Who Benefits?
Looking at Minnesota Foundation Grants to the Disadvantaged

by Frederick W. Smith

Minnesota has a national reputation for generous private philanthropy. Corporation and foundation giving here totaled over $180 million in 1982. Additionally, the philanthropic community here enjoys a reputation as one of the most innovative and responsive in the United States. A little-raised question in philanthropy, however, is “Who benefits?” Usually the closest this question comes to being addressed is through breakdowns of grantmaking into broad categories such as education, arts and humanities, community affairs, and social services. The categories indicate what types of activities receive support, but fail to show who the beneficiaries are.

A study released last fall by the Philanthropy Project* examined the question of who benefits by looking at how much of Minnesota’s philanthropic support goes to the disadvantaged. This included disadvantaged both in Minnesota and elsewhere. Making use of the same data, this report explores how the disadvantaged in Minnesota alone have benefited from corporation and foundation giving. As with the report of the Philanthropy Project, the purpose here is not to analyze or explain but to describe the extent of support that Minnesota’s foundations have provided to Minnesota’s disadvantaged.

The Disadvantaged

The problems of the disadvantaged are increasing in the 1980s. Between 1979 and 1982, the number of United States families living in poverty rose by 47.2 percent. Women with children led the list. One-fourth of all United States children now live in poverty. In the Twin Cities in 1980, one in every four minority families were living in poverty, compared to one in twenty among white families. Twin Cities racial minorities fared worse than minorities in twenty-five other metropolitan areas. Many people thrive and succeed in Minnesota, but people in the economic top and bottom of our society are growing apart and the number of those at the bottom is increasing.

For the purposes of this study, the disadvantaged were defined as “those groups who have been systematically denied full participation in the life of society by political, social, economic, religious, cultural or other barriers.” Based on this definition, three major groupings of disadvantaged constituents were selected: 1) Racial Minorities, 2) Women, and 3) Other Disadvantaged. The last category is predominately low income people and includes the handicapped, the unemployed, senior citizens, the mentally ill or mentally impaired, illiterates, and disabled veterans.

The Philanthropists

Philanthropy, and charity in general, is often regarded as a unique American mechanism for remedying ills that exist in society. Nonprofits are seen as an important force for pluralism, one that is able to tackle problems in ways that complement the actions of government. The nonprofit sector can be a source of innovation, can increase government accountability and responsiveness, and can give voice and opportunities to those at the bottom of the social and economic ladder.

*Jon Pratt and Rosangela Baurto, Minnesota Philanthropic Support for the Disadvantaged. Philanthropy Project (1982, South 5th Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404) (30 September 1984). Copies are available from the Project for $4.00 and may be ordered by phoning CURA at 612/373-7833.
advantaged people. The largest forty foundations account for over 75 percent of philanthropic giving each year in Minnesota. The most recent year for which adequate data were available was 1982. Philanthropic giving was examined by grant. Because the detailed information needed could be obtained only for grants from thirty-three out of the largest forty foundations, the results are based on these thirty-three foundations. These thirty-three gave a total of $118 million in 1982 or 65 percent of the total amount given by all Minnesota foundations that year. The sample is a valuable predictor of the entire amount, particularly given the strong correlation found between foundation size and the extent of foundation support for the disadvantaged.

The sample of thirty-three foundations is broken down into two major types of foundation: corporate and private. Some corporations choose not to formally establish a foundation but instead use corporate giving programs; programs of this type which responded are included here with the corporate foundations. A third type of foundation is the community foundation, usually formed in large cities only. Two community foundations are grouped with the private foundations in this study. The sample thus includes nineteen private foundations (sixteen based in the Twin Cities metropolitan area and three in greater Minnesota) and fourteen corporate foundations (all based in the metro area).

The Questions

To what extent is Minnesota philanthropy reaching Minnesota’s disadvantaged? No definitive answer can be made. What was examined was how much money goes from Minnesota-based foundations to organizations serving Minnesota’s disadvantaged. With the available data, we were able to compare private foundation giving with corporate foundation giving and to explore four main questions: How much money do Minnesota foundations provide to disadvantaged groups and programs? How much of this money goes to the disadvantaged in the metropolitan Twin Cities area and how much to the disadvantaged in greater Minnesota? How much of the money in Minnesota goes to each type of disadvantaged: racial minorities, women, and other disadvantaged? And how much of the money goes to organizations in Minnesota that are actually governed by the disadvantaged constituencies themselves?

How Much for the Disadvantaged?

