

**Corporate-Nonprofit Linkages  
in Minneapolis-St. Paul:  
Findings from a Longitudinal Study  
1980-1988**

Principal Investigator:  
Joseph Galaskiewicz

Research Assistants:  
Sarah Allen  
Wolfgang Bielefeld  
Tammie Bougie  
Naomi J. Kaufman  
Alisa Potter  
Kay Schaffer

**Corporate-Nonprofit Linkages in Minneapolis-St. Paul:**

**Findings from a Longitudinal Study - 1980-1988**

**September, 1990**

Principal Investigator:

Joseph Galaskiewicz

Research Assistants:

Sarah Allen  
Wolfgang Bielefeld  
Tammie Bougie  
Naomi J. Kaufman  
Alisa Potter  
Kay Schaffer

Funding for this research was provided by the National Science Foundation (SES 80-08570, SES 83-19364, and SES 88-87258), the Program on Nonprofit Organizations at Yale University, and the University of Minnesota. Special thanks go to the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs who provided funding for the reproduction and distribution of this report.

Additional copies of this report are available from: Joseph Galaskiewicz, Department of Sociology, 909 Social Science Building, 267 19th Avenue South, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

## Executive Summary

The report summarizes findings from several studies that have been done over the last ten years on the Third Sector in the Minneapolis-St. Paul metro area. We interviewed representatives of not-for-profit organizations and corporate giving programs, chief executive officers of local business firms, institutional elites, and corporate philanthropic leaders in 1980 and 1981 and again in 1988 and 1989. Our goal is to describe how the sector has changed and how prominent people in this community viewed these changes.

The first section of the report examines the nonprofit organization. We surveyed a sample of nonprofits in 1980, 1984, and 1988. We also interviewed and reinterviewed a panel of 174 organizations for these same three years. Our main findings are:

- 1) Average operating expenditures (measured in both current and constant dollars) and the average number of full time employees have increased over the eight year period. This was true for both our three cross-section surveys and our panel.
- 2) In 1980, 1984, and 1988 full time employees and operating expenditures were concentrated in a few large not-for-profits. Roughly half of the nonprofits surveyed in each of these three years had no full time employees.
- 3) The increase in the size of nonprofits between 1980 and 1984 appears to be due to an increase in donated revenues from businesses, foundations, and individuals, and not to increases in the sale of unrelated services or program service revenue.
- 4) The increase in the size of nonprofits between 1984 and 1988 appears to be due to an increase in program service revenue.
- 5) Between 1980 and 1988 organizations in our panel had significant increases in revenue (in both current and constant dollars) from almost every income source.
- 6) The percentage of organizations relying on program service revenue has remained constant (about 50%), while the percentage relying on donated income has increased dramatically between 1984 and 1988.

The second section of the report examines the backgrounds and attitudes of institutional elites and corporate philanthropic leaders in 1981 and 1989. We interviewed a sample of elite respondents in each year and these respondents identified the corporate philanthropic leaders for us. Our main findings are:

- 1) The 1989 elite was less likely to be born in Minnesota and appeared somewhat less attached to the Twin Cities community than the 1981 elite.
- 2) Both elite samples and sets of corporate philanthropic leaders thought that corporations should allocate the largest percentage of their contributions to health/welfare organizations, educational, and cultural organizations. The smallest percentage should go to legal services, recreation, and organizational development. There was virtually no change in the priorities of the elite or the corporate philanthropic leadership over this eight year period.

- 3) The 1989 elite and corporate philanthropic leaders thought that too much corporate funding had been given to recreational and cultural organizations in recent years.
- 4) The company most recognized by the 1989 elite as a business success was the 3M Company; the company most recognized by the 1981 elite as a business success was Control Data Corporation.
- 5) The company most recognized by the 1981 and 1989 elites as being generous to nonprofits was Dayton-Hudson Corporation.
- 6) The 1989 elite was more likely than the 1981 elite to agree with the following statements: companies give generously to nonprofits in the Twin Cities; the prospects for getting donations from corporations are better in the Twin Cities than elsewhere, and nonprofits which rely heavily on corporate contributions end up with little discretion in the use of corporate funds.
- 7) The 1989 elite was less likely than the 1989 corporate philanthropic leaders to think that corporations had a moral obligation to make contributions and was more receptive to the idea of cause-related marketing.

The third section of the report examines corporate contributions in the Twin Cities. The data on company giving were obtained from interviews with corporate giving staff in 1981 and 1989. For the sake of brevity we focus on publicly held companies headquartered in the Twin Cities area which have more than 200 employees. Our main findings are:

- 1) Between 1981 and 1989 company giving programs among firms with 1500 or more employees became more formalized, and there was some evidence that decision-making became more decentralized as well.
- 2) Comparing corporate giving staff in 1981 and 1989, we find the latter more likely to be over 40 years of age, born and raised in Minnesota, female, to have no degree or a graduate degree, and to have had work experience outside a corporation prior to their current job.
- 3) Focusing on companies with less than 1500 employees, we find that firms in 1987-89 gave less, on average, in current dollars than firms in 1979-81.
- 4) Focusing on companies with 1500 or more employees, we find that firms in 1987-89 gave more, on average, in current and constant dollars than firms in 1979-81.
- 5) Focusing on companies with 1500 or more employees, we find that, on average, about 70.0% of their contributions went to nonprofits in Minnesota. There has been no change in this statistic over the six years we studied.
- 6) Among companies with 1500 or more employees, contributions as a percentage of revenues remained constant from 1979 to 1989 - from .10% to .12% of revenues; while contributions as a percentage of net income fluctuated greatly over the same period.

## Table of Contents

Introduction and Acknowledgements .....	1
I. The Nonprofit Organizations .....	3
A. Methodology .....	3
B. Activity Areas .....	4
C. Staffing and Volunteers .....	7
D. Operating Expenditures .....	8
E. Income Streams .....	9
F. Discussion .....	18
II. Institutional Elites and Philanthropic Leaders .....	20
A. Methodology .....	20
B. Background of the Institutional Elites .....	24
C. Funding Priorities .....	24
D. Evaluations of Corporate Business Success and Philanthropic Largesse .....	27
E. Attitudes Related to Philanthropy .....	33
F. Discussion .....	36
III. Corporate Donors .....	38
A. Methodology .....	38
B. Methods of Giving .....	41
C. Corporate Giving Staff .....	44
D. Corporate Giving Amounts .....	44
E. Corporate Giving Patterns .....	46
F. Discussion .....	50
IV. Conclusions .....	52
APPENDIX A .....	53
Publications Based on Prior Research	
APPENDIX B .....	54
Nonprofit Organization Cross-Section Samples: 1980, 1984, 1988	
APPENDIX C .....	65
Institutional Elite Samples and Corporate Philanthropic Leaders: 1980, 1988	
APPENDIX D .....	69
Population of Publicly Held Corporations Headquartered in the Twin Cities (1500+ Employees): 1980, 1988	

## Introduction and Acknowledgements

This report is a follow-up to a report prepared in 1982 and distributed to the Twin Cities nonprofit and funding community. At that time we presented a snap-shot of various aspects of the 1980-81 Twin Cities corporate grants economy: basic characteristics of a sample of public charities headquartered in the Twin Cities, attitudes of a cross-section of prominent residents and individuals active in corporate giving, and a brief profile of company giving programs in the Twin Cities area. Several articles and a book were subsequently written on the Twin Cities corporate grants economy, including the Social Organization of an Urban Grants Economy: A Study of Business Philanthropy and Nonprofit Organizations published in 1985. A complete list of publications is presented in Appendix A.

Since that report we returned to the field twice. In 1984 and 1985 my research assistants and I surveyed the nonprofits that we originally surveyed in 1980 and 1981 as well as a new sample of public charities which was representative of that period. In 1988 and 1990 we surveyed the original panel a third time, surveyed a new cross-section of nonprofits, surveyed a new sample of prominent residents in the area, surveyed a new cadre of philanthropic leaders as well as the leaders we interviewed in 1981, and surveyed company giving staffs and CEOs in publicly-held corporations headquartered in the Twin Cities. Altogether about 800 people were interviewed or surveyed in this most recent effort.

The purpose of this report is to present a statistical snapshot of the Twin Cities corporate grants economy in 1988-89 and to compare it to the grants economy of 1980-81 and 1984-85. Our hope is that foundations, companies, government agencies, nonprofit administrators and their boards, and the general public can use this information to help them plan for the decade ahead. This report presents a great deal of information, but we do not spend a great deal of time analyzing or interpreting the data. This will come later in articles and monographs. Our present goal is simply to provide the community with an overview of how the Twin Cities nonprofit/corporate giving scene has changed over the last ten years. However, by no means do we pretend that this report captures all of the heartache, joy, hard work, dedication, sacrifice, follies, and failures of those who worked in the Third Sector over the past decade.

Throughout the decade the bulk of the funds for this research was provided by the Social and Economic Science section of the National Science Foundation (NSF). NSF began their support in August, 1980, issued a second grant in 1983, and made a third grant in 1988. Without their support this research would not have been possible. The Program on Nonprofit Organizations (PONPO) at Yale University has funded the study throughout the decade as well. Yale's funding began July, 1981; a second, third, and fourth grant were made in 1984, 1988, and 1991 respectively. We are greatly indebted to John Simon, Scott Boorman, and Paul DiMaggio who first gave us a hearing, and our gratitude extends to the current director of PONPO, Brad Gray, who is continuing to help us find funding for this research.

There are also several units at the University of Minnesota which have funded the research over the years. The Graduate School provided funding for research assistants at some very critical junctures. The Carlson School of Management not only provided supplies for the research, but also funded a research assistant as well. The Department of Sociology and its chairmen, David Ward and David Knoke, have also been very helpful and supportive providing us with computers, supplies, phones, copying machines, furniture, office space, and an accountant to administer the grants.

Without this assistance the costs for this research would have been prohibitive. Continuing Education and Extension sponsored a community forum in June, 1990 where study participants were able to hear a report of our preliminary findings. Over 125 representatives from the nonprofit and funding community attended. The Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program has funded undergraduate research assistantships.

The most faithful supporter of our efforts has been the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs with Tom Scott as its director. Not only has it funded the reproduction and distribution of the earlier report and this report, but it provided funding for research assistants since we began the research and now sponsors the University of Minnesota Nonprofit Proseminar. This is a forum where researchers doing work on the not-for-profit sector come together four times a year to share research results and insights on the Third Sector.

However, the real heroes of this project are the nonprofit executives, corporate representatives and citizens of this community who have given so much time to this study. We have tried to provide feedback to them by participating in forums across the community and distributing this report. But, alas, there is no way that we could ever repay our respondents for all the time and effort that went into scheduling and doing interviews, digging up data for us from their archives, and completing mail surveys. We are happy to report that the corporate and not-for-profit sectors were as generous in 1988-90 as they were back in 1980-82. All of the events of the topsy-turvy 80's did not leave this community jaded, and for this we are very grateful. There are no reports, articles, or books, if there are no respondents. It's as simple as that.

I must also acknowledge and thank all the graduate students and staff who have worked on this project. I feel fortunate to have had as my graduate research assistants: Sarah Allen, Lisa Atkinson, Wolfgang Bielefeld, Steve Carlton-Ford, Denise Hesselton, Naomi Kaufman, Wayne Kobbervig, Patti Mullaney, Michael O'Neal, Sarah Phillips, Alisa Potter, Asha Rangan, Joe Raiche, Barbara Rauschenbach, Mary Jo Reef, and Kay Schaffer. My undergraduate assistants have included Donna Bergstrom, Tammie Bougie, Kong-Kin Pitt Cheang, and Gretchen Matteson. My support staff has also been outstanding. I am indebted to Hilda Daniels, Gloria DeWolfe, Karl Krohn, Jeanne Marie Rohland, and Lisa Thornquist. This research turned out to be a mammoth effort, and we could not have gotten to the point we are at today without the capable and persevering assistance of these people.

Joseph Galaskiewicz  
Principal Investigator

Minneapolis, Minnesota  
May 31, 1991

## I. The Nonprofit Organizations

This section of the report presents data on public charities in the Twin Cities area. Organizations can qualify for tax-exempt status under a number of different Internal Revenue Service codes. The most privileged status is that of public charity, i.e., the so-called 501(c)(3) tax exempt status. Like other types of nonprofits, public charities are exempt from federal income tax and eligible for a host of other tax-exempt privileges depending upon their locale (e.g., exemption from state sales tax, local property taxes, etc.). Their unique privilege is that they can receive tax deductible contributions from individuals and businesses.

Among public charities we find almost all of the health and human services typically associated with the not-for-profit sector, e.g., hospitals, mental health outreach centers, battered women's shelters, social welfare agencies, etc. We have cultural organizations and educational organizations ranging from Montessori schools to colleges and universities as well. There are also mass media organizations, legal services, recreational organizations (e.g., Little Leagues and swim clubs), fund raising organizations (e.g., the United Way), organizations providing technical assistance to nonprofits or doing basic or applied research, and organizations that build and manager apartments and group facilities. Private, community, and corporate foundations and charitable trusts are public charities as well. Finally, churches, congregations, assemblies, and the schools, nurseries, and clubs associated with them are also public charities.

### A. Methodology

We developed three populations of public charities. The first two were taken directly from the Cumulative List of Organizations published by the Internal Revenue Service. We drew on published documents current for October 31, 1979 and October 31, 1983. The third population was taken from the IRS tape which contained information on public charities current for October 31, 1987. Because we wanted to include only service providers in our sample we did not include private or corporate foundations, although community and operating foundations were included. Nor did we include churches, congregations, assemblies, or any other explicitly religious organization, although we did include organizations which provided charitable services that were affiliated with some church or denomination, e.g, the University of St. Thomas or Lutheran Social Services. In 1979 we selected organizations that were headquartered in the five county metro area (Anoka, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Washington); in 1983 and 1987 we selected public charities in the seven county area (Scott and Carver were added). Altogether we identified 1,601 public charities in our sampling frame in 1979, 1,951 in 1983, and 2,735 in 1987.

The increase in the number of public charities from 1983 to 1987 merits comment. To see if changes in the Twin Cities paralleled changes nationally we turned once again to the Cumulative List of Organizations for 1979, 1983, and 1987. We proceeded to sample 2% of the pages in each volume and count the number of organizations per page. We then estimated the total number of organizations listed in each volume based on this rough sample. We estimated that in 1979 there were approximately 184,000 public charities or 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations (this includes all types of foundations but very few churches since the latter are not required to file for tax-exempt status). In 1983 this number increased to approximately 208,000, and in 1987 it jumped to approximately 293,000. This represents an increase of 13.0% between 1979 and 1983 and 40.9% between 1983 and 1987. This suggests that the increases in the Twin Cities area of 21.9% between 1979 and 1983 and 40.2% between 1983 and 1987 were not out of line with trends nationally.



Our next task was to group these organizations into functional categories (e.g., health/welfare, education, legal, housing/urban development, mass media, recreational, cultural, civic, environmental, and miscellaneous). Assignments were made on the basis of name and descriptions that were available in community directories. If we were still unsure about the organizations, we assigned the organization to an "unidentified" category. After all organizations had been grouped, we drew a one-in-five (20%) stratified systematic sample from the 1979 and 1983 sampling frames and a one-in-eight (12.5%) stratified systematic sample from the 1987 sampling frame. This produced targets of 326, 387, and 318 organizations to interview in 1980, 1984, and 1988 respectively. Appendix B contains the names of the nonprofits in each of the three samples.

In the end we interviewed 229 organizations in late 1980 and early 1981 (70.2%), 266 in late 1984 and early 1985 (68.7%), and 230 in late 1988 and early 1989 (72.3%). Most of the missing organizations simply could not be located or we were unable to track down a contact person even though we were able to find an address for the organization (typically a private residence). Forty-two organizations in 1980, 58 organizations in 1984, and 31 organizations in 1988 fell into that category. Other organizations were truly defunct; some were only paper organizations (e.g., trusts). A small minority refused to be interviewed or respond to our survey: 15 in 1980, 10 in 1984, and 13 in 1988. Data from the cross-section samples in 1984-85 and 1988-89 were obtained through mail surveys and phone interviews. Data from the 1980-81 sample were gathered through face-to-face interviews. For the most part, data gathered in 1980-81, 1984-85, and 1988-89 were for fiscal years 1980, 1984, and 1988 respectively.

In addition to surveying a cross-section of organizations in 1984 and 1988, we also interviewed the organizations remaining from the original 1980 sample. Of the original 229 nonprofits interviewed in 1980-81, we reinterviewed 201 in late 1984 and early 1985 (22 died between 1981 and 1984, 3 no longer had NPO status, and 3 refused to be reinterviewed) and 174 in late 1988 and early 89 (22 died between 1985 and 1988, 2 no longer had NPO status, and 3 refused to be reinterviewed). In all three time periods interviews with members of the original panel were face-to-face and conducted by the principal investigator or his graduate research assistants. We spoke with the top administrator or his/her designate. Interviews lasted between 30 minutes and three hours.

There is a considerable amount of information to present, because we have both cross-section as well as panel data. Thus we will limit our discussion and describe only the activities, staffing, and finances of our panel and cross-section survey organizations.

## **B. Activity Areas**

In each of our cross-section surveys respondents were given a list of nine activity areas and asked to rank them in terms of their organizations' own priorities. The most important activity would be ranked first, the second most important ranked second, and so on. To simplify our discussion we will characterize each organization's activity by looking only at the activity their administrator ranked as their top priority.

TABLE I-1 Primary Activity of NPOs in Three Cross-Sectional Surveys: 1980, 1984, 1988

Which of the following services does your organization provide for clients? Also rank order in terms of organizational priorities. (e.g., 1 = most important; 2 = second most important; and so on.)

Number of nonprofit respondents indicating that their organization's primary activity was. . .

	X-Section 1980	X-Section 1984	X-Section 1988
1. Health/Welfare Services (e.g., health care, counseling, rehabilitation, foster care)	74 (32.3%) <sup>1</sup>	84 (31.6%) <sup>1</sup>	54 (23.5%) <sup>1</sup>
2. Educational Services (e.g., classroom instruction, seminars, tutorials)	65 (28.4%) <sup>1</sup>	73 (27.4%) <sup>1</sup>	73 (31.7%) <sup>1</sup>
3. Legal Services (e.g., advocacy, legal advice)	5 (2.2%) <sup>1</sup>	6 (2.3%) <sup>1</sup>	9 (3.9%) <sup>1</sup>
4. Recreational Services (e.g., promoting amateur sports, summer camps, etc.)	15 (6.6%) <sup>1</sup>	31 (11.7%) <sup>1</sup>	27 (11.7%) <sup>1</sup>
5. Cultural (e.g., exhibitions, performances, libraries)	25 (10.9%) <sup>1</sup>	35 (13.2%) <sup>1</sup>	38 (16.5%) <sup>1</sup>
6. Organizational Development (e.g., evaluation of programs, management assistance, consulting, fund raising)	18 (7.9%) <sup>1</sup>	23 (8.6%) <sup>1</sup>	19 (8.3%) <sup>1</sup>
7. Scientific (e.g., basic research, applied research, dissemination of research findings)	10 (4.4%) <sup>1</sup>	7 (2.6%) <sup>1</sup>	5 (2.2%) <sup>1</sup>
8. Housing and Urban Development (e.g., constructing or rehabilitating housing, tenant referral, economic development, urban planning)	14 (6.1%) <sup>1</sup>	9 (3.4%) <sup>1</sup>	11 (4.8%) <sup>1</sup>
9. Other	25 (10.9%) <sup>1</sup>	35 (13.2%) <sup>1</sup>	30 (13.0%) <sup>1</sup>
Total Number of Organizations Responding	229	266	230
Don't Know	0	0	0
Refused to Answer	0	0	0
Total in Sample	229	266	230

<sup>1</sup> The percentages total more than 100% since organizations were allowed to tie ranks. Thus, when an organization had more than one primary activity, they could respond "1" to each.

TABLE I-2 Employees, Staff Positions, and Expenditures of NPOs in Three Cross-Sectional Surveys and The Panel

	X-Section 1980 (N=229)	X-Section 1984 (N=266)	X-Section 1988 (N=230)	Panel 1980 (N=174) <sup>1</sup>	Panel 1984 (N=174) <sup>1</sup>	Panel 1988 (N=174) <sup>1</sup>
Average number of full-time employees per organization	24.2 (n=222)	23.2 (n=264)	43.8 (n=229)	29.6 (n=170)	54.7 (n=174)	62.7 (n=172)
Average number of part-time employees per organization	14.2 (n=222)	8.6 (n=263)	26.1 (n=229)	16.7 (n=170)	19.2 (n=173)	33.2 (n=172)
Average number of volunteers per organization	94.0 (n=211)	244.2 (n=263)	212.3 (n=229)	115.0 (n=161)	166.9 (n=171)	247.7 (n=171)
Percentage of organizations employing a full-time paid person who is <u>only</u> responsible for...						
Market research and/or evaluation	1.8% (n=223)	-- <sup>2</sup>	-- <sup>2</sup>	2.3% (n=171)	5.7% (n=174)	4.6% (n=174)
Public Relations	7.6% (n=223)	-- <sup>2</sup>	9.1% (n=230)	8.8% (n=171)	9.2% (n=174)	9.8% (n=174)
Fundraising	5.4% (n=223)	-- <sup>2</sup>	7.0% (n=230)	7.0% (n=171)	6.3% (n=174)	9.8% (n=174)
Grant Writing	1.8% (n=223)	-- <sup>2</sup>	3.0% (n=230)	2.3% (n=171)	5.2% (n=174)	4.6% (n=174)
Regulating/overseeing finances, expenditures or accounting	16.1% (n=223)	-- <sup>2</sup>	-- <sup>2</sup>	18.7% (n=171)	17.8% (n=174)	21.3% (n=174)
Average operating expenditures (in 1000s) per organization - current dollars	\$925.8 (SD=5844.8) (n=212)	\$1230.4 (SD=7247.9) (n=264)	\$1928.9 (SD=17607.5) (n=214)	\$1139.8 (SD=6639.8) (n=163)	\$1723.7 (SD=9628.1) (n=169)	\$2926.8 (SD=19979.2) (n=163)
Average operating expenditures (in 1000s) per organization - constant (1979) dollars	\$867.2 (SD=5486.6) (n=212)	\$920.3 (SD=4339.2) (n=264)	\$1401.4 (SD=12792.7) (n=214)	\$1067.8 (SD=6232.9) (n=163)	\$1303.1 (SD=7285.0) (n=169)	\$2126.7 (SD=14516.1) (n=163)

<sup>1</sup> The panel includes only the organizations which survived and were interviewed in 1981, 1985, and 1989.

