

## **'Our journey through Lampeter': a marginal space of geographical knowledge**

Paper delivered at the AAG Annual Meeting, Los Angeles, March 2002

Chris Philo,  
Department of Geography and Topographic Science,  
University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8QQ,  
Scotland, UK.

[cphilo@geog.gla.ac.uk](mailto:cphilo@geog.gla.ac.uk)

---

### **Introduction**

To adopt an historiography for geography that takes seriously the situatedness of knowing would mean, I suggest, abandoning normative history and looking to those contingent factors that ... shape scientific inquiry. It will mean locating particular geographical theories, methodologies, representations, schools of inquiry, and so on, in their intellectual context, their social space, their physical setting.

(Livingstone, 1995, p.28)

Changes are afoot in the way that we now write the history of geography. One aspect of this is the increasing attention paid to the *sociology* of key phases in geography's history, as in Trevor Barnes's (2001a, 2001b) compelling recent reconstructions of the personnel, institutions and networks at the heart of geography's 'quantitative revolution'. A closely related aspect is the interest being shown in the *geography* of geography, concentrating upon what David Livingstone (1995) calls 'the spaces of geographical knowledge' within and around which ideas, practices and applications of geographical learning are produced, circulated and consumed. Both of these routes into rewriting the history of geography could be brought together to inform my consideration of the *marginal space of geographical knowledge* that was the Department of Geography at the University of Wales, Lampeter (previously St.David's University College).

I say "was" because this Department has now closed, much to the great sadness of many people who have been associated with the Department over the years. I should immediately add that geography *does* still have a presence in Lampeter, in the shape of a much scaled-down Centre for Geography, possessing only three full academic staff members (only one of whom is a human geographer, and we will hear from him, Tom Delph-Januirek, towards the close of this paper). Yet, this Centre is itself scheduled for closure in circa three years time, when the final (tiny) cohort of students passes through. Maybe we could talk later about the genuine recruitment problems and the

dubious institutional micro-politics that have led to this sorry pass, although I will have cause to mention something of how it has been experienced in a moment.]

The chief purpose of this paper – besides providing a context for today's session – is to reflect upon Lampeter geography's marginality, and to ruminate a little on the playing off of *marginality* and *centrality*. In order to help me, I have conducted a small e-mail survey of Lampeter human geographers, past (dating back to the 1980s) and (in Tom's case) present, including lecturing staff, research assistants, postgraduates and undergraduates who went on to postgraduate studies (in Lampeter or elsewhere). I obviously must thank all of those who have responded, nearly thirty of you, and their comments in response to my questions will form the backbone of today's paper.<sup>1</sup> I will be quoting verbatim a selection of these comments, but I do have copies of a longer written version of my paper including a fuller digest of such comments. Revealingly, several people, either in their responses or in covering e-mails, confessed how tricky it was to put into words the feelings that they still had regarding their Lampeter experience:

*Very mixed and complicated feelings – very special and significant but also very difficult – too much to say really, I am afraid ... . I don't really feel comfortable about trying to express ... [L]*

As an aside, this paper can also be usefully read in combination with Paul Cloke's auto-ethnographic account of what Lampeter contributed to the 'making' of himself as a human geographer over a number of years (Cloke, 1994).

I should underline that my focus here is very much on the years after the later-1980s, coinciding with my own personal experience and knowledge, and more could certainly be said about the years between the department's foundation in the early-1970s and the later-1980s. My focus is also human geography at Lampeter, and my survey has been solely of human geographers. In this latter respect, it should therefore not be forgotten that throughout the life of the Lampeter department circa half of the academic staff – five or six people at most points, although only two now – have been physical geographers. There is a whole story to tell about Lampeter physical geography, then, starting with the marked difference between the high turnover of the human geographers year on year and the relative stability of the physical geographers (most of whom bar one were appointed and stayed until retirement or redeployment rather than moving on). One theme emerging from the comments of some of my respondents, mainly junior staff

---

<sup>1</sup> All direct quotes from respondents to my survey are in italics. I have kept all quotes anonymous except the final one in the paper, for which I have the permission of the individual concerned to identify them as its source. I have nonetheless given a little background information for each quote: L = lecturing staff; R = Research staff (research fellow or assistant); T = Teaching assistant; P = Postgraduate student; U = Undergraduate student. An attribution such as [U,G] indicates an undergraduate going on to become a postgraduate *also* in Lampeter.

members during the 1990s, was that of “*support from physical geog colleagues*” [L], all except one of whom were by then senior staff (and hence responsible for managing the department):

*There's also something important here about the physical geographers and their support for what we were doing: principled people governing departments through the laws of cricket (minus ball-tampering) was, in retrospect, a model. Mike Walker and John Crowther were top men!* [L]

One respondent did state that “*There was a distinct split between the physical and human geographers*” [U,P], and it would have to be acknowledged that there was a period, from the late-1980s into the early-1990s, when specific tensions arising around issues of management did spill over to a small degree into the outworking of human-physical relations in the department. Even then, though, most relations remained excellent at the inter-personal level.

I should also acknowledge that I am not saying much here about the various support staff who were invaluable to the Lampeter experience – the secretaries, the computing staff, the technicians, the trainee cartographers, and others – although no account of the Lampeter department would be complete without reference to the enormous contributions made by the likes of Caron, Trevor, Connie, Maureen and Ian. If we are indeed to take seriously the labour relations of the geographical academy (eg. Castree, 1999; Wills, 1996), then we must consider the whole span of ‘labour’ embodied here, not only that of academics, but there may also be claims to make about the role that support staff play in the overall production, circulation and consumption of geographical knowledge.

### **Lampeter: a marginal place and its constituent spaces**

There are various reasons why it may be appropriate to refer to the Lampeter department as a ‘marginal space of geographical knowledge’, the simplest of which is that the physical location of the department – as part of a very small university (c.2000 students) within a very small Welsh-speaking settlement (c.2,500 people) hidden within the hills and fields of the West Wales countryside, not even on a railway line – is one that would conventionally be described as ‘geographically marginal’. I take my main title today, ‘Our journey through Lampeter’, from Book II, Chap.4 of the document reporting Gerald of Wales’s travels ‘to preach the Cross’ the length and breadth of Wales in 1188,<sup>2</sup> and here the word *through* was most apposite. Like very many people subsequently, notably holiday-makers on their way to the coast, Gerald definitely only passed *through* this out-of-the-way place, stopping just for a quick sermon before heading on to North Wales. If you blink, it is indeed easy to miss Lampeter on your way to somewhere ostensibly more important; generations of undergraduate students coming by car to Lampeter for the first time have found themselves at the coast, having failed to realise that they had

---

<sup>2</sup> I am using the translated and introduced version by Thorpe (1978).

already passed through the 'university town' which was their destination.

