



Laidlaw Scholars Undergraduate Leadership and Research Programme
Research Report

The Impact of Work Integration Social Enterprises on Youth in Toronto

Katrina Eilender

Research Advisor: Professor Deborah Leslie

July 23rd, 2025

Background: What is the issue at play?

Youth experience a particularly high degree of precarity in the labour market compared to other groups. Youth unemployment is rising (Government of Canada, 2025), and those who do find employment are increasingly likely to be able to find seasonal, part-time, or gig work -- that is, precarious work -- as opposed to a secure full-time position (Morissette, 2021). It is clear that the rise of precarious work among young people is not due to a preference for flexible or part-time work on the part of youth; but rather the labour market conditions that make it difficult to obtain a standard full-time job. (Morissette, 2021) This is reflected in the experiences of interview participants for this study, who described sending out hundreds of applications and receiving a single or even no response as a common occurrence (Interviews). The labour market for youth was also hit harder by the pandemic than the labour market as a whole, and youth unemployment has been increasing since then. (Government of Canada, 2025). A compounding factor is the reality that youth are one of the groups most vulnerable to the impacts of automation, because the entry-level, low-skill jobs they rely on to gain access to the labour market are at the highest risk of being automated first. (Switzer, 2025) This is likely to worsen in the coming years, as governments and institutions are far behind in the pace of technological change in terms of responding to the social and economic impacts of these changes (Frey & Osborne, 2017; World Economic Forum, 2016).

Youth in precarity is a concerning trend given what is known about the effects of being in precarious work: such workers struggle more to cover basic costs of living (Martin et al, 2018), have worse physical and mental health, and have more difficulty forming friendships (Lewchuk et al, 2017). Unpredictable employment or exclusion from the labour market altogether leaves young people unable to plan for the future or enter into long-term commitments that would traditionally shape their emerging adulthood, because they have no sense of security about even the near future. One interview participant, the director of a print-shop social enterprise, characterized young people in precarious labour as working jobs with shorter and shorter timespans, unable to make reliable plans for even the next few months of their lives (Interviews). There is even evidence that younger workers are delaying forming relationships and families as a result of uncertainty about their employment (Lewchuk et al, 2017).

In addition to the clear human cost of youth marginalization in the labour market, there is a significant economic cost. Using NEET [Not in employment, education, or training] youth as a proxy for those most disengaged from the labour market, a 2018 study estimated that each NEET youth incurs \$6,069 in extra fiscal costs per year compared to a non-NEET youth, in the form of social assistance, healthcare services, increased likelihood of homelessness, crime, and forgone income tax, adding up to 1.92 billion yearly for all NEET youth in Ontario (Blueprint, 2018). This is just in direct costs to taxpayers and does not even consider costs to the economy as a whole. Additionally, as NEET rates have been rising since then, these numbers are likely even higher today. (Statistics Canada, 2025) It is clear that youth failing through the cracks in the labour market is a problem both socially and economically and that policies to integrate marginalized youth into the labour market relatively early will be far more cost-effective than allowing their exclusion to continue into adulthood.

Moreover, exclusion from the labour market for youth in Toronto falls along unequal lines, and inability to find work often intersects with other barriers such as lower educational attainment, a racialized background, a disability, housing precarity (Blueprint, 2018). Ultimately, precarity reinforces itself. In order to remedy these inequalities and shore up stability for youth, a bridge must be built between the population most distant from the labour market, who face multiple barriers to employment and who may have no work experience, and the market that could benefit from their participation.

One possible model for such a bridge is the Work Integration Social Enterprises (WISE), a business whose purpose is to employ those who would struggle to find employment in the mainstream market. The WISE model has received recent attention among scholars (Leslie et al, 2024) and policymakers (Government of Canada, 2025) for its potential to address compounding inequality through their provision of “a first job in a supportive setting with additional skill-building opportunities, ancillary services, and assistance connecting to specific employers in the unsubsidized labor market; an approach that offers work experience and the bridge to a better job.” (Cooney, 2011) There are two broad categories of WISEs. The first focuses on people with mental or physical disabilities and is based on the sheltered workshop model that emerged in the 19th and early 20th centuries. The second, which will be the focus of this paper, serves the broader population of people trapped in poverty or unable to access the mainstream labour market, although that may include people with disabilities. This model emerged in the 1990s and

2000s in response to the welfare cuts and restructuring that encouraged market-based and ‘workfare’ solutions to unemployment as opposed to direct support (Cooney, 2016).

