

A Community of Communities? Similarity and Difference in Welsh Rural Community Studies

GRAHAM DAY

University of Wales, Bangor

Abstract: Work in the community studies tradition has been accused of perpetuating a static, over-integrated conception of community. Recent critics of communitarian thought similarly attack the idea of community for its exclusiveness, and for privileging unity over difference. A review of the classic Welsh rural community studies shows that although much in them supports these claims, they also allow an alternative conception of communities as loosely structured networks lending themselves to subtle distinctions and flexible boundaries. This less repressive version of community is endorsed by recent accounts of the social construction of community in the context of changing rural social relations.

I INTRODUCTION

The work produced by sociologists and anthropologists within the genre of community studies has never been particularly easy to absorb into the mainstream of social theory and analysis. One reason often suggested for this is that the work itself has failed to be sufficiently cumulative (Kent, 1981, p. 37; Crow and Allan, 1994, p. 195); whatever their individual merits, the various studies do not display enough continuity and comparability to allow useful generalisation, of the kind that has been regarded widely as the end goal of the social sciences. Although attempts have been made from time to time to place them within some integrating theoretical framework — for example, Warren (1963) and Stein (1964) in the USA, Frankenberg (1966) in the UK — this has owed more usually to the imposition of some predetermined perspective such as “bureaucratisation” or “modernisation” derived from the outside than to any coherent interpretation generated from within

the studies themselves. Their value has been rather as case studies, to provide relevant illustrations, to suggest possible lines of exploration, and to add some richness of observation to the sociological diet. Consequently there has tended to be a willing endorsement of Ruth Glass's somewhat glib dismissal of the community study as the sociologist's inadequate substitute for the novel (Glass, 1966, p. 148).

When time has been found to pay serious attention to the actual content of community studies, then a pretty consistent and very damaging set of critical points have been made about it, harmful enough to bring about a lengthy period during which they were largely ignored. The recent resurgence of interest in ideas of community (Crow and Allan, 1994), linked in part to the rise of ideas of communitarianism, has brought with it some emphatic restatements of essentially this orthodox critique, which is encapsulated well in Wright's verdict (Wright, 1992, p. 202) that "the representation of community in the studies was ahistorical; it relied on a model of functional equilibrium; and it could not cope with change". This comment is familiar enough not to require much elaboration. Rural community studies in particular have been accused again and again of depicting the community as a well-defined, relatively self-contained entity, small in size, and marked by an inner coherence and structural consistency, that behaves in a system-like way to maintain the status quo and resist external pressures for change (for example, Bell and Newby, 1971; Harper, 1989; Rapport, 1993, pp. 32-33). Similar statements have been made about sociological accounts of small-town communities, such as the classic "Yankee City" studies (Warner *et al.*, 1963) and Stacey's original work on Banbury (Stacey, 1960) and they would also apply, to some degree, to well-known studies of working class communities, mining villages etc. (Young and Wilmott, 1962; Dennis *et al.*, 1969).

It is this image, or ideal, of community which is reproduced, and challenged, in some more recent responses to the growth of communitarian sentiments and practices in Britain and the USA. A recent review notes the fears which have been expressed that *any* movement founded on a concern for community life is liable to "degenerate into some form of Fascist authoritarianism" (Tam, 1998, p. 32), while, in an influential paper, Iris Marion Young has attacked the ideal of community as it is presented in democratic socialist political thought, on the grounds that it "privileges unity over difference, immediacy over mediation, sympathy over recognition of the limits of one's understanding of others from their point of view" (1990, p. 300). Young has the unusual, if not unique, distinction of finding a political position from which it is permissible to be "against" community (pace Williams, 1977, p. 112).

In a more complete expression of her objections, in which we can see clear

echoes of the charges that have been levelled at the community studies literature, she makes the following claims:

Insofar as the ideal of community entails promoting a model of face-to-face relations as best, it devalues and denies difference in the form of temporal and spatial distancing. The ideal of a society consisting of decentralised face-to-face communities is undesirably utopian in several ways. It fails to see that alienation and violence are not only a function of mediation of social relations but also can and do exist in face-to-face relations. ... The ideal of community ... totalises and detemporalises its conception of social life ... It provides no understanding of the move from here to there that would be rooted in an understanding of the contradictions and possibilities of existing society. (Young, 1990, p. 302.)

While Young's analysis is projected forwards, to the future realisation of an ideal, and is therefore addressed to the rhetoric of community rather than to the nature of actually existing communities, nevertheless much of what she says fits closely with arguments that have been attached to sociological representations of the realities of community. They also have been accused of failing to recognise the existence of conflict and division within communities, presenting instead a false impression of consensus and harmony, and therefore have been seen as incapable of providing any explanation for change other than as a result of exogenous contingencies (Gibbon, 1973; Day, 1979).

What Young objects to principally is the *exclusiveness* implied by notions of community. As she puts it, the "desire for unity or wholeness in discourse generates borders, dichotomies, and exclusions" (Young, 1990, p. 301) which can lead to a forced homogeneity. Thus the attempt to embody the discourse of community in feminist and radical political organisations is seen as bringing about unwanted exclusions, since any definition of what members have in common necessarily implies some form of closure against "outsiders". Young advocates instead a politics of *difference*, a vision of "inexhaustible heterogeneity" and "irreducible particularity" of the kind which she considers can be experienced between strangers in the life of the city. This contrast is replicated elsewhere, more bluntly, in the assertion that "community is about closed systems and reified relations, and city, about openness and change. This difference is predicated upon different life-worlds and modes of appropriating space". (McBeath and Webb, 1997, p. 249.)

There is no question but that Young identifies correctly some of the possible dangers associated with ideas of community. In particular she notes the affinity between this type of understanding of community, and "the desire for identification that underlies racial and ethnic chauvinism" (Young, 1990, p. 312), and hence the probability that in the context of a racist and

chauvinistic society, appeals to community may be used to validate such impulses. However, Young's argument is flawed by her readiness to attribute a single meaning to the term community, as if there was only one way in which it could be interpreted. Even within the limited sphere of social democratic thought, this is an unlikely proposition. Furthermore, there runs through her discussion the sort of confusion between normative and factual claims about community that has constantly bedevilled the use of the term in sociology, despite the efforts of writers like Bell and Newby (1976) to distinguish our knowledge of what community is from our beliefs about what we would like it to be. Other critiques of communitarian ideas from a similar stance to Young's challenge precisely this tendency to elide description with prescription in many of the accounts offered (Frazer and Lacey, 1993, p. 141). This begs the question of how well grounded the normative claims are in the "facts" of community.

The remainder of this paper draws upon community studies conducted within rural Wales to see to what extent they conform to Young's characterisation, and to determine whether it is possible to construct from them an alternative, less repressive, understanding of community than that which has been discussed so far. It will be suggested that the Welsh studies represent a coherent body of work from which useful lessons can be learned. It is not presumed that they are unique in this respect; indeed, there are many parallels and points of comparison with work done in Ireland, Scotland and rural England over the same time period, some of which have been highlighted elsewhere (Frankenberg, 1966; Day, 1979). A systematic comparison and contrast of all these studies is beyond the scope of this discussion. Nor is the intention here to reverse our understanding of the classic community studies: the criticisms which have been made of them are well founded, and in certain instances (Arensberg and Kimball, 1940; Rees, 1950) can be endorsed wholeheartedly (see for example Brody, 1973; Day, 1979). But in other cases, the orthodox critique itself can be seen as a partial reading, which does not do justice to the subtlety and sophistication of some of the traditional analyses, while more recent studies can be shown to have moved beyond the limitations of the earlier approaches into a very different kind of interpretation (Cohen, 1985; Crow and Allan, 1994; Murdoch and Day, 1995).

