

ARTICLE

Bridging the Geospatial Gap: Data about Space and Indigenous Knowledge of Place

Carolyn Briggs,
Ingrid Burfurd,
Matt Duckham,
Olivia Guntarik,
Di Kerr,
Mark McMillan,
Daisy San Martin
Saldias

Abstract

Indigenous knowledge of place is not well-served by today's digital geospatial technologies such as spatial data, maps, spatial databases, and GIS. This paper aims to identify and explore new connections between Indigenous knowledge of place and digital geospatial technologies. Our analysis is structured around three key gaps in past work: 1. the overrepresentation of digital data about space, rather than knowledge of place; 2. a lack of facility to differentiate access to knowledge and enable Indigenous data sovereignty; 3. a lack of facility to support and sustain relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. The paper further identifies and explores recent research topics in the field of geographic information science (GIScience) with relevance to addressing these gaps. This includes identifying new serendipitous synergies with previously unconnected research areas such as research into location privacy, uncertainty, qualitative spatial reasoning, or distributed spatial computing. The conclusions acknowledge that our retrospective approach is unlikely to lead to radical reformulation of geospatial technologies. Nevertheless, we argue that identifying technological opportunities could offer a pragmatic pathway to more rapidly bootstrap new approaches, beyond simply technological "fixes".

I | INTRODUCTION

The distinction between, and union of, the concepts of *space* and *place* lie at the core of the discipline of geography (Tuan 1979). Space concerns the observable or measurable features of location, described in an abstract way such as can be stored and processed by a machine; place concerns the meaning that humans invest into locations, and how humans understand the world through that located meaning (Tuan 1977; Cresswell 2015). Jonathan Agnew (2011) succinctly captures this duality in terms of "when" and "where" (space) and "how" and "why" (place).

Geospatial data and computing technologies are acknowledged to be better-suited to manipulating data about space, rather than curating knowledge of place (Sheppard 1993; Pavlovskaya 2006; Goodchild 2011; Merschdorf and Blaschke 2018). This gap between data about space and knowledge of place is especially stark in connection with Indigenous knowledge (Rundstrom 1995; Palmer and Rundstrom 2013; Veland et al. 2013).

Our paper aims to explore the scope for bridging this geospatial gap. Our analysis identifies three themes that frame the disconnect between geospatial technologies and Indigenous knowledge of place. First, an overrepresentation of digital data about space, rather than knowledge of place, is evident across past work in this area (the “space-place gap”, Section 3). Second, we argue that this imbalance both perpetuates and is caused by a lack of support for appropriate access to spatial data and in particular for Indigenous data sovereignty (the “control gap”, Section 4). Finally, arguably underpinning both limitations is a lack of recognition about the cross-cultural relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous knowledge systems (the “relational gap”, Section 5). This lack of recognition emphasises the need to account for different experiences and knowledges of place in ways of thinking about geographic space and place-based knowledge. This recognition is crucial to broader questions of coexistence and social relations in settler colonial contexts.

Building on this analysis, the paper proceeds to highlight relevant research in the field of geographic information science (GI science). In addition to surveying research explicitly oriented towards inclusion of Indigenous knowledge of place (Section 6), the review identifies recent research in the field that—while not intended for this purpose—has characteristics that might be repurposed or adapted to begin to bridge the gap (Section 7). The conclusions (Section 8) acknowledge that this approach is not without its own dangers, including the risk of focusing on simple technological “fixes” to complex human social and cultural issues and prioritising incremental change over radical reformulation of today’s technologies. Nevertheless, we argue highlighting such opportunities can increase understanding between Indigenous and non-indigenous GI scientists, and could offer a pragmatic pathway to bootstrapping new innovation.

2 | COMING TO KNOW PLACE

Indigenous knowledge and the notion of indigeneity are inextricably connected with “place” (in the above sense of “location with meaning”, including meaning from history, tradition, ancestry, culture, Battiste and Henderson 2000; Cajete 2000). It is perhaps surprising, then that most common definitions of Indigenous peoples refer only obliquely to space (as “locations”, “territories”, or “regions” for example), and frequently do not explicitly mention place (with the notable exception of the dictionary definition of “indigenous”). The World Health Organisation (2015), for example, describes Indigenous populations as the communities that “live within, or are attached to, geographically distinct traditional habitats or ancestral territories, and who identify themselves as being part of a distinct cultural group, descended from groups present in the area before modern states were created and current borders defined”. In another description, the UN International Labour Organization (1989) identifies people “... who are regarded as indigenous on account of their descent from the populations which inhabited the country, or a geographical region to which the country belongs, at the time of conquest or colonisation or the establishment of present state ...”.

In turn, Indigenous people’s knowledge of place often reflects the unique social, cultural, and environmental context of Indigenous communities. Hence, while acknowledging that any attempt to define Indigenous peoples—and by implication Indigenous knowledge—creates a “tangle of ambiguities” (Johnson et al. 2006), we adopt the term “Indigenous knowledge” (IK) to refer broadly to the “unique, traditional, local knowledge existing within and developed around specific conditions of [people] Indigenous to a particular geographic area” (Grenier 1988). In keeping with this broad,

intentionally loose definition, we follow Camacho et al (2016) in not exploring here any finer distinctions between “Indigenous knowledge” and closely related terms, such as “Indigenous knowledge systems”, “traditional knowledge”, “traditional environmental knowledge”, “local knowledge”, and so forth.

Indigenous knowledge is also often contrasted with Western scientific or “Eurocentric” knowledge (Nakata 2002; Aikenhead and Ogawa 2007). For example, Indigenous knowledge has been characterised as qualitative, holistic, experiential, and oral, in contrast to Eurocentric knowledge as quantitative, reductionist, objective, and written (Nadasdy 1999; Stephens 2001). Such distinctions between Indigenous and Eurocentric knowledge must be approached critically, as they tend to oversimplify similarities, overemphasise differences, and entrench false dichotomies (Agrawal 1995; Nadasdy 1999; Ellen et al. 2005; Pickerill 2009). It is widely acknowledged that there exists “no simple or universal criteria that can be deployed to separate Indigenous from Western or scientific knowledge” (Agrawal 2002). The lack of a simple distinction between Indigenous and non-Indigenous knowledge should not be taken to imply that Indigenous people do not have different knowledge from non-Indigenous people. Rather, it is to caution against the risk that non-Indigenous knowledge systems are implicitly elevated by these comparisons, setting a benchmark against which Indigenous knowledge is selectively sampled, valued, and accepted.

Indeed, Indigenous people’s knowledge about their local physical and social environment has frequently been documented, communicated, and interrogated outside an Indigenous context and knowledge systems. Nakata noted in 2002 that the “... push to describe and document Indigenous knowledge is gaining momentum without any commensurate interest in the epistemological study of Indigenous Knowledge systems.” While this situation is arguably changing, it remains the case that non-Indigenous knowledge is frequently disseminated in the context of primarily non-Indigenous knowledge systems; in contrast, Indigenous knowledge is frequently decoupled from its cultural context. We therefore draw a distinction between data that is derived from Indigenous knowledge *about* space, and Indigenous knowledge *of* or *from* place. Knowledge *of* place is grounded in Indigenous knowledge systems, including ways of sharing, renewing, respecting, and honouring knowledge.

In seeking to understand and bridge the gap between “space” and “place”, our focus is identifying geospatial technologies that can be harnessed to facilitate knowledge *of* place by engaging with Indigenous knowledge systems. This approach is informed by Nakata’s concept of a *cultural interface* (2002). In response to the “contested” space that exists between Indigenous and non-Indigenous knowledge systems, Nakata (2002) proposes that practitioners might “harness” non-Indigenous knowledge and technology to maintain and promote Indigenous knowledge systems. This may involve adaptations to existing spatial technology and adaptations in how people use and access knowledge of place.

