

•Bill Reimer - Sept. 10, 1999 - Health Canada

•Thank you for the invitation

•We are pleased that Health Canada has established the Office of Rural Health

•We have been arguing for such initiatives over the 10 years of our existence



•I am here to explore collaboration opportunities with you:

•through the Canadian Rural Restructuring Foundation

- •national and international network of researchers, policy makers, community activists, rural people who are concerned with the state of rural Canada
- •operating for about 10 years
- •not-for-profit charitable foundation (registered)
- •through The New Rural Economy Project
 - •5-year research and education project
 - •involves macro, meso, and micro-level analysis
 - •e.g. systematically selected 32 rural sites; profiled them; 25 have research teams operating in them
 - •cf. Flyer for some of the activities and products
- •through our proposal regarding Social Cohesion in Rural Canada
 - •SSHRC Proposal under their strategic grants program
 - •Passed LOI stage: now preparing the final proposal
 - •due the end of this month

Social Cohesion in Rural Canada: Objectives

- Define and measure social cohesion
- □ How has it changed?
- □ Why has it changed?
- □ What are the consequences?
- □ What opportunities are created?

•Rural Canada is the traditional seat of social cohesion

- •economic and social homogeneity
- •small populations
- mutual interdependence

•Undergone major changes in those structures which support it

- more diversified
- •more open (economically and socially)
- •more integrated with regional and national systems
- more marginalized
- more complex

•Need to know what are the consequences of these changes?

•for social cohesion

•Have people become less connected, or have the bases of relationships changed?

•What new forms of attachment are emerging?

•Are rural communities less able to respond collectively to deal with economic, social, and environmental stresses?

•for those aspects of economic and social life which are related to social cohesion

•social cohesion has been shown to be related to **economic performance** (Knack and Keefer, 1997)

•Does this mean that declining social cohesion will contribute to a further decline in the rural economy?

•for health

Social Cohesion and Health

- □ vulnerable groups and individuals
- □ environment (physical and social)
- \square access to services
- □ social support
- □ the healthy community



•Vulnerable groups:

•isolated, unconnected, or excluded individuals are vulnerable to poor health (Kawachi, 1997)

•Does outmigration of youth, higher mobility of families, and more open economic competition, therefore place the elderly, single mothers, the poor at greater health risk

•environment:

•the reorganization of work into a smaller, more mobile work force may undermine an important basis for cohesion

•this is most dramatic in those industries where occupational health and safety is relatively low (fishing, mining, forestry, agriculture - all rural based).

•Are health and safety regulations better at reducing problems than the traditional reliance on cohesive groups?

Access to services

•we have already conducted research on this issue (cf. Flyer)

discovered its complexity

•rural administrators: access = in my town (provides tax base, attracts population)

•rural citizens: access = nearby (is a tradeoff made for living outside a city

•access is not simply a function of distance, but includes the organization of resources (e.g. ambulances, personnel) (Halseth and Rosenberg, 1991)

•standards must therefore take into account local conditions (existing infrastructure, administration, community composition)

•What level of access is currently found in rural Canada?

•How does it vary by community size?

•What strategies have communities used to deal with changing service delivery?

•Social support: health delivery systems require cohesive communities

•informal networks are a key to access to formal health institutions - they don't compensate each other (Stone)

•Does an emphasis on home care place rural people at greater risk?

•Volunteer groups are facing a crisis (Halseth Report)

•membership (esp. social service groups)

•burnout (esp. health groups)

•both types of groups face a crisis in funding

•in general, they are not connected to government sources of information (especially the Internet)

•they show a disturbing effect with respect to funding:

•about 25% indicated that their mission statement was not eligible for funding

•about 23% had to change their mission statement for funding

•if we assume that the mission statement reflects a collective interest -- is this an indication of rural concerns not being recognized and met because of the structure of funding programs?

•The healthy community

•these perspectives emerged from research which suggested that the level of trust, economic equality, and high social capital are important elements of community health (cf. "Caring Community" research)

•If they do, however, the relationship promises to be complex

•those communities which were most 'vital' also had higher levels of public debate (conflict?) and outside networks

•Does this a case of low social cohesion - if the community members engage in public debate over contentious issues?

•Under what circumstances is it pathological? This is the subject of work which looks at **community capacity**

•What types of communities have the ability to respond to emergencies, or to gradual, but ultimately destructive processes?

•What types of communities have the knowledge, skill, and resources to act in a preventive fashion to avoid fragmentation or destruction?

•These are some of the issues which we have identified and in some cases are acting upon

•We need your help to make sure that we haven't missed anything important and to get the job done.



•Experience

•10 years of research, education, policy making experience

•over 100 publications

•analysis of rural trends and issues with policy relevance (cf. Flyer)

•National Perspective

•only national rural think-tank

•committed to the value of comparison

•useful for the goal of setting standards - must be both comparative and responsive to the local concerns and conditions

•Access to local knowledge and rural people

•committed to strong rural involvement

•always hold our conference and workshops in rural areas

always involve local people

•treat local people as collaborators

•provided significant dividends - not only for researchers but for policy people as well: create direct dialogue

International network

•much of our work is inspired by colleagues in Europe, Mexico, Brazil, Japan

•some of our work is being replicated in other countries (e.g. sample frame in Japan)

Information

•Rural Canada Database: 1986, 91, 96 CSDs

•field work materials: profiles, enterprises, 3rd sector organizations

photos

•communications: documents, reports

•Research infrastructure

experiment in conducting research over dispersed area, multidisciplinary teams
use of Internet server as central repository. Check it out.

•a structure for your own data collection and analysis (cf. Social Cohesion project) •household survey in strategically selected rural sites

•with access to rich contextual information via field teams

What can Health Canada offer?

- □ Knowledge
- Data
- □ Institutional infrastructure
- □ Finances
- □ Moral support

