

The publication of the European Journal of Geography (EJG) is based on the European Association of Geographers' goal to make European Geography a worldwide reference and standard. Thus, the scope of the EJG is to publish original and innovative papers that will substantially improve, in a theoretical, conceptual, or empirical way the quality of research, learning, teaching, and applying geography, as well as in promoting the significance of geography as a discipline. Submissions are encouraged to have a European dimension. The European Journal of Geography is a peer-reviewed open access journal and is published quarterly.

Received: 24/04/2024

Revised: 09/07/2024

Accepted: 14/07/2024

Published: 15/07/2024

Academic Editor:

Dr. Alexandros Bartzokas-Tsiompras

DOI: 10.48088/ejg.a.bot.15.2.147.153

ISSN: 1792-1341



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Licensee European Association of Geographers (EUROGEO). This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license.



## 1. Introduction

The term "geographicity" adverts to historicity, whose origin stems from a philosophical tradition illustrated by ontologists, hermeneutics, and existentialists such as Heidegger, Jaspers, or Kierkegaard. This concept alludes to the historical quality of humanity, which, complemented with geographicity, corresponds to the two categories of human space-time reality. Eric Dardel, a geographer influenced by philosophers of historicity, used these theoretical orientations to conceptualize the spatial aspect of reality through the term geographicity from a humanistic geography perspective. Geographicity, according to Dardel (2022), is the existential link of the human being with the earth, meaning the spatial experience given by the subjective apprehension of the objective world. The term is key in humanistic geography and, consequently, in this work.

Despite its relative neglect and devaluation in the field of geography and social sciences, Dardel's definition remains fertile, with possibilities for further development. For that reason, this work intends to establish a deepening of the concept of geographicity from a social construct perspective so that the theoretical and epistemological foundations expand the original conceptions of Dardel and other later geographers. This is done through a proposal of a relationship between humanistic geography with phenomenology and the sociology of knowledge. The aim is to revalue the concept in the debate of the social sciences by connecting geographical categories as forms of social construction of reality, considering the geographical-spatial together with the historical-temporal as social constructs.

France, in the context in mid-twentieth century that Eric Dardel faced was one where the model or paradigm of the new geography or neopositivist geography prevailed, based on the models and geometry of geographical space, far from the subjective and sensitive perspective that this author traced in his work on the relations between man and the Earth. However, it is not necessary to delve into Eric Dardel's work but to consider him as an heir in the humanistic tradition of geography to the term geographicity, as the origin of a need to humanize science, which was dominantly positivist at the time.

In addition to Dardel's contributions, there are other works that have also set a precedent in the field of geographicity, such as André Meynier's (1969) "Histoire de la pensée géographique en France", Paul Claval's (1994) "An Historical Geography of France", and the works of Marie-Claire Robic and Philippe Pinchemel on the history of geography in France (Robic, 2022; Pinchemel et al., 1984). However, this article, although revisiting some precedents, aims to develop a theoretical-epistemological review based on key concepts and diverse analytical categories, stemming from phenomenology, the sociology of knowledge, and humanistic geography, which constitute the components of a geographicity seen as a social construct.

In the first section, the defining theoretical currents for the development of this theoretical-epistemological review are established, fundamentally acquired from geographical, philosophical, and sociological currents. In this sense, allusion is made to phenomenology as a method that emerged in philosophy, from the Husserlian perspective, to then arrive at the narrowing of the applied method in the social world, through the

## Review Article

# Social construction of geographicity: A vision from humanistic geography

Adrian Botello-Mares <sup>1</sup>✉

<sup>1</sup> El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, Mexico

✉ Correspondence: [abotello@colef.mx](mailto:abotello@colef.mx)

**Abstract:** Society is a human construct in a continuous historical process, hence, also geographical. The Social is always composed of a temporal and spatial dimension and, therefore, necessarily endowed with historicity and geographicity. According to Dardel (2022), geographicity is the existential connection of the human being with the earth, that is, the spatial experience obtained by the subjective apprehension of the objective world. This article aims to establish a reevaluation of the concept of geographicity in the social sciences debate, discerning it as a social construct by considering theoretical foundations from humanistic geography, phenomenology, and the sociology of knowledge, linked as a proposal for an epistemological alternative in the field of theoretical geography itself. The concepts of space, landscape, place, perception of space, material space, conceived space, and lived space are the key concepts that interlace the dialectical relationship between the objective and subjective manifestations of reality, as a way of socially constructing geography. The result is, therefore, the evident epistemic fertility of humanistic geography, presented in this work through the theoretical review regarding a social construction of geographicity.