Hence, in the following three Sections (3–5) we identify three common themes from the literature that can interrupt the proper functioning of the cultural interface between geospatial technologies and Indigenous knowledge of place. Sections 6 and 7 then draw together data *about* space with knowledge *of* place, in order to shift the focus to harnessing spatial technologies in ways that better reflect Indigenous ways of knowing (place).

3 | ADVANCING INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE OF PLACE

Recent years have witnessed remarkable growth in the capacity of spatial technologies to capture and manipulate data about space, including Indigenous data about space. In stark contrast to these advances, it is hard to identify any improvements in mainstream spatial technologies' capacity to support the curation of Indigenous knowledge of place. We refer to this apparent contradiction as the "space-place gap". A natural question to ask, then, is: why? What features of geospatial technologies tend to favour data about space over Indigenous knowledge of place? What are the causes of the "space-place gap"?

An answer to this question can be found in the processes of transformation from dynamic, mediated, and experiential Indigenous knowledge to digital data. Such a transformation is inherently "lossy". Agrawal (2002) identifies three distinct mechanisms by which Indigenous knowledge is diminished when transformed into digital data: *particularisation*, *validation*, and *generalisation*.

First, particularisation concerns the tendency to extract from traditional knowledge only that data which is perceived as "useful" at the point of digitisation (Agrawal 2002). This degradation in data may arise through the technical constraints and limitations imposed by spatial databases and GIS (Aitkenhead 2007; Wellen and Sieber 2013; Nakata et al. 2014). It may also arise due to the laborious and costly nature of collecting information from diverse Indigenous sources (Tripathi and Bhattarya 2004). Or it may simply be that the users of the data are simply unwilling or unable to use other types of information. For example, Nadasdy (1999) describes an attempt to manage wild Dall sheep in the Yukon. Despite working with elders and hunters of the Kluane First Nation, rich traditional knowledge about sheep behaviour and populations was ultimately transformed into simple data about head-counts of sheep, as the only information that government managers were willing or able to use.

Second, validation concerns the tendency to store only that data which can survive the application of testing and examination using scientific criteria (Agrawal 2002). Sillitoe (1998) provides an example of the effects of validation in connection with the traditional knowledge of the Wola people in the Southern Highlands Province of Papua New Guinea. The Wola names for different soil types have a natural "validation" against soil groups within Western soil science classifications, such as FAO or USDA soil classes. However seductive such a mapping may appear, it fundamentally distorts the complex and qualified use of the names by the Wola in practice. In turn, this distortion obscures the fact that Wola soil names are underpinned by a completely different conceptualisation of soil types, as sequences of soil horizons rather than the soil profiles of Western soil science (Sillitoe 1998).

Third, generalisation concerns the tendency to omit from stored data those elements of traditional knowledge that appear location-specific (Agrawal 2002). This process of generalisation prepares the stored elements of traditional knowledge for exploitation in other locations. Briggs (2005), for example, surveys traditional agricultural knowledge from around the world, highlighting in particular its cultural and location specificity, with much that is relevant and practical but only "within the place/space in which these knowledges have been developed" (Briggs 2005).

Taken together, we find strong agreement across the literature for the distortion, dilution, devaluing, and fragmentation of Indigenous knowledge as inherent effects of digital data capture and storage (Eyzaguirre 2001; Pearce and Louis 2008; Eisner et al. 2012; Tuhiwai Smith 2015). However, this process of “digital diminution” of Indigenous knowledge begins, but does not end with capture and cataloguing.

4 | ACCESS TO INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE OF PLACE

A central question raised by many previous researchers in the area is: for what purpose is Indigenous knowledge being collected and catalogued? Notwithstanding the limitations associated with “digital diminution”, discussed in the previous section, who benefits from the capture of Indigenous knowledge?

All too often, these beneficiaries are other than Indigenous peoples (Nadasdy 1999; Palmer and Rundstrom 2013). The entrenched power imbalances that channel those benefits are a long-established subject of study (e.g., Bell 1979). In this paper, we use the term “control gap” to refer to this issue. Indeed, the process of digitisation itself, discussed in the previous section, translates Indigenous knowledge into a form more amenable to exploitation by established non-Indigenous interests (Agrawal 2002; Castellano 2004; Briggs 2005; Wellen 2013; Nakata 2014).

Several studies have sounded this alarm in connection with geospatial technology specifically. An early example of such a study by Madsen (1994) identifies multiple instances of remotely sensed data being used in combination with GIS to unfairly exploit Indigenous lands and arguably infringe Indigenous peoples' right to privacy. In a study of using GIS to map high-fertility soils at pre-colonial Amazonian settlement sites, WinklerPrins and Aldrich (2010) recognise the potential for applications of this data to lead to damage at archaeological sites and land use intensification. More recently, Reid and Sieber (2019) show how geospatial ontology engineering tended to promote stereotypical and homogenising views of Indigenous knowledge.

Certainly, many authors also highlight the potential for digital geospatial technologies to empower Indigenous communities, for example by supporting land title claims (Veland et al. 2014; Duerden and Kuhn 1996); through increased potential for community participation in decision-making (Harris and Weiner 1998); or through supporting intergenerational relationships in Indigenous communities (Veland et al. 2014). However, the chances of realising potential benefits are slim without authentic and meaningful inclusion of Indigenous communities in the entire project life-cycle, from project conception, through data collection and analysis, to decision making (Tripathi and Bhattarya 2004). Further, the pitfalls are varied and often subtle. West, Akama, McMillan (2016) highlight the issues that arise for Indigenous people who no longer reside within their traditional lands, often as a result of colonisation activities, such as forced relocation. How should such displaced Indigenous people be enabled to participate in remote mapping projects about their ancestral lands? What would this mean in the context of an increasingly diasporic Indigenous culture with most Indigenous Australians located in urban centres rather than rural and remote locations?

Veland et al. (2014) explore the particular importance of intellectual property rights agreements for protecting Indigenous knowledge and Indigenous peoples' interests in mapping-related projects. In developing a GIS application to support a Native Title Claim in Australia by the Yorta Yorta Nation, Veland et al. (2014) developed a protocol with five key principles for digital security of Yorta Yorta data. These principles codify the requirements that Indigenous Yorta Yorta people: be consulted at every stage of the project; retain ownership and copyright of collected Indigenous knowledge; retain the right to choose to keep secret cultural knowledge; can always access and inspect database contents; and have the right to control any future exploitation or use of their data through an approval process and intellectual property agreement (Veland et al. 2014).

More recently, a range of critical issues connected with maintaining control and ownership over the digital products of Indigenous knowledge are coalescing under the heading of "data sovereignty". Data sovereignty concerns the management of data "consistent with the laws, practices, and customs of the nation-state in which it is located" (Snipp 2016). Indigenous data sovereignty refers to the right of Indigenous peoples to exercise ownership over Indigenous data including data collection, ownership and application of data by or about Indigenous people or territories (Maianayri Wingara and AIGI 2018).

Maintaining data sovereignty has become a significant challenge for sovereign authorities in recent years, due to the ease with which digital technologies, such as cloud computing, allow data to be communicated to and physically stored in locations independent of nation boundaries (Amoore 2018). If nation states such as the UK, US, and Canada are struggling to maintain data sovereignty, it should come as no surprise that the challenges are magnified for historically marginalised sovereign Indigenous peoples. Indigenous communities must struggle to assert ownership not only as new data is created, but also in the context of historical and ongoing non-Indigenous misappropriation of First Nations' data. Thus, the struggle for data sovereignty occurs not only at the technical level, to protect ownership and use of data; but also at the social, political and economic level to assert ownership over data (Tuhiwai Smith 2015; Dewar 2019).

