CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Agency, power and confrontation: the role for socially engaged art in CSCW with rurban communities in support of inclusion
Authors	Murray, Maria;Pantidi, Nadia;McCarthy, John
Publication date	2023-10-07
Original Citation	Murray, M., Pantidi, N. and McCarthy, J. (2023) 'Agency, power and confrontation: the role for socially engaged art in CSCW with rurban communities in support of inclusion', Computer Supported Cooperative Work, 33(3), pp.435-472. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10606-023-09482-7
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	10.1007/s10606-023-09482-7
Rights	© 2023, Springer Nature B.V. This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of an article published in Computer Supported Cooperative Work. The final authenticated version is available online at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10606-023-09482-7
Download date	2026-11-06 11:31:52
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/15215



UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

Agency, power and confrontation: The role for Socially Engaged Art in CSCW with rurban communities in support of inclusion.

Maria Murray[a], Dr. Nadia Pantidi[b], Prof. John McCarthy[c]

[a] *School of Applied Psychology, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland.*
[b] *Computational Media Innovation Centre, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand*
[c] *School of Applied Psychology, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland. Lero – The Irish Software Engineering Research Centre*

Corresponding author:

Maria Murray
School of Applied Psychology, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland
maria.murray@mtu.ie

Abstract
Rapidly expanding rural communities (often termed "rurban") face complex social challenges around inclusion of newcomers, which can be unsettling for long-established community identity. Although participatory CSCW provides resources to support rurban social inclusion, complementary approaches may be needed to facilitate potentially uncomfortable creative and political responses to questions of agency, power, inclusion and confrontation. We suggest that socially engaged art (SEA) has the appropriate qualities and track record to complement better known CSCW approaches in these settings. SEA offers a specifically experiential and dialogical approach to community participation in design, where the kinds of interactions made available by SEA can provide a space for a more dissensual participation. As well as introducing SEA and explaining its potential contribution to participatory CSCW, the paper presents a focus group study undertaken in an Irish rurban community, and considers the implications of insights from that study in future SEA-informed CSCW with this community. The focus group analysis highlighted supportive organised community action, queried social encounters in public space, examined misperceptions and poor communication, and problematised the role of powerful organisations in fostering inclusion. SEA-informed design considerations in support of social inclusion in this community include: supporting volunteerism; examining the evolution of community institutions; reimagining interactions in public place; and dispelling misconceptions through building mutual understanding. We propose that the dialogical aesthetic of SEA

complements other CSCW approaches by drawing attention to tacit, visceral and emotional experiences; dialogue and conflict in collaborative processes; and increasing participant (including emerging community) agency in enacting alternative possibilities.

Keywords:
Socially engaged art, rurban communities, rapidly expanding rural communities, diversity, social inclusion, CSCW, HCI

1 Introduction

The rapidly expanding rural community is a site marked by diversity and change due to an influx of new people. These communities have been called ‘rurban’, ‘peri-urban’, ‘new rurality’ and ‘urban fringe’ (Allen 2003; Busck et al. 2008; Eliasson et al. 2015; Prakash 2018; Torre 2015). We choose ‘rurban' because while some of these terms render the rural invisible, on a semantic level ‘rurban’ represents both rural and urban characteristics of these places (Busck et al. 2008; Gražulevičiūtė-Vileniškė and Vitkuvienė 2013) and in our work, we have found that preserving rural values is an important aim for these communities. Rurban communities are former rural communities that, as a result of rapid expansion, have characteristics that differ from both rural or urban communities (Allen 2003; Busck et al. 2008). Typically, they are close to large urban areas and often become ancillary communities to the urban community (Torre 2015). However, they retain a separate identity, rooted in their rural traditions, influenced by their new relationship with the urban (Allen 2003; Gonçalves et al. 2017) and the rapid increase in population. There are multiple reasons for such rapid increase. Most recently for example, the COVID-19 pandemic prompted a new wave of migration to rural areas (Guaralda et al. 2020; Malatzky et al. 2020).

The social challenges associated with a rapidly expanding rural community involve questions of visibility, power, agency and participation as majority demographics adjust their sense of community identity to reflect the new diversity, and as minority demographics begin to find a place for themselves and influence community life. Disciplines such as CSCW and Participatory Design (PD) have a long history of engaging with power and participation and are well positioned to work with rurban communities. However, while PD has emphasized agency, emancipation and empowerment (Björgvinsson et al. 2010; Kuutti and Bannon 2014), it is seen to have strayed from these ideals (Bannon et al. 2018) and CSCW is said to have more of an emphasis on artifacts over agency and power (Kuutti and Bannon 2014). With a call for more pluralistic approaches, and a need to renew the activist intentions of community-based participatory work (DiSalvo et al. 2012; C. Harrington et al. 2019; Holmer et al. 2015), we are interested in the potential of integrating a Socially Engaged Art (SEA) approach when supporting rurban challenges around

expansion in order to refresh this focus on agency and agonistic participation. In this paper, we describe empirical findings on the lived experience of people in an Irish rurban community, and we put forward suggestions (based on our analysis, and SEA theory and practice) for SEA-informed CSCW in support of social inclusion in that community.

SEA is a pluralistic, activist and critical art form that aims to tackle social justice issues through creative processes. It typically values process and dialogue over the final output, with an emphasis on developing agency and social bonds. Some very well-known examples would include the work of Suzanne Lacy, who has used SEA to interrogate ideas around visibility and agency of both teenage girls and older women in public life (Lacy 1997, 2013). At the heart of SEA is a critical, political and agonistic participation that looks to activate participants in interrogating their social reality. The challenges to participation in SEA are around exchanging dissensus for conviviality and substituting participation for a tokenistic consultation with communities that actually results in a neutralisation of participants (Beech 2008, 2009; Bishop 2012; Tiller 2014). SEA has the potential to make available wider modes of exploration and expression in CSCW as participants are provided with multiple creative and critical entry points into sharing experience, as we will discuss.

SEA has provided support for issues such as social and economic inequity (Anwar McHenry 2011; Diprose 2015), reduced civic engagement (Balfour et al. 2018), stigmatized neighbourhoods (Cameron and Coaffee 2005), decreased participation (Carey and Sutton 2004; Verschelden et al. 2012) and fragmented community cohesion (Matarasso 2007). Participating in SEA processes is said to increase collective problem solving on social issues (Edwards et al. 2016), promote democratically inclusive practices (Edwards et al. 2016; Sharp et al. 2005) and support a reconceptualising of 'community' to include more marginalised voices (Verschelden et al. 2012). These various aims connect with PD, CSCW and HCI that encourage adversarial and agonistic participation, such as work that looks to create spaces for multiple, conflicting social interests that challenge hegemonies (Björgvinsson et al. 2012; Hansson et al. 2018), examines how to amplify goals around democratization and empowerment (Frauenberger et al. 2018), explores design as provocation on social issues through revealing, questioning and challenging social norms (DiSalvo 2012; Hansson et al. 2018).

The work presented here is situated in Northrock[1], a rapidly expanding rural community in Ireland. We present data from a series of focus groups. Namely, insights around the dynamics of inclusion in the community; where and how inclusion happens or not, as well as evidence of experiences that were difficult to articulate and contrasting standpoints that people were reluctant to engage with. We then present an argument for including SEA approaches in CSCW recommendations for

[1] Anonymised

this community. This is based on our analysis coupled with theory and practice-based examples of SEA.

In the next sections, we describe inclusion in the specifically rurban context. We discuss existing approaches to working with issues of inclusion in CSCW and we outline how SEA is useful to CSCW for inclusion. We go on to present our findings on the dynamics of inclusion in Northrock. Drawing on our analysis and relevant SEA theory and practice, we put forward SEA-informed design considerations that look supporting inclusion in this community, and we discuss how these considerations are valuable to the CSCW community.

2 Background

Our work is interested in how SEA might inform CSCW with the Northrock rurban community as it addresses challenges around expansion. We outline these challenges in 2.1, and we find relevant connections with CSCW for diversity, migration and inclusion (2.2). We look at the practices and aesthetics of SEA and how these might be useful to CSCW in support of inclusion (2.3).

2.1 Inclusion in rapidly developing rural communities

The rapidly developing rural site is rich in potential for CSCW interventions in support of inclusion. Inclusion itself has been broadly defined as the ability of individuals to participate in community life (Le et al. 2015) with the aim of tackling inequalities and social justice issues (Gaffikin and Morrissey 2011).

Migration is seen to have shaped rurban communities (Alexandru 2012) and literature around inclusion and migration in rural, peri-urban and rurban areas describes the various marginalisations and tensions that can occur as a result evolving symbolic boundaries between new and long-term residents (Lichter and Brown 2011; Meagher 2009; Sherman 2006, 2018, 2021; Shucksmith 2012; Walton 2021). Long-term community members can experience marginalization as they perceive their old ways of life being eroded and replaced with the new values, beliefs and social norms of new community members (Sherman 2018, 2021; Sherman and Schafft 2022). Equally, new community members can suffer from a gatekeeping of the community, particularly if they are of a disadvantaged economic status, or different cultural, racial or ethnic background relative to the established community (Meagher 2009; Patten et al. 2015; Shucksmith et al. 2012; Walton 2021). Patterns of in-migration also lead to complex identities within new community members – for example, in the US context, Mexican-American residents are caught between the social groups of Mexican migrants and the established, majority white, long-term residents (Lichter and Brown 2011). These various evolving and conflicting identities can lead to fracturing rural values around friendliness and support. The antidote to this is seen to lie in the cultivation of opportunities for meaningful social

interaction between the various identities in a community in order to develop a greater level of mutual understanding (Anwar McHenry 2011; Balfour et al. 2018; Le et al. 2015; Patten et al. 2015; Roberts et al. 2017; Sherman 2021).

A high level of social interaction and participation is seen as a strong indicator of a healthy and vibrant rural community (Patten et al. 2015; Roberts et al. 2017). In urban contexts, public policy and grassroots activity have combined to promote the inclusion of new community members in political, social and cultural life (Gaffikin and Morrissey 2011; Stern and Seifert 2010). This focus also extends to rural cultural initiatives that emphasise increasing social participation in order to combat depopulation, enhance quality of life and secure service provision (Crawshaw and Gkartzios 2016; A. Fischer and McKee 2017).

Acceptance of difference is seen as an integral part of the process towards inclusivity, recognising that a 'community' is not a homogenous or static concept, but preferably one which welcomes and supports divergent voices (Sharp et al. 2005) with the hope of cultivating a shared sense of belonging (Gaffikin and Morrissey 2011). Given that rurban communities are typically characterised by rapid changes in demographic due to influxes of new populations that may or may not be familiar with the particular culture of the host community, the process of accepting difference, supporting contradictory voices and cultivating a shared sense of belonging is central to the enduring resilience and vibrancy of these communities. This diversity calls for a heterogenous approach founded in dialogue (DiSalvo et al. 2009), and a dialogical approach automatically raises questions of participation, in terms of who is included or excluded and who has the most powerful voice (Bishop 2006).

Somewhat counter-intuitively, very well-integrated communities can particularly struggle with this new diversity as a strong sense of community identity can lead to exclusion for those different to the dominant community group (Thomas et al. 2015). This is particularly relevant to formerly rural, now rurban communities, which are smaller and often more culturally homogenous than urban communities. Typical themes of rural inclusion and exclusion look at interpersonal relationship, socio-cultural norms and the stance of organisations and institutions (Patten et al. 2015). This paper extends this body of work with insights on the workings of Irish rurban inclusion based on findings from the Northrock focus groups.

2.2 Inclusion in CSCW

This work is situated in the context of migration, diversity and inclusion in CSCW, HCI and PD, where boundaries and power hierarchies are mutable and complex (Chamberlain et al. 2013). Le Dantec and Fox (2015) summarise this well when they say that there are a multitude of 'us vs thems' in the community setting with 'multiple and overlapping domains of influence and conflict'. Their work articulates a range of nuanced challenges and opportunities, such as: situating our research contribution, building rapport, and accounting for how we balance and

discuss our own roles and subjectivities. This objective of building rapport connects with PD that looks at the importance of intermediaries and dialectics in community based work (Frauenberger et al. 2018; Teli et al. 2022). The various 'us vs thems' are also recognized in PD that describes the need to provide space for multiple, often marginalised, conflicting identities and agendas (Björgvinsson et al. 2012). Chamberlain et. al (2013) also reference these various identities while discussing the challenges inherent in rural community engagement and how to design for meaningful collaboration. These notions of multiple 'us vs thems' are central to our research in terms of making these various identities more visible and supporting inclusion in the rurban context.

