

IMAGES OF THE PERIPHERY IMPEDING DEVELOPMENT?
The Construction of the Rural in Estonian Peripheralization Discourse
RegPol² WP 1: Evolution, Reproduction and Persistence of Centrality and Peripherality

Author: Bianka Plüschke
Supervisor: Dr. Andres Kuusik

Project Overview My research concentrates on the “communicative level” of peripheralization processes, hence on the framing of space and society through discourse. Employing Political Discourse Theory, it treats ‘periphery’ as empty signifier, which is predominantly attached to rural areas. I follow the regional sociology approach in focusing on questions of power and mechanisms of exclusion, and conceptualize peripheralization as boundary-drawing and othering discourse. This does not only allow me to analyze how rural peripheries are subordinated to urban centers due to a hegemonic development concept based on competitiveness, but also how they are produced as internal others of the national self. I therefore argue that peripheralization discourses employ spatial and economic as well as social categories, including socio-economic position, ethnicity, culture, religion, language and others. But peripheries are not only constructed by the centers. Instead, those subjected to peripheralization, actively relate to it, by either accepting or rejecting the discourse. Applying this conceptualization to a largely rural country as Estonia seems particularly promising. On the one side, post-soviet rural areas often face negative images by being placed on the ‘downside’ of the urban-rural, progress-decline and west-east hierarchies. Moreover, in Estonian public discourse they often figure as internal others. On the other side, positive images of the rural and claims to “place/land” are employed in constructing national identity. This is the discursive structure, which defines the room for maneuver on the local level. Using case study research, corpus linguistics and narrative interviews, my research therefore addresses the questions, how rural spaces are constructed as peripheries in Estonian national discourse and how those subjected to it relate to external and produce own images in dealing with discursive peripheralization.

1. RESEARCH PUZZLE (QUESTION AND ASSUMPTIONS)

My research focuses on the “making of peripheries” and, hence, moves beyond the dominant formalist view which treats space as “passive locus”. Following Lefebvre’s (1974) notion of the “production of space” and Laclau’s (1996) definition of the social as essentially discursive, I understand space and society as structured by discourses. Peripheries are therefore not seen as structural condition of space, but as “result of societal processes of peripheralization” (Lang 2013). Hence, I want to draw the attention to the discursive level of peripheralization, which does not only represent socio-spatial order, but is also constitutive of it (Bürk 2013, Lang 2011).

With its focus on discourses, my research follows a constructivist approach and centers on the meaning of space to different actors and how these are shared and/or contested. Thus, I want to move away from objectivist classifications of peripheries and focus on what Cloke (2004) calls “understanding” or the perceptual level. Following a constructivist approach does not mean to ignore materialities, instead I argue that the ascribed meanings to places and people is real, in the sense of consequential for human action and socio-spatial structure (Graham 1997). The material and discursive are intertwined: whereas marginalization and decline can be put into motion by negative images, these materialities can also reinforce the discourse and be used as evidence for further stigmatization (Meyer/Miggelbrink 2013).

Employing Political Discourse Theory, I treat periphery as empty signifier, which is predominantly attached to rural areas (Fischer-Tahir/Naumann 2013). If peripheries are constructed in discourses, it is important to ask how, by whom and with what consequences? Following the regional sociology approach, which focuses on questions of power and mechanisms of exclusion, I conceptualize peripheralization as boundary-drawing and othering discourse. This does not only allow me to analyze how rural peripheries are subordinated to urban centers due to a hegemonic development concept based on competitiveness, but also how they are produced as internal others of the national self. I therefore argue that peripheralization discourses employ spatial and economic as well as social categories, including socio-economic position, ethnicity, culture, religion, language and others in setting the center as the norm by constructing peripheries as deviation. But peripheries are not only constructed in the centers. Pointing out the agency of subjects in relating to value-laden ascriptions, Meyer and Miggelbrink (2013) show that locals are not passive victims but actively deal with “moments of peripheralization” in accepting and reproducing or rejecting and counteracting them. As the discursive peripheralization of places is consequential, it effects thoughts, feelings and actions of people as well as the socio-spatial

structure. The question, how much room there is for maneuver within the dominant discourse, is therefore central.

Applying this conceptualization to a largely rural country as Estonia seems particularly promising. On the one side, post-soviet rural areas often face negative images as the “biggest losers” of transformation by being placed on the ‘downside’ of the urban-rural, progress-decline and west-east hierarchies (Editorial 2014, Lang 2013, Leibert 2013). Moreover, in Estonian public discourse they often figure as internal others. On the other side, positive images of the rural as “traditional way of life” (Berg 2002) and claims to “place/land” (ibid.) are important features of Estonian identity-construction.

With its focus on the discursive peripheralization of rural spaces and different actors (re-)producing and/or dealing with them, my work seeks to address the research gaps identified by Kühn and Bernt (2013). Using case study research, corpus linguistics and narrative interviews, I plan to address the questions, how rural spaces are constructed as peripheries in Estonian national discourse and how those subjected to it relate to external and produce own images in dealing with discursive peripheralization.

2. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH (CONCEPTUALIZATION)

If we understand center and periphery as emerging discursively (Lang 2013), then it is important to pay attention to the existing knowledge production and reveal it as hegemonic but contestable discourse. In the discussion of my theoretical and methodological approach, I will first focus on the current development concept which subordinates the rural periphery to the urban center. After that, I will sum up the basic assumptions of Political Discourse Theory. PDT is employed to deconstruct peripheralization as hegemonic boundary-drawing and othering discourse, which produces rural peripheries as places lacking development potential and internal others to the national self. Finally, I will concentrate on the question how peripheralization is received and responded to locally, considering the dominant discourse structure as limiting and enabling room for maneuver.

2.1. Making Peripheries: Subordination of the Rural

The most prominent attribution to peripheries stems from the neoliberal development concept proliferated since the early 1990s, which favors a particular understanding of regional development equating it with economic growth and competitiveness (Bristow 2005). Thereby, it narrows down development to the survival of the fittest, leaving regions with the option to either “be competitive or die” (Bristow 2010). Against the back-drop of globalization, competition is portrayed as inevitable, which does not only justify every policy claimed to be “competitiveness-enhancing”, but also delegitimizes possible alternatives (Bristow 2005 and 2010).