Because WISEs operate as businesses, they do have a revenue stream, but this typically covers business expenses and not necessarily the “social costs” of operation: that is, the free training and wraparound support that they offer. Such social costs usually constitute 20-40% of total costs, and WISEs rely on governments and foundations to fill that gap. However, from the perspective of WISE directors, this does not make them less financially viable businesses. As one interviewee described, it is not uncommon for private sector businesses to receive significant government subsidies in exchange for contributing to employment goals. There are even completely private companies which receive contracts from government employment agencies such as Employment Ontario to find placements for unemployed youth, but without re-investing the profits back into social services or supports (Interviews). In this view, WISEs are far more financially efficient in terms of solving the problem than similar private companies, and the 20-40% paid by external funding sources is a fee for service rather than a subsidy.

In recognition of the potential of the social enterprise sector to address rising inequality and precarity, the Government of Canada launched a major project funding longitudinal studies of WISEs in Canada. The results of Phase I of that project, which was active from 2017-2022, suggest that they can be effective at reaching populations marginalized from the labour market over time and reducing indicators of precarity (Employment and Social Development Canada, 2024). The Canadian Economic Development Corporation conducted a quasi-experimental, longitudinal study, found that WISE participants were significantly more likely to be employed full-time at a 3-year follow-up than the comparison group (CED, 2022). Lysaght et al (2022), a longitudinal on the impact of WISEs on people with significant mental health struggles, found that WISE participants scored better on a range of wellbeing indicators after three years; they also found that WISEs were successful “launching pads” for participants to find employment in the community. Celeste et al (2022) found that a WISE project focused on food insecurity in Northern Ontario had an SROI (social return on investment; that is, the total estimated value of the outcome of the project over the investment in the project) of \$1.89.

However, scholars and interviewees have also observed the tension inherent in the dual mandate of the WISE: the social mission and the necessity of competing in the market (Rantisi & Leslie, 2021). The most significant critique of WISEs, and social enterprises in general, is that

they are an individualistic, band-aid solution to the structural problems of precarity and inequality; that the language of “innovation” and “social entrepreneurship” that marked their peak popularity in the 2000s (McQuilten et al, 2020) is a way to sidestep the real issues of taxation, regulation, and welfare (Interviews).

This study will be a qualitative investigation of how WISEs function in the lives of at-risk youth in Toronto to produce the measurable impacts on indicators of precarity that previous studies have identified, and it will also investigate how that impact is maintained while balancing the social and economic mandates.

Key Benefits of WISEs

The key benefits of WISEs are their flexibility, the fact that they lower barriers to important educational credentials and transferable skills while providing wraparound supports in the process, and that they have a focus on long-term stability.

First and foremost the “Catch-22” that comes with lack of work experience. As one interviewee described it, “A lot of employment, a lot of companies require experience. But if no company is willing to give young people a chance to start, how can young people gain experience, without the first experience? How can they find a good job?” (Interviews) WISEs give young people a foot in the door even if they have no previous experience, allowing them to escape the vicious cycle described above. Their flexibility in hiring and ability to work around life circumstances that would normally make finding a job difficult, if not impossible, allow them to reach people who are kept out of the mainstream labour market. One interviewee found BuildingUP through a social worker while incarcerated and was able to apply from prison and successfully complete the program. A staff member at Paintbox Bistro described changing work schedules so that a participant who had childcare responsibilities and a precarious housing situation could maintain employment:

“So we adjusted it, or we'd give her half shifts, or I could almost guarantee she was going to call in sick at least one day a week....we kind of recognize her patterns and instead of punishing her for it. We worked with her.” (Interviews) The participant now works in insurance

and owns her own home, an example of how the flexibility of WISEs can interrupt the cycle of precarity.

They are not just adaptable in their hiring processes; they are also nimble as organizations, able to respond as issues emerge and to constantly tailor their skill training to meet changing market demand. LOFT Kitchen has adapted their food service program to several different populations, depending on demand and government priorities, each time re-shaping the supports they offer: refugees, 2SLGBT people, youth. BuildingUP keeps abreast of what is most cutting-edge in the construction industry, shaping its training to “really sort of figuring out what the sector needs out of the next wave of tradespeople, and making sure that people receive that when they're with us”, giving their participants an edge on the labour market.

