From:
Holloway, L., & Kneafsey,
M. (2004). *Geographies of
rural cultures and societies*.
Ashgate Pub Limited.

Chapter 5

Constructing Multiple Ruralities: Practices and Values of Rural Dwellers

Hanne Kirstine Adriansen and Lene Møller Madsen

Introduction

While rural geography in the last decade has been enriched by new and challenging theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches inspired by the cultural turn, the empirical focus seems to be limited to certain cultures – it is difficult to find studies concerned with ‘Third World’ countries. Although our perception of Europe has changed after the fall of the Berlin wall and the division between ‘East’ and ‘West’ broken down, there still appears to be a division between what, for want of better terms, can be labelled ‘developed’ and ‘developing’ countries¹. In this chapter, we want to show that this division is an unnecessary boundary precluding us from inspiration and insights gained in ‘the other’ world. Instead of studying either developed or developing countries, a more fertile approach is to focus on the issues of interest. When the concerns are identities, construction of ruralities, territoriality, and belonging our research questions may well be the same, but the answers are different. We do not advocate comparative studies, as these often reproduce the boundaries; instead we find that the differences in answers can be of inspiration for asking new questions within the respective areas of research.

Based on this premise, we discuss how rural people and their land use can be understood with special emphasis on what can be labelled ‘the cultural turn’, emphasising identity, discourse, motives, and agency as well as the cultural construction of rurality (e.g. Cloke and Little, 1997; Milbourne, 1997; Philips et al, 2001; Haartsen et al, 2000; van Hoven, 2001). The recent change in rural studies has raised many interesting questions, but we find that in this process, the physical/material aspects of life in rural areas and the use of rural space have been omitted. We want to (re-) turn the attention to these physical aspects, but we want to do it within the light of culturally inspired studies. Hence, the aim is to provide an understanding of rural people and their land use by considering them in a broader context of the social and cultural embeddedness of their actions. In this way, we also hope to contribute to the ongoing debates concerning the use of qualitative methods in human geography (e.g. Winchester, 1999; Johnston, 2000; Crang, 2002).

Consequently, the purpose of this chapter is twofold. At a general level, we want to show that many of the issues raised by the cultural turn transcend the

gap between research in so-called developing and developed countries. Most emphasis, however, is given to the second objective, namely, to provide an approach towards the study of rural areas that can combine studies of physical/material and social/cultural issues. In order to do so, we use examples from our respective research from Denmark, Egypt, and Senegal.

The chapter is divided into six sections. First, we provide a short introduction to the case studies. The next section elaborates on the research gap between developed and developing countries and the issue 'sense of belonging' is used to illustrate how concepts can be used for transcending this research gap. Then, attention is drawn to the issue of combining studies of physical/material and social/cultural issues in rural studies; in this case focus is on a combination of the cultural turn with more 'conventional' geographical studies of land use. An analytical approach is developed in the fourth section – as a study of the practices and values of rural dwellers. The applications of the approach developed are discussed in the fifth section, and finally some concluding remarks are given.

Presentation of Case Studies

The discussion in this chapter is the outcome of problems and questions raised during our work with two quite different research projects, one in Denmark and one in Senegal. We found that during this work, we were faced with a number of similar troublesome considerations concerning the integration of different methodological and philosophical approaches and decided to pursue the answers together. This led us to see that many approaches and concepts transcended the boundary between research concerning developed and developing countries, a boundary that is manifest in many research institutions. Since then, we have continued our research in 'different worlds' while maintaining a common interest in the directions of rural geography, of which the last case study from Egypt is an example.

The brief introduction provided here is meant to acquaint the reader with the three studies because these are used as illustrations in the discussion throughout the chapter. The first two concern what could be called 'the use of rural space', while the third from Egypt is more related to discussions of constructions of ruralities.

The study from Denmark concerns the location of private afforestation under EU-regulation 2080/92². The objective is to analyse land use changes resulting from private afforestation and the implementation of the scheme within the Danish planning system. Focus is on the landowner and their role in the afforestation process. On the basis of interviews, map-analysis, aerial photos, administrative data and field registration, it is shown that location of new woodlands that fulfil the goals of the afforestation programme is more a coincidence than a result of good planning – it is the individual landowner who has the decisive influence on the woodland's contribution to securing the goals of the afforestation programme (Madsen, 2002b). Landowners engaged in afforestation represent a wide range of different practices and values concerning their forest and

the complex reasoning behind the location of afforestation areas on their farm cannot be understood through economic reasoning alone (Madsen, 2003). Instead a typology of different landowners is developed, which can be used to explain both the actual location of a new woodland, and why this location is chosen. The study is further described in Madsen (2002a).

The objective of the study from Senegal was to analyse pastoral mobility both in physical terms (length and duration of mobility) and in terms of cultural understanding and importance of the movements and the concept of being mobile. The pastoralists of the northern Senegal are semi-settled, which means they have a rainy-season camp and depending on the dry season they may go on migration with the herds of cattle, sheep, and goats. Contrary to the usual image of nomads as freedom loving people for whom mobility is a necessity, the pastoralists turned out not to be very keen on going on migration. Nevertheless, the livestock are quite mobile due to daily mobility in the vicinity of the rainy-season camp. GPS³ was used for measuring livestock mobility and mapping the patterns (Adriansen and Nielsen, 2002). This turned out to be a good input for discussion with the pastoralists about their use and perception of mobility. Further information can be found in Adriansen (2002).

The study from Egypt concerns the construction of rural identities in reclaimed desert lands. Land reclamation and construction of new communities in the desert has been among the Egyptian government's most important policy objectives for decades. While agro-ecological consequences of land reclamation have been widely discussed, little is known about the settlers' ability to create new communities and make a living in these areas. The study shows that the new lands can be seen both as 'spaces of opportunity' and as 'spaces of poverty' and that these issues central to cultural geographers can be used for understanding peoples' perceptions of their life and their constructions of rural livelihoods. Further, it is argued that measures should be taken to ensure that the existing social exclusion is not reproduced and enhanced in the new lands. The study is based on interviews with settlers in the new villages combined with participatory village mapping and ethnographic observations (see Adriansen, 2003).

Transcending the Research Gap Between Developed and Developing Countries

The current division between research in developed and developing countries can be seen as reminiscent of a more political economic approach, according to which the differences between various parts of the world were so great that different lines of reasoning and approaches should be used. Looking back, however, agricultural and to some extent rural geography have been considered subjects that transcend regions. This can be seen in the progress reports on agricultural geography published in the journal *Progress in Human Geography* in the 1980s (Grigg, 1981; 1982; 1983; Bowler, 1984; 1987). With the increasing emphasis on political economy, the focus turned towards developed countries and since then geographers (and other researchers) have tended to 'stick by their region'. Atkins describes the

trend this way: 'There has been an unfortunate neglect by agricultural geographers of the rural development process in poor countries' (1988, p.281). A tendency that can be seen in Whatmore's progress reports in *Progress in Human Geography* from 1991 and 1993 (Whatmore, 1991; 1993) and also in Bowler and Ilbery's paper in *Area* from 1987 (Bowler and Ilbery, 1987). We consider this division a futile boundary. The argument is along the lines of thought presented by Crang when he points to 'the need to think of cultures and spaces in ways other than as bounded containers' (Crang, 1998, p.175).

