View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

brought to you by CORE

provided by Aberystwyth Research Portal

Aberystwyth University

Language struggles:

Gkartzios, Menelaos; Remoundou, Kyriaki

Published in:
Geoforum

DOI:
10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.04.016

Publication date:
2018

Citation for published version (APA):
Gkartzios, M., & Remoundou, K. (2018). Language struggles: Representations of the countryside and the city in an era of mobilities. *Geoforum*, *93*, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.04.016

Document License
CC BY-NC-ND

General rights
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Aberystwyth Research Portal (the Institutional Repository) are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

• Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Aberystwyth Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
• You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
• You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Aberystwyth Research Portal

Take down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

tel: +44 1970 62 2400
email: is@aber.ac.uk

Download date: 09. Jul. 2020

Language Struggles:

Representations of the Countryside and the City in an Era of Mobilities

Menelaos Gkartzios[a] and Kyriaki Remoundou[b]

[a] Centre for Rural Economy, School of Natural and Environmental Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU, UK

[b] Aberystwyth Business School, Aberystwyth University, Aberystwyth, SY23 3AL, UK

Language Struggles: Representations of the Countryside and the City in an Era of Mobilities

This paper stresses the role of language in rural studies research. It does so by exploring conceptualisations of the city and the countryside in a period of mobility transformations and economic crisis in Greece. We use survey data from open-ended questions asking respondents to provide words they associate with the 'village', the 'city' and the 'eparchy', a term for non-metropolitan spaces of regional scale used in the Greek language. The survey was implemented to a sample of 300 residents in the city of Athens, and 300 residents in two regional towns in Greece. Our results demonstrate negative associations with the city and generally positive images attached to non-metropolitan settings, a finding that is important in contexts similar to Greece, where the 'rural idyll' has been far from a hegemonic discourse. Furthermore, we advocate the use of indigenous and informal narratives of rurality, such as the 'eparchy', for contextualising rural spatialities and development narratives, in the context of rural mobility, and wider, rural social research. Such terms are particularly powerful because their use in international platforms unequivocally challenges, and resists, the dominance of Anglophone research.

Die Grenzen meiner Sprache bedeuten die Grenzen meiner Welt

The limits of my language are the limits of my world

Ludwig Wittgenstein, 1921

1. Introduction: Positioning Rurality

This paper explores contemporary conceptualisations of the city and the countryside in Greece – a non-Anglophone research context, posing considerable challenges in writing it in English. This challenge, implicit in most research projects in non-Anglophone contexts, represents also one of the arguments of the paper: that although language matters, its importance and its complications are not critically considered in rural studies research, a field which is asymmetrically influenced by UK-US, and wider Anglophone, academic discourses (Lowe, 2012).

Social scientists have been long aware of the role of language in understanding the social and natural world, not least in the concept of discourse (Foucault, 1972). For Lisle, for example, (1985, p. 24) 'language is not simply a medium to carry concepts. It is itself the very matter of scientific observation and discourse'. Most social scientists accept that language constructs meaning and realities, that language is neither neutral nor disconnected from culture, and that it carries its own politics (Phillipson, 2011). In Fairclough's words 'a language defines a certain potential, certain possibilities, and excludes others' (2003, p. 24). However, although few social scientists would disagree with the above assertions, there is scant discussion on the impact of English, as a *lingua academica*, in rural mobility research, despite the debates on rural definitions and concepts used across academics, policy makers and local communities (e.g. Allan and Mooney, 1998; Halfacree, 1993; Jones, 1995).

The paper draws on numerous research projects on lay representations of rurality (see for example: López-i-Gelats et al., 2009; Baylina and Berg, 2010; Willets et al., 1990), and explores the social construction of rurality in Greece in a context of mobilities linked to the economic crisis. Over the last decade, an increasing body of work has advocated a 'mobilities turn' in social sciences, reflecting increasing levels and new forms of mobility, thereby placing mobility as omnipresent feature of social life (e.g. Cresswell, 2006, 2010; Elliot and Urry, 2010; Sheller and Urry, 2006; Urry, 2007). As Cresswell (2010) highlights, this literature combines ways of thinking and conceptualising that 'foreground mobility (of people, of ideas, of things) as a geographical fact that lies at the centre of constellations of power, the creation of identities and the micro-geographies of everyday life' (p. 551). For Cresswell and others, a mobilities perspective is essentially relational: it moves beyond more narrow fields, such as transport or migration studies, to embrace all forms of mobility (material and immaterial), from small scale personal and even transient movements (or even immobility experiences) to the global flows and of capital and labour (see also review in Scott et al., 2017). In this mobility

era, researchers have investigated diverse representations, practices and experiences produced by mobilities, such as what mobilities mean and for whom; what representations are embodied through mobility; how they might change our understanding of places; and what power struggles and inequalities they might produce across intersectional identities:

> […] mobility is more than about just getting from A to B. It is about the contested world of meaning and power. It is about mobilities rubbing up against each other and causing friction. It is about a new hierarchy based on the ways we move and the meanings these movements have been given (Cresswell, 2006, p. 265)

A large body of literature has explored the 'mobilities turn' in rural studies (see for example: Milbourne, 2007; Smith, 2007; Milbourne and Kitchen, 2014; Stockdale, 2016) and, more recently, efforts have been made to attach mobility research in the context of crisis and debates around sustainability and resilience (Camarero et al., 2016; Murphy and Scott, 2014). This refers to contributions for example on the interplay between mobility and crisis through decline in public funding for infrastructure and transport, which for rural residents means that they might need to travel even further for accessing services that they need, but also what the crisis might mean for spatial justice (Oliva, 2013; Bock et al., 2015).

Adding to this research, this paper seeks to explore conceptualisations of rurality through a mobility lens. Our quantitative fieldwork took place in the shadow of the financial crisis in Greece and the observed representations are likely to have been influenced by the wider socio-economic environment shaped by the crisis (see a review by Anthopoulou et al., 2017). Greek researchers for example have discussed 'reverse mobilities', involving urban-to-rural relocations, related to the financial crisis associated with new roles and expectations about the countryside (Kasimis and Zografakis, 2012; Kasimis and Papadopoulos, 2013; Gkartzios et al., 2017), although there is a debate over the underlying drivers and the magnitude of these

mobilities (Anthopoulou et al., 2017). Gkartzios (2013) used the term 'crisis counterurbanisation' to describe mobility experiences related to the financial crisis, while Remoundou et al. (2016) further observe the potential of wider mobility processes (inclusive of counterurbanisation too) associated with the economic crisis. In this paper, we aim to explore the discursive construction of certain words associated with different spatial scales in a context of crisis. Instead of downplaying the linguistic medium of carrying out the research (i.e. the Greek language), we make a clear point about the social and cultural construction of different terms in specific languages, by using words that correspond to the socio-linguistic context of our case, and specifically avoiding the term 'rural'.

Empirically, we draw on two household surveys that were implemented independently; first, in the capital city of Athens and, subsequently, in two regional towns of around 10,000 people. Following primarily the quantitative empirical works by van Dam et al. (2002) and Rye (2006), we asked respondents in both surveys to name up to three words they associate with the words 'village' (*χωριό*; transcription: chorio), 'eparchy' (*επαρχία*; transcription: eparchia) and 'city' (*πόλη*; transcription: poli). We purposefully used the lay term 'eparchy', which could be also translated as the province in English, referring to a 'non-metropolitan space of regional scale' (as suggested by one of the paper's reviewers) for two reasons. Firstly, to make a specific point about the value of indigenous terms which challenge the hegemony of Anglophone research. A key difference for us is that the term 'eparchy' essentially implies and includes both urban and rural spaces (from small villages, to medium-size towns, and regional cities) avoiding an artificial distinction between the urban and the rural, which is so characteristic in the English language and culture (e.g. Williams, 1973; Sharp, 1940). Secondly, we use the term 'eparchy' in an empirical research design to advocate its use as a more useful discourse to discuss non-metropolitan social phenomena in Greece. We felt uncomfortable using the term 'rural' in a context that the term is not commonly used to describe a spatial identity – at least in the way

that the term rural is discussed in English rural studies. We should acknowledge though that while the ‘eparchy’ is a term that is associated with identities (also in negative terms, such as implying parochialism), it does introduce another distinction, this time between the metropolis and the periphery, which is more pronounced in Greek than in English. Our aim, therefore, is to explore the lay characteristics, symbols and ideas that these different spatial terms encompass in the Greek context. In the following sections we review the role of language in rural studies research, both internationally and in the Greek context, and then discuss the literature on contemporary mobilities in the Greek settlement pattern. The methodology is then presented drawing on two household surveys. Our results and conclusions are then discussed, suggesting that people in both surveys hold positive images for non-metropolitan settlements and negative perceptions of urban life. These representations are likely to be influenced by the wider socioeconomic environment and expectations about the future economic situation shaped by the financial crisis.