One logical outcome of achieving true data sovereignty for Indigenous peoples, however, is the emergence of "data repatriation". Data repatriation concerns the return of digital cultural objects, such as images, recordings, records, and of course geospatial data, to Indigenous owners (Gardiner et al. 2011).

Although examples of data repatriation are today rare, they are important for demonstrating the importance and viability of repatriation endeavours. Dewar (2019) cites the example of the Havasupai Tribe of Arizona, who successfully repatriated their genetic data after its authorised use in a research study, with the repatriation commemorated through ceremony. In Australia, the Australian Torres Strait Islander Data Archive is working with the University of Sydney and the Buku-Larrnggay Mulka Centre at Yirrkala in Arnhem Land to digitise and repatriate a collection of approximately 100 1940s Yulngu paintings on bark, together with related documentation including voice recordings describing the significance of the paintings made in the 1970s by a Yolngu elder (Gardiner et al. 2011).

The First Nations Indigenous Governance Centre (2016) proposes that where true repatriation is not possible, “data governance agreements or data-sharing contracts can be negotiated to effectively maintain First Nations’ control over their data”. But, as summarised in Tuhiwai Smith (2015) “Changes in technology, as much as Indigenous efforts to recover and repatriate important knowledge, are forcing us to think more creatively and critically about current information systems and practices and their usefulness for the future.”

5 | IN RELATION TO PLACE

Meaningful data sovereignty involves the right and ability to protect, renew and share data according to Indigenous peoples’ values and priorities. What, then, does this mean for sharing knowledge of place?

A central concept is that “how” knowledge is shared, matters. As shorthand, we label this concept in the context of this paper as the “relational gap”. In the context of academic research, a particularly formal example of knowledge-sharing, Wilson (2001) talks about moving beyond “Indigenous perspectives” to “an Indigenous paradigm... Indigenous research needs to reflect contexts and world views...”. Hart (2010) cites Garrouette’s work on research methodologies that reflect and reinforce Indigenous peoples’ roots and principles, and argues that, otherwise, Indigenous peoples “potentially end up straining our knowledge for only those pieces that fit the dominating perspectives.” Thus, when seeking to bridge the gap between spatial technologies and Indigenous understandings of place, we propose that spatial technologies should, whenever possible, facilitate an Indigenous context and world-view, and that this is crucial to the integrity of the process.

While existing spatial technology may be used to advance Indigenous interests, this differs from the development of technology that reflects Indigenous ways of knowing. Vellend et al. (2014), for example, acknowledges the potential for GIS to strengthen relationships between generations of Yorta Yorta people, but references Rundstrom (1995) to argue that “GIS has been critiqued for its limited potential because it de-emphasises or ignores concepts that are of central importance to Indigenous cultures including the ubiquity of relatedness, the value of non-empirical experience, the need to control access to levels of geographical knowledge, and the value of ambiguity...” We focus on three concepts to help bridge the gap between knowledge about space, and Indigenous knowledge of place: the importance of knowledge-in-context; the nature of relationships between people sharing knowledge; and the notion that knowledge is privileged and may therefore be subject to restriction.

The importance of engaging with Indigenous knowledge *in context* arises from different understandings of “knowledge”. When describing understandings of nature, Aitkenhead and Ogawa (2007) draw a contrast between Indigenous knowledge as a “verb-oriented” process of “coming to know” (Cajete 2000), versus the “noun-oriented” Eurocentric notion of “discovery”. Nakata et al. (2014) cites Eyzaguirre (2001) when cautioning that “...[taking] ‘validated’ nuggets of Indigenous knowledge out of its cultural context... may undermine the knowledge system itself”, and emphasises that Indigenous knowledge is dynamic rather than a fixed “fact”, with Indigenous knowledge deriving, producing and renewing meaning as conditions change and as knowledge is enacted and practised in situ (Verran 2002). Muecke (2012) similarly draws attention to the significance of knowledge building and the “aliveness of place” in place-based and localised

considerations. Technology that facilitates the isolation of “facts” from context, and technology that precludes a revising and renewing of knowledge through time, will both erode the processes for acknowledging Indigenous knowledges of place.

Respectful, accountable relationships also emerge as key themes for sustaining and renewing Indigenous knowledge. Discussing an Indigenous research methodology, Wilson (2001) argues that “relational accountability” is crucial to an Indigenous world-view. In turn, this requires that knowledge-sharing occurs in a reciprocal context and reflects Indigenous peoples’ desire to honour relationships with other life (Wilson 2001). Outside the GI science field there are examples of technologies that have been designed to facilitate relationships between people who are either sharing, working with, collating or remediating diverse cultural knowledge forms. These technologies recognise that knowledge-sharing occurs between Indigenous and non-indigenous peoples, and across different knowledge systems. Christie (2014) describes the design of a device, developed in collaboration with members of the Yolŋu community in Australia, which provides a structure for medical “conversations” rather than abrupt diagnostic statements. The device is designed to facilitate patient-guided, rather than physician-guided, exploration of culturally sensitive medical images. Cunsolo Willox et al. (2015) describe a digital narrative method designed to examine the linkages between climate change and the physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual health and well-being of the Inuit community in Rigolet, northern Canada. These projects provide important insights into the ways that technology could be harnessed to share knowledge of place in the context of reciprocal and mutually respectful relationships.

Non-indigenous knowledge systems typically strive for “openness” to examination, replication and verification. In contrast, Indigenous systems of knowledge often treat knowledge as privileged to be shared according to context-specific rules. These rules may be expressed in terms of secret and sacred knowledge, and can extend to the privacy of individuals and their families and communities (Garnier et al. 2011). Nakata et al. (2014) explain that Indigenous knowledge is “differentiated” across levels, with Gumbula (2005) identifying public areas (open-access); peri-restricted areas which require negotiation for access and use; and highly restricted or closed areas, which include secret-sacred knowledge sites, practices and documentation. Vellend et al. (2014) emphasises that knowledge restrictions are particularly important for Australian Indigenous cultures that have strict demarcations around knowledge access. The partitioning and privileging of knowledge may occur in multiple directions: Wellen and Sieber (2013), for example, highlights that Crees feel uncomfortable asserting claims about others’ traplines. In this context, culturally sensitive sharing of information meant that interviewers limited their focus to spatial areas with which the [Cree] participant had some “affiliation”. A crucial feature of technology for sharing knowledge of place, while protecting Indigenous knowledge systems, is infrastructure which supports restrictions on who shares knowledge, with whom, and where.

6 | GI SCIENCE FOR IK TECHNOLOGIES

The previous three sections provide an analysis of the gap between Indigenous knowledges of place and digital data about space, structured around three main gaps: transforming knowledge to data (the “space-place gap”); access to knowledge and data (the “control gap”); and being in relation to

Indigenous knowledge (the “relational gap”). While there are evidently no simple, technological solutions to such challenges, there has already been broader research efforts aimed at leveraging new geospatial technologies to better serve Indigenous communities and Indigenous knowledge.

