

Western University

Scholarship@Western

Occupational Therapy Publications

Occupational Therapy School

2017

Precarity in the Nonprofit Employment Services Sector

Carlo Fanelli

Western University

Debbie Rudman

Western University, drudman@uwo.ca

Rebecca Aldrich

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/otpub>



Part of the [Occupational Therapy Commons](#)

Citation of this paper:

Fanelli, Carlo; Rudman, Debbie; and Aldrich, Rebecca, "Precarity in the Nonprofit Employment Services Sector" (2017). *Occupational Therapy Publications*. 67.

<https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/otpub/67>

Precarity in the Nonprofit Employment Services Sector

Introduction

This paper adds to the growing body of literature exploring the experiences of organizational and workplace precarity within nonprofit employment services agencies. It considers how precarity in nonprofit workplaces in a mid-sized Canadian city is connected to neoliberal reforms in funding and performance-based outcomes, and how workers seek to manage their own sense of insecurity while providing employment support services. Existing literature documents the rise of employment precarity in the nonprofit sector in Ontario and Canada, connecting this to the processes of marketization and government devolution. Drawing on original interviews and focus group data with frontline staff and managers in the employment services sector, this article addresses a pervasive sense of precarity in relation to organizational sustainability and workplace insecurity, and connects this sense of precarity to a shift away from core program to contract-based funding. Our findings also show how the parallel movement away from process measurement to outcomes-based funding has detrimentally impacted service delivery as greater resources are consumed to meet data tracking requirements.

Overall, our study's results demonstrate how employment precarity in the nonprofit employment services sector is amplified by top-down and centralized relationships with funding partners and policymaking divorced from the employment experiences of frontline staff. The resulting transfer of responsibility without power to the nonprofit sector intensifies organizational and individual precarity, while state actors continue to exert considerable power while devolving responsibility. Our research also shows how workers attempt to manage their own precarity via engagement in required outcomes-based techniques while, at times, also taking risks that may make their own work more precarious in efforts to address client needs. For our

study's participants, managing precarity appeared to have important implications for the emotional and mental health of workers who must not only cope with their own sense of workplace precarity but also with their clients' difficult emotional situations. We subsequently contend that it is important to work against rising precarity among frontline staff of nonprofit employment services to ameliorate organizational and workplace conditions, and create environments more supportive of optimal employment support services. Our analysis points to the need for more holistic measures of so-called positive outcomes and worker-centred reforms that enhance and strengthen both service delivery and workplaces within nonprofit employment services organizations.

Methodology

Data for this article were drawn from a multi-sited, cross-national collaborative ethnographic study of long-term unemployment. This four-phase study is generating data with organizational stakeholders, front-line service providers, and people experiencing long-term unemployment in Ontario, Canada and Missouri, U.S.A. The study aims to understand what possibilities and boundaries exist in the everyday experience of long-term unemployment, as well as how those possibilities and boundaries relate to the provision and receipt of social support services. We utilize a collaborative ethnographic (Lassiter, 2005; Lassiter & Campbell, 2010) and community-engaged (Aldrich & Marterella, 2012) research approach to recognize community partners' and study participants' contributions to the knowledge generation process. The study also employs a critical occupational science perspective (Laliberte Rudman, 2015; Njelesani, Gibson, Nixon, Cameron, & Polatajko, 2013) and draws on both governmentality theory (Laliberte Rudman, 2010) and political economy approaches (Baines, 2006; Evans et al.,

2005) to understand how everyday activities (or, occupations) are shaped by sociopolitical discourses that people adopt, contest, or transform.

Data from the second phase of the study provides the basis for this article. This phase of the study aimed to understand how historical and economic factors, sociopolitical discourses, political policies, organizational guidelines, and front-line service providers' discretion (Lipsky, 1980/2010) shaped the provision of support services to people who were unemployed long-term. In this second phase, 7-12 front-line service providers and program managers from employment support service organizations in each study context participated in 1-2 semi-structured interviews, 1-4 workplace observation sessions, and/or 2 focus groups. The interviews focused on identifying general service provision processes, how service provision has changed since the 2008 recession, how service providers define long-term unemployment, and how service providers respond to clients who are at-risk of or experiencing long-term unemployment. Observations of various service provision processes – including individual meetings with clients, team case conferences, or educational workshops – augmented information gained through the interviews. Two focus groups brought service providers together to discuss the findings from interviews and observations to-date with peers in and across study contexts. All interviews and focus groups were audio-recorded, and those recordings were transcribed verbatim for analysis. All field notes written during interviews, observation sessions, and focus groups were also converted to an electronic format for analysis. Open and focused coding using Quirkos software, combined with critical discourse, political economy (Cheek, 2004; Laliberte Rudman, 2013) and situational (Clarke, 2005; Clarke, Friese, & Washburn, 2015) analyses, fostered multi-layered understandings of the material, human, and non-human elements that shape service providers' experiences within the arena of long-term unemployment.

