park. I did my best not to choose logical locations, e.g. the best views or nicest trees. Instead I simply walked around the site reflecting on the physical shifts inside myself and pattern of thoughts that flowed through my consciousness. I also enlisted the help of others in this process.

One of the first people I asked was a local psychic who lived in a street nearby. Together we met at the park site and managed to walk around the location, but she observed that some areas were still unable to be entered directly and needed careful navigation. She noted that the park had a very strong protection around it. Her impressions were of a place that was not only energetically very powerful but also deeply concerned with the welfare and future of rangatahi. At the end of our walk I had identified four key points that I knew should be the foci for further attention.

Next, I invited a group of individuals I had interviewed in my Stage One interviews. They frequently worked together to investigate and ‘heal’ what they called ‘sore spots’ on locations using a form of subtle Earth energy work. I had recently attended a couple of Dowsing and Radionics Society meetings and had purchased a dowsing rod ‘bobber’ (see Figure 10) which I had adjusted (hacked) to fit onto my phone.
I intended to use it as part of my investigation with the group to see if old and new technologies and ways of engaging with place could coincide.

It was an interesting day. The group found a number of spots around the park that they felt needed work. They spent a lot of time clearing what they identified as lost and lingering souls, and also interdimensional entities that had apparently been imprisoned on the location by other forces. I assisted them with their activities by helping to clear locations and used the hacked dowsing bobber to divine whether spots needed work or were healed. At the end of the day I felt drained and emotionally exhausted and for several days afterwards felt unusually light headed and ‘unwell’. By the end of the third day after the process at the park had taken place, I woke up lighter than I had in years and felt a deep inner calm. The others, when contacted, said that they had also noticed a similar process.

I revisited the park a week or so later and noticed another substantial shift in my relationship to the location. It was warm and inviting and all areas seemed open to approach. I finalised my other three points during this visit, and realised that they formed a circular path around the park. Around this time I was re-
contacted by the gallery curator who told me there was a space in the Matariki Exhibition.

Matariki is a time of year celebrated by a number of events around New Zealand, including kite flying which represents the connection between Earth and Sky. The commemorative nature of my park project, and the harvesting and reseeding of knowledge seemed to fit very well with this theme, as does the connection between device and the ‘clouds’ to which it connects. I imagined that my work was part of a larger process of healing of that site and the surrounding area and that the forthcoming ‘exhibition’ was also a ritual of healing in a way yet to unfold.

Gathering Material from the Past
I spent a number of weeks visiting archival research institutions around Auckland. At the South Auckland Research Centre I found copies of the original documents awarding compensation to the descendants of Chief Takanini (via the Raupatu Document Bank). I also read Native Land Court proceedings, noticing my anger rising as I read how local Māori were treated by officialdom of that time. It was through this initial research that I realised the historical significance of the site including the fact that it had been confiscated during the wars and then reallocated as part of the NZ Settlements Act (1863). Later, at the Auckland Regional Office of Archives New Zealand, I discovered the original grant documents for the Kirikiri Block and traced Clark Smith’s purchases and allocations back through the many different logs and record books (see Figure 11).
In the same time period I visited Auckland Council Archives and found the original Papakura District Council\textsuperscript{37} file on Te Kōiwi Park and Papakura Marae. I read and photographed documents including the original letter to change the name to Te Kōiwi Park, and numerous letters from local horse owners, local residents, environmental officers, and hobby societies all of whom had something to say about the park. I would end up using a number of these letters and memos in the eventual exhibition (see Figure 12).

\textsuperscript{37} The Papakura City Council no longer exists. It was subsumed within a larger civic structure now called Auckland Council in November, 2010.
Once I had visited these institutions I arranged a visit with Nancy Hawks (nee Smith), the great grand-niece of Clark Smith and a prominent genealogist and council representative in Papakura. Nancy allowed me to interview her about her family history and told me many stories about Clark Smith, his son Alexander Smith, and her uncle James (Jim) Alexander Smith. It was an interesting experience for me to have paper documents suddenly come alive in front of me.

At the end of the meeting Nancy volunteered a number of family images to me that I could use as part of the exhibition. These included an image of James Alexander Smith and his wife, and a picture of James and her father standing outside the family homestead in 1913. I was humbled that she would volunteer this material and vowed to do it justice (see Figure 13).
Shortly after this meeting I met with a Māori woman [name omitted] who had lived in the vicinity of the park since she was a small child. I spent a wonderful couple of hours with her as she recollected what it was like to know the park as a young child. She described scenes from her childhood where she hid in the giant flax bushes when she was in trouble with her parents. She also described the puna [spring] that was on the site, and noted that this was an abundant food source for her and her family. She talked about how when it rained heavily the bright red clay from Pukekiwiriki Pā would flow down the gutters near her house. She also recounted how sad she felt on the day that bulldozers arrived and began to redevelop the site.

Technology and the Present

By late summer I had begun to gather material at the park in earnest and involved others in this process. AUT University’s Knowledge Engineering and Development Research Institute (KEDRI) engage in complex data analysis and informatics. I had heard about their recently purchased Emotiv Neuroheadset which is used to conduct electroencephalography (EEG). In simplified terms, the mobile helmet-like device records basic brain activity using a series of (non-invasive) probes which fit onto a user’s head (see Figure 14). The device allows brain activity information to be recorded outside the four walls of a medical
institution. I was fascinated to record the internal workings of my brain activity, and saw it as an additional perspective in amongst others at the park. This kind of recording fits well with my goal to work integrally – in this case using a creative approach to investigate the first person perspective.

Figure 14: From Left: Emotiv Headset; EEG Recordings Using Headset.

One of KEDRI’s PhD students helped me record my brain activity at each of the seven locations. I would close my eyes and relax at each location and allowed the headset to pick up my brain activity which could then be picked up on a laptop and recorded to be shown at a later date (see Figure 15). It was interesting that the two areas to which I felt most connected, recorded slightly different waves than the other sites.  

---

38 Unfortunately all of the data from these points was lost before much more detailed analysis could take place. The PhD student had undertaken a brief analysis on the spot in order to make this general comment.
I had for a long time been interested in gathering some aerial shots of the location. Through local networking I found a young man with an octocopter – a mini helicopter-like drone that could be powered by remote to fly over the location (see Figure 16). I decided I would tape my smartphone onto the drone to ensure I could have access to the images immediately and also support my goal of using the phone as much as possible in my explorations.

The filming was successful but at times nerve-wracking – particularly when he flew quite low over the ponds. The quality was very high and it closely resembled a flying dream – as if spirits were flying over the park.
After this I was interested in investigating the opposite end of the visual spectrum and so arranged to meet with the Applied Science department of our university. Two scientists there offered to help me: Dr John Robertson, a chemist specialising in soil analysis, and Professor John Brooks, a microbiologist, who specialised in food microbiology. Both were curious about my project and were kind enough to volunteer their help to investigate the park.

Dr Robertson told me how to see the narrative of a place through its soil. He introduced me to a soil coring mechanism which is used to pull long samples of soil from the earth. When pulled up, the corer displays different layers. He lent me one to use, along with a PhD student whose job was to ensure I did not break this expensive piece of equipment. The student and I spent a good deal of one morning digging up cores at the park (replacing soil once we had taken photos and samples) (see Figure 17).
At one point we imagined we had found some archeologically significant material but found out later it was just iron rich clay – often found in sites with large amounts of landscaping. The student did much of the digging work as I was unable to push the core sampler more than a centimetre into the soil. In the process of digging I learnt a great deal from the student about different kinds of soil and about his work. I sent images of the soil (see Figure 18) and some physical samples to Dr Robertson who sent them back with annotations as to type and composition.
In order for Professor Brooks to get to work on my microscopic images, I spent a morning obtaining samples from each of the seven locations. I gathered the material by demarcating a metre square around each point and chose random samples of a certain visible size range: these included rotten wood, bottle tops, fungi, gum, and a water sample from the pond. I placed these in carefully labelled, plastic sample bags and delivered them in a little brown box to the Applied Science Reception (see Figure 19).
Two weeks later Professor Brooks called me in for a meeting to show me the images he had created. He noted that it was quite a difficult process, as the samples were quite rough compared to those he normally engages with in his work in microbiology. But he also commented that it was enjoyable and interesting to do work that was outside of his normal day-to-day activities.

Apparently he had initially started his process of imaging with a ‘fluorescence microscope’ (using an ultraviolet illuminator) but due to the awkward shape of a few of the samples he moved on to a ‘dissecting microscope’ which had a larger depth of field and could more easily cope with the more bulkier, more oddly shaped items. By using a larger lens with a longer working length he could fit these other items into the frame. Magnification of samples was x 10 approximately (comparatively low powered compared to his normal work which was in the x 100 range). His results generated a sense of awe inside me, as if I were discovering the location for the first time. As I viewed each image on his large computer screen I felt pure joy inside, I felt as if the park had let me inside it somehow to a secret world of beauty (see Figures 20, 21, 22, 23).

**Figure 19: Samples in Box**
Figure 20: Microscopic Images of Filaments (Mycelium) on Fungal Fruiting Body (Toadstool) and Clay Fluorescence (Prof. J. Brooks)

Figure 21: Images of Mould on Eucalyptus Gum (Prof. J. Brooks)
Figure 22: Images of Water under Microscope (Prof. J. Brooks)

Figure 23: From Left: Microscopic Water Sample (Prof. J. Brooks); Lichen on Wood (Prof. J. Brooks)
Alongside these collaborations I worked on-site individually. Sometimes I went to the site to meditate or draw. Sometimes I asked for guidance from the spirit of the place on challenges with the research or my PhD in general. On each of these occasions I felt my relationship with the site shift and evolve. On a number of occasions I felt a very deep sense of connection to everything on the site, as I became a small part of a bigger assemblage.

On each visit I gathered a variety of images and sounds using my phone and other digital information capturing tools. I experimented with a number of different sound microphones and sound capture devices: contact microphones (which record vibration); a hydrophone (an underwater microphone); a shotgun microphone (a microphone on a long pole that can be targeted at specific sounds e.g. bird sound); and a basic hand held Zoom HXLR microphone. Through trial and error and by visiting the site at different times of the day and week, I started to build a library of sounds at each of the seven points.

I also experimented with images. I used a time lapse application on my smartphone to capture cloud tree movement, puddles of light and leaves; and ripples on the ponds (see Figures 24 and 25).

Figure 24: Still Images from Timelapse Sequence of Trees and Sky
I sourced a plastic smartphone bag from an adventure shop and used it to film underwater by dunking it in and out of the pond (with my phone inside) on a fishing line contraption that I tinkered together (see Figure 26). This was a short experiment as fear overcame me quite quickly.

I found a small rubber band-like macro lens to attach to my phone and captured some beautiful images of lichen and lawn daisies. I also used an attachable microscope (by Keeploop) to create ‘homemade’ microscopic images (see Figure 27).
I returned almost daily to notice new material that emerged on the site. One day oyster catcher birds took up roost and I recorded their sounds. Another day, I came across a crop of mushrooms and used all of my attachments to examine them for hours (see Figure 28).
One particular day I was taking pictures of the sky when I looked down and noticed some bones poking out from under a tree. On closer inspection, they looked disturbingly like a human hand (see Figure 29). Bearing in mind the name of the park (Te Kōiwi – The Bones) this rather disturbing find caused me to (literally) run to the nearby marae to inform them that I may have stumbled across tribal remains. Unfortunately Mr Kake was away that day, but I contacted one of the Stage One interview participants, who was an archaeologist, and who very kindly came out a few days later to verify that they were cow bones (see Figure 29, second image). I was simultaneously relieved and disappointed, but decided to include the image of the bones in my exhibition as a record of the interesting story.
A few days later, when examining the images I had taken of the sky I noticed some very peculiar patterns which looked very much like faces appearing in the clouds – one appears to be handing me some keys (see Figure 30). This image assumed great significance for my Māori colleagues who took it as a sign that my work was supported by spirits of that site.

![Sky Image](image)

**Figure 30: Sky Image**

Towards the end of April 2013 Mr Kake told me to go back up to Pukekiwiriki Pā and look over the park from up high as this may help with moving the project forward (by literally seeing the big picture). When I got there I realised there was a need to include images from the pā in the beginning of the exhibition to ensure that my research into the pre-European history was also acknowledged. I took some images of the stratified rocks up on the pā site noticing the many layers of time that they represented (see Figure 31).
At the end of this process I decided that the first ‘point’ on the walk would be related to pre-history up to the land confiscation and grants, the next point would be the land sale by James Alexander Smith and the other points would be mixes and layers of the different data collected at the other points.

I came to the conclusion, at the top of the Pā, that I would not tell the story of the park, or even say I was revealing all of the unrevealed aspects of the park, instead the mobile experience and exhibition at the gallery would be a record of my practice-based investigation of the location. I felt that this would ensure that I was not being culturally insensitive by trying to tell other people’s stories and oral history, instead I was presenting my own.
Before finally going ahead with the exhibition I checked with two local Māori elders to ensure the material was appropriate. As a result of these discussions I decided to omit the names of Māori individuals (related to Chief Takanini) who had been compensated for land confiscations, and found a way to show only the numerical amounts from the document I had retrieved from the Native Land Court Proceedings (see Figure 32). As the kaumatua said, “names are names”, and I would need permission from descendants to include this information. I understood the reason why the names could not be included. However, I was disappointed because it was powerful to see them listed. It was interesting to note that my gut feeling about this issue had said no and this was the reason I had asked about the issue in the first place.

![Figure 32: Compensation Amounts, Daily Southern Cross Native Compensation Court: 1/5/1866, p.5.](image)
Sourced from Papers Past, National Library of New Zealand.

**Digital Re-Articulation and Representation**

At the beginning of May 2013 I had hundreds of images and hours of sound and no real idea how to pull it all together. I lacked confidence in my technical abilities and worried how I would put the images together in a way that was
coherent for the mobile version (of seven different geo-located videos) and the longer gallery sequence on the monitor.

An artist friend helped me solve this technical challenge. He suggested I turn all of my still photographic images into moving images (via animation software)\(^{39}\) and then use a live visual performance (VJ) software program called Resolume to intuitively mix together the images with the sounds I had collected. I could then record this ‘live’ process for later presentation. The VJ program would enable me to mix my gathered material live on location allowing me to maintain my connection to the park and gain direct inspiration from each of the different points I had chosen.

I spent several weeks animating the still images and editing the video footage, including the footage I had taken underwater and with the octocopter\(^{40}\). It was a difficult process as I had no prior training in animation or film editing. Eventually I set up the material up in the VJ program, allocating it into seven different sections representing the different points around the park. The intention was that I would reach each point, pull up the relevant section on the program, and then intuitively mix that material together creating a layered effect. Until the material was mixed, it was simply a list of videos – the mixing process brought the material to life on the screen.

My first experiment in VJ-ing at the park did not go well. Unfortunately, I was not in good spirits before I arrived at the site but despite this pushed ahead and set up my laptop on a little table ready to efficiently process my material (see Figure 33).

\(^{39}\) The VJ software mixes and layers video images not still photographic images, hence the need to animate my still images first. VJ programs are the visual equivalent of DJ programs which enable the live mixing of music tracks.

\(^{40}\) I edited the video footage to ensure that there were quality extracts available for the VJ programme.
It was not to be. Within one second of starting, four different groups of people simultaneously arrived at different parts of the park, disgorged their quad bikes and miniature motorbikes and proceeded to ride around the park in the noisiest manner possible. I gave up after a few points. When I returned home, I checked the footage I had managed to mix – it was unable to be used because something had gone wrong with the equipment.

Later that night I realised that in all the months I had been at the park this was the first time I had seen people riding motorised bikes – to have four groups at once was a strange coincidence. I took this as a sign that I had treated my VJ session at the park as a machine-like process, had not respected my own intuition, and had not engaged in a respectful manner. I resolved to do things differently and realign myself again with the spirit of the park.