There is a growing body of work in CSCW, HCI and PD that looks at designing for inclusivity (Dye et al. 2018; Giglitto et al. 2019; Light et al. 2009; Mustafa et al. 2020; Roberson and Nardi 2010; Steinhardt et al. 2015). These include a consideration of how digital technologies might leverage cultural and heritage-related activities to support inclusion of at-risk communities (Giglitto et al. 2019), and aging populations (Light et al. 2009). Internet and social media usage have been examined for inclusivity, for example, in the research by Dimond et al.(2013) research on combatting street harassment, telling and sharing stories online provided a space where community members felt included and able to make sense of their experience, while also acting as a social movement that supported collective activism. Similarly, creative expression coupled with digital storytelling has been found to support migrant participants in increasing levels of digital inclusion and positioning themselves in the host society (Weibert et al. 2017), as well as supporting the social inclusion of older generations (Balestrini et al. 2014). Social bonds in both rural and urban communities have been supported through sharing information and increasing access to digital infrastructure (Fröhlich et al. 2009; Klaebe et al. 2007; Willis 2019). The growing interest in social living labs, fab labs and maker labs all seek to cultivate community bonds at a grassroots level through creative, communal and generative appropriation and use of technologies (Dezuanni et al. 2017; Taylor et al. 2016, 2017). Engaging with grassroots organisations is seen as useful in understanding complex community-based relations and in working towards addressing power imbalances (Teli et al. 2020, 2022). This research typically endeavours to fulfill individual and collective needs, interrogate existing social boundaries and power hierarchies, create stronger interpersonal connections and communities, and support social change through meaningful participation and collaboration (Chamberlain et al. 2013; Holmer et al. 2015; Le Dantec and Fox 2015; Pantidi et al. 2015). Recently, there has been an increase in interest in exploring what we mean by social justice and activism in CSCW, HCI and PD, and how we might use technology and design to advocate and work towards for better futures (Bellini et al. 2022; Bray et al. 2022; Dombrowski et al. 2016; C. Harrington et al. 2019; O'Leary et al. 2019; Strohmayer 2021).

These various research projects are all valuable in understanding how to work with a community on the complex social issues around inclusion. As we will outline, integrating SEA into such work supports emerging activist intentions and provides space for polyvocality, contradiction and dissent through processes of creative exploration and expression, supporting participants in imagining and communicating their own solutions.

2.3 The benefits and challenges of an SEA approach to CSCW for inclusion

SEA endeavours to support inclusion in local communities in terms of facilitating a dissensus-based, creative process to amplify marginalised voices, communicate differences and make visible those social experiences that are challenging to describe. SEA is political and collaborative, it typically aims to increase agency, democracy and social bonds as it works towards some social change. Here we put forward some related literature and practice-based examples of SEA, as well as some of the challenges around doing this work.

Art-based events have contributed to an evolving sense of community identity through promoting the recognition of diverse experiences and perspectives (Le et al. 2015; Roberts and Townsend 2016) and creative spaces have been deployed to share experiences and build community cohesion (Matarasso 2007; Taylor et al. 2016). SEA processes have also supported shared experiential understandings of culture and identity (Carey and Sutton 2004; Edwards et al. 2016; Thomas et al. 2015). For example, Tania Bruguera's *School of Integration* focuses on highlighting the experiences of immigrants and critically questioning terms such as 'migrant' and 'integration' through informal, creative, learning spaces (Arte Útil 2021). These SEA interactions are said to help build trust, bring differences into dialogue and contribute to a collective sense of place and community identity (Anwar McHenry 2011; Balfour et al. 2018; Cameron and Coaffee 2005; Carey and Sutton 2004; Kelkar and Spinelli 2016).

There are challenges to doing this work. Kester (2011) discusses the danger of superficial arts participation and puts forward the importance of engaging with existing conflicts in a bottom-up, rather than top-down way. Olsen (2019) warns of the danger of overly-simplifying complex power systems. The core of these various concerns are around how to facilitate an effective participatory process. One that provides real opportunity for dissent and confrontation, eschewing a reductive approach to complex social problems (Bishop 2012). Beech discusses issues of neutralisation, tokenism, and a lack of critique in many forms of arts participation, particularly public art which can promote hegemonic forms of placemaking (Beech 2008, 2009), and in the same work argues that a more activist, critical participation can help counteract this. Working to ensure the SEA aesthetics of dissent and agonism are at the heart of participatory work can support this.

These aspects of SEA resonate with CSCW, HCI and PD that is interested in pursuing an activist agenda and bringing multiple perspectives and identities into dialogue in order to identify and realise social goals. For example: supporting members of disadvantaged communities to create and share personal stories to promote empowerment around health (Grimes et al. 2008), building connections in the workplace for mutual benefit and shared creative ideals (Pace et al. 2013), and understanding community dynamics to achieve shared goals around reducing energy consumption (Dillahunt and Mankoff 2014). The emphasis on creative exploration and expression makes SEA of value to CSCW, HCI and PD that is interested in taking creative approaches to community-based work (Giaccardi et al. 2006; Hjorth et al. 2019; Rüller et al. 2022; Sturdee et al. 2021). For example, integrating SEA approaches and standpoints might be useful to work exploring how traditional craft can support sharing of knowledge and collective action on issues (Aytekin and Rızvanoğlu 2019; Strohmayer 2021; Strohmayer and Meissner 2020).

While the many aims of SEA are congruent with existing CSCW and HCI work in inclusion, there is little SEA in HCI currently to draw on. The work of Light et. al (2009) provides one strong example, where researchers and SEA artists designed a workshop inspired by performance art to include the voices of marginalised populations in the discussion of digital technologies. We also look towards the work of Clarke et. al (2013), where digital photography and photo-sharing practices helped to affirm new bonds and give a sense of agency and identity to the vulnerable participants. These examples show the value of bringing SEA to CSCW. The various modes of aesthetic expression in SEA can allow for non-prescriptive, spontaneous, generative and unexpected engagements with complex issues. SEA processes and outputs are inherently pluralistic and open to interpretation, creating opportunities for dialogue and allowing participants to mediate how much they want to share, as well as providing multiple avenues for how they might like to share it. Centering aesthetics of dissent and contradiction promote the facilitation of conflicting viewpoints, not necessarily with a view towards reconciliation but more towards mutual understanding. The dialogue that happens around the process of making and sharing creative artefacts on experience often offers subtle and nuanced insights that are less accessible through traditional or design research methods.

We believe that exploring both the benefits and challenges of SEA is useful for CSCW that seeks to centre contradiction and dissent in order to query social norms and to refocus participatory work around agency, power and social change. This exploration can support interventional design that looks towards participation as a political and social endeavour towards more equitable societies (Frauenberger et al. 2018). SEA takes the uncovering and articulating of transgressive, agonistic issues and experiences as a central aesthetic, placing this confrontational dialogical process as the key concern over any specific tangible output. While there are challenges to this, prioritising this standpoint allows for increased modes of expression, confrontational dialogue and meaningful connection when engaging with complex

social issues. An analysis of the various challenges that arise when doing this kind of participatory SEA is also of benefit to CSCW, HCI and PD that shares a similar change-making agenda.

As a first step towards designing SEA-informed CSCW with the Northrock rurban community in Ireland, a focus group study was conducted to learn more about the dynamics of social inclusion in Northrock. The next sections present background information on Northrock, researcher positionality and the specifics of that study design.

3 The Focus Groups

In the middle of the last century there was around 400 people in the farming community of Northrock. Today there is over 5000 people, around forty languages spoken and six churches in the community. Northrock expanded by 323% between 2001 and 2011 and in the last census of Ireland it was reported that the community expanded at about four times the national average. Further expansion is planned over the coming years. The first author grew up in Northrock, and lived there until she was 22 years old. This proved useful as in the context of both CSCW and SEA, the relationship of the researcher to the community is central due to the required level of trust in community engagements, which is built deliberately over time (Chamberlain et al. 2013; Hardy et al. 2019; Le Dantec and Fox 2015). This also necessitates a greater need for reflexivity, where researchers need to constantly reflect on how their values, beliefs, experiences and preconceptions might impact data analysis (Braun and Clarke 2019).

Through various meetings with community leaders and groups, and attendances at events, we identified and approached three community organisations for participation in our study. These were: i) a group set up to explore and promote inclusion in the community, ii) the historical society which has an interest in preserving and publicising aspects of community history, and iii) the Family Resource Centre (FRC), a prominent organisation providing support services to those in need. These three organisations were chosen because they represented a wide spread of community members and interests. The primary researcher approached leading members of these three organisations at an early stage in the project to seek support for recruiting focus group participants. An invite went out to the members of all three organisations describing the focus groups as a discussion on what it is like to live in a rapidly developing rural community. Prospective participants were told that the focus groups would be facilitated by a past community member (the primary researcher) as part of a broader research project and that data would be used to inform the design of future workshops in the community. Participants were also provided with an information sheet on ethics and consent procedures. Three focus groups, one per organization, took place, and in total, twenty participants took part in the focus groups: seven men (all cis gender) and thirteen women (one trans, twelve cis

gender), six nationalities (Irish, Polish, Albanian, Ethiopian, Nigerian, English), aged from their twenties to their eighties. There were seven participants in the first focus group (inclusion group), five in the second (historical society group) and eight in the third (FRC group). It is worth acknowledging that the participants were all involved in some sort of community volunteering, or receiving support from the FRC, and so are quite enthusiastic and active citizens. The inclusion group were all 'New Rock'[2] residents. The historical society was all 'Old Rock'[3] residents and the FRC group had a mix of both. In the following section, participants are denoted by transcript (e.g. T:1) and by number (e.g. P:1).

Each focus group was loosely structured around the themes of: life in Northrock, changes in Northrock over time, inclusion and village identity as perceived by the participants. Each session lasted between 60 and 90 minutes and was audio recorded. The recordings were transcribed by the lead researcher and analysed using a six-stage reflexive thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke 2006, 2019; V. Clarke and Braun 2013). Thematic analysis was chosen for its flexible approach in analysing qualitative data in order to articulate themes, giving both a rich and complex account of the data (Braun and Clarke 2006, 2021). The first stage of analysis involved in-depth readings of all data, creating a list of interesting ideas arising, continuous revisiting of the data and iterative note-taking, taking care to cultivate an active and reflexive process as described by Braun and Clarke (2019). The second stage generated 44 initial codes, where each code signified a single idea associated with segments of data (Braun and Clarke 2006). Both the lead researcher and three members of the research team were involved in this initial coding which followed an iterative process of discussion and revisiting coding decisions. The third stage involved the grouping of these codes into potential themes, while collating the corresponding coded data extracts under each potential theme. Two members of the research team reviewed and refined these groupings and the corresponding data extracts. The team then continued with an iterative process of discussion, reviewing the data, and creating and reviewing thematic maps to work towards final themes. This resulted in defining and naming the themes as; (1) Contested Identities, (2) Dynamics of Inclusion and (3) Rurban Experience.

All analysis stages involved revisiting and re-examining each previous stage in an iterative progression towards the final themes. Given that the lead researcher has grown up in this community, she has background knowledge which may lead to biases and assumptions. This was offset using reflexive note-taking and discussion of codes and themes among all authors. The final stage of the analysis involved the writing up of the themes. The first theme, 'Contested Identities', was published as a short paper and outlined how the many different identities in the community are manifested and contested in various ways (Murray et al. 2019). In this paper, we

[2] Described by one participant as people who have moved to the community in the past fifteen years

[3] People who have resided in the community for over fifteen years

present the second theme, 'Dynamics of Inclusion', detailing aspects of community life that play a supportive or impeding role for social inclusion. The third theme, 'Rurban Experience', brings together particular nuances of life in a rurban community and informs the shape and development of the project overall. Again, we draw on Braun and Clarke in presenting one theme at a time in order to provide 'a more detailed and nuanced account of one particular theme, or group of themes [to] relate to a specific question or area of interest' (Braun and Clarke 2006 pg. 83). In this paper, that specific question is around how inclusion happens (or doesn't happen) in this rurban community.