II RURAL WALES — COMMUNITY WITHOUT DIFFERENCE?

Raymond Williams described how while growing up in his Welsh border village he acquired a set of assumptions about the meaning of community, as entailing a recognition of certain forms of mutual responsibility and social obligation towards those who occupied the same place, which he later came to

appreciate as common property throughout a very wide area of Welsh social thought (Williams, 1977, p. 113). These assumptions have been transmitted to a wider audience, at least in part, through the medium of Welsh community studies.

British rural sociology might be said virtually to originate in rural Wales. For a brief period, Welsh scholars were at the forefront of the examination of rural social issues, and their ideas and approach had a formative influence on many of their successors. From their base in the Geography department of the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth, they made significant contributions to the development of community studies, and through this they helped embed certain understandings of rural life within the emerging discipline of sociology. Subsequently, as these assumptions came into question, so their work was critically appraised, and largely excluded from the centre of sociological attention. Nevertheless, their descriptions and analyses of rural Wales have a continuing importance, both as a kind of yardstick against which change has often been measured, and as the explicit articulation of a set of values and beliefs which have been widely shared, and remarkably influential, in determining the policy agenda within Wales. The presumed nature of community plays a key role among these ideas.

A preoccupation with documenting the social distinctiveness and value of rural life formed a central theme of the early Welsh rural community studies. Those who undertook them were influenced strongly by a preceding generation of human geographers who already had begun to propagate an image of rural Wales as a distinct moral order whose traditions and way of life preserved cultural and spiritual assets which were lacking elsewhere (Gruffudd, 1994). As has been noted elsewhere (Day, 1979), the studies were reticent about their theoretical standpoint. Explicit references to sociological perspectives and concepts are few, and this gives the studies the appearance of simple, descriptive, accounts. Referring to the foundational Welsh rural community study, *Life in a Welsh Countryside* by Alwyn Rees (Rees, 1950), one of Rees's students and collaborators, Trefor Owen, comments that in making his study of the Montgomeryshire village of Llanfihangel-yng-Ngwynfa, Rees had "no particular methodological approach in mind"; what we get is an "integrated description" (Owen, 1986, p. 94). Even so, there are clear selective principles at work, and beneath the surface theoretical presuppositions can be discerned.

Llanfihangel was chosen by Rees partly for practical reasons, but also because in his view it occupied a particular position along the developmental trajectory being followed by rural Wales. As is common in community studies, life in this place is held to be at once distinct and unique, but also representative. As a "relatively secluded and entirely Welsh speaking" community, the

most Welsh of the Montgomeryshire parishes, Llanfihangel represented a pocket of Welsh life that was “out of touch with trends in Welsh society” (Rees, 1950, p. 14). Yet at the same time, it was an exemplification of the “essentially rural culture of Wales” (p. 108). In his later review, Owen reaffirms this position. He regards Llanfihangel as both *representative* of Welsh rural life at a certain time and also as an *embodiment* of Welsh history. Hence he says “it is difficult to find a better introduction to the rural life of Wales *as a whole* in the first half of the Twentieth Century” (Owen, 1986, p. 104, my stress), while “the history of Wales, we are made to feel, bore out Rees’s findings in his analysis of this little community”. In this sense Llanfihangel seems less a real place which comes to life through Rees’s account than an emblem of Welsh distinctiveness — as Owen appears to recognise when he writes about the book’s “useful generalities” and “lack of particularity”. Rees’s writing is replete with remarks designed to underline the generalisability of what he has to say, to other parts of rural Wales, and to other bygone times. Its strength lies less in the ethnographic detail than in its illustrations of more general assertions.

The community which Rees describes is a loosely bounded network of social relationships spread across an ill-defined geographical space. The absence of a centralised village settlement is said to be characteristic of rural Wales, the majority of the population living in scattered farms and cottages. Although there are small clusters of public buildings, such as shops, pubs, post offices, and places of worship, the institutions which frame social relationships are family, neighbourhood, and religious affiliation. Family ties are all pervasive, and are expressed in all local social situations; Rees famously cites the colloquial description that they are “like a pig’s entrails”. Members of the community meet one another in a variety of contexts, as wholes, against a background of shared knowledge of family history, and local involvement. Most are locally born, and many can trace their family attachment to the place back over several generations.

Life in a Welsh Countryside does not allow the people of Llanfihangel to speak for themselves; there are few, if any, direct quotations. Instead Rees gives voice for them. In his eyes, Llanfihangel constitutes “one of the most sociable and friendly places imaginable” (Rees, 1950, p. 98). Among its people, he claims, there is little overt sign of discontent or conflict, and certainly no structured social division. Members of the community know and understand what is expected of them, and the limits of what is permissible in behaviour and morality are policed, apparently without dissent, by agents of the community, such as the “lads” who are licensed to defend it from threats from within as well as from outside (Rees, 1950, p. 83). Conduct is governed by the power of tradition, which has deep roots in the Celtic past. Llanfihangel is

presented as a place where “the countryman (sic) has continued to live in a world of his own, the standards of which differ from our industrial civilisation” (1950, p. 30). It is, in short, Iris Marion Young’s vision of pure hell! As a sympathetic commentator concedes, it appeared that the individual, “surrounded by the smothering constraints of a closed and inward looking social system, was totally unable to exploit his or her potential”. By contrast, “the urban world might generate anomie, but it also gave the freedom to experiment” (Carter, 1996, p. 7).

In the absence of definite socio-spatial boundaries, the communal solidarity of Llanfihangel rested on “a continuous network of reciprocities”, revealed in patterns of co-operation between neighbouring farms, and in the unwillingness of individuals to enter into precise calculations of the terms of their social exchanges. This is made easier by the fact that the community, as depicted, is socially undifferentiated. Since the bulk of the inhabitants are employed in small-scale farming, Rees contends that no significant internal class distinctions arise. The main class relationship lies outside the community, connecting its members with the local representatives of an anglicised landowning gentry whose way of life is set apart, economically, politically and culturally, from the lives of ordinary people. Among the latter, we are informed, there was little concern with “materialistic” judgements of wealth and power, although great importance was attached to life style characteristics such as an unassuming manner, good reputation, moral rectitude, and readiness to fulfil social obligations (Rees, 1950, p. 144).

As someone who regards himself as belonging to the culture he describes, Rees states that he has struggled to gain some objective distance from it; even so, the description is suffused with value commitments, which correspond fairly obviously to the anti-urban, pro-rural biases that are implicit in the construct of a “rural idyll”. Carter notes that Rees’s position is “entirely engaged” (Carter, 1996, p. 3). The small Welsh rural community serves as the repository of certain intrinsic values, against which it must be judged. Any other judgement which relies upon external standards — such as regarding its members as unambitious or conservative — is deemed to be unscientific and illicit. (Rees, 1950, p. 144.)

