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Learning-through-Touring uncovers ways in which people interact with the built environment by exploring the spaces around, between and within buildings. The key idea embodied in the book is that learning through touring is haptic – the learner is a physical, cognitive and emotional participant in the process. It also develops the concept that tours, rather than being finished products, are designed to evolve through user participation and over time. Part One of the book presents a series of analytical investigations into theories and practices of learning and touring that have then been developed to produce a set of conceptual methods for tour design. Projects that have tried and tested these methods are described in Part Two. Technologies that have been utilised as portable tools for learning-through-touring are illustrated both through historical and contemporary practices. In all of this, there is an underlying belief that what is formally presented to us by ‘authorities’ is open to self-discovery, questioning and independent enquiry.

The book is particularly relevant for those seeking innovative ways to explore and engage with the built environment; mobile learning educators; learning departments in museums, galleries and historic buildings; organisations involved in ‘bridging the gap’ between architecture and public understanding and anyone who enjoys finding out new things about their environment.
Scope

The rapid co-evolution of technology and learning is offering new ways to represent knowledge, new educational practices, and new global communities of learners. Yet the contribution of these changes to formal education is largely unexplored, along with possibilities for deepening our understanding of what and how to learn. Similarly, the convergence of personal technologies offers new opportunities for informal, conversational and situated learning. But this is widening the gulf between everyday learning and formal education, which is struggling to adapt pedagogies and curricula that were established in a pre-digital age.

This series, *Technology Enhanced Learning*, will explore learning futures that incorporate digital technologies in innovative and transformative ways. It will elaborate issues including the design of learning experiences that connect formal and informal contexts; the evolution of learning and technology; new social and cultural contexts for learning with technology; novel questions of design, computational expression, collaboration and intelligence; social exclusion and inclusion in an age of personal and mobile technology; and attempts to broaden practical and theoretical perspectives on cognition, community and epistemology.

The series will be of interest to researchers and students in education and computing, to educational policy makers, and to the general public with an interest in the future of learning with technology.
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The most memorable guided tour I’ve participated in as an adult was *Cruisin’ the Castro* with Trevor Hailey in San Francisco (1995). Meeting at Harvey Milk Plaza, the tour lasted around 4 hours and included lunch. The easy-going conversation over lunch reflected the personality of our tour-guide who had invited questions and story-telling from the start. She explained, ‘I used to be in the Navy and when I left, decided I should change my name. I was watching a film and when the credits came up I read the name Trevor and thought it sounded nice. “Treeevoor. That’s the one.” I’ve since found out from the English what kind of name it is …’ She was adept at weaving stories and histories of the area into the real time-space of the group of walkers. Memories of the tour include: seeing the Aids Quilt at the Names Project, calling me ‘sister’ and joking about cats and veggie casseroles, her greeting passers-by in the street, the nice lunch, the fact that it felt a bit risqué and alternative to be on a ‘gay’ tour at that time and that straight people were interested in it, the 1940s cinema, the eclectic businesses that had blossomed in a gay area, the plethora of rainbow flags, coveting the brownstone salvage houses en route, getting a bus from the cable car terminus where there were several homeless people and the contrast and irony of this with cleanliness of The Castro, the warmth of the sun on my back …. And because I enjoyed it so much, I learned a lot about the place.

There are many elements of this tour that combined on that day and at that time to make it a great learning experience for me. Some of this was down to luck. For example, the fine weather. Other elements were planned in advance – such as the itinerary and the tour-guide’s ‘script’. And then there were expected yet unpredictable elements like the passers-by, other customers in the lunch café and people in the tour group. In hindsight it felt as though I was able to make connections between all of these elements to personalise the tour. This kind of experience is very different from tours that are overtly controlling in telling you where to go and what to see without acknowledging the active and informal nature of learning. The ‘public guidance system’, a thick uncoiled length of royal blue or crimson rope, often velvet covered, suspended in loops between chrome stands, has been designed for just this. A polished crowd control barrier that says ‘look but don’t touch. Stay behind the line.’ It’s almost as though the really interesting stuff is always the other side of that line. As a child I remember wanting to see the stuff underneath the beds in tours of stately homes, rather than looking in from behind the rope. There is perhaps here a declared interest in wanting to explore things that are metaphorically and physically cordoned off by ‘public guidance systems’.

Providing participants in tours with a ‘bunch of keys’ that enables them to independently get into and find out how buildings work through interactions with people and objects is the big idea in this book; making buildings and their environs visible and accessible for learning. Drawing on studies in cultural psychology I argue that buildings are simultaneously conceptual and material in that they are produced by participation and interaction, both historically and through current use. Understanding that space is produced by people is argued to be fundamental in
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exploring how buildings work in unintended ways. Acquiring knowledge about materiality and developing skills in recognising decay as a positive element of transition in seemingly planned locations contributes to understanding buildings as haptic learning environments. Although the focus for the creative practice in this book is on visitors’ learning-through-touring, it is important to recognise that the methodology also provides a framework for architects and designers to consider how buildings may be designed to ‘teach about themselves’. For example, knowledge about the ways in which technologies are utilised as touring devices to explore buildings offers opportunities for thinking about the ways in which they may be designed to reveal patterns of use in architectural design. I have also considered how a learning-through-touring methodology may support architects and users talking with each other in design and planning processes. Learning activities have been designed to engage non-experts in understanding architectural design practice and to communicate their contributions to the design process.

In this book learning is defined through embodied interactions with the physical built environment. And touring is defined as participation in mobile learning activity that involves taking risks as a means to understanding and contributing to the built environment. In tours of buildings and the built environment the guide (person and/or technological device) moves alongside visitors to promote engagement with the site and this book positions the participant at the centre of that experience. What visitors bring to the event – the ‘take in’ – is as important as what they ‘take out’. Understanding and exploring the role of technologies, the tour guide and their relationship to participants is integral to developing touring as learning activity; I argue that there is an implicit contract between guide and participant based on trust that is similar to that of teacher and learner. Learning can be reinvigorated through touring and this book proposes new concepts, methods and processes for doing this.
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INTRODUCTION

Tours, as leisure-based activities that aim to engage interest and develop knowledge about the built environment and to guide visitors around a site are often presented as a ‘readymade’ package in which visitors are not involved in generating content for the tour. There seems to be an apparently straightforward problem here in terms of learning. Tours can be argued to close the text of the building and define what visitors ‘take out’ from the experience. I argue that this problem is made necessarily complex in an interdisciplinary set of theoretical investigations (Part 1) and practice-based projects (Part 2) that aim to find out how the social dimension of interacting with other people and objects whilst on the move can reposition learning at the centre of designing tours of buildings.

