Defining and theorizing place-based communities in the era of globalization

Xaquín Pérez-Sidín López

INVESTIGADOR POSTDOCTORAL VISITANTE EN DEPARTMENTO DE GEOGRAFÍA DE LA UNIVERSIDAD
DE COPENHAGEN INVESTIGADOR POSTDOCTORAL UNIVERSIDADE DA CORUÑA
xaquin.perezsindin@udc.es

Abstract: *Despite being a typical word that, like democracy, culture or development, is easily intelligible when used in everyday language, the definition of "community" within the discourse of the social sciences poses some difficulties. The objective of this chapter is to offer a brief overview of the theoretical evolution of the word "community" within sociology, as well as reflect on its meaning in the era of globalization and information technology. Tönnies' conceptualization of community or Gemeinschaft as a natural form of social relations had an enormous impact on the development of the discipline itself. As the flow of communications and exchanges between members of traditional communities and the external world increased, many wanted to bring the old sociological debate over industrialization and community disruption to an end. so Instead, however, recent theoretical developments have brought about a revitalization of the concept of community and its ability to explain contemporary social processes. By bridging class and modern theories, I define place-based community today as a place of socio-spatial identification where interactions are consciously established as a way of potentially facing the disintegrating effects of globalization.*

Keywords: *community, sociology, Gemeinschaft, Zigmunt Bauman, globalization, Ferdinand Tönnies*

Resumen: A pesar de tratarse de la típica palabra que, al igual que democracia, cultura o desarrollo, es fácilmente inteligible cuando es utilizada en el lenguaje cotidiano; la definición de comunidad en el seno de las ciencias sociales contempla algunas dificultades. El objetivo de este capítulo es el de hacer un breve recorrido por la evolución teórica de la palabra concepto "comunidad" en el discurso de la sociología, así como reflexionar sobre su significado en la era de la globalización e información. La conceptualización de comunidad o gemeinschaft de Tönnies como forma natural de relacionarse tuvo una enorme repercusión en el propio desarrollo de la disciplina. A medida que el flujo de interacciones entre los miembros de las comunidades tradicionales y el mundo externo se acentuó, no faltaron quienes quisieron dar por cerrado el viejo debate sobre industrialización y desintegración de la comunidad. Lejos de ser así, recientes desarrollos teóricos han supuesto una revitalización del concepto de comunidad y su capacidad para explicar procesos sociales contemporáneos. En este artículo propongo una definición de comunidad como lugar de identificación socio-espacial donde las interacciones se establecen, conscientemente, para, potencialmente, hacer frente a los efectos desintegradores de la globalización.

Palabras clave: comunidad, sociología, Gemeinschaft, Bauman, globalización, Ferdinand Tönnies.

1. Introduction

The term "community" often refers to the mere concentration of individuals in a given place. From the point of view of ecology, this idea is equally applicable in the case of animals and plants: thus, it is possible to speak of bird communities, for example. Nevertheless, regardless of the etymological meaning of the word, its use mostly refers to concentrations of people or institutions. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines community as "group of people living in the same place or having a particular characteristic in common". Therefore, it would be possible to speak of place-based communities, in so far as they are limited to a more or less delimited space, as well as communities of interest, such as communities of scientists, where space is not the central element. Whatever the case, the term's most common use emphasizes the very fact of concentration.

However, defining community from a sociological point of view is more complicated. In sociology, "community" does not denote simply a concentration of individuals in a given place but also the way those individuals are socially organized. As Cohen argued (2013), over the years there has been great reluctance to agree on a satisfactory definition. The objective of this chapter is to provide a brief overview of the theoretical evolution of the word "community" within the social sciences, especially in sociology. After analysing its origin and evolution to the present day, a new conceptual definition is proposed based on a combination of different modern sociological theories.

