

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

Final Report

Ethno-cultural 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>
Executive Summary.....	iv
Introduction	1
Legal Basis and Mandate	1
Sustainability	1
Planning Capacities	2
Environmental Issues	2
Technology Issues	2
Salaried Employees	2
Volunteers	4
Boards of Directors	5
Revenues	6
Government Funding	7
Philanthropic Funding	7
Affiliation, Mandate and Tenure	7
Adequacy of Outputs	10
Need for a Sector Wide Umbrella Organization	10
Summary	10

List of Tables

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1 Activity Area of Mandated and Non-Mandated Organizations	9

Executive Summary

This report compares organizations with a mandate to serve ethno-cultural and/or ethno-religious communities with other organizations which do not claim such a mandate.

The following differences were identified.

1. Description

Mandated organizations are, on average, older and are more likely to be affiliated with provincial and national organizations.

2. Legal Basis and Service Mandate

Mandated organizations are over-represented in religion and under-represented in the environment, business and professional associations and some human service sectors (social services, development and housing). They are more likely to be involved in international activities. They are more likely to be registered charities and to claim a mandate to serve youth and Aboriginal people.

3. Resource Inputs

1. Fiscal Resources

Mandated organizations receive a higher percentage of their funds from individual philanthropy. They see government funding as becoming increasingly conditional and requiring large expenditures of time to secure. They also note the advantages of seeking funding from individuals.

2. Salaried Employees

Belief in the organizational cause is more important for mandated organizations in recruiting and retaining employees.

3. Volunteers

Mandated organizations use volunteers for indirect services to the organization, fundraising and support to clients. They perceive fiscal limitations as more salient in limiting their use of volunteers.

4. Board of Directors

Mandated organizations experience longer tenure of board members and less competition in recruiting them.

4. Internal Planning Capacity

Mandated organizations experience greater limitations in implementing plans due to lack of fiscal resources, but do not differ in their appraisal of internal planning capacities.

5. 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.

6. Sustainability

Mandated organizations do not differ from others in their forecast of growth over five years; but do experience fiscal resource limitations, labour-management problems, changing socio-demographic characteristics and competition from other providers as more significant limiting factors. They also are more likely to note that the public views them with suspicion and mistrust.

7. Inclusiveness

Visible minority persons are more highly represented in the volunteer and board complements of mandated organizations. Aboriginal persons are more highly represented among staff, volunteers and board members. Youth are more highly represented in mandated organization staff and volunteer complements.

8. Sector-Wide Organization

Mandated and other organizations do not differ on the need for a voluntary sector-wide umbrella organization.

Introduction

This report focuses on differences between organizations which claim a particular mandate to serve ethno-cultural and/or ethno-religious communities and the rest of the sample. There are 268 such organizations (21.1%) in the sample. A two-tailed alpha level of .05 is utilized to identify differences. Mandated organizations are more likely to be in Winnipeg (79.5% (n=213) versus 72.6% (n=727)) and less likely to be in the north (15.7% (n=42) versus 23.0% (n=230)) ($\chi^2 = 6.7000$, d.f. = 2, $p = .035$).

Legal Basis and Mandate

Mandated organizations are much more likely to be registered charities than the rest of the sample (74.6% versus 57.0%) ($\chi^2 = 27.381$, d.f. = 1, $p = .000$). They are also much more likely to claim a mandate to serve Aboriginal people (24.2% versus 4.0%) ($\chi^2 = 113.340$, d.f. = 1, $p = .000$) and youth (52.8% versus 28.5%) ($\chi^2 = 55.288$, d.f. = 1, $p = .000$).

Sustainability

Chief executive officers in mandated organizations are more likely to forecast growth (53.4% versus 45.5%), but this may be due to chance alone (Mann-Whitney $U = 124,167.500$, $Z = -1.713$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .087$).

Mandated organizations are more likely to experience a number of barriers to growth including insufficient funds (Mann-Whitney $U = 118,008.500$, $Z = -2.941$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .003$) (86.1% (n=230) versus 81.8% (n=810)), competition from other organizations providing similar service (Mann-Whitney $U = 114,699.500$, $Z = -3.306$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .001$) (49.1% (n=129) versus 37.6% (n=370)), and socio-

demographic changes in the community (Mann-Whitney $U = 106,745.000$, $Z = -4.824$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .000$) (60.1% (n=158) versus 44.4% (n=436)).

Planning Capacities

Mandated organizations do not differ from others related to internal planning capacities, but are more likely to experience lack of funds to implement plans (Mann-Whitney $U = 103,955.000$, $Z = -2.234$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .025$) (67.6% (n=167) versus 63.2% (n=584)).