Life in a Welsh Countryside lends itself to being regarded as an archetype for that phase of rural sociology — “the halcyon days of an uncomplicated ruralism” — during which “researchers unfailingly sought to reconstitute an original state before tracing its transformation and adulteration to the present” (Sautter, 1990, p. 98). Its central themes of integration, harmony, and continuity, even if not explicitly couched in such terms, are strongly marked by sociological functionalism, as is the readiness with which all the actions described, even those which to outsiders might appear to be acts of

petty maliciousness and vandalism, if not worse (Wright, 1992, p. 206), are interpreted as contributing positively to the well-being of the social organism, forming part of that “completeness” of rural life which enables individuals to have such a strong and certain sense of belonging.

Like the earlier researchers in Ireland (Gibbon, 1973), Rees presents himself as having the good fortune to witness this form of life just as it was crumbling under the onslaught of development and “modernisation”. Even in this remote outpost of the traditional way of life, “the little community ... through accepting current values and becoming part of the contemporary economic system, is already in the initial stages of the social atomisation which is general in Western civilization” (1950, p. 168). Ultimately Rees was despondent about its prospects of survival, but the loss, he felt, would be profound, since:

The failure of the urban world to give its inhabitants status and significance in a functioning society, and their consequent disintegration into a formless mass of rootless nonentities, should make us humble if planning a new life for the countryside. The completeness of the traditional rural society — involving the cohesion of family, kindred and neighbours — and its capacity to give the individual a sense of belonging, are phenomena that might well be pondered by all who seek a better social order. (Rees, 1950, p. 170.)

This conclusion is reiterated by Carter in his introduction to the recent reissue of the book, where he writes that “everyone with views as to the source of contemporary malaise would do well to read *Life in a Welsh Countryside*” (Carter, 1996, p. 10).

There could hardly be a greater gulf than that between Rees, and an exponent of the post-modern celebration of “difference” and the city such as Young, and the way in which Rees develops his argument lends considerable weight to her linking of community with forms of chauvinism. In the Welsh case, as Rees explains it, the process of change was complicated by the fact that the forces involved were also synonymous with *anglicisation*. It was not just the rurality of Llanfihangel, and places like it, that was under attack, but also their very *Welshness*. Indeed the two go together, in Rees’s view, because the contrast between country and town (community and social atomisation) corresponded to that between the historic legacy of Welshness on the one hand, and the intrusion of English values and modes of organisation, such as centralisation and formality, on the other. In this Manichean struggle, even the spread of such modern conveniences as bathrooms brought with it the taint of alien ways of living.

Rees’s work resonated powerfully with sentiments prevalent in Wales at

the time, and its success stimulated a further wave of Welsh community studies, done as postgraduate theses, as a result of which "a series of social monographs was published depicting the static and family centred pattern of rural life in Wales" (Gasson *et al.*, 1988). Returning to the point made at the start of this paper, Bell and Newby have questioned whether it is possible to draw any useful general conclusions from this material:

Any attempt to give some unity to the Welsh studies ... is prevented by that bane of community studies, non-comparability of data. It is clear that whilst these studies may be intrinsically satisfying in their own terms, it is by no means possible to synthesise them into something more. Though part of the same genre, they share no common framework or theoretical position. Indeed most of them lack any explicit theoretical position and even basic descriptive information. (Bell and Newby, 1971, p. 140.)

Much the same critique has been expressed more recently by Harper, who refers to "a complete absence of common framework or theoretical position, indeed most of these studies lack an individual theoretical position and this severely questions their contribution to the general theme of rural life." (Harper, 1989, p. 165.) However, this verdict is too harsh. There is a common framework which unifies the Aberystwyth studies: a shared definition of the essential nature of rural Welsh society, which, as Harper herself notes, leans heavily upon the conventional *Gemeinschaft* model of rural community.

In later publications, particular aspects and themes identified by Rees are singled out for special attention because they are felt to focus on those things which hold the greatest value for members of the society (Davies and Rees, 1960, p. xi), including by implication the various authors, who were themselves natives of rural Wales. They present therefore an account of rural Welsh culture and social organisation as viewed from within, and while each deals with slightly different issues, there is a consistency of vision attributable to the fact that the various aspects, "although in detail particular to their localities, are not peculiar to them. They are characteristic of rural communities throughout Wales ... The detail of one is explanatory of the generalisation of the other" (*ibid.*, p. x). This statement challenges, in the Welsh context, the distinction which Harper draws between making a contribution to the general understanding of rural life, and producing particular, unrelated, insights into "Welsh micro-culture" (Harper, 1989, p. 165). In these accounts, a community is a Welsh rural community because it displays these specific characteristics, and when it ceases to do so, then it is either no longer Welsh, or rural, or more likely, both.

Thus the four reports included in the volume on *Welsh Rural Communities*

(Davies and Rees, 1960) can be regarded as a set of exploratory probes into the nature of Welsh rural society, which together add up to a general portrait of its chief features. Nothing in these case-studies demands any fundamental revision of Rees's description; instead, albeit with some minor qualifications, it is reinforced, and elaborated. The centrality of the same basic relationships is emphasised. In Glan-llyn, Merioneth, for example, Owen informs us:

The intensity of social interaction within the community, with its basis in the interweaving of ties of kinship with those of neighbourliness, co-operation and joint participation in chapel activities, has built up an effective obstacle to the permeation of city ways. (Owen, 1960, p. 189.)

The same "web of reciprocity", binding together an extensive network of small family farms, is found in the area surrounding the market town of Tregaron, in Cardiganshire, and in Aberdaron, on the Llyn peninsula, where stability and immobility of population are held to be necessary conditions for the maintenance of "traditional alliances from generation to generation" (Jones Hughes, 1960, p. 162). In these places, people were held to be still close to a peasant way of life whose "survivals, mainly of a pre-industrial character ... are today regarded as the hallmarks of Welsh nationality and cultural separateness" (Jones, 1960, p. 123). The principal "hallmark", of course, was the Welsh language.

At the time of writing, all the places examined were intensely Welsh, in language and culture, and overwhelmingly nonconformist in religion. Religion figures prominently in each analysis, the authors providing detailed accounts of the social organisation and importance of chapel congregations within their particular localities. Rees's discussion of the way Welsh rural people evaluate one another is expanded upon in Emrys Jones's account of Tregaron, and more especially in the essay by Jenkins, who highlights the existence in Aber-porth of status distinctions centred on contrasting ways of life (*Bucheddau*) which distinguish respectable from less respectable members of the society largely in terms of the extent to which they conform to norms of religious conduct (Jenkins, 1960). Once again the preface to the volume assures us that this is not a merely local phenomenon, but "represents a fundamental social division which is more or less evident in all Welsh rural communities". It can be seen as expressive of the local culture, as relayed through the nonconformist chapel, whereas "cruder" class distinctions, based on occupation and income, derive, like other intrusive modern elements, from England, and represent "a pattern woven largely outside (which) ... bears no relationship to earlier Welsh society." (Jones, 1960, p. 113.) This is a claim which has been disputed subsequently, giving rise to a debate on the relationship between local "subjective" models of

stratification and objective patterns of power and inequality in rural Wales (Day and Fitton, 1975; Williams, 1978; Jenkins, 1980).

