Social Exclusion, Community, and Integration of Lower Income Young Adults in the Brainerd Lakes Area
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This proposal describes a project that Richelle Winkler will pursue as part of her dissertation research in conjunction with a group of community residents in the Brainerd Lakes Area. The goal of this proposal is to summarize the research goals, methods, budget, and expected products. This proposal is negotiable in the sense that any agreed upon project should meet both the needs of the researcher and the more practical goals of the community.
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**The Project**

*Attempts to address inequality and social exclusion must seek both to alter the structures which constrain individuals’ actions and also to build the capacity to act of those actors with the least power and opportunities (Shucksmith 2000, p.209).*

This research project is a collaboration between a group of community leaders in the Brainerd Lakes area, community members in Crosby and Brainerd, and Richelle Winkler (a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin- Madison-- see below for a list of collaborators). It is based on a community-based participatory research model, where a professional researcher works in conjunction with community leaders and community members to carry out a research endeavor that will provide useful information that can be applied in the community to better the lives of local residents. The ideas for this particular research came out of meetings of a group of local community leaders who organized around the idea of promoting social capital in the Brainerd Lakes area and out of interviews conducted by Richelle Winkler in the Brainerd Lakes area in summer and fall 2007. Together, this group has decided on the following goals for the research project and agreed upon the methods presented here. This proposal is meant to provide a rough guideline for how the project will proceed. Still, it is important to recognize that the proposal may need to be modified to better fit the needs of the local participants.

**Summary and Goals**

This study aims to better understand those who are at the margins of economic and community life in the Brainerd Lakes Area and to work with these people to identify common problems they share and then work toward problem resolution. We want to better understand barriers that keep low socio-economic status young adults in the Brainerd Lakes area from achieving more meaningful integration into social and economic life and then work toward alleviating those constraints. More specifically, the target group is lower income people with relatively little education and few professional experiences who are age 18-30 and live in or around Crosby or in southeast Brainerd. This target group was chosen based on prior research in the Brainerd Lakes Area suggesting that younger adults with low socio-economic status (SES) are among the most excluded residents of the community and on data from U.S. Census 2000 that shows that relatively large numbers of young adults live in Brainerd and in Crosby and that both of these areas have relatively high levels of low income, poverty, and unemployment.

There are three goals of this project. Each will be discussed in detail below.

1. to identify constraints to economic and community integration of low SES adults age 18-30
2. to work with and empower the target population toward organizing to address shared problems
3. to evaluate the process aimed at including the target population in economic and community life

Research suggests that empowering individuals to understand and address their own problems is often the best way of integrating them into social and economic life. Similarly, offering opportunities for people to define and discuss problems, come up with ways to address problems, and work together to meet their goals provides people with the tools necessary to meet their personal needs while also making the community a better place to live. Rather than a top-down approach where academics or policy-makers decide what the problems are, this approach allows people living in the situation to have a say in determining what the most important issues are to address and how to address them.
In sum, we will examine specific constraints that low socio-economic status young adults in the Brainerd Lakes Area face, implement strategies meant to empower these individuals to work towards addressing these constraints and achieving more meaningful inclusion in economic and community life, and evaluate the results of the process. We hope to learn what some of the most important issues are that lower income young adults in the community face. And, we hope to learn how well this kind of a process works to better include these folks in social and economic community life.

Throughout this project, the role of the researcher is one of facilitator. Ultimately, any tangible successful outcomes will be the result of real work undertaken by community members themselves. The idea is to offer an inclusionary process through which excluded residents are invited in, listened to, encouraged toward more involvement, offered some tools and skills to aid them in future involvement, and connected with more advantaged community members to bridge social capital. In the end, we will evaluate how the process works.

**Scope of Work**

**Initial Community Meetings**

In each of the two case sites (Crosby and southeast Brainerd), we will solicit between 25 and 60 participants to engage in a World Café\(^1\) style meeting. Participants will be solicited by (1) placing flyers announcing the meeting, (2) newspaper announcements, and (3) directly inviting people to participate. Community members in Crosby and Brainerd will help to recruit participants by directly inviting folks and taking their phone numbers. Then reminder calls will be placed prior to the meeting. Participants will be encouraged to attend by holding the meeting in an easy to reach and accessible location, making the meeting very informal and relaxed in nature, offering a free meal, offering free childcare, offering a chance to win several items of interest, including a flat screen TV and gas cards. These meetings will be conducted July 16, 2008 (Crosby) and the week of July 21-25, 2008 (Brainerd).