Despite its apocalyptic life or death logic, the discourse suffers from a “success bias” (Bristow 2005), promising more prosperity and a higher standard of living to those who accept the rules of the game. But the question “what kind of development and for whom” (Pike 2007) has to be critically addressed. As the one-sided understanding of development suffers from a sense of placelessness and the benefits are unevenly distributed, not everyone can be a ‘successful’ competitor (Bristow 2005). If the ultimate objective is to create economic advantage (over other regions) through productivity, innovation, or the attraction of investments, firms and labor, then the criteria for ‘success’ and ‘failure’ are already preset (Bristow 2005, Shearmur 2012). Imposing the logic of firms on regions as entrepreneurial ‘place-sellers’, spatial polarization and social inequality are essentially explained by macro-economic performance indicators as: GDP, innovation potential, tax income, enterprise settlement, firm performance, business environment, employment rate or real estate prices, which are usually related to geographic and functional indicators of accessibility, infrastructure, population density and service provision (Annoni/Dijkstra 2013, Assembly of European Regions 2009, Bristow 2005, Friedrich/Kosiński 2002, Hollanders/Es-Sadki 2014, Schürmann/Talaat 2000, Shearmur 2012). Compiled into composite indexes, rankings and league tables, they are used to compare regions and find out “who is winning” (Bristow 2005). This usually results in an opposition of prosper, structurally strong, innovative, and active urban centers to

lagging, underdeveloped, remote and passive rural peripheries, suffering from selective outward-migration, structural cut-backs and disinvestment (Kühn/Bernt 2013, Leibert 2013, Shearmur 2012).

The significance and impact of such generalizations have to be critically scrutinized though. On the one hand, the selection of indicators, their relation to the overall concept and with each other, as well as the threshold for successful competitiveness often remain unclear. Where is for example the difference between an acceptable and non-acceptable distance when defining accessibility (Lang 2013)? As these statistic 'facts' objectify success and failure and ascribe them to certain places, on the other hand, there is the risk of stigmatising peripheries as failing because of their own deficiencies (Bristow 2005, Meyer/Miggelbrink 2013). Often measured against a hidden western standard and receiving high attention amongst policy-makers and media representatives, such comparisons universalize a particular idea of development and neglect potential alternative measures as e.g. subjective well-being, quality of life, life satisfaction, or happiness (Bristow 2005, Hayo 2007, Helliwell et al. 2013, Kőrveveski 2011, Peiro 2006, Shuck-smith et al. 2009, Sørensen 2013, EU SILC, Shearmur 2012, Weckroth 2014).

Therefore, the current development concept is not neutral. Instead, the application of economic growth, geographic and functional indicators has a huge impact on our imagination of space. It does not only link centers to progress and peripheries to decline, but also inherently privileges the urban over the rural (Lang 2013, Shearmur 2012). Hence, it constitutes rural places as peripheries *per se*. Breaking with the understanding of centers and peripheries as pre-defined poles on an 'objective' development scale, I follow the regional sociology approach, which focuses on questions of power and mechanisms of exclusion. Convinced that we should stop looking for peripheral spaces and start focusing on processes, Keim (2001) introduced the term peripheralization into the debate (Lang 2013). The concept draws our attention to the social construction of center-periphery relations, which are not only structured by hard materialities but also (re-)produced in a hegemonic discourse, naturalizing the ascription of development potentials to centers while denying them for peripheries. Moreover, it reflects that the term periphery is relational to the center, one cannot exist without the other (Keim in Leibert 2013). Therefore, the term is not necessarily restricted to certain places or the countryside *per se*, but used in discourses on different scales, from neighborhood level to entire countries (Kühn/Bernt 2013). Mirroring this social-constructivist understanding of core-periphery relations, Lang (2013) has called for a discursive approach to complement the dominant structural approaches.

2.2. Peripheralization Process: Drawing Boundaries towards the Other

Peripheralization as discursive process evolves around the construction of 'the periphery'. Employing Political Discourse Theory (PDT), I treat it as empty signifier. Signifiers are mental constructs of the signified or the object, which are related to one another in the process of signification. This relation is not always clear-cut and can be arbitrary. Whereas for example 'red' can relate to a colour, it can also relate to a political direction. Empty signifiers do not point to any particular object. They are floating in the sense that their meaning is changing over time. Consequently, they bare traces of the past and potential for the future in them. Being emptied of shared meaning, they absorb whatever is projected on them and, hence, are susceptible to political use¹.

Using PDT, my aim is to deconstruct with which meaning 'periphery' is filled via a chain of equivalence and difference and expose the inherent hierarchy in the centre-periphery binary. Focusing on notions of ascribed similarity and difference, I understand peripheralization as boundary-drawing discourse. The concept of discursive boundaries was introduced by Barth in 1969 to show that distinction from others is constitutive of the collective self. Boundaries contain what he calls "cultural stuff", meaning criteria that are defined as central for the differentiation from others. This distinction usually goes in line with a positive self-bias and othering process (Reinke de Buitrago 2012). The post-colonial othering concept particularly draws our attention to the discursive construction of peripheries *by* the core.

¹ For more information on empty signifiers, see: Claude Lévi-Strauss (1987) and Roland Barthes (1985)

According to Foucault (1999), discourses are an entity of sequences and signs. Through their manifestation in the subjects' articulation and texts, they structure knowledge and meaning. Hence, discourses define and limit the thinkable, expressible and, hence, doable. They function as self-assurance of the society, answering the question of who we are by the construction of differences. PDT points out the socially constructed and contingent - therefore alterable (Wimmer 2013) - character of discourses, which becomes temporarily fixed through hegemony. According to Laclau (1996), the concept of hegemony describes the superiority of one discourse over competing others, leading to its naturalization. Discourses are thus embedded in power relations, at the same time representing and (re-)producing them. If discourses are understood as struggle for the recognition of different voices and propagation of forms of knowledge (Lang 2013, Spivak 1987), power structures determine who has the power to speak, who is heard in the discourse and whose constructions become manifested through the institutionalization in symbols (Jenkins 1996), categorizations (Brubaker/Cooper 2000) and institutional practices (Paasi 1986). The power to institutionalize sets the framework for socio-spatial socialization through which discourses become internalized (Paasi 1996). Due to its discursive character, this form of power is difficult to tackle, as it has no specific location (Foucault 1999). Despite being actively reproduced by actors in different discourse positions, the agency behind the discourse often seems ungraspable and therefore unchallengeable.

PDT is useful to denaturalize this hegemony and show that discourses do not only represent socio-spatial processes but also constitute them. It is therefore important to ask, who has the power to name, show, create and therefore bring to existence (Bourdieu 1991)? The "interpreting coalition" of core-periphery relations consists of actors from academia, politics, media, administration, business, local interest groups and the locals themselves (Bürk 2013). As the discourse is embedded in power relations, actors in and from the center tend to dominate it. They set themselves as the norm by portraying the periphery as deviation, using different boundary-drawing criteria and othering strategies. The use of spatial and economic criteria as well as strategies of objectification and statistification have figured prominently in the neoliberal development discourse, portraying rural peripheries as "cut-off" regions (Bristow 2005, Meyer/Miggelbrink 2013). Going beyond that, boundary-drawing theory suggests that social criteria relating to socio-economic position, ethnicity, religion, culture, language or other could be meaningful for differentiation as well and should therefore be considered.

Postcolonial studies reveal demonization, exoticism, feminization, enemy stereotyping as well as normative divides into west and east, progressive and backward, good and evil, authentic and artificial as potential othering strategies (Hall 1992, Jacobs 1995, Said 1995, Spivak 1987). Rural areas in post-soviet space are an illustrative example of these strategies as they face particular negative images as the "biggest losers" of transformation by being discursively placed on the 'downside' of the urban-rural, west-east and progress-decline hierarchy (Editorial 2014, Leibert 2013). Moreover, othering studies make us aware that seemingly positive ascription as "rural idyll" or "slow and clean place for life" do not break the dominant hierarchy, as they are connected to notions of modernity and project peripheries as frozen in time (Hechler in Lang 2013).

