

**RURAL DEVELOPMENT
LEARNING ACROSS THE
NORTH**

**NORDIC-SCOTTISH
CONFERENCE**

**RURAL DEVELOPMENT
LEARNING ACROSS THE NORTH**

**Report of the Nordic-Scottish conference
Inverness, 27-28 May, 2002**

**Compiled and edited by:
Vanessa Halhead and Jo Lee, University of Aberdeen
Arkleton Centre for Rural Development Research
on behalf of The Scottish Executive**

**Scottish Executive Central Research Unit
2002**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report documents the proceedings of a conference held in Inverness on 27-28 May, 2002. The conference was organised by the Arkleton Centre for Rural Development Research, on behalf of the Scottish Executive, to promote transnational research into rural development in Scotland and Scandinavia. The report could not have been completed without the contributions and assistance of the many people who generously gave of their time and expertise. These include:

Organising team:

Juliet Harvey	The Scottish Executive, Central Research Unit
Gill M. Clark	The Scottish Executive, Central Research Unit
Mark Shucksmith	Arkleton Centre for Rural Development Research, U. of Aberdeen
Vanessa Halhead	Arkleton Centre for Rural Development Research, U. of Aberdeen
Stuart Black	Highlands & Islands Enterprise
Gordon Summers	The Highland Council
Helen Betts-Brown	Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations

Plenary speakers and chairs:

Cllr. William J. Ross	The Highland Council
Staffan Bond	Popular Movements Council for Rural Development in Sweden
Mark Shucksmith	Arkleton Centre for Rural Development Research, U. of Aberdeen
Ulla Herlitz	Gothenburg University, Sweden
Kristian Aasbrenn	Østlandsforskning, Norway
Jukka Oksa	University of Joensuu, Finland
Stuart Black	Highlands & Islands Enterprise
Prof. Robert Cormack	UHI Millenium Institute
Raymond Young	

Workshop speakers and facilitators:

Norma Graham	Fife Local Rural Partnership
Vanessa Halhead	University of Aberdeen
Frank Rennie	UHI Millenium Institute
Fiona Bell	Aberdeenshire Council
David Bryan	The Sutherland Partnership
Polly Chapman	The Highland Council
Margaret Davidson	Abriachan Community Woodlands
Elsbeth Grant	Cairngorms Partnership
Philip Jones	Dumfries & Galloway Council
James Knowles	Aberdeenshire Council

Research group co-ordinators:

Mark Shucksmith	Arkleton Centre for Rural Development Research, U. of Aberdeen
Vanessa Halhead	Arkleton Centre for Rural Development Research, U. of Aberdeen
Dr. Frank Rennie	UHI Millenium Institute
Marion Lacey	Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations
Helen Betts-Brown	Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations
Rhys Evans	Arkleton Centre for Rural Development Research, U. of Aberdeen
Bill Slee	University of Aberdeen
Paul Courtney	Macaulay Institute

Conference Organiser:

Vanessa Halhead	Arkleton Centre for Rural Development Research, U. of Aberdeen
-----------------	--

Conference Recorder:

Jo Lee Arkleton Centre for Rural Development Research, U. of Aberdeen

Venue:

Staff of The Highland Council

Thanks are also due to the conference participants for their time, their significant inputs to the proceedings and for the long distance travelled by many from across Scandinavia and Scotland. In preparing this report, every effort has been taken to ensure that the report is an accurate reflection of the different contributions by speakers and participants. It is hoped that the report will serve as a basis for further discussion and consideration of potential research between Scotland and the Nordic countries.

Vanessa Halhead

Research Fellow, Arkleton Centre for Rural Development Research, University of Aberdeen
2002

CONTENTS

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

DAY 1 – CONFERENCE

Session 1: Northern Perspectives

Welcome and Introduction	Councillor William J. Ross
A Northern Perspective – Opening address	Staffan Bond
Key Themes in Rural Development	Prof. Mark Shucksmith
Local Governance and community empowerment – The Swedish Village Action Movement	Ulla Herlitz
Questions to speakers	
Service provision in sparsely populated rural areas	Kristian Aasbrenn
Communications and involvement – The local information society	Jukka Oksa
Rural Economy – Opportunities for the rural economy in the 21 st century	Stuart Black
Questions to speakers	

Sessions 2 & 3: Conference Workshops & Future Directions

Reports from workshops:

Group 1 – Local governance and community empowerment
Group 2 – Communications and involvement
Group 3 – Innovation in rural services
Group 4 – Wider uses of the countryside
Group 5 – The rural economy
Discussion of workshop reports

Future Directions	Raymond Young
-------------------	---------------

DAY 2 – RESEARCH GROUPS

Group 1 – Local governance and community empowerment
Group 2 – Communications and involvement
Group 3 – Innovative rural services
Group 4 – Wider use of the countryside
Group 5 – The rural economy

CONCLUSION

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Conference programme
Appendix B – Conference participants

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

Background

This report documents the proceedings of a conference organised by the Arkleton Centre for Rural Development Research, University of Aberdeen, on behalf of The Scottish Executive Central Research Unit. The conference was organised in co-operation with The Highland Council, Highlands and Islands Enterprise, the Forestry Commission, the UHI Millenium Institute and the Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations. It was funded by The Scottish Executive and The Forestry Commission. The conference was held in The Highland Council and the Craigmonie Hotel, Inverness, on the 27 & 28 May, 2002.

The aim of the conference was to share good practice in rural development and to strengthen rural research networks across the Nordic-Scottish countries. The conference was stimulated by the work of the Nordic-Scottish Rural Transfer Network, a transnational research project to document and transfer knowledge on sustainable rural development policy and practice in the northern periphery of Europe. It was also seen to link to the aims of the Nordic-Scottish Action Plan, agreed in 2001 between the Nordic countries and Scotland.

The conference objectives:

The conference had the following objectives:

- To bring together those involved in rural development research, policy and practice, from the Nordic countries and Scotland.
- To provide a forum to enable co-operation and exchange of ideas on rural development, in line with the recently launched Nordic-Scottish Action Plan.
- To provide an opportunity to develop proposals for future Scottish-Nordic research projects, which help to identify and share good practice in the field of rural development.

The conference was intended for researchers, policy makers and practitioners working with rural development in Scotland and the Nordic countries. It provided a rare opportunity for direct connections to be made between those working in rural development across the Nordic-Scottish area. It allowed the sharing of good practice and the identification of future research agendas, between a diverse range of participants. Nordic speakers and participants were drawn from those involved with the Rural Transfer Network and research contacts identified by them.

The conference structure:

The main themes of the conference derived from the findings of the Rural Transfer Network and from current rural policy priorities in Scotland.

The conference was focussed around five key themes:

- Local governance and empowerment of rural communities
- Communications and community involvement
- Innovation in rural services
- Wider use of the countryside
- Developing the rural economy and building on natural assets

The event was divided into 2 days:

The first day comprised the main conference, with speakers from the Nordic Scottish area and workshops on the five key themes. Each workshop was addressed by a Scottish practitioner in the field, who gave a practical perspective of the topic.

The second day provided an opportunity, for those interested in developing research proposals on the five key themes, to meet in work groups and develop their ideas. The intention was to develop trans-national proposals for each theme, for submission to relevant funding programmes. Each theme had a co-ordinator, who worked with interested parties prior to and during the conference.

Contributors:

140 people attended this conference. This number was limited only by the size of venue and many more were on the reserve list. The delegates included 22 people from 5 Nordic countries: Norway, Finland, Sweden, Denmark and Iceland. These included academics, public officials, NGO and community representatives. The Scottish delegates represented a very broad range of rural interests, including academics, politicians, public officials, NGO officials, community activists and independent consultants and researchers.

The conference speakers, chairs and facilitators were drawn from across the range of delegates listed above. As the focus of the conference was on rural research, the plenary speakers comprised research and policy professionals in Scotland and the Nordic Countries:

- Staffan Bond delivered the opening address, setting out the northern perspective on rural development. Staffan is Head of International Affairs for *Hela Sverige ska Lev* the Popular Movements Council of Sweden, a nation-wide network of over 4000 rural communities, which aims to support effective links between local communities and policy makers. Staffan has been engaged in rural development and regional policies for many years, working for both the government and NGO's – locally and nationally. He has worked for the Popular Movements Council, for 10 years, mostly from his home island in the heart of rural Sweden. In recent years he has also been involved in the development of rural movements in Eastern Europe, based on the Nordic experiences.
- Prof. Mark Shucksmith presented key themes in rural development found in recent research comparing Scotland, Norway, Sweden and Finland. Mark is Professor of Land Economy at the University of Aberdeen and Co-Director of the Arkleton Centre for Rural Development Research. His main research interests include rural development, social exclusion in rural areas, agricultural change, and rural policy. He provides advice to governments and agencies in several countries, and has led research for the EU and UK and Scottish Government. He is expert adviser to the Rural Development Committee of the Scottish Parliament.
- Ulla Herlitz addressed the question of local democracy in rural areas. Ulla works as a rural researcher for the University of Gothenburg, Sweden. For many years she has carried out research for the Swedish Popular Movements Council, with a focus on Local Democracy. Her current research focus is on the Rural Economy.
- Kristian Aasbrenn spoke about service provision in sparsely populated areas of Norway. Kristian is Assistant professor in the Institute of Social Sciences in Hedmark College, Norway. He was educated in social and economic geography in the University of Oslo. His research interests include: demography, economic geography, rural geography, services and information in a regional context.

- Jukka Oksa spoke on the Finnish experiences of the local information society. Jukka works with the Karelian Institute of the University of Joensuu, Finland. He has 25 years experience as a researcher at the Institute, where he is also affiliated to the Department of Sociology as a docent of rural sociology. He has published on development problems in peripheral areas, especially in Finnish and Russian Karelia. His research interests include social change in remote rural areas, local and rural development policies and social impacts of information technology.
- Stuart Black looked at developing rural economies. Stuart is Director of the Strengthening Communities Group of Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE), Scotland. He is a graduate of Edinburgh and Glasgow Universities and has held his current post since January 2001. Previously he was Head of Economics at HIE, and before then Lecturer in the Dept of Land Economy at Aberdeen University from 1990-96. As Director, Stuart has overall management responsibility for a remit which includes community land, community regeneration and capacity building, arts and culture, Gaelic, the environment and transport.
- Raymond Young chaired the final discussion and presented his thoughts for future directions in rural research. Raymond is an Honorary Senior Research Fellow at the Department of Urban Studies at the University of Glasgow. He is a member of the UK Sustainable Development Commission, and the Scottish Welfare to Work Task Force with particular interest in rural issues. Formerly he was the Director North, Scottish Homes with responsibility for the development of the agency's rural policy, and now runs part time consultancy with clients in Scotland and Denmark. He is also chair of the Rural Housing Service.

