Understanding the New Rural Economy: Options and Choices
FIELD SITE MANUAL

Bill Reimer
Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology
Concordia University
1455 boul. de Maisonneuve O
Montréal QC H3G 1M8

REIMER@VAX2.CONCORDIA.CA
(514) 848-2171
Fax: (514) 689-5435

DRAFT VERSION

November 12, 1997

Understanding the New Rural Economy: Options and Choices
FIELD SITE MANUAL

Table of Contents

Understanding the New Rural Economy: Options and Choices
FIELD SITE MANUAL

1. Introduction

The New Rural Economy (NRE) Sample of Research Sites provides information on a number of themes related to the NRE project. This information will continue to grow over the lifetime of the project. We begin with a basic profile of information related to the core themes and questions of the NRE project. As information becomes available and as new questions arise, we will add the relevant data to each site database.

The initial stages of the NRE field research are designed to:
- C provide information about each site to use as a context for more detailed analysis,
- C permit comparative analysis across sites,
- C provide an opportunity to initiate and develop a relationship with residents in each site, and
- C provide a source of information to which new questions can be put.

2. Requirements of the Field Site Research

In order to accomplish these goals, the site research will have to meet the following requirements.

- C Work within the field sites aims to increase local control in relationships with the rest of the global economy. Control is primarily viewed with respect to learning.
- C The site research must include information which is relevant to the themes and research questions of the NRE.
- C The research in each site must include a substantial body of information which is compatible to that collected at other sites: with respect to themes and research questions of the NRE.
- C The methodology must be sufficiently robust to accommodate local preferences for research styles and involvement without significantly compromising the validity of the data for supporting inferences.
- C All methods should be replicable in other field sites.
- C The information must be produced and distributed in a way which respects confidentiality.

3. Stages and Products of the Field Site Research

The field site research is only one part of the NRE project. It is, however, crucial to the project since it serves as a focus for question formulation, information gathering, collaboration, and the preparation of public documents. Since it will involve the participation of local residents, it will also bring together researchers and rural citizens in a collaborative relationship which is guaranteed to further our collective goals.

The database will be developed in a number of stages guided by the availability of information. At each stage various products will be developed and used as foci for deliberations and modifications of the research. Four of these stages are identified below.

3.1. Site Selection

Thirty-two field sites will be chosen through a process of negotiation involving researchers, NRE supporters, and local citizens. A sample frame has been developed to ensure that researchers' concerns for appropriate comparisons will be met (Reimer, 1995, 1997). There remains considerable choice within this frame so that specific regional and local concerns can be accommodated in the final selection.

This process is in its final stages, with the deadline of November 28 for the selection of all 32 sites. There may be some changes to these selections as we contact the local people involved.

Deadlines:
C   November 28, 1997: selection of field sites

Products:
C   Report: "A Sampling Frame for Non-Metropolitan Communities in Canada" (Reimer, 1995).
C   Report: "Understanding the New Rural Economy: Options and Choices - Sample Selection", (Reimer, 1997).
C   Presentation: "Sample Selection for the NRE Project", North Bay Workshop, May, 1997 (Reimer).
C   Report: Field Sites Selected, with preliminary census information, December, 1997.

3.2. Field Site Profiles

A profile of each site will be developed using easily available information. The information will come from two major sources: census and administrative databases, and initial contacts with local and regional people familiar with the sites. At this stage, we will not engage in systematic interviews or surveys at the local level. Appendix 1 provides more details regarding procedures for the field research.

The Profiles will be prepared by regional teams in collaboration with the Research Manager, Data Archivist, and the Profile Sub-committee of the NRE Steering Committee.

Each site will have a Field Site Log in which information regarding the site, contacts with local people, methodologies employed, observations, and experiences will be recorded. Each NRE participant will be asked to contribute to this Log throughout the period of the project. These Logs will serve as a basis for coordination of activities, information, and evaluation as the project develops. They will also serve as a rich source of material for local people and those who continue similar research in the future.

Deadlines:
C   November 28, 1997: establishment of the Profile Sub-Committee of the NRE Steering Committee.
C   December 18, 1997: descriptions of each site using census and administrative data from the NRE CSD database.
C   January 5, 1998: finalization of information to be collected for the initial profiles.
C   March 20, 1998: descriptive profiles of each site: integrating data from the CSD database and initial discussions with local and regional people.
Products:
C   Logs: Field Site Logs,
C   Report: Field Site Profiles, March 27, 1998.
C   Report: Access to Government Services in Selected Sites, March 27, 1998

3.3. Preparations for intensive field site research

The work of the previous stage will provide introductions to the sites and a framework to develop research approaches and instruments for the later stages of the project. Two types of materials will be developed:
C   a manual of the core information to be collected in each site, and
C   a protocol for relating to local people in a way which helps develop a learning culture.
The manual will be developed using material from:
C   this version of the Field Site Manual,

C   supporting documents (cf. List of References and Supporting Documents),
C   proposals from NRE Theme teams,
C   proposals from focused and allied NRE research, and
C   proposals arising from the analysis of the profile information collected during the first stage of the research.

These materials will be developed by two Subcommittees of the NRE Steering Committee: the Profile Subcommittee and a Protocol Subcommittee. Examples relevant to them can be found in the Appendices to this document.

Deadlines:
C   November 28, 1997: Establishment of the Protocol Sub-Committee of the NRE Steering Committee.
C   April 24, 1998: Draft manual of the core information (with data collection instruments)
C   April 24, 1998: Draft manual of the protocol

Products:
C   Presentation: Core information to be collected, May 7-9, 1998
C   Training Sessions: Protocol and techniques for relating to field sites, May 7-9, 1998
C   Manual: Core Information for the field research (with instruments), May 29, 1998
C   Manual: Protocol for relating to field sites, May 29, 1998

3.4. Field Work data collection

Detailed field work will begin in June, 1998. It will continue throughout the period of the project according to the opportunities and developments in each of the regions. Information will be collected using a number of sources, such as:
C   interviews,
C   focus groups and local meetings,
C   surveys,
C   historical and administrative documents, and
C   field notes.
The collection process will be participatory in nature, including local people as well as NRE supporters from regions other than those of the site. The guidelines for this process will be established by the Protocol Manual, and monitored through regular evaluations.