In a constantly changing economy, social enterprises are keeping up, and in fact are more likely to survive the vagaries of business for longer than their traditional small business counterparts.

WISEs use this flexibility to bring in a broad spectrum of people who then have access to key educational credentials and training without the barrier of cost. For example, Infiniguard, a security social enterprise, covers the cost of training, study sheets, and the certification exam, which would otherwise be unaffordable for its participants. The majority of participants in interviewed will be leaving the WISE with a concrete educational credential that grants them entry into a field. One interviewee described how it would not have been possible for them to go to college for the trade they were entering if not for BuildingUP’s financial help:

“Because my finances and stuff weren't typically, weren't necessarily in order to go back to college, right? I did just, I was just incarcerated, just before that, right? And I was just trying to get my life back on track and kind of still stay within my field.”

Behind these educational credentials are transferable skills, both hard and soft. Depending on the enterprise, this might look like food preparation and catering, childcare, first aid, excel and data analysis, or any number of other field-specific marketable skills. BuildingUP, for example, offers health and safety certifications and trades-based math so that participants can pass the trade union math entrance exams. However, across all the WISEs, interviewees consistently emphasized that in addition to these job-specific skills, WISEs provide the foundations of punctuality, confidence, and functioning well in the workplace. Infiniguard achieves this in part through a “buddy system” of mentorship, in which each youth participant is paired with a 20-year veteran of the security industry: “we buddy them up with this new young

folks to kind of teach them security etiquette, teaching the basics of professionalism, and just follow them through until they're ready to work on their own.” This one-on-one mentorship is crucial because of the multiple barriers faced by participants: “drugs, addiction, mental health are affecting their personal lives and and like they're set back, just like when it comes to just, you know, living life, they're they're lacking a lot of essential skills by the times that by the time that we kind of capture them,” which means that many require extra support through programs like the buddy system.

Many WISEs take this even further through wraparound supports that actively help participants deal with the life circumstances that may have kept them out of the workforce before. This often includes help with housing, immigration status, transportation, professional attire, and mental or physical health. LOFT Kitchen has an integrated ‘Life Management’ program that teaches participants to take care of a myriad of basic tasks: “So the life management stuff is very simple things that you and I everybody needs in life. You know, you need to have a bank account, an email address, you need to have a form of communication, an address, like basic things like clothes and hygiene. So, when we go through the training, we also go through all these areas of how to kind of build your life so that the successes that you achieve can stick.”

In addition to life skills training, it can take the form of material help with rent and groceries, or access to free counseling. WISEs invest in wraparound supports because they establish the fundamental stability necessary to work and prevent what the director of LOFT Kitchen calls ‘the revolving door’: people coming back to shelters or programs again and again because they aren’t able to sustain the improvements that they made.

WISEs strive to accomplish the opposite of that; their goal is to set the participants up for the rest of their career. WISEs are designed to produce good employment and wellness outcomes in the long-term, even though their training programs may only last for a period of weeks or months. They ensure that those outcomes extend into the future in two main ways: by employing participants long-term themselves, and by using their industry expertise and networks to connect participants directly to a stable employment pipeline in their field. LOFTKitchen brings participants on 10-12 site visits to tour different food service work environments to help them decide what direction to go in and give them concrete options in the industry. BuildingUP connects participants to the construction unions, which are a real pathway to social mobility in

the industry: “There's stability. There's a pension at the unions, and like the long term kind of opportunity to enter the middle class.” The organization also offers a case manager to help participants plan their career trajectories:

“When I first started, like pursuing electrical. I told my career case managers I wanted to pursue electrical. She came with so much resources and documentation to be like, hey, yeah. This is, this is like, these are different approaches that you can take, and this is exactly how it works.”

One participant argued that this was the single most helpful support offered by BuildingUP. The ability to plan how one’s career will move forward, to make choices and have support for whichever path one chooses allows participants to reclaim agency. Participants are no longer mired in the uncertain timelessness of precarious work, but rather have a sense of their own futures and how they can shape them.