1.2. Origin of the concept in sociology

The concept of community is already present in Aristotle's texts, where he refers to the sociability of humankind. However, we have to wait until the contribution of Ferdinand Tönnies (Tönnies & Loomis, 2002) before we see it undergoing a further evolution as a concept word. First used in 1887, the word "community", or *Gemeinschaft* in German, suggests the natural organization of humankind that is typically found in small, isolated villages where everyone knows everybody else and interacts with them on a day-to-day basis, and where each person is involved in a network of family and friends. In contrast, Tönnies proposes the term "society" or Gesellschaft for the type of organization that is typically found in urban centres and is characterized by formal organizations, impersonal relations and the absence of generally held or binding norms. The artificial nature of Gesellschaft, which can be related to Hobbes' theory of the unsociability of man and the need for men to agree to keep the peace, responds to a type of rational will where individuals act according to their own interests. Tönnies proposed these two ideal types or analytical tools in order to account for the social transformations that gave rise to industrial and capitalist society.

Tönnies' contribution had a great impact in epistemological terms (López Meléndez, 2012). By considering the concept of community and its non-rational character as part of every society, he overcomes the radical dichotomy between reason and passion.[1] Indeed, the concept of society emerged as a product of reason, of the need to provide a secularized foundation for the study of institutions. Locke, for instance, differentiated between the law of nature and the social contract that give rise to the state and accordingly the need for a separation between Church and state. Under Locke's influence, many classic theoretical currents avoided introducing any non-rational component into their definition of society, from Comte himself, who argued that every society has a system of shared opinions about nature and humankind, to the economic concepts of Marx, who considered that society consists of nothing more than economic relations between individuals (Álvaro, 2012).

A similar typology of society escaping the limits of reason can be found in Durkheim (1933) and his distinction between mechanical and organic solidarity. As he argues in The Division of Labour in Society, first published in 1893, in primitive societies, mechanical solidarity – that is, people acting and thinking with a shared collective conscience – is what allows the social order to be maintained. In this type of society, each individual carries out most of the work, with slight differentiations due to gender and age. Solidarity comes from the fact that many things are shared that produce a strong commitment. Equally, the lack of interdependence between members explains why they are governed by repressive laws based on the notion of revenge. In contrast, other societies, especially modern ones, have organic solidarity characterized by greater differences between the members of society due to the social division of labour. What produces solidarity in this type of society is the interdependence of its members based on their respective roles within the social structure. This interdependence means that, despite a lesser degree of collective consciousness, societies remain united. Due to this interdependence, the aim of non-repressive but cooperative laws is to repair the damage caused in governing this form of social organization.[2]

Other theories largely influenced by Tönnies were Horton Cooley's (1983) categorization of primary and secondary groups, Redfield's (1947) distinction between

---

1.   Although perhaps less explicitly, Max Weber (1922) also presents the concept of community as a component of every society. He does so by confronting community with the concept of association. The former accounts for substantial action, i.e. cooperation or solidarity, while the latter is the result of formal or rational action in terms of ends, that is, it is instrumental (Marinis, 2010).

2.   Structuralist anthropology (Lévi-Strauss, 1987) would reverse this distinction. In the first place, regarding the type of law, the legislative and cooperative community of reparation would prevail among peoples considered primitive, as opposed to technically developed Western societies, where both the legislative and repressive community of revenge prevail (see Foucault, 1979). Second, the supposed lack of interdependence in pre-modern societies is called into question. The marriage market, the economic structures of the community and the family represented an organized organic whole, balanced by its own mechanisms (Pérez, 2005)

folk society and urban society, and Talcott Parsons' (2013) antagonistic dualities (Light, Keller, Calhoun, & Light, 1991), namely affectivity-affective neutrality; collectivity-individuality; particularism-individualism; quality-performance; diffusion-specificity. In each pair, the former refers to the idea of community, the latter to that of society.

