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Introduction

Terms of Reference

In July 2001, the Human Resources Committee of the Capacity Joint Table of the Voluntary Sector Initiative (VSI) commissioned two research reports to be prepared as background documents for a Human Resources Think Tank with representatives of the business, government and voluntary sectors to be held on September 16-17. The purpose is to develop an action plan to help the voluntary sector become more of an “employer of choice,” i.e., “an employer that attracts, optimizes, and holds top talent for long tenure because employees choose to be there.” The two components of this work are:

1. A literature review and analysis of research done on human resources (HR) in the Canadian voluntary sector since 1997 (the cut-off point for a previous literature review).
2. An overview of the trends, which will have a short- and long-term impact on the workforce.

However, these reports only concern the studies of, and implications for, paid staff; they do not address the burgeoning literature on volunteers, except in passing. They are also focused almost exclusively on the Canadian voluntary sector, although some U.S. studies are brought to bear on the discussions for supporting evidence or to illustrate emerging trends.

The first component is dealt with in the separate report, Backgrounder on the Literature on (Paid) Human Resources in the Canadian Voluntary Sector (hereafter, the “first Report”) which also characterizes the nature of our subject matter – the voluntary sector. For the purposes of the VSI, the voluntary sector can be summarized as “a diverse range of organizations comprised by freely-associating individuals who act on behalf of their communities, clients, or members, rather than for any shareholders’ personal benefit, and operate independently of government.”

Thus, the QUANGO (Quasi-Autonomous Non-Governmental Organizations) or “MUSH” (Municipalities, Universities, School divisions, and Health facilities, and other transfer agencies which are heavily dependent on public funding) sector(s) shall largely be excluded from these discussions. Clearly, however, with a national (and indeed international) shortage of qualified nurses, doctors, professors and related professions, these sectors obviously have acute HR issues of their own which need to be addressed by other policy initiatives.

This report examines the trends in the literature not only regarding (1) the implications of the demographic changes for the voluntary sector workforce over the next five to ten years (i.e., to 2011), but also (2) the implications of the changes in the workplace and working arrangements in the labour force in general, regarding the effects these changes will have on the workplace and workers, and how those changes may impact the voluntary sector’s ability to attract and retain workers over the next decade.

Given the tight timeline for both the preparation of this report and for the Think Tank, this is not a blow-by-blow account of individual works, however, so much as a global synthesis of
the literature. Thus, apologies are due in advance to the many insightful authors listed in the references (particularly Graham Lowe), who are not always given due credit as the original source of the individual points being made. In addition, this analysis is also confined to the aggregate, national level; no attempt is made to review the particular challenges which individual provinces or regions may be facing, nor is the urban-rural divide addressed.

We begin with an overview of the demographic pressures which have given rise to serious concerns in other Canadian sectors, and then review the various changes and trends in workplace arrangements in the Canadian labour force in general and in the United States. Finally, the possible implications of the preceding on the voluntary sector in general are discussed, by exploring two main scenarios: acute pressures in the voluntary sector, as well, which will necessitate serious accommodations in Human Resources (HR) practices; or more of a status quo, with indications of a continuing supply of sufficient numbers of willing and able workers even if no substantial reforms of workplace arrangements and compensation practices are made.

**Demographic Pressures**

We have all no doubt heard that our population is “graying” or “aging,” in the sense that there are more older people (both proportionally and in absolute numbers) than ever before, and proportionally fewer younger people to take their place in the workforce.

That is a function of two factors: better health (and health care) and high life expectancy, on the upper end, and a smaller replenishment rate at the younger end, with a very low natural increase rate (only about 0.5% per year), not so much because of high infant mortality, as because of a low total fertility rate. An additional pressure in both Canada and the United States is the huge bulge in the middle of the age range – which one Canadian demographic analyst/wag (David Cork) dubbed “The Pig in the Python.” Known, of course, as the infamous “Baby Boomers,” the people born between the end of World War II and the Vietnam war (1946-1966) comprise about a third of our population, and fully half of our working-age population, and they are starting to approach (early) retirement age. By 2005, their leading edge will be 60 years of age: which is/was (as of 1999) the average age of retirement in Canada, for women (60.1 years); for men, it is/was 61.7 years. (Schetagne, 2001)

1 Life expectancy at birth is now fairly high, at 76.1 for males and 81.5 for females, as of 1998. In contrast, women born at the turn of the (last) century could expect to live 50.1 years, and men, about 47. As of 1996, people who reach age 65 are expected to live about another 18.4 years (five years longer than in 1921). It is higher for senior women, who have a longer remaining life expectancy (20.2 years, i.e., to age 85.2) than do men (16.3 more years, to 81.3). These figures may have inched up since then; there was a half-year increase between the 1991 Census and the 1996 one. (All figures from Statistics Canada (2001b, 2001c, 1999c).)

2 Which is quite low in Canada – only 6 per thousand live births – compared to a developing country such as Kenya, which had an infant mortality rate of 59 per thousand live births in 1998. Source: Richard H. Anderson, the Department of Sociology and the University of Colorado at Denver, online at [http://thunder1.cudenver.edu/sociology/introsoc/topics/UnitNotes/PopPyramid.html](http://thunder1.cudenver.edu/sociology/introsoc/topics/UnitNotes/PopPyramid.html).

3 Which has declined over the past 50 years from a peak of about 3.5 births per woman in the late 1950s and early 1960s, to just 1.56 in 1997, and is expected to decline and possibly stabilize at the 1.48 level from 2001 on. Source: Statistics Canada, including George et al. (2001) and a February 2001 Social Trends seminar in Manitoba which used Census and other data (cat. no. 10H0052).
Let us now get an overview of the magnitude of these population changes, and how they will affect the composition of the workforce.

**Total Population Changes**

These phenomena are best illustrated graphically, through the use of “Population Pyramids,” which are bar graphs showing the relative sizes of different age groups (usually presented in five- or ten-year intervals), divided along an axis with the males on one side and the females on the other. When we compare the Population Pyramids for the same region at different intervals, we can watch how the different “cohorts” or bands of people born in a specific period proceed to go up the age pyramid, and how that affects the overall shape of the pyramid, and thus, society. A bottom-heavy pyramid means lots of young people in schools and poised to hit the labour force, and a top-heavy pyramid means lots of retirees, pensions, and health care needs.

Statistics Canada has provided an animated population pyramid for 1971 to 2005 online, in which you can see the population bands appear to rapidly age before your eyes, or, as in Cork’s analogy, watch how the huge Boomer “pig,” which first entered at the population python’s ‘mouth’ at birth, works its way up to the other end. Appendix 1 to this report provides a Statistics Canada Population Pyramid from a print publication which superimposes three intervals to give a good single snapshot of how this works, but it only goes up to 2005, and is somewhat harder to read. To clearly project these changes further, to 2011, we can turn to the U.S. Census Bureau, which has a handy interactive site which can both generate the population pyramids for a number of countries for any years between 1991 and 2050, and deliver the data in tabular form.

The Population Pyramids for Canada for three main cut-points (the beginning, middle and end) over the next ten-year interval follow, along with some brief analysis.

**Graph 1:**
Population Pyramid for Canada, 2001

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, International Data Base.

---


5 Source: U.S. Census Bureau, online at [www.census.gov/ftp/pub/ipc/www/idbnew.html](http://www.census.gov/ftp/pub/ipc/www/idbnew.html).
As you can see from Graph 1, there are indeed a great many Canadians in the 35- to 54-year-old age brackets (the Boomers) occupying the middle of our population landscape, and relatively fewer people between the age of 25 and 34 (known variously as part of the “Baby Bust” generation, “Generation X,” or, in Canada, the “Nexus” generation) to take up their middle and senior management positions in the future.

When these figures are projected five years into the future (assuming the current birth, death and immigration rates continue at the same rates) in Graph 2, we see there will still be plenty of Boomers in their prime working years, but they will be between the ages of 40 and 59, so there will be more in the leading edge who are retiring; and although there will be lots of people in their 20s and 30s, there won’t be as many as there were when the boomers were that age a decade or two previously.

Graph 2:
**Population Pyramid for Canada, 2006**

This will become more of a concern in the third interval (2011), shown here in Graph 3, when even the youngest Boomers⁶ are in their late 40s, and a large clump of them will be in their 60s, and there won’t be quite as many people in their mid- to late-30s to assume their management positions and professional roles, due to the lower birth rates in the late 1960s and 1970s.

---

⁶ These are the “genuine” Gen-Xers, according to the original use of that term: the trail end of the Baby Boom, born between 1960 and 1966, who found it difficult to crack the housing and job markets not only because of the huge number born in the decade before them who saturated the job market and drove up housing prices, but also because their own cohort – 2.6 million – was the largest this country had ever seen. See Foot and Stoffman (1996).
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Graph 3:
Population Pyramid for Canada, 2011

We can also depict those trends in a more precise, tabular form, with the latest projected population figures from Statistics Canada (which are somewhat lower than those of the U.S. Census Bureau’s projections above) for these three intervals, based on five-year age bands. In this report, we are focusing on the working-age population, however (usually defined as between age 15 and 65); and for the purposes of the voluntary sector, we only concentrate on those over 20, both because most teens are still in the education system full-time and so are only available to work part-time, and because many minors may be excluded from working for voluntary organizations, due to screening regulations (given the vulnerable populations they work with).

Appendix 1 contains some more detailed breakdowns for the specific five-year age bands, including the 15-19 bracket, whose numbers are projected to continue to be replenished, and even increase slightly over the decade, as would be expected from being part of the “Echo” generation, or offspring of the large number of Boomers. But we concentrate here mainly upon the five main age groups likely to be of most interest to HR planners over the medium term:

The total Canadian populations predicted by the U.S. Census Bureau for these intervals – 31.6, 33.1, and 34.5 million – appear to be based on the assumption that the approximately 1%/300,000 annual increases which prevailed in the mid-1990s would continue from the 1996 Census levels. Statistics Canada (George et al., 2000) places them at 31.0, 32.2, and 33.4 million, under medium growth assumptions (starting at 250,000 more per year in 2001, gradually declining to +200,000/yr., over the next 20 years), and 31.0, 32.5, and 34.0 million, assuming high growth (starting at 250 and rising to +300,000/yr. within 10 years). This means the U.S. figures in those pyramids could be out by an average of 2.7% or 1.8%, respectively, but these excesses would probably be most applicable to the youngest age ranges, because Statistics Canada was using more recent figures on the declining fertility rate.

