

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

Final Report

Youth-Mandated Organizations



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

September, 2003

Research Team

**Dr. Sid Frankel
Professor Jay Rodgers**

**Principal Investigator
Principal Investigator**

**Michael Caslor
Jill Falk
Tara Rudy
Rachel Sawatzky
Kimberley Spiers
Rona Stupnikoff**

**Senior Research Assistant
Research Assistant
Research Assistant
Research Assistant
Research Assistant
Research Assistant**

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
List of Tables.....	iii
Executive Summary	iv
Introduction	1
Mandate and Legal Barriers	1
Sustainability	1
Environmental Issues	3
Planning Capacity	3
Technology Capacity Issues	3
Salaried Employees	4
Volunteers	5
Board of Directors	6
Revenues	7
Activities: Area, Type and Tenure	8
Adequacy of Outputs	11
Umbrella Organization	11
Summary.....	11

List of Tables

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1 Comparison of Youth Mandated and Other Organizations Regarding Factors as Limiting Growth.....	2
Table 2 Geographic Spheres of Activity of Organizations	10

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report compares the 430 organizations, which claim a mandate to serve youth with other organizations, which do not claim such a mandate.

The following differences were identified.

Legal Basis and Service Mandate

Mandated organizations are more likely than other organizations to be registered charities and to claim mandates to serve ethno-cultural and ethno-religious communities and Aboriginal people.

Mandated organizations are over-represented in the social services sector and under-represented in the health, development and housing, business and professional and environmental sectors. They are more likely to be affiliated with provincial or national organizations.

Resource Inputs

1. Fiscal Resources

Mandated organizations receive a higher percentage of their funds from non-donated (especially user fee) sources and a lower percentage from membership dues.

2. Salaried Employees

Belief in the organizational cause is more important for mandated organizations in recruiting and retaining employees. They perceive more difficulties in employee recruitment than other organizations perceive. They have similar sized staff complements to other organizations, but have shown more growth over the last five years.

3. Volunteers

Mandated organizations use volunteers for indirect services to the organization, such as administrative support, assistance with computer technology, staff training, fundraising and cleaning, custodial services and food preparation, more than non-mandated organizations. They also use them more for community development and the provision of recreation and personal services.

4. Board of Directors

Mandated organizations experience a shorter average tenure of board members.

Internal Planning Capacity

Mandated organizations do not differ from other organizations on any of the planning capacity issues.

Environmental Issues

Youth mandated organizations are more likely to agree that they are increasingly called upon to accept tasks shifted by government

Technology Issues

Mandated organizations are more likely to disagree that they are not very interested in acquiring information technology and that staff and volunteers do not have the time to make the best use of information technology.

Adequacy of Outputs

Mandated organizations do not differ from others in the perceived adequacy of the activity most central to the organization's purpose in meeting need or demand.

Sustainability

Mandated organizations are more likely to expect growth and less likely to expect decline. They identify almost all limiting factors except unavailability of volunteers at higher levels than other organizations.

Inclusiveness

More mandated organizations have youth staff, volunteers and board members; but they do not have a higher average percentage than other organizations with youth staff or board members. However, they do have a higher average percentage of visible minority volunteers and board members, as well as a higher average percentage of Aboriginal staff, volunteers and board members.

Sector-Wide Organization

Mandated organizations agree more with the need for a voluntary sector-wide umbrella organization than non-mandated organizations do.

Introduction

This report examines the differences between organizations, which claim a mandate to provide services to youth and other organizations in the sample. A two-tailed alpha level of .05 is adapted to locate differences, which are not due to random sampling error. Comparisons are made on key variables. There were 430 (33.8%) of organizations, which identified themselves with a mandate to serve youth. They are distributed throughout the province in a manner similar to non-mandated organizations (75.8% - Winnipeg, 18.6% - southern outside Winnipeg, 5.6% - northern) ($\chi^2 = 4.279$, d.f. = 2, $p = .118$).