In particular, we restrict our focus in this paper to relevant research from one particular research community: geographic information science (GI science¹). GI science is an active research discipline concerned with the foundations of geospatial information, having broad application to geospatial technologies. The GI science community has its own long-established conference series (e.g., *GIScience*, *COSIT*, *ACM SIGSPATIAL*) and journals (e.g., *International Journal of Geographic Information Science*, *Transactions in GIS*, *Journal of Spatial Information Science*, *Cartography and Geographic Information Science* amongst many others, see Kemp, Kuhn, and Brox 2013). GI science is interdisciplinary and positioned at the intersection of geography, computer science, statistics, cartography and design, political science, and cognitive science (Goodchild 2014).

This subsection outlines the potential of GI science to reshape and adapt geospatial technologies to be more in harmony with an explicit social and cultural context. The following subsections briefly review progress in four of the most active established topics in GI science with existing applications to Indigenous knowledge: PPGIS, VGI, location-based services, and spatial language and ontologies.

6.1 | Public Participation GIS (PPGIS)

The term “public participation GIS” (PPGIS) emerged in the 1990s (Schroeder 1996) to describe research aimed at broadening participation by the public in GIS-related technology, projects, policies, and decisions (Sieber 2006). Central to PPGIS research is the development of new geospatial tools and approaches to using geospatial technologies that empower otherwise marginalised actors and institutions in the spatial decision-making process (Sieber 2000; Elwood 2002; Haklay and Tobón 2003). Sieber (2006) provides a thorough review of the first decade of literature in the area. As might be expected, increasing participation and empowerment of Indigenous people has been one specific focus of PPGIS research. For example, Eisner et al. (2012) investigated the development of a web-based GIS containing traditional environmental knowledge in collaboration with Alaskan Indigenous Iñupiat communities, although the authors acknowledge community reaction was, at least in the short-term, “lacklustre”. Working with the traditional owners of Gunbower Island, Australia, McConachie et al. (2020) used cultural mapping techniques to integrate a diversity of spatial data and Indigenous knowledge of the Barapa people for the purpose of education and teaching of non-Indigenous and Indigenous communities. Critiques of PPGIS often highlight the dangers of meaningful participation degrading into mere legitimisation (Harris and Weiner 2002; Chapin, Lamb, and Threlkeld 2005).

6.2 | Volunteered Geographic Information (VGI)

Volunteered geographic information (VGI) is a form of user-generated content (UGC) where private citizens create and make publicly available geographic information (Goodchild 2007). The phenomenon of VGI has undoubtedly had a profound impact on the generation and capture of

¹ Note, following Hall (2014) we use the term “GI science” to refer to the academic field of geographic information science, and reserve the oft-used moniker “GIScience” to refer specifically to the international conference series in the field of that name, <http://giscience.org>.

geographic information, as evidenced by the growth of online sites and platforms such as OpenStreetMap, Wikimapia, and Ushahidi (Sui 2008; Elwood 2008; Haworth 2016). A recent review of a broad range of VGI initiatives can be found in Elwood, Goodchild, and Sui (2012). In common with PPGIS, VGI holds the potential to elevate non-authoritative data sources and empower marginalised citizens (Verplanke et al. 2014). In this way, VGI has been particularly effective in opening up new opportunities to capture and analyze aspects of human knowledge of place (e.g., Purves and Edwardes 2008; Elwood, Goodchild and Sui 2013; Hardy, Frew, and Goodchild 2012), including Indigenous knowledge of place (Corbett 2013). Critics of VGI, however, identify a tendency of VGI to reinforce rather than resist established power imbalances, pointing to the highly uneven access to technology across society and the world (Hollenstein and Purves 2010; Sui, Goodchild, Elwood 2013) and the neoliberal business models that often underpin UGC platforms (Burgess 2006).

6.3 | Location-based services (LBS)

Location-based services (LBS) integrate mobile computing devices with positioning systems and wireless communications to provide information and services to a user relevant to that person's current location (Schiller and Voisard 2004). Most readers of this article will be intimately familiar with LBS, through the myriad location-enabled tracking our location right now on our smart phones or similar devices. The technological advances behind LBS have enabled a vast range of new location-aware applications in areas such as navigation and wayfinding, emergency response, tourism, commerce, mobile gaming, amongst many others (Rao and Minakakis 2003; Schiller and Voisard 2004; Raper et al. 2007). The potential of these location-aware applications to utilise, augment, or even enhance knowledge of place have been vigorously explored. For example, by encouraging playful interactions with space, location-based gaming applications have been used to promote place-making and enhance a sense of place (De Souza e Silva and Hjorth 2009; Hjorth and Richardson 2017). Others have recognised the possibilities of using LBS technology for walking tours and digital storytelling for enhancing a sense of place (Butler 2007), including communicating or maintaining Indigenous knowledge of place (Edmonds et al. 2014; Buxton 2015; Ridgeway and Guntarik 2017). Criticisms of LBS point to the privacy threats and surveillance opportunities inherent in the technology (Michael and Michael 2011). Others have also highlighted ways LBS technology can disrupt rather than enhance relationships with, and knowledge of place, by structuring and reducing the opportunities for users' direct interactions with space (Wilson 2012; Hjorth and Richardson 2017).

6.4 | Spatial language and ontologies

The term "ontology" is used in GI science to refer both to the philosophical study of what exists (often singular, capitalised "Ontology"), and to the study of explicit and machine-readable specifications of domain knowledge (i.e., "ontologies" in connection with "ontology engineering") (Gruber 1995; Guarino 1998). For example, Kauppinen et al. (2008) describe the use of geospatial ontologies (in the latter sense) to help simplify searching through a digital database of cultural heritage in Finland, in the context of changing place names and regions between 1865 and 2007. Sieber and co-authors have explored the extent to which geospatial ontologies can include and exclude Indigenous ways of knowing. In the case of the Cree Nation of Wemindji, geospatial ontologies provide a platform for recording and preserving Indigenous language and concepts as well as for homogenisation of Indigenous language and assimilation of Indigenous peoples (Sieber and Wellen 2011; Wellen and Sieber 2013; Reid and Sieber 2019). Underneath the challenges of ontological engineering for

Indigenous knowledge lie more fundamental ontological differences (in the former, philosophical sense). Basic geographical concepts, such as boundaries and time, have been shown to exhibit fundamentally different ontological bases (in the former philosophical sense) in Indigenous and Eurocentric knowledge (e.g., Turnbull 2007; Veland et al. 2014). Such ontological differences are evident in linguistic differences. Mark and Turk's comparative study of English language and Indigenous Australian Yindjibarndi terms for landforms and waterbodies uncovered fundamental conceptual differences in how such features are categorised (Mark and Turk 2003; Mark et al. 2007). Similarly, Cruikshank spotlights the fundamental ontological differences in the way elderly Athapaskan speakers in the southern Yukon use and associate meaning with place-names, for example as markers in time and space (Cruikshank 1990).

7 | NEW HORIZONS

In addition to GI science research with direct relevance to closing the gap between digital spatial data and Indigenous knowledge (such as that surveyed in the previous section) there exist a wide range of other GI science topics with potential but largely unexplored relevance. This section looks to highlight potential synergies from amongst established GI science topics, where applications to inclusion of Indigenous knowledge may not yet have been considered. Our objective is to briefly spotlight serendipities, which may in turn lead to new insights or innovations.

For example, reflecting the endemic nature of uncertainty in any geospatial data, the study of the capture, management, and presentation of uncertainty in spatial data is amongst the most long-standing of research challenges in GI science (Chrisman 1983; Fisher 1989). Central to GI science work in this area is the approach of tracking and reporting uncertainty as the basis for learning, dialogue, and improved decision-making, rather than a vain attempt to reduce or remove uncertainty (Duckham et al. 2006). Hence, uncertainty handling techniques in GI science can help to provide a richer context to data, as situated and partial knowledge (Duckham and Sharp 2005). Schuurman and Leszczynski (2006), for instance, explore the use of geospatial uncertainty management tools to augment geospatial land use data with metadata (data about data) that provides additional context for data, such as the reason data was originally captured, land use policy constraints, and anecdotes connected with the data. In this way, adding back in context through uncertainty handling tools could be valuable to explore further with a view to addressing the “relational gap” (being in relation to place, Section 5).