In their treatment of Welshness, these authors contributed towards making the rural “a predominant and powerful metaphor in the construction of Welsh national identity” (Gruffudd, 1994, p. 33), since they harnessed conceptions of national identity to the features of rural life which they described. As happened elsewhere, a particular definition of the countryside comes to serve as “the container of national identity and the measure of social change” (Short, 1991, p. 34). It is a position reiterated, for example, in the recent strategy document of Wales Rural Forum, an organisation dedicated to acting at a grassroots, “community” level, where the section on Culture and Identity draws attention to:

a popular perception that rural communities remain the “Welsh Heartland”, providing the main areas where Welsh is the major medium of social and economic intercourse. There is great psychological significance in having this cultural well, which nourishes and replenishes the feeling of “Welshness” throughout Wales. Any threat to this resource is often seen as a threat to the very identity of the Welsh people. (Wales Rural Forum 1994, p. 72.)

Similarly, in their portrayal of a “deeply rooted community ethos underpinned by tangible and intangible aspects of Welsh culture” (Wyn Jones, 1991), community itself comes near to being appropriated as a distinctively Welsh characteristic, one which can undoubtedly be exclusive, in the sense that those who do not share the essential attributes — more specifically, who do not speak the language and worship in the chapels — cannot truly form part of the society. Writing of Tregaron, Jones says that such people are destined to remain outsiders, for:

the primary division in the society is between those who belong and those who do not belong. ... A man who has lived in the town for some years can be a stranger, although he may have been accepted in most senses, and respected as a valued member of the society. (Jones, 1960, p. 98)

III RURAL WALES — COMMUNITY WITH DIFFERENCE

These studies certainly leave us with an impression of rural Wales that comes close to the Durkheimian condition of mechanical solidarity, in that it exhibits a “social structure of determined nature”, composed of “a system of segments homogeneous and similar to each other” (Durkheim, 1964, p. 181). Apparently each community replicates, to a greater or lesser extent, the same

basic elements, assembled in such a way as to maintain that "order based on settled and reciprocal social and economic relations of an avowedly total kind" to which Raymond Williams has referred as characteristic of much writing about rural society (Williams, 1973, p. 48).

However, contrary to some later interpretations, the boundaries of the units described in these studies are not hard and fast, or self contained, or even static. Instead, the entirety of rural Wales is said to be held together by the complicated interweaving of social networks and family relationships which enable individuals to feel a strong sense of belonging both to a particular place but also to a wider culture and society. This stretching of social bonds, from place to place, and from one social group to another, is the basis on which rural Wales can be said to form a "community of communities", a claim which in other contexts is broadened without difficulty to include the industrial and urban communities of the South Wales valleys as well. It also provides the basis on which it is possible to see at least a glimmer of a chance that community, after all, can be reconciled with difference.

As Crow and Allan (1994) have shown, the conception of community as rooted in the organisation of social networks enables it to be approached in a much more fluid and dynamic way. It is characteristic of a network, as opposed to an organised group, that its boundaries are not precisely delimited. Each individual or family/household unit stands at the centre of a distinct, and unique, network of its own, and consequently each occupies and perceives a distinct social world, many elements of which may be shared with others, but not all. Hence "community is never experienced in an identical way by everybody involved" (Crow and Allan, 1994, p. 183.) Because a network is not closed, but always has the potential for further extension, its existence may marginalise certain individuals or categories, but without necessarily excluding them for ever, while the vagueness with which limits are defined creates a space for ambiguity, and for the formation of new and imaginative identities. Viewed in these terms, it is inappropriate to conceptualise communities as displaying "firm boundaries, fixed membership, and rigid pattern of inclusion and exclusion" (Crow and Allan, 1994, p. 189).

There is much support for this alternative conception in the Welsh examples. Thus, in an extraordinary reconstruction of the historical nature of community in South-West Cardiganshire at the turn of the century, David Jenkins confirms that no boundaries could be drawn to isolate particular communities, nor was it possible to define a single centre for each neighbourhood: rather, "there are different centres for different activities, usually there are several centres for each activity, and they are not necessarily the centres for those who live in that particular geographical neighbourhood" (Jenkins, 1971, p. 7). This is graphically illustrated by an

account of the way in which neighbours' paths might cross as they made their way to join different, and incompatible, chapel congregations. Furthermore Jenkins remarks how, although they held an especially prominent part in people's *images* of the community, only a minority of families in rural Cardiganshire actually remained on the same farm over generations; a great deal of movement, involving change and adaptation of social ties, occurred over time (Jenkins, 1971, p. 116; cf Williams, 1963).

A similar sense of an unfolding, ill-defined, yet integrative set of social relationships underpinning Welsh rural society emerged from a more recent study in central Wales where it is stated that:

Farming constitutes very definitely a core economic activity, generating a range of shared experiences and interests within much of the local population ... However, the boundaries of the local agricultural system are ill-defined, because individual farmers are tied into quite varied relationships with different markets, and direct economic links between farms ... are limited. Depending on the quality of their stock, their volume of production, and the customary practices they have developed, farmers make complicated and diverse arrangements for their inputs and outputs. The effect ... is that the farmers of the valley form part of a network of relationships that spread across the whole of mid-Wales; each farmer is differently located within the network according to the detailed way in which s/he organises production and distribution. (Day and Murdoch, 1993.)

For this reason, one of the first priorities of a Welsh farmer on meeting someone unfamiliar is to try to place that person by situating him or her in terms of network connections. The way in which social relationships are organised allows farmers to exercise considerable choice as to when, and how, the network is activated. The presence of such overlapping or loosely bounded social relations means that Welsh rural communities present us not with the awesome identity of Durkheim's mechanical solidarity but with a potential for subtle distinctions and variety, to which the observer may be oblivious.

Crow and Allan (1994, p. 186) suggest that it is the outsiders who are most likely to miss the fine gradations within communities. This has not always been the case in rural Wales. Frankenberg (1957) paid particular attention to this in his account of the village of "Pentredywaith" (Glynceiriog), where he shows that while the criteria used to establish belonging were recognisably the same as those used elsewhere in Welsh rural communities — kinship, chapel membership and Welshness, with a bedrock attachment to home and place of birth — nevertheless they were used in a highly inventive and

flexible manner. There was agreement that the village belonged to "Pentre people", but it is not always obvious who should count as such; while the idea of the "stranger" is a shifting concept, such that to be a stranger in one context does not necessarily make one a stranger in another (Frankenberg, 1957, p. 19).