Our initial review of the data revealed a striking difference between study contexts: workplace and organizational precarity came across strongly as a theme among Canadian but not U.S. front-line service providers. Accordingly, this paper focuses solely on the Canadian data from the second phase of the study. In total, the sample in the Canadian site consisted of 12 employment support services providers. As will be discussed below, study participants reflected the gendered composition of nonprofit organizations found elsewhere. Of twelve participants who were associated with four employment services organizations, ten were women. Eight women (Teresa, Natalie, Sarah, Meghan, Emily, Courtney, Hillary and Kate) and two men (Dwight and Kevin) self-identified as frontline employment services counsellors and consultants (these two job titles were often used interchangeably, although workplace responsibilities often differed slightly among and between workers). Reflecting the highly-skilled and diverse nature of their work, employment services counsellors were often responsible for a number of tasks, including one-to-one and group counselling and assessment, staff training, workshop facilitation and design, resume writing, interview and self-marketing skill development, employment and school search assistance, social services referrals, literacy, basic skills upgrading, outreach and advocacy work. Among these frontline workers, experience in the nonprofit employment support services sector ranged from four years to over twenty. Consistent in changes in nonprofit employment services sector in Ontario towards ‘one stop’ organizations, each of the four organizations involved was required to provide a full array of employment support services to a diversity of client groups. At the same time, some of the organizations had specifically targeted immigrant and refugee populations, youth, or those living in a particular geographical area marked by generational poverty.

This study's other two participants self-identified as management-level employment services personnel and were not involved in the day-to-day delivery of their frontline services. Nicole had been in the sector for fifteen years and served as assistant manager in an employment service organization. Her tasks included managing the community employment services office, employment consultants, research, information officers and administrative support. Second, Kim served as executive director and oversaw the general operations of the nonprofit Organization, including its staff, financial resources, outreach with employers and other nonprofit organizations.

Precarious Employment and the Nonprofit Sector

In recent decades a growing body of literature has documented the erosion of the standard employment relationship amid the rise of precarious work – that is, forms of employment with limited social benefits and statutory entitlements, low wages, uncertainty of job tenure, and high risks of ill health (Vosko, 2006). The deterioration in the quality and character of work has also been noted in the increasing flexibilization of workers, lack of control over its terms and conditions, limited access to career ladders, and predominance of temporary, contractual, and part-time labour (Thomas, 2009; Lewchuk et al., 2011; Fanelli, 2016). While the growth and differential distribution of precarious work has been well documented across many sectors and workplaces, less attention has been devoted to job quality and rising precarity in the nonprofit social services sector (Baines, 2010; Evans and Shields, 2014). This sector, though, is by no means insulated from the degradation of labour and mounting pressures of neoliberalism.

Since the 1980s, nonprofit work is increasingly being reshaped by processes of neoliberalization, which have compounded and contributed to the rise of precarious employment in this sector. This includes a movement away from core funding to (often volatile) targeted and

means-tested financing; budget cuts specifically targeted at social policy expenditures resulting in the off-loading and (quasi)marketization of social services; the market disciplining of labour through increases in competition and driving down of labour costs; new pressures for commercial revenue generation; performance-based contracting-out; and an augmented role for private donors, venture philanthropists and social entrepreneurship, further blurring the distinction between nonprofit and for-profit organizations (Hasenfeld and Garrow, 2012; Evans et al., 2005). These changes have been especially noted with the import of so-called New Public Management (NPM) in the nonprofit sector.

NPM asserts that government should function more like the private sector, imposing market discipline on the provision of goods and services and re-constituting work structures. As articulated by Evans and colleagues: “The effects on community-based organizational structures can be dramatic as relatively egalitarian work structures are pushed to mimic the hierarchical structures found in the private and state sectors...NPM encourages managers to view their organizations as business units, adopting business oriented solutions within sectors that traditionally eschew such routinized and rigid methods of work organisation” (Evans, Richmond and Shields, 2005, 88-89). The effect has been to recast the nonprofit sector as a form of alternative service delivery, emphasizing results over process and cost-effective administration (Kelly and Caputo, 2012). Such measures enhance workplace precarity as decision-making powers are divorced from frontline service workers, resources are directed away from services and toward record keeping, and the threat of defunding, and consequent loss of employment, looms ever present. The contract, rather than the state, becomes the governing regulatory mechanism reinforcing workplace insecurity in the event of the failure to meet outcomes-based performance targets.

In Ontario, the context in which the following data were generated, the nonprofit sector employs more than one million persons working in areas such as children, youth, senior and family services, persons with physical and developmental disabilities, health, and homelessness initiatives in addition to services for immigrants and refugees, unemployed, and low-income individuals (Zizys, 2011). At the same time as this sector attempts to meet a diversity of needs so as to promote economic and social justice, the sector as a whole exhibits many indications of workplace precarity and growing pressures to marketize social services. For example, research by the Social Planning Network of Ontario (2015), an umbrella organization of more than 20 local and regional social planning and community development councils across Ontario, shows that although nonprofit workers are on average higher educated and older than their for-profit counterparts, they are more likely to be contractually or part-time employed with fewer health benefits, lower pay, and higher caseloads. These findings build on previous research by McMullen and Schellenberg (2003, 19), and Saunders (2004, 25), which found that the rate of temporary versus permanent employment in the nonprofit sector (14 percent) was nearly double the for-profit rate (8 percent), while almost one-quarter of nonprofit employees worked on a part-time basis, twice the rate observed in the for-profit sector.