Part 1 describes a series of analytical investigations that draw on theories and practices across architecture, art, education, geography and urbanism in new ways to shape the practice in Part 2. These theoretical investigations question standardisation and conventions associated with ‘seeing’ the buildings in predicted ways and instead explores how participants may be active in making their own meanings through using imagination, association and asking questions in relation to the experiences they have whilst moving through the built environment.

Chapter 1 outlines an understanding of subjectivity in making meaning that differentiates between passive consumption and active production of texts. I explore theories concerned with spatial practice that work across disciplines of art, architecture and education to argue for a shift in subjectivity from guide to participant in the production of tours. Jonathan Hill’s concept of ‘creative users’, Jane Rendell’s notion of ‘critical spatial practice’ and Richard Edwards’ and Robin Usher’s concern with ‘pedagogies of (dis)location’ are formative in creating an interdisciplinary intersection between learning and touring that questions notions of perceived authority in art, architecture and education. I establish a context for considering processes of touring in which the social dimension of interacting with other people and objects whilst on-the-move is integral in co-constructing meaning.

Chapter 2 begins by describing mobile learning. Learning is defined as mobile, and a particular perspective concerned with physical bodily movement and the situatedness of participants is developed within this field. Activity theory is presented as a basis for developing a theory for mobile learning in which different ways of understanding ‘context’ are explored. In particular Mike Sharples’ interpretation of ‘woven context’ and Richard Edwards’ and Robin Usher’s ‘polycontextualisation’ contribute towards defining a set of attributes of the mobile learner that identify how a ‘contained’ notion of context that has evolved through compulsory classroom-based learning is a problematic one. These attributes provide a platform for further investigation and analysis of what it means to be a
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mobile learner in tours of the built environment and so this chapter moves on to consider how buildings may also be considered as active in developing attributes of the mobile learner. Theoretical perspectives on subjectivity in archaeology and material culture (particularly those of Michael Shanks and Tim Edensor) are combined to explore how ‘context’ and, perhaps more importantly, ‘out-of-context’ and ‘recontextualisation’ are reworked through ideas of material and user transition in the built environment. This creates a need to consider how attributes of the mobile learner may be expanded upon in ways that engage a multi-sensory approach to learning through the design of ‘cues’ technologically embedded in the built environment so that they become mobilised learners.

Chapter 3 starts by defining the tour, tour-guide and participant from an historical perspective to produce a set of interpretative concepts for analysing contemporary conventional tours and critical tour-guides. These case studies draw on research undertaken as an active participant in a range of locations and various types of tour. They look at the structure, content and delivery of information about a location that is relevant to developing understanding about what both interferes with, and enhances opportunities for learning through guided tours. The case studies explore further what it means to be a mobilised learner within a touring context and describe specific traits of the tour that are important to consider in developing an active approach to learning.

Part 2 of the book describes three conceptual methods for learning-through-touring that were conceived and developed through a series of projects spanning 2005 to 2009 and involved working with different groups of young learners aged between 11-16 years. Working with groups of young people who do not normally expect to learn in ‘off-site’ locations as part of their learning programme in schools provided opportunities to explore in practice how mobilised learners take action through being in location. Having analysed different kinds of guided tours as an adult participant I wanted to bring findings from this to the design of learning activities for younger people, primarily to see if the attributes of the mobilised learner and the traits of the tour can be explicitly ‘taught’ through activities located in buildings and their environs. But perhaps most importantly, my experience of working with young people as an architectural educator has been underpinned by a desire to provide opportunities for them to develop knowledge about the built environment in creative and engaging ways that may motivate a lasting investment with the urban landscape. I would argue that young people’s views are not considered in urban design and planning processes and that these projects provide opportunities for facilitating better engagement with this group. The learning-through-touring methods – ‘haptic referencing’, ‘micromapping’ and ‘ground untruthing’ – initiated and developed through working with young learners are presented as practical concepts for making tours.

In differentiating between hypothesis-testing experiments and experimental practice, educationalist Donald Schön offers a way of describing the research methodology in the projects presented. He says that ‘the practitioner has an interest in transforming the situation from what it is to something he likes better. He also has an interest in understanding the situation, but it is in the service of his interest
INTRODUCTION

in change’. As such, Schön argues that the design process is ‘reflection-in-action’ and that experimental action is simultaneously ‘exploratory, move testing and hypothesis testing’. The interest in changing a situation can take precedence over understanding it and, for me, it is this that describes practice-led research in which experimental action is ‘initiated by the perception of something troubling or promising, and it is terminated by the production of changes one finds, on the whole, satisfactory or by the discovery of new features that give the situation new meaning and change the nature of the questions to be explored.’ Schön directly connects learning with reflection in his understanding of the design process; if the designer is primarily concerned with producing change, they do not learn by reflecting on the situation and are creating conditions for the experimentation to conform to their own views. For Schön practical experience is central to understanding the nature of research in practice contexts as ‘reflection-in-action’.

The parallel structure of the two parts of this book embodies this ‘reflection-in-action’. For example, the analysis of contemporary tours in Chapter 3 was undertaken as both a participant and a designer. The tours were analysed in terms of my experience as a participant and also as someone who is involved in designing participatory tours and this affected the analysis. I was, for example, able to evaluate what might have been done better, understand how difficult it was to achieve certain elements and make informed judgements about processes of production. The resulting ‘traits of the tour’ from this analysis have therefore informed productive concepts in my own practice. My practice-led research is not about designing new tours for the visitor attraction industry but is focused on the design of learning activities in tours that may be applied more broadly in a range of contexts and situations. The intention of the projects is to critically rethink the tour as learning activity and, as such, my design process is my research methodology. In this I suggest that rather than solving a perceived problem, my practice is concerned with exploring process as outcome by doing experimental activities and working out what kinds of conceptual methods emerge from this process.

