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CHAPTER 8
WITHOUT CATEGORIES AND CLASSIFICATIONS: "RURAL" AS A SOCIAL EXPRESSION

Loka Ashwood

ABSTRACT
This chapter explores social representative groups as a medium to study "rural" meaning in Ireland. In research terms, the concept of "rurality" is increasingly debated, its existence questioned, and approaches to establish conceptual and methodological boundaries continuously challenged. By studying the language of social representative group leaders, it is argued in this chapter that the "rural" can be fluidly explored through its expression. Through a theme-based deconstruction of interviews with group leaders, I explore the expression of loss in Irish dialogue and its implication on "rural" meaning.

INTRODUCTION
Social classifications are increasingly challenged in an age where time and space boundaries are permeated by technological advances. "Rural" as a social category is particularly vulnerable to these changes because of the term's orientation with place and time-held traditions. In an attempt to move

away from such classifications of the "rural" and toward a more fluid approach to the term. I use social representative groups in Ireland that actively invoke "rural" language to explore the meanings and uses of "rural." Because of these groups' status as social representative groups, this research takes their viewpoints as popularly accepted representations of "rural" meaning. I begin this chapter by reviewing theoretical foundations of social categorization and its effect on "rural" classifications. Launching from the complexities of these "rural" categorizations and attempts at creating boundaries, I review the varied uses of "rural" in the recent Irish past. In my section, Methodological Issues, I detail my use of social groups to explore current "rural" expressions in Ireland, which I follow with my methodology of group selection. I then review the results of my analysis, and for purposes of this chapter, I only focus on one of the emerging themes in detail — the expression of loss. In Ireland, loss is different than the sentiments of "rural" expressed in the past century. The varied dialogues of the "rural" in the Irish past and the disagreement over whether a claimed loss of the "rural" is a myth or reality (Newby, 1977) highlights the tentative state of "rural" as a concept without clear boundaries, which must be interpreted in the context of time. It is through the combination of theoretical challenges, past differentiations, and current usage of the term that "rural" is argued in this chapter to be a social expression, with common meanings in constantly evolving forms that challenge categorization.

Embedded in the exploration of social differences and cultural boundaries is the assumption that the characteristic divisions of land and the history of the people living within it are inherent in culture. Culture, tradition, and knowledge in effect are linked to the differentiations and habits embedded in the repetition of time. Giddens (1984) defines social differentiations through time and space and until recently these time and space differentiations were generally accepted in the social sciences as a given mean of separation to define societies. A rise of the "informal, global, networked" society (Castells, 2000, p. 10) and increased "diverse mobilities" in a "placeless" world (Urry, 2000, pp. 191, 219) are challenging the use of spatially defined terms. Differences, boundaries, and place feed categorizations of societies, and can be used for blank and stark division. Particularly with use of "rural" as a descriptive term imbedded in space and time division, increased technological connection poses challenges to the conception and potential extinction, assuming the former existence, of the term "rural." Woods (2006, p. 590) writes that the "rural" is defined by "geographic stability" and "rootedness to place, by a belonging to land and locality by an understanding of spatial boundaries..." leaving "rural" areas particularly prone to conflict with "transient populations," whose mobility threatens this identity. By defining place through Marc Augé's (1995) terms as "relational, historical and concerned with identity" (p. 77), the "rural" becomes a term particularly vulnerable to the crippling of space and time.

The challenge of creating criteria for what classifies or determines "rural" has led to a variety of critiques of the term and suggestions as to potential methods that could define it as a category of analysis. In order to identify or find the "rural," Halfacre (1993) writes that the physical environment does not determine physical behavior, but rather that the locality defines the "rural" and that the "rural" is symbolic. Little (1999, p. 438) writes that, "A greater sensitivity toward the complexity and fluidity of 'rural' otherness requires that we focus more directly on the meaning and construction of identity in a 'rural' context." It is argued that the cultural turn in "rural" studies finally gave freedom to study masculinity and femininity in the "rural" setting (Little & Leys, 2003, p. 258). In a critique of the increased popularity of an abstract approach to the "rural," Cloke (2006) writes that the use of the "idea rural" is too unstructured, whereas Bell (2007) uses it as one of the two categorizations, writing that an "idea rural," "is to engage the possibility that it is too late for the rural, for it is already gone, and maybe never even existed" (p. 411). Bell's second category is more traditionally agricultural and is titled material production. This stark classification, Bell (2007, p. 409) writes, attempts to create "boundaries in the boundless," although he overall concludes that the only appropriate approach to the "rural" is one with plural meanings. The plethora of approaches used to define "rural" or clarify the use of the word magnifies the impossibility of defining the conception in a fenced arena.