<sup>2</sup> Data were not obtained for these years in the cross-sectional survey.

In Table I-1 we see that the distribution of organizations across the nine activity areas has stayed relatively the same over the eight year period, although there have been some slight shifts. Most notably, there has been a decrease in the percentage of organizations providing health and welfare services (from 31.6% in 1984 to 23.5% in 1988). This has been accompanied by a slight increase in the percentage of nonprofits providing educational services (from 27.4% to 31.7% in 1988), cultural activities (from 13.2% to 16.5% in 1988), legal services (from 2.3% to 3.9%), and housing and urban development services (from 3.4% to 4.8%). There has been virtually no change over the eight year period in the percentage of organizations providing recreational services, organizational development, or scientific research.

### C. Staffing and Volunteers

In all our interviews and surveys we asked for the total number of full-time employees, part-time employees, and volunteers. We also asked if there were full-time employees who were solely responsible for fund raising, grant writing, overseeing finances/budgets, and/or doing program evaluation/market research.

When we look at the cross-section samples for 1980, 1984, and 1988 we find that between 1980 and 1984 the average number of full time employees stayed about the same, the average number of part time employees went down slightly, and the average number of volunteers increased considerably. Between 1984 and 1988 the average number of full time and part time employees increased dramatically, while the average number of volunteers decreased slightly.

Looking at the panel we find a different pattern. The average number of full time and part time employees increased between 1980 and 1984 and then again between 1984 and 1988. The average number of volunteers used by the panel organizations also increased steadily across the eight year period.

It is useful to look at the percentage of nonprofits having no full-time employees and the degree to which employment has remained concentrated in a relatively small number of organizations. In 1980, 46.4% of our original sample had no full-time employees, and only 10.4% had more than 50 full time employees. In 1984, 46.2% of the cross-section had no full-time employees and only 7.2% had more than 50 full time employees. And, in 1988, 52.0% of the cross-section had no full-time employees and only 6.1% had more than 50 full-time employees.

When we added up all the full-time employees in our 1980 sample, 4.0% of the NPOs accounted for 56.0% of the sample's total full time employment. When we did the same exercise in 1984 and 1988, we found that 2.3% of the NPOs in 1984 accounted for 51.9% of that sample's total full time employment, and 1.3% of the NPOs in 1988 accounted for 75.5% of that sample's total full time employment.

Next we look at the percentage of organizations employing a full-time paid person who is only responsible for market research and/or evaluation, public relations, fundraising, grant writing, or regulating/overseeing finances, expenditures or accounting. Looking at Table I-2 and our cross-section surveys we see no clear cut pattern. Unfortunately, we did not ask about these specialists in the 1984 cross-section survey nor did we ask about market research or budgetary specialists in the 1988 cross-section survey. We do, however, see a slight increase in the percentage of organizations employing a full time public relations, fundraising, and/or grant writing specialist.

Data on these specialists were gathered from the panel organizations for all three periods, but again there is no clear cut pattern across specialty areas. The percentage of organizations employing a market research/evaluation specialist increased between 1980 and 1984, then decreased between 1984 and 1988. The percentage of organizations employing a full time public relations specialist increased steadily across the three time points. The percentage employing a full time fundraiser decreased between 1980 and 1984, then increased between 1984 and 1988. The percentage employing a full time grant writer increased between 1980 and 1984, then decreased between 1984 and 1988. Finally, the percentage of panel organizations employing a full time finance/accounts person decreased slightly between 1980 and 1984, then increased between 1984 and 1988. Indeed it is difficult to identify a pattern in these findings. However, the data in Table I-2 do show that if the nonprofit had a full time specialist it was probably an accounts/finance person.

#### D. Operating Expenditures

Table I-2 also has data on nonprofit operating expenditures. To derive operating expenditures for each organization we averaged expenditures across 1979 and 1980, 1983 and 1984, and 1987 and 1988. This helps to ensure against short term fluctuations. In those cases where only 1980, 1984, or 1988 data were available, we used that figure alone. After we computed these averages we then added up the total expenditures for each year and divided by the number of organizations providing us with data. Constant dollar figures were computed by first deflating current dollars into 1979 dollars using the Producer Price Index and then computing the organization's average expenditure for each two-year period.

Looking first at the cross-section surveys, we find that expenditures in constant dollars were roughly the same in 1980 and 1984 but increased significantly between 1984 and 1988. Looking next at the panel organization we again find that expenditures in constant dollars were about the same in 1980 and 1984 but dramatically increased in 1988.

We must remember, however, that the figures presented here are only averages and that there is considerable variation among our organizations. This is evident in the large standard deviations for expenditures in Table I-2. For example, the range of expenditures for our 1988 cross-section was from zero to \$263 million, yet the average was only \$1.9 million while the standard deviation was \$17.6 million. This suggests that there was a large number of very small organizations and a small number of very large organizations. The distribution was far from normal.

This was actually the case in all three cross section surveys. Resources tend to be concentrated in the hands of a few organizations. In 1980, 40.6% of the cross-section had expenditures less than \$25,000 (1979 dollars) and only 11.3% had expenditures greater than \$1,000,000 (1979 dollars). In 1984, 40.2% of the cross-section had expenditures less than \$25,000 (1979 dollars) and only 10.2% had expenditures greater than \$1,000,000 (1979 dollars). Finally, in 1988, 42.5% of the cross-section had expenditures less than \$25,000 (1979 dollars) and only 7.4% had expenditures greater than \$1,000,000 (1979 dollars). Thus, as we found looking at employment, the distributions are highly skewed and have not changed much over the eight years. Resources and employees still are concentrated in the hands a small minority of nonprofit organizations.

## E. Income Streams

Next we turn to the income sources of our cross-section and panel organizations. These data were gathered in the course of the interview or survey along with the data on activities, employment, and expenditures. The figures we analyze are again averages of averages. To ensure against short term fluctuations we averaged the amounts received from any single source across 1979 and 1980, 1983 and 1984, and 1987 and 1988. If only 1979, 1984, or 1988 data were available we used just that figure. The amounts in the table are averaged across all the organizations providing us with information on income from a given source. Again both current and constant (1979) dollars are presented using the Producer Price Index as the deflator.

Before we analyze the data we should discuss briefly our income categories. Foundation, business, and individual gifts and grants are direct contributions to the organization. Gifts given by individuals or businesses through an intermediary like the United Way are listed under federated fund drives. Individual and business contributions that come into the organization because the former buy a ticket to a fundraiser or pay a fee to participate in a fund-raising event are counted under special benefit fundraising events. Although we gathered data on the gross income from these events, we felt it was more meaningful to present only data on net income. Gifts or contributions that come from churches, other nonprofit organizations, or charitable gambling are listed under other income.

Public sector monies always present problems for researchers. Often money that was authorized at one level of government, e.g., the county, ultimately came from another, e.g., the federal government. Furthermore, some of that money authorized by the county may contain some state money as well. Thus it is very difficult for respondents always to identify correctly where their government money actually came from. Another problem is that some government money is an interorganizational transaction like a grant or contract, while other monies are more like vouchers or reimbursements (e.g., Medicaid payments). The decision for expending the latter at a particular site for a particular service are supposedly made by the patient, client, student, or consumer. Thus these dollars could also be considered program service revenue.

To simplify matters, we decided to lump together all grants and contracts (i.e., interorganizational transactions) coming from either the federal, state, county, or municipal government into one category: government grants and contracts. On the other hand, vouchers or reimbursements (i.e., where the individual decides on the provider) will be counted as program service revenue.

There are also problems with self generated income. Some organizations, e.g., public television stations, prefer to call their individual contributions, membership dues. Instead of quibbling with organizations over definitions, we decided to include individual gifts as membership dues if the organization categorized them this way. There was nothing else we could do. Another potential problem is the distinction between sale of unrelated services and program service revenue. The former includes the sale of any product (e.g., a T-shirt or prints of art works) or service which has no relation to the tax exempt purpose of the organization.

TABLE I-3 Average Income from 13 Sources to NPOs in Three Cross-Section Surveys

Average Income (in 1000s) from...	Current dollars			Constant Dollars (1979)		
	X-Section 1980 (N=229)	X-Section 1984 (N=266)	X-Section 1988 (N=230)	X-Section 1980 (N=229)	X-Section 1984 (N=266)	X-Section 1988 (N=230)
<b>Private Sector:</b>						
Private or Community Foundations	\$23.5 (SD=97.7) (n=207)	\$84.9 (SD=778.1) (n=263)	\$29.7 (SD=91.3) (n=220)	\$21.7 (SD=89.6) (n=207)	\$63.5 (SD=582.0) (n=263)	\$21.5 (SD=66.2) (n=220)
Business or Corporate Foundations	\$15.6 (SD=73.9) (n=207)	\$97.5 (SD=803.5) (n=263)	\$21.4 (SD=140.7) (n=217)	\$14.5 (SD=68.9) (n=207)	\$72.9 (SD=601.0) (n=263)	\$15.6 (SD=102.2) (n=217)
Individual Gifts	\$14.7 (SD=86.3) (n=208)	\$124.1 (SD=1079.6) (n=263)	\$40.8 (SD=185.5) (n=220)	\$13.4 (SD=77.7) (n=208)	\$92.8 (SD=807.6) (n=263)	\$29.7 (SD=134.8) (n=220)
Federated Fund Drives (e.g., United Way, United Arts Fund)	\$10.8 (SD=63.0) (n=211)	\$25.6 (SD=137.3) (n=263)	\$19.2 (SD=83.2) (n=220)	\$10.1 (SD=59.1) (n=211)	\$19.1 (SD=102.7) (n=263)	\$14.0 (SD=60.5) (n=220)
Special Benefit Fundraising Events (net after expenses)	\$0.5 (SD=2.8) (n=211)	\$5.6 (SD=46.7) (n=237)	\$11.1 (SD=106.0) (n=209)	\$0.5 (SD=2.7) (n=211)	\$4.2 (SD=34.9) (n=237)	\$8.1 (SD=77.4) (n=209)
Trusts/Bequests	\$2.8 (SD=25.9) (n=211)	\$8.9 (SD=70.1) (n=263)	\$9.8 (SD=49.7) (n=218)	\$2.6 (SD=23.3) (n=211)	\$6.6 (SD=52.4) (n=263)	\$7.1 (SD=35.9) (n=218)
<b>Public Sector:</b>						
Gov't Grants and Contracts (Federal, State, County, Municipal)	\$141.5 (SD=574.5) (n=209)	\$172.6 (SD=753.4) (n=263)	\$70.1 (SD=266.1) (n=220)	\$132.1 (SD=536.9) (n=209)	\$129.1 (SD=563.5) (n=263)	\$50.8 (SD=192.8) (n=220)

Average Income (in 1000s) from...	Current dollars			Constant Dollars (1979)		
	X-Section 1980 (N=229)	X-Section 1984 (N=263)	X-Section 1988 (N=230)	X-Section 1980 (N=229)	X-Section 1984 (N=266)	X-Section 1988 (N=230)
<b>Self Generated Income:</b>						
Membership Dues	\$30.6 (SD=174.3) (n=212)	\$19.2 (SD=109.5) (n=263)	\$20.5 (SD=176.1) (n=220)	\$28.1 (SD=158.7) (n=212)	\$14.3 (SD=81.9) (n=263)	\$14.9 (SD=128.0) (n=220)
Interests/Rents/Royalties	\$56.5 (SD=410.7) (n=213)	\$64.7 (SD=482.9) (n=263)	\$48.1 (SD=288.7) (n=220)	\$52.8 (SD=384.8) (n=213)	\$48.4 (SD=361.2) (n=263)	\$34.9 (SD=209.2) (n=220)
Sale of Assets (net after expenses)	\$1.0 (SD=10.6) (n=212)	\$-1.0 (SD=22.5) (n=263)	\$-3.3 (SD=47.5) (n=217)	\$0.9 (SD=9.4) (n=212)	\$-0.8 (SD=16.8) (n=263)	\$-2.5 (SD=35.3) (n=217)
Sale of Unrelated Services (net after expenses)	\$14.2 (SD=76.6) (n=193)	\$9.3 (SD=97.9) (n=240)	\$-1.9 (SD=40.9) (n=212)	\$13.3 (SD=71.9) (n=193)	\$6.9 (SD=73.2) (n=240)	\$-1.4 (SD=30.2) (n=212)
Program Service Revenue	\$562.0 (SD=5812.6) (n=193)	\$758.2 (SD=5262.6) (n=263)	\$1914.3 (SD=20962.3) (n=219)	\$526.4 (SD=5445.3) (n=193)	\$567.1 (SD=3936.4) (n=263)	\$1390.7 (SD=15228.4) (n=219)
Other	\$18.8 (SD=202.3) (n=211)	\$13.5 (SD=79.9) (n=263)	\$5.6 (SD=26.8) (n=209)	\$17.6 (SD=189.9) (n=211)	\$10.1 (SD=59.7) (n=263)	\$4.1 (SD=19.4) (n=209)



Because we are interested in the revenues available for program activities, we decided to list only the net income from the sale of these products or services. The latter are any services (e.g., counseling or treatment) or products (e.g., pamphlets or books) which are related to the tax exempt purpose of the organization. Needless to say, the distinction between these two are often not that clear, but again we let the organization decide how to count these dollars and we entered them into our categories accordingly.

### 1. Average Revenues from Thirteen Income Sources

Tables I-3 and I-4 contain a rich amount of information, and we need to be patient in sorting through our findings. In Table I-3 we have the average income from 13 different sources for the three cross-section surveys. These income figures are presented both in current and constant (1979) dollars. Because it is easier to interpret constant dollars, our discussion will focus on the right hand panel of Table I-3.

Looking first at private sector income, we find some interesting patterns. Contributions (in constant dollars) from foundations, businesses, individuals, and federated donors to the 1984 cross-section were greater than to the 1980 cross-section. However, contributions from foundations, businesses, and federated fund drives to the 1988 cross-section were on average lower than to the 1984 cross-section but about the same as to the 1980 cross-section. In other words, the average nonprofit in 1988 received about the same amount of money from foundations, businesses and federated fund drives as its 1980 counterpart, but far less than its 1984 counterpart.

The 1988 organization received about \$29,700 a year from individuals which was higher than the \$13,400 that its counterpart received in 1980, but far less than the \$92,800 contribution that its 1984 counterpart received. In contrast, the average nonprofit in 1988 received more funding from special benefit fundraising events and trusts/bequests than its counterpart in either 1980 or 1984. However, it is important to note that only a small fraction of the nonprofit's total income comes from these two sources.

Next, let us examine patterns of public sector funding. Looking again at constant dollars, we find that the average organization in 1984 received about the same amount of government funding as the average organization in 1980. However, the average organization in 1988 received considerably less in government grants and contracts than its counterpart in either year.

There was considerable variation across self generated income streams. Income from membership dues in 1984 and 1988 was about the same but considerably less than in 1980. Income from interest/rents/royalties, the sale of assets and unrelated services, and other income sources (e.g., churches and charitable gambling) has steadily declined over the years. In contrast, income from program service revenue has more than doubled between 1984 and 1988.

Before leaving Table I-3 we should say a word about the wide variance around some of the averages we just presented. In particular, we should note the standard deviation for program service revenue in 1988. The large number suggests that there is a wide range of values across our sample of organizations. Thus it would be wrong to infer that every organization in the 1988 cross-section was earning more revenue from program services than every organization in the 1980 or 1984 surveys. In fact, the largest organization in the 1988 sample (which had operating expenditures

TABLE I-4 Average Income from 13 Sources to NPOs in Panel Survey

Average income (in 1000s) from...	Current dollars			Constant Dollars (1979)		
	Panel 1980 (N=174) <sup>1</sup>	Panel 1984 (N=174) <sup>1</sup>	Panel 1988 (N=174) <sup>1</sup>	Panel 1980 (N=174) <sup>1</sup>	Panel 1984 (N=174) <sup>1</sup>	Panel 1988 (N=174) <sup>1</sup>
<b>Private Sector:</b>						
Private or Community Foundations	\$30.7 (SD=111.6) (n=156)	\$50.5 (SD=243.2) (n=170)	\$63.1 (SD=279.1) (n=161)	\$28.4 (SD=102.3) (n=156)	\$38.1 (SD=182.8) (n=170)	\$45.7 (SD=201.9) (n=161)
Business or Corporate Foundations	\$20.2 (SD=84.6) (n=156)	\$51.4 (SD=251.7) (n=170)	\$87.8 (SD=353.5) (n=161)	\$18.8 (SD=78.9) (n=156)	\$38.7 (SD=189.6) (n=170)	\$63.8 (SD=256.8) (n=161)
Individual Gifts	\$18.8 (SD=99.1) (n=157)	\$37.2 (SD=157.2) (n=169)	\$72.9 (SD=324.2) (n=161)	\$17.2 (SD=89.2) (n=157)	\$28.1 (SD=118.8) (n=169)	\$53.0 (SD=235.8) (n=161)
Federated Fund Drives (e.g., United Way, United Arts Fund)	\$13.6 (SD=71.8) (n=160)	\$22.1 (SD=92.5) (n=170)	\$33.6 (SD=133.9) (n=162)	\$12.7 (SD=67.3) (n=160)	\$16.7 (SD=69.9) (n=170)	\$24.4 (SD=97.3) (n=162)
Special Benefit Fundraising Events (net after expenses)	\$0.7 (SD=3.2) (n=160)	\$9.8 (SD=60.7) (n=164)	\$14.4 (SD=88.3) (n=160)	\$0.6 (SD=26.7) (n=160)	\$7.4 (SD=18.7) (n=170)	\$10.5 (SD=64.2) (n=160)
Trusts/Bequests	\$3.6 (SD=29.7) (n=160)	\$3.7 (SD=24.9) (n=170)	\$10.5 (SD=88.3) (n=160)	\$3.3 (SD=3.0) (n=160)	\$2.7 (SD=45.8) (n=170)	\$7.7 (SD=64.1) (n=160)
<b>Public Sector:</b>						
Gov't Grants and Contracts (Federal, State, County, Municipal)	\$179.0 (SD=655.9) (n=158)	\$319.9 (SD=1053.9) (n=170)	\$430.9 (SD=1460.1) (n=161)	\$167.0 (SD=613.0) (n=158)	\$241.6 (SD=795.8) (n=170)	\$312.8 (SD=1060.2) (n=156)

Average Income (in 1000s) from...	Current dollars			Constant Dollars (1979)		
	Panel 1980 (N=174)	Panel 1984 (N=174)	Panel 1988 (N=174)	Panel 1980 (N=174)	Panel 1984 (N=174)	Panel 1988 (N=174)
Self Generated Income:						
Membership Dues	\$36.9 (SD=195.7) (n=162)	\$48.0 (SD=301.4) (n=170)	\$69.7 (SD=423.2) (n=161)	\$34.0 (SD=178.3) (n=162)	\$36.3 (SD=227.8) (n=170)	\$50.7 (SD=307.5) (n=161)
Interests/Rents/Royalties	\$70.9 (SD=468.0) (n=163)	\$132.4 (SD=765.1) (n=169)	\$183.6 (SD=912.8) (n=160)	\$66.3 (SD=438.5) (n=163)	\$100.1 (SD=578.4) (n=169)	\$133.3 (SD=663.4) (n=160)
Sale of Assets (net after expenses)	\$1.3 (SD=12.1) (n=162)	\$-0.1 (SD=11.2) (n=168)	\$-1.0 (SD=60.3) (n=158)	\$1.1 (SD=10.7) (n=162)	\$0.0 (SD=8.1) (n=168)	\$-0.8 (SD=44.6) (n=158)
Sale of Unrelated Services (net after expenses)	\$16.9 (SD=86.0) (n=147)	\$6.4 (SD=97.3) (n=152)	\$2.9 (SD=63.9) (n=151)	\$15.9 (SD=80.8) (n=147)	\$4.7 (SD=73.5) (n=152)	\$2.0 (SD=46.9) (n=151)
Program Service Revenue	\$695.0 (SD=6643.5) (n=147)	\$971.6 (SD=8631.3) (n=170)	\$2439.0 (SD=24078.4) (n=161)	\$650.9 (SD=6223.6) (n=147)	\$734.9 (SD=6531.7) (n=170)	\$1772.1 (SD=17492.5) (n=161)
Other	\$23.7 (SD=231.4) (n=161)	\$7.5 (SD=31.1) (n=170)	\$12.9 (SD=66.6) (n=162)	\$22.3 (SD=217.2) (n=161)	\$5.7 (SD=23.5) (n=170)	\$9.4 (SD=48.3) (n=162)

<sup>1</sup> The panel includes only the organizations which survived and were surveyed in 1981, 1985, and 1989.

