

# **The Status of Manitoba's Voluntary Sector: An Omnibus Survey**

## **Final Report**

### **Aboriginal-Mandated Organizations**



**Prepared by:  
Child and Family Services Research Group  
Faculty of Social Work  
University of Manitoba**

**September, 2003**

#### **Research Team**

<b>Dr. Sid Frankel</b>	<b>Principal Investigator</b>
<b>Professor Jay Rodgers</b>	<b>Principal Investigator</b>
<b>Michael Caslor</b>	<b>Senior Research Assistant</b>
<b>Jill Falk</b>	<b>Research Assistant</b>
<b>Tara Rudy</b>	<b>Research Assistant</b>
<b>Rachel Sawatzky</b>	<b>Research Assistant</b>
<b>Kimberley Spiers</b>	<b>Research Assistant</b>
<b>Rona Stupnikoff</b>	<b>Research Assistant</b>

## Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
List of Tables.....	iii
Executive Summary .....	iv
Introduction.....	1
Legal Basis and Mandate .....	1
Predictions of Sustainability .....	2
Planning Capacity .....	2
Environmental Issues .....	2
Technology Capacity .....	3
Salaried Employees .....	3
Volunteers .....	4
Boards of Directors .....	6
Revenues .....	7
Tenure, Activities and Geographic Mandate .....	8
Adequacy of Outputs .....	10
Sector Wide Organization .....	10
Summary .....	11

## List of Tables

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Table 1 Geographic Sphere of Activities .....	9

## *Executive Summary*

*This report compares 108 organizations that claim a mandate to serve Aboriginal peoples and other organizations on key variables. The following differences were found.*

### *A. Manitoba Sector and Geographic Sphere of Activity*

*Aboriginal mandated organizations are more likely to claim mandates to serve youth and ethno-cultural and/or ethno-religious communities. They are more likely to operate in national and international spheres, and they are over-represented in the civil rights and advocacy sector.*

### *B. Resource Inputs*

#### *1. Fiscal Resources*

*Mandated organizations report higher percentages of total and federal government revenue, but lower percentages of municipal government revenue. They are more likely to report distortions in organizational purposes due to government and corporate funding.*

#### *2. Salaried Employees*

*No differences between mandated and other organizations were found.*

#### *3. Volunteers*

*Mandated organizations perceive more limitation from insufficient funds in using volunteers. Volunteers in mandated organizations are more likely to be involved in advocacy, community development, providing information about external resources, providing personal care, and counselling.*

#### *4. Board Members*

*Mandated organizations perceive less inter-organizational competition for board members and less disinterest from youth.*

#### *5. Technology*

*Mandated organizations report more interest in acquiring technology.*

## 6. Planning Capacity

*Mandated organizations are less likely to report that they do not have sufficient funds to implement plans.*

### D. Adequacy of Outputs

*Mandated organizations perceive the output most central to their purpose as more adequate in meeting need or demand than did other organizations.*

### E. Environmental Opportunities and Threats

*Mandated organizations perceive more attempts from government of shifting tasks to them and more mistrust from the public.*

### F. Sustainability

*Mandated organizations forecast more growth. They perceive insufficient supply of funds and appropriate staff recruits as more salient limiting factors.*

### G. Sector-wide Organization

*Mandated organizations do not differ from others with regard to the need for a sector-wide organization.*

### H. Inclusiveness

*Mandated organizations report a higher percentage of Aboriginal staff, volunteers and board members. They also report a higher proportion of youth volunteers and lower percentages of youth staff.*

## Introduction

This report examines the differences between 108 (8.5%) organizations that claim a mandate to provide services to Aboriginal people and the other 1,168 (91.5%) organizations in the sample. Compared to non-mandated organizations, fewer mandated organizations are in Winnipeg (n=72 (66.7%) versus n=870 (74.5%)) or southern Manitoba outside Winnipeg (n=20 (18.5%) versus n=254 (21.7%)), and more are in northern Manitoba<sup>1</sup> (n=16 (14.8%) versus n=44 (3.8%)) ( $\chi^2 = 26.959$ , d.f. = 2,  $p = .000$ ). A two-tailed alpha level of .05 is adopted to locate differences that are not due to random sampling error. Comparisons are made on key variables.