Environmental Issues

Mandated organizations are more likely than other organizations to find that the general public tends to view them with suspicion and mistrust (Mann-Whitney $U = 82,251.500$, $Z = -4.657$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .000$) (33.2% (n=77) versus 20.2% (n=176)).

Technology Issues

There are no significant differences related to technology issues.

Salaried Employees

Mandated organizations are no more likely to employ salaried employees than other organizations ($\chi^2 = .111$, d.f. = 1, $p = .739$).

Counting only organizations with staff mandated organizations are more likely to perceive that belief in the cause is more important in recruiting staff (Mann-Whitney $U = 35,783.000$, $Z = -3.262$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} =$

.001) (88.7% (n=133) versus 76.9% (n=436)) and retaining staff (Mann-Whitney U = 34,465.000, Z = -3.909, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .000$) (90.7% (n=136) versus 77.9% (n=442)).

There are no significant differences between mandated and other organizations related to changes in staff complements over one year (Mann-Whitney U = 44,359.500, Z = -.744, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .457$) or over five years (Mann-Whitney U = 42,333.0, Z = -.431, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .667$). Non-mandated organizations also do not differ on their use of independent contractors as compared to five years ago (Mann-Whitney U = 14,228.500, Z = -.737, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .461$).

The size of full time staff complements do not differ between mandated (n = 142, M= 12.71, s.d. = 32.08) and non-mandated (n = 557, M = 10.82, s.d. = 31.94) organizations (t = .630, d.f. = 697, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .529$) with full time staff. The same is true of part time staff (for mandated organizations, n = 139, M = 8.00, sd. = 22.109 versus for non-mandated organizations, n=537, M = 7.31, s.d. = 30.70) (t = .249, d.f. = 674, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .803$).

There is no significant difference in the proportion of mandated (35.6%) and non-mandated (28.6%) organizations with any visible minority staff ($\chi^2 = 2.174$, d.f. = 1, p = .140). The average percentage of visible minority staff in organizations with any visible minority staff is not higher in mandated organizations (t = 1.476, d.f. = 86.950, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .143$). Considering all organizations, the average percentage of Aboriginal staff is higher (M = 9.17%, s.d. = 20.62% versus M = 5.15%, s.d. = 15.43%) in mandated organizations, and this difference is significant (t = 2.397, d.f. = 315.692, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .017$). Mandated organizations also employ more youth. On average, the percentage of youth staff is 9.1% higher in mandated agencies (t = 4.132, d.f. = 400.194, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .000$) (M = 24.50%, s.d. = 26.99% versus M = 15.40%, s.d. = 23.42%).

Volunteers

Mandated organizations are 8.3% (82.7% versus 74.4%) more likely to use volunteers ($\chi^2 = 8.023$ d.f. = 1, $p = .005$). Mandated organizations ($n = 208$, $M = 154.73$, s.d. = 1391.00) and non-mandated ($n = 693$, $M = 108.19$, s.d. = 666.22) organizations did not differ significantly in the size of their total volunteer complements ($t = .662$, d.f. = 895, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .508$).

Mandated organizations differ from others in the sample on only one volunteer issue. They are more likely (48.2% versus 36.6% agree or strongly agree) to cite insufficient funds as a barrier to using volunteers (Mann-Whitney $U = 57,885.000$, $Z = -2.935$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .003$). They experience no difference in the change in the number of volunteers over time from other organizations in the sample (Mann-Whitney $U = 72,669.000$, $z = -1.114$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .265$).

Volunteers in mandated organizations are much more likely to provide administrative and clerical support (61.4% versus 49.5%) ($\chi^2 = 8.877$, d.f. = 1, $p = .003$), assistance with computer technology (58.1% versus 49.2%) ($\chi^2 = 4.855$, d.f. = 1, $p = .028$), transportation for clients (49.0% versus 28.5%) ($\chi^2 = 29.053$, d.f. = 1, $p = .000$), visits to people (55.0% versus 40.7%) ($\chi^2 = 12.764$, d.f. = 1, $p = .000$), counseling (35.9% versus 21.8%) ($\chi^2 = 16.179$, d.f. = 1, $p = .000$), fundraising (76.1% versus 68.6%) ($\chi^2 = 4.312$, d.f. = 1, $p = .038$) and custodial cleaning and food support services (59.6% versus 40.9%). However, they are much less likely to be involved in committee work (9.7% versus 29.7%) ($\chi^2 = 5.073$, d.f. = 1, $p = .024$).