It is interesting to hear what respondents to my survey said about Lampeter the place as a material and cultural setting. Some were enthusiastic:

*I spent a great deal of time in Scotland but found Lampeter to be a good base and preferable to a city location for my personal preferences. Again very personally, it was good to be located outside British metropolitan centres in a 'Celtic country' and, for me, a different kind of rural space. [P]*

*It really was like nowhere else on the planet. Where else could you do a Phd with such enthusiastic, intellectually challenging, insightful and supportive supervision, and also get bitten by a sheepdog whilst cycling home? [P,R]*

Other responses were basically positive, but began to qualify their positive assessments:

*I felt that Lampeter was a very special place to both live and study in. There is a certain atmosphere there that is quite hard to describe, but one which I'm sure most other ex-Lamparians can relate to. Part of it was perhaps the rural location, which I enjoyed. It was a wonderful setting with hills all around. Also I think, both the town and the university were small, and so that encouraged a very friendly, environment, where people from all parts of the community did mix. Perhaps also, Lampeter tended to attract certain kinds of students/people. We didn't have nightclubs, or McDonalds, etc, but we did have a small river running through the middle of campus, and wonderful walks in the area! Sometimes the rural location could be a downside – it took quite a long time to reach other places by public transport, but I think this was far outweighed by the positives. [U]*

*As a place to live, Lampeter was a mixed bag. It was grim at times (Sundays, and beautiful but quiet in the summer), but on the whole I recall a very warm community and a sense of living in an organic place, not an empty city. I could see that it might be difficult for certain social groups in particular. [L]*

*As a place to live, I found Lampeter to be a little claustrophobic, but the benefits of the geography department outweighed these concerns. I had a great time, and can still count among my friends a number of former Lampeter students (mostly non-geographers). [U]*

*As a place to live Lampeter was always a bit of a double-edged sword especially after six years. As an undergrad it was almost perfect as you were never more than five minutes walk from a friend if you needed one and the restrictions in terms of transport etc. often meant that you had to get involved in the life of the University. However, making the transition to postgrad meant that in many ways your life was on display. If you went out you couldn't be anonymous if you wanted. (certainly a geographical issue!). After a while you begin to miss some of the trappings of the modern world, cinemas, shops etc. [U,P+T]*

Other responses again veered more towards the negative, perhaps showing the meeting of 'urban' expectations with 'rural' reality, and even entailing

geographical imaginings of Lampeter that coded it in various ways: as set apart from the (post)modern world; as culturally very different and perhaps, as a result, ultimately unknowable and inaccessible to 'outsiders'; even as something almost unreal, fictional, other-worldly. Thus:

*Six years in Lampeter almost drove me to insanity, it was a cultural backwater. No cinema, clubs, theatre, music etc. No fresh veg unless you were prepared to beg for rejects at the organic food factory. However, beer and rent were both cheap. [U,P]*

*As a place to live – very mixed feelings here. We mostly had a great time for three years, but there was always a sense of living on borrowed time – I knew I couldn't stay there for the whole of my career (even assuming the finances had been sustainable). We loved living in Lampeter, but mainly because of the people we knew and because we got away often. I don't have much affection for the place itself. The Welshness was a definite barrier – I never felt I would ever be considered more than a visitor (even if I'd spoken fluent Welsh – Catherine Ogden being the case in point). When I was there it didn't seem as peripheral as it seems now, but for me being 'on the margins' doesn't really appeal that much. I'm a city boy at heart and rural living has very limited appeal - too claustrophobic. [L]*

*It was also, for me, a problematic place to live. I liked some things about it (a sort of surreal and beautiful Welshness, for which Northern Exposure was the reference point), but could not really imagine a future there. It felt a bit like living under water! Hence the quick move back to London. [L]*

*As a place to live its only rival for eccentricity was Twin Peaks. [L]*

*... an isolating, incestuous, wet, boring crap place to live (see that Travels in an Old Tongue book for a great description of Lampeter as a university, town). [L]*

For some, the rural remoteness and 'Celtic' connections of the place were evidently a source of inspiration for some, personally and academically, but it would obviously be wrong to 'idealise' – or indeed to 'idyllise' – Lampeter as a location where academic staff were always contented to be.

Moreover, for some the very location of Lampeter was actually quite an obstacle to what they wanted to achieve, which introduces another gloss on the 'geography of geography' debate. One respondent admitted that "I found it very difficult to do research in Lampeter because it was so far away from where I tried to conduct it" [L]; another that "In practical terms it was a lousy place to conduct the kind of research I wanted to do, largely because it took so long to get to case study areas etc." [L]; and a third that "My research involved going to America and using archives so location was pretty much irrelevant" [L]. What all three of these respondents also intimated, nonetheless, was how the personal connections arising between the human geographers sharing this place *did* play key role in both sustaining them on a day-to-day basis *and* influencing their academic development as researchers and teachers. As two of them elaborated: "The interests of my colleagues constantly changed the direction of my questions in interesting ways and still do several years later" [L]; and, "I suppose I'd

*focus on the value of collaborative research, or perhaps not collaborative research in the strict sense, but rather the intellectual value of collective working, discussion, friendship, sociability. These are my main memories of the advantages of Lampeter” [L]*

Several of the quotes above also underline that for many the place *was* the people, and one respondent encapsulated this view when declaring that “*The ‘placeness’ utterly depended upon the people*” [L], while another concluded that “*In the end I think it does have more to do with the people than the place, though no doubt the fact that people were thrown together socially in a way that might not happen so much in other places was an important contributory factor*” [L]. In short, to think seriously about Lampeter as a space of geographical knowledge is not to deny the importance of the material and cultural contexts – for quite a few respondents these clearly were significant – but it is to consider in more detail the social spaces of intellectual interaction facilitated therein (albeit being wary of over-romanticising the extent of these social spaces, as one respondent indicated: “*It’s perhaps the social side of Lampeter that I find a bit over romanticised when it is talked about*” [L]).

Before exploring these social spaces in more detail, though, let me just remind us about a number of the more specific sites that were indeed crucial to the production, circulation and consumption of geographical knowledge in Lampeter. I can take a cue here from Hayden Lorimer and Nick Spedding’s (2002) very recent excavations of different spaces within the Department of Geography, University of Aberdeen, from the basement files of this department to the room wonderfully known as ‘Map Control’. And let me do this with the help of a few photographs taken by Jane Norris-Hill, a biogeographer who is currently in charge of the remaining Centre of Geography at Lampeter.<sup>3</sup> There are many spaces that I could show and perhaps discuss, including the lecture rooms where staff and students joined together in ‘producing’ geography, and then the likes of the main departmental office and, where significant amounts of geographical chat certainly occurred, the main corridor [overheads]. In particular, though, I personally recall the following spaces as ones that were genuinely significant spaces of geographical knowledge production, and let me wander these spaces in tandem with reflections from one of my erstwhile colleagues [overheads]:

*I still miss the spontaneous debates that would start over coffee at 11am in the Department, continue through to a Newbridge fry-up and thence to an early arrival at the Quarry before winding up at our place (or yours) in the small hours. Much of this was sheer hedonism, but there were also moments of real intellectual spark and vitality that I haven’t often encountered since. [L]*

That small room doubling as the coffee room, seminar room, place to ‘hang out’ and one-time site of Dave Kay’s early bacteriological experiments was crucial; but perhaps even more so were the Newbridge Café, the Quarry, the

<sup>3</sup> The fact that Jane was happy to take these photos for me a few weeks back is another small indication of the good relations that developed between human and physical geography at Lampeter.

