John P. Bartkowski
Susan E. Grettenberger

The Arc of Faith-Based Initiatives

Religion's Changing Role in Welfare Service Provision

Springer

The Arc of Faith-Based Initiatives

John P. Bartkowski · Susan E. Grettenberger

The Arc of Faith-Based Initiatives

Religion's Changing Role in Welfare Service Provision

Springer

John P. Bartkowski
Department of Sociology
The University of Texas at San Antonio
San Antonio, TX
USA

Susan E. Grettenberger
Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work
Central Michigan University
Mount Pleasant, MI
USA

ISBN 978-3-319-90667-6 ISBN 978-3-319-90668-3 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90668-3

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018939937

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer International Publishing AG part of Springer Nature
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Acknowledgements

No book is an accomplishment of its authors and contributors alone. We are grateful, first and foremost, to the agency directors, program managers, and clients whose perspectives—and very words—are represented in this book. Without the gracious investment of their time in our research, this volume would not exist. We hope that we have fairly represented their views here.

We are thankful for generous funding for the initial wave of data collection from the Pew Charitable Trusts through a grant to the Rockefeller Institute of Government. We are especially grateful to Richard Nathan, David Wright, and Thomas Gais at the Rockefeller Institute for their unswerving commitment to this project in its early and most formative stages.

We are also thankful to our many colleagues on the Roundtable for Religion and Social Welfare. The Rockefeller Institute convened the Roundtable on several occasions for lively discussions in which we participated and from which we benefitted immensely. Many of these colleagues contributed to the Faith Integration Survey and other research instruments that were used to conduct our study. We are particularly thankful for their important contributions and hope they see their ideas fruitfully employed and explored in this volume. Several of these Roundtable colleagues commented on our early research findings from the first wave of data collection. The conclusions offered here are our own, but we hope these colleagues see how their input shaped this work.

Several other colleagues showed patience with us during the writing of this volume. The authors thank the Springer Editor, Evelien Bakker, for shepherding this volume through the review process. The authors relied heavily on the thoughtful comments of several anonymous reviewers who scrutinized this volume prior to its publication. We took such comments most seriously and made every effort to integrate their remarks into our work. We hope those reviewers will recognize their formidable influence. The authors are grateful to Frank Howell, who suggested Springer as a suitable outlet for this work. The vision of leaders and staff at Springer has been instrumental in carrying this volume across a finish line that, prior to our relationship with Springer, sometimes seemed like a moving target.

Writing a book is accompanied by unanticipated twists and turns, and this volume was no exception. This work introduced a number of hurdles along the way in terms of data availability, coordination, scheduling, and other challenges. John and Susan are thankful for Steve Smith's contribution in Chap. 5, as well as his perseverance and foresight. Collaborative research adds a layer of complexity to scholarship, and we believe that our relationships as well as our diverse disciplines enrich this volume.

The patience exhibited by trusted family members, friends, and colleagues is also cherished. John is especially grateful for the stamina demonstrated by his wife, Nicci, during discussions of this book's key arguments and challenges introduced by writing several portions of this volume. He is also thankful for conversations about drug treatment programs and related concerns with Jerri Avery, Eileen Ewing, Pam Smith, and Mark Stovall. John was supported by the capable research assistance of Amanda Avenoso, Favor Campbell, and Nicole Reed. Susan is indebted to her social work faculty colleagues at Central Michigan University for their patience throughout the development of this volume. She is particularly grateful for the support of her wife, Nicole Springer, and her sister, Charlotte Fitzgerald, at various points in the project. Finally, she acknowledges Leisa Fuller for her very able intellectual contributions and logistical work during the data collection. Steve Smith would like to thank Benjamina Menashe for her editorial and research support in the preparation of Chap. 5. Additional research assistance was also provided by Laurie Werner and Stephanie Goldberg Belle. Steve is also grateful for the support of the Nancy Bell Evans Center on Nonprofits & Philanthropy at the Evans School of Governance and Public Policy at the University of Washington.

Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1
Faith-Based Persistence and Permutations

Faith-based initiatives first entered the American lexicon over two decades ago, and the practice of government has been significantly altered ever since. This initiative's genesis, effectively Faith-Based 1.0, formally began under Charitable Choice, a provision in 1996's Welfare Reform Law.[1] This provision offered clients of government funded job placement, housing, food distribution, and other programs the choice of receiving services from a faith-based or secular provider. It also reversed the longstanding requirement for faith-based organizations to secularize themselves before becoming eligible to bid for government service contracts.

George W. Bush was swept into office, in part, on his promise to unleash the "armies of compassion" against the social disadvantages faced by many who had been left behind in the economic boom of the 1990s. So began Faith-Based 2.0, the apex of this revolution. Shortly after his election in 2000, Bush's administration worked to make public funds more accessible to faith-based organizations. President Bush created the White House's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. All major government agencies (Health and Human Services, Justice, and Housing and Urban Development, among others) were charged with partnering more closely with faith-based and community-based providers. A religious liaison in the Office of Public Liaison was created by executive order. Shortly thereafter, the Bush administration established the Compassion Capital Fund by presidential mandate. The Compassion Capital Fund was designed to provide a series of capacity-building grants to small faith-based and community-based nonprofit organizations. These grants aimed to correct what the administration called an "unlevel playing field" between historically well-funded secular social service

[1]On the Charitable Choice provision of welfare reform law and congregationally run poverty relief efforts, see, for example: Ammerman (2005), Bartkowski and Regis (2003), Chaves (1999), Cnaan et al. (2002). On the administrative and legal challenges associated with Charitable Choice, see for example: Kennedy and Bielefeld (2002), Brownstein (1999).

J. P. Bartkowski and S. E. Grettenberger, *The Arc of Faith-Based Initiatives*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90668-3_1

agencies and their smaller faith-based and community-based counterparts.[2] All told, $10.6 billion in federal grants were awarded to faith-based nonprofits during the Bush administration.[3]

Religious social service provision under two Obama terms, Faith-Based 3.0, was initiated by the February 2009 announcement of the revamped White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships. The press release[4] for this office indicated its continuation of several Bush administration priorities, such as "encouraging responsible fatherhood" by supporting "fathers who stand by their families," and aiming to get "young men off the streets and into well-paying jobs." And yet, this office also departed from Bush-era religiously driven priorities. The Obama administration replaced abstinence education for youth with comprehensive sex education. And, in the wake of the economic downturn, the top priority of this office shifted to "making community groups an integral part of our economic recovery and poverty a burden fewer have to bear when recovery is complete." Given longstanding criticism about the closeness of church-state relationships through faith-based initiatives, the press release also asserted that "the separation of church and state is a principle President Obama supports firmly." The Obama administration also created a new President's Advisory Council on Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships composed of religious and secular leaders from various backgrounds as well as scholars.

Critics continued to level charges against faith-based programs underwritten by government funds, with some portraying the new Advisory Council as mere window dressing rather than a serious effort to address publicly funded religious discrimination brought about by Charitable Choice.[5] Supporters of religious social service provision charged that the Obama administration failed to deliver on its promise to "expand the reach" of the faith-based office.[6] Fuel was added to such arguments by waning media coverage[7] of this issue with the transition to the Obama administration, thereby leading to charges of "faith-based inertia" in the Obama

---

[2]An extensive treatment of the historical and legal dimensions of Charitable Choice in the U.S. for readers fluent in German is offered in Nagel (2006a). See also Nagel (2006b).

[3]Boorstein and Kindy (2009).

[4]The press release, from which quotes featured here are drawn, can be found at the following web address: http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/ObamaAnnouncesWhiteHouseOfficeofFaith-basedandNeighborhoodPartnerships/. Accessed November 15, 2016.

[5]Boorstein and Wan (2010). In another critique, Americans United cited 2008 Pew Research Center poll data revealing that "61 percent of Americans say groups that encourage religious conversion should not be eligible for public funding … [and] an overwhelming 73% say organizations that hire only people who share their religious beliefs should not receive government grants." See http://www.au.org/media/press-releases/archives/2010/03/obama-inaction-on-faith-based.html. Accessed May 3, 2016.

[6]Boorstein and Kindy (2009), Boorstein and Wan (2010).

[7]Boorstein and Wan (2010).

White House.[8] With the rise of same-sex marriage and challenges to conventional definitions of family, questions were then raised about legal obligations for publicly funded faith-based providers to offer welfare services to families of various types, heterosexual and gay alike.[9] And, for its part, the President's Advisory Council faced internal divisions over requirements for houses of worship to form separate corporations upon the receipt of federal funding and the permissibility of displaying religious art, symbols, and icons in service provision settings.[10]

Admittedly, it seems like eons ago that Charitable Choice was passed and that Bush-era compassionate conservatism became the vehicle for expanding the role of faith-based providers in the delivery of social services. So, among the questions that might be reasonably asked are these: Why study a defunct initiative? What more is there to learn about a set of policies that were implemented episodically and seem to have amounted to little more than a historical footnote? Our reply is pointed and, we think, compelling. There is great peril in a rush to judgment about the demise of faith-based initiatives. While the Obama administration did not move on this issue with anywhere near the same force as its predecessor, Faith-Based 4.0 in the post-Obama period should not be ruled out. Precisely what form it will take has yet to be determined. Nevertheless, there are several reasons not to dismiss faith-based initiatives as yesterday's news.

First, the Trump administration has shown overtures toward again prioritizing faith-based initiatives or at least expanding the role of religion in public life after receiving strong support in his election from many evangelicals. Admittedly, in the first couple years of a presidential administration, the ultimate fate of activities undertaken during the election is difficult to determine. Although his policies are still taking shape as this book is being written, efforts with respect to faith-based initiatives have apparently gained some traction. As celebrated by the religious right-leaning *Charisma News*, Donald Trump established and met with his Faith and Cultural Advisory Committee prior to his November 2016 election. Conservative Catholics and evangelical Christians were heartened by this committee's consultations with Trump who, for his part, expressed his "desire to have access to the wise counsel of such leaders."[11] Trump's Faith and Cultural Advisory Committee was led during the election by Joseph Cella, a principal founder of the National Catholic Prayer Breakfast. And, despite concerns about Trump expressed by some religious conservatives during the 2016 presidential contest against Hillary Clinton, his election was strongly supported by conservative religious voters. Riding waves of conservative concern about religious liberty, the more restricted role of religious organizations in public life, and the influence of Supreme Court nominations on unsettled legal issues related to religion and politics, Trump

[8]Waters (2010).
[9]Craig and Boorstein (2009).
[10]Waters (2010).
[11]Eschliman (2016). See also Shellnutt and Zylstra (2016).

captured 81% of the evangelical vote and 60% of the white Catholic vote in November 2016.[12]

Religious constituencies were therefore pivotal contributors to his surprise victory and Trump has shown every sign of prioritizing their concerns. After the election, Jim Towey (former Director of George W. Bush's White House Office of Faith-based Initiatives) used a *National Review* article to celebrate Trump's victory as an end to what he characterized as the federal government's "campaign of hostility toward faith-based organizations" and a retreat from what he described as "the ineptitude of [Obama's] White House Office of Faith-based and Neighborhood Partnerships."[13] Many of Trump's initial appointees hold conservative religious convictions and strongly believe that faith institutions must have an expanded role in public life and political governance.[14] Along with evangelical Vice President Mike Pence and staunchly conservative Catholic former Chief Strategist Steve Bannon,[15] Trump Cabinet members have included Betsy DeVos (Education), Rick Perry (Energy), Ben Carson (Housing and Urban Development), and Tom Price (formerly of Health and Human Services), among others, whose outspoken Christian beliefs and, in many cases, voting records have led to headlines like "Onward Christian Cabinet."[16] Some media commentators have therefore suggested that the views of many of "these [Cabinet] picks … mesh nicely with Christian Reconstructionist principles that have been embraced by religious right leaders who argue that the Bible says that educating people, feeding the poor, and providing health care are the church's job, not the government's."[17] The Trump administration also established a Conscience and Religious Freedom Division in the Department of Health and Human Services. While these developments do not signal a wholesale reversion to Bush-era Faith-Based 2.0, the pendulum has clearly swung back toward dramatically enhanced involvement of faith—or, at least, conservative Christianity—in American political life. How such factors will affect faith-based initiatives remains to be seen and is an issue to which we return in the conclusion of this volume. Yet, after an eight-year moderation of the role of religion in politics, the public face of religion has had a resurgence.

Second, political devolution—the shifting of welfare responsibilities from the federal government to the states—persists. Beyond any actions that may or may not be taken by the Trump administration, devolution was institutionalized in 1996 Welfare Reform law. Two decades later, there are no signs of turning away from this monumental change. Calls to reduce the size of the federal government persist, but here is the rub. A quick glance at the budgets of most states reveals severe economic constraints. The long shadow of the Great Recession coupled with low

[12] Smith and Martinez (2016).

[13] Towey (2016).

[14] Glueck (2017).

[15] Poggioli (2017).

[16] Sommer (2016).

[17] Montgomery (2017).

taxes have put many states in a fiscal double-bind with respect to available revenue (low) and service demand (high). Given this state of affairs, faith-based organizations are likely to again get the nod in the ongoing American struggle to address significant gaps in the social safety net. Yet, it is unclear what additional resources, if any, will accompany their efforts to address gaps created by the ongoing dismantling of the American welfare system. Thus, it is possible that Faith-Based 4.0 will feature expectations for faith organizations' heavy involvement in providing social services to the disadvantaged coupled with little fiscal underwriting of such relief efforts. Contradictions like these have led some scholars to offer strong criticisms of the manner in which faith-based initiatives were implemented even prior to the Obama administration, with some warning that faith-based initiatives were amounting to little more than a "folly" or "holy smoke and mirrors."[18] Others have called attention to politicians' and policymakers' limited understandings of faith-based organizations despite efforts to partner with them or have offered incisive critiques of the semantics of "public-private partnerships."[19]

Finally, beyond these very contemporary considerations, there is a longstanding history of collaboration between the government and religious service providers. The alliance between government and faith-based organizations did not begin with Charitable Choice. Scholars have traced the long—really, centuries old—history of service provision partnerships between government entities at various levels and faith-based organizations.[20] Those efforts might not have been dubbed "faith-based initiatives" prior to 1996 Welfare Reform legislation. But, as the saying goes, if it walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it is a duck. In short, contemporary political developments, current stresses to the social safety net, and the long stretch of American history leave little doubt that there will be a Faith-Based 4.0. What this new permutation will hold is not fully clear. But there is value in the lessons derived from a careful study of faith-based social service delivery.

1.1 The Aims of This Volume

This book examines the complex and sometimes tense relationship between faith-based organizations and the broader social worlds they inhabit. These social worlds include networks of service providers (faith-based and secular, governmental and nongovernmental), distinctive dynamics in local communities (cultural, economic, geographical, etc.), and the larger sweep of faith-based initiatives in American society. Our principal focus is on faith-based social service provision

---

[18]See, for example, Wineburg (2007), Sager (2010). The "holy smoke and mirrors" depiction of faith-based initiatives seems to have originated with Sager based on a reference to what was then the title of her forthcoming work in the following publication: Chaves and Wineburg (2010).

[19]See Wuthnow (2004), Nagel (2013).

[20]Bartkowski and Regis (2003), Sager (2010).

during the heyday of this initiative under the Bush administration, essentially what we have called Faith-Based 2.0. All three of our case studies—conducted in Mississippi, Michigan, and Washington-Oregon—feature in-depth qualitative data drawn from various faith-based organizations during that time. Our principal focus on Bush-era faith-based initiatives is complemented by follow-up snapshots from Michigan and Washington-Oregon. These later snapshots were collected during the Obama administration (Faith-Based 3.0). Mississippi, which was a faith-based trailblazer following the 1996 passage of the Charitable Choice provision, dropped its support for this effort shortly after the Bush-era expansion of faith-based initiatives. Even here, the variable lifespans of faith-based implementation among our three cases offer important lessons. (The methods and timing of data collection are discussed in Appendix A.)

This volume aims to address several critical questions. To what extent does the delivery of social services by faith-based organizations differ from those provided by their secular counterparts? While a great deal of sound scholarship has been conducted on faith-based organizations, few efforts have offered direct comparisons with peer organizations that are secular in character. This book calls attention to significant points of divergence between faith-based and secular providers of comparable social services along with variability among faith-based organizations themselves. For instance, faith-based organizations are more inclined to aim for transformation in the value orientations among those they serve. Conversely, secular providers place a premium on achieving practical outcomes often through compassionate approaches to knowledge and skill building. In this sense, faith-based organizations are values-oriented while secular agencies tend to be more goal-directed in orientation. This being said, we also pay careful attention to the many ways in which agencies of various types are similar, including their efforts to deliver holistic services, often in creative and diverse ways.

Second, do different types of faith-based organizations exhibit marked distinctions in service provision? Perhaps most notably, our project discerns important distinctions between publicly funded faith-based organizations and their privately funded counterparts. Small privately funded faith-based organizations are often intensively focused on the delivery of services in a manner that is consonant with their mission and organizing principles. Some have intentionally chosen to remain small, and accept their persistent smallness as a consequence of avoiding public funding. Large faith-based organizations whose programs are underwritten by public funds often seek to strike a balance between mission-driven considerations and more pragmatic concerns such as steady funding that makes sustainable programming possible. The middling position occupied by these larger faith-based organizations makes them capable of implementing programs in which the form and intensity of faith—ranging from very subtle to overt—can be carefully calibrated to meet their clients' diverse preferences. We also find that organizations generally gravitate toward funding sources that they view as consonant with their mission and culture. Thus, we generally did not observe organizations charging that they had been unfairly excluded from bidding on government contracts. Agencies generally pursued funding avenues that they had deliberately chosen. A self-sorting process is clearly at work among the organizations featured here.

Finally, what role does the broader social context play in the delivery of social services by faith-based providers and their secular counterparts? We render multidimensional comparisons with programming data drawn from diverse social service domains (family support, transitional housing, and addiction recovery) and different regions of the country (Mississippi, Michigan, and Washington-Oregon). For example, where geographical locale is concerned, we find that faith-based parent education in the rural South (small-town Mississippi) is influenced by the dominance of evangelical Protestantism in the Bible Belt. This is not to say that all programs embrace evangelical tenets. But all must address evangelical understandings of biblically based parenting, including scriptural passages about the corporal punishment of young children. And, where social service domain differences are concerned, faith-based providers are relative newcomers in parent education, at least as taught through a formal curriculum commensurate with those found in the secular parent education field. By contrast, faith-based providers are old hats in housing and addiction recovery. Addiction recovery exhibits a special affinity for faith-based approaches given the formidable influence of twelve-step programs for drug rehabilitation. Therefore, our study reveals that faith-based providers may be relatively advantaged in some service domains, but not in others.

We note two significant limitations to our study at the outset. First, the sample of faith-based organizations featured here is overwhelmingly Christian. Given the prevalence of Christianity in the U.S., it is not terribly surprising that Christian faith-based organizations dominate the service provision landscape and in some areas may be the sole faith-based service providers. In light of this circumstance, we provide a special caution against applying these findings to non-Christian faith-based organizations. Programs run by other faith traditions might use highly distinctive strategies for addressing client needs given their non-mainstream status. More research on service provision dynamics and informal benevolence efforts conducted by non-Christian faith-based social service agencies is certainly needed.

Second, much of the evidence we have before us is drawn from social service providers. For various reasons, client data proved very difficult to secure. Clients participate in programs with a specific purpose in mind, and involvement in research is often seen as a distraction from more pressing matters in their lives. Many clients with whom we interacted were wary of divulging details about their lives and program participation to researchers for fear that such information might be used against them at some future point in time. Some programs simply did not have large numbers of clients, thus limiting the availability of current and past clients. Our discussions of data safeguards, false names (pseudonyms), and the like did little to assuage such concerns. By contrast, service providers were generally quite pleased to discuss their programming aims and strategies with us, although even here we use pseudonyms for the small transitional housing programs. We address client perspectives in Chap. 6, but generally cannot do so elsewhere in this volume. Aware of this limitation, we readily admit to the perspectival nature of our data, which generally represents the standpoints of service providers rather than program participants. Additional research on client perspectives is still needed.

1.2 Intersecting Influences: Faith, Funding, Program Domains, and Regional Contexts

Before turning to the substantive evidence on which these findings rest, a fundamental question demands some attention. Why yet another book on faith-based approaches to welfare service provision? One would think that more than two decades after the passage of welfare reform scholars have learned just about all they need to know concerning the nationwide experiment called faith-based initiatives. We acknowledge the considerable ground already plowed by scholars who have studied religious providers of social services, with such work discussed in the following chapter. Yet, the argument underpinning this volume is that, despite the deluge of research on this topic, fertile fields have been left fallow. And it is those fields that we aim to cultivate in this volume.

Our approach differs from previous investigations of faith-based initiatives because it is principally qualitative and offers a more meticulous approach to comparative analysis. This latter point is especially important. At its heart, science is a comparative enterprise. How is X different than Y? How, if at all, are they similar? And how do the contexts within which things are located—that is, their circumstances, environments, or milieus—affect these differences and similarities? It would be disingenuous and inaccurate to portray our book as the first comparative investigation of faith-based organizations. Previous studies of faith-based initiatives have enlisted the logic of comparison to generate typologies of various forms of faith-based organizations. Unruh and Sider, for example, identified a handful of different types of congregationally based approaches to offering poverty relief while others have drawn important distinctions between social services provided by congregations as opposed to those offered by faith-based nonprofit agencies.[21] (Our study focuses on faith-based agencies.) We are indebted to the contributions of such studies even as we seek to advance the field by offering unique insights.

Our study adopts a four-way comparison to shed new light on the practice of social service provision in what some call the post-welfare era. With a richly comparative palette, the portrait we render evinces hues, shades, and dimensions not evident in previous work. In what ways, then, do we up the comparative ante? First, we compare different provider types. Our investigation seeks to discern the extent to which differences characterize social service provision among faith-based and secular nonprofits. On this front, we seek to determine if discernible distinctions emerge across the fault line of faith, that is, among religious versus secular

[21]Unruh and Sider (2005). See also, Sider and Unruh (2004), Jeavons (2004), Monsma (2004).

social service agencies. Because our study is principally a qualitative analysis, we are less concerned with the outcomes and effects associated with faith-based versus secular programs and focus more pointedly on the *process* of service provision—in short, the contours, dynamics, and strategies of program implementation. In a qualitative study such as ours, we do not treat faith status or funding source as causal variables that have discrete effects on organizations or the clients they serve. But the diversity of our sample permits us to determine key points of convergence and divergence in the service delivery process.

Second, and related to this first point of comparison, we scrutinize the relationship between funding sources and social service provision. Despite the expansion of faith-based initiatives, some religious providers continue to underwrite their programs solely with private funds, typically in the form of donations. Others draw on public monies, that is, government funding. Our investigation analyzes service provision among faith-based agencies whose programs are supported through different financial means. Some of the organizations we study are supported entirely by private funding streams, while others draw on varying mixtures of private funds and government underwriting. We seek to determine how these different funding sources are linked to organizational dynamics in faith-based agencies as well as the work that is undertaken in them. Our broad comparative palette includes not only publicly and privately funded faith-based organizations, but secular organizations as well. This approach allows for an investigation of the intertwined axes of organizational identity (secular agencies as well as more and less intensively religious nonprofits) and funding source (public versus private underwriting). On this point, it bears mentioning that we (like many colleagues before us) define social welfare broadly, to include not only cash assistance from the government but the broad array of social services that are provided to disadvantaged populations with the use of public funds. It is those social services that is our principal focus here. Our goal is not to determine the specific outcomes associated with underwriting sources, infusions of funding, or particular allocations of financial resources. The investigation of such effects requires a more quantitative, survey-based approach that would compare before and after snapshots in relation to the receipt of public funding. We do no such thing. Still, our analysis is attuned to differences in service provision dynamics among agencies that draw on different funding streams.

A third point of comparison, namely, social service domains, is also given attention in our study. The family support, transitional housing, and addiction recovery programs examined here could reasonably be expected to operate according to different logics. For example, faith-based approaches to addiction recovery have a long history and, one might surmise, enjoy a leg up on their secular counterparts given the dominance of twelve-step programs in this particular service domain. Twelve-step programs can be considered faith-based inasmuch as they focus on participants surrendering control to God or, in some variants, a higher power. The roots of the program are Christian, although participants are typically adamant that that the program is not itself a religion. And yet, where parent education and transitional housing are concerned, the playing field is tipped more in favor of secular providers. This is not to say that faith-based providers have been wholly absent from these service domains. Congregations have long sought to provide parents with family ministry programs. However, faith-based providers in this social service domain have not enjoyed the vaunted status of faith-based addiction recovery programs, nor have they typically been able to draw on government funding to do so. Not uncommonly, congregations have often been the first in communities to offer shelter to the homeless and smaller independent nonprofit organizations serving homeless persons have been started by congregations. However, the bulk of government funds for housing has been in public secular domains. Thus, we contend that broad-brushed conclusions that can be drawn about faith-based service provision writ large need to be inspected against a key contextual factor, namely, the kinds of services that are provided. There is good reason to believe that just as the objectives of service provision vary depending on the type of social service program in question, so do the strategies used to offer those services.

Finally, regional and community contexts featured in our study are remarkably diverse and offer intriguing comparisons. The Southern evangelical influences on parent education in rural Mississippi stand in considerable contrast to transitional housing programs in urban areas of Michigan. Urban areas of Michigan tend to be religiously diverse, and more socially progressive than rural areas of Michigan or, for that matter, rural Mississippi. Different yet are the addiction recovery programs found in Washington and Oregon. The Pacific Northwest is much more politically progressive, less religious overall, and quite pluralistic with respect to the presence of diverse faith traditions.