4 Dynamics of Inclusion in Northrock

Focus group participants regularly discussed inclusion practices, both historical and contemporary, that have manifested themselves in community life. These practices, which may hinder or support inclusion, entail an interplay of various interpersonal, intergroup and intercultural dynamics. Our findings look at: the role of a leading grassroots organisation (FRC), the evolution of dominant organisations (the Gaelic Athletic Association (GAA[4]) and the Catholic Church), the configuration of social encounters in public places, and the range of perceptions and attitudes involved in developing relationships between old and new communities as seen through the migrant experience. We find inclusive and exclusive practices that impact on trust, collaboration and social cohesion and we work towards outlining how these elements may be supported through CSCW, drawing on SEA theory and practice.

4.1 The Family Resource Centre

In the Northrock context, we found that previous social problems fueled the activity of grassroots organisations and community volunteering, notably in the form of the Family Resource Centre (FRC). The vigour of this organisation, its empowerment ethos and the subsequent volunteering tradition has contributed to a more collaborative, inclusive and empathetic community today. The reach of this organisation extends throughout this rurban community, centralising support responses and creating a dynamic hub of volunteerism and aid.

4.1.1 Historical support of inclusion

Previous social issues in the community mobilised community members to participate in the FRC programme, which facilitates the establishment of centres to provide family and community-based support in disadvantaged areas:

[4] The GAA is the Irish national games association. It is very much connected with Irish culture and local communities.

> P1: the reason we did have the resource centre was because of the anti-social behaviour in the village and it was felt we had to address it. (T:A, P:1)

The language used here, such as 'it was felt we had to address it' is indicative of a grassroots DIY ethos. Referencing this period in time as 'the first integration we had to do' (T:A, P:1) also points to feelings of responsibility among this particular group to tackle social issues. An approach of friendliness and mutual respect is suggested in the following statement by a lead FRC member:

> P1: that opened up great friendships […], people who came back in the 1990s are still coming to us today, just to come in for the tea and the chats (T:A, P:1).

4.1.2 Current support of inclusion

These agentic and compassionate attitudes are evident in the operations of the FRC today and the centre is a strong source of inclusion in the community, promoting mutual understanding and social cohesion. Many testimonials from new residents reflect the transformative impact the centre has had on their lives and the resultant strong regard for the community, for example:

> P5: they see the potential and they want you to grow and they want you to do something for community as well. […] They are welcoming, seeing the person potential, encouraging the person to be a part, appreciating. (T:C, P:5)

Much of the FRC activity seems to involve women, with statements such as 'I suppose we deal mostly with women, and women are women, the world over' (T:A, P:1). Many of our female participants discussed the FRC as central to their inclusion into the community, often revolving around childcare, education and volunteering. This suggests that this is an inclusion avenue that men might find more difficult to access, although this was not outwardly stated by the participants.

4.1.3 The role of volunteering in inclusion

Volunteering practices in this community are of a reciprocal nature with an expectation that people will contribute back to the community:

> P5: They motivate people to do things, if you do one thing they say thank you and they will motivate you even more. […] They want you to be involved, to be part of the community. (T:C, P:5)

This tradition of volunteering is seen to have spread throughout the community, manifesting itself in other contexts and has been noted to build relationships between existing and new residents, where new residents are seen to have embraced this tradition:

> P2: There's a huge sense of volunteerism there, and like that is actually continuing an awful lot. I use St Patricks day parade now as an example. There's ninety volunteers each St Patricks day parade, and there's well in excess of half of those are new Rock. (T:B, P:2)

The workings of the FRC indicate a relationship between volunteering, empowerment and inclusion. They also suggest that some pathways to inclusion can be mediated by gender and the implications of this aren't fully engaged with. Northrock is highly diverse while still being relatively small. The FRC, while being pivotal to the community, rests on the work of a few key individuals that hold an in-depth and personal knowledge of the workings of the larger community. These individuals provide opportunities to engage extensively with this small but mighty organisation and to develop a nuanced understanding of community needs. In our discussion, we outline how these insights might be leveraged by SEA in CSCW to promote volunteerism as a dynamic for inclusion.

4.2 The GAA and the Catholic Church

Much longer serving and more prominent organisations than the FRC are the Catholic Church and the Gaelic Athletic Association (GAA). These organisations have traditionally played a prominent role in rural Irish life. In our rurban Northrock context, participants frequently discussed the role of the Church and the GAA in inclusion, indicating that while the community is becoming more multicultural, the traditional rural Irish village structures still very much persist. While inclusive elements of these organisations were apparent, it became evident that they have also promoted exclusivity.

4.2.1 Inclusion and exclusion facilitated through sport

The GAA is discussed with regard to its ability to bring people together and to act as a gateway into the community. P3, P5 and P5's husband in the extracts below are all newcomers to the community:

> P3: I've been getting along with a lot of people and my kids are, they love Northrock, presently my kids are members of the GAA so they interact with other kids. (T:C, P:3)

Playing, volunteering and attending sporting events were discussed as helping to transition into community life and promote common interests, as illustrated by the following quote:

> P5: when I met my husband […] he never saw a hurley, and my son plays for under 13s now and my husband is the trainer. (T:A, P5)

However, traditions around the GAA have also historically involved nepotistic and exclusionary practices. This is illustrated in the dialogue below between long-term community members:

> P7: at one time there was the whole ban, you couldn't play foreign games and be in the GAA
> P1: you know your father nearly had to be in the GAA for you to get a match, or else you stand on the sideline and that was a real issue as well, (T:A, P:7,1)

The impact of expansion has had a positive impact in terms of the establishment of new sports clubs that have provided further opportunities for volunteering:

> P2: if you went over to the soccer club right, they have volunteers, coaches, I don't know how many different nationalities they have over there, and they'd have a lot of that completely new Northrock involved in that. (T:B, P: 2)

These excerpts indicate the positive impact of expansion in terms of widening community sporting life and providing more avenues for meeting, sharing interests and forming social bonds. While participants acknowledge the history of exclusive practices held by the GAA, this is not discussed in terms of any potential impact on the present day.

4.2.2 Inclusion and exclusion facilitated through religion

Participants commented on the opportunities religious events provide to engage new residents with the traditions and general way of life of more long-term residents. Religious events were discussed for their potential to introduce different sections of the community to each other:

> P2: It is the communion and the confirmations is very important because that's the new Northrock getting a feel for the old people and seeing who's around. (T:B, P:2)

However, a history of exclusion is also evident through participants' comments around the social profiling of community members in terms of where they would sit in the church, remnants of which persist to this day:

> P2: And a lot of people will still to this day, you would have the men's side and the women's side
> P:5: Families and married people would be in the centre, and the big farmers would be up the top. (T:B, P:2,5).

This exchange points to gender, marital and economic status divides facilitated by the church, imposing artificial restrictions and segregations on how people organise themselves and interact with each other. Again, these exchanges are focused

on historical incidents of exclusion. If there are present-day exclusive practices, these are not discussed.

While we saw the expansion of the community resulted in the GAA becoming more 'mellow', the arrival of new community members is seen to have invigorated a waning Church:

> P6: It will have a very serious impact because all you have going to mass now is the old people […]. Tis a sad, sad situation.
> P1: we'd recognise quite a few of the new communities at mass, and they're the younger people in the church, which is interesting, your peer group, the Irish, aren't going to mass. (T:A, P:1)

While older community members such as P6 mourn the waning of what are important traditions to them, P1 recognises the vitality the new communities have brought to those traditions.

Participants' accounts show the importance of these institutions to the community and the positive effect expansion has had on them. Given that Northrock was a traditional rural Irish community in recent years, it is unsurprising that the GAA and the Catholic Church are still highly influential organisations. For those interested in GAA and Catholicism, they provide many opportunities to meet, collaborate and strengthen social bonds. This gives rise to questions around the marginalisation that can occur of those who don't fit the majority cultural demographic. It also provides opportunities for bringing old and new populations together. The discourse related here shows the inclusive and exclusive practices that can be present in these organisations, as well as gives some insight into the impact of transitioning from a rural to a rurban community on these stalwarts of rural Irish life. However, it falls short of directly critiquing any present-day practices, which would be useful in ensuring a healthy evolution of these institutions in response to the changes in the community. In our discussion, we put forward suggestions of how SEA might be useful in CSCW to support this critique.

4.3 Social encounters in public places

Here we present participants' accounts of everyday encounters in public places such as the school gates, communal play areas, ethnic shops and the pub. Given that the old village still looks much the same, and all of these amenities are clustered on one small main street, the opportunities for large cross-sections of the community to meet on a daily basis are great. These public places become hubs for building collective understandings and enacting community life.

4.3.1 School gates and communal play areas

Public spaces that support child-related activities are seen to support social encounters between newcomers and more long-term residents. The school gates provide opportunities for social encounters for those with children:

> P3: Well 'tis[5] a great way to meet new people coming in, it's actually a totally different thing to what we experienced growing up. Parents never met each other at the school gate. (T:B, P:5)

This example of social encounters supporting inclusion is one of a number of examples that revolve around the care of children. While these encounters work well for those with children, they also show that this mode of inclusion is inaccessible to those without children. The following statement echoes that sentiment:

> P3: when the new estates came, you just couldn't keep your hand on it, unless you had children going to school, that you could meet them in the schools or the sports, they'd be the only opportunities you could meet people. (T:B, P:3)

Besides these spaces centred around children, more adult-centred spaces were also discussed by our participants, as outlined below.

4.3.2 New ethnic shops

One of the more visible aspects of the recent population expansion is the arrival of ethnic food shops, providing new spaces for social encounters between residents. These shops diversify the dominant culture and create spaces and opportunities for connections that are specifically for new communities, while also welcoming the established community. This development was seen as positive by some of the long-term residents:

> P2: The change that would be in village would be the Polish shops and the African shops, and Chinese and they give a real change to us instead of having just Franks[6] up the road, so we've a few ethnic shops now. (T:A, P:2)

These spaces provide opportunities for local residents to familiarise themselves and engage with new cultures, such as tasting Polish food in our example below:

> P2: we use the Polish shop over, and the girls in the preschools and the after schools would go to the Polish shop, sometimes before they go to Mace across the road, because they like the stuff over there.

---

[5] Vernacular expression of 'it is'

[6] The traditional Irish takeaway in the community

P5: The fresh bread is beautiful, and the tomatoes, are like tomatoes you'd get foreign, in Spain or someplace. (T:A, P:2,5)

The Polish shops are cited as hubs for the Polish community, thus providing a space for encounters that is comfortable and familiar to these new communities, helping forge connections between new residents:

P4: I remember first day the shop was open, […]all day it was full of Polish people and I knew everyone there […] I'm talking with them when I meet them in the shop so it's a good thing actually. (T:A, P:4)

The ethnic shops play a role beyond the simple provision of groceries. They provide a space where the culture and traditions of new communities are central, connecting newcomers to the wider expatriate community. They also provide friendly and familiar opportunities for long-term residents to interact with the new communities and so supporting community cohesion.

