Women, Men, Positionalities and Emotion: Doing Feminist Geographies of Religion

Peter E. Hopkins[1]

School of Geography, Politics and Sociology, Newcastle University, UK
Email: peter.hopkins@ncl.ac.uk

Abstract

In the last ten years, geographers have increasingly focused upon religion as a significant marker of social and cultural difference. Using such work as a base for discussion, this paper maps out some potential avenues for future work about feminist geographies of religion. I draw simultaneously upon existing trends in the discipline, and experiences of fieldwork with Muslim youth to suggest ways in which feminist approaches might be developed in research on geographies of religion. In doing so, I focus in particular upon three areas of feminist geographical inquiry – gender relations, positionalities and emotions.

Introduction

Appreciations of the ways in which women experience space and place, perspectives about the nature of geographical knowledge as situated, and challenges to the sexist and exclusionary nature of society (and geography as a discipline) are just some of the many contributions that feminist geographers have made, and continue to make, to geographical knowledge (e.g., Rose, 1993). Arguably, feminist geography is now a well-established sub-field of the discipline, and this is evidenced in the recent publications of 'Geography and Gender

Reconsidered' by the Women and Geography Study Group of the RGS-IBG (Sharp, Browne and Thien, 2004), Blackwell's 'Companion to Feminist Geography' (Nelson and Seager, 2005) and the continuing success of the journal *Gender, Place and Culture* which started in 1994. This is not to say that equality of opportunity is experienced by all women — far from it — and instead, there are still many ways in which feminist geographies can contribute to understandings of the ways in which sexism — and other inequalities and power relations — work to marginalise individuals, influence their spatiality and determine their life chances. Linda Woodhead (2007) observes that the sociology of religion has been slow to consider the significance of gender, and the same could be said of the geographies of religion. One area of geographical scholarship that has had little interaction with feminist geographies is the study of religion, and the main aim of this article is to discuss some of the ways in which researchers might *do* feminist geographies of religion. As such, there are many aspects of this article that raise questions rather than provide answers. Lily Kong (1990: 355) has observed that a focus on geography and religion as 'a valuable focus of inquiry has not always been immediately apparent'. Although recent work has started to take religion seriously as focus of geographical enquiry (Brace, Bailey and Harvey, 2006, Kong, 2001, Olson and Silvey, 2006), examples of feminist approaches to understanding the geographies of religion are relatively few in number (although notable exceptions include Dwyer, 2000, Kay, 1997, Mohammad, 1999 and the recent edited collections by Aitchison, Hopkins and Kwan, 2007, Falah and Nagel, 2005, Morin and Guelke, 2007). However, there is much scope for feminist geographers to make important interventions into the landscapes and places of the religious, and I now consider some of the ways in which these and other feminist geographies have informed my own experiences in doing geographies of religion.

This article is organised around four main sections. First, I explore an issue that has been fundamental to the feminist project within geography: the study of gender relations. Second, I build upon this discussion to explore understandings about the positionalities of researchers and the relationships between researchers and researched. Third, I make some suggestions for consolidating and extending the ways in which scholars adopt feminist approaches to their study of religion and place. Here, I draw upon recent work about emotional geographies (Davidson, Bondi and Smith, 2005) to highlight some of the ways in which geographies of religion might embrace what Bondi, Davidson and Smith (2005: 1) have called the 'emotional turn' within human geography. Finally, by focussing on the relationships between men, women, religion and space, I propose an agenda for feminist religious geographies. In each of these sections, I situate the discussion in a recent research project with young Muslim men in Scotland where feminist perspectives encouraged me to explore how gender relations are tied up with experiences of being Islamic. Furthermore, I attempt to adopt a reflexive approach by seeking to account for the ways in which my various positionalities influenced

the research, and in doing so highlight that feminist geographies are multiple, fluid and contested.