TABLE I-5 Percentage of NPOs Receiving Support from 13 Sources

Percentage of Organizations Receiving Support from...	X-Section 1980 (N=229)	X-Section 1984 (N=266)	X-Section 1988 (N=230)	Panel 1980 (N=174)	Panel 1984 (N=174)	Panel 1988 (N=174)
<b>Private Sector:</b>						
Private or Community Foundations	30.4% (n=207)	25.9% (n=263)	32.3% (n=220)	34.0% (n=156)	38.2% (n=170)	41.0% (n=161)
Business or Corporate Foundations	27.1% (n=207)	25.9% (n=263)	30.4% (n=217)	29.5% (n=156)	41.2% (n=170)	45.3% (n=161)
Individual Gifts	41.3% (n=208)	49.8% (n=263)	60.5% (n=220)	45.2% (n=157)	55.6% (n=169)	70.2% (n=161)
Federated Fund Drives (e.g., United Way, United Arts Fund)	10.0% (n=211)	12.2% (n=263)	11.4% (n=220)	11.3% (n=160)	16.5% (n=170)	19.1% (n=162)
Special Benefit Fundraising Events (net after expenses)	9.0% (n=211)	17.3% (n=237)	23.9% (n=209)	11.9% (n=160)	20.7% (n=164)	24.4% (n=160)
Trusts/Bequests	5.7% (n=211)	6.5% (n=263)	7.8% (n=218)	5.6% (n=160)	10.6% (n=170)	8.1% (n=160)
<b>Public Sector:</b>						
Gov't Grants and Contracts (Federal, State, County, Municipal)	42.6% (n=209)	34.2% (n=263)	33.6% (n=220)	44.9% (n=158)	50.0% (n=170)	50.3% (n=161)
<b>Self Generated Income:</b>						
Membership Dues	31.1% (n=212)	38.3% (n=263)	39.5% (n=220)	34.6% (n=162)	40.0% (n=170)	34.8% (n=161)
Interests/Rents/Royalties	40.8% (n=213)	47.5% (n=263)	58.6% (n=220)	45.4% (163)	69.2% (n=169)	73.8% (n=160)

Percentage of Organizations Receiving Support from...	X-Section 1980 (N=229)	X-Section 1984 (N=266)	X-Section 1988 (N=230)	Panel 1980 (N=174)	Panel 1984 (N=174)	Panel 1988 (N=174)
Sale of Assets (net after expenses)	17.0% (n=212)	4.6% (n=263)	6.0% (n=217)	5.6% (n=163)	6.6% (n=168)	7.6% (n=158)
Sale of Unrelated Services (net after expenses)	19.7% (n=193)	15.4% (n=240)	10.8% (n=212)	21.1% (n=147)	11.8% (n=152)	19.9% (n=151)
Program Service Revenue	48.7% (n=193)	54.0% (n=263)	47.0% (n=219)	51.7% (n=147)	52.9% (n=170)	55.9% (n=161)
Other	26.5% (n=211)	18.3% (n=263)	25.4% (n=209)	28.6% (n=161)	23.5% (n=170)	30.2% (n=162)

of \$263 million) was almost entirely dependent upon program service revenue for its income. Thus the distribution on this variable was highly skewed; and the average for program service revenue in 1988 was so high, because this organization was part of the 1988 sample. Thus the reader should interpret these very crude measures of central tendency with some caution. They describe what happened in the sector as a whole; they do not describe the situation of every individual organization.

Next, we turn to the panel data. Again only those organizations which survived the decade are included; those which had died or merged with other organizations are excluded. The pattern here is very different than what we found looking at the three cross-section surveys. Looking first at private sector income, we see that contributions and grants, whether measured in current or constant dollars, are considerably higher in 1988 than in 1984 or 1980. This holds true whether looking at revenue from foundations, businesses, individuals, federated fund drives, special benefit fundraising, or trusts/bequests.

Turning to government funding and self generated income, we see basically the same pattern. Public funding, income from membership dues, interest/rents/royalties, and program service revenue have increased considerably over the decade. The increase in the latter is truly impressive. The only sources of revenue that haven't grown are net profits from the sale of assets, net profits from the sale of unrelated services, and contributions from other sources.

## 2. Percentage of Organizations Receiving Support from Thirteen Income Sources

Another angle on funding is to examine the percentage of nonprofits receiving support from the thirteen sources listed in Tables I-3 and Table I-4. Turning to Table I-5, we first examine the percentage of organizations in our three cross-section surveys that received income from each of the private sector funders. Compared to the 1980 and 1984 cross-section surveys, we see that a larger percentage of NPOs in 1988 received foundation, business, and individual funding and revenues from fundraising events and trusts/bequests. About the same percentage of NPOs received funds from federated fund drives in all three years (10.0% to 12.2%).

In contrast, a smaller percentage of nonprofits received government grants and contracts in 1984 and 1988 than in 1980. Looking next at self generated income, we see that a larger percentage of NPOs in 1984 and 1988 received funding from membership dues than in 1980. The percentage receiving income from interest/rents/royalties has steadily increased over the decade. The percentage receiving revenues from the sale of assets or unrelated services has decreased steadily. The percentage earning program service revenue has remained about the same (hovering around 50%). Finally, the percentage receiving income from other sources in 1988 is about the same as in 1980 but less than in 1984.

Table I-5 also presents data on the percentage of panel organizations that received funding in each of the three years. Looking at private sector funding, we see a pattern similar to that for our cross-section organizations: compared to 1980 and 1984 a larger percentage of the panel received funding in 1988 from foundations, businesses, individuals, federated fund drives, and fundraisers. The only source that panel organizations were less likely to tap in 1988 was trusts/bequests.

We see also that a larger percentage of the panel in 1988 received funding from government sources than in 1980, although there was no change between 1984 and 1988. In 1988 there was also greater reliance on interests/rents/royalties, profits from the sale of assets, and other sources of funding. A smaller percentage of the panel in 1980 and 1988 received funding from membership dues than in 1984; and a larger percentage of the panel in 1980 and 1988 received funding from the sale of unrelated services than in 1984. About the same percentage of NPOs received funding from program service revenue. In all three years just a little over a half of the organizations surveyed earned money from this source.

## F. Discussion

From these data it appears that the sector has changed radically between 1980 and 1988. The number of charitable organizations increased modestly between 1980 and 1984; then there was a radical increase in the number of public charities between 1984 and 1988. More importantly, the "average" organization has increased in size between 1980 and 1988 - whether measured in terms of operating expenditures or employment.

While the "average" organization grew in size, there was not a proportionate increase in all revenue streams. It appears that much of the increase in the average size of the nonprofit between 1980 and 1984 was due to an increase in constant dollar giving from foundations, businesses, individuals, and federated fund drives. Revenues from government grants and contracts increased but only slightly. Contrary to some theories, nonprofits were not turning to the sale of unrelated services (which actually were less in 1984 than in 1980). Rather it was the generosity of individuals and institutional donors and the steady increase in government and program service funding that explained the growth of the average organization.

On the other hand, the growth between 1984 and 1988 was due to an increase in program service revenues. The average donation from foundations and corporations returned to 1980 levels; individual gifts declined as well. Indeed, this was understandable in light of the continued, and unexpectedly, strong support from government between 1980 and 1984 and the expanding number of public charities - an increase of about 40% between 1984 and 1988. The "crisis" in government funding was not as bad as expected and there was an increasing demand from more and more nonprofits. Thus the "average" contribution to nonprofits declined, although donors were still giving at very high levels. Unfortunately, organizations in our 1988 sample received considerably less from government than their counterparts in 1984. This could have precipitated a serious funding crisis in the sector. But fortunately, there were increases in program service revenue which more than made up for the decline and, on average, nonprofits in 1988 were better off than their counterparts in either 1980 or 1984.

Our panel of organizations did quite well throughout the eight-year period. Their budgets increased, the number of employees increased, and income from almost every revenue source increased in both current and constant dollars. But indeed, not all the organizations in our panel breezed through the decade. We began with 229 not-for-profits in our sample in 1980; by 1988 there were only 174. Of the ones we lost, only four were refusals, i.e., organizations that refused to be in the panel any longer. Thus fifty-one organizations (or 22.3%) of the 229 organizations that we started with either merged, turned for-profit, or went out of business by 1988. Also not every surviving nonprofit in our panel grew and prospered. By 1988 some were barely hanging on, and more than a couple have closed their doors since we talked to them two years ago.

Nonetheless, the organizations that did survive until 1988 were, on the whole, doing quite well. We suspect that organizations which did survive went back again and again to their donors, members, or customers while cultivating new donors, members, and customers at the same time. Certainly survivors in our panel were the "success stories." They not only survived the decade; a large percentage prospered as well.



## II. Institutional Elites and Philanthropic Leaders

In 1981 we interviewed a sample of prominent citizens who lived in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area. We wanted to elicit their opinions on the not-for-profit sector and corporate contributions in particular. Corporate philanthropy takes place within a community context, and we thought that the institutional elite might have some interesting thoughts on the subject. This section presents findings from the original survey as well as the results of a replication which we conducted in 1989.

In 1982 we interviewed those who had a reputation for being a corporate philanthropic leader. In this section we also present findings from this earlier study along with the results of a series of interviews with current philanthropic leaders conducted in 1990.

### A. Methodology

We used the same methodology in 1980 and 1988 to select our sample of institutional elites. First, we scanned Marquis' Who's Who in America, 1980-81 and Who's Who in America, 1988-89 for names of people who lived in the Twin Cities seven county metropolitan area. In 1980 we found 820; in 1988 we found 952. Second, we needed to augment this list, because individuals have the option of not being listed in Who's Who, and Marquis' criteria for inclusion are not clearly defined. To ensure that we had all the names of prominent people in the area, we went to two positional leaders in different sectors of the community, handed them a list of Who's Who names for their sector, and asked them to add the names of any other prominent people in their sector. All the names mentioned by our informants were added to our list. If someone was identified as being in two sectors, s/he was randomly assigned to one or the other sector. This gave us a grand total of 1242 names in 1980 and 1299 in 1988. Overall in 1989, we categorized 31.9% of our population as being managers (almost all in business), 23.6% as educators/scientists, 5.2% as health care workers, 8.0% as artists/performers, 13.5% as lawyers, 3.8% as government officials/politicians, 3.6% as sports figures, 4.0% as clergy/religious leaders, and 6.5% as miscellaneous professionals (e.g., architects, journalists, engineers, etc.).

Third, we drew a 7% stratified systematic sample in 1980 and a 8% stratified systematic sample in 1988. Of the 90 people drawn in 1980, we interviewed 80 respondents for a response rate of 88.9%; of the 108 people drawn in 1988, we interviewed 93 respondents for a response rate of 86.1%. We only had three refusals in the earlier period and seven refusals in the latter. The other non-respondents either had died or moved out of the area before we could contact them or the interview was not usable. The two cross-section surveys were conducted between June and September, 1981 and between September and December, 1989. Interviews were all face-to-face at respondents' homes or places of business and lasted between 45 and 90 minutes. The principal investigator or a research assistant conducted these interviews.

In the course of the 1981 and 1989 interviews respondents were asked to identify "the individuals who had been most instrumental in raising the level of corporate contributions over the past few years." Some respondents named several people; others mentioned no one. Individuals who were named three or more times were labeled a Corporate Philanthropic Leader (CPL). Twenty-nine and thirty-two individuals were thus identified in 1981 and 1989. We attempted to interview all of these people. Between January and June, 1982 we interviewed 26 CPLs (one individual was deceased and two refused the interview). Between January and July, 1990 we

TABLE II-1 Background and Attitudes towards the Twin Cities of the 1981 and 1989 Institutional Elites

	1981		1989	
	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency
<b>Birthplace of the Local Institutional Elite</b>				
Twin Cities Metro Area	27.5%	22	19.4%	18
Outstate Minnesota	16.2%	13	11.8%	11
Iowa, Wisconsin, N. Dakota, S. Dakota	7.5%	6	18.3%	17
Elsewhere in USA	40.0%	32	41.9%	39
Outside USA	<u>8.8%</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8.6%</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	100.0%	80	100.0%	93
<b>Length of Time Living in the Twin Cities Area</b>				
Zero to Five Years	1.3%	1	3.2%	3
Six to Ten Years	12.5%	10	6.5%	6
Eleven to Twenty Years	22.4%	18	22.6%	21
Twenty-one + Years	<u>63.8%</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>67.7%</u>	<u>63</u>
Total	100.0%	80	100.0%	93
<b>Response to the Question: "If you had to leave the Twin Cities for whatever reason, how sorry would you be to go?"</b>				
Very Sorry	73.4%	58	63.4%	59
Somewhat Sorry	22.8%	18	35.5%	33
Somewhat Pleased	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Very Pleased	2.5%	2	0.0%	0
No Opinion/Don't Know	1.3%	1	1.1%	1
Refused/Missing Data	---	<u>1</u>	---	<u>0</u>
Total	100.0%	80	100.0%	93
<b>Response to the Question: "Do you feel that you belong in the Twin Cities?"</b>				
Yes	96.2%	77	97.8%	91
No	3.8%	3	2.2%	2
No Opinion/Don't know	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Refused/Missing Data	---	<u>0</u>	---	<u>0</u>
Total	100.0%	80	100.0%	93
<b>Response to the Question: "How interested are you to know what goes on in the Twin Cities?"</b>				
Strongly Interested	85.0%	68	73.9%	68
Somewhat Interested	15.0%	12	26.1%	24
Not Very Interested	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Uninterested	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
No Opinion/Don't Know	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Refused/Missing Data	---	<u>0</u>	---	<u>1</u>
Total	100.0%	80	100.0%	93

	1981		1989	
	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency
Membership in the Following Types of Local Organizations:				
Work Related	83.5%	66	79.6%	74
Government	40.5%	32	22.6%	21
Political	38.0%	30	39.8%	37
Educational	35.4%	28	39.8%	37
Church	62.0%	49	55.9%	52
Health/Welfare	48.1%	38	29.0%	27
Community	44.3%	35	40.9%	38
Sports/Social	60.8%	48	46.2%	43
Cultural	-- <sup>1</sup>	-- <sup>1</sup>	55.9%	52
Environmental	-- <sup>1</sup>	-- <sup>1</sup>	28.0%	26
Other	<u>10.1%</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8.6%</u>	<u>8</u>
Total		79		93

<sup>1</sup> Information Not Asked in 1981 Survey

TABLE II-2 Funding Priorities of the 1981-82 and 1989-90 Institutional Elites and Corporate Philanthropic Leaders

To get an idea of how local corporate philanthropic money ought to be spent in the next few years, we would like you to "spend" \$100 on the sectors below. Let us pretend that this sum represents all the corporate (and corporate foundation) money available in the Twin Cities for nonprofit support in the next two years.

Percent of the total to be spent on . . .

	<u>Health/ Welfare</u>	<u>Education</u>	<u>Legal</u>	<u>Recreational</u>	<u>Cultural</u>	<u>Organizational Development</u>	<u>Scientific</u>	<u>Housing/ Urban Devel.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
1981 Institutional Elite (N=80)	22.5% (n=79)	16.1% (n=79)	6.3% (n=79)	7.0% (n=79)	15.5% (n=79)	5.9% (n=79)	11.7% (n=79)	12.6% (n=79)	2.0% (n=79)	99.6% <sup>1</sup>
1989 Institutional Elite (N=93)	24.6% (n=93)	18.4% (n=93)	4.9% (n=93)	5.3% (n=93)	14.7% (n=93)	5.4% (n=93)	10.0% (n=93)	14.1% (n=93)	2.7% (n=93)	100.1% <sup>1</sup>
1982 Philanthropic Leaders (N=26)	25.0% (n=24)	22.6% (n=24)	2.8% (n=24)	5.5% (n=24)	17.4% (n=24)	6.6% (n=24)	8.0% (n=24)	8.1% (n=24)	2.8% (n=24)	98.8% <sup>1</sup>
1990 Philanthropic Leaders (N=28)	31.0% (n=26)	22.8% (n=26)	3.4% (n=26)	4.5% (n=26)	19.0% (n=26)	2.4% (n=26)	4.0% (n=26)	11.0% (n=26)	2.0% (n=26)	100.1% <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> These totals don't add up to 100%, since some people chose to "spend" less than \$100 and others more than \$100.

interviewed 28 CPLs (two individuals were deceased and two refused). Of the 32 CPLs identified in 1989, 16 were also among the 29 CPLs identified in 1981. The elite samples and the names of the corporate philanthropic leaders for 1981-82 and 1989-90 are listed in Appendix C. The latter have been merged with the sample to ensure anonymity.

## **B. Background of the Institutional Elites**

Table II-1 presents summary statistics on the 1981 and 1989 institutional elite samples. The occupation of the respondents will not be different because our populations were stratified by occupation before the sample was drawn. We begin by looking at where our elites were born and the length of time they lived in the Twin Cities. Compared to 1981, respondents in 1989 were much less likely to have been born in the Twin Cities (27.5% vs. 19.4%) or Minnesota (16.2% vs. 11.8%) and much more likely to have been born in Iowa, Wisconsin, or the Dakotas. Roughly the same percentage was born outside the Upper Midwest in 1989 as in 1981 (48.8% vs. 50.5%). The sample in 1989 was also slightly newer to the community than the 1981 sample. However, this difference was not very great, and a little more than two-thirds of the 1989 elite had lived in the Twin Cities over twenty years.

Next we look at some attitude items which are rough indicators of community attachment. Compared to the 1981 sample, a smaller percentage of the 1989 sample said that they would be "Very Sorry" to leave the Twin Cities (73.4% vs. 63.4%) and a smaller percentage said that they are "Strongly Interested" in what goes on in the Twin Cities (85.0% vs. 73.9%). About the same percentage said that "Yes," they feel that they belong in the Twin Cities (96.2% vs. 97.8%).

Finally, we see that the 1989 sample consistently indicated that they belonged to fewer local organizations than the 1981 sample. This was the case for work related, governmental, church, health/welfare, and sports/social associations. About the same percentage said that they belonged to political, educational and community organizations. A large percentage of the 1989 sample belonged to cultural and environmental organizations as well. However, overall, the participation of the 1989 sample in the associational life of the community appears to be lower than that of the 1981 sample.

## **C. Funding Priorities**

In both elite and CPL surveys we asked respondents a series of questions about their priorities for corporate giving. We asked each respondent to imagine s/he had \$100 and this represented all the money which local corporations were going to give to local charities in the next couple of years. They were then to "spend" that \$100 on nine different areas: health/welfare, education, legal, recreation, culture, organizational development, scientific inquiry, housing/urban development, and other.

Table II-2 shows that in 1981-82 and in 1989-90 both samples of elites and both sets of corporate philanthropic leaders agreed that the most support should go to health/welfare organizations followed by education and cultural organizations. The least support should go to legal services, recreation, and organizational development. This distribution may simply reflect the fact that in 1980 and 1988 there was a larger number of health/welfare, educational, and cultural organizations in the community and a smaller number of legal services, recreational organizations, and organizations doing organizational development (see Table I-1).

TABLE II-3 Perceptions of Excessive Corporate Support by the 1981-82 and 1989-90 Institutional Elites and Corporate Philanthropic Leaders

Considering the same service areas,  
check off the areas you feel have  
received too much support from corpo-  
rations and corporate foundations  
over the past two years or so.

Percent of respondents who believe that too much has been spent on . . .

	<u>Health/ Welfare</u>	<u>Education</u>	<u>Legal</u>	<u>Recreational</u>	<u>Cultural</u>	<u>Organizational Development</u>	<u>Scientific</u>	<u>Housing/ Urban Devel.</u>	<u>Other</u>
1981 Institutional Elite (N=80)	10.1% (n=79)	3.8% (n=79)	11.4% (n=79)	7.6% (n=79)	11.4% (n=79)	10.1% (n=79)	6.3% (n=79)	8.9% (n=79)	0.0% (n=79)
1989 Institutional Elite (N=93)	4.4% (n=91)	5.5% (n=91)	16.5% (n=91)	23.1% (n=91)	23.1% (n=91)	26.4% (n=91)	13.2% (n=91)	8.8% (n=91)	1.1% (n=91)
1982 Philanthropic Leaders (N=26)	16.0% (n=25)	16.0% (n=25)	16.0% (n=25)	8.0% (n=25)	8.0% (n=25)	16.0% (n=25)	8.0% (n=25)	4.0% (n=25)	0.0% (n=25)
1990 Philanthropic Leaders (N=28)	7.7% (n=26)	3.9% (n=26)	15.4% (n=26)	19.2% (n=26)	30.8% (n=26)	3.9% (n=26)	0.0% (n=26)	7.7% (n=26)	3.9% (n=26)

TABLE II-4 Perceptions of Company Business Performance by the 1981 and 1989 Institutional Elites

Top Five Companies reported by the Institutional Elite to have "been extraordinarily successful in their business ventures over the last two or three years."

1981

N = 80

201 - 1500 Employees

% of Elite Checking Firm	Name of Company <sup>1</sup>
58.8%	Apache Corp.
53.8%	Cray Research, Inc.
51.3%	Piper Jaffray, Inc.
48.8%	Northwestern National Life Insurance
45.0%	Tennant Company
45.0%	Schaak Electronics, Inc.

1500+ Employees

% of Elite Checking Firm	Name of Company <sup>1</sup>
82.5%	Control Data Corp.
81.3%	Dayton-Hudson Corp.
81.3%	MN Mining & Mfg. Company
65.0%	General Mills, Inc.
63.8%	Honeywell, Inc.
61.3%	Pillsbury Company

1989

N = 93

201-1500 Employees

% of Elite Checking Firm	Name of Company <sup>2</sup>
38.7%	Golden Valley Microwave Food, Inc.
31.2%	Minnetonka Corp.
30.1%	St. Jude Medical, Inc.
25.8%	International Dairy Queen, Inc.
22.6%	Ciatti's, Inc.