The workshop speakers were, by contrast, drawn mostly from practitioners working at the local level. The aim being to reflect the realities of undertaking rural development on the ground, as a means of informing the research agendas. The workshop presenters were:

- Norma Graham, Fife Local Rural Partnership
- Frank Rennie, UHI Millenium Institute
- David Bryan, The Sutherland Partnership
- Margaret Davidson, Abriachan Community Woodlands
- Philip Jones, Dumfries & Galloway Council

The report

This report is structured around the format of the conference itself and around the five conference themes. Commencing with the initial plenary talks, it sets the background to rural research issues across the Nordic-Scottish area, the first section provides a brief summary of each presentation and of the resulting discussions. The workshops are reported in brief, with a further appendix documenting the notes taken during the workshops. The outputs of the day 2 research groups could be said to be the main output from the conference. These provide a synopsis of initial research proposals for the five conference themes.

Conclusions

The conference aimed to share good practice in rural development and to strengthen rural research networks across the Nordic-Scottish area. It brought together those involved in rural research, policy and practice, provided a forum to enable co-operation and exchange of ideas on rural development, and created an opportunity to develop proposals for future Scottish-Nordic research projects. The conference achieved these aims, and it is hoped that those who attended have been stimulated to maintain the links and to take forward some of the research ideas developed.

NORDIC-SCOTTISH CONFERENCE

Rural Development – Learning Across The North

DAY 1

Session 1: Northern Perspectives

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Councillor William J. Ross, The Highland Council. Chairman, Sustainable Development Select Committee

A NORTHERN PERSPECTIVE – OPENING ADDRESS

Staffan Bond, Popular Movements Council for Rural Development in Sweden.

The speaker described his work in rural development in Sweden over 20 years, including working for 10 years for the Popular Movements Council – '*Hela Sverige ska leva*' (All Sweden shall live), the umbrella organisation for over 4000 Village Action Groups and more than 50 NGO's. This structured, village movement was originally inspired by Finland. Nordic networks of rural movements have been developed more recently, and such movements are now being established in Eastern Europe, with support from the Nordic countries. Although rural population figures are declining in the Nordic countries, many villages have had more positive development than municipal centres. Research is needed on local structures for action in rural areas and supporting scientific structures must develop, such as the Rural Transfer Network.

Comments were given on each of the conference themes:

1. Local Governance and community empowerment

Local capacity to influence change and meet new challenges presented by globalisation is needed. In Sweden, local people are opting to organise their own villages, rather than waiting for external organisations to do it. This action has grown from the efforts of individual communities and 'fiery spirits' into local democratic structures and an organised national movement with respect from most political parties, government and municipalities. Participatory democracy and responsibility are important, and the Village Movement in Sweden is an example of how respect can be gained. He advised that politicians should be 'reverse crocodiles', with big ears and small mouths. Policy in the rural North should support a honeycomb structure: a thin, light, flexible and strong structure, in order to produce local empowerment. Rural scientists have an important mission in supporting local empowerment, adjusting new methods and creating the local sustainable, and flexible, structures.

2. Innovation in rural services

Basic services are critically important. Many service facilities are now closing down in rural areas due to population decline and market rationalisation. Neither the old centralised, sectoral, top-down provision of services, nor the one-sided market orientation guarantees good services at the local level. Local people should take the lead in combining different resources, sectors and services and in using new technology. Service providers, like the postal services, must fully join in this process, however the increasingly privatised nature of such services may act as a barrier to this.

3. Communications and involvement

Communication is crucial in local development. Gossip is said to differentiate humans from other primates and make us reach still higher levels of development. Communication and co-operation is important within the community to involve people. Fragmented or spilt rural communities have no chance – unity gives power! Communication between communities is also important. Forming horizontal networks is an efficient way of exchanging experiences and gaining strength. Using information technology (IT) this can be done in a cheap and efficient way. In some sparsely populated regions in the north of Sweden almost every villager is out digging ditches for the optic fibre cable. Finally, vertical communication, to integrate active local communities and institutions, is important in forming partnerships where local people have real influence.

4. The rural economy

IT has potential for rural areas in diminishing the distance to markets and enabling good links. However, IT also simplifies dominance and control, and so far most IT jobs have been in the cities. To date, IT has not proved to be as much help as it was originally hoped. Rural areas cannot only rely on natural resources, they must also diversify their economies, and rural economies are increasingly moving away from dependence on primary production. The sustainable use of natural resources is important and motivates powerful rural policies with investments in rural regions. Farmers still have an important role including tourism and stewardship of the land, but in some areas they are a dying breed. Rural researchers should act as guides to the ecological sustainable society politicians talk so much about, including the balance between urban and rural living.

5. Wider use of the countryside

Concentration gives space for small scale businesses, again adding value to the rural economy. Consumer preferences change, there is a growing concern for safe and high quality food, environment, cultural and historical heritage and landscape. This brings new possibilities for rural areas.

Overall, the importance of networks for rural development was stressed, not only nationally, but internationally. Sweden has played a part in Nordic networks that are contributing to village movements in other European countries, mainly pre-accession countries. The possibility of a European-wide rural network (All Europe shall live) is being discussed, with the North taking the lead in rural empowerment that is needed all over Europe.

KEY THEMES IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Prof. Mark Shucksmith, Arkleton Centre for Rural Development Research, University of Aberdeen

The main forces for change in European rural development are markets, civil society and the state.

1. Markets

Current development trends are characterised by globalisation of production and moves towards flexible specialisation. In manufacturing and other production, there is a global division of labour between complex tasks, where wages are high, and simpler tasks, where work is poorly paid and casual or flexible. The question for rural areas is which of these types of area will you be – secure or peripheral? Global capital will exploit the resources of your area unless local capital can underpin them. This is not just an either / or question however, as rural areas need both. Entrepreneurial skill is also a critical factor in maintaining competitive rural communities, as is co-operation and organisation. Most European rural areas have growing economies, but with low unionisation. The sense of identity, location, natural and cultural heritage will determine prosperity.

2. Civil Society

Country life attracts people from the cities, resulting in changes in population and demography. There may be a trend to supplant farmers and land owners with a consumption-based elite who are socially selective. There are also age-related aspects as the young leave and older people move in. The sociologist Ulrich Beck describes individualisation in a risk society, whereby we are dependant less on the traditional institutions of family and church, and more on the market and welfare state. These have different kinds of values and result in different relationships between people and society. Feelings of insecurity and being out of control may arise from this. Changes in work and family life mean different forms of interaction with flexible labour. But social networks are still important and social capital means that gossip still does matter. Nordic examples show the importance of social movements, although there may be differences in efficiency.

3. State

The role of the local state has altered in rural areas. Many services of local governments have been centralised, resulting in a need for more strategic planning by them. The welfare model divided policy into sectors of agriculture, fishing and public services, for example. These were directed at the national level and co-ordinated locally. These roles have over the last 20 years been diminished by fragmentation. National welfare policies have also changed, as new forms of welfare provision have made welfare conditional on engagement with labour market policies. Changes in agriculture and rural development policy have led to a decline in price support and a shift to direct payments, conditional on environmental and other standards. A new context thus exists for rural development. Increasing centralisation creates the need for more individual responsibility as the local institutions decline.

4. Citizenship and participation

How can people have a say and exert some control over their own lives? Endogenous development, empowerment and the challenge of social inclusion are central to this debate. Changes in local governance have led to a loss of accountability, with policies formed to meet a top-down agenda and a tendency towards tokenism. The trend towards the partnership model of governance has led to partnership-poor areas and less accountability. However there are also pro-active measures to build cultural and social capital, and the use of community agents helps to address local inclusion.

5. Conceptualising Social Exclusion and Inclusion

‘Exclusion is an idea that asks the right kind of questions.’ It is a dynamic, multi-dimensional process that happens to individuals, where ‘history’ intersects with ‘biography’. It asks the question

of what are the processes by which individuals or groups gain resources, and so are integrated in or excluded from participation in our society? It also asks – how do people become excluded? There are 4 different kinds of logic for gaining resources (economic, social, cultural and symbolic), in order to become either integrated or excluded from participation in society:

- Market processes
 - Bureaucratic processes (state)
 - Associative processes (voluntary)
 - Reciprocal processes (family & friends – e.g. getting a piece of land, or help to build a house)
- If you have agility in all of these, you can be included, if not you may be excluded.

4. Northern Dimension

What is the same and what is different across the North?

Markets present similar challenges in terms of the globalisation of production, also fiscal pressures and the importance of the EU. The role of the state has altered in rural areas, but it has altered in different ways in different countries. A major difference lies in the structures for rural development. Norway has very small municipalities. Scotland has the largest municipality in Europe. Sweden has local representatives and national organisations meeting in town halls. In terms of civil society, there appears to be a higher level of trust and social economy in the Nordic countries. There is a strong voluntary movement in Sweden. However, common to all areas are the trends of migration, loss of young people and declining services. Regional development patterns vary, with differing emphasis on the use of partnerships as opposed to village or local level structures. The communications infrastructure is also quite varied, with high levels of public transport in Norway, but very poor provision in Scotland.

5. Young people

The role of young people in rural development deserves special mention. There has been a perception that ‘getting on’ means ‘getting out’. Is this inevitable? Support to stay must be provided alongside support to leave. The pathways are rarely linear or planned, requiring a flexibility in policies and delivery mechanisms. This includes more flexibility in educational systems, continuing animation and work with those who are marginalised and effective systems of guidance.

6. Learning Across the North

Knowledge and communication between rural regions is necessary and increasingly important within an EU context. It is important to contextualise experience in order to better understand transferability - what made it work in one area and not in another? Identifying the good practice experience and successes is useful, as was attempted through the ‘Rural Transfer Network’ The idea of the ‘Learning Region’ brings together rural challenges and needs with experiences elsewhere.

The ‘Rural Transfer Network’ identified 5 key questions, and produced national dossiers on each.

These are available from: www.abdn.ac.uk/arkleton/npp

- How can rural communities compete effectively in the global economy?
- How can people come together to promote rural development?
- How can programmes and policies be integrated at local level?
- How can rural communities use IT for their own development?
- How can rural communities learn from each other?

7. Key Themes

Our work has identified 5 key themes

- How ‘top down’ and ‘bottom up’ approaches meet.
- Models of how government and others can support and empower local groups and individuals.
- Processes of animation, capacity building and empowerment.
- How communities meet challenges that are both common and particular
- Processes for collective learning, rather than transfer of knowledge.