The thirty-three foundations surveyed gave a total of $118 million in 1982, both in Minnesota and outside of Minnesota. Of their total giving, $27.4 million (or 23 percent) was specifically earmarked for the disadvantaged in Minnesota. Thus, approximately one out of every four dollars given by Minnesota foundations in 1982 was given to benefit the disadvantaged in Minnesota. Among the individual foundations, total giving to the disadvantaged ranged from almost 80 percent in one case to less than 2 percent in another.

When comparing how private and corporate foundations gave to Minnesota’s disadvantaged in 1982, several differences emerged. Of the total amount given by private foundations, $19.1 million or 26 percent was to benefit Minnesota’s disadvantaged (Table 1). For corporate foundations the comparable figures are $8.3 million and 19 percent. Because the size of foundations, both corporate and private, varies so much, these aggregate figures may be misleading. The typical corporate foundation—the median corporation was chosen—gave 20 percent of its total contributions to the disadvantaged in Minnesota while the typical private foundation—again, the median was chosen—gave 18 percent. A larger difference was that for the typical corporate foundation, one in every five dollars given to the disadvantaged went to organizations outside of Minnesota. The typical private foundation made no grants to the disadvantaged out of state.

Table 1. MINNESOTA FOUNDATION GRANTS, 1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Giving</th>
<th>Giving to Minnesota’s Disadvantaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dollar Amounts</td>
<td>Dollar Amounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both Inside and</td>
<td>Both Inside and Outside Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(in millions)</td>
<td>(in millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Foundations</td>
<td>$74</td>
<td>$19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Foundations</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 14)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$118</td>
<td>$27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF GRANTS TO MINNESOTA’S DISADVANTAGED, 1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Number of Grants</th>
<th>Average Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Foundations</td>
<td>$8,172,672</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>$8,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to Twin Cities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to greater</td>
<td>173,029</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Foundations</td>
<td>$15,943,344</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>23,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to Twin Cities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations</td>
<td>3,145,741</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>22,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to greater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$27,434,785</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>$14,726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other differences between corporate and private foundations’ giving were found in the number and size of grants. For every four grants made to the disadvantaged by private foundations, corporate foundations made five, but the average corporate grant was less than one-third the size of the average private foundation grant.

Where Were These Disadvantaged?

As expected, foundation giving to the disadvantaged was not distributed evenly throughout the state. Of the total $27.4 million, $24.1 million was given to organizations headquartered in the Twin Cities metropolitan area, while $3.3 million went to organizations in greater Minnesota. Slightly over 2.5 percent of the total monies given by Minnesota foundations in 1982 was to benefit the disadvantaged in greater Minnesota.

Comparing foundations based in the Twin Cities area with those in greater Minnesota, one notes that more foundation money for the disadvantaged came from greater Minnesota into the Twin Cities than went in the other direction. Of the three greater Minnesota foundations, only one made grants to the Twin Cities’ disadvantaged but these grants equaled 13 percent of the total amount given to the disadvantaged by all three foundations. For Twin Cit-

*See the Philanthropy Project’s report for a listing of the foundations and more details on how the data were assembled.
ties foundations, 8 percent of the money and 7 percent of the grants for Minnesota’s disadvantaged went to organizations in greater Minnesota. Nine of the Twin Cities foundations made no grants to the disadvantaged in greater Minnesota while another seven made fewer than three grants to non-metro organizations.

Overall, foundation grants were distributed so that for every one grant and dollar given to an organization serving the disadvantaged in greater Minnesota, eight grants and eight dollars were given to organizations serving the disadvantaged in the Twin Cities area.

Corporate and private foundation giving can be compared while looking at the overall distribution of foundation grants to the disadvantaged within the state (Table 2). We note again, that more grants were made by corporate foundations than by private foundations. Corporate grants were made overwhelmingly in the metro area; less than 4 percent of the grants and about 2 percent of the corporate money for the disadvantaged went to greater Minnesota. The corporate grants that were made to organizations outside the metro area were less than half the size, on average, of those made to organizations in the Twin Cities.

Members of the United Handicapped Federation are participating in a rally at the state capitol. The Federation is one of the groups defined in this study as “other disadvantaged.” As such, they represent a constituency of predominately low income people. Organizations serving “other disadvantaged” receive the largest share of funding going to Minnesota’s disadvantaged groups from Minnesota foundations. The United Handicapped Federation was formed in 1974 as a coalition of over twenty groups seeking to give handicapped people greater control over their own lives through such things as access to personal care in the community rather than in nursing homes and access to public transportation and to job opportunities. The federation also seeks to educate the community about the handicapped.