**Keywords:** Geographical theory, geographicity, objective and subjective reality, phenomenology, sociology of knowledge, humanistic geography

## Highlights:

- Geographicity integrates human experience with earth's spatial dimensions.
- Phenomenology enriches geographic study by examining subjective space.
- Social construction of geographicity blends objective space with subjective perception.

phenomenological reduction of Alfred Schutz and establishing a deepening from the sociology of knowledge, particularly considering the contributions of the work of Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, through their contribution to the social construction of objective and subjective reality. In the second section, we consider the approach that geography has taken with phenomenology, from its beginnings to its development in the so-called humanistic geography. This aims to open the disciplinary debate that can lead to significant theoretical development within geography itself, particularly in humanistic geography. The third section focuses on the concept of geographicity, analyzing key concepts and categories such as space, landscape, and place. It also considers the subjective factor of perception, which has its own field of study in geography and is a central focus of humanistic geography, especially concerning lived or experienced space. Additionally, we delve into theoretical contributions from critical geography, such as Lefebvrian space's social production or Soja's trialectics of spatiality. In the final section, we connect the ideas explored in the previous sections as a theoretical-epistemological integration, founded on interdisciplinary fertility within the field of humanistic geography.

## 2. Phenomenology and the social construction of reality

The phenomenological method originates from the German philosopher Edmund Husserl as a reaction against psychologism, which limited all truth to the psychological processes of the subject. Husserl argued that there is a need to go to the essence (Ardiles, 1977). For Husserl, phenomenology consists of "describing the present essential structures and their manifestations in the intentional field of consciousness" (Husserl, 2012). This intentionality of consciousness always refers to a given world; therefore, phenomenology analyzes the structures of the given as they are, stripping itself of any a priori assumptions (Ardiles, 1977), inquiring into what the factual sciences take for granted, and considering the subjective as an epistemological end.

Ritzer (2020), in his effort to translate Husserl's philosophy into sociological concepts, speaks of a scientific phenomenology in the author, which implies the commitment to penetrate the strata constructed by actors in the social world to reach the essential structure of consciousness. Husserl conceives phenomenology as a science that is not concerned with existence, but with essence, especially the essence of consciousness. He mentions that, for Husserl, consciousness is not a thing or place, but a process, which is not found in the actor's head, but in the relationship between the actor and the objects of the world.

Husserl had a decisive influence on later phenomenologists, such as Martin Heidegger and Alfred Schutz. Husserl (in Ritzer, 2020) rejects the tools of modern social science for research (such as standardized or statistical methods), dedicating himself to a scientific phenomenology that analyzes and describes all social phenomena as they are experienced by human beings.

Alfred Schutz, in his attempt to concretize the ideas of Husserl's phenomenology, proposes a phenomenology of the social world, already focused on a concrete object of knowledge, that is, the social. Schutz refers to this task as a "phenomenological reduction," the purpose of which is to analyze the phenomenon of meaning in ordinary social life, i.e., to make a science of essence, in particular of a society composed of living minds (Schutz, 1972).

Schutz (1972) then proceeds to study the social world, accepting its existence both in everyday life, or the world of life, and in sociological observation, or the world of science. Therefore, he dedicates himself to studying the human being born in a social world.

The basis of Schutz's work consists in his definition of intersubjectivity, which exists in the lived present since we share the same time and space with others. According to Schutz (1972), this simultaneity is the essence of intersubjectivity, which means that we grasp the subjectivity of the alter ego (the other, the others) at the same time that we live in our own stream of consciousness. Schutz was not interested in the physical interaction of people, but in the way in which their consciousnesses understood each other, that is, the way in which they relate intersubjectively to each other (Ritzer, 2020).

Based on Schutz's ideas, along with the most influential sociological schools of thought, Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann provide a new field of knowledge within the social sciences, specifically in the sociology of knowledge: the social construction of reality.

It can be said that these authors emerge from a basic question: How is it possible for subjective meanings to become objective facticities? Their interest is focused on the fact that the adequate appreciation of the "sui generis reality" of society requires inquiry into the way in which this reality is constructed.

Methodologically, Berger and Luckmann ground their contributions in phenomenological analysis. However, this task is carried out from a pre-sociological exercise, whose purpose is for the method to serve as a starting point for sociological analysis. Sociology must develop in permanent dialogue with history and philosophy, and if this doesn't happen, it loses its own object of study. This object is society as part of the human world, made by men, inhabited by men, and which, simultaneously, forms men in a continuous historical process (Berger and Luckmann, 1991). This perspective opens up the connection between the social and its historicity; from now on, I will also consider it in terms of its geographicity.