One of the answers to why the cultural turn has not had an impact on agricultural studies in developing countries may be found in Morris (this volume). Here she responds to the criticism that cultural issues are a kind of luxury, out of the question for researchers concerned with salvaging rural life and providing food. We want to reply by asking 'can we salvage rural life without including cultural issues?' There is ample evidence showing that food provision is not to ensure rural livelihoods. To show sensitivity towards peoples' own perceptions of their life and constructions of livelihoods is one way to avoid providing ethno-centric and mechanistic solutions to rural problems. This is not to say that all areas should be studied in the same way and that context does not matter. On the contrary, context is important for understanding rurality in a given area, but this should not preclude us from establishing communication about concepts, methods, and material used in rural studies world-wide.

The reluctance among (rural) researchers to establish and value communication between researchers of the developed and developing world is not due to mere lack of goodwill or interest. First of all, the gap is constantly reproduced in the sense that we usually attend different conferences, seek different funding, read different journals, and – not least – often have different professional and personal relations, which hamper us from drawing attention to the benefits of research in 'the other world'. Further, opportunities for communications between research methods are neglected due to the fact that many funding opportunities are dependent upon research having direct policy relevance. As Crang notes, the demands tied to funded research often are a 'clear set of predicted outcomes rather than an evolving programme' (Crang, 2002, p.650). This means that opportunities for research relating concepts and methodologies in developed and developing countries are abandoned even before they start.

The issue of 'sense of belonging' can be used to illustrate how concepts can transcend the research gap between developed and developing countries. In textbook material on cultural geography, sense of belonging is often linked with issues of nationality, spatially bound identity, and 'imagined communities' (e.g. Crang, 1998). With regards to more local scale processes, however, the concept is related to ideas of constructing 'place' and 'home' (Morley, 2001) and it can be valuable for understanding processes of land claims, attachment to certain areas, and even farming behaviour. Sense of belonging has a common-sense air to it that we appreciate, because it is part of everyday language. However, it is important to note that sense of belonging is 'inevitably complex, filtered as it is, and frequently reworked, through sedimented layers of memory and lived experience, shaped by

the intangible intimacies of history and the pragmatics of the present' (Hammar, 2002, p. 228).

In the study of people resettling in reclaimed desert in Egypt, the concept has been used to understand why people move to the desert and to find factors of importance for relating to the new village communities (Adriansen, 2003). The Egyptian government tries to make 'the greening of the desert' a national project that everybody should feel obliged to participate in. Hence, some see the possibility to be granted desert land as a way to serve their country. Others feel encouraged by the Qur'ân, where they find justification for migration to the desert. Both the national and the religious discourse provide legitimate reasons, though quite different from the accounts found at the individual and family level. For instance, one family came to the new lands because they had nothing in their original village to make them stay. To settle in the new lands was their only way to get to own land.

Many of the inhabitants of the new villages complained that the families had to split up and some move back to the old lands due to the lack of services and infrastructure. This caused a feeling of loneliness and lack of belonging as well as being abandoned by the government which did not provide the services promised. Furthermore, there was an impression that local officials such as doctors and teachers were not interested in living in the new lands, and this led to an image of the new land as a place not worth staying in. On the other hand, they felt that the land originally brought them together and made a community of them.

It takes time to construct a sense of belonging, and time certainly is a key to establishing a feeling of being at home in the desert. This can be seen when interviewing inhabitants of the first new villages. Despite all the difficulties they experienced in the beginning, and for some the feeling of being left to their own devices by a state not caring about its desert inhabitants, most have grown accustomed to living in the margin. Moreover, with the ongoing reclamation of desert land, the majority of the older reclaimed land can no longer be considered frontier. Today they provide the spatial linkage between the old and the new lands.

In the study of afforestation in the Danish countryside, it was shown that the sense of belonging to a given property affected not only the degree of interest in creating woodland, but it also affected the actual planting and the shape of a given woodland (Madsen, 2002a). A critical question for the grant-aided field afforestation programme is the issue of actual planting of woodlands on the fields. The rationale of the implementation of the subsidy scheme is that if a landowner gets a subsidy, they will plant, and if they do not obtain a subsidy, they will not plant (Madsen, 2003). The controlling mechanism associated with the scheme is based on this rationale: the landowner gets the subsidy in portions according to statements of actual planting and maintenance. However, the study shows that this is a simplification of what is actually happening. The relation between obtaining a grant and actual planting is far from straightforward. In fact a complex relation between receiving a grant and planting versus not receiving a grant and not planting was found. This complex relation turned out to be a question of understanding the individual landowner's use of their 'room for manoeuvre', where sense of belonging was one component. As long as the landowner perceives

the farm as ‘a place of production’, the actual planting follows a pattern of economically rational decision-making. If the subsidy is obtained, the field is planted; if the subsidy is not obtained, the field is not planted. On the other hand, when the landowner perceives the farm as ‘a place of living’, the planting becomes independent of the subsidy: The landowner applies for the subsidy in order to get financial help for the afforestation, but if the subsidy is not obtained, the fields are planted anyway.

Different senses of belonging also led to differences in the shaping of woodlands. While production-oriented landowners often let physical boundaries like field edges define the woodland shape (it was most often square), landowners expressing different types of recreational relations to their new woodland made an effort to shape their woodland, so for instance, it could be seen from the house or would screen off a trafficked road.

These two examples show how concepts can transcend the research gap between developed and developing countries – how researchers can acquire conceptual inspiration from each other without studying the same subject matter or region.

Combining Different Approaches in Rural Studies

The cultural turn in rural studies has brought much new and interesting material as well as new methods forward and revitalized almost forgotten subject matters within the research field. Within the sub-field of agricultural geography, however, it might be thought that researchers have bypassed the cultural turn (Clope, 1997; Little, 1999). As Morris (this volume) shows, a number of possible explanations for this can be put forward. Here we want to stress the influence of policy-oriented research. Many of the agricultural studies of the past decades, for instance, have been impact studies of certain agricultural reforms or policies. Policy makers often expect that the methodologies used are standardized and replicable, so results can be applied nationally and allow comparisons over-time. This is valid both for rural researchers involved in studies concerning evaluation of EU agri-environmental schemes and for impact analysis of development aid. The implication for researchers of this ‘reality’ is often an implicit denial of the ability of qualitative studies to inform policy-processes and thereby a tendency to neglect the benefits of culturally informed studies. This is nicely illustrated by Beedell and Rehman, who point out that ‘subjective studies consisting of a small number of farmer interviews are not sufficiently convincing or easily replicable to inform the policy-making reliably’ (2000, p.117). We find instead that policy related studies *will* benefit from the perspectives offered by more culturally informed research.