A further strand of GI science research with relevance to reconnecting geospatial data with its context can be found in work on distributed spatial computing. By default, digital communication networks make it possible to disconnect data from its location. Geospatial technology then enables individuals to know a place without physical presence (Sutko and de Souza e Silva 2011). However, it is also entirely possible and sometimes desirable to physically locate geospatial data in the specific geographic location which it describes. In some cases, this may be a natural consequence of the objectives and constraints of data archiving and digital libraries (Goodchild 1997). In other cases, it may be an intrinsic feature of the distributed spatial technologies, such as wireless geosensor networks (Duckham 2012). In a similar way, it might be fruitful to explore technologies for making access to selected Indigenous digital data about space available only to authenticated individuals physically located on the specific ancestral lands to which that spatial data refers. Such approaches might underpin new technologies for being in relation to place when accessing data about space (“relational gap”, see Section 5). Related ideas have already been explored in other application areas,

such as implementing location-based privacy controls for securing access to sensitive, personal data (Langheinrich 2007).

Apropos, research into location privacy is itself a highly active area of GI science. Location privacy is a type of information privacy concerned with controlling access to sensitive and personal information about an individual's location (Duckham and Kulik 2006). There are clear parallels between the technologies for securing personal information about an individual's location (surveyed for example in Krumm 2009) and the technical aspects of maintaining or regaining control of First Nations' sovereign data (even if not the, admittedly, more challenging social and institutional aspects; see "control gap", Section 4).

Indeed, it is possible to identify many areas of as yet under-explored synergies between current GI science research and technical aspects of the three challenge areas identified in Sections 3–5. Work in the area of qualitative spatial reasoning aims to bring geospatial technologies closer to human cognitive spatial concepts and capabilities (Freksa 1991), potentially increasing the diversity of "valid" digital data that can be captured and stored ("space-place gap", Section 3). Such work can, for example, reduce the need to precisely specify or bound stored geographic locations in order for them to be valid (e.g., Galton and Hood 2005). Research into geospatial technologies for virtual and immersive fieldwork is helping to provide an authentic experience of remote locations for scientific education (Stainfield et al. 2000; Klippel et al. 2018), with evident parallels to the goals of being in relation to place ("relational gap", Section 5). And reproducible research is also helping to shift the focus of the field from spatial data onto the provenance and processes used to generate data (Kray et al. 2019), resonating with the challenge of providing a richer context for digital spatial data ("relational gap", Section 5).

8 | CONCLUSIONS

This paper has attempted to highlight existing and new synergies between the latest technical advances in GI science and the unique characteristics of Indigenous knowledge of place. In doing so, we aim to identify the potential synergies that may exist, in a way that acknowledges the significant gulf still to be bridged at the "cultural interface" between traditionally distinct research traditions (Nakata 2002). Thus, our objective is best encapsulated by Nakata (2002) as "maintaining the continuity of one when having to harness another and working the interaction in ways that serve Indigenous interests ..."

Thus, the review touches on four existing areas of GI science focussed on constructing geospatial technologies that are more inclusive of Indigenous knowledge of place (Section 6). Given the fundamental nature of the challenges set out in Sections 3-5, however, it will come as no surprise that this existing work can only partially address those challenges. By lowering the barriers to Indigenous communities' creation and curation of digital data, work on PPGIS and VGI arguably contributes to improvements against the first challenge, transforming knowledge into data. However, such work also holds the potential to erode data sovereignty (access to knowledge, challenge 2), especially in connection with VGI. Similarly, LBS can change the way Indigenous and non-indigenous people interact with place-need knowledge in context (being in relation to Indigenous knowledge, challenge 3). At the same time, these technologies can increase risks of surveillance and infringements of privacy (challenge 2). And while ontological studies of Indigenous knowledge may help increase

understanding of the far-reaching impacts of Eurocentric ways of knowing embedded in geospatial technologies, they may also contribute to an underestimation of the differences in knowledge systems often characterised as “incommensurable” (Nadasdy 1999; Turnbull 2008; Verrans 2008).

Similarly, Section 7 identifies several new synergies, from amongst established GI science topics. The potential applications to inclusion of Indigenous knowledge in topics such as distributed spatial computing, reproducible research, and qualitative spatial reasoning may not yet have been considered, and were certainly not initial motivations for the development of those research areas. While such connections hold clear promise, they are not without their own potential dangers of underestimating challenges or over-simplifying solutions. Scientists and engineers are adept at developing new technology to solve problems. But even well-meant searches for a technological “fix” can exacerbate deep-rooted challenges. The potential for geospatial technologies, in particular, to be a force for assimilation of Indigenous peoples and the adoption of hegemonic representations of space over diverse knowledges of place has long been acknowledged (Chambers 2004).

Hence, these conclusions acknowledge that our approach is not without dangers, including the potential to retard radical reformulation of geospatial technologies and continued marginalisation and assimilation of Indigenous knowledge. Nevertheless, in pursuing this line we hope instead that identifying technological opportunities may offer pragmatic pathways to better understandings of the interdisciplinary opportunities, beyond simple technological “fixes”.

9 | ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Authors are grateful for the support and advice of Jason Brailey and Distinguished Professor Justin Zobel in the development of this paper. The research of Mark McMillan and Daisy San Martin Saldias is partially supported by an Australian Research Council (ARC) Grant IN180100065, “Indigenous leaders: lawful relations from encounter to treaty”, while the research of Mark McMillan and Olivia Guntarik is supported through an ARC Linkage Grant LP180100397, “Talking Country: Sharing Indigenous stories of place through mobile media”. All Authors contributed equally to the manuscript and share first authorship status; they have been listed in alphabetical order for simplicity.

10 | REFERENCES

- Agnew, J. (2011). Space and place. *The SAGE Handbook of Geographical Knowledge* (pp. 316–331). London, UK: SAGE Publications. doi:10.4135/9781446201091.n24
- Agrawal, A. (1995). Dismantling the divide between indigenous and scientific knowledge. *Development and Change*, 26(3), 413–439. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7660.1995.tb00560.x
- Agrawal, A. (2002). Indigenous knowledge and the politics of classification. *International Social Science Journal*, 54(173), 287–297. doi:10.1111/1468-2451.00382
- Aikenhead, G. S. & Ogawa, M. (2007). Indigenous knowledge and science revisited. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 2(3), 539–620. doi:10.1007/s11422-007-9067-8
- Amoore, L. (2018). Cloud geographies: Computing, data, sovereignty. *Progress in Human Geography*, 42(1), 4–24. doi:10.1177/0309132516662147
- Battiste, M. & Henderson, J. Y. (2000). *Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage*. Saskatoon, CA: Purich Publishing.