Ireland has been chosen as the location in which to probe the conceptualization of "rural" boundaries and study the use of "rural." The country's extreme economic change, increased development, recent implementation of technologies, and relative lack of industrialization pre-European Union membership in 1973 makes it a particularly relevant and unique example. Referring again to Augé's definition of place as, "relational, historical and concerned with identity," Ireland's long-litany of struggles over land control and ownership are central in understanding the historical importance of place in the country and the linguistic adhesion to "rural" in the past and present. Using observable and measurable means to define the "rural" has been less prevalent in Irish literature, particularly in the 1990s, and more typical in British work. Such literature in Ireland is primarily confined to Cawley (1980, 1991), Duffy (1987), and most recently Mahon (2007), who writes that in Ireland the "rural" is becoming increasingly
complex, with “seemingly contrasting and contradictory meanings of this term” (p. 355). In comparison to current attempts to measure the “rural,” descriptive use of the term in Ireland has changed substantially since the early 1900s. In the 1930s, “rural” Ireland was framed as a picturesque sustainable ideal by Arenberg and Kimball (1940), based on the conception that the “rural” was determined spatially and through community, although the theoretical basis of the work was later discredited. In striking contrast, community group Muintir na Tire was founded in 1940 to combat poverty, describing “rural” Ireland as a “drab, dull and lifeless place” (Tierney, 2004, p. 7). In the 1950s and 1960s, newfound fears that “rural” communities were dying dominated discourse (Healy, 1968). With EU membership in 1973, the theme of modernization of Ireland primarily dominated “rural” discussion into the 1980s. The 1990s marked an increased sense of “crisis” (Varley, Boylan, & Cuddy, 1991) and a defense of “rural” Ireland against claims that it was an “irrelevant backwater” (Curtin, Haase, & Tovey, 1996). In the modern decade, Ireland is referred to as increasingly complex (McDonagh, 2001), and as having overcome its “rural” roots, “to take its rightful place as an equal among the nations of the world” (Coulter, 2003, p. 15). In 2007, Ireland was the second wealthiest country in the EU based on Gross Domestic Product. These rapid changes in Ireland from a peasant-based culture to a technologically driven, industrial economy are reflected through very different “rural” dialogues, echoing a transformation away from time-space differentiations and toward interconnection and mobility.

**METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES**

Regardless of what the “rural” can be or is identified with, any sort of classification or boundary for “rural” is immediately thwarted with impossibilities. Taking the concept of “boundaries” and going further, attempts at defining the “rural” dissect the object(s) of study in order to create classifications, a nearly unfeasible quest in a recognized age of networks (Castells, 2000, 2004) and mobilities (Urry, 2000). These attempts at categorization disregard the use of “rural” as a social expression rather than a structure. By instead beginning with expressions of the “rural” at the lay level – the insiders’ perspective versus that of the outsiders (Jones, 1995; Long, 2003) – the “rural” in its modern linguistic use can be probed within the context of fundamental social changes driven by mobility.