Although the cultural turn may not have had a significant impact on agricultural geography, it is increasingly recognized that studies of farming practices must be widened to include the culture of agriculture. Among others Winter finds that ‘future policy reforms should recognize the complex and inter-related factors influencing farmer behaviour’ (2000, p.47). Likewise, Morris and Potter (1995) in a review of research on farmers’ participation in agri-

environmental schemes point to the need for a more behaviourally informed perspective in order to evaluate the effects of the agri-environmental policies on the ground.

It can be argued that the cultural turn within rural geography has caused a detachment of studies of the material/physical world. Not surprisingly, focus on the verbal and materials such as films, texts, or discourse in general has left studies of land use and agricultural practices largely untouched. Within culturally inspired studies 'the rural' is often considered in terms of its social construction (e.g. Halfacree, 1993; Murdoch and Pratt, 1993). However, we find that this does not limit us to focus on the social part solely. Agriculture still takes up a significant proportion of rural land and as noted by Murdoch 'land is a key marker of rurality' (Murdoch, 2000, p.408). The challenge, therefore, lies in using the insights gained through culturally inspired studies to enrich combined studies of both the material/physical and the social/cultural spheres. Hence, the purpose of the rest of this chapter is to show how issues raised by the cultural turn can enrich 'conventional' geographical studies of land use and agriculture.

Some may argue that this is just old wine in new bottles. And yes, among rural researchers, perhaps especially among those concerned with developing countries, combined studies of both cultural and physical phenomena are quite common. But little discussion is found on the methodological and philosophical implications of combining these issues. One exception is Röling (1994; 1997), who suggests a division into human and physical systems, which should then be studied within different frameworks. Physical systems or environments should be studied using an ecosystem approach within a positivist stance. Human systems, on the other hand, should be studied using action research and based on a social constructionist stance. Consequently, Röling believes that these different epistemologies can be integrated. This approach and similar eclectic approaches are used implicitly in many land use studies (e.g. Turner, 1999). However, instead of integrating knowledge created within different epistemologies, we argue for the need to combine methods within the same philosophical framework in order to build knowledge with due respect to the integrity of the differently obtained data. Such an approach will be discussed in the following sections on a practices-values approach and its implications.

Practices and Values – a Combined Approach

As we are interested in 'the use of rural space', which can be seen as a subject matter transcending rural research in both developed and developing countries, we want to be able to combine studies of the material/physical and the social/cultural spheres. Our notion of 'the use of rural space' concerns both the physical land use and the practices and values of individual actors influencing the land use. In order to understand rural people and their land use, they are considered in the broader context of social and cultural embeddedness of their actions. Moreover, the conceptualisation of rural space includes more than agricultural activities related to production of food. In many countries, the majority of people living in rural areas

and even owning the countryside are not directly involved in agricultural production (see examples in Haartsen et al, 2000). Even in countries where most people living in rural areas are involved in agricultural production, agriculture is not a question of mere production, as recent research on, for instance, rural livelihoods suggests (Ellis, 1998; Bebbington, 1999).

The focus on the embeddedness of peoples' actions does not mean that the limits and possibilities imposed on rural areas by the structures of economy, ecology, politics etc. should not be acknowledged. Instead, we find that these structures are mediated through the complex and often unarticulated processes of decision-making. It is this mediation that should be analysed if the practices leading to a certain use of rural space are to be understood. Further, we emphasize the importance of studying the individual actor and using him/her as the focus for understanding the processes of shared meanings, negotiations, and beliefs that legitimate certain practices and lead to the abandonment of others. Hence, we examine how individuals respond differentially to structure in order to unfold the complex world of the use of rural space. Further, we want to point to the importance of paying attention to the philosophical implications of the methods used and the interplay between methodology and philosophy throughout the research process. Based on these premises the 'practices-values approach' is outlined.

In the analysis of the use of rural space, the rural dweller is used as the point of departure. This means that in order to combine social issues of rurality with physical issues of rural land use, the focus is on the practices and values of individual actors or the group they are member of, e.g. a household. Here, practices should be understood quite literally as actions carried out by individuals, whereas values consist of traditions, preferences, motives, thoughts, and beliefs. We do not perceive the interrelationship between the practices and values of individuals as a linear one-to-one relationship; rather they are interwoven in a complex patchwork. Hence, the relationship between practices and values is not predefined, as this would leave little space for the unexpected. Further, it is stressed that similar practices can be based on different values and similar values may lead to different practices, hence we see the interrelationship as a complex one where one variable cannot be deduced from the other. No claims are made about the novelty of looking at practices and values (see e.g. Kaltoft, 1999; Busck, 2002); here we simply want to suggest an explicit approach towards these issues. The practices-values approach functions as an analytical tool for understanding the interwoven relations between what people do and what they believe in. Further it facilitates an understanding of discrepancies between what people say they are doing and what they actually do. In this way, our approach is different from Kaltoft (1999), who bases her approach towards practices solely on what people say they are doing; this means that it is only a verbalized approach. We find it important to focus not only on a verbalized approach but also on the actual practices that can be observed in a variety of ways. It must be noted that practices and values are not two discrete boxes; they should not be represented as a dualism calling for different research methods e.g. quantitative methods for practices and qualitative for values. Inevitably, it is the researcher who decides what is labelled practices and what is

labelled values. Hence, in order to understand the use of rural space, we have to acknowledge the social embeddedness of actions and to gain information on the legitimating process of certain practices.

Actors' practices are context dependent and do not entail a universal rationality. Hence, actions cannot be understood on their own. Instead every individual can be said to be rational within his/her own perception of the world and hence understood in this context (Fay, 1999). Or, as explained by Vayda, 'recognizing that as more is known of their contexts the better are any activities of concern to us understood' (1983, p.272). Consequently, we find that practices and values should be contextualized. This is in contrast to behavioural studies of farmers' goals, values and attitudes conducted in the 1970s and 1980s (e.g. Gasson, 1969; 1988; Ilbery, 1983), which are often considered important for paving the road for today's cultural turn within geography (Philo, 2000; Morris, this volume). We find that the positivist philosophy inherent in some of these behavioural studies creates problems in relation to culturally informed research especially for combining studies of the social/cultural and material/physical spheres. This is an argument that needs some comments.