Castle Green, the Ram and the College Bar. Generations of human geographers, whether lecturer or undergraduate, had little choice but to share time in these venues, there being virtually no other alternatives for socialising in Lampeter, and inevitably there would be times when matters to do with geographical scholarship and learning became the subject of debate. Corny as it may sound, I think that there were indeed 'moments of real intellectual spark and vitality' fostered in these small spaces, maybe not ones that were decisive in shaping the human-geographical approaches of the participants concerned, but often ones that still had an influence working away in the interstices of 'our' ongoing research and teaching.

There are almost certainly other claims to be made about these micro-geographies of the Lampeter experience, but one that surfaced in one response, usefully underlining too that we certainly did not always get everything right in Lampeter, ran as follows:

*Another example of this difference [between staff and postgraduates] was reflected spatially in the remoteness of the postgraduate research room. Certainly in the early days of the expansion of the graduate community (1988-90), there was a degree of isolation and exclusion from departmental affairs. This came to a head in 1990 with the publication of the departmental research newsletter which failed to mention any of the research going on amongst the PhD student community and resulted in Chris Thomas and I taking the lead in producing the 'Alternative Research Newsletter'.*  
[U,P]

The relative isolation of the postgraduate room from the rest of the department was a recurring issue, although only the one respondent here touches upon it. It is worth underlining that lines of division in the department did arise on occasion, of course, and that negotiating such divisions in a small department, and also in the small *Gemeinschaft*-type community of Lampeter, was always difficult: a definite downside to the positive attributes of close-knitness that will be my focus further on in the paper.

### **Research: specific points?**

I asked my respondents about what explicit comments they might advance regarding the influence of Lampeter on the content of their research theory, practice and ethics. An especially fulsome description on this count covered conceptual matters (notably 'the cultural turn' and its correlates), methodological innovations (notably qualitative fieldwork) and also the relevance to more 'applied' research conducted by the respondent:

*My time at Lampeter introduced me to qualitative fieldwork methods; theoretical critiques and approaches to research and fieldwork; regulation theory; a range of social theory and 'the cultural turn' in human geography. The result was a move away from political economy (structuralism), as an approach to a post-structuralist and post-colonial approach. This has provided a robust base from which to conduct research*

*and rural development consultancy. In terms of my consultancy work, it has enabled me to include strong cultural elements in work which is traditionally constrained to basic economic approaches. The pivot of my consultancy work is one-to-one semi-structured interviews and historical/cultural research, through which more traditional methods such as questionnaire surveys, economic area profiles derived from census material and development strategies are contextualised and applied through a participative process. [P]*

Similar sentiments appeared in a few responses, including some reference to the more 'personal' dimensions of how researchers deal with one another:

*The years at Lampeter gave me a thorough and comprehensive grounding in qualitative research techniques. I felt as though I was part of a cutting edge social science unit which equipped me with much self confidence. The skills that I acquired in Lampeter have assisted me in contributing to the literature that challenges the 'normal' approaches to the vocational discipline of Town Planning. [U,P]*

*Conducting Research: incredibly exciting in terms of the possibilities it opened up -- although I was only there for one year, I learnt about new directions in cultural and economic geography which are still important to this day, particularly from Ian Cook, Catherine Nash and Dave Atkinson. [L]*

*Got me interested in ethnography. Phil C being inspiration, mentor and too clever by half. ... More seriously, the positive engagement with my work was an example for how I have tried to treat all my co-researchers ever since. [P,R]*

Intriguingly, though, numerous responses admitted some problems in specifying *precisely* what the Lampeter experience contributed to the content of research. Rather, the prevailing message was that the influence remained mostly quite intangible, to do with the personal contacts and interactions already mentioned and to be elaborated upon shortly. To quote two individuals:

*I think I learned a lot from people who were there at the same time, although it would be hard to pinpoint exactly what. There was, I think great importance attached to research, as well as enjoyment in doing it which was very stimulating. [L]*

*Research in Lampeter was an exciting business, but also one that was preserved against all pressures as (along with teaching) the central activity of the Department, and thus something to be treated very seriously. Most importantly, Lampeter allowed me (and other young scholars) the space and support to develop their research in a stimulating and nurturing environment. I distinctly remember that, after a few months there, research suddenly became a still more exciting and vibrant exercise, filled with possibilities and potential as a broad interdisciplinary endeavour, but one grounded in a firm but progressive sense of geography as a discipline. [L]*

### **Teaching: delivery and reception**

I also asked my respondents about what explicit comments they might advance regarding both the delivery (if staff) and the reception (if



undergraduates) of teaching, and this question elicited far more commentary than that about the specifics of the Lampeter influence on research. Thinking first about comments from lecturing staff, one respondent nicely stated that “*I think we may have taught radical geography, radically! It wasn't a production line*” [L]. A lengthy remark from one ex-staff member conveyed the following:

*This is the big difference. Like most (all?) of the H[uman] G[eography] staff I worked with, we were teaching exactly the kind of geography degree which we'd love to have taken ourselves. The programme was full of ideas, cross-fertilisations, collaborations, and I remember feeling that we really were 'on a mission' with our teaching. Teaching was all about engaging students in the research process from day on (the Practising HG course), demystifying research as a result (maybe), and getting students involved. As a member of staff stepping into the shoes of people who'd left us with such a great degree programme [it] was fantastic, and one of the biggest effects that working in Lampeter had on me. Standing on their shoulders. Working with people who really enjoyed HG ... was quite inspiring. [L]*

A repeated theme was the general ‘ethos’ valuing the importance of teaching, and it was certainly never rated second in importance after research, and this theme was often linked to the sheer range of teaching which staff had little choice to conduct (given the smallness of the department) but which was routinely pursued collectively through the pooling of ideas, the borrowing of resources and the literal sharing of teaching sessions:

*Most helpful: the help I received initially and throughout my time was phenomenal. Having to teach across the board also helped – there's nothing that I couldn't or wouldn't do now. [L]*

[I valued] *The idea that you should be able to expect a lot from the students that you teach, as long as you are also prepared to put the effort in. The idea that you should be prepared to and be able to teach on a wide range of subjects in human geography (at the drop of a hat!). That teaching, and in particular course development, is a collaborative affair that springs from group ideas, a willingness to contribute, and intellectual energy. [L]*

*More positively, the ethos of committed and innovative<sup>4</sup> teaching was inspiring and teaching people for whom education mattered was often rewarding. [L]*

*Close contact with students helped to develop critical approach to teaching, where you could not take what you were doing for granted. Also lots of courses team taught helped me to appreciate creative possibilities of teaching with others. [L]*

The latter respondent hinted at how the smallness of the student intake – entailing graduating Honours years that never exceeded seventy students and probably averaging out at around thirty to forty (but with many fewer more

---

<sup>4</sup> This reference to ‘innovative’ should be contrasted with another response: “*Teaching: again an exciting feel for the different possibilities, although interestingly I think it is probably the content of teaching at Lampeter that was innovative rather than the methods. Have adapted elements of the curriculum, but probably learnt more about the practices of teaching in subsequent job*” [L].