2. Language Politics and Rural Studies

Perhaps most polemically, Robert Phillipson (1992) introduced *linguistic imperialism* to criticise the role of English language within a neoimperial and neoliberal project that strengthens the interests of the transnational capital class. For Phillipson (2016; forthcoming), calling English a neutral *lingua franca*, simply underestimates its hegemonic cultural and economic implications. He argues for example that the English language embodies corporate business practices, Hollywood consumerist ideologies and universalises such values in asymmetrical terms when compared to national traditions and cultures. Similarly, in the academic context, he criticizes the use of English, a *lingua academica* as he argues, for assuming that it can universally explain human behaviour and social phenomena. Such assumptions run the risk of excluding realities from academic scrutiny, while portraying certain

phenomena as universal truths. Along these lines, the sociologist Abram de Swaan (2001, p. 78) also points out:

> "the English language may single out and impose the experience of the English speaking societies, of the United States in the first place, as the standard of human interactions and the model of social institutions: the American experience presented as universal human destiny"

Apart from the fallacy of trying to understand and explain the social world in one, in fact *any* language, many language problems are commonly observed particularly in international comparative projects where the English language is the communication medium between researchers. In these cases, English also serves as the foundation for conceptualising and debating research questions, theoretical frameworks and methodologies, given that most authoritative and credited works are published in English. It is also not uncommon that many comparative research projects draw on Anglophone counties, given the communication that a common language enables and that comparative research is a particularly opportunistic research field, i.e. researchers conduct comparative analysis in contexts their linguistic skills or networks allows them access.

On the other hand, parochial academic monolinguism renders invisible works that are not written or translated (or translated well enough) in English (Mendieta et al., 2006). Mangen (1999) reviews a series of limitations in relation to the use of language in international research projects: for example, the linguistic competences of researchers are downplayed, although they are central to translating empirical data; the interpretation of emotional responses is problematic across different cultural contexts; even when translation is professionally made, conceptual equivalence is problematic. Ungerson (1996) discusses how the language of international dissemination can distort meanings observed in fieldwork, which has been carried

out in a different linguistic context. Hantrais (2009) argues that native English speakers are both advantaged and disadvantaged in international comparative research projects in social sciences: on one hand their native language facilitates their participation in international research projects often in leadership roles. This constitutes also their limitation because they cannot always comprehend the nuances of how certain words are used within particular contexts, or in the words of Hantrais 'because researchers whose native language is English tend, as in the natural sciences, to believe that the concepts transmitted through their language are universally understood (2009, p. 89).

These debates have been marginally discussed in rural mobility research, despite the central positionality of meanings and representations of rurality if the field (e.g. Milbourne and Kitchen, 2014). One such exception has been Philip Lowe, who discusses language as a significant 'obstacle or grist' in international comparative analysis. Drawing on examples that demonstrate the problematics of conceptual equivalence (for example between the English '*farmer*' and the French '*paysan*'; or, in internationalising the terms stewardship, paternalism, gentrification and right to roam, which are so embedded within Britain's landed class history) he argues on the English language that (Lowe, 2012, p. 32):

> "While it has improved the scope for international exchange of ideas and information in rural sociology, it has marginalised communication between national schools whose primary language is not English, thus heightening their isolation and rendering their concepts and cases more inaccessible, except in second-hand (i.e. translated) form"

Another side of this argument is that because English is the authoritative language of science and knowledge exchange, non-Anglophone national schools and researchers increasingly publish and communicate their research only in English, excluding this way their national audiences. Furthermore, certain concepts developed in English academic contexts appear to

travel far beyond their linguistic and fieldwork boundaries. A characteristic example in rural academic discourses has been the notion of the 'differentiated countryside' and its ideal types (Murdoch et al., 2003) that, surprisingly perhaps given Britain's contrasting urban-rural experience internationally (OECD, 2011; Shortall and Alston, 2016), have provided a theoretical frame for many cultural contexts that share very little similarities with the geography and power relations described by its authors. Obviously, this is not an argument that the countryside is not a differentiated terrain of power struggles across assorted social agents, or that this is a unique English experience; but, an argument about whose experience, fieldwork data and, ultimately, language matters in producing rural social science knowledge. Another example from mobility research is the heavily contested concept of counterurbanisation, again born and developed within UK-US contexts, which has shaped a popular international research agenda for four decades now, but also frequently clashes with empirical findings that do not conform to well-established counterurbanisation narratives (Grimsrud, 2011; Hoggart, 1997), with Halfacree (2008 and 2001) asking to avoid typologies of counterurbanisation and to widen the lens of 'counterurbanisation stories'. So while the term counterurbanisation broadly refers to relocations from metropolitan areas to rural places and the social changes that this means for the rural destinations, the literature is conflicted because the very nature, meanings, representations and languages of rurality are so diverse internationally, inextricably linked with industrialisation histories across different cultural contexts:

> In essence, what appears to be a problem of defining and classifying, might constitute an impossibility to conceptualise and internationalise in a *lingua franca* the diversity of global socio-spatial structures and systems which are linked with the experience of counterurbanisation (Gkartzios, 2013, p. 159)

This regards the central (at least in rural geography and rural sociology fields) meaning of *rurality* across different linguistic contexts. Woods (2011) reviews the development of the

word rurality from the Latin *rus* which has found expression in many European languages (but not in Greek). Other words too are commonly used to attach meanings of rurality to land and agriculture or to national identity (in English: country; countryside). This creates complications not least because meanings of the rural carry different emotional charges internationally (Bunce, 2003), but also because its use in a monolingual academic discourse tends to wipe out such nuances, unless these are clearly discussed and contextualised. For example, in many languages (such as in Japanese) words for 'rural' can be dismissive and derogative (UN, 1980) often because they are associated with farming and are far from the middle class identity and 'rural idyll' associations in England (Murdoch, 1995; Newby, 1985).

Furthermore, in other linguistic and cultural contexts outside England, the urban-rural dichotomy is not so strongly evidenced, not only in linguistic terms, but also because national planning systems did not operate on such strong distinctions (Murdoch and Lowe, 2003) and because rural lobby groups have not been as elitist as in England (Gkartzios and Shucksmith, 2015). We know for example that post war planning in England operated a fundamental separation between the urban and the rural attaching distinctive policy narratives and expectations to either spaces, resulting to very restrictive rural planning policies. Although not unique (i.e. the Dutch planning system has a similar ethos, see de Groot et al., 2012), but certainly exceptional internationally in its rural planning restrictions (Gallent and Allen, 2003), such policy separations were not irrelevant from the English language itself. For example, Thomas Sharp (1940) writes in his classic *Town Planning*:

> […] the very words town and country comprise one of the most violent antitheses in the language. There has not generally been any meeting and mingling of these two creations: there has been no greyness or twilight between them. Where one stopped, the other has begun, sharply, abruptly, unequivocally (p. 29).

Such distinctions founded and further co-produced a particular image of rurality – that of the 'rural idyll' (Ibery, 1998; Bunce, 2003). The 'rural idyll' is more pronounced in England than anywhere else in the UK (Satsangi et al., 2010) and western countries (OECD, 2011), and has provided a normative discourse for contextualising rural social phenomena in the English context (Gkartzios and Shucksmith, 2015), but also internationally because of well observed Anglocentric tendencies in the field (see Vepsalainen and Pitkanen, 2010). Therefore, the dominance of English language, experienced in rural studies for example through mainstreaming the discourse of the 'rural idyll' internationally, might create certain hegemonies in academic studies framing what and how certain phenomena are discussed. Following on from points by Phillipson (2016) this might mask a series of other realities that cannot find expression within the Anglophone academic discourse, or might be distorted through translation to fit normative academic understandings and debates of the rural.

