

# DECENT WORK FOR WOMEN

A literature review of women working in Ontario's nonprofit sector



# About ONN

We are the independent network for the 55,000 nonprofits in Ontario, focused on policy, advocacy, and services to strengthen Ontario's nonprofit sector as a key pillar of our society and economy.

We work to create a public policy environment that allows nonprofits and charities to thrive. We engage our network of diverse nonprofit organizations across Ontario to work together on issues affecting the sector and channel the voices of our network to government, funders, and other stakeholders. The network began in 2007 as a mobilization of sector leaders concerned about proposed changes to the Ontario Not-for-Profit Corporations Act (Bill 65). Incorporated as a nonprofit in 2014, ONN was developed as an incubated project of the award-winning Centre for Social Innovation.

## **Vision**

A Strong and Resilient Nonprofit Sector. Thriving Communities. A Dynamic Province.

## **Mission**

To engage, advocate, and lead with – and for – nonprofit and charitable organizations that work for the public benefit in Ontario.

## **Values**

Courage to take risks and do things differently

Diversity of perspective, creativity, and expertise to get stuff done

Optimism and determination

Solutions created by the sector, with the sector, for the sector

Celebrating our successes and learning from our experiences

Strength that comes from working together

## **Ontario Nonprofit Network**

300-2St Clair East

Toronto, ON M4T 2T5

[www.theonn.ca](http://www.theonn.ca)

[info@theonn.ca](mailto:info@theonn.ca)

<http://theonn.ca/our-work/our-people/decent-work/decent-work-women/>

Pamela Uppal, project lead: [pamela@theonn.ca](mailto:pamela@theonn.ca)

This project has been funded by Status of Women Canada.

The logo for the Government of Canada, featuring the word "Canada" in a serif font with a small Canadian flag above the letter 'a'.

March 2018

# Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	p4
PART 1: INTRODUCTION	p6
PART 2: THE LABOUR MARKET	p17
PART 3: THE NONPROFIT SECTOR	p20
PART 4: MAJOR THEMES	p26
A gendered division of labour translates into unequal labour market patterns	p26
The nonprofit sector is women-majority but not always women-led	p29
Immigrant, Indigenous, and racialized women, women from the LGBTQ community and women with disabilities have worse labour market outcomes	p35
Unequal job opportunities and a glass ceiling exists for diverse women in the sector	p39
The gender wage gap is at the core of women’s labour issues	p44
Women in the nonprofit sector have a lower compensation package, compared to men, consisting of a “care penalty”, limited access to a pension plan and maternity top-ups, and a gender wage gap	p50
PART 5: REFLECTIONS AND NEXT STEPS	p55
BIBLIOGRAPHY	p60

# Executive Summary

This review critically analyzes literature on the experiences of women working in Ontario's nonprofit sector, from a wide variety of sources, in order to:

- Paint a current and relevant picture of women's employment experiences in Ontario's nonprofit sector
- Identify any gaps in research and data
- Inform the development of future key activities for ONN's larger project on [Decent Work for Women Working in Ontario's Nonprofit Sector](#)

## KEY FINDINGS

### The nonprofit sector is women-majority but not always women-led

The nonprofit sector in Ontario is women-majority as 75% to 80% of the workforce is women. While the sector has more women in leadership positions than the public and for-profit sectors, the 75-80% employment share is not reflected at the leadership level. Women are underrepresented in senior leadership positions and men are overrepresented. Women are more likely to lead smaller organizations, and smaller organizations make up a large part of the sector.

### Unequal job opportunities and a glass ceiling exist for diverse women

Immigrant and racialized women are concentrated in the immigrant, refugee and settlement services subsector where they also make up a majority of the workers. They are more likely to be in frontline rather than senior leadership positions. Overall, there is a lack of data on how many immigrant, Indigenous and racialized women, women from the LGBTQ community, and women with disabilities work in the sector.

### Women in the nonprofit sector have lower compensation than men

Nonprofit sector wages are lower than other sectors, in large part because of a phenomenon known as the "care penalty", despite the fact the workforce is highly educated and experienced. Within the sector women experience a gender wage gap as they earn less than men, especially in senior leadership positions. Limited access to a pension plan and maternity top-ups in the sector are particular challenges to women's economic advancement.

## MAJOR GAPS IN THE LITERATURE

### In labour force dialogues, a gender equity lens is missing in the nonprofit sector and the nonprofit sector lens is missing in gender equity

Discussions on gender equity in the labour force tend to lack the nonprofit sector lens while labour force discussions on the nonprofit sector lack a gender equity lens. The only intersection between gender equity and the nonprofit sector to date has focused on clients and communities rather than nonprofit workers.

## Greater focus is needed on the experiences of Indigenous women, women from the LGBTQ community and women with disabilities working in the sector

While the review was able to locate some research on the experiences of immigrant and racialized women working in the sector, research on the experiences of Indigenous women, women from the LGBTQ community and women with disabilities working in the sector was not found. Lack of information makes their contributions and experiences invisible.

### KEY LEARNINGS

#### What did we learn?

The gendered and racialized division of labour and the nonprofit sector's labour market structures are interconnected, impacting employment trends in the sector. This understanding sheds light on the second learning, that broader gender and race labour force market patterns manifest in the sector, yet manifest differently in comparison to other sectors.

#### What more do we need to know?

From this review, additional intersecting questions on women's employment experiences in the sector have emerged. Using ONN's seven pillars of decent work, these questions interrogate what decent work for all women would look like in the sector. For instance, how does workplace harassment for women manifest in the sector? Do women negotiate pay? And why are women not in leadership positions in larger organizations? ONN will explore these questions in the second phase of this project and also call for further research on them.

# Introduction

This literature review is part of Ontario Nonprofit Network's (ONN) larger [project](#) focusing on the experiences of women<sup>1,2</sup> working in Ontario's nonprofit sector<sup>3</sup>. ONN is undertaking a three-year project, with funding from [Status of Women Canada](#), that will apply a GBA+ lens ([gender based intersectional analysis](#)) to identify barriers to women workers' economic empowerment and prosperity in Ontario's nonprofit sector and develop and implement pilot solutions to address these barriers at the organizational, network and policy levels

The data and information collected, lessons learned, and project successes are being documented and shared throughout the project. The project is informed by an [advisory council](#) of diverse women working in the sector, a [community of practice](#) representing the project on the [Gender Equality Network Canada](#), sector partners, and any other relevant local, provincial and national stakeholders. Key activities over the three years include building partnerships, conducting a literature review, holding focus groups, key informant interviews and disseminating a sector wide survey, prioritizing barriers and themes, and piloting and implementing collaborative strategies for change.

The purpose of this review is to critically analyze literature on the experiences of women working in Ontario's nonprofit sector, from a wide variety of sources, in order to:

- Paint a current and relevant introductory picture of women's employment experiences in Ontario's nonprofit sector
- Identify any gaps in research and data
- Inform the development of the project's key activities moving forward

This was an exercise of breadth rather than depth as the review provides an overarching picture of experiences rather than a deep dive into particular employment issues across, subsectors (e.g., social services, arts & culture, sports & recreation), geographies (e.g., northern Ontario, Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area or GTHA, Ottawa), and roles (e.g., frontline, middle manager, senior leader).

This literature review is divided into five parts:

- Part 1 consists of the introduction, methodology and limitations
- Part 2 looks at how precarious work is significantly shaping the labour market
- Part 3 details the value proposition of the nonprofit sector, its distinctive challenges and trends that impact its labour force, and outlines ONN's decent work agenda for the sector
- Part 4 explores major intersecting themes found on women working in Ontario's nonprofit sector
- Part 5 discusses the gaps found in the literature, key learnings, and concludes the review with next steps

---

<sup>1</sup> This literature review uses an inclusive definition of women that recognizes and welcomes trans women, queer women and nonbinary people.

<sup>2</sup> The term "women-majority" will be used rather than "women-dominated" because, although the sector consists predominantly of women workers, women are underrepresented in senior leadership positions.

<sup>3</sup> This review is looking at the core nonprofit sector, which excludes school boards, post-secondary institutions, and hospitals. Please see p9 for a full definition.

# Key Terms

## Care Work

An act of caring for others that is unpaid (parents raising their children, family caring for relatives with disabilities, elder care) or paid (child care providers, teachers, nurses, home-care providers) (Meyer 1; England 381). It includes direct personal care as well as household maintenance tasks that are a precondition for care (International Labour Organization 1). It is a gendered activity that is designated as women's work across histories and geographies because of the belief that women have a natural capacity and desire to care (a socially constructed phenomenon) which is reinforced and reproduced by disproportionately burdening women with undervalued and unpaid/low-paid care work (Meyer 1).

## Decent Work

Decent work consists of work opportunities that are productive, provide fair income, security in the workplace and social protection (employment insurance, social programs), better prospects for personal development and social integration, freedom for people to express their concerns, organize and participate in the decisions that affect their lives, and equality of opportunity and treatment for all (International Labour Organization "Decent Work").

## Deskilling

The deskilling of immigrants to Canada consists of three interrelated practices: (1) discounting foreign educational credentials while privileging Canadian educational credentials; (2) discounting foreign work experience and requiring Canadian work experience in most sectors of employment; and (3) strong preferences for local, Canadian-accented English rather than English accents from (most) other parts of the world (Creese 97). These three practices of deskilling result in immigrants being employed in an occupation below one's level of qualifications and experience and therefore implies a phenomenon of under-utilization of skills, and overtime, loss of professional skills (Creese 97). Deskilling is also further shaped for immigrant women by the gendered and racialized division of labour.

## Disability

This term encompasses a broad range and degree of conditions, both visible and invisible (OHRC). A disability may have been present from birth, caused by an accident, or developed over time (OHRC). They can be invisible or visible.

## Equal Pay for Equal Work

This ensures women and men are paid comparably when performing substantially the same work under similar working conditions that requires the *same* level of skill, effort, and responsibility (Employment Standards Act 2018; Pay Equity Commission of Ontario "A Guide to Interpreting Ontario's Pay Equity Act"). This is different than Pay Equity, which compares pay for *different* work (female-class jobs versus male-class jobs).

### **Feminist Participatory Action Research (FPAR)**

This term refers to a participatory and action-oriented approach to research that centres gender and women's experiences both theoretically and practically (Reid and Gillberg 2). FPAR can be referred to as a paradigm, a theory, a research framework, a conceptual framework, a research approach or a research methodology (Reid and Gillberg 2). Most commonly, it is understood as a conceptual framework that enables a critical understanding of women's multiple perspectives and works towards inclusion and social change through participatory processes while exposing researchers' own biases and assumptions (Reid and Gillberg 2). FPAR combines feminist theories and research with Participatory Action Research (PAR) (Reid and Gillberg 4).

### **GBA+ (Gender Based Intersectional Analysis)**

GBA+ is an analytical tool used to assess how diverse groups of women, men and gender-diverse people may experience policies, programs and initiatives (Status of Women Canada). The "plus" in GBA+ acknowledges that GBA goes beyond biological (sex) and socio-cultural (gender) differences (Status of Women Canada). Multiple identity factors intersect to make individuals; GBA+ also considers many other identity factors, like race, ethnicity, religion, age, and mental or physical disability (Status of Women Canada).

### **Gendered Division of Labour**

This refers to the way in which traditional gender roles that dichotomize work and family, where the men's role is defined as the provider and the women's role as the family caregiver, are replicated in the labour market (Perrone 4). Racialized Gendered Division of Labour refers to the way in which division of labour is both gendered and racialized where caregiving work is particularly viewed as low-income and/or racialized women's work (Galabuzi 127).

### **Gender Wage Gap / Gender Pay Gap / Female-to-Male Earnings Ratio**

The difference in earnings between women and men in the workplace. It can be measured in three ways: (1) average annual earnings, (2) full-time, full-year average annual earnings, and (3) hourly wages (Canadian Women's Foundation; Ontario Equal Pay Coalition "Calculating the Pay Gap"; Moyser 26).

### **Glass Ceiling**

This metaphor describes the idea that gendered artificial, attitudinal, and organizational barriers keep women from leadership positions. The transparent nature of the glass barrier suggests that women can envision achieving leadership positions, that opportunity and advancement are possible; however, the often invisible barriers remain, preventing real advancement to leadership positions (Boyd 1).

### **Glass Cliff**

This metaphor describes the idea that women are able to achieve leadership positions during times of organizational crisis (Bruckmüller "How Women End up on the "Glass Cliff"" 1; Harvard Business Review 1). It illustrates how the leadership position is more risky and precarious in an organization facing crisis than it would be if they were leading in a successful organization (it is more dangerous to be standing on top of a cliff than a mountain) (Harvard Business Review 1).

## **Immigrant**

One who moves from their native country to another with the intention of settling for creating a better life or for better opportunities (Canadian Race Relations Foundations 37). This can be for a number of personal, political, religious, social, or economic reasons (Canadian Race Relations Foundations 37). Some immigrants have resided in Canada for a number of years, while others have arrived “recently” (up to five years prior to a given survey year for Statistics Canada) (Hudon 37).

## **Indigenous**

The collective name for the original people within Canada and their descendants. This includes First Nations (status and non-status), Métis and Inuit (Anti-Racism Directorate of Ontario 53). The term Indigenous also has positive associations with self-determination, human rights, and Indigenous peoples’ connection to the land (The Circle on Philanthropy and Aboriginal Peoples in Canada 8).

## **Intersectionality**

Acknowledges the ways in which people’s lives are shaped by their multiple and overlapping identities and social locations, which together can produce a unique and distinct experience for that individual or group (Anti-Racism Directorate of Ontario 53). In the context of gender, this means recognizing the ways in which people’s experiences of gender may differ and vary depending on an individual’s or group’s additional overlapping (or “intersecting”) social identities, such as race, ethnicity, Indigenous identification, experiences with colonialism, religion, citizenship, socio-economic status, sexual orientation or disability (Anti-Racism Directorate of Ontario 53).

## **Leaky Pipeline**

This metaphor describes the idea that women disappear from entry-level positions to executive positions at some point on their career path, for multiple reasons, creating a small number of women leaders emerging at the end because of the earlier ‘leaks’ (“Leaky pipeline”). This metaphor is often used to describe women’s careers in science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) and academia.

## **LGBTQ**

This acronym stands for lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, and queer.

## **Marginalization**

A long-term structural process of systemic discrimination that creates a class of disadvantaged minorities (Anti-Racism Directorate of Ontario 54). These groups become permanently confined to the margins of society where their status is continually reproduced because of various dimensions of exclusion particularly in the labour market and in full and meaningful participation in society (Anti-Racism Directorate of Ontario 54).

## **Nonprofit (or Not-for-Profit) Sector**

The sector is made up of organizations with a purpose/mission other than profit (i.e., non-share-capital corporations). This includes but is not limited to charities and nonprofit co-operatives. For the purposes of this review it excludes government departments, agencies, board and commissions as well as the “broader public sector” (i.e., schools, hospitals, municipalities, and post-secondary institutions). (This aligns approximately with Statistics Canada’s definition of the “core nonprofit sector.”)

### **Occupational and/or Industry Gender Segregation**

The uneven distribution of workers across (horizontal segregation) and within (hierarchical segregation) occupations and industries based on gender. Segregation is based on social or cultural norms and beliefs that under-value women's work (International Labour Organization "The Gender Division of Labour" 1). It is measured by summing the concentration of women relative to men in a sector or occupation (Kühn et al 10). Other terms used to describe this segregation are "Pink Ghetto" or "Pink Collar Work".

### **Public Benefit Nonprofits**

Public benefit nonprofits (as opposed to member-serving nonprofits) are a subsector of the nonprofit sector. They operate for the good of the public, they reinvest excess revenue back into meeting their mission, and they retain their assets in the public domain for the public good. They include charities, nonprofit organizations and nonprofit co-ops – have a mission to serve the public.

### **Pay Equity**

Pay equity is a policy response to the gender wage gap that ensures that the pay for jobs usually done by women ("female class" jobs such as clerical, social work, nursing or cosmetology) is the same as the pay for jobs usually done by men ("male class" jobs such as construction, truck driving, engineer or technician) when compared in the same organization (Pay Equity Commission of Ontario "A Guide to Interpreting Ontario's Pay Equity Act" 10-11). Pay equity is not about comparing people in jobs but the jobs themselves; regardless of who is in the position the pay is according to the job. It can also be referred to as equal pay for work of equal value.

### **Precarious Work**

Paid work characterized by uncertainty, insecurity, and there is a lack of control of how work is performed (Lewchuk et al "Origins of Precarity" 3). More specifically, uncertainty around continuous employment, low income, limited benefits, constrained access to regulatory protection, and non-standard employment status (temporary, part-time or self-employment) (Vosko et al 3). Precarious work can also be shaped by an individual's social location (gender, race, class, status) and social context (occupation, industry, and geography) (Vosko et a. 3).

### **Racialized**

This refers to people who have racial meanings attributed to them as a group in ways that negatively impact their social, political, and economic life (Anti-Racism Directorate of Ontario 55). Unlike the term "visible minority," "racialized" acknowledges that race is a social construction that can change over time and place.

# Methodology

## Guiding Conceptual Frameworks

Both project outcomes and processes are equally important to the success of ONN's project on Decent Work for Women Working in Ontario's Nonprofit Sector. In short, outcomes and processes are interconnected in this project. For instance, in order to achieve the project outcome of greater awareness of what decent work for diverse women working in the nonprofit sector looks like, the project processes must centre and engage the voices of diverse women to arrive at that outcome. For this reason, the methodology for this project is informed by two key frameworks: Feminist Participatory Action Research (FPAR) and Gender Based Intersectional Analysis (GBA+). The latter is at times referred to as intersectionality as well. Both frameworks are embedded in the advisory council's terms of references.

The FPAR framework facilitates knowledge building that changes the conditions of women's lives, both individually and collectively, while reconstructing conceptions of power so that power can be used in a responsible manner (Reid et al 316). It advocates for women's involvement in all stages of the research process including identifying the problems that are to be explored, carrying out the research, and interpreting and acting upon the results (Reid et al 316). FPAR goals consist of identifying changes of immediate benefit to research participants, analyses of the structural determinants of social problems, and action strategies (Reid et al 316). Action is defined in relation to the project at hand. GBA+ complements FPAR as it provides an intersectional lens to assess the impact of project process and outcomes on intersectional identities. While this project does not neatly fit into the FPAR framework nor at all times encompass the breadth of social locations GBA+ advocates for, we attempt to situate it as best as we can by consistently asking ourselves the following methodological question: What kind of feminist processes can be integrated into the project? (Gouin et al 264).

This project aims to build knowledge on women's employment experiences in the nonprofit sector in Ontario and to further use that knowledge to combat any barriers that they may face. Power is reconstructed by centering the voices and experiences of diverse women working in the sector. The project began by talking with and listening to individuals in Ontario's nonprofit sector across roles, subsectors and regions as well as sector partners such as academics, research centres, government officials, funders and policy institutes. Within these conversations individuals were asked: (1) What characteristics are unique to your subsector and region? (2) What issues/barriers do you see women working in the sector facing / What should we be addressing? (3) Who else should we be connecting with and What else should we be reading? These interactions expanded knowledge and helped root the project in the lived realities of those working in our sector and in the research of those writing about the sector. This centering also allows for the women who this project is about to be engaged throughout the activities. Engagement occurs in multiple ways. For example the Advisory Council, consisting of diverse women working in the sector, are directly involved in guiding the project and providing input on specific activities and processes. The co-chairs are young and emerging women leaders in the sector. In the next phase of the project, women working in the sector will have an opportunity to share their experiences and voices to also inform strategies and solutions development. The following definition of action is used in this project as it encompasses all project activities, "...multifaceted and dynamic process that can range from speaking to validate oneself and one's experiences in the world to 'the process of doing something', such as taking a deliberate step towards changing one's circumstances..." (Reid et al 317).

## Literature Review

The key parameters of the literature review were date published (2012 to present)<sup>4</sup>, geography of issue or study discussed (Ontario)<sup>5</sup>, theme (nonprofits, employment, gender) and type of source (government, peer-reviewed, organizational/think tank). Geographical limitations helped keep the review focused on the Ontario social, political and economic context as well as reveal any gaps in local research. While much literature on this area was available from other jurisdictions, it is not necessarily applicable to Ontario and Canada's context as nonprofits and employment are regulated differently and in a different socio-political and economic climate.

Underpinning this project are three key broader themes: gender, nonprofit sector, and employment. Literature on women's employment experiences in Ontario's nonprofit sector sits at the intersection of these three themes. Reviewing literature across the three individual themes and within their respective intersections alongside where all three intersected created an introductory picture of women's employment experiences in Ontario's sector. More specifically, individually each theme and its intersection with each other provides little information but taken together a more nuanced picture can be painted. In turn, this literature review is essentially three built into one: gender and employment, nonprofit sector labour force, and gendered employment in the nonprofit sector<sup>6</sup>.

Within each theme, a wide variety of source types were taken into account as they captured different perspectives and issues that would not necessarily be available in one particular type of source. For example, government sources were able to provide credible data but peer-reviewed literature provided qualitative experiences and a theoretical analysis of what those numbers may mean. Organizational reports from within the sector delved deeper and identified information specific to the sector, which government sources and peer-reviewed articles did not as they either focused on the for-profit or public sectors. Moreover, comparing what different sources had to say either built stronger themes for consideration or challenged assumptions.

Most literature was found online through manual searches on Google, government, and organizational websites. Peer-reviewed literature was found through Google and journal portals such as ProQuest, Scholars Portal and JSTOR. Specific journals explored were:

- *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*
- *VOLUNTAR: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*
- *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*
- *Journal of Industrial Relations*
- *Work, Employment and Society*
- *Feminist Economics Today*
- *Gender Work and Organization*
- *Canadian Ethnic Studies*

---

<sup>4</sup> Critical literature that was published before 2012 was included in the review because some sources have a quicker turnaround in new research than others.

<sup>5</sup> The geography parameter was expanded to include all of Canada because there were multiple national literature across sources (i.e. compensation and benefits reports) that detailed key information about the sector. This literature was not limiting as a large majority of the nonprofit sector is situated in Ontario.

<sup>6</sup> This literature does not include references to women's employment experiences where the women were the clients - not employees - of nonprofits.

Moreover, as there are numerous names and ways to describe the nonprofit sector, employment and gender, the following tags were used in conjunction with each other to find literature: community organizations, human services, broader public sector<sup>7</sup>, social services, labour force, occupations, industry, income, education, women, female, and gendered. Consistent with a GBA+ lens, these terms were researched in conjunction with: Black women, immigrant women, LGBTQ, Indigenous women, racialized women, women with disabilities, women.