After a few days of reflection, I felt the urge to return to the park and try again. When I arrived, while still in my car, I asked permission to undertake my work,
and felt a warm affirming feeling inside me. I set up my equipment, quietly meditated at each point, and slowly worked my way around the park mixing the material. It went perfectly. The sun was shining, there were no other people there, and the material, when checked later, was glitch free. The live mixing program enabled me to layer the different images together and experiment with different textures, topics and patterns. In this way, the connections I had made with individuals and the images and sounds I had gathered (including newly animated archival documents) found new relationships and connections with each other. Through the digital manipulation of the material, my relationship with the park changed again and I found myself playing and experimenting with connection and disconnection and with building then shifting relationships between different types of digital material. It was if I was re-articulating my own understanding of the location.

I processed the brain material I had recorded at each of the seven locations and interwove it with the other images. I also found ways to creatively link the microscopic images with archival footage with family photos. I felt like an alchemist, mixing materialities, histories and energies together. At times, as I lost myself in this process and felt deeply connected to the spirit of the place through the window of the digital – the layers swirled together, and I felt as if it was not just me choosing and mixing the material, but that others had come to help. (The images in Figure 34 are extracts from this work.)
is to whether there is going to be a few horses at this site for my horses as has been set aside for this important point as there are very few of this nature left.
Each point now had its own video, with associated sounds compiled from the samples I had gathered at each area. Once these small videos were made they were uploaded to the seven points around the site. Once this was complete, I recompiled the seven separate videos into one long sequence to create a DVD to be presented via a monitor in the gallery. For the transitions between the different videos I used the aerial footage shot with the octocopter. This created
an ethereal effect and marked the movement\textsuperscript{41} from point to point around the park.

I also created a booklet (Buxton, 2013) for the work (which the gallery curator published with an ISBN number). In total, I learnt seven new editing/production software packages just for this project (Audacity, Adobe After Effects; Adobe Premiere Pro, Adobe Illustrator, Adobe Photoshop, Adobe In-design, and Resolume).

The weekend before the exhibition started, one of the kuia from the marae came and did a weaving workshop at the gallery. It was, as I understand it, the first time they had had this relationship with the marae. It had happened because the gallery assistant had contacted the marae using my name as an entry point (with my permission). This was satisfying to me as it continued the theme of building bridges across worlds that seemed to be developing during all of my different case studies.

**Exhibition – Talking about Talks, Talks and Walks**

Seeing the mobile version for the first time was very exciting for me. I had decided to name each GPS point a ‘pore’, an idea that came to me early in the project when I began to liken each area I had chosen to a pore allowing information in, and out, of the skin of the park. I also saw each point as a portal, with the phone allowing access to a different world not visible with the eye.

When standing at the park and viewing each of the 2-3 minute clips on the phone at each of the ‘pores’ I remember it seemed very unusual, as I had not seen this kind of information displayed on a phone before.

\textsuperscript{41} As the video is viewed, the sounds become progressively quieter because the points-pores are located further and further from the main road and into the depths of the park. They become louder as the last point completes the circuit almost back to the main road.
In the gallery, the exhibition was designed so that audiences could view the material on a TV monitor hanging on the wall and then, using instructions in the gallery booklet, visit the park. They would then use their phones to see the same information in context at the seven different pores. In this way the audience was invited to compare and contrast their experiences in the different locations, or if they simply stayed in the gallery, to have a different view of a park that they had perhaps overlooked or taken for granted.

The exhibit opened on a Monday, and on the Tuesday evening there was an artist talk. I invited the iwi representative who had blessed me at the park site to do an opening blessing. I also invited Professor Brooks, representatives from KEDRI, Nancy Hawks (nee Smith) and various other individuals whom I had worked with in and around this project and the other case studies (such as Dr Smith). On the night many of these people turned up, alongside members of the public and I found it to be a very special evening (see Figure 35).

Figure 35: Images from Exhibition and Artist Talk
After a karakia and mihi from the mana whenua representative, I talked through the footage showing behind me. I described the *kaupapa* [purpose] behind the work, and shared some stories of *my* experiences at the park. At the end of my talk a number of individuals spontaneously stood up, and shared stories with each other of what it was like for them to be involved in the project, and about the place itself.

Mrs Hawks (nee Smith) shared stories from her family history and expressed her pride in the original work that Clark Smith had undertaken to break the difficult land in for his family. Professor Brooks spoke of how fascinated he was by the water samples he had photographed. He shared that he originally intended to spend only an hour or so on the project but ended up spending many hours working through the little brown box I had given him. Another participant, one of the marae founders who had been videoed for the Marae Case Study, shared stories of the founding of the Papakura Marae (which is situated next to the park) and Māori history of the local area.

In many ways this was the most special night of the entire project and perhaps one of the most significant of my PhD journey. The work was very well received, and not only that, it had become a vehicle for the people in the room who I had connected digitally, to then connect (and in some cases re-connect⁴²) in person. Many people commented on the different layers that they could see both in the room, and on the screen, and noted what an interesting group of ‘experts’ had gathered in the room at the same time (including tohunga, kaumātua, university professors and doctoral recipients, genealogists, former town councillors, and local historians). One kaumatua noticed the significance of the project happening at Matariki and the wish that it would be of benefit to the spirit of the park, and to those residing around it.

⁴² There were several reunions that evening of old friends and former colleagues – a reflection of working in a small town.
Later in the week (on a Saturday morning) I took a small group (including the gallery curator) around the site and showed them the mobile footage. This was a different kind of ‘talk’. In a way it was both a type of performance while also being commemorative in nature.

I walked around each point and by about Pore 4 everyone had clicked into how to use the technology. . . . I took the time to let them see the footage before I talked. I told lots of funny stories and felt really happy in my heart to have people there to share it with. . . . It was fun at Pore 5 for them to say they loved the spinning Daisy image, and then for me to point out it was a simple lawn daisy under their feet. (Entangled Worlds Blog, 29/6/2013)

At the end of the week, when the monitor was switched off and the signage was taken down, I felt a deep feeling of sadness which lingered for several weeks. I only resolved this feeling by going down to the park again and having a picnic lunch, and realising that the work there is on-going, into the future. On my return home, I set up a ‘Friends of Te Kōiwi’ Facebook page and started the process of lobbying for the current draft management plan to be turned into a formal, enacted document thereby providing an increased degree of protection for that place.

Comments and Feedback

I interviewed a number of individuals who had collaborated with me on the project to gain their perspective on the experience. I did not ask the gallery audience to fill in questionnaires, but invited them to write comments in a book I provided next to the exhibition. I asked those who attended the walk for their feedback via a questionnaire or interview.
General Feedback

First of all there was a small amount of (mainly) anonymous feedback in the gallery book both directly after the talk and during the week. There was a variety of positive sentiments expressed about the work, some of which I found very poignant in that those people clearly understood the philosophy behind the work.

In addition, there were emails that arrived directly after the talk, and during the week that it was exhibited. Two of these were from individuals working at research-archival institutions who had helped me to find information for the exhibition. The first individual had helped me find the information about the land confiscations at a local research library:

Sorry I wasn't able to make the opening of Place. However, I called in at the art gallery on Saturday to have a look. Until then I didn't really understand what you were trying to create, but now I do. It's very impressive. I also had a walk around Te Kōiwi Park (thanks!). I admire in particular the way archival documents and photographs have been revived or brought to life by linking them to their place of origin.

This last sentence was exciting for me to read at the time as it showed that someone new to the work had understood the deeper philosophy and intention behind my work.

Another individual from a different research institute from which I gathered data sent this email:

My colleague and I visited Papakura Gallery yesterday to see your work. The video was amazing and we loved the concept behind the work. The interaction between technology, visual stimulus and sense of place was wonderful. We did not have enough time to go to Te Kōiwi Park and test out the app but next time I am out that way I will be sure to check it out.
I was interested that they had picked up on the idea of sense of place and connected it with the technology. I was also pleased that individuals from other institutions had taken the time to visit the exhibition and see their work re-contextualised.

A number of individuals who had worked with me on my other case studies had attended the talk and provided feedback. Marae Participant 6 gave their feedback in three different ways:

via an email the next day:

Created new opportunities for learning and ones that needs [sic] to be expanded and developed with the technological tools used – here and other marae.

via a signed comment in the gallery book:

What an awesome presentation that captures the beauty, whakapapa and wairua of a joyful landscape; magical touches, going deep into the roots of a land, through its pores and LIFE.

via a supplement to his Marae Demonstration interview:

Notion of inclusion was a factor during the exhibition with tangata whenua, academics, general public feeling an affinity with elements of the exhibition. Left me feeling elevated and honoured by depth and knowledge that was shown.

**Interviews with Collaborators**

In the weeks following the exhibition I contacted a number of people who had collaborated with me in some way during the exhibition and asked them some questions about the experience. They were:
Table 4: Collaborator Interview List Park Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Occupation/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gallery Assistant (name omitted)</td>
<td>Assisted and coordinated all events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor John Brooks</td>
<td>Professor of Food Microbiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr John Robertson</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer: Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Hawks (nee Smith)</td>
<td>Genealogist/descendent of original European settlers at park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gallery Curator (name omitted)</td>
<td>Facilitated exhibition and provided expertise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have only selected a few key extracts from each conversation, but the conversations were all extremely rich and interesting in their own ways.

The gallery assistant helped with practical matters (including installation and de-installation) and who also attended the Tuesday night Artist Talk. She sent her feedback to me via email, and emphasised the connections that were made as a result of hosting my work in the gallery:

Through Maggie's exhibition I met with people at the Papakura Marae for the first time. I met the CEO and the local chairperson. Through this meeting I was introduced to a local weaver who, a few weeks later, ran a workshop in weaving *harakeke* [flax] at the Papakura Gallery. . . . Brought together Papakura Museum's historian and educator with the gallery staff to enjoy Maggie's exhibition and to see further possibilities of sharing interests and resources.

She also talked of connections made with the local area:

Connected Papakura Art Gallery to a specific local location. This project helped the gallery to feel very connected to the land and to the community through Maggie's exploration of time and place.

and local community:
Maggie's exhibition brought together the marae, gallery, museum, AUT, people engaged in the local community to share, discover and celebrate. . . . At the opening it was obvious that Place inspired people in the local community to support projects such as Maggie’s and felt inspired to take this project further by engaging more with local youth through this project.

And across disciplines:

This project brought together people from different disciplines such as from Fine Arts, Science and Technology creating a collaborative project which truly engaged with the local community through her art practice. Overall Place established and developed relationships in the community bringing existing organisations together and developed existing relationships through a unique exhibition.

Professor Brooks attended the Artist Talk and sent a comment via email afterwards:

Thanks for the invitation to your exhibition opening tonight. I enjoyed your presentation and really like the way you incorporated my images into the whole. Thanks for inviting me to be part of your project; it was something different from my normal work, but at the same time it was what I am good at.

I interviewed him several weeks later and he expanded on this comment noting that he enjoyed the experience of engaging with his normal tools but having fun using them for a different purpose:

I thoroughly enjoyed it. It gave me the opportunity to do things I don’t normally do . . . playing with my microscopes and so on. I thought the context was interesting. The whole concept right from the very beginning interested me. So when you brought the samples – it gave me the opportunity to be a bit artistic as well, rather than entirely scientific. I took the best pictures I could but I chose to give you the ones that I thought were the
nicest aesthetically. There were lots of pictures that I took or could have taken that I thought were not really the sort of things that people would want to see but they were interesting in of themselves. But the pictures I took and gave to you I thought were pleasing generally. So that was fun. And it gave me the opportunity to do things with microscopes that I don’t normally do – trying to stick my camera down the eyepiece of a dissecting microscope for example – and trying to make it work. Because they are not designed to do that. So that was fun.

Professor Brooks shared his surprise at my obvious attachment to the land, and also similar views expressed by the kaumatua who had attended and performed the blessing:

I was a bit surprised by your obvious attachment to that piece of land. To me, a total outsider, it is a bit of land in the middle of Auckland which is now perhaps used differently than it originally was. But is it any different for me than Albert Park, or the Marina, and the answer is probably no it is not, but to see your link with it and the kaumatua, to see his obvious association with it, that was really interesting.

Another participant, Dr John Robertson, was unable to attend the talk but I took him the DVD of the work to view in his office and interviewed him after the viewing. While he was disparaging of the technical quality of the work, he was intrigued by the ideas and concepts behind it:

Any time somebody comes up to you with a different point of view it is valuable. Anything, even if it is something you disagree with entirely. Your idea of going around a place, a reasonably mundane suburban park it is a good idea. I think it is a very good idea. Perhaps it would be worth trying to extend into other open spaces around because every space has its own soul-character if you wish. It might, it would be nice if people had something that might induce them to take a moment and try to feel the space more. Because I don’t think we do that
enough. Too often we tend to view things two dimensionally on a TV screen rather than go there and smell it, poke it, get your finger wet, that sort of thing.

He also commented on the temporal dimension that the work included:

Going back to what you were doing I like that sense of time, I like also the sense we are not just individuals now, at this point but we are at the end of a very long time string which stretches behind us – however many generations back we want to go.

The interview covered a range of different topics, including the neutrality of technology and the nature of the spirit of place. I noticed afterwards a feeling of gratitude that my work had brought me in touch with such interesting thinkers that I would never otherwise have met.

Mrs Nancy Hawks (nee Smith) was interesting to interview as she had been very vocal with her praise during the Artist Talk, but during the interview had some concerns and requests in terms of the data. In general she seemed very happy to be involved and to contribute her own family history to the process:

Oh I was delighted. I just feel that if I hadn’t been involved the Smith part wouldn’t have been involved.

But it became clear during the course of the interview that she was very concerned that someone viewing the material, without an understanding of NZ history, might think that her family had directly taken land from the Māori or had personally cheated them in some way. She also wanted to make sure that one of her photographs was clearly labelled in future exhibitions. We discussed this for a while and I reassured her that even greater clarity would be brought to the historical information in future talks so that the process of land acquisition was set out clearly.
This discussion reminded me of the very personal and sensitive nature of the information that I had compiled, and the fact that documents and images were artefacts of real lives and stories and contested cultural dynamics. It reminded me of the importance of taking care of any concerns and always respecting the wishes of those who contribute information and remembering that in contested places and situations one should never take good relations for granted.

The final participant whose feedback I wish to share is that of the gallery curator. In some ways, her feedback was the most powerful and intriguing. It seemed, from my discussions with her, that she had had a quite profound experience on the ‘Artist Talk and Walk’ event that occurred on the last Saturday morning of the exhibition.

At the beginning of the interview she talked about her analytical interest as a curator, and the fact that this was an ideal project for her in that it:

collapsed a whole lot of things in one space which was a robust conceptual framework, based on research which I have real interest in. And the outcomes out of that – they were linked directly with a place and that place had a direct link to the place where the work was going to be shown – that is fundamental to me. And so for me it was like a dream project. It was like the project that didn’t exist but the idea that a project like that was possible took me to Papakura and it was a project like that, that if I had the time and the resources and the energy that I would have tried to create. Although not exactly like that in terms of its outcomes and its research, but one that’s deeply connected to place, activated history, activated stories, engaged people in a real way, took a whole lot of stories, and perspectives and narratives and brought them into one place and presented them by the community for the community.