LOCAL GOVERNANCE AND COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT – THE SWEDISH VILLAGE ACTION MOVEMENT

Ulla Herlitz, Gothenburg University, Sweden

The Swedish Village Action Movement and Popular Movements Council – ‘*Hela Sverige ska leva*’ (referred to in the presentation by Staffan Bond) has been a success story, which during the last 20 years has developed into a wide-ranging organisation. However, for the participants, there is still a long way to go to fulfil their vision for a future sustainable rural society. Their vision includes an extensive program for sustainable local democracy with real citizen influence in policy making and implementation.

1. History and structure

The Village Action Movement comprises more than 4000 local village groups, across all of rural Sweden, with 80,000 people active in them. The movement involves participants at all levels from the local and regional to national and international. The Swedish movement was inspired by the Finnish Village Action Movement, in the 1970s. It began as a spontaneous reaction in local communities to the post-war de-population of rural areas, centralisation and to the loss of local democratic powers. Local people took matters into their own hands, producing a pragmatic approach to the development of communities. This followed the call of the EU for rural development in the late 1980s. This was against a backdrop of changing rural policy approaches, the development of regional policy for the north, a special focus on sparsely populated areas and enterprise and infrastructure development.

A ‘Rural Parliament’ was set up in 1989, which meets every two years. This is in effect a large conference, which brings together the Village Action Groups, with representatives from government and other institutions, to discuss rural policy needs. These meetings are attended by 1000-2000 delegates.

The Popular Movements Council, composed of 50% Village Action Group representatives and 50% NGOs, supports the local groups and helps to provide a national voice for them. It has its head office in Stockholm and receives 1 million ECU p.a. funding from the government. The movement has gained a strong position and reputation in relation to government, and has also had significant influence in other countries.

The Village Action Groups form the foundation for the movement. The groups take collective responsibility for the development of their community. Most work, on a volunteer basis, on specific issues identified by the community (school, shop, jobs, environmental and cultural projects etc.). External actors, including public bodies, may also be involved, but do not ‘direct’ the work. The Village Action Groups are legal entities, having the ability to own assets, take loans, employ staff and deal with public and legal bodies. They are based on the democratic principles of one member – one vote. They provide a significant contribution to the social economy of rural Sweden, contributing to culture, services, jobs and housing. These new forms of local democracy may also produce new forms of local identity and social co-operation.

2. Success factors

There are three key factors which have determined the success of the movement: *local mobilisation*, *external stimulation* and *public backing*. The movement also responded to the ‘carrot’ of support, both economical and intellectual, offered by the authorities, and to the ‘whip’ of democratic deficit, which the same authorities had caused. This year Sweden celebrates 80 years with the right for all to vote. But 80 years ago there were 6 Million inhabitants in 2490

municipalities, with locally elected councillors and administrators. Now there are 9 million inhabitants in only 289 municipalities. The democratic deficit is a reality.

The movement has passed several challenges: firstly *mobilisation*, followed by *organisation* and now *integration* is the big issue. The movement is also faced by the challenge of how to influence local and national government with their knowledge.

3. The local democracy movement

The Rural Transfer Network findings highlighted the importance of local democracy in rural development. The Nordic countries have a tradition of local level democracy, which has persisted more in some areas (eg. Norway & Finland) than in others (eg. Sweden). Through the work of the Village Action Movement and similar movements in the other Nordic countries, a new Nordic model for the development of local democracy may be emerging.

The overall trend in Sweden is still for fewer citizens making decisions for more people, as the size of municipalities increases. This may produce a democratic deficit. A new form of democracy may be needed, based on a place ideology rather than a political party ideology. 'Place' is now the main focus. Village Action Movements attempt to reconnect local identity with power.

To summarise my findings:

“The ones that now are in formal power of the local community do not have their identity there, and the ones that have their identity in the community do not have the power. The Swedish village action movement is a movement that tends to reclaim the connections between identity and power that we had a long time ago in our small communities; which were territories with historical roots back to parishes established during the Middle Ages.

Many new questions will arise when seeking good models for local level democracy; what about efficiency, effectiveness, accountability and equity? The Swedish way as pointed out by the Popular Movements Council is a sustainable local level democracy with local boards elected and run by the local people. The Swedish grassroots are fed up with short term projects, temporary partnerships and blurred power structures.”

For further information on the Swedish Village Action Movement see: www.bygde.net

NB. Possible to include an organisational diagram of the Swedish movement.

QUESTIONS FOR STAFFAN BOND, MARK SHUCKSMITH AND ULLA HERLITZ

1. What is the participation of the indigenous people of Sweden in Village Action Movement? Are there connections with the Saami?

Staffan Bond – Saami are members of the Popular Movements Council, and the connections are improving. The Chernobyl disaster had a big impact on the Saami society and meant that local mobilization was not in focus for many years, i.e. the PMC:s most important issue in late 80's and early 90's. There are mostly good grass roots relationships and co-operation, but also some conflicts about land use.

2. Is it feasible for global and local markets to be mixed in rural development?

Mark Shucksmith – actually referred to global and local capital, not markets. Examples of the importance of global capital could be the loss of textiles jobs in the Borders, and the effect of use of non-local capital could also be seen in the Highlands. The importance of local entrepreneurs could also be emphasised.

3. How does ICT work in networks of social exclusion?

Mark Shucksmith – ICT would cut across the characterisation he used. Voluntary, networks, business, old / young people could teach each other.

4. What has been the impact of telecottages in Sweden?

Staffan Bond – Most importantly they showed the possibilities to use IT in remote and sparsely populated areas. There are not many left now that call themselves telecottages – IT-centers or IT-café's are more common. Many developed into private businesses and had a hard time during the economic recession in Sweden in the beginning of the 90's. They should have had better long-term support, eg. for measures for unemployed people.

SERVICE PROVISION IN SPARSELY POPULATED RURAL AREAS

Kristian Aasbrenn, Hedmark College, Norway

The speaker revisits a 1982 paper on this topic in relation to Norway. In 1982 there was concern about rural depopulation and the closing of local service enterprises, but hope existed of preventing this and therefore avoiding a welfare crisis.

1. Today's challenges

Today, there is still a low and falling population. The tyranny of small-scale production for small local markets, with few service funders and providers, still exists. The tyranny of distance also still affects development. The prevalent trends in settlement patterns and demography since 1982 have been towards depopulation and an increasing proportion of elderly people. There is also a centralisation of shops, jobs, transport and the closure of post offices. Customers need to travel further. 2002 has seen a new wave of centralisation amongst public services. There has, however, been no general crisis. Few people express great dissatisfaction, although they dislike travelling and planning processes and miss the variety and quality of services. Things are not as problematic as the theory suggests though, this is because of:

- Integration: Providers are chained to more than one system, and customers are integrated into wider systems. There has been a shift from a 'community' of common destiny to a 'region' of common destiny.
- Innovation: There is now an ambiguous, decentralised welfare state. Local actors are developing coping strategies: providers, for moving small-scale services and reaching customers; customers, coping culture includes modesty, flexibility, informal networks and increased mobility (car ownership). The internet also contributes.

2. Meeting the challenges

Models that have been developed to cope with decreasing demand include:

- Combining functions
- Combining jobs
- Provision of services on a semi-permanent basis
- Automation and ICT self-service
- Optimising demand
- Subsidising marginal providers

Models to cope with increasing distances include:

- Reducing the friction of distance by improve transport services
- Ambulatory service improvements
- Go-betweens – including post orders and internet

3. Challenges to come

Broadening the scope, the question is why should we worry in 2002? What are the future challenges? Firstly, there is a social disintegration and cultural change taking place. New generations have new attitudes and old solutions will not necessarily work. Secondly, modern, global capitalism is a major force for change requiring new public management systems and welfare state transitions. Finally, technological innovation is moving apace, and will present both new challenges and new solutions.

Now, even increasing population doesn't necessarily save services. Having local service providers doesn't guarantee that customers will find the service acceptable. There are economic and cultural barriers. However, alternative models for running service enterprises and for distribution of services can be further developed. The jobs situation seems less optimistic however.

COMMUNICATIONS AND INVOLVEMENT – THE LOCAL INFORMATION SOCIETY

Jukka Oksa, University of Joensuu, Finland

1. Factors of social exclusion

The historical layers of rural development in Finland can be traced. These include the development of forest workers, small farms, manufacturing and services, along with the influence of settlement policies, the mechanisation of production, planning, the EU and information technology. Each of these stages had their own form of social exclusion. These included exclusion from land and exclusion from welfare reforms and income distribution. In today's Europe the key to being involved in development is the connection to the networks of consumption, production and learning. In addition, innovations and their diffusion are taking place through networks. If you are not connected into the networks, you are in danger of being excluded, even if you live in a major metropolitan area.

The key question of local development is how to mobilise the limited local resources in such a way that they connect that locality to a growing wave of general development, including learning, consumption, production, innovation – and to those who are running things. This paper discusses a new model of involving communities of peripheral rural areas to networks in Finland.

2. Learning districts

The concept of so called "learning districts" is relying on social innovations, new forms of co-operation, and on mobilising unused human and social capital in a peripheral area. It is deviating from the main stream of information society policies and projects that seem to emphasise technological innovations, expert knowledge and such urban features as plurality of cultures and critical mass.

3. Community networks

North Karelia has long been aware of the importance of the information society. The first 2 telecottages in Finland were formed here in 1986. It is also one of the main priorities in the regional development plan. The first of the learning district initiatives was the Learning Upper Karelia project, implemented in a remote rural area of about 20,000 people. In two years the Learning Upper Karelia project was able to create a local community network where about 25 percent of the population were registered as users. This is a local 'intranet' network for enabling local people to communicate with each other, rather than an external 'internet' network. The structure of 'Community Net' includes networks for citizens, schools, enterprises, municipal and other intranets. In Spring 2001 there were 9,000 registered users. After that the network was enlarged into three neighbouring municipalities. Last year the Finnish National Fund for Research and Development SITRA started the OSKU programme of Learning Districts, where the same concept is being experimented in eight other localities in rural and in urban areas.

4. The lessons

Evaluation studies have been carried out on the original project and its enlargement. These showed the critical success factors included:

- training for local lay trainers in the basic skills for all age groups, and support to schools.
- open access through kiosks in shops, banks, post offices, libraries and club rooms. There are problems of placing them in remote villages, however.
- adequate external support of for the process
- innovative and committed implementation
- high quality of content to keep people participating.

The weekly number of users of the network has shown a steady increase. New possibilities for interaction have been created, and with them social capital. However, specific social objectives are needed as part of longer term objectives for rural development.