An outstanding role for understanding the construction of peripheries by the centers is played by studies on territorial stigmatization. Linking the notion of stigma (Goffman 1983) as discrediting difference to the power to institutionalize, the studies by Bürk (2013) and Wacquant et al. (2014) show how peripheries are not only associated with development deficits (statistics) or visible decay (physical environment), but also with social categories which are related to pathologies as crime, xenophobia, alcoholism and immorality. The problems of peripheries are therefore justified by "inherent socio-cultural traits" of the inhabitants and detached from structural ill-beings (Wacquant et al. 2014). When conceptualized as boundary-drawing and othering process, peripheralization is not only connected to development discourses, subordinating rural peripheries to urban centers, but also to identity discourses, constituting national core-identity by the differentiation towards internal others.

Hegemonic peripheralization discourses play a key role in distributing negative images of peripheries. As the work of Bürk (2013), Lang (2013), Meyer/Miggelbrink (2013) and Wacquant et al. (2014) show, peripheralization as discursive boundary-drawing and othering process is deeply consequential. It affects individual feelings, thoughts and actions as well as socio-spatial structures and mobility, which has been well proven for residential decision-making (Ley in Cloke 2004). Negative and stigmatizing images tend to “stick” (Wacquant et al. 2014), materializing in space and strengthening disadvantages. They also legitimize further neglect and marginalization of places labelled as peripheries.

2.3. Ways of Dealing with Peripheralization: Coping Strategies

How can subjects, faced with “moments of peripheralization” (Meyer/Miggelbrink 2013), react? How do they receive these discourses and what kind of coping strategies do they develop? Their room for maneuver is delineated by the discourse itself, which is defined as structuration process effecting the way subject think and act (Giddens in Pred 1984). As structuration is always incomplete, the consequences of hegemonic discourses and territorial labelling are twofold: at the same time limiting and enabling different forms of agency.

Laclau (1996) has concluded that hegemonic discourses constitute us as society and subjects, meaning that they offer certain subject positions to which we are able to relate by accepting or rejecting them. Even if those who are subjected to peripheralization discourses are argued to possess particularly little discursive and material power, they should not be perceived as passive victims to external processes, but as actively relating to and co-constructing or counteracting them (Bürk 2013, Meyer/Miggelbrink 2013). Despite keeping in mind the important question “if the subaltern can speak” (Spivak 1988) and is heard in the discourse, we have to break with the polarizing image of powerful centers and absolutely powerless peripheries. Focusing on the “formation of the subject”, Meyer and Miggelbrink (2013) point out the agency of both, the subjecting and those being subjected to peripheralization, hence, show how subjects relate to value-laden ascriptions and negotiate them in the discourse. Following Goffman’s (1983) theory on stigma, local responses can be divided into those confirming the norm by internalizing it and relying on it when trying to prove the opposite or generate pity, and those, who reject the norm and actively resist it (Bürk 2013).

Internalizing the norm of the periphery as the other and therefore subordinated to the center is what Bürk (2013) and Lang (2013) call “peripheralization in mind” or “mental lock-ins”. It goes back to the notions of “self-stigmatization” and “voluntary subjection” and can be seen as a local reproduction of the negative image, hence, of one’s own positions as peripheral. The situation is consequently perceived as hopeless, impeding the inhabitants’ engagement for changes in the future.

When trying to prove the opposite, local actors tend to opt for a reversal strategy by attaching positive or idyllic images to places described as rural peripheries. As an endogenous resource, regional images and strong local identity have been proposed as new beacons of hope for overcoming peripheralization and enhancing regional development (Bristow 2005, Fischer-Tahir/Naumann 2013, Paasi 2013). When mobilized strategically, they are claimed to offer possibilities for (1) place-marketing initiatives to attract tourists, dwellers, and investors or (2) community initiatives to foster social capital² and attachment to the region³ (Jasso 2005, Messely 2014, Semian/Chromý 2014). It is debatable though, who benefits from these image-reversal strategies and if they can really overcome rural subordination. First, place marketing initiatives remain deeply in the logic of competitiveness and entrepreneurship (Fischer-Tahir/Naumann). Second, they are focused on fulfilling the urban demand for “rural lifestyle and leisure activities” to not “disappear from public consciousness” (Kobayashi/Westlund 2013). Thus, they run the risk of being focused on satisfying the urban gaze of rural societies, which then becomes commodified and exotified⁴. Moreover, even though community-building is perceived as a central source of rural development enhancement (European Rural Vision 2002), also ‘soft’ development factors as engagement and

² For further information on the social capital concept, see: Coleman (1988), and Putnam (1993)

³ For further information on the concept of place attachment, see: Lewicka (2010), Tuan (1977)

⁴ Kašková, and Chromý (2014) have for example pointed out the excessive emphasis on the rural in regional product labelling

social capital have been coopted by the center-periphery divide, declaring urban centers to be highly active and labelling rural areas to passive peripheries. Alternatively, local actors in the periphery could utilize negative images to generate pity and attract for example development funds or turn to *strategic essentialism* of features ascribed to them in othering discourses and use them for achieving their own objectives (Bürk 2013, Jacobs 1997). Yet, they do not split with the hierarchic center-periphery logic.

All coping strategies so far stay within the dominant national and neoliberal framework and do not question the hegemonic development concept or the ultimate aim of achieving a competitive advantage (Fischer-Tahir/Naumann 2013, Paasi 2013). Following Soja's (1999) notion of *thirdspace*, socio-spatial stigmatization also offers potential for resistance which breaks with dominance. Contesting the uneven development and distribution of benefits, resistance movements, who reject the norm, question this hegemony and draw on alternative visions of justice, democracy and the state (Bristow 2010).

3. RESEARCH DESIGN (OPERATIONALIZATION)

When approaching my research question, I plan to divide it analytically into two phases. First, I will focus on reconstructing the hegemonic discourse on rural peripheries in Estonia, in order to understand what images and categorizations subjects have to relate to or position themselves against. Second, I want to study how the peripheralization discourses are retrieved on the local level and what discourses and images are mobilized by locals in order to deal with discursive peripheralization. My remarks on the research design will include first ideas to methods, databases and the anticipated challenges.

3.1. First phase: Peripheralization discourse and imaginations of space

In the first phase, I plan to analyze how the term periphery is attached to rural places in Estonian discourse. This will be done by using corpus linguistics against the background of Political Discourse Theory. PDT processes deductively from the theoretical background of discursive knowledge production to the deconstruction of one specific term. With the help of a large corpus, it searches for the situatedness of an empty signifier via the identification of chains of equivalences and difference. The aim of this research phase is not only to reconstruct the discursive production of rural peripheries, but also to identify possible case studies, hence rural areas which are predominantly referred to in the discourse.