1500+ Employees

% of Elite Checking Firm	Name of Company <sup>2</sup>
90.3%	3M Company
81.7%	Dayton-Hudson Corp.
73.1%	Deluxe Corp.
72.0%	General Mills, Inc.
55.9%	NWA, Inc.

<sup>1</sup>Name of company taken from Corporate Report Factbook, 1981 Edition.

<sup>2</sup>Name of company taken from Corporate Report Factbook, 1989 Edition.

cultural organizations in the community and a smaller number of legal services, recreational organizations, and organizations doing organizational development (see Table I-1).

Looking at where the 1981 and 1989 elites wanted corporate money to go, we see that there has been almost no change in the priorities of the elites. The 1989 sample allocated money almost exactly the same as the 1981 sample. The same is true for the corporation philanthropic leaders. The only significant change is with respect to health/welfare. The 1990 leadership wanted almost a third of the corporate money to go to health/welfare organizations as compared to only a fourth back in 1982. Apparently the money would come from organizational development and scientific organizations.

Table II-3 gives us an idea where respondents believed corporations had overspent their contributions dollar. Looking at the same list of service areas, respondents were asked to check off those areas which had received too much corporate support in the past two years or so. Several respondents said they did not know enough about corporate contributions to make a judgment and checked none.

We see that the cross-section in 1989 was much more critical of company giving than the 1981 sample. The 1989 group was more likely than their 1981 counterparts to say that companies had given too much to education (5.5% vs. 3.8%), legal services (16.5% vs. 11.4%), recreational organizations (23.1% vs. 7.6%), cultural organizations (23.1% vs. 11.4%), organizational development (26.4% vs. 10.1%), and scientific organizations (13.2% vs. 6.3%). However, only 4.4% of the 1989 sample (4 respondents) said that too much money was being given to health/welfare organizations compared to 10.1% of the 1981 sample.

The 1990 corporate philanthropic leaders were also critical of the support going to recreational and cultural organizations. The latter were especially targeted with 30.8% of the 1990 CPLs saying that culture had received too much corporate funding. In comparison, only 8.0% of the 1982 CPLs had said too much corporate funding was going to culture. However, the 1990 CPLs were much less critical of giving to the other areas than the 1982 elite. The 1990 CPLs appeared especially satisfied with funding for education, science, and organizational development.

#### **D. Evaluations of Corporate Business Success and Philanthropic Largesse**

In the course of our interviews we handed our elite sample and corporate philanthropic leaders a list of the publicly held corporations headquartered in the Twin Cities which had 200 or more employees in 1980 and 1988 respectively. We then asked respondents to check off the companies which had been extraordinarily successful in their business ventures over the last couple of years.

In Table II-4 we learn that in 1981 the biggest vote-getters among the elite cross-section were: Control Data (82.5%), Dayton-Hudson and MN Mining and Manufacturing (81.3%), General Mills (65.0%), and Honeywell (63.8%). In 1989 the biggest vote-getters among the cross-section were: 3M (90.3%), Dayton-Hudson (81.7%), Deluxe (73.1%), General Mills (72.0%), and NWA (55.9%).



TABLE II-5 Perceptions of Company Business Performance by the 1982 and 1990 Corporate Philanthropic Leaders

Top Five Companies reported by Corporate Philanthropic Leaders to have "been extraordinarily successful in their business ventures over the last two or three years."

**1982**

N = 26

201-1500 Employees

% of Elite  
Checking Firm      Name of Company<sup>1</sup>

88.5%      Apache Corp.  
80.8%      Cray Research, Inc.  
65.4%      Tennant Company  
61.5%      Data Card Corp.  
53.8%      The Valspar Corp.

1500+ Employees

% of Elite  
Checking Firm      Name of Company<sup>1</sup>

100.0%      MN Mining & Mfg. Company  
96.2%      Dayton-Hudson Corp.  
92.3%      Control Data Corp.  
92.3%      Deluxe Check Printing, Inc.  
92.3%      General Mills, Inc.  
88.5%      Honeywell, Inc.  
84.6%      Medtronic, Inc.

**1990**

N = 28

201-1500 Employees

% of Elite  
Checking Firm      Name of Company<sup>2</sup>

42.9%      Golden Valley Microwave Food, Inc.  
42.9%      International Dairy Queen, Inc.  
42.9%      St. Jude Medical, Inc.  
39.3%      Minnetonka, Corp.  
32.1%      Mesaba Aviation  
28.6%      Hutchinson Technology, Inc.  
21.4%      Colwell Industries, Inc.  
21.4%      MEI Diversified, Inc.

1500+ Employees

% of Elite  
Checking Firm      Name of Company<sup>2</sup>

96.4%      3M Company  
89.3%      Dayton Hudson Corp.  
78.6%      Deluxe Corp.  
75.0%      General Mills  
71.4%      The Valspar Corp.

<sup>1</sup>Name of company taken from Corporate Report Factbook, 1981 Edition.

<sup>2</sup>Name of company taken from Corporate Report Factbook, 1989 Edition.

TABLE II-6 Perceptions of the 1981 and 1989 Institutional Elites of Largesse of Company Contributions

Top Five Companies reported by the Institutional Elite to be doing an "outstanding job in supporting Twin Cities Nonprofits."

1981

N = 80

201-1500 Employees

% of Elite Checking Firm	Name of Company <sup>1</sup>
30.0%	Northwestern National Life Insurance
25.0%	Piper Jaffray, Inc.
16.3%	Tennant Company
11.3%	Apache Corp.
7.5%	The Valspar Corp.
7.5%	Webb Company

1500+ Employees

% of Elite Checking Firm	Name of Company <sup>1</sup>
72.5%	Dayton-Hudson Corp.
58.5%	General Mills, Inc.
53.8%	MN Mining & Mfg. Company
47.5%	Control Data Corp.
47.5%	Pillsbury Company
41.3%	Honeywell, Inc.

1989

N = 93

201-1500 Employees

% of Elite Checking Firm	Name of Company <sup>2</sup>
15.1%	International Dairy Queen, Inc.
15.1%	St. Jude Medical, Inc.
10.8%	Colwell Industries, Inc.
10.8%	National City Bancorporation
6.5%	Dahlberg, Inc.
6.5%	Green Tree Acceptance Inc.
6.5%	MEI Diversified, Inc.
6.5%	Minnetonka Corp.
6.5%	Sheldahl, Inc.

1500+ Employees

% of Elite Checking Firm	Name of Company <sup>2</sup>
91.4%	Dayton-Hudson Corp.
77.4%	General Mills, Inc.
73.1%	The Pillsbury Co.
72.0%	3M Company
59.1%	First Bank System, Inc.

<sup>1</sup>Name of company taken from Corporate Report Factbook, 1981 Edition.

<sup>2</sup>Name of company taken from Corporate Report Factbook, 1989 Edition.

TABLE II-7 Perceptions of the 1982 and 1990 Corporate Philanthropic Leaders of Largesse of Company Contributions

Top Five Companies reported by Corporate Philanthropic Leaders to be doing an "outstanding job in supporting Twin Cities Nonprofits."

1982

N = 26

201-1500 Employees

% of Elite Checking Firm	Name of Company <sup>1</sup>
69.2%	Piper Jaffray, Inc.
61.5%	Apache Corp.
50.0%	Northwestern National Life Insurance
50.0%	Tennant Company
26.9%	The Valspar Corp.
23.1%	Data Card Corp

1500+ Employees

% of Elite Checking Firm	Name of Company <sup>1</sup>
96.2%	Dayton-Hudson Corp.
96.2%	First Bank System, Inc.
92.3%	General Mills, Inc.
80.8%	Northwest Bancorporation
76.9%	Honeywell, Inc.
76.9%	Pillsbury Company
73.1%	St. Paul Companies, Inc.

1990

N = 28

201-1500 Employees

% of Elite Checking Firm	Name of Company <sup>2</sup>
17.9%	Lieberman Enterprises, Inc.
14.3%	International Dairy Queen, Inc.
10.7%	Colwell Industries, Inc.
10.7%	MEI Diversified, Inc.
3.6%	Green Tree Acceptance Corp.
3.6%	Hutchinson Technology, Inc.
3.6%	Minnetonka Corp.
3.6%	Osmonics, Inc.
3.6%	St. Jude Medical, Inc.
3.6%	The Sportsman's Guide, Inc.
3.6%	Vaughn Communication, Inc.

1500+ Employees

% of Elite Checking Firm	Name of Company <sup>2</sup>
96.4%	Dayton-Hudson Corp.
82.1%	General Mills, Inc.
78.6%	Honeywell, Inc.
67.9%	Deluxe Corp.
67.9%	H.B. Fuller Company
67.9%	Tennant Company
64.3%	First Bank System, Inc.
64.3%	3M Company
64.3%	Northern States Power Company
64.3%	St. Paul Companies, Inc.
64.3%	The Valspar Corp.

<sup>1</sup>Name of company taken from Corporate Report Factbook, 1981 Edition.

<sup>2</sup>Name of company taken from Corporate Report Factbook, 1989 Edition.

TABLE II-8 Attitudes on General Philanthropic Issues of the 1981 and 1989 Institutional Elite

We would like to get your reactions to several statements that relate to corporations and nonprofit organizations. We have listed several attitudes that are frequently heard. You are to indicate whether you agree or disagree with the statement as it is presented. If you have no opinion, circle that option.

		Strongly Agree/ Agree	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Missing/ Unwilling to Answer	Total
The prospects for getting donations from corporations are better in the Twin Cities than in other major cities.	1981 Elite	65 (82.3%)	2 (2.5%)	12 (15.2%)	1	80
	1989 Elite	85 (91.4%)	1 (1.1%)	7 (7.5%)	0	93
It is hard for new nonprofit organizations to get included in private philanthropic donations.	1981 Elite	43 (55.1%)	21 (26.9%)	14 (18.0%)	2	80
	1989 Elite	58 (63.0%)	12 (13.0%)	22 (23.9%)	1	93
Twin Cities residents have pressing needs which are not being met because of shortages of private donations.	1981 Elite	27 (34.2%)	36 (45.6%)	16 (20.2%)	1	80
	1989 Elite	48 (53.3%)	31 (34.4%)	11 (12.2%)	3	93
Corporate donations for non-profit organizations in this region have reached their limit.	1981 Elite	8 (10.1%)	61 (77.2%)	10 (12.7%)	1	80
	1989 Elite	13 (14.0%)	69 (74.2%)	11 (11.8%)	0	93
In the next few years, government funding will replace the need for private gifts to nonprofit organizations.	1981 Elite	1 (1.3%)	78 (98.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1	80
	1989 Elite	3 (3.2%)	87 (93.5%)	3 (3.2%)	0	93
Local corporations give generously to worthy causes in the area.	1981 Elite	61 (77.2%)	11 (13.9%)	7 (8.9%)	1	80
	1989 Elite	81 (88.0%)	9 (9.8%)	2 (2.2%)	1	93

		Strongly Agree/ Agree	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Missing/ Unwilling to Answer	Total
It is not difficult for non-profit organizations to find substitute sources of funding if one source dries up.	1981 Elite	5 (6.3%)	69 (87.4%)	5 (6.3%)	1	80
	1989 Elite	10 (10.8%)	78 (83.9%)	5 (5.4%)	0	93
There is good reason to be pessimistic about the future of local nonprofit organizations to meet their funding needs.	1981 Elite	42 (53.8%)	29 (37.2%)	7 (9.0%)	2	80
	1989 Elite	42 (45.7%)	39 (42.4%)	11 (12.0%)	1	93
Nonprofit organizations that rely heavily on corporate contributions wind up with little discretion in the use of corporate donations.	1981 Elite	3 (3.8%)	58 (73.4%)	18 (22.8%)	1	80
	1989 Elite	24 (25.8%)	40 (43.0%)	29 (31.2%)	0	93
Nonprofit organizations ought to place more emphasis on cost containment and greater efficiency in the delivery of services.	1981 Elite	61 (77.2%)	9 (11.4%)	9 (11.4%)	1	80
	1989 Elite	64 (68.8%)	16 (17.2%)	13 (14.0%)	0	93
In addition to earning a return on stockholder's equity, corporations should contribute close to 5% of their pre-tax profits.	1981 Elite	48 (60.8%)	18 (22.8%)	13 (16.4%)	1	80
	1989 Elite	49 (53.5%)	34 (39.5%)	6 (7.0%)	7	93
A corporation's division of profits should be limited to paying dividends to shareholders and reinvesting for the future.	1981 Elite	4 (5.1%)	70 (88.6%)	5 (6.3%)	1	80
	1989 Elite	7 (7.6%)	83 (90.2%)	2 (2.2%)	1	93

In Table II-5 we learn that in 1982 the biggest vote-getters among the corporate philanthropic leadership were: MN Mining and Manufacturing (100.0%), Dayton-Hudson (96.2%), Control Data, Deluxe Check Printing, and General Mills (92.3%). In 1990 the biggest vote-getters among the CPLs were: 3M (96.4%), Dayton Hudson (89.3%), Deluxe (78.6%), General Mills (75.0%), and Valspar (71.4%).

Handing them the same list of corporations, we next asked our sample of prominent citizens to check off the companies that were doing an outstanding job in supporting Twin Cities nonprofit organizations. Again, they could check off as many as they wished.

Table II-6 lists the top vote-getters among the elite in both years. In 1981 the companies cited most often by the cross section were: Dayton-Hudson (72.5%), General Mills (58.5%), MN Mining and Manufacturing (53.8%), Control Data and Pillsbury (47.5%). In 1989 the cross-section cited the following companies most often: Dayton-Hudson (91.4%), General Mills (77.4%), Pillsbury (73.1%), 3M (72.0%), and First Bank System (59.1%).

Table II-7 lists those companies cited most often by the 1982 corporate philanthropic leaders as being generous to nonprofits: Dayton-Hudson and First Bank System (96.2%), General Mills (92.3%), Northwest Bancorporation (80.8%), and Honeywell and Pillsbury (76.9%). In 1990 the CPLs were most likely to cite the following firms as being most generous to nonprofits: Dayton-Hudson (96.4%), General Mills (82.1%), Honeywell (78.6%), Deluxe, Fuller, and Tennant (67.9%).

#### **E. Attitudes Related to Philanthropy**

In both cross-section surveys of the elite we asked respondents to look at and respond to a number of attitude items. Respondents read each statement and then indicated if s/he "Strongly Agreed", "Agreed", "Disagreed," or "Strongly Disagreed" with the statement. They could also indicate "No Opinion."

Let us first compare the responses of the 1981 and 1989 study participants. Both samples were given the same set of questions; their responses to our attitudinal items are in Table II-8. As we might expect, attitudes have changed over the years. Compared to their counterparts in 1981, the 1989 elite was more likely to agree or strongly agree that the prospects for getting donations from corporations are better in the Twin Cities than in other major cities (91.4% vs. 82.3%), it is hard for new nonprofit organizations to get included in private philanthropic donations (63.0% vs. 55.1%), and Twin Cities residents have pressing needs which are not being met because of shortages of private donations (53.3% vs. 34.2%). The 1989 elite was also more likely to agree or strongly agree that local corporations give generously to worthy causes in the area (88.0% vs. 77.2%) and nonprofit organizations that rely heavily on corporate contributions wind up with little discretion in the use of corporate donations (25.8% vs. 3.8%).

In contrast, a larger percentage of the 1981 elite was likely to agree or strongly agree that there is good reason to be pessimistic about the future of local nonprofit organizations to meet their funding needs, nonprofit organizations ought to place more emphasis on cost containment and greater efficiency in the delivery of services, and in addition to earning a return on stockholders' equity corporations should contribute close to 5% of their pre-tax profits.

TABLE II-9 Attitudes on Corporate Giving of the 1989 Institutional Elite and 1990 Corporate Philanthropic Leaders (CPLs)

Please circle the response which best reflects your beliefs.  
 Indicate if you "Strongly Agree, Agree" or "Disagree, Strongly Disagree"  
 If you have no opinion circle that option.

		Strongly Agree/ Agree	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Missing/ Unwilling to Answer	Total
Company giving should be sensitive to the needs and interests of employees.	CPLs	26 (96.3%)	1 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1	28
	Elite	75 (86.2%)	12 (13.8%)	0 (0.0%)	6	93
If a company earns a profit, it has a <u>moral</u> obligation to society to make charitable contributions.	CPLs	24 (85.7%)	3 (10.7%)	1 (3.6%)	0	28
	Elite	56 (65.1%)	26 (30.2%)	4 (4.7%)	7	93
Companies should use contributions as a marketing tool whenever they can.	CPLs	6 (23.1%)	18 (69.2%)	2 (7.7%)	2	28
	Elite	40 (46.0%)	43 (49.4%)	4 (4.6%)	6	93
Companies should give to charities even if they can't tell how these gifts benefit them in the short or long term.	CPLs	21 (77.8%)	6 (22.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1	28
	Elite	64 (77.1%)	18 (21.7%)	1 (1.2%)	10	93
The general public in the Twin Cities doesn't appreciate the support that companies give to charities.	CPLs	13 (48.2%)	12 (44.4%)	2 (7.4%)	1	28
	Elite	38 (43.7%)	44 (50.6%)	5 (5.7%)	6	93
Even if they could, firms should not assess the benefits they will derive from contributions.	CPLs	9 (33.3%)	18 (66.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1	28
	Elite	34 (39.5%)	50 (58.1%)	2 (7.4%)	6	93
Unless corporations engage in public service activities, the society will revoke their franchise and privileges.	CPLs	8 (30.8%)	18 (66.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2	28
	Elite	9 (10.3%)	69 (79.3%)	9 (10.3%)	6	93

		Strongly Agree/ Agree	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Missing/ Unwilling to Answer	Total
If tax incentives for charitable contributions were eliminated, companies would give <u>less</u> to charity.	CPLs	26 (96.3%)	1 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1	28
	Elite	78 (89.7%)	5 (5.7%)	4 (4.6%)	6	93
The clients/students/audiences who benefit from corporate contributions don't appreciate the support of corporations.	CPLs	11 (40.8%)	13 (48.1%)	3 (11.1%)	1	28
	Elite	38 (44.2%)	45 (52.3%)	3 (3.5%)	7	93
If tax incentives for charitable contributions were eliminated, companies would give <u>nothing</u> to charity.	CPLs	1 (3.7%)	26 (96.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1	28
	Elite	8 (9.2%)	75 (86.2%)	4 (4.6%)	6	93
Unless a company realizes a direct benefit from its contributions, it has violated the shareholder's trust.	CPLs	1 (3.8%)	25 (96.2%)	0 (0.0%)	2	28
	Elite	1 (1.2%)	82 (95.3%)	3 (3.5%)	7	93
Companies which earn a profit in a community have an obligation to make contributions to charities in the area.	CPLs	25 (92.6%)	2 (7.4%)	0 (0.0%)	1	28
	Elite	63 (74.1%)	18 (21.2%)	4 (4.7%)	8	93
Companies should only give to charities that benefit customers, employees, shareholders, or the firm in some way.	CPLs	3 (11.5%)	23 (88.5%)	0 (0.0%)	2	28
	Elite	9 (10.5%)	74 (86.0%)	3 (3.55)	7	93



Finally, we asked both the cross-section and the CPLs in 1989-90 to respond to an additional set of items that dealt exclusively with corporate giving. Again they were to circle the appropriate response indicating if they "Strongly Agreed," "Agreed," "Disagreed," or "Strongly Disagreed." They could also indicate that they had "No Opinion."

In Table II-9 we find disagreement on a number of items. The 1989 elite sample was much more likely than the CPL to agree or strongly agree that companies should use contributions as a marketing tool whenever they can (46.0% vs. 23.1%). In contrast, the 1990 corporate philanthropic leaders were more likely to agree or strongly agree that company giving should be sensitive to the needs and interests of employees (96.3% vs. 86.2%), that if a company earns a profit it has a moral obligation to society to make charitable contributions (85.7% vs. 65.1%), that unless corporations engage in public service activities the society will revoke their franchise and privileges (30.8% vs. 10.3%), and that companies which earn a profit in a community have an obligation to make contributions to charities in the area (92.6% vs. 74.1%).

## F. Discussion

There appears to be some significant changes in the composition and thinking of the Twin Cities institutional elite between 1981 and 1989. We began to notice some of the changes when looking at the background and attitudes of the two elite samples. The data suggest that metro area institutional leaders in 1989 seemed less attached and interested in the Twin Cities than their predecessors. They also belonged to fewer local associations. Still, overall, they seemed to like the area and were involved to a great extent, but not as much as their counterparts in 1981.

Perhaps this is simply due to the larger percentage of elite respondents who were born outside of Minnesota in 1989. Because they do not have the same "roots" in the area as their predecessors in 1981, the current institutional elite may be somewhat more withdrawn from the local community. However, a more detailed analysis is needed before we can draw any firm conclusions.

Both the 1981 and 1989 elites believed that companies were very involved in supporting Twin Cities nonprofit organizations and were very generous, but the 1989 elite tended to feel this a bit more strongly. It seems that there is almost a consensus in our 1989 sample that corporate giving in the Twin Cities is very much alive and well.

However, the 1989 elite was a little more critical of how company contributions were disbursed than the 1981 elite. In the attitude items, about a fourth of the 1989 elite (as compared to only 4% of the 1981 elite) agreed or strongly agreed that nonprofits end up with little discretionary control in the use of corporate donations. Also a much larger percentage of the 1989 respondents offered opinions indicating that companies were giving too much to one or another sector. For example, over 20% of the sample thought that companies had given too much to recreational, cultural, and organizational development organizations. In 1981, no more than 12% of the sample voiced opposition to the amounts going to any sector.