The themes were identified by first labeling every literature piece as one or more of the themes: nonprofit, employment and gender. Then secondary labels were applied to each piece:

- Arts and culture, developmental services, employment services, immigration, refugee and settlement services, healthcare, family services, fundraising services<sup>8</sup>
- Austerity measures
- Board diversity
- Care work
- Childcare
- Compensation/benefits
- Diversity
- Early childhood educators
- Frontline
- Funding
- Gender wage gap
- Immigrants
- Leadership
- LGBTQ
- Neoliberalism
- Occupational health/violence
- Overhead
- Pay Equity
- Precarious work
- Professionalization
- Recession
- Racialized
- State of the sector
- State of sector services
- Students/interns
- Volunteering

Literature was then grouped based on primary and secondary labels.

---

<sup>7</sup> This does not describe the definition being used for nonprofits in this literature review. However, external use of this definition at times can include some public benefit nonprofit organizations.

<sup>8</sup> These particular subsector tags were used because sources wrote about these subsectors.

# Limitations

## Under-explored area of research

Women's employment experience in the nonprofit sector is an under-explored area of research in Ontario and Canada. Literature surveying gender and employment investigates whether the structures of the labour market and the economy are supportive of diverse women accessing and participating in the labour force, as it consists today. It questions what those structures are, how they are built and for whom, and whether they can recognize the needs of diverse women. However, this set of literature predominantly focuses on the for-profit and/or public sectors, and/or caregiving industries in general. At times it is unclear whether this literature includes nonprofits in their interpretation of the public sector. It has not captured the nuances of how gendered labour trends manifest particularly in the nonprofit sector in Ontario and/or Canada, and the impacts on diverse women. The nonprofit sector is a key aspect of Ontario and Canada's social, economic and political fabric; it differs from both the for-profit and public sectors; and is a women-majority sector where care work makes up a significant portion of the sector. For this reason, it requires an independent analysis of both its labour market and the labour market's gendered aspects.

Recognizing the sector's importance, literature on the nonprofit sector labour force has been emerging lately. Literature has explored the connection between the distinct features and human resources (HR) practices of the sector, compensation and benefits in the sector, leadership pipelines, and diversity. Recently, ONN has been using the Decent Work<sup>9</sup> framework to illuminate how working conditions can be improved for those working in the sector. However, there is no deliberate focus on gender and/or gender and race, despite that it is a women-majority sector. In short, gender and employment literature requires the addition of a public benefit nonprofit lens while the nonprofit sector labour force literature requires an intersectional gender lens.

Nonprofit sector labour market information is scarce and rarely disaggregated by gender and race. Comprehensive provincial and national data on the sector that is disaggregated by various aspects of diversity, namely gender and race, is either non-existent or sparse, outdated, and/or not comparable from study to study. Access to quality labour market information that is disaggregated would allow for a robust picture of the sector. It should take into account its diverse labour force's contributions, provide comparable numbers for nuanced analysis, and assist with better workforce planning. It is essential in understanding the sector broadly and how it is doing as an employer (Lalande and Ymeren 11). Data disaggregated particularly by gender and race is important given the sector is women-majority and a racialized gendered division of labour exists.

Currently, statistically representative and credible labour market data exists in two forms: sector-specific research and broader labour force surveys conducted by Statistics Canada. Challenges for the sector exist in both approaches. Sector-specific research has been conducted at both the federal and provincial levels; however, the federal level research was done over a decade ago. The last national research project on the nonprofit sector, *The National Survey of Nonprofit and Voluntary Organizations* (NSNVO), was conducted in 2003 by a consortium of organizations with the Canadian Centre for Philanthropy (now Imagine Canada) to better understand the capacity of organizations to meeting their missions. The first

---

<sup>9</sup> As defined by the International Labour Organization, see glossary for definition.

phase consisted of nation-wide consultations with organizations while the second phase consisted of a national survey conducted by Statistics Canada of approximately 13 000 organizations. However, it included hospitals, post-secondary institutions, and excludes school boards which makes it more difficult to study the community-governed (or core nonprofit) sector as they are considered broader public sector rather than exclusively core public benefit nonprofits<sup>10</sup>. The second national source for sector-specific research on the sector is Statistics Canada's *Satellite Account of Non-profit Institutions and Volunteering*. In its time it aimed to identify the economic contributions of the nonprofit sector<sup>11</sup> in Canada and increase understanding of its interaction with other parts of the economy, depicting an analysis of the size, scope and nature of Canada's nonprofit sector in economic terms (Haggar-Guénette et al 5). While this source was able to distinguish the core nonprofit sector, its last publication was over a decade ago in 2007 (with data from 2006 and 2007).

At the provincial level, sector-specific research is available from *The Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector in Ontario: Regional Highlights of the National Survey of Nonprofit and Voluntary Organizations* (2003)<sup>12</sup>. It was developed by Imagine Canada and the Canadian Council on Social Development (CCSD) by analyzing Ontario data from the second phase of the NSNVO research project. However, issues with what part of the nonprofit sector is included in the data persist in this report at the provincial level as well. It is important to note that all the reports described above do not disaggregate the nonprofit sector labour force by gender or race.

Systemic challenges are deeply embedded in the way in which broader labour force data is traditionally collected through Statistics Canada. For example, Statistics Canada collects labour force data by classifying workers by industry<sup>13</sup> (North American Industry Classification System - NAICS) and occupation<sup>14</sup> (National Occupation Classification) (Zizys 1-4). However, there is no distinction in this system between public, nonprofit and for-profit employers, as the nonprofit employer can fall into many different industries and the existing occupational classification codes do not capture the breadth of positions in the sector. In other words, labour force data collected by Statistics Canada fragments the nonprofit workforce into diverse industry categories. As a result, any description and analysis must be based on those industries and occupations where labour force activity is predominantly (but not entirely) in the nonprofit sector, such as Individual and Family Services (industry) and Community and Social Service Workers (occupations) (Zizys 1-4). Depending on the publication using this data, it may be disaggregated by gender and/or race.

---

<sup>10</sup> The criteria used: (1) non-governmental, (2) nonprofit distributing, (3) voluntary, and (4) formally incorporated or registered under specific legislation with provincial, territorial or federal governments

<sup>11</sup> For the Canadian satellite account, a number of organizations classified to the government sector in national accounts statistics are considered nonprofit institutions. These include hospitals, residential care facilities, universities and colleges. All other entities classified to general government in the Canadian SNA have been excluded, irrespective of whether they are registered as charities or are designated as legal nonprofit institutions (public school boards).

<sup>12</sup> Another provincial source is the 2013 *State of the Sector: Profile of Ontario Not-for-Profit and Charitable Organizations*. However, ONN does not use the data at all because it was a sample, the data was not consistently applied, and the questions were not statistically relevant.

<sup>13</sup> Industry refers to the general nature of the business carried out in the establishment where the person works. Industry categories may be important as they relate to government investments and job creation or loss (Ministry of Labour 20)

<sup>14</sup> Occupations are determined by the kind of work and the description of a job's main activities (Ministry of Labour 20)

For this reason this literature review relies on multiple studies conducted through nonprofit organizations themselves and peer-reviewed journals in addition to the dated data sources described above. It must be noted that data from nonprofit organizations and peer-reviewed journals are typically either qualitative and/or they speak to a small sample size that is not representative of the whole sector in Ontario and/or Canada. Moreover, the use of an inconsistent definition of the nonprofit sector is key across data sources. It makes the core public benefit sector invisible. Data was either disaggregated by only two sectors (for-profit and public) or it is lumped in with the public sector and referred to as the broader public sector<sup>15</sup> (hospitals, post-secondary institutions, school boards). At times, the nonprofit sector is included in the examples provided but not directly studied and analyzed as a sector impacting employment, in the way in which for example nursing is.

---

<sup>15</sup> Broader public sector

# Precarious work is significantly shaping the labour market

## The rise of precarious work

In “Origins of Precarity,” Wayne Lewchuk, Stephanie Procyk and John Shields identify a number of global shifts in the labour market that have also impacted Canada and have effectively created space for the rise of precarious work. According to their work, from the 1980s onwards there have been weak labour market mechanisms and government regulations in place to support wage increases and the equitable distribution of income (Lewchuk et al “Origins of Precarity” 3). Lower unionization rates<sup>16</sup> and changes in how unions negotiate with employers, a decrease in government supports (e.g., employment insurance), wages no longer tracking labour productivity (i.e., labour’s falling share of income), and perhaps most importantly a sharp decline in standard employment relationship (SER) jobs which perhaps is accelerated by the gig economy (short-term contracts, freelancing, self-employment) have also contributed to the rise of precarious work (Lewchuk et al “Origins of Precarity” 2-3). The SER is an employment arrangement in which the worker has one employer; works full time, year round on the employer’s premises under his or her supervision; enjoys extensive statutory benefits and entitlements; and expects to be employed indefinitely (Cranford and Vosko 455). In Canada, these global shifts in the labour market have translated into the top 1% of income earners having double their share of the national income, the median wage has stopped growing, young workers are having difficulty finding jobs and/or are starting at lower pay, and highly skilled immigrants are either not working, deskilled, and/or working in low-wage jobs (Lewchuk et al “Origins of Precarity” 3). The ideological component of this rise in precarity is rooted in neoliberalism where, in Lewchuk et al’s characterization, the state and for-profits evade accountability by using the individual responsibility rhetoric. In other words, if you work hard enough you will live the “North American dream”, and if you are not living it, it’s your own fault.

As a result of these global shifts, precarious work is the fastest growing employment in Canada (Lewchuk et al “Origins of Precarity” 4). Census 2016 data shows that over the last 15 years there has been a significant shift from full-time, full-year employment to part-time or part-year work between 2005 to 2015 (Statistics Canada “Labour in Canada: Key Results from the 2016 Census”). From 2011 to present, The Poverty and Employment Precarity in Southern Ontario (PEPSO) research project has documented the impacts of precarious work on individuals, families, and communities, citing significant impacts to social, mental, and health well-being (Lewchuk et al “It’s More than Poverty”). According to the 2015 PEPSO report, in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA) at least 20% of those working were in precarious work while another 20% were in employment relationships that share some characteristics with precarious work (Lewchuk et al “It’s More than Poverty” 5). Examples of precarious work include project-based employment in the “knowledge sector”, universities and colleges relying on temporary workers for teaching and research, and services that used to be delivered by public-sector workers in secure jobs are now contracted out to nonprofit agencies on fixed contracts creating insecure jobs (Lewchuk et al “Origins of Precarity” 8).

---

<sup>16</sup> While not discussed specifically in this review, multiple sources of literature have repeatedly cited unions having a positive impact on women’s working conditions in the broader labour market.

## Precarious work is shaped by gender, race, and immigration status

Literature assessing precarious work in Ontario has found that precarious work is gendered and also shaped by other markers of identity such as race and immigration status (Lewchuk et al “It’s More than Poverty” 31; Lewchuk et al “The Precarity Penalty” 30; Premji and Shakya 18; Vosko and Cranford; Vosko et al “Closing the Employment Standards Enforcement Gap” 3). A gendered analysis by the *Closing the Gap: Employment Standards Enforcement* research initiative in Ontario revealed key differences based on various indicators of precarious work between different population groups<sup>17</sup>.

Population Group	Part-time work	Temporary Employment	Multiple Jobs	Low Wages	No Union
Men	12.1%	12.1%	4.1%	27.1%	74.7%
Women	24.0%	13.2%	6.3%	35.5%	72.0%
Immigrant Men (Canadian-born / settled immigrant men)	12.1%	11.5%	4.2%	26.4%	74.0%
Immigrant Women (Canadian-born / settled immigrant women)	24.0%	12.8%	6.3%	34.9%	71.5%
Recent Immigrant men	9.7%	20.2%	3.8%	46.6%	89.4%
Recent Immigrant Women	24.9%	19.2%	3.6%	52.2%	87.7%

Vosko et al “Closing the Employment Standards Enforcement Gap: An Agenda for Change” 8

As the table highlights, women are more likely to earn low wages, be in part-time work and in temporary employment compared to men. However, recent immigrant women are more likely to be in part-time work, temporary employment, and have low wages compared to their counterparts across gender and immigration status (Vosko et al “Closing the Employment Standards Enforcement Gap: An Agenda for Change” 8).

PEPSO’s 2013 report indicated that employment precarity was more pronounced among racialized workers as they are more likely to be in the “vulnerable” and “precarious” clusters (Lewchuk et al “It’s More than Poverty” 31). On the other hand, recent immigrants were more likely to be in the “precarious” cluster when they first arrived in Canada and remain there only during the first decade of their life from which they were then more likely to move into “secure” employment clusters (Lewchuk et al “It’s More than Poverty” 32). Report findings did not disaggregate information for the nonprofit sector, only by the manufacturing, service and knowledge industries. The 2015 follow-up study re-affirmed intersectional experiences of precarious work. It found that white women were the only group to report an increase in secure employment and a decrease in precarious employment in 2014, while racialized women had an

<sup>17</sup> Data was taken from the 2016 Labour Force Survey and weighted using annual weights.

increase of over 20% in precarious employment (Lewchuk et al “The Precarity Penalty” 31). Qualitative studies on immigrant and racialized women have found that they may experience lengthy periods of unemployment between precarious jobs and as a response do extensive volunteer work and informal income generating work as well as experience negative health outcomes (Abugala et al 8; Premji 128).

Authors Cranford and Vosko argue that forms of employment that fall outside of SER - precarious work - have historically and continue to be associated with women’s work and that women and immigrant and/or racialized men and women have always been employed precariously (Cranford and Vosko 459). That is, the SER model is the normative model of (white) male employment in Canada post World War II and on which labour legislation is based (Cranford and Vosko 455; Lewchuk et al “Origins of Precarity” 7). Cranford and Vosko explain that women do not “choose” to be in part-time and temporary forms of employment but rather end up there because of stereotypical gender roles, inequitable distribution of unpaid work in the home where the burden falls on women, and gendered occupational and industrial segregation (Cranford and Vosko 459-460). These structural factors have in the past (and to a somewhat lesser extent today) contributed to the relative advantage of men’s labour market position and the concentration of precarious employment amongst women (Cranford and Vosko 459-460).

Precarious work has more recently proliferated in the labour market and has now impacted male-dominated sectors and occupations (Cranford and Vosko 459; Lewchuk et al “Origins of Precarity” 7; Moyser 4). While this proliferation may have closed the gender precarity gap, it is not because women are doing better; it is just that men are doing worse. The 2013 PEPSO report found that men and women were equally present in “secure” and “precarious” clusters (Lewchuk et al “It’s More than Poverty” 26). This is a result of multiple changes that have impacted traditionally male-dominated industries and male class jobs. Such as, hyper-globalization, increasing advancement in technology, communication and transportation, decline in manufacturing; and falling unionization rates; (Moyser 26; Lewchuk et al “It’s More than Poverty” 26). The authors of *It’s More than Poverty* contend that women benefited from more “secure” employment in sectors such as healthcare, education, and the public service in Ontario (Lewchuk et al “It’s More than Poverty” 26). A similar trend was noted in the follow-up 2015 report where SER jobs declined more for men than it did for women (Lewchuk et al “It’s More than Poverty” 27). Melissa Moyser in *Women in Canada Gender-based Statistical Report - Women and Paid Work* points out that jobs are more broadly increasing in the services-producing sectors - traditionally female-dominated industries, which was a similar trend found in the 2016 Census (Moyser 26; Statistics Canada “Labour in Canada: Key Results from the 2016 Census”). However, the quality of jobs in growing sectors such as healthcare, education, public sector and more broadly in the services-producing sector, that are traditionally female, is unclear. *It’s More than Poverty* has reported that retail dominates the services-producing sector and “Today, retail - an industry that typically pays below-average wages, lacks security and offers few benefits - is the leading employment sector in the economy (Lewchuk et al “It’s More than Poverty” 26). Historically higher unionization rates in healthcare, education and public services play a role in better quality jobs than in the services-producing sector such as retail where unionization rates are low.

# What is distinctive about the nonprofit sector?

## The sector makes an often unacknowledged contribution to society

This sector plays a significant role in Ontario and Canadian society that is distinct from those played by the for-profit and public sectors. Contrary to the common assumption that nonprofits are an economic “drain”, the sector has made significant contributions to the economy that are on par or exceed other industries. The second phase of the 2003 national NSNVO research project highlights that the estimated 161 000 organizations operating in the sector in Canada (Hall et al 10-11). The *Satellite Account of Non-profit Institutions and Volunteering* indicated that the nonprofit sector accounted for 2.5% of GDP (excluding hospitals and post-secondary institutions), in 2006 core public benefit nonprofits generated 20% more GDP than the entire accommodation and food services industry, more than 2.5 times that of agriculture and 6 times as much as the auto industry (Hagggar-Guénette et al 10). The Ontario nonprofit sector is a critical nonprofit hub within Canada as it accounts for 43% of all revenues in Canada’s nonprofit sector, 28%<sup>18</sup> of organizations (second to Quebec with 29%), and it houses a number of large high-revenue organizations that have a national reach (Hall et al 12, 20-21, 30). Currently, it is estimated that Ontario has 55 000 nonprofit organizations and is a \$50 billion dollar economic driver (ONN “Open For Business” 7).

It is the combination of the sector’s community-led governance and its focus on public benefit that sets it apart from the other two sectors. It provides a social good to people in communities and spends its money not in paying profits but in reinvesting in the work that it does and in its local communities and ensures communities retain assets (ONN “Introducing the “Public Benefit Nonprofit Sector” 1). This translates into critical programs and services for some of the most vulnerable communities, opportunities for civic engagement and volunteerism across life cycles, and strong social justice advocacy on pertinent public policy issues (Hagggar-Guénette et al 6; Shields et al 33; YWCA Hamilton 32). In other words, nonprofits create and distribute value and wealth in more inclusive and environmentally sustainable ways through decent work, social enterprises, co-operatives, community land trusts, and more (ONN “Introducing the “Public Benefit Nonprofit Sector” 11). John Shields, Donna Baines, and Ian Cunningham explain that the nonprofit sector increasingly occupies an important position in society where there is a shrinking state and a retreat of government responsibility for social provision (Shields et al 32). The sector is expected to fill gaps in services and partner with government for delivery of (leaner) services (Shields et al 32). They comment that despite incredible stress, the sector is growing to meet these needs and expectations (Shields et al 32).

---

<sup>18</sup> Numbers are not controlled for population size, i.e number of organizations relative to population of community.

Nonprofits have an ear to the ground and are positioned to see firsthand when communities are struggling, and to mobilize people to create bold and lasting solutions (ONN “Introducing the “Public Benefit Nonprofit Sector”<sup>10</sup>). It is “...an important force in meeting Canada’s social, economic, cultural, and environmental objectives...As a social mission sector, it is expert in delivering social, economic, and environmental solutions, especially at the community level” (Emmett 1). With particular relevance to this project, the presence of feminist nonprofits helped to build the women’s movement in Canada, bringing to light issues of women’s health, reproductive rights, and domestic violence (YWCA Hamilton 32-33). Recently, many nonprofit organizations such as the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives and YWCA have been part of successful advocacy on raising the minimum wage in Ontario and including a gender lens on the National Housing Strategy in Canada.

## A large sector of mostly small employers

In 2003 Ontario accounted for 47% of nonprofit organizations in Canada with paid staff totalling just under 1 million<sup>19</sup> (Hall et al 10-11; Scott et al VI-VIII). More than half of Ontario organizations had fewer than five employees, while 15% had between five and nine employees, and 6% had 100 or more paid staff (Scott et al 35-26). Organizations (excluding hospitals and post-secondary institutions) with large revenues only accounted for a small percentage of sector organizations but employed the largest share of paid staff while organizations with the smallest revenues accounted for the largest percentage of sector organizations but employed the smallest number of staff (Scott et al 40). This interesting split signals that a “one size fits all” HR strategy cannot be implemented in the sector. The largest number of paid staff outside of hospitals and post-secondary institutions were in the Development and Housing (15%) and Social Services (13%) subsectors, indicating that a large portion of the labour force was engaged in care work (Scott et al 37). *Shaping the Future’s Looking Ahead Leadership Survey* found Social and Human Services, and large and very large organizations, are also more likely to be unionized (McIsaac et al 14).

## Distinct challenges and trends impact the labour force

Human capital in the nonprofit sector is its greatest strength and is key in visioning, leading, delivering critical programs and services, achieving its objectives, and advocating in the public policy arena for communities’ most vulnerable people (Edwardh and Clutterbuck 3; Hall et al “The Capacity to Service” VIII). However, often the nonprofit sector’s distinctive challenges and trends become barriers to providing decent work to its women-majority workforce. This also unknowingly undermines gender equity. Organizations can become stuck between investing in program demands, on one hand, and in organizational support, management, and infrastructure, on the other, losing sight of the inherent connection between the health and effectiveness of the organization and its ability to meet its mission and mandate (Lalande and Ymeren 3).

### **Restricted funding in a climate of resource constraints**

The nonprofit sector is often functioning in a climate of resource constraints because of its mission driven purpose. In Ontario in 2003, government funding (grants and contributions, payment for good and services delivered) accounted for 29% of revenue; 45% came from earned income (memberships, sales of goods and services, investment income, charitable gaming); 22% from donations and gifts (from individuals, corporations and other organizations); and 4% from other sources (Scott et al 16). The funding mix a nonprofit’s budget consists of depends on its primary activity, as it may make them more reliant on one source of funding, namely government (Scott et al 20-21).

---

<sup>19</sup> Only one third of them were employed in hospitals and post-secondary institutions.

The nonprofit sector's revenue generating model has historically and to date heavily relied on restricted funding. Although the numbers above highlight a mixture of revenue, it does not highlight the quality of revenue, the restricted and unrestricted sources of funding that shape organizations' daily budgets. Restricted funding means money that has deliverables and/or outcomes and/or directions attached while unrestricted means money the organization can use as it directs. The NSNVO project found that financial capacity issues were raised as the greatest challenge to meeting missions, and not just more money but "better money" that was stable, longer-term, helped fund core operations, and gave organizations autonomy to direct their operations and programs (Hall et al "The Capacity to Service" VIII). NSNVO participants identified external factors such as government downloading and funding cutbacks, emphasis on project funding, increased competition for scarce resources, declining availability of human capital, mandated collaboration, and negative public and media perceptions impacting financial health of their organizations (Hall et al "The Capacity to Service" VIII). ONN's 2015 report ChangeWork highlights similar trends, adding increased focus on measuring outcomes and impact accountability which is driving up administration costs (Lalande and Ymeren 22-23).

Resource constraints can also be exacerbated by legislative and regulatory structures, impacting long-term planning and flexibility of organizations (Lalande and Ymeren 22). For example, the Pay Equity Act was particularly difficult for nonprofit organizations to implement when it came into effect as it requires critical HR support for implementation and resources to cover any pay equity liabilities. More recently, while Ontario's nonprofit sector has in principle welcomed the new Fair Workplaces, Better Jobs Act 2017<sup>20</sup> which increases minimum wage and provides other protections for employees, not all subsectors have seen an increase in its funding to support the increase in costs.