The first step is to create a text corpus for analysis. In reconstructing hegemonic discourses, PDT usually draws on texts written by the elite. The first idea would therefore be to rely on a corpus of academic texts⁵, media articles⁶, policy documents⁷ and statistical data⁸. The danger here is to derive 'only' the elitist view on rural peripheries and neglect how 'normal' inhabitants (re-)produce the discourse. I do not have a solution to that challenge yet, but think that group interviews or the consideration of social media data could balance both perspectives.

From the analysis, potential case studies can be identified which are predominantly associated with rural peripheries in the discourse. I therefore do not want to pre-determine the geographical scale of analysis or the scope of possible regions. Depending on the places mentioned in the discourse, these could be for example villages, rural areas, administrative counties or historical regions. Accounting for the relational aspect of peripheralization, the main question here is whether I can understand the construction of rural peripheries by 'only' choosing respective cases or if it would be better to consider also other cases e.g. presumably urban peripheries as Lasnamäe⁹ in Tallinn or rural centers as Viimsi parish. Taking into consideration the strong media focus on Tallinn, it has to be methodologically problematized as well that not all peripheries are constructed by explicit negative images ascribed to them, but also by not being part of the discourse at all.

⁵ Mainly focusing on peripheralization processes, shrinking regions, rural areas in Estonia, for example: Leetmaa et al. (2013)

⁶ Mainly national and local print media, for a list of Estonian newspapers, see: <http://www.w3newspapers.com/estonia/>

⁷ Mainly national, regional and local development and spatial plans

⁸ Mainly competitiveness and development indexes/rankings, for example: Kivilaid/Servinski (2013), Noorkõiv/Ristmäe (2014), and Sõstra/Aru (2013)

⁹ Conference note from community imitative workshop in Tartu (Apr., 22, 2015): Stereotype reversal has been identified as main objective by initiative "Lasnaidee"

3.2. Second Phase: Discourse Reception and Ways of Dealing with Peripheralization

In the second phase, my focus lies on the reception of the peripheralization discourse by those subjected to it. Two different ways have been proposed for this stage: In a study on Estonian boundary-drawing towards Russia, Aalto (2003) relied on the Q-method, meaning that he first retrieved relevant categories in the dominant discourse and then confronted his respondents with them in questionnaires. In my opinion, this runs the risk of reinforcing elitist representations, which are not meaningful to the people concerned. As my focus in this phase is on the analysis of categories mobilized by locals, I prefer the approach suggested by Miggelbrink in her study on shrinking regions in Germany¹⁰. Therefore, I plan to conduct narrative interviews with locals, asking them for example about their life and their plans for the future in their place of residence, the perceived development chances of the region and their own engagement. In trying to avoid referring to hegemonic concepts myself, I want to find out which categories “pop up”, hence are used by the locals.

The question is not only how to interview, but also whom. As I want to know, how locals deal with discursive peripheralization considering options from “peripheralization in mind” to active resistance, it is important to talk to local inhabitants as well as to decision-makers and activists in community and place-marketing initiatives. According to Estonian law, the registration of residence does not necessarily have to take place in the place of living. Moreover, the place of living in Estonia is highly seasonal. Identifying who are “the” locals is thus not so straightforward. Local can include those registered there to pay their taxes to this municipality, summer house residents and finally those who live there permanently. At the moment, I am still puzzled about the question how to sample and when to stop, considering on the one side sampling until theoretical saturation and on the other side choosing interviewees according to pre-defined criteria so as to consider the specifics of these three groups. In approaching decision-makers and initiatives, I hope that the contacts of Geomedia and a contact database of community activists¹¹ can be helpful.

In this phase it is crucial to consider the contextuality and temporality of discourses. As Valentine (2007) shows in her study on intersectionality, the way subjects relate to dominant discourses highly depends on the social role they perform, the place they act in and the time frame. As subjects are unstable (Meyer /Miggelbrink 2013), depending on the situation, decision-makers could for example strategically employ positive images of the rural in place-marketing initiatives and negative images of the rural as periphery when applying for development funds. Moreover, the intensity of local discourses could possibly change when confronted with the publication of new development rankings or vary with the seasonality of living. I do not yet know how to accommodate for these factors, but have considered for example several field phases in the same case study areas.

Moreover, I have to be aware of my own role as a researcher in the field, who is also part of the discourse. First of all, I have to pay attention to the concepts and categories which I refer to myself. In order to avoid essentialization on my side, I find the differentiation between categories of analysis and categories of practice proposed by Brubaker and Cooper (2000) particularly useful. Second, it is also important for me to reflect the potential subject position ascribed to me as e.g. German woman, who has lived during the last years in an urban area and works for a consulting company associated with one of the most influential local capacity rankings (KOV). Third, I consider the language of interview conduction to play an important role as it enables or limits ways of expression and understanding. It will be possible for me to conduct interviews in Estonian, but my knowledge of Russian is not yet at the respective level. As I do not want to preclude Russian-speaking areas in my analysis, this is an issue that has to be addressed.

Finally, I see two general challenges for my research. The first is connected to the question of how to not neglect the materialities of peripheralization without reinforcing statistical discourses on peripheries.

¹⁰ Introduced at the RegPol school in Tartu, Febr. 2-6, 2015

¹¹ For further information see “Kodukant”: <http://kodukant.kovtp.ee/andmebaasid>

My proposed solution is an extensive contextualization of my case studies, the inhabitants, decision-makers and initiatives by (1) critically reconstructing the national and local discourse, and (2) describing them on different dimensions, which go beyond statistical development analysis. The second and most important is not to contribute to the stigmatization of peripheries through my research, which in my opinion can only be overcome by working as transparent and reflexive as possible so as to increase intersubjectivity. These are criteria, which are also indispensable for qualitative research in general (Lamnek 1993).

4. EXPLORATORY PHASE (FIRST RESULTS)

In the still ongoing exploratory phase I consulted secondary literature, statistical data and media articles covering spatial classifications, development debates, othering processes, and the portrayal of places labelled as periphery (*ääremaa*) in Estonian discourse. As this has not yet been conducted in systematic manner, the results below have to be seen as preliminary. Moreover, I attended several field trips and conferences organized by the university and consultancy meetings from Geomedia in order to get a first impression of the local discourses on and in space.

4.1. First phase: Peripheralization discourse and imaginations of space

Politico-administrative classifications of space play a crucial role as they are at the heart of planning activities and statistical analysis in Estonia. Based on a bounded territory logic, the most important are the national division into counties (*maakonnad*), rural municipalities (*vallad*), and urban municipalities (*linnad*) as well as the European classification into the NUTS 3 regions North (*Põhja*), West (*Lääne*), Central (*Kesk*), Northeast (*Kirde*) and South-Estonia (*Lõuna*). For the rural areas, Raagmaa and Noorkõiv (2013) have developed a typology, dividing villages into four types: urban villages (mainly suburbs or urban hinterlands), big villages (*alevik*) functioning as service provision centers or production settlements, holiday villages (summer house regions), and small villages. Pointing to the blurry boundaries between urban and rural, they address the difficulties of such divisions (*ibid.*). Whereas rural spaces used to be associated with a certain mode of production and fields of occupation as “farmers, fishers and foresters” (Raagmaa/Noorkõiv 2013), this ‘definition’ does not hold anymore.