Later, as a participant in the guided walk at the park itself, she had a quite profound experience that took her relationship with the work to another level. I
am including a large section of this conversation as it has a number of themes that I will pick up later in the discussion of all of these cases:

But until we were actually in the place, on the site, you were crucial to that process – that you took that walk, you took a group of people around the site and we got to hear the story of the place but then as we stopped at the individual sites, that became portals, we got a deeper understanding of the multiplicity of layers and could then understand, it then became palpable and tangible how all those different threads of knowledge fed into the work and how it became alive through that experience. That for me was a really defining moment it was one of my – you know if I had had nothing else to do with that project and I had turned up and just gone on that walk it would have changed my life. Like it really changed my life hearing the stories, understanding your perspective and understanding the way you’d approached the whole project. And learning how you had tried to collapse this high end technology, into very archaic spiritual practices for want of a better word and using dowsing because it was on this waterway. I loved all of that. I loved through physically engaging with the project those other elements were able to weave into it. It became real as an artwork, but it also became real as to what I perceive the intent to be – which was to give people an experience of this site that they wouldn’t otherwise have. And actually one of the funny things was I had heard you talk about it all the way through – the idea of these portals – giving people a portal and that’s the way I had used that language but it wasn’t until I was physically on that site standing on that space, accessing this portal in this kind of magical way and then stepping a metre that way and losing my portal and wanting to go back into my portal I became like – it was a really defining moment in terms of the history and experience of place and the way that has lived on in me. But also as an art experience it was a defining moment in what art can be and its possibilities.
When asked about whether the work supported the spirit of the place she agreed, and echoed the words of the Marae Case Study participants when she said that it was because of the process that I had undertaken to create the work:

There was so much integrity in the way you had approached it and the way you’d gone about collecting the stories and information. Your strategic approach was very much about honouring the stories and the history and the people and you kind of collected a story of that place and all of the multiple layers. And there is so much respect in that process. And it wasn’t just the stories but also the actual physical place. You had tried to understand what it was and what it felt in order to choose what those sites would be. I don’t know how to really put that into language. And that way that you spoke at the end, you said something lovely about how all the decisions you made, and the way you used technology, it had to give, it had to be an act of giving rather than taking. Because so many people go somewhere and they want to take something in order for it to be part of their project, but yours was all about giving. It was about taking that and being a channel or a conduit, in that sense you became a crucial part of that work – because it had all come through you and back into that place.

Park Artist ‘Talk and Walk’ Questionnaire

In addition to this feedback from the gallery curator, I asked the three members of the public who attended the event to fill in a similar questionnaire (see Appendix 5) to that of the other cases. The only addition or change in this questionnaire was a question related to the use of a monitor to engage with the park and also the addition of the words ‘relate to’ in the question: Did this experience in any way shift or change the way you perceive, or relate to, Te Kōiwi Park? This was added to see if the members of the public who attended the walk had a shift in relationship (attachment/connection) in addition to a change in perception. I felt it was a valid change given that this was a slightly different group of participants, all of whom were completely new to the site.
While the number is small, their feedback was interesting and valued (see Table
5).

Table 5: Participant List Park Case Study – ‘Walk and Talk’ Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Participant 1</td>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>Pākehā, Male</td>
<td>46-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Participant 2</td>
<td>Marketing Executive</td>
<td>Pākehā, Female</td>
<td>46-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Participant 3</td>
<td>Manager, Cultural Institution</td>
<td>Pākehā, Female</td>
<td>46-55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Experience**

One participant (scoring a ‘3’) reflected the comments of the gallery curator in
that she saw my commentary as integral to her enjoyment of the event, and the
technology detracting more than adding to the experience:

Initially, the experience was fun. I enjoy exploring technology
and am very interested in the possibilities for providing
surprising and enlightening experiences. However, in the end I
found the technology more of a barrier. Most of my interest
was sustained by the creator’s commentary rather than the
mobile device. A couple of reasons for this: the technology
wasn’t “quite there” as an engaging experience. Although I
understand the reasons for using the website, the need to
manually drive the experience diminished it for me. I am looking
to get swept along in the magic of the experience and this didn’t
achieve that. As well as manually moving from Pore to Pore, the
video button was below the crease on the screen (from
memory).

Secondly, although I understood this to be an art project, the
connections between the works for each pore and the location
were not clear to me. Without explanation I would have lost
interest quicker as the screen was too small to engage my
emotional response to the digital works and the works didn’t
speak to me directly about the landscape. (Park Participant 3)
Another participant echoed this view commenting that it was the human element that they enjoyed the most (scoring a ‘3’):

Being somewhat old fashioned and a technology luddite, the mobile application was certainly interesting and helped display aspects of the site that were not immediately visible. The insight into the history of the site was the most interesting element. However, the most enjoyable element of the tour was the group engagement, discussion and dynamic. The stories around the application were more of interest to me than the application itself. (Park Participant 1)

In contrast, the final participant scored the experience a ‘5’:

It provided insight into a piece of land that at first glance was somewhat uninspiring. (Park Participant 2)

In order to carry out a comparison, participants were asked how they found the material in the gallery.

When faced with this comparison, the Participant 2 marked the gallery experience lower i.e. a ‘3’, as compared to her previous result of a ‘5’. Her reasoning was that it was:

Less engaging than the walk around the reserve. There was no sense of relevance to what was seen on the monitor and as a result it lacked context.

On the other hand, Participant 1, who had previously scored a ‘3’ now scored a higher score of ‘4’ for the gallery experience noting that the type of more ‘passive’ technology in the gallery suited them better:

In some ways the engagement via the monitor was more rewarding, though in this sense it would have been better to have seen the park before going to the gallery. From a technology sense, the monitor was a bit more stable and also
more passive. It didn’t require fiddling around with the device to get the data. The passivity suited my circumstances at the time, letting me drift in and out of the displayed images over a longer period of time whilst also engaging with other elements of the gallery space.

Participant 3’s score remained a’ 3’ in response to this question, and she relayed some unexpected aspects of her experience:

Following the brief introduction at the gallery I was keen to experience the digital version in the park. However, as a non-local that interest was more to do with the innovation than it was with the park per se. I was interested in the installation but I would not have been moved to visit the site if I did not go with that in mind. Interestingly, I was surprised by the landscape when we arrived at the park. From the installation I was expecting something more lush and, dare I say it, interesting as an environment. I realise the project aimed to show how interesting the place actually is – and I certainly did learn that.

**Shift in Perspective**

None of the participants had been to the park before and two qualified their responses with this point:

Yes, but really only in the sense of first impressions. Having never been to the reserve before there was no preconceived ideas about what it was like. First impressions on arrival were that it was relatively bland piece of land. The experience added richness to the land. (Participant 1)

Yes. Though in reality having never been to the park before this would not be surprising. The mobile application did allow the peeling back of layers in the site in a way that would not be possible otherwise. Normally, I wouldn’t have looked twice at a reserve like this but the mobile application allowed you to take a different perspective. (Participant 2)
Participant 3 had already commented on this point at the end of her previous response:

I realise the project aimed to show how interesting the place actually is – and I certainly did learn that.

**Spirit of Place Supported**

The penultimate question was whether the participants felt that the technology supported the spirit of the place. One participant responded with a ‘3,’ commenting that while it did not support, it also did not ‘detract’:

I guess I’ll answer this by saying that I don’t feel it detracts. It certainly respects from the point of view of allowing us to engage with underlying, invisible aspects of the park’s story (either because of passing time or lack of knowledge) and that is possible. In this respect it brings the park back to life. (Participant 3)

Another participant (scoring a ‘4’) also gave a qualified response:

This is a tricky one. I think it is fair to say that the technology does not disrespect the space in anyway. I don’t feel that it really captures the heritage of the site fully. What pulled the whole experience together was the narrative that accompanied it. This seemed the most respectful element as it aligned with the oral history associated with Māori tradition. (Participant 2)

Participant 1 scored ‘4’ but for different reasons:

Yes. It provided an insight in the history of the place in a non-invasive manner. (Participant 1)

**Use for Own Work**

The final question addressed the potential for the technology to be used in their own work, however only one (Participant 3), was a place practitioner. This
participant scored a ‘2’ (the lowest score for any questions) and commented that they were interested only in principle, reflecting their overall disappointment of using the technology in practice:

Not without some advancement. I felt the technology was a little raw and insufficiently satisfying to meet our objectives for audience experience. In principle though, yes. I am interested in how such technology develops.

Obviously these results reflect a very small group of general members of the public, but do offer some interesting insights when compared with the commentary by the gallery curator who attended the same experience with this group. It is also interesting to compare these results with the feedback from those actually involved in the process.

Personal Reflections
This case was the most complex of the three, the most personally satisfying and most representative of trickster practice. By engaging across a number of different boundaries (discipline, culture, dimensions) I not only learnt about myself, but allowed others to connect and build relationships in ways that would not have otherwise occurred.

On an inner level, I gained a great deal of personal knowledge from the case study: about the history of my town; about different technologies and software packages; about individuals connected with the location; and about researching place in general. Key to this learning was the experience of how to engage across cultures of discipline, ethnicity and organisation with integrity and with the ability to hold all of their points of view as valid. In the case of contested sites such as this one, there are many different personalities and stories at play, and it was challenging for me to balance these different interests.
I noticed that I constantly had to remember that the gallery and the park exhibition-sites were equal and needed equal attention. The white gallery space with my name on the wall boosted my ego much more than a park where nothing was visible, only the video content at the different ‘pores’. I had to keep remembering that the material needed to be of the same quality in both, and the same care and attention should be given to each exhibition.

It was interesting to use the portal of the phone and other digital devices to see the park in new ways. Viewing the park from up high, at microscopic level, and through different digital channels (visual and auditory) allowed me to engage in a deeper more holistic way than I would have if I had simply walked around. The device of the phone became a way to reveal aspects that were previously hidden, not just in gathering the material but also in presenting it later.

Overall, this project represented most clearly my own relationship to, and investigation of the spirit of place. Here, more than in any other location, I felt a palpable presence, a personality or soul of place which, at the beginning, was wary of me, but later welcomed, supported and protected me in my work. There were a number of uncanny elements at play (e.g. dreams, strange images in photos) that were as valid and useful in knowing the location as the scientific and technical data that were collected. I felt that the forms of the exhibition did support the spirit of that location, with others appreciating what I myself could see, and each ‘pore’ acting as a conduit for this appreciation to flow back into the spirit of the site using the phone as a portalling device.

In this project, I enacted all the trickster traits noted in Chapter 5. I twisted and turned within a complex array of realities while working with whatever was to hand. I created a path of discovery using spiritual and non-‘rational’ methods blending old and new way-finding systems. By redistributing knowledge out of institutional settings, and allowing many forms of expertise to be layered together, I opened up opportunities for liminal moments of transformation to
occur. This is artus work. All of these elements will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 8, when I synthesise all three case studies together, but for now some general reflection is needed in relation to the central proposition.

General Reflections

The central proposition of this thesis is that geo-locative technologies can support the work of individuals who actively engage with spiritual sites, and can also support the spirit or spirits of those places when used within a trickster-inspired place practice. The inquiry focusses on the opportunities and issues that geo-locative mobile technologies generate when used on-sites with traditionally spiritual associations.

It is clear from the research that many participants saw these tools as being potentially useful to support and add value to their work. Some participants pointed to the potential to create ‘rich and immersive’ experiences, and to be able to ‘dig deeper into stories’ through use of links to videos and other media. For others it created a sense of ‘empowerment’ as the user was in control of what information they engaged with. It also offered a possibility to them to engage more effectively with youth. For collaborators, it ‘stretched horizons’ and allowed them to engage in activities that they would not normally do (becoming technologists or micro-artists).

Feedback from the participants generally affirmed the notion that these technologies supported the spirit of place, with marae participants more affirming than those on the cemetery site. Collective feedback on the park site demonstrated a generally positive result. When describing how the experiences supported the spirit of place, or in the case of the marae, the wairua, there were a number of reasons given. I classify these reasons in two ways: participants felt that either the mobile experiences themselves had supported
the spirit of places, or they felt the intent and integrity of the practice *behind* the mobile experiences was the critical factor.

Within the first category, individuals felt that the mobile experiences provided new meaning to the locations, making them more relevant and perhaps more respected as a result. The experiences allowed people to engage with invisible elements and brought places to life. For others, the experience was inherently connective, allowing them to connect to the knowledge, or the ‘IP’ of the place, and to the ancestors who had lived there previously. Others saw the capture of stories as key to supporting the spirit as it allowed these stories and memories to live on for future generations.

In the second category, the sensitivity, respect and integrity demonstrated in the consultation, selection and creation of the material were most important. For them, if the right protocols were adhered to, and the right individuals spoken to or involved, then the spirit of place was, as a direct result of this process, respected and supported. Two participants indicated that there were signs given to them that the work was supported by, and supporting, of spirit.

Of course there were others who did not believe the spirit of the place was supported, for them the chief reason was issues with app functionality. On the park site during the artist walk, it was *my performance* and *my story of working with the technology* that were important in supporting the spirit of the place and enjoying the experience – not necessarily the technology itself which one person found distracting. I will discuss each of these findings in more detail and then note the opportunities and issues that emerge out of these different points of view.

A number of issues were identified in this work. First and foremost there were technical issues (particularly in the case of the cemetery), and issues related to the sensitive selection and use of material, protection of intellectual property,
importance of maintaining political control of what type of technology is 
adopted and when, and cultural safety in light of the powerful stories and 
doorways that could be opened by using these kinds of technologies. There 
were also a number of opportunities that emerged across these processes, 
including the opportunity to learn “what is out there” and have new 
experiences not only of technology, but also of places and self in relation to 
place.

In the next chapter I examine this proposition and inquiry more deeply – what 
does support actually meant when enacted within a trickster practice? I 
examine the case studies in the context of artus work: the re-articulation of 
meaning, place, knowledge; and culture. Taken as a whole, I see this as a more 
sophisticated understanding of what supporting the spirit of place may actually 
involves.
Chapter 8 - Synthesis

This thesis reinvents the trickster as a guiding metaphor, a presiding spirit, and as an inspirational figure for a new form of place practice that supports the spirit of place, and those who work in and around spiritual sites. This practice creatively weaves together ubiquitous technologies, indigenous and speculative ontologies, and integral research methodologies.

My results demonstrated that the use of geo-locative mobile technologies supported the spirit of place, as it was variously understood by place practitioners, and in the context of the practice that was enacted. For many research participants it was the experience that was created using the technologies that was supportive, for others it was the process of creating the experiences and sensitivity and intention behind the work. Many participants had comments about both which is natural as the experiences using the phones and geo-locative apps were not created in isolation but as part of a particular practice. In this chapter I examine these different findings in more detail, and also critically examine some of the issues and opportunities that emerge as a result.

Shapeshifting, Polytropia and Bricolage

In my practice I had a number of different ‘skins’. At times I was a site-specific new media artist. Site-specific artists are most successful if they have links within a community (Kwon, 2002, p. 135). These links enabled me to network and collaborate in ways that other artists coming fresh to the location could not. That said, without formal training in fine arts, or in art practices, this was not a skin within which I felt comfortable. I was merely using an artistic identity to tunnel my way into the art establishment and find a way to support the spirit of the park in a creative way.
I was also a creative technologist working in the digital world to process and play with images and sounds taken from each site. This skin felt more comfortable as my belief is that anyone can use technology creatively. I am also, very obviously, an academic researcher, albeit one who was ‘inside’ the community in which I was working. I was also a facilitator who worked with the spirit of the location as an active stakeholder to heal and adjust energies in a way that supported the multiple layers of that site.

As a female Pākehā researcher engaging with Māori histories and contested and conflicted European histories in relation to Māori, it was a difficult to navigate the different knowledge terrains. To do this I engaged polytropically within and across all the case studies. Within the project at the cemetery, for example, I was in a relatively comfortable Pākehā-European paradigm as the material was almost purely European colonial history. At the marae the material was Māori but the project utilised technology from a Pākehā company. I shifted my perspective to engage with this world view and find ways for technology to be adapted appropriately within it. At Te Kōiwi Park multiple worlds collided with layers of stories intersecting each other forming a woven mat of pain, toil, triumph, contestation, pride, and resignation.