In the same fashion, Jenkins's detailed consideration of the centrality of kinship terminology to people's understanding of community in South West Cardiganshire demonstrates that its use in practice is far from inflexible (Jenkins, 1971). His comments bring out very clearly the delicate balance between an emphasis on consensus and organic unity, and an alternative sense of the degree of choice and ability to differentiate that exists within it:

The small scale of the society was a general condition of social life and within a locality people were inescapably concerned in one another's affairs ... Talk of relatives and of relationships is pervasive, and not only about the speakers' own kinsmen but about other people's as well. Conversations are shot through and through with references to the relationships of people who are the subject of discussion ... But remarkably widespread as is the interest in kin it is also true that knowledge about kin, including one's own, varies from person to person in considerable measure ... while interest is widespread it is neither universal nor dispensable and it does not appear that this is something new. ... One has the impression that there is a community of people who can be discussed because their relationships are known and that because their relationships are known they are recurrently brought to mind (and yet) it is the case that the main institutions of the society are such that a man can choose not to "avow relationship" if he so decides. Kinship considerations do not so dominate that a man in practice has no option but to "avow relationship" and this is certainly not a development of recent years. (Jenkins, 1971, pp. 159-165.)

The depth of local knowledge which can be brought to relationships has been a common theme of rural community research. It is one of the features which gave rise to the concept of "total status" as a distinguishing characteristic of community (Plowman *et al.*, 1962), but again this can suggest a perhaps impossible level of completeness. Jenkins's emphasis on the capacity "not to know" or to "disavow" shows that we must not assume communities are marked by total homogeneity. The same point is made by Isabel Emmett, writing about the North Wales town of Blaenau Ffestiniog:

Those who have grown up in the town have such a wealth of knowledge of each other as to make each encounter densely elaborate. Men and

women are known as parents, as drinkers or non-drinkers, as singers and speakers, in some version of their work records and in some version of their records as lovers ... Every aspect of their life is used in the picture others have of them, but the knowledge varies from member to member of their community, each of whom has a different composite version of their different facets ... In encounter after encounter, in a very large proportion of the talk, the term "double meaning" is totally inadequate to convey the density of meanings, cross-references, awareness of ignorance here, a layer of knowledge there, and double, triple, quadruple layers of knowledge and understanding ... the shared knowledge of a particular place and its people enables all members to participate in a continuous fashioning and telling of the story of the place. ... it is more a question of everyone having a part in recognisably the same play which they are jointly performing and making a record of. (Emmett, 1982, p. 208.) [For a comparable Irish example, see Curtin, 1988, p. 83.]

Far from being antithetical to difference, here community makes difference its very essence. By their ability to comprehend differences, and their involvement with and participation in the ongoing "story", people convey their membership of and belonging to the community.

IV USING "COMMUNITY" IN RURAL WALES

We have established that community need not rule out difference; indeed, in some ways differences can flourish within communities as members deploy accumulated knowledge and multiple criteria to locate one another. However, there are limits to the differences communities can encompass, and in this sense Iris Young is right: any categorisation (inclusion) must imply exclusion. Examination of the ways in which such boundaries operate has been a major theme of rural sociology and geography for some time (Pahl, 1966; Newby, 1980), and it has been a recurrent topic of research in rural Wales. This is because, like other rural areas in the British Isles, rural Wales has undergone extensive, and accelerating, social and economic transformations during the post-war period. (Day *et al.*, 1989.) In particular, it has experienced prolonged depopulation, and continuing loss of locally born people, accompanied more recently by a counteracting inward movement of predominantly urban emigres, mostly from across the English border (Day, 1989; Cloke *et al.*, 1997). This has left rural Wales far more socially mixed. Given these social changes, it is not surprising that analyses have become increasingly preoccupied with relationships among various categories of insiders and outsiders, locals and newcomers, and with the ways in which the boundaries

of community and "belonging" are defined and redefined (Frankenberg, 1957; Emmett, 1964; Day and Murdoch, 1993; Cloke *et al.*, 1997).

For example, when the conception of rural Wales as a "collection of communities" surfaces again in a study of political life in Cardiganshire, carried out in 1971 (Madgwick *et al.*, 1973, p. 30), the idea that the county as a whole, let alone all of rural Wales, could form a single community is said to exist only within the imagination, as a powerful image, although not one which related to the daily realities of living (Madgwick *et al.*, 1973, p. 226). While the authors note some important continuities with past patterns of life and attitudes, they are also conscious of fundamental changes opening up the Welsh countryside in ways which leave it more outward looking, specialised, and pluralistic than it was before (1973, p. 44). The actual communality of living, we are told, is being eroded by diversity. Indeed there are major cleavages which give rise to possibilities of polarisation, conflict, and the disruption of community: "latent conflict abounds" in rural Cardiganshire, and in this context, the term "community" itself becomes ambiguous and open to polemical use (Madgwick *et al.*, 1973, p. 227).

Interestingly, in the light of the earlier discussion of the Welsh countryside as a moral order, a depth of attachment to established ways of life, values, and culture of the area, along with a fear of imminent anglicisation, are seen as being more typical of a local "elite" of teachers and Ministers of religion, than it was of the farmers and trade unionists interviewed, described as "workaday seculars" who took a more sceptical and relaxed view of their Welshness. This provides a more precise location for those anthropological accounts produced "from within", for they also represent very definitely the views and standpoint of a local, academic, Welsh intelligentsia, who themselves are much preoccupied with the relationship between "insider" and "outsider" perceptions (Rees, 1950, pp. 112, 144; Davies and Rees, 1960, p. xi; Jenkins, 1980). They insist that descriptions of community must be authentic in terms of insider views. For this reason Jenkins questions the relevance of any study of community which does not concern itself with "how people conceptualise their own society" (Jenkins, 1980, p. 117). Yet it is apparent that the standpoint from which they write represents only one among several "inside" versions. In this regard, it hardly needs stressing now that they are all men, and that women's views on community life in rural Wales barely figure in the accounts which they produce.

In subsequent analysis, there has been an unavoidable tendency to equate "outside" perceptions with the viewpoint of the English in Wales, and to draw the main distinction between the English and the Welsh. Writing in 1957, Frankenberg observes that while the social life of Pentreduwaith can extend to embrace those who live and farm in the surrounding parish, and for major

events, other parts of north Wales, providing they share one or more "complex informal ties" with the villagers, those who are definitively disqualified from membership are distinguished from Pentre people by class and occupation, by religion, by language, and by place of birth; they are not of rural Welsh society, and even when living nearby, they remain "nameless English visitors" (1957, p. 41). Thus the outer bounds of community are set by "Englishness", just as for Rees the outer limits of Llanfihangel were defined by its relationships with a distanced, anglicised, class of gentry.

Similarly the distinction between the Welsh and the English provides the organising principle of Emmett's study of Llanfrothren in Merioneth (Emmett, 1964). She deploys her "outsider as insider" perspective to convey an understanding of some of the exclusionary practices used to sustain local identity in the face of encroaching threats. Emmett contends that local solidarity is achieved by uniting against the outside world of "English" officialdom, a concept that extends to cover the locally resident English intelligentsia who had made Llanfrothren into a little bohemian outpost, deep in Welsh speaking rural Wales. "Deviant" forms of local behaviour (such as salmon poaching) are explained as an expression of anti-Englishness. But Emmett also examines the pressures on local people, especially the young, to choose between commitment to local ways and standards, and along with it a Welsh identity, or absorption into a wider value system and ladder for social mobility, which opens the way to economic and social opportunities far beyond what is available locally, but at the expense of abandoning identification with place and community. It seems that identities can be chosen, but that the choices are fateful both for the individual and for the direction taken by rural Welsh society. In later work, Emmett develops an examination of the *different* ways of being Welsh which were available, even within the narrow confines of a small town in a rural location (Emmett, 1978). By showing how young people found effective ways of integrating novel aspects of wider youth culture into their own strong and persisting identification as Welsh, and local, she demonstrates somewhat against her previous assertions that it was not necessary to leave the area to be "modern".