## Legal Status and Mandate

Organizations with a mandate to serve Aboriginal people (n = 71, 67.0%) are no more likely to be registered charities than other organizations (n = 646, 59.9%) ( $\chi^2 = 2.011$ , d.f. = 1,  $p = .156$ ). They are much more likely to claim a mandate to serve ethno-cultural and/or ethno-religious communities (61.5%, (n = 64) versus 17.2% (n = 200)) ( $\chi^2 = 113.340$ , d.f. = 1,  $p = .000$ ) and to serve youth (75.9%, (n = 82) versus 29.8%, n = 345) ( $\chi^2 = 94.208$ , d.f. = 1,  $p = .000$ ).

---

<sup>1</sup> Norman and Thompson regions.

## **Predictions of Sustainability**

Chief executive officers in Aboriginal mandated organizations are more likely to predict growth over the next five years ( $n = 108$ ,  $md. = 4$  (growth) versus  $n = 1,160$ ,  $md. = 3$  (remain the same) (Mann-Whitney  $U = 48548.500$ ,  $z = -4.283$ ,  $p_{two-tailed} = .000$ ). They are 15.8% more likely (61.7% ( $n=68$ ) versus 45.9% ( $n=515$ )) than other organizational chief executive officers to define the insufficient supply of appropriate persons to hire as staff as a growth limiting factor (Mann-Whitney  $U = 49,766.000$ ,  $z = -3.240$ ,  $p_{two-tailed} = .001$ ). They are also more likely to define insufficient supply of funds as a limiting factor (88.0% ( $n=95$ ) versus 82.3% ( $n=952$ )), (Mann-Whitney  $U = 54,451.000$ ,  $z = -2.398$ ,  $p_{two-tailed} = .017$ ).

## **Planning Capacity**

Aboriginal mandated organizations are 8.9% less like (72.1% ( $n=75$ ) versus 63.2% ( $n=678$ )) to agree that they do not have funds to implement plans (Mann-Whitney- $U=47,833.500$ ,  $z=-2.511$ ,  $p_{twotailed} = .012$ , (62.7% ( $n=57$ ) versus 45.0% ( $n=361$ )).

## **Environmental Issues**

Aboriginal mandated organizations are 17.7% more likely to agree that they are increasingly called upon to accept tasks shifted from government (Mann-Whitney- $U = 29,489.000$ ,  $z = -3.076$ ,  $p_{two-tailed} = .002$ ). They are also 19.0% more likely (40.3% ( $n=42$ ) versus 21.3% ( $n=214$ )) to agree that the general public tends to view organizations like theirs with

suspicion and mistrust (Mann-Whitney U = 40, 884.000,  $z = -.3891$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .000$ ). Mandated organizations do not differ from other organizations on any other environmental issues.

### **Technology Capacity**

Aboriginal mandated organizations are 9.7% more likely (84.3% (n=86) versus 74.01 (n=779)) to disagree that they are not very interested in acquiring information technology (Mann-Whitney U = 47,405.000,  $z = -2.037$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .042$ ).

### **Salaried Employees**

Aboriginal mandated organizations (n = 81, 75.7%) are 16.1% more likely to have salaried employees than non-mandated organizations (n = 684, 59.6%), ( $\chi^2 = 10.685$ , d.f. = 1,  $p = .001$ ). However, among those with salaried employees the size of full time staff complements ( $t = .029$ , d.f. = 701,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .321$ ) did not differ between mandated (n = 73, M = 11.22, s.d. = 18.86) and non-mandated (n = 630, M = 11.11, s.d. = 33.05) organizations. The same is true of the size of part-time staff complements ( $t = -.993$ , d.f. = 678,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .321$ ) for mandated (n = 71, M = 4.04, s.d. = 10.08) and non-mandated (n = 609, M = 7.59, s.d. = 29.92) organizations.

As for non-mandated organizations, mandated organizations reported a median of 3 (about the same) staff as one year ago (Mann-Whitney U = 25587.500,  $z = -.881$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .379$ ) and five years ago (Mann-Whitney U = 22189.000,  $z = -1.602$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .019$ ). Both mandated and non-mandated organizations report a median of unchanging use (2) of

independent contractors over the past five years (Mann-Whitney  $U = 25175.00$ ,  $z = -2.45$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .807$ ).

Mandated and non-mandated organizations also did not differ from each other on any chief executive officers' opinions related to salaried employees.

Aboriginal mandated organizations ( $n = 35$ , 53.0%) are more likely than non-mandated organizations ( $n = 129$ , 24.8%) to have any Aboriginal staff ( $\chi^2 = 23.254$ ,  $d.f. = 1$ ,  $p = .000$ ).