Each project is divided into sections that reflect three phases of design and development: introduction, background and brief; process and outcome; and key findings and reflections. The first phase, ‘introduction, background and brief’, captures where the project came from, how ideas described in Part One relate to the project and the focus for design. The second phase, ‘process and outcomes’

---

7 Ramia Mazé and Johan Redström have explored aspects of Schön’s work and others to describe critical practice in design and research. The paper outlines what distinguishes design research as critical practice in which problematics are opened up rather than problems solved. Mazé, R. and Redström, J., ‘Difficult forms: Critical practices of design and research,’ *Research Design Journal*, 1(1), 28-39.
8 Jane Rendell makes a distinction between design for architecture and design through architecture. She suggests that design for architecture is ‘driven by the sector’ and that design through or ‘into’ architecture makes new historical and theoretical interpretations. Moreover, she states that ‘the focus of such practice-led research in architecture can be process or product.’ Rendell, J., ‘Architectural Research and Disciplinarity,’ *Architectural Research Quarterly*, 8(2), 141-147.
describes the development of learning-through-touring activities that were explored in a series of practical workshops with different groups of young people. The content and structure of these workshops were key in developing conceptual methods for learning-through-touring. The third phase, ‘key findings and reflections’ describes my personal responses to the project and also references those of key stakeholders.

Establishing a co-design process underpins the practice and has informed the production of content for the tours and/or guides, technical specifications for toolkits and the way in which the projects were managed. A series of workshops involving co-designers and other experts was planned at the start of each project. Each workshop was designed to feed into the next and so review time was integrated throughout the project. For example, in *Mudlarking* the Phase 2 workshops focus on co-designers as ‘seeders’ to develop the concept of evolving content in tours and in *Transitional Spaces*, the concept of ‘seeders’ was developed further using the idea of time-lapse in tours. And in *Cracking Maps*, co-designers were conceived differently as ‘critical tour-guides’ to further understanding of the role of the tour-guide.

The book ends by drawing together the key elements of the learning-through-touring methodology. Rather than suggest a point of closure, my aim is to end with a ‘springboard’ for further thinking, design and development by offering a framework for mobilising learners and learning through wider application of the methodology.
PART ONE

PRODUCTIVE CONCEPTS
CHAPTER 1

PRODUCTIVE PARTICIPANTS

Presented as a consumer product as part of a quality assured service provision, the
guided tour carries expectations of receiving authoritative information about a site.
The ‘point, click and listen’ audio devices that allow users to select from pre-
loaded content as they move around a gallery, museum or tourist attraction, for
example, illustrate how technology has been used to provide visitors with the same
information about objects in front of them. Users are able to choose information
that provides an interpretation of the object from a particular point of view.
Content for audio devices that has been designed to communicate the institution’s
interpretation illustrate how these kinds of guides offer uniformity through a one-
way flow of information. Although the user may be invited to imagine or look
closer or make links with another object they are not asked to share this with any
other people or add their interpretation to that content or question the authority of
the guide. It could be argued, therefore, that there is a lack of criticality in
providing a tour service based on ensuring standardised content that focuses on a
unidirectional flow of information.

In their introduction to a project that explores ‘critical itineraries,’ curators
Nuria Enguita Mayo, Jorge Luis Marzo and Montse Romaní describe the impact of
service industries in terms of ‘social touristisation’ in which culture has been
defined as a ‘definitive form, a machine for refrigerating and museumifying the
reality of different peoples.’9 Aspects of the form of the tour, as a consumer
product, are open to standardisation by national heritage institutions and tourism
industries in which ‘consensus’ dominates over ‘dissent.’10 The introduction to an
alternative guide to the city of Edinburgh produced in 1972 encapsulates this issue:

This special issue of Roots was produced partly to show visitors to Edinburgh
that the city contains more than an endless display of castles and monuments,
of festivals and shows. You will find it is cynical and critical of the city – if
you want a eulogy to Edinburgh’s historic buildings then buy, borrow or steal
any tourist guide.11

The tour-guide (human and/or text) may transform the given, opening up
opportunities for asking questions, posing contradictions and seeing things in new
and different ways and, I argue, support the visitor in processing this by actively
contributing to the tour event. (This is explored further in Chapter 3.) The guide

---

9 Mayo, E.M., Marzo, J.L. and Romaní, M. (project curators), 2004, Tour-isms: The Defeat of Dissent,
Barcelona: Fundació Antoni Tàpies, p. 9.
10 Mayo et al., Tour-isms, p. 9.
may be described as expert through the way in which they engage with a group on a tour to enable individual opportunities for learning and thus to understand participants as active. This notion of authority as expertise, I would argue, can be differentiated from an authoritarian approach. An authoritarian approach may be concerned with conforming to a homogenous service provision which seeks to define the tour group as passive consumers. Alternatively, an approach focused on sharing expertise in response to learner-led enquiries provides opportunities for participants to frame their own questions, investigations and discoveries. In this, it is important to acknowledge that individuals may still come away with different experiences as it is they who are mobile in socially moving through space and time, and have abilities and opportunities to make interpretations, meanings and associations unintended by the tour-guide. For me, this idea originates from Roland Barthes’ declaration that ‘the author is dead.’

Roland Barthes’ essay ‘The Death of the Author,’ first presented at a seminar in 1967 and published later in the same year, argues that it is the language of the text that speaks rather than the author. He suggests that scripted texts are open to varying interpretations by the reader. In this, the notion of an author as a controlling authority on the meaning of the text is announced ‘dead’ and replaced by the birth of the reader. In a critique of authority, Barthes’ essay argues that reading is not a form of consumption based on an understanding of the work as a fixed commodity, nor is it to be understood through deciphering authorial intention. Rather the text is produced by the reader who brings their own knowledge, experiences and understanding to make meaning. This view consequently challenges the role of the critic who attempts to translate, clarify or work out what the author meant. According to Barthes a text is ‘a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture’ in which the reader’s subjectivity is brought to an understanding of language as a system of signs.

Barthes’ essay encapsulates in a concise and provocative way several ideas that are relevant to introducing a critical discussion of the authority of the tour-guide. Barthes challenges unquestioning belief in a notion of control and authority in the mind of the author by arguing that meaning occurs through the interplay of signifiers in a process of reading that continually reproduces the text. In a sense, according to Arnold Bennett, the work is never finished or completed by working out the ‘signified’ and ‘the theorist’s interest can shift from attempting to understand the author’s intentions or the way that her life, thought or consciousness defines and limits the text’s meaning, to a certain thinking of textuality, of textuality without origin.’ Barthes refers to traditional literary criticism as ‘that somewhat decrepit deity’ alluding to ‘authoritative’ critiques of texts that uncover
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13 Barthes, ‘The Death of the Author,’ p. 146.
14 Bennett, *The Author*, p. 15.
or decipher authorial intention. It is within this context of ‘old criticism’ that Barthes argues for the author to be renamed a ‘scripter’ or writer of text that the reader constructs. Through the process of reading, it is the reader who is argued to control the text’s unity as ‘someone who holds together in a single field all the traces by which the written text is constituted.’