This research uses social representative groups in Ireland that actively use “rural” language to explore meanings and uses of the “rural”. By studying "rural" expression through lay discourse via group representation, this research particularly challenges notions of a “symbolic rural” (Halfacree, 1993), where some aspects of the “rural” are argued not to actually exist (Newby, 1977), but to be a projection and imaginative force driven by those who utilize or in some cases exploit “rural” mythical perceptions (Hopkins, 1998). Although being careful not to undermine the importance of these approaches to understand emerging perceptions of “rural,” they can mistakenly be used to de-legitimize “rural” at the lay level and problems expressed through “rural” discourse. Through groups, the “rural” can be studied as a malleable social description that is dependent on lay perception, particularly the people in Ireland who prescribe to the projected “rural” language of these groups and appoint leaders as their vocal representatives. The use of social representative groups is a step toward removing the projections of the researcher onto the subject. Since the groups studied in this chapter express “rural” in their group formation and in continuing issues, the term is not being isolated and given meaning and agency, but is emerging from social representation and lay discourse.

Representative groups have been used as a method to explore social change and a reflection of the general associations of society. In America, Putnam (1995) connects the decline of social representative groups to low levels of civic engagement and the failure of government. He writes that civic groups reflect the moral and intellectual associations of the country (p. 65). Using groups to study larger trends, in Great Britain, Hay (2004) writes that the overall decline of civic engagement reflects the disenchantment of the country. In the context of specifically studying the “rural,” Woods (1997, 2003) uses groups to document an increase in revolts and demonstrations in “rural” areas. Continuing to use representative groups to study social change, but countering Hay (2004) and Putnam’s (1995) themes of decline, Boonstra (2006) argues that social representative groups are arising in nontraditional forms that represent increasingly diverse communities. In their study of “rural” Illinois cooperatives, Foreman and Whetten (2002) relate members’ identities in organizations to social identities at large and individual’s beliefs. Thus groups socially formed to represent the needs of a larger constituency by virtue are socially representative. Taking this concept further, social representation theory (Moscowici, 2000) argues that people make representations to reflect their reality and these representations are shared by a mass of people. People’s representations, therefore, reflect reality just as representations of the “rural” reflect reality. Literature further contests that the meaning of words are not of themselves definite, but are socially constructed (Berger & Luckman, 1966). Applying Berger and Luckman’s theorization to the
“rural,” its meaning becomes socially constructed and created by those who employ the word “rural.” The representative groups I selected for study and their leaders that I interviewed are thus representational of “rural” meaning in two ways: Through the direct dialogue of group leaders who socially construct the “rural” by employing the word, and also by being representatives of the groups that are representational by nature.

**METHODOLOGY**

All groups selected were voluntary in nature at their formation. The primary criteria for the selection of groups was that they used “rural” as a central topic in their reasons for founding and the issues central to their purpose. The groups selected span nearly a decade of founding from 1911 to 2002:

1. The Irish Countrywomen’s Association (ICA), founded in 1911 under the name The United Irishwomen, was originally formed to address the “Problem of Rural Life” (Plunkett, Pilkington, & Russell, 1911, p. 2). The group has been in existence for nearly a century. Current membership is 15,000.

2. The Irish Farmers’ Association (IFA), originally founded in 1955 under the name the National Farmers’ Association, was formed by 2,300 farmers to address economic problems (Anderson, 1974, p. 65). The IFA recently developed a new partner, the IFA Countryside (IFAC), although the group is still a part of the overarching IFA. The IFAC is “for all with an affinity for the countryside. This includes anyone who grew up on a farm and those who use the countryside for fishing, shooting, walking, and other country pursuits as well as all involved in field sports such as hurling and football. It helps to build links between farmers and those removed from the land, ensuring that it does not become a question of ‘them and us’” (IFA Countryside, 2008). Current overall membership is 80,000.

3. The Keep Ireland Open (KIO) association was formed in 1993 by farmers to keep commonage, primarily in mountains and bogs used commonly in “rural” areas open in wake of efforts to fence it off. The mission statement of the organization has evolved to “An environmental organization devoted to the maintenance of traditional access to our common heritage of mountain, lake and river” (KIO, 2007, p. 2). Current membership is estimated at 450, with associated membership through 10 other organizations of about 4,500 members.

4. The Irish Rural Dwellers Association (IRDA) was formed in 2002 to reduce the ability of planners to control and prevent the building of homes in “rural” Ireland. IRDA’s goal is, “To unite all rural dwellers and people of goodwill toward rural Ireland and in the context of peaceful, multicultural co-existence in the common cause of ensuring, by legal and constitutional means, the growth and maintenance of a vibrant, populated countryside in the traditional Irish forms of baile fearann or dispersed village, said bhaile or street village and the clachan or nucleated (clustered village)” (Connolly, 2006, p. 2). Current membership is 1,600.