The Model of Upper Karelia is an example of policy invention that can successfully involve the local community with information society development. It can do this in various ways:

- It creates new possibilities for interaction inside the area.
- Locally generated interactions of rural and urban people are initiated.
- Experience of being in the periphery is turned into proactive activity.
- Local knowledge is translated into network content, used by the locals.
- Excluded groups are helped to connect to regional, national and international partners and to knowledge resources.

The work also provides some more general lessons about information technology related development projects:

- Learning improves self-esteem and image.
- Technology projects need social objectives.
- Information Society projects are more about local social learning than about transferring newest technology.
- One project is nothing if it is not part of a process maintained by a committed coalition of actors.

RURAL ECONOMY – OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE RURAL ECONOMY IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Stuart Black, Highlands & Islands Enterprise

The Highlands and Islands of Scotland constitutes 51% of the land area of Scotland. Following a long period of decline and population loss, the region has seen a 20% population growth in recent years. Problems still remain in certain areas, especially in the Hebrides, and certain parts of the mainland.

1. Key drivers

Key drivers in the region at the moment include:

- Globalisation
- The impact of ICT
- The knowledge-based economy
- Quality of life
- Demographic change
- Political change – a drive to counter the power of the centre.
- Environmental awareness – both quality and treatment.

2. Trends

Between 1998 and 2000 there has been a growth in employment in hotels, distribution, banks and finance, public administration, and other services. Stronger rural than urban growth has taken place in these areas. By contrast, agriculture, fishing, forestry and manufacturing have all declined, although the drop in manufacturing is less than in urban areas. Teleservices now provides 3000 full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs. There are 12 E-business companies in the Highlands and Islands, providing 200 FTE jobs and £8m. to the economy. Higher and further education is expected to be a growth sector with the University of the Highlands and Islands Millennium Institute developing. The Social Economy is particularly important in the region, providing 10,000 FTE jobs and contributing £370m.. There has been an increase of 30% in this sector in five years, much of it accounted for by the changes in provision of public services. Niche manufacturing and Research & Development are other important areas in the Highlands and Islands.

3. Future opportunities

Future opportunities for economic expansion exist in marine biotechnology, renewable energy, medical sciences, the creative industries, aquaculture, niche tourism (especially genealogical tourism) and back office functions.

4. Conclusion:

Our conclusion is that today, connectivity is key – both ICT and physical. In the knowledge economy we should be concerned with ‘value added’, not just with ‘cost’. There is evidence of regional divergence that needs to be addressed. Finally, community confidence has a key role in opening opportunity and unleashing creativity.

QUESTIONS TO KRISTIAN AASBRENN, JUKKA OKSA AND STUART BLACK

1. Why is there little money for the continuation of telecottages? Funding is usually only for 'new' things.

Jukka Oksa – there should be continuation not just as part of a market base, but as a new kind of welfare state.

Stuart Black – cited the example of Unst telecottage, a success that has now diverged into training courses. There is a continuing challenge, however.

William Ross (chair) – there are finite budgets also.

2. Centralisation can be a dual phenomenon – of place and of function. These should not be confused.

3. Why was the Enterprise Net in the Finnish Community Net not so successful?

Jukka Oksa – Small businesses perhaps did not see the need and did not have the time to develop leadership. They used the internet for outward communication. Micro enterprises (1 or 2 persons) use it a little.

4. Trends in Western democracy are that less and less people are voting, but more people involve themselves in voluntary activity. However, this often doesn't affect national policy, so how can we get around this?

Stuart Black – The media tend to be negative. The social economy is very relevant. People are switched off by politics, but they may start voting as volunteering continues to be popular.

SESSIONS 2 & 3: CONFERENCE WORKSHOPS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

GROUP 1 – LOCAL GOVERNANCE AND COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT

Chair: Vanessa Halhead, Arkleton Centre for Rural Development Research, University of Aberdeen

Presenter: Norma Graham, Fife Rural Partnership

Norma Graham spoke from the perspective of a practitioner in a rural partnership. She defined local governance and community empowerment as being about giving rural communities the skills, knowledge and confidence to influence, manage, deliver and improve services. This includes better targeted, services and financial planning for their area, therefore allowing rural communities to take greater control. “Knowledge is power and if you control your resources you can control your own world”. Partnerships can be a useful way of achieving this provided that they built on solid foundations. Development itself needs to be organic and achieve both capacity and sustainability.

Norma emphasised the importance of asking: who is being empowered? what are you empowering people to do? who is doing the empowering? She noted the importance of good practice in partnership working, including partners being committed to a shared agenda, having a clear understanding of their role and the ability to effect change in their own organisations, and all partners having equal value despite their financial resources. Strong foundations of good relationships built on trust and transparency, good communications with the community, long-term timescales, focus on capacity building rather than outputs and flexibility were found to be essential.

Practical ways of tackling democratisation included:

- restoring the balance between rights and responsibilities;
- understanding the relevance of any actions and valuing contributions made by rural communities;
- valuing the cultural difference in rural communities and viewing them positively.
- working intensively at neighbourhood level, as opposed to working from a distance, to establish trust, build relationships and mutual respect and ensure those people who are marginalised and isolated have a voice and their needs are recognised.

The group identified the following key lessons and research questions from their discussions:

1. Lessons

1.1. Vertical processes: There is a need to look at the relationship between the top down and bottom up, both are needed to buy into change at government and grass roots levels. The commitment from the ‘top’ to capacity building and sustainability at the ‘bottom’ is critical. The pace of change is important – short-termism and ‘scattergun’ approaches are not successful. The ‘process’ rather than the ‘product’ of an initiative is worth emphasising. Negotiated governance and shared power are needed, using elected and other kinds of representation. There should be a move from consultation to participation, but it should be remembered that this may be perceived as a threat by elected representatives.

1.2. Horizontal processes: This included the relationship between people representing the community at grass roots level and between those charged with delivery mechanisms and subjects. It is important to have balance between ‘local elites’ and communities. Communities need to have the institutional capacity for delivery as well as representation.

1.3. Empowerment: There is a need to support new entrants to the system. A 'place-based' focus is helpful to local participation. There is no one blueprint, recognise diversity – local solutions for local needs. Understand the relationship between local and national democracy.

2. Research questions (relating to each lesson)

2.1. Carry out evaluation, looking back over time, in the form of historical research. Include a series of initiatives rather than just one.

2.2. Search out mechanisms which bring together input and output, representation and delivery, and relate these to how local structures can be better organised.

2.3. Look at what motivates and de-motivates participation. Identify how local processes work. International comparison could be useful. Consider how to change information to communication, and allow 'hearing' from the system. Identify theoretical and practical models of what is transferable and what is not.

GROUP 2 – COMMUNICATIONS AND INVOLVEMENT

Chair and Presenter: Frank Rennie, University of the Highlands and Islands Millenium Institute

1. Lessons

1.1. 'Community and involvement' - ICT was considered an end in itself, but is now seen as a tool to support the community, to be employed at a community-wide level.

1.2. Each community is unique and has certain leaderships and meeting places. The importance of these meeting places within the community needs recognition. Dialogue should be facilitated, in order to generate accidental and chance conversations. There cannot be a blueprint or masterplan.

1.3. A strategy or overview is needed for community 'animation'. There is a lack of strategic overview for animation of communications, and no vision for national development, far less international. What has happened has just been the result of serendipity.

2. Research questions

'Bottom-up' research was advocated, including:

2.1. What do we want in communities? What do we want communities to be, look like, aspire to? How does technology help us to get there? Include not only ICT, but desktop publishing, photocopying, other labour saving devices. Consider the 'social-shaping' of technology.

2.2. Collective learning – how we learn from each other, according to the 'common will', or 'sprit' of the community? Many places of social learning are undervalued by outsiders. This perspective is opposed to problem setting by outsiders.

2.3. What are the (cross-sectoral) tools required to help animation? Look at the ways in which we use techniques or pilot projects in the contexts of multi-sectoral and 'place' centred rural development, including 'virtual communities'. These should be bottom up, and not driven by inflexible formulas.

GROUP 3 – INNOVATION IN RURAL SERVICES

Chair: Polly Chapman, The Highland Council

Presenter: David Bryan, The Sutherland Partnership

This group was introduced by a presentation from the Sutherland Partnership, looking at transport, employment, social inclusion and partnership working. The Partnership works by bringing together the public, private and voluntary sector, providing funding advice and guidance for community initiatives, initiating and contributing to promotional initiatives, and acting as a vehicle for regional and national initiatives. Success has been achieved by adopting innovative and non-standard solutions, but the major hindrances and future threats include the short-term nature of core funding, uncertainty over core funding, and the lack of budget with which to make a bigger impact.

The group discussed the importance of targeting resources at needs identified by local communities. The importance of communities taking more responsibility was emphasised, including more direct involvement and control of service development and targeting. Flexibility, sustainability and local control of funding were promoted, as was the importance of integrated solutions and partnership approaches. More flexible, mobile and client centred approaches were foreseen as the way forward. Research was needed to investigate the viability of these approaches, including trans-national comparisons.

1. Lessons

1.1. Community-led partnerships need to be flexible, creative and underpinned by adequate transport and ICT provision.

1.2. There needs to be a national recognition of the particular issues created by rurality – supporting communities to take responsibility for decisions in rural development.

1.3. Ensure funding is flexible, sustained, and focussed on community needs.

2. Research questions

2.1. Identify examples of communities directly influencing the spending of public agencies.

2.2. Identify examples of communities creating integrated development plans.

2.3. How can agencies include components of a vibrant, healthy, ‘well-being’ community into public policy? Carry out socio-economic comparisons and analysis of modes of service delivery, looking at the link between service delivery, economics and sustainability of rural communities.

GROUP 4 – WIDER USE OF THE COUNTRYSIDE

Chair: Elspeth Grant, Cairngorms Partnership

Presenter: Margaret Davidson, Abriachan Community Woodland

Margaret Davidson presented the work undertaken in the small rural community of Abriachan, in the Scottish Highlands, to utilise its natural resources for multiple benefit, through community action. This focussed on the development of a community woodland, including provision for recreation, amenity and small scale products. The group then considered the practical lessons for

integrating tourism with other parts of the economy, in order to spread the benefits. They identified the following lessons and research issues:

1. Lessons

- 1.1 Administrators are needed by communities, not animateurs.
- 1.2 Communities can take control.
- 1.3 Paperwork needs to be rationalised.
- 1.4 Encourage action and participation at all levels.

2. Research

- 2.1. What is the best practice for citizen participation locally and nationally?
- 2.2. Cross compliance: How do you measure the level of public good a project provides?
- 2.3. How do you measure the benefits of investing in communities?