This contextual (or ecological) thread that is woven into our study is vitally important. Faith-based organizations sometimes have relationships to local congregational and denominational entities, and the market share of particular religious groups varies dramatically by region. Catholics, for example, have a greater presence in the Midwest than in the South. And Catholic approaches to social service delivery may be quite distinct from those offered through conservative Protestant organizations. Moreover, relationships between faith-based organizations and other entities in their community may be formally cooperative, even sanctioned by memoranda of understanding (MOUs, in organizational parlance). Or, these relationships may be quite informal, simply the product of an organic collaboration. Beyond these considerations are other ecological concerns. By virtue of their location in the broader field of community organizations and increasingly for-profit entities, nonprofit social service agencies may adopt a posture toward one another that is characterized by cooperation, competition, or an amalgam of these. Thus, in the nonprofit world, some agencies work closely together in the context of community coalitions even as they transition to competitors when vying for a pool of funds offered by the state or federal government.

Regardless of what form they take, such relationships should be acknowledged when considering the manner in which services are provided to those in need. Faith-based organizations are profoundly influenced by the local religious climate. A Muslim social service program may have the prospective clientele to remain viable in Seattle, Washington but may not survive in a predominantly evangelical, remote rural Mississippi town. A faith-based organization with strong Christian components might be welcomed in one region while being seen negatively in another. Local service providers, faith-based and secular, can also have a range of relationships with one another in the form of collaborative coalitions or as stand-alone separate organizations. And, of course, where government connectedness is concerned, service providers may embrace or reject the public-private partnership model that has become a prominent feature of the nonprofit world in the past few decades.

Here, then, is the key point. The ecological factors articulated above are not a matter of pure individual choice or agency-level decision-making. Ecologies are powerful inasmuch as they create norms for the way things are done in particular social settings. So, it is important to consider how local ecologies—religious, political, and otherwise—may shape service provision. In short, our investigation weaves together various axes of distinction, including different types of agencies, funding streams, social service domains, and geographical locales. The result, we hope, is a volume that significantly advances the ongoing discussion about the role of faith-based organizations in the broader social safety net of American society. Before turning to the overview of the chapters that compose our book, it is important to consider the merits and limitations of utilizing qualitative case study research as our chosen approach.

1.3 Comparative Case Studies: Faith-Intensive, Faith-Related, and Secular Programs

Faith-based social service agencies continue to be asked to address a range of social problems. Poverty, food insecurity, teen sexual risk, and addiction recovery are just a few of the contemporary maladies targeted by religious providers of welfare services, with increased opportunities for government support available since the inception of what is now commonly known as faith-based initiatives. Given the proliferation of programmatic offerings by religious social service providers, a conscious choice was made at the outset of this study to sample for programmatic diversity across a range of faith-based organizations. Beyond programmatic diversity, we used as a sampling instrument the Faith Integration Survey. This survey was developed by scholars convened by the Rockefeller Institute of Government's Roundtable on Religion and Social Welfare. This survey, which is found in Appendix B of this volume along with interview instruments, permitted us to select faith-based and secular organizations for examination based on a wide array of attributes.

The Faith Integration Survey recognizes that faith can be manifested within organizations and social welfare programs in a variety of ways and to differing degrees. This instrument helped ensure that, in the selection of organizational cases and programs, we considered faith in terms of a multifaceted continuum (diverse in character and intensity of expression) rather than a dichotomous feature (presence versus absence of faith). Our comparative study reveals that beyond exploring the organizational identities of social service providers, it is vitally important to examine manifestations of faith in terms of: (1) administration (e.g., religiosity of agency directors, program staff, and volunteers); (2) environment (e.g., the display of religious symbols in a facility); (3) funding (e.g., dependency on religious donations for revenue); and (4) programming (e.g., the curricular integration of religious teachings and principles).

Using this survey as well as extensive on-the-ground research conducted in faith-based and secular organizations, we discerned clear distinctions and implications concerning the role and relative influence of faith within social service agencies, including faith-based agencies themselves. Adapting a framework developed through previous research, we draw a distinction between faith-intensive and faith-related service programs.[22] The issue here is a matter of degree, with religious convictions and sometimes religious practice figuring prominently into the cultural ethos and service delivery among faith-intensive programs. In a word, faith is a more central organizing principle in these contexts. By contrast, expressions of faith in terms of administration, environment, funding, and programmatic offerings are more subdued or malleable in faith-related programs. We concede the limitations of categorical approaches to faith-based social service delivery. For example, religious convictions of staff or the religious foundation of an organization may be very strong without being overtly expressed in measurable ways. Therefore, the Faith Integration Survey was primarily used to ensure a diverse sample of agencies and programs in each context rather than as a determinative instrument for clear-cut categorization.

We recognize that capturing finer-grained distinctions among faith-based programs beyond a two-dimensional framework (faith-intensive and faith-related) may be advantageous, but not for our research project. The case study method is typically predicated on a relatively small number of cases that can be studied intensively. Consequently, our approach permits us to examine variations among, say, faith-related programs without having to create an overly complicated typology that would be inappropriate for this sample. Our typology provides us with a general framework for sorting and sampling, after which qualitative methods (generally in the form of interview data) enable us to examine internal variations among cases of a similar type (e.g., different types of programs all categorized as faith-related). For example, programs associated with the Mississippi fatherhood initiative were all faith-related, but were run by a mix of organizations (some clearly secular, others not so).

Table 1.1 features a thumbnail overview of the cases included in this study. (See Appendix C for more detailed program and agency descriptions.) Our observations about this table are prefaced with an important caveat. While some forms of social science inquiry aim to generalize findings from a sample to the larger population and attempt to identify causal patterns, that is not the purpose of case study

[22]Smith and Sosin (2001).

Table 1.1 Descriptive information on social service providers featured in study

Faith-based	Faith-intensive	Publicly funded	No public funding
			Mississippi (Parenting) St. Andrew's Mission Life Renewal Ministries *Michigan (Housing)* Mary's House *Washington-Oregon (addiction recovery)* Open House Ministries Salvation Army-Seattle City Team Ministries Salvation Army-Portland Union Gospel Mission
	Faith-related	*Mississippi (Fatherhood)* Vicksburg Family Develop. Our House, Inc. North Bolivar Family Center Tunica Fatherhood program *Michigan (housing)* Hope House Faith House Charity House *Washington-Oregon (addiction recovery)* Providence Hospital Adult treatment program [Name withheld]	*Washington-Oregon (addiction recovery)* Hospital program [Name withheld]
Secular		*Mississippi (Parenting)* Emerson Family School Neshoba Family Center *Michigan (housing)* Hospitality House *Washington-Oregon (addiction recovery)* DePaul Treatment Center Volunteers of America Tulatin Valley Center Residence XII Sundown M Ranch Drug Prevention Action Ctr. Highland Courte Ctr. of Alc./Drug Treatment Sea-Mar Treatment Center	*Washington-Oregon (addiction recovery)* Pacific Ridge Adult treatment program [Name withheld]

research. Given the inevitable trade-off between breadth and depth in the conduct of research, the strength of case study research is found in an intensive focus on the particular processes evident in the cases selected. In Chaps. 3–5, we prioritize depth over breadth. Chapter 6 then tackles the issue of breadth through a synthesis of combined case data around the question of client transformation. We have carefully selected our cases for diversity (e.g., different types of faith-based organizations funded by various sources across diverse locales). So, the lessons learned from these cases are instructive, significant, and even far-reaching. But generalizability, causation, and such are not our aims.

That said, a few observations can be made from Table 1.1. First, we have a total of thirty-two agencies featured in our sample. One program was studied from each of these agencies. Programs were selected based on their status as faith-based or secular as well as their funding source, that is, privately funded or publicly funded, given our aim to capture variability along these lines. We have more Washington-Oregon substance abuse treatment programs (N = 19) in our overall study sample than Mississippi parenting programs (N = 8) or Michigan transitional housing programs (N = 5). The metropolitan locales in the Pacific Northwest provided greater abundance in terms of programs eligible for inclusion in our study when compared with the less populous communities in Michigan and Mississippi. Service domain dynamics also influenced numbers, as substance abuse programs operate independently while housing programs are networked within communities, thereby limiting the appropriateness of including isolated programs outside a given community.

Second, the drug treatment programs exhibit greater variability in the form of non-publicly funded service providers. We were able to include one non-publicly funded faith-related drug treatment program in the Pacific Northwest. We were also able to enlist one privately funded secular drug treatment program in this same study locale. We did not find secular programs without public funding for Mississippi parents or Michigan homeless persons. Rather, such programs in Mississippi and Michigan were faith-intensive. This distinction across study locales is likely related to the service domain. Private insurance and private pay by service recipients is essentially only available for substance abuse programs, and this distinctive feature creates a profit motive for secular providers. There are, on the other hand, other motives for religious funders, some of which are visible in the cases that follow.

Third, we found no publicly funded faith-intensive programs to include in our investigation in any of our study locales. They may exist, but they were not evident in the communities in which our study was conducted. The absence of such programs may be linked to the intensity of the faith convictions and practices leading such programs to not even consider the pursuit of public funding. It seems likely that the depth of religion these organizations seek to integrate into their interactions with clients makes them ineligible for public funding because it would cross the line that prohibits public funding for religious activities. We do not offer this explanation as a general observation applicable to communities across the U.S. But we certainly found evidence supporting this self-selection process in our study.

Finally, while not directly apparent from Table 1.1, it bears mentioning that organizations in our sample vary greatly in size and structure. In general, faith-intensive programs—those in which religion figures most prominently—tend to be smaller in terms of number of staff and clients served than their faith-related and secular counterparts. Often, faith-intensive organizations consist of one person or a few people whose efforts were supplemented by a group of volunteers. Many faith-intensive organizations are run in an informal manner. They either do not use formal curricula (much less evidence-based programs) or use such materials in a very flexible fashion to suit their clients' preferences.

Faith-intensive programs are generally not in a position to have their programs evaluated, in part because they do not have the funds to do so but also because their small client numbers would not support a formal evaluation based on statistical analyses of outcomes. When compared with their often larger faith-related counterparts, several of the faith-intensive programs are situated outside the established provider networks in the community. There were generally a few organizations—in many cases, congregations—from which faith-intensive programs could secure donated operating funds and volunteers. But faith-intensive agencies are more likely to be inwardly focused and often intentionally avoid becoming more structured and professionalized because doing so, in their view, risks making their organizations bureaucratic and impersonal.

1.4 Why Qualitative Methods? The Value of an Interpretive Approach

It is important to note that we offer a qualitative analysis of welfare service provision among faith-based and secular providers across various social service domains and geographical locales. While outstanding comparative work has been conducted by scholars using primarily quantitative survey data,[23] qualitative data drawn from multiple sources is the centerpiece of our investigation. Our study relies heavily on qualitative in-depth interviews with agency staff and clients, while coupling these interviews with organizational surveys (largely for case selection and sorting using the Faith Integration Survey, as described above) and agency documents. This triangulated approach permits us to contrast the provision and receipt of services among religious nonprofits and their secular counterparts.

The richness of this approach enables us to focus not only on the contours of service provision, but also to analyze the cultural logics underlying these services and perceptions about these programs' impact on clients and communities. Through the combined use of a case study sampling framework and intensive in-depth interviews, we provide a multi-layered comparison of service provision across family support programs in Mississippi, transitional housing initiatives in Michigan, and residential addiction treatment programs in Washington and Oregon. Among its other findings, our study analyzes how ethics of inclusiveness surface in some otherwise sectarian faith-based programs, and how spiritual themes are sometimes interwoven into secular programs. Moreover, given the diversification of service

[23] Monsma (2004).

provider types under the expansion of faith-based initiatives, workers in some nonprofits have become multilingual, that is, able to invoke religious rhetoric and secular vocabularies as specific circumstances demand. We also investigate the frequent claim offered in the discourse on faith-based organizations that faith-intensive programs (sometimes called faith-saturated) provide services in a qualitatively different fashion. Consequently, we determine how types of faith integration in a social welfare agency are connected to the delivery of services.

Qualitative research provides rich information that can also shed light on contextual factors that are not immediately apparent or easily measured. For many policymakers, the allure of faith-based organizations has been fostered by a series of broader interests such as political devolution (local autonomy, community empowerment), government outsourcing, individualism, and consumerism. For example, it was political devolution and the outsourcing of government services to private providers that gave rise to criticisms about the unfair marginalization of faith-based organizations from competition for public funds. At the same time, arguments rooted in the logic of consumerism lent credence to calls for welfare clients to be given a choice about how they received public services—that is, with or without faith. And precious little analysis has been undertaken to compare how community marketplaces of service provision influence organizational competition for government contracts from one locale to the next, much less the evolution of these markets over time. Hence, this book explores how perceptions and actions on the local scene shape the contours of service provision while also permitting us to look for traces of broader trends in the stories that people share. In the end, we render a balanced, yet complex portrait of faith-based service provision in America after the implementation of Charitable Choice as part of welfare reform.

Our effort to drill down to the local level with interview data drawn principally from agency staff is quite intentional. Qualitative data collected from the trenches of social service agencies shed light on the perceptions, motivations, and actions of social service workers and leaders, thus immersing us in the complicated process of localized social service provision. Qualitative data are ideally suited to render and contrast rich localized portraits of welfare service provision. The black boxes of standpoints (perceptions), strategies (motivated actions), and stories (experiential narratives) around which social action is organized are best illuminated by qualitative approaches. This consideration is quite important because the Welfare Reform Act of 1996 institutionalized political devolution by elevating the autonomy of states in the welfare provision process. However, this move has been complemented and extended by an increasing emphasis on the localization of welfare service provision, a process sometimes called second-order devolution.[24] Under second-order devolution, the states in no small measure have handed off the baton of welfare service provision to local communities. Our comparative case study approach contrasts how local marketplaces of service provision influence the work conducted by a range of community organizations. Moreover, recognizing

[24]Nathan and Gais (1999), Poole (2003).

that standpoints and experiences within any one agency may vary by social position, we conducted interviews with agency directors, program managers and frontline workers, and (where possible) program clients.

The use of qualitative methods in our study is also informed by the characteristics of many of the organizational cases in our sample. As noted, some of the organizations featured here—especially, those we call faith-intensive—are small and informally run. These organizations would be quite disinclined to respond to a standard evaluation survey that inquired about program-level processes or outcomes in measurable terms. Small, informally run agencies often do not generate records in this fashion, are not motivated by benchmarks, and do not have the professional staff to retain and assess client data. They run programs that are predicated on the cultivation of a personal rapport between agency personnel and those they serve. Quite tellingly, even words like "client" and "data" are off-putting in some of these agencies because such terminology suggests an approach to one's work that smacks of detachment and is motivated by what is perceived as a numbers game. Given our goal to include such agencies and programs in our study, qualitative methods permitted us to develop a rapport with agency staff in a manner consistent with their worldview. Moreover, qualitative interviews permit agency staff to speak in terms that were comfortable and meaningful to them rather than having a survey impose preconceived categories upon them that may or may not align with their approach to their work.

Questions might be asked about the noise—that is, the confounding influences—that are invited into a study by generating multi-layered comparisons across agency types, funding sources, programming domains, and geographical areas with the use of qualitative data. Yet, qualitative research operates on a set of assumptions that are quite different from those which govern quantitative inquiries. As a qualitative investigation, our study is less concerned with controlling for potentially confounding factors, and instead welcomes such intersecting influences as part of the richness, complexity, and situated character of social experience. Nevertheless, we employed a similar research protocol across service domains and geographical locales to maximize the comparability of the findings from each case study. We also collected additional field data several years after our initial foray into the field in an effort to provide a longitudinal portrait that accounts for changes exhibited over time (Bush-era versus Obama-era activities) and to consider the influence of individual staff characteristics in these small agencies.

Given our qualitative focus, our study does not address questions of program effectiveness, apart from the subjective appraisals of program performance offered by service providers and, in Chap. 6, clients. In this way, our study peers inside the black box of welfare service programming to examine the contours, processes, and dynamics of service provision. Some outstanding quantitative research on the effectiveness of different types of welfare service programs has surfaced[25] and, given the increasing emphasis on the rigorous evaluation of government-funded

[25]Monsma (2004).

programs, more is likely to emerge. We welcome such developments. Yet, our purpose is different. In the language of program evaluation, our primary focus here is on studying implementation rather than outcomes, although we have some data on impact. Stories that agency staff and program clients tell about the impact of programming are eminently worthy of scholarly attention, even as subjective accounts of program impact, rather than objective measures of outcomes. There is a long history of interpretive research that reveals how standpoints and stories influence courses of conduct pursued by groups and individuals. So, while this is certainly not a study about outcomes and effectiveness, conventionally defined, we believe that the richness of the portraits afforded by our approach illuminates key social processes that have not received their due in previous research.

Our analysis of qualitative data is deeply informed by theory, with our most essential insights coming from the paradigm of new institutionalism. We use insights from new institutionalism to illuminate distinctions between faith-based and secular providers while also recognizing important points of divergence among different types of faith-based organizations. New institutionalism has been quite usefully employed by Nagel[26] to study faith-based social service provision in the United States, and we aim to extend his incisive work. Because we wish to engage a broad audience that may not be familiar with social theory or, for that matter, new institutionalism, we restrict ourselves to conveying a few key points about this theoretical perspective. New institutionalism examines organizations as nimble social actors that are capable of creatively adapting to their broader social environments and strategically navigating cultural change. New institutionalists reject simplistic arguments about whole classes of organizations and instead appreciate diversity, complexity, and change, the last of which may not always proceed in a linear fashion.

In the realm of religion, new institutionalists are quite critical of straight-line arguments for secularization that presume the pervasively diminishing influence of religion. New institutionalists instead ask, "Under what conditions does religious influence flourish and recede? In what ways can religion be expressed? In what social settings do particular types of religious expression commonly occur?" Secularization may occur in some ways but not others, and may surface in some but not all social venues. Faith may be expressed through formal religious means (e.g., organized religion, denominational affiliation) or in principally informal ways (e.g., spirituality, personal piety). Given its appreciation of complexity, new institutionalism does not aim for cause-and-effect relationships and instead examines social patterns, tendencies, and couplings (that is, elective affinities among social factors or social forces that are not readily reducible to causal relationships). New institutionalism also attunes us to the cultural dynamics that occur within the nonprofit organizations we study. Organizational cultures may be governed by very different considerations, such as the most efficient pursuit of an agency's objectives, which is sometimes called goal-rational action (or instrumental rationality) following the

[26] Nagel (2006b). See also: Nagel (2010, 2013).

classical work of sociologist Max Weber.[27] A contrasting basis for organizational culture may entail pursuing what an agency defines as the most ethical course of conduct irrespective of efficiency considerations. In Weber's terms, this prioritization of ethical conduct is called value-rational action (or substantive rationality).

Adding richness to this volume is the diversity of perspectives brought to this project by authors who were trained and work within different disciplines: sociology, social work, and political science/public administration. The melding of these disciplinary perspectives provides added nuances to the interpretation of data and is in no small measure responsible for the development of our multifaceted theoretical framework. The interdisciplinary nature of our research also creates a scholarly perspective that is tempered by practitioner experiences within the nonprofit sector. Distinctions are sometimes drawn between basic (academic) scholarship and applied (practitioner-centered) research. Where possible, we intentionally move across this boundary with prose and analysis designed to address issues that appeal to a broad range of readers. Finally, the merits of interdisciplinary authorship are visible in the very structure of this volume. The book features chapters that synthesize insights (Chaps. 2, 6, and 7) along with those that dig deeply into the particulars of individual cases based on our discipline-specific research training (Chaps. 3–5).

Our volume, then, seeks to advance current research on this subject by examining how these and other intersecting influences shape the service provision process, often in complicated ways. We use empirical evidence to assess conventional wisdom about faith-based organizations, such as the assumption that a greater religious commitment in an agency produces a more caring, compassionate orientation toward clients. Similarly, we shed light on the ways that the motivations, strategies, and contours of client transformation vary by organizational type and policy domain. Some proponents of faith-based programming argue that because religion can promote deep personal transformations in people's lives, faith-based programs are better equipped than their secular counterparts to produce durable benefits in terms of family functioning, sobriety, housing, and employment. And yet, critics of faith-based initiatives charge that religious service provision is characterized by a lack of professional training or may feign effectiveness by, for instance, turning away difficult clients—a process known as creaming. Regrettably, to this point, these countervailing claims have not been scrutinized with evidence.

Our research is based on an extensive, detailed comparative study of faith-based and secular agencies that was undertaken from 2002 to 2005 with funding from the Pew Charitable Trust and the support of the Rockefeller Institute of Government at the State University of New York at Albany. This initial wave of qualitative data has been further enriched by follow-up research conducted in 2010–2011, thereby permitting us to compare the long-term trajectories of welfare reform in each locale. The dust from the Bush-era apex and Obama-era follow-up to faith-based initiatives has settled, and this passage of time has permitted us considerable opportunity for

[27] Weber (1978), see also: Ebaugh et al. (2003).

reflection as these eras have given way to what many are calling "Trumpism." With additional hindsight, we are able to offer insights that would not have been possible before the outcome of the 2016 presidential election had been determined. In the end, we believe that our insights remain quite applicable to our current context. We are thus able to explore how the distinctive cultural dynamics and resource bases of faith-based and secular organizations combine with ecological factors to shape the work of such agencies.

1.5 What's Ahead: Layout of the Volume

Our comparative exploration of faith-based and secular welfare service provision commences as follows. Chapter 2 addresses the conceptual and theoretical underpinnings of our study. We begin by reviewing the current approaches to conceptualizing faith-based organizations. While existing approaches have much to recommend them, we seek to advance the field by arguing that the very concept, *faith-based*, can be usefully understood as an action word that entails the implementation of a specific vision of programming and organizational functioning. In short, faith-based is not merely an organizational attribute and is certainly not best understood as a static characteristic. Faith integration is, in this sense, an ongoing accomplishment. This perspective helps us to underscore the complexities and dynamic process associated with what is commonly known as service delivery.

As discussed more extensively in Chap. 2, our analysis also hinges on what we call the three C's of social service provision, namely, *content*, *culture*, and *context*. Issues of *content* turn our attention to programming objectives and dynamics. The key questions associated with programmatic content are those such as the following: What services are offered, to whom are they delivered, through what funding source(s) are they underwritten, and what are the goals around which programming is organized? *Culture*, the second element in the analytical paradigm we outline, turns our focus to issues of an organization's identity, its social norms and values, and the strategies of action it uses to conduct its work. Whereas content focuses on "what" questions, culture raises issues of "why" and, therefore, "how." The focus on organizational culture illuminates how an organization's identity and mission are defined, the means and strategies by which services are offered, and why specific approaches are preferred. Finally, because content and culture are shaped by broader social forces, *context* is a vitally important element of our analytical perspective. Context raises important questions about how broader environmental factors such as the service provision marketplace, religious ecology, and public policies shape programming and organizational dynamics.

Time is also a contextual factor, one that led us to collect longitudinal data. We reject a deterministic orientation wrongly aimed at identifying the causal influence of any one of these elements, and instead argue that content, culture, and context are facets of social service provision that are intertwined in a complex relationship of coupling. Chapter 2 also describes our approach to what we call layered case studies. Layered case studies connect broad social ecologies (e.g., regional religious climates, state-level welfare reform, community-level service provision markets) with more grounded subjective standpoints (perceptions, actions, and experiences of agency personnel and clients). This layered approach to case study analysis allows us to explore the links between large-scale, macro-level phenomena and small-scale, micro-level processes.

Having laid this groundwork, we then turn to our three case studies. Chapters 3–5 tell stories from the frontlines in each of our study locales (Mississippi, Michigan, and Washington-Oregon). Each chapter is structured around a common series of motifs, with a principal focus on the role of faith in the welfare service provision process. At the same time, careful attention is paid to the twists and turns these motifs take as they are traced through three different regional contexts, religious ecologies, and welfare service domains.

The initial contribution in this section, Chap. 3 of the volume, focuses on the case study of parent education in Mississippi. This research, conducted by John Bartkowski, offers a detailed examination of secular and faith-based parent education programs, including those with a strong religious—and specifically Southern evangelical—emphasis. He finds that the cultural logics underlying faith-based and secular programming differ dramatically. Secular programs adopt a value-neutral metaphor for parenthood (parent as technician) and use curricula that emphasize skills acquisition while eschewing questions of ultimate meaning. Conversely, faith-based programs are considerably more value-centered in the metaphors they employ (parent as caring shepherd) and the curricular approaches they adopt (e.g., a Bible study that depicts God as the model parent). Interestingly, publicly funded faith-based organizations use hybrid pedagogies through which religious workers in government-funded programs shift between religious and secular vocabularies.

Chapter 4 of the volume details Susan Grettenberger's study of transitional housing in a major metropolitan area of Michigan that includes an array of secular and faith-based transitional housing programs. Among noteworthy findings, her investigation reveals that secular and faith-related service providers (the latter of which compartmentalize faith elements) are generally receptive to government funding, while faith-intensive agencies are leery of the constraints associated with public monies. The rules that govern transitional housing programs vary considerably among faith-based and secular programs, with the faith-intensive programs avoiding client fees (e.g., monthly rent) but imposing moral strictures on their clients (e.g., no sharing residences with a member of the opposite sex, and no sexual relations for unmarried persons served by the program).