1.3. The debate over community persistence

The theories of Tönnies gave rise to what can be considered the first great debate within sociology, that over social or community disruption. Much later research focused on answering the question: Do urbanization and industrialization mean the disintegration of the community? Alternatively, can the community persist in urban and industrial environments? Contributions by the Chicago School were especially relevant in this regard. For example, Wirth (2017)[3] found that the size, density and heterogeneity of cities make contacts between strangers extremely superficial, potentially creating friction, as people feel that it is very difficult to find space and privacy for themselves. Wirth linked the impersonal nature of city life to the reproduction of serious social problems. When individuals feel isolated and without emotional support, they are more susceptible to experiencing mental breakdowns, depression, and physical violence. Similarly, an indifferent attitude to others can lead to rising rates of crime, delinquency and corruption.[4]

Other authors of the Chicago School, conversely, contradicted the community disruption hypothesis. As early as the 1920s, authors such as Harvey Warren Zorbaugh (2005) argued that social problems in cities are not necessary caused by the disruption of communities. Each area of the city forms a new community, with its own institutions, customs, beliefs, traditions, attitudes, feelings and interests. Hence, problems are caused by tensions arising from the need for community cohesion and the underlying limits between different social groups based on their economic or racial statuses. In other words, what generate social problems are socio-spatial segregation and the consequent distance between different communities.

Later, other authors developed theories to explain the persistence of the community in urban environments. For example, Gans (1962) provided evidence for

---

3.   Simmel (1903) also validated Tönnies theories at the beginning of the twentieth century. Simmel considered that urbanization had corrosive effects on social relations. In urban areas, people tend to develop an attitude of indifference in order to protect themselves from the constant stimuli, noise and overcrowding that ends up producing emotional exhaustion. Consequently, city dwellers become more distant from one another than those who live in traditional communities.

4.   Later, in 1978, Harvey Cholding would show that population density is not a primary cause of crime (Light et al., 1991) but can be better predicted through factors such as racial mixing or the distribution of wealth.

the existence of a community as described by Tönnies in urban environments. In 1957 he rented an apartment in Boston's West End to witness life at first hand. It was a low-income, working-class district with about seven thousand residents, mostly second- and third-generation Italian-Americans. Gans found that the area was far from being the alienating city district that Wirth had described but instead a community with the close and enduring ties and mutual support networks that were typical of small towns. Similarly, Suttles (1968) studied the inhabitants of the Near West Side of Chicago and found some areas that could be called "urban villages", using Gans's term. The district was clearly divided into ethnic Italian, Mexican, Black, and Puerto Rican neighbourhoods. Like the West End in Boston this district was considered a slum, but life there did not correspond to the experience of loneliness and alienation described by Wirth. Ethnic businesses had become centres of social life in the neighbourhood. People could stop to joke and gossip, discuss their problems, and express their opinions. It was common for a customer to leave a shop without having bought anything. In other words, the economic transaction itself took second place, and postponing payment due to a lack of cash was seen as normal.

In the first half of the twentieth century, community studies also proliferated in Europe. Already in 1955 G.A. Hillery had identified 94 different sociological definitions of the term "community" (Murphy, 1989), indicating a certain abuse in the use of the concept itself, a fact that would be highlighted in 1968 by one of the most prominent researchers in this field of sociology, Norman Dennis (Dennis, Henriques, & Slaughter, 1969). Having synthesized all the previous definitions, Dennis and his colleagues proposed the following as the most popular definition: "on the one hand, a village or rural area, or the lifestyle of the working class existing in the centre of some cities and towns that simulate life as it was in the past" (in Murphy 1989, p. 32)

Decades later, Claude Fischer (1982) found other forms of community in city centers. Having interviewed more than a thousand men and women who lived in places that varied greatly in their degree of urbanism, he concluded that people tend to look for friends in wider geographical areas. The physical distance between friends in no way weakened the personal bonds they formed. In other words, urbanism does not involve the destruction of the community, but simply broadens the geographical boundaries within which it was built. Likewise, relationships tend to be based less on similarity or belonging to a place or ethnic group and more on work roles and commitment to secular associations, such as clubs, interest groups, and civic organizations. Ultimately, what Fischer suggests is that sharing a common space, whether rural or urban, is no longer essential for the existence of a community.