recently) – could allow a closeness between staff and students, itself exacerbated by the limited social spaces outside of the classroom, that held certain pedagogic benefits. The same respondent then went on to mention how “Ultimately the development of students from fairly low A-level scores made one realise the potential of a supportive academic teaching environment” [L], and another respondent enlarged on this point as follows when listing what he took to be three strengths of teaching human geography at Lampeter:

*First, the value of mixed ability teaching, or at least of a student intake that was ‘middling’ in terms of school achievements. Compared with my present job, where most of our students have two As and a B at A level, I thought Lampeter was much more rewarding. This is partly about ‘added value’ in QAA terms, but also about the diversity of the student mix (though there were limits to its diversity, of course – disproportionately white and English, for starters). Second, genuinely collaborative relationships with colleagues that were an ongoing everyday reality (rather than an occasional bonus as now). Third, a commitment to innovation in curriculum design and content. Practising Human Geography, for example, was way ahead of its time, as were several optional modules. [L]*

The demands of a heavy teaching load meant that, for some, their recollections in this respect were not entirely positive, and it would be wrong to ignore the sheer desperation at the hours spent preparing teaching materials, often late at night and ‘just in time’, that many of us did feel on occasions:

*It obviously gave me huge experience but the first couple of years with very heavy teaching loads took their toll in terms of stress and time to publish and did make some of that first teaching feel uncomfortably ill-prepared. I think this still haunts me! [L]*

*As an institution it was very stressful to work in, as the teaching load was high and a lot of demands on time. [L]*

It strikes me that there are here highly personal dimensions to the teaching experience, to do with over-work, being stressed, physical exhaustion and emotional heart-ache, that should be factored into any discussion of the conditions under which geographical knowledge dissemination takes place.

The most telling observations about teaching at Lampeter, however, were those from undergraduate and also a few postgraduate students who were on the receiving end of this teaching. Some of the comments were quite specific – for example, “I will never forget the inspiration and passion I felt for Geography on Wednesday mornings in my last year in Ulf’s Paris class” [U], while others were more general – for example, “It was a very inspiring environment to be in – I suppose that’s why so many of my peers carried on with PhD research” [U]. The exposure to new geographical thinking was unequivocally valued:

*Being an undergrad at Lampeter allowed me to be exposed to a wide variety of geographical ideas, from an on the whole young and innovative department. The relative turnover of staff during my time there meant that I was exposed to a large*

*number of 'up and coming' academics without actually moving myself. This inspired me to not be afraid of thinking in new ways or indeed, as a Joint Honours student, draw upon a wide variety of sources. [U,P+T]*

*I think that my undergraduate course was strong both in terms of its methodological and theoretical elements. The cultural geography which we were taught opened my eyes to new ways of looking at the world, and we really got a chance to use new skills. I remember in particular a participant observation exercise that I did – a research technique that I have used extensively since. [U]*

*One of the odd things about life as an undergraduate is that you are never really aware of how your course compares to other departments teaching the same subject elsewhere. I think that we were aware from comparison with departments in the college that there was something unusually exciting and even inspirational going on in geography, and certainly I think that as students we felt that we were part of the department and got swept along with the general tide of enthusiasm. But it was not really until we became postgrads and began to experience other departments and began going to conferences that we realised the qualitative difference between what we had been taught at Lampeter, and what was being taught on geography courses elsewhere. [U]*

More broadly, one postgraduate who also taught for a while in Lampeter simply summarised his feelings in this respect as follows:

*I learned practically all I know at Lampeter ... I have copied liberally from everyone I met there. ... I no longer have to wonder what is or isn't 'geography', being at Lampeter taught me that anything can be. [P+T]*

High on the agenda of undergraduate students were the smallness of classes, the regularity and informality of contacts with staff, and, in general, the presence of a supportive teaching environment that – if more by luck than by self-conscious design – seemed to foster in students the confidence that they could both grasp more difficult new geographical thinking and even contribute back to this thinking. Not dissimilar sentiments were also expressed by some postgraduate students, and an intriguing comparative insight was ventured by one PhD student who is quoted below. These are the sorts of claims being made:

*The path my work has taken reflects (at least I think it reflects) a lot of what I was taught at Lampeter – for example the importance of the individual, a celebration of difference and not forgetting the benefits of qualitative research! What I think Lampeter taught me, which at the time I didn't realise was any different from anywhere else, was how a supportive faculty could inspire you, and push you towards success, both academically and personally. [U]*

*Lampeter had a huge influence on the way in which I research as my experiences there, and the tutors/teachers I had contact with, really kick-started my autobiographical and situated standpoint approach to writing /research. I had a lot of support and encouragement from tutors at Lampeter – people such as Ian Cook and*

*Phil Crang really made me believe that what I had to say was important and that my autobiog. approach was valid. Without their initial encouragement I don't think I would have had the confidence to ever consider doing a PhD. [U]*

*I feel now that Lampeter was a really unique learning environment. At the time I didn't really appreciate how open, friendly, un-intimidating all the staff were. It felt like tutors really knew who you were at Lampeter. The importance of this didn't really occur to me until I moved on to a much bigger institution and could see that, really, the standard of teaching and level of support given to students was far inferior due to the much bigger level of student numbers ... . It was like you were not just a 'number' there and you could always go to talk to someone about your work and they would know who you were. Academically also, there was a real buzz about the place and the ideas floating around felt really new and exciting. It was very stimulating and the whole ambience of the department (and place, to some extent) made me feel that anything was possible for me academically ... [U]*

*Lampeter provided me with an extremely supportive academic environment. The staff and ex-staff offered a broad range of theoretical perspectives and research interests from which postgraduates benefited hugely. The staff were very generous with their time and knowledge and the emphasis was on mutual support rather than personal competitiveness, which is a more common focus in certain Geography Departments. [P]*

It is hence telling the extent to which students who have gone on to PhDs and then to post-PhD positions have sought to take elements of what they experienced during their Lampeter days as a significant input to what they themselves aspire as tutors and lecturers:

*Thinking retrospectively about how my induction into the geographical community via Lampeter has shaped my subsequent research and teaching ... . In terms of teaching, the most important influence has been one of pedagogical attitude – treating students as part of the geographical community and wanting to introduce them to the wonders and curiosities of modern geography by getting them to read papers and talking to them about new research and challenging them with difficult theoretical ideas. Perhaps most significantly, I think that my Lampeter experience showed me the importance of telling stories, in both research and teaching. [U]*

*Wouldn't have changed the experience for the world. I certainly wouldn't be the geographer I am today (for good or for bad). I think that the small class sizes and the depth of ideas taught benefited me more than if I had been at a larger department. [U,P+T]*

*I received invaluable guidance in researching and writing my first lengthy piece of work (undergrad. thesis I believe) from Dr. Miles Ogborn. I also received advice from a range of scholars in undertaking research and writing term papers. ... I didn't do any teaching at Lampeter, but certainly in my teaching today –I endeavour to attempt to recreate the positive style of delivery, the engagement with students and the creation of an active learning environment which I was lucky enough to experience at Lampeter. [U]*