3. Greek Rurals

The urban-rural dichotomy is not so strong in the Greek language and social sphere, mainly due to the relatively recent and slow industrialisation trends of the country after the end of the WWII. Damianakos (1997) explains this in his writings about the country's 'fluidity of cleavages between urban and rural zones' (p. 193). The idea of hybrid urban and rural spaces, identities and networks is most developed by Damianakos (2001a, 2001b, cited in Zacopoulou, 2008), drawing on earlier works of Karavidas. In this continuum, localities, socio-economic activities and identities were never truly separated across distinct urban and rural binaries. Unlike industrialised western countries, Zacopoulou (2008) argues that the Greek city was never truly disconnected from the countryside. Damianakos (2002), for example, reports on the magnitude of social and geographical mobility of Greek farmers, who migrated to urban areas particularly after the 1960s, but never lost their emotional and identity connections with their (rural) areas of origin. On these grounds, drawing on Karavidas, Damianakos (2002)

demonstrates why the term 'peasantry' is rejected in the Greek case, preferring the term 'urban peasants' (αστοχωρικός) to capture Greece's hybrid urban-rural social identities. Examples of such urban-rural co-coexistences constitute phenomena such as urban-based residents traditionally maintaining land and housing in rural areas of origin. Unlike western societies, these hybrid spatialities construct a fusion across local and national identities, whereby rurality in Greece doesn't hold central meanings (such as national identity and authenticity) as in other contexts (Damianakos, 2002).

Pastoralism has not been central in understanding Greek rural realities, as it has been in the case in England or in Anglo-American contexts (Bunce, 1994). Contrary to British Romantics who were highlighting non material values of the countryside in a period of industrialisation (Satsangi et al. 2010), Greek rural areas were generally characterised by economic and technological backwardness (see Mouzelis, 1976a; Koliopoulos and Veremis, 2002). The harsh living conditions in Greek villages left 'little space for emotional rural idylls' (Meraklis 1992, p. 29). Meraklis (1987) reports that, at the time when the Greek state was formed 'nobody claimed a rural idyll; there were no portraits of rural paradise, but instead of rural hell' (p. 129).

Nevertheless, there is reference to Greek rural idylls in Greek academic research with authors reporting on narratives that resemble it. For example, research has shown that Greek governmental documents support agritourism on the basis of a romantic rural life (Kizos and Iosifides, 2007). Korfiatis et al. (2003) discuss 'biophilic' representations of nature in Greek primary school textbooks. Anthopoulou et al. (2017) and Gkartzios et al. (2017) discuss the (emerging) idyllic representation of the countryside and other non-metropolitan areas (i.e. regional towns) in the context of the financial crisis. However, this does not suggest a rural idyll hegemony that constructs realities and shapes policies about the Greek countryside. In fact, a common narrative of the Greek rurality its association with 'backwardness' (Verinis, 2014; Mouzelis, 1976b), lagging behind technologically and culturally. Furthermore, in light

of Phillipson's thesis, we cannot ignore that the very question of a 'rural idyll' has been an exogenous academic influence. Given the international academic interest in such discourses, it is inevitable that these will be influencing Greek rural studies and Greek scholars.

Linguistically the term 'rural' poses challenges when required to be translated in Greek, because the distinction between the rural and the agricultural is not so clear in Greek. This is discussed by Kizos (2012) in relation to the translation of Michael Wood's 'Rural Geography' (2005) in Greek. Two terms can be used to imply the term 'rural' (as an adjective): *αγροτικός* (transcription: agrotikos) and *γεωργικός* (transcription: georgikos). However, both these terms can be translated back as agricultural, leaving little imagination for post-productivist land uses and other, beyond agriculture, interests and power struggles in rural areas. The term *ύπαιθρος* (transcription: ypethros) can also be found in Greek rural studies literature (equivalent to the countryside perhaps in English, and the actual term that was used for Wood's 'Rural Geography' given the problematics of the terms georgikos/agrotikos). Nevertheless, this term is not commonly used in modern Greek, creating unnecessary distance between academic and lay discourses of the rural (drawing on Jones, 1995). Furthermore, the term *ypethros* is not used as a spatial identity in the Greek language, as the rural is in English rural studies (see Woods, 2003). This means that Greeks do not make a specific point using the term *ypethros* when they describe who they are, where they live or even where they come from. Instead, the term *ypethros* is used in reference to the natural/physical environment, creating difficulties contextualising socio-cultural phenomena as these are commonly debated in rural studies – despite the fact that this is the formal term used by many rural social scientists in Greek academic platforms.

Lay terms that are used to describe the spatial pattern in Greek are the 'village', the 'city', while 'eparchy' or 'province' provides a very popular lay term for describing life in non-metropolitan spaces of regional scale, found also in qualitative data in Greek rural social research (e.g.

Anthopoulou et al., 2013) and commonly used in governmental (e.g. MRDF, 2012) and media discourses (e.g. iefimerida, 2016; tovima, 2011). In fact, some Greek social scientists have referred to the 'eparchy' or 'province' as a non-metropolitan discourse (e.g. Kasimis and Zografakis, 2012; Bada, 2008; Gkartzios, 2013; Gkartzios and Scott, 2015; Apostolopoulos et al., 2018), although the term has been hardly used as an analytical spatial concept, because it does not find expression in national census data. Our choice of the word 'eparchy' although not unproblematic (see also discussion later on) challenges the hegemony of Anglophone 'rural' research as well as introducing a more nuanced representation of the binaries across the rural and the urban, in line with Greece's urbanisation and industrialisation history.

4. Greek Mobilities

Greece is still experiencing a severe and prolonged crisis that resulted in a significant deterioration of the country's macroeconomic environment. Unemployment increased sharply (20.8% in December 2017 according to the most recent estimates) especially for the younger cohorts within the population (Hellenic Statistical Authority, 2018), while inequality and poverty also worsened significantly (Andriopoulou et al., 2017).

Evidence suggests that the economic crisis is associated with a series of 'reverse mobilities', as introduced by Kasimis and Papadopoulos (2013, p. 263):

> However, in the environment of economic crisis, the conditions of the 'new rurality' have been affected by falling incomes, contraction of public services and by a 'back to the land' movement. This 'reverse mobility' has the elements of both modernity and tradition: engagement with new methods of organisation and work and rediscovery of traditional crops, products and cultures.

Attention has been paid to the return in agriculture: for example, Kasimis and Papadopoulos (2013) report that between 2008 and 2011, 17,000 people moved to rural areas to work in the

primary sector. Similarly, a governmental report claimed that 68 per cent of residents in the two major metropolitan areas of Greece (Athens and Thessaloniki), had thought of moving to the Greek *eparchy* (the actual term that was used in the Greek report) with half of those wishing to work in the agricultural sector (MRDF, 2012), although the magnitude of such phenomena has been questioned by Anthopoulou et al. (2017). Drawing on qualitative interviews, Gkartzios (2013) observed emergent counterurban mobilities not necessarily associated with agriculture (or return to agriculturally-dominated rural areas), whereby urban residents have moved in the Greek eparchy, i.e. inclusive of both small towns and villages, motivated by lower costs of living in these areas, and facilitated by high homeownership rates and supportive family networks.

Such trends are supported by quantitative demographic analysis of census data although firm conclusions on the nature (short term or permanent) and magnitude of counterurban mobilities cannot be made from the available data. For example, looking at Greek census data, Giannakis and Bruggeman (2015) report that during 2008-2013 "the population of urban and intermediate regions decreased by 2.6 per cent and 1.4 per cent, respectively, while the population of rural regions increased by 0.6 per cent" (p. 7). Similarly, Anastasiou and Duquenne (2015) argue that regional population changes indicate "a possible exodus from the two main urban areas to other regions". The authors are, however, more sceptical on whether this is actually a 'return' (i.e. that these residents moved back to a place of origin) as this information is not captured in the census. Their analysis suggests that internal migration takes the form of relocations either to neighbouring municipalities or to rural municipalities of the same local administration unit. This finding corroborates earlier observations on the role of regional towns in satisfying counterurbanisation trends in Greece (Koutsou and Anthopoulou, 2008). In a similar vein, Gousios (1999) has argued that regional towns provide significant economic and social melting pots constituting of urbanites, farmers, return migrants and international migrants. Regional

towns and even small cities in the eparchy should therefore not been dismissed from the 'counterurbanisation story', simply because they don't fit descriptive definitions of rurality in Greece (the term refers to villages with less than 2,000 population) (Gkartzios et al., 2017). Greek researchers have also discussed the resilient qualities that the countryside has demonstrated in the face of the financial crisis, despite having been in crisis *before* the financial crisis (Kasimis and Papadopoulos, 2013):

> Both quantitative and qualitative evidence, however, suggest that agriculture and rural areas 'resist' better than other sectors of the economy and are increasingly turned into a 'refuge and laboratory' of ideas and initiatives for a large part of urban dwellers directed towards the countryside and agriculture by either necessity or choice (p. 281-2)

Psycharis et al. (2014) find that the region of Attiki, which includes the city of Athens, is the most affected region by the economic crisis and the least resilient in Greece. This does not, however, imply that the countryside is not affected by the crisis (Anthopoulou et al., 2017). Nevertheless, it does suggest a different set of values, imagined or real, associated with non-metropolitan settings, and in this paper we aim to unpack such representations by focusing on the words 'city', 'eparchy' and 'village'.