In April 2008 I participated in a Republican walking tour of Falls Road in Belfast that departed from Divis Tower at one end and finished at Milltown Cemetery at the other. The tour is described in a guidebook for visitors to Belfast as an ‘authentic’ and ‘detailed’ tour that visits ‘sites of historic and political significance on the Falls Road’ and it was structured as a linear two mile walk with guide-led pauses lasting approximately three hours. The tour was led by Pádraic McCotter, a trainee development officer with Coiste na n-Iarchimi, an organisation ‘working for the social, economic and emotional well being of current and former republican prisoners and their families.’ On the ‘political tours’ section of the Coiste website, the tour-guide describes himself: As a former republican prisoner I have been doing political tours for Coiste for 3 years. Before that, as a member of Belfast National Graves, I was taking tours of Republican graves in Milltown Cemetery. I have a keen interest in Irish history and politics and this compliments my post as a tour guide.

The political walking tour located in Falls Road is part of a growing training and development project in Irish political tourism that aims to facilitate trainee development officers in completing tour guiding qualifications as well as contributing to ‘increasing the levels of skills within the ex-prisoner community.’ Our tour-guide met us at the base of Divic Tower, a 22-storey residential block at the junction of Divis Street and Falls Road, West Belfast. He introduced himself as an ex IRA prisoner who had a particular history to share and made it clear that he welcomed questions and discussion but it was important that the group should understand where he was coming from. His introduction established expectations as a tour guide in terms of his personal history and the way this would affect both what buildings and objects he chose to describe along the road and what he included in those descriptions. This example illustrates that a guide-as-author, who works to scripted points of interest, is not replaced by the visitor-as-reader but by one who understands that the tour is both a personal and shared experience. Although the personal involvement of this guide in the tour could be argued to give him a strong authorial voice, his lived experience also provided access to subject matter that is outside the experiences of most people. Through the process of touring, I was able to construct my own meanings by physically walking along the street, listening to the guide’s account of events and ad hoc talk with passers-by, engaging in conversation within the group, drinking a coffee at the community
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centre, drawing on previous knowledge and experiences and instigating further opportunities for learning about the Maze Prison (buying books and later going to a photographic exhibition of Donovan’s Wylie’s work, *The Maze* at the Photographer’s Gallery in London). So although it was difficult to question authenticity of the guide’s lived experience, the tour was very much open to personal and shared interpretation.

The notion of the reader as productive in making meaning can be explored further through art, architecture and educational theorists who focus on the productivity of people and their relations with space in making meaning. The first of these involves looking at how architectural writer Jonathan Hill21 has interpreted ‘The Death of the Author’ for architectural design by arguing for a different kind of professional architect and how this has impacted on my understanding of a different kind of professional tour-guide. The second considers guiding as new critical practice by exploring art and architectural critic Jane Rendell’s notion of ‘critical spatial practice.’22 And the last takes into account the work of educational theorists Richard Edwards and Robin Usher who suggest that sites for learning in a global world cannot be described in fixed terms but through the movements that people make.23

**CREATIVE USERS**

Hill introduces the concept of the ‘creative user’24 when he describes two occupations in architecture: the ‘activities of the architect’ and the ‘actions of the user’ and argues that both are productive.25 Through ‘inhabitation,’ according to Hill, users creatively occupy and experience architecture in ways that are not always considered by architects. Hill presents an argument for a new kind of architect who not only recognises the creative user but actually uses this productivity in design. He draws on his reading of Barthes’ ‘The Death of the Author’ to make this point:

> Barthes recognises that a profusion of ambiguities and interpretations inhabit the gap between writing and reading but does not imply that the writer should be without ideas. Instead, he proposes that the writer should be aware of, and indeed use, the limitations of his medium.26
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23 I was first introduced to critical spatial practice through the work of Jane Rendell in Rendell, J., ‘A Place Between’ in Sarapik, V and Tüür, K. (Eds.), *Place and Location: Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics III*, Estonia: Estonian Academy of Arts, p. 223.
26 Hill, *Occupying Architecture*, p. 140.
Making a direct analogy between the text and building or literature and architecture, Hill compares readers with users. He suggests that the kinds of ‘relations’ manifested between architect, building and user may correspond to those between author, text and reader. Hill says, ‘I suggest that author-text-reader relations, as a whole, are analogous to architect-building-user relations.’ He also highlights Barthes’ argument for a new kind of writer who understands that the reader has ‘a role in the creation of a text.’ In this, Hill says that the architect who considers the ‘profusion of ambiguities and interpretations’ that come about through occupation and use of buildings, understands ‘creativity of use to be the central issue of design.’

In an approach drawn from Hill’s application of Barthes’ essay, it is likewise important to consider different kinds of relations between guide, tour and visitor with respect to author, text and reader as well as architect, building and user. A guide who both acknowledges that the tour is never ‘finished’ as a consumer product, but is made through participation can be considered analogous to an understanding that ‘a centred system of language’ can never be closed into finite meanings by an author. Likewise, it could be argued that to give a building a tour is to impose a limit on that building that ‘closes’ the design. A standardised tour that is planned and delivered in accordance with an expected level of service can be likened to Barthes’ notion of an author who controls a reader who consumes. The reader-as-critic offers a different paradigm for the role of guiding in which participation produces the tour. Developing Hill’s argument that ‘architecture is made by design and use’ for the tour I suggest that tours are produced by both guide and visitor.

In making an analogy of tour as text it is possible to present the case that tours consist both of the walking experience and the documentation of that experience in the form of texts. These texts are read by people before they visit a location in order to plan itineraries and in location. In this way, there is an argument to be made about the way in which tours themselves are like texts but also that they exist as texts which can be critically read. What is perhaps more interesting here though, is to make an analogy between readers and visitors. Writing in 1980, literary theorist Catherine Belsey argues that the reader or spectator as passive consumer is still regarded as ‘the norm in our society.’ Her concept of active producers of meaning is one that can be applied to a notion of participation as active production of a tour. Participation suggests some kind of active involvement, whether this is personal or shared, short term or long term, in producing new meanings. Drawing on Hill’s idea of ‘creative users,’ learning can be understood through the kinds of new knowledge and experiences interactively evolved through spatio-temporal
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30 Barthes, ‘Death of the Author,’ p. 148.
33 This idea provides the basis for defining the nature of participation in tours in Chapter 3.
processes of touring. Understanding the nature of this involvement and interaction and how this contributes to developing new approaches to learning through the built environment is now developed through understanding touring as a productive critical practice.