Among organizations with Aboriginal employees, Aboriginal mandated organizations report an average of 35.49% more Aboriginal employees than other organizations ( $M = 53.58\%$ ,  $s.d. = 35.63\%$  versus  $m = 18.09\%$ ,  $s.d. = 17.78\%$ ) ( $t = 5.288$ ,  $d.f. = 32.821$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .000$ ). However, the average percentage of visible minority ( $t = .739$ ,  $d.f. = 11.690$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .464$ ) employees do not vary between Aboriginal mandated organizations and other organizations counting only those with employees. However, on average Aboriginal mandated organizations do have fewer ( $M = 27.72\%$ ,  $s.d. = 15.58\%$ ) youth employees than other organizations ( $M = 35.96\%$ ,  $s.d. = 27.72\%$ ) ( $t = -2.786$ ,  $d.f. = 62.585$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .008$ ).

## **Volunteers**

Aboriginal mandated organizations are no more or less likely to use volunteers than other organizations ( $\chi^2 = .806$ ,  $d.f. = 1$ ,  $p = .369$ ). However, counting only organizations with volunteers, Aboriginal mandated organizations ( $n = 43$ , 51.8%) are 14.0% more likely than non-mandated organizations ( $n = 303$ , 37.8%) to agree that they have insufficient funds to properly use volunteers (Mann-Whitney  $U = 27595.500$ ,  $z = -2.639$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .008$ ). Aboriginal mandated organizations experienced the same pattern of changes in the size of

their complements of volunteers over time as other organizations (Mann-Whitney  $U = 35158.000$ ,  $z = -1.158$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .247$ ) (md. = 3 (about the same as last year).

The size of current volunteer complements of mandated ( $M = 85.29$ , s.d. = 325.98) and non-mandate ( $M = 122.16$ , s.d. = 923.62) organizations also do not significantly differ ( $t = -.357$ , d.f. = 900,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .721$ ), counting only agencies currently using volunteers.

Aboriginal mandated organizations using volunteers are 31.8% more likely to have any Aboriginal volunteers (63.3% versus 31.5%) ( $\chi^2 = 24.492$ , d.f. = 1,  $p = .000$ ). Only considering the 17 mandated and 39 non-mandated organizations with Aboriginal volunteers, Aboriginal mandated organizations report an average of 37.01% more Aboriginal volunteers ( $t = 4.275$ , d.f. = 20.499,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .000$ ) ( $M = 57.09\%$ , s.d. = 33.48% versus  $m = 20.08\%$ , s.d. = 18.73%). Considering all organizations with volunteers, those with Aboriginal service mandates do not report significantly more visible minority volunteers ( $t = 1.643$ , d.f. = 616,  $p = .101$ ); but mandated organizations do report an average of 10.41% more youth volunteers ( $t = 2.124$ , d.f. = 650,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .034$ ) ( $M = 33.28\%$ , s.d. = 36.95% versus  $M = 22.87\%$ , s.d. = 33.95%).

With regard to activities, volunteers in Aboriginal mandated organizations are 15.7% more likely to provide information about other services ( $\chi^2 = 7.104$ , d.f. = 1,  $p = .008$ ) (63.3% (n=50) versus 47.6% (n=384)), 16.3% more likely to be involved in advocacy ( $\chi^2 = 7.710$ , d.f. = 1,  $p = .005$ ) (55.9% (n=43) versus 39.5% (n=316)), and 13.5% more likely to be involved in community development work ( $\chi^2 = 5.116$ , d.f. = 1,  $p = .024$ ) (55.3% (n=42) versus 41.8% (n=335)), 10% more likely to provide personal care ( $\chi^2 = 4.432$ , d.f. = 1,  $p = .035$ , 28.0%, n = 21

versus 18.0%,  $n = 144$ ), and 10.8% more likely to provide counselling ( $\chi^2 = 4.514$ ,  $d.f. = 1$ ,  $p = .034$ ), 35% ( $n = 28$ ) versus 24.2% ( $n = 194$ ).