The phenomenological task is to describe the reality of common sense, everyday life, or the world of life, as Schutz said, taking into account its presuppositional character. In this sense, it is imperative to return to Husserl's proposal of the analysis of consciousness and, in terms of geographicity, to a geographical awareness, a recognition of space that manifests in the consciousness of those who live it.

The position of Berger and Luckmann (1991) is in the same original line of thought as Husserl's, as they mention that consciousness is always intentional and object-directed, whether the object of consciousness is experienced as part of an external physical world, such as space or place, or as an element of an inner subjective reality. For example, they mention that if one contemplates a city's panorama or becomes aware of an inner anguish, in both cases, the processes of consciousness are intentional.

In agreement with Schutz, these authors consider the reality of everyday life as an intersubjective world, a world shared between signifiers and signifieds. In this sense, the spatial structure has a social dimension according to the fact that the zone of manipulation of some intersects with that of others (Berger and Luckmann, 1991).

Considering this theoretical background in phenomenology, we begin with the analysis of the social construction of reality, starting from the conjunction of objective reality with subjective reality, as indicated in the following sections.

### 2.1. Objective reality

Human existence develops empirically in a context of discipline, direction, and stability, which arises because the human being relates not only to a specific natural environment but also to a cultural and social order preceded and mediated by other signifiers in charge of it (Berger and Luckmann, 1991). In this social and cultural order, externalized geographical space is found as a dimension of objective reality.

Another dimension is institutionalization, which is experienced as an objective reality since, like the social and cultural order, it has a history that precedes the individual. This history, as a tradition of existing institutions, has the character of objectivity. This objectivity of the institutional world is a human product and construct (Berger & Luckmann, 1991).

Berger and Luckmann (1991) call objectification the process by which the externalized products of human activity attain the character of objectivity. Therefore, the institutional world is objectified human activity. Objectivity characterizes the social world in human experience. Man, as the producer, and the social world, as his product, interact, the product acts on the producer and vice versa.

Externalization and objectification constitute a continuous dialectical process. It is precisely this internalization that involves subjective reality, which is addressed below.

## 2.2. Subjective reality

As mentioned before, internalization completes the dialectical process of the relationship between objective reality and subjective reality. Internalization is understood as the apprehension or interpretation of an objective event as it expresses meaning (Berger & Luckmann, 1991). The process of the social construction of the reality of the experienced space could not be understood without this process. According to Berger and Luckmann (1991), this process takes place through socialization, which can be defined as the broad and coherent induction of an individual into the objective world of a society. Socialization always occurs in the context of a specific social structure, historical and geographical, with a macro-sociological background.

Objective reality, which has to be internalized, also produces an identity that fully represents this objective reality. In other words, people are what they are supposed to be. Everyone knows who each person is and who the others are. Identity and the world are socially defined and subjectively assumed (Berger & Luckmann, 1991).

In summary, these sections on objective and subjective reality are crucial in defining geographicity as a social construct. Building upon this foundation, the theoretical contributions from the relationship between phenomenology and geography in the field of humanistic geography are then reviewed, along with geographicity as a central epistemic concept.

## 3. Phenomenology and geography

In this section, the relationship between phenomenology and geography is contemplated, with the intention of framing the analyzed criteria of this field of thought and the social construction of reality in geographical space. It is important to mention that theoretical phenomenology is being considered, as it is the field that historically has contributed with geography, specifically humanistic geography. On the other hand, there has not been a previous systematic approach to integrating geography and the sociology of knowledge, highlighting the importance of the phenomenological perspective in this work.

However, the term "phenomenology" is not yet completely familiar in geography (Sukhorukov & Gladkiy, 2019), although this line of thought has been immersed in this science for more than half a century, as evidenced by Eric Dardel's work "L'homme et la terre" from 1952, where he establishes the need for a geography dedicated to an essential perspective, taking the phenomenological method as its foundation.

Dardel (2022) claimed a determinant differentiation between geographical space and geometric space, since geometry operates on an abstract space, empty of all available content, while geographical space has a horizon, a modeling, a color, and a density that limit and resist. Therefore, an ontology of human spatiality should be called geography, and a formal ontology of spatial objects should be called geometry. Geography, according to Dardel, must have the role of a science of essences.

For Edward Relph (1970), phenomenology comprises the phenomena of experience, which forms the basis of the formal body of knowledge of geography. Additionally, García Ballesteros (1998) states that phenomenology has become the necessary theoretical basis for a geography concerned with places and everyday life, to study the intentionality of human action and to understand the social meaning of the lived world, emphasizing the social construction of places. Phenomenology assumes that subjective experience is a source of knowledge and therefore socio-spatial reality is studied from the perspective of the people who act within it.