4.3.3 The role of the pub

In addition to the ethnic shops, the pub is cited as a space to meet new and long-term residents:

P2: I have dealings with more New Rock than I have with Old Rock on a daily basis for myself […] if I go to the pub, half of the people… it could be 50/50. (T:B, P:2)

The function of the pub as a space for facilitating social encounters between the male population is also discussed by some participants as having changed in recent years:

P1: in the old days it was quite acceptable like for the husband to head off down to the pub to have a few pints and the women stayed back […] that has changed […] of course the women go to the pubs too but by and large it would have been a male dominated thing, when you talk about meeting the newcomers it would have been the male newcomers maybe at that time, in the pub. (T:B, P:1)

The undercurrent of this excerpt, while not overtly stated, was a sense of loss of a male space for this older participant. This points to difficulties faced by older men in getting to know the new community as their previous spaces become less familiar. This is also evident in the following excerpt provided by the same older male participant:

P1: how would we interact with new people, the opportunities are less than what they would have been. You talk about where you'd meet people long go like, not alone was going to mass a religious event, but it was a big social event on the day because you met people outside and you met new people. Everyone who got involved in sport, because there was only one sport really,

the GAA, and even the pub has changed […] that was a good place to meet […] new people, anyone who was interested in going for a pint. (T:B, P:1)

The discourse here highlights the complexities and subtle social configurations of social encounters. While the relatively small size of the rurban community means that these spaces serve a large catchment of the population, we see that some sections of the community become marginalised from certain kinds of inclusion opportunities due their individual or group characteristics. While this is typical of all communities, understanding the nature of these various marginalisations suggests directions for interventions in public place to have those difficult conversations and support a wider inclusion and social participation.

4.4 The migrant experience

Our focus groups included ten participants from Nigeria, Ethiopia, England, Poland and Albania. Each focus group was mixed between long-term local residents (many with generations of family in Northrock), new residents without a migration background, and new residents with a migration background. The inclusion group had all new residents and a majority of migrant participants; the historical society group was mostly long-term residents and the FRC group was evenly split between new and long-term residents, with the majority of new residents being migrants. Dialogue between our migrant participants sheds some light on the migrant experience of integrating into what was recently a small rural village. Friendliness and tenacity are seen as key in building relationships in the community. Participants discuss misconceptions born out of lack of knowledge as their biggest obstacle to inclusion and suggest ways to alleviate this. The various excerpts presented here are all from new residents with a migrant background and focus on their strategies for inclusion and the barriers they have experienced.

4.4.1 Friendliness

Migrant participants discuss the importance of taking the first step in initiating friendships. This approach is promoted for its potential to forge connections and build relationships. It is attributed with powerful results when it is sustained and genuine, as evidenced in the following dialogue, where a participant describes her commitment to initiating friendly exchanges with strangers. These exchanges have led to her getting to know key organisations and making friends in the community:

P1: In fairness [P2] is very friendly person [everyone laughs] I didn't even know her before but every time she sees me outside, she always says hello […]

P2: Sometimes I say hello to people, they say do you know the person, I say no!

P1: But the way she says hello to you is like she has a really good relationship you know? You feel it when someone says hello from the bottom of their heart. (T:C, P:2,1)

This exchange was in the context of meeting people on the main street, which is a relatively small stretch (approx. one kilometre) and is host to all the main amenities. Thus, the geographic configuration of this rurban community allows this sustained friendliness to have quite a big impact. We also see a commitment to this ethos in the following statement:

> P6: we try to make connection in community, we are very happy to meet people there, they are very friendly. If you live in a new community, I think Irish people have a right to know about us, or other peoples who live with them. (T:C, P:6)

4.4.2 Tenacity

Many of the new residents discussed the importance of perseverance in initiating relationships with other community residents:

> P1: I think making the first step matters, yes people are really nice, but no matter how nice they are, if you don't push the boundary a little bit, it's very hard, everyone would be waiting [..] and then you will never talk or you will have different perception, bad perception about each other. (T:C, P:1).

Persistence and consistency of approach are seen as useful tools against challenges to inclusion:

> P1: it has to do with how you interact with people in the community as well as an incomer, it's very difficult sometimes until you break the barrier of being different and coming from a different culture, it's very… it's very intimidating […] because people have their own perception of who different people are, so you have to first break that wall down and then create the relationships. (T:C, P:1)

Being different, coming from a different culture and the perceptions people develop of new residents are all cited here as barriers to inclusion. The language used by this participant in terms of 'push the boundary / it's very hard / bad perception / break down the barrier / it's very intimidating / break that wall down' is indicative of the struggle and tenacity involved in overcoming the various misperceptions and becoming included in the community. This value on self-initiative and tenacity is also reflected in the following statement:

> P5: if I wanted to integrate, I need to do it my first step, [….] I just decided it's really good to do something, so I search on internet and I found what organisation were here and where I can go with a three-year-old, so I found the toddler group and I came there. (T:C, P:5)

These statements show a level of determination and perseverance inherent in these participants, an attitude which has led to the building of valuable relationships:

P5: That's how I start meeting the people and knowing the people and they became very close friends […] I treat them now as a family they call me sister, and I call them sisters because we don't have, I don't have family here, so friends became the family here. (T:C, P:5).

4.4.3 Misperceptions

Many of the long-term residents mention a curiosity about new residents. This is supported by stories related by new residents where they detail encounters where they are probed or questioned:

P4: they're curious to know about my culture, my country, and I love to talk about that you know, and sometimes with the Irish people that I speak with, we have some, commons together, like culture and tradition, […] so it's nice to discuss. (T:C, P:4)

However, while new residents discuss the general curiosity shown towards them, they also outline the various assumptions they are sometimes faced with, ranging from language spoken, levels of poverty and marital status, and how these assumptions can be frustrating and upsetting:

P1: sometimes it's upsetting as a different person, when you're asked for example, questions that sound really nosy. Like, for example, they automatically assume I'm married to an Irish person, "so Andy", "yeah", "is he Irish?" every time! Is it because I'm African, so I have to be married to Irish? (T:C, P:1)

This is an example of how the curiosity mentioned above can cross the line into offensive personal questioning when it is coupled with assumptions. New residents feel that while these assumptions are sometimes annoying and frustrating, they can be overcome through entering into dialogue:

P3: some people do think that English is not your first language, when they listen to the way you speak, they say 'your English is actually good, do you speak English in your country?' […] I just explain to them. (T:C, P:3)

Curious and somewhat naive questioning is said to sometimes have an undertone of hostility, as evident in the following quote where one participant discusses an aggressive edge to some people's questioning:

P1: you know how you are asked; most people ask you out of curiosity, but some people ask you out of anger. You pick up on that, and you just ignore it. (T:C, P:1)

New residents discussing problems with misperceptions and negative opinions identify portrayals in the media as often contributing to the problem and feel that through more accurate representation, these problems could be alleviated:

> P1: when you see people's opinions, the negative one, […] It's not based on fact, so you can see that there is a knowledge gap that hasn't been captured. […] even if it's captured it's the wrong way […] so it's not portraying migrant in a positive way […] there should be I think a media airtime that focuses specifically on migrants, you know the positive, the negative, the challenges […] so that people will have the real experience of people. (T:C, P:1)

The same participant expands on these harmful assumptions, while also pointing out that it's difficult to speak about the challenges when asked directly:

> P1: when you're asked, […] you always tend to give all of the positive things, and even when I ask Irish person how migrants are, they always give me the good stuff, but we don't want to bias the information as well so we have to say the challenges that are there. Not on a personal level maybe, but in general, that people expect you, they put you in one box, and then they have their assumption. (T:C, P:1)

The dialogue presented here gives some indication of the migrant experience in Northrock. It signposts attitudes and traits that can support inclusion, such as friendliness and tenacity. This tenacity can be heavily tested when newcomers continuously choose to give the benefit of the doubt and remain congenial when faced with frustrating and sometimes offensive misconceptions. More overtly hostile and demeaning attitudes also impede efforts towards inclusion, as can the tendency to gloss over issues and focus on the positives. It is felt by participants that the main culprit in these issues is a lack of communication between groups and that both interpersonal dialogue and meaningful media representation can work to overcome these issues. While participants spoke well of their experience overall, the difficulty in discussing negative experiences and the tendency to focus on the positives is seen as a barrier against mutual understanding. In the following section, will discuss how we might capitalise on positive dynamics such as tenacity and friendliness, and how we might alleviate some of the negative effects of assumptions and misconceptions through dialogue and meaningful representation. We will also discuss how an SEA focus in CSCW can provide the vehicle for difficult conversations that might otherwise go unsaid.

5 Directions for SEA-Informed CSCW in Rurban Settings

Our analysis focused on inclusion processes in this rurban community and uncovered how these processes are supported or hindered through nuanced dynamics of community life. Our findings resonated to some extent with existing literature on inclusion and migration in rapidly expanding rural experiences. For example, supporting Sherman's (2021) findings, we also found that long-term community

members tended to mourn old ways of life and perceive a decrease in typical rural values around friendliness and support, while new community members found that Northrock still very much held these values. However, in our context, this seemed more related to whether or not long-term residents had opportunities to meet newcomers, while in Sherman's context, this was found to be related to divides in various forms of capital. Much existing literature seems to examine contexts where inmigrants had greater (Lichter and Brown 2011; Sherman 2018; Sherman and Schafft 2022; Shucksmith 2012) or less (Meagher 2009; Walton 2021) economic and social capital than the existing residents. In the Northrock context, the new residents were from vastly varying backgrounds. Many of them coming to Ireland as refugees for example, while some were attracted specifically by new industry and proximity to the city. The long-term residents themselves are also very mixed in terms of economic background, even though culturally and ethnically they often have much in common. Based on our analysis of the focus groups and the subsequent insights around the lived experience of our Northrock participants, we now put forward suggestions for SEA-informed CSCW in support of social inclusion in rurban settings, drawing on SEA theory and practice and relating it to CSCW.

We found tensions and exclusionary practices around powerful organisations, such as the Church and the GAA, and observed how gender, age and family status mediated social encounters, rendering some inclusion pathways less accessible. On the other hand, we saw how problematic assumptions could be overcome through more effective communication and everyday acts of tenacity and friendliness; and how volunteering empowered our participants and impacted positively on inclusion. Underlying the various insights gained from the focus group was a sense that more contentious issues were often left under the surface as they can be challenging to articulate and discuss. This was most evident in the comment from one of our 'New Rock' participants around the tendency to always focus on the positive.

As we consider those analytic insights, we are interested in how SEA can be used in CSCW to engage with the above tensions, and both promote the positive elements that were found to support inclusion while enabling the articulation and communication of challenges to inclusion as experienced by both old and new residents. We propose that SEA as an approach in CSCW offers specific opportunities for research and action in this community. It has the potential to bring into light those nuances of experience that can be challenging or controversial to articulate, refreshing previous CSCW positions on interrogating power and participation with a focus on dissensus and contradiction through creative, arts-based exploration that engages with contested social realities and imagines alternative futures.

In this respect, we look at SEA such as the recent Uprise exhibition (Akoto 2021), a nationwide UK augmented reality artwork by artist Baff Akoto that aimed to expose the pathology, history and underlying drivers of English civil unrest in the digital age. The exhibition brought together artists, community leaders and youth through digital installations, an online game and a community radio show,

showcasing how such 'digital networks can connect marginalised people and shape real-world mass dissent'. Similarly, Tania Bruguera's extensive work (Bruguera 2015, 2017; Kershaw 2015; Tate 2012) sits at the intersection of activism and performance art and devises new (usually utopian) models of authority to challenge power structures. This is of interest to us as it engages communities in reimagining systems of power to change them into more inclusive and democratic forms.

We propose that considering and incorporating SEA when designing CSCW interventions to support inclusion processes opens up new forms of engagement and dialogue both in the rurban context, but also more broadly in any community-based work. It provides extra modes of expression for difficult conversations around complex social issues and looks towards making complex experiences more accessible and understandable. It also firmly places focus on designing a process that looks to build participant agency and create opportunities for debate and dissent in order to provoke standpoints and evolve community issues.

We provide a set of design considerations that bring together our findings and SEA approaches to inform CSCW in support of inclusion in a rurban context. These four design considerations are 1) using personal stories to promote volunteerism as a path to inclusion; 2) examining the evolution of institutions; 3) revealing and reimagining interactions in public space; and 4) dispelling misconceptions through encouraging mutual understanding.

