

Reinventing Localism: The Evolving Nature of Rural Service Principles
Lecture presented at the University of Keele, England
Sponsored by the Fulbright Senior Scholars Program
November 30 2006

Emilia E. Martinez-Brawley
John F. Roatch Distinguished Professor and Professor of Social Work
Arizona State University

I am delighted to be able to meet with this distinguished audience of academic colleagues, professionals and individuals who are interested in pursuing the "rural cause". For I have always believed that rural practice and research, whether in social work, education, health services and even economic development, has grown because there have always been individuals and groups who were committed to the preservation of rural areas as viable and as assets in modern societies. The rural "cause", like the human rights cause, or the environmental cause or so many other causes, has always had to be embraced not only as an intellectual pursuit but as a commitment to a way of life, which has been at peril, through many decades in contemporary times.

So, I hope that today, I will be able to provide you with some ideas for discussion. For discussion among peers reinforces and rekindles any cause's fire, securing renewed energies for the road ahead. Politicians know this and professionals can learn a thing or two from them. Rural areas need social scientists and practitioners who can advocate for rurality without being blind to its shortcomings. Rural people need practitioners who believe in what they are doing while recognizing real challenges; they need researchers who can approach rural scholarship in full awareness of the contradictions that acting on a rural paradigm often imply. We will discuss this in greater detail as we move along.

When I was asked to give a global overview of rural practice and research, I stressed that I needed to move humbly and cautiously. Here are a few caveats. I will primarily be drawing my observations from the English-speaking world, and not from all of it at that. The US and the UK will be the focus. I will also be making reference to Spain, Latin America and Australia, where I have had some experience and, in passing, to other countries. I will rely on the audience to ask questions about areas or issues they may be particularly interested in. My research, writing and scholarship have generally focused on social services in a broad sense, often including health and education. My interest has been on how the structures and practices that govern rural social service delivery can be made congruent with the idiosyncrasies, realities and culture of rural areas. As the interaction between providers and recipients became more and more bureaucratized, depersonalized and distant it was necessary to help bend bureaucracy to rural expectations and dreams. My focus has been on documenting how systems of care, created primarily for urban areas, did not often make sense in rural ones and how they needed to be modified. My interest has been on the local, and although the term localism has been habitually haphazardly used and abused, I will use it here to denote those aspects of local autonomy that respond to local needs and priorities when delivering services, within a framework of trust for local differences.

Today, I propose to go back 25 or 30 years to review the tenets of practice which brought about the contemporary rural movement in social services and social work, at least in the US and, I might venture to say, in the English speaking, industrial, world. I propose to begin by identifying at least a couple of important principles of rural practice, some of which go back to the early 20th century, but were, in a way rediscovered and made popular in the 1980s and 90s. I will focus only on those elements of the rural paradigm that made a great deal of sense and inspired a great deal of action in the past, but also make sense today. I will then suggest some of the difficulties involved and discuss the contradictions those rural practice principles imply in 2006. Then, I will propose that in spite of contradictions, it is still possible to use the tenets to bring positive results and desirable change.

Tenets of rural social service delivery

Twenty five years ago, Ginsberg, 1976; Green and Webster, 1977 and others, including myself (Martinez-Brawley, 1981), identified and wrote about the basic tenets of rural service delivery and practice models. In short, they were generalism, localism and community orientation. **Generalism**, I said then, refers not only to the entry level at which the client gains access to help, but also to the orientation of the worker in providing help. **Localism** and locality specific practice refers to the degree of individualization of the models and services offered, given the unique cultural, linguistic and infrastructural characteristics of the areas. It also refers to the level of government at which services are administered and provided. Finally, **community oriented services** refer to the degree to which they incorporate natural systems and the degree to which social service practitioners do mobilize communities to partake and take over their own care and well being. (Martinez-Brawley, 1991).

I think those were reasonable explanations of generalism, localism /locality specific and community oriented services then, which are still useful for our purposes today.