If at all – the labour force participation rate (which included part-time work, and merely looking for work) for 15 to 19 years in the 1990s was only about 50% (see next section). The average school-to-work transition span for Canadian youth as of the late 1990s is now over six years, two years longer than it was in the early 1980s, ranging from ages 16+ to 23 (see Bowlby, 2000; Lowe, various; or Schetagne, 2001).
• entry-level workers, in their 20s (many of whom will still be in college or university);
• more experienced people, in their 30s;
• middle-management material, in their 40s;\(^9\)
• senior managers and highly experienced people, in their 50s; and
• people poised to retire, in their 60s.

As Table 1 indicates, there will be a constant influx, and indeed, a fairly hefty increase (of 300,000) of people in their 20s over the next decade, who could potentially take entry-level jobs. But there will soon be a sustained drop of more than 350,000 people at the next stage (their 30s), and although the number of potential workers in their 40s will swell by several hundred thousand by the middle of the decade, that will ebb back near the current level, by the end. There will also be a surge of people reaching retirement age in ten year’s time: 64%, or 1.6 times as many more as there are now. But the biggest change – and, as we’ll discuss in more detail towards the end of this report, this may be very good news for the voluntary sector – will be in the glut of people in their 50s scrambling for senior positions: there’ll be about 1.2 million more Canadians in their 50s by the year 2011, a 32.5% increase over current levels.

Table 1:
Projected Population Levels for Selected Age Brackets and Intervals, Canada (in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20s</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4,197.3</td>
<td>2,134.6</td>
<td>2,062.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4,361.7</td>
<td>2,219.2</td>
<td>2,142.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4,504.9</td>
<td>2,292.1</td>
<td>2,212.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4,894.2</td>
<td>2,471.0</td>
<td>2,423.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4,528.4</td>
<td>2,287.8</td>
<td>2,240.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4,571.1</td>
<td>2,313.9</td>
<td>2,257.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5,044.0</td>
<td>2,521.2</td>
<td>2,522.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5,339.4</td>
<td>2,681.0</td>
<td>2,658.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5,052.0</td>
<td>2,543.0</td>
<td>2,509.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50s</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3,740.6</td>
<td>1,857.5</td>
<td>1,883.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4,436.6</td>
<td>2,199.9</td>
<td>2,236.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4,955.7</td>
<td>2,462.7</td>
<td>2,493.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,291.1</td>
<td>631.3</td>
<td>659.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,578.1</td>
<td>771.6</td>
<td>806.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2,011.3</td>
<td>984.1</td>
<td>1,027.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^9\) HRDC (2001c) reports that 59% of the management workers in the health, education and community service sectors are 45 years or older.
Projected Change in the Labour Force Population

Of course, the preceding numbers ranged over the entire population, and so may considerably overstate the numbers of people actually available for work, because not everyone can, or chooses to, work. The various reasons for not working include disability, education, illness, independent wealth, personal or family responsibilities, retirement, or being “discouraged” workers frustrated by an inability to obtain suitable employment.

Some fluctuations and anomalies in these rates occurred during the 1990s (particularly as young people waited out the recession by staying in school longer, and older people who were laid off began to give up and count themselves as retired rather than simply unemployed). But as of 2000, for the various prime working-year age brackets we’re most interested in (see Table 2), the national labour force participation rates varied between 46% and 93% for men of different age groups, and they were quite a bit lower (between 27% and 81%) for women.

### Table 2:
**Canadian Labour Force Participation Rate by Age and Sex, Selected Intervals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Accordingly, some researchers have estimated the expected changes in the size of the labour force by age bracket, by projecting the prevailing labour force participation rates of the day onto the population figures. Denton, Feaver and Spencer (2000) run through several different scenarios (of high, low or standard population growth, according to different assumptions). For their “Standard” projections, they assumed the same rates of immigration, death and participation rates as prevailed circa 1998. They calculated these projections for the years we are interested in, including both the absolute numbers and the relative changes, for the whole spectrum of age brackets (see Table 3).
Table 3: Projected Labour Force in Canada for Both Sexes by Age Group (in thousands) and Percentage Growth Rate Over the Preceding Five Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65-69</th>
<th>70+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>3,667</td>
<td>4,521</td>
<td>3,637</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% growth</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>3,711</td>
<td>4,303</td>
<td>4,103</td>
<td>1,828</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>16,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% growth</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td>3,843</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>2,165</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>17,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% growth</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Denton, Feaver and Spencer (2000)

Denton et al. also go on to estimate what percentage of these workers would be female. However, I shall not calculate and display the results for the two genders, because their report uses somewhat different cut-points for the age brackets than the ones we may be more interested in here, and they also used late-1990s labour participation rates which may turn out to be lower than the ones which prevail over the next decade. Consequently, I have taken those preceding population projections from Statistics Canada, and multiplied them all by the Labour Participation Rates for the relevant age brackets for 2000 reported above (assuming for the sake of argument that they are maintained at that level\(^{10}\)). That method yields the following results (see Table 4).

Table 4: Projected Labour Force Levels for Selected Age Brackets and Intervals, Canada (in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20s</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3,404.8</td>
<td>1,818.3</td>
<td>1,586.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,539.3</td>
<td>1,891.2</td>
<td>1,648.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3,655.3</td>
<td>1,953.1</td>
<td>1,702.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4,215.7</td>
<td>2,289.3</td>
<td>1,926.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,900.9</td>
<td>2,119.6</td>
<td>1,781.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3,938.3</td>
<td>2,143.8</td>
<td>1,794.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4,337.1</td>
<td>2,314.0</td>
<td>2,023.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4,590.7</td>
<td>2,459.9</td>
<td>2,130.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4,342.2</td>
<td>2,332.3</td>
<td>2,009.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50s</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,689.7</td>
<td>1,497.4</td>
<td>1,192.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,167.0</td>
<td>1,763.5</td>
<td>1,403.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3,538.1</td>
<td>1,974.5</td>
<td>1,563.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>470.5</td>
<td>291.0</td>
<td>179.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>575.1</td>
<td>355.7</td>
<td>219.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>733.1</td>
<td>453.7</td>
<td>279.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

\(^{10}\) This assumption is shared by David Baxter, Executive Director of The Urban Futures Institute in Vancouver and author of The Retiring Kind: An Exploration of the Past and Future of Labour Force Participation in Canada (released September 1, 2001; abstract is online at [www.urbanfutures.com/abstracts/report53.htm](http://www.urbanfutures.com/abstracts/report53.htm)) – at least, for men. However, he speculates that the participation rates of women in the 15 to 44 age group may be reduced slightly due to the new EI provisions regarding a 12-month rather than 6-month maternity leave. He may have a point, regarding short-term drops: this may delay the return of new mothers slightly. However, it probably will not affect the overall participation rate, because it appears that the vast majority of new mothers return to the workforce within a year (86%) or two (93%): at least, that was the case for those who gave birth in 1993-1994 (reported in Sunter, 2001).
Of course, the magnitude of those changes for these intervals and age brackets can also be calculated – both in absolute terms, and on a percentage basis; not only for the whole decade, but also for the two five-year intervals in-between (see Tables 5 and 6).

**Table 5: Projected Labour Force Changes for Selected Age Brackets and Intervals, Canada (actual number, in thousands)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20s</td>
<td>2001-2011</td>
<td>250.4</td>
<td>134.8</td>
<td>115.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001-2006</td>
<td>134.5</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006-2011</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>2001-2011</td>
<td>-277.4</td>
<td>-145.4</td>
<td>-132.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001-2006</td>
<td>-314.8</td>
<td>-169.7</td>
<td>-145.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006-2011</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>2001-2011</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>-13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001-2006</td>
<td>253.6</td>
<td>145.9</td>
<td>107.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006-2011</td>
<td>-248.4</td>
<td>-127.6</td>
<td>-120.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50s</td>
<td>2001-2011</td>
<td>848.4</td>
<td>477.1</td>
<td>371.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001-2006</td>
<td>477.3</td>
<td>266.2</td>
<td>211.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006-2011</td>
<td>371.1</td>
<td>211.0</td>
<td>160.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>2001-2011</td>
<td>262.6</td>
<td>162.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001-2006</td>
<td>104.6</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006-2011</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6: Projected Labour Force Changes for Selected Age Brackets and Intervals, Canada (percent)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20s</td>
<td>2001-2011</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001-2006</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006-2011</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>2001-2011</td>
<td>-6.6%</td>
<td>-6.4%</td>
<td>-6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001-2006</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006-2011</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>2001-2011</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001-2006</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006-2011</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50s</td>
<td>2001-2011</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001-2006</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006-2011</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>2001-2011</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001-2006</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006-2011</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When these figures are analyzed, we find that, although the absolute numbers of the projected workforce available are, of course, much smaller than the ones examined previously for the population as a whole (especially in the 60s age bracket), the overall trends remain the same:

- **A steady influx of about 250,000 more entry-level age workers over the decade** (with slightly more of them being males, however, which may not be as welcome news to the voluntary sector, whose employees appear to be about two-thirds female: see first Report), with about a 0.75% annual increase.

- **A substantial decline in the number of workers in their 30s**: there will be over 300,000 fewer of them within the next five years. Despite a larger decline in the number of male workers in their 30s in absolute terms over the decade, there will be a greater loss of females in proportional terms, and the 6.9% reduction in the number of women workers in this age group over the decade may be felt acutely in certain segments of the voluntary sector (such as child care and home care), where they fill the vast majority of direct service provision jobs.

- **A nearly equally (and not coincidentally) large increase in the number of people hitting their 40s in the first part of the decade**, who will be looking to advance their positions or career prospects, followed by an almost as sharp decline in the number of people in that age bracket during the final half of the decade: when it may start to become harder to fill the middle management positions which had been so eagerly sought only a few years previously.

- **A steady, almost frightening expansion in the number of workers in their 50s**, such that they will comprise a total of over 3.5 million by the end of the decade – more than a tenth of the national population – in their own right. There will be nearly half a million more male 50-something workers to absorb by the end of the decade, and over 375,000 women, about a third more of each group, and as Baby Boomers (albeit the tail end of them), they were reared with expectations that career paths advance along with age.

- **A 55% increase in the number of the most senior staff rapidly approaching retirement age over the decade**. But as just noted, there will be no shortage of people immediately behind them in age willing to take their place. Perhaps that, and some of the previous points, can be brought home best through the use of Graph 4 to show the relative sizes of these different age groups.
For many professions, these demographic factors are compounded by the fact that, with the job market being saturated by the Boomers in the 1980s, many fields and jurisdictions began a deliberate policy of restricting training and recruitment programs for the subsequent cohorts, even though there were fewer of them to begin with. In addition, the era of fiscal restraint and a sustained recession beginning in the early 1990s led to massive downsizing in many companies, along with hiring freezes which tended to shut out younger workers. The federal public service, for example, had a moratorium on hiring new employees. In addition, the Free Trade agreements – which have reduced migration barriers and the concomitant shortages of highly skilled and trained workers in other, sometimes wealthier jurisdictions – have exacerbated the problem with the so-called “Brain Drain”: the loss of predominantly medical, academic and advanced technology workers to other countries.