Mandated organizations are more likely to have visible minority volunteers ($n = 83$, 52.9% mandated versus $n = 219$, 42.6% non-mandated) ($\chi^2 = 5.114$, d.f. = 1, $p = .024$). Considering only

organizations with visible minority volunteers, on average the volunteer complements of mandated organizations (n = 117, M = 26.85%, s.d. = 29.17%) include 7.30% more visible minority volunteers (t = 2.217, d.f. = 221.540, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .028$). Mandated organization volunteer complements do include higher percentages of Aboriginal volunteers (M = 12.50%, s.d. = 25.17% versus M = 15.93%, s.d. = 16.00%) (t=3.444, d.f. = 301.899, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .000$) and youth volunteers (M= 28.26%, s.d. = 28.59% versus M = 17.15%, s.d. = 23.63%) (t = 4.982, d.f. = 394.599, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .000$).

Boards of Directors

Mandated organizations (n =239, 89.8%) are as likely to have boards of directors as other organizations (n = 890, 90.0%) ($\chi^2 = .005$, d.f. = 1, $p = .946$), but are more likely to disagree (35.4% (n=73) versus 28.9% (n=230)) that there are too many organizations competing for too small a pool (Z = 72,818.500, Z = -2.357, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .011$).

Mandated organizations are more likely (n=58, 29.7% versus n = 158, 21.3 %) to have some visible minority board members ($\chi^2 = 6.167$, d.f. = 1, $p = .013$). On average, counting only organizations with visible minority board members, mandated organizations include 39.25% more visible minority board members (t = 7.515, d.f. = 73.703, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .000$) (M = 62.44%, s.d. = 37.23% versus M = 21.19%, s.d. = 23.02%). Considering all organizations, mandated organizations (M = 10.86, s.d. = 27.52) report significantly more Aboriginal board members (t = 2.721, d.f. = 227.910, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .007$) than non-mandated organizations do (M = 5.31%, s.d. = 14.99%). The proportion of youth board members does not vary between mandated and other organizations (t = -.205, d.f. = 945, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .838$). Board

members in mandated organizations tend to serve longer than in other organizations (Mann-Whitney U = 90,717.500, $z = -2.710$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .007$ (46.2% (n = 108) versus 36.8% (n = 320) more than five years).

Revenues

Mandated organizations are no more or less likely to have received any kind of revenue in the last fiscal year than non-mandated organizations ($\chi^2 = 3.355$, d.f. = 1, $p = .067$).

Mandated organizations (M = \$711,075.90, s.d. = \$2,500,563.03) do not vary from other organizations (M = \$739,954.90, s.d. = \$6,524,851.81) on average total cash revenue ($t = -.058$, d.f. = 881, $p_{\text{two-tail}} = .954$), but did vary on the average percentage which flowed from one major source. On average, mandated organizations receive 11.57% more of their income from philanthropic sources (M = 36.25%, s.d. = 38.84% versus M = 24.68%, s.d. = 35.36%) ($t = 3.621$, d.f. = 258.051, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .000$). This is composed of an average of 12.72% more from individuals (M = 27.83%, s.d. = 37.29% versus M = 15.10%, s.d. = 30.56%) ($t = 4.218$, d.f. = 242.200, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .000$), but an average of 1.48% less from corporations (M = 1.69%, s.d. = 6.90% versus M = 3.17%, s.d. = 12.30%) ($t = -2.134$, d.f. = 499.338, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .033$).

The pattern of change in mandated organization's total revenues over the past five years does not differ from other organizations (Mann-Whitney U = 74,765.500, $Z = -.658$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .51$), nor did changes from federal (Mann-Whitney U = 5,192.500, $Z = -1.128$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .259$), provincial (Mann-Whitney U = 15,342.500, $Z = -.160$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .873$) or municipal sources (Mann-Whitney U = 2,414.500, $Z = -.259$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .795$).

Government Funding

With regard to issues related to government funding, mandated organizations are more likely to agree (48.9% agree versus 40.2% agree) that too much staff and board time has gone into securing revenues from government sources (Mann-Whitney $U = 17,366.5000$, $Z = -2.209$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .042$). They are also more likely to agree that compared to five years ago governments are increasingly putting more conditions on the use of funding (Mann-Whitney $U = 16,222.500$, $Z = -2.848$, $p = .004$) (67.8% agree versus 56.1%).

Philanthropic Funding

Mandated organizations are more likely to agree (77.8% agree versus 68.1% agree) that the advantages of seeking funding from individuals outweighs the disadvantages (Mann-Whitney $U = 19,605.000$, $Z = -2.02$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .044$).