*As a geography professor in the United States now, I still prefer smaller classes, office hour visits, small tutorials, discussion sections and an 'open door' policy –because I experienced this at Lampeter –and I know I benefited from it. This isn't always the norm in the US. [U]*

*I'll remain forever grateful to the geographers at Lampeter who opened my eyes to the lifelong pursuit of learning. Those strong Lampeter theoretical foundations have served me well around the world, and upon them I have constructed my own research, built my own career (and reputation!). In fact, one of my most treasured possessions remains a battered old file which contains my undergraduate lecture notes! I'll always consider myself, first and foremost, a Lampeter geographer, and everytime I step into the classroom, that's what I try to live upto. It ain't easy! [U]*

### **A community of scholars at Lampeter and beyond**

Probably the most common remarks, chiefly in reply to a question asking about Lampeter human geography as a 'community of scholars', were ones that elaborated upon the theme of there being a "*Lively intellectual environment*" [R] associated with the dense personal interconnections of basically like-minded scholars thrown together in Lampeter:

*A unique place for lots of reasons. As a community it was exciting to live and work alongside people who loom large in academic influence in my life, in part because the closeness of the place means we have kept in touch. [L]*

*As a community of scholars, it was a wonderfully supportive environment where ideas were constantly bouncing around and a tremendously exciting intellectual atmosphere prevailed. ... Wonderful place to live and work, fantastic intellectual atmosphere which helped me enormously at a critical stage of my career. A unique experience which I am very pleased to have had. [L]*

*As a community of scholars, Lampeter had a strong underlying sense of identity or common aim during my time there. Although coming from a variety of angles there always seemed to be an underlying ethos about both the practice and study of geography. I think that this fitted into a wider interdisciplinary set of concerns with other departments especially History and Archaeology. [U,P+T]*

*In terms of geography at Lampeter, I think it had a certain special quality. In some ways I think this was because of the way in which 'new' cultural and social geography were taught with confidence and enthusiasm. There just seemed to be a really creative mix of lecturers which generated lot of enthusiasm. [U]*

*The community of scholars qua my then lecturers inspired me to carry on with geography and aim to become a professor of geography. ... The community of scholars involved not only great individuals but also they included my fellow undergrads so that the sense of "community" filled the entire teaching lab during class. [U]*

Some limitations within this scholarly community were also admitted, although for the most part the negative reflections here came from

respondents experiencing difficult times during the 'later' days of the Lampeter department. At this time, the community of (human) geographers was literally shrinking, and scant support for the geography cause was forthcoming from other scholars elsewhere in the university:

*It was a great place to live and a stimulating and friendly atmosphere in which to research, although it became increasingly depressing towards the end (falling numbers, staff leaving ...) [L]*

*Great community within geography but no real community across the landscape of departments. My goodness, how everyone preyed upon one another! No-one rescued geography towards the end – all were fixated upon their own survival. [L]*

Moreover, taking many of the above answers in tandem with the wider picture painted by most respondents, much could be made of reciprocities arising between: firstly, the 'space' of Lampeter (as a small, marginal place dotted with more specific spaces for social encounter); secondly, the 'society' of Lampeter human geographers (spending a lot of time together, more or less willingly, both 'at work' and 'out of work'); and thirdly, the geographical knowledge production by members of this 'society' operating within this 'space'. As such, the social geography of Lampeter's human geographers appears to have been far from incidental to their intellectual 'form of life', and hence to both the research conducted and the teaching delivered. A sustained attempt to turn the likes of Livingstone's ideas about spaces of geographical knowledge on to the Lampeter experience could not avoid taking seriously this social geography, even if it might mean exploring aspects of social worlds seemingly quite irrelevant, at first sight at least, to the intellectual and practical activities of 'making' geographical knowledge.

An additional basis for commentary on the largely positive affordances of the scholarly community that *was* Lampeter human geography arose when respondents wondered about why it was so hard to reproduce something similar in other establishments, including ones where many of them are now academics:

*Community of scholars – a huge privilege and pleasure to start my academic career in the company of Philo, Crang P, Goodwin, Cloke, Ogborn et al. We gave life to the phrase 'community of scholars' in a way I suspect rarely happens elsewhere. [L]*

*Life-changing, and can't be replicated elsewhere. [L]*

*Since moving on, will accept no alternatives! I like others, perhaps, have attempted to make my new department as much like Lampeter, where I have the power to do so. [L]*

*Miss it tremendously. And I noticed how my goal [now] is to recreate the great things from the Lampeter days – only to fail largely because many people just don't think along those utterly collegial lines. Also, whenever I mention this to ex-Lampeterians, they look at me and tell me how naïve of me to expect to be able to re-create THAT feeling. But why? [L]*

### Hidden in the margins, or left to our own devices?

A prevailing sentiment in many remarks concerned what might be taken as a further gloss on the theme of marginality, in that respondents spoke about feeling somehow 'left to themselves' without being bothered by the normal protocols, expectations, conceits and so on associated with departments elsewhere. There was a sense that 'nobody' externally was really over-looking or judging us out here miles from the big centres of academic 'regulation', and that as a result all of us could simply get on with doing whatever we wanted in terms of both research and teaching.

Internally, there was a healthy *laissez-faire* attitude on the part of the departmental and university hierarchies, and, thinking back, I am amazed by how few hoops we had to pass through: ie. there were no research committees vetting our ideas for research and cajoling us in certain directions rather than others; and neither were there forms to fill in or teaching committees to convince in relation to our teaching. In short, and despite an interest in audit on the part of our Head of Department, we were largely free of anything approaching a heavy-handed audit mentality. Possibly this was more a perception than an actual reality, maybe fuelled by working in a seemingly out-of-the-way place, and possibly too, at least on my part, it reflects memories of an era that was generally less hung-up on checking, interfering and turning us all into mindless entrepreneurial drones. Yet the intimation remains that, safe in our marginal fastness, we were, after all, largely left to our own devices. The upshot was assuredly not an unprofessional approach, far from it, but rather a wholly committed involvement in research and teaching that was all the more convincing *because* it sprung from within and not from the tablets of RAE and QA documentation.