The meeting participants will be asked to discuss their community and common issues that they face. The World Café format will offer participants a chance to discuss the common circumstances that they face and how they might work together to improve well-being. Using the World Café format, participants sit at tables of 4-6 people each. Each table has a designated “host” to guide the conversation and to record the table’s responses. We will address the first question in these small groups, then everyone except the host at each table is asked to move to a different table and to sit with new people. Once the moves are made, we address the second question in these small groups, and so forth through the 4-5 questions. At the conclusion, the entire group comes together and table hosts have an opportunity to present what their table discussed.

The World Café is a conversational process for sharing collective knowledge and increasing people’s capacity for effective action in the pursuit of common aims (Brown 2005). The World Café method is meant not only to convey information but also to empower participants, build connections between participants, and to foster a sense of camaraderie and direction toward collective action. As such, this method offers an ideal process for learning about constraints that participants face and for empowering residents to work toward alleviating these constraints. The process itself will build social capital among disadvantaged individuals, while at the same time participants will work toward more visible ways to address common problems.

---

\(^1\) Learn more about the World Café method at [www.theworldcafe.com](http://www.theworldcafe.com)
Preliminary World Café Questions:

1. I want to learn about people like you and your neighbors. What are some important life goals that people in your neighborhood have?
2. What kinds of things stand in the way of being able to reach those goals?
3. What kinds of things keep young adults in Crosby/Brainerd from having a good economic situation?
4. Some people are not as involved in community life as other people. By this, I mean some people don’t trust very many people in the community, or get involved in a lot of different community groups or clubs or vote in elections or attend a lot of community events. Thinking about people your age, what would you say are some of the reasons that those folks aren’t more integrated into community life?
5. What are some of the most important problems that need to be addressed in Crosby/Brainerd for younger adults who are having a hard time making ends meet and/or who are not very involved in community life?

The meetings will finish by asking each individual to write down the most important constraints that inhibit people in their neighborhood’s ability to get more involved in economic and community life. And anything else that they think we should know.

At the conclusion of the session, participants will be asked to respond to a survey that will assess initial levels of economic and community connectedness and allow them to summarize their thoughts from the meeting. This survey will be used in the evaluation part of the program described below. They will also be asked to return at a later date for a strategic planning meeting where participants will brainstorm ways that they might work together to respond to common challenges.

**Strategic Planning Meetings**

Participants will be asked to return for a follow-up strategic planning meeting to be held in October 2008 where participants will decide upon a particular constraint or issue that they want to address and begin to set up a plan for how they might go about addressing this issue. We will discuss what issues are of most concern and which we could feasibly do something about. After having narrowed down the issues to one that is both important and the group is capable of addressing, we will set up a committee and lay out an initial game plan for how this issue might be addressed.

Residents will be empowered by the act of voicing their concerns and having them heard, making a decision that something can be done and how to work toward it, and then working on alleviating the problem themselves. Whether or not they are successful in the tangible effort of addressing the issue of their choice, participants will have built social capital amongst themselves, been included in an important process, and begun to identify and discuss in a meaningful way issues of common concern. Rather than serving as the leader and manager of this effort, the researcher will serve as a facilitator and encourage leadership from within.

**Evaluation**

The researcher will solicit follow-up remarks from all participants by mailing a follow-up survey in spring 2009 and conducting in-person follow-up focus groups to determine how this process has succeeded and how it has fallen short. What is working? Where do needs remain? How might the process be altered? Can this kind of inclusionary process begin to chip away at the problems of social exclusion? The follow-up survey will be compared against the initial survey to examine whether and how participants’ connections (economically and socially) to the community have changed with this process. We will be
able to compare surveys from one individual at two different points in time, and we will compare the entire group of surveys at two different points in time.

This evaluation will offer insight into how the process might be modified with the same participants to encourage its success. It will also offer insight that might be applied to additional programs in the Brainerd Lakes area and/or in other areas.

**Products**

The major product that will result from the proposed research is the dissertation. This will be provided to five professors who make up my dissertation committee at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. In addition, it will be published in the University of Wisconsin-Madison library.