GROUP 5 – THE RURAL ECONOMY

Presenter: Philip Jones, Chief Executive, Dumfries & Galloway Council

The group discussed a case study of how Dumfries & Galloway Council had managed the Foot & Mouth Disease outbreak in 2001. It was nationally recognised that the response to the outbreak had been managed well in Scotland and that Dumfries and Galloway Council had played a central role in the response. The Council was responsible for the region's Major Emergency Scheme, and the lessons learned from the Lockerbie Air Disaster and other emergency responses had been used to good effect. What was needed however was for the lessons learned to be applied to the day to day management of the Council's business. In Dumfries & Galloway it was noted that the geographic remits of many organisations are co-terminous, and that this aids communications and working relationships. During the Foot and Mouth outbreak they all looked after the same patch.

The group discussion highlighted the following themes:

Small business development and entrepreneurship:

This raised the issues of support to small business, the need for Broadband in rural areas, creating a 'level playing field' for small rural businesses and understanding the differential needs of rural areas in terms of training and support.

Diversification:

The need to integrate existing rural activities and support diversification in traditional agricultural industries was highlighted. This should be backed-up by support schemes which recognise the start-up needs of diversified operations and issues of succession in agriculture.

Competitiveness and differential performance:

The potential to strengthen competitiveness by improving the linkage between traditional and new production structures, in the context of new forms of production and consumption was

discussed. The role of networks and collective action needs to be understood, as does the causes effects of migration patterns in determining 'successful' places. A classification of business characteristics in 'leading' and 'lagging' areas would be useful.

The social economy:

The role of the social economy in rural areas, its potential and scope need to be better understood.

Rural tourism:

The sustainable use of natural assets as a competitive advantage, and the benefits from green and cultural tourism were raised, including the promotion of protected areas as assets and linkages to regional food and other produce. Equally, a better understanding of the factors linking these factors with tourism is needed.

Developing sustainable communities

Creating self-reliant communities and using local resources to add value and promote import substitution were explored. The role of rural transport in local economies needs to be better understood as does the role of small towns to act as 'growth poles' and networks to promoting economic success.

Relationship between heritage, environment, wildlife and development

The role of natural heritage in rural development needs to be better understood, as do the positive and negative impacts of development on biodiversity. An examination of practical solutions to sustainable management of resources, including renewable energy, waste and transport, is needed.

1. Lessons

1.1. Exploit and value local knowledge and stakeholders. There are narrow and wide communities. Transfer of this knowledge to realistic and integrated policies is then needed.

1.2. Empower communities to bring about development and identify infrastructure weaknesses. This includes recognising the issues related to service infrastructure, which is determined nationally.

1.3 Retain young people and remove the stigma of being left behind. Recognise, understand and utilise the value of high amenity in attracting business and people.

2. Research questions

2.1. How do we empower communities and generate the concept of social capital? We need to tap into knowledge that communities have at their disposal, for economic development and understand why some communities/ places are more successful.

2.2. What are the motors for economic development and a knowledge based economy? How do we place value on factors which currently have no economic figures attached to them? What are the success factors in multi-purpose rural businesses?

2.3. What should the future shape of institutions be, and how can agencies act in a joined-up way?

DISCUSSION OF WORKSHOP REPORTS

Chaired by Professor Robert Cormack, University of the Highlands & Islands Millenium Institute

It was noted that a lot had been said about how communities should take control. 'Community planning' was a fine phrase but the process was not being properly implemented yet. Community Planning has to be from the bottom up, and there is a tendency for this not to happen.

A tension between best practice and actual communities was noted, and a lack of understanding as to why best practices don't necessarily work, or can't be easily transferred.

Frank Rennie – Communities are engaging with new technology for learning. However, the business community either didn't fully engage with this new technology. Their idea of community was something that they could sell to. There needs to be a wider space for business to take part in communities, as a social or educational function.

Robert Cormack – UHI degrees were meant to have a vocational element, to fit with the business community.

Philip Jones – There was a limited understanding of the nature of the relationship between the farming community and the wider community before foot and mouth in Dumfries and Galloway. Over the period the inter-relationship became better understood, as did the extent to which economic impact on one sector impacted on another. This will greatly assist future planning in the region.

Businesses and communities have to work together. If they are separate, there is no sense of community.

Small businesses can co-operate. There cannot be a chartered accountant in every village, but a mobile accountant could work. There is a need for professional support to small village communities.

Entrepreneurship is not just a feature of the private sector. Schools need enterprise education, and can be involved in the social economy. Community animation is needed and the UHI/ Universities could play a bigger role.

Agenda 21 is important, including local purchasing and sources of local capital.

Work in Finland has documented good practice of business in rural areas.

Robert Cormack – Attention needs to be drawn to the uniqueness of communities. One size doesn't fit all. Plans drawn up in the Central Belt may not work in the Highlands & Islands. We need multifunctional people, who have multiple skills.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Raymond Young

Perceptions of rurality can be very important in these debates - remoteness, for instance, can be a subjective judgement. Social exclusion and poverty can occur in rural areas as well as in cities, and lack of services can make this worse, however this is often masked.

We need to look at what works and why, with the possibility for trans-national exchange of experience. Reinforcement and mutual support are worthwhile, as we have a lot to share despite the disparities between the global and the local. It is important not to copy models, but to share a learning process.

Wealth creation remains important. Sustainable means self-sufficient, so wealth is needed. Partnerships without money are talking shops. Real money should be devolved to them. Business is involved in this, through the New Deal and Welfare to Work. The young unemployed are of particular concern here. Business people often do not want to take part in Community Councils or other local groups, but should be allowed to contribute in their own ways.

We need more long-termism, rather than continuous innovation.

In relation to information technology, it was questioned as to why is Scotland is so far behind in the application of Broadband technology. This has serious implications for competitiveness, especially in rural areas.

However, if this conference had been held 20 years ago, we would have been talking about how to protect and preserve rural communities. They are not now disappearing, and while they may not be growing at the rate we would like, there is confidence, social inclusion and access to services, and entrepreneurs are confident. We do however need to recognise the diversity of rural communities. Multifunctional people used to be called crofters.

Future directions, therefore, should include best practice exchanges, learning and joint research. The Rural Transfer Network dossier packs are a commendable example of such exchange. We need to understand other philosophies. In research, international exchanges are good, but we also need to involve members of communities. 'Twinning' between Highland and Nordic communities would be very worthwhile.

Who does the research? Is it possible for community academics to be trained? Also, do we always have to research only the best practice? It is also possible to learn from failure. We should be wary of using too much jargon of community development.

NORDIC-SCOTTISH CONFERENCE

Rural Development – Learning Across The North

DAY 2

The second day provided an opportunity, for those interested in developing research proposals on the five key themes, to meet in work groups and develop their ideas. The intention was to develop trans-national proposals for each theme, for submission to relevant funding programmes. Each theme had a co-ordinator, who worked with interested parties prior to and during the conference. The research groups were free to develop the day as they wished, and to focus on those aspects considered most important by the group, whilst taking into account the recommendations of the previous day's workshops.

The research groups proved to be extremely productive, formulating a range of research agendas, developing relationships and the potential for future networking and academic exchange. It is hoped that the work done in these sessions will lead to future co-operative research.

GROUP 1 LOCAL GOVERNANCE AND COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT **Co-ordinated by Vanessa Halhead and Prof. Mark Shucksmith, University of Aberdeen**

The initial presentations by Prof. Mark Shucksmith and Vanessa Halhead identified key issues:

- Forms of organisation which enable local governance and community empowerment
- Cultural linkages to national differences
- Comparative outputs of different forms of governance
- Sustainability
- Legitimacy of new forms of governance
- Inclusiveness of governance mechanisms and processes
- Location of control over power and resource

This was a very large and international group. Following initial presentations on the background to the topic, and a discussion to identify the key themes, the group split into 3 to develop proposals.

1. Local structures and linkages
2. Young people and democracy
3. Transnational networking and collective learning

Theme 1: LOCAL STRUCTURES AND LINKAGES

This was a large and diverse group, consisting of researchers and practitioners from several countries. The group was united as to the importance of this topic in underpinning rural development. They identified the general aims for future research as:

- identifying the opportunities for local people to have influence over their own lives
- understanding the influences of cultural and historical frameworks over local democracy
- identifying the structures and processes utilised in each context
- investigating the linkages between formal and non-formal systems of governance
- identifying barriers caused by current systems of governance.

The group discussed the potential benefits from trans-national learning, the need to have a framework for describing and mapping local systems and structures of governance, and the importance of rooting this within the perspective of the local community as well as within a regional and national perspective. It was seen as important to move from description to analysis, to focus on what is sustainable and measurable, to bring out the differentiating issues within and between national contexts and to create common theoretical patterns to describe these contexts, including ways of identifying hard outputs.

Based on these aims, the group went on to develop the outline for a trans-national research project:

Project Title: Local Governance and Sustainable Development in Northern European Rural Regions

This proposal builds on the foundations established under the Nordic-Scottish Rural Transfer Network, This was formed in 1998 with the aim of providing a networking mechanism between academic institutions in the Nordic-Scottish region, to enable the documentation and transfer of knowledge on sustainable rural development policy and practice. By a process of comparative analysis, it aimed to deepen common understanding and to suggest alternative development approaches from shared experience.

The project will aim to broaden the Network to include all of the Nordic countries and to take the analysis of rural development approaches to a more detailed level. The focus for this project will be on one of the policy areas identified as most critical for the future wellbeing of rural communities in the region, namely that of local community empowerment and the mechanisms for supporting this. Not only is this a key area for the development of rural communities, it is also a fruitful area for study because of the very varied and deep traditions of local democracy represented in the participating countries. It also links to the EU requirements for subsidiarity.

Trans-national analysis will help to overcome the limitations of national context and vision and develop solidarity. It will enable the pooling and analysis of mechanisms and traditions, leading to a greater understanding of the opportunities and barriers existing in each of the member countries. It will also enable a collective understanding of the potential for trans-national learning and the future development of national and European policy.

A key feature of the research will be the active participation of the village movements and partner communities in each country. This will root the analysis at the level of 'place', it will help to investigate how strong 'place ideology' is and how it can be used to advantage. It will also allow local people to describe the situation in terms of what is useful to them. The local partners will provide access to previous research and experience and comparative case-studies covering a range of rural situations. They will also participate in trans-national analysis of the effectiveness of differing structures, processes and outputs. Participating communities will be asked to volunteer for this task to ensure their full commitment to the process.