Gender relations

Overall, feminist geographers have made a broad range of important contributions to understandings and experiences of various aspects of human geography, including studies about economic geography, identity construction and urban studies to name a few (Rose, 1993 and see Berg and Longhurst, 2003, Bondi and Domosh, 2003, Brown and Staeheli, 2003, Jacobs and Nash, 2003, for recent overviews of feminist geography). Much of the work in feminist geographies draws attention to the salience of gender relations and the complex ways in which space and place are both produced and experienced in gendered ways. As Laurie, Dwyer, Holloway and Smith (1999: 1) in their introduction to *Geographies of New Femininities* clarify, while 'sex – male and female – might be understood as a category based on biological difference, gender is understood as a social construction organised around biological sex (although scholars such as Judith Butler (1990) point to the need to consider the ways that sex/gender come into being through performative acts (rather than being in existence already)). Thus, individuals are born male or female but, over time, they acquire a gender identity, that is an understanding of what it means to be a man or woman (WGSG, 1997: 53). This gender identity is defined as masculinity or femininity'. Genders – such as masculinities and femininities - are therefore not understood as fixed categories and are instead social constructed forms of classification, given meaning by their constant repetition during socialisation processes, imposed by those in power, and subtly reinforced by everyday experiences and encounters with various media. As a number of important contributions to feminist geographies have shown, social constructions of gender have powerful influences in determining the life chances and spatial experiences of women and men in a range of different localities including: home, street, nation and community to name a few (Bondi, 1998, Mohammad, 2005, Staeheli, 1996, Rose, 1993). However, there has been little dialogue between this important work about gender relations and the geographies of religion (Holloway and Valins, 2002), and such conversations provide fruitful opportunities for future research. Lily Kong (2001) suggests that human geographers must consider the ways in which religion and place are experienced in various ways by different groups of the population, including men, women, children, adults and older people. This is a key issue for scholars interesting in doing feminist geographies of religion.

Given the focus upon people's everyday gendered experiences within feminist geographies, my own work has been attuned to exploring the ways in which young Muslim men's masculine identities are constructed and contested in different places and times. Dwyer (2000: 479) has shown how 'local patriarchal gender relations were reinforced by young men' and continued by explaining how

'this policing by the young men appeared to be a means by which their own adolescent masculine ethnic and religious identity could be maintained'. This observation makes an important point about understandings of gender in that it demonstrates that constructions of femininities often relate to, connect with and respond to the ways in which masculinities are constructed. As Willis (2005: 99) notes 'the constructions of appropriate male and female behaviour are inter-related, as what it is 'to be a man' may be partly based on not behaving 'like a woman''. Furthermore, Mac an Ghaill (1994, 61) notes that '… we need to consider not only gender differences but also relations between young men and women and within young men's peer groups … Masculinities are also developed in specific institutional contexts in relation to and against each other.'

These factors – many of which are key to feminist geographies – led me to consider the ways in which young Muslim men's identities were constructed in gendered ways, and the ways in which this changed in different contexts, localities and situations. For example, I have shown how the young men's masculine identities are constructed around a focus on sport and peer group, with many of the young men placing emphasis on earning money and providing for the family home (Hopkins, 2006, 2007a). Furthermore, this construction of masculinity is also bolstered by the young men's use of religious discourses in order to justify the association of Muslim women with the spaces of the home, and the greater spatial freedom afforded to the young men compared with their female counterparts. As Dwyer (2000) has demonstrated, the young men in her research felt it appropriate to monitor, control and survey the behaviour and conduct of young Muslim women, emphasising the ways in which gender relations are constructed in relation to and against each other, rather than in isolation.

However, although the young men's masculine identities were often constructed in terms of power, control and patriarchy (with religion often used as justification for this), my exploration of the young men's identities also highlights ways in which the young men displayed emotions of fear, shame and sensitivity to their everyday experiences and circumstances (see also Pain, 2001). For example, it was during individual interviews - as opposed to during focus group discussions - that the young men were more likely to reveal the emotions and fears associated with their everyday experiences of racism and religious intolerance. This shows the salience of the young men's peer groups and the presence of other young men on the ways in which the young men construct their religious, racial and gendered identities. Furthermore, Susan Smith and I have also argued that their was a general tendency for young Muslim men to withdraw to the private spaces of the home after September 11th 2001 as a result of the hostility and lack of comfort associated with negotiating the street on an everyday basis (Hopkins and Smith, 2008).

Exploring positionalities: differences, otherness and similarities

As well as exploring constructions and contestations of gendered identities and relations, feminist geographers have been key contributors to calls to recognise the politics of the positionalities of the researcher and the researched, and to examine this reflexively (Rose, 1997). Following this, many researchers now realise that their construction of knowledge is not balanced, rational and all-seeing – an aspect of earlier geographical research that feminist geographers would criticise for being masculinist – and is instead partial, influenced by the positionality of the researcher and dependant upon the content and context of the research setting. Although such a move has been critiqued within the discipline as part of 'cultural geography's fragmenting, reflexive self-obsession' (Peach, 2002: 252), I was persistently reminded, not only through feminist geographical literature, but by researchers, informants and others, that my positionality in doing research with young Muslim men was potentially problematic.