These contributions, all in some sense made from "outside" or beyond the local culture, suggest that as rural Wales becomes more modern, so the likelihood decreases that any single, shared, representation of community can serve to unite an increasingly diverse social base. As a consequence of social change, community within rural Wales becomes very clearly a contested phenomenon, and competing definitions of community are articulated in opposition to one another. Hence understandings of the sort of place that rural Wales is, or should be, are employed more and more to safeguard it as the possession of some, but not of others (Borland *et al.*, 1992), while at the

local level discussion of community is rife with references to “attack”, “defence”, “resistance” or “counter attack” (Cloke and Milbourne, 1992, p. 366; Cloke *et al.*, 1997).

Although there has been no further thorough exploration of these issues through the medium of a “holistic” investigation of a specific Welsh rural community, they have been touched on to a greater or lesser degree in more recent contributions. In keeping with broader theoretical tendencies, current work is aimed more closely and consciously at investigation of the way in which views about such matters are expressed — attending to the “voices” of rural individuals. The turn towards cultural and linguistic analysis among human geographers and rural sociologists has inspired closer consideration of the ways in which people in rural contexts deploy social representations (Halfacree, 1995), engage in lay discourses (Jones, 1995) or mobilise their cultural competences (Cloke *et al.*, 1998) to make sense of their social worlds. While these questions have been explored primarily in the context of popular understandings of the meaning and significance of the “rural” in contemporary society, it is evident that the idea of “community” works in a very similar way. As we have seen already in the Welsh example, conceptions of community are closely entwined with notions of the rural, and Halfacree’s work on social representations shows how aspects of community and “communitarian” behaviour weave in and out of people’s idea of rurality. Among them is a perception that community signifies “insularity, judgementalism and intolerance of diversity” (Halfacree, 1995, p. 15).

The most developed instance of such culturally oriented work in Wales is the investigation of “rural lifestyles” by Cloke *et al.* (1995; 1997; 1998), which employs qualitative interview data to show how respondents in selected rural places talk about questions of community, rurality and identity. The research demonstrates convincingly that as an organising framework, the contrast between “Welsh” and “English” perspectives is significant, but grossly oversimplifies a complex situation. Throughout the research reports, we are given ample proof that notions of Welshness and Englishness are used extensively by respondents to create images and stereotypes of social groups and categories within their various localities. This yields competing constructs of identity at local level (Cloke *et al.*, 1997, p. 29). The authors themselves suggest that because English in-migrants and Welsh locals possess differing cultural competences and operate according to different assumptions about rural life, this leads them into a multitude of misunderstandings, confusions, and conflicts, reflecting the underlying clash between their lifestyles. In fact, whereas comparable research in England threw up the notion of community as “a shifting negotiation of ideas, kith and kin structures and other social relations” (Cloke *et al.*, 1997, p. 156), community in Wales seemed to be lent

some stability by this underpinning Welsh/English dichotomy. To that extent, one might say rural Wales at the close of the twentieth century continues to be brought together in opposition to conceptions of "ruling England" (Emmett, 1964). And yet, even here, community is "tacitly understood as a negotiated concept" (Cloke *et al.*, 1997, p. 157).

This is because, beneath some of the cruder claims about the incompatibility between the two identities, lie infinitely more subtle distinctions and differentiations. The simplifying conception of "English newcomers" subsumes a highly diverse range of contrasting individual and social identities (Cloke *et al.*, 1997, p. 18; Day, 1989) and there is no reason to think the Welsh are any less diverse. Indeed, Cloke *et al.* draw attention to Bowie's statement, based on her reflections upon the experience of living in the rural county of Gwynedd, that whereas Wales may present "a coherent picture of cultural self-sufficiency and a firm sense of identity" to the rest of the world, once one penetrates beneath this surface reflection then:

the unproblematic and monolithic nature of Welsh identity begins to fragment. One is left not so much with a coherent notion of Welshness ... as with a sense of many conflicting and interlocking definitions of identity which actively compete for symbolic space and public recognition. (Bowie, 1993, pp. 168-169.)

Overall then, in contemporary rural Wales there is evidence of a plurality of identities subject to negotiation and interaction within particular local settings (Cloke *et al.*, 1997, p. 148). This has major implications for the way in which we understand not only local senses of belonging, but also the processes through which national identities are defined (Thompson and Day, forthcoming 1999). There is broad endorsement by now of the view that at both local and national levels, community is something which is essentially "imagined" (Anderson, 1983) or "constructed" (Cohen, 1985). In other words, it is a concept which people deploy in particular contexts, for particular purposes. To comprehend its meanings, we have to consider therefore to whom it is addressed, in what situations, and for what reasons. In many circumstances, fuzziness and ambiguity about its limits are vital to the way in which it works; the element of "not knowing", or of being able to disregard certain facts, examined by Jenkins and Emmett, and the different layers or degrees of belonging to which they and Frankenberg refer, are crucial in enabling the flexibility and manipulability of its borders.

There is accumulating evidence that the scope this provides for creativity and inventiveness is at the heart of contemporary uses of "community". Work in a variety of rural contexts (Boyle and Halfacree, 1998) confirms that the meanings of such categories as local, newcomer, insider, outsider, with all

their colourful local variants, are not hard and fast, with fixed memberships closed for all time, but are capable of fluid and dynamic interpretation. Thus in work done on the language of "locals" and "incomers" in Scotland, Allan and Mooney (1998) comment on the blurred and problematic nature of the categories. They observe how, depending upon the context, the emphasis and implications of the terms were "constantly altering and open to (re)interpretation", so that boundaries are "neither based solely upon length of residence nor are they necessarily clear cut. (I)t is also evident that divisions ... are not insurmountable" (Allan and Mooney, 1998, p. 290).

Despite their emphasis on the contested nature of representations and the propensity this has for creating disagreement and conflict, some of the recent "cultural" accounts are weakened by the absence of any close exploration of how that contested nature is negotiated and resolved. Treating community solely in terms of sets of social understandings or mental constructs risks detaching them from the actual social relationships among people in which their use is grounded, and thus losing sight of the way in which they are negotiated in and through local networks of interaction. Day and Murdoch (1993) provide some Welsh examples of such negotiations in action within the communities of the upper Ithon Valley, and show how the lines between social categories are drawn differently in different contexts, according to various distinct spheres of co-operation and interaction. For instance, different attitudes are displayed towards "outsiders" in the sphere of formalised local political representation than with regard to involvement in social activities around the village hall. However, in none of the spheres are the boundaries between "locals" and others sharply defined, and people can be enrolled into networks or pushed away from them, for example, according to whether they show behaviours and attitudes thought to be appropriate or inappropriate to local styles of interaction. "Pushy" attempts at premature integration may lead to rejection, while a readiness to play a "helpful" role may bring acceptance. Cloke *et al.* (1997, p. 25) also note how barriers can be "diluted" through local processes of assimilation and personal interaction. Hence, "community" is like the "rural" in not having a fixed or even stable referent (Boyle and Halfacree, 1998, p. 4) but is worked at, and worked out, locally, for particular purposes, and in particular settings.