### 3.1. Humanistic Geography

As mentioned, the specific field of humanistic geography is the reference point where the connection between phenomenology and geography is highlighted. In this sense, the intention of this section is to clarify the definition and relevance of this disciplinary realm in the context of human and social geography.

In a general overview, Ortega Valcárcel (2000) says that the modern geographical tradition is characterized by the dichotomy between physical geography, rooted in the culture of the natural sciences since the Enlightenment, and human geography, which aims to integrate the physical and the human. Human geography identifies a new geography, a modern geography.

However, Ortega (2000) himself mentions that human geography is a generic, classificatory term that encompasses various geographical branches whose object is social phenomena (such as historical, political, economic, urban, rural, or cultural geography). With this in mind, he suggests social geography as an epistemological alternative. He mentions that this has an alternative scope to human geography, as it is another human geography transformed into social geography, proposing to reorient human geography as a whole. These epistemological alternative positions social geography as a social science.

The character of a social science arises from a double requirement: that imposed by the nature of the social space that geography studies, and that which derives from the object of a modern discipline capable of answering the needs of contemporary society. Therefore, geography emerges as a social discipline oriented to the analysis and, where appropriate, the solution of spatial problems that have social relevance (Ortega, 2000).

Humanistic geography is an aspect of this social geography. This field is the expression of currents coming from the humanities, which has been developing its own content, based fundamentally on the philosophical assumptions of phenomenology and some existentialist contributions applied to the study of geography as a social science (García Ballesteros, 1998).

For Yi Fu Tuan (1990), humanistic geography is a recent area of study within geography, dedicated to the complexity of the relationships between people and places as forms of signification, that is, as social constructs. On the other hand, Gómez Rojas (1999) adds that, with the advent

of humanistic geography, the problem of scale in geography in social terms arises, expressed in the dichotomy between the objectivity of geographical space and the subjectivity of place; therefore, the logic of a social construction from a geographical perspective becomes understandable.

Regarding the theoretical-methodological contribution of humanistic geography, Gómez Rojas (1999) mentions that this field has generated an epistemological framework in which human consciousness gives meaning to geographical space, in accordance with the phenomenological postulates of geographicity, that is, with the conscious manifestation of the space that is experienced.

In summary, the relationship between humanistic geography and phenomenology is inseparable, since the concepts and categories of analysis proposed by the former are largely supported by the latter, and simultaneously constitute its object of study. In the following sub-topics, these concepts and categories are reviewed.

#### 4. The concept of geographicity

The contribution from the theoretical approaches reviewed favors the insertion of the concept of geographicity as a necessary construct for the explanation of the dialectical relations between objective and subjective reality. As mentioned before, society is a human construct in a continuous historical process and, therefore, also geographical. The social is always composed of a temporal and spatial construction and, therefore, necessarily endowed with historicity and geographicity.

The term "geographicity" from a humanistic geography perspective was introduced by Eric Dardel, according to Alicia Lindón (2007). In this sense, Dardel's (2022) concept of geographicity stands out: "(...) Knowing the unknown, reaching the inaccessible, geographical restlessness precedes and leads to objective science. Love of the native soil or investigation of uprootedness, a concrete relationship is established between man and the earth, a geographicity of man as a mode of his existence and his destiny."

Robic (2022) highlights that the notion of geographicity alludes to that of historicity, drawn from a philosophical tradition illustrated by Heidegger, Jaspers, or Kierkegaard, fostering a geographical phenomenology, or a phenomenological geography, which in Dardel is manifested when exploring the dimensions of geographical knowledge as it turns towards the interpretation of the original presence of the subject in space, as it would be in time or in the historical moment in historicity.

In this sense, Lindón (2007) adds that geographicity refers to the existential relationship between the human being and the land he inhabits; it is the relationship between the external material world and the internal world of the subject. In the subjective apprehension of the world, the sensory aspect stands out, which is why, for Dardel (2022), geographicity is the spatial experience.

According to Relph (1970), the phenomenological bases of geographical reality consist of three pillars: space, landscape, and place, as they are directly experienced as attributes of the lived world. He calls the relationships between these three components "geographicity," influenced by Eric Dardel's phenomenological geography. Geographicity is a term that encompasses all the responses and experiences we have of the environments in which we live. This geographicity then becomes the center of importance in the phenomenological study of space.