Inevitably resource constraints impact employment conditions as human resources is usually the first part of a budget to be cut back (McIsaac et al 4). ONN's Shaping the Future report points out that this tendency results in increased part-time and contract employment, non-competitive wages, increased shift work, and fewer benefits and pensions which in turn contributes to job dissatisfaction and may result in people leaving the nonprofit sector for more stable employment (McIsaac et al 3).

### **Overly restrictive regulatory environment creates significant burdens**

Ontario nonprofits operate under a significant regulatory burden that has only increased with time, adding overhead costs to already stretched organizations. The Ontario Government's 2012 *Open for Business - Business Sector Strategy: Not-for-Profit Sector* report identified significant opportunities to reduce the regulatory burden for Ontario nonprofits and there has been slow progress on many of these priorities (Government of Ontario and Ontario Nonprofit Network). For example, on top of any statutory requirements for specific subsectors (such as staffing ratios and licensing and reporting requirements for child care centres or nursing homes), many nonprofits must meet a host of regulatory, financial and program-related requirements under incorporation laws (e.g., the Ontario Corporations Act), provincial transfer payment agreements, federal Income Tax Act rules and charity regulations, the Broader Public Sector Accountability Act (for procurement), employment standards and labour relations regulations, health and safety rules, police record checks legislation, the Public Sector Salary Disclosure Act (for executive salaries), the Lobbyist Registration Act (for government meetings) and registration/reporting as "third-party advertisers" under the Ontario Election Finances Act if they undertake policy advocacy during election periods. This difficult regulatory burden adds to nonprofit staff workloads, contributing to potential burnout and increased turnover.

---

<sup>20</sup> [Bill 148, Fair Workplaces, Better Jobs Act, 2017](#)

## **Complex sector narrative**

The nonprofit sector narrative is complex as there are multiple facets to it that are mutually reinforcing. It is important to understand because the way in which the sector is understood is directly linked to women's work and more broadly impacts decent work in the sector. The sector is understood as "do gooder", "caring", "helping" and "altruistic" because of its use of the charity model (organized helped), its public benefit missions and mandates, and its roots in religious organizations as well as women's private sphere work. In fact, Paula Maurutto's work on charity and public welfare history in Ontario notes how in the 1830s funding was channeled through through local charities and/or women's organizations as it was a way to obscure the extent of government involvement in relief (Maurutto). The racialized gendered division of labour has made it so that caregiving work particularly became that of immigrant, racialized, and low-income women. It is no coincidence the nonprofit sector is a women-majority sector. For this reason, the narrative of the sector includes that those working in the sector should not be paid as well and be focused on their working conditions, rather all efforts and money should be focused on programs and clients. ONN's *Changework report* notes that there is selfless concern for the well-being of others and a desire to only personally benefit when all people in the community can benefit, for example with fair wages (Lalande and Ymeren 24). This narrative allows for the prevalence of damaging myths about the sector, such as the overhead myth where low charity overhead is characterized as an indicator of high performance<sup>21</sup>.

*Changework* highlights how this narrative impacts employment. In situations where leadership is deeply focused on community service, employees may be encouraged or expected to adopt this narrative to forego salary increases, professional development activities, and stable employment (Lalande and Ymeren 24). Lalande and Ymeren explain that especially in areas that involve service delivery, employees reported feeling obligated to carry out duties above and beyond their positions because of the negative effects on clients and community if the work was not carried out (Lalande and Ymeren 22).

## **Precarious working conditions are tied to the sector's resource constraints and complex narrative**

The nonprofit sector is characterized by unstable employment in the form of part-time and contract work. In his 2011 report, Zizys found that the proportion of women in the Toronto CMA working part-time in the nonprofit sector was similar to the overall workforce numbers at the time (2006), (21.4% for overall workforce and 22.0% for nonprofit) (Zizys 13). Although men were less often in part-time roles compared to women in the nonprofit sector, they were in part-time roles at double the rate compared to men in other industries (10.9% vs. 19.0%). *Shaping the Future's Looking Ahead Leadership Survey* also sheds light on precarious work within the sector and found that for organizations with at least one paid employee, approximately 53% of employees are in full-time permanent positions, 28% are part-time, and 19% are contract workers (McIsaac et al 15-16). These numbers followed the broader precarious work trend highlighted in the The Poverty and Employment Precarity in Southern Ontario (PEPSO) research project (McIsaac et al 16). While the data does not indicate stability or choices of those employed in the part-time and contract positions (flexibility and temporariness can be seen as an attractive feature of working in it), qualitative data from the *Changework* report highlights concern around growing prevalence of part-time, contract, and project-funding based precarious positions (Lalande and Ymeren 14).

---

<sup>21</sup>See [Furniture Bank - Charity Overhead, A Graphic Re-Visioning of Nonprofit Overhead](#)

John Shields, Donna Baines and Ian Cunningham state that while precarious employment is part of every sector now, the ways in which it manifests itself within the nonprofit sector is noteworthy (Shields et al 31). It has been particularly susceptible and as a result several dimensions of precarity are highly visible in the sector (Shields et al 31). They explain that precarity exists at three mutually reinforcing levels in the sector (1) in the nonprofit organization itself (2) within the nonprofit workforce and (3) within the lives of the clients and communities served by nonprofit organizations (Shields et al 32). Shields et al argue that neoliberal funding structures and accountability regimes resulting in the imposition of business models and work processes produce precarious work in the nonprofit sector (Shields et al 31, 37). As also echoed in ONN's *Changework* report, changes in funding from flexible and stable core funding to competitive, short-term, program-based financing where there is continuous drive to control spending and lower overhead costs impacts the salaries and benefits budget line (Shields et al 42). This has been argued in other body of literature as well (Baines and Cunningham "'White Knuckle Care Work': Violence, Gender and New Public Management in the Voluntary Sector"; Baines et al "Filling the gap"; Baines et al "Not Profiting from Precarity"; Baines et. al "Self-Monitoring, self-blaming, self-sacrificing workers"; Cunningham et al "Austerity policies, 'precarity' and the nonprofit workforce", Fanelli et al ). Between 2012 - 2015, they conducted three case studies of multi-service nonprofit organizations in Ontario all of similar size (100+). They asked participants about changes they had experienced in the last few years, reasons for working and staying in the sector, and experiences of working in the sector. Their data showed that there is little security of employment, wages and benefits are low, and worker stress is high (Shields et al 42). More importantly, "The sector's caregiving instinct is increasingly used to extract more and more unpaid labour in the form of free overtime and an increased reliance on volunteers to fill gaps" (Shields et al 42.)

### **Demographic changes are shaping the the labour force composition**

Mclsaac et al state that changes in demographics (an aging population, intergenerational cultural change, and immigration) are shaping Ontario's nonprofit sector labour force (Mclsaac et al 2). First, an aging population means that there is an impending retirement "tsunami" that will impact most significantly the leadership level and have serious implications for succession planning and engaging younger generations (Mclsaac et al 2). It is coined a "tsunami" because the rate of retirement of leaders is expected to be higher than those entering the workforce and/or ready to take on leadership positions. An aging population also impacts certain nonprofit subsectors as it entails a focus on elder/senior care and investment in new sector initiatives aimed at making strategic use of people's time and talent after they leave the world of full-time work (Mclsaac et al 2). Second, an intergenerational workplace may mean conflict in the way in which work is conceived, particularly if an organization's culture has been shaped by the older generation. For example, Mclsaac et al note that younger workers use technology to blend work and life seamlessly into their day, an open-concept workspace without regard to hierarchy is often preferred, and telecommuting/flex work hours are preferred (Mclsaac et al 3). Many younger workers want their performance to be evaluated on results, not presence (Mclsaac et al 3).

The third demographic change is increasing rates of immigration, as in Ontario they have been used as a source of growing the labour force, and the growing diversity in Ontario. For the nonprofit sector, immigrants are not only an important source of talent, but it also means that communities and service users are increasingly diverse, and the organizations that serve them need to reflect this change (Mclsaac 3). The nonprofit sector in Ontario has seen a proliferation in conversations around diversity, equity, and inclusion both internally as communities demand that organizations reflect the populations they serve and externally so the needs of diverse communities are met better with culturally competent services. The sector also consists of ethno- and religion-specific organizations and organizations whose missions and mandates are specifically to serve religious, racialized, and/or immigrant communities.

# Decent Work Agenda for the Nonprofit Sector

Over the years, ONN has actively been working on Ontario's nonprofit sector labour market issues through multiple research projects and more recently by building a [Decent Work movement](#) in the nonprofit sector by adopting the International Labour Organization's (ILO) concept of Decent Work. It provides a framework in which social protection and inclusion goals are explicitly linked to employment and economic growth (Lalande and Ymeren 5). ONN has identified and explored in depth seven elements of ILO's concept of decent work that apply to the sector (Lalande and Ymeren):

- **Employment Opportunities:** Access to quality jobs, including recruitment and retention of workers with diverse backgrounds and skill sets.
- **Fair Income:** Adequate earnings, social protections, and predictable income that ensure income security.
- **Health and Retirement Benefits:** Health (health including drugs and vision, dental, life insurance) and retirement (pension or contribution to an RRSP) benefits are key to dignity in the workplace and an essential part of making the sector an employer of choice.
- **Stable Employment:** Employment protections and specific policies and mechanisms that can be put in place to support sectors that are characterized by high turnover, season or unpredictable work.
- **Opportunities for Development and Advancement:** Access to both formal opportunities and a culture of growth in an organization in the form of professional development (training and learning) and advancement for workers.
- **Equality Rights at Work:** Employees being able to express their concerns, participate equally and feel included and safe in the workplace.
- **Culture and Leadership:** The regulations, standards and leadership norms that govern workplaces, management styles and work cultures particularly impact the ability of workers to balance work, family and personal time, and receive fair treatment in employment.

# A gendered division of labour translates into unequal labour market patterns

## Traditional gender roles shape what is women's work

Literature over the years and across disciplines has highlighted the gendered division of labour where work is divided based on traditional gender roles (Hayes 2; International Labour Organization 1; LeBlanc 27; Moyser 22). Gender stereotypes position women's role as natural caregivers and men's role as natural providers (evolutionary biology) (Baines and Cunningham 763; Perrone et al 2). In turn, the labour market and access to it is gendered. This includes form of labour (paid/unpaid, volunteer, 'informal' i.e black market, paid in cash), the occupation and the skills and responsibilities associated with the labour, the sphere in which the labour is performed (public vs. private), and in which industry. What is designated as men's work and women's work is viewed and valued unequally. Men's' labour, usually in the form of paid employment in the public sphere, and its corresponding skills, experience, industries and occupations is valued while women's labour in the form of unpaid work in the private sphere, and its corresponding skills, experience, industries and occupations are not.

Unpaid work includes household work, caregiving, subsistence activities, and unpaid family work that is counted under another member of the household (Werner et al). This work is often devalued because it is not defined in "...conventional statistics as paid activities linked to the market...Despite efforts of several generations of feminist scholars to make unpaid work visible, it remains marginalized in most methods of measuring economic activity" (Werner et al). However, it is valuable. The last valuation of unpaid work in Canada in 1998 stated that 94% was completed in the household and was worth \$279 billion, with women contributing the most (Hamdad 11). Unpaid household work benefits those in the home and in the community (Hamdad 11). If not carried out by women in the household, it would then either have to be completed by a paid caregiver, cut into the time of those in paid employment in the household, or taken on by the state in the form of social assistance and health programs.

## Inequitable distribution of unpaid work in the home creates inequities in the workplace and vice versa

The social and economic costs associated with sustaining oneself and dependents are directly related to an individual's capacity to engage in the labour force (Werner et al). For this reason, the disproportionate burden of unpaid labour within the home on women impacts their access and participation in the labour market worsens inequality as it limits their time to participate in economic, social, and political activities (Lambert and McInturff 3). In short, unpaid work in the home hurts women's economic advancement (LeBlanc 32). Canada and Ontario's current care structure for the home, children, aging and/or sick family members, and family members with disabilities relies on unpaid caregiving, the majority of which is done by women in the private sphere (Austin et al "Final Report and Recommendations" 20). According to Statistics Canada's 2015 *Time Use Survey*, women still contribute the most time to unpaid housework and child care (Houle et al 3). Women do more household work regardless of how long they spend on paid work, 86% of women who worked 8 hours or more during the day performed household work in comparison to 65% of men who had worked 8 hours or more (Houle et al 3). The survey does note that

the division of household labour has changed over the past 30 years, where the difference between men and women doing household work is decreasing (Houle et al 4). However, the decrease is attributed to an increase in men sharing responsibilities and not to women doing less (Houle et al 4). Moreover, women are more likely than men to miss days at work, retire at an earlier age, quit or lose their job, or turn down job offers due to unpaid care activities (Austin et al “Final Report and Recommendations” 20-21). 70% of claims under Employment Insurance (EI) Compassionate Care Program were women (Government of Canada 17).

A disproportionate caregiving burden coupled with lack of access to affordable childcare constrains women’s choices related to the labour market (LeBlanc 38; Lambert and McInturff 13; McInturff “Time to Grow Up” 12, Moyser 2,16). These constraints include whether they should work or not, the kinds of jobs they can take on and in which sectors, and the hours they are able to work. In order for women to work outside the home, their work in the home needs to be supplemented (Goodman and Kaplan). It may make more financial sense for a woman to stay at home than work to pay for daycare (especially if she is earning less than her partner) or to work in flexible and/or part-time jobs that do not compromise work-life balance (LeBlanc 38; Lambert and McInturff 13; McInturff “Time to Grow Up” 12). Melissa Moyser in *Women in Canada Gender-based Statistical Report - Women and Paid Work* states that the reason most cited by women for working part-time was caring for children which in turn impacted their earnings (Moyser 16). Women are more likely to participate in the labour force if childcare is accessible and affordable (McInturff “Time to Grow Up” 12). Across the country, regions with higher daycare fees have a higher gender employment gap<sup>22</sup> (Moyser 16).

Economic and social benefits of universal child care, especially on women’s employment, are well researched and documented (Lambert and McInturff 13; McInturff “Time to Grow Up”; McInturff “Study: The Economic Leadership and Prosperity of Canadian Women” 1). Recently, the federal government has taken other steps to mitigate the constrained choices women face when it comes to paid employment. Federally regulated workplaces will offer a “use-it or lose-it” 5 week parental leave incentive for the second parent (aimed at fathers) to share parental responsibilities and an option of taking an 18 month parental leave at a lower earnings replacement rate of 33% for greater flexibility.

Women’s role as caregivers shape how employers think of them, resulting in discrimination (Moyser 3). Policies described as family-friendly are sometimes applicable to only women, upholding their role as caregivers, dissuading men from seeking to be equal caregivers (LeBlanc 28). Instead, family-friendly policies should be gender-neutral to support men and women in their caregiving roles (LeBlanc 28). In doing so, it relieves the women of the stigma as the only ones taking time off work to care. If everyone is doing it, it is more likely to be seen as a norm and not a burden on employers.

## Women's work is often care work, which results in occupational and industry segregation

Women’s roles in the private sphere are designated as women’s work in the public sphere (International Labour Organization “The Gender Gap in Employment”; Moyser 22). Consequently, historically and to a somewhat lesser extent recently, women have been concentrated in occupations and over-represented in industries that parallel their traditional gender roles (Moyser 22). This phenomenon is known as occupational and industry segregation. Most of these occupations and industries are care work related and are predominantly located in the public and nonprofit sectors, which encompass health, education,

---

<sup>22</sup> The difference between the number of women and men in any paid work at a job or business including self-employment.

social services, home care, community living for people with disabilities, child care, and women's shelters (Austin et al "Final Report and Recommendations" 32; Baines et al 364). Care occupations, which are often viewed as female-class jobs, include personal support workers, nurses, home-care workers, domestic workers, and community front-line workers. Care occupations and industries are viewed as unskilled (requiring little education), low-value, and are low-paid as they are seen as an extension of women's labour in the private sphere (Austin et al "Final Report and Recommendations" 20-23; International Labour Organization "The Gender Gap in Employment"). In other words, the feminization of care work occurs because care work is designated as women's work. Occupational and industry segregation can be self-reinforcing, as there are more female-class jobs in women-majority industries than in others (Kühn et al 12; Moyser 23).

In Canada, industry segregation occurs for women at more than double the rate of men (Moyser 22). In 2015, the three industries with the greatest share of women relative to men were health care and social assistance (82.4%), educational services (69.3%), and accommodation and food services (58.5%) (Moyser 22 & 23). The proportion of women who worked in these industries was 41.0%, versus 13.1% of men (Moyser 22). The same three industries that had the greatest share of women in 2015 did so in 1976 as well: health care and social assistance, accommodation and food services, and educational services (Moyser 22). The proportion of women in all women-majority industries increased between 1976 and 2015, from 35.4% to 59.6% (Moyser 22).

Occupations in which women are concentrated (female-class jobs) are typically at lower levels in an organization than men's occupations (male-class jobs) (Moyser 23). Even in industries in which the women are over-represented, women's occupations are at lower levels than men's (Moyser 23). In Canada, most women are still employed in traditionally female occupations, in which they have been concentrated historically (Moyser 23). More specifically, 56.0% of women were employed in caring, clerical, catering, cashiering and cleaning occupations; this has not changed much from 1987, when 59.2% of women were employed in these occupations (Moyser 23). Recently released Census 2016 data shows that women outnumbered men four to one among fast-growing health occupations, while men outnumbered women three to one in high-tech occupations (Statistics Canada "Labour in Canada: Key Results from the 2016 Census" 1). Among women, retail salespersons accounted for 355,620 people, or 4.3% of total female employment followed by registered nurses and registered psychiatric nurses (3.2%), cashiers (3.1%), elementary school and kindergarten teachers (2.9%) and administrative assistants (2.8%) (Statistics Canada "Labour in Canada: Key Results from the 2016 Census" 11). More managerial positions were occupied by men than by women in May 2016 (62.2% versus 37.8%) (Statistics Canada "Labour in Canada: Key Results from the 2016 Census" 13). Although the share of women in these occupations increased from 36.5% in 2006 to 37.8% in 2016, significant gender differences persisted in managerial occupations in agriculture, construction and manufacturing (Statistics Canada "Labour in Canada: Key Results from the 2016 Census" 13). At the same time, women outnumbered men in managerial occupations in finance, advertising, marketing and public relations, health, and education (Statistics Canada "Labour in Canada: Key Results from the 2016 Census" 13).

# The nonprofit sector is women-majority but not always women-led

## A women-majority sector

Using Statistics Canada industry and occupation data for 2006, Tom Zizys found that women make up 84.2% of the Toronto CMA<sup>23</sup> nonprofit labour force and 84.8% of the nonprofit labour force in Ontario (Zizys 5). Based on the 2008 results of the (defunct) HR Council for the Nonprofit Sector quantitative study of Canadian nonprofit sector employees, women make up 75% of the nonprofit sector labour force in Canada (HR Council 1). The 2006 figures include those employed and unemployed in the labour force whereas the 2008 numbers only include those employed. Community Development Halton's (CDH) *Halton Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Labour Force* study found that 89.5% of the employees in 81 responding agencies identified as women, while one employee identified as transgender (Edwardh et al 21). Charity Village's *Canadian Nonprofit Sector Salary & Benefits Study* across 2011, 2013 and 2017 also reported that the nonprofit sector consists primarily of women workers at all position levels and that there have been no material changes since when the first survey was issued in 2011 (Charity Village).

Zizys also found that women and men were concentrated in specific subsectors in the sector. In the Toronto CMA, women were particularly concentrated in child day-care services (95.9%), Individual and family services (82.3%), and outpatient care centres (81.1%) while men were concentrated in community food & housing, emergency and other relief (35.0%), Social Advocacy organizations (29.2%), and Civic and Social Organizations (28.4%) (Zizys 10-11). The report noted that the figures for Ontario as a whole are comparable. .

Sara Charlesworth and Baines et al provide analysis for why the sector is women majority. Charlesworth argues in her work *The Regulation of Paid Care Workers' Wages and Conditions in the Non-profit Sector: A Toronto Case Study* that gender is a key structuring regulatory force in delivering social services and in the wages and conditions of care workers, this is why there is an overwhelming presence of women workers in the sector (Charlesworth 390). Baines et al state in their work that the selfless altruism assumed of staff in the sector overlaps with and reinforces the selfless and endless sacrifice assumed from mothers and other female caregivers (Baines et al 364). Further, that it is often difficult to differentiate between the ideal nonprofit employee and the assumed and "naturalised" female focus on relationship, care of others and boundless capacity to put the needs of others ahead of one's own (Baines et al 354).

## More women in senior leadership positions compared to other sectors

When compared to other sectors, the nonprofit sector emerges as an inclusive workplace for women leaders. The 2013 *Looking Ahead Leadership Survey* found that 72% of its leader respondents in Ontario were women (McIsaac and Moody 2). The 2015 Peel Leadership Centre's executive director survey found that 55% of leader respondents were women (down from 63% in 2013) and 45% were male (up from 36% in 2013) in Peel region (Peel Leadership Centre 3). The 2017 national *Boland Survey of Nonprofit Sector*

---

<sup>23</sup> Toronto CMA includes Halton (excluding Burlington), Peel (including Orangeville and Mono), York, Toronto, and Durham (including only Uxbridge, Pickering, Ajax).

*Salaries and Human Resource Practices*<sup>24</sup> report found that across the nonprofit sector in Canada, 62.6% of CEOs were women and 37.4% were men, which was consistent with previous year findings (CCVO 7). However, most of these surveys do not provide size and revenue details of the organizations men lead and of the ones women lead.

The 2016 *Visible Minorities and Women in Senior Leadership Positions: London, Hamilton and Ottawa* investigated the prevalence of women and racialized women<sup>25</sup> in leadership positions in the municipal public and nonprofit sectors in London, Hamilton and Ottawa<sup>26</sup>. Its authors Medianu and Esses found that when compared to the municipal public sector, education sector, and municipal agencies, boards and commissions, the nonprofit sector (referred to as the voluntary sector in the report) in all three cities had the highest representation of women senior leaders (Medianu and Esses 19).

---

<b>City</b>	<b>% of population that identifies as women</b>	<b>% of women leaders in the nonprofit sector</b>	<b>% of leaders across sectors</b>
London	51.4%	55.1%	44.5%
Hamilton	51.2%	55.7%	45.6%
Ottawa	51.3%	48.9%	44.3%

---

*Medianu and Esses pg 8-9*

City of employment emerged as an influential factor when analyzing the gender balance of leadership positions in the nonprofit sector. According to Medianu and Esses', in both London and Hamilton the share of women in senior leadership positions in the sector was above their population share (Medianu and Esses 8-9). However, in Ottawa their share in senior leadership positions in the sector was below their population share.