The problematisation points to the discursive character of the ‘rural’, which is only filled with meaning by chains of equivalences and difference. Current understandings of rural areas rather associate them with the label ‘periphery’. This dominant imagination of spatial order is embedded in a hegemonic development concept. Different development indexes and competitiveness rankings (Kivilaid/Servinski 2013, Noorkõiv/Ristmäe 2014, Sõstra/Aru 2013) utilizing economic growth, functional and geographic indicators, describe “weaker municipalities” by e.g. depopulation, selective out-migration, low income/education and high unemployment rates, missing service provision¹² and discursively oppose them to “stronger municipalities” (Kaukvere 2014). They objectify a Northwestern-Southeastern development divide. Accordingly, Statistics Estonia (2009) has grouped Estonian regions into the “successful” Tallinn, Tartu and Pärnu city regions with their surrounding municipalities, the “problematic” proximity of Lake Peipus and Southeastern Estonia, and the “in between” corridor from the Gulf of Narva to the Gulf of Riga. This is affirmed by one of the most influential indexes, the local government capability index (KOV), where rural municipalities in the counties of Valga (at the border to Latvia), Võru (including the South Estonian region of Setomaa), Tartu (Old Believer settlements at Lake Peipsi), the post-industrial county of Ida-Virumaa and on the island of Saaremaa (Torgu municipality) rank among the lowest. Higher ranks are filled by urban municipalities and their proximities, for example the suburbs Viimsi and Rae¹³.

But rural areas in Estonia are not only associated with “losers of transformation” (Leibert 2013). In a predominantly rural country as Estonia, they are also portrayed as *essentially* Estonian territories. Claiming “the connection to place/land” figures prominently in discourses of belonging, where the “traditional way of life” is an important feature of identity-construction (Berg 2002). Or as Saar (1999) put it, referring

¹² For further information on indicators, see: Noorkõiv/Ristmäe (2014), and Statistics Estonia: <http://www.stat.ee/ppe-45400>),

¹³ For further information on Estonian suburbs in general and Viimsi in particular, see: Kährik et al. (2012), Noorkõiv (2014), Noorkõiv/Sepp (2005)

to Estonian history, “we are country people (*maarahvas*), speak country language (*maakeel*) and the country is our place of living (*elupaik*)”. This also figures prominently in Estonian marketing campaigns¹⁴. Saar (1999) for example proposed to base place-marketing on the historical parishes (*kihelkonnad*), which were defined as network of church territories in the 1920s and exist until today. They are to a large extent based on “natural” (*looduslik*) boundaries, dividing the Estonian territory into a continental (*mandri*) and a coastal (*merepool*) part. The latter is furthermore subdivided into the Northern open sea coast and the Southern inner sea coast, whereas the continental part is divided into northeastern forest, central river and southeastern mountain land.

The link to nature is also an othering strategy (Rausing 2004), which is employed for example towards the so-called “new-Russians” (Petersoo 2007) and their settlements in Ida-Virumaa. The region and its inhabitants are faced with an overlapping othering discourse as they are (1) predominantly Russian-speaking, (2) portrayed as “urban transits” (Berg 2002) in opposition to the Estonian connection with land, and (3) associated with soviet occupation and post-industrial space¹⁵. In addition, Petersoo (2007) identified two more internal others, to whom boundaries are drawn within a discursive east-west frame, employing not only spatial, but also social criteria as ethnicity, language use or religion. Their primary settlements tend to overlap with the regions categorized as ‘underdeveloped’. These include the Old believer, settled around Lake Peipsi, and the South-Estonian minorities of Seto and Võru, who are labeled as deviation from the standard Estonian language norm (Koreinik/Saar 2012). The fact that more than half of Setomaa’s territory is situated in Russia also plays an important role in the discourse. Moreover, Sooväli (2004) has analyzed, how Saaremaa is represented as the other. Framed in a modernity discourse, it is associated with a timeless image of “backwardness”¹⁶ or a sense of “uniqueness”, which has to be conserved.

4.2. Second Phase: Discourse Reception and Ways of Dealing with Peripheralization

This is the discursive structure which sets the frame and defines the local room for maneuver. The main question in the second phase of analysis is therefore, if these dominant discourses are meaningful to local people and how they relate to it when trying to deal with peripheralization. The intense debates about the external association of Estonia in general and Haapsalu in particular with the term ‘periphery’, shows the awareness of its political or problematic character¹⁷.

As discourses overlap and are moreover temporal and contextual, we find traces of all above defined coping strategies. Studies by Berg (1999) and Valk/Särg (2015) have identified signs of self-stigmatization in Ida-Virumaa and Setomaa, which they call shame and passivity or non-resistance. In opposition to that, local pride figures prominently in the stories told about Viimsi municipality (Rüütel 2014). The first results also reveal incidences of contesting the dominant understanding of development and the measures for success and failure¹⁸.

What I have encountered most so far, are strategies which try to prove the opposite. It still remains to be seen though, to what extent these local counter discourses question the urban-rural dichotomy as part of the hegemonic center-periphery discourse. Place-marketing initiatives as the “Gateway to Lake Peipus” proliferated by the local visitors’ center and “Yours Authentically” originating from Setomaa tourism MTÜ play with images of the rural and strategic essentialism to attract visitors. Idyllic images are also used by local initiatives in Saaremaa to prevent second-home ownership at the coast (Sooväli 2004) and by Misso and Värskä municipalities in Setomaa for their “back to the countryside” (*tule tagasi*

¹⁴ For further information, see: “Kuidas me endast räägime?” URL: <http://brand.estonia.eu/et/esileht/disain>

¹⁵ For further information on the discursive construction of Ida-Virumaa and ‘socialist’ villages, see: Annist (2011), Pfoser (2014), Virkkunen (2002)

¹⁶ See for example: “Eesti Perifeeria” URL: <http://www.saartehaal.ee/2007/11/01/repliik-estimaa-perifeeria/>

¹⁷ See for example: “Haapsalu on Eesti ääremaa” URL: <http://online.le.ee/2014/05/26/sukles-haapsalu-on-estii-aaremaa/> and „Ääremaa Eesti?” URL: <http://epl.delfi.ee/news/arvamus/juhtkiri-aaremaa-estii?id=51172750>

¹⁸ See for example: “Rae ja Peipsiääre: vaese valla hiigelrikkus on mõõtmatu” URL: <http://epl.delfi.ee/news/estii/rae-ja-peipsiaare-vaese-valla-hiigelrikkus-on-mootmatu?id=65104528>

maale)¹⁹ campaigns to attract inhabitants. For whose interest and benefits these images as mobilized, has been critically addressed though²⁰. Moreover, they run the risk of commodification and exoticism.