More broadly, the most recent National Survey of Non-Profit and Voluntary Organizations (NSNVO, 2003), conducted more than a decade ago across some 13,000 member organizations, showed the rate of temporary employment in the nonprofit sector to be 35 percent versus 12.5 percent across the Canadian labour market. Similar rates were observed in Ontario with temporary nonprofit work accounting for 31 percent of all employment, nearly three times the rate in the provincial labour market as a whole (Scott et al., 2006, 38). A 2013 report prepared by McIsaac, Park and Toupin (2013) for the Ontario Nonprofit Network, found that for

organizations with at least one paid employee, just over half of all employees (53 percent) are in full-time, permanent positions, while 41 percent are part-time. However, the report also noted that only 28 percent of non-unionized permanent, part-time workers were eligible for benefits (life insurance, dental, pension, vision and drug), and only 18 percent of workers were able to access some form of retirement income plan. This differed sharply for unionized permanent part-time employees, where 59 percent were able to access both benefits and retirement plans (17). With only 14 percent of all nonprofit organizations indicating a unionized workplace, however, most workers remain excluded from non-wage benefit and retirement plans (SPNO, 2015).

Within the non-profit sector, gender disparities intersect with increasing employment precarity. While women make up nearly half of the total Ontario labour force, they make up nearly three-quarters of all nonprofit workers and, in some regions, as much as 84 percent of the total nonprofit labour force (Zizys, 2011, 5). Despite women's over-representation in the sector, though, especially in frontline and non-managerial administrative positions, women are on average compensated less than men in comparable positions, with racialized women at an even greater disadvantage. Because nonprofit work is associated with altruism, care work and labour market flexibility, the gendered nature of the work reinforces the feminization and undervaluation of the sector as a whole (Baines et al., 2014; Freedland et al., 2007).

Attending to rising workplace precarity is significant given that higher precarity of job tenure not only produces economic hardship but significant work-life imbalances as a result of high stress, anxiety, burnout and overall lower quality of health and well-being (Eikenberry and Lover, 2004; Curtis, 2006). Workplace precarity not only undermines nonprofit organizations' ability to attract and retain highly-skilled and qualified workers, but also institutionalizes precarity through a lack of organizational continuity, high turnover and impacts on service

delivery mandates. As Clutterbuck and Howarth (2007, 47) have noted: “Increasingly, the “intrinsic” rewards of work in the sector are being overcome by greater job insecurity, continuing poor compensation and deteriorating working conditions.”

The Ontario nonprofit sector generally receives some 80 percent of their funding from all three levels of government (Eakin, 2001, 5). Although supported by public funds, the net effect of neoliberal reforms has been to re Commodify social services provisioning – along with significant cuts to public sector employment. This has occurred through transforming the state’s role in society as a direct producer of public goods and services, to one that contracts-out to organizations that must compete in the market to attract public and private funds. In the case of employment services, this results in the transfer of responsibility without power to the nonprofit (and to a lesser extent for-profit) sector, while state actors continue to exert considerable power without responsibility. Nonprofit social services providers, in turn, are tasked with continuously doing more for less in the absence of stable, long-term funding, while market-based competition, not the least of which is from for-profit competitors, places downward pressures on wages and working conditions (Eikenberry and Kluver, 2004). In other words, such pressures further discipline workers to market imperatives and labour rationality via relentless pressures to meet increasing service demands with lower labour (input) costs.

Combined, a very competitive environment for nonprofits’ access to federal, and especially provincial, funding has been created. In Canada, organizations with revenues over \$1 million – 10 percent of all Ontario organizations – are in receipt of 80 percent of all sector revenues (Scott et al., 2003, 15). Such a dependence on public funding places increased pressures to comply with neoliberal mandates at an organizational level in order to maintain funding and ensure survival (Phillips and Rathgeb Smith, 2011; Evans and Shields, 2014). As nonprofits

compete with one another to attract government funding and desirable constituents, and repel less desirable ones such as immigrants with unrecognized credentials who take longer to employ, new pressures are placed on organizations to not only meet but exceed outcomes. In turn, creeping benchmarks result in reporting overload and human resources fatigue (Harrison and Weber, 2015).

Like previous findings elsewhere (Reed and Howe, 2000; Richmond and Shields, 2004), respondents in this study noted how onerous evaluation and outcomes measures often have the contrarian effect of actually reducing service efficiency, imperiling the abilities of nonprofit organizations to meet their service mandates as a result of the considerable financial and personnel resources they consume. Our research adds to literature identifying many of the troubling interconnected trends toward employment precarity, marketization and deprivation of funding in the nonprofit sector. It also shows how organizational and workplace insecurity permeates the paid and unpaid work experiences of employment services providers, its significant emotional tolls, and the ways in which workers seek to resist further neoliberalization of their employment while attempting to manage their own precarity (Baines, 2006; Evans et al., 2005).

Experiencing Precarity: Workplace Speed-up and the Fear of Job Loss

One of the central challenges identified by nearly all participants concerns workplace speed-up in the form of narrow timelines and pressures to ‘positively’ outcome clients within the parameters set by government funders. “The client comes in, they should be [positively] exited at the three-month mark – training, education or employment. However, that’s not always the case.” (Dwight). Respondents noted how rising pressures to account for positive outcomes often increased their own sense of precarity. Teresa, for instance, noted:

“I would like to have less pressure for the numbers really. I would like to see only counting whatever they want to count as a success but with the understanding that if you don’t have this percentage of success, somebody in your agency will not be fired. ...Use the data, but don’t pressure people with the data. Our mission is to give support and to produce results for the individuals not for the government.”