The young Muslim men consulted in my research often asked or made assumptions about my positionalities. During one of the focus groups, the participants thought I was a government official and would only allow me to start moderating the discussion when I had convinced them otherwise. They also assumed that I was a member of the British National Party[2] and so would use what they said to encourage the circulation of Islamaphobic literature (Hopkins, 2007b). Moreover, many assumed that I belonged to a religious group, referred to the Bible as 'my book', and queried whether I was a Catholic or Protestant. They also questioned my opinions about Islam. These are just some of the examples of where my positions, attitudes and opinions have been questioned by research participants. Many of these questions and issues are fundamental to the feminist project within geography as they problematise the role of the researcher, question the salience of power relations in the research encounter and point out the significance of markers of social difference in various contexts.

There is a broad range of literature both within feminist geography and across the social sciences exploring perspectives on the ways in which researchers can seek to interrogate their positionalities. As I wanted to 'reflexively examine my positionality' (Rose, 1997: 305), I was particularly attracted by the writings of feminist geography which deconstruct 'the barrier between the academy and the lives of the people it professes to represent' (Kobayashi, 1994: 73). However, within feminist geographies, there are a range of different perspectives about the ways in which researchers should think through their positionalities. The approach that I found most useful sees the researcher as never being completely the same, nor entirely different from their participants. Levels of difference and similarity

[2] The British National Party are a far-right political organisation in the UK

may vary throughout the research project in different places and at different times. This constant negotiation between various degrees of difference and similarity can be seen as a position of 'betweenness':

> But even when differences in a field are small, because we are positioned simultaneously in a number of fields we are always, at some level, somewhere, in a state of betweenness, negotiating various degrees and kinds of difference - be they based on gender, age, class, ethnicity, "race," sexuality, and so on. Betweenness thus implies that we are never "outsiders" or "insiders" in any absolute sense (Nast, 1994: 57).

Robina Mohammad (2001) regards herself as occupying the spaces of betweenness. She sees herself as 'a British, Pakistani Muslim (by birth), but non-practising and non-believing, a little Marxist, somewhat feminist, of middle working-class origins' (Mohammad, 2001: 107). Mohammad's research looks at the education and employment of Pakistani women, and so the majority of people, including many of the research participants, regard her as an 'insider'. However, Mohammad was also divorced, pregnant and in a relationship with a white man. She also therefore occupies a space 'outside' of the local Pakistani community because she possesses different levels of education, religiosity and different social values. Mohammad is clearly sensitive to the multiple, interweaving and sometimes contradictory positions that may exist between the researcher and their participants.

However, feminist geographers, such as Gillian Rose (1997: 317) are well aware that the 'negotiations that are part of a research process are not fully knowable', and this may cause some researchers to render pointless the analysis of their positionalities in the research process. I agree that we will never be fully aware of our positionalities, how they have manifested during the research project, how others have interpreted them, and how they have influenced the research participants. This inability to fully know our positionalities could encourage researchers to realise the importance of the research they are carrying out and the methods they are using. However, to suggest that there is therefore no point in considering the influence of the positionality of the researcher is an easy way out of a complex issue. To do this is to ignore a potentially significant aspect of the research process. For these reasons it is important that I sought to explore these issues in my research with young Muslim men.

Like Mohammad (2001) and Nast (1994), I see myself as occupying a space of 'betweenness'. I am simultaneously positioned in a number of different social category groups that place me at various levels of similarity and difference with the research participants. Many of the research participants occupy a space of similarity (indifference) with me because we are young people, Scottish and male. However, unlike the research participants, I am not Muslim, nor am I 'black' or 'Asian'. This comment about similarities and differences portrays my positionality

in very simple terms. On looking through the transcripts, I am aware when I have been talking to the young men the disclosure of my religiosity has changed throughout the research project. There have been times when I have claimed to be agnostic (Interview, 16th May 2002) and other times where I have claimed to be an atheist (Focus Group, 5th September 2002). Furthermore, the point during the research where I felt most different to the research participants was during a focus group in an elite private school in Edinburgh (14th November 2002). Despite our similarities in terms of being young men, the focus groups participants identified as British, and did not see Scotland as being different from the rest of Britain. They also accorded with the principles of the Conservative Party and made racist comments. The experience of difference during this focus group was largely down to social class and not, as many would expect, race or religion. However, although class was a crucial factor here, it is also likely that the intersection of the young men's class alongside other markers of identity – such as their masculinity, age and the school setting – worked in a series of associations with each other to result in particular sets of (classed masculine) positionings and negotiations. The inability to fully 'know' how these various factors combine highlight to me that there is likely to have been many points in the research process where the young men felt very different from me, and my inability to fully know all aspects of my positionalities prevented me from recognising this. This all highlights how the positionalities of the researcher (and the participant(s)) may change throughout the research process, and even if it has not changed, the researcher (and/or the participant) may claim that particular positionalities have changed.