Affiliation, Mandate and Tenure

Mandated organizations are no more likely to be affiliated with a provincial or national organization than other organizations ($\chi^2 = .159$, d.f. = 1, $p = .690$). On average, they are no older than others in the sample ($t = 1.532$, d.f. = 283.622, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .127$).

Organizations are classified according to the service or activity most central to the organization's purpose. The proportions of mandated and non-mandated organizations in each class are then compared. Mandated organizations were under-represented in social services (10.8% versus 18.7%) ($\chi^2 = 8.351$, d.f. = 1, $p = .004$), the environmental sector (0% versus 2.7%) ($\chi^2 = 6.592$, d.f. = 1, $p = .010$), development

and housing (1.7% versus 6.8%) ($\chi^2 = 9.218$, d.f. = 1, $p = .002$), and business and professional associations (.4% versus 5.3%) ($\chi^2 = 10.979$, d.f. = 1, $p = .001$). However, they are over-represented (26.3% versus 10.2%) in the religion category ($\chi^2 = 41.993$, d.f. = 1, $p = .000$). Most mandated organizations are in the religion (26.3%), culture and recreation (24.2%), and education and research (13.3%) categories.

Table 1 describes the number and percentage of mandated and other organizations in terms of the area of their activities. Almost one in three mandated organizations serve an entire municipality and almost one quarter serve the entire province. A much higher percentage of mandated organizations are engaged internationally than is true for other organizations.

Table 1
Activity Area of Mandated and
Non-Mandated Organizations¹

Area	Mandated (N=257)	Other (N=982)
Neighbourhood	N=35 13.6%	N=166 16.9%
Multiple Neighbourhoods	N=42 16.3%	N=155 15.8%
Entire Municipality	N=82 31.9%	N=250 25.5%
Region of Manitoba	N=6 10.1%	N=105 10.7%
Manitoba	N=60 23.3%	N=275 28.0%
National	N=23 8.9%	N=53 5.4%
International	N=36 14.0%	N=47 4.7%
Particular ethnic or religious community (non-geographic)	N=5 1.9%	N=4 .4%
Mostly in another province	N=0 0%	N=3 .3%
In a particular organizational environment	N=1 .4%	N=7 .7%
Manitoba and other provinces	N=0 0%	N=1 .1%

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

Adequacy of Outputs

Mandated organizations do not differ from other organizations with regard to the extent that they can meet need or demand in the area of their activity most central to their purpose (Mann-Whitney U = 119630.5, $z = -.097$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .923$). The median for both is 3 (to a limited extent).

Need for a Sector Wide Umbrella Organization

Mandated organizations do not differ from other organizations in the level of the need expressed for an umbrella organization (Mann-Whitney U = 121,898.500, $Z = -.031$, $p_{\text{two-tailed}} = .975$).

Summary

Organizations mandated to serve ethno-cultural and/or ethno-religious communities are more likely to be in Winnipeg and less likely to be in northern Manitoba. They are more likely to be registered charities and to claim a mandate to serve youth and Aboriginal people. On average, they have been in existence longer than other organizations.

Mandated organizations are over-represented in the religion category and under-represented in social services, the environmental sector, development and housing and business and professional associations. They are also more likely to have an international area of activity.

Mandated organizations perceive that belief in the organization's cause is very important in staff recruitment and retention. They also employ a higher proportion of youth and Aboriginal employees.

A higher percentage of mandated organizations use volunteers. They are also more likely to note insufficient funds as a barrier to using volunteers.

Volunteers in mandated organizations are more likely to provide administrative and material support, services to clients (visiting, counseling) and to be involved in fundraising. However, they are less likely to be involved in committee work.

Mandated organizations are more likely to have visible minority volunteers and, on average, have a higher percentage of them. They also have a higher percentage of youth and Aboriginal volunteers.

Mandated organizations report less inter-organizational competition for board members. They are more likely to have some visible minority board members, and also have higher proportions of Aboriginal and visible minority board members. Their board members also serve longer tenures.

Mandated organizations receive more of their revenue through philanthropy from individuals.

Mandated organizations are more likely to perceive that government funding is becoming increasingly conditional and that too much staff and board time must be spent in securing it. However, they are also more likely to agree that the advantages of seeking funding from individuals outweigh the disadvantages.

Mandated organizations report a number of barriers to growth at higher rates than other organizations. Those include insufficient funds, competition from other activities and socio-demographic changes. They are more likely to experience lack of funds as a barrier to implementing plans and to find that the public views them with suspicion and mistrust.