Teresa’s experience is illustrative of the workplace precarity shared by many in the sample that was framed as resulting from being caught between needing to respond to demands of outcomes-based measures, on the one hand, and meeting broader conceptualizations of client needs held by the frontline service providers on the other. Similar pressures were also communicated by managers of employment services organizations who voiced their concern with the ways that meeting funder-determined positive measures impacted frontline staff members’ job security:

“I can ask all of the frontline workers who were here pre-Employment Ontario and post-Employment Ontario if they agree. But did you feel that your job was threatened before Employment Ontario? No. It breaks my heart to think that people are thinking ‘oh my God, I’ve got to get my numbers’. That shouldn’t be distracting them.” (Nicole)

Sarah further discussed how meeting this pressure can be complicated by clients’ precarious employment and the ways in which it prevents frontline service providers from accounting for ‘positive’ outcomes: “Sometimes, clients, they are not contacting us when they are employed because they are busy. And we can’t approach them during daily hours because they are working. So we are missing a lot of opportunities...ticking them as employed. Then, after a few months, they will contact us when they lose that temporary job to look for another job. So for me, as a person, I don’t like to put that ticking point. Why? Because I want to help them to be in a stable career not only temporary. That’s most important.”

The threat of defunding as a result of not meeting outcomes-based funding requirements, and the potential for consequent layoffs, reduction or outright elimination of services, loomed ever-present in the minds of employment service counsellors, which created an atmosphere of insecurity across many of the diverse organizations that were interviewed. “What are the implications of this situation for the way we do the work?” asked Teresa rhetorically. “Well, at

some point, even if you keep your mind on the client, you are in the stress of the organization for being targets. So that is stressful. Sometimes worrisome because you can lose your job. And that is the reality we face every day.” Hillary expressed a prevailing sense of workplace insecurity, noting how “our funding is based on if we hit our targets. So, we have monthly and yearly targets that we have to hit, which would be people that are – files that are employed or close to in training... If we didn’t – if we all just kinda didn’t close the files that we had to, yeah, our funding could be not given to us. And our center could close.”

In addition to the continual pressures of outcomes-based funding, and the all-pervasive sense of workplace insecurity engendered by these pressures, employment precarity was also amplified by incessant demands to obtain the highest amount of worker productivity possible. As Kevin noted: “the ministry doesn’t typically care what you are doing well, they want to know how you are going to improve the things that you are not doing well. So, because we are in a continuous improvement model, you must always be continuously improving. Every quarter we have to report how we are doing well in our numbers or not.” Such exercises represent a radical importation of business practices identified with lean production and Total Quality Management initially established in Japanese automotive factories in North America (Thomas, 2007). Essentially, these practices entail a redesign of a firm or entire sectors’ organizational structures and processes to achieve maximum output with the least amount of labour inputs. At the heart of this process are a number of employment practices that have increased worker precarity, including: *kaizan* (continuous improvement), flexible employment, work teams and zero downtime for workers. Such a reengineering of the employment services work process, and new pressures to multi-task in the form of administration and data collection, squeezes more work out

of a smaller number of workers and places continual pressures to outperform their ‘competition’ elsewhere.

The Precarious Deployment of Resources

In addition to enhanced workplace oversight and performance-based evaluation criteria, incessant pressures to do more with less were described as especially pronounced as a result of uncertainty in regards to long-term and stable funding.

“Funding is precarious in this not-for-profit area, and you know, as needs change, pendulums shift. Because we have so many different funders you can imagine what we wait through when there’s an election because you don’t know what that new mandate is going to be...So, trying to find sustained, multi-year funding so that you can actually have a vision for where you need to go next is challenging.” (Kim)

The absence of sustained funding was described as having significant implications for employment services centres as they struggle to meet both service level demands and personnel needs. These challenges are compounded in the face of electoral cycles that may usher in a change in funding formula and political ideology. Such uncertainty hampers organizations’ abilities to craft long-term solutions to service-level shortfalls, places limits on how existing funds can and cannot be used, and increases the administrative burden on frontline service workers. As Kim continued:

“We’re required by this funder to have an audit every year, so that has a fee. And then we put insurance in there, and they said, no we won’t pay for insurance. It’s like, okay. Let me get this straight. I have people who have to do the work that you require us to do through the mandate of that particular funding. But you’re leaving me with this huge gap of liability because you won’t cover the insurance for them to be in this building? Nope. So, now I have to find a way to fund that, right. So, that’s an in-kind contribution. It’s like, that’s the infrastructure. It’s like if I have a person who’s providing a workshop, then there’s HR around that. There’s payroll around that. There’s liability around that. But there’s no funding for those infrastructure pieces. Or very, very little. It doesn’t really – and as I said, we’re a lean organization. We’re not for profit. Our folks don’t earn astronomical salaries. They’re here because they want to be here. They want to work in this sector. They want to work for a not-for-profit. So, that’s a huge frustration.”

Such frustrations illustrate the connections between the omnipresent fear of job loss, organizational precarity, and constant monitoring of worker performance. In this sense, funders – predominantly provincial grant funding agencies – regulate the labour process by instilling an otherwise permanent sense of precarity via both coercive/passive methods, as well as through a bureaucratic hierarchy of control. At issue is how funding partners are able to influence what the priorities of the organization are, how funding may be deployed, and the impacts that such decisions have on the experiences and autonomy of workers. Such a ‘passive’ form of control exerts a perceptible effect upon workers who have to work harder and faster with preset limitations on how funds may be invested.