Deadlines:
C   June, 1998: Begin field site research

Products:
C   Presentations: Initial findings re. core themes, October, 1998
C   Reports: Core theme, focused initiatives, and allied research products related to the field work will be produced throughout the NRE project.

4. A Framework for Field Site Profile Information (Dec. 1997-March 1998)

Preliminary profile information from the field sites will be used to further the analysis of the NRE core themes, meet the requirements of focused and allied research, prepare for the more intensive field work, support local initiatives, and answer emerging questions. In addition, the initial profiles will be used to verify the validity of the site selection procedures, and initiate discussions with residents in the field sites.

To help organize the diverse nature of these objectives, we will use a framework for the data which focuses on the core issues of the NRE project and highlights the major structures and processes which play a part in rural Canada. They are identified in six major topics:

C those related to the identification of the **site boundaries**,
C those related to the changing **spatial arrangements and infrastructure** in rural Canada,
C those related to the **economic fortunes** of rural Canada,
C those related to **social and political** institutions and activities,
C those related to the **resource base and amenities** in rural Canada, and
C those related to **demographic and social** changes.

We will also maximize the extent to which the data collected in our field research is compatible with the case study information proposed by our European colleagues in the document entitled "Agriculture and employment in the rural regions of the EU" (Post and Terluin, 1997). This means including information regarding the **strategies** of the primary actors within the relevant topics above. The specific actors will vary to some extent in each location, but we expect them to include representatives from each of the three rural Canadas (Davilla-Villers, 1996; Apedaile and Reimer, 1996).

Before turning to the more operational level of information in each of these 6 topics, we will outline the rationale for each group and some of the questions which will be addressed.

4.1. Identification of prospective **boundaries** of the site using:
 C local knowledge and identifications
 C local and regionally available documents
 C information from the rural Canada database
The bases of site identification are to be determined as described in Appendix 1.

4.2. A brief history of changes in the **spatial arrangement and infrastructure** of activities, businesses, and collectivities in the field site and between the site and nearby settlements. This will be more detailed for recent years and cover only the most important aspects during the pre-1970s period. This information will be used to:
 C verify the metropolitan adjacency of the site using sampling frame criteria;
 C provide a basis for comparison with OECD classifications and materials;
 C provide preliminary information related to the "Location and Mobility" core theme. It should include information regarding the composition of and changes in:
  C the primary communication and transportation infrastructure,
  C travel and commuting patterns of the population,
  C access to the means of communication and transportation, including new information technology
  C the financial and administrative responsibility regarding communication and transportation infrastructure.
The information will be used to answer such questions as:
 C How has the spatial organization of activities and institutions changed?
 C In what ways does the local infrastructure enhance or inhibit trade, mobility of resources, and information exchange?
 C What are the most important processes related to those changes?
 C Are the institutions compatible with the activities?
 C Do the inconsistencies create problems? What types?
 C Do these vary by type of cell, region, programs, etc.?
 C What limitations exist on access to services and facilities?

4.3. A brief history of changes in the **economic fortunes** of the field site. This will be more detailed for recent years and cover only the most important aspects during the pre-1970s period. This information will be used:
 C to verify the assessed level of exposure to global economic processes
 C to verify the extent of fluctuation and stability in the economic basis of the site

C   to provide preliminary information related to the "Employment and Enterprise Restructuring" core theme. It should include information regarding the composition of and changes in:
- C   the labour force (sector, human capital, work structure, age, gender),
- C   enterprises and their composition (including co-operatives),
- C   the level and nature of public expenditure relating to employment and enterprise restructuring (including government programs),
- C   the level and nature of financing for enterprise restructuring.

C   to provide preliminary information related to the "Trapping and Instability" core theme. It should include information regarding:
- C   the form of economic equilibrium,
- C   the type of economic stability,
- C   the basis for changes in the economy (influential parameters), and
- C   the timing and focus of the major impacts on the economic fortunes of the site (impulses on variables or parameters).

C   to provide preliminary information related to the "Leading and Lagging" core theme. This will make use of the information identified above.

The information will be used to answer such questions as:
- C   How has the economic base of the site changed?
- C   How do these changes relate to the structure of economic enterprises in the site?
- C   What government programs are relevant to economic activities in the site?
- C   To what extent is the local economy integrated with nearby communities?
- C   How has local financing been obtained and maintained?
- C   What are the primary economic strategies of those in the three rural Canadas?

4.4. A brief history of changes in the major **social and political** organizations and associations in the field site. This will be more detailed for recent years and cover only the most important aspects during the pre-1970s period. This information will be used:
- C   to verify the level of local capabilities (social capital) of the site,
- C   to provide preliminary information related to the "Marginalization" core theme. It includes information regarding:
  - C   the composition of, changes in, and access to:
    - C   formal organizations and institutions in and nearby the site (e.g. churches, hospitals, police, local government, media),
    - C   informal organizations and associations in and nearby the site (e.g. business, social support, political, recreational, cultural, social action groups),
    - C   intra- and inter-site networks,
    - C   special types of people or groups vulnerable to exclusion (e.g. elderly, children, youth, single mothers, working poor, Aboriginal peoples),
    - C   levels of social integration and disintegration (e.g. crime, suicide, health, housing, divorce, social conflicts and crises, celebrations, festivals, fairs)
  - C   the representations of important local social and political groups and identities,
  - C   the strategies adopted by primary local actors to maintain or improve their quality of life.
- C   to provide preliminary information related to the "Leading and Lagging" core theme. This will make use of the information identified above.
- C   to provide information for the "Historical Review of Public Policies and Programs" project. In addition to some of the information identified above, it includes information regarding the nature of and changes in:
  - C   publicly funded programs which relate to the site,

C   public policies which directly relate to the site,
C   the participation of local government, business, commerce, and social organizations in programs sponsored by local and higher levels of government,
C   local responses to these programs and policies.