The Philanthropy Project

The Philanthropy Project is a three year coalition of over seventy-five Minnesota non-profit organizations dedicated to increasing the amount of philanthropic support for the disadvantaged. The project works to accomplish this goal through peer education, grantmaker education, and research.

For peer education the project sponsors a breakfast series for non-profit directors and funders. Topics have included: “Making the Case for Funding Advocacy,” “A Grants Course on S.M. Minnesota Grantmakers,” Opportunities and Problems for Funding Non-Metro Organizations,” and “Evaluating the Grantmaker/Grantees/Relationship.”

Annual membership meetings, monthly board meetings, and informal consultations are also directed at peer education.

To date, the project has conducted three tours—one in St. Paul and two in Minneapolis—for over one hundred funders and corporate leaders to hear from fifty smaller non-profits serving the disadvantaged. A preliminary meeting has been held in Duluth. As a follow-up to the project’s research report, meetings are being held with each of the foundations to discuss the data generated by the report.

Under research, in addition to the recent report Minnesota Philanthropic Support for the Disadvantaged, the project has conducted a detailed member survey on fundraising capabilities and needs and on which foundations are currently supporting member organizations.

The Philanthropy Project publishes a quarterly newsletter which covers recent developments in the local foundation community and in funding for the disadvantaged. Subscriptions for non-members are $15 per year.

Jon Pratt is the Director of the Philanthropy Project and for more information can be reached at (612) 973-7833. Along with local grantmakers CURA has been a consistent supporter of the Philanthropy Project.
Compared to corporate grants, private foundation grants to the disadvantaged were more evenly distributed throughout the state, though the Twin Cities still received the lion’s share. Seventeen percent of the private foundation grants and 16 percent of the money went to organizations in greater Minnesota. The average grant to these organizations was only slightly smaller than the average grant to the Twin Cities organizations.

**Who Were the Disadvantaged?**

The Philanthropy Project developed data for three groupings of disadvantaged constituencies: racial minorities, women, and other disadvantaged. For every three dollars given to the disadvantaged in Minnesota, roughly two went to “other disadvantaged” while the remaining one dollar was shared by racial minority groups and women (Table 3). The division, however, was not equal. In the Twin Cities, women received one dollar for every two received by racial minorities. This pattern was reversed in greater Minnesota.

Organizations serving racial minorities in greater Minnesota received less than 10 percent of what similar organizations in the Twin Cities were granted. Greater Minnesota’s women’s organizations received 36 percent of their Twin Cities’ counterparts and “other disadvantaged” organizations in greater Minnesota received 11 percent of the amount granted to similar organizations in the Twin Cities. For comparative purposes, it may be useful to note the distribution of Minnesota’s disadvantaged populations in the Twin Cities area and in greater Minnesota. According to the census figures, which have traditionally undercounted disadvantaged populations, racial minorities in greater Minnesota include slightly more than 3 percent of Minnesota’s black population, 22 percent of the Hispanic population, and 50 percent of the American Indian population. Women are divided fairly evenly between the Twin Cities area and the rest of the state, according to a recent report from the Commission on the Economic Status of Women, though women over age sixty-five are more numerous in greater Minnesota. Data for people living in poverty (which can be taken as roughly equivalent to “other disadvantaged”), again from the 1980 census, show that while slightly more than half of the state’s families live in the Twin Cities area, 65 percent of the families living in poverty are found in greater Minnesota.

Women’s organizations, both in the Twin Cities and greater Minnesota, received, on average, smaller and fewer grants than either of the other two categories. The average grant to women’s organizations was $9,127 while it was $10,407 to racial minority organizations and $18,346 to the “other disadvantaged.” This same pattern held in the geographic distribution of grants to these three constituencies with the exception of the number of grants received by women’s organizations in greater Minnesota.

When comparing corporate and private foundation giving to these three constituencies, it becomes clear that their patterns are basically the same and that the pattern of their giving is the same as that already noted. Women and minority organizations received far fewer grants from both corporate and private foundations than “other disadvantaged” organizations. Also, again, corporate foundations give more frequently to all categories but in smaller amounts than private foundations. Looking only at the Twin Cities based foundations, and comparing corporate and private foundation giving, the similarities in their giving patterns continue to stand out. The large number of grants to women’s organizations outside the Twin Cities area is observed again. Both corporate and private foundations in the Twin Cities area gave smaller grants to these organizations but the number of grants to women’s organizations (46)