One of the organizational responses to enhanced precarity is to dedicate greater resources to meeting accountability demands. However, as study participants noted, this often leads to less direct services available for unemployed workers as resources are reallocated to meet new tracking and monitoring requirements. As Nicole and Kevin articulated, such measures had the contrarian effect of actually decreasing services delivery efficiency:

“Another huge challenge is that the ministry purchased an out of the box computer system and then tried to customize it to meet the needs of the program. And it’s a piece of crap. I have never experienced any sort of system like this. And I worked a lot with client information management systems...And that is why so much human resources have been taken away from client facing activity is because of the CAM [Case Management] system. I’ve got a full time person and a part time person who do nothing but CAM’s data entry. And I’ve only got five employment consultants. Tell me that makes any logical sense.” (Nicole)

“Employment Ontario is getting tighter and tighter in what they require for data entry and CAM’s is – I don’t know why the Ministry requires as much information on people as they have, but – you can’t argue with the funder. The funder is who pays us.” (Kevin)

A consequent impact has been to increase the share of unpaid work undertaken by frontline staff who must now redirect time and resources away from delivering services to unemployed individuals. As Kim noted:

“So, she’s entering, and she’s doing it after hours. She’s doing it on the weekends. We did hire a new 0.5 FTE [an employee that works half the full-time hours] to do data entry for us. But none

of that is funded...That's our huge frustration is you can't provide the supports and services and the programming to the clients without having an infrastructure there that supports those things. And there's really almost no recognition of that whatsoever in terms of the dollars. That's something, you know. It's really, well, it's stupid."

The implementation of new information and workplace tracking technologies may, paradoxically, lead to less available services as a result of greater resources devoted to data collection and, potentially, labour displacement as funding is redeployed to meet accountability demands. What is more, as computerization, administration and data collection fills a larger portion of the working day, this increases the possibility of repetitive strain injury and other chronic health concerns, potentially increasing workplace precarity and the risks of ill-health found elsewhere (Jackson, 2010).

Megan also noted how recent changes have not only resulted in more self-direction for those seeking employment services but "less time to actually sit with an individual to do a lot of coaching. Because of our time constraints as counselors...the progress of the client in the file is largely through e-mails and then bringing them in when we need to, and so it's become a large part of how things have changed in our business." In a similar way, Emily notes how "a large part of our job now is paperwork, whereas somebody else used to do that before computers came on the desk. We were much more directly counselors then than we are now, and so we've had to move with the changes... You can imagine we have 1,770 clients come through eight people a year. There's a good portion that just needs information and regular workshops, but the amount that don't, we don't get the time to help or sporadically help." As a result of increased tracking demands and decreased human services personnel, many employment counsellors noted how this has resulted in an inordinate amount of active caseloads. For instance, Dwight observed that of the seven staff at his organization each had a caseload of around one-hundred; Sarah had one-hundred and thirty active cases, while Meghan had one-hundred and twenty; Kate had around

seventy-four open files, with about thirty percent of them returning clients; Kevin had about eighty active files, while Emily noted that at her organization each counsellor carries a caseload of between eighty and one-hundred, the implication being “there’s no such thing as spare time.”

In addition to heightened job stress and case overload, study participants noted how workplace precarity has risen in the absence of collaborative engagement and partnerships with grant funding agencies. Rather, respondents in management positions noted how the relationships with funders were often top-down and centralized. As executive director Kim put it: “The ministry does not partner with us on anything. There’s good people working at the ministry. But in terms of how they interact with us and how it works, they do things to us. They don’t do things with us. There’s no partnership whatsoever with the funder. And when they say they consult with us, it’s so not consultation under my definition.” Assistant manager Nicole shared a similar view: “So they pretend consult with us so that they can say they consulted...[A]nd I've caught them a couple times in that the decision's already been made and then they have a – like they invite in select service providers to provide their thoughts and inputs into something that's already been decided. It's sad and it breaks my heart because who knows better than the people who report to me what clients' needs are?” As Nicole and Kim elucidate, although the language of partnership has proliferated, in practice, these relationships are far from co-determinous and marked by significant power imbalances. Such partnerships also impose “complex and burdensome accountability schemes disguised as evaluation measures” (Richmond and Shield, 2004, 4) as contracts with the state are used to facilitate longer term strategies of services marketization, eroding professional discretion and thereby enhancing the precarity of workers in this sector. The failure of grant funding agencies to adequately engage with frontline staff detracts from a more participatory and cooperative workplace culture. It may also miss

important opportunities for enhancing service-level shortcomings and improving the productivity and well-being of workers, overlooking new ideas for improving workplace practices.

Workplace Resistance to Neoliberalization

While heightened competitiveness is supposed to lead to survival of the fittest (to secure one's own organizational success), the data collected here suggests workers and organizations challenge this assumption in a number of unexpected ways. Many participants noted how they increasingly sought to pool their resources and collaborate (rather than compete) with other non-profit employment services agencies in the interests of those utilizing the services being provided. Consider, for example, the illustrations below:

“If I have a client that I feel would be better served at another organization, I will refer the client there. Or they are coming from there, and they are kind of confused or not have a clear view of what they are doing, I say go talk to the employment counselor there. If you still feel like you want to come here. We have similar services. So we are very collaborative. We use a very collaborative model. We refer to people to other services no matter what because the client wants that, or it's beneficial for the client. It's a common practice. We need to help the client to go ahead.” (Teresa)

“We're working with an agency with this client on their learning disabilities. We're also working with an agency on this client because they're receiving Ontario disability. And they're working with me for the employment perspective. So each agency has a little pot of money. Something as simple as transportation was a huge barrier. And that's ridiculous. Why? So we all pulled. We've been all picking from our pots to get him a bus pass for several months.” (Dwight)

Such collaborative engagement has been a hallmark of the nonprofit sector and runs counter to the market diktat of cutthroat-competition. Rather, workers sought to resist pressures to compete to attract clientele, putting the needs of the client ahead of organizational self-interest. Such an example is illustrative in the sense that proactive resistance to neoliberalism takes many forms as workers struggle to envision alternative forms of service delivery that are not based on the survival of the fittest, but rather collaborative engagement with a broader network of social services agencies.