Positive images fostering place attachment have also been identified as promising factors for rural development in Estonia in general (Raagmaa/Noorkõiv 2013) and for Setomaa in particular (Raagmaa 2012). Their main role is supposed to be played by local community-initiatives²¹ focusing on community life enhancement, local problem solving and strengthening of local attachment (Vihma/Lippus 2014). Despite the high engagement of community initiatives on the countryside (73% of the 4438 villages, Vihma/Lippus 2014), we also find a media and research coverage divide here, which favors the urban initiatives²², thereby strengthening the image of active urban centers, especially in Tallinn. An intense study was conducted by the Estonian Village Movement “Kodukant” taking the different organizational forms of rural community initiatives into account. Dividing the villages into awoken (*ärkanud*), awakening (*ärkavad*) and sleeping (*uinivad*) (ibid.), they deeply stay in the active-passive hierarchy as well, running the risk of further stigmatizing those who they categorize as “sleeping”.

What I conclude from the exploratory phase is that applying my conceptualization of peripheralization as boundary-drawing and othering process to the Estonian case seems promising. As the preliminary results have revealed, rural areas are on the one hand connected to the empty signifier ‘periphery’ by the hegemonic development concept based on competitiveness. In the discourse, measures of economic growth and the provision of public functions are related to geographic indicators as distance and low population density, so that they are portrayed as “remote” and “empty”. On the other hand, positive images of the rural are employed for Estonian identity construction as “country people” (*maarahvas*) and against internal others. Hence, images of the rural are mobilized not only to ‘define’ development (non) potentials and consequential investment in or neglect of places labelled as peripheries but also to reinforce Estonian core-identity.

The possible case study areas, which I have identified in the discourse are commonly situated at natural fringes as borders or on islands. Interestingly, those areas associated with lower development potential are also those areas, to whom boundaries are drawn using social criteria as language use, ethnicity and religion. Common othering strategies are essentialization, exoticism, and presenting the areas and their inhabitants as “frozen in time”. The first results also show that images of the rural are mobilized in a two-fold way: in the peripheralization process and also in attempts to deal with it. It has to be critically questioned though, for whose interest and benefits they are mobilized.

5. QUESTIONS FOR FEEDBACK

The scope of my research stays within the ESR 5 topic of “Development Perspectives of Village Communities in Rural Estonia”. In the first phase, it will accommodate the tasks of analyzing development related to strategic development documents as well as national registers and population census databases. But this will be done not for the purpose of ‘defining’ development stages or potentials, but for critically reflecting the indicators used and discourses drawn upon. In the second phase, I will accommodate the tasks of preparing case studies and conducting interviews with key stakeholders. But I argue that the task of reflecting day to day practices should go beyond stakeholders and consider the perspectives of local inhabitants as well.

I would be happy to get feedback from the RegPol² network on the question, if the second phase of my analysis, which focuses on dealing with peripheralization, overlaps too much with the focus of WP3 or if this could produce useful synergies. Moreover, I would be thankful for critical feedback on my

¹⁹ For more information, see: <http://www.tulemaale.ee/et/kogukond/verska> and <http://www.tulemaale.ee/et/kogukond/misso>

²⁰ Field note from Kolkja (Oct., 11, 2014) Initiators of visitors' center are newcomers and talked about missing contact with locals; field note from Värskas (Nov., 27, 2014) municipality government said that “Tule maale” initiative lead to return of 26 ppl.

²¹ See for example “kogukondade Eesti” URL: <http://riigireform.ee/#kogukondade-estesti> and “Ilves: külaseltsid ja tublid inimesed hoiavad elu maal” URL: <http://www.postimees.ee/406803/ilves-kulaseltsid-ja-tublid-inimesed-hoiavad-elu-maal>

²² See for example: “Uus maailma Documentary” by Tootsen, 2011; “Kalamaja short film” by Leigh, 2014, and “Asumiselsid on popp uurimisteema” URL: <http://www.linnaidee.ee/content/asumiselsid-popp-uurimisteema>

methodological approach, especially on the conduction of field studies and narrative interviews for analyzing the discourse reception. Finally, I am still not quite sure, if, according to PDT, periphery or rural is my empty signifier and how to create the text corpus accordingly. Hence, I am looking forward to comments in this direction as well.

6. PRELIMINARY WORKING PLAN

Theoretical and Exploratory Phase (September 2014-December 2015)	
Tasks	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acquisition of methodical skills for research design (courses in discourse analysis, statistics, and Estonian language, practicing interview conduction in Estonian) 2. Elaboration of theoretical framework, incl. literature review (further focus on: internal colonialism and othering strategies and the specifics of the post-socialist and rural context) 3. Elaboration of methodological framework (further focus on PDT specifics and consolidation of research design) 4. Primary and secondary literature analysis on peripheralization, development, othering discourses in Estonia, incl. statistical data and policy documents 5. First exploratory field trips and background interviews 6. Presentation of conceptualization and first results for feedback 7. Collection of texts for discourse analysis
Expected results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Consolidated research outline ✓ Conference presentations and articles on “visions of rurality” and “spatial development discourses” ✓ Chapter 1: Research Puzzle, State of Academic Debate, Literature Review ✓ Chapter 2: Theoretical/Methodological Conceptualization and Research Design ✓ Consolidated text corpus for empirical phase # 1
Empirical Phase # 1 (January 2016-July 2016)	
Tasks	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduction of and Reflection on Discourse Analysis 2. Identification of case studies 3. Presentation of results for feedback
Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Chapter 3: Images of the Rural in Estonian peripheralization discourse ✓ Consolidated case study choice for empirical phase # 2 ✓ Conference presentations and articles
Empirical Phase # 2 (August 2016-March 2017)	
Tasks	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identification of interviewees 2. Preparation, conduction and analysis of case studies 3. Presentation of results for feedback
Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Chapter 4: Images of the Rural employed in dealing with peripheralization in Estonia ✓ Conference presentations and articles
Wrap-Up Phase (April 2017-October 2017)	
Tasks	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interpretation of Results, reflection and consolidation 2. Handing-in and defending dissertation 3. Presentation of Results at Final Conference
Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Chapter 5: Conclusion and reflection ✓ Distribution of results

7. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aalto, P. (2003). Revisiting the Security/Identity Puzzle in Russo-Estonian Relations. *Journal of Peace Research* 40(5): 573-591.

Annist, Aet (2011). *Otsides kogukonda sotsialismijärgses keskuskülas. Arenguantropoloogiline uurimus*. ACTA Universitatis Tallinnensis.