My trickster practice, translated through the integrally informed research design, promoted a degree of epistemological and ontological flexibility. This allowed me to work inclusively across different disciplines and cultural paradigms, allowing each to be valid within its own frame of reference. I listened to physical scientists, for example, talk about their own way of engaging with the narrative of the land. I could understand why they were surprised at the spiritual attachment expressed by the kaumatua and myself, to ‘a bit of land in the middle of Auckland’. At the same time, I worked alongside a local psychic.

---

43 Efforts were made by the original author for this not to be the case as noted in the Cemetery Case Study.
and a team of earth healers and considered their practices to be just as valid. Each group had a different understanding of ‘the spirit of place’ – in the trickster framework each was right.

I also assisted others to try out new identities. In the case of the Professor of Microbiology, it gave him an opportunity to do things he wouldn’t normally do, and to be (in his words) “a bit artistic as well.” Several other individuals were also able to engage in this way – and contribute to an artistic venture which was outside their normal role in society.

Being able to be flexible and open-minded to the realities one encounters is only possible through reflexivity. I used my relationship with the places in my case studies as a way of supporting my reflexive practice. I recorded a number of instances where my own judgements and assumptions were unearthed. I was surprised at the degree of land confiscation that had occurred in my own town and the depth of history that was evident both from a Māori and a Pākehā perspective. I also had multiple moments of surprise working with the collaborators – particularly the scientists who truly embraced and understood the deeper motives behind my work in a way that I had not expected. I learned a great deal from those that I worked with, both about their work, but also the worlds in which they engaged.

**Bricolage**

My practice was made up of a bricolage of methods, set within a methodological framework inspired by tricksters and manifested through integral theories and mindful of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. I tinkered with a range of technologies in order to achieve different visual and auditory perspectives, and used methods from hard and soft sciences to assemble a variety of other material. I had a direct dialogue with the places I visited – interpreting my dreams and noticing signs and synchronicities to guide
me along the way. I was an ‘interpretive bricoleur’, creating montages (in the case of the park), as part of a technologically inspired form of transdisciplinary, cross-boundary research.

In the park I networked with formal institutions to access material from their archives while also connecting with the histories and stories of local residents, friends, and families who were associated with that site. I collaborated with scientists, soliciting their help and their ‘eyes’ to understand the site through perspectives foreign to my own, while also engaging with mana whenua and kaumātua associated with that site to receive spiritual mentoring and advice for my work.

The mixing and layering of material at all the sites, but particularly the park, allowed new ‘stories’ and ‘representations’ of the place to be revealed. Somerville (2010) argues for work in place to “encompass the multiple forms in which alternative representations of place are expressed; the embodiment of experiences in place; and the multiple alternative voices and stories about any particular place” (p. 342). My research allowed new representations of those sites to emerge through the bricolage of data and actions that occurred.

Denzin and Lincoln (2005) describe an ‘interpretive bricoleur’ as somebody who pieces together representations that are specific to complex situations and who notices, through the bricolage, how emergent properties emerge (p. 4). They explore the notion of ‘montage’ where a number of images are laid upon one another or juxtaposed in order that, like a jazz improvisation, “images, sounds and understandings are blending together, overlapping, forming a composite new creation” (ibid). This, in retrospect, is a description of my work, particularly the use of live visual mixing software (VJ) to layer material and allow something new to emerge.
The bricolage of engagements created an opportunity for different kinds of expertise to be juxtaposed and mutually appreciated and allowed experts to see themselves in different ways as the following quotes illustrate:

Notion of inclusion was a factor during the exhibition with tangata whenua, academics, general public feeling an affinity with elements of the exhibition. Left me feeling elevated and honoured by the depth of knowledge that was shown. (Marae Participant6-Park Participant 6)

This project brought together people from different disciplines such as Fine Arts, Science and Technology creating a collaborative project that truly engaged with the local community through her art practice. Overall ‘Place’ established and developed relationships in the community bringing existing organisations together and developed existing relationships through a unique exhibition. (Art Gallery Assistant)

Bricolage fits with speculative ontologies in so far as it brings together a number of objects and relations in a way that is emergent and engaged with here and now interactions. Perhaps in its most extreme forms, this type of research bricolage is deeply co-creative in so far as place and researcher inquire into each other. Certainly there were moments in my research where I felt as if I was being examined as much as the locations in which I was engaging in my work. Not just by the humans, but by unseen elements associated with those sites.

Rodman (1992) advocates for the viewing of places from systemic, reflexive, and multi-vocal perspectives (p. 647). By shape shifting, twisting and turning, and engaging in bricolage across the different sites, I supported a multi-vocal, inclusive understanding of the spirit of place which brought together individuals from different worlds, fostering a spirit of mutual understanding and respect. This process expanded several participants’ horizons and created opportunities for them to learn about new technologies, and about other types of expertise.
By including the spirit of each place as an active stakeholder, I allowed myself to be guided as to what type of support was needed. I was open to not only participant and collaborator dynamics shifting at any time, but also my relationship with the location itself. I allowed myself to notice the signals that were occurring in and around me via dreams, gut feelings, coincidences, and physical signs (e.g. the images appearing in the photographs). The inclusiveness of the engagement created an opportunity for innovation and for significant shifts in perspective to take place in the participant group and in myself, as will be noted later in this chapter.

Wayfinding and Redistributing

My practice revealed hidden trails of stories which had always been linked to those places but needed to be made more visible. In the cemetery case study, Dr Smith allowed the stories she had researched to be reattached to the individuals that generated them. At the Papakura Marae, stories and archival photos previously held only by kaumātua were re-located back onto the grounds. At the park, institutional archival documents and historical research materials were re-placed onto the site making them immediately accessible, albeit in an artistic, layered form. At the same time, scientific data normally extracted and then held in institutional settings was made available to the general public. Non-institutional community research undertaken by family members also became available for the first time to a more general audience.

By placing previously hidden or cloistered stories and data back into the landscape from where it was sourced or inspired, a re-contextualisation and redistribution of knowledge occurred and a different form of learning was enabled. Participants were excited and/or empowered by the greater degree of accessibility of stories and information (italics my emphasis):
Most interesting and easy way to learn more about the people buried in this cemetery . . . a great way for tech-savvy people to explore history. (Cemetery Participant 2)

Everyone has a phone. Everyone wants to know and understand. The individual is empowered and in control of what he or she wants to engage with. (Marae Participant 1).

I admire in particular the way archival documents and photographs have been revived or brought to life by linking them to their place of origin. (Exhibition Feedback)

Dr Smith has worked hard to bring history out into the community and in many ways she personifies the current movement to demystify and democratise the information contained in institutions such as museums. As she notes:

Not everyone wants to come in here [Museum], but it is again trying to say to the community we are taking the history to you, you don’t always have to come to us. (Dr Smith).

Smart devices of any sort facilitate the movement of knowledge out of institutional settings and allow not only a greater degree of accessibility, but also a sense of empowered navigation. One participant felt positively about the ability to follow links and rich media content in addition to the story:

like the ability to dig deeper into a story through additional resources. (Cemetery Participant 7)

These empowered, self-navigating experiences take place both in physical but also digital space. Place practitioners using these tools are therefore supporting a new form of wayfinding which mediates between virtual and physical realms. P. L. Arthur (2006) sees a convergence of online resources occurring, and a decontextualizing of information (for example historical information), as the collections of multiple institutions are able to be navigated at once (pp. 9-10). I see, however, a re-contextualisation of information occurring, where stories,
histories and data of any sort are re-situated back into their original contexts using geo-locative, augmenting reality, mobile applications. This data is then navigated via a form of way-finding that mediates between physical, digital, social and in my case, spiritual worlds.

McLuhan (1964b) sees the meaning of communication residing in the medium of its transmission. Does resituating data in this way change its meaning? Certainly there is the possibility that providing access through a device associated with popular culture may detract from its perceived value. Away from institutions of memory such as museums and archives, and removed from the rituals one goes through to access documents (e.g. passcards, gloves, ceremonial handovers in hushed environments), this knowledge may now be less ‘valued’ than before. Also, when placed in hypertextual environments where one can simultaneously access multiple layers of conflicting stories, the mana of certain stories may be diminished or retreat into a blur of information.

At the same time, putting information back into the communities to which it relates and revealing knowledge from one part of a community to another is potentially empowering. For me it harks back to Gruenewald’s (2003b) declaration that places are “profoundly pedagogical”. Geo-locative technology combined with appropriate place specific content and valued-filled practices brings that notion more clearly to life.

**Connected and Embodied Learning**

The process of revealing previously hidden stories also supported learning and community connection (italics my own emphasis):

> use the technology to *increase understanding and power* of our culture. (Marae Participant 6)

> It is something we can connect to in the community . . . *it does bring all races together*. Fosters *connection* between Māori and
other groups. The more people know about it through technology the more people can connect to it . . . it is the connecting of people. (Marae Participant 5)

Supports spiritual connection to the land, water, trees, sky and ancestors. Sensitivity with which project has been handled. Intrinsic value to future generations. (Marae Participant 6)

Participants felt that the spirit of the place was supported by simply recording the stories and allowing them to be shared in different ways:

It records the stories so that they can be shared for a long time. (Marae Participant 2)

Many locals that are not from Papakura are able to retell the kōrero [talk/speech] to their mokopuna. (Marae Participant 3)

The work presented opportunities to those working in places who wished to create immersive learning experiences:

The technology has huge potential to offer visitors with a rich and immersive experience of a historic site. (Cemetery Participant 6)

The experiences also supported embodied and holistic learning on-site. As one marae participant put it when asked about the difference between the mobile versus purely online material:

Walking around helps you be in the environment – you can tap into the wairua, you can smell the grass after it has been mown, feel the sorrow at a tangi. If it is just online then there is no way to really connect to the marae’s spirit. (Marae Participant 7)

Another participant, Dr John Robertson, encouraged me to take the work further as it offered an opportunity to re-embody places:
Too often we tend view things two dimensionally on a TV screen rather than go there and smell it, poke it, get your finger wet, that sort of thing.

This embodied form of learning allowed not only the physical environment, but also the digital material, to enrich and support the learning experience. In this way the user is navigating their way through stories and knowledge in a similar (but more superficial) to that in which original peoples navigated their way through ‘storied’ landscapes. Once participant likened this to ‘attaching’ narrative to place:

I really enjoyed the stories attached to each area (Marae Participant 2)

It is a vastly different experience to have information delivered on tap than to know it through oral, embodied experiences. However it is more accessible than when locked away in institutions that are only accessed by those who know the rules of engagement, who have ready access to transport and know where to look.

Participants and collaborators on the various sites saw the increased availability of knowledge as a way of supporting the spirit and spirits of the place:

The more information that is freely available the most justice it does to the people profiled . . . Gave insight into the lives of the early settlers . . . which would not have been possible without a great deal of research on my part. (Cemetery Participant 2)

For others a layer of new meaning was added to the site and a deeper, one-to-one connection made with the people who lived there previously:

It gives meaning to what you are seeing and reading in the cemetery . . . brings home that you are not just wandering through a public park there are real people . . . real lives. There is a one to one relationship with story you are hearing – not just
using a phone to call your friends in auditory range of loved ones. (Cemetery Participant 5)

This kind of mobile, situated engagement is fundamentally embodied. It allows users to engage in a multi-sensory experience of a site that brings knowledge to life in a way that exclusively online e-learning does not. The benefits of multi-sensory learning have been supported for many years in alternative education streams (see for example Yonemura, 1989) but are only relatively recently being explored mainstream academia (Fors, Bäckström, & Pink, 2013).

The process of resituating knowledge supported practitioners by demonstrating how these tools and processes can be used to empower and connect. At the same time, the spirit of place was enlarged conceptually as it was enriched and augmented by material that was carefully and sensitively retrieved and curated. The material was inherently connective, bringing people, stories and place together in new ways and fostering a new appreciation and respect for those sites. For some, the capture of stories was itself key to supporting the spirit, as it allowed these stories and memories to live on for future generations.

Transforming

My trickster practice facilitated small to major transformations not just within myself but also within others who engaged with the work. This happened not only through assisting others to try out new identities and providing opportunities to learn from other perspectives, but also through direct experiences of the locative technologies in action. These experiences facilitated shifts in perspective that, while varying in degree, gave places and the spirit of places new meaning.

Liao and Humphreys (2014) argue that mobile augmented reality allows people to change the way they ‘see’ spaces and places as users actively modify the world around them (p. 13). My research shows that augmenting reality mobile
applications also support shifts of different levels. In all case studies some form of perspective shift occurred in at least a small portion of those engaging with the experiences. Across the case studies it was clear that those who were completely new to the location scored higher levels of perspective shift on the site than those who were already familiar with the location (who scored very low in this area). But even those who were familiar with a location had elements of shift in their point of view. One participant, for example, who had a long history with the Papakura Marae noted that it “uplifts the place like new paint work or planting new plants in the garden”. Another, again already connected, noted that it made it feel as if it was a “marae on the move with ambition and aspiration.”

The research of Hofmann and Mosemghvdlishvili (2014), found that those heavily using AR (in the strictest definition of this term) became more unfamiliar with their surroundings with a negative result, and casual users had only a minimal change in their awareness of the spaces they visited. Navigational and display issues were among the causes noted. In this study on locative mobile technology (rather than strictly defined AR), users had experiences of unfamiliarity in a positive way despite the technical issues present. For many participants, their perception of the environment shifted from of a dead, inert plane to one that was vibrant, alive, and filled with new meanings and connections. The experiences revealed previously invisible elements, bringing places to life. For others, the experiences connected them more directly to the knowledge, or the ‘IP’ of the place, and to the ancestors who had lived there previously.

From Dead to Living Places
Technology is by many accounts considered to be a ‘dead thing’, indeed a participant commented on this: “it is a machine sort of thing and you haven’t got that living aspect of what the information is going to allow you to hear . . . ”
It is also considered to be something profane. Mobile technologies are made up of a variety of technologies originally created for military applications (e.g. GPS) and could not easily be associated with any form of spiritual practice. And yet, paradoxically smartphones – profane ‘dead things’ – have been a catalyst for bringing places to life, and were acknowledged by participants to support the spirit of the spiritually significant sites.

Thrift and French (2002) see software sitting between the “artificial and a new kind of natural, the dead and a new kind of living, or the material and a new kind of material semiotics” (p. 310). And indeed, a number of participants talked about how the mobile experiences made the places somehow ‘alive’ (italics my own for emphasis):

Great to hear the stories, makes the place come alive even to someone who hasn’t a personal connection. (Cemetery Participant 7)

It *enlivened* the experience for me....What would have been a static experience otherwise, became a *living and vivid* experience . . . It *brought to life* the history, events and people and the connections they have to place in new and interesting ways. (Cemetery Participant 6)

I admire in particular the way archival documents and photographs have been revived or *brought to life* by linking them to their place of origin. (Exhibition Feedback)

This sense of enlivenement brings to mind the work (mentioned in Chapter 4) of Bennett (2004, 2010), Barad (2007), Hornborg (2001, 2006) and Bird-David (1999). Bennett (2004, 2010) argues against “dead or thoroughly instrumentalized matter” which “feeds human hubris and our earth-destroying fantasies of conquest and consumption” (p. ix). For her the world is fundamentally ‘alive’, engaged and interactive. Likewise, within Barad’s (2007) ‘agential realist’ paradigm, matter is not stable but instead is a “stabilising and
destabilising process of iterative interactivity” (p. 151). Places with smart point ‘intelligences’ in operation, can in some way be seen as unstable territories that are highly relational in their nature – connecting people, code and place in ever changing configurations.

Hornborg (2001, 2006) and Bird-David (1999), from a perspective drawn from indigenous ways of knowing, see the world as profoundly relational and also spiritual. They, like many of the traditions around the world from which they have drawn, engage with places as interconnected, profoundly spiritual, and inherently alive. In this way, these experiences, albeit in a superficial way, connected both old and new ontologies.