Table 3. GRANTS MADE TO THREE CONSTITUENCIES OF MINNESOTA’S DISADVANTAGED, 1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Racial Minorities</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Other Disadvantaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dollar Amount</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Average Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(in millions)</td>
<td>of Grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Cities</td>
<td>$4.4</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>$9,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater MN</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disadvantaged</td>
<td>$4.8</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>$10,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cynthia Holmes teaches a beginning reading class at the Red School House in St. Paul. The school is representative of another disadvantaged constituency that benefits from Minnesota foundation grants—racial minorities. Red School House was created in 1972 as an alternative to public school education for American Indian children. The school was designed by Indians and is controlled by them. It seeks to keep Indian culture alive, prepare students for higher education or productive employment, and educate Indian youths to use their talents and help their people.
Volunteer attorney Paula Maccabee, center, and Junior League intern Mary Ann Fallon, right, are shown with a client at the L.A.W. clinic (Legal Assistance for Women) at Chrysalis. Chrysalis is representative of a third disadvantaged constituency that has benefited from Minnesota foundation grants—women. Chrysalis, A Center for Women, is a multi-service agency providing mental health, chemical dependency, and legal services for women and their families. Formed in 1974, it has expanded over more than a decade to serve over 12,000 women and their families each year.

accounted for more than one-third of the total number of grants (126) made by all Twin Cities foundations to disadvantaged organizations in greater Minnesota.

How Were the Disadvantaged Groups Governed?

A final element examined in the Philanthropy Project’s study was the type of governing structure operating in organizations that received grants. One strategy used by the disadvantaged is to develop organizations which they control themselves. How successful were these self-governing organizations in competing for grants as compared with other organizations? To examine this, three types of organizations were identified, each differing in the level of constituency control.

- **Type #1**: Organizations controlled by the constituency they serve, as for example, the Metropolitan Senior Federation (controlled by seniors elected by the organization’s members) and the Lexington-Hamline Community Council (controlled by residents of the Lexington-Hamline neighborhood). We called these constituency-controlled organizations.

- **Type #2**: Organizations that serve the disadvantaged exclusively but are not controlled by them, as for example, the Emergency Needs Project, Camp Courage, and Jobs Now. We called these advocacy organizations.

- **Type #3**: Organizations serving diverse constituencies that have one or more projects devoted to the disadvantaged, as for example, Macalester College, which has a Minority Student Program, and Catholic Charities, which runs an emergency shelter program. We called these multi-service organizations.

Overall, the total amount of money given to organizations serving the disadvantaged in Minnesota in 1982 was distributed so that 27 percent (or $7.4 million) went to organizations controlled by the disadvantaged. Another 25 percent ($7 million) went to organizations that serve the disadvantaged exclusively but are not controlled by them. And the remaining 48 percent ($13 million) went to multi-service organizations with one or more programs for the disadvantaged.

When looking at the number of grants, however, a rather different picture emerges. Type #1 organizations (controlled by the disadvantaged) accounted for 45 percent of all grants made to disadvantaged organizations. Type #2 accounted for 34 percent and type #3 for only 21 percent. The average grant was the inverse of this progression. Type #1 organizations received on average, $8,849 per grant, type #2 received $10,342 and type #3 received $33,840.

When comparing grants to these types of organizations by geographic distribution, a difference emerges between grants going to Twin Cities organizations and those going to greater Minnesota organizations. Twin Cities grants follow the pattern of increasing amounts for decreasing levels of constituency control. But in grants to organizations in greater Minnesota there was no consistent pattern—type #1 organizations received an average of $16,400, type #2 organizations received $24,636, and type #3 received $14,963.

Were there variations within the three constituency groups already identified? With the one exception of grants to women’s organizations of type #2, the same pattern of funding by governance type holds within each constituency group as a whole (Table 4). The lower the level of

| Table 4. AVERAGE GRANT BY CONSTITUENCY GROUP AND TYPE OF GOVERNANCE, 1982 |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                             | Racial Minorities | Women             | Other Disadvantaged |
|                             | #1    | #2    | #3    | #1    | #2    | #3    | #1    | #2    | #3    |
| To Twin Cities organizations| $8,434 | $9,475 | $16,225 | $7,303 | $11,311 | $10,018 | $8,844 | $9,805 | $49,763 |
| To greater MN organizations | 18,036 | 5,250  | 84,407 | 16,699 | 0      | 11,360 | 14,313 | 8,020  | 11,712  |
| To all MN organizations     | 8,699 | 9,173  | 18,881 | 8,782  | 11,311 | 10,323 | 9,214 | $10,975 | $42,186 |

Key to governance types

#1 constituency-controlled organizations
#2 advocacy organizations
#3 multi-service organizations
Table 5. A COMPARISON OF CORPORATE AND PRIVATE FOUNDATION GIVING BY GOVERNANCE TYPE, 1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of Monies to Minnesota’s Disadvantaged (in percents)</th>
<th>Size of Average Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Foundations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Twin Cities organizations</td>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To greater MN organizations</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Foundations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Twin Cities organizations</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To greater MN organizations</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to governance types:
#1 constituency-controlled organizations
#2 advocacy organizations
#3 multi-service organizations

derived from the Philanthropy Project study noted on page 1. The authors of that study, Jon Pratt and Rosangelica Aburto, provided many helpful suggestions in preparing this article. Becky Clauson gave invaluable assistance in assembling the data.