As a result, a number of fields and professions are indeed experiencing acute shortages even now, and they are sounding the alarm about even more acute, chronic and persistent shortages in the decades to come. For example, many bodies – including the Public Service Commission of Canada, the Conference Board of Canada, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, numerous trade unions and professional associations, and many other groups representing both employers and workers alike – have issued reports with dismaying statistics, dire warnings and plaintive titles, such as “Help Wanted” (Bruce and Dulipovici, 2001) and “Where Did All the Workers Go?” (Canadian Labour and Business Centre, 2001).
Workplace Changes and Accommodations

With these kinds of pressures threatening the continuity of their workforce and productivity, what sorts of changes have employers been making to try to retain their remaining workers or recruit more, particularly in sectors or jurisdictions where labour shortages have already been felt? What would be involved in making a field or industry an “employer of choice”?

Although various categorizations could no doubt be made, there seem to be several main classes of alterations which can be made to workplace arrangements or conditions in order to make employment more palatable, attractive or feasible.

The first, most familiar group of changes is oriented to adapting the employees to the work: the strategy is to overcome their aversion to the work by compensating for it, and the inducements here, of course, include:

• improving the actual wages or salaries; and
• improving or introducing “fringe” benefits, in any number of ways (various types of insurance plans, pension plans, holiday pay, sick leave, extended leave, professional development subsidies and time-off, etc.).

Another set is more oriented to altering the work itself to make it less aversive, by changing:

• the nature, scope or extent of the work, e.g., by reducing the workload (possibly by hiring additional or temporary staff or “outsourcing” to deal with certain parts of it, or by introducing new technologies or systems to eliminate repetitive or mundane tasks);
• the social, political or command structure of the workplace: instituting grievance procedures, reducing hierarchical structures, soliciting and entertaining more employee input, etc., to reduce workers’ frustrations; or
• the physical environment, by introducing ergonomic or technological improvements to reduce the risk of repetitive stress injuries (e.g., voice recognition software), or to accommodate older or disabled workers with mobility problems.

A third set (although it overlaps with the other two) is primarily oriented to the employees’ extra-career needs, with the strategy here often being both to alter the working arrangements or conditions and introducing more benefits in order to accommodate the extra demands on the worker’s time outside the workplace. The examples here include:

• allowing alternative schedules (“flex time”), such as allowing time off for their families’ health care appointments or needs; staggered work times (to pick up and drop off the kids); compressed work weeks (four 10-hour days rather than five 8-hour ones); or accumulating overtime which can be cashed in as days off, etc.;
• providing on-site daycare;
• helping employees find suitable care for their elderly relatives, or performing other research and referral services related to their extended families’ needs;
• providing on-site exercise gyms or spas to bring part of the life to work, etc.; and
• allowing people to work from home, or “telecommute.”
Part of the reason for the latter category is what has come to be known as “the work-life balance.” That is, many workers have a life – or try to – and it has aspects which place demands on the workers’ time with which their jobs interfere. In many cases, these other demands involve caring for family members, both young and old – sometimes simultaneously.

“Working mothers” are now quite common: in 1996, 72% of the mothers who still had children at home were in the labour force (up from 52% in 1981); even where at least one child is under age 6, two-thirds of mothers were in the paid labour force, earlier in the decade.11

Statistics Canada also reports that about 2.1 million Canadians look(ing) after older family members or friends with long-term health problems (in 1996). The majority (61% or 1.3 million) of these informal caregivers were women, and they dedicated more time (5 hours per week) than did men (3 hours) on these care-related tasks, and were more likely to be the primary caregiver (39% vs. 27% of men). (Frederick and Fast, 1999)

Although more recent figures are not available, it appears a significant number of middle-aged workers may be caring for both their offspring and their progenitors: the so-called “Sandwich Generation.” The 1990 data indicate that 36.4% of people aged 45-49 (an age group which is apt to have children) still have two living parents.12

A truly staggering range of options and ‘perks’ is now available in each of these categories; some tables listing some of the myriad possibilities are provided in Appendix 2. However, most of them have evolved in large organizations (100+ employees), often in unionized environments, and largely in the United States which, with an unemployment rate of about half our own over much of the past decade and with a slightly older population, has been ahead of our curve on these matters. Hence, it may not be very meaningful to detail how frequently these various perks and alternative arrangements have been offered in these other jurisdictions to compare with the Canadian voluntary sector’s rather more limited HR options: because they are simply not in the same league (and do not compete for the same workers).

However, one recent Canadian survey conducted by the Centre for Families, Work and Well-Being (2000) at the University of Guelph is much more applicable. It involves about 300 small businesses (fewer than 100 employees, almost half had between 10 and 25 employees) in five provinces (British Columbia, Nova Scotia, Ontario, Quebec and Saskatchewan), representing several sectors (half in manufacturing, 20% in business services, the remainder in a variety of industries, including health and education services), and fewer than 10% were unionized. The results, presented in Appendix 2, show that flex time is becoming quite common (although on an informal basis), and various other forms of flexible work arrangements are already being used in about 20% of companies.

---


Will the Voluntary Sector Have Labour Shortages in the Y2-Naughts?

With the demographic changes outlined above arising over the next decade, placing increasing pressures affecting the ability of all three sectors (public, private, non-profit/voluntary) to replenish and keep their labour forces at optimal levels, will the voluntary sector have difficulty attracting the number and quality of workers it needs through the next decade?

The most justifiable preliminary answer, of course, is “That depends” – primarily, on what happens to the overall Canadian economy, and especially the unemployment rates. Accordingly, we will divide the discussion into the implications of two main (un)employment scenarios.

Scenario 1: If There Were Another Sustained Recession

If there is another serious, prolonged downturn within the next few years as there was in the early 1990s, then, assuming the same main patterns of unemployment which prevailed at that time (about 10% overall, and between 15% and 20% for young people) were repeated, it would appear that there should be no real problem for voluntary organizations to be able to pick and choose amongst the hundreds of thousands of available surplus workers, as it did through much of the 1990s.

Considering the labour force projections detailed in the earlier “Demographic Pressures” section and Appendix 1, it would appear that the voluntary sector would have an embarrassment of riches to choose from – particularly at both the young, highly educated (more on this in the next section), entry-level end, eager to get work experience (even at diminished wages), and at the other end of the age spectrum, with the highly experienced 45- and 50-plus age brackets (more on this below, as well).

There would be a relative deficit (-12%) of people in their late 30s during the first part of the decade seeking middle-management positions, however. But those positions are disappearing in the corporate world and are relatively uncommon in the non-profit sector, anyway, so there may be no shortage of people in these age groups willing to settle for (or hang on to) mid-level Coordinator and Supervisor and Program Manager positions for a longer period than they might have preferred in a more open job market.

Thus, in this scenario, there may be no major adjustments needed in the overall HR practices of the voluntary sector as a whole: with at least one important caveat.

Certain segments of the voluntary sector (and indeed, the entire economy) which depend significantly on that 35- to 39-year-old demographic for direct service positions are likely to be hit fairly hard, due to the sharp decline of more than 300,000 people in that age bracket over the decade, most of that (123,000 fewer women, and 148,000 fewer men) over the next five years. Judging from the literature reviewed in the first Report, this may be most applicable to both home care and early childhood education, and probably nursing homes and related health and social service settings. Because these settings have all used predominantly female employees, to date, let’s isolate just that part of the working force to portray this development in Graph 5.
As you can see, there is a large ridge of women now in their late 30’s (the “genuine” Gen-Xers, before that became frozen in time to mean “20-somethings”) which now has a relative surplus of about 200,000 compared to the surrounding age groups. However, that surplus is about to drop off sharply.

Besides the greatly reduced number of people five years junior to them, the challenge of replacing these people now in service positions may be compounded by the fact that so many people in this age band found themselves effectively shut out of the full-time job market in the early- and mid-1990s. Hence, many of them (both women and men alike) had to take part-time and/or service-sector jobs they felt over-qualified for, and many also prolonged their education by taking more courses or advanced degrees in order to wait out the recession (and then, “jobless recovery”).

As a result, some of these people now in their late 20s and early 30s who are needed to take these late-30s workers’ social services workers’ places may be relatively jaded, in comparison to other cohorts, and so may be less likely to “donate labour” to non-profits (as many analysts suggest its other workers do). They may also have crushing debt loads as a result of their more extended post-secondary education, and feel they cannot afford to work for the sector’s prevailing wages (more on this with respect to the subsequent cohort, in the next sub-section).

Thus, voluntary organizations which need 35- to 39-year-old workers will likely need to increase their salary and benefits inducements and/or modify their HR practices and workplace conditions in several other significant ways in order to ensure a continuing supply, and not lose their workers to other sectors (or, in this era of increased trade and labour mobility, other countries). This would likely entail such factors as:

---

13 If they become burned out, and/or decide to move on to more lucrative careers, or leave the workforce to start the families they have delayed: all of which are likely options for women in this demographic and these positions.
• paying a “living wage” capable of purchasing a home or supporting a small family in its own right, rather than depending on workers in these age groups to either continue to put off buying homes or having families, or to have partners with larger incomes;
• offering “flex-time,” compressed work weeks, telecommuting, or other alternative working arrangements to enable them to better juggle work and starting a new family and/or assisting their more elderly parents; and
• stepping up benefits such as group pension and insurance plans, as well as daycare.

On the other hand, these particular fields may be able to meet their needs through several other means:
• with increasingly liberalized and targeted immigration programs;
• by hiring more people in their 20s (even though they may have less education and experience) – there are between three and four million of them (of both sexes) about to make their way through the labour force; and
• of course, by hiring more men.

This is not to suggest that these would be desirable tactics, or that the status quo is an optimal situation, however; see the first Report for an account of studies which argue the contrary. The quality of organizations’ care or services is also likely to suffer as the result of HR practices which tend to alienate workers or result in high turnover due to low wages, or which depend upon importing workers whose linguistic and cultural backgrounds may not match those of the clients. Those potential repercussions would need to be dealt with in a separate review, however; this one only addresses whether the labour force requirements are likely to be met.

Scenario 2: If Unemployment Rates Remain Near Current Levels

If Canada’s economic recovery of the past few years lasts, on the other hand, and/or the unemployment rate remains at about the 7% mark, overall, and 12% for youth, then, judging from both the characteristics and trends of the different demographic groups outlined in the literature and the projected labour force population changes, the picture and likely answers appear to be quite a bit more complicated.