- Bell, M. (1979). The exploitation of indigenous knowledge or the indigenous exploitation of knowledge: whose use of what for what? *The IDS Bulletin*, 10(2), 44–50. doi:10.1111/j.1759-5436.1979.mp10002008.x
- Briggs, J. (2005). The use of indigenous knowledge in development: Problems and challenges. *Progress in Development Studies*, 5(2), 99–114. doi:10.1191/1464993405ps105oa
- Burgess, J. (2006). Hearing ordinary voices: Cultural studies, vernacular creativity and digital storytelling. *Continuum*, 20(2), 201–214. doi:10.1080/10304310600641737
- Butler, T. (2007). Memoryscape: How audio walks can deepen our sense of place by integrating art, oral history and cultural geography. *Geography Compass*, 1(3), 360–372. doi:10.1111/j.1749-8198.2007.00017.x
- Buxton, M. (2015). Practicing place with locative mobile technology. *Whanake: The Pacific Journal of Community Development*, 1(1), 29–38.
- Cajete, G. A. (2000). *Native Science: Natural Laws of Interdependence*. Santa Fe, US: Clear Light Publishers.
- Camacho, L. D., Gevaña, D. T., Carandang, A. P., & Camacho, S. C. (2016). Indigenous knowledge and practices for the sustainable management of Ifugao forests in Cordillera, Philippines. *International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services & Management*, 12(1–2), 5–13. doi:10.1080/21513732.2015.1124453
- Castellano, M. B. (2004). Ethics of Aboriginal research. *International Journal of Aboriginal Health*, 1(1), 98–114. doi:10.3138/ijih.v1i1.28935
- Chambers, K., Corbett, J., Keller, C., & Wood, C. (2004). Indigenous knowledge, mapping, and GIS: A diffusion of innovation perspective. *Cartographica*, 39(3), 19–31.
- Chapin, M., Lamb, Z., & Threlkeld, B. (2005). Mapping indigenous lands. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 34(1), 619–638. doi:10.1146/annurev.anthro.34.081804.120429
- Chrisman, N. R. (1983). The role of quality information in the long-term functioning of a geographic information system. In *Proc. International Symposium on Automated Cartography (Auto Carto 6)* (pp. 303–321).
- Christie, M. & Verran, H. (2014). The touch pad body: A generative transcultural digital device interrupting received ideas and practices in Aboriginal health. *Societies*, 4(2), 256–264. doi:10.3390/soc4020256
- Corbett, J. (2013). “I Don’t Come from Anywhere”: Exploring the role of the geoweb and volunteered geographic information in rediscovering a sense of place in a dispersed aboriginal community. In *Crowdsourcing Geographic Knowledge* (pp. 223–241). Dordrecht, NL: Springer.
- Cresswell, T. (2014). *Place: An introduction (2nd ed.)*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons. doi:10.1111/nzg.12102
- Cruikshank, J. (1990). Getting the words right: Perspectives on naming and places in Athapaskan oral history. *Arctic Anthropology*, 27(1), 52–65.
- Cunsolo Willox, A., Harper, S. L., Edge, V. L., “My Word”: Storytelling and Digital Media Lab, & Rigolet Inuit Community Government. (2013). Storytelling in a digital age: Digital storytelling as an emerging narrative method for preserving and promoting indigenous oral wisdom. *Qualitative Research*, 13(2), 127–147.
- De Souza e Silva, A. & Hjorth, L. (2009). Playful urban spaces: A historical approach to mobile games. *Simulation & Gaming*, 40(5), 602–625. doi:1177/1046878109333723
- Dewar, J. (2019) First Nations data sovereignty in Canada. *Statistical Journal of the IAOS*, 35(1), 47–69. doi:10.3233/SJI-180478

- Duckham, M. & Sharp, J. (2005). Uncertainty and geographic information: Computational and critical convergence. In *Representing GIS*, 113–124. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Duckham, M. & Kulik, L. (2006). Location privacy and location-aware computing. In *Dynamic & Mobile GIS: Investigating Change in Space and Time* (pp. 34–51). Florida, USA: CRC Press.
- Duckham, M., Lingham, J., Mason, K., & Worboys, M. (2006). Qualitative reasoning about consistency in geographic information. *Information Sciences*, 176(6), 601–627. doi:10.1016/j.ins.2005.01.021
- Duckham, M. (2012). *Decentralized Spatial Computing: Foundations of Geosensor Networks*. Dordrecht, NL: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-30853-6
- Duerden, F. & Kuhn, R. (1996). The application of geographic information systems by First Nations and government in northern Canada. *Cartographica*, 33(2), 49–62. doi:10.3138/7013-6H87-2376-8QJK
- Edmonds, F., Rachinger, C., Singh, G., Chenhall, R., Arnold, M., de Souza, P., & Lowish, S. (2014). What's ya story? The making of a digital storytelling mobile app with Aboriginal young people. *Sydney: Australian Communications Consumer Action Network*. Retrieved from https://accan.org.au/Whats%20ya%20Story_FINAL.pdf
- Eisner, W. R., Jelacic, J., Cuomo, C. J., Kim, C., Hinkel, K. M., & Del Alba, D. (2012). Producing an Indigenous knowledge Web GIS for Arctic Alaska communities: Challenges, successes, and lessons learned. *Transactions in GIS*, 16(1), 17–37. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9671.2011.01291.x
- Ellen, R., Parkes, P., & Bicker, A. (2000). *Indigenous Environmental Knowledge and its Transformations: Critical Anthropological Perspectives*. Amsterdam, NL: Harwood Academic.
- Elwood, S. (2002). GIS use in community planning: A multidimensional analysis of empowerment. *Environment and Planning A*, 34(5), 905–922. doi.org/10.1068/a34117
- Elwood, S. (2008). Volunteered geographic information: Key questions, concepts and methods to guide emerging research and practice. *GeoJournal*, 72(3–4), 133–135. doi:10.1007/s10708-008-9187-z
- Elwood, S., Goodchild, M. F., & Sui, D. Z. (2012). Researching volunteered geographic information: Spatial data, geographic research, and new social practice. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 102(3), 571–590. doi:10.1080/00045608.2011.595657
- Elwood, S., Goodchild, M. F., & Sui D. Z. (2013). Prospects for VGI Research and the Emerging Fourth Paradigm. *Crowdsourcing Geographic Knowledge* (pp. 361–375). Dordrecht, NL: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-4587-2_20
- Eyzaguirre, P. B. (2001). Global recognition of Indigenous knowledge: Is this the latest phase of “globalisation”. *Indigenous Knowledge and Development Monitor*, 9(2), 40.
- Freksa, C. (1991). Qualitative spatial reasoning. In *Cognitive and linguistic aspects of geographic space* (pp. 361–372). Dordrecht, NL: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-94-011-2606-9_20
- First Nations Indigenous Governance Centre (2016) Pathways to First Nations’ data and information sovereignty. *Indigenous Data Sovereignty: Toward an Agenda*. Canberra, AU: ANU Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22459/CAEPR38.11.2016>
- Fisher, P. (1989). Knowledge-based approaches to determining and correcting areas of unreliability in geographic databases. *Accuracy of Spatial Databases*. (pp. 45–54) London, UK: Taylor and Francis.
- Galton, A. & Hood, J. (2005). Anchoring: a new approach to handling indeterminate location in GIS. *International Conference on Spatial Information Theory* (pp. 1–13). Berlin, DE: Springer. doi:10.1007/11556114_1