In Conclusion

The purpose of the Philanthropy Project’s report and this article is to describe rather than explain. The data that this study makes available raise many questions. What would explain, for example, the relative lack of support by corporate foundations for greater Minnesota organizations? And the relative lack of support by private foundations for constituency-controlled groups? Broader questions also remain. What are appropriate levels of support for Twin Cities organizations and for organizations in greater Minnesota? How much support should go to women’s organizations and racial minority organizations as compared to "other disadvantaged”? And what level of support is appropriate for constituency-controlled organizations as compared with advocacy organizations and multi-service providers? These questions lead to others not touched at all by the data. Perhaps most importantly, who will participate in helping shape the answers to these questions?

Frederick Smith is coordinator of Community Development Programs for CURA. This article is based on data

Urban Pedestrian Systems

A two-day conference exploring architectural, social, economic and public policy aspects of elevated and subterranean walkways, will take place April 13th and 14th at the Walker Art Center and the University of Minnesota. Through large group presentations, professional workshops, discussion panels, and tours of Minneapolis skyways, the conference will promote inter-disciplinary and comparative perspectives on existing pedestrian systems as well as systems being planned for major cities in the United States and Canada. Topics to be discussed include pedestrian systems and city growth patterns, architectural and engineering design criteria for pedestrian systems, pedestrian systems as economic development tools in central business districts, legal aspects of pedestrian system planning and implementation, and public/private scenarios for pedestrian system development.

Sponsored by the Walker Art Center, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, CURA, and the School of Architecture, this unique conference will feature distinguished U.S., Canadian, and European urbanists, designers, historians, developers, public officials, and planners. Registration fee for professionals attending public presentations and workshops is $100; general admission for public presentations is $20. For information call 375-7622.
The Baby Boomers are Coming Home
by John Fraser Hart

People are born, they move, and they die—these three facts explain all population change. I explored the movement of people between counties in Minnesota during the 1970s and discovered that: 1) roughly two-thirds of all migrants moved no more than fifty miles from the Twin Cities; 2) agricultural and mining areas continued to lose people by out-migration; 3) the members of the baby boom generation, unlike members of earlier generations, apparently have elected to return home after they have graduated from college or completed their tours of military duty; and 4) resort areas continued to attract migrants of all ages.

Migration Patterns

The state as a whole had almost no net migration between 1970 and 1980. Ninety-eight percent of the total population increase can be explained as natural increase (births minus deaths), leaving an increase of only 5,280 persons that must be explained by in-migration from outside the state.

Roughly two-thirds of all net migration between counties in Minnesota during the 1970s was concentrated within fifty miles of the Twin Cities (Figure 1). It consisted of migration outward from the two central counties to the surrounding nine-county ring (the seven county-ring plus Isanti and Chisago). Hennepin and Ramsey counties lost a total of 121,168 out-migrants, and the nine nearby counties gained a total of 115,755 in-migrants.

Beyond the metropolitan peripheries the principal areas of in-migration were resort areas in two large lake-speckled regions, one in Becker, Otter Tail, and Douglas counties between Detroit Lakes and Alexandria, with an outlier in Kandiyohi County near Willmar, and the other between Bemidji and Mille Lacs Lake in Hubbard, Cass, Crow Wing, Mille Lacs, and Kanabec counties (Figures 1 and 2). All of the good agricultural counties of the south and west lost migrants, as did the mining areas in St. Louis and Lake counties in the northeast.

Figure 1. MIGRANTS PER SQUARE MILE, 1970-1980

Figure 2. MIGRANTS, 1970-1980, AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE 1970 POPULATION
How Old Are the Migrants?

Every ten years the census of population publishes data on the number of people in each five-year age group, or cohort, for each county and for all cities of 10,000 or more people. I estimated the number of people in each cohort who had migrated to or from each county by comparing the number of people in each age group in 1970 with the number of people in the age group ten years older in 1980. It is obvious that the members of each age cohort were ten years younger at the census taken ten years earlier, and they will be ten years older at the census taken ten years later. The members of the cohort aged 45-49 at the 1980 census, for example, were aged 35-39 at the 1970 census and will be 55-59 when the next census is taken in 1990.