Considering both the demographics of the workforce and the nature of the work, my reading of the literature is that it supports thinking that there are probably two very different answers for two main age groups: those well over 35, and those well under. (As just noted, however, those at the mid-point between these two clusters, the 30-something age group itself, is something of a special case which is likely to pose significant challenges for certain aspects of the voluntary sector, no matter what the overall unemployment rate is.)
An Ample Supply of Older Workers and Managers

Regarding the older groups, there will likely be no shortage of senior managers and middle-aged workers available to the voluntary sector over the next decade, for a variety of reasons.

First, this is, of course, the very age group where the Boomer “pig” will be situated, and there will be plenty of them to choose from: with the estimated number of workers between the ages of 45 and 59 forming 33.5% of the entire (age 20 to 64) workforce in 2001, 36.9% in 2006, and an almost staggering 38.4% in 2011, when 5,826,700 Canadian workers will be in that age range. With so many people in the same age groups vying for senior positions in the private and public sectors, coupled with the trend to flattened corporate structures which took place over the past 10 to 15 years, there will be a “plateauing” effect: there simply will not be enough managerial positions to go around. Among these millions, there are likely to be many thousands of highly competent personnel who would like more autonomy, authority and responsibility in their positions than they will be able to get in their current positions, who are likely to regard a senior management or Executive Director position in a voluntary organization as an attractive option – despite the low pay.

Second, despite all the complaints in the business community about the labour shortages already being here, another sobering thought regarding a possible shortage of older workers is that the bloodletting isn’t over – it appears many major companies and government departments are still downsizing. For example, the Canadian Labour and Business Centre conducts a “Leadership Survey” of business and labour leaders every two years. The latest survey asked the respondents how many of the current or impending retirees their firms would be replacing over the next five years. Only 40% of the private sector, and 31% of the public-sector managers said they’d all be replaced, and the intended replacement rates were lower for larger firms (see Table 7 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Employees in Firm</th>
<th>1-99</th>
<th>100-999</th>
<th>1,000+</th>
<th>All Mgmt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Retirees Replaced</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50% but not all</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None would be</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Canadian Labour and Business Centre (2001)

If these figures are representative, then it appears there will be relatively few positions for these huge waves of 45- to 59-year-old workers to migrate or be promoted to.

---

14 Which was sent to 4,442 labour and management leaders in the private and public sector, and received about 800 replies (an 18% response rate).
Third, even the genuinely acute and well-documented pressures on the federal civil service (e.g., see Smith and Snider, 1998) and some other sectors regarding the impending shortage of senior workers may actually turn out to be a bonanza for the voluntary sector. The indications in the literature are that, over the next decade, many early- or near-retirees will want to work for (or, in some cases, with) the voluntary sector, and may be able and inclined to put in another 10 or more good years, whether as (employed) managers and Executive Directors, or as (self-employed) consultants.

In some cases, this will mainly be because they want a new challenge, and for many people with an extensive private-sector background, one of the greatest challenges they can well apply themselves to is to help the non-profit sector become more efficient and more business-like. In the past few years, there has been a rapid growth in “social entrepreneurs” and “venture philanthropists” in the United States, who are taking a very hands-on approach, not only in forming new foundations and new networks of donor/investors (most from the high-tech sector), but also in selecting, cultivating and working with grantees, to assist with the business plans, evaluations and management of innovative projects; a number of foundation “incubators” have been formed to teach these new philanthropists how to go about this.

In other cases, it will because, as a proverbial “child of the sixties,” they may have always wanted to work for a non-profit, ever since they first got out of high school, but they never felt they could afford to do so before, when they had families to raise. But now many of these people will be able to work for a non-profit, even at half their former salaries, whether it is because they have received early retirement packages from public service jobs, or generous severance packages from large businesses which are continuing to downsize even as they expand into other markets, or because they simply have fewer expenses now that their homes are paid off and their children have left the nest.

This was predicted by Foot and Stoffman (1996) in their seminal *Boom, Bust, & Echo*:

[Nonprofits] are complicated organizations to run, and they are likely to become even more complicated as governments back out of the delivery of services…[There] will be rapid growth in the nonprofit sector and tremendous pressure on these organizations to respond to society’s new demands … Fortunately, because of population aging, a new source of highly skilled professional managers is becoming available to guide these organizations through this difficult and challenging period. The front end of the baby boom is in its middle or late 40s. That’s mid-life crisis time, when you ask what you are going to do with the rest of your life … this is also when, after years in the corporate world, you rediscover the idealistic side of your personality … many talented and able executives, stalled and bored in the corporate world, will be available to work for nonprofit organizations.

---

Foot’s prediction that the late-Boomers will soon begin to jump into the non-profit management breach has already been corroborated by several studies. Patterson’s 1998 study of the Canadian Red Cross, which had recently experienced a high turnover of managers (due to the tainted blood affair). Nine out of the 12 managers she profiled had a background in the public service, and nine (three-quarters) were also front-end baby boomers (born between 1947-1956); about half of the managers agreed they fell into the category of viewing their non-profit work as a second career. Similarly, the Executive Director surveys in San Francisco and Washington State (see first Report) found that most EDs were in the “leading-edge Boomer” cohort: one-third of the San Francisco sample were between ages 47 and 51 in 1999; and in Washington, the average age was 48.

Another reason why many thousands of workers who are reaching (early) retirement age may be more of a boon to the voluntary sector than a source of concern for it, is related to the growing trend to “contracting out,” noted in the first Report. Increasingly, these contracts are not simply being reserved for short-term, relatively dispensable and interchangeable “contingent workers” doing one-off projects. Instead, some non-profits are actually hiring their executive directors on contract (Causer, 2000). The trade publication Nonprofit World even advises organizations to outsource tasks as vital as HR management, rather than trying to build or maintain these capacities in-house, which they may not be able to afford to do properly (Parmenter, 1999). These opportunities may provide a natural fit for retired corporate and public service managers and executives.

On a related point, it should be noted that studies have shown that, over the past decade at least, many people – particularly men – who “retire” aren’t really retired, or don’t stay that way. This is true not only for the “Freedom-55” set just discussed, but even for those over age 65, which suggests that there will also be a large supply of consultants and contract workers available for the voluntary sector well into their mid- and even late-60s. As Walsh (1999) reports, the labour force statistics indicate that it’s becoming increasingly likely that men who haven’t yet retired by their early 60s will still be employed five years later. In 1986, only 29% of employed men between the age of 60 and 64 were likely to still be employed (or self-employed) five years later; but by 1998, the likelihood had increased to 41%. In fact, the employment rate for 65- to 69-year-olds in 1998 was surprisingly high: 18%. Of course, considering the mandatory retirement provisions in most sectors, most of those (59.5%) were self-employed. Indeed, as Table 8 shows, the incidence of self-employment for workers aged 65 to 69 has been growing much faster (from 51% in 1989 to 60% in 1989) than for all the other age groups.

Table 8:
Self-employment, by Age Group, 1989 and 1998 (number and percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 54</td>
<td>972,200</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59</td>
<td>111,100</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64</td>
<td>83,000</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 69</td>
<td>39,100</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, Sunter (2001) reports that the median age of retirement for the self-employed in the late-1990s was 66 (compared to about 62 or 61 for private-sector employees, and about 60 declining to 57 for public-sector employees), which means that there’s an equal number of them still working well after that age.

Granted, many of these self-employed seniors are farmers, rather than people the voluntary sector would be apt to draw on. But some would be lawyers, accountants, public relations experts, and other professionals whose expertise is badly needed by the sector, and a significant number may also be managers. Walsh (1999) also notes that almost one-third of all managers in 1998 were self-employed – nearly double the rate for all other occupations.

Thus, between the projected surplus of 50-ish workers (many of whom will be finding their career paths blocked in the other sectors due to their sheer numbers, and many of whom will be inclined to seek new challenges in the voluntary sector for other, more altruistic reasons), and the distinct possibility that even many who have reached their late 60s will continue to be both healthy and willing enough to continue to apply their talents productively on behalf of the voluntary sector, it would appear that there would be no shortage of managerial and more experienced personnel over the next decade, even in times of full employment.

**Younger Workers May Need More Inducements**

The literature suggests that older workers may well be inclined, and be able to afford, to work for the voluntary sector, even for a decline in pay, particularly in light of the fact that there are going to be so many people in the same age groups vying for senior positions in the private sector, that they may not have many other options. But for young people it’s quite a different story, particularly if they have other options, as they are likely to, not only given their increased education and technological savvy, which makes them more marketable, but also because there are relatively fewer of them entering the job market, and the public and private sectors will be recruiting to replace their retirees.

In gauging whether young people are likely to find the voluntary sector an employer of choice, there are several factors to consider. First, are young people today even motivated to work for anything but the private sector, or themselves? That, in turn, involves two issues: are significant numbers of them altruistically inclined? And, do they have sufficient confidence in the voluntary sector as a worthy vehicle for their talents? Finally, even if they are so inclined and do have faith in it, can they afford to work for the voluntary sector?

**The Altruism Factor**

First, many trend-watchers, pollsters, and pop-sociologists have opined that the younger (post-Boomer) generation is simply not as altruistic and applied as previous ones. If they are right,
then it will be difficult to recruit the now 20- (and in some cases, early-30) -something cohort to what can be very draining, thankless and poorly remunerated jobs, if they do not find their own rewards internally.

For example, in the United States, Conger (1997), a well-regarded management consultant, writes this of the Baby Bust or Generation X group(s) born between 1961 and 1981:

They are the children of dual-career couples and of parents whose marriages ended in record national divorce rates. In contrast to the Boomers, this is the group that chose majors in business and economics rather than in political science and psychology … With this generation, the adolescent idealism so characteristic of the Boomers gave way to a more pragmatic and cynical realism.

Similarly, in Canada, the pollster Michael Adams (1997), of the Environics Research Group, who formulates a series of portraits of the different generations in Canada, also characterizes most of the Generation X cohort (which he defines as born between the mid-1960s to the early 1980s) as far less prone to work in organizations on behalf of society.