The information will be used to answer such questions as:

C   To what extent do different types of rural Canadians have access to government and para-government programs and services? How has this changed in the recent past?
C   To what extent do informal associations buffer misfortune? Which misfortunes? For who? Which associations?
C   To what extent do informal measures of support complement more formal institutions?
C   Are there special services for the marginalized? How are they organized?
C   What are the processes and conditions which contribute to: cyclical marginalization, chronic marginalization (hysteretic), or irreversible marginalization?
C   Which types of people or communities can be helped? How?
C   What are the strategies adopted by community organizations, the elderly, women, young people, farmers, and representatives of the 3 rural Canadas in their attempts to maintain and improve their quality of life?

4.5. A brief history of changes in the **resource base and amenities** in and near the field site. This will be more detailed for recent years and cover only the most important aspects during the pre-1970s period. This information will be used:

C   to provide preliminary information related to the "Trapping and Instability", "Marginalization", and "Leading and Lagging" core themes. It includes information regarding the composition of and changes in:
      C   the natural resources and amenities of the region,
      C   air, soil, water, noise pollution,
      C   strategies and projects affecting the use of natural resources and amenities.

The information will be used to answer such questions as:

C   What processes and conditions contribute to environmental degradation or improvement?
C   What practices or policies contribute to environmental degradation or improvement?
C   What are the impacts of environmental conditions on the local populations?

4.6. A brief history of **demographic and social changes** in the field site. This will be more detailed for recent years and cover only the most important aspects during the pre-1970s period. This information will be used to augment several of the theme topics above as well as to provide 'controls' for much of the subsequent analysis. It could include information regarding the composition of and changes in:

C   age and gender,
C   population,
C   migration (outmigration and inmigration),
C   family structure,
C   ethnicity and language,
C   crime,
C   health, and
C   literacy.

5. Site-level Information to be Collected for Initial Profiles (Dec 1997- March 1998)

This information is to be collected using easily available information from sources such as visits with local people, local guidebooks or documents, and knowledgeable people. In most cases a few telephone calls and short site visit will be sufficient. It will be supplemented by census and survey information from the CSD database. The latter information can be requested from Bill Reimer.

The list below consists of a mixture of information currently available in the CSD database and information which must be collected in the sites. Much of the latter information will rely on key informants. Use standard techniques of cross-checking the information where appropriate. During this preliminary stage of data collection, some of the information may be skipped where its collection is likely to be too time consuming. On the other hand, for those sites where more specific information is available which is relevant to our objectives, this should be included in the profile. To facilitate future work, it is very important that you keep track of the procedures followed and sources of information which you used.

In the process of collecting this information, enter notes into the Site Log regarding:
- how the collection of information was accomplished,
- what sources were utilized,
- which people and organizations were contacted (including their relevance to the locale or study, phone number, and address),
- the names of people or organizations which were mentioned by your informant (with their relevance to the locale or study),
- proposals for future data collection and analysis,
- inconsistencies in the information, and
- the dates and location of your activities.

NOTE: items marked with • below are in the CSD database for 1991. A full list of variables included in and planned for the CSD database is also available. This information can be requested from Bill Reimer.

5.1. Identification of prospective boundaries of the site

- CSD maps are available for consultation
- If local labour markets are used to define local boundaries, Census Consolidated Subdivisions could be used as an approximation.
- other regions can be defined as aggregates of CSDs
- the classification of sites by OECD categories and the typology of rural Canada established by Liz Hawkins (Working Paper #29: Statistics Canada 21-6010MPE29000) are also available.
- assess whether the site meets the sampling grid classification with respect to:
  - exposure to global economy,
  - whether the economy is fluctuating or stable,
  - whether the site is adjacent to a metro region (pop. > 50,000),
  - whether the site has a high or low level of social and institutional capabilities, and
  - whether the site is leading or lagging.
- Describe the settlement patterns in the CSD.
- Identify the location in the CSD which has the largest number of people, and use this as the population centroid when answering the relevant questions below.
- How do people in the CSD identify the community or region in which they live?
- How do these identifications correspond to local CSD boundaries?
- Provide a brief historical overview of the region.

5.2. Spatial arrangements and infrastructure

C   provide a map or maps of the region indicating the main settlements, physical and land use characteristics, and transportation routes

C   describe the climatic and primary resource characteristics of the site

- population density
- metro adjacency and community size has been identified by Beale codes (based on Census Divisions: BEALE91).
- Employment in transportation and storage industries (PITRAN91). Also available by gender.
- Employment in communication and utilities (PICOMM91). Also available by gender.
- Employment in transportation equipment operating occupations (OC91MTRA). Also available by gender.
- Usual place of work is in census subdivision of residence (CW91MCDR). Also available by gender.
- Usual place of work is in a different census subdivision from residence (CW91MCDD). Also available by gender.
- Usual place of work is in a different census subdivision, but in same census division as residence (CW91MCDS). Also available by gender.
- Usual place of work is at home (CW91MAH). Also available by gender.

C   How far away from the nearest urban centre (pop. >50,000) is the CSD centroid (in km and time)? Identify the urban centre.

C   Describe the spatial relationship of the site to nearby settlements, including km and time. Has this changed significantly in the recent past?