The recurring theme of localism and local community specific efforts

Today, I want to pick up the recurring themes of localism and community orientation, which are interlaced or tied together and tend to appear jointly. It is the long history of these tenets that has proven not only resilient but successful in a broad range of economic and social endeavors. Through the decades, the principles of localism and a community orientation have attempted not only to unleash innovation but also, to ensure the provision of basic services. The 2006 Nobel Peace Prize went to Muhammad Yunus of Bangladesh, who defying all odds and rising above the massive corporate structures of international aid, accomplished a turn around in the local economy with his Grameen Bank. Based on loans of as little as 27 dollars to local enterprises, primarily owned by women, Mr. Yunus' long term vision is to eliminate poverty in the world. The Nobel Prize Committee thoughtfully warned that poverty cannot be eliminated by microcredit alone, but over the years, "the movement to provide financial services to the poor has become more capacious, stressing the need for services beyond loans" (Dugger, 2006:1).

His efforts were local but have world-wide significance. His efforts were community based and rural, but have shaken and changed the type of solutions for combating poverty way beyond Bangladesh. An article in the Guardian just two of three days ago, reviewed the interesting work of the British Micro Loan Foundation (MLF) in Africa just as we speak.

But, in explaining the importance of localism and community based social services efforts, let me begin at the beginning. In America, as Paul Stuart (2004) suggested, policies that made it relatively easy for white immigrants to acquire land made agriculture and other rural occupations attractive to new comers. In the 19th Century, while the country was being populated, and following English law, a locality determined its social welfare programs. In rural areas, arrangements were informal, and responses were by-and-large spontaneous, local and often religious. As my story will tell, government, central or local, only became significant much later.

In my first book, *Pioneer Efforts in Social Welfare 1904-1939* (Penn State Press, 1980), I went back to the efforts of pioneer rural service providers before the Great Depression in the US, to identify what inspired their actions, what motivated their quest. One of the basic principles that could be identified through all the writings and policy debates of the pre-Depression years, including those of Teddy Roosevelt's Country Life Commission, was a commitment to providing locality based and locality inspired services, ranging from education in the one room school house to health services by a local family doctor, to help with the aging by local volunteers. Still at that point, government, particularly central government, was not a provider (neither of often needed financial resources nor of direct services) but was playing the role of facilitator. A philosophic commitment to the local was a major tenet of services

Locality based work and locality based development were established very early in the trajectory of rural social intervention. On the other hand, locality based research at that time, appeared often as the effort of well-intentioned but sometimes misguided outsiders who wanted to introduce standardizing "solutions" into rural areas. Researchers and their findings were often rejected. For example, the influential Grace Abbott, chief of the Children's Bureau circa 1927, felt the tensions when she sought to enlarge the unit of administration for school attendance laws because "local officials...made little effort to enforce the law" and because she was disturbed by the personal elements that played so large a part in the local systems (Abbott, in Martinez-Brawley, 1980: 192-193). There was strain between the highly personalized local and the more anonymous central. Localism, as understood by those early investigators, did not include trust in local autonomy. To them, the local represented affective and personalistic intervention, the central more objective and scientific efforts. Localism encompassed then, as it does today, the inherent tensions between the central and the local, about levels of decentralization, about national standards and about inclusive solutions to local problems. I know similar situations existed much later on in Australia, and I am sure, those who know more about the history of service delivery in rural England could point out similar examples here, though the situations may have been different in the prosperous Southern English counties and the less affluent Northern ones.

There were added elements of localism that scared professionals and progressive reformers, who were, in fact, the early social science scholars and social workers in rural areas. Rural and local were often associated not only with personalism, favoritism and nepotism but also with prejudice, lack of professionalism and acceptance of differences. In a 2005 wonderfully written book, Julian Barnes, captures the theme of prejudice in the English countryside of old. I am mentioning it because it is based on the forgotten trial of a young Indian solicitor in a Staffordshire village in the early 1900s. Apparently, the case was famous and broadly covered by the newspapers in its time. The solicitor was the son of an Indian born vicar in the Anglican Church, and is finally defended by none other than Arthur Conan Doyle. Barnes' descriptions of villagers' fear and loathe of differences is very graphic. The villagers cannot understand mixed race marriages or household differences. And when it is revealed that the vicar sleeps in the same room as his son, the whole family is immediately suspect! The story exemplifies to perfection a fear that is still prevailing among social reformers and social work practitioners, in whose eyes local people cannot be trusted to be objective or fair. Of course, this is often the case but the same can be said of urban people.