Extensive interviews with frontline staff also revealed a significant undercurrent of precarious work that is often overlooked. The first concerns employment counsellors' unease with the creeping language of NPM that dehumanizes clientele dealing with both job loss and, in some cases, broader life crisis situations, while the second concerns the often unseen and unheard emotional labour of frontline support workers. In regards to the first, Kevin notes how Employment Ontario refers to individual clients as business units or service plan units: "So when you go to that mindset, once you call a person a unit... funders don't care that they're people, it's tough to argue with funders to say this isn't a unit. This is a person." As Doreen Massy (2015) has argued, such use of vocabulary reflects part of the way that neoliberalism has become part of our commonsense understanding of life. The message underlying the use of 'business units' reduces complex human interactions as if operating as consumers in a marketplace, and is reinforced via a remaking of institutional practices. In other words, the experiences of unemployed workers have become one of instrumental market exchange. Such change is illustrative of the political construction of language that reinforces dominant discourses and ideological practices.¹ Despite the possibility of not meeting monthly quotas, workers resisted such rationalization of the labour process preferring instead to exercise their own professional discretion and putting the needs of their clients ahead of mandated outcomes. They noted doing what they think is 'right' even if this might enhance their own workplace precarity. Dwight stated, "I don't care what the statistic says, personally, I just want to get the client employed," while Kevin expressed a similar approach to putting clients before the numbers:

¹ As the quote from Kevin above illustrates, many workers sought to actively resist the neoliberalization of workplace language, culture, and practice as it reduced human services provisioning to economic units. As employment counsellors expressed to us time and again, a singular focus on quantitative data collection masks important qualitative dimensions that are often missed in official measures of positive outcomes. In reality, such data collection may obfuscate both a lack of adequate support services and overestimate the success of existing support systems failing to take into account the numerous small steps (e.g. opening a bank account, updating a resume, resolving familial conflicts) that unemployed workers take on the path to (re)employment.

“If you could somehow convince like a law firm to take you on as a volunteer as a paralegal, that should be a success. My numbers can go up and down...but I think that should be something that’s considered a success. I do what’s generally best for the clients, but sometimes I’m like, yeah, it would be better for me if I registered you as a client, referred you to one training center, yay checkbox with your referral, you make the client jump through two hoops so I get credit for one little [checkbox] – so again, as I tell clients there are no hoops in this office.”

In a related vein, it was clear that the inability to provide adequate services to clients in crisis situations – combined with the inscription of dominant neoliberal tropes on workplace practices that reduces individuals to business units – had significant emotional implications for frontline workers providing these services, thus exacerbating their own sense of workplace precarity and risks of ill health. Consider the quotes below:

“You have people who come in with high stress because be it the unemployment, be it the money, and be it the fights that come from money and you are never quite sure what could be a good day. I know I have had times where I had a client who got into gambling pretty heavily and the client sounded like he was debating, is it still worth living at this point. Which then, obviously, I had a whole other conversation instead of skills, but that is a reality and to be always looking for those signs too and those triggers of are you thinking of killing yourself? I have had that conversation a number of times and it’s when people are feeling that absolute desperation and there is no other out, other than that and we obviously get them the right supports and things. So it can go from everything from, it’s a little tough paying the bills this week to its just not working. I have also had marital breakdowns as well and I have a couple of clients right now that are going through messy divorces because one spouse that was making the money, isn’t making any now.” (Kevin)

“I had a client come in and said, ‘I can’t stop thinking about hanging myself.’ That doesn’t sound very good. Can we have a conversation about that? ‘Sure, yeah,’ I said, ‘Well, I really can’t help you, but I’m willing to listen for a little. Let’s figure out a solution.’ ‘Okay, okay’. So he agreed to talk to a social worker, and he agreed to talk to his doctor. And then he was going to come back and get a suit the next day because we have the Suit Drive, and I gave him some canned food, and I gave him some bus tickets. And I said, ‘Okay, so tomorrow, we’re going to meet each other at 11:00.’ ‘Yeah, man, that sounds great.’ So tomorrow came, 11:00, 11:30, 1:00. So I called the cops. I said, ‘Here’s the client name. Here’s a description. Here’s what he said he was going to do.’ I don’t know if he gave me the right name. I don’t know if he was telling me the truth. I don’t know what was there. So I went, and I talked to my other staff member across the hall who was a social worker. And almost the first thing out of her mouth when I described it, she said, ‘Are you okay?’ And I said, ‘Yeah, why wouldn’t I be okay? I did what I had to do.’ But that was my own emotional intelligence ringing through.” (Dwight)

While Dwight’s alleged ability to deal with such traumatic experiences is noteworthy, other respondents mentioned how they often take these pressures and stresses home with them on account of the significant emotional and physical tolls they experience. Emily, for instance, notes how they are able to manage these challenges collectively: “A lot of us are constantly taking care of ourselves and our emotional state. We’re a strong, supportive unit because we all feel this

way.” These sentiments point to the way frontline staff must often build trust and compassion by demonstrating professional demeanor and judgement, while at the same time develop coping strategies in order to maintain their own mental health and well-being as well as job satisfaction. As an undercurrent of precarious employment, it remains an open question to what extent the inability to do so may result in higher levels of workplace discontent, stress and personnel turnover.