Problems with WISEs and How They Are Addressed: Balancing Market and Social Mandates

The most significant issue identified with WISEs, both in the scholarly literature and in the interviews, is the tension between their social and economic mandates. They are criticized as a market solution to a social problem, an outgrowth of the neoliberal destruction of the welfare state and its attempt to devolve those social responsibilities onto the private sector. Moreover, the WISE can be seen as an individualistic solution born out of ‘workfare’ era logic: instead of addressing the root causes of precarity and inequality, it tries to make individuals more competitive within the existing unequal market (Garrow & Hasenfeld, 2014). No one sees the truth in this critique more than the executive directors of WISEs. As one described it:

“I am convinced that it is a positive way of putting a positive spin on a broken system. And rather than acknowledge the brokenness, we're going to play around on the edges with the same tools that caused the brokenness in the first place. ... Well we are going to call it Innovation. Really what we should be doing is having a hard look at tax policy. But we're not ready for it, so we're doing all this other stuff instead, which completely diverts all of our attention from the things that would really have an impact.”

However, that executive director, among many others, is finding ways to make the social enterprise sector transform market logic instead of serving it. In practice, this looks like scaling

up, building assets, funding, and networks over time, and collaborating with other social economy organizations. Countries such as Australia and Scotland have had incredible success with this, and both now have robust social economy sectors that own significant assets and have had measurable impacts in terms of responding to the effects of brutal deindustrialization. Two specific strategies that social enterprises use to scale up and build assets, funding and networks are social procurement and Section 37 agreements.

Social procurement refers to “using a firm’s [or government’s] spending power to generate social value”; in other words, reallocating money that would be spent regardless to suppliers or service providers that also generate social or environmental benefits. For example, a firm might choose to have their end of year party catered by a social enterprise. This is related to the idea of the “triple bottom line”, an accounting framework that takes into consideration economic, social, and environmental dimensions.

In recent years, some large institutions have codified social procurement through official policies. The executive director of LOFT Kitchen for the impact of such policies if they became widespread: “I mean the possibility of every institution in Toronto actually having a policy about triple bottom line on how they spend their money. All the, you know, the dinners, all this, everything, you know, there's probably tens of millions of dollars at UofT that could be allocated.” Furniture Bank, one of the social enterprises examined, has a contract with the City to provide furniture for its housing assistance programs, which has benefits for all involved: the city doesn’t have to buy new furniture for its housing beneficiaries, old furniture is kept out of the landfill, which also saves the city money, and the long-term contract helps keep Furniture Bank in business. The City of Toronto is also an important client for BuildingUP. The social procurement policy allows firms to skip the competitive procurement process if they are a nonprofit and at least 51% of employees are residents of Toronto Community Housing, which means BuildingUP can win contracts without beating out other firms on price and speed.

The executive director of Infiniguard explained how social procurement is a lifeline in the security industry, where such a small company with extra social costs could otherwise never compete: “And you can tell how that becomes a challenge when you're trying to be when you're trying to compete in such an aggressive industry that folks are under bidding, folks can and take a loss just to get a client, and we cannot compete whatsoever in that regard. So it's more, it's more so like capturing clients that believe in the social enterprise sector, those are folks that we

target.” In essence, social procurement is a framework for turning the enterprise’s social mission into a competitive advantage, instead of just an extra cost that would prove fatal in obtaining private-sector contracts.

Another innovative strategy that social enterprises use is participation in Section 37 community benefits agreements. These are negotiated settlements between the City and developers that trade density for community benefits; that is, the developer is allowed to violate zoning rules if they pay for amenities in the surrounding community, typically in the form of community spaces such as schools, libraries, or parks. However, by working with city councillors, social enterprises have been able to obtain spaces through these agreements, securing an asset that can enable stability and growth despite rising rents. LOFT Kitchen is housed in one such space within George Chuvalo Community Centre. This strategy is yet another demonstration of the adaptability of social enterprises; when provincial funding is being drastically cut, as is currently the case in both Ontario and Quebec, they find ways to work with the municipal government to maintain their impact.

The most important way to scale up and have a structural impact, however, is through collaboration with other social economy organizations. As defined by Quarter et al (2017) “The social economy bridges the many different types of self-governing organizations that are guided by their social objectives in the goods and services that they offer.” These organizations include charities, cooperatives, labour unions, foundations, credit unions, and social enterprises. The aforementioned strategies are also inextricably tied up with such collaboration: social procurement requires it to create comprehensive lists of social enterprises, and to lobby for social procurement policies, and Section 37 agreements often provide spaces for multiple organizations to share, as is the case with LOFT Kitchen.