Preferences for non-metropolitan environments were recently observed in the city of Athens (Remoundou et al., 2016). The research showed that 61 per cent of a random sample of 300 residents in Athens had considered moving out of the city. Furthermore, 86% of those willing to relocate declared willing to move to settlements in the Greek eparchy, inclusive of both villages and regional towns. A large majority linked their willingness to relocate to the financial crisis. The research suggested that those willing to relocate to the eparchy were significantly younger and more likely to be unemployed, although the nature of the data does not allow to

assess whether these declared mobilities are or will be actually realised. As regards the factors influencing the choice of destination, in line with observations made by Anastasiou and Duquenne (2015), a choice experiment demonstrated that localities within 60 km of cities were the most preferred areas for relocation.

5. Methodology

In light of this emerging literature, this paper looks at people's representations of the 'village', the 'city' and the 'eparchy'. Such representations are important because, drawing on Cresswell (2006), mobility is associated with particular meanings and expectations about 'the rural', constituting rural mobility both politically and ideologically (Gkartzios and Scott, 2015). Thus, these representations may convey information in explaining mobility patterns, although we cannot directly attribute any mobility experiences to images for different settlements.

Data were collected through two household surveys implemented during the period of the crisis. The first survey was administered in the city of Athens (the 'Athens survey') and the other in the regional towns of Eretria and Agios Konstantinos (the 'province survey'). The surveys were carried out in different periods (the former in 2013 and the latter in 2015); however, they included a series of common open-ended questions that were asked to a sample of 300 residents in both cases. In Athens, data were collected from a stratified random sample of the urban population (see also Remoundou et al., 2016), while the survey in the two regional towns utilised a snowball sample (see also Gkartzios et al., 2017). Different sampling approaches were required due to the nature of the population of interest. In particular, the 'province survey' aimed to elicit the views of residents who had experienced long or short distance relocations, during the last 6 years from the time of the survey. Due to the absence of a sampling frame to identify these residents, we followed a snowballing approach (TenHouten, 1992). The interviewers defined two starting points in each survey location (Church, Town

Hall) and then randomly selected the first household. Potential respondents were asked a screening question (whether they had relocated in the previous 6 years) to examine their eligibility to participate in the survey. Respondents were then asked to suggest other eligible individuals from their social networks. If the respondent was unable to indicate others, the interviewer would randomly approach the third next household to start a new chain. It should be noted that since a non-probability sample (snowball sampling) was used for data collection, the results reflect the views of the sample and cannot be generalised. The sample is likely to be biased towards the inclusion of individuals with wider social networks. Selection bias may be also present in our data as individuals in the same chain may share similar preferences and views. The 'Athens survey' aimed to examine potential future mobility trends among residents in the city of Athens. We therefore opted for a stratified random sample of the permanent adult population. A professional marketing company administered the survey through face to face interviews at people's homes in both cases.

The questions discussed in this paper were developed originally in Greek, drawing inspiration primarily from the works of van Dam et al. (2002) and Rye (2006). Van Dam et al. (2002) for example used an urban sample and asked respondents to give four words they associated with 'the countryside'. These words were eventually categorised in four groups drawing on morphological (i.e. green, farms), functional (i.e. agriculture), socio-cultural (i.e. quiet) and topographical characteristics (i.e. North Netherlands). Similarly, Rye (2006), through a quantitative survey, asked teenagers to rate how well certain words or terms (examples: nature; opportunities; masculine; everyone knows everyone) describe 'the rural'. Neither of the above mentioned authors pays in depth attention on language, translation and conceptual equivalence given that, in both cases, the language of fieldwork is different than the language of dissemination, although Rye in a footnote critically points out how some Norwegian terms are 'impossible to translate in English' (2006, p. 414). Similarly, Baylina and Berg (2010) only

briefly refer to 'the language problem' (p. 279) on their research involving translating between Spanish and Norwegian discourses of rurality as found in popular magazines.

In this paper, we focus on the words respondents associated to the words: 'village', 'eparchy' and 'city'. As discussed previously, we purposefully used the term 'eparchy' as meaningful (and, somewhat, experimental) discourse describing non-metropolitan life, avoiding the terms urban and rural altogether. We don't argue that the 'eparchy' is a less differentiated construct than the rural; on the contrary, the eparchy is an extremely heterogeneous space which requires academic scrutiny, but one which is encompassing a wider, regional scale and more diverse settlements – not just villages and inclusive of regional towns as suggested by Gousios (1999). This also corresponds to the fluidity of hybrid urban-rural identities in Greece and the need to avoid opposing binaries in mobility research (Pratsinakis et al., 2017). A key difference we introduce by using the term eparchy is that the eparchy is *both* urban *and* rural, yet distinctive from metropolitan life. In this context, the very use of an indigenous term challenges Anglophone hegemony in 'rural' research, and introduces a more nuanced understanding of the settlement pattern and its associated identities. Such terms are not unknown in the international literature – although greatly varied for obvious reasons – and many researchers have used similar terms (instead of rurality) to contextualise social science phenomena in non-metropolitan contexts. Laschewski et al. (2002) for example suggest that rurality in the German context is a rather secondary concept, subordinated to more widely accepted terms such as region, peasant or periphery.

Respondents in both surveys were asked to mention up to three words they associate with the three different spatial terms (open-ended question). This question was asked first in both questionnaires to ensure that the associations would not be biased by the other questions and tasks in the surveys. Results are summarized in Tables 1-6. Words with very similar meanings in the Greek context were grouped to simplify the exposition. Both authors have Greek as

mother language, but neither is a linguist. We did not over categorise the words in systematic groups across the two samples (as van Dam et al. did), because we wanted to show the heterogeneity of the words that were given to us. Each table reports the mean and standard deviation for each word. The values in the tables therefore refer to the percentage of the sample that indicated at least one word that fell in the relevant category.

6. Results

6.1. The 'province survey'

In the 'province survey' all 300 respondents in the two regional towns had some mobility experience. Both regional towns wouldn't be described as rural, but they would be seen as part of the Greek province or eparchy. Respondents were asked to state up to three words for each spatial term. This resulted in a number of words that were then grouped for the analysis and translated in English by the authors. For example the word 'natural environment' also includes the words 'nature', 'green', 'forest', 'mountain', and 'trees'. In the following Tables (1-3), these constituent words are given in brackets.

We further examine the associations that these words have for people having moved from bigger cities ('counterurbanisers') and people having moved within the same localities in the towns ('local movers'). The second column reports the mean and standard deviation for the full sample, while columns three and four summarize the mean for counterurbanisers and locals respectively. Of the 300 individuals who had experienced mobility within the last six years from the survey, 147 are in-movers from larger urban centres and 109 are local movers. The remaining 44 individuals experienced other mobilities (e.g. from smaller settlements).

Table 1 suggests that the word 'village' has positive connotations for the majority in the sample. People associated life in the village with calmness and proximity to the natural environment. They also referred to quality of life and the potential to live a healthier lifestyle.

Human relationships and family ties were also mentioned as important aspects of the life in the village. On the negative side, people referred to gossip, distance from big cities, and limited access to services and amenities, and reduced population. Furthermore, the means for the words subscribing to a dull representation of the life in the village are very low implying that only a minority referred to such negative aspects.

Insert Table 1 around here

A higher diversity is observed within the words associated to 'eparchy' (Table 2). Mirroring the life in the village, results point to the importance of human relationships and family ties especially for counterurbanisers in the sample. Respondents highlighted the existence of stores and shops in the provinces. Other frequently cited aspects related to the quality of life and the natural environment. Cultural opportunities as well as entertainment were also mentioned, which were not referred to in association to the word 'village' demonstrating a more diverse representation of the 'eparchy'. Respondents further noted the problems and challenges of living in the eparchy by mentioning closed communities and the subsequent risk of isolation and gossip. Local movers were also concerned about traffic.