Furthermore, aside from good-humoured banter, there was little in the way of a more informal regulation of what we were doing: the scoffing and snorts of derision from colleagues, the hostility to proposals at staff meetings, the curious lack of funds, rooms, time and space made available by senior members of the department, and the like. There *was* some of this, it cannot be denied, and some participants in today's session may remember quite intense battles from the mid-1980s to the early-1990s that, in retrospect, might be cast as embodying an internal resistance to new developments in human geography. Even here, though, my own recollections are of struggles that basically *united* virtually all of the staff, human and physical, which meant that the day-to-day experience of colleagues, meetings and committees within the department was a positive one of collectively trying to overcome what might be construed as a certain narrow-mindedness in certain (very specific) quarters. As such, there seems to have been - and here my rose-coloured lenses probably do kick in - a genuine respect between colleagues, including across the human-physical divide, that negated that more informal regulation of academic activity probably typical of many other departments. My interpretations in this context have been particularly prompted by the

following three sets of comments from one ex-Lampeterite:

*I also have a clear memory of the encompassing scale of possibilities that seemed to open up in that atmosphere. There was no sense that any research was marginal, or illegitimate. ... Rather, all work was supported and valorised. Conversely, even though some of the work undertaken was radical, neither was there any real sense that this was going 'too far' or being 'too extreme' - for in that supportive environment, the possibilities for research seemed unlimited, and certainly were not constrained by colleagues. I think senior colleagues and physical geographers are particularly worthy of praise in this respect. [L]*

*[E]ven in the increasingly stringent financial contexts of 1997 onwards, there was never any real or sustained pressure to undertake the kind of grubby cash-seeking and fund raising that seem to characterise so much of the contemporary British academy these days. There was absolutely no sense that certain kinds of research (those that raised overheads and additional income) were more valid and worthwhile than others, and that those who didn't work in these areas were somehow shirking their departmental citizenship and should re-orientate their research towards these interests. Again, this is particularly marked in retrospect. [L]*

*The teaching environment at Lampeter benefited from similar advantages: nothing was deemed too different, and experimentation with teaching design, delivery or content was not only tolerated but actively encouraged. This enabled the wide use of sources including visual, literary, aural, and 'popular' materials. It also meant that course themes and topics were seldom a worry - as long as sufficient literatures could be located. This was very important. There was no 'teaching committee' enforcing orthodox, traditional views - but responsibility lay with the lecturer and their decision and judgement was adequate guarantor of quality. To my mind, this allowed the ready pushing of boundaries and stretching of sub-disciplinary and disciplinary borders. [L]*

Other respondents echoed these comments in various ways, emphasising that there were "no strait-jackets here" [L] and that "Lampeter helped in providing a congenial atmosphere where any idea found its sounding board" [L]. A parallel comment ran as follows:

*No-one thought what I was doing was strange (I think!). There was a considerable amount of academic freedom ... . As an institution it was fairly unobtrusive but incompetently run. I suppose it did allow us to get on with what we wanted to do without being too directive. [L]*

Several related remarks also seemed to get at much the same theme, accenting the flexibility that a relatively unregulated teaching environment afforded, while highlighting too how the 'quirks' of the Lampeter experience - ones militating against the competitive drive that often forms the basis of regulating what can and cannot be done in the wider academy - could perhaps allow a vision of creative alternatives to emerge:

*I think students at Lampeter were taught pretty much what the staff were thinking*



*about at the time and that was exciting. I still like to teach students what's on my mind at the moment to reduce the time lag between research and teaching. [L]*

*The Lampeter Posse have provided me with enduring inspiration and support. Participation in this group means on-going access to intellectual stimulation and a striving towards socially responsible research. I would not have cared to be located in some of the bigger departments which I observed, during shared post-graduate training sessions, [to] operate[ ] through aggressive personal competitiveness and schooled postgraduate students in this. [P]*

*As someone who had previously never really succeeded academically, things seemed to 'click' at Lampeter. I came out with a new confidence and some great friends. So many times people mocked me for living in Lampeter (where's that?) and though I'd never been to the place before starting my undergraduate years I loved it (is that really sad?!). Small and not perfectly formed, the quirks of the place made it what it was. [U]*

### **From the margins to the centre?**

There are reasons other than just the conventionally geographical for why the term *marginal* may be appropriate in talking about Lampeter geography, another of which is the smallness of the department throughout its history (the full academic staff complement never reaching above twelve). This made the department really quite tiny in relation to the 'competition', as we are sadly compelled to think of other British departments in these RAE and (T)QA days, and as such it could never hope to emulate the numerical achievements – in terms of publications, research grants, postgraduate throughout and other 'esteem indicators' – of other, larger and more financially secure departments. In this sense, it cannot be denied that Lampeter geography was indeed destined to remain marginal within the more officially ranked hierarchies of achievement.

Yet, it might also be argued that on some counts at least, ones more qualitative and to do with subjective judgement, Lampeter geography came to inhabit, if briefly, a more *central* than *marginal position* within the hallways of (inter)national geographical learning. Just as Trevor Barnes demonstrates how certain British and North American departments, such as at Bristol and Washington, were central to the 'quantitative revolution', so a case could be made that Lampeter geography – or at least geographers passing through Lampeter – did occupy quite a central place in the transitions of British human geography from the late-1980s to the late-1990s. Moreover, just as some historians of geography have sought to identify important and well-connected nodes in the topology of the discipline, so I believe Lampeter will appear to future disciplinary historians as just such a node sitting at the heart of an extensive network of scholars spreading across the 'map' of British and even North American higher education establishments. I have prepared a handful of simple and preliminary tables that begin to convey something of this nodal quality [tables]. These data need considerable refining and additions, and it

would be good to produce some 'real' maps from them to capture more visually the interlinkedness of Lampeter into wider networks of geographical scholarship, but the case for the centrality of Lampeter human geography in disciplinary space surely does begin to be made.

More specifically, and reflecting a term in one of the quotes below – which also appeared in a heading from a draft paper subsequently published in *Antipode* by Clive Barnett (albeit with this heading removed) – claims can perhaps be advanced about the influence of 'the Lampeter school' on the so-called 'cultural turn' within human geography (see Philo, 1991, which was desk-top published out of Lampeter with inputs and assistance from many colleagues). The creation of a *new* and inclusive cultural geography rather different from any of its North American cousins clearly did reflect the strains of research and teaching at Lampeter over these years, notably in how a diversity of cultural implications began to be worked out in the sub-disciplinary fields of social, economic, political, historical and (of course) rural geography. It is therefore revealing to hear these assessments:

*Lampeter punched well above its weight (to use geopolitical jargon). I was constantly asked about it abroad (in the US). It was an accident people put a lot of work into both before and after the time I spent there. It seems to have had a huge impact on the students who went on from there (see [name]'s website at [prestigious North American university]). That is the most rewarding thing. [L]*

*It amazes me looking back on the experience and so many people acknowledge it today like [well-known North American geographer] and others at [prestigious North American university] that there were an unusual number of high quality people together in such a small place. [U]*

*Whilst I was studying at Lampeter, I don't think I realised that I was being taught by all these new, trendy (?!), famous, cutting edge geographers. It was only when I went on to do postgrad research and said to people that I'd been to Lampeter that the response was usually something like 'Oh the Lampeter School' and then trotted out all these names ... that I gradually realised how important Crang, Cloke et al's work was in Geog circles. [U]*

*It seems to me that many people wrote excellent and key articles while affiliated with Lampeter, and a series of these would not only stand as more sustained testimony to the department, but might also trace the progressive development of changes in the themes and approaches of Human geography over the past thirty years. I wouldn't want to name names and articles here. However, increasing interests in the historical geographies of knowledge production and their circulation and renegotiation in different contexts would provide a germane context for such a collection. It might also provide a home for the kind of exercise being undertaken here? Certainly, if 'big scholars' can release their greatest hits as a collection, why not an institution? [Another British department] released a pretty-well received book (mixing human and physical geographies) on their tenth anniversary - and valuable as that department's contributions have been, they are matched and bettered, I think, by Lampeter. [L]*

I am reluctant to pursue such claims too far, precisely given the risk of claiming too much and because of crucial contributions to the discipline's cultural turn being made by numerous other scholars in many other institutions through the 1990s. Perhaps it is another issue that we can discuss later, then, and I would be intrigued to hear the views of others with possibly greater perspective and distance on the Lampeter experience, and on the Lampeter 'disaporic' community, than I personally possess. Indeed, I put things like this because I must admit just how 'close' I myself still feel to Lampeter, and I acknowledge my own risk of overstating what Lampeter geography was like and what it accomplished.