Transformative Process

Csikszentmihalyi (1990) notes that in every flow activity there is some sense of discovery where a person is pushed into a new reality and the self is transformed by making it more complex (p. 74). Thus, when in flow on a site using these technologies (if they are working well), there is the potential not just to catalyse shift of meaning at a superficial level but to also create more deeply spiritual experiences. Again, referring to Coyne (2010), these devices “work the thresholds of the urban environment” and may “irritate by their defective functioning”, but can also “act as catalysts and stimulants by expanding spatial experience, provoking and nudging their users, as well as critics and commentators, to behold new horizons” (pp. 169, 184).

For some the expansion of awareness was small, they were simply excited about the possibilities that were generated while exposed to the technologies.

   Exciting just thinking of possibilities . . . Learning what is out there – as in technology. . . (Cemetery Participant 5)

For others it enlarged perception of location (and potentially other places)
Strengthens and enlarges perception of this marae and all other marae – potentiality of using technology to put together information for greater publicity and potentiality. (Marae Participant 6)

But in other cases, deeper shifts occurred. In the Park Case Study the exhibition-based experiences were ritualistic in nature, operating during Matariki – a liminal festival where both the past and future are honoured together. It represented a harvesting of knowledge where the earth and sky came together through the engagement of spiritual, physical, social and digital elements. The phone became the entry point, the portal and connector from the body to the various pores located around the site. Information was provided to the audience (via the cloud) and the audience then sent information back to each pore through expressing wonder and appreciation at each location (and in the gallery space remotely as they viewed the place through the portal of the TV monitor). This resonates nicely with the Matariki tradition of flying of kites during this time, reinforcing the connection between self, earth and sky.

In this liminal zone of possibility, deeper shifts occurred within at least one individual. Their experience was of a spiritual nature but involved a number of changes occurring in basic values and assumptions as in the extract below:

but it wasn’t until I was physically on that site standing on that space, accessing this portal in this kind of magical way and then stepping a metre that way and losing my portal and wanting to go back into my portal I became like . . . it was a really defining moment in terms of the history and experience of place and the way that has lived on in me. But also as an art experience it was a defining moment in what art can be and its possibilities.

In this way it could be said the experience, as a whole, but mediated particularly through the GPS-enabled device, supported a transformative educational experience. Referring back to earlier discussions on transformative learning and
meta-reflective experience, this can be said to be a ‘second order’ perspective shift that has occurred through a disruptive or disorienting event, in this case viewing the many facets of the park via the ‘pores’ of the park.

**New Meaning and Respect**

The experiences fostered in some individuals, a new sense of respect and interest in locations. Participant felt it encouraged people to explore further:

One needs a bit of encouragement to explore further as opposed to knowing where the cemetery is and having walked through it. (Cemetery Participant 2)

Others pointed out that the experiences had the potential to make people more aware of the places where they lived, and make places more relevant i.e.:

taken it into digital technology world. (Marae Participant 4)

Some saw this as an opportunity to increase environmental appreciation:

Anything that makes the cemetery more relevant and well-known in the community is desirable. Greater interest will lead to more security, less vandalism etc. (Cemetery Participant 3)

It gets people aware of vandalism and decay – that has to be a plus. (Cemetery Participant 5)

Any time somebody comes up to you with a different point of view it is valuable. Anything, even if it is something you disagree with entirely. (Professor John Robertson)

These latter comments in particular, point to the need for greater research on the relationship between these technologies and positive environmental behaviour. Through shifting the meaning of places from dead plots of land to enlivened environments, and through reconnecting stories to people, can a stronger attachment and respect for places be achieved?
Kincheloe and Steinberg (2008) argue that ‘epistemological and ontological’ shifts occur through exposure to situations of multilogicity. For them, multilogical approaches, in which different kinds of logic (and realities) are juxtaposed, promotes “a spatial distancing from reality that allows an observer diverse frames of reference”. This can be likened to the way that Kegan (1982, 1994) discusses the concept of ‘subject-object’ shifts and cognitive development where individuals move from one way of seeing and being to another. Kincheloe and Steinberg (2008) recognise that art and aesthetics allow for new types of meaning to occur, and, in effect, promote a kind of “alternate epistemology, a way of knowing that moves beyond declarative knowledge” (p. 140). In my work, the multilogical, heterotopic nature of the places and the practice perhaps combined together to promote shifts in understanding those locations.

Somerville (2010), describing her work with Indigenous Australians, notes how “new pedagogies, and alternative ontologies and epistemologies” were created in the emergent, in-between space. For her, this was an emerging form of place pedagogy which was constituted by a deep engagement with stories (and other different kinds of representation), the importance of embodiment in place, and the view that places are third space or meeting point of cultures (p. 335). She noted that changing our relationship to places means seeking out previously invisible place stories or generating new stories about place (p. 336). When related to my research, it seems that relationships to places were, in some cases, changed. At the very least new, more expansive meanings were attached to the locations that were not there previously – whether this process changes future behaviour in relation to those sites is a point for further research.

**Portal Revealing and Creating**

The case studies represent a continuum of different kinds of support and trickster work. On one end I situate the Cemetery Case Study where I worked alongside an existing place practitioner to support their work and add
value/augment research that had already taken place. In this case the material was already revealed so a portal was opened between existing knowledge formats (oral and written) and new technology. The work also opened a portal to those in the past who became known and celebrated in the present.

At the marae, the work involved curating partially revealed material (via a public publication and already shared stories). Stories from elders were digitally captured so that they would be accessible for future generations. The wairua and mana of the location were supported not just through fully revealing and making these stories accessible to a wider audience, but also through celebrating the past, present and future of that community and that place. In this way a portal was opened between different parts of the marae community (but also between the marae community and the Papakura community in general via the connections with the art gallery, museum and university). The portal between the spirits of those before and the generations to come was potentially supported and regenerated in this process.

In the final case study, the park, the site was hidden in many ways and the information almost completely unrevealed. To the naked eye Te Kōiwi was a relatively unremarkable suburban park and its ‘tapu’ status, its contested history, and the hidden worlds that existed within it were largely (but not completely) unknown to the public. Using a bricolage of different methods to gather data, the hidden depths of the site came alive, not just to the collaborators who worked on, or around the project, but also to the audience who encountered the digitally mixed samples that I had taken from the site. In the exhibition, particle board samples merged with family photos, water samples with clay images, letters from teenagers with macro photos of daisies.

In this case study, layers of history and of knowledge merged, mixed and melded, and in certain moments, the spirits of the place revealed themselves on camera and handed me a key to the site. It was in this project that I literally
opened portals, through the ‘pores’ of the park which became liminal sites during the festival of Matariki, for not only investigation but also healing and a ‘meeting’ of worlds.

After engaging in this research I can see how geo-locative mobile apps have the power to not only reveal and amplify heterotopic locations, but also to create them. Through the juxtaposition of material from different times, and different realities a heterotopia of place upon place emerges. Using ‘layered’ technologies one can create an unexpected bricolage of signs and sound bites that do not usually go together and that transgress social order and traditional sense-making. In this way places can be organised in a way different to their surroundings, revealing secret worlds of intertwined media with good or evil intent.

During these projects the smartphone was itself a portal or ‘mirror’ in Foucault’s (1986) terms. The device connected knowledge from The Cloud to those on Earth. It can also be likened to trickster tales where the gods are visited in order to bring (steal), knowledge for use in the human world. In the case of the marae application, karakia were eventually inserted into the start of the application to ensure cultural safety for those encountering the precious information. In the cases of the park, which was ‘wāhi tapu’, and the cemetery, a minority of participants struggled with the relationship between the technology and the location. These devices acted as portals between the sacred and the profane.

Potential Issues

Technical

In a number of cases technical issues disrupted the connection of user to place and undermined efforts to support the spirits of those places. As one participant noted:
Fiddling around with the phone works against the experience of the place. Ideally the experience should not involve touching your phone at all on the tour. (Cemetery Participant 7)

Indeed when mobile technologies are not blending seamlessly into the background but are instead thrust into the foreground they are no longer seamlessly strengthening connection or shifting meaning. Coyne’s (2010) notion of tuning is relevant in this situation. When in-tune with a location a device disappears into the background. But, in his words, “nothing brings a device into conspicuous awareness so much as its complete breakdown” (p. 19). He argues that ubiquitous devices can present as “alien and alienating artefacts [as they were at some points in these cases] rendering the environment unfamiliar and distorting the landscape of everyday encounters” (p. 185).

I liken this experience of disappearance to the concept of flow proposed by Csikszentmihalyi (1975, 1990). Flow emerges out of positive psychology and describes a state of immersive focused motivation. To be in flow, there need to be clear goals; a good balance between the challenges at hand and perceived skill level and an inherent confidence that the task can be achieved; and immediate feedback to allow for adjustments to keep coming back to a positive state of flow (Csikszentmihalyi, Abuhamdeh, & Nakamura, 2005).

In all the case studies, but particularly at the cemetery, the participants had clear goals, but in some cases they perceived their skill level with any form of mobile device to be poor. The level of feedback was not quick enough, due to clunky aspects of the particular set up of the technology, for individuals to stay ‘in flow’, which meant also staying ‘connected’ to the site. This is a critical point in relation to experiencing the spirit of a place, as it is difficult to do so when you are fiddling about with technology and feeling as if you ‘haven’t got it right’. As devices and apps become more responsive and merge further into the background this issue may not be so impactful but there is an opportunity to
experiment with different combinations of device and software to optimise user experience and minimise disruption on these sites.

**Political**

Mr Kake advocated for controlling the pace of change within his marae, and being very aware of what was coming – as opposed to being ignorant of it. He said, “I don’t discount the fact that it is happening, I’m not afraid of it, but like any change it would be nice to be a part of it as opposed to being controlled by it”. That said, one of the participants (a staff member at the marae) commented that resourcing technologies like this could be an issue and it was critical that different voices were incorporated into any future applications:

> difficult if you cannot afford access for staff, and updating material may be an issue. Need other input than just the kaumatua represented. (Marae Participant 8)

Other participants strongly advocated for the material to be in Māori as a first choice:

> should be in Māori with options to access other languages (keeps essence of kōrero intact). . . everything wraps around speaking Māori . . . need to minimise compromise but find other ways for languages to access it . . . can’t express the importance of telling location stories in Māori. (Marae Participant 1)

Indigenous peoples have a long history of having their knowledge “discovered, extracted, appropriated, commodified, and distributed “by colonial powers (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p. 5). Walker (1996) describes Māori as having a “long and deep-seated aversion to the commodification of their knowledge”, particularly when this knowledge provides income to those who appropriated it (p. 175). L. T. Smith (1999) argues, that with the dawn of a new century, the recognition of indigenous knowledge is not so much of an issue as the “commodification of knowledge as intellectual property, of collective
knowledge as public knowledge, and as valued-added takes the struggle to a new set of cultural interpretations” (p. 108).

The neo-liberal forces of consumerism and commodification strive to package everything into a new form of experience, one that can be monetised and commercialised in some form, and within this nature itself has not been immune (Castree, 2003). My work created opportunities for generating revenue in those places where it was previously disallowed; perhaps it is also an oppressive study in indigenous and environmental commodification.

Urry (1995) claims that places are increasingly restructured as centres for consumption through, among other things, the ‘tourist gaze’. Individuals or groups move from what they understand to be their home, to other places with an expectation of solace, excitement, completion, romance, learning and in the process of their encounter with places, they consume them visually, and also on a material level through exhausting resources and degrading the environment.

Certainly the three case study locations are now set up to be gazed at more easily (should the relevant organisations choose to commercialise the material that has been gathered). Instead of learning stories through residence, or at least diligence and effort, individuals and groups can simply flick on their phone and gather a superficial layer of information about the site: a bit sized chunk of cemetery stories, and a two minute visual dilution of traditions and memories at a marae.

Urry discusses a number of different kinds of tourist gazes in his work: reverential gazing (in relation to sacred monuments); environmental gazing (looking for and assessing impacts); and collective gazing (where the gazing needs others to fully consume the visual delights). The technology allows the tourist or audience to augment their experience to provide the fullest
experience possible – they can then consume the location via multiple channels and thereby fulfil their sensory needs.

Manovich (2006) argues that today’s augmented spaces are dense with data and video surveillance as video monitoring and sensors harvest information from any point in space (p. 223). Every aspect of life is now captured and stored to create an invisible panopticon that is ever-watching and always-on. The trickster god Hermes was the god of spies – by setting up experiences on these sites I may have set up the infrastructure for people to be spied upon as they engage in and around these sites.

McLuhan (1975), and later Ihde (1979) describe technology, specifically electronic media, as simultaneously amplifying and reducing (also rendering obsolete and reversing) aspects of human activity. Recently, Papagiannis (2011) has adapted these ideas to augmented reality. She argues that AR enhances information sharing entertainment, gaming, education, and human vision and renders obsolete Virtual Reality which is a completely ‘online’ form of immersive environment. She sees AR ‘retrieving’ among other things tactility, physical engagement, and mobility. Eventually, she argues that AR will itself be rendered obsolete (or reversed) when technology allows individuals to no longer be able to distinguish reality from the virtual (p. 64). I would also add to this model the idea that any form of augmenting mobility enhances and also renders obsolete the ability to connect to self, others, place and spirit. The practice and intent behind the use, not the technology itself, would be critical to these outcomes.

44 Although this research used Augmented Reality only in the latter part of the Marae Case Study, it has relevance to geo-locative technologies which are essentially augmenting sites.
Legal

Digitising previously oral and analogue materials has made it much easier for the material to be copied and intellectual property stolen from the individuals and organisations that submitted it. Even though stringent controls were put in place there are still risks involved, particularly with cloud-based, multi-server systems. Some augmenting reality and geo-locative applications available via the Playstore or iTunes offer no protection for the IP of users, and the fine print in many instances, turns over the IP rights of the material to the software developers in return for free use of product.

In all case studies it was necessary to seek permissions to use different kinds of material as part of the research. In the Cemetery Case Study, owners of material who had already given permission for publication and public use were consulted to ensure they were happy the material was able to be used as part of mobile experiences. The complex layering of images at the park site also meant that acknowledgements of images needed to have multiple contributors listed in order to ensure each aspect of the montage was represented.

Cultural, Social and Moral

Issues were raised by participants about the care that needs to be taken with the selection of material on these sites. Dr Smith, for example, took great care to ensure that material at the Cemetery was sensitively presented and did not sensationalise family histories. As a cemetery participant noted:

> Anything you put online would need to be careful over and think about the consequences. Make it interesting but not for titillation purposes.

On the marae site there were issues raised about cultural safety protocols to protect those engaging with sensitive material:
If a person has no knowledge at all then need to have some basic warnings about coming on the marae – we take some of these simple mechanisms for granted . . . Cultural safety needs to be taken into account. (Marae Participant 8).

protocols, tikanga have been added in. A karakia (prayer) needs to be added so people clicking into it can be comfortable. We should try and do what we do in the physical. (Original Participant 5)

For some participants in the stage one interviews (living on traditional rather than urban marae) there was no place at all for mobile phones in around marae and certainly no place for karakia or other aspects of tikanga to be integrated into the design of mobile experiences. While it would be easy to assume that the work on these sites could be easily replicated, each context is different and careful consultation is needed in all cases.

Shackley (2001) notes that the behaviour of fellow visitors materially affects the nature of the individual visitor experience as it modifies the ‘spirit of place’ of a spiritual site (p. 35). She points out that tourists have sometimes had an adverse effect on the very spirit that they wish to encounter through inconsiderate behaviour, crowding and environmental degradation.

In New Zealand, for many individuals, particularly in older generations and indigenous peoples, mobile devices are culturally inappropriate to use in cemeteries (or marae or wahi tapu sites). Encountering individuals using their phones in these locations could potentially cause great offence.