CRITICAL SPATIAL PRACTICE

Rendell presents a concept of critical spatial practice\textsuperscript{34} that develops Belsey’s notion of the critical reader by pointing to the importance of space and the spatial which, I would argue, is even more relevant to the tour. Rendell argues that a practice which is spatial and which critiques a site is a critical spatial practice. She describes the key characteristics of critical theory as reflectivity and transformability as providing the potential for critical practice. Rendell suggests that critical spatial practice provides opportunities for making change, for transforming the given, ‘to imagine something different.’\textsuperscript{35} There are many different types and forms of tours and tour-guides that have ‘critiqued’ the given in order to ‘imagine something different.’

The Situationist International group of avant-garde Marxist activists operating in Europe between 1957 and 1972\textsuperscript{36} defined one of their basic practices, the ‘dérive,’ as ‘a mode of experimental behaviour linked to the conditions of urban society: a technique of rapid passage through varied ambiences. The term also designates a specific uninterrupted period of dériving.’\textsuperscript{37} The practice of moving through the city by responding to complex phenomena that give rise to ‘combinations of ambiences’ provided participants with a form of walking for feeling and knowing the urban environment in ways that are different from routines of everyday life. Although chance plays an important part in this practice, to undertake a dérive is not purposeless wandering:

In a dérive one or more persons during a certain period drop their relations, their work and leisure activities, and all their other usual motives for movement and action, and let themselves be drawn by the attractions of the terrain and the encounters they find there. Chance is a less important factor in this activity than one might think: from a dérive point of view cities have psychogeographical contours, with constant currents, fixed points and vortexes that strongly discourage entry into or exit from certain zones.\textsuperscript{38}

\textsuperscript{34} Rendell, J., ‘A Place Between,’ p. 223.
Figure 1. Champions League Postcards, 2006.
The aims of the dérive are reflected in contemporary ‘alternative’ or experimental urban walking practices in which the physical contour of the terrain and the ‘appealing or repelling character of certain places’ 39 are consciously revealed and often challenge mainstream tours. Seeking out alternative tours is a deliberate choice and often the guide is provocative in exposing hidden information or asking participants to think critically. Being motivated to explore a location as a visitor in unofficial ways, I have made my own tours that are initiated by a personal enquiry related to that place. For example, I have toured Paris in response to a self-made enquiry: ‘find evidence that the Champions League final between Arsenal and Barcelona took place here 48 hours ago.’ This involved travelling to the outer suburbs to the Stade de France and finding and recording remnants of the event along the way – from stud marks on changing room benches to discarded press tickets. One of the physical outcomes from this tour was a small set of ‘souvenir postcards’ of the findings. By making a collection, I had the opportunity to reflect on what I’d found by selecting, editing and organising a series of images. This experiment provided me with a means to make a tour and process the experience in which I learned to: initiate a personal enquiry, plan a route, select and use a recording device, notice everyday objects in new ways, develop confidence in taking risks and creatively reproduce data.

Rendell describes a view of ‘interdisciplinarity’ that involves people moving ‘between disciplines and in so doing question[ing] the ways in which they work.’40 In this she emphasises the collaborative nature of interdisciplinary ways of working that require a ‘mode of “thinking between”’ that is challenging ‘because this way of working requires us to be critical of what we do and open to change.’ 41 Reflecting on Rendell’s understanding of interdisciplinarity opens up possibilities for transforming practice that bring activities of learning to those of touring. Rendell uses the term ‘critical spatial practice’ to describe a selection of projects that challenge and stretch traditional disciplinary boundaries in ‘a place between’ art and architecture.42

I have [also] argued that understandings, informed by critical spatial theory, of the place between art and architecture in terms of the spatial, the temporal and the social, allow terms like site, insertion and relationships to be reconfigured at the intersection between disciplines.43

In her discussion around specific public art projects Rendell explores the importance of spatiality through reconfiguring terms such as ‘site and context in art and architecture,’ of temporality through ‘new user insertions in existing locations’

40 Rendell, J., ‘A Place Between,’ p. 223.
41 Rendell, Art and Architecture, p. 11.
42 Rendell, Art and Architecture, pp. 6-12 and pp. 191-193.
43 Rendell, Art and Architecture, p. 192.
and of subjectivity through interactions between 'people, things and locations' in
discussing a relationship of transformation between critical spatial theory and
practice. 44 I argue that spatiality, temporality and social interactivity may be drawn
upon as terms developed through critical spatial practice to design new ways of
learning-through-touring.

In the first part of Art and Architecture, Rendell describes the work of cultural
geographers in establishing the 'importance of space in producing social
relationships' during the 1970s. 45 According to Rendell, Edward Soja's notion of
the 'social-spatial dialectic'; 46 repositioned the spatially productive nature of the
social in a form of critical social theory where social relations were seen as
dependent on space and as producers of space. Soja argued that subjects interact
with spaces and spaces interact with subjects through 'inter-reactive' and
'interdependent' relations. 47 Soja draws on the philosophy of Henri Lefebvre in
developing this argument. 48 Lefebvre suggests that specialising space into multiple
'descriptions and sectionings' leads to a separation of social practice and spatial
practice and that 'society continues in subjection' to a dominant authority in whose
interests it is to maintain those divisions. 49 In considering the productive nature of
space/the spatial and social relations it is important to note, albeit briefly, that
Lefebvre argues that space is both materially and mentally produced and that social
relations do not exist in an abstract form but are spatially produced. He describes
attempts to abstractly rationalise space associated with political and state
authorities as 'that space where the tendency to homogenization exercises its
pressure and its repression with the means at its disposal: a semantic void abolishes
former meanings (without, for all that, standing in the way of the growing
complexity of the world and its multiplicity of messages, codes and operations.)' 50
Lefebvre goes on to suggest that commodified space is the space of exchange in
which planning may be conceived as a strategic means to promote 'accumulation
and growth.' 51 This concept resonates with that of visitors as consumers and the
tour as a consumer product described at the start of this chapter in which tours are
designed to convey standardised information in a centralised way. The space of the
tour group, however, is often productive in disrupting the conventions of the
guided tour. Hanging back, asking questions, having conversations, going 'off
route,' feeling surfaces, remarking aloud and looking through closed doors are just
some of the indications that both visitors and guides are active in producing the
tour.