C   Describe the proximity (km and time) of the following types of services those in the site:

    C   Business Services
- the nearest federal government business development office
- the nearest provincial government business development office
- the nearest employment office
- the three major private-sector employers (i.e. excluding hospitals, school boards, and other public agencies)

    C   Consumer Services
- convenience shopping
- complete shopping
- retail/wholesale shopping
- the nearest branch of a chartered bank
- the nearest credit union or caisse populaire
- the nearest ATM

    C   Social Services
- the nearest municipal government office
- the nearest elementary school
- the nearest high school
- the nearest CEGEP or college
- the nearest hospital
- the nearest hospital with a 24-hour emergency service
- the nearest ambulance service
- the nearest police station
- the nearest fire station
- the nearest major religious institutions (churches or synagogues)
- the nearest community centre or hall
- the nearest major public sport facility (arena, playing field, park, etc.)

    C   Transportation and Communication Services
- the nearest post office
- the nearest bus or train station
- the nearest airport
- the nearest internet service centre

Has this changed significantly in the recent past? For each of the services, identify the dates at which major changes in proximity have occurred since 1956. Identify the nature of those proximity changes.

C   Describe the primary transportation and communication infrastructure of the site (roads, railroads, airports, media, telephone quality, internet)? Provide this information on a map. Has this changed significantly in the recent past?

C   Describe the principal shopping and commuting patterns of the population in the site. Has this changed significantly in the recent past?

C   What public transportation facilities are available in the site? What are the costs?

C   Which organizations hold the responsibility (fiscal and administrative) for zoning and roads in the site? Where are they located? Has this changed significantly in the recent past?

5.3. Economic fortunes

C   Labour Force and Employment
   •   The CSD database contains information on several labour force characteristics: unemployment and participation rates (by age, gender, and age of children); change in employment rates from 1981 to 1991; self-employment rate (by gender); unpaid family workers (by gender); worker time status (by gender); employment by industry and occupation; education (by gender and qualifications)
   C   What are the three major employers for people in the site? Identify critical dates since 1956 for changes in the major employers.
   C   What are the numbers of people they employ (in the office, in the plant)? Has this changed significantly in the recent past?
   C   Are there any education or research organizations in the region?
   C   What is the structure of wages in the site?

C   Enterprises
   C   What are the primary economic enterprises and organizations in the site and nearby? Has this changed significantly in the recent past? This information will be used to verify our assessment of the extent to which the site is integrated into the global economy, and whether its economy is fluctuating or stable. Any other information which touches on these issues will be useful.
   C   Estimate the share of total employment involved in exporting goods and services outside the study site. Has this changed significantly in the recent past?

C   Income
   •   The CSD database contains several income characteristics: income (individual-by employment time status and gender, age, census family, economic family, household, economic family with children < 6 yrs) by gender; economic family low income status; income inequality; average employment income; composition of total income (% employment, transfers, other)

C   Wealth and Finance
   •   The CSD database contains some information related to assets and finance: value of dwelling; average gross rent; average major payments; rent as % of household income; payments as % of household income; period of construction of housing and need for repairs; type of dwelling
   C   How have the economic fortunes of the site fared since the end of WW II? When did the major upturns and downturns occur? To what events were they associated?
   C   What financial institutions are available in the site and nearby (banks, credit unions, micro-lending, micro-financing arrangements, etc.)? How close are they (in km and time)? Has this changed significantly in the recent past?
   C   What (if any) government services for business are there in the site or nearby? How close are they (km and time)? Has this changed significantly in the recent past?

C Have there been any major government programs (federal or provincial) which have had special significance for the site (since WW II)? Which programs? What is their significance? Estimate the dollars consumed per year.

5.4. Social and Political Organizations and Associations

C Public Sector
- The CSD database contains information regarding employment in teaching and related occupations (POC91TEA). Also available by gender.
- Employment in medicine and health occupations (POC91MED). Also available by gender.
- % of population in institutions
- Work is under way to attach information regarding the nearest hospital to each CSD. This information includes number of staff, beds, type of hospital, etc.
- Work is under way to attach information regarding the nearest police detachment to each CSD. This information includes number of personnel, types of crimes, outcomes, etc.
- Work is under way to attach the HRDC mailing list for "Community Development News" to the CSD database.
- Work is under way to attach several program distribution lists from HRDC to the CSD database.
  - C How close (km and time) and of what type are the nearest public service institutions and organizations (hospitals, schools, colleges, universities, police, fire, ambulance, social services, post office, local government, business centres, federal and provincial offices, Human Resource Centres, etc.)? Which levels of government are implicated, and in what way? Has this changed significantly in the recent past?
  - C What is the usual response time for police, fire, ambulance? Has this changed significantly in the recent past?
  - C Describe the structure of any municipal and regional-level bodies which have jurisdiction affecting the site. What types of persons are represented in these bodies? How has this changed in the recent past?
  - C What rural development policies or programs (since WW II) have been important for the site? Describe the nature of their importance.

C Third Sector and Voluntary
- Religious affiliation
  - C What and how close (km and time) are the major community organizations (churches, political groups, recreational groups, cultural groups, social action groups, social support groups)? Has this changed significantly in the recent past?
  - C Estimate the number of persons who are members of these organizations.
  - C To what extent are these organizations and associations local in nature, or are they related to people or groups in neighbouring communities? Provide some details.
  - C Describe the relative importance of the primary institutions for the welfare of the site.
  - C What types of collective action (if any) have taken place in the site over the last few years? What issues were involved? What were the outcomes?

5.5. Resource Base and Amenities

C What are the prominent physical characteristics of the site? Consider especially those which create problems for the people and those which might serve as an attraction.

C What are the local resources in the region: land, water, minerals, wildlife, touristic, cultural? To what extent are they exploited and exploitable?

C What issues regarding environmental quality are important for the site? Consider those which might improve the quality as well as those which might make it worse. Consider water, air, soil, and noise. Has this changed significantly in the recent past?