Opportunities: The Work of Artus

According to Relph (2007) the precise, sacred sense of the genius loci cannot be simulated in virtual worlds any more than it can be created in real ones, because “humans do not create gods and spirits” (p. 5). But with this work, instead of simulating the genius loci, I believe that it was supported through
being reconceptualised into a more dynamic and relevant notion for the 21st century. In a trickster practice, those who work with place become polytropic, porous boundary dwellers, wayfinders, and multidimensional facilitators within heterotopic assemblages of voices, intelligences and realities. I consider this practice in all its manifestations to be a form of ‘artus work’ — trickster work at the joints of society to open portals of opportunity.

The juxtaposition of expertise and knowledge systems through a bricolage of activities and methods was a form of artus work. Unlikely individuals were brought together at a liminal time in the calendar — Matariki. Within this framework existed an opportunity for the joints of the knowledge and truth associated with those places to be revealed, and slightly subverted through mutual meeting and story sharing. At the same time, shape shifting and enacting a form of polytropia worked at the joints of my own personal identity as I twisted and turned to meet the needs of the different worlds I encountered.

The placement and re-placement of stories was also a manifestation of artus work. Through this research different representations of place came together in montages of kōrero, particle board, family photo, leaf, sky people, birdsong, grave stones and truck noise. These representations were delivered via a mobile portal that only revealed these stories when individuals were actually physically embodied in place. The work increased the accessibility of sometimes contested information about places and supported greater connection across a number of areas. Joints between knowledge institution, self, discipline, culture and place were broken and reconnected in new and different ways.

Through revealing existing but hidden stories and knowledge, and collaboratively creating new stories and knowledge, changes in relationship to places occurred in small and profound ways. Places and their dead became newly relevant and alive, and the joints of epistemology and ontology were reworked as multi-vocal, multi-local engagements and actions brought disparate
lives and understandings together in new ways. According to Markevičienė (2012), what he calls ‘genius loci sites’ often lack the visual characteristics of heritage sites, but are of great importance to local communities, seeming ‘nothing special’ to the others at the same time (p. 78). This work revealed the heritage that was invisible and made the importance of the sites more clear. Heidegger (1954/1977) and (following him) Ihde (1979) see technology as an ontology, a way of knowing the world that “is a mode of revealing.” Is this mode of knowing and being in the world so dissimilar to other, ‘alternative’ and ‘speculative’ philosophies where humans are but one piece in gatherings of spirit, body, place and code?

Perhaps this ontology, associated with the profane, paradoxically opened portals to the sacred. Indeed, throughout all of these trickster acts the joints between what is sacred and what is profane were shaken. It was clear from participant feedback that the tools and techniques I used were supportive of what they understood to be the spirit of the place, but the act of engaging with these tools on traditionally sacred locations was boundary tinkering.

A participant pointed out that the work “raises consciousness of Māori to really debate and rationalise this work in terms of tikanga and protocol.” In other words, the very nature of the work forces Māori to engage with these tools in the context of their own rites and rituals in relation to sacred places and wāhi tapu. Due to the emerging nature of the tools that were used, boundaries of culture need to be shifted or arranged around them (by adding in a karakia for example) in order for cultural safety to remain intact.

Indigenous adaption to new digital environments is not new. Kral (2014), writing of his work with the Ngaanyatjarra people of Central Australia, describes funeral protocols changing as youngsters say, write and retain names and images of recently deceased via social media – traditionally forbidden practice (p. 178). He writes of developing practice in Aboriginal Australian media where in digital
databases ‘sorrow photos’ (of deceased) are closed off until family agrees to have them restored to public view (p. 78). And in New Zealand, O’Carroll (2013) has pointed out that digital media (particularly social networking sites) support traditional relationship-building practices, albeit in new ways.

In the Park Case Study, I used the gallery as a place of ritual to support rejuvenation of the park during Matariki. Hyde (1998) compares art galleries to sacred precincts. He argues that the same way that something entering a sacred place becomes (in some way) sacred, so ‘art’ becomes art when in an ‘art gallery’ (p. 195). I also treated the park as a gallery, allowing a public space (that was secretly a sacred space) to be seen in a new way.

The trickster’s art is often not to fundamentally change systems, but rather to point out the boundaries that exist within them. In this way the experiences emphasised the need to have to rules and boundaries, but catalysed a process whereby these were reconceptualised to be more relevant to today’s shifting society. In a digitally enabled world the boundaries between living and dead, sacred and profane, true and fictional, real and unreal have become negotiable. In this territory those working in place to reveal, protect, understand, and nourish the land have the opportunity to also rearticulate the structures of the society that lives upon it.
Chapter 9 - Conclusions

My contention is that geo-locative technologies can support the work of existing place practitioners working in and around places of spiritual significance and can support the spirit or spirits of place when used within a trickster-inspired place practice. In this thesis I have advocated for a progressive understanding of the spirit of place and a practice orientation when working in and around places.

In the chapter ‘Placing Self’ I contextualised my research within a lifetime of attempting to bridge between world views. I described how practice, tricksters, the spirit of place, and emerging technology wove their way through my life to the point where they came together in this work. I introduced the town, and the places that are the focus for this work.

Next, in ‘Place and Spirit’, I argued that place is made up of a multiplicity of objects, intelligences, and realities. I pointed out that the spirit of place is no less messy, and traced how this concept has shifted from an ontologically distinct and real entity, to a purely internal, mental construction through a process of several hundred years of societal change. Over this period, place-based knowledges were demoted and/or removed from the ranks of learning, institutionalised and de-contextualised. At the same time, sacred tools were subsumed within technology and deemed profane. The legacy of this process has been to segment professions and disciplines concerned with place, and marginalise the world views of entire cultures. This exclusion of large tracts of knowledge from academic inquiry diminishes opportunities for innovation.

In the next chapter, ‘Practice, Technology and Spirit’, I pointed out that ubiquitous technologies are enacting a shift in the way that places are encountered and understood. Added to this, places across the planet are increasingly facing ‘wicked’ problems – issues that are difficult to solve by
traditional methods and approaches. There has been a call for more creative methodologies, and an encouragement to adopt new ontologies and ways of engaging in place. Emerging technologies, alternative and speculative ontologies, and cross-disciplinary methodologies present an opportunity to know, and be in place, differently. When spirit is allowed to exist as a sentient other, whether that be in the form of the all-encompassing energy of a place, in the form of those who reside there unseen, or the digital intelligences virtually embedded in the landscape, there is greater possibility for innovation. This progressive view of the spirit of place inspires an emerging place practice that is at once personal, political, social and spiritual, and where instead of studying or researching place, individuals instead practise place.

In ‘Reinventing Trickster’, I demonstrated how the trickster traits of polytropic shape shifting, bricolage, wayfinding, redistributing, transforming, portal revealing and artus work are useful for place work today. In Chapter 6, Trickster in Practice, I set out how this approach could be enacted pragmatically by setting out, in detail, a multi-stage, multi-methodological research framework that was inherently reflexive and encompassed intra-, inter- and transpersonal elements.

In Chapter 7, ‘Conversations and Cases’, I provided details of the different stages of research and provided narrative accounts of three case studies of trickster-inspired place practice at three spiritually significant, heterotopic sites: a cemetery, a marae and a local park. At the end of that chapter, and throughout the next chapter, ‘Synthesis’, I presented evidence to show that the spirit or ‘genius loci’ of the locations was supported as it was understood by a variety of individuals. The practice also supported place practices through shifting the perspective of those encountering places, allowing access to information previously hidden within institutions, reframing how knowledge
and expertise is validated, and inviting discussion about boundaries of what is sacred and profane.

The research also raised a number of issues that need to be addressed when engaging in this type of work which include the danger of commodification, the potential abuse of power and the importance of paying attention to cultural safety. This practice was described as ‘artus’ work – work at the boundaries of knowledge, culture and society.

Limitations and Learning Points

There were a number of limitations and learning points emerging out of this research project. First, the emergent and relatively unconventional nature of the research methodology was challenging to manage within the confines of academia which traditionally tends to favour specialised, planned engagements. Although presented as a relatively coherent framework, the research design was a bricolage of general intentions put into a coherent design retrospectively. I am comfortable with this approach although I notice the tension that existed between the expectations and philosophies of the academy, and my own experiences of what worked in those communities in practice. It could be considered a weakness, from a traditional academic perspective, that the methodology emerged within the process of engaging with those sites. However, enacting a pre-planned, predictive quantitative or qualitative study would have been difficult given that a key reason for this research was to respond to calls for methodologies to have greater methodological flexibility and creativity.

Relatedly, the research design was very complex. This has made explaining this system to others difficult. However, in practice it was seamlessly enacted and the complexity was not noticed. By setting up a framework, and some principles, in general terms a degree of freedom and creativity was possible.
Somerville (2007) sees the development of alternative methodologies as not “a choice but a fundamental requirement of the nature of the research” (p. 226). Given that place is widely recognised to be a ‘messy’ and ‘slippery’ concept and is seen as the meeting point of a variety of realities (social, spiritual, technical or otherwise), research necessarily needs to be creative and methodologically inclusive. Spirit and spirituality are not widely embraced in academia, so any project that had these concepts as part of its raison d’être is automatically unconventional. In this context, it should be noted that my experience of working within academia on this research project was extremely difficult. Perhaps this is a learning point i.e. it is important to ensure that the context for unconventional research is appropriate on every level.

Simultaneously engaging in three case studies which had multiple stakeholders (with whom I had complex relationships), used multi-layered research processes, and all of which culminated in events and exhibitions at roughly the same time was, in retrospect, a challenging strategy. It was only my years of working on complex projects as a consultant that carried me through. The Park Case Study in many ways encapsulated the research and could have stood as a single case study. However, the multi-case study approach, while difficult to enact as a single researcher, did allow for cross-comparison and a richer tapestry of encounter.

I did my best to be inclusive and to involve participants in my work but feel that my research fell far short from being truly collaborative. The case studies were initiated by me in the first instance, the technology was familiar only to me, and the processes were largely driven by me as a producer-director. I would have much preferred to have co-generated the work with others, to have others driving the schedule and to have had much more input from the wider community. This would have, and has, been my normal mode of operation. That said, the research was enacted with a great deal of integrity, and this has meant
that, at least in one case study, ownership has now been transferred to the collaborators and participants themselves.

Practical Recommendations

Tricksters are ambiguous and it may be that on closer reflection I repackaged the spirit of place to be readily consumed through an augmented tourist gaze, and reduced the real to the tattered threads underneath. Perhaps the only difference between supporting and subverting the spirit of place is the intent behind the process and the virtues behind the practice. MacIntyre (1981) stresses the importance of virtues in any form of practice as they enable the achievement of the goals of that practice (p. 191). Practice, according to Fitzmaurice (2010) makes methods and techniques, and in my case perhaps tools important, but also places importance on the “qualities and disposition of the practitioner” (p. 46).

Traditionally tricksters are amoral creatures not values driven practitioners. However, in this thesis tricksters are contextualised within a practice that embraces a multiplicity of realities and contexts, including academic and professional environments. In this context, I identified a number of virtues that assisted my practice. These, when placed alongside the trickster traits can be seen as practical recommendations and points of inspiration, rather than prescriptions, for practice.

Authenticity

There were times where a decision needed to be made between authenticity and more ‘commercial’ production values. At the cemetery a more professional sound could be achieved by cheating i.e. recording Dr Smith’s voice in a studio and then overlaying background sounds from the location to make it sound as if she were in place. Both Dr Smith and I felt that this would have been not only
inauthentic but also disrespectful to the spirit of the location and to the stories which were attached to the location.

For the Marae Case Study the oral history videos could have been recorded at the university studio in the city. Instead the camera person came to the site so that the kaumātua were not dislocated from their stories. At the park, I had the choice of mixing and layering my material in the comfort of my home rather than on-site, but I realised that I needed to more directly engage with each ‘pore’ in order to be true to the spirit of that place.

In all these instances, the value of authenticity prevailed. This was, on reflection, a direct response to being in relationship with the spirit of the places and wanting the work to, as much as practically possible, emerge out of the place (and be of service to its spirit) rather than be manufactured for an audience. While there may be practical issues preventing place practitioners from engaging in technical work on a site (e.g. safety, climate, effect on other visitors, etc.), working on-site to record stories should be given careful consideration. As Dr Smith said:

If you are engaging with a place you have to be there to do it . . . you have to be passionate and believe in what you are doing

**Partnership**

It seems obvious, but the more stakeholders involved in a project, or associated with a place, the more time needs to be given to communication, consultation and relationship building. While the Cemetery Case Study only had one key contact, the Marae and Park Case Studies had multiple stakeholders, many of whom were individuals with deep ties to the locations. It was critical to me that in all cases stakeholders had full knowledge of all of my activities and that appropriate permissions and advice were sought throughout the project. This
was more time consuming in the latter two projects than the first for obvious reasons.

During the research process I used my intuition in combination with my critical reflective skills in order to know when it might be appropriate to check in and ask for approval and advice from different individuals. I was highly sensitive to the possibility that aspects of my work might inadvertently offend due to the experimental nature of the cases and the sensitive nature of the sites. I was also aware that multiple boundaries were being blurred culturally (between sacred and profane activities), legally (in the case of the park when I ‘layered’ material together raising IP issues), and socially (by mixing material from different ‘worlds’ together, and using the technology on the sites at all). Because of these sensitive issues I made sure to include others in the process along the way and was very clear in my contracting process to let them know exactly how and where information would be used. In the Marae Case Study, for example, I encouraged individuals to choose the spaces where material would be geo-located.

When engaging in place practice research needs to be undertaken to understand all of the stakeholders involved and ensure that communication does not just meet institutional standards (regarding ethical protocols), but also builds trusting, holistic relationships. In the case where the work is undertaken in one’s own system (e.g. work or home town), as it was with me, there would have been greater negative repercussions for me personally than if I was a researcher who could disconnect and never return. In the case of engagement with places where the researcher has no link there is perhaps a greater need to actively reflect on both the practitioners’ motivations for being there and on the relationships with those who are connected to the location.

In all case studies I asked permission not only from individuals associated with the location but also from the spirits of the sites. I also consulted these spirits
continually throughout the process. I did not take for granted that the spirits of that location were always on my side and treated them with the same respect as more visible, tangible stakeholders.

**Participation and Inclusion**

I worked hard to involve others, and to ‘train’ them in the use of the technology – at least so that they could review and input information. In future I will work even harder to involve others from the earliest stages and assist them to realise their visions for the end result rather than negotiate them around mine. The next stage of the Papakura Marae project seems to be unfolding in this direction with ownership of the project’s next stages now driven by marae management rather than myself.

**Protection**

Mobile-based smartphone and augmenting and/or mixed applications have complex layers of intellectual property issues that are critical to understand fully before engaging with any group. This is particularly the case with cultures that have long histories of exploitation and abuse in this area. I went to great lengths to ensure that IP rights were protected for the different groups concerned through agreements around the work but also the choices made about the design of the software (e.g. use of passwords, protections around access to different ‘levels’ of information). Many applications use ‘cloud’ storage systems which are based overseas. There are positive and negative consequences for using different cloud systems and these should be adequately researched, alongside the software terms and conditions before engaging in any digital information-based research product.

Another area of protection is culture and particularly language. Despite extensive consultation I overlooked some fundamental aspects e.g. at the marae the material could also have been collected and available in Māori rather
than just English (although this decision was endorsed at the time by mentors and supervisors at the site). In future I would partner with individuals to ensure that the protection of the taonga or language was more fully appreciated and protected.

Finally, when engaging with places which have some recognised spiritual or sacred identity, I felt it was important to constantly treat the spirit as a stakeholder worthy of protection. As an example, I was always discreet and ensured I did not mix activities on my phone e.g. making loud phone calls when also engaging in data gathering.