1.4. Criticism and revitalization of the concept

Despite often being presented as an ideal type or analytical tool, there has been no shortage of those who have criticized an excessively idealistic vision of community. Norman Dennis goes so far as to affirm that the term "community" was often used in the literature for nostalgic reasons (Murphy, 1989). For Davidoff et al. (1976), claiming the survival of traditional communities in the face of rapid social changes amounted to no more than ideological control before changes in power relations. Moreover, the British sociologist Ray Pahl (1967) warned of the problems surrounding so-called "community studies" by arguing that treating communities as separate systems was an unrealistic exercise in the context of the urbanized society of the twentieth century. As he argued, people's lives are always shaped by a combination of both local and national processes and influences, meaning that linking particular patterns of social relation-ships to a geographical milieu is a fruitless act. It is for this reason that studies of rural communities lost credibility in the 1970s and 1980s, coming to be described as "a poor sociological substitute for the novel" (Oxford Reference, 2015).

The British sociologist Margaret Stacey (1969) has also contributed to this dis-crediting of the notion of "community studies". In one of her articles published in 1969 under the title "The Myth of Community Studies", Stacey proposes the aban-donment of this concept and its replacement by "local social system". The population of the localities she had studied was determined by a combination of both local and national influences and processes. Institutions such as trade unions or wages were rarely local. All of this would make it difficult to describe what constitutes a commu-nity and who belongs to it. The concept of the local social system was introduced to take account of these aspects.

Despite her great contribution, the impact of her theory would be limited in later years (Oxford Reference, 2015). At the time of her article, urban sociology, a discipline within which the concept of community had occupied many efforts, was undergoing a change of course away from the microsociology typical of community studies. Instead, the focus was on how macrosocial processes occurred or manifested themselves by functioning in different locations. In other words, the community went from being an empirical unit to being treated as an indicator in which processes of global change are reflected. There was then a reactivation of interest in community studies among urban sociologists, this time under the name of locality studies (Oxford Reference, 2015). This is mainly due to the interest of many researchers in explaining the pat-terns of social change that many industrialized regions of countries with advanced economies experienced, as in Saskia Sassen's concept of the global city (2001). The deindustrialization processes experienced by many of these regions have encouraged studies of the affected communities and the changes in their social, political and eco-

nomic structures. Literature abounds with case studies describing the conversion of the traditionally working-class areas of a city into urban middle- and upper middle-class neighbourhoods through gentrification (Lees et al., 2008), the proliferation of ethnic or multicultural neighbourhoods (Murdie and Borgegard, 1998; Pérez-Sindín, 2019), or the demographic explosion experienced by many rural populations as a consequence of the installation of large industries in remote regions (Pérez-Sindín 2020).

While all these phenomena have led to an increasing interest in community studies, an issue that has received less attention is the conceptualization of community itself. Most studies either avoid a strict definition of it or assume a definition provided by classic theorists such as Tönnies. One of the main reasons for this is the absence of any consolidation of community studies as a field within sociology. Despite its relevance in the early phases of sociology, and despite the fact that there are still numerous departments and research centers on the subject, it is remains a field of study common to other branches of the discipline, such as urban sociology, rural sociology, human ecology or environmental sociology, among others. This means that studies do not always call themselves community studies, although they could be considered such if we take into account the local scale of the analyses (Oxford Reference, 2015).