Only migration or death can change the number of people in a given age cohort. The size of the cohort increases if people of the appropriate age migrate into the county, and it decreases if people of that age migrate out of the county, or if they die. A change in the size of a cohort thus is a useful estimate of migration. It is expressed as the cohort survival ratio, which is the number of people in the cohort in 1980, for example, as a percentage of the number of people in the same cohort in 1970.

In Crow Wing county, to continue the example, take census data on the number of persons in three age groups in 1980 and in 1970:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Number of persons</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39 years</td>
<td>2,423</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44 years</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 49 years</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cohort aged 45-49 in 1980 had a survival ratio of 119.6, because the county had 1,558 people aged 35-39 in 1970 and 1,864 people aged 45-49 in 1980; apparently 306 people of this age had migrated into the county during the decade between censuses. A cohort survival ratio above 100 for a given age group indicates that people of the relevant age had moved into the county during the decade, and a ratio below 100 suggests out-migration. Survival ratios can be depressed by deaths as well as by out-migration, especially in the older age groups.

Cohort survival ratios actually underestimate migration unless they are "adjusted" to compensate for the number of deaths in the cohort during the decade, but data on age at death are not readily available for counties. It is customary to adjust the survival ratio for each cohort in each county by comparing it with the ratio for the same cohort in some larger area, such as the state or the nation, despite the fact that age-specific death rates can vary considerably within such large areas.

Such an adjustment seemed unnecessary in Minnesota in the 1970s, however, because most age groups in the state as a whole had survival ratios close to 100. In fact, many counties had unadjusted survival ratios well over 100 in many age groups, and these counties obviously had enjoyed in-migration of people in these groups.

First I tried plotting age-migration profiles for all eighty-seven counties in Minnesota, but the resulting graph was totally confusing—it looked like nothing quite so much as a pile of jackstraws. I simplified this graph by using only the values for the median county and the upper and lower decile counties for each age group (Figure 3). In each age group half of the counties had survival ratios above the median, and half were below it. The deciles indicate the range of values within the state. In each age group ten percent of the counties had survival ratios above the upper decile, ten percent had survival ratios below the lower decile, and eighty percent of the counties had values between the two decile lines.

Figure 3. AGE-MIGRATION PROFILES FOR COUNTIES IN MINNESOTA, 1970-1980

The Baby Boomers Are Coming Home

The most arresting feature of the age-migration profiles is the "off at school" phenomenon; the cohort of young adults aged 20-24 has a trough of heavy out-migration, when young people are away at college or in military service, and the cohort aged 30-34 has an impressive peak of in-migration, when they return home. In the state as a whole, for example, the cohort aged 10-14 in 1960 had 324,710 people. In 1970 the same cohort, now aged 20-24, had dropped to only 292,037 people, but the cohort aged 30-34 in 1980 had bounced back to 313,104 people. The survival ratios of 89.9 in the 1960s and 107.2 in the 1970s could be misleading, and a survival ratio of 96.4 for the twenty years between 1960 and 1980 is a more meaningful statistic.

The "off at school" trough and peak seems to be a standing wave that retains the same form at consecutive censuses. I

Age-migration profiles show the cohort survival ratios for each five-year age group. Ratios above 100 show in-migration, and ratios below 100 show out-migration. The median is the value of the ratio in the middle county in each age group. Ten percent of all counties have ratio values higher than the upper decile, ten percent have values lower than the lower decile, and eighty percent have values between these two deciles.
transferred the median age-migration profile for all counties in 1980 to a second graph, and plotted the median age-migration profiles for all counties in 1970, 1960, and 1950 on the same graph to show how migration patterns have changed in Minnesota counties (Figure 4). The median age-migration profile for 1950 reflects the dislocations of World War II, but the profiles for each census since 1960 show the same trough of outmigration in the college/military age group and the same peak of return migration in the group aged 30-34 (Figure 4). Both the trough and the peak were about thirty percentage points higher in 1980 than in 1970, however, which suggests that fewer young people were leaving their home counties in the 1970s, and that more of those who had gone off to college or to military service were returning.

I explored this idea by comparing twenty-year survival ratios for the cohorts in each county that were aged 10-14 in 1950 and in 1960. For example, Crow Wing county had 2,625 people aged 10-14 in 1950, and 1,687 people aged 30-34 in 1970, for a twenty-year survival ratio of 64.3. The county had 3,268 people aged 10-14 in 1960, and 2,790 people aged 30-34 in 1980, for a twenty-year survival ratio of 85.4, or a whopping increase of 21.1 percentage points. The county continued to lose young people during the 1970s, to be sure, but a vigorous return migration was compensating for a greater part of the loss than had hitherto been the case.