### **In conclusion: nostalgic geographies, lost geographies**

Such a risk of overstatement is one explicitly recognised by several other of my respondents, and this is an underlying 'health warning' – the imagining, even mythologising, of a special place for Lampeter in recent disciplinary history – that should be emphasised as I now conclude my paper today. As two of my respondents said, the first also accenting something that we must not forget in this session:

*Nostalgia may put rosy spectacles on it all but my memories of Lampeter are always of a great four years, only marred by the stress of faculty with the gloomy cloud of immanent closure putting a dark spot on the landscape. Towards the end it really did seem like a sinking ship. [U,P]*

*It was remarkable, and I'm not sure I can quite explain its success. At the same time I don't think we should over-romanticise it. There were significant problems and limitations (most dramatically the fact that it lost its appeal to students after the mid-1990s). [L]*

*This feels a little bit like one of those 'I love you, you're my best mate' conversations. It is easy to idealise in hindsight, and it wasn't perfect, the academic culture, etc. was it?? It's also difficult to write about, and I've rushed it. [L]*

Nonetheless, and whatever the exact politics of memory playing out here, there can be no doubting the force of what many of my respondents recollect, nor their palpable sense of just how central Lampeter's marginal human geography has been to their own biographies.

At the same time, this celebration fuses with sadness: with a deep sense of loss pertaining to something that cannot easily be recreated elsewhere, to a way of doing things that has seemingly 'had its day' in an emerging competitive, managerial and audit-obsessed academic environment, and to Lampeter geography simply in and for itself:

*I doubt that this kind of support and encouragement as facilitated in Lampeter was available to the same degree in many other departments at the time; I doubt still more that there are any places, even this short time afterwards, that can offer this degree of support today. [L]*

*Briefly: for me the department was a wonderful place to work (especially as a first job), the institution was a bit crap (although in an impossible situation re student recruitment after the new/old university distinction went), ... I could not imagine a better combination of colleagues and students with whom to learn my trade. I have had to tone down my 'when I was in Lampeter' stories, but I don't think I'll ever work in a place with such supportive, imaginative, clever and funny people down the corridor.*  
[L]

*When I recall my times at Lampeter or merely mention it to someone in conversation I feel an immense sense of enjoyment and good fortune. ... It is certainly sad that the department is no longer around (still unsure about the exact status). I think that makes us all as ex-Lampeterians somewhat poorer as academics.* [U]

This remark now allows to segue into the final moments of the paper, and in so doing let me leave the closing thoughts to Tom Delph-Januirek, the one remaining human geographer still working in the Centre of Geography at Lampeter. Tom wanted me to convey the sentiments of his observations to the session today, and it therefore seems entirely appropriate for me to leave the last word to Lampeter's last human geographer:

*I feel that I arrived here clutching my two cans of warm, cheap lager somewhat after the party was over and everyone else had more or less gone home, if you understand what I mean. Having said that though, I still would not have missed the experience. Even the recent descent into a nightmare world of teaching and marking has been useful in terms of broadening my understanding and awareness.* [L]

*I have encountered previous members of staff here through inherited lecture notes ... . At the risk of sounding whimsically romantic, in this way it has been the enthusiasm, intelligence, creativity, intellectual muscle, and the spirits of geographers past that have sustained me this academic year. I don't think it's stretching things at all to say that the luminescence of these people collectively shone so strongly that it has continued to illuminate the department long after their departure, so that I continue to draw strength and comfort from its warmth.* [L]

\* \* \* \* \*

### **Acknowledgements**

Simply, huge thanks to everyone who completed my e-mail survey (even Dr. Florence Gusset!). Special thanks too to Jane Norris-Hill for the photographs.

### **Bibliography**

- Barnes, T.J., 2001a, 'Rethorising quantitative geography: from the quantitative revolution to the 'cultural turn'', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol.91, pp.546-565  
Barnes, T.J., 2001b, 'Lives lived and lives told: biographies of geography's quantitative revolution', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, Vol.19, pp.409-430  
Castree, N., 1999, "Out there'? 'In here'? Domesticating critical geography', *Area*, Vol.31, pp.81-86

- Cloke, P., 1994, '(En)culturing political economy: a life in the day of a 'rural geographer'', in Cloke, P., Doel, M., Matless, D., Phillips, M. and Thrift, N., *Writing the Rural: Five Cultural Geographies* (Paul Chapman, London), pp.149-190
- Livingstone, D.N., 1995, 'The spaces of knowledge: contributions towards a historical geography of science', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, Vol.13, pp.5-34
- Lorimer, H. and Spedding, N., 2002, 'Excavating geography's hidden places' (unpublished typescript)
- Philo, C. (compiler), 1991, *New Words, New Worlds: Reconceptualising Social and Cultural Geography* (Social and Cultural Geography Study Group of the Institute of British Geographers, St.David's University College, Lampeter)
- Thorpe, L. (trans.), 1978, *Gerald of Wales: The Journey Through Wales and The Description of Wales* (Penguin, London)
- Wills, J., 1996, 'Labouring for love? Academics and their hours of work', *Antipode*, Vol.28, pp.292-303

## Lampeter Human Geography 'FactFile'

(Data is incomplete and in places involves my faulty memory and some guesswork, and it will need to be added to and amended; but it give a good impression of both the personnel involved and also the 'scale' of Lampeter's contribution)

### Lampeter Human Geography Lecturers, post-1977, and Subsequent Careers

Paul Cloke (1977-1992)	<i>Geography, University of Bristol</i>
Nigel Thrift (1985-1988)	<i>Geography, University of Bristol</i>
David Sadler (1987-1989)	<i>Geography, University of Durham; Geography, University of Liverpool</i>
Phil Bell (1988-1989)	<i>Planning, University of Manchester</i>
Chris Philo (1989-1995)	<i>Geography, University of Glasgow</i>
Mark Goodwin (1989-1992)	<i>Geography, University of North London; Geography, University of Aberystwyth</i>
Phil Crang (1990-1994)	<i>Geography, University College London; Geography, Royal Holloway London</i>
Joe Painter (1990-1993)	<i>Geography, University of Durham</i>
Miles Ogborn (1992-1993)	<i>Geography, Queen Mary and Westfield London</i>
Ian Cook (1993-1998)	<i>Geography, University of Birmingham</i>
Tim Cresswell (1993-1999)	<i>Geography, University of Aberystwyth</i>
Catherine Nash (1993-1998)	<i>Geography, Royal Holloway London</i>
David Atkinson (1994-1998)	<i>Geography, University of Hull</i>
Ulf Strohmayer (1994-2000)	<i>Geography, National University Ireland, Galway</i>
Luke Desforges (1996-1997)	<i>Geography, University of Aberystwyth</i>
Brain Hoskin (1999-2000, PT)	<i>Geography, St.Mark and St.John, Plymouth</i>
Allan White (1999-2001)	<i>Geography, Nottingham Trent</i>
Tomasz Delph-Januirek (2001-)	