The two largest enterprises interviewed, Learning Enrichment Foundation and BuildingUP, both cooperate extensively with other organizations, which is a large part of what has allowed them to be so successful. Learning Enrichment Foundation is essentially a unification of several social enterprises, with the largest being childcare centres. The executive director described how combining multiple social enterprises allowed for greater flexibility and risk tolerance, because the most profitable can subsidize new or less profitable enterprises. Additionally, all the administrative functions are handled centrally, which is a significant burden

off the backs of the small enterprises and allows an efficiency that a single one could never reach alone:

“They're not corporations or entities. So, all of their accounting goes through accounting. They don't have to think about staff policies, that goes through HR, right. They don't have to think about how people get paid, or cash flow - they are leaning on the whole. They can just focus on the sales, training, customer experience, client experience.”

The efficiencies and spillover effects from such a large network working together is what allows LEF to have 80-90% of revenue coming from fee-for-service and 35 childcare centres across Toronto, caring for more than 2000 children.

For BuildingUP, this collaboration takes place not with other social enterprises but with the Parkdale Community Land Trust. The land trust, which collectively owns and manages affordable housing, hires BuildingUP to renovate aging houses as it acquires them. This is a fruitful partnership: it represents about 50% of BuildingUP's general contracting work, allows the Land Trust to maximize their triple bottom line while building nonmarket housing, which is by any lights a radical and impactful rewriting of the neoliberal market logic social enterprises are supposedly embedded in. Collaborations within the social economy can also help create the financial pipeline that many social enterprises lack. Credit unions are an important source of financing for social enterprises (Government of Canada, 2022), in part because they are more likely to be focused on investing locally and investing with social issues in mind, given that they began as a form of social finance. (Canadian Economic Development Network, 2022)

Only when the social economy comes together on a larger scale can it challenge the systems within which it operates and create structural change. By recognizing the fact that structural change is needed and entering into broad collaborations to build collective power, social economy organizations can work to change the rules of the game, directly, through their own impact, and indirectly, through policy advocacy. LEF offers full-time hours and benefits to their childcare workers, which is not the industry standard. They are big enough, however, that doing that makes a dent in the industry in Toronto and helps set a less precarious standard for all childcare workers, a clear demonstration of the power of scale. On the policy side, LEF hosted 22 organizations over the course of a weekend to create an advocacy strategy: changing tax law, for example, to incentivize offering secure rather than precarious jobs. Working together allows social economy organizations such as WISEs to incrementally build assets and power, ultimately

working towards reshaping the economic structures that create inequality in addition to just mitigating its effects in individual cases. This is how the social economy was able to become what it is in places like Scotland and Australia, and this is the way forward for Canadian social enterprises as well.

References

- Blueprint. (2018, June). Towards a Better Understanding of NEET Youth in Ontario. https://global-uploads.webflow.com/5f80fa46a156d5e9dc0750bc/5fd223a5e5a89c9087781f02_NEET-draft-DEC2020.pdf
- Bone, K. D. (2019). “I don’t want to be a vagrant for the rest of my life”: young peoples’ experiences of precarious work as a “continuous present.” *Journal of Youth Studies*, 22(9), 1218–1237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2019.1570097>
- Celeste, De Raaf, & Poiteven-Desrivieres. (July 2022). Field trials and evaluation of WISE programming in North Simcoe Final Report. The Social Research and Demonstration Corporation. <https://www.srdc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/WISE-North-Simcoe-Final-Report.pdf>
- Canadian Community Economic Development Network (2022). Alleviating Homelessness: WISE Research Summary Final Report. <https://ccednet-rcdec.ca/sites/ccednet-rcdec.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/CCEDNet-WISE-Final-Report.pdf>
- Canadian Economic Development Network. *Social finance and credit unions: Differentiating by making a difference* -(2022, September 7). <https://ccednet-rcdec.ca/resource/social-finance-and-credit-unions-differentiating-by-making-a-difference/>
- Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: how susceptible are jobs to computerization. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 114, 254–280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.08.019>
- Garrow, E. E., & Hasenfeld, Y. (2014). Social Enterprises as an Embodiment of a Neoliberal Welfare Logic. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 58(11), 1475-1493. <https://doi-org.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/10.1177/0002764214534674> (Original work published 2014)
- Government of Canada. (2022, March 31). *SME Profile: Social enterprises in Canada* [Reports; Navigation Pages; Index Pages]. Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada. <https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/sme-research-statistics/en/research-reports/sme-profile-social-enterprises-canada>
- Government of Canada (2025, February 27). Government of Canada boosts funding to help 1,600 youth across Canada overcome barriers to employment [News releases].