Insert Table 2 around here

A largely negative image is associated with life in the 'city' (Table 3). Respondents referred to poor living conditions, noise, crime, traffic and pollution. Participants further noted the dilapidated build environment and poor housing conditions. Some positive views on urban life were also observed mainly relating to more choice, access to services and cultural opportunities. Cultural opportunities were mentioned by 30% of the sample.

Insert Table 3 around here

Overall, respondents in the 'province survey' tended to stress the calmness and tranquillity of life in the village and the eparchy as opposed to stressful city life. They also defined life in the

eparchy in terms of occupational structure (farming) and tended to perceive this lifestyle as more natural compared to life in the cities, in agreement with earlier studies (Rye, 2006). These characteristics suggest largely positive representations of life in the eparchy. However, respondents in these regional towns also stressed the advantages of urban life when it comes to access to services. Villages and provinces lack these opportunities and are often perceived as closed communities where individuals may feel isolated.

6.2. The 'Athens survey'

Respondents in the 'Athens survey' (N=300), were also asked to reflect upon the same spatial terms. Similar to the 'province survey', they had to mention three words they associate with the words 'village', 'eparchy' and 'city'. The results, summarised in Tables 4-6, suggest very similar images for the three terms, as observed in the 'province survey'. The 'village' and the 'eparchy' were pictured as places close to nature where life is calm and the living conditions are good. On the negative side, Athenian residents stressed the smaller population size of these communities and the associated gossip. On the contrary, the dominant conceptualisation for the 'city' is largely negative, where life is hectic and there is noise and pollution (Table 6). For example, the word 'crisis' and conceptual equivalents were mentioned only in association to the 'city'. Respondents did, however, note that city living offers more cultural options and better services.

It is worth noting that some respondents in this survey referred to 'village' while describing the 'eparchy'. This implies that, in their minds, the 'eparchy' is more 'rural' in its characteristics than 'urban', and perhaps a useful analytical discourse for discussing non-metropolitan life, as suggested in this paper. This can be further seen when the words for the 'village' and the 'eparchy' are contrasted, demonstrating very similar representations across the two. The two terms, however, have very different scalar attributes: while the village refers

usually to very small settlements of less than 2,000 (as suggested by the Greek census), the term eparchy (which is not a term used in Greek official statistics) is a wider non-metropolitan discourse of regional scale, inclusive of villages, regional towns and even small cities.

We further split the Athenian sample to those residents who declared willing to relocate to more rural residential environments (151 respondents) and those unwilling to abandon their residency living in Athens (117 respondents). For the purposes of the following tables (4-6) the former are named 'potential counterurbanisers', while the later 'stayers'. We find similar conceptualisations of the words 'village', 'eparchy' and 'city'. Again, the two groups expressed positive views on both 'village' and 'eparchy'. On the other hand, respondents in both groups referred to poor quality of life, pollution, traffic and the crisis while referring to the city.

Insert Table 4, 5 and 6 around here

7. Discussion

In the context of rural mobility research, this paper aimed to explore the construction of certain words that are used in the Greek language to describe metropolitan and non-metropolitan spaces. A mobility lens offers an opportunity to explore such conceptualisations, as in many cases new (or even potentially new) residents add alternative and sometimes contested meanings and identities to places. In a period of economic crisis, we draw on the literature that discusses emergent mobilities (encapsulated as 'reverse mobility' or 'crisis-led counterurbanisation'), and the implications these might have for our understandings of places (see for example Kasimis and Papadopoulos, 2013; Anthopoulou et al., 2017; Gkartzios, 2013). Our empirical data is based on household surveys in the capital city of Athens and two regional towns. As in the works of van Dam et al. (2002) and Rye (2006), respondents were asked to reflect on various spatial terms and provide words they associate with them. We further take into account the neglected literature on language politics within rural studies circles, and the

fact that most studies outside Anglophone contexts normally use the word 'rural' in Anglophone research platforms, without necessarily referring to the language struggles they go through, as they navigate between the language of fieldwork (in original language) and that of publishing (in English). In the case of Greece, such struggles refer to the conceptual equivalence challenges of the word 'rural', especially when the word is used within non-agricultural contexts. For this reason, we decided to include words that are commonly used in the context of the settlement pattern in Greece, such as the 'city' and 'village', and also test the word 'eparchy' as a potentially useful academic discourse that characterises non-metropolitan life, but also responds to Greece's own hybrid social identities regarding the fluidity of urban-rural spatialities (Damianakos, 2002). The aim of this research was not to assess whether any of these characterisations are valid or correct, but to reflect on their variability, particularly in the context of Greece, a country with limited evidence of a dominant discourse around an idyllic rurality.

The responses on these words were largely similar across different (i.e. metropolitan and non-metropolitan) residents in both surveys. Generally, we found positive words associated with the 'village' and the 'eparchy', although the 'eparchy' demonstrated more diverse representations compared to the 'village', given its larger scale connotations (similar perhaps to the word 'region', 'territory' or 'periphery' in English). On the contrary, in both samples, the 'city' was mainly described in negative terms, suggesting the emergence of a discourse that resembles the 'rural idyll' (see also Anthopoulou et al., 2017). This is particularly interesting because the idyllic representation of such spaces is not something that is situated in the historic context of Greece. For example, researchers in Greek rural studies have highlighted that a dominant 'rural' narrative is that of 'backwardness', with villages normally being seen as lagging behind economically, technologically and culturally (Verinis, 2014). Only recently, and in the context of the crisis there has been a resurrection of lay, media and political

discourses around an idyllic rural life in Greece (Anthopoulou et al., 2017; Gkartzios, 2013). Nevertheless, it should be noted that given the relatively small sample sizes and the non-probability sampling in one of the surveys (which does not allow for the results to be generalised), further research is needed to investigate our findings, with the critical inclusion of linguists in the research design.

A key point of the mobility literature, is that these representations cannot be considered outside the wider economic and political context of Greece, and it is true that the crisis affects both metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas (Anthopoulou et al., 2017). Social representations are not random; they are of particular times, contexts and continuously shifting (see for example Horton, 2008). Whether real or imagined, they are powerful because they change our understandings of places, making them appealing places to migrate to and live (Murdoch et al., 2003). This is particularly important in Greece because, as evidenced in our survey, there is a tendency of representing the economic crisis as an *urban* crisis with the countryside (and, wider, non-metropolitan eparchy) imagined and presented – correctly or wrongly – as more resilient (see also Anthopoulou et al., 2017; Gkartzios, 2013).

We further observe that the words for ‘eparchy’ and the ‘village’ are very similar in the types of responses we get, although they represent different scalar spatialities, with the village usually referring to very small sized settlements (less than 2,000 people in keeping with the Greek Statistics Office), while the eparchy to large territories, inclusive of regional towns or even small cities (and not being used in formal statistical reports). While the urban/rural binary distinction is not so common in the Greek language and mobility experience (Damianakos, 2002), we advocate here the use of the (non-metropolitan) ‘eparchy’ as a meaningful and analytical term to describe Greek ruralities. Our data suggest that as a term the ‘eparchy’ encapsulates many of the characteristics of rurality, and in a more diverse way than the ‘village’. A key difference here is that the eparchy is *both* ‘urban’ *and* ‘rural’, encompassing a

wider regional scale, inclusive of small and regional towns (in agreement with Gousios, 1999). Furthermore, unlike the term 'ypethros' which is preferred in Greek academic circles, the term 'eparchy' is commonly used in lay Greek (e.g. Greeks would say that they live, or want to migrate to the 'eparchy' – but it would be extremely unlikely to use the term ypethros in this context).

This is important because it challenges what terms are meaningful in the production of Greek rural sociological knowledge (drawing on Jones, 1995) and, wider, because it exposes the hegemony of Anglophone rural research. The term eparchy presents an opportunity perhaps for a more nuanced, diversified and endogenous discourse in the Greek context for discussing regional and rural development, specifically because the discourse of 'rural' (i.e. georgikos/agrotikos) has been so much closely associated with agriculture. Furthermore, the term ypethros lacks the identity references usually alluded to with the use of rural in English academic texts. These somewhat nuanced linguistic differences are hardly discussed in rural studies, not least because of the difficulty of contextualising those in monolinguist academic platforms (Phillipson, 2016), but because of the characteristic, continuous and well observed Anglo-centric tendencies of rural studies (Lowe, 2012).