I conducted interviews with group leaders from each of the four organizations in January and February 2008, ranging between 1 and 4 hours in length. The leaders I interviewed are as follows: The Honorary National Secretary for the ICA, the Chairman of the IFA Countryside, the IFA Regional Representative, the KIO Connaught Secretary, and the IRDA President. My interviews of group leaders were loosely structured, following with qualitative methodological research arguing that interviews provide more freedom for the interviewee in their responses (Fontana & Frey, 2000). The interviews were central to understanding the language and culture of the groups. Although the primary intention of the group leader interviews was to remain as unstructured as possible, there was particular information I needed to gather. Thus I asked group leaders what their primary group orientation or issues were, how the group had changed, how the group represented the “rural,” and if the group was in conflict with any other organizations. Because interviews require a constant “rapport” with the interviewee (Kitchin & Tate, 2000, p. 215), depending on the group leader that I was interviewing, there were sometimes fewer questions prompted in some interviews than in others.

I adopted themes as the method to absorb, dissect, and digest the lengthy interviews with social representative group leaders in an effort to thematically identify “rural” meaning in Ireland. “Theme discovery” is used as a commonly accepted qualitative methodology as part of the “interpretivist tradition” (Ryan & Bernard, 2000, p. 86). In Opler’s (1946) work, still strongly drawn on today (Ryan & Bernard, 2000), he writes that, “It is probable that much of what we have loosely called ‘structure’ in culture is essentially the interrelation and balance of themes” (p. 202). Particularly Opler (1946) argues that themes are a culmination of expressions. I adopt the term expression throughout this chapter in the data analysis. It is through interviews that I identify themes and consequently develop the expression of “rural” meaning.
My group leader interview analysis focused on identifying themes through a "labor-intensive, line-by-line analyses that, so far, only humans can do" (Ryan & Bernard, 2000, p. 85). The scrutiny techniques that I employed to find themes were observational and did not employ coding or manipulating techniques. In the process of transcribing and on analysis after transcription, I employed the observational techniques of repetition (Ryan & Bernard, 2000, p. 89), and similarities and differences (Ryan & Bernard, 2000, p. 91). The themes that I identified ranged from those particularly relating to each of the groups and more general themes that were shared by all four of the organizations. For the purposes of this chapter, I discuss the theme of loss, which was a shared theme between the four groups that related to an overarching "rural" expression of loss and pride.

**EXPRESSION OF LOSS**

Loss was expressed by all group leaders interviewed, from the most recently founded IRDA to the oldest organization, the ICA. Recently created groups were founded to protect what they felt was being lost in the "rural," and representatives of the older groups spoke of challenges and changes that had brought loss to the group and communities. Representatives laments change and express their respective quests to maintain the "rural," whereas stressing the interconnection between "rural" and Ireland. When group leaders spoke of their organizations and their "rural" members, it was with a sense of justification of purpose and central importance for restoration and most acutely, future survival, whether it be survival of the group itself, a continuation of heritage, the survival of a particular Irish "rural" settlement pattern, or saving a proclaimed Irish social structure.

The IRDA takes a stance against planning regulations that the group argues are preventing the survival of the townlands, a scattered community of homes and the lowest-level officially defined geographical unit of land in Ireland. The group's reasoning is that by overcoming planners, communities can have the freedom of development, townlands can be reinvigorated, and the "rural" in Ireland can survive. The dialog becomes one of the heritage and saving what is being lost:

One of the saddest most heart-breaking factors of rural life that I'm familiar with is it is actually dying. Centuries, and in the case of Ireland, thousands of years of culture, of tradition, is disappearing. It can never be replaced. In Ireland it is particularly sad because we have such a long tradition of culture, such a long long tradition. And it is in our literature, this rural. Our music is, our language was. (Connolly, 2008)

This general sense of losing what is Irish and "rural" is targeted by the IRDA through planning, whereas the KIO, although also trying to preserve the countryside, takes a protective stance. Trying to prevent what they call a loss of the old Irish countryside, the KIO association is orientated around saving green tracks and old paths becoming restricted to the general public because they are on private property. The goal of the KIO is embedded in an overall theme of sustaining the Irish heritage of freedom and roaming that they view as under attack. To prevent this loss, action must be taken, thus the reason for the formation of the group and the orientation of its future goals.