Besides the formal dissertation, I will write brief and accessible summary reports describing the methods and results of the study described in the Scope of Work. These summaries will be tailored specifically to meet the needs of the group and will be distributed to all research group members and to all participants of any of the group meetings. Similarly, I would be happy to present results in person to any small group of community members who are interested in the study. We might also decide to produce a press release for the newspaper or discuss other potential avenues for summarizes results that would be useful to community members.

Finally, there is potential for more formal publication resulting from this study. First, results may be presented at academic conferences. Second, papers may be published in academic journals. Finally, more practical publications may also result, and I would welcome joint authorship with community research group members and/or participants in World Cafes. See notes below about data sharing and disclosure.

**Data Sharing and Disclosure**

Recognizing that some of the information generated in this study may be sensitive to individuals, the confidentiality of each participant (including all group members) will be strictly protected. For instance, names of participants will not be disclosed and information shared by participants will not in any way be associated with identifying characteristics in any publication, presentation, or even conversation. Even within the group, individual information with identifying information attached will NOT be shared, but rather summaries of issues will be shared or the person who said certain things will be kept confidential.

The community research group will have the opportunity to read and comment on all material prior to publication (even the dissertation) related to Paper 3 described in the Scope of Work above.
Collaborators and Roles
I consider all collaborators to be partners in my dissertation research. While additional collaborators may be included based on interest and need, the current major collaborators on this project include:

Social Capital Group
Mike Burton, Brainerd Lakes Area Community Foundation
Sheila Havercamp, Brainerd Lakes Area Development Corporation
Lisa Paxton, Brainerd Lakes Area Chamber of Commerce
Don Hickman and Kathy Gaalswyk, Initiative Foundation
Larry Lundblad, Central Lakes College
Terry McCollough, Brainerd Dispatch
Todd Lyscio, Community Education

Community Residents
Mike Hofstrand, Crosby
[I’m working on adding a few others to this list]

Researcher
Richelle Winkler, PhD Student, University of Wisconsin- Madison

I am indebted to the social capital group for helping to identify research ideas and needs, for offering insight into community issues through our meetings, and for providing access to data generated through the social capital survey.

I hope that the social capital group will continue to engage in this research by:
- Allowing collaborators to refer to the local social capital study and group members when soliciting participants and in the World Cafes
- Engaging with the results of the meetings, helping to interpret them and providing support for the target group’s work where appropriate
- Providing funding for supplies and incentives needed to conduct group meetings
- Engaging in continued discussions about the methods and results of this research
- Reviewing and editing any published results of Papers 3, and potentially collaboratively authoring publishable work related to this project

The community residents will also provide support and suggestions that are absolutely necessary to the success of this project, particularly with respect to recruiting participants and the logistics of making the meetings happen. I hope that these folks will:
- Aid with recruiting participants
- Promote the meetings
- Make suggestions about locations, incentives, childcare, etc.
- Engage in continued discussions about the methods and results of this research
  - Make suggestions about how to ask questions at the World Café meetings
  - Review results and help with interpreting results
- Review and edit any published results, and potentially collaboratively author publishable work related to this project

As researcher, I will coordinate this effort and manage the research. This means that I will set up meetings, recruit participants, lead meetings, write questions and surveys, gather and summarize results, write summary reports, and maintain communication and coordination with the entire group.
Funding Requested

The success of this project will be determined by the depth and breadth of participation by local residents, particularly of low socio-economic status residents. In order to gain widespread participation, I would like to offer some incentives to participation. Also, there will be needs for supplies associated with the meetings, postage and printing costs, and travel costs.

Budget:

**World Cafés & Strategic Planning Meetings (4 meetings total):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digital Voice Recorders (3 @ $50/each)</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals at meetings</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room fees</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for Participation</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies (pens, paper, flipcharts, markers, etc.)</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Mailing</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas and Travel</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Products:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper &amp; Printing</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel for Presentation</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$550</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total:** $4,050

Funds secured from alternative sources: - $500

**Total Funds Requested:** $3,550
### Timeline

**July 2008:** I will spend approximately four weeks living in the Brainerd Lakes Area working on this project. During this time, I will recruit participants and conduct the two World Cafes sessions (one in Crosby on July 16 and one in Brainerd the week of July 21-25).