5.1 Using personal stories to promote volunteerism as a path to inclusion

In Northrock, we saw how volunteering enriched the lives of our participants through helping them find their place in the community. We found that volunteering supported empowerment and inclusion, and that this relationship was disseminated through participants' sharing their personal experiences. We also saw how this path to inclusion was possibly less accessible to men in the community, even though this was not overtly stated. Our first suggestion for CSCW in support of inclusion with this community then, involves capturing and promoting personal stories that reveal this relationship between volunteering, empowerment and inclusion in order to further encourage that dynamic within the community. We are also interested in facilitating conversations around what barriers there might be towards volunteering and how these might be alleviated. This design consideration draws from and extends SEA that has been interested in fostering engagement among volunteers and facilitating grassroots activism. One example of such work can be found in Suzanne Lacy's 2013 *Silver Action* project. The project highlighted the work of women activists over 60 while cultivating intergenerational links through a conversation-based performance piece at The Tanks at Tate Modern. 400 activists engaged in live, unscripted conversational performances while their first experiences of activism were projected onto the walls of The Tanks (Lacy 2013). Younger women

activists were invited to witness the conversations and live blog and tweet them as they happened, using the hashtag #silveraction. This powerful project highlighted the contribution of volunteers active from the 1950s to the 1980s using the age-old media of conversation and storytelling, while augmenting and disseminating the experience through video, social media and the engagement of the younger generation. What is further interesting in Lacy's work is that *Silver Action* was the culmination of a series of workshops led by Lacy involving smaller groups of women charting their experiences with volunteerism, activism and the wider social context they operate in. This brings the impact of volunteering to vivid life in a way that provides an emotive and tangible experience for viewers to connect with on a visceral level.

CSCW interventions designed with this consideration in mind could involve the capturing of multicultural and/or intergenerational stories to highlight difference and equally focus on the positive work and experiences of the volunteers in the FRC and how this strengthens the wider community. Such stories might also do the difficult work of querying any barriers to participating in volunteering, such as those around gender alluded to in the findings. It would be beneficial to ground any such intervention on an initial process of private, smaller group discussion and reflection on experiences before continuing with a more public and dialogical sharing of volunteering stories via social media or interactive installations, much in the vein of the Lacy example above. Moreover, integrating an SEA approach suggests that any interventions in this space would require active participation of, or engagement with, individuals whose personal stories are connected with this dynamic of volunteering and empowerment in order to develop authentic and relatable outcomes. Staying true to the empowering, grassroots activist ethos of SEA interventions such as Lacy (2013), which we also found echoed in the work of the FRC, makes it important to foreground that any techniques, media, ways of dissemination in such interventions need to be determined and owned by the participants.

There is much CSCW that has looked at how stories have the potential to cultivate empathy, positivity and inclusion within a community (Cao et al. 2010; Dimond et al. 2013; Procyk and Neustaedter 2014; Starbird and Palen 2013) and the potential of connecting with grassroots organisations to examine relationships in communities has been acknowledged (Teli et al. 2020, 2022). Bringing a SEA approach to this kind of work would mean engaging participants across multiple forms of media and dialogue, being open, generative and non-prescriptive with outcomes, encouraging critical thinking about how volunteering is enacted in key organisations, providing opportunities to debate contradictory experiences and connecting these conversations with the wider community to further encourage a dynamic and change-making volunteering tradition.

5.2 Examining the evolution of community institutions

Our second finding involved the inclusive and exclusive practices of the GAA and the Catholic Church. While both organisations provide opportunities for people to meet and find a place in the community, they also both have a history of exclusion. As these powerful organisations evolve with the community, it is worth examining how that power has historically impacted on the rural community and how this might extend into the current-day rurban community. We found that in our focus groups, participants spoke openly of historical exclusive practices but did not extend that into a reflection on current-day practices. We are interested in how taking an SEA approach to CSCW with the community might provide the vehicle for such difficult and possibly controversial conversations.

Exploring powerful structures is a constant theme in SEA. It requires diverse social interaction and the representation of multiple points of view (Bishop 2006; Kelkar and Spinelli 2016). Jeanne Van Heeswijk's far-reaching 2017 project *Philadelphia Assembled* illustrates this necessity (Van Heeswijk 2017). Van Heeswijk's work typically looks towards redistributing power and radical community building. To this end, *Philadelphia Assembled* looked at rewriting personal and collective narratives and reimagining the future and the built environment through festivals, community kitchens, map-making, performance, video, blogging and digital soundscapes involving both online and on-street, site-specific actions throughout the city. This multi-pronged approach could translate to Northrock via cohesive and diverse community mobilization around relevant principles and various modes of dissemination, both digital and analogue. This has implications for materials, methods, participants and venues, as well as thematic explorations. For example, in terms of venue(s), it is particularly incumbent on the facilitators and/or designers to find spaces that are as inclusive as possible and to understand how those spaces may have been configured in the past to include or exclude community members. Following on from Van Heeswijk, it would be useful to incorporate multiple venues to reflect and 'reimagine' multiple experiences. With regard to thematic exploration, a rigorous critique of exclusive practices and representation of marginalised voices via SEA in CSCW has the potential to help disassemble exclusionary dynamics through an enhancement of agency and a disruption of traditional perceptions of community. Given that community members look fondly on these organisations, this critique would require a sensitive facilitation and a recognition of their positive impact while also ensuring real opportunities for dialogue and dissent, both important aspects of any examination of power dynamics (Chamberlain et al. 2013; Freire 1967; Le Dantec and Fox 2015; Tiller 2014; Verschelden et al. 2012), and both central aesthetics in any SEA process. There is also an opportunity to make visible the positive impact the recent expansion has had on these organisations. For example, facilitators might bring together older community members who express regret at the changing of these organisations with new members who are revitalising them. This could be a positive expression of the benefits of expansion while

building connections around shared values. The emphasis would be on examining these various community practices around both sport and religion with a view to developing mutual understanding, building trust and forming social bonds.

This exploration of power is also a recurring theme in CSCW. For example, the work of Fox et. Al (2015) reflects on how particular spaces can perpetuate inequities, but have the potential to become venues of empowerment when reappropriated and reconfigured. CSCW has also been concerned with interrogating structural barriers faced by participants and how these impact on how power is distributed (Fox et al. 2015, 2017; Steinhardt et al. 2015). Drawing on SEA interventions as described above is useful to CSCW that navigates complex issues around power, visibility and marginalization. Providing opportunities for SEA-based exploration of topics that are difficult to articulate and communicate is an asset towards disassembling hegemonic practices and redistributing power across communities.

5.3 Revealing and reimagining interactions in public place

In our findings, we outlined how various public spaces are sites of very specifically mediated social encounters between different parts of the community. While these places and encounters are central to community life, they are mediated by factors such as gender, family status, age and religion, thus not always accessible to all. This is consistent with community-arts and rural studies literature that describes how some people might find a public space inviting and safe, while others find it alienating or threatening, depending on who is implicitly welcome (Grodach 2010; Shucksmith 2012), as well as CSCW placemaking literature that describes how social and cultural understandings of place make available a prescribed and limited set of social interactions and behaviours (Dourish 2006; Harrison and Dourish 1996). Our third design consideration then, is connected to the nature of interactions in rurban public space and understanding how certain groups may be marginalized in these spaces. This involves making visible the various configurations of these spaces in order to re-imagine how they can become more inclusive and meaningful loci of social interaction.

The 2013 installation, *Yobosayo* (Lifethings 2013), is relevant here as it aimed to reconfigure public interaction in playful and surprising ways in order to connect people in public space. It was installed to commemorate the opening of Seoul Citizens Hall in South Korea and it includes a large, ear-like sculpture that invites citizens to talk into it. These messages are recorded by the sculpture and played inside the Citizens Hall. The attention paid to each recorded message is measured by motion sensors in the building; if people stop and listen to any particular message, it is added to a playlist. Those messages that are ignored are transformed into music through the amplification and distortion of their specific auditory characteristics. This music is played in a sound gallery in the Citizens Hall. The principles of innovation, playfulness, unexpectedness and dialogue evident in this work may form a

cornerstone of any public intervention hoping to engage with the Northrock community.

In addition to *Yobosayo*, we draw again on Suzanne Lacy, this time reviewing *The Turning Point* (Lacy 1997), where Lacy worked with teenage girls, to develop an intervention that examined the visibility and agency of girls in public spaces that often position them for voyeurism. This examining and repositioning of roles of typically marginalized groups in public space is central to the concerns of this design consideration. While participants again rarely openly named barriers to their interactions in public place, these were alluded to across the focus groups. Typically, SEA can provide modes of expression that would allow for the articulation of experiences that are difficult to name. Much can be learned from Lacy's work in terms of how the social and cultural meanings of space and place, and the implications of who belongs there, can inform effective CSCW to create opportunities for inclusion in Northrock. Such CSCW interventions could integrate SEA aesthetics in order to examine who is included, how they are positioned and who is marginalised in public spaces and places, with the aim of reconfiguring existing, or creating alternative, public sites that welcome a wider range of people. Site-specific work that facilitates an interactive, public dialogue, as in *Yobosayo* and *The Turning Point*, would be encouraged in this context where participants might examine the dynamics of public space with a more critical eye in order to identify who is welcome and why, and how this can be expanded upon.

SEA interventions in public space are relevant to CSCW, HCI and PD that engage in space, place and placemaking (Ciolfi 2004; Crivellaro et al. 2016; Freeman et al. 2019; Gonsalves et al. 2021; Paay and Kjeldskov 2008, 2008; Peacock et al. 2018; Sanusi and Palen 2008; Slingerland et al. 2022). As mentioned, the work of Harrison and Dourish (Dourish 2006; Harrison and Dourish 1996) centralises 'place' as a cultural phenomenon and an impacting factor on human interaction, where the interactive affordances of places are based on shared understandings of what behaviours and actions are appropriate in any given place. This idea that the configuration of certain spaces supports certain kinds of behaviour and interactions held true in the Northrock context. Work such as *Yobosayo* and *The Turning Point* challenge these understandings and provide non-prescriptive and generative opportunities to redefine what might be expected in particular spaces and places. The creative and emotive nature of this kind of work can give rise to unexpected insights that move beyond those relevant to technology design and have the potential to reimagine public space to greater support inclusion and visibility of marginalized groups.

5.4 Dispelling misconceptions through encouraging mutual understanding

Our participants reported misconceptions and assumptions to be one of the biggest barriers to their inclusion and felt that these attitudes were borne out of a lack of knowledge. Participants also recognized the difficulty in communicating challenges faced around assumptions and harmful attitudes. With that in mind, our final design consideration focuses on how best to communicate and represent migrant experiences to the wider community with the view to encouraging mutual understanding.

These aims of addressing misconceptions and building solidarity are visible in the SEA of Harriet Purkis (Purkis 2013) and Baff Akoto (Akoto 2021). Purkis developed *The Local People Project,* a digital storytelling project to foster cross-border relations between people of Derry and Donegal in Ireland (Purkis 2013). The project comprised of both an exhibition of film, photography and personal possessions; and an online curation of digital stories aimed to generate stronger social ties and understanding between these communities. Akoto launched *Up:Rise* Exhibition in 2021 (Akoto 2021) to engage with issues around marginalization and media misrepresentation. This was a street exhibition using posters with QR codes that linked to archived footage and testimonials from participants in the nationwide UK riots of 2011. Akoto aimed to challenge narratives around the rioters and explore deeper themes of civil unrest resulting from the marginalisation of people. A series of community workshops across the UK accompanied the exhibition, generating dialogue on how digital media can connect marginalized people and be a platform for dissent. Both of these projects use readily available technologies to dispel misconceptions, where dialogue and confrontation is an essential part of this process.

These approaches can be carried forward into CSCW with the Northrock community to support minority groups in communicating their experiences. The centrality of dialogue in this process raises challenges again around participation and the role of the researcher in terms of careful facilitation of such interactions. When encouraging migrants to share stories, it is important to be conscious of the emotional labour of participants reporting experiences of fatigue, socio-cultural tensions and concerns about maintaining a sense of personal privacy (Lingel et al. 2014). Again, the multi-modal and expressive nature of SEA provides support and opportunity for these difficult conversations (R. Clarke et al. 2013). The friendliness and tenacity reported by our migrant participants provides a focus for the design of interventions to make visible the work and determination undertaken in becoming part of the community. Of course, any such work hoping to address the misrepresentation of community groups would need to involve a diverse participant demographic, drawing on the various cultures, skills and interests in the Northrock migrant community (Giglitto et al. 2019). Again, there are many challenges in supporting such heterogenous work (DiSalvo et al. 2008, 2009). Researchers and facilitators would need to be conscious of the vulnerability of a population that may have endured immense personal hardship to arrive in their new community and are

constructing new lives and experiencing an amount of identity transition. As a result, participation needs to be particularly carefully designed and there needs to be space and support for various cultural interpretations of activities and eventual outputs.