Good examples of community studies not being called such are studies related to social capital theories as developed by such authors as Coleman (1988), Bourdieu (1987) or Putnam (2000). The concept of social capital refers, in its most elementary state, to the efficient functioning of social groups through interpersonal relationships, as well as the existence of a feeling of belonging and shared norms, mutual trust and cooperation. Despite the theoretical and methodological differences that separate the different theories, they all share a dynamic vision of community (Plascencia, 2005), which undoubtedly invites us to reconsider the potential of the concept of community as an analytical tool. All of them regard social capital as a set of resources that can be created, destroyed or maintained, suggesting that communities can be seen as a reality to be built. In a context of increasing individualization, the mere fact of sharing a space may be sufficient reason to establish a community. This is precisely the idea behind social capital-related concepts such as community development (Bhattacharyya, 2004; Robinson Jr & Green, 2011, Marchioni, 1999; Rezsohazy, 1988, 1991), which advocate building networks of actors committed to new activities and associations.

1.5. Communities in the era of globalization.

In a context of globalization, with its speeding up of movements and exchanges of human beings, goods, services, capital, technologies, and cultural practices all over the planet in the last quarter of the twenty century, the idea of a community without

a spatial dimension within the discourse of social science will be reinforced. As the flow of interactions between members of traditional communities and the external world increase, the difference between in-groups and out-groups become blurred, and the spatial dimension eventually loses weight in the definition of communities. Given the growing geographical mobility associated with labour flexibility, the arrival of the digital age, and the impact of new social networks on the internet, there are compelling reasons for bringing the old sociological debate around community survival to an end, realizing that much of the solidarity that allows the social order to be maintained does not necessarily depend on daily interactions. However, I argue that globalization does not completely negate the importance of the spatial dimension. We should start by asking how individuals experience communities based on sharing a common space in a context of the predominance of the individual factor and the high degree of transience in, for example, geographical and labour mobility.

Zygmunt Bauman's (2009) concept of "aesthetic community" is eloquent enough to delimit contemporary neighbourhoods: "communities ready for consumption, instant communities […] that do not require a long history, their common characteristic is the superficial and episodic nature of the links that arise between their members…the links are cold and ephemeral" (Bauman, 2009, p. 86). Indeed, the way many people experience community today has a lot to do with what Bauman calls a "liquid society" (Bauman, 2013). This would be reflected very well in, for example, the daily, intangible, almost imperceptible efforts of a family in the construction of a space of material conditions, but also of a climate of trust and communal understanding that resembles the ideal of home. Consequently, weak social relationships fail to be strengthened due to the ephemeral situations resulting from labour flexibility and geographical mobility, among other factors (González, 2007). In contrast, Bauman speaks of "ethical communities" (2009), which are characterized by the weaving together of fraternal commitments and reaffirming the right of all the members of such communities to community security. This type of community points toward long-term commitments that are impossible in aesthetic communities. Bauman nonetheless vindicates the idea of an ethical community as a way of recovering spaces of socio-spatial identification that facilitate the complete construction of identities and lasting life projects.

Bauman also argues that, in the era of globalization, ambiguity is what characterizes individual identities. On the one hand, there is nostalgia for the traditional community, while on the other hand "absolute conformity with the ethos of liquid modernity" (González, 2007, p. 186). It is as if the individual suffered from the dilemma of wanting at the same time the security of a time gone by – evaporated by

the "cracking of the structures that supported the links in solid modernity" (ibid.) – and the freedoms that come from the absence of ties in a vaporous and ungraspable present time.

Bauman argues that aesthetic communities proliferate in a context of the growing individualization of society, and he does not hesitate to express his pessimistic view of the future of humanity, which in turn brings him closer to other contemporary sociologists such as Anthony Giddens. Giddens also argues that humankind is not in a position to face globalizing forces alone. For him, the new problematic situations are giving rise to what he calls reflective communities (Bialakowsky, 2010), which seek to escape the types of relationship that are typical of both Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft but that generate communities in a more active sense, often through "indefinite space-time distances", such as self-help groups (Giddens, 1991)

Compared to Giddens, however, the novelty of Bauman's concept lies in the importance it gives to the spatial dimension. Giddens understands space as an essential element in constituting not so much communities in themselves but cohesive communities that fully protect the individual from the disintegrating forces of globalization. Theorists like Marc Augé, who coined the concept of the non-place (1992), or anthropological spaces of transience where human beings remain anonymous and that do not contain enough significance to be regarded as "places", is even more explicit in this regard: "a relationship is built through time and space" (2012). For this French anthropologist, the importance of the spatial dimension lies, as for Bauman, in its relationship with identity, while he points to the new information technologies as instruments of "passive identity" that would make it lose the dimension of time and space.