44 Rendell, Art and Architecture, p. 192.
45 Rendell, Art and Architecture, p. 17.
47 Soja, Postmodern Geographies, p. 81.
49 Lefebvre, The Production of Space, pp. 7-9.
50 Lefebvre, The Production of Space, p. 307.
51 Lefebvre, The Production of Space, p. 307.
Educationalists Edwards and Usher suggest that social and spatial relations are ‘inter-reactive’ in forms of learning that are not bound by an institutionalised curriculum:

People interact with each other and objects in space and in so doing construct, disrupt, and resist meanings and understandings. They therefore invest certain meanings in their built environment through the forms of interaction in which they engage […] The attempts to spatially order the curriculum are therefore always subject to disruption, because one cannot escape the wider networks within which it is enmeshed.52

Experiencing space through the controlled movement of the guided tour can be argued to abstract learning from everyday life by managing or controlling the way in which people move through spaces of the physical environment, so that the tour becomes a specialised space for informal education. If instead, learning is conceived of as an everyday experience, an approach to ‘site’ as a context for learning may require a shift from defining site as a way of describing an ‘original’ position and intended occupation towards site defined in transitive terms as the learner’s spatial ability to orientate expressed through their actions. Site-specificity may be understood in terms of the productive potential of the physical environment to be activated by people moving through its spaces.53 Art critic Miwon Kwon describes how a definition of site-specificity has changed through contemporary art practices from one in which the physical location is defined in fixed terms towards one in which site-specificity may be understood in transitive terms as ‘ungrounded, fluid, virtual.’54 Performance art theorist Nick Kaye argues that such a concept of site-specificity is intrinsically linked to performance in which the viewer recognises him/herself as both a performer and witness in constructing the work. He suggests that ‘this effect rests upon the viewer’s awareness of an opposition, here ‘performer’ and ‘viewer,’ at the very moment in which its construction is revealed to be contingent upon her looking.’55 In this way, I would argue that Kaye alludes to the ‘unfinished’ nature of site-specific performance through positioning the viewer as active in constructing the work. I return to this idea later, specifically in defining ‘site’ in the context of mobile learning and to explore performance as a form of interpretation in tours.

In the second part of Art and Architecture, Rendell describes ‘artworks and architectural projects that reconfigure the temporality of sites, repositioning the relationship of past and the present in a number of different ways,’ so opening up ways of thinking about how artists make ‘insertions’ into existing locations.56

53 Although not the focus for this book, it is important to note that spaces can be designed to be transformed through interaction.
54 Kwon, M., ‘One Place After Another: Notes on Site Specificity,’ October, 80, p. 95.
56 Rendell, Art and Architecture, p. 75.
Rendell draws attention to ‘insertion as montage’ as both a creative and critical experience in which ‘new insertions into locations adopt “inappropriate” materials or languages in order to displace dominant meanings and to interrupt particular contexts.’\(^{57}\) I would argue that this is particularly relevant in considering spatiality and temporality in experiential learning. The antithesis of institutional preservation is perhaps everyday decay and Rendell points towards the interest in the ‘ruin’ in the work of contemporary artists and architects who are drawn towards sites ‘with the functions that once defined them removed and how these places appear as ruins of the past in the present.’\(^{58}\) She explores how critical responses to work in such environments may occur as sudden initial reactions but also arise as ‘reverberations’ over time.\(^{59}\) Rendell makes a strong distinction between how one might respond through an allegorical mode and a montage mode, suggesting that contemporary works that operate in an allegorical mode may be explored in their potential for politicisation (rather than ‘retrospective contemplation’) and that montages may be considered through more ‘subjective and intimate aspects’ (rather than their ability to ‘shock’).\(^{60}\) I suggest that Rendell alludes to a particular understanding of participation in her notion of exploring relations between immediate reactions and responses and reverberations over time, linking concentration with contemplation in making critical responses to a work. Participation in a tour may be characterised by these linked and developmental abilities to concentrate and contemplate.

This element of critical spatial practice may be developed further by focusing on how the ways in which people notice or sense material change in the built environment might allow a critique of authoritatively controlled space. Architectural theorist John Habraken suggests that the built environment is ‘organic’ in the way it continuously grows and changes over time and that ‘restoration’ projects can be likened to ‘freezing a collage of intervention.’\(^{61}\) Rather than ‘freezing’ snapshots of change as the subject for a guided tour, I am interested in exploring how skills in ‘noticing’ transition may be developed by touring different sites of the built environment over time and how these may facilitate critical engagement with urban design and planning proposals. Rendell highlights the importance of prior knowledge of ‘original context’ in being able to experience ‘new relationships in a particular context at a specific time.’\(^{62}\) Being able to recognise objects as misplaced, unusual or strange requires knowledge about their original contexts in order to construct meaning through the temporal juxtapositioning of such objects in a new location (Figure 2). In this way, it could be argued that participants of tours can activate a concept of continuous change in

\(^{58}\) Rendell, *Art and Architecture*, p. 82. I also note that this interest in the ruin is dominant in the gothic picturesque of the late 18th Century.
\(^{59}\) Rendell, *Art and Architecture*, p. 82.
\(^{60}\) Rendell, *Art and Architecture*, pp. 81-82.
\(^{62}\) Rendell, *Art and Architecture*, p. 82.
the built environment by developing awareness of how the notion of ‘out of context’ can be creative by making associations between the present and past, one site and another. In Part 2, I explore this idea in the conceptual method ‘micromapping’ by focusing on ways in which we can find evidence that buildings are in a constant spatial and temporal transition.

Figure 2. ‘Detritus,’ Deptford Creek, December 2003.