Adams does resist the temptation to paint the entire generation with the same broad, “slacker” brush which befell it during much of the late 1990s. Instead, he opts to divide Canadian “Gen-Xers” into five types of temperaments and values (or “tribes”): thrill-seeking materialists (25%), aimless dependants (27%), social hedonists (15%), new Aquarians (15%), and autonomous post-materialists (20%). Given everything he says about all these sub-groups – and their labels almost say it all – it appears they will provide very slim pickings for the voluntary sector. By his reckoning, the aimless dependants would neither want, nor be wanted for, jobs. The materialists and hedonists might want jobs, but would only be interested in high salaries and security.17 The final two groups – the “Autonomous Post-materialists” (20% /1.4 million) and the neo-Hippy “New Aquarians” (also 900,000) – do seem to be driven by other sorts of values and may show some promise for being involved in some types of voluntary organizations (particularly advocacy groups), as they are interested in egalitarianism and human rights. However, the overall impression which this pollster’s analysis leaves is that this will be a “Lost Generation” as far as most voluntary organizations are concerned.

Although these sources are more impressionistic than based on solid empirical data, particularly vis-à-vis the non-profit sector, several large-scale surveys suggest that most people in their 20s who are emerging from the universities are unlikely to work for voluntary organizations in their immediate future: either because they explicitly do not intend or prefer to work for non-profit organizations, or because their salary or workplace expectations are such that they will effectively largely exclude the voluntary sector market by default.

Let’s begin with the salary issue. In the fall of 2000, Ipsos-Reid conducted an Internet-based survey of a self-selected sample of 3,006 students from 20 universities across Canada who responded to the ads for the survey in the student newspapers. Even though only 19%

17 Adams (1997: 112) actually explicitly attributes the sentiment, “A job with social meaning? Are you kidding? That’s for wimps!” to this sub-group.
explicitly indicated that their main career goal is for a high-paying occupation, the group as a whole appears to expect to **start** at executive salaries, and proceed to make six figures. As the press release for the study put it:

> The ambitious young scholars are most attracted to “interesting” vocations (81 per cent), not just high-paying occupations (19 per cent), with their sights firmly set on starting annual salaries averaging $46,145 for undergraduates ($57,301 for graduate students), with expectations to earn $68,084 by 2005 ($81,052 – graduate students), $170,004 by 2020 ($177,908 – graduate students) and $264,041 by retirement ($246,306 – graduate students). (Canada NewsWire, 2000)

Of course, even though it is quite large, the sample in that particular survey may have been somewhat skewed towards people in more professional or high-tech programs (breakdowns of their disciplines were not given). There may also be something peculiar about Internet-based surveys, lending to more hubris. However, another large and more conventionally conducted survey a few years earlier found similar – although not as profound – gaps between what university students expect to make and what the voluntary sector has been paying to date.

This survey (Smith and Snider, 1998), conducted in the fall of 1997 on behalf of the Public Service Commission of Canada, received responses from a total of 2,537 university students in a variety of disciplines (although there was an over-representation of engineering students: 24%) from among a sample which had been chosen at random by their university administrations to represent both men and women, and post-graduates and undergraduates equally. Regarding their minimum (starting) salary expectations, although a significant number (30%) of those under age 25 (i.e., mostly undergraduates) did fall into the broad range of the voluntary sector ($20,000 to $29,000), almost two-thirds did not: 43% expected to make at least $30,000 to $39,000 upon graduation, and 18% expected at least between $40,000 and $49,000.

As we saw in the first Report, however, apart from the duly accredited professional staff such as nurses and psychologists, the latter brackets are the salary ranges of the Executive Directors and Senior Managers, not the entry-level workers. For the students who were older than 25 (many of whom would be in Master’s or PhD programs), there was an even greater gulf: only about 15% had minimum expectations in the $20’sK; while 31% expected at least $30,000 to $40,000, 28% expected their first positions to command salaries in the $40’sK, and 13% thought they wouldn’t settle for less than $60,000.

These surveys had other indications that this upcoming generation (at least, the portions of it who are attending universities) may be ill-suited or disinclined to work for voluntary organizations. In the Ipsos-Reid survey (which was conducted for the Royal Bank), it emerged that 29% of these students preferred to work for a large company with 100 to 500 employees; and **not one** expressed a preference for working for a small company of fewer than 20 employees (Canada NewsWire, 2000). Considering that the vast majority of voluntary organizations (outside the university/hospital sector) fall into the latter category (see first Report), this suggests that voluntary organizations may have considerable difficulty...
attracting newly minted graduates in the foreseeable future. These two factors – salary and firm size – are not unrelated, as these students may have known full well. According to Statistics Canada data (Drolet, 2001), in 1997, the average full-time (FT), full-year (FY) salary for firms with 100 to 499 employees was indeed $49,273 – for men, although only $32,017 for women. For firms with less than 20 employees, however, the average FT-FY salaries were much closer to the voluntary sector range: $32,261 for men, and $24,723 for women, i.e., 35% and 23% lower, respectively.

Interestingly, the survey also found that these students did not rule out the sector entirely, however. In fact, 20% of the respondents were interested in employment with non-profit organizations: but not as their workers – rather, as their Directors. Further evidence is provided by the Smith and Snider (1998) survey, which also asked students what they wanted from a job, and which sector of the economy they’d like to work for. Even though 69% of the respondents did indicate that “Work that contributes to the betterment of society” was a job-related factor they thought was either important or very important, that only ranked 17th among a list of 31; a competitive salary or compensation was much more important, ranked as important or very important by about 85% of the respondents, and ranked the second most important factor driving their career choice. (“Most interesting” was again the first; more on the other factors in the next sub-section.)

More to the point, only 3.5% of all the university students in this study selected the “Not-for-profit/NGO (i.e., non-governmental/charitable)” sector as the one they would most prefer to work for. This preference for the non-profit sector was a little higher (about 4%) for those who were over the age of 25 in 1997; so almost all of these individuals would be in their 30s, now. But for those (then) under age 25, the figure appears to be less than 2%.

Similarly, there is also a large annual survey of people getting their MBAs which asks them about their values and career plans (GMAC, 2000); although its respondents are predominantly American, apparently there are some from other countries, as well. In the 1999/2000 survey, just 1% of the new MBA graduates overall had accepted employment with a not-for-profit organization (0.4% men, and 2.0% of women), and as they use that term in the United States (where there are many for-profit hospitals), that would likely include and indeed may actually apply predominantly to hospitals. For the latest survey for the class of 2001, it is even worse: out of a total of 4,569 MBA respondents, only 28 people indicated that their employing organization was going to be a not-for-profit organization: that represented 0.6%

---

18 “University students’ ranking of career desirability shows they are most interested in becoming: entrepreneurs or consultants (40 per cent); lawyers or other professionals (36 per cent); teachers (31 per cent); technology workers (23 per cent); filmmakers, musicians, artists or writers (22 per cent); doctors/physicians (21 per cent); directors of not-for-profit agencies (20 per cent); computer programmers (15 per cent); stock brokers (13 per cent); politicians (11 per cent); and commissioned sales people (two per cent).” (Canada NewsWire, 2000).

19 The vast majority, 64.8%, chose the private sector, followed by the public sector(s) – federal (18.0%), provincial (6.9%), municipal (2.0%), and other government (1.6%); and a write-in “Other” came in at 3.2%.
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of the population: 0.2% of the males, and 0.4% females.\textsuperscript{20} (Nor is it the case that Business Administration graduates have no business/place in voluntary organizations: particularly the large ones. For example, Patterson (1999), reporting on the whole complement of managers of the Canadian Red Cross (apart from the 10 Executive Directors across the nation), reveals that 41% held Business degrees.\textsuperscript{21})

Moreover, not only do the well-educated young people now (or soon to be) entering the labour force seem to be more inclined to work for the other sectors for their financial or career-advancement reasons, but the voluntary sector may also be losing its attraction to potential workers for other, non-career related reasons. The latest (2000) National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (NSGVP)\textsuperscript{22} found that many people’s support for the voluntary sector has been declining in the past several years, not only in the amount of volunteering they are willing to perform for it, but also in their attitudes about its efficiency, integrity and overall worth.

First, let’s consider volunteering, an important indicator of young people’s interest in – and probably a good predictor for whether they are willing to work for – voluntary organizations. Although the volunteer rates for youth aged 15 to 24 in 2000 were the third highest,\textsuperscript{23} at a 29% participation rate, this was down from 1997 (33%). Moreover, even though those who did volunteer in this age group ended up volunteering more hours per year than people in that age bracket did a few years ago (130 in 2000, vs. 125 in 1997), these averages were lower than the all-ages national averages in both years (162 in 2000, and 149 in 1997), and were the lowest for all the age groups. Even worse, those modest averages for the number of hours youth volunteered per year are actually buoyed by the significant number of young people in the 15- to 19-year-old bracket who were required to “volunteer,” as part of the curriculum in some provinces and jurisdictions. Although the 1997 survey didn’t ask about mandatory community service, the 2000 survey did, and found that more than 7% of those who volunteered in 2000 (of all ages) indicated they were required to do so by their school program, employer or the government/corrections system; for those aged 15 to 19, 35% were required to do so. As Hall et al. (2001) note, these curriculum requirements likely accounted for much of the variability they found in the volunteer rates for the 15- to 19-year-olds among the different provinces. Unfortunately, they do not actually provide the rates for the 15- to 19-year-old group alone, nor a list of which provinces had such curriculum requirements in 1997.

\textsuperscript{20} Source: correspondence from Rachel Edgington, Project Manager, Information Services, Graduate Management Admission Council, McLean, VA, August 2001.

\textsuperscript{21} Their total numbers and main fields of study/degrees were as follows: 144 (41%) had Business Degrees; 42 (12%) had Social Work degrees; 38 (11%) had Humanities degrees; 35 (10%) had Health Sciences degrees; and 22 (6%) had degrees in education.

\textsuperscript{22} The NSGVP is a large-scale survey akin to the regular Labour Force Survey but with questions specifically on volunteering, donating and memberships of clubs and other forms of civic participation; the 2000 survey was based on a representative sample of 14,724 household-dwelling Canadians aged 15 and over (except for people on reserves or in the Armed Forces). The first one was conducted in the fall of 1997, and the latest one in the fall of 2000.

\textsuperscript{23} With the 35- to 44- and the 45- to 54-year-old brackets tied at first place, at 30%; the 55- to 64-year-olds coming in fourth, at 28%; the 25- to 34-year-old group fifth, at 24%; and the 65+ set last, at 18%, although they volunteered the highest number of hours per year on average (269), by far.
and 2000, but for the full 15- to 24-year-old range, the volunteer rates and averages and medians per year were as illustrated in Table 9.