**October 2008:** Conduct follow-up strategic planning meetings with World Café participants.

**November 2008:** Provide collaborators with summary of strategic planning meetings.

**Spring 2009:** Conduct evaluation of process

**Summer 2009:** Write up evaluation and write dissertation. Provide summary report of evaluation and entire project to collaborators by July 1, 2009.
Dissertation Project Overview:

Destination Development, Community, and Social Exclusion in Rural America

Brief Summary:
This dissertation will examine relationships between destination development and community well-being in the rural United States. More specifically, I am interested in the relationships between destination development and social and economic inequality, and I propose to address these relationships from the perspective of social exclusion. The dissertation is a collection of three papers that build off of one another and each addresses a particular dimension of these relationships. The first paper addresses definitions of “amenities” and challenges widespread presumptions about the geography of amenity-related development by quantitatively examining the spatio-temporal extent of destination development across the rural United States. The second paper addresses relationships between destination development and socio-economic measures of social exclusion in rural communities across the United States. In this paper, these relationships are addressed by decomposing three components of population change in destination communities (seasonal home-ownership, in-migration from metropolitan areas, and high housing values) and analyzing the influences of these components, as well as a collective measure of destination development, on outcome measures of socio-economic status and socio-economic inequality. The third paper is based on a case study of the Brainerd Lakes Area of central Minnesota. The purpose of this paper is to better understand those who are excluded from social life (focusing on low SES young adults in two particular neighborhoods) and to examine the structural and cultural constraints to inclusion that they face.

Overall, I expect that destination development brings new people into rural communities who have substantial financial, social, and human capital (Krannich, Petzelka, and Brehm 2006). This should spur economic development and community well-being and help to integrate rural communities into the broader regional and national society. However, if the people with these resources are not integrated into the social fabric of local community life, then their presence may create exclusion and divisions within communities that limit positive outcomes, generate economic inequality, create mostly low-paying and seasonal employment, threaten community, and restrict social solidarity.
Detailed Summary:

Recent research has documented a paradigmatic shift in the way that rural resources are valued from extractive-oriented natural resources to scenic and recreation-oriented environmental goods (Egan and Luloff 2000; Marcouiller, Deller and Green 2005). In an increasingly globalized and information-based society, rural communities in the United States (and elsewhere) are increasingly shifting development strategies toward attracting in-migrants, seasonal residents, and tourists who bring social, financial, and human capital to the community. As jobs in both manufacturing and extractive (farming, forestry, mining, fishing, etc.) industries have declined over the last thirty years, these traditional backbones of the rural economy have become less dependable in meeting the employment needs of rural American communities (Galston and Baehler 1995). In this context, national and local state agencies promote tourism and seasonal residents, and develop programs to attract new residents (oftentimes retirees) as a means of reviving rural economies. In the language of economic base theory, rural communities “export” their natural and cultural amenities to outsiders to build their economic base and grow their broader economies. The idea is that in-comers bring financial capital from outside the community, education, political involvement, and offer new links through their relationships both within and beyond the local community. In fact, Galston and Baehler argue that quality of life may be the new rural comparative advantage (1995).

Likewise, economists and rural development agencies promote amenity-based development as a key strategy that may help rural communities overcome economic and social hardships experienced in relation to economic restructuring and out-migration during the twentieth century (e.g. USDA Rural Development Initiatives and various state Cooperative Extension programs). Many rural communities, especially those rich in natural amenities and/or cultural heritage sites or those within extended commuting distance to vibrant metropolitan areas, are drawing this new type of development and have become magnets for tourism, seasonal residents and in-migration. While much research highlights the potential of such strategies for rural development (Frederick 1992, Galston and Baehler 1995, Power 1996, McGranahan 1999, Reeder and Brown 2005), a substantial number of studies emphasize the negative impacts of amenity-related rural development (Bontron and Lasnier 1997, Bourke and Luloff 1995, Hettinger 2005, Rothman 1998) leaving the debate over the outcomes of amenity-based development on rural communities unresolved, particularly with respect to community class divisions.