The final case study in this section, Chap. 5 of the volume, focuses on Steven Rathgeb Smith's study of residential addiction treatment programs in Washington state and Oregon. His study is based on an investigation of over twenty drug treatment agencies in these two states, ranging from very religious agencies to their avowedly secular counterparts. This chapter details a series of convergences and divergences between faith-based and secular addiction recovery programs, and provides intriguing accounts of the holistic nature of treatment in both venues, variously defined. This chapter also reveals that the historical legacy of faith-based workers in a particular service domain strongly influences the perceptions of religious agencies as legitimate partners in solving social problems. The long history of faith-based approaches to substance abuse treatment, namely, twelve-step programs, works to the advantage of faith-based organizations in this social service domain. However, addicts have often felt stigmatized by organized religion, and faith-based organizations carefully negotiate their relationships with addicts to build trust among a population that has generally felt alienated by conventional religion.

Chapter 6 of the volume tackles the issue of transformation with combined data from all case studies and research locales. Some proponents of faith-based initiatives argue that more genuine and permanent transformations occur in the context of religious service provision, though they lack the methodological rigor and data to prove such assertions. Marvin Olasky's *The Tragedy of American Compassion*, and subsequent works that fueled the adoption of Charitable Choice legislation, feature historical vignettes that would seem to underscore the ability of religious providers to facilitate transformation. These vignettes, however, do not constitute scholarship and are replete with ideological argumentation. We engage the issue of transformation with empirical data and aim for a more even-handed approach grounded in social research. Is transformation observed solely in faith-based organizations? How is transformation defined? How are objectives related to promoting change in clients' attitudes and behaviors different among faith-based and secular providers? Does the infusion of public monies into an organization alter the way that these objectives are defined or pursued? This chapter reveals the competing logics of transformation often present in faith-based organizations. For parent education and transitional housing, change in faith-based organizations is seen as occurring in an inside-out fashion (what we call change of heart, potentially leading to change of head) whereas secular organizations construe client change as an outside-in transformation (knowledge transfer, or what we refer to as change of head, potentially leading to change of heart). By contrast, the longstanding dominance of faith-based programs in addiction recovery leads to pervasive perceptions of transformation as a deeply subjective phenomenon, though government funding and referrals lead several faith-based programs to adopt more generically spiritual (rather than formally religious) means of achieving transformation. Through a comparative analysis of transformation narratives, this chapter reveals that attitudinal and behavioral changes are often understood in distinctive ways by different types of service providers and program clients. They also vary with respect to funding sources (public versus solely private) and social service domain (family support, transitional housing, and addiction recovery).

The volume ends with a concluding chapter that distills key insights from the three case studies and the comparative analysis of transformation. Here, we draw together the most vital lessons learned from our in-depth study of various types of providers (faith-based and secular, privately and publicly funded) across a range of social service programming domains (family support, transitional housing, and addiction treatment programs) and geographical locales (Mississippi, Michigan, and Washington-Oregon). We explore how the various steps of the service provision and service receipt process (organizational functioning, personnel recruitment and retention, client intake, program administration, and after-care) are manifested among different organizations, while also identifying variations in these practices across the geographically distinct case studies. Because our study employs a shared protocol that was implemented in very different geographical settings and policy domains, we can highlight both ideographic (locally specific) findings and broader patterns. We also show that multiple factors influence service provision, whether an organization is faith-based or not. We discuss the inappropriateness of making broad generalizations about faith-based versus secular program provision and consider the cultural and political implications of what we have learned.

References

Ammerman, Nancy Tatom. 2005. *Pillars of faith: American congregations and their partners*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bartkowski, John P., and Helen A. Regis. 2003. *Charitable choices: Religion, race, and poverty in the post-welfare era*. New York: University Press.

Boorstein, Michelle, and Kimberly Kindy. 2009. Faith-based office to expand its reach. *The Washington Post*, February 6. http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/02/05/AR2009020500834.html. Accessed 3 Nov 2016.

Boorstein, Michelle, and William Wan. 2010. Religious leaders worry that Obama's faith council is for show. *The Washington Post*, February 3. http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/02/02/AR2010020203770.html?sid=ST2010020301568. Accessed 3 Dec 2016.

Brownstein, Alan E. 1999. Interpreting the religion clauses in terms of liberty, equality, and free speech values—A critical analysis of "neutrality theory" and Charitable Choice. *Notre Dame Journal of Law, Ethics & Public Policy* 13: 243–284.

Chaves, Mark. 1999. Religious congregations and welfare reform: Who will take advantage of "Charitable Choice?" *American Sociological Review* 64: 834–846.

Chaves, Mark, and Bob Wineburg. 2010. Did the faith-based initiative change congregations? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 39: 343–355.

Cnaan, Ram A., C. Boddie Stephanie, Femida Handy, Gaynor Yancey, and Richard Schneider. 2002. *The invisible caring hand: American congregations and the provision of welfare*. New York: University Press.

Craig, Tim, and Michelle Boorstein. 2009. Catholic Church gives D.C. ultimatum. *The Washington Post*. November 12, 2016. http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/11/11/AR2009111116943.html. Accessed 3 Nov 2016.

Ebaugh, Helen Rose, Paula F. Pipes, Janet Saltzman Chafetz, and Martha Daniels. 2003. Where's the religion? Distinguishing faith-based from secular social service agencies. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 42: 411–426.

Eschliman, Bob. 2016. Donald Trump launches new faith-based advisory committee. *Charisma News*. September 23. http://www.charismanews.com/politics/elections/60126-donald-trump-launches-new-faith-based-advisory-committee. Accessed 11 Jan 2017.

Glueck, Katie. 2017. Trump's religious deal making pays dividends. *Politico*. December 7. http://www.politico.com/story/2016/12/trump-religious-dealmaking-dividends-232277. Accessed 2 Jan 2017.

Jeavons, Thomas H. 2004. Religious and faith-based organizations: Do we know one when we see one? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 33: 140–145.

Kennedy, Sheila Suess, and Wolfgang Bielefeld. 2002. Government shekels without government shackles? The administrative challenges of Charitable Choice. *Public Administration Review* 62: 4–11.
Monsma, Stephen V. 2004. *Putting faith in partnerships: Welfare-to-work in four cities*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press.
Montgomery, Peter. 2017. Ted Cruz Lost, but Trump is giving the religious right his cabinet. *The Advocate*. January 4. http://www.advocate.com/commentary/2017/1/04/ted-cruz-lost-trump-giving-religious-right-his-cabinet. Accessed 12 Jan 2017.
Nagel, Alexander-Kenneth. 2006a. *Charitable Choice: Religiöse Institutionalisierung Im Öffentlichen Raum*. Hamburg: Lit Verlag.
Nagel, Alexander-Kenneth. 2006b. Charitable Choice: The religious component of the US welfare reform—Theoretical and methodological reflections on “Faith-Based Organisations” as social service agencies. *Numen* 53: 78–111.
Nagel, Alexander-Kenneth. 2010. Public religion and state transformation: zero-sum game or fruitful partnership? *Journal of Religion in Europe* 3: 323–349.
Nagel, Alexander-Kenneth. 2013. Agents, armies, allies: Semantics of public-private partnerships in US welfare reform. *Journal of Religion in Europe* 6: 175–200.
Nathan, Richard P., and Thomas L. Gais. 1999. *Implementing the Personal Responsibility Act of 1996: A first look*. Albany, New York: The Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government.
Poggioli, Sylvia. 2017. Steve Bannon aligns with Vatican hard-liners who oppose Pope Francis. *National Public Radio*, February 8. http://www.npr.org/sections/parallels/2017/02/08/514102356/steve-bannon-aligns-with-vatican-hardliners-who-oppose-pope-francis. Accessed 8 Feb 2017.
Poole, Dennis L. 2003. Scaling up CBOs for second-order devolution in welfare reform. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* 13: 325–341.
Sager, Rebecca. 2010. *Faith, politics, and power: The politics of faith-based initiatives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Shellnutt, Kate, and Sarah Eekhoff Zylstra. 2016. Who’s who of Trump’s “tremendous” faith advisors. *Christianity Today*. June 22. http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2016/june-web-only/whos-who-of-trumps-tremendous-faith-advisors.html. Accessed 22 Dec 2016.
Smith, Steven Rathgeb, and Michael R. Sosin. 2001. The varieties of faith-related agencies. *Public Administration Review* 61: 651–670.
Smith, Gregory A., and Jessica Martinez. 2016. How the faithful voted: A preliminary 2016 analysis. Pew Research Center. November 9. http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/11/09/how-the-faithful-voted-a-preliminary-2016-analysis/. Accessed 2 Jan 2017.
Sider, Ronald J., and Heidi Rolland Unruh. 2004. Typology of religious characteristics of social service and educational organizations and programs. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 33: 109–134.
Sommer, Allison Kaplan. 2016. Onward Christian cabinet: Trump’s White House picks are a Christmas gift for the religious right. *Haaretz*. December 14. http://www.haaretz.com/us-news/.premium-1.758733. Accessed 12 Jan 2017.
Towey, Jim. 2016. Obama’s sustained assault on religious liberty is finally over. *National Review*. December 12. http://www.nationalreview.com/article/442939/religious-freedom-conscience-rights-obama-administration-hillary-clinton-donald-trump. Accessed 22 Dec 2016.
Unruh, Heidi Rolland, and Ronald J. Sider. 2005. *Saving souls, serving society: Understanding the faith factor in church-based social ministry*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Waters, David. 2010. Obama’s faith-based inertia. *The Washington Post*. February 9. http://newsweek.washingtonpost.com/onfaith/undergod/2010/02/obamas_faith-based_inertia.html. Accessed 3 Nov 2016.
Weber, Max. 1978. *Economy and society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Wineburg, Bob. 2007. *Faith-based inefficiency: The follies of Bush’s initiative*. New York: Praeger.
Wuthnow, Robert. 2004. *Saving America? Faith-based services and the future of Civil Society*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Chapter 2
Faith-Based Initiatives Reconsidered: The Complicated Relationship Between Religion and Social Welfare Service Provision

More than two decades after the passage of welfare reform law and Charitable Choice, what is known about faith-based initiatives? What questions remain to be addressed, and how might we benefit from a reconsideration of critical issues on this topic? In this chapter, we seek to shed light on these questions. We begin by reviewing research that is most germane to the focus of our study, namely, service provision dynamics in faith-based and secular organizations. Given the rather sizable research literature on faith-based initiatives, we do not aim to provide comprehensive coverage when reviewing previous work.[1] Rather, we select the more limited body of studies that bears directly on our efforts to contrast faith-based and secular social service provision.

After reviewing insights from previous work, we proceed to articulate our perspective on the subject. We argue for a reconsideration of several key issues by, for example, underscoring the need to graduate from categorical schemes for understanding faith-based organizations to a more dynamic (resource-focused) view of faith in nonprofit organizations. We further call attention to three key factors linked to faith integration within social service organizations, namely, content, culture, and context. These considerations stem directly from our adoption of a new institutionalist framework (described briefly in Chap. 1). The relationship between these three elements is characterized by a loose coupling that does not yield easily predetermined outcomes. This chapter sets the stage for our investigation of parent education in Mississippi, transitional housing in Michigan, and addiction recovery in Washington and Oregon (Chaps. 3–5). It also sets up our combined analysis of all case study data that is featured in Chap. 6 on client transformation across programming domains. We are also careful to provide a brief history of recent developments pertaining to faith-based initiatives in each of the three study locales.

[1] Among reviews of research on faith-based initiatives following the Bush era, see Sager (2010), Bielefeld and Cleveland (2013).

J. P. Bartkowski and S. E. Grettenberger, *The Arc of Faith-Based Initiatives*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90668-3_2

2.1 Faith-Based Versus Secular Social Services: What Previous Research Tells Us

To begin, how do faith-based social service agencies differ from their secular counterparts in terms of the services they offer and the impact of their programs on clients? A previous review provides an excellent summary of themes that emerge across existing research on faith-based organizations.[2] Given the welfare-to-work focus of the late 1990s era during which faith-based initiatives were ushered into public discourse, a good deal of attention in this research has examined job readiness programs. Among the more comprehensive treatments of this subject is excellent research conducted by Stephen Monsma.[3] In *Putting Faith in Partnerships*, Monsma not only contrasted the dynamics of faith-based and secular employment programs. He also provided a promising paradigm for contrasting faith-based and secular social service providers.

Using organizational and welfare-to-work programming data collected from just over five hundred agencies in four major American cities (Chicago, Dallas, Philadelphia, and Los Angeles), Monsma astutely recognized that a dichotomization of programs into faith-based versus secular does an injustice to the varieties of programs operating within the U.S. Rather, he subdivided welfare-to-work programs into six different types, four of which were secular and two of which were faith-based. Among programs classified as faith-based, Monsma recognized a key distinction between what he called faith-segmented and faith-integrated programs. Faith-segmented programs separated religious elements from program offerings. By contrast, faith-integrated programs infused religious elements such as worship, prayer, and client-targeted invitations to make faith commitments into their programming.

While a summary of Monsma's many important findings is beyond the scope of this brief review, several key insights are useful to set the stage for our investigation. First, Monsma found small community-based secular programs quite comparable in size, staffing, and functioning to faith-based programs. Thus, his research suggested that the faith-based versus secular programming distinction was valid in the content of services, particularly with faith-integrated programs. However, this difference was not as valid in terms of agency and program structure (e.g., staff educational background, program size), where secular community-based programs resembled their faith-based counterparts. Additionally, beyond affiliation with a broad denominational tradition, Monsma discovered that employment programs directly connected with a congregation were more likely to be faith-segregated. This finding seriously challenged assumptions that congregational actors would offer the most faith-integrated programming.

---

[2] Bielefeld and Cleveland (2013).

[3] Monsma (2004).

Monsma also discovered an additional insight that is highly relevant to our study. He found that geographical locales influenced the mix of providers that offered services in specific areas. The service provision marketplace of welfare-to-work programs in Chicago was dominated by secular nonprofits. By contrast, Dallas and Philadelphia featured a large number of faith-based providers. In explaining these geographical variations, Monsma recognized that state and local efforts to support faith-based providers had likely contributed to their expanded market share in Dallas and Philadelphia.

Follow-up research on the pioneering volume, *Putting Faith in Partnerships*, further enriched understandings of faith-based versus secular employment service programs. Monsma himself produced a later collaborative volume, *Faith, Hope, and Jobs,*[4] that examined seventeen employment programs in Los Angeles. This investigation revealed that clients in faith-based programs commonly received social network enhancements (social capital) through their involvement in these programs. Moreover, faith-based clients offered particularly favorable evaluations of the programs in which they participated. Quite interestingly, religious and non-religious clients were equally well served by faith-based programs. However, when their effectiveness was gauged against the ultimate test of success for employment programs—that is, the placement of clients in jobs—for-profit programs in Los Angeles outperformed competitors of all other organizational types.

Other research has rounded out the portrait of faith-based versus secular employment programs. In a comparative investigation of welfare-to-work programs in Massachusetts, Indiana, and North Carolina, Sheila Kennedy and Wolfgang Bielefeld[5] found that faith-based programs (whether moderately or intensively religious) were not as effective in promoting employment as secular programs. Their study also suggested that compliance mechanisms and management resources for ensuring accountability with government mandates were lacking, potentially leaving the nation's social service network vulnerable to a failure in compliance with widely accepted standards such as those ensuring non-discrimination.[6]

William Lockhart[7] conducted intensive fieldwork comparing faith-based and secular welfare-to-work programs in Raleigh, North Carolina and Richmond, Virginia. His qualitative investigation focused on the processes through which social capital is generated in these different organizational contexts and the role of each organization's cultural values in the cultivation of social capital. Lockhart perceptively attended to variations in secular organizations (government-run, nonprofit, and for-profit), but opted for homologous sampling of faith-based programs (explicitly religious or faith-integrated programs). Lockhart's research demonstrated that all programs effectively generated bridging capital, that is, the formation of relationships across racial and class-based boundaries. However, the

---

[4] Monsma and Soper (2006).

[5] Kennedy and Bielefeld (2006).

[6] See Breaux et al. (2002).

[7] Lockhart (2005).

faith-based programs were more explicit about seeking to overcome such barriers, for example, in mission statements of commitment to address related issues. Moreover, the faith-based organizations coupled this emphasis on bridging capital with strategies for the cultivation of bonding capital, or the formation of strong intra-organizational ties between provider staff and participants. In this sense, then, faith-based organizations might be seen as more compassionate than their secular counterparts, if compassion is defined as the development of meaningful, empathetic ties with the people served by a program.

Although the lion's share of attention comparing faith-based and secular organizations has been paid to job training and placement (welfare-to-work) programs, a good deal of research has also surfaced concerning efforts to combat homelessness, among other anti-poverty initiatives. In one early comparative study, Helen Rose Ebaugh led a team of researchers who rendered detailed comparisons of faith-based and secular providers of services to the homeless in Houston, Texas.[8] Ebaugh and colleagues found significant points of distinction in terms of organizational culture, decision-making procedures, programming practices, and personnel characteristics among both leadership and staff. Moreover, they found that the vast majority of faith-based organizations in that locale explicitly used religious imagery in their mission statements. Other comparative work has augmented these findings. Faith-based social service agencies in several Pennsylvania communities were similar in size, funding, and service capacity to their secular counterparts; however, faith-based organizations in these locales relied more heavily on volunteers, were less inclined to engage in political advocacy, and were considerably less reliant on government funding than were their secular social service counterparts.[9]

Laudan Aron and Patrick Sharkey[10] explored how different types of providers (secular nonprofit, faith-based nonprofit, government-run, and for-profit) offered services to homeless persons nationwide. Their respective roles in service to the homeless took many different forms, including the provision of shelter, food, and health care. Interestingly, program specialization in this service domain was quite evident. Faith-based providers focused largely on food distribution, while other providers focused more pointedly on access to housing. Only the government-run organizations concentrated on health care services in addition to housing and food. In providing the widest range of services to a large number of clients, these results could be interpreted to suggest that holistic programming was most clearly found in government-run programs.

Malcolm Goggin and Deborah Orth's[11] qualitative investigation of Grand Rapids, Michigan agencies providing services to the local homeless population provided a somewhat different portrait. In that study, faith-based homeless programs were viewed as more holistic in orientation than the local government-run

---

[8]Ebaugh et al. (2003).

[9]Kearns et al. (2005).

[10]Aron and Sharkey (2002).

[11]Goggin and Orth (2002).

program with which they were compared, and faith-based staff persons tended to be seen as more caring than their secular peers. As was the case with employment programs, faith-based programs evinced a stronger commitment to such values as justice, dignity, and spiritual well-being while aiming to address the needs of the whole person.

However, when Goggin and Orth's conclusions are compared with those offered by Aron and Sharkey,[12] it quickly becomes clear that the meaning of the term holistic is problematic. Just what does holistic service provision entail? On the one hand, holistic programming could be interpreted as offering a wide range of services (e.g., food, shelter, health care) to one's clients rather than relying principally on a single service. By this definition, the government-run programs studied by Aron and Sharkey were the most holistic. Yet, on the other hand, holistic service provision could also be understood as addressing not only physical needs, but others as well (e.g., emotional well-being, social support, and even spiritual development for those who desire it). In this sense, several of the faith-based programs in Goggin and Orth's study were more holistic than the government-run program against which they were compared because the former represents efforts to treat a broader range of needs and desires among those seeking services. Our goal is not to adjudicate this distinction here. Rather, we raise the issue of variegated definitions of holistic programming as an important point for consideration in our investigation.

Interestingly, Goggin and Orth also found that these Grand Rapids programs were diverse in their approaches to addressing homelessness. Such distinctions among faith-based homelessness programs were evident in terms of the allowable lengths of stay within programs, as well as the nature and enforcement of rules among providers. Moreover, whereas some faith-based providers explicitly emphasized core components of their faith in the implementation of their homelessness programs, others "went out of their way to emphasize that they avoid using religious ideals as tools to transform clients."[13] This finding, then, strikes a theme that runs through various social service programs, whether targeting unemployment or homelessness. Faith-based programs can vary widely in terms of their mission, strategy, and program implementation.[14] Indeed, even studies of faith-based initiatives implemented by congregations reveal remarkable diversity among social services provided through churches, mosques, synagogues, and the like.[15]

Differences among religious service providers are evident in other ways as well. Robert Wuthnow's[16] comprehensive survey-based comparison of different types of religious service providers indicated that congregational programs were much more religiously intensive than faith-based programs. These differences were evident in

[12]Aron and Sharkey (2002).

[13]Goggin and Orth (2002).

[14]Lockhart (2005), Monsma (2004), Pipes and Ebaugh (2002).

[15]Bartkowski and Regis (2003), Farnsley III (2007), Unruh and Sider (2005).

[16]Wuthnow (2004).

congregations' greater prioritization of spiritual transformation, explicitly religious mission statements, staff discussions of religion and spirituality with clients, and staff invitations for clients to join religious activities outside the program. Variations also surfaced among organizational types in terms of clients' ratings of programmatic effectiveness. When comparing public welfare departments, secular nonprofits, faith-based organizations, and local congregations, Wuthnow found that public welfare departments were rated most negatively. Congregational service providers were rated most favorably. Ratings of faith-based organizations and secular nonprofits were situated between these poles with no meaningful distinctions between them. To his credit, Wuthnow was careful to recognize that these ratings might reflect distinctions among the types of people who seek services from various sorts of organizations and the kinds of services they wish to receive. People who seek employment assistance are more likely to use public welfare services, and job training is among the most difficult forms of assistance to provide in a sustainable fashion.

Alexander Nagel[17] also draws important distinctions between different types of religious providers as well as between secular and faith-based organizations. He argues that congregations are more intensively religious and donation-based than faith-based providers. By contrast, faith-based organizations are more socially focused, which is to say less explicitly religious. Faith-based organizations also often underwrite their services through fees rather than relying on donations. Nagel also developed a very useful comparative matrix of secular nonprofits and faith-based organizations. Faith-based organizations have a more religiously oriented organizational identity than their secular counterparts, commonly use religious criteria to screen clients, often employ religious means to achieve their goals (even if the goals are secular), and embrace a combination of value-rational action (driven by ethics) and goal-rational action (oriented towards efficiency). Nagel convincingly demonstrates that secular nonprofits are more thoroughly nonreligious in terms of both goals and means, and that their activities are typically goal-rational in character, that is, focused on the efficient achievement of objectives and not explicitly rooted in ultimate values.

Such research, then, highlights some factors that might account for diversity among faith-based providers. There are a host of different influences to consider, including an agency's mission, the values embraced by its staff, the faith tradition of the agency, and the preferences expressed by clients, some of whom may desire either more or less intensive religious instruction to be delivered with program services.[18] Of course, funding streams would also be expected to exert an influence on the role of religious and spiritual values in faith-based programming. There are some indications that faith-based programs that receive government funds are more secular than their counterparts that are not publicly funded, while those supported

[17]Nagel (2006).

[18]See, for example, Lockhart (2005), Pipes and Ebaugh (2002).

by private donations tend to enlist faith more centrally in delivering services.[19] This pattern follows from early research that identified more openness to public funding among secular providers when compared with their faith-based counterparts.[20] Of course, caution is in order here because the direction of this relationship is a complicated matter. It is possible that faith-based programs with a more secular character are more inclined to apply for and be awarded government funds. Alternatively, it is possible that programs that are awarded government funds become more secular as a result of forming a partnership with the government. Questions of causal direction aside, national-level data are clear. Faith-based organizations that are less explicitly religious are more likely to be receiving government funding.[21] Moreover, case studies reveal that faith-based entities that accept public funding frequently adopt creative strategies to negotiate the tension between their organizational mission and government mandates.[22]

2.2 Faith Integration: A Multifaceted and Dynamic Perspective

Although much of the previous research reviewed above has a great deal to recommend it, the analytical perspective we use here differs from prior scholarship in significant ways. Most notably, rather than holding fast to categorical schemes in which to place particular types of faith-based organizations, we introduce the concept of *faith integration*. Faith integration invites a conceptual change, not merely a terminological shift. Instead of focusing principally on fitting faith-based organizations into discrete categories, we argue that faith is a dynamic resource that can be integrated into organizations to differing degrees and in a wide variety of complicated ways. Hence, faith integration stands in bold contrast to static categorical typologies. Bielefeld and Cleveland[23] have helpfully summarized various typologies developed by others as typically focusing on three areas for assessment: organizational control, expression of religion, and program implementation. The instrument used in our study, the Faith Integration Survey (see Appendices A and B) seeks to assess how and to what degree faith is expressed in a social service program or organization. The concept of faith integration is governed by the following considerations.

First and foremost, faith is a resource, not just an organizational characteristic. As such, faith serves as a dynamic tool that organizations can enlist to accomplish the goals they seek to achieve. Our methodological approach—unapologetically

[19]Ebaugh et al. (2005).

[20]Ebaugh et al. (2003).

[21]Ebaugh et al. (2005).

[22]Vanderwoerd (2004).

[23]Bielefeld and Cleveland (2013).

qualitative—is designed to examine the social processes through which faith is employed to meet organizational goals and purposes. To be sure, important distinctions need to be drawn between faith-based organizations and their secular counterparts, along with different types of faith-based organizations (particularly, congregations versus social service agencies). Our volume accepts the validity of such distinctions inasmuch as faith-based and secular social service agencies are intentionally represented in each of our three study locales. We also concede that categorical approaches have a necessary place in our research. To this end, we draw distinctions between faith-intensive programs and their faith-related counterparts. (These are roughly equivalent to Monsma's distinction between faith-integrated and faith-segmented programs.) However, faith can be expressed in diverse forms, such as at the program level only or organization-wide, in the form of prayer among staff or prayer with clients who wish to do so, and through referrals to a local congregation or maintaining a pastor on call as needed. Therefore, it is incumbent on researchers to dig more deeply into this diversity with a conceptualization of faith sensitive enough to detect how it is expressed and experienced within the agency rather than viewing faith as a static attribute. It is useful to conceive of faith as a resource that can be enlisted by organizations to get their work done. Faith-based, then, is more of a social accomplishment than an organizational state of being or a fixed attribute.