Upon reflection these findings should not be too surprising. As company giving grew and became institutionalized over the eight year period, members of the local elite became more aware of what companies were doing. Almost everyone acknowledged their generosity and the value of

the gifts, but a significant minority came to believe that company giving has strings attached. The elite may have come to this conclusion because of a significant number of gifts to the University of Minnesota during this period which resulted in the renaming of the school of management and the establishment of several named chairs. There were also a number of business partnerships established between companies and units within the university. We should remember that 23.6% of our sample were educators and/or scientists, and thus a large percentage of our respondents were very close to developments at the university. At the same time, there was a large number of corporate sponsorships of sporting events and several visible mega fund-raising events where corporate logos were prominently displayed.

Although the elite was very much aware of company giving, perhaps they were not sophisticated enough to distinguish between charitable contributions and event sponsorships, between gifts from businessmen and gifts from businesses, and between gifts and partnerships. To them it may have all been the same - money going from business to nonprofits. If partnerships and sponsorships served the self interests of business, then probably charitable contributions did as well.

Still, when we look at the attitudes of the 1989 elite and the 1990 corporate philanthropic leaders we find that a significant percentage of the elite do not expect company giving to be strictly altruistic. Most interestingly, the 1989 elite appeared to be much more tolerant of cause-related marketing than corporate philanthropic leaders. Also the elite was much less likely to say that companies have a moral obligation to support local nonprofit organizations or that companies had to give or risk losing their franchise. Thus, although there may be some skepticism about corporate giving, it is still seen as correctly motivated - although maybe a bit self-serving - and it is certainly appreciated by the local elite. In contrast, the corporate philanthropic elite still viewed corporate contributions as truly philanthropic and other serving.

### III. Corporate Donors

This part of the report focuses on cash contributions that Twin Cities companies made to charitable organizations from 1979 to 1981 and from 1987 to 1989. Because of limited resources we focus only on contributions from publicly owned corporations which were headquartered in the Twin Cities metro area and had 200 or more employees. Although corporate or business contributions only constitute a small percentage of the sector's income, we believe that it is a very important part of the Twin Cities grants economy and worthy of our attention.

#### A. Methodology

The populations of Twin Cities publicly owned corporations were taken from the Corporate Report Factbook, 1980 and the Corporate Report Factbook, 1988. These volumes were current for October 31st, 1979 and October 31st, 1987 respectively. All publicly owned firms with zip codes 550, 551, 553, and 554 were included. The names of all the corporations in the 1980 and 1988 populations are listed in Appendix D.

We identified 98 corporations to interview in 1980. By the summer of 1982 we had successfully interviewed or surveyed 69 for a 70.4% response rate. There were 13 refusals, and 16 companies had either gone out of business, moved out of the area, been acquired by another company, or otherwise disappeared before we got to them.

In 1988 we identified 117 companies to interview. By the summer of 1990 we had successfully interviewed 77 for a 65.8% response rate. There were 12 refusals, and 28 companies were unavailable for one or another of the aforementioned reasons. Thus the number of cases for 1980 and 1988 respectively are 69 and 77 respectively.

An initial letter was sent to the Chair of the Board in 1981 and to the CEO in 1989 explaining the research and asking him/her to identify a representative whom we could interview. Sometimes the Chair or the CEO met with us himself, but more often we interviewed an officer of the company or a staff person. From our first interviewee we obtained a list of all the people in the company who were involved in contributions and an estimate of the amount of time these individuals spent on contributions.

In 1981 we interviewed only one representative from each of our 69 firms, although we obtained background data on others who worked on contributions. In 1989 we attempted to interview all exempt personnel who spent more than 10% of their time on contributions. However, if there was only one person involved in contributions, we interviewed this person even if s/he spent less than 10% of their time on contributions.

This resulted in our targeting 123 giving staff in 1989. By the summer of 1990 we had interviewed 92. Our success rate for staff employed in companies with over 1500 employees was 92%; our success rate for staff employed in companies with less than 1500 employees was 47.9%. All interviews with companies of more than 1500 employees were face-to-face and conducted by the principal investigator. They lasted between 45 minutes and 4 hours. Data from medium size companies (between 200 and 1500 employees) were gathered through personal and phone interviews. Interviews were conducted between October, 1981 and June, 1982 and between November, 1989 and June, 1990.

TABLE III-1 Average Percentage of Contributions Disbursed through Different Channels by Companies with 1500+ Employees: 1981; 1989

What percentage of your disbursements are channeled through the company foundation, given directly by corporate headquarters, disbursed through divisions/units/plants, or given through other channels?

	1981 (N=37)	1989 (N=40)
1. Foundation	35.4% (SD=39.0) (n=36)	38.8% (SD=40.8) (n=38)
2. Direct Contributions from Headquarters	47.2% (SD=41.5) (n=36)	38.7% (SD=40.0) (n=38)
3. Contributions from Divisions/Units/Plants	16.7% (SD=20.9) (n=37)	20.9% (SD=24.2) (n=38)
4. Trust	0.0% (SD=0) (n=36)	1.5% (SD=9.6) (n=39)
5. Other	0.3% (SD=0) (n=37)	0.0% (SD=0) (n=39)

TABLE III-2 Department Location of Company Contributions Program for Companies with 1500+ Employees: 1981; 1989

In which department is your company's contribution program located? That is, who has formal authority over it?

	1981		1989	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1. CEO, President	2	(5.6%)	2	(5.1%)
2. Treasurer, Finance, Accounting	0	(0.0%)	2	(5.1%)
3. Personnel, Human Resources Industrial Relations	2	(5.4%)	1	(2.6%)
4. Corporate Communication, External Relations	16	(43.2%)	14	(35.9%)
a. Communications	1	(2.7%)	3	(7.7%)
b. Public Relations	2	(5.4%)	1	(2.6%)
c. Community Relations/Affairs	3	(8.1%)	5	(12.8%)
d. Public Affairs	2	(18.9%)	2	(5.1%)
e. Other	3	(8.1%)	3	(7.7%)
5. General Administration, Executive Offices	5	(13.5%)	11	(28.2%)
6. Other	2	(5.6%)	3	(7.7%)
7. Free Standing, None	10	(27.8%)	8	(20.5%)
Total Responding	37		41 <sup>1</sup>	
Don't Know	0		0	
Refused to Answer	0		1	
Total in Size Category	37		40	

<sup>1</sup> Total adds up to 41, because two companies had the function located in two different departments and one refused to provide the information.

In the paragraphs below we will discuss corporate cash contributions. This includes disbursements directly from the company to charitable organizations and disbursements from the corporation's foundation. Although we recognize that companies make generous donations of equipment, advertising time, services, executive time, and other non-monetary gifts, we will analyze only cash contributions. The reason is simply that most companies don't value these contributions in a way that would make their gifts comparable to one another. Cash is the simplest common denominator. However, cash contributions which are treated by the firm as business expenses (e.g., sponsorships) will not be counted. Finally, we are studying total disbursements (direct giving plus foundation disbursements) and not total tax deductible contributions.

## B. Methods of Giving

There are several different channels through which companies can disburse funds. They can give through a foundation or trust, a direct giving program at company headquarters, or their branches/plants/subsidiaries. Table III-1 gives a breakdown for the companies in our 1981 and 1989 studies which had more than 1500 employees. In 1981 and 1982 we asked the most senior manager responsible for contributions to tell us the percentage of his/her disbursements that passed through each of the channels listed in Table III-1. In 1989 and 1990 we asked the most senior manager the same question for 1989 disbursements.

Table III-1 shows that there has been some change in the pattern of giving among companies with 1500 or more employees. In 1981, on average, companies gave 35.4% of their contributions through a corporate foundation; in 1989, on average, they gave 38.8% of the charitable dollars through a foundation. Thus the percentage disbursed through corporate foundations was up slightly. In 1981, on average, 47.2% of the funds were given directly by the corporate parent; in 1989 this was down to 38.7%. Finally, in 1981, on average, 16.7% of the contributions were disbursed by plants, subsidiaries, and other subunits of the company; by 1989 this was up to 20.9%.

We also asked our respondents to identify the department in which contributions/foundation activities were located. Table III-2 presents data again on firms with 1500 or more employees. Comparing 1981 to 1989 we find that roughly the same percentage of firms administered their giving programs through the CEO's or President's office (5.6% vs. 5.1%). We also find a smaller percentage administering contributions through personnel/human resources/industrial relations (5.4% vs. 2.6%) or corporate communication/external relations (43.2% vs 35.9%). Also a smaller percentage has contributions as a free standing function (27.8% vs. 20.5%). In contrast, a larger percentage of companies administer the program through their general administration/executive offices (13.5% vs. 28.2%) or through the treasurer/finance/accounting department (0.0% vs. 5.1%).

Procedures for handling grant applications have also changed over the eight year period. Among companies with more than 1500 employees, in 1989, 59.0% published an annual contribution report separate from the company's annual report as opposed to 43.2% in 1981. In 1989, 71.8% had published guidelines which were available to the public as opposed to 56.8% in 1981. In 1989, 59.0% had a set of written policies governing grants decision-making as opposed to 57.6% in 1981. In 1989, 25.6% had grant applications forms which prospective grantees must complete as opposed to 18.9% in 1981. In 1989, 79.5% acknowledged the receipt of a grant application or written proposal as opposed to 70.3% in 1981. Finally, in 1989, 18.5% did a follow-up written evaluation on at least half their contributions as opposed to 22.2% in 1981.

TABLE III-3 Background Characteristics of Corporate Giving Staff in Firms with 1500+ Employees: 1981; 1989

	1981		1989	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Gender</b>				
Female	14	30.4%	38	52.8%
Male	<u>32</u>	<u>69.6%</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>47.2%</u>
Total	46	100.0%	72	100.0%
<b>Educational Attainment</b>				
H.S. Graduate	7	15.2%	14	20.3%
College Graduate (B.A./B.S.)	25	54.3%	27	39.1%
Graduate Degree	14	30.4%	28	40.6%
Missing Data	<u>0</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>---</u>
Total	46	100.0%	72	100.0%
<b>Birthplace</b>				
Minnesota	21	46.7%	36	53.0%
Iowa, Wisconsin, North or South Dakota	8	17.8%	9	13.2%
Elsewhere in USA	16	35.5%	21	30.9%
Outside USA	0	-	2	2.9%
Missing Data	<u>1</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>---</u>
Total	46	100.0%	72	100.0%
<b>Raised as a Child</b>				
Minnesota	26	56.5%	44	65.6% <sup>1</sup>
Iowa, Wisconsin North or South Dakota	8	17.4%	8	11.9% <sup>1</sup>
Elsewhere in USA	12	26.1%	17	25.4% <sup>1</sup>
Outside USA	0	0.0%	2	3.0% <sup>1</sup>
Missing Data	<u>0</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>---</u>
Total	46	100.0%	---	--- <sup>1</sup>

	1981		1989	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Age in 1981/1989</b>				
21-30 years	1	2.2%	3	4.3%
31-40 years	15	32.6%	15	21.7%
41-50 years	8	17.4%	28	40.7%
51-60 years	12	26.1%	22	31.9%
over 60 years	10	21.7%	1	1.4%
Missing Data	<u>0</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>---</u>
Total	46	100.0%	72	100.0%
<b>Years living in T.C.</b>				
Five Years or Less	2	4.3%	3	4.3%
6-10 years	2	4.3%	5	7.2%
11-20 years	10	21.8%	10	14.5%
21 years or more	32	69.6%	51	74.0%
Missing Data	<u>0</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>---</u>
Total	46	100.0%	72	100.0%
<b>"Were you ever employed in the not-for-profit or government sector? Or were you only employed in the corporate sector?"</b>				
Not-for-Profit Sector	13	28.3% <sup>2</sup>	19	26.4% <sup>2</sup>
Government Sector	16	34.8% <sup>2</sup>	26	36.1% <sup>2</sup>
Corporate Only	24	52.2% <sup>2</sup>	30	41.7% <sup>2</sup>
Missing Data	0	---	3	---

<sup>1</sup> Percentages do not all add up to 100%, because some respondents were raised in more than one locale.

<sup>2</sup> Percentages do not add up to 100%, because some respondents have worked in more than one setting.



### C. Corporate Giving Staff

Although we were not able to interview all the corporate giving staff in our earlier research, we did gather data on the percentage of time these people devoted to contributions, their gender, education, birthplace, the place they were raised, age, the number of years they lived in the Twin Cities, and their previous job experience. We focus on the companies which had 1500 or more employees in 1981 and 1989 and staff who either devoted more than 10% of their time to contributions or were the only person responsible for contributions in the firm. Only exempt personnel are included in this analysis. Consultants are excluded. Data were gathered in the course of the staff interviews. In 1982 we targeted 46 people in 37 companies; in 1990 we targeted 72 people in 40 corporations.

Table III-3 shows that the percentage of women in these staff positions increased from 30.4% in 1981 to 52.8% in 1989. Staff also appear to be slightly older. In 1981, 65.2% were over 40 years old; in 1989, 74.0% were over 40. In 1989 there was a larger percentage of staff who had only a high school diploma (20.3% vs. 15.2%) or who had some kind of post graduate degree (40.6% vs. 30.4%). However, a smaller percentage had only a bachelor's degree (39.1% vs. 54.3%).

In 1989, 53.0% of the staff were born in Minnesota as compared to 46.7% in 1981. A smaller percentage came from other parts of the upper midwest or elsewhere in the United States (53.3% vs. 44.1%), and a slightly larger percentage were born abroad (0.0% vs. 2.9%). A similar pattern is found looking at where staff were raised. In 1989, 65.6% of the staff had been raised in Minnesota as compared to 56.5% in 1981; a smaller percentage were raised in the upper midwest; about the same percentage were raised elsewhere in the U.S.A.; and a slightly larger percentage had been raised abroad.

Staff in 1981 and 1989 lived in the Twin Cities for a comparable number of years. The same percentage lived here five years or less (4.3%), a little larger percentage in 1989 lived here only six to ten years (4.3% vs. 7.2%), a smaller percentage in 1989 lived here eleven to twenty years (21.8% vs. 14.5%), and a larger percentage in 1989 lived here more than 20 years (69.6% vs. 74.0%).

Finally, we see that staff's previous employment history in 1989 is slightly more varied than in 1981. In 1981, 28.3% had worked for a not-for-profit organization and 34.8% had worked for government at some point in their work history. In 1989 about the same percentage had worked for a not-for-profit (26.4%) and/or government agency (36.1%). However, only 41.7% of the 1989 group had worked only in business, while 52.2% of the 1981 group had only worked in the corporate sector prior to their current employment.

### D. Corporate Giving Amounts

We next turn to the amounts that companies gave to charity. We include in our analysis all the publicly held companies headquartered in the Twin Cities which had more than 200 employees. In both years companies provided us with these data. We should remind the reader that we are only interested in cash contributions directly disbursed by the company and/or through its foundation. These amounts have been added together to produce one total amount for a given fiscal year.

TABLE III-4 Average Corporate Contributions: 1979-1981; 1987-1989

	1979	1980	1981		1987	1988	1989
<b><u>Current Dollars</u></b>				<b><u>Current Dollars</u></b>			
200-1500 Employees in 1979 (N=32)	\$53,690 (SD=79,683) (n=31)	\$70,109 (SD=102,140) (n=32)	\$101,825 (SD=147,587) (n=32)	200-1500 Employees in 1987 (N=37)	\$26,619 (SD=47,511) (n=30)	\$52,125 (SD=161,803) (n=35)	\$25,552 (SD=40,874) (n=36)
1500+ Employees in 1979 (N=37)	\$1,157,474 (SD=1,921,953) (n=35)	\$1,359,992 (SD=2,118,139) (n=36)	\$1,384,830 (SD=2,144,884) (n=37)	1500+ Employees in 1987 (N=40)	\$2,156,956 (SD=3,802,401) (n=39)	\$2,294,784 (SD=3,857,584) (n=39)	\$2,486,379 (SD=4,429,305) (n=39)
<b><u>Constant Dollars (1979)</u></b>				<b><u>Constant Dollars (1979)</u></b>			
200-1500 Employees in 1979 (N=32)	\$53,690 (SD=79,683) (n=31)	\$61,836 (SD=90,088) (n=32)	\$82,173 (SD=119,103) (n=32)	200-1500 Employees in 1987 (N=37)	\$19,592 (SD=34,968) (n=30)	\$37,426 (SD=116,175) (n=35)	\$17,478 (SD=27,958) (n=36)
1500+ Employees in 1979 (N=37)	\$1,157,474 (SD=1,921,953) (n=35)	\$1,199,513 (SD=1,868,198) (n=36)	\$1,117,558 (SD=1,730,921) (n=37)	1500+ Employees in 1987 (N=40)	\$1,587,519 (SD=2,798,657) (n=39)	\$1,647,654 (SD=2,769,745) (n=39)	\$1,700,683 (SD=3,029,644) (n=39)

Table III-4 give us the statistics on contributions for six fiscal years: 1979, 1980, 1981, 1987, 1988, and 1989. We present the means and standard deviations for current and constant (1979 dollars). Looking first at companies with less than 1500 employees, we find that their giving in current and constant dollars has actually decreased over the decade. The decline in contributions from 1981 to 1987 is noteworthy. There was an increase in giving in 1988, but this was due to a one time, large gift by one donor. If this gift is not counted, giving among these smaller firms hovers at about \$25,000 to \$30,000 annually.

In contrast, the giving of companies with 1500 or more employees has increased steadily both in current and constant dollars. Yet not all large firms are equally generous. In Table III-4 we see that the standard deviations for total giving are quite high. This means that some companies are giving considerably more than others even within the same general size category. If we add up the total amount of cash contributions made by our 69 companies in fiscal year 1981, the two biggest donors accounted for 29.4% of the total; the four biggest donors accounted for 47.3%. In 1989 the two biggest donors accounted for 37.2% of the total; the four biggest accounted for 51.8%. Thus giving has been and still is the province of a few wealthy and generous donors.

Companies have different capacities to give because of company size. Our next probe divides the total amount of company contributions in the population in a given year by the total net income earned by the companies and then by the total revenues of these companies. Both among the smaller companies (with less than 1500 employees) and the larger companies, contributions as a percentage of net income fluctuates yearly. For example, among the larger companies the percentages were 1.91% in 1979, 2.38% in 1980, 2.45% in 1981, 2.83% in 1987, 3.40% in 1988, and 2.69% in 1989. Among the smaller companies the percentages are 1.49% in 1979, 2.12% in 1980, 1.98% in 1981, .96% in 1987, 1.42% in 1988, and .52% in 1989.

In contrast, contributions as a percentage of revenues is fairly constant across the years for larger firms but not for smaller companies. Among the companies with 1500 or more employees the percentages were .10% in 1979, .12% in 1980, .10% in 1981, .12% in 1987, .12% in 1988, and .11% in 1989. Among the companies with less than 1500 the percentages were .08% in 1979, .09% in 1980, .10% in 1981, .05% in 1987, .08% in 1988., and .04% in 1989.

#### E. Corporate Giving Patterns

Finally, we want to see if the pattern of giving has changed much over the decade. Again we focus on the companies which have more than 1500 employees. In the course of our interviews with staff we asked respondents to estimate the percentage of their disbursements which went to Twin Cities area nonprofits, nonprofits in Greater Minnesota, nonprofits elsewhere in the country, and nonprofits abroad. We also asked them to give us the amounts that they donated to local federated fund drives: the Minneapolis and St. Paul United Way, Cooperating Fund Drive, Minnesota Private College Fund, United Arts Fund, and any other local consolidated fund drive.

Table III-5 summarizes statistics on the geographical dispersion of funds. The elements in the table are means or averages based on the total number of firms providing data to us. In 1981, on average, companies made 70.6% of their donations to charities located in Minnesota. In 1989, on average, companies still made 70.1% of their donations locally. The percentage of donations to nonprofits in other states and abroad has also remained roughly the same.