Employing the same methodology, the 2017 *EXCLerator Project: Women & Diversity in Executive and Community Leadership*<sup>27</sup> report benchmarked the extent of gendered and racialized<sup>28</sup> disparities in senior leadership positions across nine sectors, one of which was the nonprofit sector<sup>29</sup>, in the City of Hamilton and the Regional Municipality of Halton (YWCA Hamilton 8)<sup>30</sup>. Consistent with its 2014 findings, in comparison to others the nonprofit sector had the greatest proportion of women in leadership. Women

---

<sup>24</sup> Conducted from June to September 2017, by the Calgary Chamber of Voluntary Organizations (CCVO) the survey includes data from 282 organizations from 10 provinces representing 29 672 paid staff. 265 organizations across Canada submitted data for CEO position. 40 organizations representing 10 400 paid staff in Ontario participated.

<sup>25</sup> The term visible minorities as defined by Statistics Canada was used instead of racialized.

<sup>26</sup> 2415 leadership positions were analyzed for their racialized status and 2500 leadership positions were analyzed for their gender.

<sup>27</sup> Identified the 20 largest registered charities in each community based on 2015 donations totals as reported by the Canada Revenue Agency. Across the 60 organizations, 844 leaders were identified.

<sup>28</sup> The term Visible Minority in the report is used.

<sup>29</sup> Registered charities, voluntary and nonprofit organizations

<sup>30</sup> Identified and recorded current gender and racial data for 2,436 leaders in the City of Hamilton and Halton Regional Municipality.

overall held 51.0% of senior leadership positions in 2016 (YWCA Hamilton 34). In particular, women were in 52.5% of senior management positions and in 48.7% of board positions (YWCA Hamilton 34). In this project, women were better represented in senior management and board positions in Halton than in Hamilton (YWCA Hamilton 34).

### Women are more likely to lead organizations with smaller revenues

The sector may in part appear as a more inclusive space for women’s leadership because, as stated above, the sector predominantly consists of smaller nonprofit organizations and women are more likely to lead smaller nonprofit organizations. The 2017 *Boland* report sheds light on this analysis. It found that women were significantly more likely than men to lead organizations with smaller operating budgets, which made up half of the sector while men were more likely to lead organizations with larger operating budgets, which made up a very small portion of the sector (CCVO 7).

---

<b>Operating Budget</b>	<b>% of Organizations</b>	<b>% of Women CEOs</b>	<b>% of Men CEOs</b>
Less than \$5 million	55.1%	67.8%	32.2%
Between \$5 and \$10 million	17.4%	71.7	28.3%
Between \$10 and \$20 million	12.8%	50.0%	50.0%
More than \$20 million	14.7%	43.6%	56.4%

---

CCVO 7

Across budget levels and regardless of organizational size, men were more likely to be associated with larger average operating budgets, almost double the size of what women were associated with (CCVO 7). The report disaggregated their data on CEOs by years of service and age, finding that there was no significant difference between men and women CEOs along these lines (CCVO 7). This implies that the difference in men and women leadership of organizations can be attributed to gender inequity, particularly gendered conceptions of leadership.

### Based on employment share in the sector, women are underrepresented in senior leadership positions while men are overrepresented

Senior leadership and management positions in the sector are disproportionately occupied by men while women are overrepresented in frontline, administrative and support staff positions (Baines et al 364; Charity Village 28; Edwardh 22; HR Council 1; Zizys 27). The HR Council report noted that an exception to this finding in their work were health and social services sector where women were better represented in senior positions as they were more concentrated in these subsectors (HR Council 1). Using 2006 data, Zizys’ analysis of occupations within the nonprofit sector in Toronto CMA<sup>31</sup> found that women made up 65.8% of senior manager positions which falls short of women’s 84.2% employment share in the sector in Toronto CMA (Zizys 27). In the second highest occupation of managers in social, community and

---

<sup>31</sup> The report provides detailed percentages of full-time and full-year women workers in various occupations; it notes that the numbers reflect workers in other industries as well as the nonprofit sector, but most are concentrated in the nonprofit sector (Zizys 27).

correctional services, women held 64.9% of these positions in Toronto and 65.3% of those positions in the rest of Ontario minus Toronto (Zizys 35). Percentages of women in the second highest level of occupation were unavailable. In the next levels of occupations (social workers, family, marriage and other related counsellors, and community and social service workers), there was more gender parity in women’s employment share compared to how many of them work in the whole sector and their income as compared to men’s (Zizys 35). In the early childhood educators and assistants occupation, women occupied 97% of the positions and earned more than men in the occupation; however, this is also the lowest paid occupation (Zizys 30).

2017 *Salary & Benefits Study* by Charity Village<sup>32</sup> found that women and men made up the following percentages of workers at each position level:

---

<b>Position</b>	<b>% of Women</b>	<b>% of Men</b>
Level 6: Support Staff	82%	18%
Level 5: Functional and Program Staff	82%	18%
Level 4: Management/Supervisory Staff	79%	21%
Level 3: Senior Management	74%	26%
Level 2: Senior Executives	66%	34%
Level 1: Chief Executives	71%	29%

---

### *Charity Village 28*

Women’s share of Support Staff, Functional and Program Staff, and Management/Supervisory Staff positions are relatively comparable to women’s employment share in the nonprofit sector in Canada (at 80%). However, their share declines at the Senior Executives and Chief Executives positions (Charity Village 28). On the other hand, while over men working in the sector are a minority, their employment share in the sector is the lowest at levels 5 and 6 and increases as the position increases. Baines et al states that men often quickly rise to administration and management positions in women-majority sectors because it assumed they have the technical and leadership capacities (Baines et al 354).

### Gender is a strong influencer once women are in senior leadership positions

Only one piece of literature in Ontario and Canada on women’s leadership experiences in the nonprofit sector was found. It was a 2014 PhD dissertation by Michelle Hawco in the School of Business and Technology at Capella University. She investigated career trajectories of female executive directors in Canada’s nonprofit social service sector. The dissertation specifically pointed out that studies addressing women’s career trajectories to senior leadership positions in the nonprofit sector are limited as most focus on the for-profit, public, or male-dominated sectors<sup>33</sup>. Hawco conducted interviews with 15 women Executive Directors (which she defines as equivalent to CEOs), aged 18 to 65 in social service

<sup>32</sup> 1,016 organizations participated, reporting 4,105 positions, and representing 14,879 employees.

<sup>33</sup> Career Trajectories of Female Executive Directors in Canada’s Nonprofit Social Service Sector: A phenomenological study pg 2

organizations in Canada to explore their career trajectories to the Executive Director position. Interestingly, 60% of participants in her research also indicated that their agencies' budgets fell below \$5 million per year (Hawco 67). She found that participants experienced gender barriers in their career progression in the nonprofit sector, but identified gender specifically as a stronger influencer of barriers once being appointed to the Executive Director position (Hawco 95).

She found that preconceived notions about gender and leadership, non-recognition for skills, and individual or organizational attitudes on gender required women to fight twice as hard and act strategically to compensate for the gender disadvantages enroute to the Executive Director position (Hawco 95). Another barrier identified was work-life balance where the clash between demands of the Executive Director role and the woman's caretaking responsibilities impacted their decision to accept or pursue the position (Hawco 9-100). The following two quotes from study participants adequately describe their experiences: one participant stated she heard "...like you are not going to go anywhere in this organization if you keep going home at 5 o'clock to get your kids out of daycare", another participant shared that "...they'll look at you and go, 'Can she really lead? She's a woman, Can she? Is she going to get too emotional?' You can hear the questions, and you can see it" (Hawco 96-97). This experience was also shared by participants in Sita Jayaraman and Harald Bauder's work on immigrant women working in the immigrant refugee and settlement services subsector (Jayaraman and Bauder 17). Once in the role, participants shared that they generally felt a lack of support and faith from their board, that they were bullied by them and/or some board members resigned over their appointment, that the board deferred to the organization's male leaders in a way they did not defer to them as an Executive Director, and that they had to constantly prove themselves to the board (Hawco 102-104).

### A different type of glass ceiling exists in the sector

A "traditional" glass ceiling where leadership positions appear available but are unattainable does not exist in the nonprofit sector; rather as the literature above points out women are attaining leadership positions in the nonprofit sector. The glass ceiling in the sector consists of access to senior leadership positions in particular organizations, larger revenue and size organizations.

One reason for this might be a lack of professional development and advancement opportunities in the nonprofit sector. The key informant interviews in *Shaping the Future* report highlighted that investment in training within the sector was limited, not understood or viewed as important, nor part of the organizational culture, in comparison to the investments in professional development the other two sectors makes (McIsaac et al 17). In the *Looking ahead Leadership survey* 45% of respondents indicated that the availability of professional development opportunities for staff over the last three years (2010-2013) remained constant while 34% said there was an increase in opportunities, 15% said there was a decrease in opportunities, and 6% were unsure (McIsaac et al 17). However, neither the quality and meaningfulness of the professional development opportunities nor how embedded they are in the organizational culture is tracked. *Changework* notes that nonprofit organizations tend to pursue lower cost, informal types of professional development while smaller organizations pursue cooperative ones (Lalande and Ymeren 17). If professional development is lacking in the sector as a whole, what does that mean for the advancement of women in the sector? Michelle Hawco found in her dissertation that there are virtually no internal support structures supporting women's career development (networking opportunities and mentorship) to the executive level in the sector, which was juxtaposed with the fact that the sector is a "helping sector" (Hawco 100-102). In turn, participants stated that they had to be determined, resilient and strong willed, had to identify their own mentor outside of the sector, and seek or establish their own networking groups and relationships (Hawco 100-102).

There is no robust available literature documenting women's leadership experiences in the nonprofit sector in Ontario or Canada that could further shed light on this type of glass ceiling. What exists is research on the state of leadership in the sector, its diversity (in terms of gender and race but not racialized women) the way in which leadership is changing, and what skillsets the new generation of leaders will require. For example *The 2017 Leading our Future: Leadership Competencies in Ontario's Nonprofit Sector* outlines seven competencies of leadership that will be needed by future leaders in the sector but it does not reference gender nor the gendered makeup of the sector (Clutterbuck and Arundel 29).

For this reason, the following questions remain unanswered: To what extent is leadership in the nonprofit sector gendered? Given barriers women face in leadership in the sector, are women able to achieve these competencies in the sector? Perhaps most importantly, how can female leadership in the sector position the sector as a pioneer in gender equity? EXCEerator aptly puts it "...the accomplishments of women's leadership in this field should be celebrated as a hard-fought victory, without neglecting the persistent and increasing precarity in voluntary positions. For women's success to be complete in this sector, leadership positions must be accompanied by improved pay, benefits, and societal recognition" (YWCA Hamilton 33).

# Immigrant, Indigenous, and racialized women, women from the LGBTQ community and women with disabilities have worse labour market outcomes

Labour experiences are shaped not only by gender but also by multiple other intersecting identity markers such as race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, ability, class, and immigration status (Block "Ontario's Growing Gap" 9; Galabuzi 127). In turn, different groups of women have different labour market experiences. Their experiences are rooted in the disparate historical trajectories and unequal characterizations of their communities. This gives rise to specific challenges each group faces in the labour market. An intersectional analysis of Ontario's labour market reveals that immigrant (recent and racialized), Indigenous, and racialized women, women from the LGBTQ community, and women with disabilities have worse labour market outcomes compared to other groups of women (Abugala et al 7-10; Block 9; Block and Galabuzi 13; Galabuzi 127; Shakya et al 4-10). In the following section, the labour market barriers different groups of women in Canada and Ontario face, based on available research and data, are explored further. However, research and data is not as recent nor comparable with the overall data for women because it was either not historically collected or is collected from sources other than the Labour Force Survey, and different groups of women are defined in various ways across literature (i.e. visible minority vs. racialized, all racialized women collapsed into one category).

## Racialized Gendered Division of Labour

In addition to being gendered, the division of labour is also racialized. In his seminal piece, *Canada's Economic Apartheid*, Grace-Edward Galabuzi explains how particular racialized group of workers are viewed as naturally best suited to perform certain work functions, particularly that racialized women are often particularly portrayed as less competent, less skilled, less disciplined (e.g they take too much time off work to fulfil parental duties), and are mainly secondary wage earners (Galabuzi 127). For this reason, racialized women are not only concentrated and over-represented in helping and nurturing industries, but also are disproportionately marginalized and ghettoized in predominantly female occupations (e.g., racialized nurses face barriers to management positions and find themselves over concentrated in nurse's aide or orderly work and other low-end occupations) (Galabuzi 127). He states that "Racism and sexism clearly interact with class to define the place of racialized women workers in the labour market, even in relation to other women workers" (Galabuzi 127). Low-wage, socially undervalued or "unproductive" work, and precarious types of jobs are systematically offloaded to women, particularly immigrant and racialized women (Premji 136). In turn, the feminization and racialization of such occupations trigger a further decline in the wage rate, job security and social value of these occupations (Premji 136). Multiple literatures explain how immigrant women are funneled systematically through government immigration policies from poorer countries to fulfill the global North's "care deficit" (Werner et al; Shakya and Premji 19). This racialized gendered division of labour translates into unequal labour market patterns for diverse women. It fuels a further decline in the wage rates, job security and social value of these occupations/jobs (Abugala et al 7-10; Premji 123-124).

---

<b>Population Group</b>	<b>% of female in Ontario</b>
All of Ontario	51.22% (6,889,105)
Immigrant	29.57% (2,037,480)
Racialized	29.14% (2,007,505)
Indigenous	2.8% (194,420)
Women with disabilities	16% *

---

Statistics Canada "Census Profile" except \* = Statistics Canada - Canadian Survey on Disability, 2012

### Racialized Women

Using the long-form 2006 Census data, Sheila Block and Grace Edward-Galabuzi found that the Canadian labour market is colour coded where the pay gap between racialized and non-racialized Canadians is large, stemming from disparities in the distribution of good paying, more secure jobs (Block and Galabuzi). More specifically, "Racialized women have it worse: They're 48% more likely to be unemployed than non-racialized men. This may contribute to the fact that racialized women earn 55.6% of the income of non-racialized men" (Block and Galabuzi 4). Using the same data, Block concluded in her report titled *Ontario's Growing Gap* that both sexism and racial discrimination impact racialized women in Ontario and their earnings (Block "Ontario's Growing Gap" 7). In 2005 they made \$0.84 for every dollar that non-racialized women made, \$0.725 for every dollar that racialized men made, and \$0.53 for every dollar non-racialized men made (Block "Ontario's Growing Gap" 7). Block and Galabuzi conducted a follow-up analysis in 2014 using the National Household Survey, focusing specifically on Ontario, and found that the occupational and industrial distribution of the labour force remains racialized and gendered (Block and Galabuzi). In *Who is Working for Minimum Wage* Block found that, while the number of people working in minimum wage jobs increased between 2003-2011, racialized women employees were more likely to be working for minimum wage than the total population, racialized and immigrant men and immigrant women (Block "Who is Working for Minimum Wage" 4). This was based on labour market data from the Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics (SLID) from 2003-2011. Recent data paints a similar picture. Statistics Canada shows that racialized women have lower employment income compared with non-racialized women and in 2011 were more likely than the rest of the female population to be in a low-income situation (Chui and Maheux 33).

### Immigrant Women

Compared to any other group, recent and racialized immigrant women continue to experience the worst labour market conditions and outcomes (Premji 123; Shakya and Premji 18). They are over-represented in low-paid, low-skill jobs characterized by high risk and precarity, have lower rates of labour force participation and higher unemployment rates (Chui 33; Premji 123; Shakya and Premji 18). Block found that recent immigrant women were working for minimum wage at almost three times the rate of the total population (Block "Who is Working for Minimum Wage" 4). However, according to recent Statistics Canada data, immigrant women have comparable education levels compared to Canadian-born women (Chui 33). Access Alliance's qualitative study on racialized immigrant women's employment experiences found that the key labour market barriers they faced were: non-recognition of foreign credentials (and the common "Canadian experience" requirement), race-based discrimination (including based on religious

affiliation and accent), language barriers, information and access barriers about services, and limited professional networks (Abugala et al 8). The Ontario Women's Health Network's (OWHN) qualitative study on immigrant women (most respondents but not all were racialized) reveals similar findings, adding that the impacts of these experiences for themselves and their families also shape their experience of the gender wage gap and systemic issues that perpetuate it (Lessels and Maher 10). Premji's qualitative study on gendered dimensions of precarious employment in Canada for racialized immigrant women additionally found that language barriers, information and access barriers about services and a limited professional network also impacted their ability to find decent work (Premji 130). Particularly, that they are ending up in gendered occupations that are precarious (Premji 136). Moreover, Shakya and Premji explain that due to the racialized gendered division of labour, racialized immigrant women may experience different work-related risks and health problems (Shakya and Premji 20).

Roxana Ng's "captive labour force" conceptual framework is cited by multiple literature exploring immigrant women's employment experiences. She states that they are "essential" for the effective functioning of certain sectors and the labour market in general, but at the same time are treated as "disposable" and consequently the unstable and precarious nature of their jobs makes them "captive" and so they are unable to find stable, meaningful employment (Abugala et al; Premji 126).

## Indigenous Women

Based on 2011 National Household Survey numbers, Statistics Canada reports that Indigenous women are less likely than non-Indigenous women and Indigenous men to be part of the paid workforce (Arriagada 19). While Indigenous women and non-Indigenous women have similar participation rates in Canada's labour force, the employment rate for Indigenous women was 50.4% while for non-Indigenous women it was 57.3% and for Indigenous men 53.9% (Arriagada 19). Indigenous women also experienced a higher unemployment rate compared to non-Indigenous women, 13.3% compared to 7.2% (Arriagada 22). In 2010, the median income of Indigenous women aged 15 and over was about \$5,500 less than the median income of non-Indigenous women and \$3,600 less than that of Aboriginal men (Arriagada 22).

The report noted that there were differences in labour market outcomes depending on whether Indigenous women live on or off reserves (Arriagada 19-22). For example, in 2011 among First Nations women the employment rate for those living on reserve was 35.2% compared with 50.2% for First Nations women who lived off reserve (Arriagada 19). First Nations women living on reserve experienced the highest unemployment rate at 20.8%, while the unemployment rate for their counterparts living off reserve was 13.9% (Arriagada 22). First Nations women living on reserve also had a lower median income than First nations women living off reserve (Arriagada 22).

In their submission to the the Ministry of Status of Women Ontario, Ontario Federation of Indigenous Friendship Centres (OFIFC) stated that to understand urban Indigenous women's economic empowerment, the history of Indigenous women in Canada and how it is different than the mainstream narrative of women's history must be recognized (OFIFC 5). As a result of colonial history, Indigenous women in Ontario face disproportionately high levels of poverty, discrimination, and violence while poor access to social and health services, adequate transportation, and economic opportunity compound these issues (OFIFC 4). Barriers cited to participating in the labour market were little or no access to self-employment or small business development, the more pronounced gender wage gap for Indigenous women, and lack of cultural competency and respect for Indigenous ways of being (OFIFC 7-10).

## Women from the LGBTQ Community

Many people from LGBTQ communities face discrimination in the workplace and many trans and gender-non-conforming individuals in particular face barriers to even entering the workforce (Hixson-Vulpe 12). The 2011 Trans Pulse Project's study *We've Got Work To Do: Workplace Discrimination and Employment Challenges for Trans People in Ontario* found that while 71% of trans people have at least some college or university education, 37% of trans Ontarians were employed full time and about half make \$15,000 per year or less (TransPulse 1). Some key barriers that trans people experienced in the workplace included lack of choice around disclosing their identity if they were visibly identifiable; difficulty accessing and providing records and other personal documents from before their transition while trying to limit the disclosure of personal information; and a lack of trans-positive attitudes and trans-inclusive policies in the workplace (TransPulse 1-2). According to the survey, 18% have been turned down for a job because of their trans identities or histories, 13% say there were fired for being trans, and 17% reported declining a job offer due to the lack of a trans-positive work environment (TransPulse 2).

The 2016 Telus study that surveyed<sup>34</sup> lesbian and gay experiences in the workplace found that of 37% of respondents believed that their workplace was not inclusive of lesbian and gay people, while almost half (45%) believed that the same workplaces were not inclusive of trans people (Hixson-Vulpe 12). Pride at Work Canada conducted a cross-Canada survey<sup>35</sup> in 2017 to better understand the experiences of LGBTQ people seeking jobs. They found that 22% of respondents felt they would not be taken seriously because of their appearance and 34% of respondents were concerned they would experience discrimination on multiple aspects of their identity and (Hixson-Vulpe 13).

The gendered and racialized division of labour conceptualizations of the labour market are binary and dichotomize gender. They do not take into account the experiences of those who don't identify with binary notions of gender. How can the experiences of trans women in the labour force be accounted for? What type of work do they have access to? Are they viewed as viable participants of the labour force?

## Women with Disabilities

Women with disabilities experience barriers in participating in the labour force market (Burlock; Turcotte; DAWN Canada). According to Statistics Canada 2011 numbers, there was no difference in labour force participation rates between men and women with disabilities (61.3% and 63.4%, respectively) but there was a significant difference between people with and without disabilities (Burlock 20). The unemployment rate of women with disabilities was 13.4%, compared to 5.4% for women without disabilities (Burlock 20). The most frequently reported types of perceived labour force discrimination by women with disabilities aged 25 to 54 in Canada were feeling disadvantaged in employment due to their condition (44.5%) or feeling that their employer or potential employer considered them disadvantaged due to their condition (46.1%) (Burlock 22). Martin Turcotte noted in *Insights on Canadian Society Persons with disabilities and employment*, that severity of disability is a factor in labour force participation but those who can hold employment are unable to because of barriers unrelated to their condition (Turcott 1). In particular, workplaces can be physically inaccessible, not offer workplace accommodations, or there might be discriminatory hiring practices (Turcott 1). In *Study on Economic Security of Women with Disabilities*, DAWN says that for women with disabilities to have equal participation in the labour force, the following would need to improve: wage equity, meaningful employment opportunities, workplace accommodation, household accommodation, skills training, and a daycare system (DAWN 1-2).

---

<sup>34</sup> 814 respondents

<sup>35</sup> 225 respondents

# Unequal job opportunities and a glass ceiling exist for diverse women in the sector

## Unclear how many diverse women work in the sector

It is unclear how many of the 75%-80% of women workers in the nonprofit sector are immigrant, Indigenous and racialized women, women from the LGBTQ community, and women with disabilities. This is because there is no up-to-date race-based disaggregated data available for the nonprofit sector labour force in Ontario. Their employment share in the nonprofit sector should be relatively comparable to each community's population share in Ontario.

While we do not have provincial data that disaggregates the sector's workforce, there is data for the City of Toronto. Using Statistics Canada data industry and occupation data for 2006, in *Not Working for Profit* Zizys found that in Toronto CMA 41.7% of women workers in the sector were from racialized groups (referred to as visible minorities in the report) compared to 40.6% of women workers from racialized groups in all other industries (Zizys 12). There was a higher concentration of Black women in the nonprofit sector (11.8%) than compared to all other industries, followed by Chinese women (5.8%), and Filipino women (5.4%) (Zizys 12). There was an underrepresentation of Japanese (0.3%), Korean (0.5%) and Southeast Asian (0.6%) women (Zizys 12). 47.9% of women workers in the nonprofit sector were from immigrant populations which was slightly less than across all other industries (Zizys 12). Immigrant population data was not disaggregated by racialized/non racialized immigrants nor was there data available on Indigenous women, women from the LGBTQ community, and women with disabilities working in the sector.