Moreover, it strikes us that there are several paths along which this dynamic resource, faith, can travel where social service agencies and welfare provision are concerned. Put differently, there are several different *axes of faith integration*. A primary axis of faith integration is that of *source*. Here, questions can be raised about the origin or wellspring of faith in a social service agency. Is faith the result of an association with a particular denomination, congregation, or some other form of organized religion? If so, does that association take the form of monetary support, the supply of volunteers, the provision of material goods, referral partnerships, or other forms that infuse faith into a social service agency? Or, rather, does faith as an agency resource stem from sources such as the spiritual convictions of a nonprofit's founders and its board of directors, with little connection to organized religion?

Other axes of faith include the expression, intensity, and prevalence of this resource within an agency. Where the *expression* of faith is concerned, how are the religious convictions or spiritual sensibilities of the organization manifested? Is it through symbols, iconography, spaces, talk, ritual practices, or other means? And are there specific paradigms used that indicate particularistic expressions of faith (e.g., the Bible, born-again experiences) as opposed to more inclusive conceptualizations (e.g., spiritual transformation, outreach to "all God's children")? Is the faith expression overt or subtle?

The *intensity* of faith integration is also an important axis for consideration. The degree to which faith is manifested in a given program can vary dramatically. On the one hand, faith can serve as a central and persistent component of a religiously based program. Here, faith can be thought of as a boldly colored thread that is woven deeply into a program. On the other hand, faith can function more as an add-on or ancillary element of service provision. When enlisted as an ancillary service provision component, the thread of faith takes on a more muted color and can be woven quite subtly into the service provision process. To extend this image, faith within the program may be indirect and invisible from the outside, as it is expressed through the attitudes of staff toward their work and interactions with clients, much as some material within an article of clothing is not visible yet offers shape and durability to the garment.

Finally, the organizational *prevalence* of faith is an important consideration. Prevalence, of course, speaks to the substantive breadth of the resource that is faith. Does a social service organization feature only faith-based programs while largely ceding secular services to other agencies? Are those who work within the organization expected, as a matter of their association with the agency, to have robust faith commitments, or are secular-minded employees accepted? Such questions are raised by the axis of faith prevalence.

These axes of faith integration—again, conceptualized as continua rather than categories—can be woven together by social service agencies in complex ways. Imagining just one of the many possible points of intersection of these several axes, one might encounter a social service agency that is directly connected to a congregation through a revenue and volunteer stream provided by that religious body. In this sense, organized religion is a key *source* of the agency's faith. This agency may have facilities that include an area for religious worship replete with a pulpit and altar of sorts, thereby indicating a strong form of religious *expression*. However, this same agency might feature an array of programs, some of which are centrally organized around religious or spiritual elements, an indicator of high faith *intensity*, but others of which have no faith component. The presence of such unabashedly secular programs coupled with explicitly faith-based programs would suggest moderate faith *prevalence* within this organization. The point here is that social service agencies are capable of weaving together these faith axes in complicated ways that sometimes defy observers' preconceptions of faith-based versus secular social service agencies. Conceptualizing faith as a resource that can be brought to bear on agency functioning and program offerings in myriad ways presents a world of possibilities potentially obscured by purely categorical perspectives.

2.3 Layered Case Studies and the Three C's: Content, Culture, and Context

Our analysis is also shaped by what we call the *three C's of social service provision*, namely, *content*, *culture*, and *context*. This conceptual framework complements our view of faith as a resource while attending to broader issues of organizational functioning and environmental influences. In that light, we contend that content, culture, and context are necessary units of analysis in any case study research. The organizations that we analyze throughout the remainder of this volume are investigated using a particular approach we called layered case studies. Layered case studies examine the linkages between large-scale social ecologies (e.g., regional religious climates, state-level social welfare policies, community-level service provision markets) and grassroots subjective standpoints (perceptions, actions, and experiences of agency personnel and clients). How, then, do content, culture, and context figure into layered case studies? Essentially, each of these terms highlights a particular analytical dimension of our study's approach, along with questions pertaining to that analytical dimension.

Content directs us rather pointedly to programming dynamics and objectives. It is the most narrowly focused facet of the three C's. The unit of analysis in the content dimension of the three C's, then, is the social service program. (In this sense, the first C is shorthand for programmatic content.) The content dimension of a layered case study approach raises questions such as the following. What services are offered in a program? To whom are these services delivered? What funding source(s) underwrite such services? And, what are the goals sought through such programming? In the language of program evaluation, the content dimension of the layered case study approach focuses on program processes. However, a case study approach does not entail a simple bean counting of inputs (investments necessary to deliver services) and outputs (program deliverables such as the number of persons served or the dosage of services received). The vision of case study research articulated here moves beyond simple measurable indicators to investigate social processes with qualitative methods.

Paramount among these considerations, at least for our purposes, is the programmatic content dimension of a layered case study. This facet of our approach attunes us to whether or not the program features elements of faith in the delivery of social services, and the means through which faith is manifested in the program. We are also keenly interested in the funding mechanisms (private, public) that make such services possible. It is important to recognize that, even with this focused analytical approach, complexity abounds. As we have argued above, faith elements can be woven into programs in complicated ways, and different content strands (faith and funding) can intersect in a complex fashion. The goal of a layered case study approach is to avoid reductionism in any analytical dimension, including here.

Culture, the second dimension of our layered case study approach, broadens our analytical lens somewhat. Here, our focus shifts away from the particular program in question to organizational features and practices. Using culture as a dimension recognizes that programs are implemented within an organizational setting and often reflect that setting. Each organization has a mission and identity. As we have suggested, these might include direct references to faith, such as a mission focused on encouraging the religious and spiritual development of those served. Alternatively, an organization might eschew faith altogether, even calling itself a secular agency. Of course, these are not the only two alternatives. An organization might artfully navigate the faith-based/secular boundary with a mission that specifies or allows, for example, the provision of holistic, compassionate assistance, including opportunities for spiritual development to those who desire them.

Therefore, the unit of analysis in the culture dimension of the three C's is the organization.

Organizational culture, as we conceive it, encompasses but is not reducible to an agency's mission or identity. Beyond these facets of culture are social norms and values that create behavioral expectations and visions of morality (the good) within the organization. In addition, culture shapes action. Consequently, organizational culture influences more than how people think about right and wrong or what they believe should be done in given circumstances. It presents strategies of action that influence conduct, turning away from "what" questions to instead examine issues of "how" and "why." The focus on culture raises a number of important questions. What are the organization's mission, norms, and values, and how do these inform conduct within the agency? Through what means and strategies are services provided? Why are some approaches to service provision elevated over others?

Finally, because broader social forces shape content and culture, *context* is a vitally important element of our analytical perspective. Context broadens our analytical lens yet further in the layered case study approach. It, in fact, has the broadest range of vision among the three C's of content, culture, and context. As we define it, context entails the ecological setting or broader social environment within which programs and organizations are situated. Like culture, context has a number of different facets embedded within it. Hence, many contextual factors are open for consideration in a layered case study approach.

Context is broad enough to encompass the service provision marketplace, including the broader constellation of agencies and organizations in the community (e.g., nonprofit providers, government entities, local businesses) as well as the intended beneficiaries of such services (e.g., individual program participants, families, students). Because we are interested in faith-based and secular approaches to social service provision, religious ecology (that is, the faith environment in a locale) is another important facet of the contextual setting. A largely evangelical religious ecology in rural Mississippi creates a very different environment for service provision than a more pluralistic ecology like that found on the West Coast. Beyond the service provision marketplace and religious ecology, context also includes the climate toward public social welfare within a state.

The larger social service domain within which programs and organizations operate is another important contextual factor to analyze in a layered case study. Social service domains run the gamut, with some initiatives targeted at employment (welfare-to-work) and others aimed at family functioning (e.g., marriage promotion, parenting programs), physical and mental health (e.g., substance abuse prevention or treatment, anti-obesity programs), or housing (e.g., homeless shelters, affordable housing initiatives). An agency that focuses principally on providing a particular set of services to a specific population will find itself embedded in a social network distinct from those with a different programmatic focus and target population. An agency that provides tutoring and mentoring services to local youth will likely be situated within a network that includes schools, child welfare agencies, and parents, whereas one that provides health care services to the homeless will likely have a very different set of partners, such as medical professionals, health care specialists, and homeless advocates, with whom it is networked. In short, it is important to consider the inner and outer dimensions of organizations and the programs they implement. To be sure, social forces and cultural factors permeate every social setting, whether within or outside local nonprofits. Nevertheless, we find that the conceptual distinctions between programmatic content, organizational culture, and ecological context are useful to generate focused comparisons among nonprofits and the locales in which they are situated. It is to this point we turn next.

2.4 The Comparative Dimension

We utilize the layered case study approach described above by focusing on each level of analysis, namely, programmatic content, organizational culture, and ecological context. However, we do not stop there. We recognize that the sharpest conclusions to be drawn from case study research are generated by a comparative approach. In the case studies that follow this chapter, four comparative dimensions attract our eye.

First, we compare different provider and program types, seeking to discern how services are delivered in variegated agency settings. To be sure, we are principally concerned with how service provision dynamics differ among faith-based nonprofits, and between faith-based and secular nonprofits, and what distinctions surface when faith-based programs are compared to their secular counterparts. How do program goals and processes differ across the fault line of faith? Is client change conceptualized and pursued differently in faith-based versus secular programs? These are pressing questions given the revolution in faith-based service provision, and our study seeks to address them.

Yet, at the same time and as noted above, we are keenly aware that a simple dichotomy between faith-based versus secular organizations does an injustice to the complex landscape of actual service provision. Given our conceptualization of faith as a resource that can be enlisted in any number of ways across organizational settings, we also attend to more complicated scenarios. What happens when faith-based programs are run by secular organizations? Are such programs largely similar to faith-based programs that are situated within what many would presume to be their more natural home, namely, religious organizations? So, while we recognize the validity of distinguishing between faith-based versus secular programs, and between religious versus non-religious organizations, we point out that these conventional categories can break down. Such circumstances provide opportunities for new empirical insights and innovative theory-building that includes recognizing important distinctions among faith-based providers and different expressions of faith at the agency level, program level, etc.

A second comparative facet of our study concerns the role of funding in social service provision. A principal point of comparison on this front is that between private funding, such as donations, versus government funding. We have intentionally selected organizational cases in our three geographical locales—

Mississippi, Michigan, and Washington-Oregon—to examine how the programming conducted by publicly funded faith-based organizations compares with those run by their publicly funded secular counterparts and privately funded religious nonprofits. This comparison permits us to investigate how different types of revenue streams may be associated with particular approaches to social service programming. Certainly, other studies have examined the changes brought about by the infusion of public funds into faith-based organizations.[24] Such is not our task here. A clear strength of qualitative case study research is found in the ability to examine the full gamut of commonalities and differences exhibited among cases that, at first glance, seem to be quite similar. In this sense, we stop well short of claims about public funds operating as a causal mechanism that produces given discrete, predictable outcomes. Rather, we explore how funding sources exhibit an elective affinity (or loose coupling) with different types of programs and organizations.

Third, we contrast the dynamics of social service provision across family services, transitional housing, and addiction recovery. These are three different types of programming domains. This point of comparison is important because it is possible that the contours of service provision vary across these domains. For example, faith-based approaches to addiction recovery have a distinctive history and, one might surmise, enjoy a competitive advantage over their secular counterparts given the dominance of twelve-step programs in this particular service domain. And yet, where parent education is concerned, the playing field has long been tipped more in favor of secular providers, with much of the emphasis on child welfare programs. This is not to say that faith-based providers have been wholly absent from this service domain. Congregations have long sought to provide parents with family ministry programs. However, they have not enjoyed the mainstream status of faith-based addiction recovery programs, nor have they typically been able to draw on government funding to do so. Homelessness, the remaining service domain, is quite complex. Faith traditions often direct their adherents to assist people in need of basic sustenance and shelter, thereby leading to various housing provision efforts. Still, the scope of homelessness and housing-related issues in the U.S. has led to the mobilization of public agencies through programs that have dwarfed the efforts of faith-based organizations, including congregations, in terms of the number of programs and people served. Thus, we contend that broad-brushed conclusions that can be drawn about faith-based service provision writ large need to be inspected against a key contextual factor, namely, the kinds of services that are provided. There is good reason to believe that just as the objectives of service provision vary depending on the type of program in question, so do the strategies used to offer those services.

Finally, our study contrasts service provision across regional contexts and among different types of communities. We examine family support (specifically, parent education) in rural Mississippi communities, and highlight how the Southern evangelical context within which such programs are situated influences the content

[24]For example, Sinha (2012).

and delivery of its services. These patterns contrast quite markedly with transitional housing programs in urban areas of Michigan, which tend to have a rich blend of Protestant traditions, Catholicism, and Judaism. Increasingly, other religious traditions such as Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism are also developing a presence in many communities. Urban centers also lean progressive, in contrast to the more rural areas of Michigan. The regional and religious context in Washington and Oregon, the site of addiction recovery programs in our study, is much more politically progressive and more religiously pluralistic, with non-Christian faith traditions better represented.

We have presented the framework within which we consider the cases we studied. Next, we turn our attention to those case studies that form the heart of this volume. We begin with parent education programs in rural Mississippi. Thereafter, our attention turns to transitional housing in Michigan and residential addiction recovery the Pacific Northwest. In taking this journey, we draw out the contrasts between these locales and service domains. Where similarities are evident among cases, we are careful to recognize those as well.

References

Aron, Laudan Y., and Patrick T. Sharkey. 2002. The 1996 National Survey of Homeless Assistance Providers and Clients: A comparison of faith-based and secular non-profit programs. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. http://www.urban.org/publications/410496.html. Accessed 2 Jan 2017.

Bielefeld, Wolfgang, and William Suhs Cleveland. 2013. Faith-based organizations as service providers and their relationship to government. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 42: 468–494.

Breaux, David A., Christopher M. Duncan, C. Denise Keller, and John C. Morris. 2002. Welfare reform, Mississippi style: Temporary Assistance for Needy Families and the search for accountability. *Public Administration Review* 62: 92–103.

Ebaugh, Helen Rose, Paula F. Pipes, Janet Saltzman Chafetz, and Martha Daniels. 2003. Where's the religion? Distinguishing faith-based from secular social service agencies. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 42: 411–426.

Ebaugh, Helen Rose, Janet Saltzman Chafetz, and Paula F. Pipes. 2005. Faith-based social service organizations and government funding: Data from a national survey. *Social Science Quarterly* 86: 273–292.

Farnsley, Arthur E. III. 2007. Faith-based initiatives. In *The Sage handbook of the sociology of religion*, ed. James A. Beckford and N.J. Demerath III, pp. 345–356. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Goggin, Malcolm L., and Deborah A. Orth. 2002. *How faith-based and secular organizations tackle housing for the homeless*. Albany, N.Y.: Rockefeller Institute of Government. http://www.religionandsocialpolicy.org/docs/research/10-23-2002_grand_rapids_study.pdf. Accessed 10 Dec 2015.

Kearns, Kevin, Chisung Park, and Linda Yankoski. 2005. Comparing faith-based and secular community service corporations in Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 34: 206–231.

Kennedy, Sheila Suess, and Wolfgang Bielefeld. 2006. *Charitable choice at work: Evaluating faith-based job programs in the states*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Lockhart, William H. 2005. Building bridges and bonds: Generating social capital in secular and faith-based poverty-to-work programs. *Sociology of Religion* 66: 45–60.

Monsma, Stephen V. 2004. *Putting faith in partnerships: Welfare-to-work in four cities*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press.

Monsma, Stepen V., and J. Christopher Soper. 2006. *Faith, hope, and jobs: Welfare-to-work in Los Angeles*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Nagel, Alexander-Kenneth. 2006. Charitable choice: The religious component of the US welfare reform—Theoretical and methodological reflections on "faith-based organisations" as social service agencies. *Numen* 53: 78–111.

Pipes, Paula F., and Helen Rose Ebaugh. 2002. Faith-based coalitions, social services, and government funding. *Sociology of Religion* 2002: 49–68.

Sager, Rebecca. 2010. *Faith, politics, and power: The politics of faith-based initiatives*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sinha, Jill Witmer. 2012. Unintended consequences of the faith-based initiative: Organizational practices and religious identity within faith-based human service organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 42: 563–583.

Unruh, Heidi Rolland, and Ronald J. Sider. 2005. *Saving souls, serving society: Understanding the faith factor in church-based social ministry*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Vanderwoerd, James R. 2004. How faith-based social service organizations manage secular pressures associated with government funding. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* 14: 239–262.

Wuthnow, Robert. 2004. *Saving America? Faith-based services and the future of civil society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Chapter 3
Faith-Based Versus Secular Support for Fragile Families: Parent Education in the Rural South

The first stop on our tour of the service provision landscape in post-welfare America is rural Mississippi. In many respects, Mississippi is an ideal state in which to begin our investigation. Mississippi has long been known for its inordinately high poverty rate and its large proportion of female-headed families. Mississippi, sometimes referred to as the buckle of the Bible Belt, is also one of the most religious states in the country. The dominant faith traditions in Mississippi are those of the conservative Protestant variety, including denominations often described as fundamentalist such as Baptists. Pentecostals such as Church of God in Christ are also well represented. United Methodists, the primary mainline Protestant denomination in the state, enjoy a significant share of the religious market as well, although Mississippi Methodists are generally more conservative than their methodists in other parts of the country.

Mississippi was a trailblazer in faith-based welfare reform initiatives with its Faith and Families program begun in the mid-1990s under then Governor Kirk Fordice.[1] The initiative sought to create a network of congregations that could adopt impoverished families in local areas and provide such families with a combination of short-term aid (e.g., food assistance) and long-term support (e.g., life skills training, job placement). Although the program faltered, it solidified Mississippi's status as a welfare reform innovator and also placed family policy, including the reduction of out-of-wedlock childbirths and the promotion of two-parent households, at the center of Mississippi's welfare reform efforts.

As welfare reform and faith-based initiatives gained additional momentum at the federal level in the late 1990s, Mississippi lawmakers' attention remained fixed on family-oriented approaches to welfare reform. For several years, the state funded a group of faith-based fatherhood programs designed to promote paternal involvement and responsible parenting. In this chapter, these publicly funded, faith-based programs are compared with faith-based parenting programs that are privately funded and with secular parenting programs underwritten by public funds.

---

[1]Bartkowski and Regis (2003).

J. P. Bartkowski and S. E. Grettenberger, *The Arc of Faith-Based Initiatives*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90668-3_3

This is the first of four chapters in which we turn to qualitative data collected from a wide range of agencies (faith-based and secular) whose programs are supported by distinct funding streams (public versus private). As described more fully in Appendix A, in-depth interviews with various stakeholders in parent education programs (agency directors, frontline workers, and clients) enable us to address these questions from multiple vantage points. In this chapter, the perspectives of provider personnel (agency directors and parent educators) are featured to capture the supply side of welfare service provision. Chapter 6 examines the perceived effects of program participation on clients. While care must be taken not to generalize from qualitative case study data, the portrait that surfaces about parent education in Mississippi is both intriguing and instructive.

Because this chapter is our initial foray into the study locales from which we gathered extensive qualitative data, the analytical framework governing this chapter and those that follow it bears some reiteration. Our analytical framework is organized around what we have called the three C's of social service provision. The first of these C's is *content*, which is to say programmatic objectives and dynamics. C*ulture*, the second C, turns our attention to organizational identity and values. And, our third C, *context* consists of the broader service provision marketplace, religious ecology, and regional setting. We also explore the various ways in which faith is integrated into faith-based organizations and programs with a religious emphasis. Recall that faith integration can vary in terms of *source* (Is the organization affiliated with a denomination?), *expression* (Is faith conveyed through conventional religious means or a more general spiritual sensibility?), *intensity* (Are religious messages a centerpiece of the program?) and *prevalence* (Is faith restricted to a specific program or is it infused throughout the social service organization?).

Among the most critical findings to emerge from our study of parent education in Mississippi, we find that faith-based and secular providers share a common goal, namely, supporting and enhancing the vital work of parents. In short, all programs aim to promote good parenting. On this dimension of programmatic content (our first C), broad similarity is evident. However, definitions of good parenting vary across provider types, due in part to differences in organizational culture and the broader context, specifically, environmental influences in the respective fields of parent education versus congregational family ministry (our second and third C's). Given the secular cultural ethos in non-religious agencies, they opt for a skills-based definition of good parenting in which caregivers are construed as tacticians who are taught technical proficiency in evidenced-based parenting skills. By contrast, the principle-centered cultural ethos among faith-based providers privileges a values-oriented approach to good parenting. For faith-based providers, parenting is more a matter of moral responsibility than technical proficiency. Both types of organizations are goal-oriented, but use very different means to achieve their goals. And, where the integration of faith into programming and organizational dynamics is concerned, faith-intensive programs tend to have a more explicit engagement with religious themes.

Table 3.1 features Mississippi parent education programs included in the study. Using the Faith Integration Survey (see Appendix B), two programs were classified

Table 3.1 Rural Mississippi parent education programs

Faith-based	Faith-Intensive	Publicly Funded	No Public Funding
			St. Andrew's Mission Parenting Program
			Life Renewal Ministries Parenting Program
	Faith-Related	Vicksburg Family Development Fatherhood Program	
		Our House, Inc. Fatherhood Program	
		North Bolivar Family Resource Center Fatherhood Initiative	
		Tunica Fatherhood Initiative	
Secular		Emerson Family School Parenting Program	
		Neshoba County Parents as Teachers Center	

as faith-intensive, such that faith was infused throughout the organization and its parenting program. These were St. Andrew's Mission and Life Renewal Ministries. These same two programs had received no public funding. Faith-related programs exhibited lower scores with respect to the organizational and programmatic role of faith on the Faith Integration Survey. These more moderately faith-based programs, all of which targeted fathers given the state's family support funding priorities at the time, were found at Vicksburg Family Development, Our House, North Bolivar Family Resource Center, and the Tunica Fatherhood Initiative. Beyond the obvious gender component in these programs, they generally served disadvantaged African American men. These faith-related programs were publicly funded by the state of Mississippi. Finally, two publicly funded secular programs were included in the study. Emerson Family School and Neshoba County Parents as Teachers Center were not gender-specific but did generally serve women.

3.1 What Do We Know About Parenting Programs? Prior Research Briefly Summarized

Before delving into the specific dynamics of Mississippi's faith-based and secular parenting programs, a brief consideration of prior research on parent education is warranted. Parent education programs have existed now for several decades. These programs initially gained momentum in the 1960s and early 1970s with the rise of Parent Effectiveness Training (P.E.T.) and other programs that followed. Although many elements of these programs (e.g., communication techniques, conflict-resolution strategies) were inspired by humanistic psychology, actual research on the effects of these programs did not emerge until some time after they were initially conceived. Evaluations of parent education programs became more abundant as broader efforts took hold to determine if social service interventions (that is, curriculum-based programs) could produce results that withstood scientific scrutiny. Interventions that could reliably deliver proven results were designated as evidence-based programs. This trend toward using evidence-based programs (or EBPs) has accelerated through the social service field and in parent education during the past twenty years.

For some time now, evaluation studies have pointed to positive outcomes associated with various curriculum-based parenting programs, particularly among populations deemed to be at risk, (e.g., teen mothers, incarcerated parents, low-income households, children with special needs).[2] And, with the more recent emergence of fatherhood programs beginning in the 1990s, many of these interventions have exhibited positive impacts on paternal involvement as well as improved relationship knowledge and skills among fathers.[3] Qualitative studies have revealed which elements of parenting and fatherhood programs are attractive to their target audience (e.g., improved listening skills, social support) and what barriers are sometimes encountered (e.g., time constraints, pressing family responsibilities).[4] Fatherhood programs targeted at low-income African American men often deftly weave together traditional and progressive ideals about manhood, and thereby encourage the pursuit of novel alternatives to street masculinity.[5]

There is not a comparable body of research on faith-based parenting programs. Why not? Perhaps most importantly, faith-based approaches to parent education have generally not been formalized into interventions or curriculum-dependent programs. Congregations have positioned themselves on the parenting support landscape through informal classes or workshops, as well as grassroots chapters of religiously based family and parent support organizations. These endeavors are typically carried out under the auspices of congregational family ministry programs. Rather than using a curriculum-based intervention approach to parent education, these classes or groups are organized (sometimes rather loosely) around religious resources such as parenting advice books, online caregiver support materials, or parent-child activities. Parenting manuals and online self-help resources are especially abundant in conservative Christian congregations, and have been used widely enough to generate sales in the millions of copies for some evangelical Christian parenting manuals.[6] Parenting resources are made readily available from such

---

[2]See, for example, McConachie and Diggle (2007), Thomas and Zimmer-Gembeck (2007), Kaminski et al. (2008), Wilson et al. (2010).

[3]Holmes (2010).

[4]Anderson et al. (2002).

[5]Roy and Omari (2010).

[6]Bartkowski and Ellison (1995).

outlets as Focus on the Family, Mothers of Preschoolers (MOPS), and other support organizations.

Research on faith-based parent education efforts is sparse to non-existent, and these programs, given their often free-form character, are certainly not able to be evaluated through conventional means.[7] And that's just the point. The proof of these endeavors is to be found not in science. Rather, the effectiveness of faith-based parenting programs is rooted in testimonials of lives changed and, within conservative Christian circles, the use of scriptural passages to justify any and all parenting advice that is offered. With this backdrop in mind, we now turn to the key insights that surface from the careful study of parenting education in Mississippi.

3.2 Mississippi Faith-Based and Secular Programs: Convergences in Programmatic Content

How, if at all, does the faith factor influence the content of parent education programs in Mississippi? Interviews with executive directors and program coordinators at eight agencies statewide underscored important similarities in program objectives, broadly defined, and in some service provision strategies.