At this point, it is of interest to bring in Castells' views of the impact of the new communication technologies (2012). Contrary to Bauman and Augé, Castells suggests that technology does not have to conflict with place-based communities. For him, the "liquid internet life" described by Bauman does not necessarily have to occur at the expense of community life. As he argues: "the Internet is the global-local connection, which is the new form of control and social mobilization in our society" (Castells, 1997, p. 222). In writing these words, Castells realizes that the most important movements are now movements of values (environmentalism, feminism, human rights) and that, although they operate at a global scale, people have experiences and create values, resistance and alternatives locally. Hence, for Castells, the internet allows people to oppose globalization with their local experiences, for instance, by fighting environmental degradation and violations of human rights, or articulating alternative local projects through global partners. Ultimately, Castells suggests that social networks or virtual life could contribute to aesthetic communities moving

towards ethical communities to the extent that their members articulate alternative local projects, thus breaking with the discourse that problematizes the relationship between the growing use of communication technologies and the survival of place-based communities.

2. Final comments

In this article, I have conducted a literature review on the concept of community in order to facilitate its use in the context of globalization. Literature abounds with scholars trying to discredit and defend the use of this concept as analytical tool. Hence, talking about community today needs to be conducted with rigor in order to avoid leaving out all its essential components. The old parameters that defined the concept of community based on belonging to an isolated and more or less physically delimited space might not be enough in a globalized world. The importance of actors that are external to the community itself, such as transnational companies, international organizations or "transnational villagers" (see Levitt, 2001), complicates the task of defining community today. This text represents an attempt to do so by bridging Bauman's concept of ethical community, theories of social capital and Castells' (1999) concept of the network society to establish new parameters for defining "community".

First, it is worth asking whether Bauman's concept of community is comparable to that of Tönnies and therefore liable to be branded as nostalgic. The truth is that the sociologist makes continuous references to the latter as a source of security and recognition. However, it is not clear that the community and the shared living spaces that Bauman discusses are comparable to Tönnies' Gemeinschaft. The latter referred to pre-industrial societies where understandings are shared and taken for granted by all their members: that is, they are not built or achieved at the end of a journey, but are simply there, with no one daring to become aware of it, since the state of innocence that allows such an existence would then be lost. On the contrary, Bauman's community is a reality that needs to be built, despite the disintegrating forces of globalization, and that requires to be fully aware of itself. Second, the security that emanates from the preconceived character of the pre-industrial community also contrasts with its pre-deterministic character. In Parsonian terms, the statuses and roles of its members were not acquired by individuals but assigned according to, for example, the type of family into which they had been born. In other words, the Gemeinschaft provided security at the expense of freedom – and "security without freedom is equivalent to slavery" (Zygmunt Bauman, 2009, p. 27). Hence, it is improbable that, after the process of liberation being experienced to this day, the individual would be willing to resume that path, even at the cost of being without security. Rather, s/he

will tend to build new spaces of identification as a way of protecting himself against the disintegrating effects of globalization.