Mandate and Legal Basis

Youth mandated organizations are more likely to be registered charities than other organizations (70.3% versus 55.4%) ($\chi^2=26.175$, d.f. =1, $p=.000$). They are more likely to have a mandate to serve ethno-cultural or ethno-religious communities (33.0% versus 15.0%) ($\chi^2=55.288$, d.f. =1, $p=.000$) and Aboriginal people (19.2% versus 3.1%) ($\chi^2=94.208$, d.f. =1, $p=.000$).

Sustainability

Chief executive officers of youth mandated organizations are significantly more likely to forecast growth over a five year horizon, and somewhat less likely to predict decline (Mann-Whitney $U = 163,591.500$, $Z = 2.725$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .006$) (Md. = 1 (growth) versus 2 (remaining the same)). Perhaps because of this expectation of growth, youth mandated organizations are more likely than other organizations to identify most factors as limiting growth or survival. This is indicated in Table I.

Table I
Comparison of Youth Mandated and Other
Organizations Regarding Factors as Limiting Growth

Factor	Percent Agreement (very much or somewhat) of Youth Organizations compared to other Organizations	Mann-Whitney U	P (two-tailed)	N
Insufficient Funds	87.2% versus 80.4%	U = 148,961.500 Z = -5.222	.000	1,261
Insufficient Need or Demand	39.7% versus 35.0%	U = 163,269.000 Z = -2.063	.039	1,245
Need or Demand changing too rapidly	54.5% versus 44.6%	U = 154,289.000 Z = -3.306	.001	1,238
Insufficient supply of appropriate staff recruits	56.2% versus 45.6%	U = 139,480.500 Z = -5.516	.000	1,227
Problems in Governance of Organization	45.1% versus 39.7%	U=163,691.000 Z=-2.095	.036	1,227
Problems in Management of the Organization	42.0% versus 35.1%	U = 160,938.500 Z = -2.652	.008	1,248
Labour Management Problems	20.7% versus 13.5%	U = 158,592.000 Z = -3.278	.001	1,235
Competition from other providers	47.3% versus 36.3%	U = 155,686.000 Z = -3.792	.000	1,251
Socio-demographic changes	53.2% versus 45.4%	U = 161,686.500 Z = -2.405	.016	1,249

Lack of complementary providers	45.5% versus 39.0%	U = 162,175.500 Z = -2.150	.032	1,244
---------------------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------	------	-------

Thus, although more youth mandated than other organizations are expecting growth, they are also more likely to expect this growth to be limited by a range of internal and external capacity factors and insufficient need or demand, itself. The only exception is the supply of volunteers, which they identify as a limitation at similar levels as other organizations (Mann-Whitney U = 170,149.000, Z = -.736, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .462$).

Environmental Issues

Youth mandated organizations are more likely to agree that they are increasingly called upon to accept tasks shifted by government (Mann-Whitney U = 82660.500, Z = -.2.351, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .019$). Their median was 4 (mildly agree) as opposed to 3 (neither agree or disagree) for the non-mandated organizations.

Planning Capacity

Youth mandated organizations do not differ from other organizations on any of the six planning capacity issues.

Technology Capacity Issues

Youth mandated organizations are more likely to disagree (79.3% (n = 314) versus 73.6% (n =

550 disagree)) that they are not very interested in acquiring information technology (Mann-Whitney $U=135626.500$, $Z=-2.576$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=.010$), and that staff and volunteers do not have the time to make the best use of information technology (Mann-Whitney $U=135186.000$, $Z=-2.186$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=.029$), (39.7% ($n = 160$) versus 36.1% ($n = 262$) disagreed).

Salaried Employees

More youth mandated organizations (66.3% ($n = 281$) have salaried staff than other organizations (58.1% ($n = 481$)) ($\chi^2 = 7.880$, $d.f. = 1$, $p = .005$). Youth mandated organizations with salaried staff are 15.8% more likely to agree that they have difficulty recruiting suitable staff (Mann-Whitney $U = 51,413.500$, $Z = -3.566$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .000$). They are also more likely to agree that staff are attracted (Mann-Whitney $U=55191.5$, $Z=-2.311$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=0.21$) (93.9% ($n= 224$) versus 76.4% ($n = 345$)) and retained (Mann-Whitney $U=55353$, $Z=-2.217$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=0.27$) (83.5% ($n = 222$) versus 78.8% ($n = 357$)) in their organizations because of a belief in the organizational cause.