##### 4.1. Space, landscape, and place

Defining the object of study of a geographical dimension implies the need to distinguish between the conceptions of space, landscape, and place as the foundations of geographicity. To make such a distinction, this sub-topic sets out the definition of each of them. First, the concept of "space" will be addressed, followed by "landscape," and finally "place," all of which are decisive for the object of study of this work.<sup>1</sup>

Regarding the definition of space, Milton Santos (2021) refers to it as a social instance, which he says is a "social fact," in Durkheimian terms, imposed on all individuals in society. It is both conditioning and conditioned, determining and determined by other social structures. Thus, space is, as a social structure, a social entity, the space organized by man.

In agreement with Santos' position, Ortega Valcárcel (2000) mentions that space is indeed a social dimension, with which geography is closely related, so that we can speak concretely of geographical space. This geographical space represents a specific construction of this social dimension, properly understood as the object of geography. However, this construction varies according to the theoretical and conceptual approach of geography itself.

For Relph (1970), space, seen from a phenomenological perspective, is not an empty space but possesses qualities and meanings. Therefore, this space is not Euclidean or geometric, as Dardel had already clarified. Space is a lived space.

On the other hand, according to Ortega Valcárcel (2000), the term landscape responds to a perception and is identified with appearance and aspect. It is the image presented by the space in a determinate area that, as such, allows it to be distinguished and individualized. He conceives it as a totality that combines physical and human elements in a given historical trajectory. Relph (1970) argues that the term "landscape" is involved in semi-precise meanings since, in experience, a landscape can represent many meanings as it is essentially an individualization, and therefore a relativization that is not entirely precise.

For its part, the term "place" has another connotation; it's even a key concept in the explanation of the so-called humanistic geography. This term, says Relph (1970), focuses space and landscape on human experiences. Furthermore, Ortega Valcárcel (2000) mentions that the place is unique and complex, as it constitutes a spatial ensemble endowed with history and meaning.

Cresswell (2008) establishes necessary differences between space and place, referring to the fact that space is in motion, and place is paused, that is, as a memory endowed with meanings. He also argues that place is where humans give meaning to space, that is, as a social space. Cresswell (2008) also mentioned that place is a concept that expresses a vision of the world, emphasizing subjectivity and experience, meaning that through perception and experience, one can know the world.

Together, these three concepts constitute the necessary categories of geographicity, all as part of a construct of meanings that allow us to highlight that spatial experience mentioned by Dardel, that geographicity. Space, rather than geometric, is understood as social and experienced; place serves as the foundation for meanings in spatial relationships; and landscape acts as a mental representation of experienced space. As a

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be clarified that the concept of territory is not considered here, as it evokes a state-centric and/or power-oriented perspective from classical political geography (Benedetti, 2011). According to David Delaney (2005), the verbalization of the term in this perspective serves grammatically as a noun or as a verb to territorialize.

social construct, geographicity is understood here dialectically through the subject knower - object known relationship. However, later on, it will also be explained trialectically when considering non-social space, that is, geometric and material space.

#### 4.2. Perception of space

The concept of perception, applied in geography, has had a significant impact specifically in humanistic geography. In the context of geographicity, perception is relevant as it is a product of the subject through its signification, according to the experience with space, landscape, and place. This section describes the importance of perception in spatial study, starting from defining perception per se, and then linking it to the discipline of the geography of perception.

In an abstract definition, perception comes from the rationalist distinction of the mind with Descartes and its empirical precision with Hume, where the percept is the effect of the organized senses, and the concept is the naming of those effects. The sum of these two makes up perception, which then consists of knowing through the senses and interpreting them subjectively.

According to Yi-Fu Tuan (1990), perception is both the response to external stimuli and the proposed activity, in which certain phenomena are clearly recorded consistently, while others disappear. Perception has biological, survival, and cultural value, in the sense of personality and identity. On the other hand, Maurice Merleau-Ponty (2017) writes that all perception presupposes a certain past of the perceiving subject, and the abstract function of perception, as a reunion of objects, implies an act by which we elaborate our environment.

From the phenomenological point of view, Martin Heidegger (2022) says that apprehension directed to perceiving becomes accessible to perception as it is, thanks to this method, so that is possible to give oneself a perception of the thing as it is.

Regarding the perception of space, specifically, Merleau-Ponty (2017) says that it is the knowledge that a subject could have of the spatial relations between objects. However, the problem of this perception lies in asking how, in an express act, we can determine spatial relations and objects with their properties.

In the mid-20th century, an area called the geography of perception was developed for the study of perception from a geographical perspective. According to Ortega Valcárcel (2000), this geography relates perception and spatial behavior in such a way that spatial configurations appear conditioned by the knowledge the subject has of the environment in which they act.