The discourse leading to behavioural studies emerged in the 1960s and dismissed the notion of the farmer as 'the economic man' (Thom and Woolmington, 1988). Ilbery, who has used this approach in agricultural studies, describes it this way: 'Based on the assumption that there are further sets of influences which affect agricultural decision-making, including farmers' values, aims, motives and attitudes, the behavioural approach recognizes that farmers may not always perceive the environment as it is ... therefore, the objective of the behavioural approach is clear: to reject the notion of the economic man and replace it with a model that is closer to reality' (1986, p. 25-27). By including other factors in the research of farmers' decision-making process, a more comprehensive notion of the farmer as an actor was obtained. Hence, modelling of human behaviour was the response of some behavioural approaches to the shortcomings of the economic man (Walmsley and Lewis, 1984). However, we do not find this satisfactory. One of the problems is that studies were still conducted within a positivistic framework where the behaviour of farmers was often explained using models that linked behaviour to farm and farmer characteristics (see e.g. the work of Ilbery, 1983). As explained by Röling, assumptions used in mathematical models are problematic because 'in making assumptions, the models violate the variability, diversity and the negotiated, contextual, contingent and adaptive nature of human intentionality, and the flux of trade-offs people make among their different goals' (1997, p. 250).

This 'historical' view is important because this approach still influences contemporary research of motives, attitudes, and values (e.g. Potter and Loble, 1996; Wilson, 1996; Kazenwadel et al, 1998; Beedell and Rehman, 2000). This creates confusion because these issues often are identical with issues central to the cultural turn, but the research process is quite different. The implicit positivist approach means that the obtained data – and especially knowledge about how the data are derived – are often reduced in order to function as inputs in statistical measures. In this process, valuable information about context is usually disregarded and thereby provides no tools for analysing qualitative data and

making them a part of the explanation. In contrast to this, the cultural turn has given emphasis to qualitative methods and usually drawn upon post-structuralist frameworks. Here, context is regarded valuable for knowledge building.

In order to take full advantage of the cultural turn within the field of rural studies, we therefore need to pay attention to the philosophical implications of the practical research, i.e. of the method and theory choices throughout the research process. This is especially an issue of concern when trying to combine 'conventional' geographical studies of land use with culturally informed perspectives, because these studies relies upon a combination of methods and data that can lead to philosophical eclecticism.

When looking at values, we are concerned with understanding and analysing meanings in specific contexts, or as Baxter and Eyles state 'we set out to learn to view the world of individuals or groups as they themselves see it' (1997, p.506). This is important because the practices of people can only be understood in the context of how they construct and perceive their reality. Values do not lead directly to a certain action and are often expressed at a more abstract level than practices. Therefore, practices and values should be understood in context.

The emphasis on context also leads to an investigation of the space where the actions take place whether this space is physical or abstract. Especially interesting are issues of space and place⁴ (e.g. Tuan, 1977; Taylor, 1999). Among human geographers, there is an increasing interest in the idea that space is culturally constructed (Unwin, 2000), in the relation between space/place and identity, and in the image of home/place versus outside/space (e.g. Buttimer, 1998; McHugh, 2000). This means that an important part of understanding context is to be aware of both the physical space and the legitimized use of space created through power, negotiations, and values of a given group of individuals. These different types of space delimit, shape, and challenge the individual actors' 'field of legitimate opportunities'; and in that way they are important when studying the use of rural space (see e.g. Liepins, 2000a; 2000b).

Consequently, the practices-values approach outlined here will often lead to a focus on spatial issues. In order to understand the use of rural space, a focus on both the space in which the actions take place and on the spatial distribution of actions will be often be part of the analysis. Hence, not only tangible issues of the use of rural space should be studied, but a spatial approach that is open towards social and cultural phenomena should be used. This has been done by Müller-Mahn, who has studied social change and poverty in rural Egypt. He has used a spatial approach that '... provides a framework within which people organize their lives and within which they act today. In dealing with the link between space and agency, geography presents some analytical tools that can bring about sensitivity to the spatial aspects of social phenomena' (1998, p.274). However, there is a tendency to equate spatial approaches with quantitative methods (e.g. Johnston, 2000). As argued above, we want to apply a broader understanding of spatial approaches that can also include qualitative methods. We find it unhelpful to reduce spatial approaches to quantitative methods and call for suggestions on how methodologically to enrich the more abstract understanding of space that is part of the 'spatial turn' in humanistic and social sciences. Hence, there is a need for

spatial approaches that do not deny people free will in decision-making and treat them as members of categories rather than individuals (Johnston, 2000, p.132).

When combining social issues of rurality with physical issues of rural land use, a combination of methods and data is an almost inevitable result. Such a combination of quantitative and qualitative data and methods is a daily challenge not only for rural researchers. However, few papers deal explicitly with the philosophical and methodological implications of research based on a combination of different data and methods (some exceptions being Yeung, 1997; Pratt, 1995). In the practices-values approach, we advocate studying practices and values using multi-methods in an iterative process. This is what Yeung describes as ‘a total method approach in which these different methods are seen as employed as a *coherent whole*’ (Yeung, 2000, p.23, emphasis in original). However this has some philosophical implications.

Different ideas about the conduct of research occur, depending on the philosophical point of departure. This means different data collection methods, data handling methods, and evaluation rules, etc. are considered appropriate. The whole idea of being able to choose between methods is based on implicit or explicit assumptions at the philosophical level. There is a risk of eclecticism when working with multi-methods applying a wide range of methods and data types, because data derived from the use of completely different methods cannot just be compared. In order to avoid eclecticism, the integrity of the different methods has to be respected, which points to the importance for connection between philosophy and methodology throughout the research process. However, often it is how the data are used, and not how they are collected, that differs for the various research methods and philosophical stances. Hence, it is how the data are interpreted that matters. The interplay between philosophy and methodology is important, because only philosophical reflections that are used in interplay with methodological considerations can enhance the research process.

Different ways to apply the practices-values approach

In the following, some reflections concerning the application of the practices-values approach are presented. As the discussion shows, we do not advocate one specific method for collecting empirical material or one way of analysing this – on the contrary. The first section concerns the use of multi-methods for collecting information on both practices and values and to reveal discrepancies between what people do and what they say they are doing. This implies that fieldwork is important. Like Yeung, we find in situ research necessary for establishing context and want to avoid ‘armchair theorising’ and ‘remote sensing empirical studies’ (Yeung, 2000). In the next section, we open the array of methods for collecting information on practice and the lived values by including spatial approaches well-known to geographers. Finally, we describe one means to analyse this information and construct abstractions, this is by the use of ideal types.