Furthermore, alongside markers of social difference, other personal characteristics and traits may reveal various degrees of similarities and differences between the researcher and the researched. For example, a number of the young Muslim men I spoke to were interested in knowing what school I attended before going to university, some discussions raised questions about the football teams I did or did not support or my personal values and opinions on a broad range of issues. Some were also interested in discovering where I was born and brought up, and so engaged in discussions about the politics of locality. So, personal characteristics such as accent, dress, deportment and general background may also influence research encounters (for an excellent account of some of these issues see, Vanderbeck, 2005).[3]

[3] A further point of consideration – and contention – relates to my identity as a man and my engagement with feminist geography. There is not room in this paper to discuss this in-depth, however, this is an issue I have struggled with for some time (and continue to do so) and I am particular aware of the often 'contradictory positioning(s) of men who work within feminist geography' (Butz and Berg, 2002: 88). This is clearly an issue that would benefit from further engagement, discussion and debate from critical geographers interested in using feminist methodologies and philosophies.

The points raised above highlight the complexities involved in considering the positionalities of the researcher. The sentiments of Audrey Kobayashi (2003: 347-348) gel with my own:

> … I have struggled with a mounting dis-ease over the reflexive turn in human geography, and with a mounting conviction that much of what passes for anti-racist scholarship, by including a reflexive acknowledgement of the writer's 'positionality' with respect to her subjects, is actually a privileged and self-indulgent focus on the self that provides anything but an anti-racist lens and ends up distancing the writer – by virtue of her power to name (even if she is only naming herself) and to situate – from the very people whose conditions she might hope to change.

Kobayashi (2003) also notes that geographers need to acknowledge the limits of reflexivity and realise that it is a subsidiary concern. Furthermore, she also advocates that reflexivity has little purpose unless it is connected to a wider purpose and agenda about how the world should be and needs to change. As such, scholars interested in doing feminist geographies of religion may find it productive to reflect upon their positionalities in order to highlight various forms of inequality, challenge power relations and appreciate the complexity of social relations. Having now discussed the ways in which gender relations and considerations of the positionalities of the researcher are important aspects of doing feminist geographies of religion, I now seek to offer a couple of suggestions about how work within feminist geographies might contribute to the continuing advancement of the geographies of religion.

Emotional geographies

As I mentioned briefly in the introduction, Bondi, Davidson and Smith (2005: 1) have recently edited a collection in which they introduce 'geography's 'emotional turn'. As they observe:

> Clearly, our emotions *matter*. They affect the way we sense the substance of our past, present and future; all can seem bright, dull or darkened by our emotional outlook. Whether we crave emotional equilibrium, or adrenaline thrills, the emotional geographies of our lives are dynamic, transformed by our procession through childhood, adolescence, middle and old age, and by more immediately destabilising events such as birth or bereavement, or the start or end of a relationship. Whether joyful, heartbreaking or numbing, emotion has the power to transform the shape of our lives, expanding or contracting our horizons, creating new fissures or fixtures we never expected to find (Bondi, Davidson and Smith, 2005: 1).

The importance of emotional geographies to people's everyday experiences have been the subject of a number of recent publications by feminist geographers (see for example, Bondi, Smith and Davidson, 2005, Sharp, Browne and Thien, 2004 and Social and Cultural Geography 2004 5(4)), many of which focus on how emotions and space are tied up and connected with embodied experiences. 'Emotions, to be sure, take place within and around this closest of spatial scales' (Davidson and Milligan, 2004: 521). Furthermore, 'the gendered basis of knowledge production is probably a key reason why the emotions have been banished from social science and most other critical commentary for so long' (Anderson and Smith, 2001: 7). This has been reinforced by the fact that 'it was necessary for many feminist geographers to present themselves as serious academics and therefore keep their emotions at home' (Sharp, Browne and Thien, 2004). Clearly, emotions are not only experienced by or confined to feminist geographies, however, it is generally feminist geographers who have contributed most to the development of emotional geographies as a significant sub-field within human geography.

