



**STANFORD**  
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

**STANFORD** SOCIAL INNOVATION *review*

## Upfront

**What Profits Do for Nonprofits: A rare study shows how earned income helps agencies-and how it doesn't. By Alana Conner Snibbe**

Stanford Social Innovation Review  
Summer 2006

Copyright © 2006 by Leland Stanford Jr. University  
All Rights Reserved



**STANFORD**  
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

Stanford Social Innovation Review  
518 Memorial Way, Stanford, CA 94305-5015  
Ph: 650-725-5399. Fax: 650-723-0516  
Email: [info@ssireview.com](mailto:info@ssireview.com), [www.ssireview.com](http://www.ssireview.com)

## What Profits Do for Nonprofits

*A rare study shows how earned income helps agencies – and how it doesn't*

The field of social enterprise is long on stories but short on numbers. Baorong Guo, an assistant professor in the School of Social Work at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, is trying to change that. Her research article in the March 2006 *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* is one of the first to explore empirically how commercial income affects human service agencies.

Guo's numbers tell a mixed story. On the one hand, commercial revenues do not help organizations fulfill their missions, deliver their services, or attract donors or volunteers, report the survey's participants. These findings jibe with neither the hype nor the early reports, which lauded venturing as both a sharpener of mission and enhancer of services, Guo says. She speculates that earned income does not translate into improved programs, because organizations are often thrown off balance by the demands of managing a business.

On the other hand, generating income gives organizations greater self-sufficiency, helps them attract and retain staff, and bestows on them a better reputation. Guo further finds that improving an organization's reputation creates an enterprising cycle,

## A Mixed Bag

*Variation is the rule when it comes to foundation expenses and compensation*

While Congress threatens to regulate how much foundations can spend on themselves, three organizations have amassed data that should make legislators think twice about adopting a cookie-cutter approach. The Urban Institute's Center on Nonprofits & Philanthropy, the Foundation Center, and GuideStar examined the expenses and compensation practices of the 10,000 largest (by giving) independent, corporate, and community foundations in the United States. They not only discovered that foundations vastly differ in whether and how they spend money on themselves, but also teased apart which factors lead to more or less spending.

"The most important factors are whether [foundations] are staffed, and their number of staff," says Elizabeth T. Boris of the Urban Institute, the study's lead author. "It's common sense, but no one has demonstrated it before. That's the major breakthrough." The authors also found that foundations with more staff members tend to have international giving programs, run direct charitable activities (such as conference centers, museums, or research laboratories), or make grants (such as scholarships, fellowships, or prizes) to individuals – all functions that require many hands.

Boris further notes that although there were a few foundations with "extraordinary" expenses and salaries, these were far outnumbered by foundations that are "basically being run by volunteers," she says. A full 30 percent of the 10,000 largest foundations have neither operating nor administrative expenses. And 66 percent do not pay any compensation to staff or trustees.

"We hope that this will be the basis of a more informed debate on expenditures and help policymakers see that this is not a one-size-fits-all field," says Boris.

Other authors of the report, titled "Foundation Expenses and Compensation: How Operating Characteristics Influence Spending," include Loren Renz and Asmita Barve, both of the Foundation Center, and Mark A. Hager and George Hobor, both of the Urban Institute. —*Alana Conner Snibbe*

whereby the improved reputation increases sales, and increased sales improve reputation. These findings are "consistent with the prevailing view" that venturing helps nonprofits, she notes.

Guo's data come from a survey of nonprofit business ventures, which was conducted by the Yale School of Management and the Goldman Sachs Foundation. For the survey, one manager or employee from each of 519 organizations answered questions about the nonprofit's characteristics

and outcomes. Guo concentrated only on data from the study's 67 venturing human service agencies.

The study has its shortcomings, notes Cynthia Massarsky, former co-director of Yale University's Partnership on Nonprofit Ventures and one of the original survey's researchers. First is that its sample is not representative of income-generating nonprofits, and so its findings may not accurately reflect their usual experiences.

She also cautions that many venturing nonprofits "would not want to

give anyone the impression that commercialization affects [their mission or service delivery] in any way – either positively – because they are already doing a bang-up job – or negatively – because they don't want people to frown upon their taking these entrepreneurial steps." Moreover, she notes that "many of those engaging in earning income hesitate to attribute additional benefits to the activity for fear that this newfound source of support will cause donors and volunteers to feel they're no longer needed." And so what the managers and employees said on the survey may not tap what's actually happening on the ground.

Guo likewise acknowledges that her data are not ideal. "For a long

time, this topic has been discussed only by practitioners and researchers in business. I wanted to look at it from a social work perspective, which focuses on the needs of clients, especially poor clients. But to my knowledge, there are no data from the

clients' perspective," she says. In lieu of those data, Guo concentrated on the nonprofits' point of view.

And so "this is not the final conclusion," she says, "but it is the start of empirical evidence in this area."

—Alana Conner Snibbe



"Good news! I held my IPO at recess and now I'm the 12th richest man in America."

CARTOON BY SHANNON BURNS

STANFORD SOCIAL INNOVATION REVIEW | ASSOCIATION OF FUNDRAISING PROFESSIONALS (AFP)



SEPTEMBER 25 – 26, 2006

FRANCES C. ARRILAGA ALUMNI CENTER, STANFORD, CA

Unique two-day institute conducted by the world's leading experts and professors from Stanford Graduate School of Business. Strengthen your executive management skills to lead a more effective nonprofit.

## TWO-DAY NONPROFIT MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

*Stanford University*



SHAPING EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATIONS

**Institute Professors Include:**

**Chip Heath**, Professor of Organizational Behavior, Stanford Graduate School of Business

**Bill Meehan**, Lecturer, Stanford Graduate School of Business; West Coast Chairman, McKinsey & Company

**Nancy Lee**, President, Social Marketing Services, Inc.

**For complete program information:**

[www.ssireview.org/npinstitute](http://www.ssireview.org/npinstitute)  
800-666-3863 ext. 497

Stanford Social Innovation Review  
Subscribers and AFP Members pay \$895 – \$200 off the early bird registration fee!

[www.ssireview.org/npinstitute](http://www.ssireview.org/npinstitute)  
**800-666-3863 ext. 497**