Table 9:
Volunteer Rates and Average and Median Number of Hours Volunteered per Year for 15- to 24-Year-Olds, 1997 and 2000, by Province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NF</th>
<th>PEI</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>QC</th>
<th>ON</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1997</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Besides their actual willingness to work for such organizations for free, another indicator of whether young people might be willing to work for voluntary organizations as a career, is how much they trust them. The NSGVP asked several attitudinal questions related to people’s reasons for trusting the sector, and their reasons for not volunteering or donating more. For three of the most relevant questions, the latest findings indicate significantly declining support for the sector along these dimensions within the past few years; on an uncharitable reading, the results show:

- almost one million fewer Canadians believe non-profits play a major role in improving our communities;
- nearly an additional 1.25 million believe the non-profits don’t use donations effectively; and
- nearly 800,000 have trouble finding a charitable cause they think is worth supporting (see Table 10).

Table 10:
Estimated Number and Percent of Canadians over the Age of 15 Who Agree or Disagree with:
“Generally, charitable and voluntary organizations play a major role in making our communities better places to live.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td>21,579,654</td>
<td>20,628,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td>1,446,493</td>
<td>2,052,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don’t know</strong></td>
<td>424,566</td>
<td>402,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refusal</strong></td>
<td>33,955</td>
<td>267,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not stated</strong></td>
<td>323,483</td>
<td>1,032,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23,808,151</td>
<td>24,383,207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Ontario instituted a province-wide 40-hour community service requirement in its high school curriculum in fall 1999.
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“The reason that you do not donate (more) is: ...
... because you think the money will not be used efficiently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9,098,825</td>
<td>10,323,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14,453,254</td>
<td>13,135,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>214,232</td>
<td>250,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>41,841</td>
<td>119,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>553,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23,808,151</td>
<td>24,383,207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“The reason that you do not donate (more) is: ...
... because it is hard to find a cause worth supporting.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2,990,176</td>
<td>3,775,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20,659,150</td>
<td>19,807,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>114,577</td>
<td>186,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>44,248</td>
<td>109,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>504,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23,808,151</td>
<td>24,383,207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Unfortunately, I cannot report what proportion of this one million additional Canadians who appear to have lost faith in the voluntary sector falls into the 15 to 19 and/or 20 to 24 age groups. The results for these questions are not readily available for specific sub-groups (but Statistics Canada will run such tables on a cost-recovery basis, for those who might want those or any other specialized statistics from these and many other surveys).

The Affordability Factor

Besides the underlying values and inclinations of those in their late teens and 20s, an equally important question to address is “the affordability factor.” That is, even if a sufficient number of young people were willing in principle to work for the voluntary sector, with the average wages for the vast majority of voluntary sector positions now only averaging between $20,000 and $30,000 (see Appendix 1 to first Report), the odds appear to be that a large portion of them are likely to decide that they simply cannot afford to work for a voluntary sector salary.

As we just saw, the Royal Bank and PSC surveys found that most young people getting university degrees – the kind of worker wanted by voluntary sector organizations, because relatively few positions being filled now require any less, particularly with the professionalization trend driven in part by the funders’ increasing reporting requirements (as


26 For example, the 1998 BC Nonprofit Sector Salary and Benefits Survey (discussed in the first Report) found that at least 70% of the organizations required a post-secondary degree for four of the five categories of administrative positions, and even 29% of the clerical positions did, as well.
noted in the first Report) – expect to make over $30,000 right out of the gate, with many wanting $45,000 or more, at a minimum.

Of course, to the thousands of voluntary employees who are currently averaging $25,000 per annum or less, those expectations might seem quite unrealistic – and even greedy. However, according to Statistics Canada data, the average full-time, full-year earnings of people in their late 20s with a university degree in 1997 was indeed nearly $40,000 – for men (for women, it was about $33,000) (reported in HRDC, 2000a). These expectations may also be quite justified in another sense: considering the amount of money young people have invested in their education, and the mounting levels of debt they are carrying, they may feel they have little choice but to take a job which pays at least $35,000 per year, particularly if they ever want to buy a house or start a family, as well.

It used to be that only medical students graduated with tens of thousands of dollars in debt, which they regarded as ample justification for receiving six-figure salaries. However, with rising tuition fees for undergraduate degrees along with some truly staggering prices for textbooks, coupled with the (until quite recently) lack of even part-time work available for young people and students, those levels of debts are becoming commonplace.

The levels of tuition fees and student debt loads have increased significantly over the past ten years, and it shows little signs of abating. For example, HRDC (1998b) reports that even for 1990 post-secondary graduates, a significant number of students borrowed up to $20,000, and some even more, although the average loans were $5,500 to $9,000 (depending on the degree or level of study). As tuition fees continued to rise (and part-time employment opportunities fell), a $20,000 debt load became more common for the 1995 post-secondary graduates, as Clark (1999) reports, comparing it to those of the last of the Boomers over a decade earlier:

Compared with the class of 1982, graduates in 1995 owed between 130% and 140% more to student loan programs at graduation (after adjusting for inflation). On average, the 1995 graduates owed $9,600 (college) and $13,300 (bachelor’s) when they graduated. Averages, however, do not tell the whole story. While some borrowers (7% of college and 22% of bachelor’s) owed more than $20,000 at graduation, others (21% and 14%, respectively) owed less than $5,000. With these widely varying amounts, graduates face different pressures to find good jobs and begin repaying their loans.

For people in Social Sciences and Related fields, and the Educational, Recreational and Counselling Services, the average debt at graduation for the 1995 grads was about $9,250; and for those with humanities degrees, it was $10,000 (Clark, 1999). And these are just the debts to the official student aid programs; they may be carrying additional personal debts to friends and family members, as well. The debt loads for people with university degrees were also several thousand dollars higher than those from colleges or trade schools (which is likely attributable to the shorter periods of study), and were highest for those in the 25- to 29-year-old range, as illustrated in Graph 6.
As Bouchard and Zhao (2000) note, average tuition fees have approximately doubled between the 1989-1990 and 1998-1999 academic years. This is true even when the cost of inflation is taken into account and the same type of degree is compared: the Canadian Education Statistics Council (2000) provides a table on “Average Tuition Fees in Undergraduate Arts Programs, Canada and Provinces, 1988-1989 to 1998-1999, in Constant 1998 Dollars,” which shows that tuition averaged $1,615 (in 1998 dollars) at the national level in 1989-1990, and this rose to $3,199 in 1998-1999. It continued to rise by 2% or 3% annually over the past few years: to $3,281 per year in 1999/2000; $3,380 in 2000/2001; and this year, it is $3,452 (StatsCan, 2000b, 2001). Of course, that is just for a BA; it is much higher in professional programs. Thus, this report in the Economist (2000) may not be apocryphal: “nowadays, a typical student graduates with a debt of about C$25,000.”

Of course, not all of the young people who will be hitting the job market in 5 to 10 years’ time will be going to university or college/trade school. However, the trends indicate that a great many will be. For example, the University of Lethbridge sociologist Reginald Bibby periodically conducts surveys of about 3,500 high school students, aged 15 to 19, from across the country. In the most recent survey (conducted in 2000), he found that about 70% expected to attend university (reported in Bergman, 2001). That may not be so far-fetched, either (although a large portion of these will probably end up in other forms of post-secondary education instead). The Canadian Education Statistics Council (2000) reports that, in 1998, 61% of Canadian women and 55% of the men aged 25 to 29 (the Nexus generation) were post-secondary graduates. That is up quite a bit, even from the highly educated levels of the late-Boomers/Gen-X primes, about a decade earlier, as illustrated in Table 11.
Considering the make-up of the voluntary sector, it is also of note that it is women who are leading the post-secondary charge. The Canadian Education Statistics Council (2000) also reports that women now comprise over half of all the college and university enrolments and graduates, they accounted for more than 80% of the increase in the number of university graduates between 1988 and 1997, and they received 58% of the university diplomas and degrees in 1997. There are now about a quarter million more newly minted graduates each year (of both sexes): approximately 100,000 receiving community college diplomas; 125,000 getting a BA or first undergraduate or professional degree; 21,250 earning a Master’s; and nearly 4,000 completing PhDs (ibid.).

### What Young People Want From Employment

Thus, if young people are, as it seems:

- relatively disinclined to work for the voluntary sector (given their values, goals and debt loads, and the sector’s meagre salaries);
- relatively scarce (compared to the bumper crop/ready supply of them the sector had become accustomed to, over the past 15 years); and
- far more marketable (with their post-secondary educations and information technology savvy) and in demand than in recent memory (with both the private sector and especially the public sector already poised to pursue more aggressive recruitment campaigns (including more co-op programs) in order to implement succession planning and replace their retirees); then:

…it would appear only prudent to find out what young people might want from a job, in order to give the sector more of a fighting chance to be able to attract sufficient quantities of young workers before they all get snapped up by the other sectors. Fortunately, there are several good sources of data on precisely this issue (even though they were commissioned by and prepared on behalf of the other sectors).
First, as already noted, the 1997 survey for the Federal Public Service Commission (Smith and Snider, 1998) asked students to rank how important a whole series of job-related factors were to them. The five most important factors identified in this survey were:

1) **interesting work**: ranked most important by 22% of the female students, and 21% of the males;
2) **competitive salary/compensation**: ranked most important by 25% of the males, but only 18% of the females – which is good news for the voluntary sector;
3) **opportunity to use their education/work in their field of study**: ranked most important for about 8% overall;
4) **ability to balance work, family and other interests** (i.e., 60-hour weeks should not be the routine): ranked the priority for about 7% overall; and
5) **employment security**: ranked the most important factor for 5% of them.

The PSC also commissioned another survey of university students (Booker et al., 2001) a few years later (summer, 2000). This time, the target population wasn’t just undergrads and grads generally, but students who had been in a federal work experience, co-op or internship program that summer. A total of 3,487 students responded to the survey, which was conducted by Ipsos-Reid. Once again, the respondents’ most important career choice factors were: interesting work, competitive wages, opportunity to work in their field of study, being able to balance work-life, long-term job security, and advancement opportunities.

When they summed up all the factors which made up the students’ top three choices, the overall rankings were as illustrated in Graph 7.