- Gardiner, G., McDonald, J., Byrne, A., & Thorpe, K. (2011). Respect, trust and engagement: creating an Australian indigenous data archive. *Collection Building*, 30(4), 148–152. doi:10.1108/01604951111181100
- Goodchild, M. F. (1997). Towards a geography of geographic information in a digital world. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 21(6), 377–391. doi:10.1016/S0198-9715(98)00009-X
- Goodchild, M. F. (2007). Citizens as sensors: the world of volunteered geography. *GeoJournal*, 69(4), 211–221. doi: 10.1007/s10708-007-9111-y
- Goodchild, M. F. (2010). Twenty years of progress: GIScience in 2010. *Journal of Spatial Information Science*, 1(1), 3–20. doi: 10.5311/JOSIS.2010.1.2
- Goodchild, M. F. (2011). Formalizing place in geographic information systems. In *Communities, neighborhoods, and health* (pp. 21–33). New York, US: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4419-7482-2_2
- Grenier, L. (1998). *Working with Indigenous Knowledge: A Guide for Researchers*. Ottawa, CA: International Development Research Centre.
- Gruber, T. (1995). Toward principles for the design of ontologies used for knowledge sharing. *International Journal of Human Computer Studies*, 43(5–6), 907–928. doi:10.1006/ijhc.1995.1081
- Guarino, N. (1998). Formal ontology and information systems. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Formal Ontology in Information Systems* (pp.3–15).
- Gumbula, J. N. (2005). Exploring the Gupapuynga legacy: Strategies for developing the Galiwin'ku Indigenous Knowledge Centre. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, 36(2), 23–26. doi.org/10.1080/00048623.2005.10721245
- Haklay, M. & Tobón, C. (2003). Usability evaluation and PPGIS: Towards a user-centred design approach. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*, 17(6), 577–592. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1365881031000114107>
- Hall, A. C. (2014). GI science, not GIScience. *Journal of Spatial Information Science*, 2014(9), 129–131. doi:10.5311/JOSIS.2014.9.204
- Hardy, D., Frew, J., & Goodchild, M. F. (2012). Volunteered geographic information production as a spatial process. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*, 26(7), 1191–1212. doi:10.1080/13658816.2011.629618
- Harris, T. & Weiner, D. (1998). Empowerment, marginalization, and “community-integrated” GIS. *Cartography and Geographic Information Systems*, 25(2), 67–76. doi:10.1559/152304098782594580
- Harris, T. & Weiner, D. (2002). Implementing a community-integrated GIS: Perspectives from South African fieldwork. *Community Participation and Geographic Information Systems* (pp. 246–258). London, UK: Taylor and Francis. doi:10.1201/9780203469484.ch18
- Hart, M. A. (2010). Indigenous worldviews, knowledge, and research: The development of an indigenous research paradigm. *Journal of Indigenous Voices in Social Work*, 1(1), 1–16.
- Haworth, B. (2016). Emergency management perspectives on volunteered geographic information: Opportunities, challenges and change. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 57, 189–198. doi:10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2016.02.009

- Hjorth, L. and Richardson, I. (2017). Pokémon GO: Mobile media play, place-making, and the digital wayfarer. *Mobile Media & Communication*, 5(1), 3–14. doi: 10.1177/2050157916680015
- Hollenstein, L. & Purves, R. (2010). Exploring place through user-generated content: Using Flickr tags to describe city cores. *Journal of Spatial Information Science*, 2010(1), 21–48. doi:10.5311/JOSIS.2010.1.3
- International Labour Organisation (1989) C169 - Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention (No. 169): Convention concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries. https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_ILO_CODE:C169
- Johnson, J. T., Cant, G., Howitt, R., & Peters, E. (2007). Creating anti-colonial geographies: embracing indigenous peoples' knowledges and rights. *Geographical Research*, 45(2), 117–120. doi:10.1111/j.1745-5871.2007.00441.x
- Kauppinen, T., Väättäinen, J., & Hyvönen, E. (2008). Creating and using geospatial ontology time series in a semantic cultural heritage portal. In *European Semantic Web Conference* (pp. 110–123). Berlin, DE: Springer.
- Kemp, K., Kuhn, W., & Brox, C. (2013). Results of a Survey to Rate GIScience Publication Outlets. In *Proceedings AGILE 2013*, Leuven, BE.
- Klippel, A., Zhao, J., Oprean, D., Wallgrün, J. O., Stubbs, C., La Femina, P., & Jackson, K. L. (2018). The value of being there: toward a science of immersive virtual field trips. *Virtual Reality*, 22, 1–18. doi:10.1007/s10055-019-00418-5
- Kray, C., Pebesma, E., Konkol, M., & Nüst, D. (2019). Reproducible Research in Geoinformatics: Concepts, Challenges and Benefits (Vision Paper). In *Proc. 14th International Conference on Spatial Information Theory (COSIT 2019)*. Regensburg, DE.
- Krumm, J. (2009). A survey of computational location privacy. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing*, 13(6), 391–399. doi:10.1007/s00779-008-0212-5
- Langheinrich, M. (2007). Secure localised storage based on super-distributed RFID-tag infrastructures. *Journal of Location Based Services*, 1(3), 208–230. doi:10.1080/17489720802008083
- Madsen, W. (1994). Protecting Indigenous peoples' privacy from Eyes in the Sky. *Proceedings of the Conference on Law and Information Policy for Spatial Databases*. Arizona, US.
- Maiam nayri Wingara Indigenous Data Sovereignty Collective and the Australian Indigenous Governance Institute (2018). "Indigenous Data Sovereignty." *Indigenous Data Sovereignty Summit 2018*. <https://www.aigi.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Communique-Indigenous-Data-Sovereignty-Summit-1.pdf>
- Mark D.M., Turk A.G. (2003). Landscape categories in Yindjibarndi: Ontology, environment, and language. In *Proc. Conference on Spatial Information Theory (COSIT 2003)*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 2825. Berlin, DE: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-39923-0_3
- Mark D. M., Turk A. G., Stea D. (2007). Progress on Yindjibarndi ethnophysiology. In *Proc. Conference on Spatial Information Theory (COSIT 2007)*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 4736. Berlin, DE: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-74788-8_1
- McConachie, F., Jenny, B., Reinke, K., & Arrowsmith, A. (2020) Barapa Country through Barapa eyes: Cultural mapping of Gunbower Island, Australia, *Journal of Maps*, 16(1), 13–20, doi:10.1080/17445647.2019.1701574
- Merschdorf, H., Blaschke, T. (2018) Revisiting the role of place in geographic information science. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*, 7(9), 364. doi:10.3390/ijgi7090364