In the third part of Art and Architecture, Rendell highlights a shift in ‘contemporary criticism and art practice’ towards ‘understanding art as relational or dialogical’ and goes on to explore art and architectural projects that ‘operate as the place of exchanges between subjects.’ 63 It is important to note that she describes subjects as ‘artists and architects, producers and users, viewers and occupiers’ in discussing the nature of processes and interactions that reflect the mediating capacities of objects. I consider visitors to be productive in their mobility across space and time, developing ways of interpreting or making sense of sites that may also inform how they mediate that experience through recorded data such as geolocative tags, photographs, audio narratives or annotated maps. So rather than the singular tour we may think about processes of touring in which social interaction within a mobile group of people provides opportunities for learning. Expression and exchange are suggested as key terms in considering how

63 Rendell, Art and Architecture, p. 151.
social interactivity might evolve what it means to participate in the built environment. Expression as a verbalising of thought and exchange as a shared opportunity for expressing or, in other words, speaking and listening, is developed out of an understanding that ‘verbal discourse’ is a ‘social phenomenon.’

Literary theorist, Mikhail Bakhtin describes the dialogic nature of language as socially and historically determined. In this he distinguishes ‘unitary’ language from ‘living language.’ Unitary language for Bakhtin is the ‘abstract grammatical system of normative forms, taken in isolation from the concrete, ideological conceptualizations that fill it, and in isolation from the uninterrupted process of historical becoming that is characteristic of all living language.’ Bakhtin suggests that genre unifies language by creating stratification systems in literature that are tied up with expectations that limit discourse: ‘Certain features of language take on the specific flavor of a given genre: they knit together with specific points of view, specific approaches, forms of thinking, nuances and accents of the given genre.’

Bakhtin goes on to argue that there is also a ‘professional stratification’ of language which operates through specific professional vocabularies and forms for ‘manifesting intentions’ and for ‘making conceptualization and evaluation concrete.’ Bakhtin gives examples of such professions as lawyers, doctors, politicians and teachers. He stresses that it is important to consider how the ‘denotative and expressive dimension’ of this ‘shared’ language is intentional in its specificity to particular professions and genres. As such, he argues, ‘these languages become things, limited in their meaning and expression’ making it difficult for words to be used in ‘unintentional’ ways by those outside that profession.

In describing the intentionality of a language that is stratified according to genre and profession, Bakhtin suggests that it is the expectations and formulae embedded within these that limit discourse and describes this as being ‘situation’ dependent. Here, situation refers to the specifics of a system of expression. ‘Situation’ is thus differentiated from Bakhtin’s use of the term ‘environment’ in which he describes how words are ‘dialogised’ through being spoken. Bakhtin uses the metaphor of a ‘ray of light’ to explain how words become dialogic when uttered. According to Bakhtin as the ‘ray-word’ is uttered it passes through ‘an atmosphere filled with the alien words, value judgments and accents’ making a ‘spectral dispersion’ in its direction towards the object it addresses. For Bakhtin, ‘The social atmosphere of the word, the atmosphere that surrounds the object, makes the facets of the image sparkle.’ He describes such an environment as ‘elastic,’ one in which the word is
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71 Bakhtin, Dialogic Imagination, p. 277.
‘agitated’ in becoming ‘individualised.’\textsuperscript{72} The concept of an ‘elastic environment’\textsuperscript{73} in which spoken words take shape is particularly important in considering the notion of relationships between people and the socio-spatial production of meaning. Is there a correlation to be explored between how individuals co-construct meaning through speaking and listening and the situation generated by generic shared expectations of the tour? I believe there is, and that investigating this relationship is crucial in furthering understanding of interactions between subjects and objects in the socio-spatial production of the tour.

Following Rendell (following Soja) spatiality, temporality and social interactivity form key elements of a framework for participatory practice in tour design. I argue that they are also vital for exploring how practices of touring and approaches to learning may be mutually transformative. It has been suggested that effecting shifts in thinking from site as fixed location to a context for learning, from the institutional preservation of buildings to everyday user activation and from consumer product to socially produced tour may be instrumental in producing a framework for evolving learner-centred approaches to touring as a form of critical spatial practice.

\textbf{(DIS)LOCATING PEDAGOGIES}

The work of radical educationalist Paulo Freire underpins my learning philosophy of which reflectivity and transformation are key elements in bringing about change. In 1970, Freire described a prevalent pedagogy in Brazilian schools based on an authoritarian ‘banking’ concept of education.\textsuperscript{74} Freire’s uses the analogy of ‘banking’ to describe an education system in which students, as objects, are ‘filled up’ like a ‘container.’ He suggests that the quality of a student was based on their compliance in being ‘filled up’ and their ability to receive knowledge.\textsuperscript{75} Freire questions the traditional teacher-student relations and argues for a shift towards learner-centred learning, pedagogy in which the experiences of the learner are fundamental to the activity. He emphasises dialogue and interactivity as key elements of this kind of learning environment:

Problem-posing education […] enables teachers and students to become Subjects of the educational process by overcoming authoritarianism and an alienating intellectualism; it also enables people to overcome their false perception of reality. The world – no longer something to be described with deceptive words – becomes the object of that transforming action […]\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{72} Bakhtin, \textit{Dialogic Imagination}, p. 276.
\textsuperscript{73} Bakhtin, \textit{Dialogic Imagination}, p. 276.
\textsuperscript{75} Freire, \textit{Pedagogy of the Oppressed}, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{76} Freire, \textit{Pedagogy of the Oppressed}, p. 67.
Friere later develops this concept in a published conversation with educationalist Myles Horton concerning the role of ‘experts’ in learning. Horton suggests that ‘If I’m the expert, my expertise is in knowing not to be an expert or in knowing how I feel experts should be used’ highlighting a difference he perceives in the ‘use of expert knowledge’ and ‘the expert telling people what to do.’ Horton describes organising and technical training as strategic practice that focuses on developing issues rather than people and this can be compared with a standardised approach to tour-guide training. Horton defends a separation of organisation and education and consequently, experts and learning, in situations where the expert tells people what to do. He says that this is not to say that an organising experience cannot be educational but ‘it has to be done with the purpose of having democratic decision making, having people participate in the action and not having just one authoritative leader.’

Friere provides an interesting angle on this argument by pointing towards a need for a ‘dialectical relationship between strategy and tactics’ in education:

> You have to have some tactics that have to do with the strategy you have.
> You understand the strategy as the objective, as the goal, as the dream you have, and as the tactics you raise as you try to put into practice, to materialize the objective, the dream … A good process of mobilising and organising results in learning from the very process and goes beyond.