The cohort aged 10-14 in 1960 and 30-34 in 1980 is the postwar baby boom generation. Its members seem far more likely to return to their home counties after college or service than the members of earlier generations. Between 1970 and 1980 nearly half of the counties in Minnesota had increases of ten percentage points or more in twenty-year survival ratios for the group aged 30-34 in the census year, almost a quarter had increases of more than twenty percentage points, and less than a quarter actually lost percentage points (Figure 5).

The counties that had the greatest gains in twenty-year survival ratios were in the outer suburban ring around the Twin Cities and along the second home trail that extends northward past Mille Lacs Lake, Brainerd, and Bemidji (Figure 5). The southern and western parts of the state fared less well. The counties that suffered losses were at the urban extremes—for the most part they had cities of considerable size or no urban places at all.

The median age-migration profiles for all Minnesota counties have been rising steadily since World War II. The trough at age 20-24 shows that young people have gone away to college or to military service, and the peak age 30-34 shows that increasing numbers have been returning home.

Figure 5. CHANGE IN MIGRANTS AGED 30 TO 34 BETWEEN 1950-1970 AND 1960-1980

The median age-migration profiles for all Minnesota counties have been rising steadily since World War II. The trough at age 20-24 shows that young people have gone away to college or to military service, and the peak age 30-34 shows that increasing numbers have been returning home.
the prospect of the good life, and they may be oblivious to economic considerations, but one must assume that most of them like to eat, and they would not, could not, afford to migrate to an area where they could not find jobs. Some of them, it seems, have found jobs in the expanded resort economy, which is not as seasonal as it once was, and some have found jobs providing services for retired people who have moved into the area.

Retirement to the Cottage

I combined the two younger retirement age cohorts (60-64 and 65-69) into a single map (Figure 7). (Academics and other white collar types, who like to hang on to their jobs until they are 70, must remember that 55 is not an unusually early retirement age for many manual workers, and people can start drawing their Social Security benefits at the age of 62.)

A cluster of counties in north central Minnesota had survival ratios above 100 for the younger retirement years. These counties seem to have enjoyed an influx of retired people who have converted their former summer cottages into more permanent residences, but the census data may underestimate the number of retired people who live in them for at least part of the year.

Retired people are not tied down by jobs, and presumably they are footloose as far as residence is concerned; they are free to live where they will, at least within the limits of their pensions. A few well-to-do retired people—and no one really knows how many—have two regular places of residence, a summer home in the north and a winter home in the south, where the taxes are not as high and the snowdrifts are not as deep. If the census were taken in July, rather than on the first of April, as at present, it might find a very different age distribution in the Great North Woods.

Retired people may have a greater impact on north central Minnesota than their numbers alone indicate. They receive transfer payments that have given the local economy a major shot in the arm, and even when they are not physically present they generate employment in construction, caretaking, maintenance, and other services. These jobs, in turn, can have a multiplier effect when there are enough of them, and they may help to explain some of the immigration to other counties that are within fairly easy commuting distance.

The New Northland

The counties highlighted in Figure 7 form the core of the region of in-migration in north central Minnesota during the 1970s (Figures 1, 2, 5, and 6).

The same cluster of counties in the north central part of the state seems to have attracted migrants of all ages—younger people returning home from college or from service, people in their middle years, and people over 60 who presumably have retired.

Although these counties have enjoyed an influx of retired people, their age-migration profiles indicate that they are far more than mere havens for the elderly. The influx of migrants of all ages suggests that a new economy may have matured in the region. This new regional economy is based in part on the traditional resort sector, which once was highly seasonal but has now come of age with the growth of winter recreational activities. It is also based in part on the development of a retirement service sector.

The resort sector and the retirement service sector have become large enough to provide full-time, or nearly full-time, employment for significant numbers of people. These sectors have attained the critical mass necessary to create a multiplier effect—they now employ enough people to generate additional jobs in other sectors of the economy.

The attainment of this critical mass, rather than any dramatic turn-around or changes in trends, seems to have been the major demographic development of the 1970s in north central Minnesota.

A Brief Retraction

Two-thirds of all migration between counties in Minnesota during the 1970s consisted of movement from the Twin Cities and their inner suburbs to the surrounding nine-county ring. The good agricultural counties of the south and west and the mining counties of the northeast also lost migrants to other areas. The principal area of in-migration extends northwestward from the outer suburbs of the Twin Cities along the second home trail through north central Minnesota.