Youth mandated organizations with staff have similar sized full time ($M=11.38$, $sd.=28.05$) ($t=.138$, $d.f. =699$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=.891$) and part time ($M=6.62$, $s.d.=17.45$) ($t=-.427$, $d.f. =675$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=.669$) staff complements as other organizations.

Youth mandated organizations with staff do not differ from other organizations in the amount of changes in the sizes of their staff complements over the past year (Mann-Whitney $U=64,247.000$, $Z=-.250$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=.803$). However, they do report more growth (45.6% ($n = 121$) versus 34.4% ($n = 159$)) indicating some or significant growth) over a five year time frame (Mann-Whitney $U = 54,930.500$, $Z = -2.400$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .016$).

Youth mandated organizations are more likely (67.8% (n = 162) versus 50.4% (n = 198)) to report some youth staff ($\chi^2 = 18.365$, d.f. = 1, $p = .000$). Considering only organizations with youth employees, youth mandated organizations (M= 38.08%, s.d.=24.78%) do not report a significantly higher average percentage of youth employees ($t=2.005$, d.f. =313, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=. 046$). Considering all organizations with staff, youth mandated organizations do report a higher average percentage (M=9.17%, d.f., = 20.62%) of Aboriginal employees ($t=2.99$, d.f. =315,692, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=. 017$); but not of visible minority employees ($t=1.679$, d.f. =279.106, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=. 094$).

Volunteers

Youth mandated organizations are as likely as other organizations to use volunteers ($\chi^2=3.579$, d.f. =1, $p=0.59$). They also are not more likely to agree or disagree with any of the five issues related to volunteers than the other organizations. Youth mandated organizations have not experienced different patterns of change over time in their number of volunteers than other organizations (Mann-Whitney U = 97,521.000, Z = -.450, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .653$). They also report similar sized current volunteer complements (M=62.150, s.d.=148.13) ($t=-1.894$, d.f. =619.253, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=. 059$)

With respect to activities, volunteers in youth mandated organizations are more likely (57.5% (n=183) versus 48.9% (n=287)) than volunteers in other organizations to provide administrative support ($\chi^2=6.189$, d.f. =1, $p=.013$), more likely (56.9% (n=178) versus 48.1% (n=280)) to provide assistance with computer technology ($\chi^2=6.250$, d.f. =1, $p=. 012$), more likely (52.6% (n=160) versus 38.1% (n=217)) to provide recreational services ($\chi^2=28.114$, d.f. =1, $p=. 000$), more likely (27.3% (n=84) versus 18.2% (n=104)) to train staff ($\chi^2=9.766$, d.f. =1, $p=. 002$), more likely (52.6% (n=160) versus 38.1%

(n=217)) to do community development work ($\chi^2=17.138$, d.f.=1, p=.000), more likely (76.8% (n=245) versus 66.3% (n=391)) to do fundraising ($\chi^2=10.928$, d.f.=1, p=.001), more likely (55.0% (n=171) versus 40.1% (n=228)) to provide custodial, cleaning and food support services ($\chi^2=18.047$, d.f.=1, p=.000), and are more likely (25.1% (n=76) versus 15.7% (n=89)) to provide personal care ($\chi^2 = 11.319$, d.f. = 1, p = .001).

Youth mandated organizations are much more inclusive than other organizations in their volunteer complements. They are more likely (72.7% (n=178) versus 57.2% (n=265)) to have youth volunteers ($\chi^2=16.262$, d.f. =1, p=. 000). On average, considering only organizations with youth volunteers, mandated organizations (M=37.35%, s.d.=27.22%) do report significantly more youth volunteers (t=3.250, d.f. =413, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=. 001$). Considering all organizations with staff, mandated organizations do report 6.14% more Aboriginal volunteers (t=2.709, d.f. =216.600, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=. 007$ (M = 12.76%, s.d.=24.77%) and 6.89% more visible minority volunteers (t=2.903, d.f. =226.470, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=. 004$ (M= = 15.65%, s.d.=25.06%).