Annoni P.; Dijkstra L. (2013). *EU Regional Competitiveness Index RCI 2013*. European Commission. URL: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/studies/pdf/6th_report/rci_2013_report_final.pdf

Assembly of European Regions (2009). *The Impact of Decentralisation on Economic Growth. Creating a Decentralisation Index*. URL: http://www.aer.eu/fileadmin/user_upload/PressComm/Publications/AER_Study_on_decentralisation/Studies/BAK-Part1-FINAL_cover.pdf

Barth, F. (1969). *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

- Berg, E. (2002). Local Resistance, National Identity and Global Swings in Post-Soviet Estonia. *Europe-Asia Studies* 54(1): 109-122.
- Berg, E. (1999). *Estonia's northeastern periphery in politics. Socio-economic and ethnic dimensions*. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- Bristow, G. (2010). Resilient regions. Re-'place'ing regional competitiveness. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* 2010(3): 153–167.
- Bristow, G. (2005). Everyone's a 'winner'. Problematising the discourse of regional competitiveness. *Journal of Economic Geography* 5: 285–304
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brubaker, R.; Cooper, F. (2000). Beyond Identity. *Theory and Society* 29 (1): 1-47.
- Bürk, T. (2013). Voices from the Margin. The Stigmatization Process as an Effect of Socio-Spatial Peripheralization in Small-Town Germany. In: A. Fischer-Tahir; M. Naumann (eds.). *Peripheralization. The Making of Spatial Dependencies and Social Injustice*, pp. 168-186. Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Cloke, P.; Cook, I.; Crang P.; Painter, J.; Philo, C. (2004). *Practising Human Geography*. London: Sage, pp. 285-335.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (Supplement): 95-120.
- Editorial (2012). Rural realities in the post-socialist space. *Journal on Rural Studies* 28: 55-62.
- Fischer-Tahir, A.; Naumann, M. (2013). Introduction. Peripheralization as the Social Production of Spatial Dependencies and Injustice. In: A. Fischer-Tahir; M. Naumann (eds.). *Peripheralization. The Making of Spatial Dependencies and Social Injustice*, pp. 9-26. Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Foucault, M. (1999): *Botschaften der Macht. Der Foucault-Reader*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.
- Friedrich, P.; Kosiński, J. (2002). *Competitiveness Indicators. Diskussionspapier 45*. München: Universität der Bundeswehr.
- Graham, E. (1997). Philosophies underlying human geography research. In: Flowerdew, R.; Martin, D. (eds.). *Methods in Human Geography. A guide for students doing research projects*, pp. 6-30.
- Goffmann, E. (1967): *Stigma. Über Techniken der Bewältigung beschädigter Identität*. Suhrkamp: Berlin.
- Hall, S. (1992). The West and the rest. Discourse and power. In: Hall, S.; Gieben, B. (Eds.): *Formations of Modernity*, pp. 275-332. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hayo, B. (2007). Happiness in transition. An empirical study on Eastern Europe. *Economic Systems* 31: 204–221.
- Helliwell, J.; Layard, R.; Sachs, J. (ed.) (2013). *World Happiness Report 2013*. URL: http://unsdsn.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/WorldHappinessReport2013_online.pdf
- Hollanders, H.; Es-Sadki, N. (2014). *Regional Innovation Scoreboard 2014. Enterprise and Industry*. URL: http://ec.europa.eu/news/pdf/2014_regional_union_scoreboard_en.pdf
- Jacobs, J. (1996). Authentically yours. De-touring the map. In: Jacobs, J. (ed.): *Edge of Empire. Postcolonialism and the City*, pp. 132-156. Routledge: London/New York.
- Jasso, M. (2005): Regional Identity. Its Background and Management. In: Roch, I.; Petrikova, D. (Ed.): *Border-Free River Basins. Mitteleuropäische Ansätze zu Entwicklung und Förderung landschaftsbezogener Identität*, pp.171-180.
- Jenkins, R. (1996). *Social identity. Key Ideas*. London: Routledge.
- Kährik, A.; Leetmaa, K.; Tammaru, T. (2012): Residential Decision-Making and satisfaction among new suburbanites in the Tallinn urban region, Estonia. *Cities* 29: 49-58.
- Kašková, M.; Chromý, P. (2014). Regional product labelling as part of the region formation process. The case of Czechia. *AUC Geographica* 49(2): 87–98
- Kaukvere, T. (2014). Vaata, millised on Eesti võimekaimad ja nõrgimad omavalitsused. *Postimees* 10.10.2014. URL: <http://www.postimees.ee/2948519/vaata-millised-on-estee-voimekaimad-ja-norgimad-omavalitsused>
- Kivilaid, M.; Servinski, M. (2013). Viability Index. *Eesti Piirkondlik Areng*: 84ff.
- Kobayashi, K.; Westlund, H. (2013). *Social Capital and Rural Development in the Knowledge Society*. Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Koreinik, K.; Saar, E. (2012). Maintenance of South Estonian Varieties. A Focus on Institutions. *Journal of Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues* 48(11): 48-65.
- Kõrreveski, K. (2011). Heaolu ja elukvaliteedi mõõtmisest OECD näitajate põhjal. *Eesti Statistika Kvartalkiri* 4/11: 28-37.