TABLE III-5 Average Percentage of Corporate Contributions to Different Geographical Regions: 1979-1981; 1987-1989

	1979	1980	1981	1987	1988	1989
	1500+ Employees in 1979 (N=37)			1500+ Employees in 1987 (N=40)		
Minnesota	72.7% (SD=18.9) (n=27)	70.7% (SD=19.7) (n=32)	70.6% (SD=20.7) (n=30)	70.9% (SD=26.3) (n=35)	70.9% (SD=23.4) (n=37)	70.1% (SD=24.1) (n=38)
Elsewhere in USA	26.0% (SD=18.0) (n=27)	27.9% (SD=19.1) (n=31)	28.1% (SD=20.3) (n=29)	25.5% (SD=23.3) (n=35)	28.1% (SD=23.4) (n=37)	29.0% (SD=24.2) (n=38)
Outside USA	1.2% (SD=3.1) (n=28)	1.1% (SD=3.1) (n=31)	0.9% (SD=3.1) (n=29)	0.6% (SD=3.3) (n=37)	0.9% (SD=3.9) (n=38)	0.9% (SD=3.7) (n=38)

TABLE III-6 Average Corporate Contributions to Selected Twin Cities Federated Drives: 1979-1981; 1987-1989

	1979	1980	1981	1987	1988	1989
	1500+ Employees in 1979 (N=37)			1500+ Employees in 1987 (N=40)		
<u>Current Dollars</u>						
United Way Mpls/St. Paul	\$131,290 (SD=184,169) (n=29)	\$159,909 (SD=182,310) (n=31)	\$182,169 (SD=223,770) (n=30)	\$219,978 (SD=288,320) (n=36)	\$224,799 (SD=300,316) (n=38)	\$234,458 (SD=311,300) (n=39)
MN Private College Fund	\$14,530 (SD=20,316) (n=30)	\$14,591 (SD=22,041) (n=32)	\$17,691 (SD=26,808) (n=32)	\$20,977 (SD=29,717) (n=36)	\$17,798 (SD=25,703) (n=38)	\$18,608 (SD=25,344) (n=39)
United Arts Fund	\$12,966 (SD=28,297) (n=30)	\$12,837 (SD=27,997) (n=32)	\$12,828 (SD=30,711) (n=32)	\$10,281 (SD=24,629) (n=36)	\$9,511 (SD=24,261) (n=38)	\$8,731 (SD=22,047) (n=39)
Cooperating Fund Drive	\$0 (SD=0) (n=30)	\$15 (SD=88) (n=32)	\$31 (SD=177) (n=32)	\$1,248 (SD=4,830) (n=36)	\$1,353 (SD=4,770) (n=38)	\$1,273 (SD=4,713) (n=39)
Other Federated Drives	\$206 (SD=916) (n=30)	\$219 (SD=913) (n=31)	\$332 (SD=956) (n=31)	\$3,961 (SD=13,233) (n=36)	\$3,947 (SD=11,865) (n=38)	\$4,607 (SD=13,406) (n=39)

	1979	1980	1981	1987	1988	1989
	1500+ Employees in 1979 (N=37)			1500+ Employees in 1987 (N=40)		
<u>Constant Dollars</u>						
United Way Mpls/St. Paul	\$131,290 (SD=184,169) (n=29)	\$141,040 (SD=160,798) (n=31)	\$147,008 (SD=188,652) (n=30)	\$161,903 (SD=212,203) (n=36)	\$157,944 (SD=207,014) (n=38)	\$160,369 (SD=212,929) (n=39)
MN Private College Fund	\$14,530 (SD=20,316) (n=30)	\$12,869 (SD=19,440) (n=32)	\$14,276 (SD=21,634) (n=32)	\$15,439 (SD=21,872) (n=36)	\$12,779 (SD=18,455) (n=38)	\$12,728 (17,335) (n=39)
United Arts Fund	\$12,966 (SD=28,297) (n=30)	\$11,322 (SD=24,693) (n=32)	\$10,352 (SD=24,784) (n=32)	\$7,567 (SD=18,127) (n=36)	\$6,828 (SD=17,420) (n=38)	\$5,972 (SD=15,080) (n=39)
Cooperating Fund Drive	\$0 (SD=0) (n=30)	\$14 (SD=78) (n=32)	\$25 (SD=143) (n=32)	\$918 (SD=3,555) (n=36)	\$972 (SD=3,425) (n=36)	\$870 (SD=3,224) (n=39)
Other Federated Drives	\$206 (SD=916) (n=30)	\$193 (SD=805) (n=31)	\$268 (SD=772) (n=31)	\$2,915 (SD=9,739) (n=36)	\$2,834 (SD=8,519) (n=38)	\$3,151 (SD=9,170) (n=39)

However, there were significant changes if we look only at the two largest donors in 1981 and 1989. In 1981 the two largest donors gave, on average, 49.7% of their money to Minnesota nonprofits in contrast to 41.0% in 1989. In 1981, on average, 50.3% of their funds went to nonprofits outside the region; in 1989, on average, 59.0% of their funding went out of Minnesota. As noted earlier, these two companies alone accounted for about 30% of corporate contributions in both years. Thus a shift in their funding patterns is significant.

Finally, in Table III-6 we examine contributions of firms with 1500 or more employees to local federated fund drives. Looking first at United Way, we see that the average contribution to this fund drive have increased in both current and constant dollars. However, no other fund drive has fared this well. The average contribution to the Minnesota Private College Fund has remained about the same in both current and constant dollars. Contributions to the United Arts Fund dipped in both current and constant dollars. The average contribution to the Cooperating Fund Drive increased in both current and constant dollars, but the amounts remain quite small. Finally, the average gift to other fund drives has increased somewhat in both current and constant dollars but the sizes of the gifts remain small.

## F. Discussion

There have been changes in both the way contributions are disbursed and in the size and patterns of contributions. From the data we reviewed it is safe to conclude that company giving is becoming more formalized. Comparing 1979-81 to 1987-89 we find a larger percentage of giving is going through a foundation, companies are more likely to have a contributions annual report, published guidelines, written policies governing grants decision-making, grant applications, and to acknowledge the receipt of a grant application. There are also many more professional staff working on contributions. We also found that a larger percentage of companies in 1989 administered their contributions program through general administration or their executive offices. Companies were also less likely to leave it free-standing.

At the same time, contributions appear to be more decentralized. Comparing 1989 to 1981, we find that a larger percentage of money is being administered through divisions, subsidiaries, or plants. We also found that the largest donors are giving a smaller percentage of their contributions to Minnesota nonprofits (although we did find that, on average, the larger companies still gave about 70.0% of their funding to Minnesota nonprofits in 1989).

More importantly, company giving in the Twin Cities continues to defy national trends. Giving USA, 1991 Edition notes that corporate contributions in constant dollars were \$3.9 billion in 1987 and \$4.0 billion in 1988, 1989, and 1990. Yet giving in current and constant dollars has increased among the larger corporations headquartered in the Twin Cities during this same period.

As noted earlier, this is due to the truly exceptional generosity of a few large firms. If these companies did not continue to give at exceptionally high levels, the Twin Cities business community would not be that different than business communities elsewhere. We should also remember that giving among companies with 200 to 1500 employees actually decreased considerably (in current and constant dollars) over the eight years of our study. The most generous donors in this size range in 1979-81 either grew into the 1500 plus employee group or relocated by 1987-89. The same companies are not giving less. The reason for the drop off is that companies which entered the 200-1500 size group are not giving as much as their predecessors in 1979-81 nor are they giving as

large a percentage of their revenues or net income. If the Twin Cities are to continue to be a leader in the area of corporate contributions, it is important that the two or three "leadership" firms continue to give more than their fair share, but at the same time smaller companies will have to give more.

Another important finding is that giving among the larger firms in the Twin Cities appears to be more tightly tied to revenues than to net income. Examining the ratios of contributions to net income we found a great deal of fluctuation across the six years we studied, but a great deal of this was due to fluctuations in net income not contributions. In contrast, the ratio of contributions to revenues has been remarkably constant, ranging from .10% to .12%.

We suspect that this can be explained by the way many contributions budgets are set. In many firms decisions on allocations are made prior to the beginning of the new fiscal year and may very well be set on projected revenues instead of profits. In the end the company may have poor earnings, but it still honors its commitments and disburses budgeted amounts. Since, in many cases, net income is not a direct function of revenues, we see the tight coupling of contributions and revenues. It is profits/loses which are no longer coupled to contributions.



#### IV. Conclusions

This report does not pretend to describe all the features of the Third Sector or corporate contributions in the Twin Cities. Our purpose was only to provide the reader with a snap-shot of the sector at three points in time. Still we believe that a report of this kind - albeit very numerical and descriptive - can be of use to nonprofit administrators, public officials, private donors, and the general public. It can give them some idea about how the sector has changed even if it cannot predict where the sector is going. If nothing else, it may help to "set the record straight" and put the 1980s to rest.

Nonprofit organizations remain a viable organizational form precisely because their finances are so flexible. Using both cross-section and panel data we showed that, in general, nonprofits have fared very well. We also showed that different funding streams were important sources of revenue at different times. The sector survived the 1980s, because administrators, volunteers, and board members could mobilize funds from a variety of sources. If we expect nonprofits to survive into the 1990s and beyond, we have to encourage them to develop new funding strategies and not to censure them when unorthodox methods are proposed.

Corporate contributions are also alive and well in the Twin Cities. Although this is good news for nonprofit organizations, we still are a little unsure why this is the case. We are particularly curious about the way in which local corporate donors defied trends nationally and increased contributions (in constant dollars) from 1987 to 1989. This is an issue which we hope to explore in more detail in the months ahead. It could be due to profits or revenues, the attitudes and backgrounds of local CEOs, the markets or industries of our firms, or the culture of the Twin Cities business community. Indeed the latter was most important back in 1979-81. It will be interesting to see if this was still the case late into the 1980s.

The attitudes of our elite respondents highlight one of the issues which companies will have to face in the decade ahead: how much self interest should there be in making company contributions. Local philanthropic leaders seemed committed to keeping corporate contributions philanthropic. Yet there was considerable sentiment among the elite sample in 1989 that it was appropriate for companies to pursue business goals while making contributions to charity. This is a very difficult issue to resolve. While the elite appeared receptive to such strategies as cause related marketing, converting all contributions into sponsorships may lead to a negative backlash against companies while diverting money away from very needy and worthwhile charities to nonprofits that are better able to showcase corporate largesse.

We wish the Third Sector well in the decade ahead. The sector is surviving and apparently growing, but this was not without costs and hard work. Whatever lies ahead, we suspect that the not-for-profit organization will think up some way to meet the challenge head on and survive and prosper for another decade at least.

## APPENDIX A

### PUBLICATIONS BASED ON PRIOR RESEARCH

Here is a list of books, articles, and a dissertation written from the 1980 and 1984 surveys of Twin Cities nonprofit organizations and corporations.

#### Book:

Joseph Galaskiewicz. 1985. Social Organization of an Urban Grants Economy: A study of Business Philanthropy and Nonprofit Organizations. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

#### Articles:

Joseph Galaskiewicz and Ronald S. Burt. 1991. "Interorganization Contagion in Corporate Philanthropy." Administrative Science Quarterly, 26:88-105.

Joseph Galaskiewicz. 1991. "Making Corporate Actors Accountable: Institution Building in Minneapolis-St. Paul." The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis, edited by Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Joseph Galaskiewicz. 1989. "Corporate Contributions to Charity: Nothing More than a Marketing Strategy?" Pp. 246-60 in Philanthropic Giving: Studies in Varieties and Goals, edited by Richard Magat. New York: Oxford University Press.

Joseph Galaskiewicz and Stanley Wasserman. 1989. "Mimetic Processes within an Interorganizational Field: An Empirical Test." Administrative Science Quarterly, 34:454-479.

Lisa Atkinson and Joseph Galaskiewicz. 1988. "Stock Ownership and Company Contributions." Administrative Science Quarterly, 33:82-100.

Joseph Galaskiewicz. 1987. "The Study of a Business Elite in an American Metropolitan Area." Pp. 147-65 in Research Methods for Elite Studies, edited by George Moyser and Margaret Wagstaffe. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Joseph Galaskiewicz. 1985. "Professional Networks and the Institutionalization of the Single Mind Set." American Sociological Review, 50:639-58.

Joseph Galaskiewicz. 1985. "Interorganizational Relations." Pp. 281-304 in Annual Review of Sociology, Volume 11, edited by Ralph Turner. Palo Alto: Annual Reviews, Inc.

#### Dissertation:

Wolfgang Bielefeld. 1990. "Nonprofit Response to Resource Environment Change." Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota.

## APPENDIX B

### NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION CROSS-SECTION SAMPLES

#### 1980 Cross Section

##### Civic

Anoka County Commnty Action Program  
Board of West Central Area Council/YMCA  
Citizens of Hanover Advocating Responsible Government  
Council of Community Councils  
District 1 Community Council  
Friends of Cue  
Good Helps Inc.  
Lexington-Hamline Community Council  
Midway Club  
Mn Council American Youth Hostels  
Mpls. Kiwanis Foundation  
National Foundation for Philanthropy  
Nokomis Planning District Citizens Council  
Northeast Kiwanis Foundation  
Powderhorn Residents' Group  
St. Louis Park Rotary Foundation  
Weesner Charitable Trust Fund 6107  
World Trade Week Inc.  
YMCA Illinois Area Council

##### Media

Daytons Bluff News Inc.  
Mn Public Radio Inc.  
Twin Cities Public Television

##### Housing

American Indian Business Development Corp.  
Common Space  
Loring Nicollet Development Corp.  
Mn Multi-Housing Association  
Old Town Restorations Inc.  
Southside Neighborhood Housing Service of Mpls.  
Twin Cities Center for Urban Policy Inc.  
2nd Southeast Corp.

##### Recreational

Armstrong Hockey Boosters Inc.  
Brooklyn Park Athletic Assn.  
Buck Hill Ski Racing Club  
Camp Patmos Inc.  
Crystal Little League Inc.  
Eagan Athletic Assn.  
Eden Prairie Gymnastics Club  
Edina Swim Club  
Girl Scout Council of St. Croix Valley  
Highland Groveland Recreation Assn.  
Linwood Park Boosters Club  
Metropolitan Park Foundation  
Mn Academy of Gymnastics & Sports Fitness  
Mn Babe Ruth League Inc.  
Mn Parks Foundation  
North St. Paul Hockey Boosters Club

Northend Youth Hockey Assn.  
Orono-Long Lake Baseball Assn.  
Phelps Field Boosters  
Robbinsdale Dist. Traveling Baseball Inc.  
St. Anthony Village AAU Swim Club  
St. Paul Turners Gymnastic Society  
Twin City Yoga Society  
White Bear Lake Babe Ruth League

##### Legal

Crime Stoppers of Mn  
Golden Valley Crime Prevention Fund  
Legal Assistance of Ramsey County Inc.  
Mid-Minnesota Legal Assistants  
Mn Citizens Rights Fund  
Southern Mn Regional Legal Services Inc.

##### Environmental/Natural Resources

Environmental Balance Association of Mn  
The Intersociety Consortium/Plant Protection  
Izaak Walton League of America  
Midwest Environmental Education & Research  
Association  
Mn River Valley Audubon Club  
Natural Resources Corp.  
Quetico Superior Foundation  
Tree Trust U/A (same as TC Tree Trust)  
9th Intl. Congress for Plant Protection

##### Health and Welfare

Abbott Northwestern Hospital  
Alpha Kappa Epsilon Society Foundation  
American Indian Health Care Assn.  
American Citizens Concerned for Life Inc. Education  
Fund  
Assn. of Radio Reading Services  
Augustana Home of Minneapolis  
Beltrami Health Center  
Big Brothers, Big Sisters  
Bloomington Child Development  
Building Block Child Development Ctrs.  
Central Health Services Inc.  
Child Care Parents of Anoka County  
Childbirth Education Assn. of Mpls.  
Children's Center Inc.  
Children's Home Society of Mn  
Children's Oncology Service Upper Midwest  
Christian Union Home  
The City Inc.  
Community Emergency Assistance Program  
Community Retreat Corp.  
Concern Inc.  
Covenant Living Centers - Mn

Dakota County Receiving Ctr.  
 Dakotas Adults Inc.  
 Dakotas Children's Benefit Assn.  
 Dental Home Care  
 Divine Redeemer Memorial Hospital Auxiliary  
 Door of Hope  
 Edina Special Children's Group  
 Episcopal Group Homes  
 Fairview Community Hospitals  
 Faith Fund Charitable Trust  
 Family Service  
 First Universalist Church Foundation  
 Forest Lake Area Youth Services Bureau  
 Fremont Community Health Services  
 Fremont Connection  
 Genesis II for Women  
 Great Plains Organization for Perinatal Health Care Inc.  
 Greenvale Place of Northfield  
 Guadalupe Service Center Inc.  
 Harriet G. Olson Trust Fund  
 Harriet Tubman Women's Shelter Inc.  
 Hearing Society of Minnesota  
 Helping Individuals Resolve Employment Disabilities  
 Hidden Ranch Inc.  
 Hopkins Nursery School  
 Human Aging Attitude Reassessment Program  
 Institute on Healing of the Whole Person  
 International Heart Relief  
 Jack and Jill Preschool  
 Jewish Marriage Encounter of Mn  
 Judson Family Center  
 Keep Older Persons Employed  
 Lakeview Memorial Hospital Auxiliary  
 Learn and Grow Playhouse  
 Loring Nicollet Meals on Wheels  
 Lutheran Social Services Auxiliary  
 McIntyre's Center for Gifted Children  
 Messiah Willard Day Care Center Inc.  
 Metro Affiliated Senior Entertainment Programs  
 Metro Senior Federation  
 Mn American Legion & Auxiliary Heart Research  
 Foundation  
 Mn Cardio-Pulmonary Research Foundation  
 Mn Council for Ex-Offender Employment  
 Mn Dental Research Foundation  
 Mn Diversified Industries Inc.  
 Mn Human Genetics League  
 Mn Hundred Club  
 Mn Institute of Public Health  
 Mn Law Enforcement Memorial Assn.  
 Mn Marriage Encounter  
 Mn Medical Association  
 Mn Power Mikes Inc.  
 Mn Society for Crippled Children and Adults  
 Mn State Dental Assn. Relief Fund  
 Mn Vikings Children's Fund  
 Mpls. Youth Diversion Program  
 National Council on Family Relations  
 Nativity Lutheran Church Women's Nursery Schools

New Life Homes & Family Services  
 N.E. Learning Center for Persons with Developmental  
 Disabilities  
 North East Senior Citizen Resource Center  
 North Metro Developmental Achievement Center  
 North Suburban Developmental Achievement Center  
 Northside Child Development Center  
 N.W. Suburban Youth Service Bureau  
 Opportunity Workshop Inc.  
 Ours Inc.  
 Owobapte Industries Inc.  
 Park Nicollet Medical Foundation  
 People Inc.  
 Person Education-Developmental Education  
 Pilgrim Rest Child Development Center  
 Presbyterian Homes Inc.  
 Prodigal House  
 Project Life  
 Rainbow Christian Preschool  
 Redeemer Corp.  
 Renew Inc.  
 Resident Council Services Inc.  
 Riverview Memorial Hospital Auxiliary  
 Sabathani Community Center  
 Schizophrenia Association of Mn  
 Seward Cooperative Childcare Center  
 Sholom Home Inc. Auxiliary  
 Social Opportunities and Resources  
 Southern Anoka Community Assistance  
 Southside Life Care Center  
 St. Anthony Park Nursery School  
 St. Croix Area United Way  
 St. Mary's Rehabilitation Center  
 St. Paul Ostomy Association  
 St. Paul Youth Service Bureau  
 Suburban North Alano  
 Summit-University Senior Outreach/Advocacy Program  
 Tac Two Inc.  
 Trinity Health Care  
 Twin City Home Economists in Homemaking  
 United Blind of Mpls.  
 University of Mn Hospital & Clinics Auxiliary  
 Vanderlip Trust  
 Veap Inc.  
 Victory House Inc.  
 Wakota Life-Care Inc.  
 Warm World Child Development Center  
 Washington County Association for Senior Citizens  
 Wilder Foundation  
 Willows Inner Community Center  
 Women Helping Offenders  
 Worldwide Eye Care & Research Foundation  
 Youth Emergency Services  
 Youthcraft Industries

Education

ABC Montessori School  
 Alpha Tau Omega Foundation of Mn  
 Anoka Jr. Great Books

Augsburg College  
Bloomington Scholarship Foundation  
Calvin Christian School  
Career Development and Evaluation Services  
Challenge Research Institute Inc.  
Community Resources for Education Alternative  
Treatment and Evaluation  
Dial-Logue Inc.  
Edison Scholarship & Memorial Fund  
Emma Willard Task Force on Education  
Environ Agribusiness Resources Technology and  
Horticulture Association of Mn  
Flight Unlimited  
Golden Valley Lutheran College Foundation  
Greater Gustavus Fund  
Higher Education & Development Inc.  
Institute for Continuing Education  
Kenneth Hall School  
Kinderhaus Montessori School  
Lightning and Transients Research Institute  
Macalester College  
Metrop. Med. Center Alumna  
Mn Alumni Association, U of Minnesota  
Mn Association of Continuing Adult Education  
Mn Bible College  
Mn Consulting Group Inc.  
Mn Office Education Foundation  
Mn Private College Research Foundation  
Mn State Horticultural Society  
Mn Women in Higher Education  
Mpls. Better Jobs for Women  
Mrs. Liiste's Montessori Schools  
Native American Theological Association  
Newgate Education & Research Center  
Northwestern College of Chiropractic Foundation  
Parkview Alumni Association  
Plymouth Montessori School  
Psyche Inc.  
Rainbow Research  
Richard Spruce Foundation for the Study of Ethnobotany  
Scientists and Engineers Technology Assessment Council  
Sister Joseph Endowment Fund for Nursing Education  
Spanish Evangelical Educational Crusade  
St. Paul Educational Foundation  
Survival Skills Institute Inc.  
Twin Cities Creation-Science Association  
United Ministries in Higher Education  
University Student Telecommunication Corp.  
Voluntary Action Center of St. Paul

#### Cultural

African American Museum of Art & History of the  
Upper Midwest  
Artspace Project Inc.  
Bach Society of Mn  
Bloomington Historical Society  
Center for International Education  
Children's Program of Northern Ireland  
Choreogram Dance Studio

Colonial Dames of America in Mn  
Cooperating Libraries in Consortium  
Cricket Theatre Corp.  
Dakota Center for the Arts  
Edina Historical Society  
Film in the Cities  
Greater Twin Cities Youth Symphonies  
Hennepin County Historical Society  
International Center of Medieval Art  
Jo Lechay Dance Co.  
Land O' Lakes Theatre Organ Society  
Metro Boys' Choir  
Midwest Libertarian Library Association  
Minnetonka Orchestra Association  
Mn Archaeological Society  
Mn Chorale  
Mn Dance Theatre and School  
Mn Historical Society Trust 3892  
Mn Jazz Dance Co.  
Mn Orchestral Association - Mpls. Symphony Orchestra  
Mn Theatre Federation  
Mn Zoological Garden Foundation  
Mpls. Chamber Symphony Orchestra  
Nancy Haauser Dance Co. & School  
New Hope Musical Theatre Inc.  
Park Square Theatre  
Plymouth Historical Society  
Richfield Historical Society  
Space Theatre Consortium  
St. Andrews Society of Mn  
Suburban Symphony Association  
Theatre Studio  
Thursday Musical  
Trinity Films  
Twin Cities Catholic Chorale  
Twin Cities Choirmasters Association  
Weavers' Guild of Mn  
Women Historians of the Midwest  
Women's Auxiliary of Metropolitan Musicians  
Association

#### Misc. or Not Otherwise Identifiable

Airman's Nantambu Memorial Foundation  
Board of Trustees Mt. Zion Cemetery  
Brian Rudd Trip Beyond  
Brorby, Thea Charitable Trust  
Carr, Edith for the George Washington University  
Hospital  
Community Research Associates  
Dunwoody, Kate L Trust 775  
Evaluation Systems  
Good Shepherd Residence  
Good News for Israel  
Harrington, CM Trust U/W Par 14 Item 630 26006  
Harrington, Charles Trust U/W Paris Item 10 3611-9  
Hudson Trust U/AZ 1541-1, Laura Bell  
Jesus People's Free Store  
Maple Hills of Red Wind Inc.  
Masterton, William J. Memorial Trust

Midway Hospital Foundation  
Miller Peace Memorial, James  
National Distillers Distributors Foundation  
National Fly the Flag Crusade  
O'Brien, Hannah F. Trust 8451  
Ramsey Charitable Trust  
Religion and Society  
St. Mary's Hall Ethel M. Vanderlip Fund Tr. U/A  
St. Paul Lutheran Friends of Israel  
Washington County Foundation  
Wells, Frederick B., Jr., Trust Fund  
Yeshuah Hamashiach Fellowship

Civic

Afton Citizens Forum  
CCA Inc. Highland Station  
Citizens of Hanover Advocating Responsible Government  
Community Human Resources  
Council of Community Councils  
District 8 Planning Council  
Edina Families in Action Inc.  
Friends of Cue  
Gopher Critiques  
Jordan Area Community Council JAAC  
Lake Johanna Volunteer Fire Department  
Loring Nicollet Center Inc.  
Midway Concerned Citizens Council  
Minneapolis Kiwanis Foundation Inc.  
Minnesota Charities Review Council Inc.  
Minnesota Hispanic Chamber of Commerce  
Mississippi River Parkway Commission  
Nokomis Planning District Citizens Council Inc.  
Plymouth Civic League Inc.  
Ramsey Action Programs Inc.  
St Paul Foundation  
S.E.N.C.E. Saving Established Neighborhoods by  
Community Enterprise  
Spring Lake Park Fire Department Inc.  
Third World Jubilee  
United Fund of Shakopee Inc.  
United Way of Minneapolis  
West Bank CDC Inc.  
Womans Club of Minneapolis

Media

Camden Community News Inc.  
Frogtown Forum Inc.  
Minnesota News Council  
Park Press Inc.  
Twin Cities Media Project Inc.