The Great Depression, however, brought forth a period of change. Localities in the US. were no longer able to take care of their own, and central measures, became essential. The Social Security system in the US created a much needed central government sponsored system of social provision when local and state resources had been exhausted, but unfortunately, there followed a gradual decline in the networks of local care. As Clark Chambers pointed out in *Seedtime of Reform* (1963), the 1920s and 30s were many things to many people. It was a time of contradiction. The world had seen the end of WWI, country people had become more vociferous, and even farmers, normally conservative men, were striking back at impersonal forces which had brought about their predicament. Changes in policies and levels of responsibility began to erode commitment to the local. This trend continued on both sides of the Atlantic right before and after WWII.

In the UK, a system of national insurance was put in place in 1948, which was essential in reconstructing the social infrastructure of a victorious but impoverished Britain. War time efforts, particularly the emergency wartime hospital planning efforts, had demonstrated that it was possible to provide nationally coordinated services. After the War, central government undertook a key role in funding and establishing standards and regulations for the new structures, for example, through the National Assistance and the Health Service Acts. But, as Hadley(1980) suggested, in its efforts to clean up many of the "inherited pre-war messy" structures and in its attempts to introduce needed organizational reform, the government ended up with the establishment of bigger, more centralized and inaccessible departments, from health, to education and social services. The prominent Seebohm Committee Report in 1968 and the reorganization of local government in 1974, took rationalization many steps further. The principles of local teams for service delivery, for example, were excellent from a localist perspective, but often rationalization led to exaggerated managerialism. Rolling the film fast forward, when we arrive at what I call the rural revival of the 1980s, the scales had gone from

respecting the well established tradition of local government in social provision to high levels of managerialism and political centralism, or so the critics of the situation thought.

Roger Hadley and Morag McGrath wrote "Going Local" in 1980, a very small albeit unintended seminal work for the rural movement. As far as I know from conversation with Roger Hadley, they had not intended to write it about rural areas, but debureaucratizing forces had proven stronger in the countryside. At about the same time, I spent a few months researching social service delivery in rural and remote patches. On separate visits, I went to the Outer Hebrides and the border region in Scotland, to the Bangor area in Wales, and to villages in Cumbria and Norfolk, England. I saw myself how decentralization was taking place in accelerated fashion and rural practice was going strong. It was clear that "local", both in rural and urban contexts was again becoming a positive tenet. (Martinez-Brawley, 1982 and Martinez-Brawley and Brawley, 1992)

"Going local" had always made sense in the rural areas. There was an element of thrift and conservatism intrinsic in this tenet that proposed to enhance the natural assets of communities, and rural people and communities welcome such thrift. Locality specific work was back in vogue. Furthermore, the revival of rural had a nostalgic element in it – visions of the bucolic countryside in England, the "living on a few acres" in the U.S., the little vineyard in France or Margaret River, Western Australia, or the "cortijo" or "ca" in Andalucía or Catalonia. This new revival, which could have been totally conservative in ideology, was not because it had come about after the Black Civil Rights movement in the U.S and after Paulo Freire's conscientization theme in Latin America. The rural condition gained a lot from both movements, particularly in the U.S. and Australia, where rural was not glamorized by visions of country houses. We had all become aware that being rural and ethnic and regional was something to be proud of. Cultural forces had all come together to reinforce visions of "the good rural life" and there was great hope in the air.