Multi-methods

The increasing use of qualitative methods in cultural geography has caused the semi-structured interview to gain great importance (Crang, 2002). While this is a powerful tool for collecting information, the emphasis on both practices and values means that semi-structured interviews become too unidirectional. More tools are needed, as we cannot rely on one method for gaining information on the relationship between people's values and what they actually do – their practices. We have to observe what people are doing as well as hear them tell us about their practices and values. Quite often there is a discrepancy between what people say they are doing and what they actually are doing. This is seen both among Danish farmers applying for afforestation grants and Senegalese pastoralists going on migration; therefore these studies have applied multi-methods. Furthermore, when interviews are used, there is a need to analyse not only the interview itself but also the interview location and the power relations between the interviewer and the interviewee. The importance of the interview location for the outcome of the interview has been described by Elwood and Martin (2000) among others. They discuss how researchers can navigate the spatial aspect strategically to situate the interview in its social and cultural context in order to enrich the explanations of the participants. Further, the interview location can be used actively by the researcher to change the power dynamics of the interview itself. A refreshing view on power relations embedded in research based on interviews is given by Bradshaw (2001), who points to research as a fundamentally negotiated process that is translated and transformed by participants and researchers throughout the process.

The call for multi-methods and observation of people's practice means that our practices-values approach draws upon experiences from ethnographic research emphasising observations. These have been criticized because they are susceptible to bias from the observer's subjective interpretation. But according to Adler and Adler: 'Direct observation ... enhances consistency and validity' (1998, p.90). Observations can be used to establish context for the other data collection methods. As noted by Kvale, 'If the research topic concerns more implicit meanings and tacit understandings, like the taken-for-granted assumptions of a group or culture, then participant observation and field studies of actual behaviour supplemented by informal interviews may give more valid information (1996, p.104). We use the concept 'observations' to cover broad range of methods and not only the ethnographic method, and a number of tools for collecting observations can be suggested e.g. map analysis, physical registration. Hence, we advocate geographical means to collect observations as an addition to ethnographic fieldwork, as will be discussed in the next section.

As mentioned, researchers have to be aware of the risk of eclecticism when working with a wide range of methods and data types, a risk that does not exist when working with only one type of data and method. One way to handle this challenge is through method triangulation, if the different methods are used with due respect to their integrity. Different forms of triangulation, e.g. data-triangulation, investigator-triangulation, method-triangulation exist (see e.g. Denzin, 1970; Mikkelsen, 1995; Roe, 1998). Method-triangulation allows for

studying the same phenomenon from different perspectives. As argued by Baxter and Eyles: ‘triangulation is one of the most powerful techniques for strengthening credibility of qualitative research and is based on the notion of convergence: when multiple sources provide similar findings their credibility is considerably strengthened’ (1997, p.514). However, as this approach is based on the assumption that the different data complement each other in revealing different facets of the social world (Yeung, 1997), the challenge of triangulation lies in ensuring that the data enrich each other and are not simply presented as separate findings.

The emphasis on multi-methods should not be seen as a way to justify qualitative methods by using quantitative methods as a prop – a critique that has been raised by Winchester (1999). Rather, the call for multi-methods is due to our subject matter and the need for ways to uncover the multi-layered patchwork of practices and values. In this way, we disagree with Winchester when she claims that interviews can be used as a stand-alone technique in order to uncover underlying structures and causal mechanisms of social processes. Only by approaching the issue from different angles, the often unarticulated and complex interrelationships between practices and values can be uncovered. We do not believe that one single method can provide the answers. Moreover, it is difficult to know in advance which methods will bring forward new and surprising knowledge. Few would disagree with this, but in practice it is difficult to remain open and follow the unexpected because many studies rely on prescribed – rigorous – methods, for instance prescribed by a funding agency. Nevertheless, surprise can be an important impetus for pushing inquiries as stressed by Vayda (1983).

Spatial Methods

Although ethnographic fieldwork and participatory observation are useful for collecting information on people’s practices, there are other means to observe practice and discrepancies between practice and values. As geographers we have learned some of these methods, but according to Johnston (2000), geographers have tended to neglect spatial analysis in recent years. However, as the examples below show, spatial methods can give valuable insight into the lived values and practices of individual actors in rural areas.

In the Danish study of afforestation (Madsen, 2002a), information about landowners’ practices were gained by looking at maps where the landowners had indicated the shape and size of the desired woodland. In this way, the spatial method was used in a manner similar to observations. As the practice had not yet occurred, it was impossible to observe the practice ‘on the ground’, but instead the maps indicated the landowners’ intended practice. Besides functioning as observations, the maps provided valuable spatial information. It turned out that the desired shape of the woodland varied among the different ‘types’ of landowners. For instance, one landowner had a long narrow field located away from the farm that he wanted to afforest. He described the long narrow field as arduous to cultivate due to the distance to the fields and the poor soil quality. Another landowner wanted to use afforestation in order to create shelter on the property. The quality soil of the area was good and there was already a considerable amount

of existing woodland on the property. In order to create an attractive property, he himself drew the location and shape of the area intended for afforestation. He wanted as much fringe as possible, so the area had a sinuous shape. Further, he did not want the forest to throw shadows towards the house, why it was placed away from this.

As can be seen in the two examples, the shaping of woodland is related to the values of the landowner. While the former is a production-oriented landowner not interested in the shape of the woodland itself but in its location in relation to the production unit, the latter is a nature-oriented landowner interested in and actively involved in shaping the woodland. The same can be seen for the issue of soil quality: while it is important for the production-oriented landowners, it means nothing for the nature-oriented. Without the spatial information from the maps, the relation between practices and values would not have been revealed.

Recently the availability of GPS has provided a new way to gain spatial information. This was used in the study of pastoral mobility in Senegal (Adriansen and Nielsen, 2002). Here, a number of pastoralists were given a GPS that was used for collecting information on their whereabouts. This could have been done – and has usually been done – by participatory observations in the sense that a researcher follows the pastoralists. Instead of this very extensive fieldwork, the pastoralists did the mapping ‘themselves’ and this information was combined with interviews and observations both on cultural issues and on mobility practices. Considering the cost-benefits of the different ways of collecting spatial information on pastoral mobility, GPS appeared as a promising solution especially because it was possible to study several pastoral families at the same time. This also gave insights into the power relations and networks among them.

Foremost, the GPS data provided valuable information on the extent and patterns of mobility. From an analytical point of view the GPS data can be used in combination with qualitative information to make method triangulation. The GPS data can be used prior to qualitative interviews to make informed questions about mobility and they can be used after qualitative investigations to illustrate points made or show inconsistencies. In this study, triangulation of methods was used in an iterative process to obtain information about how mobility is practised and why. Moreover, the data was used to expose differences between the local and the researchers’ perception and terminology of mobility. This would have been difficult to uncover without the spatial information.