## **Board of Directors**

Aboriginal mandated organizations are no more or less likely to have boards of directors ( $\chi^2 = .602$ ,  $d.f. = 1$ ,  $p = .438$ ) than other organizations. However, they differ on some issues related to boards of directors. Aboriginal mandated organizations are 11.8% (40.9% ( $n = 36$ ) versus 29.1% ( $n = 268$ )) more likely to disagree that there are too many organizations competing for too small a pool of potential board members (Mann-Whitney  $U = 34353.500$ ,  $z = 2.420$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .016$ ). They are also more likely to disagree that there is a lack of interest from youth in board service (Mann-Whitney  $U = 35291.500$ ,  $z = -2.314$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .021$ ) (28.1% ( $n = 25$ ) versus 20.2% ( $n = 187$ )). The tenures of directors of mandated organizations' boards do not vary from the tenure of directors of other organizations' boards (Md. 3 (more than three years and less than five years) (Mann-Whitney  $U = 45942$ ,  $z = -.388$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .735$ )).

Aboriginal mandated organizations were more likely to have any Aboriginal board members (62.7% versus 18.0%) ( $\chi^2 = 88.337$ ,  $d.f. = 1$ ,  $p = .000$ ). Counting only those with Aboriginal board members, mandated organizations ( $M = 64.51\%$ ,  $s.d. = 38.27\%$ ) report an average of 44.51% more Aboriginal board members than other organizations ( $M = 20.01\%$ ,  $s.d. = 16.45\%$ ) ( $t = 8.137$ ,  $d.f. = 57.488$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .000$ ). However they do not report

significantly more youth ( $t = 1.088$ ,  $d.f. = .949$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .277$ ) or visible minority ( $t = .650$ ,  $d.f. = 932$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .516$ ) board members.<sup>2</sup>

## Revenues

Aboriginal-mandated organizations are no more or less likely to have received revenues of any kind than other organizations ( $\chi^2 = .014$ ,  $d.f. = 1$ ,  $p = .907$ ). Considering only cash operating revenues over the last fiscal year, the average cash revenue for Aboriginal mandated organizations does not differ from the average cash revenue of other organizations ( $t = .051$ ,  $d.f. = 885$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .959$ ), but it is composed differently. Aboriginal mandated organizations report a 15.76% higher percentage of government revenues ( $t = 2.827$ ,  $d.f. = 476$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .005$ ) ( $M = 67.60\%$ ,  $s.d. = 31.34\%$  versus  $M = 51.83\%$ ,  $s.d. = 34.38\%$ ).

Government revenues were further analyzed as to source. Aboriginal mandated organizations report that, on average, they receive 24.31% more federal government revenue than other organizations ( $t = 4.019$ ,  $d.f. = 198$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .000$ ) ( $M = 43.36\%$ ,  $s.d. = 33.18\%$  versus  $M = 19.05\%$ ,  $s.d. = 28.59\%$ ). However, they also receive an average of 21.67% less municipal government revenue ( $t = -4.929$ ,  $d.f. = 12.391$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .000$ ) ( $M = 5.60\%$ ,  $s.d. = 17.37\%$  versus  $M = 27.27\%$ ,  $s.d. = 31.86\%$ ).

Aboriginal mandated organizations have not experienced different trends in total revenue over the last five years than other organizations (Mann-Whitney  $U = 32,815.000$ ,  $z = -1.493$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .135$ ). This is also true of provincial government (Mann-Whitney  $U =$

---

<sup>2</sup>This analysis involves all organizations, including those without Aboriginal board members.

8619.000,  $z = -1.710$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .087$ ), and municipal government (Mann-Whitney  $U = 8619.000$ ,  $z = -.093$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .920$ ) revenues. Aboriginal mandated organizations and other organizations also do not differ on trends of revenues from philanthropic sources (Mann-Whitney  $U = 9999.500$ ,  $z = -.806$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .419$ ). However, Aboriginal mandated organizations did experience greater increases in federal government revenues (38.0%,  $n = 16$  increased versus 28.3%,  $n = 60$  increased) (Mann-Whitney  $U = 3584.5$ ,  $z = -2.054$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .040$ ).

Aboriginal mandated organizations are more likely than other organizations to agree that securing revenues from government (Mann-Whitney  $U = 11002.000$ ,  $z = -2.365$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .018$ ) (25.85% ( $n = 15$ ) versus 18.5% ( $n = 87$ ) agree and corporations (18.5% ( $n = 7$ ) versus 8.6% ( $n = 30$ )) (Mann-Whitney  $U = 5234.500$ ,  $z = -2.266$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .023$ ) have distorted their organizational purposes. Aboriginal mandated and other organizations do not differ on any other issues related to revenue.