5.6. Demographic and Social Characteristics

- age and gender,
- population growth (1986 to 1991)
- migration (outmigration and inmigration; period of immigration; origin of immigration)
- family structure (marital status; household composition; lone parents by gender; age of children at home; persons per HH; single/ever married women by age)
- ethnic origin
- official language status
- C Is the site unusual with respect to special types of people (e.g. many elders, children, youth, young families, single mothers, illiterate people, cultural groups, poor, First Nations, language speakers, wealthy, etc.)? Has this changed significantly in the recent past?
- C Is the site unusual with respect to illegal activities, health problems, alcohol abuse, or social conflict? Has this changes significantly in the recent past?
- C To what extent have people moved in and out of the site? Has this movement been selective in terms of the type of people involved (eg. age, culture, employment status, destination, etc.)?

6. List of References and Supporting Documents

Apedaile, L.P. and Bill Reimer
1996   "A Whole Rural Policy for Canada": a presentation to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources. This presentation can be found via the CRRF Web site: http://artsci-ccwin.concordia.ca/CRRF/crrf_hm.html

Chambers, Robert
1994   "The Origins and Practice of Participatory Rural Appraisal" <u>World Development</u> 22(7)953-969.

CSAA (Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association)
1995   "Statement of Professional Ethics" http://artsci-ccwin.concordia.ca/CSAA/englcode.html

Davilla-Villers, David
1996   Discussion of 3 rural Canadas can be found in Apedaile and Reimer (1996).

Hawkins, Liz
        Working Paper #29: Statistics Canada 21-6010MPE29000

May, Doug and Terry Quinlan
1997   <u>The Community Income Accounts: a Reference Document</u>, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador: Department of Finance, Economics and Statistics Branch.

May, Doug and Terry Quinlan
1997   <u>The Community Social Accounts: a Reference Document</u>, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador: Department of Finance, Economics and Statistics Branch.

Post, Jaap and Ida Terluin
1997   <u>Agriculture and Employment in the Rural Regions of the EU (RUREMPLO): Methodology for Case Studies</u>, The Hague: Agricultural Economics Research Institute (Project FAIR3 CT 96-1766).

Reimer, Bill

1995   "A Sampling Frame for Non-Metropolitan Communities in Canada." A report to the Canadian Rural Restructuring Foundation.

Reimer, Bill
1997   "Understanding the New Rural Economy: Sample Selection" A report to the Canadian Rural Restructuring Foundation. Also via the CRRF web site: http://artsci-ccwin.concordia.ca/CRRF/crrf_hm.html

Rowalsky, Laura O., Marja Verhoes, Wilfredo E. Thurston, and Gayle E. Rutherford
1996   "Guidelines for Entry into an Aboriginal Community", <u>Canadian Journal of Native Studies</u> xvi(2)267-282.

Rural and Small Town Programme
1994   <u>Examining Information: A Guide to Collecting Community Data</u>, Sackville: Mount Allison University.

7. Appendix 1: Procedures for Field Research

The following points identify the steps and procedures which will be followed for the selection and data collection in the field sites. Modifications to these points can be made in consultation with the Research Manager so long as the requirements of the Sample Site Database are met.

7.1. Selection of the field sites

C   Consider the sites according to CSD locations nominated by Bill Reimer from the national CRRF Sampling Frame. Verify their appropriate location in the sampling grid and negotiate the final selection if necessary.

C   Discuss prospective field sites with partner organizations and potential partners. This includes local organizations as well as those organizations identified by our partners (see Appendix 3). This part of the selection process may require going back to Bill Reimer for additional nominations.

C   Determine the prospective boundary for each field site by adding contiguous CSDs. Criteria for setting the boundaries for each field site will be established by the Research Manager in consultation with the NRE network. Possible criteria include:
- C   perceptions of local people
- C   Karl Fox's functional economic areas,
- C   Stabler's definition of a local economy,
- C   a mini-Beale code centring on towns,
- C   population density,
- C   jurisdiction of governing institutions (Should each field site fall within one governing jurisdiction?),
- C   administrative areas (e.g. postal codes, HRDC etc.), or
- C   statistical reporting areas.

These suggestions are not mutually exclusive.

7.2. Establish the Participatory Framework

C   Review the CSAA Statement of Research Ethics (1995), Flora's "Pitfalls to participatory research" (cf. Appendix 4), Post and Terluin (1997), and Rowalsky, et al. (1996). Consider their implications for the sites being considered. This process should be conducted in communication with all members of the NRE project via the Research Manager.

C   Once a degree of comfort has been determined with the location and boundaries for the sites, approach local regional and municipal leaders to invite participation and work out the process to get the research and learning process underway.

C   Once formal agreement to work with the field site is established with elected/representative governing institutions, set up meetings with leader groups within the field site. These will include the presidents/chairs/managers of the: local Chamber(s) of Commerce, sectoral service board(s) and society(ies), major businesses and institutions, and volunteer organizations.

C   Establish a local steering committee for each field site. A suggested composition is seven persons: one person from each of the three rural Canadas as described in "Think Rural" (if appropriate for the site), an elected member of the county/municipal council, an executive member of a social service volunteer organization, an executive member of a local business/commerce organization and the NRE leader of the research. The Local Steering Committee could be appointed by the County/Municipal Council with nominations requested from community organizations. The committee will be convened by the NRE research

leader and chaired by the member from the Municipal/County Council. (Note that the aim and the expected result is a balanced two person representation of each of the three rural Canadas.)

7.3. Field Records

C Keep full field notes regarding procedures, encounters, meetings, and decisions in the Field Site Log. These will serve as important sources of information for subsequent data collection in your site as well as a crucial point of reference for conducting comparative analysis in other sites.

8. Appendix 2: Establishing the Benefits of Participation

Participation of local people will be sought on the basis of an exchange of useful learning and information.