Especially with regard to research in developing countries, various methods of (participatory) mapping have been developed. These are part of the much discussed Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) and Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) (see e.g. Mikkelsen, 1995). Techniques such as lifeline interviews, ranking, etc. can be useful for rural studies in most countries. However, mapping tools where locals are asked, for instance, to draw the village and fields may seem redundant in countries with extensive national surveying. Nevertheless, these techniques can be used for gaining insights into the layout of villages including social segregation as well as for the local perception of the village space/place. These types of mappings can provide information on lived practices and thereby

function as inspirations for further insight into the values legitimating certain spatial practices in rural societies all over the world.

Ideal Types

Finally, we want to stress the use of 'ideal types' as a way of making use of different types of data for understanding the use of rural space through abstractions. Ideal types are 'pure' types and cannot be transferred directly from interviews or questionnaires. Weber (1949) suggested ideal types as a means to understand social action. Burnham, who advocates the use of ideal types for studies of, for instance, pastoralism, explains Weber's idea this way: 'Weber's concept of the ideal type was developed explicitly to escape from ... the notion in the natural sciences of a causality operating outside of history and of actors' subjective consciousnesses' (Burnham, 1987, p.162). Burnham elaborates that the construction of ideal types involves the recognition of how factors operating within pastoral systems are mediated by the actors' subjective understandings of their situations. One of the benefits of ideal types is that they provide 'a datum against which comparisons can be made to advance the appreciation of particular events' (Johnston, 2000, p.366).

The construction of ideal types is a way to organize the analysis of various types of data and they can be used as abstractions allowing analyses and discussions above the concrete level. The following example show how ideal types can be used to integrate knowledge on both practices and values in order to construct a coherent image of rural dwellers' land use and the underlying reasoning.

In the study of Fulani pastoralists in Senegal, four ideal types of livelihood strategies have been developed based on questionnaires and qualitative interviews (Adriansen, 2002). The ideal types were developed and confirmed through iterative abstraction (Yeung, 1997) and method triangulation (Mikkelsen, 1995; Roe, 1998). In practice, the questionnaires were read several times and combined with information from the qualitative interviews. Later, some of these findings were discussed with the pastoralists during a focus group discussion.

The four ideal types are named: 'the agro-pastoralist', 'the Tabaski⁵ pastoralist', 'the commercial pastoralist', and 'the non-herding pastoralist'. Each of the types provides a comprehensive idea of the pastoral way of life; an idea that is based on pastoralists' motivations, socio-economic possibilities, biological constraints, etc. and not on functionalist and structuralist perceptions of pastoral societies. It should be noted that the types are described as 'individuals', but this does not mean that they can stand-alone. All pastoralists are members of a household and their actions should be interpreted within this context. However, these ideal types are abstractions that should be used to understand the diversity of strategies employed, and thus the individual, idealized form is used.

Most of the pastoralists live in large families where a combination of strategies is employed and different strategies can co-exist for many years. Moreover, the applicability of the different strategies depends upon the availability of labour, the number of animals, and the preferences of the household. As

household and herd sizes can change from year to year, so can the strategy. Although the different strategies can be interpreted as a shift away from pastoralism, the emphasis on both practices and values show that this is not the case. If the various practices revealed in the ideal types are studied without considering the underlying values, motives, and preferences, the society could be seen as very dynamic and identities as constantly changing or reconstructed, and so could the pastoral way of life. For instance, one year a pastoralist can describe his commercial activities as selling Tabaski sheep and the next he spends most of his time in his shop. If, on the other hand, we take issues such as preferences, values, and motives into account, the strategies can be seen as innovative and adaptive to a changing socio-economic environment, but not changing the pastoral way of life *per se*. Although the preferences and motives of the pastoralists vary, cattle represent the 'cultural capital' among the Fulani and this appears not to be changing, even though the ways to acquire this capital have been diversified. Hence, the new activities are not a denial of the 'pastoral way of life'. Instead they can be interpreted as a way to preserve or consolidate the values and identity of the Fulani. The four types are used to conclude that pastoralists in Ferlo have managed to make the most of market opportunities while maintaining their pastoral way of life.

This discussion of methods is by no means a comprehensive discussion of the implications of combining methods and data, but should rather be seen as an illustration and discussion of different ways to conduct rural studies that embrace both social/cultural and material/physical aspects and that respect the philosophy-methodology interplay. It should not be seen as an implicit disregard of other methods or that these methods are in themselves new. For instance, it may be noted that our way of establishing understanding and abstractions is similar to grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). While we find that grounded theory is a useful methodology, it is only one in a number of possible methodologies, which can be used for understanding the use of rural space. Likewise, our methodology is similar to 'progressive contextualisation' (Vayda, 1983). While these methodologies have been of inspiration, we find a need to stress the importance of using multi-methods and emphasize the interplay between methodology and philosophy.

Conclusions

We set out with the purpose of showing that many of the issues raised by the cultural turn transcend the gap between research in so-called developing and developed countries. This was done by illustrating how concepts such as 'sense of belonging' are useful for understanding ruralities in 'different worlds'. The majority of the chapter was devoted to discussing how to combine studies of physical/material and social/cultural issues and to providing an approach towards the study of the use of rural space. We argue that the cultural turn has given rise to much new and interesting research on neglected parts of rural studies as well as drawing attention to new material and knowledge building. Within this new area of research, we see a challenge in combining the cultural turn with its emphasis on

identity, discourse, motives, agency, and cultural construction of rurality with more ‘conventional’ geographical studies of land use.

In order to do so, we have advocated a multi-faceted approach – the ‘practices-values’ approach – towards the study of rural areas in both developed and developing countries, illustrated by examples from our research in Denmark, and Senegal. In this way, transcending the gap was an underlying issue throughout the chapter. Within the practices-values approach, studies of individual actors are used as the focus for understanding the processes of shared meanings, negotiations, and held beliefs that legitimate certain practices, abandon others, and thereby shape the use of rural space. Practices and values should by no means be considered a dualism; instead they are used as an analytical tool for uncovering and comprehending the complex and often non-verbalized relations between action and lived values. This calls for the use of multi-methods and a (re-)turn to philosophically informed ways of doing research. Finally, attention is drawn towards addressing the ‘new and surprising’. In this process, inspiration and exchange of experience between researchers studying the developed and the developing world will be valuable. A call that may well be difficult to practice within the restricted frames of research funding and request for policy relevance.

Acknowledgements

A special thanks to Professor Keith Hoggart for his encouragement and useful comments in regard to our discussions of the need to transcend the research gap between rural studies of ‘developed’ and ‘developing countries’. Also thanks to Professor Emeritus Sofus Christiansen for sharing his enthusiasm for geography and his never-ending curiosity about rural life.