With his suggestion of the construction of ethical communities and his dynamic vision of the community as capable of being created, destroyed or maintained, Bauman approaches close to theories of social capital. If the concept of Gemeinschaft and its non-rational character caused, in its day, the destruction of the radical dichotomy between reason and passion, the idea of community as something that can be constructed represents a more sophisticated, variable and multidirectional vision that moves away from the Tönniesian dichotomy between it and society. Nothing suggests that sharing the same past is essential for community development. Instead, the fact that different people share the same experiences of collective action in fighting social problems, the deterioration of human rights, gentrification, environmental degradation, and so on has the potential to shape common values, norms and forms of behaviour for the task of constructing community. In other words, residing in a specific locality does not imply that a community is constituted – it is constituted when the residents of a specific geographical area mobilize to act on collective interests that are oriented locally.

On this basis, the use of communication technology will only increase the possibilities of interactions between individuals. The networked society offers not only the ability to connect people who reside in a more or less delimited geographical area, it also has the potential to interconnect all of them with global actors and new sources of knowledge and social innovation. In this sense, space still prevails as a structuring element of the community, not necessarily due to the fact that all its members reside in it, but rather as a source of personal identity.

3. References

ÁLVARO, D. (2010). Los conceptos de "comunidad" y "sociedad" de Ferdinand Tönnies. *Papeles Del CEIC. International Journal on Collective Identity Research*, 1, 211. https://doi.org/10.1387/pceic.20878

ANDERSON, B. (1983). *Imagined communities : reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*, Londres: Verso.

AUGÉ, M (1992) *Non-Places: An Introduction to Anthropology of Supermodernity*, Le Seuil: Verso.

AUGÉ, M. (2012). Las redes sociales no harán la revolución. Entrevista a Marc Augé. *Revista de Cultura Ñ*.

BAUMAN, Z. (2013). *Liquid modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

BAUMAN, Z. (2009). *Comunidad : en busca de seguridad en un mundo hostil / Zygmunt Bauman ; traducción de Jesús Alborés,* Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.

BHATTACHARYYA, J. (2004). Theorizing community development. *Community Development*, *34*(2), 5-34.

BIALAKOWSKY, A. (2010). Comunidad y sentido en la teoría sociológica contemporánea: las propuestas de A. Giddens y J. Habermas. Papeles del CEIC. *International Journal on Collective Identity Research*, *1*, 1–30.

BOURDIEU, P. (1980). Le capital social: notes provisoires. *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 31(1), 2-3.

CASTELLS, M. (1997). The power of identity. The information age: Economy. *Society and Culture, 2*(3).

CASTELLS, M. (1999). *La era de la información: economía, sociedad y cultura*, Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.

CASTELLS, M. (2012). *Viewpoint: Manuel Castells on the rise of alternative economic cultures*. Interview in BBC.

COHEN, A.P. (2013). *The symbolic construction of community*, Londres and New : Routledge.

COLEMAN, J.S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, (94), 95–120.

DENNIS, N., F. HENRIQUES y C. SLAUGHTER (1969). *Coal is our life an analysis of a Yorkshire mining community*. London, New York: Tavistock Publications.

DURKHEIM, E. (1933) The Division of Labor in Society. (Originally published in 1897.) Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

FISCHER, C. S. (1982). *To Dwell Among Friends: Personal Networks in Town and City*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

FOUCAULT, M. (1979). *Discipline and Punishment*. New York: Vintage Books.

GANS, H.J. (1962). *The Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italians-Americans*. Nueva York: Free Press of Glencoe.

GIDDENS, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity : self and society in the late modern age*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

GONZÁLEZ, N. (2007). Bauman, identidad y comunidad. *Espiral*, *14*(40), 179–198.

COOLEY, C.H. (1962) *Social Organization: A Study of the Larger Mind*, New York: Schocken.

LEES, L., Slater, T., & Wyly, E. (2008). The birth of Gentrification. In L. Lees, T. Slater, & E. Wyly, Gentrification (pp.89-128). New York: Routledge.

LEVITT, P. (2001) The Transnational Villagers. Berkeley: University of California Press.

LÉVI-STRAUSS, C. (1987). *Antropología estructural: mito, sociedad, humanidades*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.