The contemporary rural social work and social science movement embraced "locality specific, culturally sensitive and linguistically respectful" as a basic tenet. I mention the issue of language, because there is a clear tie between rural cultures and minority languages. If we were to protect culture, we could not do it without protecting language – Minority languages have often survived in rural areas because of the nature of the milieu, isolation and traditions. Perfect examples are the Gaelic in the Outer Hebrides, Welsh in Wales, Catalán in Spain, though in the latter case, economic and political strength had something to do with it. Many of the pioneers of the contemporary "rural movement" came to it also espousing the defense of minority languages and customs. Appalachia did a great deal for the rural movement in the U.S., and authors traced Southern Appalachian language to old English. Your own Richard Pugh (Pugh and Jones, 1999) has written on dual language concerns in Wales. In Australia, for example, those who worked close to Aboriginal communities were heavily involved in defense and maintenance of cultures. Unnecessary centralization and loss of autonomy, whether in the political, economic or cultural sense, were abhorred and small scale environments that were responsive to non-bureaucratic forms of interaction were praised. This was the time

of "small is beautiful" and while global peace was an important item on many of the localists' social action agenda, global businesses and international corporations were not.

But, like in all matters, once movements get going they do not always follow the expected path. In the mid 1980s, politics had changed in both, the UK and the US, with a parallel effect in many other countries in the world. For example, Chandler (1993), referring primarily to urban areas but still valid in rural areas, stated that "[T]he highly undemocratic Local Government Act of 1986 prevented local authorities from engaging in political critiques of central government and therefore curtailed public efforts to develop local opposition to the government's industrial strategy "(p.54). These changes also had significant effects on the rural social agenda.

Using the example of the well documented community care movement in the UK, first introduced as a solution for depersonalization and bureaucratization in the personal social service sector, one can see how best intentions began to be subverted. About this point, in 1996, Hadley and Clough wrote that while the right wing policies taking shape in the Conservative Party under Mrs. Thatcher might have started cautiously, not making sweeping changes, particularly in the personal social services, the status quo was very short-lived. "...With growing confidence as the electorate returned the party to power in four successive elections", they continue, "the government sold off the main public utilities, dismantled many of the controls on industry and commerce", and here come the crux of the problem from the localist perspective, "substantially reduced the powers of local authorities"... and injected market forces where it could, thus sponsoring the development of a managerialist culture everywhere. (Hadley and Clough, 1996:14).

In their very comprehensive analysis of what went wrong with the community-oriented services, Hadley and Cough (1996) suggest that the opposition party (namely Labour), committed to defend the welfare state, failed to see the rigidity in the services offered in large public organizations or to recognize the intimidation users suffered in attempting to negotiate bureaucracies. Finally, these authors predicted that bigger problems were in stock for community care and locality based solutions. The Griffith Report of 1988 made two very controversial proposals: that social services should become "enabling agencies", restricting their role to overseeing provision, and that "central government should be closely involved in determining the priorities of a costed programme each year of its funding" (Hadley and Clough, 1996:15). My friends in the UK tell me that the New Labour movement continued the marketization that had began under Margaret Thatcher. And, as Clarke (1993) suggested, "indifference to scale means that most theories of "...marketisation assume a nation-state focus and overlook the potentially differential effects of these trends at other geographic scales..."(p.6).

In the U.S., a managerialist and market oriented ethos, which had always existed in the private sector, was becoming more prevalent in the public sector. Devolving funds from the federal government to the states and counties or municipalities had serious consequences. It was not only that funds had been cut as well as devolved, but that there was a shift in the accountability paradigm. Paying for services became a "best value" issue for counties and municipalities, and "best value" often meant cheapest.

Furthermore, it is known and accepted in the US that there is a preponderance of businessmen among local officials and that the business ethos often prevails in making community decisions. Government leaders often consult with business-oriented groups before taking action, and this was happening even in the small towns. A strong business ethos, primarily a concern with "value for money" and economies of scale began to prevail.