Notes

1. Both the dichotomies ‘developed-developing countries’ and ‘First-Third World’ are embedded in modernist and orientalist discourses encompassing a certain type of (economic) development, ethnocentrism, and ‘othering’ (see e.g. Said, 1985; Crang, 1998). The ‘North-South’ demarcation could be used instead. However, within rural studies there has been a number of interesting contributions from the Australian continent and the ‘North-South’ division therefore appears inappropriate. Nevertheless, for the argument of this paper, we need a term covering (the boundary between) these ‘different worlds’. This boundary – as other boundaries – is a social construction, but one that manifests itself in the construction of research departments and journal delimitations, just to mention a few examples. The argument of the paper is that this boundary is problematic and should be deconstructed; the usage of modernist concepts should therefore not be seen as endorsing these discourses.
2. Council Regulation (ECC) no 2080/92 of 30 June 1992 instituting a community aid scheme for forestry measures in agriculture.
3. GPS means Global Positioning System, a device that can provide coordinates for one’s location.

4. A discussion of 'space' and 'place' is beyond the scope of this chapter. Suffice it to say that while space is general, place is particular: 'space is everywhere, place is somewhere... place is a space with attitude' (Taylor, 1999, p.10).

5. Tabaski is the Senegalese word for the Muslim feast called *id-al-adha* in Arabic. Tabaski sheep are young male sheep. They are raised for commercial purposes and fed well so they can earn a good price at the right time.

References

- Adler, P.A. and Adler, P. (1998), 'Observational Techniques', in N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, pp. 79-109.
- Adriansen, H.K. (2002), 'A Fulani Without Cattle is Like a Woman Without Jewellery: A Study of Pastoralists in Ferlo, Senegal', *Geographica Hafniensia*, A11, Institute of Geography, University of Copenhagen.
- Adriansen, H.K. (2003), 'Egypt's Desert Lands: New Spaces of Opportunity or New Spaces of Poverty?', Paper submitted to *Development and Change*.
- Adriansen, H.K. and Nielsen, T.T. (2002), 'Going Where the Grass is Greener: on the Study of Pastoral Mobility in Ferlo, Senegal', *Human Ecology* Vol. 30, pp.215-226.
- Atkins, P.J. (1988), 'Redefining Agricultural Geography as the Geography of Food', *Area* Vol. 20, pp.281-283.
- Baxter, J. and Eyles, J. (1997), 'Evaluating Qualitative Research in Social Geography: Establishing 'Rigour' in Interview Analysis', *Transactions, Institute of British Geographers*, Vol. 22, pp. 505-525.
- Bebbington, A. (1999), 'Capitals and Capabilities: a Framework for Analyzing Peasant Viability, Rural Livelihoods and Poverty', *World Development*, Vol. 27, pp. 2021-2044.
- Beedell, J. and Rehnman, T. (2000), 'Using Social-psychology Models to Understand Farmers' Conservation Behaviour', *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 16, pp. 117-127.
- Bradshaw, M. (2001), 'Contracts and Member Checks in Qualitative Research in Human Geography: Reason for Caution?', *Area*, Vol. 33, pp. 202-211.
- Bowler, I.R. (1984), 'Agricultural Geography', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 8, pp. 255-262.
- Bowler, I.R. (1987), 'Agricultural Geography', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 11, pp. 425-432.
- Bowler, I. and Ilbery, B. (1987) 'Redefining Agricultural Geography', *Area*, Vol. 19, pp. 327-332.
- Burnham, P. (1987), 'Pastoralism and the Comparative Method', in L. Holy (ed), *Comparative Anthropology*, Basil Blackwell, Padstow, pp. 153-167.
- Busck, A.G. (2002), 'Farmers' Landscape Decisions: Relationships Between Farmers' Values and Landscape Practices', *Sociologia Ruralis*, Vol. 42, pp.233-249.
- Buttimer, A. (1998), 'Geography's Contested Stories: Changing States-of-the-art', *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, Vol. 89, pp. 90-99.
- Cloke, P. (1997), 'Country Backwater to Virtual Village? Rural Studies and 'the CulturalTurn'', *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 13, pp. 367-375.
- Cloke, P. and Little, J. (eds) (1997), *Contested Countryside Cultures: Otherness, Marginalisation and Rurality*, Routledge, London.
- Crang, M. (2002), 'Qualitative Methods: the New Orthodoxy?', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 26, pp. 647-655.
- Crang, M. (1998), *Cultural Geography*, Routledge, London.

- Denzin, N.K. (1970), *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*, Aldine, Chicago.
- Ellis, F. (1998), 'Household Strategies and Rural Livelihood Diversification', *The Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 325, pp. 1-38.
- Elwood, S.A. and Martin, D.G. (2000), 'Placing Interviews: location and Scales of Power in Qualitative Research', *Professional Geographer*, Vol. 52, pp. 649-657.
- Fay, B. (1999), *Contemporary Philosophy of Social Science: a Multicultural Approach*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Gasson, R. (1969), 'Occupational Immobility of Small Farmers: a Study of the Reasons Why Small Farmers Do Not Give Up Farming', Occasional Papers No. 13. Farm Economics Branch, Department of Land Economy, Cambridge University, Cambridge.
- Gasson, R. (1988), *The Economics of Part-time Farming*, Longman, Hong Kong.
- Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L. (1967), *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*, Aldine, Chicago.
- Grigg, D. (1981), 'Agricultural Geography', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 5, pp. 268-276.
- Grigg, D. (1982), 'Agricultural Geography', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 6, pp. 242-246.
- Grigg, D. (1983), 'Agricultural Geography', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 7, pp. 255-260.
- Haartsen, T., Groote, P. and Huigen, P.P.P. (eds) (2000), *Claiming Rural Identities*, Van Gorcum, The Netherlands.
- Halfacree, K. (1993), 'Locality and Social Representation: Space, discourse and Alternative Definitions of the Rural', *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 9, pp. 1-15.
- Hammar, A. (2002), 'The Articulation of Modes of Belonging: Competing Land Claims in Zimbabwe's Northwest', in K. Juul and C. Lund (eds), *Negotiating Property in Africa*, Heinemann, USA, pp. 211-246.
- Ilbery, B.W. (1983), 'Goals and Values of Hop Farmers', *Transactions, Institute of British Geographers*, Vol. 8, pp. 329-41.
- Ilbery, B.W. (1986), 'Theory and Methodology in Agricultural Geography', in M. Pacione (ed), *Progress in Agricultural Geography*, Croom Helm Progress in Geography Series, Croom Helm, Worcester, pp.13-37.
- Johnston, R.J. (2000), 'On Disciplinary History and Textbooks: or Where has Spatial Analysis Gone?', *Australian Geographical Studies*, Vol 38, pp. 125-137.
- Kaltoft, P. (1999), 'Values About Nature in Organic Farming Practice and Knowledge', *Sociologia Ruralis*, Vol. 39, pp. 39-53.
- Kazenwadel, G., van der Ploeg, B., Baudoux, P. and Häring, G. (1998), 'Sociological and Economic Factors Influencing Farmers' Participation in Agri-environmental Schemes', in S. Dabbert, A.Dubgaard, L.Slangen, and M.Whitby (eds), *The Economics of Landscape and Wildlife Conservation*, CAB international, Wallingford, pp. 187-203.
- Kvale, S. (1996), *Interviews: an Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*, Sage Publications, USA.
- Liepins, R. (2000a), 'New Energies for an Old Idea: Reworking Approaches to 'Community' in Contemporary Rural Studies', *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 16, pp. 23-35.
- Liepins, R. (2000b), 'Exploring Rurality Through 'Community': Discourses, Practices and Spaces Shaping Australian and New Zealand Rural 'Communities'', *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 16, pp. 325-341.
- Little, J. (1999), 'Otherness, Representation and the Cultural Construction of Rurality', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 23, pp. 437-442.