Anderson and Smith (2001: 7) have observed the 'silencing of emotion in both social research and public life', noting that within human geography, 'what little talk of emotion there is occurs squarely in the cultural (and often feminist) corners of the discipline'. They continue by commenting on the ways in which emotional topographies might be written into economic geographies, housing studies, population and international migration (Anderson and Smith, 2001). As well as contributing to these sub-fields of human geography, I would like to suggest that the recent flurry of interest in emotional geographies has much to contribute to the continuing development and enhancement of the geographies of religion. Not only would such an approach offer intimate, personal and embodied accounts of the salience of religion to people's everyday experiences, the emotions and feelings associated with particular religious places, events and times may also be better understood.

The young Muslim men who participated in focus groups and individual interviews with me often framed their accounts of their everyday experiences using emotional discourses about their feelings and sentiments about particular places, times and events. Many regarded the mosque as a significant place for their sense of emotional attachment and connections with their Muslim peers and others felt that the home offered them a place of comfort and contentment away from the hostile, fearful and racist streets of the local community after 11th September 2001 (Hopkins and Smith, 2008). Furthermore, some young men expressed their anger and frustration at the racist and exclusionary campaigning of the British National Party (Hopkins, 2007b) along with expressing their dedication, commitment and strength of feeling towards identifying with the Scottish nation (Hopkins, 2004, Hopkins, 2007c). All in all, the various emotional sentiments expressed by the young men towards different aspects of their embodied, local and national

experiences emphasises the insights that an approach informed by emotional geographies may contribute to enriching feminist geographies of religion.

In terms of thinking about particular religious locations, geographers of religion might use feminist and emotional geographies not only to explore a range of complex questions, but to gain deeper, more personal and profound accounts of people's religious experiences. For example, in what ways are religious buildings, sites and places – churches, mosque, synagogues, temples, crematoria, memorials – experienced in emotive, poignant and moving ways? How are pilgrimages associated with religious activities and events – such as the hajj or a visit to Lourdes – felt in a range of emotional ways, including the excitement and anticipation experienced before departure, the personal emotions of the journey, the feelings of joy, discovery and personal fulfilment once there, and the memories and savoured emotions shared with others having returned home (see for example, Graham and Murray, 1997)? How do the activities associated with membership of religious groups, organisations or collectives offer arousing emotional experiences and encounters that matter so much to peoples' everyday lives? What emotional experiences and spaces are associated with exclusion or marginalisation from particular religious spaces or groups? How have religious practices been historically located and changed (or not) over time and across space (see for example, Kay, 1997, Brace, Bailey and Harvey, 2006)? These questions are important to the geographies of religion and many of them may be answered in more profound ways if geographers of religion take more account of the role of emotions in their work.

Men, women, religion, space

Alongside focusing upon the emotional geographies of people's experiences, those interested in doing feminist geographies of religion could make important contributions to knowledge and understanding by exploring gender identities and relations – between men and women – in the context of religion and space. Although women's everyday experiences have been central to the feminist project within geography (as noted previously), it has only been in the last fifteen years that geographers have started to focus upon masculinities (e.g. Berg and Longhurst, 2003, Longhurst, 2000, van Hoven and Horschelmann, 2005). Generally, Jackson (1991: 199) attributes the interest in masculinities both as a response to feminism and to a lesser extent the rise of 'an increasingly politicised gay consciousness'. Longhurst (2000) sees the focus upon men and masculinities as part of the shifting focus of feminism rather than a response to feminism. However, these occurrences have resulted in a recognition that dominant forms of masculinity are both 'economically exploitative and socially oppressive' in nature (Jackson, 1991: 199). Although it could be suggested that work about men and masculinities in geography has recently reached a critical mass in the discipline (e.g. Berg and Longhurst, 2003, van Hoven and Horschelmann, 2005), geographers

of religion are ideally placed to make important interventions to this work by researching men and women's religious experiences, and the ways in which these experiences inform each other. Feminist geographers, such as Linda McDowell (2003) have recently demonstrated that, although many women still experience sexism and are marginalised in society, certain groups of men (in this case, young working class men in the UK) are also excluded from certain aspects of hegemonic masculinity. These complex power relationships and hierarchies would be an interesting aspect of social and spatial relations for geographers of religion to think through in their work.