For Gómez Rojas (1999), the geography of perception emerges as one of the multiple responses given to the relationship between humans and nature. It originally had a positivist approach, but through time had evolved to a humanist orientation, in which the subjectivity of the individual is accepted as a way to understand the behavior they assume with respect to the surrounding environment.

For Relph (1970), the object of study of the geography of perception, based on phenomenology, is described by the following:

- To observe a geographical phenomenon of experience, and to describe what is experienced.
- Describe the phenomenon, putting yourself in the shoes of those who are experiencing it.
- Make use of as many sources as possible.
- Seek consistency and structure in the meanings of the phenomenon.
- Starting from the identification and interpretation of the structures of the geographical experience, examine where these structures originate, how they develop, and undergo transformations, trying to place them in a broader context of origin.

Gómez Rojas (1999) adds that, in general terms, the starting point of all theories on geographical perception indicates that between the real object and the subject who perceives it, there is no direct understanding. Instead, the object is filtered by human perception, leaving a mental image of the object around which the individual decides their behavior. This is, a relationship between the signified and the signifier.

In this sense, it is essential to know the elements that make up perception and analyze them as a system of interaction since personal experiences lead to a unique universe that, however, also includes collective or shared elements, such as the residence, the neighborhood, the city, recreational spaces, etc. Therefore, it is possible for a group to share a subjective reality because these elements promote an interpretation of the same phenomenon (Urtalejo, 2011).

#### 4.3. Lived space

The connection between phenomenology and geography, within the framework of humanistic geography, reaches its definitive clarification with the recognition of existential space, the lived space. It is precisely from phenomenological analysis that this form of geographical study arises and its object of knowledge is supported. In this regard, Husserl identified two components of the lived world: the first, a predetermined or natural world of things, akin to what Berger and Luckmann mention as objective reality; the second, a lived social or cultural world that comprises human beings and their actions, similar to the concept of subjective reality (Husserl in Relph, 1970). The lived world is, therefore, the world experienced as a stage, both natural and man-made (Relph, 1970).

From the perspective of Merleau-Ponty (2017), focused on space, he says that it is existential and externalized to the point that one can speak of a world of meanings and the objects of thought that are constituted in them. In this way, Husserl's idea of the lived world is followed and applied to space, a task that will also continue to integrate the perspective of the social construction of reality.

As a concept and category of analysis in geography, the term "lived space" was proposed by Armand Frémont in 1976 to highlight the subjective relationship that humans establish with their space (Urtalejo, 2011). From this perspective, Henri Lefebvre (in Urtalejo, 2011) approaches the concept of space empirically, arguing that lived space involves representations composed of images, (non-verbal) symbols, and the experience of its inhabitants when living the previous elements.

On the other hand, Ortega Valcárcel (2000), in a more rationalist approach, understands lived space as the space connected to the existence of each individual, to their own experiences, to their particular relationship with the environment, and to the perception they have of it.

#### 4.4. Social production of space and the trialectics of geographicity

In this section, some ideas of Marxist theory are presented, linked to the categories of analysis typical of humanistic geography, from the point of view of geographicity. This is done through the connection of Henri Lefebvre's proposals on the social production of space with the contributions and theoretical adaptations of Edward Soja on the trialectics of spatiality and their relationship with my proposal of geographicity.

According to Lefebvre (1991), the social production of space is seen as a constant process, deepening the eminently social spatial category. The theoretical construction of this proposal is based Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. on the principles of historical and dialectical materialism, primarily derived from the works of Marx and Engels, from which the key idea of the production of space is derived. Concepts such as relations of production, productive forces, social relations of production, mode of production, and superstructures, among others, are essential to understanding this idea.

The relations of production fundamentally comprise product, production, and labor, which are constituted in social practice through the social relations of production, creating works and producing things. The city is not a work of art; it is a product where space is represented and space represents (Lefebvre, 1991).

For Lefebvre (1991), social space is produced and reproduced in contact with the productive forces and the relations of production. Social space contains both natural and social objects, which are also relations, that is, social relations and more precisely, relations of the production of space. He mentions that space is produced through nature, as raw material, and social relations, ultimately resulting from social superstructures, that is, the institutions that support the structure or means of production. The product that is consumed is also a means of production that configures the space and is determined by it. Space-nature, says Lefebvre (1991), is replaced by a space-product. A step is taken to the production of space as such, due to the continuous growth of the productive forces within the framework of relations and modes of production.