CSCW and HCI have integrated concepts of intersectionality and solidarity from feminist scholarship to describe how the recognition of differences and similarities is beneficial to inclusion of minorities (Bray et al. 2022; Dye et al. 2018; Fox et al. 2017; C. N. Harrington et al. 2022). The SEA interventions described here provide an example of how this recognition might be explored, articulated and communicated to increase visibility, mutual understanding and inclusion of new communities. Again, SEA's contribution to CSCW is in its critical and radical approach, encouraging dissenting voices and creating space for the recognition and articulation of different experiences and needs. Taking a SEA approach to trust-related concerns inherent in minorities sharing personal stories would integrate the long tradition in SEA of examining power dynamics while creating multiple avenues to explore and communicate complex trust-based issues inherent in working with vulnerable populations.

6 CONCLUSION

While the research presented here is situated in a specific rurban community in Ireland, the design considerations act as signposts for how to integrate SEA into CSCW to support inclusion more broadly in rapidly expanding rural communities. For example, researchers or facilitators may consider connecting with gate-keeping organisations, similar to the FRC, to investigate dynamics of volunteering. Researchers or facilitators may also consider constructively critiquing exclusionary practices of powerful institutions. Public places are said to support community development and inclusion (Balfour et al. 2018; Kelkar and Spinelli 2016), enhance social life (P. T. Fischer et al. 2010; P. T. Fischer and Hornecker 2012) and create intergenerational links (Balestrini et al. 2014). We propose that designing CSCW interventions from a SEA standpoint can amplify these aspects of rurban public places in support of inclusion (Artichoke and Best 2015; Caslin 2017; JR 2008; Lifethings 2013; Van Heeswijk 2017) while examining and repositioning the roles of typically marginalized groups in those places. Within any community, there are multiple layers of identities present (Murray et al. 2019; Skerratt 2013). We agree with Sherman (2021) when she highlights the need for avenues of meaningful social interaction in order to develop mutual understanding. We propose designing interventional work in Northrock to build an awareness and understanding of these multiple identities. Work that leverages SEA to centre marginalised and dissenting voices and to cultivate stronger social bonds through meaningful social interactions (R. Clarke et al. 2014; Sharp et al. 2005). While articulating complex social issues can be a struggle, we believe SEA is rich in potential as a vehicle for expression of

these difficult and contradictory conversations. The various aesthetics and practices of SEA have the potential to refresh the activist and disruptive persuasions already present in CSCW.

7 Acknowledgements

We thank the people of Northrock who have given their time and insights generously to this research. We thank the reviewers who contributed to the development of this work through thoughtful and helpful feedback. This PhD research is funded by Munster Technical University.

8 References

Akoto, Baff (2021). Up:Rise Exhibition. https://uprise-exhibition.com/. Accessed 30 March 2023

Alexandru, Monica (2012). Stories of upward social mobility and migration in one Romanian commune. On the emergence of "rurban" spaces in migrantsending communities. *Eastern Journal of European Studies*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2012, pp. 141–160.

Allen, Adriana (2003). Environmental planning and management of the peri-urban interface: perspectives on an emerging field. *Environmental Planning and Management*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2003, pp. 135–148.

Anwar McHenry, Julia (2011). Rural empowerment through the arts: The role of the arts in civic and social participation in the Mid West region of Western Australia. *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol. 27, no. 3, July 2011, pp. 245–253.

Arte Útil (2021). School of Integration. https://www.arte-util.org/school-of-integration-welcome-home-2021/. Accessed 5 April 2023

Artichoke; and David Best (2015). Temple: A Radical Arts Project in Derry / Londonderry. https://www.artichoke.uk.com/project/temple/. Accessed 20 February 2023

Aytekin, Behiç Alp; and Kerem Rızvanoğlu (2019). Creating learning bridges through participatory design and technology to achieve sustainability in local crafts: a participatory model to enable the transfer of tacit knowledge and experience between the traditional craftsmanship and academic education. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, vol. 29, no. 3, May 2019, pp. 603–632.

Balestrini, Mara; Jon Bird; Paul Marshall; Alberto Zaro; and Yvonne Rogers (2014). Understanding sustained community engagement: a case study in heritage preservation in rural Argentina. In *Proceedings of the 2014 SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, Toronto, Ontario, Canada*. Presented at the CHI '14: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, New York: ACM, pp. 2675–2684.

Balfour, Bruce; Michael W-P Fortunato; and Theodore R. Alter (2018). The creative fire: An interactional framework for rural arts-based development. *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol. 63, October 2018, pp. 229–239.

Bannon, Liam; Jeffrey Bardzell; and Susanne Bødker (2018). Introduction: Reimagining Participatory Design—Emerging Voices. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, vol. 25, no. 1, February 2018, pp. 1–8.

Beech, Dave (2008). Include me out! – Dave Beech on participation in art. *Art Monthly*. https://www.artmonthly.co.uk/magazine/site/article/include-me-out-by-dave-beech-april-2008. Accessed 2 April 2023

Beech, Dave (2009). Inside Out - Dave Beech on the fall of public art. *Art Monthly*. https://www.artmonthly.co.uk/magazine/site/article/inside-out-by-dave-beech-september-2009. Accessed 2 April 2023

Bellini, Rosanna; Debora de Castro Leal; Hazel Anneke Dixon; Sarah E Fox; and Angelika Strohmayer (2022). "There is no justice, just us": Making mosaics of justice in social justice Human-Computer Interaction. In

Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. New Orleans, LA, USA. Presented at the CHI '22: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, New York: ACM, pp. 1–6.

Bishop, Claire (2006). *Participation*. London: Whitechapel.

Bishop, Claire (2012). *Artificial hells: Participatory art and the politics of spectatorship*. Verso Books.

Björgvinsson, Erling; Pelle Ehn; and Per-Anders Hillgren (2010). Participatory design and 'democratizing innovation'. In *Proceedings of the 11th Biennial Participatory Design Conference. Sydney, Australia*. Presented at the PDC '10: The 11th Biennial Participatory Design Conference, New York: ACM, pp. 41–50.

Björgvinsson, Erling; Pelle Ehn; and Per-Anders Hillgren (2012). Agonistic participatory design: working with marginalised social movements. *CoDesign*, vol. 8, no. 2–3, June 2012, pp. 127–144.

Braun, Virginia; and Victoria Clarke (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, vol. 3, no. 2, January 2006, pp. 77–101.

Braun, Virginia; and Victoria Clarke (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, vol. 11, no. 4, August 2019, pp. 589–597.

Braun, Virginia; and Victoria Clarke (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, vol. 18, no. 3, July 2021, pp. 328–352.

Bray, Kirsten E; Christina Harrington; Andrea G Parker; N'Deye Diakhate; and Jennifer Roberts (2022). Radical Futures: Supporting Community-Led Design Engagements through an Afrofuturist Speculative Design Toolkit. In *Proceedings of the 2022 SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. New Orleans, LA, USA.* Presented at the CHI '22: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, New York: ACM, pp. 1–13.

Bruguera, Tania (2015). Immigrant Movement International. http://www.taniabruguera.com/cms/486-0-Immigrant+Movement+International.htm

Bruguera, Tania (2017). #YoMePropongo. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F0F0Tp4PGOw. Accessed 20 May 2023

Busck, Anne G.; Marjan C. Hidding; Søren B. P. Kristensen; Christer Persson; and Søren Præstholm (2008). Managing rurban landscapes in the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden: Comparing planning systems and instruments in three different contexts. *Geografisk Tidsskrift-Danish Journal of Geography*, vol. 108, no. 2, January 2008, pp. 1–16.

Cameron, Stuart; and Jon Coaffee (2005). Art, Gentrification and Regeneration – From Artist as Pioneer to Public Arts. *European Journal of Housing Policy*, vol. 5, no. 1, April 2005, pp. 39–58.

Cao, Xiang; Siân E. Lindley; John Helmes; and Abigail Sellen (2010). Telling the whole story: anticipation, inspiration and reputation in a field deployment

of TellTable. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work. Savannah, GA, USA.* Presented at the CSCW '10: Computer Supported Cooperative Work, New York: ACM, pp. 251–260.

Carey, Phil; and Sue Sutton (2004). Community development through participatory arts: Lessons learned from a community arts and regeneration project in South Liverpool. *Community Development Journal*, vol. 39, no. 2, April 2004, pp. 123–134.

Caslin, Joe (2017). The Volunteers. https://joecaslin.com/pages/the-volunteers. Accessed 15 March 2022

Chamberlain, Alan; Andy Crabtree; and Mark Davies (2013). Community Engagement for Research: contextual design in rural CSCW system development. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Communities and Technologies. Munich, Germany.* Presented at the Communities and Technologies, New York: ACM, pp. 131–139.

Ciolfi, Luigina (2004). Understanding spaces as places: extending interaction design paradigms. *Cognition, Technology & Work*, vol. 6, no. 1, February 2004, pp. 37–40.

Clarke, Rachel; Jo Briggs; Ann Light; Sara Heitlinger; and Clara Crivellaro (2014). Socially engaged arts practice in HCI. In *CHI '14 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems. Toronto, ON, Canada.* Presented at the CHI '14: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, New York: ACM, pp. 69–74.

Clarke, Rachel; Peter Wright; Madeline Balaam; and John McCarthy (2013). Digital portraits: photo-sharing after domestic violence. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. Paris, France.* Presented at the CHI '13: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, Paris France: ACM, pp. 2517–2526.

Clarke, Victoria; and Virginia Braun (2013). Teaching thematic analysis: Overcoming challenges and developing strategies for effective learning. *The Psychologist*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2013, pp. 120–123.

Crawshaw, Julie; and Menelaos Gkartzios (2016). Getting to know the island: Artistic experiments in rural community development. *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol. 43, February 2016, pp. 134–144.

Crivellaro, Clara; Alex Taylor; Vasillis Vlachokyriakos; Rob Comber; Bettina Nissen; and Peter Wright (2016). Re-Making Places: HCI, 'Community Building' and Change. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. San Jose, CA, USA.* Presented at the CHI'16: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, New York: ACM, pp. 2958–2969.

Dezuanni, Michael; Marcus Foth; and Kerry Mallan (2017). *Digital participation through social living labs: Valuing local knowledge, enhancing engagement.* (H. Hughes, Ed.). Chandos Publishing.

Dillahunt, Tawanna R.; and Jennifer Mankoff (2014). Understanding factors of successful engagement around energy consumption between and among households. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM conference on Computer*

supported cooperative work & social computing. Baltimore, MD, USA. Presented at the CSCW'14: Computer Supported Cooperative Work, New York: ACM, pp. 1246–1257.

Dimond, Jill P.; Michaelanne Dye; Daphne Larose; and Amy S. Bruckman (2013). Hollaback!: the role of storytelling online in a social movement organization. In *Proceedings of the 2013 conference on Computer supported cooperative work. San Antonio, Texas, USA.* Presented at the CSCW '13: Computer Supported Cooperative Work, New York: ACM, pp. 477–490.

Diprose, Gradon (2015). Negotiating contradiction: work, redundancy and participatory art. *Area*, vol. 47, no. 3, September 2015, pp. 246–253.

DiSalvo, Carl (2012). Design for Politics and Political Design. In *Adversarial Design*. Boston MA USA: MIT Press.

DiSalvo, Carl; Kirsten Boehner; Nicholas A Knouf; and Phoebe Sengers (2009). Nourishing the Ground for Sustainable HCI: Considerations from Ecologically Engaged Art. In *Proceedings of the 2009 SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. Boston, MA, USA.* Presented at the CHI '09: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, New York: ACM, pp. 385–394.

DiSalvo, Carl; Andrew Clement; and Volkmar Pipek (2012). Participatory design for, with, and by communities. In *International handbook of participatory design*. Routledge.