**Graph 7: Most Important Factors in Choosing Job After Graduation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interesting work</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competitive wages</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work in field of study</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balance work and personal life</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long-term job security</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributes to betterment of society</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training and development</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competitive benefits</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respects differences among people</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flexibility to move throughout org</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job within your region</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use state-of-the-art technology</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization with good reputation</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manager with good reputation</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=3487

Most important factors represent 1st, 2nd and 3rd rankings; percentages will add to >100%
Similarly, Graham Lowe and his colleague Harvey Krahn of the University of Alberta surveyed people in the same age cohort several years earlier (1996), when the latter were in Grade 12. The main characteristics that about 85% of the 17- to 18-year-olds (in 1996: who are thus now about 23) desired in full-time work after graduation were that it: be Interesting; have Friendly and Helpful Co-workers; Give a Feeling of Accomplishment; have Little Chance of Being Laid Off; Pay well; and provide Opportunities for advancement. About 55% of them wanted professional or semi-professional jobs, and 15% of them technical careers; only 15% aspired to clerical/sales/service jobs.27

The Royal Bank’s survey (Canada NewsWire, 2000) also asked what students felt would be most important in a job. The main replies were “experience a variety of tasks and opportunities” (51%); “challenging work responsibilities” (44%); job security (36%); opportunities for promotion (36%); “direct responsibility over tasks” (18%); and “interesting co-workers” (15%). A total of 70% also wanted to be able to work “regular hours” (as opposed to massive amounts of overtime), in order to be able to balance work with family or other interests. As one of the Bank’s spokesmen noted about the findings, “This study is clear. To be considered an employer of choice, companies must provide choices for their employees … Our findings suggest students are very optimistic and fully aware of market forces that can help them leverage a satisfying work-life balance.”

Similar sentiments about the 20-something generation knowing what they want, knowing their worth, and being prepared to ‘vote with their feet’ if they don’t get it were also expressed a year or so earlier by the participants at an HRDC-sponsored conference on the “Nexus generation”:

The strong craving for “relevance and excitement” is one trait which employers cannot overlook in recruiting and retaining Nexus members. Nexus members are strategic in their choice of employment and have high expectations that employers will deliver what they have promised. One participant suggested that “Older generations have filters, they can learn not to see the things they don’t like about their employer or their workplace. Nexus just leaves.” (PRI, 1999)

Of course, as Lowe (2001a) notes, these preferences for meaningful work, employers with integrity, and so on are certainly not unique to the younger generation: either compared to other generations at a comparable age, or simultaneously, now. There is, in fact, a major convergence, he argues, in what younger and older workers consider ‘very important’ in a job, as revealed by Graph 8 from a recent national survey of 2,500 employees of various ages across Canada.

---

There were some points of divergence, however, in some of the very areas where the voluntary sector falls short, as far as young people are concerned. “Chances for career advancement are good” was ranked as very important by about 62% of those under age 30 (and by only 43% of those over age 45), but many voluntary organizations are very small with relatively few senior positions, thus providing little room for promotion. Second, “Job security is good” was ranked very important by more than 70% of workers under age 30 (and about 59% of those over age 45). The other important factors, some of which were somewhat more important to those over age 45, but which were still very important to between about 50% and 60% of those under age 30, are: Receive recognition for job well done; Good benefits; Allow you freedom to do job; Gives a feeling of accomplishment; and You feel a strong commitment to employer.

If the voluntary sector is to fulfil at least some of these desiderata, it will need to take measures to build a stronger sense of security and allegiance for its employees, which likely means:

- higher base salaries and greater benefits packages;
- fewer part-time and short-term contract positions, and more full-time, full-year, salaried positions with benefits;
- more concerted HR evaluation and feedback opportunities than the piecemeal or sporadic approach described by Haiven (2000) as typical of the sector (see first Report); and
- more respect for the workers and their life-work boundaries, i.e., no expectation of regular, unremunerated overtime.
Finally, Lowe also presents these work preferences separately for the two sexes, which should be of particular interest to the voluntary sector (see Graph 9).

**Graph 9:**
**What Men and Women Consider ‘Very Important’ in a Job, Canada, 2000**

![Graph showing work preferences](chart)

Source: CPRN-Ekos Changing Employment Relationships Survey, Canada, 2000; chart from Lowe (2001a)

Thus, the recipe for the voluntary sector’s successful recruitment strategy is likely to be the same as the one COSO (2000) prescribes for the public sector – *workplace well-being*, which:

...is about many things: it is about people having meaningful and challenging work to do with an opportunity to apply their skills and knowledge; it is about working effectively with colleagues and managers; it is about a work environment that is safe and healthy, that is respectful of individuals and their different circumstances, including the need for work-life balance, and where people have the tools they need to get the job done; it is about being fairly compensated, both in terms of salary and benefits; it is about having learning opportunities and possibilities to achieve personal career aspirations.

Similarly, in Graham Lowe’s (2000-2001, various) analysis, the key to successfully attracting and retaining employees will be to provide *quality* work, which has four main pillars: it is fulfilling and meaningful; it provides a decent standard of living; it understands and accommodates the relationship between health, well-being and the work-life balance; and it
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respects the workers’ rights. In his view, enlightened HR management policies and practices will not only address employees’ material needs – by providing decent benefits and pay – but also their ‘intrinsic’ rewards which provide personal fulfilment, such as receiving recognition, or improving their knowledge or skills through training. He recommends a “high performance workplace model” to achieve this, through such components as:

• a Flat (non-hierarchical) Organization;
• Team-Based work;
• Flexibile Job Designs;
• commitment to Training and Learning;
• Employee Participation in decision-making;
• sharing Rewards and Information;
• promoting Health, Well-being, Work-Family balance (including having a healthy and safe work environment);
• Supportive Supervisors;
• Decent Living Standard and Economic Security;
• Mutual Trust among employers and workers;
• Encouraging initiative and creativity; and
• providing Opportunities to use and develop skills.

Needless to say, organizations which implemented such progressive measures would likely have less difficulty in attracting workers of almost any generation: not only the more coveted 20-somethings. That seems to be borne out by CPRN-Ekos’ Changing Employment Relationships Survey, Canada, 2000, which shows relatively few differences among the different age groups in their preferences for high-quality work along the dimensions just outlined.

Conclusion

With these two Reports, we have reviewed:

• some of the major finding on the trends in the Human Resource literature on the non-profit sector;
• the predicted changes in the size and age profile of the Canadian workforce over the next ten years;
• the changes in workplace arrangements which are evolving to contend with workforce demographics; and
• the implications of the preceding for the voluntary sector.

The findings seem to support that there is not a single answer to whether the voluntary sector is apt to experience an acute labour shortage and/or whether it needs to modify its HR practices considerably. Rather, three distinct responses or strategies emerge, corresponding to three main demographic bands.
• It seems quite likely that the voluntary sector will have little difficulty in attracting as many additional senior and managerial workers as it can accommodate, probably with little to no modification of its current HR policies. There will be so many people in the 45 to 59 age range, and in many cases their financial pressures will not be as acute, and many of them will be looking for a career change or new responsibilities.

• For the next group, people in their mid-30s, there will be a substantial shortage relative to current levels (which has seen a glut, this being the single-largest cohort Canada has ever seen). The voluntary sector, which depends on this segment of the population quite heavily for a wide variety of direct service jobs, will likely have to introduce a variety of reforms in their compensation practices and workplace arrangements in order to accommodate people in their 30s, and make themselves more of an employer of choice.

• Finally, for the younger generations (those now between their teens and late 20s), the situation appears to be a lot more problematic. Unless the average annual salaries increase to at least the $30,000 mark (rather than the $20,000 to $25,000 mark it is at now for many voluntary sector workers), and unless something is done to curtail the current practice of only hiring most new workers on short-term contracts and then laying them off (often without their even being eligible for employment insurance) in-between the agencies’ own service contracts, it appears that voluntary organizations are unlikely to be able to attract very many young university graduates. Moreover, unless they try to ensure that these young workers can use and expand their skills and education, and have more autonomy and input into decision-making, they may also have trouble retaining them once they do hire them.

By and large, however, the literature supports the view that there will not be an acute labour shortage in the specified timeframe (between now and 2011). However, matters will be quite different immediately after that, due not only to the massive wave of retirements which will occur then, but also the greatly diminished number of young people to enter the labour force at that time. As Lowe (2000a) notes, the 4.2 million 35- to 44-year-olds in the labour force in 1996 are going to be replaced by the young cohort of just 1.9 million who were born in the 1990s: “the first time a retiring cohort will be numerically larger than the replacement generation.” Similarly, Sunter (2001) notes, “If current age-sex participation rates hold, the overall [labour] participation rate could drop from about 65% in 2000 to about 63% in 2010. By 2020, the rate could be below 60% and may fall even more quickly, to about 57% by 2025.” The only viable solution to that problem would seem to be to increase immigration levels – but that would be the subject of another Review.
Appendix 1: More Detailed Breakdowns of the Projected Working-Age Population and Total Labour Force

For more detail on the relative pressures on expected changes in the labour force, this Appendix has three parts:

- To illustrate the “Pig in the Python” concept, and orient ourselves to the influence of the large Baby Boom cohort’s passage through the workforce and society, a Population Pyramid – which incorporates three separate time series – is presented to serve as a proxy for Statistics Canada’s online animated pyramid.28

- For more detailed, fine-grained breakdowns on the actual expected population levels for all the age brackets in the working-age population and their anticipated levels of labour force participation (assuming the current rate continues), some comprehensive Tables are provided to show both the expected levels and the magnitude of the changes (in both absolute and percentage terms).

- A series of Graphs are provided as alternative means of conceptualizing these changes, including ones which concentrate on females only, because they have represented about two-thirds of the voluntary sector’s workforce to date.

First, Graph 10 from Statistics Canada shows how the shape of the pyramid changes from 1980, when most Boomers were in their 20s (the large protuberances at the bottom quarters), to where the biggest clump of them are now (in their late 30s and early 40s), to where they’ll be by 2005 (in the middle age bracket: the late 40s and early 50s).