From the NRE side, we will offer:

- C   exclusive opportunity to ask detailed questions of NRE researchers at any time for informed discussion of options and choices;
- C   exclusive opportunity to steer the research in the field site and at other sites by formulating good questions needing unique combinations of theoretical treatment and comparative data; and
- C   annual in-house workshops to review and interpret research results, usually involving at least one NRE researcher from other parts of Canada.
- C   descriptions of change over time (1981-96);
- C   comparisons with other similarly placed local economies, based on profiles from other field sites across Canada;
- C   inclusive, in-house workshops for interested persons in each field site on the meaning of the information collected and the methods of research;
- C   invitations to memberships in CRRF and to join the partnership committee of the NRE, based on in-kind contributions;
- C   privileged (first-in-line principle) access to results of the NRE research from across Canada;
- C   participation, at cost, in selected NRE workshops involving several sites;
- C   the opportunity to host such workshops;
- C   discounts on registration fees to the annual CRRF Conferences (and the 'Rural University' when and if it is possible) for five years;

From the field site will be sought:

- C   leadership through the local NRE steering committee;
- C   agreement to share data for comparisons with other field sites;
- C   access to historical archives;
- C   support and encouragement for the surveys;
- C   access to records relating to historical development programs, and other data as may be recommended by the local NRE steering committee; and
- C   information to augment and test the validity of data from Statistics Canada and other general sources.

9. Appendix 3: Organizations to be Contacted

Organizations to be contacted for preparation of the Site Profiles.

- C Human Resources Centres
- C Aquaculture Human Resources Council
- C Canadian Council for Human Resources in the Environment Industry
- C Canadian Council of Professional Fish Harvesters
- C Canadian Grocery Producers Council
- C Canadian Tourism Human Resources Council
- C Employability and Social Partnerships, HRDC (Child Care Projects)
- C Evaluation Branch, HRDC
- C Horticulture Human Resources Council
- C Mining Human Resources Sector Council
- C National Literacy Secretariat
- C Office of Learning Technologies
- C Seafood Human Resources Sector Council
- C Youth Initiatives, HRDC (Youth Employment Strategy)
- C Women's Bureau, HRDC

10. Appendix 4: Participatory Collaborative Research Methodologies

From: Rural Sociology Discussion List
To: Multiple recipients of list RURSOC-L
Subject: x Jo Abbot
Date: Monday, June 09, 1997 3:55PM

Here is something on Participatory Collaborative Research based on the SANREM CRSP experiences.

This document that was put together by Cornelia Flora (Iowa State University) and myself (Carla Roncoli, University of Georgia) as an outcome of a workshop on Participatory Collaborative Research Methodologies held at Tuskegee University a couple of years ago.

Carla Roncoli, Phd
Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resource Management
Collaborative Research Support Program
University of Georgia
Athens, GA, USA

We would love to have feedback and response.

QUESTIONING KNOWLEDGE

A Work Tool for Critical Reflection
On Participatory Collaborative Research

What this is not:
  a bag of tricks on "how to do it"
  an insurance policy in participatory correctness

What it wants to be:

- **provocative**: a set of critical questions to help you probe the epistemological and ethical implications of participatory, collaborative research, namely:
  - how do we know what we know?
  - why we do what we do?

- **pragmatic**: it is meant to guide research practice in ways that respond to specific field conditions but also engender learnings of global significance

- **experiential**: it seeks to stimulate reflection on one's engagement in research as a process embedded in relationships and shaped by values and beliefs;

- **interactive**: you are invited to answer and/or add questions and ideas and share them with other participants in the workshop and in this debate; This instrument is the result of the collaborative work of a cluster of workshop participants, who have continued to engage in reflection and dialogue on the highlights and insights emerged in Tuskegee in order to distil them into a series of operational lessons. But rather than concluding the discussion, it seeks to set the stage for an on-going dialogic exchange on the issues and methods of participatory, collaborative research which all those with or without experience in of are welcome to join.

In keeping with this open-ended format, we avoid providing pre-packaged guidelines or recommendations on what works and what does not and on what could or should be done. Instead we propose the following set of questions pertaining our endeavors and encounters in the course of participatory, collaborative research. In each set, we outline specific "pitfalls", that is misconceptions that beset practitioners in the field. Under each "pitfall", focused questions are posed to probe into and draw from readers' personal experience, methodological repertoire, moral convictions, and theoretical inclinations.

The diversity and complexity of cases examined during the workshop, in fact, strongly suggests that there is no standard recipe on how to apply participatory, collaborative methods to research, training, and development. Rather, the challenge is to let go of some control in order to engage in collaborative learning and to embrace the contribution of all participants, including those whose voices are not commonly heard in scientific circles. This approach is also consistent with the emphasis that the participatory, collaborative paradigm places on process, relationships, and context as well as the outcomes of scientific enquiry, and on the need to bring them, as well as the data obtained and produced, into the field of critical analysis.

WHY?	On motivation and relevance
WHO?	On relationships of knowledge
WHEN?	On intersecting temporalities
HOW?	On practice and process
WHAT?	On content and context WHY?

Pitfall no. 1 : We are here to help you.

Who initiated the research project and how? Who needs it and why? What prompted each party's involvement, and what do they hope to get out of it? Who has the most at stake in its success and the most to lose from its failure? Hoe does it influence the participatory process?

What provides and sustains motivation for scientists and local people through the difficulties and demands of the participatory/ collaborative process? To what extent and in what ways do their motivating factors overlap or diverge?

What is the best time and way to discuss the mutual expectations that scientists and local people have of each others in ways that express respect and responsibility but also ensure that they are reasonable and realistic?

In what ways are scientist' motivations and/or expectations challenged and/or changed by the participatory/collaborative process? What evidence do they provide that they are not manipulating the situation to get the information they need or people to do what they want? What indicators would alert those involved to that danger?