Attempts to legislate what is "really" a Welsh rural community represent efforts to police the boundaries of belonging; but just as Frankenberg explained in his account of life in a small north Wales village forty years ago, so today, the boundaries of community in rural Wales are moveable and open to manipulation. The fluidity of social relations, and the lack of any single over-riding boundary defining criterion, ensures that the lines between social groups stay ill-defined. People who are enemies in one respect may yet be

friends in another, and different versions of membership and belonging can continue to coexist as distinct layers within the subjective awareness of the individuals. So, while for most purposes, "new age travellers" may be firmly outside the prevailing conception of community, and "locals" may put rocks across lay-bys to ensure that this is so, in situations of local action against unwanted developments, the same people may provide a focus for, and even leadership of, collective mobilisation. Conversely, mothers who meet their children from the local school may be part of the community for much of the time and for most practical purposes, but when key issues arise touching on the school's future, they may find themselves disqualified from full participation in discussion according to some other, temporarily more weighty, standard of membership — such as their Welshness. As Boyle and Halfacree (1998) suggest, there is considerable potential here to examine how concepts of community, like those of the rural, are invoked and enlisted into the networks of relationships through which people in rural areas are able to act, and there is a powerful case for revisiting the tradition of Welsh rural community studies in order to bring these newer insights to bear.

V CONCLUSION

This review of the main body of Welsh rural community studies took as its point of departure Iris Marion Young's negative commentary on "community". Hopefully, the discussion has gone some way towards qualifying the received image of rural communities as wholly "organic", closed, and totalizing. Even in the most unpromising situations, of truly remote and apparently stable social environments, this rested on a selective version of a reality which remained ultimately open-ended and capable of recognising, and responding to, individuality. The appearance of a completely closed social world may owe more to the way such communities present themselves, or were presented, to the outside world, than to their actual organisation. Young is right to suggest that the ideas of community that are contained in this body of work have within them the potential to become narrow, exclusive, and stifling, and can lend themselves to incorporation within racist, sexist, and elitist discourse (for a recent discussion touching on this point, see Williams, 1995). But they also suggest ways in which actual communities provide a framework of understandings and practices which is alive to the differences between people, adaptable to change, and capable of accommodating divergent, as well as shared, identities. It also has to be said that Young's own enthusiasm for celebrating distinctive cultures and characteristics quite plainly does not extend to, among others, racists, sexists, xenophobes or homophobes (Young, 1990, p. 319). These exclusions are taken as self-evident, and indeed it is

difficult to envisage any form of social life, real or imaginary, which could work without making such distinctions and separations. Much of the fascination of recent studies of community lies in showing how people manage to sustain such boundaries conceptually while at the same time subverting them in practice.

REFERENCES

- ALLAN J., and E. MOONEY, 1998. "Migration Into Rural Communities: Questioning the Language of Counterurbanisation", in P. Boyle and K. Halfacree (eds.), *Migration into Rural Communities*, Chichester: John Wiley, pp. 280-302.
- ANDERSON, B., 1983. *Imagined Communities*, London: Verso.
- ARENSBERG, C., and S. KIMBALL, 1940. *Family and Community in Ireland*, Harvard.
- BELL, C., and H. NEWBY, 1971. *Community Studies*, London: Allen and Unwin.
- BELL, C., and H. NEWBY, 1976. "Communion, Communalism, Class and Community Action: The Sources of the New Urban Politics", in D. Herbert and R. Johnston (eds.), *Social Areas in Cities*, Vol. 2, Chichester: John Wiley.
- BORLAND, J., R. FEVRE, and D. DENNEY, 1992. "Nationalism and Community in North West Wales", *Sociological Review*, Vol. 40, No. 2, pp. 49-72.
- BOWIE, F., 1993. "Wales From Within: Conflicting Interpretations of Welsh Identity", in S. Macdonald (ed.), *Inside European Identities*, Oxford: Berg.
- BOYLE P., and K. HALFACREE, 1998. *Migration into Rural Areas*, Chichester: Wiley.
- BRODY, H., 1973. *Inishkillane; Change and Decline in the West of Ireland*, London: Allen Lane.
- CARTER, H., 1996. "Life in a Welsh Countryside: A Retrospect", Foreword to reissue of A.D. Rees, 1950, *Life in a Welsh Countryside: a Social Study of Llanfihangel yng Ngwynfa*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- CLOKE, P., and P. MILBOURNE, 1992. "Deprivation and Lifestyles in Rural Wales — II Rurality and the Cultural Dimension", *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 359-371.
- CLOKE, P., M. GOODWIN, and P. MILBOURNE, 1995. "There's So Many Strangers In The Village Now: Marginalisation and Change in 1990s Welsh Rural Lifestyles", *Contemporary Wales*, Vol. 8, pp. 47-74.
- CLOKE, P., M. GOODWIN, and P. MILBOURNE, 1997. *Rural Wales: Community and Marginalization*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- CLOKE, P., M. GOODWIN, and P. MILBOURNE, 1998. "Inside Looking Out; Outside Looking In: Different Experiences of Cultural Competence in Rural Lifestyles", in P. Boyle and K. Halfacree (eds.), *Migration into Rural Areas*, Chichester: Wiley, pp. 134-150.
- COHEN, A., 1982. *Belonging: Identity and Social Organisation in British Rural Cultures*, Manchester University Press.
- COHEN, A., 1985. *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, London: Tavistock.
- CROWE, GRAHAM, and GRAHAM ALLAN, 1994. *Community Life an Introduction to Local Social Relations*, London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- CURTIN, C., 1988. "Social Order, Interpersonal Relations and Disputes in a West of Ireland Community, in M. Tomlinson (ed.), *Whose Law and Order? Aspects of*

Crime and Control in Ireland, Sociological Association of Ireland.