Housing

Cannon Valley Housing Resources Inc.  
Community Housing Corporation of Greater St Paul Inc.  
Gideons Bay Homeowners Association Inc.  
Loring Nicollet Development Corporation  
Nicollet Island East Bank Project Area Committee Inc.  
Phillips Neighborhood Housing Trust  
Second (2nd) Southeast Corporation  
Torre de San Miguel Homes Inc.

Recreational

Anoka Area Hockey Association Inc.  
Beaver Valley Camp Inc.  
Brooklyn Center National Little League Inc.  
Burnsville Athletic Club  
Camp Patmos Inc.  
Central Area Hockey Association Inc.  
Coon Rapids American Babe Ruth Little League Inc.  
Crystal Little League Inc.

Doberman Pinscher Club of America Greater Twin Cities  
Chapter  
Flaming Pine Youth Camp  
Girl Scout Council of St Croix Valley  
Hastings Hockey Boosters Inc.  
Highland Groveland Recreation Association Inc.  
Johnson Area Hockey Association  
Lake Region Hockey Association  
Maplewood Athletic Association Inc.  
Metropolitan Park Foundation  
Minnesota Babe Ruth League Inc.  
Minnesota Parks Foundation  
Minnetonka Hopkins Gymnastics Association  
Mustangs Inc.  
Northfield Hockey Association Inc.  
Optimist Club of Anoka Coon Rapids Boys Work Fund  
Inc.  
Pearl Improvement and Recreation Council  
Ramsey County 4-H Club Camp Inc.  
Roseville Youth Basketball Association Inc.  
St Croix Amateur Hockey Association Inc.  
South East Metro Sharks Swim Club Inc.  
Three Rivers Soccer Association  
Valley Region Hockey Association  
West Area Youth Hockey Association  
White Bear Lake Hockey and Skating Association Inc.  
Woodbury Athletic Association

Legal

Center for Environmental Conflict Resolution Inc.  
Corporation for Consumer Affairs Inc.  
Family Justice Center Inc.  
Hennepin County Bar Foundation  
Legal Advice Clinics Ltd.  
Legal Assistance of Washington County  
Minnesota Citizens for Court Reform Inc.  
Minnesota Environmental Law Institute Inc.  
North Suburban Area Crime Prevention & Criminal  
Apprehension Fund Inc.  
Police and Community Development Foundation Inc.  
Tip Inc.

Environmental/Natural Resources

Acid Rain Foundation Inc.  
Environmental Concerns Inc.  
Governors Shade Tree Foundation Inc.  
Izaak Walton League of America Inc. Minnesota Division  
Minnesota Association of Farmers Landowners and  
Sportsmen  
Minnesota Environmental Sciences Foundation Inc.  
Muskies Inc.  
Project Environment Foundation  
Soil Conservation Society of America Minnesota Chapter  
Upper Mississippi River Basin Association

Health and Welfare

Advocating Change Together Inc.

Alano Society of St Paul Inc.  
 Alpha Human Services Inc.  
 American Baptist Homes of the Midwest  
 American Indian Services Inc.  
 American Society for Preventive Dentistry of Minnesota  
 Animal Humane Society of Hennepin County  
 Arlington House  
 Association of Operating Room Nurses of the Twin  
 Cities  
 Augustana Home Foundation  
 Bethesda Lutheran Medical Center Auxiliary  
 Big Brothers Inc.  
 Bloomington Meals on Wheels  
 Calix Society International Headquarters  
 Careview Homes Inc.  
 Cebu Christian Shelter Community for Children  
 Central Center for Family Resources  
 Chanhassen Child Development Center  
 Child and Parent Enrichment Playschool Inc.  
 Child Care Services Inc.  
 Children's and Parents' Cooperative Preschool  
 Children's Heart Fund  
 Children's Village Montessori Day Care Center  
 Christ's Invaders International Prison Work Association  
 Colony Inc.  
 Community Involvement Programs  
 Concordia Arms Inc.  
 Courage Center  
 Crossroads Resource Center Inc.  
 Dakotas Children Inc.  
 Davis, J Hartwell for Family and Children's Service  
 Developmental Services Organization Inc.  
 Doll House Development Center Inc.  
 East Communities Family Center Inc.  
 Ebenezer Park Apartments  
 Eitel Hospital  
 Emergency Fund Service Inc.  
 Exceptional Children's Home of Opportunity Inc.  
 Family Networks Inc.  
 Family Service of South St Paul  
 Foundation of the Minnesota Medical Association  
 Foster Parents Association  
 Freeport West Inc.  
 Friendship Ambulance Service Inc.  
 Gestalt Center  
 Grand Avenue Alliance Nursery Day Care Inc.  
 Greater St Paul Home Services Association Inc.  
 Guadalupe Area Project Inc.  
 Hamline Nursery School  
 Hastings Family Service  
 Health Foundation Brookdale Towers  
 Helping Hand Health Center Inc.  
 Hennepin County Medical Foundation  
 Hope International Family Service Inc.  
 House of Charity Inc.  
 In Home Health Care Service of Minneapolis North Inc.  
 Institute on Healing of the Whole Person  
 International Society of Gynecological Pathologists  
 Jewish Family and Children's Service

Joint Commission on Allied Health Personnel in  
 Ophthalmology Inc.  
 Juel Fairbanks Aftercare Residence  
 Kiddie Kampus Nursery Inc.  
 Lake Owasso Residence Volunteer Council  
 Latvian Welfare Association Daugavas Vanagi of  
 Minnesota  
 Little Christians Nursery School  
 Loring-Nicollet Meals on Wheels Eitel Hospital  
 Lupus Foundation of America Minnesota Chapter  
 Marie Sandvik Center  
 Men's Center  
 Messiah Willard Day Care Center Inc.  
 Metropolitan Medical Center  
 Midwest Special Services Inc.  
 Minneapolis League of Catholic Women Inc.  
 Minnesota Academy of Restorative Dentistry  
 Minnesota Association for Retarded Citizens Inc.  
 Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life Inc. Education  
 Fund  
 Minnesota Community Corrections Association  
 Minnesota Developmental Achievement Center  
 Association  
 Minnesota Financial Counseling Service Inc.  
 Minnesota Hundred Club  
 Minnesota Jewish Group Homes Services Inc.  
 Minnesota Medical Foundation  
 Minnesota P.E.O. Home Fund  
 Minnesota Rehabilitation Association  
 Minnesota Society for Parapsychological Research  
 Minnetonka Psychiatric Institute  
 Mount Sinai Hospital Auxiliary  
 National Ataxia Foundation Inc.  
 Neighbors Inc.  
 New Life Society Inc.  
 Nexus Inc.  
 North East United Seniors Inc.  
 North Minneapolis Lutheran Coalition Inc.  
 North Suburban Consumer Advocates for the  
 Handicapped  
 Northeast Learning Center Inc.  
 Northfield Day Care Center Corporation  
 Northside Step Inc.  
 Northwest Suburban Youth Service Bureau  
 On Top Inc.  
 Operation Brotherhood  
 Our House of Minnesota Inc.  
 Overeaters Anonymous North Star Central Service Office  
 Parents Club of Stewart Prekindergarten Inc.  
 Personnel Decisions Research Institute  
 Phoenix Residence Inc.  
 Pioneer House Alumni Association  
 Prevention of Alcohol Problems Inc.  
 Project Charlie III Richfield Inc.  
 Ramsey Clinic Associates P.A.  
 Regina Memorial Hospital Auxiliary  
 Residence Inc.  
 Richfield Latch Key Child Care Center Inc.  
 Riverwood Treatment Center Inc.



St Croix Day Care Center  
 St James Child Care Center Inc.  
 St Louis Park Medical Center Research Foundation  
 St Paul Humane Society Auxiliary  
 St Paul Society for the Blind  
 St Paul's Developmental Achievement Center  
 Schizophrenia Association of Minnesota  
 Search Institute  
 Servicemen's Center Inc. of Minnesota  
 Sholom Home Inc.  
 Small Wonders of New Prague Inc.  
 South Shore Communities Inc.  
 Southside Child Care Committee Inc.  
 Southside Senior Citizen Council Inc.  
 Suburban North Alano Inc.  
 Supplemental Enterprises Inc.  
 Teachers Homes Inc.  
 Twin Cities Building Trades Employee Assistance  
 Program Association  
 Twin City Orthopedic Research Fund Veterans  
 Administration Hospital  
 United Handicapped Federation  
 University Hospitals Volunteer Association Inc.  
 Valley Preschool  
 Visiting Nurses Services  
 Waconia Nursery School  
 Walk-In Counseling Center Inc.  
 Washington County Day Activity Centers Inc.  
 Webb Foundation Inc.  
 West Side Community Health Center Inc.  
 Wildwood Lions Ambulance Co.  
 Women's Auxiliary of Fairview Hospitals  
 Worldwide Eye Care and Research Foundation  
 Youth Emergency Services Inc.

#### Education

Adlerian Family Education Association  
 Y's Men's Interclub Council of the St Paul District  
 Alumni and Friends Association of St Bernard's High  
 American Institute of Banking Minneapolis Chapter  
 Applied Psychological Measurement Inc.  
 Augsburg College  
 Blake Schools  
 Calvin Christian School  
 Central Lutheran School Association of St Paul  
 Minnesota  
 College of St Thomas  
 Community Scholarship Foundation  
 Creative Options  
 Dunwoody Development Fund  
 Edison Scholarship and Memorial Fund  
 Educational Fund for the Needy in Taiwan EFNT  
 Extraordinary Learning and Educational Antioch Mpls  
 Communiversity Inc.  
 Forest Lake Montessori School Inc.  
 Friends of the Library  
 Garvin, HC Trust 13289 u/w Winona State College  
 Growing Room 8361 Berry Benjamin

Hennepin County 4-H Foundation of Minneapolis,  
 Minnesota  
 Insight Inc.  
 Intercultural Education Committee of St Paul  
 J.S.O.E. Military Academy  
 Lake County School Montessori Learning Environments  
 Liberty Bell Education Foundation  
 Lutheran Bible Institute of Minneapolis  
 Metropolitan Open School  
 Migizi Communications Inc.  
 Minneapolis School of Anesthesia  
 Minnesota Alliance of Montessorians  
 Minnesota Association of Administrators of State &  
 Federal Educ Program St Paul  
 Minnesota Association of Realtors Educational  
 Foundation  
 Minnesota Chromatography Forum  
 Minnesota Council for the Gifted and Talented  
 Minnesota Government College Council  
 Minnesota Music Educators Association  
 Minnesota Private College Research Foundation  
 Minnesota State High School League  
 Minnesota Vocational Technical Trust Association  
 Montessori Academy Inc.  
 Mu Sigma Foundation Inc.  
 National Indian Education Association  
 North Hennepin Montessori School Inc.  
 Northwestern Electronics Foundation  
 Ozone Dance School Inc.  
 Parents Organization for Students and Educators  
 Project Gain Inc.  
 Rainbow Research Inc.  
 Religion Analysis Service Inc.  
 Roofers Local No 96 Apprentice Training Fund  
 St Paul Academy and Summit School  
 St Paul Pipefitters Joint Journeymen & Apprentice  
 Training Trust Fund  
 Smith College Club of Minnesota  
 Sunrise Montessori School Inc.  
 Trustees of the Hamline U of M  
 Twin City Carpenters Apprenticeship and Training Fund  
 University of Minnesota Foundation  
 Waconia Band Boosters of Independent School District  
 110  
 Women's Learning Institute Inc.

#### Cultural

Afro-American Music Opportunities Association Inc.  
 American Indian Women of Minnesota  
 Armenian Cultural Organization of Minnesota  
 At the Foot of the Mountain  
 Bloomington Civic Theatre  
 Burke, Mary and Jackson Foundation  
 Centre for Asians and Pacific Islanders  
 Choralis Sine Nomine  
 City of Minnetonka Historical Society  
 Community Theatre Guild of Woodbury Inc.  
 Concentus Musicus  
 Dakota Center for the Arts

Echo Theatre Company  
 Excelsior-Lake Minnetonka Historical Society  
 Forecast  
 Friends of the Minneapolis Public Library  
 Gilbert and Sullivan Very Light Opera Company  
 Guthrie Theatre Foundation  
 Hindu Society of Minnesota  
 Indian American Folklore Group Inc.  
 Irish-American Cultural Institute  
 Kenwood Chamber Orchestra Association  
 Les Amis du Theatre French through Theatre Hamline  
 University  
 Masquers Theatre Company  
 Midwest Libertarian Library Association  
 Minneapolis Athenaeum  
 Minneapolis Society of Fine Arts  
 Metropolitan Boy Choir  
 Minnesota Composers Forum  
 Minnesota Folklife Society  
 Minnesota International Center  
 Minnesota Museum of Art  
 Minnesota S.P.A.N. Association  
 Minnesota Transportation Museum Inc.  
 Minnesota Zoological Garden Foundation  
 Minnihon Arts Center  
 MSAIA Architectural Foundation  
 Natural History Society  
 North Central Opera Company  
 Norwegian-American Historical Association  
 Park Square Theatre  
 Pilots Club Dance Troupe  
 Powderhorn Community Arts  
 Roosevelt Band Boosters Club  
 St Louis Park Friends of the Library  
 St Paul Civic Symphony Association  
 Sibley House Association Minnesota Society DAR  
 Sons of Norway Foundation  
 Summer Arts Study Center at Sugar Hills  
 Theatre de la Jeune Lune  
 Twin Cities Catholic Chorale  
 Twin City Chormasters Association Inc.  
 Vietnamese Buddhist Association  
 Western Hennepin County Pioneers Association Inc.  
 Children's Program of Northern Ireland Inc.  
 Women Historians of the Midwest

Miscellaneous or Not Otherwise Identified

Anderson Trust 4676  
 Astrological Research Organization aka A.R.O.  
 Briggs, John F and Myrtle V, Charitable Trust  
 Center for Creative Living Inc.  
 Children's Holistic Learning Center  
 Common Ground Productions Inc.  
 Diether, Mary Lou and Adelaide E Diether Charitable  
 Trust  
 Elmhurst Cemetery  
 Environmedia Inc.  
 Garvin, H C, Trust 13290 u/w Lyon County Minnesota  
 Gress, C W, Trust 4237-2 u/a

Harmony Study Center  
 Harrington, C M, Trust u/w par 14 item 7 30-26003  
 Heritage Foundation of the USS Gambier Bay and VC  
 10 Inc.  
 International Society for the Study of Behavioral  
 Development  
 Jewish Ladies Aid Society  
 Little Freedom Inc.  
 Michael Servetus Unitarian Society  
 Minnesota Professional Engineers Foundation  
 Minnesota Territorial Pioneers  
 National Conference of Christian Employers and  
 Managers  
 New Franklin-Hall Development Corporation Inc.  
 One to One Inc.  
 R.D. Productions Inc.  
 St Croix Animal Shelter Inc.  
 St Paul Mobile Radio Club  
 South Asia Foundation  
 Total Community Concept Inc.  
 Upper Midwest Regional Charismatic Service Committee  
 Washington County Foundation Inc.  
 Working Boys Center Foundation Inc.

## 1988 Cross Section

### Civic

Camden Area Community Concerns Council  
Community Administrative Services  
District #1 Community Council  
Friends for a Non-Violent World  
Headwaters Fund  
Middle East Peace Now  
Minneapolis League of Catholic Women  
Mn Council of Nonprofits  
Mn Project  
National Retiree Volunteer Center  
Park Ave Urban Program and Leadership Foundation  
Progressive Roundtable  
St Anthony Park Community Council  
The Eden Prairie Foundation  
United Jewish Fund and Council  
Washington County Foundation  
Youth Advisory Council

### Media

Constitutional Commentary  
Hutch Community Video Network  
Mn Public Radio  
Pride Films  
The North End News

### Housing

Downtown Community Development Council  
Grasslands Housing  
Lowertown Redevelopment Corp.  
New Franklin-Hall Development Corp.  
Old Town Restorations  
Riverfront Redevelopment Corp.  
Tenants Council of Accessible Space  
West Bank CDC

### Recreational

Bennett Family Park  
Buck Hill Ski Racing Club  
Camp Tamarac  
Chaska Community Hockey Assoc.  
Desnoyer Park Athletic Assoc.  
East Tonka Girls Softball Assoc.  
Flaming Pine Youth Camp  
Golden Gloves  
Hastings Hockey Boosters  
Highland Groveland Recreation Assoc.  
Joyful Voices Camp  
Little Canada Recreation Assoc.  
Mn Protestant Foundation  
Minnetonka Village Little League  
North Central Camp Cherith  
Northwestern Tennis Patrons  
Region North Country United States Volleyball Assoc.  
Roseville Youth Hockey Assoc.  
South East Metro Sharks Swim Club  
St Croix Valley Girl Scout Camps

The New Prague Community Center Project  
Upper Midwest Amateur Baseball Fund  
Wells Memorial  
White Bear Sailing School

### Legal

Dispute Resolution Center  
Hennepin County Bar Foundation  
Legal Assistance of Dakota County  
Mn Citizens Council on Crime and Justice  
Mn Volunteer Attorney Program  
Northfield Police Assoc.  
St Paul Intervention Project

### Environmental/Natural Resources

Freshwater Foundation  
International Alliance for Sustainable Agriculture  
Mn Arboretum Foundation  
Mn Naturalists Assoc.  
Mn Waterfowl Assoc.  
Odowd Lakes Chain Assoc.  
Roseville Central Park Foundation  
Thomas Irvine Dodge Foundation  
Willow Lake Nature Preserve Foundation

### Health and Welfare

Accessible Space North  
Airmans Nantambo Memorial Foundation  
Alliance for the Mentally Ill of Mn  
American Baptist Homes of the Midwest  
American Legion Hospital Assoc.  
Anoka County Brotherhood Council  
Ascension Place Inc  
Association of Radio Reading Services  
Baptist Hospital Fund  
Big Brothers Foundation  
Bloomington Child Development Assoc.  
Building Block Child Care Centers  
Campus Carnival  
Carealot Services  
Cedar Riverside Peoples Center  
Chanhassen Child Development Center  
Child Development Resources  
Children's Dental Clinics  
Children's World of Waconia  
Citifutures  
Commonhealth Clinic  
Community Hot-Meals on Wheels  
Concy's Montessori School and Day Care  
Creekside Chapter Mn Division Izaak Walton  
Dakota Area Referral and Transportation for Seniors  
Damascus Way Re-entry Center  
Dinner at Your Door-South Shore  
Downtown Y's Men's Club of St Paul  
Edendale Residence  
Emergency Fund Service  
Episcopal Corp for the Elderly