Conclusions and Directions for Future Research

The data presented here suggests that the neoliberalization of the nonprofit employment services sector has resulted in more precarious and emotionally tolling work arrangements for frontline staff members. Respondents also noted how the pressure to meet outcomes-based measures has increased their own sense of workplace insecurity as well as organizational insecurity, while redirecting funding away from services delivery to data collection. Participants were often adamant that there should be a broader recognition of positive outcomes not captured by existing methods of data collection, with the recognition that some groups (immigrants, refugees, youth, and former manufacturing workers) require greater in-house supports and broader social services such as being able to access better employment insurance or social assistance. Such measures could lessen workers’ own precarity (by accounting for the diverse work they do) and enable them to provide services that are commensurate with their identification of client needs, as well as inform advocacy efforts to reform employment services in ways that enhance workplace security and services provisioning. Stakeholders also stressed the need to invest more financial supports into human services personnel citing that these costs are often not covered by grant-funding agencies. As a way to achieving stronger financial

footing, many noted the importance of consistent, multi-year funding, including more active engagement with the organizations and frontline staff providing the services on-the-ground.

A wealth of research within care professions such as nursing, social work, mental health and childcare has shown that emotional labour can exacerbate job dissatisfaction, have detrimental impacts on the health and well-being of individual workers and contribute to employment burnout (Baines, 2006, 2011; Erikson and Ritter, 2001). This line of research has also shown that these challenges are not reflected in enhanced wages, benefits and mental health/support systems. This layer of emotionally and physically exhausting precarious work is rarely acknowledged. While our research did not fully unearth to what extent adequate support systems and coping mechanisms are in place, it did give an indication of the significant emotional challenges employment support workers experience both on and off the job on a daily basis. It is hard to imagine that dealing with such crisis situations on a recurring basis would have little impact on the mental well-being and job satisfaction of employment counsellors. While preliminary indications suggest a significant emotional strain on frontline staff, future research will need to explore these questions deeper to get a fuller picture.

While workers expressed a range of concerns to us as researchers on an individualized basis, it was clear that many of the criticisms – from problems with how positive outcomes were defined, to lack of policy engagement with frontline staff, to limitations on how funding could be used – were consistent across workplaces. However, in the absence of a collective voice to operationalize such concerns, workers were left with few choices but to advance issues and concerns on an individualized basis. These points of resistance illustrate fractures in the neoliberalization of the employment services sector and may also open up new opportunities for collectively implementing worker-centred changes. Historically, unionization has been one

method workers have used to collectively organize and bargain effectively in terms of their compensation, workplace security, and working conditions. Unionization has also been an effective vehicle for identifying frontline staff-informed means for addressing services shortfalls (Jackson, 2010; Kass and Costigliola, 2004). In addition to exploring the possibilities and challenges of unionization, future research will also need to consider to what extent strengthened legal and regulatory frameworks could enhance the security of employment services organizations and the workplace precarity of the nonprofit sector as a whole.

Finally, in order to provide a more rounded analysis of how employment services have been restructured, additional research will also need to make an effort to include the experiences of clients themselves in order to provide a deeper layer of analysis; something that will be occurring in the next phase of this research. It is clear from the data presented here that nonprofit employment services workers and organizations continue to operate in an environment of insecurity and otherwise permanent precarity. If this is to be reversed, and the quality of nonprofit sector employment is to be enhanced, policymaking will need to be much more responsive and informed by the analysis and understanding of workers themselves.

References

- Aldrich, R. & Marterella, A. (2012). Community-engaged research: A path for occupational science in the changing university landscape. *Journal of Occupational Science*. doi:10.1080/14427591.2012.714077
- Baines, D. (2006). "Whose needs are being served?" Quantitative metrics and the reshaping of social services. *Studies in Political Economy*, 77, 193-207.
- Baines, D. (2010). 'If we don't get back to where we were before': Working in the restructured non-profit social services. *British Journal of Social Work*, 40(3), 928-945.
- Baines, D. (2011). 'It was just too hard to come back': Unintended policy impacts on work-family balance in the Australian and Canadian non-profit social services. *Community, Work and Family*, 14(2), 233-248.