<https://www.canada.ca/en/employment-social-development/news/2025/02/government-of-canada-boosts-funding-to-help-1600-youth-across-canada-overcome-barriers-to-employment.html>

Henderson, J. L., Hawke, L. D., & Chaim, G. (2017). Not in employment, education or training: Mental health, substance use, and disengagement in a multi-sectoral sample of service-seeking Canadian youth. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 75, 138–145.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.02.024>

Lewchuk, W., Shields, J., & Procyk, S. (Eds.). (2017). *Precarious employment : causes, consequences and remedies*. Fernwood.

Lysaght et al. (2022). WISE Impact: An Outcome Study Focused on WISE in the Mental Health Sector Final Research Report. Queen’s University.

Martin, J., & Lewchuk, W. (2018, September). The Generation Effect: Millennials, employment precarity and the 21st century workplace. Poverty and Employment Precarity Southern Ontario. United Way; McMaster University. <https://pepsoc.ca/documents/the-generation-effect-full-report.pdf>

McQuilten, G., Warr, D., Humphery, K., & Spiers, A. (2020). Ambivalent entrepreneurs: Arts-based social enterprise in a neoliberal world. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 16(2), 121-140.

Morissette, R. (2021, July 26). Portrait of youth in Canada: Data report Chapter 2: Youth employment in Canada. Statistics Canada. Government of Canada.
https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2021/statcan/42-28-0001/CS42-28-0001-2021-2-eng.pdf

OECD (2022), “Unlocking the potential of youth-led social enterprises”, OECD Local Economic and Employment Development (LEED) Papers, No. 2022/11, OECD Publishing, Paris,
<https://doi.org/10.1787/d5bddad8-en>.

Precarious Work: Understanding the Changing Nature of Work in Canada. Report of the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities. (2019, June.) Government of Canada.
<https://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/Committee/421/HUMA/Reports/RP10553151/humarp19/humarp19-e.pdf>

Rantisi, N and Leslie, D. 2021. In and Against the Neoliberal State: the Precarious Siting of Work Integration Social Enterprises as a Counter-Movement in Montreal, Quebec. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*. 53(2): 349-370.

Statistics Canada. (2025, May 1). *Youth not in employment, education or training: Recent trends*. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/81-595-m/81-595-m2025001-eng.htm>

Strategic and Service Policy Branch, Social Policy Directorate, Employment and Social Development Canada. (2024). Report summary: Work Integration Social Enterprise Research Program, 2017 to 2022. <https://www.canada.ca/en/employment-social-development/corporate/reports/research/work-integration-social-enterprise-research-program-2017-2022.html>

World Economic Forum. (2016, September). Values and the Fourth Industrial Revolution Connecting the Dots Between Value, Values, Profit and Purpose. Global Agenda Council on Values (2014-2016). https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Values_and_the_Fourth_Industrial_Revolution_WHITEPAPER.pdf

Young, J. (2025). AI takes entry-level jobs as big four slash graduate hiring. Singer Island: Newstex. Retrieved from <http://myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/login?qurl=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.proquest.com%2Fblogs-podcasts-websites%2Fai-takes-entry-level-jobs-as-big-four-slash%2Fdocview%2F3223870094%2Fse-2%3Faccountid%3D14771>

Appendix: Organizations Interviewed

Interviews used in this report were conducted by Norma Rantisi, Deborah Leslie, Benjamin Owens, and Katrina Eilender as part of an ongoing project on the social economy led by Professors Rantisi and Leslie.

BuildingUP

<https://www.buildingup.ca/>

Eva's Print Shop

<https://www.evas.ca/what-we-do/print-shop/>

Furniture Bank

<https://www.furniturebank.org/>

Infiniguard

<https://www.infiniguard.ca/>

Interpreter Services

<https://www.schliferclinic.com/interpreter-services-toronto/>

Community Researchers

<https://www.communityresearchers.org/>

Learning Enrichment Foundation [LEF]

<https://lefca.org/>

LOFT Kitchen

<https://www.conccommunity.org/loftkitchencafe/>

Paintbox Bistro

<https://www.paintboxbistro.ca/event-space/>

Studio 89

<https://studio89.org/>