Pitfall no. 2 : Our research will give answers to your questions.

To what extent do scientists bring a pre-established agenda into the participatory process? How relevant is such an agenda to local people? How can it be reformulated so that it is more so, while maintaining scientific focus and rigor?

How researchable are the questions of local people? What criteria are used to determine whether they are? How can scientists assist local people to formulate their questions in ways that are more suitable to scientific enquiry and hypothesis testing?

How can the scientists' and local people's questions be integrated? When they are not, which and whose are postponed or compromised? What are the economic, political, and moral implications of those choices?

Pitfall no. 3 : We are scientists, we don't do development.

What is the interface between scientific questions and objectives and local livelihood struggles? What do the latter contribute to local people's wellbeing how do they respond to their immediate concerns? How does it enhance their ability to engage in sustainable and self-reliant development?

How can participatory research facilitate the kind of critical analysis and awareness that leads to positive change? How does the research agenda and findings help local people move towards transformative consciousness and collective mobilization for change? What is now preventing that from happening?

To what extent are scientists committed to the participatory/ collaborative process, and/or to the changes it might engender in the community and society at large? What happens when those changes threaten their prestige and privileges as scientists?

Pitfall no. 4 : Research for research's sake, participation for participation's sake.

Is participatory/collaborative research engaged in as an end in itself or as a means to an end, to achieve certain research or development goals or outcomes? What are the implications of doing one or the other, in terms of process and relationships?

How can the costs of participation be balanced or justified against the pressure from donor agencies to show outputs and impacts? To what extent is participation effective in improving outputs or impacts? How can this be demonstrated?

Pitfall no. 5 : People refuse to participate, despite our good intentions.

What is invested, adjusted, neglected, foregone in order to participate? How does that vary across social groups in the community (according to gender, generation, ethnicity, occupation, wealth, etc.). How can the costs of participation be minimized or offset? What rewards are built into the process to make it worthwhile for people to participate?

Who does not participate, to which phase of the process, and why? What is lost and/or gained by not participating? How is non-participation interpreted by others in the community, its leadership, the government, and the researchers themselves?

What alternatives to participation are there? How can the research process be broken down into a series of roles and/or tasks that can be assumed by local people, according to inclination or availability?

How much time, energies, resources are outside researchers willing to invest in local relationships and for how long? What reasons do they provide for local people to trust them? How far do they trust local people?

Pitfall no. 5 : The community agrees to our research project.

How can one know whether the purpose of research understood and acceptable by all involved? What is taken as evidence that local people agree over why is data gathered or how will results be used? In what ways are they engaged in negotiation over these issues? Who is involved, who is not? Who agrees, who does not, and why? How are those difference settled?

How are research questions and findings related to potential benefits for local people? What shows whether they perceive those outcomes to be beneficial and responsive to their needs? How do they assess whether they are likely and tangible enough to offset the costs of participation? Which benefits are perceived and expected by whom and for whom?

Which meaningful and measurable indicators are available and amenable to be used by local people to monitor and evaluate a) the benefits of participation and b) the utility of the research findings? In what ways can they be used to hold researchers accountable?

WHO?

Pitfall no. 7 : Participation happens by spontaneous combustion.

Who has the communication and facilitation skills to enable the research to move towards its diverse goals? How can those skills be applied to improve the quality of participation and/or collaboration?

How can participatory/collaborative research be designed in such ways that local capacity for self-reliance and sustainable development is enhanced as part of the process? Whose capacity, to do what, and why?

Pitfall no. 8 : We will teach you how to do research.

How is "research" defined by scientists and by local people? How does it different from regular activities in the same domain? What are the key elements of the process and the skills needed to perform each, and who has them or needs to learn them?

What have scientists learned about and from local people's independent experiments? How are the latter different/similar to those of scientists? How do local people's learning modes and roles differ from those of scientists? How do these differences and similarities affect the research process and outcomes?

What information and capacities are learned by whom and from whom? Who decides who needs to learn what and from whom, and how that fits in the research agenda? How do these learnings relate to local people's development needs and goals? How does this affect their engagement in the research process?

Pitfall no. 9 : Only scientists can assess and analyze the data.

How and by whom are the validity and accuracy of the data and the utility of the results assessed? How can the research process allow for the operation of multiple validation mechanisms that respond to a variety of goals and concerns?

Does the research paradigm enable a diversity of interpretations of results, according to perspectives and expectations of those involved, including less powerful participating groups? To what extent are the results amenable to be adapted and modified in the course of adoption?

Pitfall no. 10: As collaborators, we are all on a level playing field.

Who determines the venue, timing, format, and language of key junctures in the research process? Who controls critical resources and organization? What is allocated and/or appropriated and by whom? What remains with local people?

How is the diversity of research projects related to diversity of issues within the community? To what extent and in what ways are they sharing crucial data and lessons learned? What shows that they share a commitment to true participation/collaboration?

What is the history of power differentials among those involved? How does it affect the decision-making process and participants' and/or collaborators' perceptions and expectations of one another? What could help balancing or minimizing those differences?

Pitfall no. 11: Participation ensures community representation.

How do various sectors and/or social groups in the community differ in their perspective on or perception of the situation? How differently do they define the research questions or assess the results? How are different groups more or less able/willing to engage in the research?

How do differences of access to power and resources (according to gender, generation, ethnicity, class/caste, etc.) in the local community and among collaborators affect or modify the research design, the participatory process, the incorporation of research results?

How can the research design integrate a regard for local people as individuated beings, leading complex, dynamic, and unique lives full of ambivalence and contradictions, with a consideration for the salience of social location and identity?

Pitfall no. 12: Donor agencies should not interfere with research.

How is donor agencies' role defined in relation to collaborating scientists and local communities? To what extent do agency representatives share responsibility for the outcome of the research project?