The work will involve:

Identifying and describing the structures and mechanisms for local governance, operating in each country, including:

- The formal democratic structures of local government
- The non-formal structures of local governance at community, district and regional levels
- The structures and mechanisms operating at regional and national levels for enabling rural communities to engage with policy makers

Identifying and describing the processes for supporting rural community mobilisation, participation and institution building, including:

- Processes for mobilising local actors at community/ village level
- Processes for networking and learning between local actors
- Processes for consulting and involving local actors in policy formulation
- Processes by which local communities safeguard their cultural and social identity
- Processes for build-up of an entrepreneurial culture in the local community

Developing theoretical frameworks for enabling their comparative trans-national analysis against a range of variables, including:

- Local and national cultural traditions influencing models of development and governance
- Current forces influencing models of governance
- Levels of democratic representation and direct participation
- Levels of accountability and legitimacy
- Levels and channels of funding
- Levels of control over resources – economic, natural, social capital
- Relative economic and social outputs resulting from differing systems
- Levels of satisfaction within and between the participating communities

Undertaking comparative and participatory analysis of the participating communities, including:

- Producing context reports for each of the participating communities, identifying the structural and process components of local governance
- Applying the theoretical frameworks to the local case-studies and mapping the differential responses and outputs of the local systems
- Enabling transnational analysis and learning between the participating communities

Linkages

This work will build on a range of previous and current research projects, including some of those identified in the first phase of the Rural Transfer Network. It is also grounded on the analysis enabled through the dialogue between rural researchers and rural communities, during the first phase of the Rural Transfer Network. Other relevant research that will be linked through the team members includes:

- Through the University of Tromsø: the ‘Circumpolar Coping Processes Project’ within the UNESCO Management of Social Transformation Programme.
- Restructuring in Rural Marginal Regions: the role of social capital in rural development (RESTRIM) project, EU-FP5, 2001-04, co-ordinated by the Arkleton Centre, University of Aberdeen.
- “The Dynamics of Rural Areas” (DORA) project, EU FP4, 1999-2001, co-ordinated by the Arkleton Centre, University of Aberdeen.
- Through the Danish Centre for Rural Research and Development regarding research on industrial entrepreneurship and voluntary organizations.
- The NRC (Norwegian Research Council) programme for regional development, particularly, the research network for regional policy and planning, co-ordinated by Sogn and Fjordane University College and Volda University College.

Value added:

The proposal offers substantial added value:

- The network of research centres is able to draw on considerable existing expertise and connections in this field. The partnership will include academic partners in each participating country. It will also link with local partners in the village movements of each country. This will provide a unique synergy between the wealth of experience on the ground and the analytical capacity of the research community.
- The participating partners have international reputations and considerable experience in the subject area, which will ensure a high quality of results. The partners have also demonstrated their previous commitment to working together and managing transnational projects.
- The transnational sharing of knowledge enables the deepening of common understanding of shared problems, questioning of what is ‘taken for granted’, increasing of vision as to possible ways forward within national contexts and solidarity in expressing common needs and solutions to policy makers.
- Comparative analysis, placed in the context of regional, European and global change, enables the exchange to be informed by this changing context and its common impacts and differing responses within a similar bio-geographical region.
- Fostering of co-operation, exchange and understanding between rural development actors at local and national levels will build on the growing and productive relationships between the academic and rural communities across this northern, peripheral region.

Participating organisations:

The academic organisations which have indicated their interest are:

- The University of Aberdeen Arkleton Centre for Rural Development Research, Scotland
- The Danish Centre for Rural Research and Development
- The University of Helsinki Mikkelin Institute for Rural Research and Training, Finland
- University of Tromsø, Norway
- Sogn og Fjordane University College, Norway
- The Center for Local & Regional Development, Faeroe Islands
- University of Akureyri Research Institute, Iceland
- School of Economics and Commercial Law, Department of Human and Economic Geography, Gothenburg University, Sweden

In addition to these academic organisations, there was interest from a range of community organisations, present in the seminar, or who had indicated interest previously. It would be the intention to engage at least one local area, in each participating country, in the work.

Theme 2: YOUNG PEOPLE AND DEMOCRACY

This group identified the option of carrying out a survey of the 12-14 age group, in a rural school in 2 villages in each country. The aim of the survey would be to identify young people’s ‘dreams for the future’.

Theme 3: TRANSNATIONAL NETWORKING AND COLLECTIVE LEARNING

This group discussed a proposal from the University of Helsinki, relating to a project just commencing in Finland. This will identify a limited number of ‘control’ communities within different types of rural areas, exhibiting different characteristics. These communities will be fully researched and re-visited over time, to identify trends and patterns of development. It was proposed that similar work be undertaken in several countries, in order to facilitate comparative learning.

GROUP 2 - COMMUNICATIONS AND INVOLVEMENT
Co-ordinated by Dr. Frank Rennie, UHI Millenium Institute

No report is available from this group.

GROUP 3 – INNOVATIVE RURAL SERVICES

Co-ordinated by: Marion Lacey and Helen Betts-Brown, Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations

The group consisted of a cross-section of service-providers from the transport, social care and health fields in Scotland, and a visiting professor from Norway.

The introductory brainstorm session identified the following guidelines for development of research on rural service issues:

The need for:

- ‘shop-floor’ input, with research informing policies
- including good practice in terms of tackling cross-cutting issues
- ongoing feedback on needs related to local services, and use of tools for seeking community views
- building in peoples real experiences into the planning arena
- the Identification of minority needs such as health needs of refugees
- cost benefit analysis of community transport, in particular in relation to meeting rural health needs
- focus on devolving budgets and spending priorities
- focus on modes of delivery of sensitive services
- models of communities.

The member from Norway identified the need for research to consider the economic geography, social geography, and rural geography of:

- service management
- quality of services
- the service economy of providing systems.

The following themes were selected for future research and under each heading a research focus identified:

- mechanisms of Service Delivery
- how culture is reproduced by experiences of providers and consumers
- gathering People’s Views
- transport and Local Economies.

Under each theme key research questions were identified, as well as subsidiary issues. The focus for research would be on learning from practice including international experience, and action research involving monitoring of innovative rural service pilots.

Theme 1: MECHANISMS OF SERVICE DELIVERY

- a) **On what basis can and should decisions be made on what services are delivered where?**
Given changes in retail delivery (use of catalogues, Internet buying) are there lessons for service providers? Should the focus be on providing support to access services (example of Tesco delivering to central point from which can arrange delivery through community transport; or support with gaining IT skills).
- b) **Do drop-in centres work? Why do some not work?**
What does putting a centre in a community mean?
Does encouraging anonymity by providing a range of services in a drop-in centre work?
Does this bring about changes in attitudes e.g. on addiction.
Can we assess the implications of planning services around asking what service users want?
- c) **How do we maintain core services after cut-backs in ‘professional’ face-to-face input - health focus?**
What are the lessons from Finland?
In relation to health care what are the acceptable alternatives to video conferencing for medical consultations?
What are the implications for service users of minimum health care service being maintained by nurses and locum doctors?
- d) **How to move away from project mentality towards mainstreaming rural development services?**
Use of cost benefit analysis tools to identify a framework for assessing acceptable costs for delivery of services to rural communities.

Specific Research foci:

1. Innovations in service delivery linking Internet buying with post office delivery of services – learning from experience of Norway.
2. Benefits and barriers of multi-functional drop-in centres
3. Mechanisms for involving key service users in service delivery cost-benefit analysis.

Theme 2: HOW CULTURE IS REPRODUCED BY EXPERIENCES OF PROVIDERS AND CONSUMERS

- a) **Experience of short-termism culture of civil servants and politicians.**
The need to develop the constructive involvement of rural communities in service development and not just when consulting on cuts.
- b) **Learning from/ being educated about new forms of delivery.**
How to build in feedback on differences in definition of what make a ‘quality’ service – not necessarily one provider or one mode of provision – how develop definition of what is appropriate?
How provide for decentralisation (e.g. what elderly define as quality service) and mobilisation of distant provision (e.g. what young people may choose as ideal to their needs)?

Specific Research foci:

1. What international examples are there of impact of local structures on service provision in response to local needs, and what factors, e.g. area/ population/ co-terminosity of providers, impact on service design?
2. What is the Impact of culture (differences by age group, or by experiences of loss of identity affected by closure of local services) on responses by different sectors of the population?
3. Does consultation without action in response lead to apathy? And is there scope for reclaiming the concept of community budgeting to promote enthusiasm for designing services to meet differing needs?

Theme 3: GATHERING PEOPLE'S VIEWS

- a) **Assessment of examples of 'linking in for the long haul', of capturing views of users and development of sustainable networks.**

Research tools for capturing the views, aggregating the information and capturing trends.
Tools for measuring the impact of 'forthright messages' on service providers?

- b) **Application of ICT**

Use of ICT chat rooms – does this exclude?

What is the range of web sites for non-English speakers?

What is the experience in Finland of increased ownership by involvement in development of community networks.

- c) **Tools for assessment of Impact**

What tools can be used to assess the use of trusted local people – funding of 'animators' / development workers?

What tools are relevant to demonstrate what steps have led to what results (early hits), and longer term sustainable results. How do we go about documenting this?

Specific Research foci:

1. How develop ongoing user input – examples of good practice?
2. How ensure involvement in developing research projects through linking to key contact persons in established networks.

Theme 4: TRANSPORT AND LOCAL ECONOMIES

- a) **Impact of appropriate modes of delivery**

How to define appropriate?

How build into cost-assessments data on needless journeys required because of the centralisation of health services for the north of Scotland in Inverness?

- b) How do we cost the impact of legislation on additional costs to the provider?

- c) How so we assess social costs? – the knock on effect on other business retailers, and alternative savings by not for profit retailers, and the social benefits of community transport for communities.

Specific Research foci:

1. Patient transport and alternatives to current medical assessment model

2. Transferability of health research tools i.e. use of nominal groups to identify choice patterns re form of transport provided.

Overarching Theme: RESEARCH INTO DEFINING QUALITY OF SERVICES AND CRITERIA FOR SELECTION MODES OF DELIVERY

The Workshop identified the need to redefine the concept of quality services, based on the model developed in Norway:

‘Face to Face’ provision can mean:

- “ordinary” – customer travels to provider
- Mobile – provider travels to customer
- Mobile – provider travels to market place e.g. drop in centre

‘Go Between’ can mean

- personal e.g. through family
- electronic ICT

Virtual can include tele-conferencing

The choice depends on definition of QUALITY; market segmentation and target groups

Conclusion and recommendations for taking forward these research agendas

Principles

The workshop identified the importance of localising service-provider contacts in order for research networks to be meaningful, and in order to have hands on involvement of users and service providers/practitioners in the research process.

Recommendation

The members of the group recommended that contact Information for all members of the group be circulated by SCVO so as to enable ongoing e-mail / telephone contact to oversee future research in innovative rural services, and to support networking across the sector.