In response to a predominantly Anglophone-led rural social science, it should not be surprising that the binary discourse of 'urban-rural' or that of the pre-industrial 'rural idyll' has found expression in contemporary Greek rural studies – in engaging for example with an authoritative (and Anglophone) academic literature. In light of Phillipson's (2016), de Swaan's (2001) and Lowe's (2012) comments on the dangers of downplaying the role of language in the production of scientific knowledge, we propose here the term 'eparchy' (or province) as a meaningful discourse for Greek 'rural' research projects and their dissemination in English. We don't argue that the term has not been used before, but we observe reluctance to do so authoritatively, contrary to the term 'ypethros'.

The eparchy can provide an insightful narrative and scale for policy implementation for promoting regional development and a diversified economy beyond the agricultural sector in non-metropolitan Greece. Existing debates on rural development in Greece for example, especially in Greek, further reinforce the hegemony of agriculture, given the reductive meanings of the 'rural' in Greek as discussed earlier, undermining integrated, territorial and multi-scalar development perspectives. Similarly, other terms, beyond the urban-rural orthodoxy, might prove equally insightful for other non-Anglophone research projects, in line with Laschewski et al. (2002). The 'rural' for example poses significant issues when required to be discussed in Icelandic or Japanese research projects because conceptual equivalence is problematic (personal communication with Icelandic and Japanese researchers). These challenges are not merely academic: the language of 'rural' may also pose significant challenges to the dissemination of regional policy at the European level. Given the importance of public engagement and involvement in the design and implementation of policies, the use of terms that are consistent with the national culture is needed to allow and encourage public involvement in the policy making platforms.

Finally, the use of the word 'eparchy' is important symbolically, because it resists the homogenisation of social phenomena discussed in rural studies under a ubiquitous 'rural', which under the UK-US influence is, in many cases, discussed in idyllic and pre-industrial terms (Vepsalainen and Pitkanen, 2010). Our aim of using the word 'eparchy' is not simply to impose a new analytical term, but to make a point on the role of language (and particularly informal language, used by the communities we interact with) in producing knowledge in rural geography and rural sociology that is symmetric and representative of different cultural and linguistic traditions, which are inevitably imprinted on the settlement pattern. Language is not just a neutral medium for academic debate and knowledge exchange, and as Phillipson (2016) argues, presenting English simply as a medium of communication, a *lingua franca*, undermines

its hegemonic role and discursive power in the production of knowledge. Language (*any* language) comes with its own politics, limitations and power struggles. The hegemony of English in rural studies (as well as in other fields across natural and social sciences as a *lingua academica*) requires us to critically reflect on whose concepts, terms, and case studies, we build 'universal' knowledge. One of the ways to resist this 'universal' knowledge is to embrace and discuss concepts in their original language and meanings.

Acknowledgements

This research has been financially supported by the John S. Latsis Public Benefit Foundation in Greece and a Newcastle University grant. Many thanks to the anonymous reviewers for their extremely insightful and constructive comments. Earlier versions of this paper have been presented and discussed by many colleagues at Trans-Atlantic Rural Research Network meetings, including John Sipple, Irianna Vlachopoulou and Bettina Bock who provided critical comments in writing. Many thanks to Stephanos Cherouvis for pointing us to a specific literature in language politics.

References

Allan, J. and Mooney, E. (1998). Migration into rural communities: questioning the language of counterurbanisation. In P. Boyle and K. Halfacree (Eds.), *Migration Into Rural Areas*. Chichester: Wiley, 280-302.

Andriopoulou, E., Karakitsios, A, Tsakloglou P. (2017). Inequality and Poverty in Greece: Changes in Times of Crisis. GreeSE Paper No.116, Hellenic Observatory Papers on Greece and Southeast Europe, The London School of Economics and Political Science.

Anthopoulou, T., Kaberis, N. and Petrou, M. (2017). Aspects and experiences of crisis in rural Greece. Narratives of rural resilience. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 52, 1-11.

Anthopoulou, T., Kaberis, N., Petrou, M. (2013). Exploring aspects and dynamics of rural society in times of crisis. First findings. URL (Accessed 7 July 2017): http://grsa.prd.uth.gr/conf2013/48_anthopoulou_etal_ersagr13.pdf

Apostolopoulos, N., Newbery, R. and Gkartzios, M. (2018). Social enterprise and community resilience: Examining a Greek response to turbulent times. *Journal of Rural Studies*, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2018.03.017

Baylina, M. and Gunnerud Berg, N. (2010). Selling the countryside: Representations of rurality in Norway and Spain. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 17(3), 277–292.

Bock, B., Kovacs, K. and Shucksmith, M. (2015). Changing social characteristics, patterns of inequality and exclusion. In A.K. Copus and P. de Lima (Eds.), *Territorial Cohesion in Rural Europe: The Relational Turn in Rural Development*. Abington: Routledge, 193-211.

Bunce, M. (1994). *The Countryside Ideal. Anglo-American Images of Landscape*. Routledge, London.

Bunce, M. (2003). Reproducing rural idylls, in Cloke, P. (ed.) *Country Visions*. Harlow: Pearson.

Camarero, L., Cruz, F. and Oliva, J. (2016). Rural sustainability, intergenerational support and mobility. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 23(4), 734–749.

Cresswell, T. (2006). *On the move: mobility in the modern western world*. New York: Routledge).

Cresswell, T. (2010). Towards a politics of mobility. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. 28, 17–31

Damianakos, S. (1997). The ongoing quest for a model of Greek agriculture. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 37, 190-208.

Damianakos, S. (2001a) Villageois et citadins de Grèce, «l'autre et son double». Strates (10). Ladyss, Paris [in French].

Damianakos, S. (2001b). Les équivoques de la statistique: dépeuplement et double appartenance sociale en Epire, 1961-1991. In: Damianakos, S. (Ed.), Villageois et citadins de Grèce, «l'autre et son double». Strates (10). Ladyss, Paris [in French].

Damianakos, S. (2002). *From Peasant to Farmer. The Greek Rural Society Against Globalisation*. Exandas-EKKE, Athens [in Greek].

Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaelogy of Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.

Gallent, N. and Allen, C. (2003). Housing pressure and policy in Europe: A power regime perspective. In N. Gallent, M. Shucksmith and M. Tewdwr-Jones (Eds), *Housing in the European countryside: Rural pressure and policy in Western Europe*. London: Routledge, 208–225

Gkartzios, M. (2013). 'Leaving Athens': Narratives of counterurbanisation in times of crisis. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 32, 158-167.

Gkartzios M and Shucksmith M. 'Spatial anarchy' versus 'spatial apartheid': rural housing ironies in Ireland and England. *Town Planning Review*, 86(1), 53-72.

Gkartzios, M., Remoundou, K. and Garrod, G. (2017). Emerging geographies of mobility: the role of regional towns in Greece's 'counterurbanisation story'. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 55, 22–32.

Gkartzios, M. and Scott, K. (2015). A Cultural Panic in the Province? Counterurban Mobilities, Creativity, and Crisis in Greece, *Population, Space and Place*, 21, 843–855.

Grimsrud, G.M. (2011). How well does the 'counter-urbanisation story' travel to other countries? The case of Norway. *Population, Space and Place* 17, 642-655.

Halfacree, K. (1993). Locality and social representation: Space, discourse and alternative definitions of the rural. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 9, 23-37.

Halfacree K (2008). To revitalise counterurbanisation research? Recognising an international and fuller picture. *Population, Space and Place*, 14, 479-495.

Hantrais, L. (2009). *International Comparative Research. Theory, Methods, Practice*. London: Palgrave.

Hellenic Statistical Authority (2018). Labour Force Survey. Available at: http://www.statistics.gr/en/statistics/-/publication/SJO02/-

Hoggart, K. (1997). Rural migration and counter-urbanization in the European periphery: the case of Andalucia. *Sociologia Ruralis* 37, 134-153.

Hugo, G., Bell, M., 1998. The hypothesis of welfare-led mig

Ibery, B. (1998). Dimensions of rural change. In: Ibery, B. (Ed.), *The Geography of Rural Change*. Harlow: Longman.

Iefimerida (2016). Επιστροφή στην επαρχία: Για αυτούς τους 5 λόγους αξίζει να ζει κανείς σε μια μικρή πόλη. (Back to the eparchy: 5 reasons to live in a small town) URL (accessed 11 July 2017): http://www.iefimerida.gr/news/263848/epistrofi-stin-eparhia-gia-aytoys-toys-5-logoys-axizei-na-zei-kaneis-se-mia-mikri-poli

Jones, O. (1995). Lay discourses of the rural: Developments and implications for rural studies. *Journal of Rural Studies,* 11, 35-49.