DiSalvo, Carl; Illah Nourbakhsh; and David Holstius (2008). The Neighborhood Networks project: a case study of critical engagement and creative expression through participatory design. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Anniversary Conference on Participatory Design 2008. Indianapolis, IN, United States.* Presented at the PDC '08: Proceedings of the Tenth Anniversary Conference on Participatory Design 2008, Indianapolis, IN, United States: Indiana University.

Dombrowski, Lynn; Ellie Harmon; and Sarah Fox (2016). Social Justice-Oriented Interaction Design: Outlining Key Design Strategies and Commitments. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Designing Interactive Systems. Brisbane QLD Australia.* Presented at the DIS '16: Designing Interactive Systems Conference 2016, New York: ACM, pp. 656–671.

Dourish, Paul (2006). Re-space-ing place: 'place' and 'space' ten years on. In *Proceedings of the 2006 20th anniversary conference on Computer supported cooperative work. Banff Alberta Canada.* Presented at the CSCW'06: Computer Supported Cooperative Work, New York: ACM, pp. 299–308.

Dye, Michaelanne; Neha Kumar; Ari Schlesinger; Marisol Wong-Villacres; Morgan G. Ames; Rajesh Veeraraghavan; et al. (2018). Solidarity Across Borders: Navigating Intersections Towards Equity and Inclusion. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing. Jersey City NJ USA.* Presented at the CSCW '18: Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing, New York: ACM, pp. 487–494.

Edwards, David M.; Timothy M. Collins; and Reiko Goto (2016). An arts-led dialogue to elicit shared, plural and cultural values of ecosystems. *Ecosystem Services*, vol. 21, October 2016, pp. 319–328.

Eliasson, Kent; Hans Westlund; and Mats Johansson (2015). Determinants of Net Migration to Rural Areas, and the Impacts of Migration on Rural Labour Markets and Self-Employment in Rural Sweden. *European Planning Studies*, vol. 23, no. 4, April 2015, pp. 693–709.

Fischer, Anke; and Annie McKee (2017). A question of capacities? Community resilience and empowerment between assets, abilities and relationships. *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol. 54, August 2017, pp. 187–197.

Fischer, Patrick Tobias; and Eva Hornecker (2012). Urban HCI: Spatial aspects in the design of shared encounters for media facades. In *Proceedings of the 2012 SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. Austin Texas USA.* Presented at the CHI '12: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, New York: ACM, pp. 307–316.

Fischer, Patrick Tobias; Christian Zöllner; and Eva Hornecker (2010). VR/Urban: Spread.gun – Design Process and Challenges in Developing a Shared Encounter for Media Façades. In *Proceedings of the 2010 British Computer Society Conference on Human-Computer Interaction, BCS-HCI 2010. Dundee, UK.* Presented at the BritishHCI 2010, New York: ACM.

Fox, Sarah; Amanda Menking; Stephanie Steinhardt; Anna Lauren Hoffmann; and Shaowen Bardzell (2017). Imagining Intersectional Futures: Feminist approaches in CSCW. In *Companion of the 2017 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing. Portland, Oregon, USA*. Presented at the CSCW '17: Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing, New York: ACM, pp. 387–393.

Fox, Sarah; Rachel Rose Ulgado; and Daniela Rosner (2015). Hacking Culture, Not Devices: Access and Recognition in Feminist Hackerspaces. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing. Vancouver BC Canada.* Presented at the CSCW '15: Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing, New York: ACM, pp. 56–68.

Frauenberger, Christopher; Marcus Foth; and Geraldine Fitzpatrick (2018). On scale, dialectics, and affect: pathways for proliferating participatory design. In *Proceedings of the 15th Participatory Design Conference: Full Papers - Volume 1. Hasselt and Genk Belgium.* Presented at the PDC '18: Participatory Design Conference 2018, New York: ACM, pp. 1–13.

Freeman, Guo; Jeffrey Bardzell; Shaowen Bardzell; Szu-Yu (Cyn) Liu; Xi Lu; and Diandian Cao (2019). Smart and Fermented Cities: An Approach to Placemaking in Urban Informatics. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. Glasgow, Scotland, UK.* Presented at the CHI '19: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, New York: ACM, pp. 1–13.

Freire, Paulo (1967). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed: 30th Anniversary Edition*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Fröhlich, David M.; Dorothy Rachovides; Kiriaki Riga; Ramnath Bhat; Maxine Frank; Eran Edirisinghe; et al. (2009). StoryBank: mobile digital storytelling in a development context. In *Proceedings of the 2019 SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. Boston, MA, USA.* Presented at the CHI '09: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, New York: ACM, pp. 1761–1770.

Gaffikin, Frank; and Mike Morrissey (2011). Community Cohesion and Social Inclusion: Unravelling a Complex Relationship. *Urban Studies*, vol. 48, no. 6, May 2011, pp. 1089–1118.

Giaccardi, Elisa; Giulio Jacucci; Debra Cash; Leah Lievrouw; Bo Helgeson; and Ina Wagner (2006). "ParticipART": Art Track Exhibition of the Participatory Design Conference 2006. In *Proceedings of the 2006 Participatory Design Conference. Trento, Italy*. Presented at the PDC'06 Proceedings of the Participatory Design Conference, New York: ACM.

Giglitto, Danilo; Luigina Ciolfi; Caroline Claisse; and Eleanor Lockley (2019). Bridging cultural heritage and communities through digital technologies: Understanding perspectives and challenges. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Communities & Technologies - Transforming Communities. Vienna, Austria.* Presented at the C&T 2019: The 9th International Conference on Communities & Technologies - Transforming Communities, New York: ACM, pp. 81–91.

Gonçalves, Jorge; Marta Castilho Gomes; Sofia Ezequiel; Francisco Moreira; and Isabel Loupa-Ramos (2017). Differentiating peri-urban areas: A transdisciplinary approach towards a typology. *Land Use Policy*, vol. 63, April 2017, pp. 331–341.

Gonsalves, Kavita; Marcus Foth; Glenda Caldwell; and Waldemar Jenek (2021). Radical Placemaking: An Immersive, Experiential and Activist Approach for Marginalised Communities. *Connections: Exploring heritage, architecture, cities, art, media*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2021, pp. 237–252.

Gražulevičiūtė-Vileniškė, Indrė; and Jurga Vitkuvienė (2013). How Rural Becomes Rurban – Rural Manor Residencies in the Urban Context: Lithuanian Case. *Architecture and Urban Planning*, vol. 7, 2013, pp. 32–37.

Grimes, Andrea; Martin Bednar; Jay David Bolter; and Rebecca E. Grinter (2008). EatWell: sharing nutrition-related memories in a low-income community. In *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work. San Diego, CA, USA*. Presented at the CSCW'08: Computer Supported Cooperative Work, New York: ACM, pp. 87–96.

Grodach, Carl (2010). Art spaces, public space, and the link to community development. *Community Development Journal*, vol. 45, no. 4, October 2010, pp. 474–493.

Guaralda, Mirko; Greg Hearn; Marcus Foth; Tan Yigitcanlar; Severine Mayere; and Lisa Law (2020). Towards Australian Regional Turnaround: Insights into Sustainably Accommodating Post-Pandemic Urban Growth in Regional Towns and Cities. *Sustainability*, vol. 12, no. 24, December 2020, pp. 10492.

Hansson, Karin; Laura Forlano; Jaz Hee-jeong Choi; Carl DiSalvo; Teresa Cerratto Pargman; Shaowen Bardzell; et al. (2018). Provocation, Conflict, and Appropriation: The Role of the Designer in Making Publics. *Design Issues*, vol. 34, no. 4, October 2018, pp. 3–7.

Hardy, Jean; Chanda Phelan; Morgan Vigil-Hayes; Norman Makoto Su; Susan Wyche; and Phoebe Sengers (2019). Designing from the rural. *Interactions*, vol. 26, no. 4, June 2019, pp. 37–41.

Harrington, Christina; Sheena Erete; and Anne Marie Piper (2019). Deconstructing Community-Based Collaborative Design: Towards More Equitable Participatory Design Engagements. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*. New York: ACM, pp. 1–25.

Harrington, Christina N.; Shamika Klassen; and Yolanda A. Rankin (2022). "All that You Touch, You Change": Expanding the Canon of Speculative Design Towards Black Futuring. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. New Orleans, LA, USA.* Presented at the CHI '22: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, New York: ACM, pp. 1–10.

Harrison, Steve; and Paul Dourish (1996). Re-Place-ing space: the roles of place and space in collaborative systems. In *Proceedings of the 1996 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work, Cambridge, MA, USA.* Presented at the Computer supported cooperative work, New York: ACM, pp. 67–76.

Hjorth, Larissa; Anne M. Harris; Kat Jungnickel; and Gretchen Coombs (2019). *Creative Practice Ethnographies*. Lexington Books.

Holmer, Hrönn Brynjarsdóttir; Carl DiSalvo; Phoebe Sengers; and Thomas Lodato (2015). Constructing and constraining participation in participatory arts and HCI. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, vol. 74, February 2015, pp. 107–123.

JR (2008). 28 Millimètres, Women Are Heroes , Brazil. https://www.jr-art.net/projects/rio-de-janeiro. Accessed 30 March 2023

Kelkar, Nikita Prakash; and Gabriella Spinelli (2016). Building social capital through creative placemaking. *Strategic Design Research Journal*, vol. 9, no. 2, June 2016, pp. 54–66.

Kershaw, Alex (2015). An Interview with Tania Bruguera. Immigrant Movement International: Five Years and Counting. *FIELD–Journal of Socially Engaged Art Criticism*, vol. 1, 2015, pp. 11–26. http://field-journal.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/FIELD-01-Bruguera-Interview.pdf

Klaebe, Helen; Marcus Foth; Jean Burgess; and Mark Bilandzic (2007). Digital Storytelling and History Lines: Community Engagement in a Master-Planned Development. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Virtual Systems and Multimedia. Brisbane, Australia.* Presented at the International Conference on Virtual Systems and Multimedia, New York: ACM, pp. 108–120.

Kuutti, Kari; and Liam J. Bannon (2014). The turn to practice in HCI: towards a research agenda. In *Proceedings of the 2014 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. Toronto, ON, Canada.* Presented at the

CHI ’14: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, New York: ACM, pp. 3543–3552.

Lacy, Suzanne (1997). The Turning Point / Under Construction. https://www.suzannelacy.com/performance-installation#/the-turning-point-under-construction/. Accessed 30 March 2023

Lacy, Suzanne (2013). Silver Action. https://www.tate.org.uk/research/publications/performance-at-tate/case-studies/suzanne-lacy. Accessed 30 March 2023

Le Dantec, Christopher A.; and Sarah Fox (2015). Strangers at the Gate: Gaining Access, Building Rapport, and Co-Constructing Community-Based Research. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing. Vancouver, BC, Canada.* Presented at the CSCW ’15: Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing, New York: ACM, pp. 1348–1358.

Le, Huong; Michael Polonsky; and Rodney Arambewela (2015). Social Inclusion Through Cultural Engagement Among Ethnic Communities. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, vol. 24, no. 4, May 2015, pp. 375–400.

Lichter, Daniel T.; and David L. Brown (2011). Rural America in an Urban Society: Changing Spatial and Social Boundaries. *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 37, no. 1, August 2011, pp. 565–592.

Lifethings (2013). Yobosayo. https://www.designboom.com/art/yobosayo-participatory-public-artwork-for-seoul-citizens-hall/. Accessed 30 March 2023

Light, Ann; Gini Simpson; Lois Weaver; and Patrick G. T. Healey (2009). Geezers, turbines, fantasy personas: making the everyday into the future. In *Proceedings of the seventh ACM conference on Creativity and Cognition. Berkeley, CA, USA.* Presented at the Creativity and Cognition 2009, New York: ACM, pp. 39–48.

Lingel, Jessica; Mor Naaman; and Danah M. Boyd (2014). City, self, network: transnational migrants and online identity work. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work & social computing, Baltimore, MD, USA.* Presented at the CSCW’14: Computer Supported Cooperative Work, New York: ACM, pp. 1502–1510.

Malatzky, Dr Christina; Judy Gillespie; Dr Danielle L. Couch; and Dr Catherine Cosgrave (2020). Why place matters: A rurally-orientated analysis of COVID-19’s differential impacts. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2020, pp. 100063.