The objective of this study is to analyze relationships between destination development and community well-being in the rural United States. More specifically, I am interested in the relationships between destination development and social and economic inequality, and I propose to address these relationships from the perspective of social exclusion. Social exclusion is a broad concept referring to the fact that different groups and individuals within our society do not have access to the same opportunities for success in life for a variety of reasons (economic and social) and subsequently, some are excluded from full participation in social life. The idea of social exclusion has been resoundingly popular as a societal critique and as a policy program in both academia and in politics in Europe over the last decade (Daly 200?, Sen 2000, European Commission 2007), but its application to research and policy in the U.S. has been sparse (see discussion by Silver and Miller 2003). The concept emphasizes both social solidarity (recognizing the importance of ties between individuals, groups, and institutions to societal success) and social divisions (calling attention to those who are excluded from such solidarity because of relations among social classes—Daly 200?). The outcomes of social exclusion affect social conditions and relationships as well as economic ones. My research focuses on the distributional aspects of social exclusion, with specific attention to divisions between more and less advantaged residents (socio-economically) in destination communities.

Sen (2000) points out that there are two ways that social exclusion matters. First, social exclusion has constitutive relevance in that “being excluded can sometimes be in itself a deprivation and this can be of
intrinsic importance on its own” (13). Second, social exclusion also has an instrumental importance in that regardless of the personal alienation of being excluded, social exclusion may lead to additional problems (e.g. restriction from economic opportunities and/or social capital, criminal behavior, or mental health problems). While most research on quality of life and well-being focuses on individual outcomes, my research is focused on community outcomes. How does destination development impact community well-being? As Sen (2000) describes, the concept of social exclusion gives relational connections a central role in well-being. The relational nature of the concept of social exclusion makes it an appropriate theoretical perspective from which to connect relationships within and between communities to community well-being.

The term “community” is an elusive concept that evokes feelings of solidarity, nostalgia, and well-being, while at the same time serving as a unit of analysis in multifaceted social science studies. It is a loaded term with geographic, interactional, and normative dimensions that has been used by academics and the public in various circumstances with different meanings. Prevalent meanings include (1) place-based definitions that imply geographic boundaries (e.g. the City of Springfield or Shelbyville), non-place-based groups within which participants share common interests (e.g. religious community, academic community, etc.), and feeling-based (i.e. normative) definitions of community that evaluate the degree of cohesion or “sense of community” within a group. In an effort to refine academic conceptions of “community,” Luloff et al. (2004) offer a helpful distinction between “studies in community” and “studies of community.” Studies in community are “distinguished by their use of the community as the setting in which investigators conduct[ed] their work” (p. 251). With studies of community, on the other hand, community is the object of study, rather than the backdrop. In this research, I employ Theodori’s (2005) interactional definition of place-based community that draws on the work of Kaufman (1959) and Wilkinson (1991) where “community is defined as a place-oriented process of interrelated actions through which members of a local population express a shared sense of identity while engaging in the common concerns of life” (Theodori 2005, p. 662). In papers 1 and 2, communities serve as the unit of analysis within which I will examine destination development. They are studies in community and conducted under the premise that I am interested in destination development and its relationship with socio-economic development in rural communities. Papers 3 and 4, on the other hand, are studies of community where the issue of interest is the relationship between destination development and community.

In the United States, rural people and rural communities are excluded economically, socially, culturally, and politically from broader integration into national society. Income, earnings, educational attainment, social services, employment opportunities, quality housing choices, and public transportation options are all sparse in rural America in comparison to urban and suburban areas. Similarly, poverty rates in rural areas are substantially higher and more persistent than in either urban or suburban areas (Duncan 1999; Jensen, McLaughlin, and Slack 2003). Popular culture dismisses rural people as uneducated, backward, simple, or traditional with negative stereotypes of “rednecks” and “hicks” proliferating. Rural areas are excluded from national and often state politics as well. The national electoral college system ensures that more populated states get the largest say in presidential elections, and representatives to national and state legislatures represent districts that are almost never entirely rural, but include at least one substantial urban area that tends to dominate the time and concern of the district’s representative. This system has implications in the extent that rural interests are ever really represented in state and national politics. In this context of exclusion, destination development may help to integrate rural communities into larger national society by bringing financial, social, and human capital into rural areas.

At the same time, however, rural communities have historically been known for their relatively homogenous class structure and egalitarian norms within communities (Salamon 2003, Marcouiller 2007). This dissertation examines how the structural and cultural changes associated with destination development may disrupt this egalitarian ideal by concentrating access to goods in the hands of a few and
excluding others from “the good life.” Newcomers and seasonal residents who may have more urban incomes, values, and norms may generate new class divisions within communities, bringing social exclusion closer to home. Development of trophy homes, expensive restaurants, recreational outfitters, and trendy boutiques may serve as an outward reminder of the economic and social class differences present in destination communities. Does destination development promote social exclusion of the poor and working classes or does it integrate communities that otherwise might be left behind into larger society and provide new opportunities for community and economic development? How does this happen?