Board of Directors

Youth mandated organizations are as likely to have boards of directors as other organizations ($\chi^2=.064$, d.f. =1, p=. 801). They do not differ from other organizations on any of the issues related to boards of directors. However, as might be expected, the tenure of their board members is briefer (29.8% (n=111) versus 43.3% (n=318)) serving for longer than five years (Mann-Whitney U=114,135.000, Z=-4.772, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=. 000$).

Youth mandated organizations are also much more inclusive than other organizations in their board

membership. They are more likely (38.0% (n=122) versus 25.2% (n=159)) to include youth on their boards ($\chi^2=16.901$, d.f. =1, p=. 000). On average, based only on all organizations that include youth board members, mandated organizations do not report significantly more youth board members (t=1.959, d.f. =208.926, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=. 051$) (M = 22.23%, s.d.=19.63%). Counting all organizations, mandated organizations reported an average of 5.2% more Aboriginal board members (t=3.617, d.f. =442.863, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=. 000$) (M = 10.58%, s.d.=24.31%) and 5.1% more visible minority board members (t=3.172, d.f. =429.965, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=. 002$) (M = 11.06%, s.d.=26.13%).

Revenues

Youth mandated organizations are more likely (89.7% (n=365) versus 84.9% (n=675)) to have had revenue of some kind during the last fiscal year. ($\chi^2=5.263$, d.f. =1, p=.022) than other organizations.

Considering only cash operating revenue, the total revenues of youth mandated organizations (M=\$579,867.60 s.d.=\$2,136,158.02) and other organizations did not differ significantly (t=-.598, d.f. =880, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=. 583$). However, the composition of the resources of operating cash revenue did differ. Youth mandated organizations, on average, reported a greater percentage of non-donated income (user fees, sales of products, events) (t=2.89, d.f. =580.162, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=. 022$, M=24.80%, s.d.=32.04%). Mandated organizations reported an average of 7.91% less of their revenues from membership fees (t=-5.750, df=1035.746, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .000$, M=5.17%, s.d.=16.05%). The increment in non-donated income results largely from user fees (t=2.995, d.f. =554.909, $p_{\text{two-tailed}}=. 003$), which, on average constituted 11.30% (s.d.=21.94%) of their revenues.

Youth mandated and other organizations do not differ on changes in their total revenues over the last

five years (Mann-Whitney $U = 102,984.000$, $Z = -1.262$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .207$). They also do not differ on changes in their revenues from the federal government (Mann-Whitney $U = 102,984.000$, $Z = -.743$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .458$) or municipal government (Mann-Whitney $U = 3441.500$, $Z = -.317$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .751$). However, youth mandated organizations are more likely (54.9% (n=102) versus 43.2% (n=124) received more) to have received more revenue from provincial government sources over the last five years (Mann-Whitney $U = 23,1998.000$, $Z = -2.074$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .038$).

Youth mandated organizations do not differ from other organizations as to changes in their philanthropic revenues over the last five years (Mann-Whitney $U = 28465.500$, $Z = -.900$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .368$) or on how much future effort they are prepared to allocate to securing philanthropic funding (Mann-Whitney $U = 32,219.500$, $Z = -1.063$, $p = .288$).

Youth mandated organizations differ from other organizations on two issues related to philanthropic funding.

They are more likely to agree (64.9% (n=111) versus 58.5% (n=155)) that organizations do not have enough influence on the funding decisions of corporations (Mann-Whitney $U = 19,956.500$, $Z = -2.195$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .028$) and that compared to five years ago, foundations provide more funding for projects and less for core operations (Mann-Whitney $U = 13,499.500$, $Z = -2.966$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .008$), (62.0% (n=88) versus 49.1% (n=113)).

Activities: Area, Type and Tenure

Table 2 describes the geographic area of activities of youth mandated and other organizations. Almost one-quarter of youth mandated organizations operate at the provincial level, and more than one-

quarter at the municipal level. Almost one-fifth operate at the neighbourhood level, and slightly more than one-fifth in multiple neighbourhoods.