GROUP 4 - WIDER USES OF THE COUNTRYSIDE

Co-ordinated by: Rhys Evans, Arkleton Centre For Rural Development Research, University of Aberdeen

Workshop Participants:

Judith Belford, Angus College

Roddy McMin, Lewis Castle College, UHI

Eeva Uusitalo, Mikkeli Inst. University of Helsinki

Paul Tabbush, Social Research Unit, Forestry Commission

Marcus Sangster, Forestry Commission

Theme 1: UNEMPLOYED MEN AND ‘NATURE’: BENEFITS FROM NON-PURPOSIVE USES OF THE COUNTRYSIDE.

Research in Finland and Scotland indicates that unemployed men use countryside spaces (especially forests) to cope with the stresses and stigma of unemployment and social exclusion. This research proposes that they use the forest as a resource to cope with social exclusion and will examine the extent to which such ‘non-purposive’ uses of forests and other countryside environments contribute to excluded men’s abilities to cope with their situation.

This research asks interesting questions from a number of academic, as well as policy perspectives. Through its focus on men, It is an enquiry into ‘gendered’ uses of the countryside. At the same time, it is an enquiry into social exclusion and counters to it. Thirdly, it looks at forests from the geographical perspective of ‘marginal spaces’.

The research will look at countryside spaces which are *marginal* in the geographic sense – that is, spaces that are seldom used and in particular, empty of surveillance and the immediate hand of authority. The term ‘*marginal spaces*’ was developed by Rob Shields in “*Places on the Margin*” (1992) to describe spaces which exist at the margins of development, often on land which was previously used for profitable enterprise which now is unprofitable and thus abandoned. They are the result of what David Harvey (1989) calls the ‘creative destruction’ of the capitalist development process, where capital moves from previously profitable sites to source sites of opportunity. Both concepts were originally developed to describe urban situations, but given the transition of commercial forestry in Britain, they could equally apply to forest spaces which are unprofitable to harvest, and which thus are left commercially fallow and empty of daily human commercial activity.

These spaces, become available to colonisation by marginal groups, local sub-cultures and others who wish to use space for unconventional activities. In the case of unemployed men, they will use these countryside spaces at the times when they would otherwise be at work. Rather than seeing this use as ‘wasting time’ or as ‘laziness’, we wish to see if these people use the forest and empty natural landscapes as a resource to counter the stigma of unemployment.

Non-purposive uses of the forest – camping, walking, bird watching and even fishing – can be seen as a common good which these socially excluded men can use. The above activities – although not at all limited to men -- are stereotypically masculine actions and thus likely to help counter the challenges to their masculine identity that unemployment and other social stigma may represent. Thus the research will attempt to determine the extent to which the ‘natural’ spaces function to replace occupational identity elements with alternate sources of self-esteem and as a resource for gender identities.

As research into identity-resources, a schema for types of identity resources can be developed. Thus the research could look for evidence of occupational identity resources, spatial identity resources, environmental and cultural identity resources.

Theme 2: ENGINEERING MARGINAL SPACES.

Given existing research on the value of marginal spaces, particularly as important resources for the socially excluded, this research attempts to understand the relationship between the physical attributes of marginal spaces and their use in order to direct the production of such environments where such production may be deemed appropriate.

It may, for example, be appropriate to allow such uses of forest land which is out of production due to economical considerations or as alternate uses or new common goods from community forestry.

The designation and ‘building’ of such marginal spaces faces the challenge of balancing risk and acceptable challenge, as challenge and the response to it is often a key component in identity-building, as exemplified by the numerous Outward Bound type challenge programmes which have been developed. Organised challenge programmes represent a highly organised and top-down use of landscape resources. Non-formal users and those who are engaged in otherwise non-purposive uses represent a bottom-up use towards similar outcomes. This research questions whether, and how countryside spaces can be created and managed to support the latter.

Thus the research will attempt to identify features and physical attributes associated with:

- informal learning
- socialisation
- environmental knowledge.

It will seek to determine:

- which associated physical attributes might be ‘engineerable’
- which associated physical attributes are legal and satisfy liability concerns
- which associated physical attributes contribute most to informal learning

It will thus generate the following tasks:

1. what are the physical attributes of marginal spaces?
2. which physical attributes are associated with non-formal learning
3. can be provided most effectively?

Theme 3: THE COUNTRYSIDE AS SPACES OF NON-FORMAL LEARNING.

This research looks into the role of countryside places as resources for non-formal learning, particularly between fathers and sons. It will examine the extent and types of such uses through qualitative research methods.

It will look for the following specific types of learning:

- inter-generational transfer learning
- learning about risk and responsibility
- peer learning
- learning about the natural environment and natural spaces
- learning affection for nature
- learning physical motor skills, fitness and endurance
- learning spatial orientation skills
- masculine emotional learning.

GROUP 5 – THE RURAL ECONOMY

Co-ordinated by: Bill Slee, Department of Agriculture and Forestry, University of Aberdeen and Paul Courtney, Socio-Economic Research Programme, The Macaulay Institute, Aberdeen

This was a large, mixed group. Workshop participants firstly identified the following themes and questions central to rural economic research in the Nordic countries:

- Risk adverse communities and businesses: a problem?
- Road equivalent tariffs: implications for the islands?
- The role of roads in attracting visitors: engineering vs. aesthetics
- The lack of infrastructure as a constraint on development in peripheral areas.
- Sustainable tourism, or otherwise?
- Commodification of rural property
- Employment vs. Environment
- The role of the social economy in rural development
- New innovation-promoting production and consumption structures: conditions for success (encompassing the social economy element)
- Determinants of success in the periphery
- Social network analysis: mediation / conflict resolution
- Access to and ownership of land
- Determinants of change in land based activities
- What is a vulnerable rural community?
- What economic/ social interventions can combat decline?
- Attitudes to business / risk/ access to capital, investment in local communities
- Local markets and sustainable food systems

From these participants agreed on the following three themes to take forward for discussion in small working groups:

1. Conflict resolution and social networks
2. Determinants of success
3. Local production systems

Theme 1: CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND SOCIAL NETWORKS

- Sustainable rural communities need to be able to make effective decisions themselves

Problems:

- Interpersonal dynamics can act as a constraint on decision making and project development, they may also reduce the amount and effectiveness of public participation and involvement
- It may also be difficult for local people to be objective, neutral and mediate. From this there are issues of trust and reciprocity that need to be assessed.
- Other possible constraints to public participation in rural communities need to be explored:
 - Generational
 - Entrenchment
 - Conservatism
 - Feudalism
 - Lack of confidence and self esteem in the community
 - Lack of status and power, social exclusion
 - Conflicts in the participation process
 - Incentives – Rewards, support, training may be required

Research agenda

Analysis of social networks in rural communities (community groups, partnerships, business groups) to:

1. Help reduce barriers to effective participation and communication in partnership working
2. Help resolve conflicts in the participation and partnership process

Devise methods of analysing community groups with the aim of identifying the cause, effect and resolution of negative inter-personal and inter-group conflicts.

Theme 2: DETERMINANTS OF SUCCESS

- Much past research has focused on production structures, although it is now recognised that consumption structures are also an important determinant of success.
- This is particularly important as the ‘new rural economy’ has become residence to ‘new rural residents’
- Need to conceptualise what creates and sustains resident-based amenity demand and amenity value etc
- Need evidence based results to help inform policy

Consumption structures can usefully be examined through an examination of consumption and employment patterns of indigenous residents and newcomers to rural localities. Thus, the focus can be on the ‘new rural residents’ of the ‘new rural economy’

- Indigenous residents
- In-migrants / newcomers >> There is currently only anecdotal evidence of the impacts of migration on rural economies, and a lack of empirical evidence

Data on migration flows is available as a starting point, and exploratory data based on perceptions and experiences which can be used to develop testable hypotheses.

Useful questions:

- Why do people move to specific rural localities?
- What types of employment do they take up?
- What are the economic impacts of their activity patterns on the local economy?

Other research questions in this context:

- What are the direct, indirect and induced effects of new rural residents in the rural economy?
- Is this related to differential performance of rural localities and regions?
- Can we attach an empirical value to quality of life factors that often drive migration to rural areas?
- Do newcomers drive new forms of consumption in rural areas and are these beneficial or detrimental to local and regional economies?

Theme 3: LOCAL PRODUCTION SYSTEMS

Participants discussed two possible avenues of enquiry into local production systems.

1. Attitudinal analysis of environment / society relationships on the part of entrepreneurs

- There is a need to assess the quality control relationships between businesses and the environment and society within local markets.
- Research could usefully analyse the attitudes of entrepreneurs to their natural environment and local communities to, for example, assess their 'duty of care' to customers.

2. Economic analysis of local production systems

- Flows of money and exchange
- New business start-ups
- Attitudes to risk and innovation (In all sectors: producer, consumer, financial and public)
- Dynamics of and criteria for business decision making including producers, consumers and the role of state intervention.

CONCLUSION

This conference was stimulated by the work of the Nordic-Scottish Rural Transfer Network. The work undertaken by this Network, between 1998-2001, identified the potential for future Nordic-Scottish research into rural development. The Nordic-Scottish Action Plan of 2001 had also identified the importance of joint research. The aim of this conference, therefore, was to take a next step in stimulating a research agenda between the Nordic and Scottish regions, as well as to share good practice in rural development and to strengthen rural research networks across the Nordic-Scottish countries.

The experience of the conference, and subsequent feedback would suggest that these aims were well achieved, and that ideas and connections have been forged, which will bear fruit in the future. This report documents but the main points raised in this communication, the full extent of the many discussions, both formal and informal, over the two days was broader and richer in content than could be documented.

The five key themes around which the conference was moulded proved to be pertinent and inclusive of the main issues currently facing rural development across the Nordic-Scottish area. They provided an appropriate platform for trans-national sharing:

- Local governance and empowerment of rural communities
- Communications and community involvement
- Innovation in rural services
- Wider use of the countryside
- Developing the rural economy and building on natural assets

The conference succeeded in attracting a full complement of 135 participants, including 22 representatives from six Nordic countries. These were drawn from researchers, policy-makers, politicians, national and local administrators, practitioners and activists. The mix of theory, policy and practice lead to full and rigorous discussion, rooted in the experience of rural communities and matched by national and international overview and analysis.

The speakers drew on a very high level of expertise and experience in the five key themes and provided participants with a rare insight into the issues and achievements of other countries. This was followed on in the workshops by the experience of Scottish practitioners, working at the 'cutting-edge' of rural development. This provided a spicy mix to stimulate discussion and inquiry. The ideas and experiences of the workshop participants provided food for thought in the research group workshops on the second day. The pre-conference contacts between research co-ordinators and research group participants, also proved to be helpful in preparing thinking for the discussions. The research groups were also very diverse, both internationally and in terms of experience and focus. The outputs of the research groups were of a very high standard, and well documented by their co-ordinators, for future development. Contacts were made and shared.