Kizos, T. (2012). Book Review: Michael Woods Γεωγραφια της Υπαιθρου: Διαδικασιες, αποκρισεις και εμπειριες αγροτικης αναδιαρθρωσης. *Γεωγραφιες*, 19, 131-133 [In Greek].

Koliopoulos, J.S. and Veremis T.M. (2002) *Greece: The Modern Sequel: from 1831 to the Present*. London: Hurst & Company.

Laschewski, L., Teherani-Krönner, P., Bahner, T. (2002) Recent rural restructuring in East and West Germany: experiences and backgrounds. In: Halfacree, K., Kovach, I., Woodward, R. (Eds.), *Leadership and Local Power in European Rural Development*. Ashgate, Aldershot.

Lowe, P. (2012). The agency of rural research in comparative context. In: Shucksmith M, Brown DL, Shortall S, Vergunst J, Warner ME (eds) *Rural Transforma-tions and Rural Policies in the US and UK*. New York: Routledge, 18–38.

López-i-Gelatsa, F., Tàbara, J.D., Bartolomé, J. (2009) The rural in dispute: Discourses of rurality in the Pyrenees. *Geoforum*, 40(4), 602-612.

MRDF (Ministry of Rural Development and Food) (2012) Press Release 27/3/2012. (accessed 11 July 2017): http://www.minagric.gr/index.php/el/the-ministry/grafeiotypou/deltiatypou/516-dt27032012.html

Mangen, S. (1999). Qualitative research methods in cross-national settings. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 2 (2), 109-124.

Mendieta, E., Phllipson, R. and Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2006). English in the geopolitics of knowledge. *Revista Canaria de Estudio Ingleses*, 53, 15-26.

Meraklis, M.G. (1992). For the Greek folklore. University of Ioannina [In Greek]

Meralkis, M.G. (1987). Peasant life. University of Ioannina [In Greek]

Milbourne, P. (2007) Re-populating rural studies: migrations, movements and mobilities. *Journal of Rural Studies.* 23, 381–386

Mibourne, P., Kitchen, L. (2014). Rural mobilities: connecting movement and fixity in rural places. *Journal of Rural Studies* 34, 326-336.

Mouzelis N. (1976a). Greek and Bulgarian Peasants: Aspects of Their Sociopolitical Situation During the Interwar Period. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 18(1), 85-105

Mouzelis N. (1976b). Capitalism and the development of agriculture. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 3(4), 483-492.

Bada, K. (2008). Η εμπειρία της μετανάστευσης από την πλευρά των γυναικών. Από τα ορεινά χωριά στις επαρχιακές πόλεις. In: Zacopoulou, E., Kasimis, C., Louloudis, L. (Eds.), *Rurality, Society and Space*. Plethron, Athens, 95-114 [In Greek].

Murdoch, J. and Lowe, P. (2003). The preservationist paradox: modernism, environmentalism and the politics of spatial division. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 28, 318-332.

Murdoch, J., Lowe, P., Ward, N. and Marsden, T. (2003). *The Differentiated Countryside*. Routledge, London.

Murphy, E. and M. Scott (2014). 'After the crash': life satisfaction and everyday financial practices and rural households in post Celtic Tiger Ireland. *Journal of Rural Studies* 34, 37–49

Oliva, J. (2013) The role of mobility in the resilience and sustainability of Spanish rurality. In: Proceedings of XXV European Society for Rural Sociology, Florence, 30 July.

OECD (1980). *Patterns of Urban and Rural Population Growth*. Department of International Economic and Social Affairs. Population Studies, No 68. New York, OECD.

OECD (2011). Rural Policy Reviews: England, United Kingdom 2011. ECD Publishing. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264094444-en

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (2011). English: From British empire to corporate empire. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 5(3). DOI: 10.1558/sols.v5i3.441

Phillipson, R. (2016). Linguistic imperialism of and in the European Union. In: H. Behr and Y.A. Stivachtis (eds.), *Revisiting the European Union as an Empire*. Routledge, London, 134-163

Phillipson, R. (forthcoming). English, the *lingua nullius* of global hegemony. In: F. Grin and P. A. Kraus (eds.), *The politics of multilingualism: linguistic governance, globalisation and Europeanisation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Pratsinakis, M. Hatziprokopiou, P and King R. (2017). Beyond Migration Binaries and Linear Transitions: The Complexification of Greece's Migratory Landscape at Times of Crisis. Sussex

Centre for Migration Research, Working Paper 92 (Accessed 11 July 2017) https://www.sussex.ac.uk/webteam/gateway/file.php?name=mwp92.pdf&site=252

Psycharis, Y., Kallioras, D. & Pantazis, P., (2014). Economic crisis and regional resilience: detecting the 'geographical footprint' of economic crisis in Greece. *Regional Science Policy and Practice*, 6, 121-141.

Remoundou, K., Gkartzios, M. and Garrod, G. (2016). Conceptualizing mobility in times of crisis: towards crisis-led counterurbanization? *Regional Studies*, 50(10), 1663-1674.

Rye, J.F. (2006). Rural youths' images of the rural. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 22, 409–421.

Satsangi, M., Gallent, N., Bevan, M. (2010). *The Rural Housing Question: Communities and Planning in Britain's Countrysides*. Policy Press, Bristol.

Scott, M., Murphy, E. and Gkartzios, M. (2017). Placing 'Home' and 'Family' in Rural Residential Mobilities. Sociologia Ruralis, 57(S1), 598-621.

Sharp, T. (1940). *Town Planning*. London, Pelican Books.

Sheller, M. and Urry, J. (2006). The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A*, 38, 207–226.

Shortall, S. and Alston, M. (2016). To Rural Proof or Not to Rural Proof: A Comparative Analysis. *Politics and Policy*, 44(1), 35–55.

Smith, D. (2007). The changing faces of rural populations: '"(re) fixing" the gaze' or 'eyes wide shut'? *Journal of Rural Studies*. 23, 275–282.

Stockdale, A. (2016) Contemporary and 'messy' rural in-migration processes: comparing counterurban and lateral rural migration. *Population, Space and Place*. 22, 599–616.

de Swaan, A. (2001). English in the social sciences. In: Ammon, U. (Ed.), *The dominance of English as a language of science: effects on other languages and language communities*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 71-84.

TenHouten, WD. (1992) Generalization and statistical inference from snowball samples. BMS: *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology / Bulletin De Méthodologie Sociologique*, 37, 25-40.

Tovima (2011), Νέοι επιστρέφουν στην επαρχία για να γίνουν αγρότες (Young people return to the eparchy to become farmers) (Accessed 21 February 2018) http://www.tovima.gr/opinions/article/?aid=415236

Ungerson, C. (1996). Qualitative methods. In: L. Hantrais and S. Mangen (eds), *Cross-National Research Methods in the Social Sciences*. London, Pinter, 63-65.

Urry J. (2007). *Mobilities*. Polity Press: Cambridge.

van Dam, F., Heins, S. and Elbersen, B.S. (2002). Lay discourses of the rural and stated and revealed preferences for rural living. Some evidence of the existence of a rural idyll in the Netherlands. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 18, 461–476.

Vepsalainen, M. and Pitkanen, K. (2010). Second home countryside. Representations of the rural in Finnish popular discourses. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 26, 194–204.

Zacopoulou, E. (2008). The triumph of the peasant: Damianakos' thesis on Greek rurality. In: Zacopoulou, E., Kasimis, C., Louloudis, L. (Eds.), *Rurality, Society and Space*. Plethron, Athens, 27-38 [In Greek].

Williams, R. (1973). *The Country and the City*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Woods, M. (2003) Deconstructing rural protest: the emergence of a new social movement. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 19, 309-325.

Table 1: Words associated with 'village' (ordered by frequency), 'province survey'

Word	**Full sample Mean (St. deviation) (N=300)[1]**	**Counter-urbanisers (N=147)**	**Local movers (N=109)**
Natural environment (i.e. nature, green, forest, mountain, trees, countryside, sea)	0.49 (0.50)	0.48 (0.50)	0.50 (0.50)
Calmness (i.e. quiet, calm, no stress, relaxation, carelessness, happiness)	0.46 (0.50)	0.50 (0.50)	0.43 (0.50)
Farming (i.e. farms, animals, farm life, vegetables, stockbreeding)	0.40 (0.49)	0.34 (0.48)	0.44 (0.50)
Healthy Lifestyle (i.e. healthy life, quality of life, fresh air, pure products, nice food)	0.39 (0.49)	0.52 (0.50)	0.28 (0.45)
Human relations/Family (i.e. humanism, family relationships)	0.16 (0.37)	0.11 (0.31)	0.22 (0.42)
Reduced population	0.10 (0.30)	0.08 (0.27)	0.13 (0.34)
Distance	0.06 (0.24)	0.07 (0.26)	0.06 (0.23)
Small houses	0.06 (0.23)	0.05 (0.23)	0.07 (0.26)
Gossip	0.05 (0.22)	0.05 (0.21)	0.04 (0.19)
Fireplace	0.04 (0.20)	0.04 (0.20)	0.06 (0.23)

[1] Please note that the full sample includes individuals that are not counterurbanisers or local movers.