- Baines, D., Charlesworth, S., Cunningham, I. (2014). Fragmented outcomes: International comparisons of gender, managerialism and union strategies in the nonprofit sector. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 56(1), 24-42.
- Cheek, J. (2004). At the margins? Discourse analysis and qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 14(8), 1140-1150. doi: 10.1177/1049732304266820
- Clarke, A. E. (2005). *Situational analysis: Grounded theory after the postmodern turn*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Clarke, A. E., Friese, C., & Washburn, R. (2015). *Situational analysis in practice: Mapping research with grounded theory*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Clutterbuck, P. and R. Howarth. (2007). *Heads Up Ontario! Current Conditions and Promising Reforms to Strengthen Ontario's Nonprofit Community Services Sector*. Toronto: Community Social Planning Council.
- Curtis, K.A. (2006). *The Impact of Welfare State Restructuring on The Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector in Canada and the US*. Toronto: Ontario Network of Employment Skills Training Projects.
- Eakin, L. (2001). *An overview of funding of the funding of Canada's voluntary sector*. Ottawa: Voluntary Sector Initiative.
- Edwardh, J. and P. Clutterbuck. (2015). Decent Work in the Non-profit Community Services Sector in Ontario: Submission to the Changing Workplace Review Special Advisors. Toronto: Social Planning Network of Ontario.
- Eikenberry, A.M. and J.D. Kluver. (2004). The Marketization of the Nonprofit Sector: Civil Society at Risk? *Public Administration Review*, 64(2), 132-140.
- Eikenberry, K. and Kluver, J. (2004). The Marketization of the Nonprofit Sector: Civil Society at Risk? *Public Administration Review*, 64 (2), 132-140.
- Erickson, R.J. and Ritter, C. (2001). Emotional Labor, Burnout, and Inauthenticity: Does gender matter? *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 64, 146-163.
- Evans, B. and J. Shields. (2014). Nonprofit engagement with provincial policy officials: The case of NGO policy voice in Canadian immigrant settlement services. *Policy and Society*, 33(2), 77-87.
- Evans, B., T. Richmond and J. Shields. (2005). Structuring Neoliberal Governance: The Nonprofit Sector, Emerging New Modes of Control and the Marketization of Service Delivery. *Policy and Society*, 24(1), 73-97.
- Fanelli, C. (2016). *Megacity Malaise: Neoliberalism, Labour and Public Services in Toronto*. Halifax and Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.
- Fredland, M., P. Craig, C. Jacqueson and N. Kountouris. (2007). *Public Employment Services and European Law*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Harrison, T. and B. Weber. (2015). *Neoliberalism and the Non-Profit Social Services Sector in Alberta*. Edmonton: Parkland Institute at the University of Alberta

- Hasenfeld, Y. and E.E. Garrow. (2012). Nonprofit Human-Service Organizations, Social Rights, and Advocacy in a Neoliberal Welfare State. *Social Service Review*, 86(2), 295-322
- Jackson, A. (2010). *Work and Labour in Canada*, 2nd edition. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Index.
- Kass, J. and B. Costigliola. (2004). The Union Advantage in Child Care: How Unionization can Help Recruitment and Retention. *Just Labour*, 4, 1-12
- Kelly, K and T. Caputo. (2012). *Community: A contemporary analysis of policies, programs and practices*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press
- Laliberte Rudman, D. L. (2010). Occupational terminology: Occupational possibilities. *Journal of Occupational Science*, 17(1), 55-59. doi: 10.1080/14427591.2010.9686673
- Laliberte Rudman, D. (2013). Critical discourse analysis: Adding a political dimension to inquiry. In M.P. Cutchin & V.A. Dickie (Eds.), *Transactional perspectives on occupation* (pp. 169-181). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Laliberte Rudman, D. (2015). Situating occupation in social relations of power: Occupational possibilities, ageism and the retirement choice. *South African Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 45(1), 27-33.
- Lassiter, L. E. (2005). *The Chicago guide to collaborative ethnography*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lassiter, L. E., & Campbell, E. (2010). What will we have ethnography do? *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(9), 757-767. doi: 10.1177/1077800410374444
- McIsaac, E., S. Park and L. Toupin (2013). *Shaping the Future: Leadership in the Ontario Nonprofit Labour Force*. Toronto: Mowat Centre.
- McMullen, K. and G. Schellenberg. (2003). Job Quality in Non-Profit Organizations, Research Series on Human Resources in the Non-Profit Sector, No. 2. Ottawa: Canadian Policy research Networks.
- McMullen, K. and G. Schellenberg. (2003). Job Quality in Non-Profit Organizations. *CPRN Research Series*, 2, 1-75.
- Njelesani, J., Gibson, B. E., Nixon, S., Cameron, D., & Polatajko, H. J. (2013). Towards a critical occupational approach to research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 12, 207-220.
- NSNVO. (2003). *Cornerstones of Community: Highlights of the National Survey of Nonprofit and Voluntary Organizations*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Phillips, S.D. and S. Rathgeb Smith, eds. (2011). *Governance and Regulation in the Third Sector: International Perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Reed, P. and V. Howe. (2000). *Voluntary Organizations in Ontario in the 1990s*. Ottawa: Kahanoff Foundation.

- Richmond, T. and J. Shields. (2004). NGO Restructuring: Constraints and Consequences. *Canadian Review of Social Policy*, 53, 53-67.
- Scott, K., S. Tsoukalas, P. Roberts and D. Lasby. (2006). The Non-profit and Voluntary Sector in Ontario. Regional Highlights of the National Survey of Non-profit and Voluntary Organizations. Toronto: Imagine Canada.
- Thomas, M. (2007) Toyotatism Meets the 60 Hour Work Week: Coercion, 'Consent' and the Regulation of Working Time. *Studies in Political Economy*, 80, 105-28.
- Thomas, M. (2009). *Regulating Flexibility: The Political Economy of Employment Standards*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Vosko, L. (2006). *Precarious Employment: Understanding Labour Market Insecurity in Canada*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Zizys, T. (2011). *Working Better: Creating a High Performing Labour Market in Ontario*. Toronto: Metcalf Foundation