## Immigrant and racialized women are concentrated in the immigrant refugee and settlement services subsector

Immigrant and racialized women are concentrated in the immigrant refugee and settlement services subsector (Cunningham et al 462; Jayaraman and Bauder 2-3; Wilson 8; Türegün "Rebuilding Professional Lives" 603; Türegün "Immigrant Settlement Work in Canada" 402). Community Social Planning Council of Toronto and Family Service Associations of Toronto 2006 survey of Toronto's immigrant and refugee serving subsector<sup>36</sup> found that it was largely a women-majority and racialized workforce. Of the respondents 86.4% were female, 75% had immigrated to Canada between 1953 and 1990, 63% were members of racialized groups, and 1% identified as Indigenous (Wilson 8). Adnan Türegün's work examined the experience of immigrant professionals in Ontario who found work in the immigrant refugee and settlement services subsector. Through an online survey and interviews conducted from 2009 - 2010<sup>37</sup>, he found that the subsector is women-majority (79% of his respondents were female), predominantly racialized (three quarters of the respondents belong to racial minority groups with 6% declining to answer), and are highly educated (88% of respondents had a bachelor's or higher degree (Türegün Rebuilding Professional Lives" 603). In his 2013 paper on the emergence of Canadian settlement work he notes that immigrants and people of ethno-religious background are a main source of settlement workforce (Türegün "Immigrant Settlement Work in Canada" 402). Sita Jayaraman and Harald Bauder's

---

<sup>36</sup> 61 organizations filled organizational survey and 321 staff filled the individual survey.

<sup>37</sup> 155 responses to the survey, 19 interviews (5 were men and 14 women), 6 interviews with settlement agency representatives. Not random nor representative sample.

2014 paper on the immigrant refugee and settlement services subsector as a field of employment for immigrant women argued that it is a highly segmented labour market with immigrant women working in positions with low pay, little job security, and limited career opportunities (Jayaraman and Bauder 2-3). Last, Cunningham et al's qualitative case study in Canada of an immigrant refugee and settlement services organization found that consisted predominantly immigrant and racialized women workers (Cunningham et al "Austerity Policies" 462).

Wilson, Türegün, Jayaraman and Bauder and Cunningham et al found precarious working conditions and job satisfaction that paralleled broader trends in the nonprofit sector. Working conditions, particularly living wage and permanent employment in the subsector, were impacted by inadequate and lack of multi-year / stable funding and there was a reliance on short-term project funding (Cunningham et al "Austerity Policies" 462; Wilson 9). Participants in the Toronto survey raised concerns around wage levels and inequity vis-a-vis wages and salaries in other areas of the sector as well as compared to the public and private sectors, and the lack of benefits including pension plans (Wilson 10-11). 69% of participants reported an annual employment income of less than \$40 000, which was less than the \$49 549 average employment income that was reported by the 2001 Census of full-time, full year workers in Toronto (Wilson 9). Despite a high level of general job satisfaction where participants would chose to work in the community sector again, almost 44% of participants reported considering leaving their jobs in the past year and almost three quarters cited considering leaving to earn a higher salary (Wilson 10-11). When Türegün asked about job satisfaction within the subsector in his work, the respondents expressed overwhelmingly positive feelings but qualified their statements by pointing out issues of decent work such as heavy workload, lack of advancement opportunities, low salary, strict requirements for client eligibility, stressful relations with clients, need for more direct services, lack of opportunities for full use of professional skills, and high staff turnover (Türegün "Professional Lives" 608 - 609). Jayaraman and Bauder compared the immigrant refugee and settlement services subsector in Canada and Germany by conducting interviews with seven key informants working in the sector<sup>38</sup>. Participant interviews referenced funding cuts to the sector, that most jobs in the sector (with some exceptions in some larger, unionized agencies) are based on annual, renewable contracts with low pay and minimal benefits (Jayaraman and Bauder 15).

Wilson's report raised some key questions for further exploration: Since a majority of this largely immigrant, female and racialized workforce reported that they would choose to work in the community sector again, and given the limitations of the sector to provide good wages and benefits, do workers feel that they have access to employment in other sectors? Is the choice to work within the sector contingent upon changes in working conditions, particularly with respect to wages and benefits? Why do individuals enter or leave the sector? (Wilson 15). Türegün's limited study partly answers some of these questions. He concluded that "...seeing that regulated professions were closed to them, our respondents found a way to get back to professional practice in the form of settlement work as an unregulated, emerging, and thus more permeable profession" (Türegün 610-611). Ultimately, practising settlement work represented different things for different individuals: for some it was out of necessity, for others a springboard to their primary profession, and for a few others a continuation of their primary profession (Türegün "Professional Lives" 610-611).

---

<sup>38</sup> Three interviews conducted with workers in Ontario and four with workers in Germany.

## Immigrant and racialized women are more likely to be in frontline rather than senior leadership positions

According to McIsaac and Moody's work on diversity and inclusion in the nonprofit sector in Ontario, the sector is not diverse in its leadership nor does it have a strong commitment to diversity and inclusion at the organizational level (McIsaac and Moody 1). They state that this is not news for many in the sector because many organizations may support equity and inclusion in principle but that may not necessarily translate into organizational practice (McIsaac and Moody 1). Using the results of the *Looking Ahead Leadership survey*, they found that the leadership profile of respondents did not reflect the diversity of the communities being served by the sector: 87% of respondents were white, 80% were born in Canada, fewer than 5% had lived in Canada less than 20 years (McIsaac and Moody 2). In contrast, of the, 29.3% racialized people 29.6% were South Asian, 19.4% were Chinese, 16.2% were Black (Statistics Canada).

---

<b>Population Group</b>	<b>% of population in Ontario</b>
All of Ontario	100% (13, 448, 494)
Immigrant	29.1% (3,852,145)
Racialized	29.3% (3,885,585)
Indigenous	2.8% (374,395)

---

### *Statistics Canada "Census Profile"*

Multiple other studies on diversity and/or leadership nationally, provincially, and in parts of Ontario echo these findings. Imagine Canada's *Driving Change: A National Study of Nonprofit Executive Leaders* found that 93% of their respondents were white (Imagine Canada 46). In 2015 Peel Leadership Centre surveyed nonprofit leaders in Peel Region and found that 74% of Executive Directors indicated they were born in Canada, up from 51% in 2013 (Peel Leadership Centre 3). 74% of Executive Directors described their race/ethnicity as white/Caucasian, up from 58% and less diverse compared to 2013 (Peel Leadership Centre 3). More specifically, 79% of 19 more recently hired Executive Directors who have been in their role 5 years or less identified as white/Caucasian even though the population they serve (Peel Region) at the time was 56% racialized (Peel Leadership Centre 3). YWCA's EXCLerator project on gendered and racialized community leadership in Hamilton and Halton found that in 2016 racialized people were in 12.9% of leadership positions across Hamilton and Halton (YWCA Hamilton 34). More specifically, racialized people held 14.9% of leadership positions in Halton where 25.7% of the population identifies as racialized and 7.9% of leadership positions in Hamilton where 19.0% of the population identifies as racialized (YWCA Hamilton 34). In all three reports, data was either disaggregated by gender or by race, not by both. Thus the number of racialized women in leadership positions is unknown in these reports.

Medianu and Esses in *Visible Minorities and Women in Senior Leadership Positions* do disaggregate their data by both race and gender, exploring leadership positions occupied by racialized women. They found that in London and Ottawa the share of racialized women in senior leadership positions in the sector was lower than their population share (Medianu and Esses 7). However, in Hamilton racialized women in senior leadership positions in the sector was higher than their population share (Medianu and Esses 7). In London, racialized women made up 6.5% of the population yet only 3.1% of senior leaders and in Ottawa they made up 10.0% of the population yet only 3.9% of senior leaders in the sector (Medianu and Esses 18, 24). In Hamilton, racialized women made up 7.3% of the population and 9.2% of leaders in the nonprofit sector (Medianu and Esses 21). In London and Hamilton racialized people and racialized women were faring better in nonprofit sector leadership positions compared to other sectors. In London, the sector was second only to the education sector and in Hamilton it had the highest percentage of racialized women in leadership positions (Medianu and Esses 18-21). In Ottawa, though, while racialized people in leadership positions in the sector were on par with other sectors, the percentage of racialized women was disproportionately low (Medianu and Esses 26). In all cities there was a higher percentage of racialized men in senior leadership positions in the sector than racialized women (Medianu and Esses 29). In this report "racialized" was not further disaggregated by Black, Immigrant, and/or Indigenous, so it is difficult to tell which group of racialized women were being represented.

In her paper *A Black Perspective on Canada's Third Sector: Case Studies on Women Leaders in the Social Economy*, Dr. Caroline Shenaz Hossein explores the leadership experiences of five Black women in the nonprofit sector in the Greater Toronto Area (she refers to it as the third sector or social economy). All five women at the time (2013) were leading and managing small and large nonprofit organizations, social enterprises, and community organizations in the Greater Toronto area. She shares that the social economy sector is one of the few spaces racialized women can participate in - to some extent - compared to other sectors but argues that racialized women need to be the decision-makers and the ones who disburse funds in the social service sector (Hossein 6). While racialized female leadership in the sector exists, particularly to help racially marginalized people, cultural and gender exclusion also exists (Hossein 6). Through her qualitative research she found that Black women leaders in the nonprofit sector were caught between being aware of what it takes to develop their communities and being constrained by financial resources and the politics of aid, which can de-fund them if they do not comply with the rules (Hossein 38). Her interviews also revealed that tokenism exists in the sector, where Black women leaders may be "at the table" but not necessarily "decision-makers" (Hossein 38). She concluded there is a need within the sector to analyze its bias as it can be restrictive and oppressive to racialized women who work in the same organizations that aim to empower the marginalized (Hossein 39).

Wilson's survey found that, of the gendered and racialized workforce in the immigrant refugee and settlement services subsector in Toronto, 17.6% were in management positions, 68.6% in front-line positions, and 13.8% in administrative support/maintenance (Wilson 9). In Türegün's work, 70% of the respondents' first positions in the sector were settlement worker/counsellor, community/outreach worker, administrative assistant/receptionist, program support worker/assistant, and employment counsellor/specialist while only 18% held a position which entailed coordinating, supervisory, managerial, or directorial responsibilities (12% did not answer) (Türegün "Professional Lives" 608). He did find that there was some positional mobility in the subsector.

In their qualitative work, Jayaraman and Bauder also found a geographical dimension to positions in the nonprofit sector, particularly employment of racialized workers in the immigrant, refugee, and settlement subsector. As stated above, this subsector has a high concentration of immigrant and/or racialized women, and thus is a pipeline for immigrant and/or racialized women leaders. One participant stated that “I think we are probably seeing more women of colour, because immigration demographics have also changed.... [but elsewhere] the sector is very white. Even the settlement sector, it mirrors the demographics of the place. The workforce is still very white in terms of the leadership. In the north there is one ED [who is racialized]... Where you see the majority of racialized men and women, it tends to be in the GTA centres: Toronto, Mississauga, Markham” (Jayaraman and Bauder 12). Another participant delves deeper into the racial stratification of the sector:

“Racialized women are on the frontlines, some in the middle management, but not in the senior management. But if you look nationally, leadership is white and male. Even where there is a shifting in terms of women’s leadership. But even there the women’s leadership is white, right? You can count the EDs who are racialized in the sector and many tend to be heads of ethno-specific organizations, so if you look at some of the larger settlement organizations, they are still white organizations”. (Jayaraman and Bauder 17)

However, the respondent was reluctant to name this stratification as racism, but rather as a result of the distinct challenges the nonprofit sector faces, particularly the lack of a career path within smaller organizations (Jayaraman and Bauder 17). It was also shared that the pipeline of immigrant and/or racialized women leaders in the subsector are impacted by funding cuts where middle management positions are being eroded and as a result managers are applying for frontline positions (Jayaraman and Bauder 17). In their qualitative study on immigrant women and precarious work, Shakya and Premji found that the education and training programs that may be accessible and affordable to immigrant women tend to be limited to gendered front-line occupations that are marked by low wages and precarity, like personal support worker or social service worker (Shakya and Premji 26).

# The gender wage gap is at the core of women's labour issues

## Calculating the gender wage gap

The gender wage gap is the difference between men and women's earnings and is commonly calculated in three ways: average hourly wages, average annual earnings full-time full-year, and average annual earnings for all earners including full-time-full-year, seasonal, and part-time workers (Ministry of Labour; Leblanc 33). Based on those methods the gender wage gap in Ontario is: (1) 14% (average hourly wages)<sup>39</sup>, (2) 25% (average annual earnings, full-time, full-year workers)<sup>40</sup>, and (3) 29% (average annual earnings for all earners including: full-time, full-year, seasonal and part-time workers)<sup>41</sup>.

The gap widens for immigrant, Indigenous, low-income, and racialized women, and women with disabilities (Ministry of Labour 21-23). McInturff's analysis of recently released Census data reveals that in Toronto, there is a wage gap for every group of women both when compared to white men and men in their own community (McInturff "A Deficit Worth Worrying About: The Gendered and Racialized Wage Gap"). White women are earning the most, even though less than white men (McInturff "A Deficit Worth Worrying About: The Gendered and Racialized Wage Gap"). Based on the 2011 National Household Survey, McInturff found that racialized women earned 19% less than non-racialized women and 24% less than racialized men, first-generation immigrant women earned 18% less than non-immigrant women and 27% less than immigrant men (McInturff "Ontario's Gender Gap" 15). Additionally, Indigenous women's median income is 17% less than those of non-Indigenous women and 25% behind the earnings of Indigenous men and 40% behind that of non-Indigenous men (McInturff "Ontario's Gender Gap" 15)<sup>42</sup>. The Pay Equity Commission of Ontario's 2014 report on the gender wage gap in Ontario used the 2006 Labour Force Survey to track women's earnings as compared to men's across the National Occupational Classification<sup>43</sup>. It found that women with disabilities had an hourly wage gap of \$5.65 compared to men without a disability (Pay Equity Commission of Ontario "Gender Wage Gaps and earnings Ratios" 22). It stated that the difference between women with and without a disability was very small, and that might be because women with disabilities have a harder time getting into employment but when they do they earn comparable wages (Pay Equity Commission of Ontario "Gender Wage Gaps and Earnings Ratios in Ontario" 22).

There is much debate around how the gender wage gap should be calculated. Some argue that average annual earnings is the best method as it captures the lower income associated with contract and part-time work and allows for a comparison in instances when it is important to consider the impact of earnings differences on people's ability to support themselves and their families (Ontario Equal Pay Coalition "Calculating the Gap"; Pay Equity Commission of Ontario "Gender Wage Gaps and Earnings Ratios in Ontario" 4). On the other hand, the average annual earnings calculation method can be considered problematic because women work fewer hours on average than men, even on a full-time, full year basis (Moyser 26-27). Hourly wages of full-time workers are considered to better express the

---

<sup>39</sup> Statistics Canada. Labour Force Survey, 2015 CANSIM Table #282-0070

<sup>40</sup> Statistic Canada. Income Statistics Division. CANSIM Table #202-0102 and 2013 Canadian Income Survey

<sup>41</sup> Statistics Canada. 2011 Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics and 2013 Canadian Income Survey

<sup>42</sup> Annual income calculation

<sup>43</sup> Average hourly wages calculation

disparity caused by gender because they reflect only the price of labour and enable comparisons of pay for similar jobs regardless of whether people work in those jobs on a full- or part-time basis. An hourly comparison also allows for the inclusion of people in other non-standard work arrangements, such as part-year work, and is therefore closer to the issue of gender-based discrimination (Moyser 26-27; Pay Equity Commission of Ontario "Gender Wage Gaps and Earnings Ratios in Ontario" 4).

The Canadian Women's Foundation explains the cascading impact the gender wage gap can have on women: With a lower earning power, they are at a high risk of falling into poverty (especially if they are single mothers), less able to save for their retirement and more likely to be poor in their senior years, forced to stay in abusive relationships, and experience negative health outcomes due to taking on both unpaid work at home and working outside the home (Canadian Women's Foundation).

### Causes of the gender wage gap

There are two aspects of the gender wage gap: a part that consists of factors that can explain why women are earning less compared to men (factors which are gendered in and of themselves) and a part that cannot be explained. The latter is starkly visible when no explainable factors exist and there is still a difference in earnings. It is also more complex for immigrant, Indigenous, low-income, and racialized women, women from the LGBTQ community, and women with disabilities because the unexplainable portion can consist of bias based on their gender and other parts of their identity (e.g., gender and race). For example, in Ontario's 2015 *Gender Wage Gap Consultations*, the Gender Wage Gap Steering Committee heard from many participants that discrimination based on their identities was a key underlying root cause of the gender wage gap for them and that it took many forms across the working life-cycle (Austin et al "Gender Wage Gap Consultations Summary"). In particular they heard that discrimination against trans women and Islamophobia against women who wear the hijab seem to affect equal access to employment opportunities, which results in a wider wage gap for these categories of women (Austin et al "Gender Wage Gap Consultations Summary"). There is no clear breakdown of what percentage constitutes explainable factors and unexplainable factors, nor is the breakdown reflected in the calculation methods described above. However, all factors impacting the gender wage gap intersect and influence each other. Moreover, broader social, political, and economic shifts such as austerity policies, the rise of precarious work, and increasing inequality, also fuel the gap.

Underpinning the gender wage gap broadly are stereotypical gender roles that position women as caregivers, the inequitable distribution of unpaid work in the home where the burden falls on women, and women's work in the private sphere also being characterized as women's work in the public sphere (caregiving) (Austin et al "Final Report and Recommendations" 29-30, 61; Canadian Women's Foundation; LeBlanc 34; Moyser 27-28; Ministry of Labour 35; Pay Equity Commission of Ontario "What is the Gender Wage Gap"; Ontario Equal Pay Coalition "Myths About the Pay Gap"). As discussed above, these social factors constrain women's choices related to the labour market which impacts their earnings, starting with what they study and which occupation and industry they enter, and subsequently affecting the amount and length of disruptions in their career trajectory and relevant supports available. In turn, job status, the number of hours women work, the stability of employment, and whether they are in minimum wage jobs, are also impacted (LeBlanc 35). All literature surveyed supported the claim that women and/or their "choices" cannot be blamed for the gender wage gap, but rather it is the way in which the labour market is built for a certain type of worker.

## Occupations and Industries

Women are over-represented in low-paying occupations and under-represented in high-paying ones (Moyser 28). Women are more likely to have an occupation in the bottom 20% of the wage distribution than they are in the top 20% while the opposite is true for men (Moyser 28). Women-majority occupations pay at lower wage rates than men-dominated occupations, even when they involve the same skill level (LeBlanc 34; Moyser 28). For example, Moyser compares the earnings of professional occupations in nursing and natural and applied sciences, which are dominated by women and men, respectively, and both usually require a university education. She states that the average hourly wage for professional women working in nursing was \$35.37 in 2015, while the average hourly wage for professional men working in natural and applied sciences was \$39.85, a difference of \$4.48 (Moyser 28). Similarly, the average hourly wage for women in administrative occupations was \$25.11, compared to \$29.76 for men in construction-related trades, and both usually require a college education or apprenticeship training (Moyser 28). The only difference is that administrative and financial supervisors and administrative occupations are female-class jobs while industrial, electrical and construction trades are male-class jobs (Moyser 28). Ontario Equal Pay Coalition makes a key distinction in understanding the gender wage gap here: It is not that women choose jobs that are in lower-paid industries, it is that women-majority industries become less respected and less well-paid occupations because women do the work (Ontario Equal Pay Coalition "Myths about the Pay Gap"). Austin et al add that among other factors, societal gender norms and biases influence the value of jobs and wages more than an individual's personal career choice (Austin et al "Final Report and Recommendations" 19-21).

The Pay Equity Commission of Ontario's report found that overall the gender wage gap has been improving with only 5 of 33 jobs facing a negative trend (Pay Equity Commission of Ontario "Gender Wage Gaps and Earnings Ratios in Ontario" 9)<sup>44</sup>. For instance, since 2008 the earnings gap increased by 2-8% in art, culture and recreation, clerical, and construction and transportation occupations (Pay Equity Commission of Ontario "Gender Wage Gaps and Earnings Ratios in Ontario" 9). In management occupations the earnings gap improved by 9% and in senior management occupations the earnings gap decreased to 6% from 10% in 2008 (Pay Equity Commission of Ontario "Gender Wage Gaps and Earnings Ratios in Ontario" 9).

Overall the gender wage gap for childcare and home support workers improved by 19% - with females comprising 93% of workers in that occupation. Average hourly wages for this occupation category were \$16.59 per hour for females in 2012 (Pay Equity Commission of Ontario "Gender Wage Gaps and Earnings Ratios in Ontario" 9). However, this is \$5.97 below the average hourly rate for females (\$22.56) for all occupations combined in 2012 (Pay Equity Commission of Ontario "Gender Wage Gaps and Earnings Ratios in Ontario" 9). In the two job categories that employ the highest percentage of women workers - business, finance and administrative (25%), and sales and services (27%) - the earnings ratios are in the middle of the range at 86% and 80% respectively (Pay Equity Commission of Ontario "Gender Wage Gaps and Earnings Ratios in Ontario" 9). Women in trades, transport, primary industry, manufacturing, and utilities experienced a larger gender wage gap at 72% to 76% of average men's earnings (Pay Equity Commission of Ontario "Gender Wage Gaps and Earnings Ratios in Ontario" 12). This report only accounts for earnings that can be captured by the Labour Force Survey. Moreover, it was unable to provide updated earnings ratios for women with disabilities and immigrant women.

---

<sup>44</sup> Average hourly wage calculation method

Strategies for combating the gender wage gap often suggest targeted focus on recruiting and retaining women in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) fields and/or in male-dominated industries and occupations such as the trades, as jobs in these industries are higher paying than others. However, data indicates that even if women enter 'higher paying' industries and occupations, they experience a gender wage gap. Women in 'natural resources, agriculture and related production occupations' experience a 42.6% wage gap and females account for 22.7% of that category (Ministry of Labour 19). Austin et al's final report indicated that when more women enter male-dominant fields, the pay in those fields decreases and that there is evidence supporting that jobs pay more and gain prestige as men start to outnumber women (Austin et al "Final Report and Recommendations" 19).