Table 2: Words associated with 'eparchy' (ordered by frequency), 'province survey'

Word	Full sample Mean (St. deviation) (N=300)	Counter-urbanisers (N=147)	Local movers (N=109)
Access to Services/Facilities/ Shops	0.42 (0.49)	0.38 (0.49)	0.44 (0.50)
Human relations/ Family (i.e. neighbourhoods, family, close relationships)	0.32 (0.47)	0.38 (0.49)	0.23 (0.42)
Natural environment (i.e. nature, trees, sea)	0.24 (0.43)	0.26 (0.44)	0.19 (0.40)
Space	0.19 (0.39)	0.18 (0.39)	0.18 (0.39)
Culture	0.17 (0.38)	0.17 (0.38)	0.17 (0.38)
Calmness (i.e. calmness, no stress, relaxation)	0.16 (0.36)	0.16 (0.37)	0.15 (0.36)
Farming (i.e. farming, animals, vegetable plots)	0.16 (0.36)	0.14 (0.35)	0.18 (0.39)
People/Crowds	0.14 (0.35)	0.09 (0.28)	0.22 (0.42)
Healthy Lifestyle (healthy life/products, fresh air, quality of life)	0.12 (0.32)	0.16 (0.37)	0.06 (0.25)
Employment opportunities	0.12 (0.33)	0.13 (0.34)	0.16 (0.36)
Small town	0.11 (0.31)	0.08 (0.27)	0.13 (0.34)
Education/Schools	0.10 (0.30)	0.10 (0.29)	0.11 (0.31)
Traditional cafes	0.08 (0.28)	0.11 (0.31)	0.07 (0.26)
No opportunities/Isolation	0.06 (0.24)	0.05 (0.23)	0.07 (0.26)
Gossip	0.03 (0.16)	0.02 (0.14)	0.04 (0.19)
Closed communities	0.03 (0.16)	0.05 (0.21)	0

Table 3: Words associated with 'city' (ordered by frequency), 'province survey'

Word	Full sample Mean (St. deviation) (N=300)	Counter-urbanisers (N=147)	Local movers (N=109)
Low quality of life (i.e. stress , intense lifestyle, fear, bad life conditions, crime, social problems)	0.42 (0.49)	0.47 (0.50)	0.38 (0.49)
Noise	0.41 (0.49)	0.37 (0.48)	0.51 (0.50)
Pollution (i.e. pollution, smog, exhaust gas)	0.32 (0.47)	0.35 (0.48)	0.29 (0.46)
Culture (i.e. entertainment, cultural opportunities)	0.3 (0.46)	0.32 (0.47)	0.26 (0.44)
Traffic (i.e. traffic, high traffic, cars)	0.22 (0.41)	0.21 (0.41)	0.26 (0.44)
Public transport	0.15 (0.35)	0.12 (0.32)	0.15 (0.36)
Medical care services	0.14 (0.35)	0.09 (0.28)	0.19 (0.40)
Isolation	0.12 (0.32)	0.13 (0.34)	0.12 (0.33)
Flats/poor housing (i.e. concrete, block of flats)	0.11 (0.32)	0.10 (0.30)	0.12 (0.33)
Employment opportunities	0.10 (0.30)	0.11 (0.31)	0.07 (0.26)
More choices	0.07 (0.26)	0.12 (0.33)	0.02 (0.13)
Crisis (i.e. crisis, unemployment, poverty)	0.05 (0.23)	0.05 (0.23)	0.06 (0.23)

Table 4: Words associated with 'village' (ordered by frequency), 'Athens survey'

Word	Full sample (N=300)[2]	Potential Counterurbanisers (N=151)	Stayers (N=117)
Calmness (i.e. quiet, peace, no stress, relaxation, carelessness, pleasure, joy, holidays)	0.52 (0.50)	0.59 (0.49)	0.47 (0.50)
Healthy Lifestyle (i.e. better quality of life, tasteful food, fresh air, pure products, healthy living)	0.50 (0.50)	0.50 (0.50)	0.48 (0.50)
Natural Environment/Nature (i.e. nature, green, forest, mountain, trees, countryside)	0.47 (0.50)	0.44 (0.50)	0.55 (0.50)
Farming (i.e. farmlands, animals, vegetables, livestock, rural life)	0.31 (0.46)	0.28 (0.45)	0.32 (0.47)
Human relations/Family (i.e. family, relatives, human contact)	0.14 (0.34)	0.14 (0.35)	0.13 (0.34)
Reduced population	0.03 (0.16)	0.01 (0.11)	0.03 (0.18)
Low cost of living	0.02 (0.14)	0.03 (0.16)	0.008 (0.09)
Gossip	0.02 (0.13)	0	0.04 (0.20)
Remote place	0.02 (0.14)	0.01 (0.11)	0.02 (.13)

[2] Please note that the full sample includes individuals that are not potential counterurbanisers or stayers.

Table 5: Words associated with the ‘eparchy’, ‘Athens survey’

Word	Full sample (N=300)	Counterurbanisers (N=151)	Stayers (N=117)
Calmness (i.e. peace, quiet, no stress, relaxation, rest, carelessness, holiday)	0.61 (0.49)	0.61 (0.49)	0.63 (0.48)
Healthy Lifestyle (i.e. pure products, better quality of life, fresh air)	0.37 (0.48)	0.42 (0.49)	0.32 (0.47)
Environment/Nature (i.e. nature, trees, green)	0.19 (0.39)	0.17 (0.38)	0.20 (0.40)
Human relations/Family (i.e. family, relatives, warm human relationships)	0.19 (0.39)	0.19 (0.40)	0.19 (0.39)
Farming (i.e. farmlands, farms, animals)	0.07 (0.26)	0.06 (0.24)	0.09 (0.28)
No opportunities/Isolation	0.07 (0.26)	0.06 (0.24)	0.08 (0.27)
Village	0.06 (0.25)	0.06 (0.24)	0.07 (0.25)
Reduced population	0.04 (0.20)	0.04 (0.20)	0.04 (0.20)
Closed societies	0.04 (0.20)	0.05 (0.21)	0.04 (0.20)
Space (open space, market squares)	0.06 (0.24)	0.07 (0.25)	0.05 (0.22)
Lack of medical services	0.03 (0.18)	0.05 (0.21)	0.03 (0.16)
Gossip	0.03 (0.17)	0.03 (0.18)	0.03 (0.18)

Table 6: Words associated with 'city', 'Athens survey'

Word	Full sample (N=300)	Counterurbanisers (N=151)	Stayers (N=117)
Low quality of life (i.e. stress, fear, poor living conditions, hell, jungle, chaos, hectic life, fatigue, routine, hard everyday life, crime, crowds)	0.59 (0.49)	0.70 (0.46)	0.51 (0.50)
Pollution (i.e. pollution, smog, exhaust gas)	0.39 (0.49)	0.38 (0.49)	0.42 (0.50)
Traffic (i.e. heavy traffic, traffic, cars)	0.31 (0.46)	0.25 (0.44)	0.33 (0.47)
Noise	0.30 (0.46)	0.28 (0.45)	0.31 (0.46)
Economic Crisis (i.e. poverty, unemployment, crisis, unaffordability)	0.16 (0.37)	0.19 (0.39)	0.14 (0.35)
Flats/poor housing (i.e. concrete/cement, block of flats)	0.13 (0.33)	0.09 (0.29)	0.15 (0.35)
Isolation	0.12 (0.33)	0.13 (0.34)	0.15 (0.35)
Entertainment	0.09 (0.28)	0.06 (0.24)	0.09 (0.28)
More options	0.06 (0.24)	0.05 (0.22)	0.08 (0.27)
Medical care services	0.03 (0.17)	0.04 (0.20)	0.009 (0.09)