While these were some of the micro forces in the social service sector, there were many macro forces adding to the challenges. An obsession with growth, economies of scale, friendly and hostile take-overs appeared in the business sector, where corporations merged and re-merged to enhance profits. The "not for profit sector" followed suit, and through the 1990s, the US. lost interest in smallness. In the social services, not for profit organizations began to be managed as if they were businesses, with business executives becoming the managers of choice. Another centralizing era had begun, although this time, centralization was based on business rather than government criteria. Efficiency was always the promised land of the new practices. This model spread like wildfire throughout the world. National and international NGOs began to be managed like businesses also. The problem was that many non-business organization became incapable of making the distinction between being businesslike, a concept that entails many positives such as responsiveness to customers, offers of alternatives, choice, etc.—and being like business, meaning preoccupied with profits and the bottom line.

A corresponding international phenomenon was also making its mark as the new century approached. I am speaking about globalization. Hewison ((2000) stated that "much recent academic discussion appears to agree that globalization catches the essence of a historical movement, a triumph of a neo-liberal and characteristically Anglo American ideology, a more intense stage of capitalism, a confluence of events and technologies, or some combination of these." (p.280)

Critics of globalization, of course, worry that the winners-- investors, companies, producers and, on instances, consumers-- cluster in the developed world and in the upper echelons of the social structure. Critics often argue for further efforts to integrate safety-nets and always for broader participation of the losers in decision making and policy formulation. Extreme critics of globalization have insisted that increased market liberalization results in misery for the minority and that globalization is nothing but the extension of the power of capital over labor (Gill, 1995; Dominelli and Hoogvelt,1996; Dominelli, 2002). They argue, and it is a valid argument, that from a demographic perspective, globalization has resulted in the chasing of markets by people who have little bargaining power (witness for example, the *maquilladoras* in the Mexican border area). In many cases in rural areas, the result of the exodus of labor has been rural depopulation or the leaving behind of the most needy groups-- the elderly and children. From a socio-cultural perspective, the movement of masses of people has also resulted in the demise of many natural networks, in the abandonment of local interests and endeavors, and in the erosion of local culture to the globalizing forces of mass entertainment, mass food production, etc.

Whether we agree with it or not, globalization has changed the nature of the rural population in many parts of the world. Yet, the contradictions and dilemmas for the rural movement in a world of globalizing forces are obvious. Globalization has motivated the movement of large numbers of people from other parts of the world to areas that were dying and introduced people who having been displaced once at least once, are willing to engage in the defense of new horizons. For example, large areas in the Mid-western US have gained population thanks to younger immigrants, documented and undocumented, arriving from Mexico. Globalization—and the EU is a form of global market-- has invigorated the economies and increased the tax and demographic base of countries that were exporters of people. Spain was able to correct its negative population growth thank to the many Latin American and African immigrants entering the country to labor in the fields or take on domestic and tourist industry service jobs. Younger workers are underwriting the pension plans of many old industrial countries with an aging population. Global companies have produced new jobs in many countries, even though they may or may not be desirable jobs from the perspective of the industrialized countries of the world. It has also produced development in many rural areas, for example, in India, with the massive outsourcing of technology jobs from the west. On the other hand, the exporting of manufacturing and even hi-tech jobs out of the powerful industrial countries has caused great loss in urban and rural areas. Countries that place higher demands on corporations or want them to support existing social provisions unfortunately find themselves with no bargaining chips. Globalization is naturally fraught with challenges and contradictions and the geographic scale at which gains and losses are assessed is almost always ignored (Clarke, 1993).

The maintenance of rural areas and rural endeavors has always required small scale development and this is hard to achieve in a globalizing world. Localists do not reject the benefits of material progress but advocate against local/regional destructiveness, whether of the environment or of a way of life. A clear example of this is being played out as we speak in the Isle of Lewis with the proposed development of a massive wind farm by two British energy conglomerates. This project is promoted by some as a big economic boost to the Outer Hebrides, which have been losing population, and as an environmental gain for Britain in trying to meet EU clean energy goals. However, the same project is viewed as a "terrible thing" by those who have stayed on the island and whose commitment is to the natural landscape and a way of life (Hundley, 2006). The problem for decades has been coming up with local ideas and solutions to local problems such as economic decline, depopulation, etc. in a world dominated by global market forces over which local authorities, and increasingly, national governments, have little control.