3.2.1 Shared Programmatic Objectives

Regardless of the type of program in question or the degree of faith integration, agency personnel articulated overall programmatic objectives that were remarkably similar—namely, to help parents become better, more capable caregivers. On this dimension of programmatic content, then, it was difficult to distinguish faith-based programs from their secular counterparts. The Parents as Teachers (PAT) program in Neshoba County is bundled within an Even Start family literacy program given the number of young mothers in the community that have not completed their high school education. Consistent with the objectives of the national PAT program, educators at this center place "a great emphasis on the parent as the child's first and best teacher." The agency's director explains that the goal of the program is to raise the awareness of parents concerning their children's developmental abilities, particularly where family literacy is concerned. Lesson plans are designed to "bring about an awareness in this parent that is struggling themselves to get educated. It cultivates an awareness of what they really need to be thinking about and doing

[7]For example, parenting classes are briefly mentioned in a study that analyzes various social services offered by congregations in Marion County, Indiana. But the focus of that investigation was on other services. See Littlefield (2010).

with their children in their language development so that as they grow and learn, they can become better parents."

Despite the fact that they sit on opposite ends of the faith continuum, there is a remarkable similarity between the secular Neshoba County program's objectives and those that animate the faith-intensive parenting program at Life Renewal Ministries. In fact, it would be difficult to find a more full-throated integration of faith expression, intensity, and prevalence into programming and an organization than is the case at Life Renewal, which is directly affiliated with a local United Methodist congregation. Nevertheless, the similarities it shares with the secular Neshoba County program are striking. The executive director of Life Renewal Ministries expresses the aims of her organization's parenting program in this way:

> Our first objective is to help parents be comfortable being parents. We want to destroy all the myths about parenting and talk about the reality of parenting. [We also try] to develop individuals who become parents to provide a safe home for their children to grow and become complete individuals that know how to make decisions and choices. They understand what it means to communicate and to express their feelings. [We teach them] to seek out some common ground to communicate and love one another for who they are, accepting things that they don't like about each other, but yet to love and care for one another. To sum it all up, to help parents to become builders of character.

Parenting classes at St. Andrew's Mission, a privately funded faith-based agency, are organized around a goal that was commonly cited by agency directors and parent educators in all programs: parental sensitivity to the needs of children and the cultivation of trust in the parent-child relationship. As explained by the parent educator at St. Andrew's, parents need to understand that "children are not little adults." Moreover, she says, as parents, we need to "keep the promises we have made" to children. St. Andrew's Mission, in fact, combines a secular Active Parenting curriculum with a robust faith component that they have integrated. So, although faith is a key pillar in St. Andrew's organizational culture and figures prominently in the content of its parenting program, they are not averse to enlisting and adapting sound secular resources into their curriculum. As such, caregivers are trained about the necessity of good parenting for building strong families: "To truly be investing in the family, we have to build strong families. The foundation has to be strong. So parenting is very important to being a family and building a strong family foundation."

During our interview, the parent educator from St. Andrew's runs through a list of practical techniques that are taught to parents to improve the care they provide.

> Children, no matter what their ages are, [must be] raised to communicate [to parents] if [parents] are not able to fulfill that commitment that [they] made. And [we teach] how parents have to have some time so that they don't get stressed. They need to have some time. Because, again, that affects how we react to our children. I like that I stress that because it otherwise seems to be that we're just talking about the children and what the children need. But [the parents] come in from work. And one young lady opened up during this discussion that her husband works twelve-hour shifts. And the seven-month old, that young, just glows like "I have taken my nap and I am ready for dad to get here." And, even though he's very tired, that's a situation where you've got to put forth that extra effort to greet her and let her know that you're as glad to see her as she is to see you, when she's that

> young. [We also teach] that [children] are never too young to begin [receiving this type of parenting]. They're noticing us, they're modeling us, and it doesn't start just when they are five, six, or seven years old. It starts very early. [We teach parents] that we must be consistent and persistent with our discipline. And no two children are alike. If you have more than one, there are going to be differences. So you cannot have just one rule and that's it because they're individuals. And as parents, we must know our children. So, we have to deal with them on an individual basis.

Other parent educators in both faith-based and secular programs could also run through a laundry list of programmatic content items designed to make parents betters caregivers. Such items as the following were cited:

- spending a sufficient amount of time with children;
- knowing each child's favorite foods, activities, television shows, and colors;
- using effective means of discipline, such as time outs and other proven techniques;
- being aware of the developmental capabilities of children as they age; and
- exhibiting sensitivity to the unique personality of each child.

The point not to be lost is that educators in both faith-based and secular programs identified a wide range of common issues when talking about their central goal of helping parents to function as better caregivers.

3.2.2 Tailored Programming and Client-Centered Care

A second point of convergence between faith-based and secular parenting programs centers more on the *delivery* of programmatic content, but is nonetheless still linked to the first C (content) of our three C's paradigm (content, culture, and context). Regardless of the type of program in question, all of the parent education programs delivered their services in a parent-centered fashion. More specifically, all programs were flexible enough to be tailored to address the specific needs of the populations served. Therefore, both secular and faith-based parent educators exhibited sensitivity to the unique needs of the constituencies they served.

At Emerson Family School, a secular agency offering secular parent education, sensitivity to client needs manifested itself in its overall approach to programming. At Emerson, the traditional model of weekly group parenting classes had not been successful. Therefore, Emerson moved to combine regular workshops that teach an array of parenting skills (e.g., disciplinary strategies, first-aid techniques, tips for recreational activities) with a private form of counseling for parents in need of more formal parent education. The workshops are open to the public and to those who participate in the private parenting sessions. These workshops are also most regularly attended by young mothers in Emerson's Even Start family literacy program. This programming strategy enables them to meet the needs of several different populations—teen mothers working on their GED, parents within the community, and those who have been court-mandated to complete a formal parenting curriculum before their children can be retained or returned to them. Emerson's program coordinator explains how this style of programming emerged, and outlined its future prospects given changing client needs:

> We have been kind of loosely structured, if those two words go together. We have started with some workshops. And one thing that we've found is that the parenting classes, if it's court-ordered, are usually looking for a certificate that says that they've completed six hours of classes. Well, to me, I don't know that that really scratches the surface of what you need to do in a household when you consider the lifestyle that this family has had for many, many years. And, of course, it is passed on from generation to generation. So, we wanted to work not just on a basic parenting class using a curriculum, but using other factors like the self-esteem of the family and the structure of the family. Of course, some of the parenting curriculum does address that. But anyway, we wanted to do some feel-good kind of workshops like aromatherapy and music therapy to introduce these families to a whole different world that they really don't have much contact with unless they come up here and see us sometimes. So, that's kind of how we started. But then we really started getting more referrals from DHS where it looked like we were going to need to do the curriculum to be able to do that little certificate.

At faith-intensive and privately funded Life Renewal Ministries, a similar style of tailoring programs to client needs occurs but takes a different form. Life Renewal strives to help clients feel comfortable sharing private concerns in a public setting. They see a mix of clients, but have noticed that their African American parents need more time to become comfortable talking about family issues in a group setting. So, they work such clients toward the group-based program slowly with the aid of a mentor assigned to the parent:

> One of the things that is culturally different in the black community is that we don't tell our business. So therefore, it's real hard for them to participate in groups sometimes. So what I do a lot is talk to them individually and ask them if they are willing to meet a mentor—one of our volunteers—and have one of the volunteers embrace and then work them into the parenting group.

Likewise, fatherhood programs were tailored to meet what were viewed as the unique needs of fathers and, specifically, the low-income dads served in these programs. The program coordinator at the Tunica Fatherhood Initiative, who is also a minister at a local church, explained how his program strives to meet the unique needs of fathers in the community. In this faith-based state-funded program, a primary goal is to educate fathers. But just as importantly, the father educator asks men to articulate to him their objectives in other areas of life. This coordinator explains that when men come into the program, he begins by asking clients a critical question:

> We ask them, "What are *your* goals?" I focus on *their* goals. Whatever they ask for, that's what we try to have. The goal of the program, the basics of the training, is to educate fathers. Well, my goal is: "What is your goal? What do you want to achieve in this program? What do you want to learn from it?" And that's a question I ask each one of them. I tell them, "What do you want from me?" Most of them will say, "Well, I want you to help me find a job." Some say, "Well, I want an education." In that case, we focus right there. If I work [toward] my goal, then you're not going to want to show up. But if I'm interested in helping you to achieve your goal, then it makes the program more effective. And that's

> what we try to do. One of the goals of the program is to equip men to be fathers. We started a special thing. I talked to the superintendent of the school [to identify] fifteen young men who are basically troubled in school. I have talked with the counselors, and they will identify them for me. And we're going to work for them to teach them real issues. And that's the whole goal for our program here—that's to educate men in all the aspects of life.

Thus, both faith-based and secular programs demonstrate a keen sensitivity to client needs in the methods through which they deliver programmatic content. Regardless of the type of agency or program in question, and irrespective of the funding that underwrites the programming activities, personnel work hard to provide services that are flexible and client-centered. Some substantive elements vary depending on the constituency in question, but responsiveness toward clients' needs is present in every agency.

3.2.3 Comprehensive Approaches to Parent Education

A third point of program convergence manifested between secular and faith-based parent education efforts in Mississippi is the comprehensive model of service provision governing them. The use of a comprehensive approach for delivering programmatic content takes many different forms. One form of comprehensive service provision is evidenced through home visits or mentoring that takes parent education out of the classroom and into everyday life. It is noteworthy that every agency considered here complements group instruction (that is, classes, seminars, and workshops) with home visits or some type of mentoring system. All agencies, whether faith-based or secular, recognize the importance of moving beyond simple classroom instruction by coupling it with home visits. Regardless of the program type, home visits foster the formation of affective ties between service providers and clients. Meeting parents and children in their homes creates a sense of intimacy and trust in the provider-client relationship, while often affording an opportunity for additional instruction.

St. Andrew's Mission integrates home visits into their parenting classes. The parent educator at St. Andrew's says that home visits are an ideal opportunity to meet the children if she has not done so already. During home visits, she talks to the parent or parents and is able to observe parent-child interactions. Secular programs such as Even Start and Parents as Teachers also complement their curriculum with home visits. When educators from such programs make home visits, they often introduce parents and children to a new lesson or activity in the curriculum. Typically, they explain and model that activity for the parents they visit.

Life Renewal Ministries has a particularly rigorous method of approaching home visits. The agency pairs up each client with a mentor who has undergone fifty-six hours of training. The training combined with a commitment of up to one year typically weeds out all but the most diligent of mentors. The director and parent educator of Life Renewal says, "We build those personal relationships. And we really go into the home, and try to ensure that [they are using] what we're telling them [in class]. We try to help them implement what we're teaching them in the home. And then we invite those children back." She adds: "The mentor is a person that calls them on the phone and says, 'How are things going today?' The mentor may go by the house and help them with things they need done. The mentor helps them with parenting skills, and shares her experience of parenting." Home visits are mutual in this particular program. It is not only the participant's home that is visited. Mentors are expected to have program participants into their homes and to invite participants into other aspects of their lives: "What we do is ask the mentor to allow this family to interact with their family so that they see what a positive family is about. We even ask them to allow them to attend church services on a Sunday, and to come over for dinner so they can see how you all sit down and eat dinner together. Invite them to some of the recreational things that you do. And they're willing to do that." Several other programs—both faith-based and secular—use a mentor system as well. In some cases, the mentor was a parent educator who modeled parenting skills (e.g., reading to children, communicating with youngsters) during home visits. In other cases, mentors were composed of participants who had successfully graduated from the program and, in turn, wished to serve in this capacity.

One agency contact underscored the benefits of home visits and mentoring by way of counter-example. This agency has integrated home visits into one but not all of the secular parenting programs it offers. This agency staff person's cautionary remarks on classroom-only instruction underscore the problems with programs bereft of more comprehensive offerings:

> I think without some kind of ongoing interaction with a lot of these families, what we teach them is not going to last very long. I think without some kind of reinforcement there, they're probably going to fall back into old patterns. It's like breaking any other kind of habit, I guess. And for these people who are coming from this environment, a lot of the ones that we see anyway, I don't know that I see them changing for any long period of time. I do know that when you're talking to them, you can see that flicker in their eyes, like "Gosh, I never thought about that." I do think that some of the ideas they believe are very good ideas. And I think they probably leave here very enthusiastic, thinking that they're going to do this and probably do it for some length of time. But then I think with a lot of them, it's going to fizzle.

Comprehensive service provision was not restricted to home visits. Another form of comprehensive programming entailed offering family support to members of the household other than the parent who is formally enrolled in the class. This type of comprehensive programming took different forms in the secular and faith-based agencies in this study. The Even Start programs offered by secular agencies place a premium on family literacy. Thus, parents (typically, young mothers) enrolled in Even Start programs must be working on their GED or high school diplomas. While they complete their high school education requirements, child care is provided for them. The preponderance of faith-based programs examined here was targeted at fathers of various ages. Given the gender difference in clienteles, it is difficult to compare fatherhood initiatives with Even Start programs typically frequented by young mothers. Yet, comprehensive family support surfaced in these fatherhood programs as well. All of these programs held regular activities in which fathers and their children—or, in some cases, whole families—were invited to participate. And, for many such activities, fatherless families were invited to participate so that mentoring relationships could be established between an older male adult and a youngster.

The evolution of an integrated family support model of parent education at Vicksburg Family Development Service is especially instructive. One of two executive directors there also serves as a minister in her church, but the prevalence of faith integration at this agency is limited. The fatherhood program is faith-based but the agency is not. The executive director explained how the program grew from a fathers-only focus to a more comprehensive family support model. She began by explaining that the initial focus of the program was "to really educate that father in the area of parenting. Number one, to help him understand that his role is as critical as the mother's role … I think the dads really needed to know that you're needed in this home. I think we have a lot of dads who don't know [that], because we have a society that says mom takes care of the children—and dad, you baby-sit. Dad does not baby-sit. Dad is a parent, so he's as much a part of the main caretaking as mom is." While administering the program, agency personnel recognized the contradiction between providing instruction only to fathers when they were teaching that the fallout of fatherlessness was influenced by broader social factors and affected the whole family. As this director put it, "Some of the issues related to fatherlessness—the crisis situation that has evolved because fathers have not been there … [such as] teen pregnancy and drug abuse … that was the opening for us." Personnel at this agency quickly realized that instruction needed to be provided "not just [to] the dads," but to the whole family. Therefore,

> the other goal [in the fatherhood program] was to educate the mothers about the importance of the dad's role … When we had ladies come into the prenatal class, and we would find out that the dads were no longer involved even at this early stage. So we felt like it was important for them to understand that your child is going to need his dad. And even if you're not in a relationship—the two of you—it's important and critical. And that's why the second year … we put our heads together after we analyzed the first year of the program and we recognized that we needed to bring the mothers and the children into this whole father piece. So, we had fathers in one room. And we brought [in] the women—wives or significant women in the lives of the men—and the children, because the impact was felt in the whole home. And then each one got the information that he was getting. Dad is important here. Parenting is important, and just the whole gamut of what that was about … And then to look at what some of the issues were. And that's been a real eye-opener with the children, to hear that perspective. The adolescent kids had their own class. The younger children were in a baby-sitting situation. But the adolescent kids got a chance to really express what they felt.

A third way in which comprehensive programming occurred among the agencies in this study was through the bundling of services. All agencies utilized this programming strategy. Yet, although bundling occurred across the board, different programs adopted distinctive ways of doing so because of their unique clienteles. On this score, a shared strategy manifested itself differently in secular and faith-based agencies. Because clients in secular programs such as Even Start and

Parents as Teachers were generally women who had not completed their high school education, parenting classes or workshops were bundled with GED classes offered by such agencies—often in collaboration with the local school district. In Neshoba County, the local school district has offered a combination Even Start/Parents as Teachers program for the past four years in a site located separately from its schools. (Initially, this program was supported by federal flow-through funds; however, program funding has gradually migrated to the local level.) The parenting program there, which focuses simultaneously on building family literacy and promoting effective parenting, is bundled with onsite child care to support the completion of GED requirements among teen mothers. What's more, the Even Start/Parents as Teachers program is complemented by the Parent Resource Center that is located in a different part of the same complex. The Parent Resource Center is staffed by professional educators and provides parents with an array of resources such as books, videos, and learning-oriented games designed to facilitate family literacy. The agency sponsors workshops on an array of parenting skills, though the most popular are those that have a family literacy focus (e.g., tutoring children with advanced mathematics homework). Thus, service bundling occurs along a number of different lines at this agency.

The bundling of services takes a somewhat different form in the faith-based fatherhood programs offered by agencies throughout the state, likely because of a mix of factors (faith and gender). Given gender norms that equate masculinity with financial provision, many of the men who attend fatherhood classes are not looking for a day care center as are the women in the programs described above. In such programs, men who have fathered children are often looking for jobs. Or, if they have not yet completed their high school education, many such men are seeking to complete GED classes. Men in need of job placement or educational advancement in these programs are often assisted in achieving these goals by program coordinators or others in the program who serve as mentors. Thus, such programs do not reduce fatherhood to parenting done by males. In addition to the provision of fathering skills, these programs offer training and support in the broadest sense of the word.

The educator at the Tunica Fatherhood Initiative explains how this program pursues the integrated goal of teaching fathering skills while promoting personal advancement. Although it would probably be easier to teach only fathering skills, the needs of clients in his program (and others like it) would not be met by doing so. Thus, comprehensive programming requires service bundling coupled with a great deal of patience:

> How do we define success? That's a good question. What I look for is, well, you can't really define it. Because some people are fast. I got one young man, we talked to him the first session. And the next thing, we took him to the GED class, he started working on his GED. And then there are some that we have been talking to for months, and they have yet to go work on their GED. What I look for, number one, is to be patient with the men. Because I want you today. If I am talking to you right now, when I finish talking to you, I [may] expect in my mind for you to get right up to that job center, fill out the application looking for a job and get out there and go to that GED class. But that's not their goal … I

> just work with them and it's a period of time. And I don't say to myself … "Well, I am going to give you ninety days to go out and find a job." And in ninety days, [when] you don't find a job, are you a failure?
>
> *Bartkowski: It sounds, then, like you define success with particular men you work with individually, on almost a case-by-case basis?*
>
> Yes, a case-by-case basis. That's why I have to be patient with them. Because if you've been [in the fatherhood program] for five or six meetings and you're still not doing anything, do I tell you to get out? Or do I continue to [encourage you]? The program is designed where you go to eight sessions, sixteen hours over a year's time frame. But sometimes these same guys that I had my first year, I still have them now … I could say, "Well, you've been through sixteen sessions. OK, you're finished and I don't [want to] bother with you anymore." And [then I could] move onto someone else. But you really can't do that. So, you've got to stay with them. And some of them I have working on their GED diligently. Some start, stop, start, stop. Some work for three or more months. Then they quit and go back to their bad habits again. So, you can't put a time frame on it. You have got to work with them at their own level.

Unfortunately, the bundling of services such as job placement into a fatherhood initiative sometimes works counter to the program because men's attendance at parent education classes can be undermined by the work hours mandated through newfound employment. This problem is magnified by the fact that it is terribly difficult to recruit men into such programs in the first place. This combination of factors makes it particularly challenging to lose men through programs that successfully bundle job placement with fatherhood education. The resourceful coordinator of the Tunica program explains that he uses home visits, public workshops, and "street ministry" to counter the problem of class attrition through job placement:

> Some, I see them, and they're working every day. And the sad thing about it is that when they get their jobs and start working, if we work with you for three sessions and you go get a job, well then you don't have time to come back to us. But we still keep in contact … I do home visits, and go where they are because that's what you have to do. Because it's not just a program where you say, "OK, I've advertised in the newspaper this week that we're doing a session at the rec center on commitment." Well, you have to go out there where they are because ideally we've got all kinds of space down here. We could go back in the back [of the agency to a classroom], but it's not that way. A lot of men, you have to go and get. I don't mind meeting them where they are. That's the strength of our program.

In summary, there are several key similarities that faith-based and secular programs share. Whether faith-based or secular in character, these parent education programs all aim to make parents better caregivers. In addition, all agencies tailor their programs to meet the specific needs of their clients, though the substance of such adaptations varies depending on the clientele served. And finally, all agencies embrace a comprehensive approach to service provision that is closely aligned with the family engagement model of parent education.

3.3 Organizational Culture, Ecological Context, and Faith Integration

The integration of faith into religiously based parenting programs is present, but often subtle in its expression and capable of being modulated in its intensity. In what follows, we describe how faith exerts an influence on parent education through factors related to the second two C's of our three C's paradigm, namely, organizational *culture* and ecological *context*. These factors create distinctive rationales for service provision, with secular programs oriented toward skills acquisition and faith-based programs emphasizing values transmission.

Secular programs treat parenting as a matter of technical competency given secular agencies' commitment to evidence-based programming and their focus on the attainment of measurable goals. This focus on evidence and measurement is part of secular nonprofits' organizational culture, typically under the rubric of accountability. Established secular nonprofit organizations featured here have a board of directors to whom they must answer, and professional ethics demand that the very best services be provided to clients. These days, best practices are defined quite pointedly as those that have withstood scientific scrutiny. Where parent education is concerned, these secular organizational commitments are nestled within the broader field of child development. The field of child development is itself an ecological context within which parent education is delivered, and the scientific standards that govern this field fit hand-in-glove with the use of evidence-based programs.

By contrast, faith-based programs define parenting as a moral responsibility. Their emphasis on values transmission is consonant with the principle-centered organizational culture of faith-based agencies. Here, too, the ecological context looms large, but in a religious fashion. Given the Baptist-dominated religious ecology in Mississippi, faith expression in programs generally takes the form of evangelical Christianity. Faith-based programs that do not embrace an evangelical orientation must still grapple with this tradition's dominance in rural Mississippi. Thus, the integration of religious themes into faith-based parent education varies, depending largely on the faith tradition in question. And yet, in all cases, faith is offered as an optional rather than a mandatory aspect of the program. This individualistic approach to faith, though, is quite consonant with the values of evangelicalism. In what follows, we turn to the specific ways in which the types of influences shape Mississippi parent education programs.

3.3.1 Distinctive Definitions of Parenting: Technical Competency Versus Moral Responsibility

One key distinction between secular and faith-based parent education programs featured here is the way in which parenting is defined. It is no accident that family literacy programs such as Even Start thrive in secular agencies. Such programs are oriented around the goal-rational objective of teaching parents the importance of promoting their children's intellectual development. The ecological context from which such programs have emerged is the science of child development. In the program, parents are taught the specific skills needed to achieve this goal. These skills include reading to their children and engaging young children in developmental exercises tellingly called "manipulatives." To be sure, secular parent educators recognize that these interactive exercises help to strengthen the parent-child bond. Moreover, the bundling of an Even Start program with a Parents as Teachers curriculum emphasizes the value that "parents are their children's first and best teachers"—an aphorism that loosely implies the obligation of parents to teach their children. Yet, in secular programs, questions of morality are submerged and issues of technical competency become paramount. Thus, in secular agencies, workshops typically focus on teaching tactical parenting skills, often rooted in scientific or instrumental approaches. Workshops abound on such topics as helping a child with homework, treating injuries with proven first-aid techniques, contending with ADHD (Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder), seeking scholarships for college-bound youth, and teaching parents how to monitor their children's use of the internet. Secular agencies often have grants that require them to achieve "targets" or "benchmarks" such as the number of clients served, a minimum threshold of workshops to be offered, or desirable client outcomes. The culture at these agencies is certainly not cool or distant. But there is a commitment to accountability, with a decided emphasis on the word "count" when being held accountable.

By contrast, faith-based parenting programs define parenting as a moral matter. When asked what he tries to teach in his parenting classes, the director and educator in one center with faith-based parent education programs invokes biblical imagery. He and his staff have taught both fatherhood courses and general parenting programs. Both have a strong faith component to them. Thus, his remarks are laced with religious imagery and underscore the parental responsibilities of protection and provision embraced in many evangelical communities[8]:

> We try to get them to understand that a child is a blessing from God. And we owe it to that child to be the best possible parent that we can be. And we try to give them the tools to become that parent that they ought to be. As a race of [African American] people, we have a history—and I remind them of this quite often—that we have a history of leaving our children unattended and then some tragedy comes and steals them away. It could be a fire, it could be a kidnapper or rapist or whatever. Part of our responsibility as parents is to protect and provide. Those are the things that we try to get them to understand. [We teach] that our responsibility as parents is to protect and provide, [and] that we need to bring them up in the way that they need to go.

It is noteworthy that this parent educator opens and closes his commentary with clearly religious references. In fact, it is because children are a "blessing from God" that parents have an obligation to "protect … provide … and bring [children] up in

[8]Bartkowski (2001).

the way that they need to go." These references all have their roots in scripture, with the last of these a near-verbatim quotation of Proverbs 22:6. As in other programs like it, caring for children here is defined as a moral responsibility—one that makes covenantal (that is to say, ethical and non-negotiable) claims on the parent. It is interesting to note that this portrayal of parenting does not preclude the inculcation of practical skills in the program. As this educator acknowledges, they "try to give parents the tools" that they need to discharge parental responsibilities more effectively. However, this focus on skills-based training is couched in religious terminology that imbues parenting with a sense of moral urgency. Moreover, despite the fact that this parent educator is African American (or perhaps because of it), he views the moral urgency of parenting as most pronounced in the African American community. Whether through parental inattention or structural disadvantage, he contends that African American parents have the most to gain from hearing about their ethical responsibilities as parents.