There are a number of avenues through which this work could develop, focusing upon different geographies, various forms of religion and religious practice and different groups of men and women. It is important to think about the ways in which different gendered religious experiences influence and are influenced by geographical context and foci. Work about the geographies of Islam has employed a range of geographical scales of analyses: Rachel Silvey (2005) has explored the salience of religion in experiences of transnational migration and Ghazi,-Walid Falah (2005) has focused on the national level at the ways in which Muslim/Arab women are represented in newspapers in the USA. Kevin Dunn's (2005) work has interrogated the intersection of national and local issues with reference to the politics surrounding mosque development in Sydney, and Abdi Ismail Samatar (2005) has explored contestations over the development of a women's mosque in Somalia. Work about the feminist geographies of religion could therefore usefully analyse the experiences of religious men and women at a variety of scales: 'global, national, regional, local and, indeed, that of the body (Kong, 2001: 226), and in a range of different geographical contexts, such as in public and private spaces, religious and non-religious places (e.g. see Watson, 2005 for a discussion about the Jewish eruv) and the ways in which these locations and sites might be resisted, used and manipulated in different ways.

Feminist geographers of religion could also explore the ways in which gender relations interact and intersect with the personal experiences of belonging to particular religious groups, including Christianity, Buddhism, Sikhism, Islam, Judaism, and other recognised religious and spiritual collectives and practices. Much work about the geographies of religion tends to focus upon religious practices, contested discourses and everyday geographies associated with Muslims and the religion of Islam. There is a need for those interested in doing feminist geographies of religion to explore the experiences of men and women belonging to a range of different religious groups – including those affiliating with the main world religions - as well as men and women associating with or participating in other broadly 'religious' or spiritual activities and events.

Alongside seeking to understand the ways in which men and women of various religions experience, use and manage different locations, sites and contexts,

one of the most influential contributions that feminist geographers could make to the geographies of religion is in exploring the ways in which different groups of men and women experience different religions and spaces in different ways, as well as the ways in which religion(s) constitute both men and women, and masculinities and femininities. Earlier I quoted Mac an Ghaill (1994) who discussed the importance of exploring the gender difference and relations between men and women, within men and women's peer groups and in various institutional contexts. This is a key issue for feminist geographers of religion. How do different groups of men and women with different markers of social difference – race, class, age, disability, sexuality, locality – experience their religion and their use of religious space, and how do these people respond to other groups of men and women? Furthermore, how does religion reinforce or challenge gendered spaces and social processes?

Conclusions

To conclude then, it is clear that feminist geographers have made a range of very significant contributions to the ways in which geographers perceive, think about and do geography. As well as highlighting a broad range of inequalities and socially constructed hierarchies, feminist geographers have also demonstrated the ways in which everyday spaces are imbued with gendered meanings, associations and assumptions. Arguably, one of the most significant contributions of feminist scholarship has been to shed light on, rethink and challenge the everyday sexism and complex experiences of marginalisation encountered by women in a range of geographical settings. Furthermore, feminist geographers have also been instrumental in encouraging researchers to reflect critically on their positionalities in research encounters, realise the situated nature of knowledge production and think carefully about the partiality of research findings.

Although feminist scholarship now has an important place within human geography, there has been relatively little interaction between geographers of religion and those interested in feminist geographies. This article has suggested a number of ways in which such a conversation might be taken forward. Alongside focusing on the role of women and the positionalities of the researcher, geographers could also do feminist geographies of religion by focusing on the salience of emotions as well as the interrelationships between men, women, religion and space in their work. By giving prominence to the role of emotions, geographers may be able to contribute to clearer understandings of the ways in which religion provides people with a sense of comfort, purpose and fulfilment during their everyday lives, as well as the ways in which religion facilitates emotions of hate, distrust and anger. As well as exploring emotional geographies of religious experiences and places, different groups of men and women may have complex experiences of religion based on their membership of different socially category groups, including those defined by gender as well as other categories such as class, age, sexuality and disability. Feminist geographers of religion are ideally

placed to discover the rich experiences and accounts of different groups of men and women, of various religious affiliations and connections in different places and times.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to Linda Woodhead and Elizabeth Olson for their feedback on an earlier draft of this article. Referees reports by Lily Kong and Jeanne Kay Guelke, as well insightful editorial guidance from Lawrence Berg, were particularly useful in helping me to improve the overall argument of this paper.