Youth mandated organizations are more likely (60.1% (n=250) versus 53.7% (n=437)) to be affiliated with provincial or national organizations ($\chi^2 = 4.588$, d.f. = 1, $p = .032$), but their tenures ($M = 31.40$, s.d. =28.69) do not vary from other organizations ($t = .736$, d.f. = 1169, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .462$).

Organizations are classified according to the sector related to the activity most central to the organization's purpose. Mandated organizations are under-represented in the health sector (5.1% versus 8.3%) ($\chi^2 = 4.2$, d.f. = 1, $p = .040$), over-represented in the social services sector (23.8% versus 14.1%) ($\chi^2 = 17.095$, d.f. = 1, $p = .000$), under-represented in the development and housing sector (2.5% versus 7.4%) ($\chi^2 = 11.598$, d.f. = 1, $p = .001$), under-represented in the business and professional sector (1.3% versus 5.9%) ($\chi^2 = 13.575$, d.f. = 1, $p = .000$), and under-represented in the environmental sector (.8% versus 2.8%) ($\chi^2 = 5.361$, d.f. = 1, $p = .021$).

Table 2
Geographic Spheres of Activity
of Organizations¹

Sphere	Youth Mandate (N=420)	Other (N=822)
Neighbourhood	N=80 19.0%	N=122 14.8%
Several Neighbourhoods	N=86 20.5%	N=111 13.5%
Entire Municipality	N=115 27.4%	N=219 26.6%
Region of Manitoba	N=40 9.5%	N=92 11.2%
Manitoba	N=100 23.8%	N=235 28.6%
National	N=24 5.7%	N=51 6.2%
International	N=37 8.8%	N=45 5.5%
Particular Ethnocultural or Religious Community	N=1 .2%	N=8 .4%
Mostly in a Province Other Than Manitoba	N=0 0%	N=3 .4%
A Particular Organizational Environment	N=4 1.0%	N=4 .5%
Manitoba and Other Provinces	N=0 0%	N=1 .1%

¹Percentages add to more than 100 due to multiple responses.

Adequacy of Outputs

Mandated organizations' appraisal of the adequacy of the outputs most central to their organizations' purpose in meeting need does not differ from other organizations (Mann-Whitney = 162,016.000, $Z = -.184$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .854$)).

Umbrella Organization

Mandated organizations more strongly agree with the need for a voluntary sector-wide organization (Mann-Whitney $U = 154098.5$, $z = -2.146$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .032$) than other organizations (52.7% (n=217) versus 45.2% (n=365) agree).

Summary

Youth mandated organizations are more likely to be registered charities and to claim mandates to serve ethno-cultural and ethno-religious communities, and Aboriginal people. They are more likely to be affiliated with provincial and national organizations. They are over-represented in social services and under-represented in the environment, health, development and housing and business and professional sectors.

Mandated organizations are more likely to have salaried staff and to report growth in the size of staff complements over the last five years. They report difficulty in recruiting staff, and that belief in the organizational cause is important in recruiting and retaining staff.

Mandated organizations are more likely to report some youth staff and a higher percentage of Aboriginal employees.

Volunteers in youth mandated organizations are more likely to provide administrative support, computer assistance, recreational services, staff training, personal care, community development, fundraising and custodial and food service support.

Mandated organizations are more likely to have youth volunteers in greater numbers, as well as more visible minority and Aboriginal volunteers.

Board members in mandated organizations have shorter tenures and their boards are more likely to include youth. They also have higher percentages of visible minority and Aboriginal board members.

Mandated organizations are more likely to have had some revenue in the last fiscal year. Their revenue includes a lower percentage of membership fees and a higher percentage of user fees. Revenues from the provincial government are likely to have grown over the last five years. Mandated organizations report that they lack influence on corporate funding decisions and that foundations provide more project and less core funding.

On average, mandated organizations forecast growth over the next five years, and identify a broad range of limiting factors. They identify increased task shifting from government, and interest and available time to use technology.

They also favour an umbrella organization.