This same theme about the moral urgency of parenting emerged in faith-based fatherhood classes. Consider the comments of the father advocate at Our House. When asked about the rationale behind their fatherhood initiative, religious themes again surfaced:

> I believe that we must understand as a nation and as a people here on earth that God structured life to be a certain way. He structured the nation to be a certain way, and a nation is made up of families. And families are made up of the father and the mother. And when the father is out of order or out of place, then that throws [off] the structure of the family, which ultimately disarrays the entire nation. And that's the reason we have a lot of crime and a lot of drop-outs in school. It's because the father is absent in the home—whether it's physically absent, or whether it's emotionally absent. And I think that once we get fathers to understand their true purpose in regards to how he relates to the family and his role in the family and in the lives of his kids, then we'll start healing the nation. But it must start at home first.

In the foregoing commentary, there is the same moral urgency in drawing connections between faith commitments, parenting, and the broader welfare of society. In such narratives, a lack of faith is believed to have created the social problem of fatherlessness. Fatherlessness is, in turn, perceived as eroding the bedrock institution of family, thereby leading to broader social ills. Here, the (perceived) ecological context of society at large is said to be affected adversely by a lack of sound caregiving and faith-based programs are viewed as having an antidote to that social ailment. The solution to such problems, from the perspective of this faith-based worker, is to reinvigorate faith, particularly in the lives of men, and restore "God's order" in the home. Thus, akin to the old aphorism about charity, it would seem that faith—and the healing it can bring to the nation—must begin at home and then can radiate outward into society.

In short, secular programs define parenting not as a moral endeavor but rather as a matter of technical competency. Faith-based programs do engage this issue of technical competence by teaching parents the skills they need to be effective caregivers. However, in such programs, skills-based training is coupled with religious rationales. In secular programs, skills-based training is paramount. Thus, the pedagogy in such programs is goal-oriented in character wherein goals are defined as discrete skills, as compared with the values-oriented approach in faith-based programs.

These competing logics of service provision are congruent with the distinction that Max Weber famously drew between instrumental rationality and substantive rationality. Instrumental rationality skirts questions of ultimate value and instead esteems the most efficient means to achieve a given objective. Weber carefully detailed and, at times, lamented that science, capitalism, and modern politics are governed by instrumental rationality. Instrumental rationality is goal-directed action that places a premium on the practical utility—that is, the usefulness—of ideas and behaviors. Scientific inquiry does not entail raising questions about the inherent worth or value of a goal, but instead is simply a tool that can be employed to calculate the most efficient means of achieving it. Similarly, capitalism is a vehicle for the accumulation of wealth, but does not imbue one's work with meaning, as had been the case centuries before since Martin Luther argued that work should be treated as a calling in which the laborer's efforts were offered up in service to God. This more explicitly value-oriented approach to work, and life in general, is what Weber called substantive rationality (or value-rational action).

The distinction between the value-rational approach to parenting exhibited by faith-based organizations and the goal-rational approach found in secular agencies was clearly manifested when questions of parental discipline, and specifically corporal punishment, were raised. Given the pervasive support for this practice in the South (including its use in many Mississippi schools), we asked educators what they taught about corporal punishment as we broached the subject of child discipline. To be sure, none of the parent educators in this study endorsed corporal punishment and all tried to recommend alternative means of discipline for parents who spanked. However, many of the educators in faith-based based programs engaged corporal punishment as a moral issue. Often, the moral dimensions of child discipline were dealt with quite directly. The parent educator at Life Renewal Ministries holds a companion Bible study class to which all clients in the parenting program are invited. And, she says, all of them attend. She explains that there is a great deal of support among her clients for corporal punishment—which she dubs a "spare the rod, ruin the child" mentality. Given such widespread support for corporal punishment, she teaches a whole Bible study class on how this practice is erroneously supported by a misinterpretation of scripture.

> I have a class on parenting from the Bible. And I deal with that one scripture where it says, "Spare the rod and ruin the child." And I go through the Greek and Hebrew terms. And I tell them that a rod is rule of measure. I also tell how God has charged them to raise this child according to his own personal characteristics and personality. And you have got to look for those things. And how we have misconstrued that. I go back and talk about the rod and the staff—how they comfort people, not abuse them, not beat them. And they're like, "I never heard that. I used to go to Sunday school, or I went to church one time." And that opens another new door.

In other faith-based agencies, the moral dimensions of child discipline and physical punishment were engaged through moral means that were not explicitly religious. The parent educator at St. Andrew's explained that she stops short of explicit critiques of physical punishment. In fact, she respects the right of parents to discipline how they see fit. Given this program's use of a secular Active Parenting curriculum interjected with scriptural references at the instructor's prerogative, classes at St. Andrew's gravitate quite a bit toward skills-based training (e.g., active listening, democratic decision-making, logical consequences). Yet, at the same time, the educator at St. Andrew's raises serious questions about the ethical consequences of physical abuse—namely, the specter of child abuse defined in a broader way to include physical harm and other forms of maltreatment.

> First I tell them that each parent has to have their own idea or method of discipline. And I have been told by some whose parents were probably my age that they were never spanked. And I do not say spanking is wrong, okay? But I tell them exactly what [pause]—and they know. Most of them know, because their children have been in day care. Or they have been told that there's corporal punishment under conditions [in schools]. So, I do not tell them that you never spank—that you never ever spank or that you should. [But] we do talk about abuses, whether they are physical, mental, emotional, and psychological. We do talk about different kinds of abuses and what we consider abuses so that we are clear on what's considered abuse.

While this approach leaves open the prospect of using corporal punishment, it encourages parents to consider the moral ramifications of doing so.

Of course, a secular agency with a secular program could hardly be expected to engage in a "Bible-bash" in which scriptural verses would be scrutinized or in which novel biblical interpretations would be introduced as they are at Life Renewal Ministries. Given the goal-rational focus of such programs, corporal punishment is engaged in a different way. In secular programs, corporal punishment is often viewed as a poor tactical choice made by parents. It is a sign of ineffective parenting and is unlikely to yield the desired results. Thus, in such programs, parents are simply encouraged to use other proven (that is to say, scientific) techniques of child-rearing. The parent educator at the Neshoba Parents as Teachers program says that this pedagogical argument has proven effective. They have not had many parents who spank enroll in their program, but they take every opportunity to recommend "age-appropriate" disciplinary technique such as "redirection." Redirection is a pragmatic technique that entails distracting the child from the focus of his or her attention so as to diffuse conflicts between children or among the parent and child. The technique is a core tool in the Parents as Teachers curriculum, and workers model this practice during group meetings because children are present at these sessions:

> [We tell parents] to be realistic. And whatever discipline they choose, that it is age-appropriate. For younger children, just [use] redirection. And for older ones, what is age-appropriate … [At group meetings] you can see the redirection … If the meeting is going on and we see something that they don't need to be getting into or playing with, or if one had a toy and another one tries to take it, we will go get something else and try to help them as much as we can to model and show them what we're talking about in our lesson plans.

In this sense, the role of the parent is construed differently—that of a tactician who should exhibit an awareness of the child's developmental needs as established by a body of scientific evidence. As will be discussed shortly, this sharp divergence in understanding the parental role across program types has important consequences for how agency personnel evaluate the programs they offer. As might be expected, they do so in very different terms.

3.3.2 The Power of Organizational Culture: Divergent Missions and Motivations

In the two privately funded faith-based agencies in this study, this definition of parenting as a moral responsibility fits closely with the overall mission and, more broadly, the organizational culture, of the agency. The executive director at St. Andrew's Mission, who is a professionally trained minister, described the agency's mission in a way that resonates with the themes of moral urgency that surfaced in faith-based parent education programs when asked about what qualities they look for in those who work there. Although their program provides a good deal of skills-based training, his comments tellingly contrast the contractual relationship that traditionally characterizes the employer-employee relationship with the covenantal mission of a faith-based social service agency. The executive director of St. Andrew's explains:

> It requires a certain spirit. We are all ministers. It requires a spirit of charity. We are not providing a job for people. It's the same conditions, but a different occupation. We are driven by the spirit instead of by working hours and salary compensation. It requires readiness and availability. We all agree not to say, "My time is finished" or "My working hours are done." We are just open. I will share one story. When I was at work at the hospital, somebody was about to die. And [can I say] "My time is up" or "My time is finished?" I cannot say to dying people, "Don't die until I come back Monday morning." By the same token, if we are ministers and are driven by the spirit of charity, we cannot do that. So, I ask—require—that all the staff have this spirit, this willingness and readiness.

There are challenges associated with implementing this vision—with putting this kind of faith into action, as it were. There are times when the covenantal obligations that bear down on workers feel somewhat oppressive or overly demanding. This director's response is to encourage his workers and remind them of the good that their sacrifices yield for the community at large:

> Some staff, they haven't thought that way. But we already have this presupposition. This is our life, and we want to make our life beautiful. At the same time, we are supporting somebody else. So, we all live together. We are one. We are not above them. They are part of our lives, and we want to make all of our lives beautiful and find God in ourselves and in the people of this community. I believe that some people are still not sure—[not] one-hundred percent clear—because we broached that issue the last couple of weeks. It takes a little bit of time to have a clear vision on that. But everybody basically agrees. If we have a strong interpretation of our vision and our goal, I don't think anyone wants to refuse that kind of spirit. I believe that's the way.

This same pattern surfaced elsewhere, though it was dealt with differently. In the other privately funded faith-based agency, Life Renewal Ministries, the fifty-plus hours of training the volunteer mentors undergo is a form of boundary work that weeds out those who do not truly share the vision of the agency. Although it is difficult to generalize from these two privately funded programs, it is telling that the language and expectation of values-based service provision is most explicit in them. It was here that the covenantal focus on values, relationships, and even "spirit" was most pronounced—even more so than in publicly funded faith-based programs.

Agencies running faith-related programs approached the matter differently. Faith was not expected of those who worked there, in part because such agencies run an array of (mostly secular) programs and often received public funding. Instead, faith was often seen as a product of personal choice on the part of workers. To be sure, strong values such as commitment and discernment exhibited by workers were viewed as an organizational asset and were seen as necessary. But these values needn't express themselves as religious conviction per se. Such was the case at Our House. When asked about the qualities they look for in those who work there, the exchange was telling. The explicit focus on strong values in this organization has happened to manifest itself in having a staff for whom faith is important across the board, but from whom it is not explicitly expected:

> *Bartkowski: What qualities do you look for [in department heads and workers]?*
>
> Loyalty, common sense, and experience.
>
> *Bartkowski: Could you describe those?*
>
> Loyalty is someone who believes in the vision and mission of Our House, Inc. Someone who understands where we're going. Someone who believes it is part of their work as well as part of their lifestyle. Common sense is just basic common sense, in the sense of knowing right from wrong and taking the appropriate steps to deal with it immediately instead of later. To address the challenges as they come and not in their aftermath.
>
> *Bartkowski: Is faith related to people having these qualities you have described?*
>
> I couldn't really be a judge of that, because all our management team currently are faith-based. And I have not had one that is not … So there is no basis for comparison on that level. On a smaller level, I could maybe make some [pause]. I don't, um [pause]. I really don't [pause]. Our House is faith-based. But, at the same time, I encourage you to live the life that you will live … I encourage you not to impose that on anyone else. Because we may be of different denominations and different teachings. If someone is an atheist, it's not our responsibility to bring them over there [to religion]. Now if through the demonstration of your lifestyle, they choose to hear it, so be it. But it's not your responsibility to teach them and to tell them that what they are doing is wrong. Because there is no right or wrong. You have to respect each person's choice. I believe that on a religious level as well as on a personal level.

In secular agencies with secular programs, the hiring of staff was driven by a combination of professional training (e.g., educational degrees, workplace experience) and personal characteristics. Laudable personal characteristics were described in nonreligious terms such as "motivation" and "passion." The executive director of the Neshoba Parent Center stressed the importance of having staff who have earned degrees in elementary education and who have classroom experience given their focus on family literacy. At the same time, she stressed the strong commitment to family literacy and community service exhibited by staff. She praised the parent educator there for exhibiting such a strong commitment.

At Emerson Family School, a degree is an important criterion for holding a coordinator position. But, as the executive director explains, it is not the most important characteristic of an effective parent educator:

> [We look for] someone that can connect with the population that you are going to be serving and someone that's had some experience in that area. Have good communication skills and basically the education is not as important. Certainly, we want college-degreed people who are in those leadership roles. But I find that people who have a passion for their work and have intelligence [pause]. Motivation and attitude probably makes up about eighty-percent of their success. And their degree probably makes up less than twenty-percent of the work that they do … What I have noticed is this, and I have been doing this for nine years. I can take a person, no matter who they are, and kind of coach them to do [what they need to do]. If you have the desire and motivation to do what they [need], and you have the right fit for the job and the personality of that person and the motivation, then I can coach them into putting things together that they need to do to be successful. But the problem is [when] you can have the education and not have those other things. And then you might as well hang it up, because your program is not going to be effective. It's not going to fly. It's going to mean that it will all fall back on me. And then I will have problems because I cannot get it all to gel correctly. So education is not a major thing, [though] it is a requirement.

Thus, although secular agencies adopt a goal-rational approach to parent education, they avoid the bureaucratic tendency sometimes connected with goal-rational orientations by not reducing staff requirements to education and experience. In a word, education and experience are important but not paramount in secular agencies.

In the end, the contrast between desirable staff characteristics in faith-based and secular agencies remains quite clear. In faith-intensive agencies, one's work is treated as a calling rather than a job. In some cases, this values-oriented approach means that the worker should not compartmentalize his or her work life (ministry) and personal life as is commonly done in secular professions. In secular agencies, desirable qualities in workers include the requisite educational credentials and experience, coupled with such laudable personal characteristics as communication skills, commitment, motivation, and attitude.

3.3.3 Spirituality a la Carte: The Influence of Mississippi's Evangelical Religious Ecology

It is noteworthy that, despite the strong emphasis placed on religious conviction in faith-based programs, faith is always offered in such programs as one element in a menu of options. Through the use of creative programming techniques, faith-based programs provide spirituality à la carte.[9] This approach to faith-based service delivery is quite consonant with the widespread commitment to voluntarism (freedom of individual choice) that pervades the U.S. and its religious marketplace, as well American evangelicalism given its privileging of the individual believer developing a personal relationship with Jesus Christ. Choice is deeply woven into the social ecology of American society, and it is present in faith-based social service delivery as well. How do faith-based programs offer services that are religious in character without being seen as coercive? They have many different ways of doing so.

At Life Renewal Ministries, clients enrolled in the parenting classes are also invited to a Bible study. The director and parent educator there says that all of the participants in the parent education program accept this invitation, even though they are told explicitly that it is their choice to do so. Quite notably, the Bible study takes place at a different date and time rather than being integrated into the parenting class itself. Although the parenting class itself utilizes a faith-based curriculum, giving clients the choice about the Bible study enables them to decide for themselves the level of religious intensity they desire from the program. Where the Bible study is concerned, clients have the choice to take or leave this more intensive aspect of the program.

At St. Andrew's Mission, the parent educator preserves and respects religious choice by adopting a secular curriculum (Active Parenting) and then integrating scripture into classes on an informal as-needed basis. Several factors seem to account for this unique approach. For one, parents often do not have a choice about attending the classes. Many are court-mandated. Thus, St. Andrew's uses a widely respected curriculum (Active Parenting) and confers a certificate of completion that holds legitimacy in the eyes of Department of Human Services workers and the courts. Yet, at the same time, this program integrates religious themes on the fly to broaden the reach of the course in terms of motivating change—although without doing so in a coercive fashion. Faith in the course, then, appears in a subtle and selective fashion, often in the language of values. This orientation not only springs from the fact that many parents are court-mandated, but also from the commitment of St. Andrew's to minister across denominational lines and to reach those who are unchurched. Although this agency is affiliated with the United Methodist Church, St. Andrew's seeks to reach a diverse clientele. Interjecting faith into a secular curriculum enables them to be all things to all people. The parent educator there explains this rationale, and justifies her cautious approach to some strongly worded questions on the Faith Integration Survey that she completed prior to the interview:

> We are faith-based. Just in talking because it comes naturally to me to use a scripture, such as 'Train up children in the way they should go.' I guess that's just my nature … On our questionnaire [the Faith Integration Survey completed as part of the study], when I checked "disagree" [to questions about religious components in the program], it was not because we lower our values. But we also don't push beliefs. You know what I mean? We operate

[9]Goldman and Papson (1998).

> ecumenically. And so that is to reach all people and if we're able to be a help in doing so, then we want to do that as well. But we do not lower value systems for that. This is a faith-based program.

Similarly, in the fatherhood programs, faith is not forced on men. Even though faith is formally a part of *The 7 Secrets of Effective Fathering* curriculum, all of the parent educators in such programs were careful to say that they adapt the curriculum to meet the needs of the program participants. The parent educator in the Tunica Fatherhood Initiative serves as a good example of how this is done. This fatherhood educator is a pastor. And because he frequently writes articles on religious topics in the local paper, many men in the community are aware of his role as a church pastor. However, he is careful not to strong-arm men in the program on the subject of religion. His sensitivity toward men outside the religious fold is motivated by a combination of factors—his own unchurched background prior to becoming a pastor and his desire to show all men "the love of Christ." In his view, it is the latter of these factors that demands his demonstration of heartfelt compassion toward men rather than harsh judgment of them. When asked how men respond to the faith component in the program, he explains:

> The great apostle Paul says, "I became all things to men that I may win some." Some young men, they want to hear about God. Some don't. So, it's wherever I am [teaching] and the audience that I am with—that's what I do. And it's refreshing to them. Because being a pastor in the community, one of my goals is to win souls for Christ. But it's the way you do it. It's not just telling them about the goodness of God and all this. It's actually trying to do what Jesus would do. Because when I go places, I know a lot of them drink. I know a lot of them are what I call living in sin with a woman. But I can't be judgmental, saying "I am not going to work with you because you drink." So my goal is that I don't beat you over the head with a Bible. What I try to do is show the love from Christ, that I am going to accept you where you are. And we are going to work together. That works good for me. It works good, because all of them know that I am a pastor. I do a lot of article-writing in the paper around here about families. And they understand this. But I understand too that you're not going to get every man in the church. And you're not going to get every man to be like you. It takes time. Because I myself didn't grow up in the church. So it takes time, just talking to them and more like telling them about our [men's] spiritual thing, about the role of a man in the home, being the spiritual leader in this house. And if [they] say, "Well, we don't want to hear this," then we move on. Because I am not going to twist them and force them.
>
> *Bartkowski: Are men receptive to faith when you introduce the subject to them?*
>
> Most of them will sit there and hear you. But whether they act on it or not, you'll never know. But I have yet to hear, "Shut up, we don't want to hear anything about God."
>
> *Bartkowski: Nobody's said that to this point?*
>
> No. They might have said it in their mind [laughs].

Thus, religiously based programs are careful to cast faith as one of many resources they offer to clients. Parent educators in such programs can introduce themes of faith and spirituality to class participants while respecting their clients' choice in selecting the tools—religious or otherwise—that will best assist them in becoming better parents. In many cases, instructors don't evangelize per se and stop well short of promoting institutionalized religion. Rather, they subtly call attention to the way in which faith can provide a moral benchmark to parents who aspire to improve the care they provide to children.

3.4 Taking Stock: Self-Assessments of Faith-Based and Secular Programs

How, then, do agency personnel overseeing faith-based and secular programs evaluate the programs they offer? Do they view programs as successful and effective, or largely ineffectual? And what types of expectations for change on the part of clients undergird the evaluations proffered by agency personnel? Evaluations were largely contingent on program-specific factors such as client needs and the particular objectives that agency personnel have set for themselves. They were also contingent on extra-programmatic factors related to their role in the community. In this way, programmatic content combines with ecological context to influence self-assessments of the work conducted by parent educators.

For programs that saw a great deal of court-mandated parents (typically mothers), the clearest measure of program success hinged on whether children had been returned to the home (if they had been removed) or retained (if threatened with removal). This practical form of evaluation was used by various types of agencies—Life Renewal Ministries, St. Andrew's Mission, and Emerson Family School. Life Renewal and St. Andrew's saw themselves as more successful in helping parents to retain custody than did Emerson. The parent educator at Emerson acknowledges that they don't make an effort to record results after a family's exit from the program because that job formally falls on the Department of Human Services. But she also sees a certificate-seeking mentality in clients and in the courts that might not bode well for long-term success:

> We don't really have anything in place that follows up on these families very much after they leave here. We consider if they continue to remain in the program, to some degree that's success. We don't really get anything in writing other than just conversations with them to see how things are going in the household. But for the most part, what we have especially with the ones that have been mandated to come here, they come and they get their certificate, which is what they are looking for. It's what the judge is looking for, that they have completed these hours. If I sent something that said that they have spent six hours with me in parenting sessions, it's like, "Well, where's the certificate?" So they get their certificate and then they leave. There really is no follow-up with them. They are not required to come back to me for anything. They're all given a list of our resources here, a current calendar of events, and then they're invited to come back. But we don't have any kind of formal follow-up.

By contrast, Life Renewal puts a great deal of effort into what its director calls "after-care." This might account for the director's more positive perception of the program's long-term benefits. She explains that her agency conducts an evaluation at the end of the course, after which clients are asked to come back at least once per month for the next three months. During such after-care, the clients

> tell them the things that are going on. And you'd be surprised at what the kids say. "She didn't look at my evaluation slip last week that's on the refrigerator" and that kind of thing. Or "we're still doing good and I love it." Or "I have to remind her sometimes that this is what she's got to do."
>
> *Bartkowski: So the children are clued in?*
>
> Yes.
>
> *Bartkowski: Does that promote long-term change?*
>
> Yes.

Thus, once clients complete the program, the group after-care lasts for three months but the mentor stays with the client for six months after program completion. The director at Life Renewal Ministries contrasts this approach with workshops or seminars that are

> a one-day kind of thing … It's like they sit down, they give them a class, they do this and do this, do that. They might bring the kids in and give a couple of snacks and go away. There's no follow-up. There's no long-term care. There's no six, seven, eight, nine, ten sessions. There's maybe just the one, and they call that parenting [instruction] … And you don't get anywhere. You cannot replace what you were for twenty-one, twenty-five, fifteen [years]—we have some young parents—[much less] forty years in one hour and twenty minutes. It doesn't happen.

Despite the stark differences in follow-up, it would be unfair to draw hard and fast conclusions from these few cases. Definitions of success, which vary from one case to the next, inevitably influence agency personnel's appraisals of their programs. And both the executive director and parent educator at Emerson have a very high standard of evaluation in mind when they assess the merits of their parenting classes. As the executive director asserts:

> It's very difficult to evaluate and show successes. Random assignment [to experimental and control groups] is not possible. It's not like a classroom research study … If you think about it, we have customers. OK, at Wal-Mart, how would you do a research study on the effectiveness of something at Wal-Mart, because you have people coming and going all the time? And you have all different types of people. There is not a whole lot of commonality there. That's kind of the way we are. We're a Wal-Mart. We are open from six-thirty in the morning to eight o'clock at night. And people access our services all day long. And it depends what's going on when you're going to enter in and when you're going to leave … There is no way to control the treatment of what happens in this building.
>
> *Bartkowski: How would you evaluate the effectiveness of the program?*
>
> I think it's just like anything else, like a medical doctor. It's hit and miss. They don't have the answer. They may tell you they have, because they want you to be confident in their treatment as a physician. But in reality, it's a practice. It is not an exact science. Because you're dealing with humans, and it is difficult.
>
> *Bartkowski: Is this why you opt for individualized instruction rather than formal group classes?*
>
> Right.

In contrast to the problems with measuring success in traditional parent education classes, Even Start programs such as that at Emerson and the one administered at the Neshoba Parents as Teachers Center have clearer benchmarks. A key goal in such programs is to promote family literacy, and to do so in incremental steps consistent with the child's age-specific capabilities. As such, measuring success in these programs is a more straightforward endeavor. The Neshoba Parents as Teachers Center has had its Even Start/Parents as Teachers program formally evaluated for the past three years and the evaluations have been quite favorable. Yet, even here, the director acknowledges that success is slow in coming:

> We see lots of success with our parents. We see a better self-image that our parents have of themselves now than they did when they first began the program. The only thing that I wish were a little different is that success is slow with our clientele. But one can see why this happens. We're working with parents that don't have a high school education. They're working on their GEDs or are still in high school as a teen mom, and it's slow in coming … And it cannot be speeded up. Just like you cannot speed up a child's learning to read. It's a process, and so it happens over a period of time. And some people in the public do not understand that … success stories don't happen overnight. It is slow in coming. But over a period of three years, you do see a good deal of success. You see people getting jobs where before they didn't have a high school diploma. Now they have their GED and they're getting jobs. So, the success of the program is slow. If I could change anything, it would be a more intense program where we would be able to offer more training to parents … These are struggling people. And success stories don't happen overnight.

*****

Faith-based and secular parenting programs in rural Mississippi exhibit a number of similar characteristics in terms of programmatic content (broadly shared objective of enhancing the provision of care given to youngsters) and the provision of such programming (e.g., comprehensive delivery methods that combine classroom learning with home visits). Yet, despite such points of convergence, the distinctions between faith-based and secular providers of parent education are quite striking. These were the result of distinctions related to organizational culture and ecological context (the latter two C's in our three C's paradigm). Most importantly, this chapter revealed that secular parent education programs define parenting as a technical competency, which is essentially an outgrowth of a goal-rational organizational culture and ecological context. Goal rationality prioritizes evidence-based programs (scientifically tested curricula) and the achievement of objectively defined developmental benchmarks (e.g., literacy, motor skills, and linguistic competency).