Our lovely network of tracks and paths, they'll be lost to future generations unless we protect them now. They're pearls of great price and they should be kept. They were green roads, another word for the old roads where they walked in the old days of persecution. They'd track across the hills to where they had a flat stone, and they'd have mass in the hidden valleys. (Murphy, 2008)

For both the IRDA and the KIO, the individual group themes are embedded in a larger context of loss and saving what is disappearing. This expression of fear and need to protect what they deem as theirs from outsiders is part of the theme of loss. "Rural" becomes the expression of this loss.

The same theme of "rural" loss and survival is recurrent in the language of longer established groups and in the groups' structural reorientations to address changing constituencies. Despite their efforts to make these changes, a major theme in the dialogue of both the Irish Farmers Association (IFA) and the ICA was that change was made to keep numbers up, whereas the overall loss of the "rural" was irreparable. Owing to the "terminal" decline of agriculture, the IFA has created a new branch of their organization, the IFA Countryside, to try to target nonfarming populations living in the countryside (Wilkinson, 2008). In doing so, the group is working on counteracting the loss of "rural" populations by advocating government intervention.

We're talking about rural decline. It's very evident. The non-viability of the local community. They lose the post office. They lose the pub. The countryside is becoming a difficult place to live without services, and yet they must be maintained. (Wilkinson, 2008)

The original goals of the ICA were to address the, "higher standard of material comfort and physical wellbeing in the country home, a more advanced agricultural economy, and a social existence a little more in harmony with the intellect and temperament of our people" (Plunkett et al., 1911, p. 2). In December 2007, the organization held a national meeting in Dublin to discuss its decline and the need to implement further changes to modernize the organization. The gains for Irish women through ICA are equated now with loss: An organizational loss and an unclear path for the
future, with dwindling membership and an aging constituency. Three options were presented to voting delegates, one of which was ending the organization in recognition that it had “served its purpose” (Dennison, 2008). The members overwhelmingly voted for reinvigoration and not to end the organization.

The expression of a “lost rural” is argued by some not to actually exist and is classified as an “idealized notion” of the “rural” (Crow & Allan, 1994; Newby, 1977, 1979). Newby (1977), who is still prominently drawn on today, looks at “rural” as a faith that he relates to the “ultimate rural idyll – the Garden of Eden” (p. 19). In stark contrast to his conclusion that “rural” loss is a belief or a faith in something that has disappeared and the language employed to express that belief is part of the myth, my research methodology employs language to understand what the “rural” is, and thus the language of loss is a social part of “rural” meaning in the Irish dialogue. The “rural” is its social expression, and in Ireland, the expression of the “rural” is loss.

**CONCLUSION**

The intertwining of “rural” and ‘loss’ in group dialogue marks a change in the expression of “rural” in Ireland, a message popularly accepted by the groups’ supporters. Regardless of categories of current meanings for the “rural,” past interpretation, statistical adoption, or “rural” oriented policy, the messages these groups are relaying revolve around a “rural” need for immediate intervention. The object of study becomes less how to categorize a term used to express a need, or what the “rural” is – an impossible task considering the variety of meanings conveyed through the term – but how the word is used as a social expression. Instead of focusing on the problem of defining the “rural,” by reinvigorating the focus on how the word is used in different places at different times and allowing it to run a course free from category, and by effect time or space, the expression becomes the most important point of study. From this comparatively structure free perspective, the utilization of “rural” as a mean, rather than an end, allows the freedom to understand what is so emotive, prone to conflict (Woods, 2003), and explosive within these groups, communities, or places that label themselves with “rural.”
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