How does information flow between agency representatives, collaborating scientists, and local communities? How does donor participation in the research process affect transparency in decision making? How is this played out in priority setting and resource allocation?

WHEN ?

Pitfall no. 13: Participation means that all are involved at all times.

What kinds or levels of participation are needed and/or desirable at various stages of the research process? How, by whom, and on which grounds is that decision made? How is it communicated and explained to those who are or not to be involved?

Which are the key junctures in the process where local input is most needed and why? What is exactly needed, from whom, and for how long? How is it received, utilized, validated, recompensed? What happens when it is not obtainable at the time that is needed?

Pitfall no. 14: Local people are always available and willing to participate.

At what points in their work and life cycles are local people asked to participate? How do the demands of participation conflict with other claims on their time and energies? How does it affect the ability of various groups to participate?

How does seasonality, of climatic, agricultural, environmental change, shape the research endeavor (how and what data is collected) and the participatory process (who gets to participates when)? What is the best time to collect each kind of information?

Pitfall no. 15: Scientists' time is more valuable than local people's.

How much homework has been done by the researchers to learn as much as possible from written sources and resource persons in order to minimize demands on local people and disruption of community life?

How can the participatory process be structured in ways that optimize the time, energies, talent, and resources of local people and/or collaborators? How are those compensated? How does that compare to remuneration and/or rewards for the scientists?

How do local people classify time devoted to research activities ("work", "leisure", "hospitality", "civic duty", social obligation") and how does it affect their ability/willingness to participate at various times in the day, season, year, etc.?

HOW ?

Pitfall no. 16: You can participate, but we make the rules.

Who structures decision-making concerning the research agenda and activities? Does the participatory process incorporate indigenous styles and rhythms of decision-making or do researchers impose those they themselves are comfortable with?

How much time and attention does the research design allocate to learning about local decision-making processes? What is it known about how do they vary across relevant domains and social groups in the community?

What is the process of focusing and prioritizing the questions, who structures it, who has most say in it? How can the process ensure that the concerns of the less affluent and influential partners are taken into account, especially in fund-driven projects?

Pitfall no. 17: Participation ensures unbiased information.

How does group size and composition affect the quality of participation and of the information elicited in group discussions? What kind of information is best elicited in group vs. individual interviews?

How do local people belonging to various social groups (according to gender, generation, ethnicity, wealth, etc.) respond to or are affected by group influence?

Who has which kind of knowledge among those who participate and those who do not? How was it acquired and can it be shared? What is the appropriate way of accessing it?

Pitfall no. 18: Counting heads rather than engaging brains.

How can local people be effectively involved and assisted in identifying and operationalizing indicators of a) quality, b) effectiveness, c) sustainability of participation? Which would those be?

In what ways, at what point, and by whom can feedback be applied to improving the participatory process and facilitating the collaborative realization of the research goals?

Pitfall no. 19: Collaboration loses scientific rigor and focus.

How can collaborative relationships among researchers and their various partners be patterned in ways that enable each party to release some control in order to allow all those involved to contribute their specific expertise in the attainment of jointly defined goals?

What mechanisms are at work throughout the research process to ensure that the input from collaborative learning and the negotiation of multiple agendas accrue to rather than diffuse scientific rigor and programmatic focus?

WHAT?

Pitfall no. 20: Participatory research is about problem solving.

How can the research design and questions incorporate skills, assets, and opportunities, as well as the needs, problems, and constraints?

How can those be reformulated in ways that ensure greater equity and balance in the participatory process and partnership relationships?

Pitfall no. 21: The purpose of research is to obtain data.

Who decides which data is needed and/or relevant? How different/ similar are the data requirements of scientists and local people? How can the participatory process reconcile their needs?

Who decides how, when, by whom is the data to be gathered and analyzed? What is done with the data gathered? Who has access to and control over it and its use? Who derives which benefits from it?

Pitfall no. 22: Participatory research captures indigenous knowledge.

How are elements of indigenous knowledge accessed and appropriated? How is the context (of historical events, social relationships, ideological elaborations) that gives them meaning accounted for in the analysis?

What are the key points of intersection and/or contradiction between indigenous knowledge and scientific expertise? How are they treated and/or incorporated into the research design and process?

To what degree is indigenous knowledge maladaptive, as circumstances change faster than experience can consolidate into collective wisdom? How can we avoid romanticizing indigenous knowledge?

What can alert researchers to the risk of eliciting information that can disrupting and/or undermining the participatory/collaborative process and the attainment of research goals? How can that risk be averted?

Pitfall no. 23: Participatory research cannot be replicated.

What aspects of the participatory/collaborative process can be transferred? Which principles and protocols of this research paradigm hold steady across a multiplicity of contextual situations?

How and by whom are the research results analyzed at various levels of specificity and generalizability? What is worth generalizing and why? What benefits are associated with it and for whom?

What are the processes and modalities whereby research results are transferred, tested, adapted, and absorbed into daily practice by local people? How is feedback incorporated into subsequent research efforts?

Pitfall no. 24: Scientific inquiry is neutral and objective.

How do diverse value systems interact in the participatory/collaborative process? What is the most appropriate and effective way of negotiating over these differences to establish common ground ?

How are the research agenda and design influenced by values stemming from the social location and intellectual lineage of the scientists and other partners involved?

What are the ideological, political, and historical legacies/contexts of scientific and development practice and how do they shape the interface between researchers and local partners (in their constituent groups)?

Pitfall no. 25: We are only doing our job.

To what extent have the experiences and relationships surrounding the research project touched and transformed those involved? How have they affected attitudes and practices as scientists, as citizens, and as persons?

Cornelia Flora
North Central Regional Center for Rural Development
317 East Hall
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011-1070

phone 515 294 1329
fax 515 294 2303

cflora@iastate.edu
http://www.ag.iastate.edu/centers/rdev/RuralDev.html