Matarasso, F (2007). Common ground: cultural action as a route to community development. *Community Development Journal*, vol. 42, no. 4, September 2007, pp. 449–458.

Meagher, Sharon M (2009). Declarations of independence: Anti-immigration politics in ‘rurban’ America. *City*, vol. 13, no. 1, March 2009, pp. 5–25.

Murray, Maria; Nadia Pantidi; and Trevor Hogan (2019). Conflict and Belonging: Socially engaged art practice as a resource for resilience-building in rurban communities. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Communities & Technologies - Transforming Communities. Vienna, Austria.*

Presented at the C&T 2019: The 9th International Conference on Communities & Technologies - Transforming Communities, New York: ACM, pp. 60–64.

Mustafa, Maryam; Shaimaa Lazem; Ebtisam Alabdulqader; Kentaro Toyama; Sharifa Sultana; Samia Ibtasam; et al. (2020). IslamicHCI: Designing with and within Muslim Populations. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. Honolulu, HI, USA.* Presented at the CHI '20: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, New York: ACM, pp. 1–8.

O'Leary, Jasper Tran; Sara Zewde; Jennifer Mankoff; and Daniela K. Rosner (2019). Who Gets to Future?: Race, Representation, and Design Methods in Africatown. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. Glasgow, Scotland, UK.* Presented at the CHI '19: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, New York: ACM, pp. 1–13.

Paay, J.; and J. Kjeldskov (2008). Understanding Situated Social Interactions: A Case Study of Public Places in the City. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, vol. 17, no. 2–3, April 2008, pp. 275–290.

Pace, Tyler; Katie O'Donnell; Natalie DeWitt; Shaowen Bardzell; and Jeffrey Bardzell (2013). From organizational to community creativity: paragon leadership and creativity stories at etsy. In *Proceedings of the 2013 conference on computer supported cooperative work. San Antonio, TX, USA.* Presented at the Computer Supported Cooperative Work, New York: ACM, pp. 1023–1034.

Pantidi, Nadia; Jennifer Ferreira; Mara Balestrini; Mark Perry; Paul Marshall; and John McCarthy (2015). Connected sustainability: connecting sustainability-driven, grass-roots communities through technology. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Communities and Technologies. Limerick, Ireland.* Presented at the C&T '15: Communities and Technologies 2015, New York: ACM, pp. 161–163.

Patten, Emma; Peter O'Meara; and Virginia Dickson-Swift (2015). Scoping review of the exclusion and inclusion of rural newcomers in community participation: Review of exclusion of rural newcomers. *Australian Journal of Rural Health*, vol. 23, no. 3, June 2015, pp. 127–135.

Peacock, Sean; Robert Anderson; and Clara Crivellaro (2018). Streets for People: Engaging Children in Placemaking Through a Socio-technical Process. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. Montréal, QC, Canada.* Presented at the CHI '18: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, New York: ACM, pp. 1–14.

Prakash, Bodh (2018). Writing in from the periphery: Partition narratives from Rurban Delhi. *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, vol. 54, no. 3, May 2018, pp. 307–319.

Procyk, Jason; and Carman Neustaedter (2014). GEMS: the design and evaluation of a location-based storytelling game. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work & social computing.*

Baltimore, MD, USA. Presented at the CSCW'14: Computer Supported Cooperative Work, New York: ACM, pp. 1156–1166.

Purkis, Harriet (2013). Local People Project. https://vimeo.com/64381411. Accessed 30 April 2023

Roberson, Jahmeilah; and Bonnie Nardi (2010). Survival needs and social inclusion: technology use among the homeless. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work. Savannah, GA, USA.* Presented at the CSCW '10: Computer Supported Cooperative Work, New York: ACM, pp. 445–448.

Roberts, Elisabeth; Brett Anne Anderson; Sarah Skerratt; and John Farrington (2017). A review of the rural-digital policy agenda from a community resilience perspective. *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol. 54, August 2017, pp. 372–385.

Roberts, Elisabeth; and Leanne Townsend (2016). The Contribution of the Creative Economy to the Resilience of Rural Communities: Exploring Cultural and Digital Capital. *Sociologia Ruralis*, vol. 56, no. 2, April 2016, pp. 197–219.

Rüller, Sarah; Belén Giménez Ciciolli; Anne Weibert; Konstantin Aal; Mark Blythe; Michael Muller; and Yasmin B. Kafai (2022). Creative Entrances to Co-Design: Exploring Collaboration through Fiction, Fairy tales, and Games. In *Proceedings of the Participatory Design Conference 2022 - Volume 2. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK.* Presented at the PDC 2022: Participatory Design Conference 2022, New York: ACM, pp. 247–250.

Sanusi, Alena; and Leysia Palen (2008). Of Coffee Shops and Parking Lots: Considering Matters of Space and Place in the Use of Public Wi-Fi. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, vol. 17, no. 2–3, April 2008, pp. 257–273.

Sharp, Joanne; Venda Pollock; and Ronan Paddison (2005). Just Art for a Just City: Public Art and Social Inclusion in Urban Regeneration. *Urban*, vol. 42, no. 5–6, 2005, pp. 1001–1023.

Sherman, Jennifer (2006). Coping with Rural Poverty: Economic Survival and Moral Capital in Rural America. *Social Forces*, vol. 85, no. 2, December 2006, pp. 891–913.

Sherman, Jennifer (2018). "Not Allowed to Inherit My Kingdom": Amenity Development and Social Inequality in the Rural West: Not Allowed to Inherit My Kingdom. *Rural Sociology*, vol. 83, no. 1, March 2018, pp. 174–207.

Sherman, Jennifer (2021). *Dividing paradise: Rural inequality and the diminishing American dream.* University of California Press.

Sherman, Jennifer; and Kai A. Schafft (2022). "Turning Their Back on Kids": Inclusions, Exclusions, and the Contradictions of Schooling in Gentrifying Rural Communities. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, vol. 8, no. 3, May 2022, pp. 150–170.

Shucksmith, Mark (2012). Class, Power and Inequality in Rural Areas: Beyond Social Exclusion?: power and inequality in rural areas. *Sociologia Ruralis*, vol. 52, no. 4, October 2012, pp. 377–397.

Shucksmith, Mark; David L. Brown; Sally Shortall; Jo Vergunst; and Mildred E. Warner, ed. (2012). Rural Poverty and Social Exclusion in the United States and the United Kingdom. In *Rural Transformations and Rural Policies in the US and UK*. Routledge.

Skerratt, Sarah (2013). Enhancing the analysis of rural community resilience: Evidence from community land ownership. *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol. 31, July 2013, pp. 36–46.

Slingerland, Geertje; Kavita Agneta Gonsalves; and Maria Teresa Murray (2022). Design Probes in a Pandemic: Two Tales of Hybrid Radical Placemaking from Ireland and Australia. In *Proceedings of the 34th Australian Conference on Human-Computer Interaction. Canberra, ACT, Australia.* Presented at the OzCHI '22: 34th Australian Conference on Human-Computer Interaction, New York: ACM, pp. 126–142.

Starbird, Kate; and Leysia Palen (2013). Working and sustaining the virtual 'Disaster Desk'. In *Proceedings of the 2013 conference on Computer supported cooperative work. San Antonio, TX, USA.* Presented at the CSCW '13: Computer Supported Cooperative Work, New York: ACM, pp. 491–502.

Steinhardt, Stephanie B.; Amanda Menking; Ingrid Erickson; Andrea Marshall; Asta Zelenkauskaite; and Jennifer Rode (2015). Feminism and Feminist Approaches in Social Computing. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference Companion on Computer Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing. Vancouver, BC, Canada.* Presented at the CSCW '15: Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing, New York: ACM, pp. 303–308.

Stern, Mark J; and Susan C Seifert (2010). Arts-Based Social Inclusion: An Investigation of Existing Assets and Innovative Strategies to Engage Immigrant Communities in Philadelphia, 2010.

Strohmayer, Angelika (2021). *Digitally Augmenting Traditional Craft Practices for Social Justice: The Partnership Quilt*. Palgrave Macmilllan.

Strohmayer, Angelika; and Janis Meissner (2020). The Partnership Quilt: An Interactive Living Archive of Sex Worker Voices. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, vol. 63, no. 2, April 2020, pp. 275–279.

Sturdee, Miriam; Makayla Lewis; Angelika Strohmayer; Katta Spiel; Nantia Koulidou; Sarah Fdili Alaoui; and Josh Urban Davis (2021). A Plurality of Practices: Artistic Narratives in HCI Research. In *Proceeedings of 13th Conference on Creativity and Cognition, Virtual Event, Italy*. Presented at the C&C '21: Creativity and Cognition, New York: ACM, pp. 1–14.

Tate (2012). Tania Bruguera: Immigrant Movement International. https://www.tate.org.uk/whats-on/tate-modern/exhibition/tania-bruguera-immigrant-movement-international. Accessed 5 June 2023

Taylor, Nick; Loraine Clarke; and Katerina Gorkovenko (2017). Community Inventor Days: Scaffolding Grassroots Innovation with Maker Events. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Designing Interactive Systems. Edinburgh, UK.* Presented at the DIS '17: Designing Interactive Systems Conference 2017, New York: ACM, pp. 1201–1212.

Taylor, Nick; Ursula Hurley; and Philip Connolly (2016). Making Community: The Wider Role of Makerspaces in Public Life. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. San Jose, CA, USA.* Presented at the CHI'16: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, New York: ACM, pp. 1415–1425.

Teli, Maurizio; Marcus Foth; Mariacristina Sciannamblo; Irina Anastasiu; and Peter Lyle (2020). Tales of Institutioning and Commoning: Participatory Design Processes with a Strategic and Tactical Perspective. In *Proceedings of the 16th Participatory Design Conference 2020 - Participation(s) Otherwise - Volume 1. Manizales, Colombia.* Presented at the PDC '20: Participatory Design Conference 2020 - Participation Otherwise, New York: ACM, pp. 159–171.

Teli, Maurizio; John McQueenie; Roberto Cibin; and Marcus Foth (2022). Intermediation in design as a practice of institutioning and commoning. *Design Studies*, vol. 82, September 2022, pp. 101132.

Thomas, Elizabeth; Sarah Pate; and Anna Ranson (2015). The Crosstown Initiative: Art, Community, and Placemaking in Memphis. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, vol. 55, no. 1–2, March 2015, pp. 74–88.

Tiller, Chrissie (2014). The Spectrum of Participation. *Create News*. ttp://www.create-ireland.ie/images/pdfs/create-news/Create-News-17-October-2014- Chrissie-Tiller.pdf

Torre, André (2015). New Challenges for Rural Areas in a Fast Moving Environment. *European Planning Studies*, vol. 23, no. 4, April 2015, pp. 641–649.

Van Heeswijk, Jeanne (2017). Philadelphia Assembled. https://www.jeanneworks.net/projects/philadelphia_assembled/. Accessed 4 April 2023

Verschelden, Griet; Elly Van Eeghem; Riet Steel; Sven De Visscher; and Carlos Dekeyrel (2012). Positioning community art practices in urban cracks. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, vol. 31, no. 3, June 2012, pp. 277–291.

Walton, Emily (2021). A culture of whiteness: How integration failed in cities, suburbs, and small towns. *Sociology Compass*, vol. 15, no. 11, November 2021, pp. e12930.

Weibert, Anne; Konstantin Aal; Nora Oertel Ribeiro; and Volker Wulf (2017). 'This is My Story...': Storytelling with Tangible Artifacts among Migrant Women in Germany. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference Companion Publication on Designing Interactive Systems. Edinburgh, Scotland, UK.* Presented at the DIS '17: Designing Interactive Systems Conference 2017, New York: ACM, pp. 144–149.

Willis, Katharine S. (2019). Making a 'Place' for ICTs in Rural Communities: The role of village halls in digital inclusion. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Communities & Technologies - Transforming Communities. Vienna, Austria.* Presented at the C&T 2019: The 9th International Conference on Communities & Technologies - Transforming Communities, New York: ACM, pp. 136–142.