### Lampeter Human Geography Research Staff, and Subsequent Careers if still in Academia

Phil Bell (1986-1988)	<i>Geography, Lampeter (see above)</i>
Catherine Hurd (1991-1992)	
Shaun Fielding (1990-1992)	<i>Education, Birmingham; other contract research</i>
Rachel Woodward (1990-1992)	<i>Social Policy, Leicester; Rural Policy, then Agricultural Economics, Newcastle</i>
Martin Phillips (1988-1990)	<i>Geography, Coventry Polytechnic; Geography, University of Leicester</i>
Paul Milbourne (1991-1993)	<i>Countryside Planning, Cheltenham College; Planning, University of Cardiff</i>

### Lampeter Human Geography Postgraduates, post-late-1980s, and Subsequent Careers if still in Academia

(\* = MPhil; first end date = leaving Lampeter; second end-date = PhD award; s = submitted)

Phil Bell (1982-1985/1986)	<i>Lecturing: Geography, Lampeter; Planning, Manchester</i>
Lyneth Davies (?-?: 1989)	
Margaret Hughes (?-1994/1994)	

Joe Howe (1988-1991/1992)	Lecturing: <i>various, now Planning, Manchester</i>
Chris Thomas (1988-abandoned)	Researcher and Lecturing: <i>various, inc. Staffordshire</i>
Matthew Bradley* (1990-1995/1996)	
Phil Cooke (1990-1995/1996)	Researcher: <i>Geography, Bristol</i>
Shaun Fielding* (1991-1993/1997)	Researcher: <i>various, inc. Education, University of Birmingham</i>
Sarah Byrt (1991-1997/1997)	
Clare Fisher (1991-1996/1997)	Teaching: <i>Continuing Education, University of Wales, Lampeter</i>
Catherine Johnson (1991-ongoing)	
Eric Laurier (1991-1995/1996)	Researcher: <i>various, now Geography, University of Glasgow</i>
Isobel MacPhail (1991-1994/2002s)	Researcher: <i>independent, Scottish Highlands</i>
Hester Parr (1992-1997)	Lecturing: <i>Geography, University of Dundee</i>
Lloyd Jenkins (1994-1997/2002)	Teaching: <i>Geography, University of Birmingham</i>
Kate Arblaster (1995-2001/2001)	
Judith Watterson (1995-deceased)	
Brian Hoskin (1996-1999/2000)	Lecturing: <i>Geography, St.Mark and St.John, Plymouth</i>
Verity Jones* (1997-1998/2001)	Researcher (PhD): <i>Geography, Aberystwyth</i>
Jonathan Willis* (1997-2000/2001)	

### **Lampeter Human Geography Undergraduates going on to Postgraduate Study, post-late-1980s, and Subsequent Careers if still in Academia**

(unless otherwise indicated, postgraduate was successfully completed in a Geography department; [p] = to my knowledge, has published papers from their postgraduate or related research)

Joe Howe (1985-1988)	PhD, <i>Lampeter</i> ; see above [p]
Chris Thomas (1985-1988)	PhD, <i>Lampeter</i> (abandoned); see above [p]
Deborah Jones (1986-1989)	PhD, <i>QMW</i> (abandoned); Researcher: <i>Sociology, UEL, UWL</i> [p]
Anna Ferrant (1988-1991)	PhD, <i>Edinburgh</i>
Hester Parr (1988-1991)	PhD, <i>Lampeter</i> ; see above [p]
Jennifer Agg (1989-1992)	PhD, <i>Coventry</i> (abandoned) [p]
Annie Hughes (1989-1992)	PhD, <i>Bristol</i> ; Lecturing: <i>Geography, Kingston</i> [p]
Huw Jones (1989-1993)	PhD, <i>Royal Holloway</i>
Matthew Waugh (1989-1992)	MA, <i>Los Angeles</i> (abandoned); MA, <i>Planning, Manchester</i>
Gavin Andrews (1990-1993)	PhD, <i>Exeter to Nottingham</i> : Lecturing: <i>Nursing Studies, Buckingham</i> (just left) [p]
Deborah Baldwin (1990-1993)	PhD, <i>Cheltenham</i> : Lecturing: <i>now Geography, St.Martin's, Carlisle</i> [p]
Tara Duncan (1990-1993)	MA, <i>UCL</i> ; PhD, <i>UCL</i> (ongoing)
Katherine Housiaux (1990-1993)	PhD, <i>Southampton</i> ; Lecturing: <i>Geography, Leeds</i> (just left) [p]
Karen Leaper (1990-1993)	PhD, <i>Bristol</i>
Paul Lehane (1990-1993)	PhD, <i>Oxford Brookes</i> (ongoing?)
Alan Toombs (1990-1993)	PhD, <i>Anglia</i> (abandoned?)
Michael Woods (1990-1993)	PhD, <i>Bristol</i> ; Lecturing: <i>Geography, Aberystwyth</i> [p]
Francine Watkins (1990-1993)	PhD, <i>Manchester to Sheffield</i> [p]
Simon Bills (1991-1994)	MA, <i>Southampton</i> (unknown)
Steve Cooke (1991-1994)	PhD, <i>Cheltenham</i> : Lecturing, <i>now Geography, Hull</i> [p]
Lloyd Jenkins (1991-1994)	PhD, <i>Lampeter</i> : see above [p]
Adrian Mulligan (1991-1994)	MPhil, <i>Cork</i> ; PhD, <i>Arizona</i> ; Lecturing: <i>now Bucknell College, PA</i>
David Land (1992-1995)	PhD, <i>Bristol</i> (ongoing)
Nina Morris (1992-1995)	PhD, <i>Hull</i> (ongoing?)
Kevin Pett (1992-1995)	PhD, <i>Aberystwyth</i> (ongoing)
Judith Watterson (1992-1995)	PhD, <i>Lampeter</i> (deceased)
Rachel Saltmarsh (1992-1995)	PhD, <i>Aberystwyth</i> ; Researcher: <i>Careers Service, Aberystwyth</i>
Simon Barrett (1993-1996)	PhD, <i>Aberystwyth</i> (ongoing?)
Alison Goodrum (1993-1996)	PhD, <i>Cheltenham</i> : Lecturing, <i>Women's Studies, Auckland</i>
Paul Kingsbury (1993-1996)	MA, <i>Kentucky</i> ; PhD, <i>Kentucky</i> [p - under consideration]
Jeremy Segrott (1993-1996)	MA, <i>Nottingham</i> ; PhD, <i>Swansea</i> : Researcher: <i>Geography, Swansea</i> [p]
Verity Jones (1994-1997)	MPhil, <i>Lampeter</i> ; see above
Jonathan Willis (1994-1997)	MPhil, <i>Lampeter</i> : see above
Helen Twidle (1996-1999)	PhD, <i>Aberystwyth</i> (ongoing)