- Madsen, L.M. (2002a), 'Location of Woodlands: the Danish Afforestation for Field Afforestation', *Geographica Hafniensia A10*, Institute of Geography, University of Copenhagen.
- Madsen, L.M. (2002b), 'The Danish Afforestation Programme and Spatial Planning: New Challenges', *Landscape and Urban Planning*, Vol. 58, pp. 241-254.
- Madsen, L.M. (2003), 'New Woodlands in Denmark: The Role of Private Landowners', *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, Vol. 1, pp.185-195.
- McHugh, K.E. (2000), 'Inside, Outside, Upside Down, Backward, Forward, Round and Round: a Case for Ethnographic Studies in Migration', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 24, pp. 71-89.
- Mikkelsen, B. (1995), *Methods for Development Work and Research, a Guide for Practitioners*, Sage Publications, Delhi.
- Milbourne, P. (1997) (ed), 'Revealing rural 'others': diverse voices in the British Countryside', Pinter Press, London.
- Morley, D. (2001), 'Belongings: Place, Space and Identity in a Mediated World', *Cultural Studies*, Vol. 4, pp. 425-448.
- Morris, C. and Potter, C. (1995), 'Recruiting the New Conservationists: Farmers' Adoption of Agri-environmental schemes in the U.K.', *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 11, pp. 51-63.
- Murdoch, J. (2000), 'Networks – a New Paradigm for Rural Development?', *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol.16, pp. 407-419.
- Murdoch, J. and Pratt, A. (1993), 'Rural Studies: Modernism, Postmodernism and the 'Post Rural'', *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 9, pp. 411-427.
- Müller-Mahn, D. (1998), 'Spaces of Poverty: the Geography of Social Change in Rural Egypt', in N.S. Hopkins and K. Westergaard (eds), *Directions of Change in Rural Egypt*, The American University in Cairo Press, Egypt, pp. 256-276.
- Phillips, M., Fish, R. and Agg, J. (2001) 'Putting Together Ruralities: Towards a Symbolic Analysis of Rurality in the British Mass Media', *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 17, pp. 1-27.
- Philo, C. (2000) 'More Words, More Worlds: Reflections on the 'Cultural Turn' in Human Geography', in I. Cook, D. Crouch, S. Naylor and J. Ryan (eds), *Cultural Turns/Geographical Turns*, Pearson, Harlow, pp. 26-53.
- Potter, C. and Lobley, M. (1996), 'The Farm Family Life Cycle, Succession Paths and Environmental Change in Britain's Countryside', *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 47, pp.172-190.
- Pratt, A.C. (1995), 'Putting Critical Realism to Work: the Practical Implications for Geographical Research', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 19, pp. 61-74.
- Roe, E. (1998), *Taking Complexity Seriously: Policy Analysis, Triangulation and Sustainable Development*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, USA.
- Röling, N. (1994), 'Platforms for Decision-making About Ecosystems', in L.O., Stroosnijder, L., J. Bouma and H. van Keulen, (eds), *The Future of Land: Mobilising and Integrating Knowledge for Land Use Options*, John Wiley & Sons Ltd, Fresco, pp. 385-393.
- Röling, N. (1997), 'The Soft Side of Land: Socio-economic Sustainability of Land Use Systems', *ITC Journal*, Vol. 3-4, pp. 248-262.
- Said, E. (1995), *Orientalism*. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth (1st edn, 1978).
- Sayer, A. (1992), *Method in Social Science: a Realist Approach*, Routledge, London.
- Taylor, P.J. (1999), 'Places, Spaces and Macy's: Place-space Tensions in the Political Geography of Modernities', *Progress in Human Geography* Vol. 23, pp. 7-26.
- Thom, B.G. and Woolmington, E. (1988), 'The Integrative Power of Interdisciplinary Geography', *Interdisciplinary Science Review*, Vol. 13, pp. 52-63.

- Tuan, Y.E. (1977), *Space and Place*, Arnold, London.
- Turner, M.D. (1999), 'No Space for Participation: Pastoralist Narratives and the Etiology of Park-herder Conflict in Southeastern Niger', *Land Degradation and Development* Vol. 10, pp. 345-363.
- Unwin, T. (2000), 'A Waste of Space? Towards a Critique of the Social Production of Space...', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, Vol. 25, pp. 11-29.
- Van Hoven (2001), 'Women at Work – Experiences and Identity in Rural East Germany', *Area*, Vol. 33, pp.38-46.
- Vayda, A.P. (1983), 'Progressive Contextualisation: Methods for Research in Human Ecology', *Human Ecology*, Vol. 11, pp. 265-281.
- Walmsley, D.J. and Lewis, G.J. (1984), *Human Geography: Behavioural Approaches*, Longman Group Limited, Singapore.
- Weber, M. (1949), *The Methodology of Social Sciences*, The Free Press, New York.
- Whatmore, S. (1991), 'Agricultural Geography', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 15, pp. 303-310.
- Whatmore, S. (1993), 'Agricultural Geography', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 17, pp. 84-91.
- Wilson, G.A. (1996), 'Farmer Environmental Attitudes and ESA Participation', *Geoforum*, Vol. 27, pp.115-131.
- Winchester, H.P.M. (1999), 'Interviews and Questionnaires as Mixed Methods in Population Geography: the Case of Lone Fathers in Newcastle, Australia', *Professional Geographer*, Vol. 51, pp. 60-67.
- Winter, M. (2000), 'Strong Policy or Weak Policy? The Environmental Impact of the 1992 Reforms to the CAP Arable Regime in Great Britain', *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 16, pp.47-59.
- Yeung, H.W. (1997), 'Critical Realism and Realist Research in Human Geography: a Method or a Philosophy in Search of a Method?', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 21, pp. 51-74.
- Yeung, H.W. (2000), 'Practicing New Economic Geographies? Some Methodological Considerations'. Paper presented at the RGS-IBG annual conference, Brighton, University of Sussex, 4-7 January 2000.