By contrast, faith-based programs and the organizational environments in which they are situated evince a more value-rational character. This is to say that faith-based approaches to parent education define caregiving as a moral endeavor. As such, parents are charged with modeling God's love to children, nurturing the "tender spirits" of youngsters, and not shying away from the normative dimensions of parenting ("raise up children in the way they should go"). Furthermore, while the parent-child relationship is governed by tactical management of children's development in secular programs, faith-based parenting programs highlight the covenantal nature of intergenerational bonds.

Consequently, where child discipline is concerned, both secular and faith-based educators recommend against corporal punishment, but do so for different reasons. For secular parenting educators, spanking is seen as *ineffective* when compared with proven behavioral control techniques such as time-outs. Yet, for faith-based parent educators, spanking is seen as *unjust*, that is, not adequately modeling God's love and mercy to youngsters. The logics—or forms of rationality—upon which secular and faith-based parenting programs rest could not be more different.

And yet, this is not to say that secular parent educators are cold, calculating, or austere. Nor is it to suggest that faith-based parent educators forcibly foist religious or spiritual values upon their clients. The portrait painted here is considerably more nuanced. Secular parent educators readily express love and concern for children; however, their pedagogical approach to parenting privileges the transfer of tactical, scientific knowledge to their clients. And, although faith-based parent educators tend to engage in values-speak by defining parenting as a divine responsibility, they offer spirituality a la carte by adjusting the tone and intensity of religion in their message to match that which their clients seek. Faith-based parent educators are multilingual in the sense that they can speak about parental values in either religious or non-religious terms. This flexible approach to faith-based parent education is especially pronounced in publicly funded programs, given legal mandates to avoid outright proselytization.

It bears mentioning that Mississippi did not continue its faith-based fatherhood initiative into the period during which a second wave of data was collected for this volume. So, a second round of data was collected in Michigan and the Washington-Oregon area during 2010 and 2011, but doing so in Mississippi was not possible. In fact, near the end of the initial round of Mississippi data collection, some of the clients in the fatherhood programs learned that the programs were likely to be discontinued by the state. One father whose life had been changed for the better through a local fatherhood program pleaded with the researcher (Bartkowski) at the end of an interview to tell policymakers in Mississippi about the positive impact of programs like these. Ironically, the very same state that had been a welfare reform trailblazer on the heels of Charitable Choice (Faith-Based 1.0) with its Mississippi Faith and Families program decided to pull back from such work just a few years later. Follow-up data lend prescient insight into faith-based initiatives in our other two cases (Chaps. 4 and 5), but a comparable postscript and update for Mississippi is not possible. Still, important lessons can be drawn from the absence of data in the Mississippi case, where shifting state priorities and the difficult choices that are often made in the face of fiscal constraints can quickly lead to the demise of an otherwise well received program.

To what degree could we expect the patterns observed among parent education programs in rural Mississippi to be exhibited elsewhere, that is, in other states and communities? And, could we expect to arrive at similar conclusions if we compared faith-based and secular programs in other welfare service domains such as transitional housing and substance abuse treatment? It is to these important questions that we next turn. The impact of faith on social service provision stands to become clearer through a comparative exploration. With this goal in mind, our tour of the American landscape of welfare service provision continues with an exploration of transitional housing programs in Michigan.

References

Anderson, Elaine A., Julie K. Kohler, and Bethany L. Letiecq. 2002. Low-income fathers and "responsible fatherhood" programs: A qualitative investigation of participants' experiences. *Family Relations* 51: 148–155.

Bartkowski, John P. 2001. *Remaking the godly marriage: Gender negotiation in evangelical families*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Bartkowski, John P., and Christopher G. Ellison. 1995. Divergent models of childrearing in popular manuals: Conservative Protestants versus the mainstream experts. *Sociology of Religion* 56: 21–34.

Bartkowski, John P., and Helen A. Regis. 2003. *Charitable choices: Religion, race, and poverty in the post-welfare era*. New York: New York University Press.

Goldman, Robert, and Stephen Papson. 1998. *Nike culture*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Holmes, Erin K., Adam M. Galovan, Keitaro Yoshida, and Alan J. Hawkins. 2010. Meta-analysis of the effectiveness of resident fathering programs: Are family life educators interested in fathers? *Family Relations* 59: 240–252.

Kaminski, Jennifer Wyatt, Linda Anne Valle, Jill H. Filene, and Cynthia L. Boyle. 2008. A meta-analytic review of components associated with parent training program effectiveness. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 36: 567–589.

Littlefield, Marci B. 2010. Social services, faith-based organizations, and the poor. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 39: 1014–1026.

McConachie, Helen, and Tim Diggle. 2007. Parent implemented early intervention for young children with autism spectrum disorder: A systematic review. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice* 13: 120–129.

Roy, Kevin M., and Dyson Omari. 2010. Making daddies into fathers: Community-based fatherhood programs and the construction of masculinities for low-income African American men. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 45: 139–154.

Thomas, Rae, and Melanie J. Zimmer-Gembeck. 2007. Behavioral outcomes of parent-child interaction therapy and triple P–Positive Parenting Program: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 35: 475–495.

Wilson, Kristina, Patricia Gonzalez, Tony Romero, Kimberly Henry, and Christine Cerbana. 2010. The effectiveness of parent education for incarcerated parents: An evaluation of parenting from prison. *Journal of Correctional Education* 61: 114–132.

Chapter 4
Across the Continuum of Care: Transitional Housing Programs in the Midwest

For the next stop on our tour, we travel to Michigan. The state of Michigan offers a dramatic counterpoint and distinctive ecological context when compared with our Mississippi case study. Situated squarely in the Midwest, Michigan is the original home of the American automobile industry. As a stronghold of American labor unions, Michigan features an intriguing political mix. The more politically progressive urban areas of the state are complemented by rural areas that tend toward political and religious conservatism. And, during the past several decades, the state has struggled mightily with de-industrialization given the movement of domestic manufacturing overseas. Hence, in shifting our attention from Mississippi to Michigan, we have effectively moved from the Bible Belt to what some have dubbed the Rust Belt. We have also fixed our gaze on transitional housing initiatives, thereby indicating a change in focus with respect to programmatic content. The economic fallout of de-industrialization in Michigan amplified the housing crisis triggered by the mortgage-driven recession that began in 2008. Housing values in Michigan plummeted, and the state has yet to recover fully.

While statistical figures never tell the full story of homelessness, they do provide a lens on the scope of this problem within the state. Estimates suggest that Michigan had over 100,000 homeless citizens in 2010.[1] Of course, this figure may be an undercount given the difficulties presented in arriving at accurate calculations of such a transient population. And the challenges faced by Michigan's homeless population are considerably more perilous than those confronted by their counterparts in many other parts of the country. With the Great Lakes regularly dropping snow on local communities and Alberta Clipper weather patterns periodically bringing very cold weather during long winters, homelessness is a dangerous matter for Michigan residents.

In both conservative and liberal Michigan religious traditions, serving the poor, the sick, and the homeless is taken quite literally. When public services for this population have proven to be inadequate, congregations in many Michigan com-

[1]Michigan State Housing Development Authority (2010).

J. P. Bartkowski and S. E. Grettenberger, *The Arc of Faith-Based Initiatives*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90668-3_4

Table 4.1 Michigan transitional housing programs

Faith-based	Faith-intensive	Publicly funded	No public funding
			Mary's House
	Faith-related	Hope House	
		Faith House	
		Charity House	
Secular		Hospitality House	

munities have often taken matters into their own hands. Congregations provide emergency shelters for the homeless through the innovative use of their buildings and physical facilities, often rotating temporary shelters among buildings and across congregations. Additionally, many of these same congregations support these emergency housing initiatives with armies of volunteers who provide direct services to homeless people and, as needed, move equipment necessary to sustain these shelters. In many communities, makeshift domiciles have evolved into more permanent shelters run by community-based nonprofits, some of which retain their faith-based character.

This chapter explores the provision of transitional housing services to families in one mid-sized city in Michigan. Table 4.1 provides a brief description of the five programs whose services are examined in this chapter. As can be noted from Table 4.1, four programs are faith-based, albeit to varying extents, while the fifth is a secular program. And although most programs are supported by a measure of public funding, there is a program—Mary's House—that is supported solely through private donations. In 2012, the region where the programs in this study are located was estimated to have over 13,000 homeless persons, nearly one third of them children.[2]

Consistent with research conducted in Mississippi (Chap. 3) and the Washington-Oregon area (Chap. 5), in-depth interviews with staff and focus group interviews with program participants were the primary means for investigating transitional housing program dynamics. However, given the continued functioning of transitional housing programs in Michigan, this chapter has the added benefit of featuring a combination of initial data collected in 2003 and follow-up data collected in 2010–2011. (As noted in Chap. 3, comparable follow-up data could not be collected in the Mississippi case study.) By 2011, all but one of the transitional housing programs in the initial wave of the study had new directors and workers. And, of the five original programs, one faith-based program—part of a much larger multi-service agency—was no longer functioning. While we are careful not to draw sweeping generalizations from this geographically situated study of transitional housing, the additional data enrich our understanding of the complex relationship between faith and funding. For the purposes of comparability with our case study of Mississippi parenting programs and Washington-Oregon addiction recovery

[2]The Campaign to End Homelessness (2010).

programs, this investigation is animated by the same series of questions: (1) What similarities and differences are exhibited among faith-based and secular programs, particularly with respect to transitional housing program objectives and the strategies used to achieve them? (2) How, if at all, is funding related to the ways in which transitional housing programs are conducted? Is public funding linked to distinctive service provision strategies in transitional housing programs?

Once again, these empirical questions are explored with due attention to our theoretical considerations, namely, the three C's of service provision (programmatic *content*, organizational *culture*, and ecological *context*). Programmatic content in this chapter departs from that of the previous chapter because transitional housing programs have a much different focus than parent education. While parent education programs principally deliver a skills-based service to their clients, the primary focus of transitional housing is on the provision of material goods, namely, a physical residence and, sometimes, other tangible resources such as clothing. Still, life skills such as budgeting, employment referrals, and even parenting classes also may be offered to support the likelihood of attaining and maintaining housing and, at times, to foster clients' quality of life.

Moreover, the argument could be made that organizational culture is even more influential in transitional housing programs because clients have more sustained contact—in the form of actual residence—with the agency that serves them. And, as has already been indicated, the distinctions in ecological context (broader community factors, economic forces, religious markets) vary dramatically as we move from the agricultural climes of rural Mississippi to the industrial setting of this Michigan city. Before digging into the particulars of our Michigan cases, some attention to prior research on transitional housing is warranted.

4.1 Key Insights from Previous Research on Transitional Housing

Although temporary shelters assure safety in the cold of winter, longer-term housing is a preferable solution. Housing instability is particularly disruptive to families with children, as it can undermine children's educational achievement[3] and social development.[4] Transitional housing programs are often structured to assist specific segments of the homeless population. Some programs are gender-specific (e.g., targeted at serving men or women), while others aim to provide housing for families with children. Still others are focused on assisting people who are especially vulnerable to homelessness, such as veterans, persons recovering from substance abuse, or those living with a mental illness. Transitional housing programs

[3]Institute for Children, Poverty and Homelessness (2016), Biggar (2001), Zima et al. (1994), Masten et al. (1993).

[4]Haskett et al. (2016), Masten et al. (1993).

aim to empower homeless people by teaching independent living skills while providing a stable residence.[5] Transitional housing programs have been found effective in inculcating skills such as budgeting, communication, technical job training, interviewing, resume writing, and leadership skills.[6] Other benefits include networking, housing referrals, and counseling services for program participants.[7] Some transitional housing programs have helped clients gain and maintain long-term permanent employment and housing while teaching problem-solving techniques to cope with social, emotional, and economic difficulties.[8] These successful programs followed earlier federal initiatives that met with more limited success.[9]

What, then, can be said of faith-based housing programs? Available evidence is limited, but suggests that faith-based housing programs can provide critical resources to their clients (e.g., job assistance, residence, transportation, benefits access), particularly for the chronically homeless.[10] Faith-based service providers vary in the degree to which they explicitly integrate religious components into their assistance efforts. However, they generally offer intangible forms of support such as hope and spiritual development,[11] with positive client outcomes in emotional well-being (e.g., sense of efficacy) and behavioral health (e.g., reduced drug use and sexual risk).[12] Religious individuals often report the greatest benefit in religious programs, while secular services are rated well for providing a supportive environment.[13]

Direct comparisons between faith-based and secular providers of transitional housing are few in number. As noted in Chap. 2, a study in Grand Rapids, Michigan found some indications of a more holistic orientation among faith-based providers.[14] Faith-based staff persons were generally viewed as more caring and motivated by values such as justice, dignity, and spiritual development. However, questions remain about the meaning of the term holistic in the Grand Rapids study and, more broadly, in the field of welfare service provision. As we and other researchers[15] have noted, the term holistic can be defined quite differently by various service providers, clients, or researchers. On the one hand, holistic can entail addressing clients' spiritual welfare along with more practical targets for improvement. On the other hand, holistic can be defined as bundling together an

[5]Washington (2002).
[6]Ferguson et al. (2007).
[7]Washington (2002).
[8]Ferguson et al. (2007), Washington (2002).
[9]Washington (2002).
[10]Bass (2009).
[11]Ferguson et al. (2006).
[12]Ferguson et al. (2007).
[13]Tsai et al. (2011).
[14]Goggin and Orth (2002).
[15]Aron and Sharkey (2002).

array of services—none of them spiritual—to meet a broad set of practical needs exhibited by clients (housing, food assistance, employment counseling, medical care, etc.). Therefore, considerable caution is warranted in concluding that faith-based services are provided to homeless persons in a more holistic fashion.

Transitional housing programs, which typically provide support and housing for up to two years, remain part of the broader effort to help homeless people achieve permanent housing. However, in more recent years, homelessness researchers and advocates have begun questioning the efficiency and effectiveness of the transitional housing model.[16] Consequently, an alternative Housing First model has gained ground in the past decade or so. The Housing First model is predicated on the provision of longer-term, even permanent, housing and jettisons common transitional housing stipulations such as demonstrated client sobriety prior to placement in a residence.[17] The persistent prevalence of chronic homelessness—repeated spells of homelessness evident among 10% of the broader homeless population, many of whom have mental health and substance abuse conditions—has contributed to the rise of the Housing First approach.[18] This approach views stable housing as a foundational, first-order resource and precursor to other changes in life circumstances and behaviors.[19] The Housing First approach is different than the transitional programs featured in this chapter. The Housing First approach has considerably more front-end investment costs, which are largely prohibitive for faith-based organizations or community-based nonprofits. Still, government run Housing First programs have met with some success that includes reduced hospital stays and incarceration.[20] Impacts on substance use and mental health, to date, have not been as positive.[21]

4.2 The Faith-Funding Nexus in Transitional Housing: Evidence of an Elective Affinity

Our turn to transitional housing in Michigan fixes our focus on more tangible dimensions of programmatic content. Few things are more tangible than the brick and mortar resources that housing programs need to survive, along with the money that is necessary to provide a domicile to homeless persons. Where transitional housing in Michigan is concerned, there is an elective affinity between funding source and the centrality of faith in programming. The idea of an elective affinity was initially introduced into the social science lexicon by the early twentieth

16 Thiele and McDonald (2012).

17 Casey (2007), Pearson et al. (2007).

18 Rynearson et al. (2010).

19 Pearson et al. (2007), Rynearson et al. (2010).

20 Culhane et al. (2002).

21 Groton (2013).

century sociologist Max Weber[22] in his analyses of cultural values and distinctive historical trajectories. An elective affinity, translated from German as kindred by choice, is the tendency for two otherwise distinct phenomena—in Weber's famous case, theological convictions and economic arrangements—to be coupled or linked together. The case of transitional housing programs in Michigan suggests the presence of an elective affinity between faith components of a program and its funding (the faith-funding nexus, for short). This elective affinity generally works out as follows: exclusively private funding is linked to faith-intensive programs while public funding is more prominent in programs that have a faith-related character. The discussion that follows illustrates that faith-related programs whose parameters for offering overtly religious program content already align with the guidelines of public funding have little reason to limit those sources of funding, while faith-intensive programs refuse it.[23]

On the side of the continuum that composes the faith-funding nexus is faith-intensive Mary's House. Expressions of faith are infused into virtually every facet of programmatic content and organizational culture at Mary's House. Within this agency, faith figures into determinations about the clients chosen to receive services. At Mary's House, the values of a client—and her openness to participation in faith-oriented activities—can affect the receipt of services, such that a religious client will be seen as more aligned with the values of the organization. Faith also plays a prominent role in the actual provision of services, with Mary's House clear from the outset about its emphasis on religious participation (e.g., prayer, worship). The cultural ties at Mary's House are binding and obligatory, factors for which this agency does not apologize. In fact, the employees at Mary's House are themselves quite religious, talking quite openly about their faith commitments during field interviews.

Faith-intensive Mary's House reported an annual operating budget of $85,000 in 2010, all of which was privately donated. Mary's House intentionally steers clear of public funding, choosing instead to draw private support from a network of about forty local churches and private donations from various benefactors. While these churches provide monetary donations, this entrepreneurial agency is also noteworthy for its enlistment of in-kind donations. In-kind donations are non-monetary materials or services that nonprofits use to enhance the implementation of their programs. At Mary's House, in-kind donations often take the form of baby supplies, furniture, and basic household goods that stock the homes in which participants live. In short, Mary's House is an excellent example of how a commitment to private funding, in-kind donations, and a willingness to stay small can be quite intentional in order to allow faith-intensive programming. Leaders at Mary's House

[22]Weber (2001).

[23]Our conclusion on this score is derived not only from the cases featured in this chapter, where we admittedly have just one faith-intensive agency. It is supported by data presented in Chaps. 3 and 5 as well.

relish the freedom to integrate faith into their programming as they wish without the strictures or expectations that accompany government funding.

The financial circumstances at Mary's House also reveal how operating budgets have both an objective and subjective character. In an objective sense, the budget at Mary's House is rather meager. Among the programs featured in this study, Mary's House has the smallest annual operating budget, a mere one percent of the agency with the largest operating budget. However, for faith-intensive Mary's House, the objective *dollar value* of the budget is less important than the subjective *cultural value* of remaining unfettered from government regulations, thereby allowing the freedom to pursue their program's religious content. In this way, the unflinching religious convictions that undergird programming at Mary's House and that form the core of this agency's organizational culture are given a higher priority than the size of its operating budget. Therefore, the old saying, "Where you stand depends on where you sit" applies. Where people stand at Mary's House (acceptance of the size of their budget) is very much a product of where they sit (their unflagging commitment to the religious values at the heart of their organization's culture).

Beyond the question of dollar values versus cultural values, evaluations of the budget at Mary's House are very much a matter of perspective. The operating budget at Mary's House may seem rather small to the onlooker when compared with other transitional housing programs in the area. However, perhaps budget comparisons are not the appropriate measure of success. At Mary's House, such comparisons clearly do not win the day. Staff persons at Mary's House are quite content with the unambiguously faith-based quality of the services they offer and the faith-driven values and outcomes they seek. To this point, the budget at Mary's House grew by an impressive 70% from 2003 to 2010 (see Table 4.2). The expansion of a $50,000 annual budget in 2003 to about $85,000 in 2010 is all the more impressive when considering the impact of the Great Recession, which began at the close of 2008, on funding in the nonprofit world. So, in this regard, Mary's House can be seen as programmatically robust and, within their cultural context, financially successful.

By contrast, the largest faith-based program in terms of the number of clients served at the initial point of data collection was Hope House. Hope House was a program with a budget of $130,000, almost all from public grants, including those received from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Hope House was capable of serving up to sixteen women and their children at one time. Hope House also received considerable in-kind donations from private sources. Such donations included Christmas gifts for residents and their children from a local women's service club.

The shift to the past tense in reviewing the programming dynamics at Hope House is intentional. By the time follow-up fieldwork was conducted in 2010, Hope House was closed. Although the housing part of the program was gone, some elements of Hope House's supportive services were absorbed into another program within its Church Affiliated Social Services (CASS) parent agency. While Hope House's program budget of $130,000 may seem large in comparison to, say, Mary's House (total operating budget of $85,000), Hope House's budget

Table 4.2 Michigan transitional housing agencies' funding sources and budgets

Agency	Faith status	Government funding ($)	Total budget ($)	Gov't funding as % of total budget (%)
Hospitality House Funding—time 1	Secular	184,775	384,749	48
Funding—time 2		236,081	519,993	45
CASS (Hope House) Funding—time 1	Faith-related	7,924,000	10,108,000	78
Funding—time 2		7,755,000	9,158,000	85
Faith House Funding—time 1	Faith-related	327,643	567,062	58
Funding—time 2		432,327	769,927	56
Charity House Funding—time 1	Faith-related	118,648	226,846	62
Funding—time 2		108,549	269,086	40
Mary's House Funding—time 1	Faith-intensive	0	50,000	0
Funding—time 2		0	85,000	0

represented less than 1.5% of the total agency budget at CASS. In spite of closing Hope House, the community's largest transitional housing program for women with children, the larger agency is still operating numerous other types of other programs for families and children.

The disparate trajectories exhibited by Mary's House and Hope House underscore an important insight. The assumption is sometimes made that privately funded programs are quite vulnerable given their reliance on the benevolence of private philanthropic support. However, in this case, privately funded Mary's House was able to withstand the adverse effects of the economic downturn because it had cultivated durable relationships with private donors who were committed to its sustainability through the Great Recession. By contrast, CASS's reliance solely on a public revenue stream to fund Hope House seems to have led to the program being dismantled.

The remaining three programs, one secular and the others faith-related (less intensively religious), reported a mix of private and public funding that was similar across agencies and that generally remained consistent within each agency at both points in time (2003 and 2010). All three of these agencies had and continued to have relatively balanced revenue sources. Where public funding was concerned, Faith House received 58% of its funding from government sources in 2003, compared with 57% in 2010. Secular Hospitality House was similarly consistent across time (48% from government funds in 2003, compared with 45% in 2010). In short, these organizations managed to maintain nearly identical proportions of public funding sources over the two points in time, a feat that Hope House could not accomplish. Charity House experienced a relative decrease in government sources of funding as a proportion of the total agency budget (from 62% of its budget in 2003 to 40% in 2010). Much of this change was due to an increase in private funding, although there was a small reduction in public funding. An important conclusion to draw from these patterns is that these community-based organizations had the ability to increase private funding in a poor economy. Indeed, all four of the smaller agencies saw increases in their overall budgets during this time, while the much larger agency, CASS, experienced a significant retrenchment (discussed in more detail below).

An examination of agency financial documentation also proved to be quite revealing. For two agencies, there were differences between director reports and IRS annual 990 reports of funding sources. Faith House's director overstated government funding as 70% of the agency budget, while the director of Charity House stated that they received no public funding except for a small stipend from the state. The latter estimated that 85% of her agency's budget was generated from private donations. However, the 990 tax forms showed much less public funding for Faith House and much more for Charity House. Because both 990s were prepared by professional accounting firms, these reports seem more likely to reflect funding sources accurately.

Possible explanations about the curiously divergent perspectives on government funding and possible implications about organizational identity can be discerned from disparities in the stated versus actual revenue streams of social service agencies. Two possible explanations point in quite different directions. First, while we are not in a position to impute motive, an organization that begrudgingly relies on government funding might be inclined to minimize its dependence on public revenue streams for the same reason that welfare is decried, namely, that the receipt of such funds is contrary to self-reliance and highly subject to the direction that political winds happen to be blowing. Within such agencies, purchase-of-service contracts with government entities might be viewed as a sort of Faustian bargain at best, leading to an understatement of its reliance on governmental support. Within the context of these executive directors' comments about government funds, this explanation seems unlikely. Second, there is also the possibility that faith-based agencies that temper faith elements in their programs even as they accept government funding simply do not find the role of government funding of enough concern to dissuade them from pursuing such revenue streams. Additionally, if funding is filtered through intermediary organizations, it might be viewed as non-public funding. Of course, it is possible that a combination of these two interpretations is the best explanation of the discrepancy observed here.

Rather surprisingly, Hospitality House, the only secular program, received proportionately less public money than any of the publicly funded faith-based groups initially. In 2003, public funds received by Hospitality amounted to less than half of its total operating budget. By 2010, Hospitality House still trailed these two faith-based organizations in the proportion of funds drawn from a public source.

Faith-based organizations that pursued public funding typically received it for the agency as a whole. Relying quite heavily on private grants and donations, very little of Hospitality's private funding came from religious sources.

The budget for CASS, the parent agency of the ultimately closed Hope House, reveals a very different picture from the other organizations. Unlike the other agencies, this large agency with an initial budget of approximately \$10 million had seen a reduction in revenue of nearly \$1 million or 10% between 2003 and 2010 (see Table 4.1). This lost revenue equaled at least twice the total budget of any of the other organizations. Further, the proportion of public funding is very different. At CASS, an agency that is part of a faith-based national federation, public funding increased from 78% of its total budget to 85%, with the latter being much greater than any of the other agencies. Here, as in other ways, the remaining agencies resembled each other far more than they resembled CASS. While a range of explanations are certainly possible, sheer organizational size seems a likely suspect, more so than faith-based content as an influencing factor with respect to the ability of agencies to preserve their transitional housing programs. In this particular case, heavy reliance on government grants seems to have left a large program in a large agency vulnerable to closing programs even though the larger agency seems to have survived the downsizing fairly intact. It is unknown how loss of the much smaller transitional programs at any of the other agencies might have affected the agency's survival, or whether any of the others could have survived retrenchment to smaller budgets as did this larger organization.