A very important contribution to the subject of geographicity is Edward Soja's (1996) proposal for the third space, which arises from the deepening of Lefebvre's work on the social production of space. Starting from the idea of trialectics, Soja mentions that this is an alternative to the Hegelian or Marxian dialectical method, based on the integration of a third, of another, of otherness. It is an approach that is built among other approaches, producing a continuous practice of knowledge production, as an antidote to hyperrelativism and the radical philosophy of "anything goes." It emerges from a spatialized dialectic, where the elements of historicity and geographicity converge to achieve the process of a third possibility through the deconstruction and reconstruction of these elements from otherness.

According to Soja (1996), the bases of this spatial trialectics, as a rereading of Lefebvre's Production of Space, are interrelated from the triad of spatial practice: the perception of material space (*espace perçu*), on the one hand; representations of conceived, conceptualized, planned, or organized space (*espace conçu*), secondly; and, finally, the spaces of representation, or the lived space (*espace vécu*), that is, in a spatial connection as contemplated in this work on geographicity.

In this sense, space is seen as a totality of infinite complexity, similar to Borges's Aleph, Soja mentions, which, in relation to Lefebvre's concept of the production of space, detonates the spatial scope of knowledge, the geographical element in its maximum expression (geographicity). This composition, Soja defines as the third space, where all places are able to be seen from all angles, which is common to all but has never been able to be seen and fully understood; it's a complexity that integrates subjectivity and objectivity, the abstract and the concrete, the real and the imagined, the repetitive and the differential, consciousness and unconsciousness (Soja, 1996).

## 5. Results and discussion: the social construction of geographicity

The integration of the theoretical and conceptual foundations reviewed in this work demonstrates epistemic fertility in the field of humanistic geography, as well as the possibilities for theoretical connection in the social sciences, as proposed here from the perspective of a social construction of geographicity.

The approach from humanistic geography, based on phenomenology and complemented by the sociology of knowledge, shapes the epistemological perspective of this work. Space, landscape, place, the perception of space, and lived space are presented as the categories of analysis that establish the dialectical relationship of the objective and subjective manifestations of reality, as signifiers and signifieds, as producers and products of this inseparable relationship in the social construction of a geographicity.

With the concept of geographicity, we have an epistemic field that successfully links with the social construction of historical and spatial reality in a dialectical continuum between an externalized world and a subjectively internalized reality. The subjective perception of space, the landscape, and the experienced place represent the components of an internalization apprehended through an objective event as it expresses meaning, namely, the geographic context preceded in time but experienced in an unfinished manner in a constant present. Thus, a social construction of geographicity occurs, necessarily in a dialectical and inherent relationship between subjective reality and objective reality, as well as between historical reality and geographic reality.

Geographicity, seen as a social construct, is added to the humanistic stream of geography, as the necessary theoretical and epistemological frameworks are established to give it its distinctive character. The social construction of geographicity thus implies an area of opportunity for knowledge within this still emerging field of humanistic geography.

The components of geographicity are always present in a social construction: the space as a social instance endowed with meanings; the landscape as individual perceptions of meanings in specific moments; the place as a subjective expression of the space perceived and lived; and, finally, the material, the conceived, and the lived space as a production and reproduction of the social life. These components, understood as a geographicity in perspective, endow merely the spatial character of the space-time duality in a process of social construction.

## 6. Conclusions

The theoretical-epistemological approach of a social construction of geographicity involves a proposal for the reevaluation of theoretical geography, more specifically within the realm of humanistic geography, as a seed that can germinate into another analytical perspective within the social sciences.

To this day, humanistic geography is a discipline that has not achieved the same level of production and development compared to other fields of human and social geography, such as critical or radical geography. In this sense, this deficiency implies more of an advantage than a disadvantage, due to the possibility of promoting the development of theoretical proposals in geography as important areas of improvement, as proposed in this work.

Radical geographies have the advantage of being referenced to theories that have been in vogue for many years in academia, such as classical Marxism, neo-Marxism, or critical theory, focusing on issues of inequalities and asymmetrical relations in the capitalist system, theories widely exploited both in geography and in many other areas, limited basically to a purely explanatory paradigm.

In contrast, humanistic geography has been relatively marginal because the philosophical currents on which it is based, such as phenomenology, hermeneutics, or existentialism, are often devalued either for being considered impractical or too theoretical by the scientific paradigm,

or for the difficulty in being identified as an alternative with direct social impact, especially in its dimension of political commitment. Additionally, the application area of humanistic geography has the precedent of initially being associated with psychoanalytic and behaviorist currents, widely criticized by the dominant paradigms of contemporary social science, which may have influenced its inability to adequately take off. Nonetheless, it is reiterated that the humanistic foundations of geography have led to an intellectual shift not only in traditional philosophical currents but also with a wide range of epistemic orientations related to the humanities, fostering an important area of opportunity for intellectual dialogue and debate within the social sciences, maintaining active relevance and great fertility from the theoretical perspective of geography.