References

Cara Aitchison, Peter E Hopkins, and Mei-Po Kwan (eds.) 2007. *Geographies of Muslim Identities: Diaspora, Gender and Belonging*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Anderson, Kay and Susan Smith, 2001. Editorial: Emotional geographies. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 26. 7-10.

Berg, Lawrence and Robyn Longhurst. 2003. Placing masculinities and geography. *Gender, Place and Culture* 10(4), 35-160.

Bondi, Liz, 1998. Gender, Class and Urban Space: Public and Private Space in Contemporary Urban Landscapes. *Urban Geography* 19(3), 160-185.

Bondi, Liz and Mona Domosh. 2003. Gender, place and culture ten years on. *Gender, Place and Culture* 10(1), 3-4.

Brace, Catherine, Adrian R. Bailey and David C. Harvey. 2006. Religion, place and space: A framework for investigating historical geographies of religious identities and communities. *Progress in Human Geography* 30(1), 28-43.

Brown, Michael and Lynn Staeheli. 2003. 'Are we there yet?' Feminist political geographies. *Gender, Place and Culture* 10(3), 247-255.

Butler, Judith, 1990. *Gender Trouble*. London: Routledge.

Butz, David and Lawrence D. Berg. 2002. Paradoxical space: geography, men and duppy feminism. In, Pamela Moss (ed) *Feminist Geography in Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp 89-102.

Davidson, Joyce, Bondi, Liz, and Smith, Mick Smith (eds). 2005. *Emotional Geographies* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Davidson, Joyce, and Milligan, Christine, 2004. Embodying emotion sensing space: introducing emotional geographies. *Social and Cultural Geography* 5(4), 521-532.

Dwyer, Claire, 2000. Negotiating diasporic identities: young British South Asian Muslim women. *Women's Studies International Forum* 23(4), 475-486.

Dunn, Kevin M. 2005. Repetitive and troubling discourses of nationalism in the local politics of mosque development in Sydney, Australia. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 23(1), 29-50

England, Kim, 1994. Getting personal: reflexivity, positionality and feminist research. *Professional Geographer* 46, 80-89.

Falah Ghazi-Walid, 2005 The visual representation of Muslim/Arab women in daily newspapers in the United States. In, Ghazi-Walid Falah and Caroline Nagel, (eds) *Geographies of Muslim women: gender, religion, and space*. New York: the Guildford Press, pp. 300-320.

Graham, Brian and Murray, Michael, 1997 The spiritual and the profane: The pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela. *Ecumeme* 4, 389-409.

Hopkins, Peter E. 2004. Young Muslim men in Scotland: Inclusions and exclusions. Children's Geographies 2(2), 257-272.

Hopkins, Peter E. 2006. Youthful Muslim masculinities: Gender and generational relations. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 31(3), 337-352.

Hopkins, Peter E. 2007a. Young Muslim men's experiences of local landscapes after 11 September 2001. In, Cara Aitchison, Peter E Hopkins, and Mei-Po Kwan (eds.) *Geographies of Muslim Identities: Diaspora, gender and belonging*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 189-200.

Hopkins, Peter E., 2007b. Global events, national politics, local lives: young Muslim men in Scotland. *Environment and Planning A* 39(5), 1119-1133.

Hopkins, Peter E., 2007c. 'Blue squares', 'proper' Muslims and transnational networks: Narratives of national and religious identities amongst young Muslim men living in Scotland. *Ethnicities* 7(1), 61-81.

Hopkins, Peter E. and Susan J. Smith. 2008. Scaling segregation; Racialising fear. In, RachelPain and Susan J. Smith, *Fear: critical geopolitics and everyday life*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Holloway, Julian and Valins, Oliver, 2002. Editorial: placing religion and spirituality in geography. *Social and Cultural Geography* 3(1), 5-10.

Jacobs, Jane M. and Nash, Catherine, 2003. Too little, too much, cultural feminist geographies. *Gender, Place and Culture* 10(3), 265-279

Jones, John Paul, Heidi Nast and Susan Roberts. 1997. *Thresholds in feminist geography: Difference, methodology, representation*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Kay, Jeanne, 1997. Sweet surrender, but what's the gender? Nature and the body in the writings of nineteenth-century Mormon women. In, John Paul, Heidi Nast and Susan Roberts *Thresholds in feminist geography: difference, methodology, representation*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield. 361-382.

Kobayashi, Audrey. 1994. Coloring the Field: Gender, "race," and the politics of fieldwork. *Professional Geographer* 46(1), 73-80.