Nevertheless, there are signs of re-emergence of the locality specific tenet, both as a conceptual localist principle --or as Pratchett (2004) has suggested, "the capacity to define and express local identity..."(p.366)-- and as a way of organizing and delivering rural services. All signs are that localism is again re-appearing, closely tied to community oriented practices and development. In England, for example, the Local Government Act of 2000 was the result of much debate and, as analysts (or perhaps supporters) of the legislation see it,

...the act focused on what devolution to neighbourhoods means in practice and how local authorities can use these different developments to define a fresh and innovative approach that responds to the needs of local communities. In short, the act paved the way for today's explosion in new styles of partnership, area based initiatives and networking at the local level..."(Coaffee and Johnston, 2005: p.166).

Diamond (2005) described that the government set out a model for local strategic partnerships (LPSs) and that the acceleration of "partnership working" has become the norm. But he also warns that the policies of New Labour are "in effect, reactive and lack an alternative to the quasi-market trends of the past 30 years" adding that many New Labour policies "conceal a distrust of local difference". (Diamond, 2004:p.20). The contradictions for scholars relating to this theme are intense. Yet the challenges are there. Definitional issues surrounding what is meant by localism provide opportunities for investigation. Is localism embedded in unbending tradition or is it a way of embracing more open participation? Does localism provide new opportunity for unique practices in rural areas or is it a way of disguising standardization? Does the localist narrative provide opportunities for moving away from narrow performance objectives or does it simply repeat the market language at a local level? These are, as I see them, some of the challenges for researchers.

In the US, where the term localism is used more ambivalently, the rhetoric and reality of local community and local organizations is ever present. Devolution in the US has had drastic consequences for funding, particularly the social services. Citizens and local governments alike have had to be vigilant of central government devolving responsibility to local areas without the funds to solve any problems. In theory, whether urban or rural, citizens like the idea of participating in the decisions that affect their lives and the closer the decisions are to them, the larger the possibilities for participation. But, behind the façade of local control often lies a real dislike for differences and an ever present desire to standardize. Nevertheless, local efforts in the US have been closely related – unfortunately, sometimes equated-- to local partnerships and they have become the fashion of the day. The federal government has opted to provide funding through highly focused projects, which make it easier to enforce the measurement of specific goals and objectives. For example, the government will fund health projects and drug rehabilitation, to mention only the most outstanding themes. In these cases, partnerships are almost a requirement. Partnerships for the treatment of AIDS patients in rural areas, partnerships for the detection of metha-amphetamine labs and the treatment of methamphetamine addicts, a mayor current concern in rural America, are highly sought for by government departments.

Academics always find it easier to be critical than constructive, but we must avoid that tendency. If we are to move ahead, we must think positively. Giving up the rural cause is not an option so I will talk about hopeful signs and possibilities. There are examples of localism in the best tradition of local democracy and initiative in the developing world. I have already referred to the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh. On a recent trip to Argentina, I discovered that a sleepy northern town which had always been attractive to tourist

because of its unique and highly local culture and life-style, has made enormous gains. Government has systematically invested in the infrastructure, supported very small, local industries and enabled the town to showcase its commitments to the arts and culture. Arriving immigrant refugees from Eastern Europe have helped regenerate a symphony orchestra that the locals had not seen since the 1920s, while a very active local government has secured the refurbishing of a building to concert hall standards, appropriate for the gains made. Tourism is booming and the town has made an industry of its way of life. And this is not unimportant since economic security is a powerful remedy for social ills.

Perhaps we need to end recognizing that change has been real and traumatic in rural areas, that there are no panaceas, but that the consequences of new practices have not all been negative. Those committed to the rural cause are often discouraged by a world that appears unsympathetic and unresponsive to the different ethos rurality involves, which is one not of different aspirations but one where context and scale are different.