I would also recommend protecting oneself spiritually on-sites such as these. I was given appropriate blessings by spiritual elders, and undertook personal rituals at each location, to ensure that I was not unduly affected by energies associated with sites. Attention should be paid to these aspects, not least to respect the cultures that are associated with the locations. In my case I had some training and understanding around different practices that support safe spiritual work of different sorts – I would not underestimate the consequences for individuals who do not take adequate steps to protect themselves when working on these sorts of sites.45

Risk

It would have been easy in some situations to opt out of different aspects of my work because it was not something I was skilled at. It would have also been easy not to have chosen sites that had such strong histories and cultural norms associated with them. However, taking risks allowed me to learn and grow, and

45 Consultation with local elders and/or spiritual authorities would be a way forward and, of course, this depends on context. A small personally designed ritual of cleansing and protection at the beginning and end of work on sites is least recommended – however spiritually imbued this may be.
to engage in work that was, I believed, of benefit to the sites and to the people who worked there.

Taking a chance to ask people if I could do the work was a critical decision and place practice needs to respect others’ viewpoints and situations, but also allow the opportunity for individuals to say yes or no without pre-empting this with one’s own belief systems about what is appropriate or not. I know from experience that working with indigenous people can be very humbling and has often revealed aspects of my own culture I would rather not have known. Avoiding is easy, entering into dialogue and relationship more difficult but is potentially more rewarding for both parties. Fear of rejection, guilt, shame or worry over ‘getting it wrong’ should not be barriers to reaching out to any person or group or place.

**Generosity and Reciprocity**

Generosity is an important aspect of place practice as I envisage it. As part of my consultation process I shared highlights of my experience and provided details (where appropriate), of the knowledge and information I was gaining. This was an ongoing process so that information was not just presented in a package at the end.

Where appropriate, I provided introductions that would help collaborators and their organisations in some way. I acknowledged and promoted them publicly and thanked people verbally and in writing.

I tried as much as possible to find ways to give back to the sites through cleaning up rubbish or weeds whenever I visited and reporting damage and vandalism. I also visualised positive energy flowing onto the sites so that what I took I gave back in much greater amounts. I cared about the sites and did my best (and still do my best) to support their spirits after my main research has been done. In the case of the park I have set up a support group to engage
politically in order to have a formal management plan adopted. In the case of the marae, I advocated for the material to be turned into a useful application to be used in the future.

**Perseverance and Patience**

Tenacity is needed with place practices, particularly when engaging with very new technologies. Much of my work involved trial and error and a great deal of patience. Because I was engaging with emerging technologies, on-sites where these tools had never been used before, and with groups I was not intimately acquainted with, there were times I had to be patient with myself, with others and with the tools I was using. Despite little training in these technologies in the beginning of the project I managed, with some assistance, to create experiences that were engaging and interesting and that fulfilled the research aims. This gives me hope that others may be inspired to use these technologies themselves, regardless of their background and previous experience.

It was necessary to be patient on some sites with the spirit, and spirits, of the places themselves. At the park, it took a number of months, and a special ritual, before the park was ready for me to do work there and I was ready to do work at the park. Places are like the key relationships in one’s life. Entering a dynamic for a quick fix, or to satisfy purely selfish desires for wealth or ego gratification, is not necessarily going to deliver a mutually enriching, sustainable relationship.

**Respect**

When engaging with sites that are associated with spiritual elements – even if the researcher does not believe in these notions – it is important to respect the view of others who do. In my case there were several instances where I felt it was ‘disrespectful’ to engage with a location without asking appropriate permissions and having appropriate ceremonies conducted. I also asked
permissions from the spirits of each location to engage with the work and internally acknowledged them whenever I walked on-site.

As an example of respectful use of these technologies, I was very careful about where and what material was placed in and around sites. At the cemetery, for example, I made a choice not to place potentially contentious material over the grave markers for soldiers engaged in that conflict. It would have been disrespectful to their contribution. I also was very careful at the marae to ensure that certain information was located carefully – in the case of the trustee information I asked for a particular point to be identified. At the park I took a long time deciding on marker points, and was very careful about what information was displayed and what was not. I chose not to include names on a particular document as I did not have permission from those families to do so – even if the document was public knowledge. As the kaumatua said at the time, ‘names are names’.

The sensitivity and respectfulness of approach was noted by several participants when asked if the work supported the spirit of place:

Dealt with the lives of those mentioned in the database in a sensitive, unobtrusive manner. (Cemetery Participant 4)

The technology is clearly designed to offer users with different perspectives on the cemetery and is handled sensitively and respectfully. (Cemetery Participant 6)

Of course, there is a fine balance between being overly cautious and being respectful – and there were instances where I perhaps slipped into too much self-censoring. I would rather have erred on the side of caution than inadvertently caused offence.
Intention

Perhaps the best summary of these recommendations is to say that some form of code of conduct is useful when engaging in place work using these technologies. I would say that this code of conduct is separate from that provided by institutional ethics committees, and is more a self-generated, reflexive code that is developed through practice. In many cases, some actions just did not feel right.

A recent report (Pew Research Center, March 2014) predicts that information sharing will flow like electricity, “effortlessly interwoven” and invisible within day-to-day life, and existing as part of an ambient networked ‘internet of things’. It also predicts that augmented reality will allow feedback on daily life through integrated wearable devices. Pew Research Center sees this either having positive effects, such as enhancing global connectivity, or being inherently negative supporting “dangerous divides between the have and have nots”, rising levels of abuse, and decreases in privacy (pp. 6-12).

In using augmenting technologies, then, there is a need to be mindful of whether additions and augmentations are of benefit to the location and the spirit of that place, and whether they contribute to a positive outcome for the planet, or not. The roles I play within the greater spirit of place, and my respect for the spirits of place, are critical to making a positive or negative contribution.

Perhaps the final word on this is best spoken by the participant who had experienced a deeply transformative experience on the park site:

There was so much integrity in the way you had approached it and the way you’d gone about collecting the stories and information. Your strategic approach was very much about honouring the stories and the history and the people and you kind of collected a story of that place and all of the multiple layers. And there is so much respect in that process. And it
wasn’t just the stories but also the actual physical place. You had tried to understand what it was and what it felt in order to choose what those sites would be. I don’t know how to really put that into language. And that way that you spoke at the end, you said something lovely about how all the decisions you made, and the way you used technology, it had to give, it had to be an act of giving rather than taking. Because so many people go somewhere and they want to take something in order for it to be part of their project, but yours was all about giving it was about taking that and being a channel or a conduit, in that sense you became a crucial part of that work. Because it had all come through you and back into that place.

Further Research

There are practical next steps already in place for this research, focused around the Marae Case Study. As has already been mentioned, a bespoke application has been built for the marae so they can maintain access to the information that has been generated as part of this research project. There are also small scale efforts underway to give greater attention to Te Kōiwi Park and ratify a formal management plan for the area.

In the final weeks of 2014, AwhiWorld was reignited. Geo-locative, AR-based mobile apps are now being created that encompass the town of Papakura. Many different organisations have committed time and resources to reveal hidden stories and discover fantastic realities existing in marginal and deactivated spaces and places in the town centre. AwhiWorld scales up the work contained in this document, and democratises the research process so that multiple individuals are contributing performances, artistic works, creative technologies, and mixed media artefacts.

On a more general level, further research is needed into the issues, ethics and impacts of using any form of mobile technology on spiritually significant sites (indigenous or non-indigenous). The tentative results (with a very small number
of participants) point to an opportunity for more research into the role of these technologies in enacting shifts in both place meaning and place attachment, and also shifts ontologically and epistemologically.

Contribution

This PhD project belongs to a growing field of doctoral research that reconfigures, rather than reinforces boundaries between different types of knowledge (Engels-Schwarzpaul, 2013). Rather than meeting a literature gap within one discourse, it contributes original knowledge by bringing together disparate concepts and discourses: spirit of place, sense of place, tricksters, mobility, augmented reality and geo-locative mobile technology.

Within mobility discourse and research on locative mobile and augmented reality technologies, non-human-centric inherently spiritual ontologies remain marginal. At the same time, any Western oriented spirit of place research that is inclusive and multidimensional does not discuss mobile technologies. This research addresses these gaps.

First, it demonstrates how mobile technologies can be used in meaningful new ways and presents pragmatic recommendations to mobile developers about how this work can best be carried out on-sites of special interest. It contributes to locative mobile and augmented reality discourses by providing tangible examples of different perspective shifts that occurred in the use of these technologies. However it contextualises these shifts within a practice orientation and holistic philosophy – emphasising that technology does not operate neutrally in isolation.

Second, the research links emerging technologies with place studies and place research. Scholars calling for work across disciplines, in third spaces, and with alternative and speculative ontologies and epistemologies, can see how these theories, principles and ideas were translated into practice using 21st century
tools. The case studies are practical enactments of philosophies of place that move above and beyond boundaries of culture, practice, methodology, technology and ontology. The case studies answer a growing call for more creative and inclusive methodologies.

Thirdly the research points out important legal, moral and political issues for anyone wishing to use geo-locative mobile apps (or any other mobile device or application) on spiritual sites and/or with indigenous peoples. Intellectual property, power differentials, and cultural safety are all important considerations in this context.

Finally, this work shows that a holistic, interstitial, practice orientation can make a practical, if tentative, contribution to the wicked problems that plague many places in the world. If places are seen as magical, living, rich environments it is less likely they will be denigrated. If places are filled with stories, then the past, present and future of that land becomes more meaningful and potentially more respected. And if experts mutually respect their experiences and contributions the chances for generating innovative solutions within a system are greater. In this way, my research contributed to supporting the spirits of those places and contributes in some small way to those desperately trying to find a way to solve tricky issues of today.

Final Words

In this thesis I have presented the case for a progressive understanding of the spirit of place within both mobility and place literature. A progressive spirit of place understands places to be multidimensional, alive and inspired and includes ubiquitous technologies as well as indigenous and speculative ontologies. For me the spirit of place is practised (rather than studied) in a way that is relational, processual, and embodied. Practising place is a ‘third’ and
‘thing’ space activity operating at time when technology is enabling new representations, but also the restoration i.e. the ‘re-story-ation’ of places.

Hyde (1998) likens opportunities to pores, portals and doorways. I see the emergence of new technologies, epistemologies, ontologies, methodologies, and practices as opportunities to address the need for greater methodological flexibility and creativity within academia. The trickster tools and practices described in this document create and represent portals to new ways of knowing the world that are no longer one or the other – but both and more. They may therefore also offer an opportunity to develop new perspectives on current problems. At the very least they can provide opportunities to view places differently, perhaps more positively, than before.

For me, this is personally true. For the first time in many years I feel as if I have a place in my community, not just through contributing to its development and supporting local organisations, but also through having knowledge about the location that I did not have previously. When I drive around the town I see street signs and buildings that are now markers for a wide range of stories and histories. I appreciate the old families that gave their names to streets and can connect more deeply to their lives. I have found and reconnected to my place in all its plenitude through the profanity of my mobile phone.

Ubiquitous technologies have made it difficult to differentiate between true and false, real and unreal, sacred and profane. Intelligence is no longer confined to God, humans, or static computers, but exists in networked systems flowing between land and the clouds. Places, and the beings, objects and relations that dwell within them, are re-presented via a wide range of physical and digital media. On many levels this can be seen as a new, and an old, way of knowing the world. It is a way of knowing and being that has spawned emergent practices in response.
Geo-locative mobile technologies are a stage in a greater process where, eventually, signals, code and computing will no longer constitute mixed or hybrid reality. They will just exist as reality. As the rigid boundaries of discipline, knowledge and culture are rapidly re-examined, the chances of creating innovative, inclusive responses to intractable issues are limited if spirit remains outside academia. Likewise, if technology continues to be deemed as ‘profane’ when it is completely integrated into day-to-day lives, there will be nowhere ‘sacred’ left. At a time when places face tricky problems, and society is rapidly changing through the exponential uptake of tricky technologies, emerging trickster-inspired practices like those discussed in this document are more relevant than ever.
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# Glossary of Māori Words

This Glossary provides basic definitions for the most common Māori words found in this document. It uses the Māori Dictionary by H. W. Williams (1985) as a core resource, as well as texts by other prominent Māori authors such as Mead (2003) and Marsden (2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Word</strong></th>
<th><strong>Definition</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aotearoa</strong></td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Atua</strong></td>
<td>god/goddess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awhi</strong></td>
<td>embrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harakeke</strong></td>
<td>flax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hikoi</strong></td>
<td>walk (march)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hui</strong></td>
<td>meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iwi</strong></td>
<td>tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaitiaki (tanga)</strong></td>
<td>guardian (ship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Karakia</strong></td>
<td>prayer or incantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaumatua</strong></td>
<td>elder (s)/ kaumātua (pl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaupapa</strong></td>
<td>physical and philosophical platform, purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kōrero</strong></td>
<td>to tell/say/speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kuia</strong></td>
<td>female elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kura</strong></td>
<td>school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mana</strong></td>
<td>power, prestige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mana whenua</strong></td>
<td>local people who have ‘demonstrated authority’ over land or territory in a particular area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manākitanga</strong></td>
<td>welcoming/hosting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuhiri</strong></td>
<td>guests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marae</strong></td>
<td>gathering places which involve a complex of buildings surrounding a courtyard and the courtyard itself. Centres for learning and rituals, providing a variety of services to Māori communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauri</td>
<td>life principle/life force, inner vitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mokopuna</td>
<td>grandchild/children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noa</td>
<td>free from tapu or restrictions/of the everyday-ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>New Zealander of predominantly European descent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pōwhiri</td>
<td>welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puna</td>
<td>spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangatahi</td>
<td>youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohe</td>
<td>area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangata whenua</td>
<td>people of the land/Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangi</td>
<td>funerals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taonga</td>
<td>prized property: tangible or intangible – a treasured thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapu</td>
<td>sacred, set apart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga</td>
<td>customs and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tohunga</td>
<td>Māori expert in spiritual matters (akin to a priest) and in other areas (e.g. carving).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tupuna</td>
<td>ancestors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urupā</td>
<td>burial grounds/cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wairua</td>
<td>spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiata</td>
<td>song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakairo</td>
<td>carving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakapapa</td>
<td>genealogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whānau</td>
<td>extended family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whare wānanga</td>
<td>place of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharenuī</td>
<td>meeting house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenua</td>
<td>land/placenta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices

Appendix 1: Indicative Interview Themes

Example questions are given next to each theme.

Please note that these will not be read out exactly as on the page – the wording may change slightly to ensure the discussion is as relaxed as possible and that the language suits the individual concerned. The questions should be seen as explorative themes.

**Place and Work:** What is your background/work? What is your relationship between ‘place’ and your work? e.g. How participants view and connect to ‘place’ (particularly the local areas that are the focus of this study). Have you heard of- identify with- the term place practitioner? Do you think particular places have a ‘spirit’? If so, how would you describe this? How do you engage with this spirit in the context of your work?

**Place, Work and Technology:** What is your understanding (and use) GPS software (like Google Maps) and your understanding of augmenting reality apps? Do you use a smartphone? Do you know of others in your field using Smartphones in their work?

**Potential Impact:** Given what I have outlined do you see any potential use of this technology in your work? What are the potential impacts on your field? Are there any implications (spiritually, culturally, politically, etc.) of using technologies like smartphones on the location you are connected with? [For those who know nothing at all or very little I will outline the technology for them first]
Appendix 2: Information Sheets and Consent Forms
Versions 1 and 2

Participant Information Sheet [Version 1]

An Invitation
Hello, I am Maggie Buxton, and I would like to invite you to participate in an interview, the results of which will be used for a doctoral thesis in the field of creative technology. Participation is completely voluntary and if you do so wish to participate you can withdraw from the study at any time without any consequences.

What is the purpose of this research?
The purpose of this research is to collect information about how certain kinds of new technologies and media formats can support place based practices. I am also interested in the impact of these technologies on place based practice.