Aboriginal mandated and other organizations do not differ on the amount of future effort they are planning to expend in securing philanthropic revenues (Mann-Whitney  $U = 12171.500$ ,  $z = -.004$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .997$ ).

### **Tenure, Activities and Geographic Mandate**

Table 1 describes the geographic nature of activities of Aboriginal mandated and other organizations. Almost one-third of Aboriginal mandated organizations has a Manitoba-wide sphere, and more than a quarter serve municipalities. Aboriginal mandated

**Table 1**  
**Geographic Sphere of Activities<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Sphere</b>	<b>Aboriginal Mandated Organizations (N=106)</b>	<b>Other Organizations (N=1139)</b>
Neighbourhood	N=16 15.1%	N=185 16.2%
Multiple Neighbourhoods	N=16 15.1%	N=182 16.0%
Entire Municipality	N=27 25.5%	N=306 26.9%
Region of Manitoba	N=14 13.2%	N=119 (10.4%)
Manitoba	N=32 30.2%	N=305 26.8%
National	N=13 12.3%	62 5.4%
International	N=18 17.0%	N=63 5.5%
Ethnocultural or Religious Community (non-geographic)	N=1 .9%	N=8 .7%
Mostly in Another Province	N=0 0%	N=3 .3%
Particular Organizational Environment	N=0 0%	N=8 .7%
Manitoba and Other Provinces	N=0 0%	N=1 .1%

<sup>1</sup>Does not sum to 100% due to multiple responses.

organizations also seem more likely to have national or international spheres than other organizations.

The tenure of Aboriginal mandated organizations ( $M = 26.98$  years,  $s.d. = 24.75$  years) did not differ from those of other organizations ( $M = 34.56$  years,  $s.d. = 29.73$  years) ( $t = -.833$ ,  $d.f. = 1,172$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .405$ ). Aboriginal mandated organizations were also no more likely to be affiliated with provincial or national organizations ( $\chi^2 = 1.944$ ,  $d.f. = 1$ ,  $p = .163$ ) (mandated = 62.3%, non-mandated = 55.2%).

Organizations were classified by sub-sector of the activity that they define as most central to their purpose. Aboriginal mandated and other organizations were then compared. Aboriginal mandated organizations were 5.8% more likely to be in the civil rights and advocacy sector (Fisher's exact test -  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .008$ ) (9.0% ( $n = 9$ ) versus 3.2% ( $n = 34$ )).

### **Adequacy of Outputs**

Aboriginal mandated organizations assign a higher level of adequacy to their activity which is most central to the organization's purpose in meeting need or demand (Mann-Whitney  $U = 47939.000$ ,  $z = -2.584$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .010$ ), (22.8% ( $n = 23$ ) versus 13.6% ( $n = 151$ ) completely or almost completely meets community need).

### **Sector-Wide Organization**

Aboriginal mandated and other organizations do not differ with regard to their appraisal of the need for a voluntary sector-wide organization (Mann-Whitney  $U = 51348.000$ ,  $z = -1.94$ ,  $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .056$ ).

## Summary

Aboriginal mandated organizations are more likely to be in northern Manitoba, and to claim mandates to serve youth and ethno-cultural, ethno-religious communities. They are also more likely to declare a primary activity in the civil rights and advocacy sector.

Mandated organizations are more likely to include Aboriginal people among their staff and have higher percentages of Aboriginal people in their staff complements. They also have higher percentages of youth.

They are more likely to find that they have insufficient funds to properly use volunteers, but are more likely to have Aboriginal volunteers. They also have a higher percentage of Aboriginal and youth volunteers. Volunteers in mandated organizations are more likely to provide personal care and counselling and to be involved in community development and advocacy activities.

Aboriginal mandated organizations are more likely to have Aboriginal board members and have higher percentages of Aboriginal board members. They do not report as much inter-organizational competition for board members or disinterest from youth.

Aboriginal mandated organizations report higher percentages of total government and federal government revenues, but lower percentages of municipal government revenues. They also experience greater increases in federal government revenue over the last five years. They are more likely to report distortions in organizational purposes through funding by governments and corporations.

Mandated organizations are more likely to predict growth over the next five years. They are also more likely to report the insufficient supply of appropriate staff recruits and limited funds as barriers to growth. However, they are less likely to report that they do not have

funds to implement plans. They also assign a higher level of adequacy to their prime output in meeting community needs.

Mandated organizations are more likely to report task shifting from government and a public view of suspicion and mistrust. They also report greater interest in acquiring technology.