In conclusion, this work has established a theoretical-epistemological review that has allowed for a dialogue between humanistic geography, phenomenology, and the sociology of knowledge, proposing a concrete perspective to study the complexity of socially constructed geographicity. The possibilities and scope of this approach can be expanded, allowing for continued theorizing, dialogue, and interaction from other humanistic perspectives as well, such as existentialism, phenomenological hermeneutics, poststructuralism, and many other options. There is still much to be written from the perspective of humanistic geography.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

- Ardiles, O. (1977). La descripción fenomenológica. ANUIES.
- Benedetti, A. (2011). Territorio: concepto integrador de la geografía contemporánea. Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1991). The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge. Penguin Books.
- Bertol, L. (2003). Fenomenología, semiótica e geografía da percepcao: Alternativas para analizar o espaço geográfico. *Revista da Casa da Geografia de Sobral*, 4(5), 67-79. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:173921975>
- Claval, P. (1994). An historical geography of France. University of Paris.
- Cresswell, T. (2008). Place: A short introduction. Blackwell Publishing.
- Dardel, E. (2022). Man and the earth: The nature of geographical reality. (E. Relph, Trans. & Rev.). University of Toronto.
- Delaney, D. (2005). Entering the territory of territory. Blackwell Publishing.
- García Ballesteros, A. (1998). Métodos y técnicas cualitativas en geografía social. Oikos-Tau.
- Gómez Rojas, J. C. (2001). La experiencia cultural del espacio: El espacio vivido y el espacio abstracto. Una perspectiva ricoeureana. *Boletín del Instituto de Geografía, UNAM*, 1(44), 119-125. <https://doi.org/10.14350/ig.59139>
- Gómez Rojas, J. C. (2006). Una geografía para la vida: El espacio vivido. In C. Conteras & A. Narváez (Eds.), La experiencia de la ciudad y el trabajo como espacios de vida (pp. 15-43). El Colegio de la Frontera Norte/Plaza y Valdés.
- Harvey, D. (1996). Del espacio al lugar y de regreso. Reino Unido.
- Heidegger, M. (2022). Being and time. Lushena Books.
- Holzer, W. (2001). A geografía fenomenológica de Eric Dardel. EDUERJ.
- Hubbard, P., & Kitchin, R. (2009). Key thinkers on space and place. SAGE.
- Husserl, E. (2012). The idea of phenomenology. Springer Netherlands.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). The production of space. Wiley.
- Lindón, A. (2007). La ciudad y la vida urbana a través de los imaginarios urbanos. *Revista EURE*, 33(99), 7-16.
- Lindón, A., & Hiernaux, D. (2007). Tratado de geografía humana. Antrophos Editorial y UAM Iztapalapa.
- Lynch, K. (1975). The image of the city. M.I.T. Press.
- Meynier, A. (1969). Histoire de la pensée géographique en France (1872-1969). P.U.F.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2017). Phenomenology of perception (Classic Reprint). Fb&c Limited.
- Ortega Valcárcel, J. (2000). Los horizontes de la geografía: Teoría de la geografía. Editorial Ariel.
- Pinchemel, P., Robic, M.-C., & Lichtenberger, H. (1984). Deux siècles de géographie française. Editions du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques.
- Popper, K. R., & Hansen, T. E. (2008). The two fundamental problems of the theory of knowledge. Routledge.
- Relph, E. (1970). An enquiry into the relations between phenomenology and geography. *The Canadian Geographer*, 14(3), 193-201. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0064.1970.tb01567.x>
- Ritzer, G., Stepnisky, J., & Stepnisky, M. J. N. (2020). Classical sociological theory. SAGE Publications.
- Robic, M.-C. (2022). Geograficidad. Hypergeo. <https://www.hypergeo.eu/spip.php?article267>
- Santos, M. (2021). For a new geography. University of Minnesota Press.
- Schutz, A. (1972). The phenomenology of the social world. Northwestern University Press.
- Soja, E. (1996). Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places. Blackwell Publishing.
- Sukhorukov, V., & Gladkiy, Y. N. (2019). Semantic outlines of modern geography. *European Journal of Geography*, 10(3), 24-32. <https://eurogeo-journal.eu/index.php/egj/article/view/198>
- Tuan, Y. (1990). Topophilia: A study of environmental perceptions, attitudes, and values. Columbia University Press.

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of EUROGEO and/or the editor(s). EUROGEO and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.