## **Education**

The fields women are studying in and not necessarily women's educational attainment rate (35% of women had a university certificate or degree compared to 30% of men in Canada in 2015) impact the gender wage gap (Ferguson 3; Ministry of Labour 46; Statistics Canada "Does Education Pay?" 4). According to the Ontario Ministry of Labour's background paper on the gender wage gap, women are clustered in health and related fields; business, management and public administration; education, social and behavioural sciences; and law (Ministry of Labour 47). They are underrepresented in architecture, engineering and related technologies; mathematics, computer and information sciences; and agriculture, natural resources and conservation (Ministry of Labor 47). The fields of study women are more concentrated in can lead to occupational and industry segregation in lower-paying jobs. For example, currently at the college level, women are more likely to graduate from low-paying fields, like administrative assistant and secretarial science while men are more likely to graduate from high-paying fields like engineering technology (Statistics Canada "Does Education Pay?" 4). According to 2016 Census data, women were more likely than men to apprentice in lower-paying trades: almost 3 in 10 women with an apprenticeship certificate apprenticed in hairstyling, with median earnings of \$34,319 (Statistics Canada "Does Education Pay?" 3). In 2015, women actually earned less than men at every education level across Canada (except in Nunavut) (Statistics Canada "Does Education Pay?" 3). Men in a given field of study still tend to earn more than comparably educated women (Statistics Canada "Does education pay?" 4).

## **Disruptions to Continuous Work**

Disruptions in employment where women need to leave and re-enter the workforce impact women's earnings and in turn the gender wage gap. One common disruption is taking time off to have children, which is otherwise known as the "motherhood penalty"; its impacts have been documented well over the years. According to Statistics Canada, it still exists: women take the majority of parental leaves, but its impact has decreased over the years (Moyser 30). Once women have had children, they are expected to take on the bulk of child care which can conflict with work where they have to pass on overtime, miss critical professional development and advancement opportunities and/or take more absences due to child illnesses (Ontario Equal Pay Coalition "Myths about the Pay Gap"). This penalty is heightened when there are inadequate options for child care (Lambert and McInturff 13). Women are also more likely to take on other family caregiving responsibilities such as elder care or care for family members with disabilities or illnesses for an extended period of time which can also be a disruption to continuous work (Ontario Equal Pay Coalition "Myths about the Pay Gap"; Lambert and McInturff 14). Other disruptions to continuous work include needing to take time off because of gender-based violence (domestic violence, sexual assault)<sup>45</sup> and workplace harassment<sup>46</sup>.

---

<sup>45</sup> See [Can Work Be Safe, When Home Isn't: Initial Findings of a Pan-Canadian Survey on Domestic Violence and the Workplace](#)

All of these disruptions, depending on how long they are, impact career trajectories, accumulation of work experience and seniority, and the health benefits and pensions that come with a long-term or uninterrupted employment -- alongside the cash earnings lost during the time off (Marshall 5; Moysler; Ministry of Labour 39). All of these facets are associated with the climbing wages that can be realized over the course of a career; when women have to leave the workforce their personal wage growth can become stunted.

### **Systemic Gender Bias and Discrimination**

When all things are equal between men and women (such education, experience, and skillset), women are still making less than men. In Canada currently, more and more women are education and participating in the workforce. The 2015 *Report of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women* heard that "...women's wages are about 90% that of men, even when you [take into consideration] ... years in the labour market, work experience, and different types of education,' as well as "types of jobs" (Leblanc 33). Gender bias and discrimination appears in hiring, promotion, and compensation practices (Canadian Women's Foundation "The Wage Gap"; Ontario Equal Pay Coalition "Myths about the Pay Gap"; Ministry of Labour 33-35). When investigating hiring practices key questions arise, such as: Are organizations reluctant to hire and invest in women workers, especially in their child-bearing years? And are women considered a greater employment cost than men? Also, men's and women's work can be evaluated differently within organizations where men's might be valued more than women's or there might be different criteria associated with each gender which can be limiting in of itself. For instance, Ministry of Labour's backgrounder on the gender wage gap cites a study on Wall Street analysts where connections were valued in men while measurable achievements and competence with women (Ministry of Labour 42). Further, a lack of family-friendly policies that allow for women to balance their caregiving responsibilities with work can impact promotions and access to professional development (Ministry of Labour 41-42, 43). All these factors contribute to a "leaky pipeline" preventing women from attaining leadership roles. However, organizations that do not have women in senior leadership positions often blame it on the fact that there are no qualified women to fill the senior leadership positions, rather than inquiring whether leadership opportunities are open to them in the first place. In turn, women miss out on raises that come with promotions and professional development, and high salaries in senior leadership positions, which contributes to a lifelong the gender wage gap.

Women's negotiation skills (which tend not to be encouraged or cultivated), combined with the lack of pay transparency laws in place in Ontario, affect women's earnings and makes it difficult to know whether a gender wage gap exists in a given workplace (Austin et al "Final Report and Recommendations" 35; LeBlanc 35; Ontario Equal Pay Coalition "Myths about the Pay Gap"; Ministry of Labour 43). The gender wage gap starts early in a woman's career, for example when female graduates earn less than their male counterparts in their first job after graduation (LeBlanc 35; Ontario Equal Pay Coalition "Myths about the Pay Gap"). Starting with unequal pay sustains the gap over the lifetime earnings of a woman as her low starting salary forms a baseline and reference point for the rest of her career (Ontario Equal Pay Coalition "Myths about the Pay Gap"). The Canadian Women's Foundation estimates that 10-15% of the gap can be attributed to gender-based wage discrimination (Canadian Women's Foundation).

---

<sup>46</sup> See [This Moment Isn't \(Just\) About Sex. It's Really About Work](#) and ['You'll never work again': women tell how sexual harassment broke their careers](#)

## Ontario's legislative mechanisms to combat the gender wage gap

In Ontario, there are two key legislative mechanisms that mitigate the gender wage gap: equal pay for work of equal value in the Pay Equity Act and equal pay for equal work in the Employment Standards Act (ESA) (Austin et al "Final Report and Recommendations" 29-30; Ministry of Labour 11). The Pay Equity Act seeks to raise wages in traditionally women-majority sectors while Equal Pay for Equal Work in the ESA seeks to ensure women's wages are the same as men's when performing a substantially similar job (Austin et al "Final Report and Recommendations" 30; Ministry of Labour 11)<sup>47</sup>. Both are enforced by separate bodies, using different mechanisms and criteria (Austin et al "Final Report and Recommendations" 30).

In 1987, the Ontario government passed the Pay Equity Act. The Act describes the minimum requirements for ensuring that an employer's compensation practices provide pay equity for all employees in female job classes. The purpose of this Act is to redress systemic gender discrimination that may be present in organizational pay practices and to adjust the wages of employees in female job classes so that they are equal to the wages of employees in male job classes found to be comparable in value based on skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions (Pay Equity Commission of Ontario "A Guide to Interpreting Ontario's Pay Equity Act" 9-10). Women-majority sectors could not access pay equity remedies until 1993, when the proxy method was added to the Act (Austin et al "Final Report and Recommendations" 32). This method allows certain broader public sector<sup>48</sup> employers (which includes some nonprofits) with only female job classes to "borrow" job descriptions and salary information from another public sector employer (the proxy employer) with similar female job classes, to make comparisons and establish pay equity job rates (Austin et al "Final Report and Recommendations" 32; Pay Equity Commission of Ontario "A Guide to Interpreting Ontario's Pay Equity Act" 84-89).

While the proxy method expanded pay equity coverage to a broader range of employers, its application has been criticized. The method adopted may result in a wide variation in pay equity job rates within the same sector as they are not using the same proxy and/or the proxy is paying higher rates than the nonprofit sector pays/can afford (Ministry of Labour 32). Even though the proxy method extended pay equity into women-majority sectors, not all employees in those sectors in or outside the broader public sector are covered by proxy as proxy is available only eligible organizations that existed in 1993 and before (Austin et al "Final Report and Recommendations" 32-34). For women workers in organizations that do not have male class jobs comparators and are not eligible for proxy, wages continue to be low despite the fact that their work may require educational and professional qualifications (e.g., personal support workers, developmental services workers, early childhood educators) and they have challenging working conditions because of the populations they serve (Austin et al "Final Report and Recommendations" 32-34). Furthermore, the Act requires employers to apply 1% of payroll each year to increase wages and thus achieve pay equity over time, and yet with inconsistencies in pay equity funding for the nonprofit sector, some organizations are still trying to achieve pay equity job rates set in 1994 (Austin et al "Final Report and Recommendations" 32-33). Organizations' pay equity plans are a one-time snapshot of pay, rather than an updated version that reflects current pay.

---

<sup>47</sup> In Fairer Workplaces, Better Jobs Act 2018 equal pay for work of equal value also means equal pay for staff across part-time, full-time, contract, and casual positions.

<sup>48</sup> See Pay Equity Act for definition of broader public sector

# Women in the nonprofit sector have a lower compensation package, compared to men, consisting of a “care penalty”, limited access to a pension plan and maternity top-ups, and a gender wage gap

## The “care penalty”

In his 2011 report, Tom Zizys found a “care penalty” applied to the wages of those working in the nonprofit sector. This “care penalty” refers to low pay and a strenuous workload for those who are in caregiving industries and occupations. He found that, while those working in the Toronto CMA earned more than those working in the rest of Ontario, in both geographic areas those working in the nonprofit sector made less than those working in other industries (Zizys 19). The gap between nonprofit sector earners and all earners in the Toronto CMA is wider than that found in the rest of Ontario. Women working in the nonprofit sector in the Toronto CMA earned 79% of the average wage for all Toronto CMA workers in 2005, while earning 85% of the average wage in the rest of Ontario (Zizys 20). This could be because the average wage is higher in Toronto CMA with its many high-paid sectors (e.g., financial services) with high-paying positions (Zizys 20). Austin et al also heard in their gender wage gap consultations across Ontario that there is a “care penalty”, and additionally that the wages for women-majority caregiving professions are too low for women to support themselves and their families (Austin et al “Gender Wage Gap Consultations Summary” 20-21).

This difference in earnings between the sector and other industries perpetuates the notion that nonprofit sector work is inherently “low-skilled” and “low-valued” compared to other sectors, especially given that the nonprofit sector labour force is highly educated. Occupations<sup>49</sup> in the nonprofit sector disproportionately require a university or college education compared to other sectors -- both in the Toronto CMA and the rest of Ontario (Zizys 7). As a whole, in Ontario, 34.0% of jobs across all industries require a post-secondary degree, compared to 73.3% for the nonprofit sector and yet those working in the nonprofit sector earn less than other industries (Zizys 24). The 2017 Charity Village report similarly finds that the sector’s employees across Canada are a well-educated group where 85% or more have at least some post-secondary education with a large portion holding a postgraduate degree (Charity Village 27). Zizys asks a critical question in light of this breakdown: why is the average employment income of this sector less than that of all other industries, which have almost half the rate of jobs requiring post-secondary degrees than the nonprofit sector (Zizys 7). Adding to the discussion, ONN’s *Changework* report highlights those working in the sector identified needing a better understanding of what is fair income in the nonprofit sector, within subsectors and in comparison to other industries (Lalande and Ymeren 13).

---

<sup>49</sup> The author clustered 520 occupations under NOC in three categories: knowledge workers (absolutely require a university degree or a 3-year college diploma or a highly refined skill), middle jobs (jobs that typically do not require a postsecondary degree but do require some skill, usually acquired through work experience or apprenticeship), entry-level jobs (require high school diploma, no experience, next job level immediately accessible after a short period in entry level). The middle and entry-level jobs are rather divided by broad industrial sector: service sector, working sector, primary sector.

## Health, retirement, and maternity “top-up” benefits are valuable for women

*Shaping the Future's Looking Ahead Leadership* survey found that a significant shaping factor for access to benefits was employment tenure (permanent vs. contract). Permanent employees (both full-time and part-time), were more likely to receive health and retirement benefits while the proportion fell significantly for contract paid staff (95% for full-time unionized permanent staff vs. 36% full-time contract unionized staff) (McIsaac et al 16). *Changework* highlighted that another factor was whether the position was full-time or part-time. Full-time employees, irrespective of whether they were permanent or contract, had more access to both health and retirement benefits than part-time permanent and contract employees (Lalande and Ymeren 16). Both found that health benefits were offered more frequently than retirement benefits and that those in unionized compared to non unionized workplaces were more likely to have health and retirement benefits irrespective of full-time or part-time and permanent or contract status (Lalande and Ymeren 16; McIsaac et al 16). In both reports it was not clear what the quality of the benefits were. For example, some organizations may not offer a complete range of health benefits such as work-related travel accident insurance, short-term and long-term disability insurance, survivor income, critical illness insurance, and health spending accounts. Moreover, full coverage of benefits may not be offered, and/or the cost is paid by the employee or shared between both employer and employee. Across Canada, Charity Village's 2017 report found that four out of five responding organizations provided health benefits to at least one staff level and just over half of participating organizations offered retirement benefits to at least some of their employees<sup>50</sup> (Charity Village 45-47). Women are more likely to be concentrated in the part-time contract positions that are less likely to have access to benefits. Consequently, women who are single mothers working in the sector are at risk of lacking coverage for their children.

Currently, there is no sector wide pension plan for Ontario nonprofit workers as there is in Quebec<sup>51</sup>, although some individual organizations have a pension plan and/or make contributions to retirement savings accounts (e.g., registered retirement savings plans, or RRSPs). Many nonprofit workers, like other working Canadians, are on track to experience a sharp drop in their standard of living when they retire. The average worker will receive only 44% of pre-retirement earnings from public programs even after the Canada Pension Plan enhancement takes full effect (decades from now). And according to a (not necessarily representative) survey of the Ontario nonprofit sector, only a minority of workers in the nonprofit sector have any kind of retirement plan: 39% have a Group RRSP, 6% have a workplace pension plan; and 51% of respondents had neither. This situation is more concerning for women workers who tend to live longer, have lower earnings, and often have gaps in their careers (and hence a reduced ability to save for retirement or contribute to a plan) compared to men. ONN convened a pensions task force from 2015 to 2017 to come up with a road map for a sector-wide approach that provides a much more efficient vehicle for retirement income security than individual workplaces can offer through RRSPs and a reduced administrative burden and lower liability compared to single-employer pension plans (ONN “A Roadmap for a Nonprofit Sector Pension Plan”). At the time of writing, ONN's pensions implementation task force is exploring implementation options with the aspiration of launching a plan with an established partner in 2018-2019.

In Canada, alongside Employment Insurance (EI) benefits, women can also be compensated by their employers for earnings lost when on maternity and/or parental leave through a Supplemental

---

<sup>50</sup> Categorized as Primary Benefits as they are provided to a significant majority of staff: Life insurance, accidental death and dismemberment, employee assistance program, extended health care/major medical insurance, prescription drug plan, vision care, benefit coverage for family & dependents, chiropractic, massage therapy, naturopathic, acupuncture and dental plan

<sup>51</sup> See [The Community and Women's Groups Member Funding Pension Plan](#)

Unemployment Benefit (SUB) or commonly referred to as a top-up (Marshall 5; “Supplemental Unemployment Benefit Program”). SUB plans are registered by employers to Service Canada to meet EI requirements because compensation from the plan is not considered as earnings and are not deducted from EI benefits (Marshall 5; Government of Canada “Supplemental Unemployment Benefit Program”). Some key requirements include that the employee is already entitled to EI benefits and the combination of EI benefits and the top-up do not exceed 95% of the employee’s normal weekly annual earnings, and it is entirely financed by the employer (Marshall 5; Government of Canada “Supplemental Unemployment Benefit Program”). The earnings replacement rate, duration of payment and coverage (birth mothers, fathers and adoptive parents) varies among organizations. According to the Employment Insurance Coverage Survey (EICS), in 2008 one in five mothers had an employer top-up benefit in Canada which lasted for an average of 19 weeks (receiving top-up for paid maternity leave only at the time) with average payments of \$300 per week (Marshall 5-7). According to the same survey, 48% of public sector mothers and 8% of private sector (including the nonprofit sector) mothers received a top-up (Marshall 8). Top-ups are valuable for women as they can enhance long-term earnings since they may stipulate a return to employment within a specified time thereby encouraging job continuity, and it can enable parents to remain on leave for a longer period (Marshall 5).

The 2017 Charity Village report found that maternity/parental benefits was one of the top five benefits received by support staff in organizations (Charity Village 56-57). However, the report did not describe what these benefits consisted of, whether they consisted of flex time, leave, and/or top-ups. In the 2017 Boland report, family leave benefits were included in its benefits list for the first time. The survey found that half of those who responded provided a maternity or paternity leave subsidy to all employees (CCVO 27)<sup>52</sup>. was a top-up or not as it could have been maternity and/or parental leave without a top-up.

### A gender wage gap exists in the sector

Zizys’ analysis in *Not Working for Profit* found that women earn less than men in the nonprofit sector (Zizys 18-19)<sup>53</sup>.

---

	<b>Men in Toronto CMA</b>	<b>Men in Ontario , excluding Toronto CMA</b>	<b>Women in Toronto CMA</b>	<b>Women in Ontario, excluding Toronto CMA</b>
All other industries	\$69,912	\$58,868	\$48,881	\$42,237
Nonprofit sector	\$56,154	\$51,050	\$38,648	\$35,752

---

Zizys 18-19

<sup>52</sup> 40 respondents to survey in Ontario

<sup>53</sup> 2005 employment income for full-year full-time earners in Toronto CMA.

The report found that there is a slightly greater gender wage gap in the nonprofit sector compared to all other industries (Zizys 19). In the Toronto CMA, women earned 70% of men's income across all industries and 69% in the nonprofit sector while in the rest of Ontario women earned 72% across all industries and only 70% in the nonprofit sector (Zizys 19). Interestingly, women fare slightly worse in the Toronto CMA than in the rest of Ontario, possibly because men earn more in the Toronto CMA (Zizys 19).

Zizys' report provides detailed gender wage gaps for full-time and full-year women workers in various occupations from senior managers to early childhood educator assistants. While Zizys notes that the numbers reflect workers in other industries as well as the nonprofit sector, in all the occupations discussed over half are in the nonprofit sector (except the senior manager category, which includes over 40% nonprofit workers) (Zizys 35). Men in the senior manager occupation earned 43% more than women, despite the educational attainment of women in the occupation being exactly the same or higher than men's, (Zizys 28). Men in the second highest occupation of managers in social, community and correctional services level earned 20% more than women even with women's educational attainment at the same or higher level as men's (Zizys 28).

Zizys found that employment income varies by subsector. The range is from a low of \$20 108 for women working in child day care services in Ontario outside the Toronto CMA, to a high of \$74 988 for males working in out-patient care centres in the Toronto CMA (Zizys 20). The highest paying sectors in both Toronto CMA and the rest of Ontario were: Out-patient care centres, grant-making and giving services, and social advocacy organizations (Zizys 21). In a related finding, McInturff and Lambert note that women employed in women's rights' organizations are the lowest paid amongst the nonprofit sector (Lambert and McInturff 19).

Charity Village's 2017 report found that in nonprofits across Canada, men who work in the sector earn more on average than women at all staff levels except at the support staff level where women earn slightly more than men (Charity Village 28). The gap between earnings at the Chief Executive level between men and women is the largest of all the levels at 24%: men earn \$109 302 annually whereas women earn \$88 204 annually (Charity Village 28). The next largest gap is at the Management/Supervisory staff level at 12% while for the other levels, the difference ranges between 4% to 7% (Charity Village 28). Moreover, average compensation for all four management levels has risen since 2013 while compensation among lower staff positions has held steady (Charity Village 5). The most significant increase was among management/supervisory staff (Charity Village 5). This finding suggests an increasing wage spread with detrimental impacts on gender equality because women are predominantly concentrated in the lower staff positions while men's share of employment in the sector is the highest at the senior levels.

Charity Village is hesitant to label the differences as a gender wage gap or rooted in gender bias. Instead, it states that other factors are at play, specifically that compensation increases with organizational revenue and number of employees (Charity Village 29). Thus, the report explains that the gap in earnings is most prominent at the Chief Executive level between men and women because men are more likely to be working in organizations with higher revenues and more employees whereas at lower levels both men and women are equally likely to be employed by organizations with lower revenues and employee size and thus have comparable earnings (Charity Village 29).

The 2017 national Boland report<sup>54</sup> found that there was a difference between men's and women's earnings across all operating budget sizes, with a significant difference in organizations where the operating budgets were greater than \$20 million (CCVO 8). Women were concentrated in CEO positions in organizations with less than \$20 million budget, with the highest representation at the less than \$5 million mark. Women CEOs earned \$0.77 for every dollar earned by men CEOs, or in other words \$171 453 versus \$221 104 earned by men in the same position within organizations with an operating budget of over \$20 million (CCVO 8). While this report particularly looks at senior leadership positions earnings, two critical questions emerge: at what point do women start to earn less than men in the sector and why is there a more pronounced gap at the senior leadership levels?

The Charity Village report does not disaggregate data at each level by gender combined with race and other factors that impact compensation such as age, years of experience, and education as well as budget of organizations. The Boland report disaggregates data by years of service and gender. At 3 out of 4 categories women had similar or more years of service under their belt than their male counterparts. However, data was not disaggregated by education, organization size, and gender combined with race. This disaggregated data would provide a clearer picture of how much of the earnings gap is gender based and how much is based on other factors -- and perhaps even how other factors are gendered (after all women in leadership positions are concentrated in small organizations).

---

<sup>54</sup> Conducted from June to September 2017, by the Calgary Chamber of Voluntary Organizations (CCVO) the survey includes data from 282 organizations from 10 provinces representing 29 672 paid staff. 265 organizations across Canada submitted data for CEO position. 40 organizations representing 10 400 paid staff in Ontario participated.

# Discussion

## GAPS

### In labour force dialogues, a gender equity lens is missing in the nonprofit sector and the nonprofit sector lens is missing in gender equity

Labour force dialogues on gender equity tend to lack the nonprofit sector lens while labour force dialogues on the nonprofit sector lack a gender equity lens. On the one hand the literature on women workers highlights extensively the barriers to women's economic advancement, such as the rise of precarious work, devaluation of women's work, over-representation in caregiving occupations and industries, lack of leadership roles, and the persistent gender wage gap. However, the literature focused on how these barriers manifested in the for-profit and public sectors with little attention to women's experiences as workers in the nonprofit sector.

On the other hand, literature on the nonprofit sector labour force (which is on the whole relatively new) predominantly focuses on precarity and the lack of decent work overall because of the distinct challenges in the sector -- with no recognition of the impacts on women in general or diverse groups of women in particular. The nonprofit sector-focused literature does not address the impact of the sector's working conditions on a women-majority workforce and/or how labour force barriers generally experienced by women manifest in distinct ways in the nonprofit sector. For example, literature highlighting precarious work in the sector neglects to examine how the experience of this form of work is shaped by gender, race, and immigration status.

It appears that the only intersection between the study of gender equity and the nonprofit sector to date has focused on clients and communities -- not women workers in the sector. For example, organizations in the sector have researched and published on women's issues (i.e. gender-based violence) and gender equity issues in the larger labour force (i.e. working conditions for different groups of women). Moreover, the sector is known to be a strong and significant advocate for women's issues and in delivering critical services to women. The nonprofit sector lens might be missing from gender equity conversations and vice versa because it is assumed that the nonprofit sector has achieved gender equity as a labour force since it is women-majority. Under the guise of being women-majority, the experiences of the most visible in the nonprofit sector labour force -- its women workers -- are rendered invisible.