The goal of the proposed research is to examine relationships between destination development and social exclusion within rural destination communities, emphasizing the unequal distribution of economic and social goods within communities by social class. I use the term destination development in reference to demand for rural place as evidenced by the attraction of people as tourists, seasonal residents, or new full time residents. I will analyze relationships between destination development and socio-economic inequality and the pathways through which destination development influences community social cohesion. The dissertation is a collection of papers that deals with the central question of how destination development is related to social exclusion of the poor and working class from different perspectives. Data for the study will primarily come from the U.S. Census 1990 and 2000 and from a detailed case study of a destination region in central Minnesota. I will use these data to investigate the following specific aims.

**Specific Aim 1 addressed in Paper 1:**
To describe spatial and temporal dimensions of destination development across the rural United States.

To do so, this paper will introduce a destination development scale that measures demand for rural place at the community (Census Place) level as it is reflected by a combination of seasonal housing, in-migration, and high housing values using data from the U.S. Census in 1990 and 2000. I will then map the scale and analyze it spatially and temporally to examine where pockets of communities experiencing (and not experiencing) destination development cluster together and how this changed in the 1990s, a period of in-migration into rural areas and substantial recreation-oriented development. Measuring destination development by its outcomes (in-migration from metropolitan areas, seasonal housing, and high housing values), and then, analyzing the spatial distribution of destination development and related variables that might serve as its antecedents, will enable me to address the concept of “amenities,” what counts as an amenity destination, and whether this varies across space in new ways. Overall, I will address four questions:

1a: How widespread is destination development across the rural United States?
1b: To what degree does destination development cluster in particular areas of the country?
1c: To what degree does destination development occur in proximity to national parks and monuments, natural amenities, recreational infrastructure, and airports?
1d: How did the extent and the spatial distribution of destination development change between 1990 and 2000?

Without understanding the extent and distribution of amenity-led development, how can we really understand what an “amenity” is? What counts as an amenity destination? Prior research has primarily taken a deductive approach to this question examining possible relationships between a specific driver (an “amenity”) and population change, without a strong unifying theory to define “amenities” or to systematically explain established relationships (Green et al. 2006). In this paper, I take a more inductive approach starting with the outcome of destination development, exploring its spatial and temporal distribution across the rural United States, and finally seeking to explain the observed spatial and temporal distribution by building on existing empirical research and theory.
Specific Aim 2 addressed in Paper 2:
To analyze relationships between destination development and socio-economic measures of social exclusion.

This aim focuses on socio-economic dimensions of social exclusion and will use regression analysis (incorporating spatial models where appropriate):

2a: To investigate links between destination development and integration of rural communities into the broader regional and national economy, measured by changes in income, education, poverty, and unemployment.

2b: To examine relationships between destination development and social exclusion within rural communities, measured by income inequality, housing affordability, and inequality in educational attainment.

Proponents argue that destination development offers an important opportunity to reinvigorate rural economies. This paper examines this claim with specific attention to those who might be left behind (or socially excluded) with such development. It emphasizes the unequal distribution of socio-economic goods as a measure of social exclusion. Are they distributed equally, or are there inequalities in access to socio-economic goods in destination communities? Does destination development improve socio-economic well-being in rural communities from the sense of a rising tide lifting all boats? Or are some residents excluded from improvements in socio-economic well-being?

Specific Aim 3 addressed in Paper 3:
To investigate how low socio-economic status (SES) residents are socially excluded in a rural destination area, and to examine the extent to which an inclusionary process aimed at promoting the inclusion of these residents can increase participation in social and economic life.

Taking a community based research approach, I will examine structural and cultural constraints to social inclusion facing low SES young adults in two excluded neighborhoods within the Brainerd Lakes area. After gaining a better understanding of the important issues, I will work together with community residents to prescribe solutions, implement those ideas, and to build bridging social capital across groups. Finally, I will evaluate the results of this process aimed at including the excluded.

3a: What barriers to socio-economic and community inclusion do low SES young adults face?
3b: How might local residents address specific barriers?
3c: How is this process aimed at inclusion and bridging social capital successful? And where does it fall short?