- Kühn, M. (2013). Peripheralization. Theoretical Concepts Explaining Socio-Spatial Inequalities. *European Planning Studies*: 1-12.
- Kühn, M.; Bernt, M. (2013). Peripheralization and Power. Theoretical Debates. In: A. Fischer-Tahir; M. Naumann (eds.). *Peripheralization. The Making of Spatial Dependencies and Social Injustice*, pp. 302-316. Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Laclau, E. (1996). *Emancipation(s)*. London: Verso.
- Lamnek, Siegfried (1993). *Qualitative Sozialforschung. Methodologie*. Weinheim: Psychologie-Verlag-Union, pp. 3-38.
- Lang, T. (2013). Conceptualizing Urban Shrinkage in East Germany. Understanding Regional Peripheralization in the Light of Discursive Forms of Region Building. In: A. Fischer-Tahir; M. Naumann (eds.). *Peripheralization. The Making of Spatial Dependencies and Social Injustice*, pp. 224-238. Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Lang, T. (2011). Regional Development Issues in Central and Eastern Europe. Shifting Research Agendas from a Focus on Peripheries to Peripheralisation? In: Eröss, A.; Karacsonyi, D. (eds.): *Geography in Visegrad and Neighbour Countries*, pp. 57-64. Budapest.
- Lefebvre, H. (2002 [1974]). The production of Space. In: Dear, M.J.; Flusty, S. (eds.): *The Spaces of Postmodernity. Readings in Human Geography*, pp. 131-141. Blackwell: Oxford.
- Leetmaa, K., Agnes K., Mari N.; Burdack, J. (2013). Strategies to Cope with Shrinkage in the Lower End of the Urban Hierarchy in Estonia and Central Germany, *European Planning Studies* 23(1): 147-165.
- Leibert, T. (2013). *The Peripheralization of Rural Areas in Post-Socialist Central Europe. A Case of Fragmenting Development? Lessons for Rural Hungary*. In: A. Fischer-Tahir; M. Naumann (eds.). *Peripheralization. The Making of Spatial Dependencies and Social Injustice*, pp. 101-120. Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Lewicka, M. (2010). Place attachment. How far have we come in the last 40 years? *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 31(3): 207-230.
- Messely, L. (2014). *On regions and their actors. An analysis of the role of actors and policy in region-specific rural development processes in Flanders*. Ghent, Belgium: Ghent University Press.
- Meyer, F.; Miggelbrink, J. (2013). The Subject and the Periphery. About Discourses, Loopings and Ascriptions. In: A. Fischer-Tahir; M. Naumann (eds.). *Peripheralization. The Making of Spatial Dependencies and Social Injustice*, pp. 207-223. Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Noorkõiv, R.; Ristmäe, K. (2014): *Kohaliku omavalitsuste üksuste voimekuse indeks*. Geomedia Siseministeeriumi tellimusel. URL: https://www.siseministeerium.ee/sites/default/files/content-editors/KOV/kov_voimekuse_indeks_2014_loppversioon.pdf
- Noorkõiv, R. (2014). Kiirest kasvust stabiilse arenguni. *Viimsi Teataja* 7.11.2014: 6
- Noorkõiv, R.; Sepp, V. (2005). Tallinnas Valgumisest Viimsi Valda. Äärelinnastumise väljakutsed pealinna lähedasele kohalikkule omavalitsusele. *Cities and Rural municipalities in figures 2005*.
- Paasi, A. (2013). Regional planning and the mobilization of 'regional identity': from bounded spaces to relational complexity. *Regional Studies* 47 (8): 1206-1219
- Paasi, A. (1996). *Territories, Boundaries and Consciousness: the Changing Geographies of the Finnish-Russian border*. Chichester: Wiley
- Paasi, Anssi (1986). The institutionalization of regions. A theoretical framework for understanding the emergence of regions and the constitution of regional identity. *Fennia* 164(1): 105-146.
- Peiro, A. (2006). Happiness, satisfaction and socio-economic conditions: Some international evidence. *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 35: 348-365.
- Petersoo, P. (2007). Reconsidering otherness. Constructing Estonian Identity. *Nations and Nationalism* 13(1): 117-133.
- Pfoser, A. (2014). Between Russia and Estonia. Narratives of place in a new borderland. *Nationalities Papers* 42 (2): 269-285.
- Pike, A.; Rodriguez-Pose, A.; Tomaney, A. (2007). What kind of Local and Regional Development and for Whom? *Regional Studies* 41(9): 1253-1269.
- Pred, A. (1984). Place as historically contingent process. Structuration and the time-geography of becoming places. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 74 (2): 279-297.
- Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making Democracy Work. Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Princeton University Press.
- Raagmaa, G.; Noorkõiv, R. (2013): *Globaliseeruv Eesti Küla. Avaneva Maailma Arenguvõimalused ja ohud*, Eesti Külaliikumine Kodukant. URL: <http://www.kodukant.ee/files/927c119c43aa27c7c9a90f57e44d4091.pdf>

- Raagmaa, G.; Masso, J.; Reidolf, M.; Servinski, M. (2012). Empowering People and Enterprises with Strong Cultural and Territorial Identity. A Case Study of Setomaa, Estonia In: Kinnear, S.; Charters, K.; Vitartas, P. (eds.). *Regional Advantage and Innovation*, pp. 233-254. Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Rausing, S. (2004). *History, memory, and identity in post-Soviet Estonia. The end of a collective farm*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reinke de Buitrago, S. (2012). *Portraying the Other in International Relations. Cases of Othering, Their Dynamics and the Potential for Transformation*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Rüütel, L. (2014). Riina Solman. Viimsilane on Viimsi uhkus! *Viimsi Teataja* 7.11.2014: 3.
- Saar, M. (1999). *Kihelkonnad ja Maaviendikud*. URL: <http://miksike.ee/docs/lisa/6klass/3linnastumine/kihelkonnad.htm>
- Said, E. (1995). *Orientalism. Western conceptions of the Orient*. London: Penguin Books.
- Schürmann, C.; Talaat, A. (2000). *Towards a European Peripherality Index*. Dortmund: Universität Dortmund. Institut für Raumplanung.
- Semian, M.; Chromý, P. (2014). Regional identity as a driver or a barrier in the process of regional development. A comparison of selected European experience. *Norwegian Journal of Geography* 68(5): 263-270.
- Shearmur, R. (2012). Are cities the fond of innovation? *Cities* 29: S9-S18.
- Shucksmith, M.; Cameron, S.; Merridew, T.; Pichler, F. (2009): Urban–Rural Differences in Quality of Life across the European Union. *Regional Studies* 43(10): 1275-1289.
- Soja, E. (1999). Thirdspace: expanding the scope of the geographical imagination. In: Massey, D.; Allen, J.; Sarre, P. (eds.) *Human Geography Today*, pp. 260-278. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Sørensen, J. (2013). Rural–Urban Differences in Life Satisfaction: Evidence from the European Union. *Regional Studies*, 48(9): 1451-1466.
- Sooväli, H. (2004): *Saaremaa waltz. Landscape imagery of Saaremaa Island in the 20th century*. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- Sõstra, K.; Aru, J. (2013). Regional Poverty Mapping. *Eesti Piirkondlik Areng*: 111.
- Spivak, G.C. (1988). *Can the Subaltern Speak? Postkolonialität und subalterne Artikulation*. Wien: Turia & Kant.
- Statistics Estonia (2009). According to the regional development, Estonia can be divided into three parts. *News Release* No. 139.
- The European Association for Rural Development and Village Renewal (2014). Rural Roadmap. For a Sustainable Development of European Villages and Rural Communities. *European Rural Vision 2020*. URL: <http://www.landentwicklung.org/assets/Uploads/PDFs/Roadmap-Englisch-beschnitten.pdf>
- Tuan, Yi-Fu (1977): *Space and Place. Humanistic Perspective*. In: Gale, S.; Olsson, G. (eds.): *Philosophy in Geography*, pp. 387-427.
- Valentine, G. (2007) Theorizing and Researching Intersectionality. A challenge for feminist geography. *The Professional Geographer* 59(1): 10-21.
- Valk, A.; Särg, T. (2015). Setos' way to manage identities and well-being. Shame and pride, opposition and openness. *Nationalities Papers* 43(2): 337-355.
- Vihma, P.; Lippus, M. (2014). *Kogukonna Uuring. Eesti kogukondade hetkeseis*. Tallinn. URL: <http://www.linnalabor.ee/failid/n/52b5698cef1431087333dbf84a56380f>
- Virkkunen, J. (2002). Place and Discourse in the Formation of the Northeast Estonian Borderland. In: Kaplan, D. H.; Häkli, J. (Eds.): *Boundaries and Place. European Borderlands in Geographical Context*, pp. 239-254. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Wacquant, L.; Slater, T.; Pereira V. (2014). Territorial stigmatization in action. *Environment and Planning* 46: 1270-1280.
- Weckroth, M. (2013?). Studying local expressions of subjective well-being. *Regional Insights* 4(1): 4.
- Wimmer, A. (2013). *Ethnic Boundary Making. Institutions, Power, Networks*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.