The little literature on women's experiences working in the Ontario nonprofit sector that has been available for review is either small-scale, outdated, does not have comparable data, or speaks to specific geographical regions. In any case, it has revealed that inequities between men and women workers in the sector exist that must be explored further. Gender equity cannot be achieved without the voices and experiences of women working in the nonprofit sector labour force, and the nonprofit sector labour force cannot offer truly decent working conditions if it does not take into account what decent work looks like for women in particular -- and especially for women who experience multiple forms of disadvantage. Given the makeup of the workforce and the sector's values to better communities, how can the nonprofit sector become and be positioned as a leader in gender equity?

## Greater focus is needed on the experiences of Indigenous women, women from the LGBTQ community and women with disabilities working in the sector

While the review was able to locate some research on the experiences of immigrant and racialized women working in the sector, research on the experiences of Indigenous women, women from the LGBTQ community and women with disabilities working in the sector was almost non-existent. The literature detailing experiences of immigrant and racialized women working in the nonprofit sector was confined to the immigrant, refugee, and settlement services subsector, both as a subsector they are found in across the nonprofit sector and as a subsector that they are overrepresented in. Only two pieces of literature detailed experiences of immigrant and racialized women in nonprofit leadership: one presented data in three cities while the other focused on Black women's leadership experiences in the sector in Ontario. However, findings related to compensation were not disaggregated beyond gender. Moreover, apart from minimal research on general labour market outcomes of Indigenous women, women from the LGBTQ community and women with disabilities, there was no literature on their experiences working in the nonprofit sector in Ontario and/or Canada.

More disaggregated data and representative information on diverse women's employment experiences working in the sector is needed. We know that they experience barriers in the broader labour market and that they work in the sector. Lack of information makes their contributions and experiences invisible. More information can assist in developing and implementing strategies and solutions for the nonprofit sector labour force that target particular challenges and that do not create adverse impacts.

### KEY ISSUES

#### What did we learn?

To better understand the employment experiences of women working in the nonprofit sector, it is critical to first understand on the one hand how and why the nonprofit sector's labour market is structured the way that it is and on the other hand how a gendered and racialized division of labour translates into unequal labour market patterns for diverse women. This is because both are interconnected. The sector's labour force market structures are rooted in the gendered and racialized division of labour. Devaluation of women's work and care work in society at large directly links to decent work barriers the sector faces, to the devaluation of the sector as a whole. Devalued work has more precarious work traits, such as low wages and instability, and for this reason precarious work is able to permeate the sector as it has.

The sector is not immune to broader gender and race labour force market patterns; they also manifest in the sector. The difference between the nonprofit sector and other sectors is how they manifest, given the sector's distinctive features. For example, while a typical glass ceiling does not exist in the nonprofit sector, women generally end up leading small organizations and not large ones. The gender wage gap exists alongside a "care penalty" and limited access to health benefits, a pension plan, and maternity top-ups. There are large numbers of immigrant and racialized women working in the sector, yet there is a glass ceiling for them and we do not have data to quantify the extent of their gender wage gap. It is important to better understand the specific manifestation of barriers women face in the sector not only because it is a women-majority sector and gender equity is a goal in and of itself, but also because it means that strategies to combat inequality in other sectors cannot be applied to this sector. The sector needs to move beyond being just women-majority to better supporting all its women workers with targeted solutions and strategies for gender equality.

## What more do we need to know?

This literature review began by asking: how do glass ceilings, leaky pipelines, the gender wage gap and precarious work - coupled with the sector's unique challenges - manifest and impact different women in the nonprofit labour force? In attempting to answer this question, the review has given rise to multiple other interesting questions which ONN will attempt to explore in the second phase of this project and also call for further research on. The list is not exhaustive. Answer to these questions can reveal what decent work for women would look like in the sector. They are outlined below using the decent work framework:

### **Employment Opportunities**

- Why do diverse women enter or leave the sector?
- What are their educational and/or experience backgrounds?
- Do women working in the sector feel they have access to employment in other sectors?
- Do diverse women feel they have access to employment in all subsectors?
- What are women's experiences working in the sector outside of the GTHA area?
- Given there are a range of jobs in the sector (i.e. across positions, subsectors, and organization functions), where would most opportunities and for whom lay?

### **Fair Income**

- What are diverse men and women earning in the sector, across subsectors and roles, compared to other sectors and their roles?
- Are legislative mechanisms to combat the gender wage gap working in the sector? How? If not, why? What is needed for better implementation? Are there any other legislative mechanisms needed (e.g., pay transparency laws)?
- To what extent do women negotiate pay? Would this be a useful skill to improve as women working in the sector?
- Why are there pronounced gaps between men's and women's earnings at the leadership level?

### **Health Benefits, Pension, Maternity Top-Ups**

- How many women have a pension plan in the sector? Is there a difference between new and older workers?
- Do organizations offer maternity top-ups? If so, how much?
- What other maternity and/or parental benefits are offered?
- How is the transition to maternity leave and back into the workplace experienced?

### **Stable Employment**

- How many diverse women are employed in part-time and/or contract positions?
- What, if any, disruptions to work do women face? Is the sector well equipped to support women during these disruptions?
- How many women face disruptions in continuous work as a result of sector structures (i.e. contract positions, summer closures)?

## **Opportunities for Development and Advancement**

- Is there a lack of leadership pipelines in the subsectors? In which subsectors and why?
- How can the sector build women's leadership pipelines?
- What professional development opportunities do women need? How can formal networking and mentoring opportunities be created?

## **Equality Rights at Work**

- How many immigrant, racialized, and Indigenous women, women from the LGBTQ community, and women with disabilities work in organizations whose function relates to part of their identity (i.e. are Indigenous women only working in Indigenous-led organizations and/or in cultural competency positions and why)? How many work in mainstream organizations? Do different women feel like they can only access certain positions and/or subsectors?
- How does workplace harassment for women manifest?
- To what extent is occupational violence a concern for women?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages for women of working in women-majority workplaces and sectors?

## **Culture and Leadership**

- What kind of glass ceiling manifests in the sector?
- To what extent is leadership in the sector gendered?
- Why are women not in leadership positions in larger organizations?
- How can female leaders in smaller organizations in the sector be better supported?
- Given barriers women face in the workplace and in leadership, how can women be supported to achieve the leadership competencies of the future?

## **Next Steps**

This literature review, both the findings and identified gaps, will inform the next phase of ONN's Decent Work for Women project. In the next phase we will be engaging with women working in the sector through focus groups, key informant interviews, and a sector wide survey. Women's voices from the sector will, it is hoped, fill the gaps of what was not illuminated in the review, allow us to further scope what key barriers to focus on, and what corresponding strategies and solutions can be developed. Particular focus will be placed on engaging women who do not normally engage in these conversations. The last year-and-a-half of the project will focus on implementing and tracking the progress of these solutions at the systemic, network, and organizational levels.

# Conclusion

This literature review has outlined three key findings on women working in the nonprofit sector in Ontario:

- The nonprofit sector in Ontario is women-majority but not always women-led
- Unequal job opportunities and a glass ceiling exist for diverse women
- Women in the nonprofit sector have a lower compensation package, compared to men, affected by a “care penalty”, limited access to a pension plan and maternity top-ups, and a gender wage gap

These findings are embedded in a larger framework of distinctive challenges and trends the nonprofit sector faces, and the gendered and racialized division of labour. Gaps exist in the literature as the labour force dialogue on gender equity does not include the nonprofit lens and dialogues on the nonprofit sector labour force do not include a gender equity lens. Moreover, a stronger intersectional lens that also includes the experiences of Indigenous women, women from the LGBTQ community and women with disabilities working in the sector is needed. As we move into the second phase of this project, we have learned that the nonprofit sector labour in Ontario is not immune to gendered labour force patterns or to worse labour market outcomes for diverse women. The nonprofit labour force market structures are rooted in a gendered and racialized division of labour. Using the decent work framework we have identified a number of intersecting questions for further exploration as we invite the women working in the sector to share their voices as well as for other researchers to take on. Despite barriers, women have worked and continue to work in the sector in large numbers because it allows them to contribute to their communities.

# Bibliography

"Introduction." *Stories of Care: A Labour of Law - Gender and Class at Work*, by LJB Hayes, Palgrave MacMillan UK, 2017, pp. VIII-232, [www.palgrave.com/gb/book/9781137611154](http://www.palgrave.com/gb/book/9781137611154)

"Racism and Racialized Women's Experiences in the Workplace." *Canada's Economic Apartheid: The Social Exclusion of Racialized Groups in the New Century*, by Grace-Edward Galabuzi, Canadian Scholars' Press Inc., 2006, pp. 126–127, [books.google.ca/books?id=dEzDhwE7JYsC&source=gbs\\_navlinks\\_s](https://books.google.ca/books?id=dEzDhwE7JYsC&source=gbs_navlinks_s).

Abugala, Wisal, et al. *Like Wonder Women, Goddesses, and Robots: How Immigrant Women Are Impacted by and Respond to Precarious Employment*. Access Alliance Multicultural Health and Community Services, 2014, *Like Wonder Women, Goddesses, and Robots: How Immigrant Women Are Impacted by and Respond to Precarious Employment*, [accessalliance.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Like-Wonder-Women-Goddess-and-Robots\\_final.pdf](http://accessalliance.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Like-Wonder-Women-Goddess-and-Robots_final.pdf).

Anti-Racism Directorate of Ontario. *A Better Way Forward: Ontario's 3-Year Anti-Racism Strategic Plan*. Anti-Racism Directorate of Ontario, 2017, *A Better Way Forward: Ontario's 3-Year Anti-Racism Strategic Plan*, [files.ontario.ca/ar-2001\\_ard\\_report\\_tagged\\_final-s.pdf](http://files.ontario.ca/ar-2001_ard_report_tagged_final-s.pdf).

Arriagada, Paula. *Women in Canada: A Gender-Based Statistical Report - First Nations, Métis and Inuit Women*. Statistics Canada, 2016, *Women in Canada: A Gender-Based Statistical Report - First Nations, Métis and Inuit Women*, [www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-503-x/2015001/article/14313-eng.pdf](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-503-x/2015001/article/14313-eng.pdf).

Austin, Nancy, et al. *Final Report and Recommendations of the Gender Wage Gap Strategy Steering Committee*. Government of Ontario, 2016, *Final Report and Recommendations of the Gender Wage Gap Strategy Steering Committee*, [files.ontario.ca/7198\\_mol\\_gwg\\_finalreport\\_eng\\_wa\\_08f\\_v2\\_1.pdf](http://files.ontario.ca/7198_mol_gwg_finalreport_eng_wa_08f_v2_1.pdf).

Austin, Nancy, et al. *Gender Wage Gap Strategy Consultation*. Government of Ontario, 2016, *Gender Wage Gap Strategy Consultation*, [www.ontario.ca/page/gender-wage-gap-strategy-consultation#section-0](http://www.ontario.ca/page/gender-wage-gap-strategy-consultation#section-0).

Baines, Donna, et al. "Filling the Gaps: Unpaid (and Precarious) Work in the Nonprofit Social Services." *Critical Social Policy*, vol. 37, no. 4, 2017, pp. 625–645., doi:10.1177/0261018317693128.

Baines, Donna, et al. "Not Profiting From Precarity: The Work of Nonprofit Service Delivery and the Creation of Precariousness." *Just Labour: A Canadian Journal of Work and Society*, vol. 22, 2014, pp. 74–93.

Baines, Donna, et al. "Self-Monitoring, Self-Blaming, Self-Sacrificing Workers: Gendered Managerialism in the Non-Profit Sector." *Women's Studies International Forum*, vol. 35, 2012, pp. 362–371., doi:10.1016/j.wsif.2012.07.002.

Baines, Donna, and Ian Cunningham. "'White Knuckle Care Work': Violence, Gender and New Public Management in the Voluntary Sector." *Work, Employment and Society*, vol. 25, no. 4, 2011, pp. 760–776., doi:10.1177/0950017011419710.

Block, Sheila. *Who Is Working for Minimum Wage in Ontario?* Wellesley Institute, 2013, *Who Is Working for Minimum Wage in Ontario?*, [www.wellesleyinstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Who-Makes-Minimum-Wage.pdf](http://www.wellesleyinstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Who-Makes-Minimum-Wage.pdf).

Block, Sheila. *Ontario's Growing Gap: The Role of Race and Gender*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, 2010, *Ontario's Growing Gap: The Role of Race and Gender*, [ywcacanada.ca/data/research\\_docs/00000140.pdf](http://ywcacanada.ca/data/research_docs/00000140.pdf).

Block, Sheila, and Grace-Edward Galabuzi. *Canada's Colour Coded Labour Market: The Gap for Racialized Workers*. Wellesley Institute, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, 2011, *Canada's Colour Coded Labour Market: The Gap for Racialized Workers*, [www.wellesleyinstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/Colour\\_Coded\\_Labour\\_MarketFINAL.pdf](http://www.wellesleyinstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/Colour_Coded_Labour_MarketFINAL.pdf).

Boyd, Karen S. "Glass Ceiling." *Encyclopedia of Race, Ethnicity, and Society*, SAGE, 2012, pp. 549–552, [edge.sagepub.com/system/files/15\\_GlassCeiling.pdf](http://edge.sagepub.com/system/files/15_GlassCeiling.pdf).

Bruckmüller, Susanne, and Nyla R. Branscombe. "How Women End Up on the 'Glass Cliff.'" *Harvard Business Review*, 2011, [hbr.org/2011/01/how-women-end-up-on-the-glass-cliff](http://hbr.org/2011/01/how-women-end-up-on-the-glass-cliff).

Calgary Chamber of Voluntary Organizations (CCVO). *Boland Survey of Nonprofit Sector Salaries and Human Resource Practices*. Calgary Chamber of Voluntary Organization

Canadian Race Relations Foundation. "Glossary of Terms." *Canadian Race Relations Foundation*, Canadian Race Relations Foundation, [www.crrf-fcrr.ca/en/resources/glossary-a-terms-en-gb-1?limit=50&orderby=alpha&letter=i](http://www.crrf-fcrr.ca/en/resources/glossary-a-terms-en-gb-1?limit=50&orderby=alpha&letter=i).

Canadian Women's Foundation. "The Facts about the Gender Wage Gap in Canada." *Canadian Women's Foundation*, Canadian Women's Foundation, [www.canadianwomen.org/the-facts/the-wage-gap/](http://www.canadianwomen.org/the-facts/the-wage-gap/).

Charity Village. *2017 Canadian Nonprofit Sector Salary and Benefits Study*. Charity Village, 2017, *2017 Canadian Nonprofit Sector Salary and Benefits Study*.

Charity Village. *2013 Canadian Nonprofit Sector Salary and Benefits Study*. Charity Village, 2013, *2013 Canadian Nonprofit Sector Salary and Benefits Study*.

Charity Village. *2011 Canadian Nonprofit Sector Salary and Benefits Study*. Charity Village, 2011, *2011 Canadian Nonprofit Sector Salary and Benefits Study*.

Charlesworth, Sara. "The Regulation of Paid Care Workers' Wages and Conditions in the Non-Profit Sector: A Toronto Case Study." *Relations Industrielles / Industrial Relations*, vol. 65, ser. 3, 2010, pp. 380–399. 3.

Chui, Tina. *Women in Canada: A Gender-Based Statistical Report - Immigrant Women*. Statistics Canada, 2011, *Women in Canada: A Gender-Based Statistical Report - Immigrant Women*, [www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-503-x/2010001/article/11527-eng.pdf](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-503-x/2010001/article/11527-eng.pdf).

Chui, Tina, and Hélène Maheux. *Women in Canada: A Gender-Based Statistical Report - Visible Minority Women*. Statistics Canada, 2011, *Women in Canada: A Gender-Based Statistical Report - Visible Minority Women*, [www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-503-x/2010001/article/11527-eng.pdf](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-503-x/2010001/article/11527-eng.pdf).

Clutterbuck, Peter, and Caryl Arundel. *Leading Our Future: Leadership Competencies in Ontario's Nonprofit Sector*. Ontario Nonprofit Network, 2017, *Leading Our Future: Leadership Competencies in Ontario's Nonprofit Sector*, [theonnc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/ONN.Report.Leadng-our-Future.FINAL\\_.pdf](http://theonnc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/ONN.Report.Leadng-our-Future.FINAL_.pdf).

Cranford, Cynthia J, et al. "The Gender of Precarious Employment in Canada." *Relations Industrielles / Industrial Relations*, vol. 58, no. 3, 2003, pp. 454–482., doi:10.7202/007495ar.

Creese, Gillian. "Addressing the Skills Paradox: Deskilling Migrant Women in Canada." *Harnessing Knowledge on the Migration of Highly Skilled Women*, International Organization for Migration, OECD Development Centre, 2014, pp. 91–101, [publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/iom\\_oecd\\_gender.pdf](http://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/iom_oecd_gender.pdf).

Cunningham, Ian, et al. "Austerity Policies, 'Precarity' and the Nonprofit Workforce: A Comparative Study of UK and Canada." *Journal of Industrial Relations*, vol. 58, ser. 4, 2016, pp. 455–472. 4, doi:10.1177/0022185616639309.

Cunningham, Ian, and Donna Baines. "How Could Management Let This Happen?' Gender, Unpaid Work and Industrial Relations in the Nonprofit Social Services Sector." *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 2017, pp. 1–33.

Cunningham, Ian, et al. "'You've Just Cursed Us': Precarity, Austerity and Worker's Participation in the Non-Profit Social Services." *Industrial Relations*, vol. 72, no. 2, 2017, pp. 370–393.

DisAbled Women's Network Canada. *Study on Economic Security on Women with Disabilities*. DisAbled Women's Network Canada, 2007, *Study on Economic Security on Women with Disabilities*, [www.dawncanada.net/main/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/StudyonEconomicSecurityonWomenwithDisabilitiesEng.pdf](http://www.dawncanada.net/main/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/StudyonEconomicSecurityonWomenwithDisabilitiesEng.pdf).

Edwardh, Joey, and Peter Clutterbuck. *Decent Work in the Non-Profit Community Services Sector in Ontario: Submission to the Changing Workplace Review Special Advisors*. Social Planning Network of Ontario, 2015, *Decent Work in the Non-Profit Community Services Sector in Ontario: Submission to the Changing Workplace Review Special Advisors*, [www.spno.ca/images/pdf/SPNO-ESA-Submission-FINAL.pdf](http://www.spno.ca/images/pdf/SPNO-ESA-Submission-FINAL.pdf).

Edwardh, Joey, et al. *Pushing the Limits: Challenges of Halton's Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Labour Force*. Community Development Halton, 2007, *Pushing the Limits: Challenges of Halton's Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Labour Force*, [www.cdhalton.ca/pdf/Pushing\\_The\\_Limits\\_Technical\\_Report.pdf](http://www.cdhalton.ca/pdf/Pushing_The_Limits_Technical_Report.pdf).

Emmett, Brian. "Beyond Strategy: Charities Building the Future Canadians Want." *The Philanthropist*, 2018, [thephilanthropist.ca/2018/02/beyond-synergy-charities-building-the-future-canadians-want/pdf/](http://thephilanthropist.ca/2018/02/beyond-synergy-charities-building-the-future-canadians-want/pdf/).

England, Paula. "Emerging Theories of Care Work." *Emerging Theories of Care Work*, Annual Review of Sociology, [www.jstor.org/stable29737725](http://www.jstor.org/stable29737725).

Fanelli, Carlo, et al. "Precarity in the Nonprofit Employment Services Sector." *Canadian Review of Sociology*, vol. 54, no. 352, 2017, p. 331.

Ferguson, Sarah Jane. *Women in Canada: A Gender-Based Statistical Report - Women and Education: Qualifications, Skills and Technology*. Statistics Canada, 2016, *Women in Canada: A Gender-Based Statistical Report - Women and Education: Qualifications, Skills and Technology*, [www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-503-x/2015001/article/14640-eng.pdf](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-503-x/2015001/article/14640-eng.pdf).

Geek Feminism Wiki. "Leaky Pipeline." *Leaky Pipeline*, [geekfeminism.wikia.com/wiki/Leaky\\_pipeline](http://geekfeminism.wikia.com/wiki/Leaky_pipeline).

Goodman, Rachael, and Sarah Kaplan. "When Care Work and Paid Work Collide." *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 2018, [ssir.org/articles/entry/when\\_care\\_work\\_and\\_paid\\_work\\_collide](http://ssir.org/articles/entry/when_care_work_and_paid_work_collide).

Gouin, Rachel R, et al. "Feminist Participatory Research in a Social Justice Organization." *Action Research*, vol. 9, no. 3, 2011, pp. 261–281., doi:10.1177/1476750310396945.

Government of Ontario, and Ontario Nonprofit Network. *Ontario Open for Business - Business Sector Strategy: Not-For-Profit Sector*. Government of Ontario, Ontario Nonprofit Network, 2012, *Ontario Open for Business - Business Sector Strategy: Not-For-Profit Sector*.

Government of Ontario. "Your Guide to the Employment Standards Act." Government of Ontario, Government of Ontario, [www.ontario.ca/document/your-guide-employment-standards-act-0](http://www.ontario.ca/document/your-guide-employment-standards-act-0).

Hall, Michael H, et al. *Cornerstones of Community: Highlights of the National Survey of Nonprofit and Voluntary Organizations*. Government of Canada, 2005, *Cornerstones of Community: Highlights of the National Survey of Nonprofit and Voluntary Organizations*, [www.imaginecanada.ca/sites/default/files/www/en/library/nsnvo/nsnvo\\_report\\_english.pdf](http://www.imaginecanada.ca/sites/default/files/www/en/library/nsnvo/nsnvo_report_english.pdf).

Hall, Michael H, et al. *The Capacity to Serve: A Qualitative Study of the Challenges Facing Canada's Nonprofit and Voluntary Organizations*. Government of Canada, 2003, *The Capacity to Serve: A Qualitative Study of the Challenges Facing Canada's Nonprofit and Voluntary Organizations*, [www.vsi-isbc.org/eng/knowledge/pdf/capacity\\_to\\_serve.pdf](http://www.vsi-isbc.org/eng/knowledge/pdf/capacity_to_serve.pdf).

Haggar-Guenette, Cynthia, et al. *Satellite Account of Non-Profit Institutions and Volunteering*. Government of Canada, 2007, *Satellite Account of Non-Profit Institutions and Volunteering*, [www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/13-015-x/13-015-x2009000-eng.pdf](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/13-015-x/13-015-x2009000-eng.pdf).

Hamdad, Malika. *Valuing Households' Unpaid Work in Canada, 1992 and 1998: Trends and Sources of Change*. Government of Canada, 2003, *Valuing Households' Unpaid Work in Canada, 1992 and 1998: Trends and Sources of Change*.