- DAVIES, E., and A.D. REES, 1960. *Welsh Rural Communities*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- DAY, G., 1979. "The Sociology of Wales: Issues and Prospects", *Sociological Review*, Vol. 27, pp. 447-474.
- DAY, G., 1989. "'A Million on the Move? Population Change and Rural Wales", *Contemporary Wales*, Vol. 2, pp. 137-159.
- DAY, G., and M. FITTON, 1975. "Religion and Social Status: *Bucheddau* and its Implications", *Sociological Review*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 867-891.
- DAY, G., and J. MURDOCH, 1993. "Locality and Community: Coming to Terms with Place", *Sociological Review*, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp. 82-111.
- DAY, G., G. REES, and J. MURDOCH, 1989. "Social Change, Rural Localities and the State: the Restructuring of Rural Wales", *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 227-244.
- DENNIS, N., F. HENRIQUES, and C. SLAUGHTER, 1969. *Coal is our Life*, London: Tavistock.
- DURKHEIM, E., 1964. *The Division of Labour in Society*, New York: Free Press.
- EMMETT, I., 1964. *A North Wales Village*, London: Routledge.
- EMMETT, I., 1978. "Blaenau Boys in the Mid-1960s", in G. Williams (ed.), *Social and Cultural Change in Contemporary Wales*, London: Routledge, pp. 87-101.
- EMMETT, I., 1982. "*Fe godwn ni eto*: Stasis and Change in a Welsh Industrial Town", in A.P. Cohen (ed.), *Belonging: Identity and Social Organisation in British Rural Cultures*, Manchester University Press, pp. 165-197 and "Place, Community, and Bilingualism in Blaenau Ffestiniog", (ibid), pp. 202-221.
- FRANKENBERG, R., 1957. *Village on the Border*, London: Cohen and West.
- FRANKENBERG, R., 1966. *Communities in Britain*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- FRAZER, E., and N. LACEY, 1993. *The Politics of Community: a Feminist Critique of the Liberal-Communitarian Debate*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- GASSON, R., G. CROW, A. ERRINGTON, J. HUTSON, T. MARSDEN, and M. WINTER, 1988. "The Farm As a Family Business", *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 1-41.
- GIBBON, P., 1973. "Arensberg and Kimball Revisited", *Economy and Society*, Vol. 4, pp. 479-498.
- GLASS, R., 1966. *Conflict in Society*, London: Churchill.
- GRUFFUDD, P., 1994. "Tradition, Modernity and the Countryside: the Imaginary Geography of Rural Wales", *Contemporary Wales*, Vol. 6, pp. 33-48.
- HARPER, S., 1989. "The British Rural Community: an Overview of Perspectives", *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 161-184.
- HALFACREE, K., 1995. "Talking about Rurality: Social Representations of the Rural as Expressed by Residents of Six English Parishes", *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 1-20.
- HERBERT, D., and R. JOHNSTON (eds.), 1976. *Social Areas in Cities*, Vol. 2, Chichester: John Wiley.
- HUME I., and W.T.R. PRYCE (eds.), 1986. *The Welsh and Their Country*, Llandysul: Gomer.
- JENKINS, D., 1960. "Aber-porth: a Study of a Coastal Village in South Cardigan-shire", in E. Davies and A.D. Rees (eds.), *Welsh Rural Communities*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press, pp. 1-63.

- JENKINS, D., 1971. *The Agricultural Community in South-West Wales at the Turn of the Twentieth Century*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- JENKINS, D., 1980. "Rural Society Inside Outside", in D. Smith (ed.), *A People and a Proletariat: Essays in the History of Wales 1750-1980*, London: Pluto Press, pp. 114-126.
- JONES, E., 1960. "Tregaron: the Sociology of a Market Town", in E. Davies and A.D. Rees (eds.), *Welsh Rural Communities*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press, pp. 67-117.
- JONES, O., 1995. "Lay Discourses of the Rural: Developments and Implications for Rural Studies", *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 35-49.
- JONES HUGHES, T., 1960. "Aberdaron; the Social Geography of a Small Region", in E. Davies and A.D. Rees (eds.), *Welsh Rural Communities*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press, pp. 121-179.
- KENT R., 1981. *A History of British Empirical Sociology*, Aldershot: Gower.
- McBEATH, G., and S. WEBB, 1997. "Cities, Subjectivity and Cyberspace", in S. Westwood and J. Williams (eds.), *Imagining Cities: Scripts, Signs, Memory*, London: Routledge, pp. 249-260.
- MADGWICK, P.J., N. GRIFFITHS, and V. WALKER, 1973. *The Politics of Rural Wales*, London: Hutchinson.
- MURDOCH, J., and G. DAY, 1995. "The Same but Different: Notes on the Social Construction of Community", Paper presented to the Annual Conference of the British Sociological Association.
- NEWBY, H., 1980. *Green and Pleasant Land? Social Change in Rural England*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- NICHOLSON, L. (ed.), 1992. *Feminism / Postmodernism*, London: Routledge.
- OWEN, T.M., 1960. "Chapel and Community in Glan-Llyn, Merioneth", in E. Davies and A.D. Rees (eds.), *Welsh Rural Communities*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press, pp. 185-248.
- OWEN, T.M., 1986. "Community Studies in Wales: an Overview", in I. Hume and W.T.R. Pryce (eds.), *The Welsh and their Country*, Llandysul: Gomer, pp. 91-133.
- PAHL, R., 1996. *Urbs in Rure*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.
- PLOWMAN, R., W.E. MINCHINTON, and M. STACEY, 1962. "Local Social Status in England and Wales", *Sociological Review*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 161-202.
- RAPPORT, N., 1993. *Diverse World Views in an English Village*, Edinburgh University Press.
- REES, A.D., 1950. *Life in a Welsh Countryside: a Social Study of Llanfihangel yng Ngywnfa*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- SAUTTER, G., 1990. "French Geography and the Rural World", in P. Lowe and M. Bodiguel (eds.), *Rural Studies in Britain and France*, Belhaven Press.
- SHORT, B. (ed.), 1992. *The English Rural Community: Image and Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SHORT, J.R., 1991. *Imagined Country*, London: Routledge.
- STACEY, M., 1960. *Tradition and Change: a Study of Banbury*, London: Oxford University Press.
- STEIN, M., 1964. *The Eclipse of Community*, Harper and Row.
- TAM, H., 1998. *Communitarianism: a New Agenda for Politics and Citizenship*, London: Macmillan.
- THOMPSON, A., and G. DAY, forthcoming 1999. "Situating Welshness: 'Local'

- Experiences and National Identity", in R. Fevre and A. Thompson (eds.), *Nation, Identity, and Social Theory*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- WALES RURAL FORUM, 1994. *A Strategy for Rural Wales*, Llandysul.
- WARNER, W.L., 1963. *Yankee City*, Yale: Yale University Press.
- WARREN, R.L., 1963. *The Community in America*, Chicago: Rand McNally.
- WILLIAMS, C., 1995. "Race' and Racism: Some Reflections on the Welsh Context", *Contemporary Wales*, Vol. 8, pp. 113-133.
- WILLIAMS, G., 1978. "Social Ranking in a Welsh Community", in G. Williams (ed.), *Social and Cultural Change in Contemporary Wales*, London: Routledge, pp. 253-267.
- WILLIAMS, R., 1973. *The Country and the City*, London: Chatto and Windus.
- WILLIAMS, R., 1977. "The Importance of Community", reprinted in R. Williams (1989), *Resources of Hope*, London: Verso, pp. 111-120.
- WILLIAMS, R., 1989. *Resources Of Hope*, London: Verso.
- WILLIAMS, W.M., 1963. *A West Country Village: Ashworthy*, London: Routledge.
- WRIGHT, S., 1992. "Image and Analysis: New Directions in Community Studies", in B. Short (ed.), *The English Rural Community: Image and Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 195-217.
- WYN JONES, R., 1991. *Rural Wales*, Summer (cited in Cloke and Milbourne 1992), "Deprivation and Lifestyles in Rural Wales — II Rurality and the Cultural Dimension", *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 4.
- YOUNG, I.M., 1990. "The Ideal of Community and the Politics of Difference", in L. Nicholson, *Feminism/Postmodernism*, London: Routledge, pp. 300-323.
- YOUNG, M., and P. WILLMOTT, 1962. *Family and Kinship in Bethnal Green*, Penguin.