This mechanism for inspiring and activating academic and applied research has proved to be dynamic and very appreciated by participants. The conference organisers have high hopes for the outcomes and time will tell if the discussion and ideas bear fruit. It would be useful to receive feedback from participants on the eventual outcomes.

APPENDIX A

NORDIC-SCOTTISH CONFERENCE Rural Development – Learning Across The North

DAY 1 - CONFERENCE PROGRAMME

Session 1: Northern Perspectives 10.00 – 13.00

10.00	Welcome and Introduction	Cllr. William J. Ross, The Highland Council, Chairman, Sustainable Development Select Committee
10.10	A Northern Perspective - Opening address	Staffan Bond, Popular Movements Council for Rural Development in Sweden
10.30	Key themes in Rural Development	Prof. Mark Shucksmith, Arkleton Centre for Rural Development Research, University of Aberdeen
10.50	Local governance & community empowerment - the Swedish village movement	Ulla Herlitz, Gothenburg University, Sweden
11.10	Questions to speakers	
11.30	COFFEE	
11.50	Rural service provision in sparsely populated areas - redefining a problem	Kristian Aasbrenn , Østlandsforskning, Norway
12.10	Communications and involvement – the local information society	Jukka Oksa, University of Joensuu, Finland
12.30	Rural economy - challenges & opportunities facing the rural economy in the 21st century	Stuart Black, Highlands & Islands Enterprise
12.50	Questions to speakers	
13.00	LUNCH	

Session 2: Conference Workshops 14.00 - 15.45

14.00	Introduction to the Workgroups: A Highlands and Islands Perspective	Prof. Robert Cormack, UHI Millenium Institute
14.15	Group 1 Local governance and community empowerment	Norma Graham, Fife Local Rural Partnership Vanessa Halhead, University of Aberdeen
	Group 2 Communications and involvement	Frank Rennie, UHI Millenium Institute Fiona Bell, Aberdeenshire Council
	Group 3 Innovation in rural services	David Bryan, The Sutherland Partnership Polly Chapman, The Highland Council
	Group 4 Wider use of the countryside	Margaret Davidson, Abriachan Community Woodlands Elspeth Grant, Cairngorms Partnership
	Group 5 The rural economy	Philip Jones, Dumfries & Galloway Council James Knowles, Aberdeenshire Council
15.45	TEA	

Session 3: Future Directions 16.15 - 17.30

16.15	Report of work groups and future research opportunities	Prof. Robert Cormack, UHI Millenium Institute
17.00	Future Directions	Raymond Young

NORDIC-SCOTTISH CONFERENCE
Rural Development – Learning Across The North

DAY 2 – RESEARCH GROUP PROGRAMME

Group 1 Local governance and community empowerment
Co-ordinated by Prof. Mark Shucksmith and Vanessa Halhead, University of Aberdeen

The formal and non-formal ways in which rural areas are organised and supported, involving all aspects of local democracy and the ways in which communities are empowered to engage in the planning, financing and implementing of development, resource management and service delivery at local level.

Group 2 Communications and involvement
Co-ordinated by Dr. Frank Rennie, UHI Millenium Institute

The methods for networking and exchanging information between communities and with outside bodies, including government and researchers, including the provision of IT services and links.

Group 3 Rural services
Co-ordinated by Marion Lacey and Helen Betts-Brown, Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations

The provision of services, including education, health and transport, for isolated areas and excluded and minority groups (the young, elderly, disabled, ethnic etc.). The provision of ‘sensitive’ services, including health, drugs and alcohol etc.

Group 4 Wider use of the countryside
Co-ordinated by: Rhys Evans, University of Aberdeen

The ways of increasing access to the benefits of the countryside, including for minority and excluded groups. Issues of access, recreation, health and wellbeing are all central to this topic.

Group 5 The rural economy
Co-ordinated by Bill Slee, University of Aberdeen and Paul Courtney, Macaulay Institute

Innovative approaches to building rural economies, including the development of natural and cultural assets and niche markets, including cultural and eco-tourism, local and green produce, renewable energy, local labelling etc.

APPENDIX B

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Kristian Aasbrenn	Ostlandsforskning, Norway
Duncan Alexander	
Poul Erik Andreasen	North Jutland, Denmark
Judith Aylett	Heughend, Strathdon
Sue Beer	Robert Gordon University
Judith Belford	Angus College
Fiona Bell	Aberdeenshire Council
Helena Bell	Perth College
Helen Betts-Brown	Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations
Stuart Black	Highlands and Islands Enterprise
John Bond	Sutherland Partnership
Staffan Bond	Popular Movements Council, Sweden
Steven Boyne	Leisure & Tourism, SAC, Ayr
Jenny Brogden	The Black Isle
David Bryan	The Sutherland Partnership
Duncan Bryden	Inverness
Brendan Burns	Federation of Small Businesses
Frank Burns	Lanark
Rita Callander	Cairngorms Partnership
Robin Callander	Birse Community Trust
Edna Cameron	UHI Millenium Institute
Lesley Campbell	Loch Lomond & The Trossachs Community
Polly Chapman	The Highland Council
John Christison	Scottish School of Forestry
Ann Clark	The Highland Council
Douglas Clark	Forestry Commission
Phyllis Clark	Fife Rural Partnership
Robert Cormack	UHI Millenium Institute
Seonaidh Cotton	Aberdeenshire Council
Paul Courtney	Macaulay Land Use Research Institute
Ann Craig	Community Education
Margaret Davidson	Abriachan Community Woodlands
Barbara Diklev	Village Association, Denmark
Alan Easton	The Highland Council
Rhys Evans	Arkleton Centre, University of Aberdeen
Eleanor Feltham	Tighra Housing Service, Inverness
John Forster	Banchory
Jill de Fresnes	Lochaber College
Oyvind Glosvik	Soqn oq Fiordane University, Norway
Janine Gordon	CBAVS Galashiels
Norma Graham	Fife Local Rural Partnership
Lennart Granqvist	Sweden
Elspeth Grant	Cairngorms Partnership
Vanessa Halhead	Arkleton Centre, University of Aberdeen
Sam Marcus	Voluntary Action Orkney
Juliet Harvey	The Scottish Executive
Roger Hemming	Rural Resource Centre

Bodil Henriksson-Johansson	Sweden
Ulla Herlitz	Gothenburg University, Sweden
Gary Hill	Macaulay Institute
John Hutchison	The Highland Council
Flora Hutton	Islay
Lena Hutton	Borders Forum of Councils for Voluntary Service
Torsti Hyyrylainen	Mikkeli Institute, University of Helsinki
John Jackson	Glasgow
Anna Jarpe	Dept of Sociology, University of Aberdeen
Kathy Johnston	The Scottish Executive
Philip Jones	Dumfries & Galloway Council
Tor Justad	Scottish Co-op, Inverness
Soeren Gais Kjeldsen	North Jutland, Denmark
James Knowles	Aberdeenshire Council
Marion Lacey	Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations
Kenny Lamont	Post Office Ltd
Margaret Lawson	Sutherland Partnership
Margaret Lobley	Gordon Rural Action, Huntly
Calum Macaulay	Albyn Housing
Yvonne Mackay	Sutherland Partnership
Anne MacLean	Albyn Housing
Sandy MacMillan	Midlothian Council
Duncan MacPherson	Isle of Harris
Ellen McCance	Fife Council
Ian McConnachie	The Scottish Executive
Eric McKenzie	RARARI
Roddy McMin	Lews Castle College
Henrik Ringbaeck Madsen	North Jutland, Denmark
Pentti Malinen	University of Oulu, Finland
Brian Martin	Aberdeenshire Environmental Forum
Roderick Matheson	Aberdeenshire Council
Janet Miles	Loch Ewe Action Forum
Jim Millard	The Scottish Executive
Frits Moensted	Denmark
Bjarni Mortensen	Faroe Islands
Sheena Munro	Highland Community Care Forum
Katrina Myrvang Brown	Macaulay Institute
Sue Nash	Argyll Council for Voluntary Service
Jens Kaalhaug Nielsen	Danish Centre for Rural Research, Denmark
David Nicol	Communities Scotland
Ken Oates	Highland National Health Service Board
Veronica O'Hare	New Futures Sutherland
Kjartan Olafsson	Iceland
Jukka Oksa	University of Joensuu, Finland
Erin Payne	Dept of Sociology, University of Aberdeen
Ailsa Peck	Highland Community Care Forum
Bob Peden	Banffshire Partnership Ltd
Jochen Peters	MOST CCPP, University of Tromso, Norway
Alix Powers-Jones	Argyll & Bute Council
Paivi Pylkkanen	Mikkeli Institute, University of Helsinki
Shane Rankin	Crofters Commission
Donald Reid	Scottish Civic Forum

Wendy Reid	East Berwick Partnership
Christian Rekkedal	Landbruksavdelinga, Norway
Frank Rennie	UHI Millenium Institute
Helen Richardson	Laggan Community Office
John Risby	Forestry Commission
Jan Riseth	NORUT Social Science Research Ltd, Norway
Jim Robertson	Orkney Island Council
Richard Robinson	Scottish Natural Heritage, Inverness
Cllr William Ross	The Highland Council
Colin Rous	Salvation Army Social Services
Sue Sadler	Perth
Leo Sherry	South Lanarkshire council
Mark Shucksmith	Arkleton Centre, Uni of Aberdeen
Alison Simpson	Banffshire Partnership Ltd
Bill Slee	University of Aberdeen
Sheena Slimon	Laggan Community
Michael Smith	Lews Castle College
Sam Smith	Rural Resource Centre
Maureen Stephen	Gordon Rural Action, Huntly
Linda Stevenson	Dept of Politics/IR, Uni of Aberdeen
Neil Sutherland	Moray Badenoch Strathspey Enterp
Maggie Symonds	Calico UK
Paul Tabbush	Social Research Unit
Emma Tayler	Highland Council - Childcare etc
Paul Torrance	South Ayrshire Council
Angela Urquhart	Loch Ewe Action Forum
Eeva Uusitalo	Mikkeli Inst, Univ of Helsinki, Finland
Terry Veitch	Community Network
Kathy Walsh	Court Hill, Dunboyne, Co. Meath
Christina West	Annfield, Lochgilphead
Karen Wren	Arkleton Centre, Uni of Aberdeen
Maureen Wright	Perth & Kinross Council
Raymond Young	Perthshire