Harvard Business Review. *The Glass Cliff Phenomenon*, [hbr.org/2010/12/the-glass-cliff-phenomenon](http://hbr.org/2010/12/the-glass-cliff-phenomenon).

Hawco, Michelle. "Career Trajectories of Female Executive Directors in Canada's Non-Profit Social Service Sector: A Phenomenological Study." *Capella University*, ProQuest LLC, 2014, pp. VII-207.

Hixson-Vulpe, Jacq. *Hiring Across All Spectrums: A Report on Broadening Opportunities for LGBTQ2+ Jobseekers*. Pride at Work Canada, 2017, *Hiring Across All Spectrums: A Report on Broadening Opportunities for LGBTQ2+ Jobseekers*, [prideatwork.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/PrideAtWork\\_2018\\_Round\\_FINAL-s.pdf](http://prideatwork.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/PrideAtWork_2018_Round_FINAL-s.pdf).

HR Council for the Nonprofit Sector. *Driving Change: A National Study of Canadian Nonprofit Executive Leaders*. HR Council for the Nonprofit Sector, 2012, *Driving Change: A National Study of Canadian Nonprofit Executive Leaders*, [www.hrcouncil.ca/documents/driving\\_change.pdf](http://www.hrcouncil.ca/documents/driving_change.pdf).

HR Council. *Trends & Issues: Gender Mix in the Nonprofit Sector*. HR Council for the Nonprofit Sector, 2008, *Trends & Issues: Gender Mix in the Nonprofit Sector*, [hrcouncil.ca/documents/LMI\\_gender\\_mix.pdf](http://hrcouncil.ca/documents/LMI_gender_mix.pdf).

Houle, Patricia, et al. *Spotlight on Canadian: Results from the General Social Survey - Changes in Parents' Participation in Domestic Tasks and Care for Children from 1986 to 2015*. Statistics Canada, 2017, *Spotlight on Canadian: Results from the General Social Survey - Changes in Parents' Participation in Domestic Tasks and Care for Children from 1986 to 2015*, [www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-652-x/89-652-x2017001-eng.pdf](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-652-x/89-652-x2017001-eng.pdf).

Hosseini, Caroline Shenaz. *A Black Perspective on Canada's Third Sector: Case Studies on Women Leaders in the Social Economy*. 2017, *A Black Perspective on Canada's Third Sector: Case Studies on Women Leaders in the Social Economy*, [www.aeaweb.org/conference/2018/preliminary/paper/QGKdyQ5A](http://www.aeaweb.org/conference/2018/preliminary/paper/QGKdyQ5A).

Hudon, Tamara. "Statistics Canada." *Statistics Canada*, Statistics Canada, 2015.  
[www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-503-x/2015001/article/14217-eng.pdf](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-503-x/2015001/article/14217-eng.pdf).

International Labour Organization. "Decent Work." *International Labour Organization*, International Labour Organization, [www.ilo.org/global/topics/decent-work/lang-en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/decent-work/lang-en/index.htm).

International Labour Organization. *Global Commission on the Future of Work*. International Labour Organization, 2018, *Global Commission on the Future of Work*,  
[www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---cabinet/documents/publication/wcms\\_618165.pdf](http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---cabinet/documents/publication/wcms_618165.pdf).

International Labour Organization. "The Gender Division of Labour." *Module on Gender, Poverty and Employment*, p. 1, [www.glopp.ch/A5/en/multimedia/A5\\_1\\_pdf2.pdf](http://www.glopp.ch/A5/en/multimedia/A5_1_pdf2.pdf).

International Labour Organization. "The Gender Gap in Employment: What's Holding Women Back?" *InfoStories - The Gender Gap in Employment: What's Holding Women Back?*, International Labour Organization, 2017, [ilo.org/infostories/en-GB/Stories/Employment/barriers-women](http://ilo.org/infostories/en-GB/Stories/Employment/barriers-women).

Jayaraman, Sita, and Harald Bauder. *Niche Employment or Occupational Segmentation? Immigrant Women Working in the Settlement Sector in Germany and Canada*. Ryerson University, 2013,  
[www.ryerson.ca/content/dam/rcis/documents/RCIS\\_WP\\_Jayaraman\\_No\\_2014\\_3.pdf](http://www.ryerson.ca/content/dam/rcis/documents/RCIS_WP_Jayaraman_No_2014_3.pdf).

Kühn, Stefan, et al. *World Employment Social Outlook: Trends for Women 2017*. International Labour Organization, 2017, *World Employment Social Outlook: Trends for Women 2017*,  
[www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---inst/documents/publication/wcms\\_557245.pdf](http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---inst/documents/publication/wcms_557245.pdf).

Lalande, Lisa, and Jamie Van Ymeren. *Change Work: Valuing Decent Work in the Not-for-Profit Sector*. Mowat NFP, Ontario Nonprofit Network, Toronto Neighbourhood Centres, 2015, *Change Work: Valuing Decent Work in the Not-for-Profit Sector*,  
[mowatcentre.ca/wp-content/uploads/publications/111\\_change\\_work.pdf](http://mowatcentre.ca/wp-content/uploads/publications/111_change_work.pdf).

Lambert, Brittany, and Kate McInturff. *Making Women Count: The Unequal Economics of Women's Work*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, *Making Women Count: The Unequal Economics of Women's Work*,  
[www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2016/03/Making\\_Women\\_Count2016.pdf](http://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2016/03/Making_Women_Count2016.pdf).

LeBlanc, H el ene. *The Economic Leadership and Prosperity of Canadian Women: Report of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women*. House of Commons Canada, 2015, *The Economic Leadership and Prosperity of Canadian Women: Report of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women*,  
[publications.gc.ca/collections/collection\\_2015/parl/xc71-1/XC71-1-1-412-5-eng.pdf](http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2015/parl/xc71-1/XC71-1-1-412-5-eng.pdf).

Lessels, Christina, and Julie Maher. "Start from Zero": *Immigrant Women's Experiences of the Gender Wage Gap*. Ontario Women's Health Network, 2017, "Start from Zero": *Immigrant Women's Experiences of the Gender Wage Gap*, [www.payequity.gov.on.ca/en/DocsEN/OWHN\\_Final%20Report\\_April%202017.pdf](http://www.payequity.gov.on.ca/en/DocsEN/OWHN_Final%20Report_April%202017.pdf).

Lewchuk, Wayne, et al. *It's More than Poverty: Employment Precarity and Household Well-Being*. Poverty and Employment Precarity in Southern Ontario, 2013, *It's More than Poverty: Employment Precarity and Household Well-Being*, [www.unitedwaytyr.com/document.doc?id=91](http://www.unitedwaytyr.com/document.doc?id=91).

Lewchuk, Wayne, et al. "Origins of Precarity: Families and Communities in Crisis." *Precarious Employment: Causes, Consequences and Remedies*, Fernwood Publishing, 2017, pp. 2–12.

Marshall, Katherine. *Employer Top-Ups*. Statistics Canada, 2010, *Employer Top-Ups*,  
[www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75-001-x/2010102/pdf/11120-eng.pdf](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75-001-x/2010102/pdf/11120-eng.pdf).

Maurutto, Paula. "Charity and Public Welfare in History: A Look at Ontario, 1830-1950." *The Philanthropist*, vol. 19, ser. 3, 2004, pp. 159–167. 3, [thephilanthropist.ca/original-pdfs/Philanthropist-19-3-298.pdf](http://thephilanthropist.ca/original-pdfs/Philanthropist-19-3-298.pdf).

Mclsaac, Elizabeth, et al. *Shaping the Future: Leadership in Ontario's Nonprofit Labour Force*. Ontario Nonprofit Network, Mowat NFP, 2013, *Shaping the Future: Leadership in Ontario's Nonprofit Labour Force*, [theonncan.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/ONN-Mowat-Shaping-the-Future-Final-Report-October2013.pdf](http://theonncan.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/ONN-Mowat-Shaping-the-Future-Final-Report-October2013.pdf).

McInturff, Kate. "A Deficit Worth Worrying About: The Gendered And Racialized Wage Gap." *Behind the Numbers*, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, 2017, [behindthenumbers.ca/2017/12/13/11924/](http://behindthenumbers.ca/2017/12/13/11924/).

McInturff, Kate. *Ontario's Gender Gap: Women and Jobs Post-Recession*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, *Ontario's Gender Gap: Women and Jobs Post-Recession*, <https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/Ontario%20Office/2014/03/Ontario%27s%20Gender%20Gap%20FINAL.pdf>.

McInturff, Kate. *Study: The Economic Leadership and Prosperity of Canadian Women*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, *Study: The Economic Leadership and Prosperity of Canadian Women*, [https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2014/05/the\\_economic\\_leadership\\_and\\_prosperity\\_of\\_canadian\\_women.pdf](https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2014/05/the_economic_leadership_and_prosperity_of_canadian_women.pdf).

McInturff, Kate. *Time to Grow Up: Family Policies for the Way We Live Now*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, *Time to Grow Up: Family Policies for the Way We Live Now*, [https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2015/01/Time\\_to\\_Grow\\_Up.pdf](https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2015/01/Time_to_Grow_Up.pdf).

Medianu, Stelian, and Victoria Esses. *Visible Minorities and Women in Senior Leadership Positions: London, Hamilton, and Ottawa*. Pathways to Prosperity, Western University Centre for Research on Migration and Ethnic Relations, 2016, *Visible Minorities and Women in Senior Leadership Positions: London, Hamilton, and Ottawa*, [diversecityonboard.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/visible\\_minorities\\_and\\_women\\_in\\_senior\\_leadership\\_positions\\_report\\_1.pdf](http://diversecityonboard.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/visible_minorities_and_women_in_senior_leadership_positions_report_1.pdf).

Meyer, Madonna Harrington, editor. "Introduction." *Care Work: Gender Labour and the Welfare State*, Routledge, 2000, pp. 1–5, [books.google.ca/books/about/Care\\_Work.html?id=DsGTAgAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=kp\\_read\\_button&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.ca/books/about/Care_Work.html?id=DsGTAgAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=kp_read_button&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false).

Ministry of Labour. *Closing the Gender Wage Gap: A Background Paper*. Ministry of Labour, 2015, *Closing the Gender Wage Gap: A Background Paper*, [www.labour.gov.on.ca/english/about/pdf/gwg\\_background.pdf](http://www.labour.gov.on.ca/english/about/pdf/gwg_background.pdf).

Moyser, Melissa. *Women in Canada: A Gender-Based Statistical Report - Women and Paid Work*. Government of Canada, 2017, *Women in Canada: A Gender-Based Statistical Report - Women and Paid Work*, [www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-503-x/2015001/article/14694-eng.pdf](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-503-x/2015001/article/14694-eng.pdf).

Ontario Equal Pay Coalition. "Calculating the Pay Gap." *Ontario Equal Pay Coalition*, Ontario Equal Pay Coalition, [equalpaycoalition.org/calculating-the-pay-gap/](http://equalpaycoalition.org/calculating-the-pay-gap/).

Ontario Equal Pay Coalition. "Myths about the Pay Gap" *Ontario Equal Pay Coalition*, Ontario Equal Pay Coalition, <http://equalpaycoalition.org/myths-about-the-gap/>

Ontario Federation of Indigenous Friendship Centres. *A Response to Women's Economic Empowerment: A Call to Action for Ontario*. Ontario Federation of Indigenous Friendship Centres, 2017, *A Response to Women's Economic Empowerment: A Call to Action for Ontario*, [ofifc.org/sites/default/files/docs/2017-07-21%20OFIFC%20Submission%20on%20Women%27s%20Economic%20Empowerment%20Discussion%20Paper.pdf](http://ofifc.org/sites/default/files/docs/2017-07-21%20OFIFC%20Submission%20on%20Women%27s%20Economic%20Empowerment%20Discussion%20Paper.pdf).

Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC). "Disability and Human Rights (Brochure 2016)." *Ontario Human Rights Commission*, Ontario Human Rights Organization, [www.ohrc.on.ca/en/disability-and-human-rights-brochure-2016](http://www.ohrc.on.ca/en/disability-and-human-rights-brochure-2016).

Ontario Nonprofit Network. *A Roadmap for a Nonprofit Sector Pension Plan*. Ontario Nonprofit Network, 2017, *A Roadmap for a Nonprofit Sector Pension Plan*, [theonn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/ONNPensionRoadmap.TechnicalReport.pdf](http://theonn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/ONNPensionRoadmap.TechnicalReport.pdf).

Ontario Nonprofit Network. *Introducing the "Public Benefit Nonprofit Sector"*. Ontario Nonprofit Network, 2017, *Introducing the "Public Benefit Nonprofit Sector"*, [theonn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Introducing-the-Public-Benefit-Nonprofit-Sector-July-2017.pdf](http://theonn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Introducing-the-Public-Benefit-Nonprofit-Sector-July-2017.pdf).

Pay Equity Commission of Ontario. *A Guide to Interpreting Ontario's Pay Equity Act*. 2015, [www.payequity.gov.on.ca/en/DocsEN/guide\\_act2015\\_EN.pdf](http://www.payequity.gov.on.ca/en/DocsEN/guide_act2015_EN.pdf).

Pay Equity Commission of Ontario. *Gender Wage Gaps and Earnings Ratios in Ontario*. 2014, [http://www.payequity.gov.on.ca/en/DocsEN/gender\\_gaps.pdf](http://www.payequity.gov.on.ca/en/DocsEN/gender_gaps.pdf).

Pay Equity Commission of Ontario. "What is the Gender Wage Gap" *Ontario Equal Pay Coalition*, Ontario Equal Pay Coalition, [http://www.payequity.gov.on.ca/en/GWG/Pages/what\\_is\\_GWG.aspx](http://www.payequity.gov.on.ca/en/GWG/Pages/what_is_GWG.aspx)

Peel Leadership Centre. *Who's Leading Now - Revisiting Peel Region's Nonprofit Sector Leaders: Executive Director Survey 2015*. Peel Leadership Centre, 2015, *Who's Leading Now - Revisiting Peel Region's Nonprofit Sector Leaders: Executive Director Survey 2015*, [www.peelleadershipcentre.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/ED-Survey-2015.pdf](http://www.peelleadershipcentre.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/ED-Survey-2015.pdf).

Perrone, Kristin M. "Traditional and Nontraditional Work and Family Roles for Women and Men" *Journal of Career Development*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2009, pp. 3–7., doi:10.1177/0894845309340787.

Pollara Strategic Insights. *2013 State of the Sector: Profile of Ontario's Not-for-Profits and Charitable Organizations*. Government of Ontario, 2013, *2013 State of the Sector: Profile of Ontario's Not-for-Profits and Charitable Organizations*, [www.ontario.ca/page/2013-state-sector-profile-ontarios-not-profits-and-charitable-organizations-executive-summary](http://www.ontario.ca/page/2013-state-sector-profile-ontarios-not-profits-and-charitable-organizations-executive-summary).

Premji, Stephanie, et al. "Precarious Work Experiences of Racialized Immigrant Women in Toronto: A Community-Based Study." *Just Labour: A Canadian Journal of Work and Society*, vol. 22, 2014, pp. 122–143.

Reid, Colleen, et al "Finding The 'Action' in Feminist Participatory Action Research." *Action Research*, vol. 4, no. 3, 2006, pp. 315–332., doi:10.1177/1476750306066804.

Reid, Colleen, and Claudia Gillberg. "Feminist Participatory Action Research." *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Action Research*, SAGE, dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446294406.n141.

Scott, Katerine, et al. *The Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector in Ontario: Regional Highlights of the National Survey of Nonprofit and Voluntary Organizations*. Imagine Canada, Canadian Council on Social Development, 2006, *The Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector in Ontario: Regional Highlights of the National Survey of Nonprofit and Voluntary Organizations*,  
[www.imaginecanada.ca/sites/default/files/www/en/nsnvo/d\\_ontario\\_sector\\_report.pdf](http://www.imaginecanada.ca/sites/default/files/www/en/nsnvo/d_ontario_sector_report.pdf).

Shakya, Yogendra, and Stephanie Premji. "No One Cares about Us': Precarious Employment among Racialized Immigrant Women." *Precarious Employment: Causes, Consequences and Remedies*, Fernwood Publishing, pp. 18–27

Shakya, Yogendra B, et al. *Where Are the Good Jobs? Ten Case Stories of "Working Rough, Living Poor"*. Access Alliance Multicultural Health and Community Services, 2013, *Where Are the Good Jobs? Ten Case Stories of "Working Rough, Living Poor"*,  
[accessalliance.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Summary\\_Where-are-the-Good-Jobs-Report-2013.pdf](http://accessalliance.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Summary_Where-are-the-Good-Jobs-Report-2013.pdf).

Shields, John, et al. "Precarious Undertakings: Serving Vulnerable Communities through Non-Profit Work." *Precarious Employment: Causes, Consequences and Remedies*, Fernwood Publishing, pp. 31–42.

Statistics Canada. *Census Profile, 2016 Census*. 2017,  
[www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/index.cfm?Lang=E](http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/index.cfm?Lang=E).

Statistics Canada. *Does Education Pay? A Comparison of Earnings by Level of Education In Canada and Its Provinces and Territories - Census of Population 2016*. Statistics Canada, 2017, *Does Education Pay? A Comparison of Earnings by Level of Education In Canada and Its Provinces and Territories - Census of Population 2016*,  
[www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/as-sa/98-200-x/2016024/98-200-x2016024-eng.pdf](http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/as-sa/98-200-x/2016024/98-200-x2016024-eng.pdf).

Statistics Canada. *Focus on Geography, 2016 Census*. 2017,  
<http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/as-sa/fogs-spg/Facts-PR-Eng.cfm?TOPIC=9&LANG=Eng&GK=PR&GC=35>.

Statistics Canada. *Labour in Canada: Key Results from the 2016 Census*. Statistics Canada, 2017, *Labour in Canada: Key Results from the 2016 Census*,  
[www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/171129/dq171129b-eng.pdf](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/171129/dq171129b-eng.pdf).

Statistics Canada. *Education in Canada: Key Results from the 2016 Census*. Statistics Canada, 2017, *Labour in Canada: Key Results from the 2016 Census*,  
<https://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/171129/dq171129a-eng.pdf>.

Status of Women Canada. "What Is GBA+?" *Government of Canada*, Government of Canada, 25 May 2017,  
[www.swc-cfc.gc.ca/gba-acf/index-en.html](http://www.swc-cfc.gc.ca/gba-acf/index-en.html).

*Supplemental Unemployment Benefit Program*. Government of Canada, 2017,  
[www.canada.ca/en/employment-social-development/programs/ei/ei-list/ei-employers-supplemental-unemployment-benefit.html](http://www.canada.ca/en/employment-social-development/programs/ei/ei-list/ei-employers-supplemental-unemployment-benefit.html).

The Circle on Philanthropy and Aboriginal Peoples in Canada, United Way Winnipeg. *Emerging Trends in Philanthropy for First Nations, Métis and Inuit Communities in Canada: A Focus on Manitoba*. The Circle on Philanthropy and Aboriginal Peoples in Canada, 2017, *Emerging Trends in Philanthropy for First Nations, Métis and Inuit Communities in Canada: A Focus on Manitoba*,  
[www.philanthropyandaboriginalpeoples.ca/wp-content/uploads/Manitoba-Indigenous-Report\\_RV\\_WEB\\_Sep18.pdf](http://www.philanthropyandaboriginalpeoples.ca/wp-content/uploads/Manitoba-Indigenous-Report_RV_WEB_Sep18.pdf).

TransPulse. *We've Got Work to Do: Workplace Discrimination and Employment Challenges for Trans People in Ontario*. TransPulse, 2011, *We've Got Work to Do: Workplace Discrimination and Employment Challenges for Trans People in Ontario*, [transpulseproject.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/E3English.pdf](http://transpulseproject.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/E3English.pdf).

Turcotte, Martin. *Insights on Canadian Society - Persons with Disabilities and Employment*. Statistics Canada, 2014, *Insights on Canadian Society - Persons with Disabilities and Employment*, [www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75-006-x/2014001/article/14115-eng.pdf](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75-006-x/2014001/article/14115-eng.pdf).

Türegün, Adnan. "Immigrant Settlement Work in Canada: Limits and Possibilities for Professionalization." *Canadian Review of Sociology*, vol. 50, no. 4, 2013, pp. 387–411., doi:10.1111/cars.12025.

Türegün, Adnan. "Rebuilding Professional Lives: Immigrant Professionals Working in the Ontario Settlement Service Sector." *International Migration & Integration*, vol. 14, 2013, pp. 597–614., doi:10.1007/s12134-012-0258-0.

Vosko, Leah F, et al. *Closing the Employment Standards Enforcement Gap: An Agenda for Change*. Closing the Employment Standards Enforcement Gap: Improving Protections for People in Precarious Jobs, 2017, *Closing the Employment Standards Enforcement Gap: An Agenda for Change*, [closeesgap.ca/closing-the-gap-policy-forum-launches-an-agenda-for-change/](http://closeesgap.ca/closing-the-gap-policy-forum-launches-an-agenda-for-change/).

Werner, Marion, et al. "Conceptual Guide to the Unpaid Work Module." *Gender Work Database*, [www.genderwork.ca/gwd/modules/unpaid-work/](http://www.genderwork.ca/gwd/modules/unpaid-work/).

Wilson, Beth. *On the Front Lines of Toronto's Immigrant-And Refugee-Serving Sector*. Community Social Planning Council of Toronto and Family Service Association of Toronto, 2006, *On the Front Lines of Toronto's Immigrant-And Refugee-Serving Sector*, [d3n8a8pro7vnmx.cloudfront.net/socialplanningtoronto/pages/416/attachments/original/1472008134/on-the-front-lines\\_immigrant-sector\\_july-2006.pdf?1472008134](https://d3n8a8pro7vnmx.cloudfront.net/socialplanningtoronto/pages/416/attachments/original/1472008134/on-the-front-lines_immigrant-sector_july-2006.pdf?1472008134).

YWCA Hamilton. *EXCLerator Project: Women & Diversity in Executive and Community Leadership*. YWCA Hamilton, 2017, *EXCLerator Project: Women & Diversity in Executive and Community Leadership*, [ywcahamilton.org/system/assets/attachments/000/001/121/original/Full\\_EXCLERATOR-report\\_FINAL.pdf](http://ywcahamilton.org/system/assets/attachments/000/001/121/original/Full_EXCLERATOR-report_FINAL.pdf).

Zizys, Tom. *Not Working for Profit: A Labour Market Description of the Non-Profit Sector in Toronto*. Ontario Nonprofit Network, 2011, *Not Working for Profit: A Labour Market Description of the Non-Profit Sector in Toronto*, [theonncan.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/Not-Working-For-Profit-ONN-TWIG-Report-May-2011.pdf](http://theonncan.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/Not-Working-For-Profit-ONN-TWIG-Report-May-2011.pdf).