I hope I have given you a glimpse of how localism and community oriented efforts are still important and popular, and how as rural professionals we might be able to capitalize on their time tested validity. My challenge has been to offer a global perspective without appearing to be pompous or, on the other had, simplistic. Speaking about the UK, for example, is dangerous for anyone who is, at best, a student of your system. It is clear that you have much to teach me. Yet, I hope I have offered some thoughts we can discuss. I tried to offer a review of rural localistic principles, not just as a dispassionate scholar but within a framework of commitment to preserving what was best in rural areas and changing what might interfere with their intrinsic possibilities.

Thank you for listening.

November 30, 2006

References

Barnes, J. (2005) Arthur and George. London: Jonathan Cape.

Chambers, C. (1963) Seedtime of reform; American social service and social action 1918-1933, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Diamond, J. (2005) Reflecting on the processes of a local evaluation. Networks, narratives and partnerships. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, V.18,2:178-189

Diamond, J. (2004) First it was "going local" in the 1980's and now it is "localism"- what have we learnt and why does it matter?, in Hardy, S and Larsen, L.B., and Freeland, F. *The challenges of localism. Conference Proceedings of the Regional Studies Association.* Seaford, UK: Regional Studies Association.

Dominelli, L. and Hoogvelt, A. (1996) Globalisation and the technocratisation of social work, *Critical Social Work Policy*, 16,2: 45-62.

Dominelli, L. (2002) *Anti-oppressive social work theory and practice*. London: Palgrave.

Dugger, C. (2006) Peace Prize to pioneer of loans for those too poor to borrow, *New York Times*, October 14, pp. A1-A6

Coaffee, J. (2005) New localism and the management of regeneration. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, V.18,2:108-113

Coaffee, J. and Johnston, L. (2005) The management of local government modernization., *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, V.18,2:164-177
Ginsberg, L., ed. (1976) *Social work in rural communities*. New York: Council on Social Work Education

Gill, S. (1995) Globalisation, market civilization, and disciplinary neoliberalism, *Millenium* 24, 3:399-423.

Green, R.K, and Webster, S.A. (1977) *Social work in rural areas: Preparation and practice*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee

Clarke, S. (1993) The new localism: Local politics in a global era, chapter I, pp. 1-21, in Goetz, E.G. and Clarke, S., eds., *The new localism. Comparative urban politics in a global era*. London: Sage.

Hadley, R. and McGrath, M.(1980) *Going local. Neighbourhood social services*. London: Bedford Square Press.

Hadley, R and Clough, R (1996) *Care in chaos. Frustration and challenge in community care*. London: Cassell

Hewison, K. (2000) Resisting globalization: a study of localism in Thailand. *The Pacific Review*, V.13,2: 279-296

Hundley, T. (2006) Plan for giant wind farm divides gusty Scottish isle. *Chicago Tribune*, reprinted in the *Arizona Republic* , October 21.

Martinez-Brawley, E. (1980) *Pioneer efforts in rural social welfare. First hand views since 1908*. State College, PA : The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Martinez-Brawley.E. (1981) *Seven Decades of Rural Social Work*. New York: Praeger.

Martinez-Brawley, E. (1982) Rural social and community work in the U.S. and Britain. A cross-cultural perspective. New York: Praeger.

Martinez-Brawley, E. (1990) Perspectives on the Small Community: Humanistic Views for Practitioners. Silver Springs, MD: NASW Press.

Martinez-Brawley, E. and Brawley, E. (1992) Community Care in a Rural Patch in Cumbria, England, Social Service Review, V. 66, No. 1:32-49.

Pratchett, L. (2004) Local autonomy, local democracy and 'New Localism'. Political Studies, 52, 358-375.

Pugh, R. and Jones, E. (1999) Language and social work practice: minority language provision within the Guardian ad Litem service, British Journal of Social Work, 29,4: 529-545.

Stuart, P. (2004) Social welfare and rural people. From the colonial era to the present, in T. Laine Scales and Calvin L. Streeter, eds. Rural social work. United States: Thomson: Brooks/Cole