LIGHT, D., S.L. KELLER y C.J. CALHOUN (1991). *Sociología*. Bogotá: McGraw-Hill.

LÓPEZ MELÉNDEZ T. (2012). De sociedad a comunidad: la teoría de la transición. *Reeditor. Red de Publicación y Opinión Profesional*.

MARCHIONI, M. (1999). *Comunidad, participación y desarrollo* (Vol. 27). Madrid: Editorial Popular.

MARINIS, P. de (2010). La comunidad según Max Weber: desde el tipo ideal de la Vergemeinschaftung hasta la comunidad de los combatientes. *Papeles Del CEIC*, *1*, 1–36.

MURDIE, R. A., y BORGEGARD, L. E. (1998): "Immigration, spatial segregation and housing segmentation of immigrants in metropolitan Stockholm, 1960-95". *Urban Studies*, no 35(10), 1869-1888.

MERTON, R.K. (1934). Durkheim's Division of Labor in Society. *American Journal of Sociology*, *40*(3), 319–328. https://doi.org/10.1086/216745

MURPHY, J. (1989). *Community and struggle: a sociological study of a village in the 1980s*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Warwick.

PAHL, R.E. (1967). The rural-urban continuum: a reply to Eugenlupri. *Sociologia Ruralis*, *7*(1), 21–29. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9523.1967.tb01043.x

PARSONS, T. (2013). *The Social System*. London: Routledge.

PÉREZ, A.M. (2005). Review of Bourdieu's The bachelors' ball: The crisis of peasant society in Bearn. *Reis. Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, (109), 257–261.

PÉREZ-SINDÍN, X. (2019) Segregation of Foreign Population in a Medium Size City in the Norwest of Spain. The case of A Coruña. *Ería: Revista cuatrimestral de geografía*, 39(1), 65-78.

PÉREZ-SINDÍN, X., & VAN ASSCHE, K. (2020). From coal not to ashes but to what? As Pontes, social memory and the concentration problem. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, 7(3), 882-891.

PLASCENCIA, J. (2005). Tres visiones sobre capital social: Bourdieu, Coleman y Putnam. *Acta Republicana: Política y Sociedad*, *4*(4), 21-36.

PUTNAM, R. D. (2000). Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. In *Culture and Politics* (pp. 223–234). Palgrave Macmillan US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-62965-7_12

REDFIELD, R. (1947). The Folk Society. *American Journal of Sociology*, *52*(4), 293–308. https://doi.org/10.1086/220015

REZSOHAZY, R. (). (1988). *El desarrollo comunitario: participar, programar, innovar*. Narcea.

ROBINSON J.W. y G.P. GREEN (Eds.). (2011). *Introduction to community development: Theory, practice, and service-learning.* Los Ángeles: Sage.

SASSEN, S. (2001) *The global city*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (first published 1990).

SIMMEL, G. (1903). "The metropolis and mental life". *The urban sociology reader*, 23-31.

STACEY, M. (1969). The Myth of Community Studies. *The British Journal of Sociology*, *20*(2), 134. https://doi.org/10.2307/588525

SUTTLES, G.D. (1968). *The Social Order of the Slum: Ethnicity and Territory in the Inner City*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Tönnies, F. y C.P. LOOMIS (2002). *Community and society*. Mineola and New York: Dover Publications.

WEBER, M., 1980 [1922], Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundriss der verstehenden Soziologie, Mohr-Siebeck, Tübingen. In MARINIS, P. de (2010). La comunidad según Max Weber: desde el tipo ideal de la Vergemeinschaftung hasta la comunidad de los combatientes. *Papeles Del CEIC*, *1*, 1–36.

Wirth, L. (2017). Urbanism as a way of life. In *The City: Critical Essays in Human Geography* (pp. 25–48). Taylor and Francis. https://doi.org/10.1086/217913

Zorbaugh, H. (2005). The natural areas of the city. *The urban sociology reader*, 82-88.