I argue that responsibility for actions, intuition, capacity to make decisions and empowerment contribute to developing the ability and confidence to understand and use ‘experts’ in learning activities. Friere highlights that if the learning process is reflective it can be mobilising (strategic) and educational (tactical) at the same time. Where the expert leads the experience, participants are not involved in questioning and the process is therefore essentially non-reflective. This cannot be described as transformative. For me, this book is a practice-led enquiry that is grounded in reinvigorating the tour as a transformative learning experience and this necessitates a critique of didactic, teacher-centred pedagogy. In this it is important to recognise that there is a danger that, in adopting an inclusive learner-centred approach, this too becomes prescriptive.

Educationalist Jan Nespor has focused specifically on relations between space and learning that considers how mobility and location may be important in transformative learning experiences. Nespor suggests that children’s bodies are
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important in ‘mediating relations with the world’ arguing that as children grow up and are ‘schooled’ they are spatially redefined. He suggests that schools and schooling play an important part in defining ‘regions of space and permissible forms of behaviour within these spaces.’ He goes on to argue that in this way schools attempt to ‘suppress bodily movement and expression and to define appropriate bodily orientations.’ Nespor highlights a need to consider pedagogies that are concerned with bodies, space and movement: “To make something meaningful is to situate it in spacetime, or better, to put it in motion along certain paths that trace out particular networks of association.” Nespor uses the term ‘spacetime’ with reference to the work of geographer Doreen Massey who argues that space and time should be ‘thought together’ in that “the imagination of one will have repercussions (not always followed through) for the imagination of the other and that space and time are implicated in each other.”

The idea of ‘networks of association’ made in ‘spacetime’ is also examined by educational theorists Edwards and Usher who explore different kinds of spatial pedagogic practices in the context of globalisation. They argue that the concept of ‘canons of knowledge and traditional forms of pedagogy have become problematic in contemporary conditions.’ In this, Edwards and Usher present ‘pedagogies of (dis)location’ as a framework for exploring more adaptable and learner-responsive pedagogies that may transgress traditional educational practices that seek to fix location for learning. Edwards and Usher describe how making difference is at the core of (dis)located pedagogies: ‘we are using the notion of (dis)location to deconstruct the binary of location/dislocation, the former with an emphasis on place, the latter on movement […] As location is simultaneously a dislocation from other positions, pedagogy therefore becomes a process of constant engagement, negotiation and (en)counter, in which the latter signifies the relatedness of a position and the diverse modes of investment in it.” Movement between positions can be understood as a process which is, as Edwards and Usher suggest, always in a state of becoming.

The concept of movement between positions is important in exploring how processes of touring provide opportunities for learning. Touring between and around locations provides opportunities for learning through making connections by being mobile. To illustrate this point I describe how physical and cognitive movement between trips to Eastern Europe and Singapore in 2004-2005 enabled
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me to thread together knowledge about experiences of occupation in two different countries during WWII.

Figure 3. Embroidery Sample and Detail from List of Prisoners, Museum of the Occupation of Latvia, Rīga, Latvia, July 2004.

A sample of embroidered names and messages was displayed in a glass cabinet at the Museum of Occupation of Latvia. Embroidering messages as a way for prisoners to communicate with loved ones represented an element of a history of mass deportation during the Soviet and Nazi occupation of Latvia between 1940 and 1944. Lists of names of people imprisoned in concentration camps were also on display at the museum (Figure 3). During a subsequent visit in April 2005 to Changi Museum, the site of a former ‘occupation prison’ in Singapore, I noted a similar form of embroidered communication on display (Figure 4). This time the
piece of embroidery was a quilt that was made by women internees to tell men who were held in separate quarters of the prison that they were alive. This connection between embroidered objects and occupation was further developed through noting that the prisoner of war post cards also on display at Changi Museum used the same typeface as the lists in the museum in Latvia. The post cards were used by prisoners of war to let loved ones know they were alive by typing up to 25 words per card. The notion of officialdom generated by the typed words in both locations is simultaneously connected through a thread of ‘communication during occupation.’ Perhaps because the visits were separated by a year, the length of time was a factor in making such connections between different countries with histories of occupation. In making the connections, however, knowledge about occupation evolved through threading objects from different locations and that this involved shifting between small objects and wider histories.

I propose that pedagogy for learning-through-touring is not defined in terms of educational programmes and their attached environments, but in terms of the learner. This challenges the notion of a predetermined educational setting and positions the mobility of the learner and environments they are moving through as active elements in creating sites for learning. Edwards and Usher suggest that
lifelong learning through ‘negotiating ambivalence’ \(^{94}\) questions the notion of mastery as a pedagogic framework so that ‘the ability to map different locations and translate between them, to shift and move and negotiate uncertainties and ambivalence\(^{95}\) becomes the stimulus for learning. The authors acknowledge that this kind of pedagogy may appear too risky for some who may feel more secure with a more didactic pedagogy that is teacher-centred and opens up questions concerning centralised knowledge and the lack of control in determining positioning processes enabled through bodily movement. Considering ways in which bodily movement may involve different kinds of spatial, temporal and social interactions in making networks of association in the built environment could create conditions for rethinking the design of learning activities in tours. It would seem that negotiating uncertainty, ambivalence and risk are necessary for learning if participants are able to develop confidence in this kind of pedagogical approach rather than fearing a loss of authority.

**Participant production of tours**

There are three key ideas that have emerged from theories discussed in this chapter. Firstly, participants in a tour can be likened to creative users in design if they are conceived as active in producing the event. Secondly, that the tour as a form of critical spatial practice opens up thinking around the ways in which people engage critically with the built environment through the medium of the tour. And the third idea is about learning by moving between positions, what propels learners to move between them and what kinds of new perspectives on the built environment this mobility offers. From a visitor’s perspective I am arguing that briefs for the design of tours should shift in emphasis from the management of one-directional information flow to consider how, where and when information can be discovered, shared and evolved by participants. Content that is designed to grow and evolve in different spaces and over time may be described as ‘seeded.’ Using the metaphor of ‘seeded content’ provides opportunities for thinking about what kind of data or information grows well, how environmental conditions interact with the content to affect growth and the spatial and temporal dispersal of content over a geographical location. Making connections in response to seeded content that involves mobile participants initiating and making threads of enquiry can be described as ‘threading.’ Another metaphor is used here to describe a horizontal mode of learning that involves participants in making imaginative associations and physical connections through interactions with seeded content and with each other whilst on-the-move. These two concepts together define what it means to be a productive participant in learning-through-touring.