Fairview Hospital & Healthcare Services  
 Forest Lake Alano Society  
 Four Directions  
 Functional Independence Training  
 Good Neighbor Club of Willernie and Mahtomedi  
 Hallie Q. Brown Community Center  
 Haven Homes of Red Wing  
 Healthcare Education and Research Foundation  
 Henry Courts  
 Hope Daycare Learning Center  
 House of Faith Nursery School  
 Independence Crossroads  
 Institute on Black Chemical Abuse  
 International Health Service of Mn  
 Jamestown  
 Jones Harrison Foundation  
 Keep em Alive  
 Knights of Columbus Youth Organization of Minneapolis  
 Lakeview Hospital Home Care  
 Laura Baker School Assoc.  
 Liat  
 Little People Day Care Center  
 Lost Chord Club of St Paul  
 Make a Wish of Mn  
 Masonic Cancer Center Fund  
 Mental Health Coalition of Rice County  
 Metro Hearing Impaired Seniors  
 Metropolitan Visiting Nurse Assoc.  
 Midwest Special Services  
 Minneapolis Children's Services Corp.  
 Minneapolis Society for the Blind  
 Mn Association for Children of All Nations  
 Mn Coalition for a Smoke Free Society 2000  
 Mn Developmental Achievement Center Assoc.  
 Mn Gerontological Society  
 Mn International Health Volunteers  
 Mn Masonic Home Endowment  
 Mn Perinatal Organization  
 Mn Senior Federation  
 Mn Therapeutic Camp Endowment Fund  
 Minnetonka Lutheran Church Nursery School  
 Mount Carmel Manor Housing Corp.  
 Mustangs  
 National Handicap Housing Institute  
 North Memorial Medical Ctr, U of MN Family Medical  
 Center  
 North Suburban Counseling Center  
 NE Residence  
 Northfield Victim Support Program  
 NW Suburban Dinner at Your Door  
 On Top  
 Optimist Club of Glen Lake Boys Work Fund  
 Outcomes  
 Parents and Friends of Orvilla  
 People Responding in Social Ministry  
 Phoenix Residence  
 Presbyterian Homes  
 Project Awareness for Domestic Abuse  
 Quality Child Care

Reachout  
 Reinforce  
 Reuben Lindh Learning Center  
 Sanford Hospital  
 Scott County Day Activity Center  
 Service League of Hennepin County General Hospital  
 Side by Side  
 Sounds Incarcerated  
 Southside Child Care Committee  
 Spina Bifida Association of Mn  
 St Croix Valley Youth Center at St Mary's Point  
 St Louis Park Emergency Program  
 St Paul Urban League Labor Education Program (Leap)  
 St Paul's Home  
 Stevens Square Community Organization  
 Sunny Hollow  
 Thanksgiving Meals on Wheels  
 The John Prescott Blind Children's Foundation  
 Trade Lake Camp  
 Twin Cities Sickle Cell Anemia Research Corp.  
 United Battered Families Network  
 Unity Nursery School  
 Upper Mid-West Branch of the Orton Society  
 Valley Preschool  
 Volunteers of America Care Facilities  
 Walker Methodist Residence Sponsors Fund  
 Wayside House Inc.  
 West Side Community Health Center  
 Westonka School Age Day Care  
 Womans Auxiliary to the Hennepin County Medical  
 Society  
 Womyns Braille Press  
 Young Womens Christian Association of St Paul Mn

#### Education

American Indian Student Assoc.  
 Anoka Ramsey Community College Foundation  
 Atelier Lack  
 Black Unity Futurism Youth Conference  
 Business Economics Education Foundation of Mn  
 Carver-on-the-Minnesota  
 Christian College Consortium  
 College of St Catherine Alumnae Assoc.  
 Country Haven Montessori School  
 Dial-Logue  
 Edina Montessori School  
 Educational Growth Exchange  
 Faith Academy  
 Fred C. Van Dusen Trust for Minneapolis Foundation  
 Golden Valley Lutheran College Foundation  
 Hammer Residences  
 Hope International Family Service  
 Iowa-Mn Chapter of the American Concrete Institute  
 Joint Religious Education and Research Fund  
 Lake Conference  
 Link Management  
 Margaret E. Andrews Scholarship Trust Fund  
 Metropolitan State University Foundation  
 Minneapolis Citizens Committee on Public Education

Minneapolis School of Anesthesia  
 Mn Apple Computer Users Group  
 Mn Association for Continuing Adult Education  
 Mn Chromatography Forum  
 Mn Council of Teachers of English  
 Mn Home Economics Assoc.  
 Mn Music Teachers Association Educational and Charitable Fund  
 Mn Safety Council  
 Mn Student Assembly Forum  
 Mn Working Women  
 MSA Services Corp.  
 National Youth Leadership Council  
 North Central Career Development Foundation  
 Northside Christian School  
 P.R.O.F. Inc.  
 Pilgrim Lane PTA  
 Groveland School PTA  
 Ridgeview Elementary School PTA  
 Sean Patrick Lyons Memorial Scholarship Fund  
 Society for the Study of Qabala  
 St David's School for Exceptional Children Endowment  
 St Paul Board of Colleges, SPBOC  
 Talmud Torah of St Paul  
 The Gestalt Institute of the Twin Cities  
 The Tuskegee Mn Alumni Club  
 Twin Cities Chapter No 50 of the Institute of Financial Education  
 Twin Cities Orthopedic Educational Fund  
 Waconia High School Alumni Assoc.  
 William Hood Dunwoody Industrial Institute  
 World Citizens

Cultural

Angelica Cantanti  
 Art Center of Mn  
 At the Foot of the Mountain  
 Bloomington Civic Theatre  
 Burnsville Area Society for the Arts  
 Chapel Strings  
 Community Theatre of Burnsville  
 Doctor Wallace H. Cole Library Foundation  
 Ensemble Capriccio  
 Film in the Cities  
 Forest Lake Korean Dancers  
 Friends of the Dakota County Central Library in Eagan  
 Friends of the Oxboro Library  
 Greater Twin Cities Youth Symphonies  
 History of Dinkytown  
 Inland Marine Interpretive Center  
 James White Review Assoc.  
 Lakeshore Players  
 The Loft Inc.  
 Mary and Jackson Burke Foundation  
 Mil-Aero Historical Library & Museum Assoc.  
 Mn Air National Guard Curtiss Oriole Club  
 Mn Bassoon Assoc.  
 Mn Conservatory of Performing Arts  
 Mn Folklife Society

Mn Jazz Assoc.  
 Mn Museum of Art  
 Mn Scottish Celtic Dance Assoc.  
 Mn Transportation Museum  
 Minnetonka Dance Theatre & School  
 Musical Instrument Society  
 New Friends of Chamber Music  
 Northern Sign Theatre  
 Opera Now  
 Pepo Alfajiri Spirit Before the Dawn  
 Polish Cultural and Educational Association  
 Riverbend Dance Arts  
 Rusin Assoc.  
 Scott County Historical Society  
 Society of the Sons of the Revolution in the State  
 St Anthony Civic Orchestra  
 St Paul Police Band Assoc.  
 The 1006 Summit Ave Society  
 The Fridley City Band  
 The Midwest Libertarian Library Assoc.  
 The Performers Ensemble  
 Theatre de la Jeune Lune  
 Twin Cities Lutheran Choral Society  
 Vietnamese Cultural Association in Mn, VCAM  
 Weavers' Guild of Mn  
 Womens Art Registry of Mn  
 Zenon Dance Company and School

Miscellaneous or Not Otherwise Identified

Alexander J. M. Ross Trust U/A 6262  
 C. M. Harrington for Cathedral of St. Marks 3-05552-0  
 Charles M. Harrington Trust UW par 15 item 5 3611-4  
 Clive T. Jaffray Charitable Trust-6616  
 District 287 Foundation  
 Emma E. Rogers Trust-7834  
 Friends of the Bill of Rights Foundation  
 Grafil Foundation  
 House of Hope Foundation  
 International Telecommunications Disaster Assistance  
 Lawrence S Donaldson II Trust Norwest Bank  
 Minneapolis NA  
 Matt Blair Community School  
 Motthem Family 59  
 Pioneer Hook & Ladder Volunteers  
 Preservation Alliance of Mn  
 Sergeant Arleigh G. Cook and Sergeant Bob Hark Memorial Fund  
 St Paul Lutheran Friends of Israel  
 The Dorsey and Whitney Foundation  
 The Management Assistance Project for Nonprofits  
 Twin West Chamber Foundation  
 Working Boys Center Foundation

## APPENDIX C

### INSTITUTIONAL ELITE SAMPLES AND CORPORATE PHILANTHROPIC LEADERS

#### 1980 Institutional Elite and Corporate Philanthropic Leaders

Dennis W. Angland	Paul F. Jessup
Elmer L. Andersen	Charles H. Johnson
Wallace D. Armstrong	Stephen F. Keating
Marvin B. Bacaner	William C. Kerkvliet
Atherton Bean	Kim Koenig
Anthony Bechik	Maruice M. Kreevoy
Judson Bemis	Woodrow P. Langhaug
Clifford E. Biggs	Dick Lareau
Bruce H. Bisping	Eugene D. Larkin
Bruce Blackburn	Russell W. Laxson
Coleman Bloomfield	Sanford Lipsky
Francis M. Boddy	Norman M. Lorentzen
Edward L. Bronstien, Jr.	Kenneth MacCorquodale
Archibald Bush	Harvey Mackay
Curtis L. Carlson	Carl L. Manfred
Charles W. Carr	Robert L. Martin
Alroy C. Clasemen	Roger Martin
Dan Cohen	George C. Mastor
Howard J. Conn	James P. McFarland
Richard C. Cross	Keith N. McFarland
John Cowles, Jr.	William L. McKnight
Harold Cummings	F. Stuart Mitchell
Stanley Dagley	John W. Morrison
Bruce Dayton	Albert Moscovitz
Donald C. Dayton	John H. Myers
Kenneth N. Dayton	Philip H. Nason
John M. Dickerson	W.C. Nemitz
Charlton H. Dietz	Johannes C. Nitsche
Carl B. Drake, Jr.	William C. Norris
Donald R. Dwight	Fred C. Norton
Ernst Eckert	Terrence P. O'Brien
Jesse E. Edwards	Robert J. Odegard
John Ervin, Jr.	Lawrence Perlman
Barbara Flanagan	Harold O. Peterson
Raymond W. Foley	Jay Phillips
Elvin Fraley	William G. Phillips
Robert A. Garrity	George S. Pillsbury
Edward J. Gearty	John S. Pillsbury, Jr.
Freddie Goodwin	Raymond Plank
Robert Gorlin	Leo J. Raskind
Bud Grossman	James Reagan
Gene Gutche	Walter H. Robilliard
Floyd Hall	Walter F. Rogosheske
Donald V. Harper	John H. Rosenow
Robert J. Hasling	Arthur A. Rouner, Jr.
G. E. Hendricks, Jr.	Ronald Saxon
Raymond H. Herzog	Lang D. Schuelke
James Hetland, Jr.	James P. Shannon
Claude R. Hitchcock	George B. Shea
Robert J. Holloway	J. L. Shiely, Jr.
Harry Humphrey	Jeff Siemon

Leon C. Snyder  
William H. Spoor  
Harold E. Stassen  
Robert Steele  
George Tagatz  
George Tesar  
William L. Thompson  
Joan Wallin  
Arthur C. Wangaard, Jr.  
Charles Weaver  
F. Daniel Wilder  
Robert D. Wirt

1988 Institutional Elite and Corporate Philanthropic Leaders

James A. Alcott  
Robert L. Altman  
Elmer Andersen  
Dewalt H. Ankeny  
Rutherford Aris  
H. Brewster Atwater  
Gilbert S. Banker  
Howard E. Barnhill  
Atherton Bean  
William F. Bear  
Judson Bemis  
Russell Bennett  
Paul J. Bilka  
Bruce H. Bisping  
Coleman Bloomfield  
Herbert P. Brooks  
John W. Buckley  
Martin N. Burke  
Gordon G. Busdicker  
Archibald Bush  
Timothy Butler  
David A. Cairns  
Elwood F. Caldwell  
Curtis L. Carlson  
Robert J. Collins  
Eugene W. Courtney  
John Cowles, Jr.  
Harold Cummings  
Earl J. Currie  
Bruce Dayton  
Donald C. Dayton  
Kenneth N. Dayton  
Mark Dayton  
Robert Dayton  
Gabor Deli  
Richard P. Doe  
Carl Drake  
Robert H. Dunlop  
Robert C. Einsweiler  
Mickey Elfenbein  
Marion Etwiler  
Russell Ewald  
Frederick Finch  
Peter E. Firchow  
Gerald T. Flom  
Paul H. Fritzke  
Paul G. Gassman  
Peter Gillette  
Tim Groshens  
Bud Grossman  
Roger Hale  
Allen D. Hanson  
John Hanson  
Donald V. Harper  
Roger L. Headrick

Robert A. Heiberg  
Raymond H. Herzog  
Sally Hill  
William S. Howell  
Kent Hrbek  
Ronald Hubbs  
William Hulme  
Oscar H. Ibarra  
Larry Intveld  
Allen F. Jacobson  
Roland J. Jensen  
Larry W. Johnson  
Lloyd P. Johnson  
William C. Johnson  
N.L. Gault Jr  
Manuel Kaplan  
Stephen F. Keating  
Kenneth Keller  
Helen Kelly  
William J. Kimbrough  
Kevin Kling  
David Koch  
Gisela P. Konopka  
Dean R. Koutsky  
Maurice M. Kreevoy  
Paul W. Kruse  
George Latimer  
Stanford E. Lehmberg  
Seymour Levitt  
Lisa Lissimore  
Norman M. Lorentzen  
Warren S. Loud  
Harvey MacKay  
Kenneth Macke  
Paul A. Magnuson  
Kenneth M. Markwardt  
Susan Marrinan  
Ed Martinson  
Richard Mason  
Patricia G. Mattos  
Donald W. McCarthy  
James McFarland  
P. Douglas McKeen  
William L. McKnight  
Vernon L. Moore  
Ralph Morris  
John W. Morrison  
Peter B. Murray  
John H. Myers  
Philip H. Nason  
James Nelson  
Thomas S. Noonan  
William C. Norris  
Robert J. Odegard  
Sally Olsen



Ray Olson  
John Pearson  
Jay Phillips  
George S. Pillsbury  
John S. Pillsbury, Jr.  
Harry C. Piper  
Raymond Plank  
Carl Pohlad  
Thomas Post  
Douglas Pratt  
Robert M. Price  
James Reagan  
Willis F. Rich  
Robert Ridder  
John A. Rollwagen  
Susan Sands  
William Schofield  
Lyll A. Schwarzkopf  
Andrew Scott  
James A. Searles  
James P. Shannon  
Roger L. Shipp  
Willard C. Shull  
Jan Smaby  
Francis J. Sorauf  
Edson Spencer  
William H. Spoor  
Edward S. St. Mary  
Stanley S. Stroup  
Meridel Le Sueur  
Wesley B. Sundquist  
Richard W. Tongen  
Fernando Torres  
Vance K. Travis  
Morris Vaagenes  
Joseph Walla  
L. Edwin Wang  
Clifton Ware  
Joseph Westermeyer  
Harold J. Westin  
August Wilson  
Max Winter  
Clare K. Woodward  
Michael Wright  
James T. Wyman  
Barbara Zohn

## APPENDIX D

### POPULATION OF PUBLICLY HELD CORPORATIONS HEADQUARTERED IN THE TWIN CITIES

1980 Population of Publicly Held Corporations Headquartered in the Twin Cities

#### 201-1500 Employees

Ag-Chem Equipment Co., Inc.  
Analysts International Corp.  
Apache Corp.  
Apogee Enterprises, Inc.  
Barbers Hairstylists for Men & Women, Inc.  
Brooks-Scanlon, Inc.  
CPT Corp.  
Colight, Inc.  
Cray Research, Inc.  
Data Card Corp.  
Detection Sciences, Inc.  
Donovan Companies, Inc.  
Econo-Therm Energy Systems Corp.  
Empire-Crown Auto, Inc.  
Fabri-Tek, Inc.  
Flame Industries, Inc.  
G & K Services, Inc.  
Gold Medallion Corp.  
International Dairy Queen, Inc.  
Interplastic Corp.  
Inter-Regional Financial Group, Inc.  
K-Tel International, Inc.  
Kallestad Laboratories, Inc.  
Knox Lumber Co.  
Kodicor, Inc.  
Kroy Industries, Inc.  
LaMaur, Inc.  
Leisure Dynamics, Inc.  
MTS Systems Corp.  
Magnetic Controls Co.  
Mid-American Bancorporation, Inc.  
Minnetonka, Inc.  
National Computer Systems, Inc.  
North Star Acceptance & Investment Corp.  
Northwestern National Life Insurance Co.  
Norwesco, Inc.  
PaR Systems Corp.  
Piper Jaffray, Inc.  
Possis Corp.  
Rembrandt Enterprises, Inc.  
Research, Inc.  
Schaak Electronics, Inc.  
Scientific Computers, Inc.  
Sheldahl, Inc.  
Sunstar Foods, Inc.  
Tal-Cap, Inc.  
Tennant Co.  
Twin City Barge & Towing Co.  
Valspar Corp.  
Van Dusen Air, Inc.

Washington Scientific Industries  
Webb Co.  
Welch Village Ski Area, Inc.

#### 1500+ Employees

American Hoist & Derrick Co.  
Bemis Company, Inc.  
Briggs Transportation Co.  
Buckbee-Mears co.  
Burlington Northern, Inc.  
Control Data Corp.  
Conwed Corp.  
Cornelius Co.  
Dayton Hudson Corp.  
Deluxe Check Printers, Inc.  
Donaldson Company, Inc.  
Economics Laboratory, Inc.  
First Bank System, Inc.  
H.B. Fuller Co.  
Gamble-Skogmo, Inc.  
Gelco Corp.  
General Mills, Inc.  
Graco, Inc.  
Honeywell, Inc.  
International Multifoods Corp.  
Jostens, Inc.  
MEI Corp.  
McQuay-Perfex, Inc.  
Medtronic, Inc.  
Minnesota Gas Company  
Minnesota Mining & Mfg. Co.  
Modern Merchandising, Inc.  
Munsingwear, Inc.  
Murphy Motor Freight Lines, Inc.  
Napco Industries, Inc.  
Nash Finch Co.  
Northern States Power Co.  
Northwest Airlines, Inc.  
Northwest Bancorporation  
Pacific Gamble Robinson Co.  
Pako Corp.  
Peavey Co.  
Pentair, Inc.  
Pillsbury Co.  
Republic Airlines, Inc.  
St. Paul Companies, Inc.  
Soo Line Railroad Co.  
Super Valu Stores, Inc.  
Tonka Corp.  
Toro Co.

1988 Population of Publicly Held Corporations Headquartered in the Twin Cities

200-1500 Employee

Advance Circuits, Inc.  
Ag-Chem Equipment Co., Inc.  
Analysts International Corp.  
Ault Inc.  
Barbers Hairstyling, Inc.  
Ciatti's, Inc.  
Colwell Industries, Inc.  
Communications Systems, Inc.  
Country Lake Foods, Inc.  
Crown Auto, Inc.  
Dahlberg, Inc.  
Deltak Corp.  
Detector Electronics Corp.  
Discus Corp.  
Dotronix, Inc.  
Ediner, Inc.  
Golden Valley Microwave Food  
Green Tree Acceptance, Inc.  
Grist Mill Co.  
Hutchinson Technology, Inc.  
Innovex, Inc.  
International Broadcasting Corp.  
International Dairyqueen, Inc.  
Investors Savings Corp.  
Kalvar Corp.  
Kinnard Investments, Inc.  
Knutson Mortgage Corp.  
Krelitz Industries, Inc.  
Lamaur, Inc.  
Lee Data Corp.  
Lieberman Enterprises, Inc.  
MEI Diversified, Inc.  
MTS Systems Corp.  
Mentor Corp.  
Merril Corp.  
Mesaba Aviation, Inc.  
Michael Foods, Inc.  
Minnetonka, Inc.  
Moniterm Corp.  
National City Bancorporation  
Network Systems Corp.  
Norstan, Inc.  
North Star Universal, Inc.  
Norwesco Inc.  
1 Potato 2, Inc.  
Osmonics, Inc.  
Polaris Industries Partnership  
Poly-Tech, Inc.  
Possis Corp.  
Research, Inc.  
Reuter, Inc.  
St. Jude Medical, Inc.  
Scicom Data Services, Inc.  
Sheldahl, Inc.

Shelter Corp. of America, Inc.  
The Sportsman's Guide, Inc.  
Sterner Lighting Systems, Inc.  
Sunstar Foods, Inc.  
TSI, Inc.  
Technalysis Corp.  
Vaughn Communications, Inc.  
Washington Scientific Industries, Inc.  
Twin City Barge, Inc.  
Zycad Corp.

1500 or More Employees

ADC Telecommunications  
American Hoist & Derrick Co.  
Apogee Enterprises, Inc.  
BMC Industries, Inc.  
Bemis Co, Inc.  
Best Buy Company, Inc.  
Buffets, Inc.  
CPT Corp.  
CVN Companies, Inc.  
Control Data Corp.  
Consul Restaurant Corp.  
Cray Research  
Dayton Hudson Corp.  
Data Card Corp.  
Deluxe Check Printers, Inc.  
Diversified Energies, Inc.  
Donaldson, Co, Inc.  
Ecolab, Inc.  
First Bank System, Inc.  
G & K Services, Inc.  
Gelco Corp.  
General Mills, Inc.  
Genmar Industries, Inc.  
Graco, Inc.  
H.B. Fuller Co.  
Honeywell, Inc.  
International Multifoods, Inc.  
Inter-Regional Financial Group  
Jostens, Inc.  
Medtronic, Inc.  
3M Company  
Minstar, Inc.  
Munsingwear, Inc.  
The Musicland Group  
NWA, Inc.  
Nash Finch Co.  
National Computer Systems, Inc.  
Northern States Power Co.  
Northwestern National Life Insurance Co.  
Norwest Corp.  
Pentair, Inc.  
The Pillsbury Co.  
Piper Jaffray, Inc.

Regis Corp.  
St. Paul Companies, Inc.  
Soo Line Corp.  
Super Valu Stores, Inc.  
TCF Banking and Savings  
Tennant Co.  
Tonka Corp.  
Toro Co.  
United Healthcare Corp.  
Valspar Corp.