The members of the baby boom generation have returned home in unprecedented numbers after they have graduated from college or completed their tours of military duty. The north central part of Minnesota has also attracted in-migrants in the older working age groups (aged 34 to 59) and in the younger retired age groups (aged 60 to 69). These migration data suggest that north central Minnesota may be maturing from a seasonal resort economy into a year-round economy based on winter recreational activities and on the provision of services to retired people.

John Fraser Hart is a professor of geography at the University of Minnesota. CURA funded the research that made this report on migration in Minnesota possible. Hart was assisted by Finnur Sveinbjornsson, "who did a yeoman job of data compilation." Two national publications have resulted from this research project as well: "Resort Areas in Wisconsin," Geographical Review, Vol. 74 (1984), pp. 192-217 and "Population Change in the Upper Lake States," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, Vol. 74 (1984), pp. 221-243.
Dispelling Over-Thereeness

by Kathryn Jones

Kathryn Jones is a graduate student in the Humphrey Institute at the University of Minnesota. She is one of six students participating in the second year of an experimental program in group internships sponsored jointly by CURA and the Humphrey Institute. In the last issue of the CURA Reporter. (November 1984) Barbara Lukermann gave her perspective, as the guiding faculty member, on the new internship model. We asked Ms. Jones to give us a student’s eye view in this Reporter.

When I entered the Master’s program at the Humphrey Institute last fall, I was unenthusiastic. I must admit, about the degree requirement that each student complete a three to six month internship. Most of the internships I’d known of had been unexciting—glorified clerical work, for the most part. I wouldn’t have anticipated that a year later, at the moment marking the formal end of my own internship—the clean-up after the Congress of Neighborhoods in mid-November—I would be lingering and hanging on, despite my fatigue, rehearsing the day’s events, unable to break off and leave, to say goodbye to a group of people and a project that had come to be very important to me.

What makes a good internship good? I certainly can’t speak for all students—for some, the goal might be getting to Washington, learning new skills, making important connections, or just having a first “real” job. In retrospect, I feel the great value of my internship was that it reconfirmed my deeply-held (though often-dented) beliefs in group process, collective decisions, and democratic, grassroots political action.

Three first-year Humphrey Institute graduate students—Paul Schersten, Greg Hohlen, and myself—were hired in spring of 1984 to staff a newly-formed Task Force on Neighborhoods. Though launched by Mayor Fraser’s office and funded by the Minneapolis Community Development continued on page 12
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Agency (MCDA), the task force was an independent body largely made up of people chosen from and by Minneapolis neighborhood groups. Its aim was to examine the neighborhood's role in city development, to reassess the existing citizen participation processes, and to look into setting up a new Neighborhood Resource Center. Throughout the summer and into the fall, the task force or its committees met weekly; we researched, discussed, argued and drank gallons of coffee; we met with city council members, representatives of the mayor's office, MCDA commissioners, and local developers; and at the end of October we issued a 132-page final report, embodying dozens of recommendations for changes in, or extensions of, current city policies that affect neighborhoods. These recommendations were adopted in November at the Congress of Neighborhoods by representatives of some forty neighborhood groups; many have been received favorably by city officials. The political task of getting them put into effect is now going on.

So there was a definite substantive result of this internship. Unlike many interns, Paul, Greg and I stand a good chance of seeing tangible, significant policy changes as a result of our work. This is, of course, deeply satisfying, and would in itself be a more than sufficient criterion for a good internship. Even more satisfying to me personally, however, was the chance to work as a valued member with a team of people whom I liked and respected, and to see these people embody in their daily work on the task force a regard for participatory democracy too often given mere lip service.

Anyone who is part of a professional school like the Humphrey Institute feels an inevitable drift towards the professional attitude that Professor Don Geesaman calls "over-thereness"—the attitude that redefines folks as "recipients" or "client systems" or "voters," impersonal blocs that become tangential to the real work of planning, research, analysis, or administration. The most valuable thing to me about this internship was that the people and the process stood in denial of this kind of professionalism. The professional knowledge and expertise we interns brought from our studies was valued, but not more highly than the experiential knowledge of the "nonprofessional" task force members; it was valued in proportion to its ability to serve the goal of citizen and neighborhood empowerment.

The "learning experience" of this internship, then, was not about knowledge gained, contacts made, skills acquired, though all of these did happen. A good internship, I think, should also give students the chance to experience working with groups of people on the issues that affect their lives. The Humphrey Institute is well-designed to give students the detached skills for delivering expertise to recipients; what an internship can provide, in contrast, is a way to connect those skills with people's needs, giving them the power to act on their own behalf.