Graph 10:
Age Pyramid of the Population of Canada, July 1, 1980, 2000 and 2005

Source: Statistics Canada, data from their CD-ROM, files as7196.xls and as9605.xls

28 The animated pyramids for 1971 to 2005 are online at www.statcan.ca/english/kits/animat/pyca.htm.
Table 12: Total Projected Working-Age Population and Available Labour Force in Canada, for Selected Intervals (in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Projected Total</th>
<th>Projected Male</th>
<th>Projected Female</th>
<th>Projected Total</th>
<th>Projected Male</th>
<th>Projected Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>2,081.0</td>
<td>1,069.7</td>
<td>1,011.2</td>
<td>1,077.9</td>
<td>554.1</td>
<td>523.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>2,097.0</td>
<td>1,070.5</td>
<td>1,026.5</td>
<td>1,613.9</td>
<td>855.3</td>
<td>758.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>2,100.3</td>
<td>1,064.1</td>
<td>1,036.2</td>
<td>1,790.9</td>
<td>963.0</td>
<td>827.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>2,252.5</td>
<td>1,138.4</td>
<td>1,114.1</td>
<td>1,941.0</td>
<td>1,055.3</td>
<td>885.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>2,641.7</td>
<td>1,332.6</td>
<td>1,309.1</td>
<td>2,274.7</td>
<td>1,234.0</td>
<td>1,040.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>2,659.1</td>
<td>1,331.6</td>
<td>1,327.6</td>
<td>2,303.1</td>
<td>1,229.1</td>
<td>1,074.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>2,384.9</td>
<td>1,189.6</td>
<td>1,195.3</td>
<td>2,034.0</td>
<td>1,084.9</td>
<td>949.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>2,114.7</td>
<td>1,053.3</td>
<td>1,061.3</td>
<td>1,664.6</td>
<td>911.1</td>
<td>753.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>1,625.9</td>
<td>804.2</td>
<td>821.7</td>
<td>1,025.0</td>
<td>586.3</td>
<td>438.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>1,291.1</td>
<td>631.3</td>
<td>659.7</td>
<td>470.5</td>
<td>291.0</td>
<td>179.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2006     | 15-19     | 2,155.3         | 1,107.5        | 1,047.9         | 1,116.5        | 573.7          | 542.8           |
|          | 20-24     | 2,167.6         | 1,105.9        | 1,061.7         | 1,668.2        | 883.6          | 784.6           |
|          | 25-29     | 2,194.1         | 1,113.3        | 1,080.8         | 1,871.1        | 1,007.5        | 863.6           |
|          | 30-34     | 2,201.6         | 1,115.0        | 1,086.6         | 1,897.5        | 1,033.6        | 863.8           |
|          | 35-39     | 2,326.8         | 1,172.8        | 1,154.0         | 2,003.4        | 1,086.0        | 917.4           |
|          | 40-44     | 2,675.7         | 1,346.9        | 1,328.9         | 2,318.3        | 1,243.2        | 1,075.1         |
|          | 45-49     | 2,663.7         | 1,334.1        | 1,329.6         | 2,272.4        | 1,216.7        | 1,057.5         |
|          | 50-54     | 2,362.9         | 1,175.0        | 1,187.9         | 1,859.8        | 1,016.4        | 843.4           |
|          | 55-59     | 2,073.7         | 1,024.9        | 1,048.8         | 1,307.2        | 747.2          | 560.1           |
|          | 60-64     | 1,578.1         | 771.6          | 806.5           | 575.1          | 355.7          | 219.4           |

| 2011     | 15-19     | 2,175.0         | 1,117.7        | 1,057.2         | 1,126.6        | 579.0          | 547.6           |
|          | 20-24     | 2,241.4         | 1,143.6        | 1,097.8         | 1,725.0        | 913.7          | 811.3           |
|          | 25-29     | 2,263.5         | 1,148.5        | 1,115.0         | 1,930.3        | 1,039.4        | 890.9           |
|          | 30-34     | 2,293.0         | 1,163.2        | 1,129.8         | 1,976.5        | 1,078.3        | 898.2           |
|          | 35-39     | 2,278.1         | 1,150.7        | 1,127.4         | 1,961.8        | 1,065.5        | 896.3           |
|          | 40-44     | 2,370.3         | 1,192.6        | 1,177.8         | 2,053.6        | 1,100.8        | 952.8           |
|          | 45-49     | 2,681.7         | 1,350.4        | 1,331.3         | 2,288.6        | 1,231.6        | 1,057.1         |
|          | 50-54     | 2,637.4         | 1,317.5        | 1,319.9         | 2,076.8        | 1,139.6        | 937.1           |
|          | 55-59     | 2,318.3         | 1,145.2        | 1,173.2         | 1,461.3        | 834.9          | 626.5           |
|          | 60-64     | 2,011.3         | 984.1          | 1,027.2         | 733.1          | 453.7          | 279.4           |

| Total    | 15-64     | 21,248.2        | 10,685.3       | 10,562.7        | 16,195.7       | 8,764.1        | 7,431.6         |
|          | Total and over | 25,183.3        | 12,364.2       | 12,818.7        | 16,591.2       | 9,163.6        | 7,627.1         |

| Total    | 15-64     | 22,399.5        | 11,267.0       | 11,132.7        | 16,889.4       | 9,163.6        | 7,725.9         |
|          | Total and over | 26,701.7        | 13,111.8       | 13,590.0        | 17,592.1       | 9,506.1        | 8,086.1         |

Table 13:
Projected Changes in Available Labour Force in Canada for Selected Intervals and Age Groups, Expressed both in the Difference in Numbers (in thousands) and in Percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>111.1</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>-312.9</td>
<td>-168.4</td>
<td>-144.5</td>
<td>-13.8%</td>
<td>-13.7%</td>
<td>-13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>-249.5</td>
<td>254.6</td>
<td>146.6</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>421.5</td>
<td>412.1</td>
<td>228.5</td>
<td>183.6</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>436.3</td>
<td>248.6</td>
<td>187.7</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>262.6</td>
<td>162.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 15-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,137.9</td>
<td>672.3</td>
<td>465.6</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 15 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,934.4</td>
<td>1,054.7</td>
<td>879.7</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>-43.6</td>
<td>-21.7</td>
<td>-21.9</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>-271.3</td>
<td>238.4</td>
<td>131.8</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>195.2</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>-43.6</td>
<td>282.2</td>
<td>160.9</td>
<td>121.3</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>104.6</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>693.7</td>
<td>399.5</td>
<td>294.3</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 15-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000.9</td>
<td>542.0</td>
<td>458.9</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 15 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td>693.7</td>
<td>399.5</td>
<td>294.3</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>111.1</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>-312.9</td>
<td>-168.4</td>
<td>-144.5</td>
<td>-15.6%</td>
<td>-15.5%</td>
<td>-15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>-249.5</td>
<td>254.6</td>
<td>146.6</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>421.5</td>
<td>412.1</td>
<td>228.5</td>
<td>183.6</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>436.3</td>
<td>262.6</td>
<td>162.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>1,137.9</td>
<td>672.3</td>
<td>465.6</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 15-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,934.4</td>
<td>1,054.7</td>
<td>879.7</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 15 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,934.4</td>
<td>1,054.7</td>
<td>879.7</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 11:
Projected Canadian Labour Force Population for Selected Age Groups for both Sexes Combined, 2001-11 (in thousands)

Graph 12:
Graph 13:
Projected Differences in the Size of the Canadian Labour Force between 2001 and 2011, by Age Group and Sex (in thousands)

Graph 14:
Projected Change in the Size of the Canadian Labour Force between 2001 and 2011, by Age Group and Sex (in percent)
Graph 15:

Graph 16:
Appendix 2: Possible Benefits and Alternative Work Arrangements

In Work Life Practices and Flexibility in Small Businesses: A Canadian Research Report (2000), the Centre for Families, Work and Well-Being reports that some small businesses in Canada offer a number of innovative programs, in addition to flexible work arrangements:

- Before and after school programs
- Trips for employees and their families
- On-site massages
- Tuition for employees and their families
- Birthday parties for employees
- Housecleaning services
- Friday barbeques for lunch in summer
- Parties and dinners

- Profit sharing
- Maternity leave top-ups
- Subsidies for childcare
- On-site nutritional food
- Potluck Fridays in winter
- Treasure hunts
- Home computer upgrades
- On-site yoga courses

In the United States, the Families and Work Institute’s periodic Business Work-Life Study asks companies with more than 100 employees which of the following they offer, and to what degree. Although the frequencies of awarding such perquisites were not very high in the first iteration of this survey (1997), they provide a good overview of the types of options which are available to help make an organization an employer of choice.

Benefits to Enhance Economic Security

- Temporary disability insurance (TDI)?
- Full or partial payment by company of TDI premiums?
- Defined/guaranteed benefit pension plan?
- [Registered] individual retirement plan?
- Company contribution to individual retirement plan?
- Scholarships or other educational assistance for employees’ children?

Flexible Work Arrangements:

- To periodically change starting and quitting times?
- To change starting and quitting times on a daily basis?
- To return to work gradually after childbirth or adoption?
- To move from full-time to part-time and back again while remaining in the same position or level?
- To share jobs?
- To work at home occasionally?
- To work at home or off-site on a regular basis?
- To take time off for school/child care functions?

Health Care Benefits

- Personal health insurance for full-time employees?
- Health insurance for part-time employees on a full or pro-rated basis?
- Health insurance includes family members coverage?
- Full or part payment of premium for family members?
- Health insurance coverage for unmarried partners who live together?
- Wellness program for employees and their families?
- Space and storage facilities at work that allow women who are nursing to continue to do so by expressing milk?

Leave Policies – and how long (e.g., <12 Wks, 13-26 wks) and Replacement Pay Levels (if any)

- Maternity Leave/Degree of Replacement Pay during
- Paternity Leave/Degree of Replacement Pay during
- Adoption Leave/Degree of Replacement Pay during
- Foster Care Leave/Degree of Replacement Pay during care of Seriously Ill Children Leave/Degree of Pay
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Child Care Assistance
- Access to information to locate child care in community?
- Child care at or near the worksite?
- Payment for child care with vouchers or other subsidies that have direct costs to the company?
- Dependant care assistance plans that help employees pay for child care with pre-tax dollars?
- Reimburse child care costs when employees work late?
- Reimburse child care costs when employees travel for business?
- Child care for school-age children on vacation?
- Back-up or emergency care for employees when their regular child care arrangements fall apart?
- Sick care for the children of employees?
- Financial support of local child care through a fund or corporate contributions beyond United Way?
- Public/Private partnership in child care?

Elder Care Assistance
- Elder care resource and referral services?
- Long-term care insurance for family members?
- Direct financial support for local elder care programs?
- An Employee Assistance Program designed to help employees deal with problems that may affect their work or personal life?
- Workshops or seminars on parenting, child development, care of the elderly, or work-family problems?

Train supervisors in responding to work-family needs of employees
- Train supervisors in managing diversity
- Consider how well supervisors manage the work-family issues of employees in making job performance appraisals
- Counselling program or a management/leadership program for women

Company Involvement in Community Life (e.g., employee volunteering): Type of Public-Private Partnership
- All types
- Child Care Programs
- Parent Education and Support Programs
- Health Care Programs
- Welfare to Work Programs
- Education Programs

Supportiveness of Supervisors and the Culture
- Supervisors are encouraged to be supportive of employees with family for sake of both employees and the organization
- Men and women who must attend to family matters are equally supported by supervisors and the organization
- The organization makes a real and ongoing effort to inform employees of available assistance for managing work and family responsibilities
- Management takes employees’ personal needs into account when making business decisions

Programs for Teenagers
- Any Program
- After-School Programs
- Financial Support for Community Programs
- Seminars/Workshops
- Summer Programs
- Employee Assistance Programs
- Referral Information Services
- Scholarship Programs/Educational Assistance
- Counselling
- Other
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