Kobayashi, Audrey. 2003. GPC ten years on: Is self-reflexivity enough? *Gender, Place and Culture* 10(4), 345-349.

Kong, Lily, 1990. Geography and Religion: Trends and Prospects. *Progress in Human Geography* 14(3), 355 - 371.

Kong, Lily. 2001. Mapping 'new' geographies of religion: Politics and poetics in modernity. *Progress in Human Geography* 25(2), 211-233.

Laurie, Nina, Claire Dwyer, Sarah Holloway and Fiona Smith. 1999. Introduction: Geographies and new femininities. *Geographies of New Femininities*. London: Longman, pp. 1-15.

Longhurst, Robyn. 2000. Geography and gender: Masculinities, male identity and men. *Progress in Human Geography* 24(3), 439-444.

Mac an Ghaill, Mairtin. 1994 *The Making of Men: Masculinities, Sexualities and Schooling*. Open University Press: Buckingham.

McDowell, Linda, 2003. Redundant Masculinities? Employment change and white working class youth. Blackwell Publishing: Oxford.

Mohammad, Robina, 1999. Marginalisation, Islamism and the production of the 'other's' 'other.' *Gender, Place and Culture* 6(3), 221-240.

Mohammad, Robina, 2001. 'Insiders' and/or 'Outsiders': Positionality, theory and praxis. In, Melanie Limb and Claire Dwyer, (eds) *Qualitative Methodologies for Geographers: Issues and Debates*. London: Arnold, pp. 101-120.

Morin, Karen and Guelke, Jeanne Kay, (eds) 2007. *Women, Religion and Space: global perspectives on faith and gender*. New York: Syracuse University Press.

Nagel, Caroline and Falah Ghazi-Walid (eds). 2005. *Geographies of Muslim women: Gender, religion, and space*. New York: The Guildford Press.

Nast, Heidi, 1994. Women in the Field: Critical feminist methodologies and theoretical perspectives. *Professional Geographer* 46(1), 54-66.

Nelson, Lisa and Seager, Joni (eds). 2005. *A companion to Feminist Geography*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Olson, Elizabeth and Rachel Silvey. 2006. Guest Editorial: Transnational geographies: Rescaling gender, development and religion. *Environment and Planning A* 38(5), 805-808.

Pain, Rachel. 2001. Gender, race, age and fear in the city. *Urban Studies* 38(5-6), 899-913.

Peach, Ceri. 2002. Social Geography: New religion and ethnoburbs - contrasts with cultural geography. *Progress in Human Geography* 26(2), 252-260.

Rose, Gillian. 1993. Feminism and geography: The limits of geographical knowledge. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Rose, Gillian. 1997. Situating knowledge: Positionality, reflexivities and other tactics. *Progress in Human Geography* 21(3), 305-320.

Samatar, Abdi Ismail. 2005. Social transformation and Islamic reinterpretation in northern Somalia: The women's mosque in Gabiley. In, Ghazi-Walid Falah and Caroline Nagel (eds) *Geographies of Muslim women: Gender, religion, and space*. New York: the Guildford Press, pp. 226-248.

Sharp, Joanne, Kath Browne and Deborah Thien. 2004. *Geography and Gender Reconsidered*. Royal Geographical Society – Institute of British Geographers: Women and Geography Study Group.

Silvey, Rachel, 2005. Transnational Islam: Indonesian migrant domestic workers in Saudi Arabia. In, Ghazi-Walid Falah and Caroline Nagel (eds) *Geographies of Muslim women: Gender, religion, and space*. New York: The Guildford Press, pp. 127-146.

Staeheli, Lynn A. 1996. Publicity, privacy and women's political action. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 14(5), 601-619.

Vanderback, Robert. 2005. Masculinities and fieldwork: Widening the discussion. *Gender, Place and Culture* 12(4), 387-402.

Watson, Sophie. 2005. Symbolic spaces of difference: Contesting the eruv in Barnet, London and Tenafly, New Jersey. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 23(4), 597-613.

Willis, Katie. 2005. Latin American urban masculinities: Going beyond 'the macho. In, Bettina van Hoven and Kathrin Horschelmann (eds.) *Spaces of Masculinities*. London: Routledge, pp. 97-109.

Woodhead, Linda. 2007. Gender difference in religious practices and significance. In, James Beckford and N.J.Demerath III (eds.) *Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*. London: Sage, pp.550-570.