- Michael, K. & Michael, M. G. (2011). The social and behavioural implications of location-based services, *Journal of Location Based Services*, 5(3–4), 121–137.
doi:10.1080/17489725.2011.642820
- Muecke, S. (2012). Motorcycles, snails, Latour: Criticism without judgement, *Cultural Studies Review*, 18(1), 40–58. doi:10.5130/csr.v18i1.1759
- Nakata, M. (2002). Indigenous knowledge and the cultural interface: Underlying issues at the intersection of knowledge and information systems. *IFLA journal*, 28(5–6), 281–291.
doi:10.1177/034003520202800513
- Nakata, M., Hamacher, D., Warren, J., Byrne, A., Pagnucco, M., Harley, R., Venugopal, S., Thorpe, K., Neville, R., & Bolt, R. (2014). Using modern technologies to capture and share indigenous astronomical knowledge. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, 45(2), 101–110.
doi.org/10.1080/00048623.2014.917786
- Nadasdy, P. (1999). The politics of TEK: Power and the “integration” of knowledge. *Arctic Anthropology*, 36(1–2), 1–18.
- Palmer, M. & Rundstrom, R. (2013). GIS, internal colonialism, and the US Bureau of Indian Affairs. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 103(5), 1142–1159.
doi:10.1080/00045608.2012.720233
- Pavlovskaya, M. (2006). Theorizing with GIS: A tool for critical geographies? *Environment and Planning A*, 38(11), 2003–2020. doi.org/10.1068/a37326
- Pearce, M. & Louis, R. (2008). Mapping Indigenous depth of place. *American Indian Culture & Research Journal*, 32(3), 107–26. doi:10.17953/aicr.32.3.n7g22w816486567j
- Pickerill, J. (2009). Finding common ground? Spaces of dialogue and the negotiation of Indigenous interests in environmental campaigns in Australia. *Geoforum*, 40(1), 66–79.
doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2008.06.009
- Purves, R. S. & Edwardes, A. J. (2008). Exploiting volunteered geographic information to describe place. In *Proceedings of the GIS Research UK 16th Annual Conference* (pp. 252–255).
- Rao, B. & Minakakis, L. (2003). Evolution of mobile location-based services. *Communications of the ACM*, 46(12), 61–65. doi:10.1145/953460.953490
- Raper, J., Gartner, G., Karimi, H., & Rizos, C. (2007). Applications of location-based services: A selected review. *Journal of Location Based Services*, 1(2), 89–111.
doi.org/10.1080/17489720701862184
- Reid, G. & Sieber, R. (2019). Do geospatial ontologies perpetuate Indigenous assimilation? *Progress in Human Geography*, 1–19. doi:10.1177/0309132518824646.
- Ridgeway, B. & Guntarik, O. (2017). This Sense of Place/this Living Archive: Cocreative Digitization and First Nations Peoples Remembering. *Collections*, 13(2), 185–198.
doi:10.1177/155019061701300212
- Rundstrom, R. A. (1995). GIS, Indigenous peoples, and epistemological diversity. *Cartography and Geographic Information Systems*, 22(1), 45–57. doi:10.1559/152304095782540564
- Schiller, J. & Voisard, A. (2004). *Location-based services*. Amsterdam, NL: Elsevier.
doi:10.1016/B978-1-55860-929-7.X5000-6
- Schroeder, P. (1996). Report on public participation GIS workshop. In *GIS and society: The social implications of how people, space and environment are represented in GIS*. NCGIA Technical Report. California, US: Regents University of California.
- Schuurman, N. & Leszczynski, A. (2006). Ontology-based metadata. *Transactions in GIS*, 10(5), 709–726. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9671.2006.01024.x

- Sheppard, E. (1993). Automated geography: What kind of geography for what kind of society? *The Professional Geographer*, 45(4), 457–460. doi:10.1111/j.0033-0124.1993.00457.x
- Sieber, R. E. (2000). Conforming (to) the opposition: The social construction of geographical information systems in social movements. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*, 14(8), 775–793. doi:10.1080/136588100750022787
- Sieber, R. (2006). Public participation geographic information systems: A literature review and framework. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 96(3), 491–507. doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8306.2006.00702.x
- Sieber, R. E. & Haklay, M. (2015). The epistemology (s) of volunteered geographic information: A critique. *Geo: Geography and Environment*, 2(2), 122–136. doi: 10.1002/geo2.10
- Sieber, R. & Wellen, C. (2011). The role of geospatial technologies for integrating landscape in language. *Landscape in Language: Transdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 381–393). Amsterdam, NL: John Benjamins Publishing. doi: 10.1075/clu.4.20sie
- Sillitoe, P. (1998). Knowing the land: Soil and land resource evaluation and indigenous knowledge. *Soil Use and Management*, 14(4), 188–193. doi:10.1111/j.1475-2743.1998.tb00148
- Snipp, C. M. (2016). What does data sovereignty imply: What does it look like? In *Indigenous data sovereignty: Toward an agenda* (pp. 39–55). Canberra, AU: ANU Press.
- Stainfield, J., Fisher, P., Ford, B., & Solem, M. (2000). International virtual field trips: A new direction? *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 24(2), 255–262. doi:10.1080/713677387
- Stephens, S. (2001). *Handbook for Culturally Responsive Science Curriculum*. Fairbanks, US: Alaska University.
- Sutko, D. M. & De Souza e Silva, A. (2011). Location-aware mobile media and urban sociability. *New Media & Society*, 13(5), 807–823. doi:10.1177/1461444810385202
- Sui, D. Z. (2008). The wikification of GIS and its consequences: Or Angelina Jolie's new tattoo and the future of GIS. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 1(32), 1–5. doi:10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2007.12.001
- Sui, D. Z., Goodchild, M. F., & Elwood, S. (2013). Volunteered geographic information, the exaflood, and the growing digital divide. In *Crowdsourcing Geographic Knowledge* (pp. 1–12). Dordrecht, NL: Springer. doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4587-2_1
- Tripathi, N. & Bhattarya, S. (2004). Integrating Indigenous knowledge and GIS for participatory natural resource management: State-of-the-practice. *The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, 1,(17), 1–13. doi:10.1002/j.1681-4835.2004.tb00112.x
- Tuan, Y. F. (1977). *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minnesota, US: University of Minnesota Press. doi:10.2307/2064418
- Tuan YF. (1979) Space and place: Humanistic perspective. *Philosophy in Geography: Theory and Decision Library*, vol 20 (pp. 387–427). Dordrecht, NL: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-94-009-9394-5_19
- Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2015). Imagining Our Own Approaches. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 53(5–6), 473–474. doi:10.1080/01639374.2015.1027982
- Turnbull, D. (2007). Maps narratives and trails: performativity, hodology and distributed knowledges in complex adaptive systems—an approach to emergent mapping. *Geographical Research*, 45(2), 140–149. doi:10.1111/j.1745-5871.2007.00447
- Turnbull, D. (2008). Knowledge systems: Local knowledge. *Encyclopaedia of the History of Science, Technology, and Medicine in Non-Western Cultures*. Dordrecht, NL: Springer. doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-4425-0_8705

- Veland, S., Lynch, A., Bischoff-Mattson, Z., Joachim, L., & Johnson, N. (2014). All strings attached: Negotiating relationships of geographic information science. *Geographical Research*, 52(3), 296–308. doi:10.1111/1745-5871.12070
- Verran, H. (2002). A postcolonial moment in science studies: Alternative firing regimes of environmental scientists and aboriginal landowners. *Social Studies of Science*, 32(5–6), 729–762. doi:10.1177/030631270203200506
- Verran, H. (2008). Knowledge systems of Aboriginal Australians: Questions and answers arising in a databasing project. In *Encyclopaedia of the History of Science, Technology, and Medicine in Non-Western Cultures*. Dordrecht, NL: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4020-4425-0_8690
- Verplanke, J., McCall, M. K., Uberhuaga, C., Rambaldi, G., & Haklay, M. (2016). A shared perspective for PGIS and VGI. *The Cartographic Journal*, 53(4), 308–317. doi:10.1080/00087041.2016.1227552
- Wellen, C. C. & Sieber, R. E. (2013). Toward an inclusive semantic interoperability: The case of Cree hydrographic features. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*, 27(1), 168–191. doi:10.1080/13658816.2012.688975
- West, M. P., Akama, Y., & McMillan, M. (2016). “I was worried about insulting Indigenous communities with my designs”: Shifting from fear to recognition to create a meeting place of sovereigns. *ACUADS 2016: Adaptation* (pp. 1–13). Acton, AU: Australian National University.
- Wilson, S. (2001). What is an Indigenous research methodology? *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 25(2), 175–179.
- Wilson, M. W. (2012). Location-based services, conspicuous mobility, and the location-aware future. *Geoforum*, 43(6), 1266–1275. doi: 10.1016/j.geoforum.2012.03.014
- WinklerPrins, A. & Aldrich, S. (2010). Locating Amazonian Dark Earths: Creating an interactive GIS of known locations. *Journal of Latin American Geography*, 9(3), 33–50. doi:10.1353/lag.2010.0029
- World Health Organisation (2015). Indigenous populations (04/06/2016). Available from: http://www.who.int/topics/health_services_indigenous/en/.