How was I identified and why am I being invited to participate in this research?
You have been identified as being part of the community surrounding Edmund Hilary School and/or a professional working in the area linked to Pukekiwiriki Pā, Papakura Marae and Te Köiwi Park. This identification process has happened through networking with Edmund Hilary School, Papakura Marae, Mana Whenua, Auckland City Council and local historical and scientific organisations.

What will happen in this research?
You will be asked a series of questions by an interviewer. The questions asked will be on your relationship to ‘place’ as it relates to your work; the way that you view a ‘place’ (particularly the area surrounding Edmund Hilary School); your understanding of technologies like mobile augmented reality apps; your understanding of the possible implications (spiritually, culturally, politically etc.) of using technologies like augmented reality apps on a location, etc.

What are the discomforts and risks?
If the questions covered in the interview have potential to cause you embarrassment or emotional stress, please do not participate.

The researcher will be audio recording the interview as so not to have to take so many notes. If the recording of your voice will cause you discomfort or unease please do not participate.

How will these discomforts and risks be alleviated?
The questions have been written as carefully as possible so as to avoid discomfort. If however you find yourself uncomfortable with answering a question you can elect to skip it with no consequences. You may withdraw from the research process at any time.

What are the benefits?
Where appropriate, participants will be provided with up to date information on the latest technological developments that may inform their work - including leading edge projects that are

Please note that layout has been condensed and personal contact details omitted for these example versions
occurring around NZ and overseas. In this way, I envisage the interview process as a form of partnership and exchange. I also hope that the information, once gathered and published, will be a valuable resource for many different groups thinking of using technology as part of their education and development programmes. It may identify issues that need to be addressed as part of any consultation process involving this kind of technology.

**How will my privacy be protected?**
Your responses to interview questions will be kept confidential, unless you specify otherwise. Only myself and my supervisors will have access to the raw data collected, and this data will be stored in a secure location. Your responses will be used in a doctoral thesis, academic articles and conference papers. It may also form the basis of book. Unless you specific otherwise, you will only be referred to by a letter (i.e. participant A) in this thesis paper. The information gained may also be published in peer reviewed journals and conference presentations. All will be done so that no research participant will be identifiable from any publications.

That said, it is important to be aware that due to the research being location specific (with a small number of individuals working within the area), there is a small possibility that participants may informally identified by others working in the location. This is because it is envisaged that quotes will be used, and the opinions of experts put forward and because recruitment for this project has happened via networking, rather than general advertisement. I will do all possible to ensure that identification does not happen, but due to the possible risk involved only partial confidentiality can be offered.

If you wish to be named in this research, please indicate on the consent form.

**What are the costs of participating in this research?**
The interview will usually take up to 60 mins, but you may wish to add material later if you wish, or take more time if necessary. I will come to a location that is comfortable and close to you so as not to incur any costs for transport.

**What will happen to this research?**
Once processed, your interview will be included in a larger research project that forms a doctoral thesis. The thesis will be published, and there may be conference and journal articles and presentations to promote this material. The raw data from your interview will be stored in a secure location for a maximum of 6 years, and then will be destroyed in a confidential manner. No individuals will have access to the raw interview material other than myself, and my supervisors during the time that it is collected, analysed and stored.

**Will I receive feedback on the results of this research?**
If you wish to receive the results of this study please email the researcher (details below) or ask in the interview to be included in a mailing list that will publish the results when complete.

**What do I do if I have concerns about this research?**
Any concerns regarding the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor [details omitted]. Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary, AUTEC [details omitted]

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 12 July, 2012: AUTEC Reference number: 12/134
Consent Form [Version 1]

☐ I have read and understood the information provided about this research project in the Information Sheet dated [...]

☐ I have had an opportunity to ask questions and to have them answered.

☐ I understand that notes will be taken during the [interviews/observations] and that they will also be audio-taped and transcribed.

☐ I understand that I may withdraw myself or any information that I have provided for this project at any time prior to completion of data collection, without being disadvantaged in any way.

☐ If I withdraw, I understand that all relevant information including tapes and transcripts, or parts thereof, will be destroyed.

☐ I understand that due to the size and nature of this study that only partial confidentiality is offered, but that if I wish to remain anonymous that researcher will do all they can to protect my identity.

☐ I wish to receive a copy of the report from the research (please tick one): Yes ☐ No ☐

☐ I wish to be identified by name in this research, having read the information sheet and understanding the risks involved in doing so: Yes ☐ No ☐

Participant’s signature: ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

Participant’s name: ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….

Participant’s Contact Details (if appropriate): …………………………………………………………………………………………………

Date:

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 12 July, 2012: AUTEC Reference number: 12/134
An Invitation
Hello, I am Maggie Buxton, and I would like to invite you to participate in an interview, and contribute some knowledge towards a demonstration application, the results of which will be used as part of a doctoral thesis in the field of creative technology. Participation is completely voluntary and if you do so wish to participate you can withdraw from the study at any time without any consequences.

What is the purpose of this research?
The purpose of this research is to collect information about how certain kinds of new technologies and media formats can support place based practices. I am also interested in the impact of these technologies on place based practice. The information you provide, once processed and edited will contribute some material towards demonstration mobile application.

How was I identified and why am I being invited to participate in this research?
You have been identified as being part of the community surrounding Papakura Marae and Te Köiwi Park [Owhao Marae], this identification process has happened through networking with Edmund Hilary School, Papakura Marae, Mana Whenua, Auckland City Council and local historical and scientific organisations.

What will happen in this research?
You will be asked a series of questions by myself. The questions asked will be based on your relationship to ‘place’ as it relates to your work; the way that you view a ‘place’; and any areas of cultural or historical knowledge you feel is appropriate to disclose and that could be safely shared with others in your community.

What are the discomforts and risks?
If the questions covered in the interview have potential to cause you embarrassment or emotional stress, please do not participate.

The researcher will be taking notes, audio recording the interview and, with your express permission, video recording. If the recording of your voice, or video recording, will cause you discomfort or unease please do not participate.

You may feel uncomfortable hearing your voice, or seeing your material in the final demonstration. If so the interviewer will amend or immediately remove your contribution if you wish.

How will these discomforts and risks be alleviated?
The questions have been written as carefully as possible so as to avoid discomfort. If however you find yourself uncomfortable with answering a question you can elect to skip it with no consequences. You may withdraw from the research process at any time and elect to remove identifiable individual material from the demonstration application/exhibition.

What are the benefits?
I see the interview process as a form of partnership and exchange – the information, once gathered and published in the PHD, will be a valuable resource for many different groups thinking of using technology as part of their education and development programmes. It may identify issues that need to be addressed as part of any consultation process involving this kind of technology. Material from the demonstrations will also be compiled and presented back to the organisations involved.
How will privacy be protected?
The information you share can be made confidential through rendering it into textual material, voice distortion techniques and not attributing an author. But, it should be noted that due to the local and interconnected nature of the project only partial confidentiality is possible. You should clearly note on the consent form if you wish your contribution to be a confidential contribution only. Alternatively, if you wish to be named, and clearly acknowledged in this research, please indicate this clearly on the consent form.

It may also be possible, due to the emerging nature of the technology, and use of Cloud Based Servers that the demonstration may inadvertently be shared with others. It is therefore recommended that you do not contribute information to this demonstration that you feel is highly sensitive for any cultural, organisational or personal reasons.

It is also important that you maintain the confidentiality of the demonstration and ensure that you do not inadvertently ‘share’ the details of how to access online information. This will protect both you and your community.

Your data will be stored on secure servers and uploaded via a particular application to the mobile devices of users. Your responses will be used in a doctoral thesis, academic articles and conference papers. It may also form the basis of book.

How will my intellectual property rights be protected?
All rights to the specific information and/or material that you provide for the demonstration application and exhibition remain your own, and it is your responsibility to ensure that this information is accurate and does not break any international or local laws in relation to civil or criminal legislation. In the case of the exhibition, once compiled in to an artistic work the work as a conceptual whole is copyrighted to the artist/researcher. You can, at any time, request your individual contribution to be removed (e.g. voice recordings, photos etc.) if it is identifiable or discrete component.

What are the costs of participating in this research?
The interview will usually take up to 60 mins [with a follow up interview of no more than 30 mins during or once you have completed experiencing the application], but you may wish to add material later if you wish, or take more time if necessary. I will come to a location that is comfortable and close to you so as not to incur any costs for transport.

What will happen to this research?
Once the demonstration is concluded, it is your choice as to what happens to the raw data. You will note clearly on the consent form if you wish your data to be compiled with all other interviews and given to your organisation. You will also note if you wish for it to be destroyed. The raw data used for the demonstrations will not be held by the primary researcher or stored on any databases or servers after the completion of the PHD. It can only be returned to you, destroyed or given to your organisation.

For the purposes of my PHD, it will contribute tangentially to a larger research project that forms a doctoral thesis. The thesis will be published, and there may be conference and journal articles and presentations to promote this material.

Will I receive feedback on the results of this research?
If you wish to receive the results of this study please email the researcher (details below) or ask in the interview to be included in a mailing list that will publish the results when complete.

What do I do if I have concerns about this research?
Any concerns regarding the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor [details omitted]. Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary, AUTEC [detail omitted]
Consent and Release Form [Version 2]

☐ I have read and understood the information provided about this research project in the Information Sheet dated 1 March 2013

☐ I have had an opportunity to ask questions and to have them answered.

☐ I understand that notes will be taken during the interviews/observations and that they will also be audio-taped and transcribed. I also understand, with my express permission that photography and video-taping will occur.

☐ I understand that I may withdraw myself or any information that I have provided for this project at any time prior to completion of data collection, without being disadvantaged in any way.

☐ If I withdraw, I understand that all relevant information including audio tapes, photographs and video footage or parts thereof, will be destroyed.

☐ I permit the artist/researcher to use moving and still images, and audio material that is part of this project and any other reproductions or adaptations from them, either complete or in part, alone or in conjunction with any wording and/or drawings for an educational public exhibition and/or demonstration. Specifically, I wish to allow use of written quotes ☐ voice recordings ☐ photographs ☐ video footage of myself/provided by myself to be used for the purposes of the exhibition

☐ I understand that they will not be published in any form outside of this project without my further express permission.

☐ I understand that any copyright material created for the Papakura Gallery exhibition, as it is compiled as a whole concept, is deemed to be owned by the artist. I understand that copyright of raw audio-video footage provided by or taken of myself, remains with me and that Maggie Buxton will withdraw my individual contribution on request.

☐ I understand that material may be placed on cloud based servers and therefore remain indefinitely accessible. It is my responsibility to ensure that no sensitive data is provided.

☐ I understand that due to the size and nature of this study that only partial confidentiality is offered, but that if I wish my contribution to remain confidential that researcher will do all they can to protect my identity.

☐ I wish to be identified by name in this research, having read the information sheet and understanding the risks involved in doing so: Yes ☐ No ☐

☐ I wish to receive a copy of the final research (please tick one): Yes ☐ No ☐

Participant’s signature: ..............................................................................................................................................

Participant’s name: ..................................................................................................................................................

Participant’s Contact Details (if appropriate): .............................................................................................................

Date:...........................................................................................................................................................................

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee: 12 March 2013
Appendix 3: Questionnaire – Papakura Cemetery

Please read the attached participant information sheet before completing this questionnaire. Completion of this questionnaire will be taken as indicating your consent to participate.

**Background information**

1a  [Please Circle] Female/Male

1b  Age Range [please Circle] Under 25  26-35  36-45  46-55  56-65  66-75  76-85  86-95

1c  Please describe your work/employment/role ___________________________

1d. Do you have a connection to this location other than attending this experience [Circle]Yes/No

1e. If ‘yes’, what is your connection___________________________________

1f. Did you own the mobile device you used for the walk? [Circle]: Yes/No

1g. It is [please circle]: Android; Apple(IOS); Windows; Don’t Know

**Some specific questions:**

2. How was the experience of using a mobile device to engage with the Cemetery?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enjoyable</th>
<th>'OK'</th>
<th>Disappointing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment as to why you rated in this way.....please be as specific as you can

---

47 Please note that layout has been condensed for this example version
3. Did this experience in any way shift or change the way you perceive the cemetery?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, very much so</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>No, not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment as to why/why not?

4. Do you feel that the use of this technology supports (and respects) the nature, or ‘spirit’, of the cemetery?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, very much so</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>No, not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment as to why (and how) or why not?

5. Would you use this technology as part of your work (should the resources be available to do so)? (Or support your staff/colleagues to use it in their work?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, very much so</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>No, not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment as to why and HOW or why not?

6. Any other comments (e.g. possible uses; potential issues; specific challenges; future improvements; etc.)

Thank you!

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 17 June, 2013: AUTEC Reference number: 12/134
Appendix 4: Questionnaire – Marae Demonstration

Please read the attached participant information sheet before completing this questionnaire. Completion of this questionnaire will be taken as indicating your consent to participate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background demographic information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a [Please Circle] Female/Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b Age Range [please Circle] Under 25  26-35  36-45  46-55  56-65  66-75  76-85  86-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c Please describe your work/employment/role ___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. Do you have a connection to this location other than attending this experience [Circle]Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e. If ‘yes’, what is your connection ________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f. Did you own the mobile device you used for the walk? [Circle]: Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g. It is [please circle]: Android; Apple(IOS); Windows; Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Some specific questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. How was the experience of using a mobile device to engage with the Marae?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enjoyable</th>
<th>'OK'</th>
<th>Disappointing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment as to why you rated in this way.....please be as specific as you can

---

Please note that layout has been condensed for this example version
3. Did this experience in any way shift or change the way you perceive the Marae?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, very much so</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>No, not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment as to why/why not?

4. Do you think this experience supports (and respects) the wairua, and the mana of the Marae?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, very much so</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>No, not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment as to why and how or why not?

5. Would you use this technology as part of your work (should the resources be available to do so)? (Or support your staff/colleagues to use it in their work?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, very much so</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>No, not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment as to why and HOW, or why not?

6. Any other comments (e.g. possible uses?; usefulness? potential issues?; specific challenges?; future improvements?; etc)

*Thank you!*
Appendix 5: Questionnaire – Te Kōiwi Park Project

Please read the attached participant information sheet before completing this questionnaire. Completion of this questionnaire will be taken as indicating your consent to participate.

Background demographic information

1a [Please Circle] Female/Male

1b Age Range [please Circle] Under 25  26-35  36-45  46-55  56-65  66-75  76-85  86-95

1c Please describe your work/employment/role ___________________________

1d. Do you have a connection to this location other than attending this experience [Circle]Yes/No

1e. If ‘yes’, what is your connection___________________________________

1f. Did you own the mobile device you used for the walk? [Circle]: Yes/No

1g. It is [please circle]: Android; Apple(IOS); Windows; Don’t Know

Some specific questions

2. a) How was the experience of using a mobile device to engage with Te Kōiwi Park?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoyable</td>
<td>‘OK’</td>
<td>Disappointing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment as to why you rated in this way.....please be as specific as you can

b) How was the experience engaging with Te Kōiwi Park via a monitor in the Papakura Gallery?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoyable</td>
<td>‘OK’</td>
<td>Disappointing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment as to why you rated in this way.....please be as specific as you can

49 Please note that layout has been condensed for this example version
3. Did this experience in any way shift or change the way you perceive, or relate to, Te Kōiwi Park?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, very much so</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>No, not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment as to why/why not?

4. Do you feel that the use of this technology supports (and respects) the nature, or ‘spirit’, of Te Kōiwi Park?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, very much so</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>No, not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment as to why and how or why not?

5. Would you use this technology as part of your work (should the resources be available to do so)? (Or support your staff/colleagues to use it in their work?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, very much so</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>No, not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment as to why and HOW or why not?

6. Any other comments (e.g. possible uses; potential issues; specific challenges; future improvements; etc)

Thank you!

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 17 June, 2013: AUTEC Reference number: 12/134