4.3 Government Funding and Faith Intensity in Transitional Housing Programs

As noted in Chaps. 3 and 5 and reaffirmed in this chapter, there is an elective affinity between government funding and the content of social service programs. The transitional housing programs examined here shed additional light on this issue. When public funding was secured, the programs and agencies were affected by the requirements of funding. Among transitional housing programs featured here, the receipt of public funds was due to leadership's willingness to limit inclusion of religious elements in programs. Thus, public funding was not perceived as a barrier or unacceptable sacrifice for any provider except the most overtly religious program.

That one program, Mary's House, insisted on the freedom to include religion and mandates for religious participation in its program in a manner of its own choosing. For Mary's House staff and board, the regulation of religion that would be imposed with public funding was viewed as incompatible with the mission of the agency. Thus, given the centrality of religious values to the organizational culture at Mary's

House, this agency chose and still chooses not to accept any public funds. In doing so, they remain free to offer Christianity and even require Bible study and attendance at worship as integral parts of its intervention with the women it served. In this way, then, Mary's House was influenced by public funding, if only by its persistent opposition to the pursuit of those funds. In 2003, the director of Mary's House put the matter this way.

> We made an active decision to be faith-based … It gives us the freedom to make the girls go to church on Sunday, to offer Christianity … We reach fewer girls. It limits what is offered here. It's hard to find people who'll work for the money. We can't afford [hiring] our own counselor.

When asked how the acceptance of public funds would likely affect their program, the 2010 director of Mary's House offered comments that resonate with those of her predecessor.

> We don't want to have to give up our focus on religion and talking to the women about Christ. So we don't accept government funding because then you have to get into what you can and can't say to your residents. We've also [confronted this situation] since United Way changed their, they made a change [that] they don't want you talking about religion either. So we are not even affiliated with them. It's very important to us to be able to teach the women about how to live a Christian life.

This robust agency-level commitment to maintaining religious content in the program is seen as freedom from government or funder mandates. This approach allows unfettered opportunity for client immersion in the cultural values and attendant program that permeate this type of faith-based organization. Clients in privately funded residential programs receive intensive and prolonged exposure to the religiously infused cultural ethos for which they strive. Mary's House views this situation not as a curtailment of client choice but an opportunity to model values it wishes to transmit to clients. This commitment to continued privatization remained consistent despite leadership changes within Mary's House, underscoring how organizational cultures may be preserved even in the wake of director transitions. Consequently, Mary's House remains profoundly faith-based and overtly Christian, with mandatory attendance at key religious activities offered as part of their program. And, because of changes in United Way's funding stipulations as indicated in the quote featured above, Mary's House does not need to speculate about what might happen if they accepted public funds. They faced this very challenge with United Way and decided to decline the monies offered by this funding source.

The impact of the United Way decision reverberated throughout the program as Mary's House sought to stay viable financially. The alternative funding it pursued came from local foundations, some of them religious, as well as from individual contributions and church donations. And yet, rather amazingly, even within a constrained funding environment, the effort of Mary's House to hold true to their vision was accompanied by budget growth, not decline. Still, the current director of Mary's House is quick to point to the continued vulnerability of this program and the sacrifices they have made to remain viable: “Well, we run on a shoestring. We’re always struggling. We’ve been here fifteen years, so it’s not like we’re going to fold. But it’s a struggle. All our staff are underpaid and we need a new furnace, that kind of thing.”

In contrast to Mary’s House, the scope and manner of faith expression of the remaining transitional housing organizations was viewed as largely unaffected by public funding guidelines. Directors of other organizations readily accepted the funding to support programs seen as vital to the community. Directors at Charity House in 2003 and in 2010 argued that religion was often helpful to people, but were content with and even preferred what might be seen as either its more subtle expression in their agency or as a faith expression in which being non-directive in programming for clients is the best reflection of their faith context. They contended that the expression of their faith is grounded in relationships with residents, principally centered on the staff’s and volunteers’ attitudes toward residents. Here, acting with compassion is seen as the best expression of their faith. Asked about the religious affiliation of her agency, Charity’s 2010 director offered the following observation.

> We see ourselves as non-denominational. We don’t profess any faith because we don’t want to intrude that on anyone. If they want to talk religion, we talk. But we don’t force it on anyone. We make things available for them to read, to search on their own. If they’d like to sit and talk, we do that. I know that there are others that you have to attend certain things, prayer meetings and stuff. We try not to do that and what I find is, you get [guests] to a comfort level where they are more likely to want to talk about certain things … But they know it is not being put on them.

Quite noteworthy in the foregoing statement are comments that speak to the boundaries that Charity House draws with respect to faith. At Charity House, faith is a private matter that should not involve an agency’s intrusion or imposition of specific beliefs and practices on clients. Rather, their approach could be described as *religion in reserve*. Faith is a language they are willing to speak, but only at the client’s initiative after they have searched on their own and arrived at a personal comfort level with such issues. So, whereas religion is a public obligation at Mary’s House, it is very much an individual option at Charity House. These divergent approaches also run deeply through organizations reflecting different religious denominations.

Directors of the other organizations point to additional documentation that is required of them when receiving public funds, but see few drawbacks with respect to their preferred program approach. The executive director of CASS, Hope House’s parent agency, saw the use of government funds as unavoidable and perhaps even an obligation given the need in the community: “We felt at the time that it was the only way to go. We are the shadow state. The state can’t do this as efficiently. We do need to find partners and not just rely on government funding one hundred percent. Business and churches should also contribute.”

There was, however, some diversity of views with respect to the influence of public funding on the programs run by these organizations. The director of Charity House saw public funding as having no impact on its transitional housing program.

Others, such as the director of Faith House, acknowledged the constraints of public funding with respect to religious expression, but saw no problem with them. In fact, she focused on the benefits brought about through securing public funding, beyond simply having additional revenue available. This director began in a somewhat ambiguous vein. However, the comment soon emphasized the positive qualities that public funding brings to their agency—that is, adherence to sound organizational and fiscal management—as well as, ostensibly, other agencies that receive it.

> The only problem is with separation of church and state. They really do not monitor but they make it a condition not to proselytize … We are not in the business of saving souls. It's not our philosophy or theology. Clients are manipulated enough by others. They don't need to be manipulated spiritually. One good thing is that government funding requires outcomes. It makes us more organized. It helps you organize and realize how and why you do things. It's a good thing. Financial management is required.

The director of Hospitality House, a secular agency and the primary local program serving families that included fathers and older sons, discussed the recent history of funding for homeless services. Given the inadequacy of this funding, she offered a larger view on the requirements for assessment attached to public funds, arguing that everyone engaged in the cause should work together to increase funding given that such efforts all help people who are homeless. In her eyes, documenting the significant needs of the homeless population through the assessment and reporting of services provided is critical to arguing for more support of homeless services:

> My view is, although sometimes you have to jump through hoops initially that we're resistant [to], in the end the outcome of the requirements of the government are better for all of us, for the nation. You can't just talk about yourself. All the data collection that we have to do, whether it is required now by the government agency, gives us credence nationally. [Data] gives us credence with people, with our funders, with politicians, with everything. So although we balked against it initially, that's what we do. We need to do [it] and we don't want to change it.

Therefore, publicly funded agencies were quick to call attention to some of the expectations imposed by government funding. However, in general, they did not portray these expectations as overly onerous. Indeed, several emphasized the significant upside of government funding, which included continued organizational viability, the ability to serve more people, and respect for client preferences. Of course, secular program contacts were also not lacking in their criticism of government funding, as indicated through comments shared by Hospitality House's first executive director. This director recognized that, in some circumstances, the need to secure funds gets overtaken by reporting complications. She explained that, in general, "We take money wherever we can get it." And yet, this comment was followed by an important caveat: "We used to accept funds from MHSDA (the state housing authority), but the reporting got too complicated."

4.4 Evidence of Faith

So, broadly speaking, public funding is perceived as having diverse effects on transitional housing programs. In what ways, then, is faith evident in areas such as programmatic content and structure, manner of religious expression, interagency collaboration, program objectives, and participant experiences?

4.4.1 Programmatic Content and Structure

The content and structure of programs seem to be influenced by faith. This conclusion is supported by the types of housing that are offered, the expectations of program participants, and the manner in which staff interact with program participants. Here again, the key points of distinction are evidenced not only between secular and faith-based providers. They are also evident among the faith-based programs themselves. Similarities and differences emerge in both cases.

The point of entry into programs was the first important similarity evident among all programs. All screened for program participants who seemed likely to be successful in their programs. For example, one faith-based program's case manager pointed to a requirement that "we want them in school or working. We don't deviate from that. It shows you're willing to work." Hospitality House, which also ran an emergency shelter program, only accepted families coming through their own shelter. In this sense, the shelter is a pipeline for potential residents into the transitional housing program, but also a screening mechanism, one through which selection criteria could be carefully applied. And, Hospitality House, like several faith-based programs, tested for drugs and excluded from further consideration any resident who was currently using drugs. The presence of active mental illness was handled with great caution, particularly when residents shared common spaces in the residence. Interviews were a popular screening tool, while at least one faith-based program's staff person also stated that she prayed about whom to admit once she had completed the other parts of the application process.

The actual way in which housing was provided varied. All the faith-related programs owned single site housing for their transitional programs.[24] Two had residents living together in houses that had been donated to the program, while a third used single-family homes on the blocks by program offices. Hope House's program was in a sixteen-unit apartment complex. In an intriguing point of distinction, secular Hospitality House did not own and provide the actual housing, using the model of scattered site housing.[25] Their residents were assisted in locating appropriate low-cost housing and provided support services such as assistance locating subsidies and linkage to other needed resources, such as parenting classes,

[24]Burt (2006).

[25]Burt (2006).

employment, and household furnishings. Owning the property where families lived offered all of the faith-based organizations a measure of control over their residents' activities and, perhaps more importantly, access to them.

Rules were especially prevalent in shared housing facilities. Hope House prohibited the presence of men after nine o'clock in the evening at its apartment complex. While this rule could be seen as an effort to control residents, it was also intended to provide its female residents with privacy and safety, neither of which most of their residents had experienced just prior to their entry into the program. The women at Charity House lived together in a house owned by the program where they, too, were prohibited from having men in their living quarters. Mary's House had the most stringent expectations, such as not drinking, forbidding men in the house, and attending Christian services on Sunday morning. At the later interviews, expectations for Mary's House had become even more stringent, such that Bible studies and weekly devotions at the house had become mandatory. In the past, these activities were simply encouraged as available options.

Rules at programs, then, were aimed at requiring certain program activities and placing some limits on social contact, especially women's contact with men. Many program participants accepted the imposition of such rules as an inevitable trade-off for the services provided. In fact, if they found the rules objectionable enough, they were not likely to be in the program and would not have been interviewed. Nevertheless, not all residents found the rules acceptable at first blush. One female resident offered a critical comment on her program's requirement that women be in their residence, with no company, by nine o'clock each night. Yet, she has gradually adjusted to this program requirement.

> I was like "Oh, God. I got a curfew?" Company has to be gone at this time? I wasn't used to it because I hadn't been through a program like [this] before. [But] throughout the month of being here, I understood why they did it that way. They give you time to think and relax to get yourself back on track. It was kind of hard to adapt. Your family has to be gone at this time and you have to be in at that time. It was hard to be grown with children to adapt to that, but if you have to, you will.

While, in hindsight, some program participants believed the rules were helpful and provided needed structure, others still living in program housing found the rules quite restrictive and chafed at them. Women at one faith-based program were upset by restrictions on their ability to have people in their rooms. Such disagreement emerged in a focus group interview, with one participant stating, "I mean, I understand the men thing," but another woman quickly following up on this remark by raising the question, "Why can't our children have their friends in their rooms and play with Barbies or cars or something like that?" Some programs intentionally instituted a series of strict rules to attract the types of clients they desired. The worker at Mary's House, with its rules against swearing and having sex, along with curfews said, "Some girls aren't ready for that. They leave the house." Thus, women who are not already willing to accept some number of religiously focused rules, rules that do not affect their ability to maintain housing, are excluded from the program.

4.4.2 Expressions of Faith

What, then, can be made of the dynamics of faith expression within the programs? Recall that the expression of faith is one of the key axes of faith integration in agencies (see Chap. 2). On this point, faith-based agencies show considerable diversity. There is little overt evidence of faith in the programs that receive public dollars, with faith elements in these programs operating somewhat like an underground stream, periodically visible on the surface but seemingly a constant in the depths of the programs. In this sense, there are periodic glimmers of faith. But, in most of the programs, the difference between being faith-based or secular is that workers in faith-based programs believe that they have permission to consider faith as part of their work, even if only in understanding their work as an expression of their personal faith. So, faith may be evidenced in subtle, yet potentially powerful ways not readily visible to the observer, including the residents themselves. Still, there is wide variation in how the generally muted expression of faith occurs in the individual programs and agencies.

The differences are quite clear between the faith-based agencies that accepted funding and the one that did not. At privately funded faith-intensive Mary's House, the overt expressions of faith throughout the program are complemented by the Board of Directors holding a spiritual retreat. At CASS, faith expression is more subdued, such that committees open their meetings with a prayer and religious symbols can be found on the waiting room wall. And while Mary's House holds Bible studies that residents are expected to attend, Charity and Faith Houses have Bibles in office bookcases if residents wish to use them. Charity House's model, expressed in such ways as referring to residents as "guests," is informed by a combination of religious tradition and basic etiquette about showing appropriate hospitality to those who visit one's home.

Still, if participants are seeking religion, they typically will find it available at the faith-based programs even if it is not overtly expressed there. One faith-based program participant described her ability to access religious offerings through her ongoing interactions with a worker:

> We had kind of an issue … so [we said], "We're going to see what God says." I know I prayed and she prayed and then she invited me to church. And I was beginning to go to church with her. I was saved. Now it's my church.
>
> *Grettenberger: Did you say that you brought it up with [the worker] or that [she] just invited you to go to church?*
>
> I kind of asked, "What church do you go to?" She told me. She asked me, "Do you want to go to church?" I was like, "Yes."

She and another participant expressed appreciation for the inclusion of religion in the program. The other had not attended worship services for three or four years, yet reported praying with volunteers who came to clean the house, and offered this description: "I like it [praying]. I feel good. I'm going to start going back to church. I want my kids to get into it."

Participants at another program seemed to feel supported in their faith by the executive director, who had considerable contact with them. As one participant described, “I know when [the director] and I met, she always asked me what I am doing for me. I would tell her everything I have going on. She’s like, ‘Do you do anything just for fun, just for you?’ And I’ll bring up church and the different activities that we have at church. That’s how that’s come up. She would always ask me was I still singing in the choir ‘cause she knows I love that so.”

4.4.3 Collaboration as a Shared Cultural Touchstone

So, how connected were the agencies and programs to each other? The breadth and relative agreement among agencies about what they are trying to accomplish is reflected in their seemingly good relationships. A commitment to interagency collaboration was woven into the fabric of housing services by public funding expectations and by the caring attitude of the staff at these agencies. In this sense, the organizational cultures of these agencies were connected by a common thread, namely, collaboration rather than competition. For example, all the programs accessed the services of another local faith-based agency which met emergency and basic needs, including new home setup such as furniture and other household goods. This faith-based agency, in turn, was a center for the coordination of goods and services donated by congregations and individuals in the community. For many years, this other agency managed a centralized community effort to ensure that all families in need received the makings for Thanksgiving and Christmas dinners, complete with turkey or ham.

Collaboration was in part an outgrowth of the receipt of federal funds by several programs, as Housing and Urban Development (HUD) grants require recipients to coordinate services through a community-level continuum of care model. One purpose of the continuum is to avoid the duplication of services within a given community. However, where homelessness is concerned, such duplication is a remote possibility given the paucity of services in the face of such great need. Indeed, the overwhelming number and needs of the homeless populations in this community touched all these programs. Recognizing how small their programs were in comparison to the large number of families and individuals who were homeless, staff seemed to blend a focus on the people they could help with an almost resigned hope that someone else might manage to pick up the pieces. The desire to help people overshadowed any reluctance staff might otherwise have had to refer people to programs that had a particular amount of faith content or a specific faith orientation.

When asked how they handle referrals, several agency directors and program managers spoke of their waiting lists and of the difficulty associated with telling people who needed services to try one of the other five agencies. Given the volume of calls they were all receiving, the proportionately tiny number they could house, and the fact that the programs typically house people for between ten months and two years, referring clients elsewhere was nearly always an exercise in futility. Several staff described getting ten to fifteen requests for help per day, when all the programs in the network were completely full. Here, faith seemed to be the only way they knew to deal with their own feelings about being able to help so few of the multitudes of people coming to them. The executive director of Charity House offered this thought about how few people her program can help in comparison to the extensive need in her community: "I have to let the rest of them be in His [God's] hands (sighing), you know. And that they will be okay until I get to them again. It's the only thing I can do."

Amidst this extensive collaboration, there were nevertheless pockets of isolation and some divisions. For instance, one of the faith-based transitional housing programs for families that had been contacted to participate in the initial wave of data collection refused to do so. This relatively large agency offered shelter and meals to chronically homeless people, but is known to require participation in Christian religious activities. Hence, this organization was considerably less connected to counterpart agencies in the area. When staff at the programs that agreed to participate in the study were asked whether there were other programs serving families outside the network to which they belonged, they tentatively identified this more sectarian Christian program. None seemed quite certain of the nature of its services, and all indicated that there was not collaboration between their programs and this more isolated sectarian program. Efforts by the Michigan researcher (Grettenberger) to invite participation from this sectarian agency elicited responses that seemed protective of the organization, perhaps indicating distrust of a researcher inquiring into the programming of faith-based organizations. The lack of collaboration with the other programs seemed to suggest an organization whose values led it to be quite closed to outside influences. Thus, organizational cultures can, in some circumstances, promote isolation rather than inclusion. Several program staff expressed regrets that they had been unable to connect with this other organization even though they had made efforts to do so. The inaccessibility of the missing faith-based organization suggests deeper differences between the programs or agencies with the most faith content. But, of course, without direct access to such an organization, any conclusions on this front are speculative.

The desire for greater collaboration with this sectarian agency had a more pragmatic purpose for Hospitality House's director. She pointed to the impact of faith-based agencies separating themselves from collaboration to document the need for funding and resources for homeless programs in communities.

> I talked to one agency in town that is completely faith-based, and it is not going to tend to take government funding. But then you still need [service delivery] numbers. So far, we've had fairly good luck with getting [those from them]. Well, they won't put [data] in but they'll let somebody come in and do it. So we get it [here while] some counties can't get the faith-based [programs] to participate.

4.4.4 Similar Objectives

The transitional housing programs featured here share a strong core purpose, specifically, to ensure that their families secure and keep permanent housing upon completing the program. While this end-goal may seem intuitively obvious, it defies assumptions of some outside observers who charge that faith-based organizations are simply using their programs as vehicles for the dissemination of religious messages. The agencies and programs in this study do not fit this critique. Numerous life skills that commonly function as barriers to client success are taught as part of the programs. Throughout the interviews, there emerged a theme of meeting people where they are and working with them holistically. All the programs shared an understanding that people's lives are complicated, with homelessness serving as one of many problems, one that may be either a cause or symptom of other problems their families are experiencing. All the programs sought to improve the quality of people's lives in concrete ways. They all recognized a need for people's attitudes and behaviors to change if their difficult life circumstance and problems of their families were to improve.

In the initial wave of data collection, program staff from all five programs, secular and faith-based, articulated their desire to help resident families improve as many dimensions of their lives as possible. Responding to open-ended questions about what they envision as success for the participants, the responses expressed an overall hope that people's lives, especially those of children, would be markedly improved by completing the program. Without exception, acquiring and maintaining stable housing was viewed as the most desirable outcome. Beyond this widely held goal, and reflecting their holistic approach, all the programs envisioned other related outcomes as well, including stable employment, financial circumstances, educational advancement for adults and school success for children. The director at Charity House pointed to the link between employment and having an education, giving the following example of an interaction with a client with young children:

> She was struggling, going to these little jobs cleaning houses. Her oldest was going to start school this year. I said, "This is an opportunity. There's grant money out there. Get you some grant money. Get an education while they're little and you'll have the day care. Go get your education." [So she started school] and I thought, oh, how neat! She will be better able to provide for these children when they are bigger. And [she won't have] this drudgery [of] scrubbing floors.

While the development of concrete skills was a uniform objective, staff recognized the importance of less tangible outcomes that do not lend themselves to measuring or monitoring. Improving quality of life, self-sufficiency, and emotional well-being were identified by staff across the full range of agencies. One such outcome was shared by three programs, Hope House, Charity House, and Mary's House, that served only women and their children. These faith-based programs, while divergent in the extent and manner of faith expression, shared a desire for women to become more empowered in their relationships with men. The first executive director at Mary's House, in a clear reflection of their religious values, expressed a hope that her program's women would someday marry. At the same time, she also wanted them to "learn they don't need to have a man in the house to feel good about themselves." Speaking to the relationships between the women Mary's House serves and their men, the director invoked language of her faith to express a broader notion, identifying one goal for the women as being for them to recognize they "have authority in all areas of [their] lives."

The executive director of Charity House in 2010 echoed earlier comments for her agency. She suggested it was necessary to "encourage them to have self-love and not have to be dependent on trying to get that love from an outside source that may not assist them in the care of themselves or their children. That, I think, has been one of the harder elements [because] they look for love in all the wrong places."

4.5 Parsing Out the Differences

Also of considerable interest is identifying differences in the goals and objectives between faith-based and secular organizations, or among faith-based organizations themselves. Here, however, there are surprisingly few areas on which faith-based and secular organizations diverged. The most important difference seemed to involve what the staff wanted residents to experience through their program. While both secular and faith-based programs sought to create a caring environment for clients they served, it seemed particularly important to the staff of the faith-based programs that their participants learn that they are loved in addition to changing behavior and making lifestyle changes. These twin motives were mingled in the faith-based programs.

Many faith-based program staff spoke of faith as a guiding motivation, with the variety of traditions leading to different expressions of that faith in interactions with residents and the programs' tone. Yet, offering love and hope was essential for all of them. One of Charity House's directors expressed her commitment to showing compassion for and acceptance of the program's guests in her comments, reflective of a Christian servant theology:

> We come from a Christian foundation of Christ telling us to feed the poor and take care of them. And that's where our whole basis is, that everything we do, we do in the name of God … We see it as our responsibility … We are supposed to do that. We're supposed to take care of those that seem less fortunate, or if they aren't less fortunate, perhaps they just made poor decisions … I think it's just the love of humankind.

Her comments were a continuation of the earlier director's philosophy about offering "love and caring for people that need caring and that are hurting. It's what we are called to do by our faith. We have to do this."

Charity House's social worker in 2010 did not reference faith elements initially. Instead, he spoke of the differences between how the executive director, a seasoned African American female social worker, might affect residents differently than he as a thirty-eight year-old black man might. Yet, when asked directly about the role of religion in the program, he seemed initially puzzled by the question. After some consideration, he then quoted from the Gospel of Matthew: "'Whatever you do to the least of my brethren, you do unto me.' We have to show them Christian love but we don't push our belief on them." His executive director also sees their work in a faith context, but in a way that informs her expectations of her own behavior, not her expectations of the residents: "My thing is that I pray. I pray that God will send me the best person who wants me to help them. Send me who you think needs help right now."

Staff in all four programs expressed a desire for their residents to experience greater hope and a palpable sense of safety, both of which they see as fostering change. The program director at Hope House explained that "a focus of the program is to help women change their priorities, to move from being in crisis with the wolf at the door, or being 'in love,' asking 'what's in it for me' to healthier behaviors. [We] try to offer hope because they can't be future oriented without hope."

The first executive director of Mary's House was a pastor's wife with professional social service experience who described the approach at Mary's House with personal conviction and religious language. She linked these intangibles with the possibility of more tangible change:

> I think people can change on their own. But it's easier when you have hope and believe that God loves you. When people get ahold of "God loves me and I want to please Him," some can make great changes on their own. We give them hope. They can set goals for the future. Self-esteem has increased. Their ability to parent is improved. They've seen Christianity worked out. They experience the love of Christ through us. They deserve love no matter what they've done or how they act.

A more nuanced picture emerges for staff in the remaining faith-based programs. In these other three programs, faith expression among the program staff sometimes seems more important than the participants' faith. In these circumstances, staff balanced their own professional values with openness to the inclusion of spirituality for residents. Comments from a worker at Hope House illustrate this balance: "We ask about her spiritual beliefs. We encourage them … [to see that] belonging to the church [can be] a support system and a positive environment for their kids." Yet, here again, rather robust personal faith convictions were tempered with respect for individuality and different life circumstances that are common parlance in the field of social work. The Hope House worker continues:

> It's an individual thing. I do expect a change. Beauty, if even the most depressed people wake up to beauty, they feel better. For example, being able to understand the necessity of work, developing self into whatever they want to do or be. Planting possibilities is important. Pick something positive, such as an interest in braiding, maybe even a salon … I try to talk about what I see as their best. I don't want to control [a resident's] life. It's a fine line. People are willing to let others take control. I need to empower them as much as possible.

The threads of faith, of seeking to provide a compassionate oasis, were also found at Hope House. In spite of heading CASS, Hope's parent agency which served 7,000 clients through fifteen different programs, the executive director seemed quite closely in touch with the hands-on details of the housing program. She emphasized the tangible aspects of Hope House's approach, characterizing its goal as "to help women who are homeless to become able to live in permanent affordable housing." She then noted, "The way we get to that is more exciting and vibrant." She clearly saw the importance of how the services are provided, hinting at a set of values later expressed by the staff. She offered that "a woman needs to change her attitude regarding her priorities to have sustainability" of her behavioral change.

In contrast to the (sometimes subtle) idioms of faith articulated by faith-based agency workers, the staff at secular Hospitality House were more interested in building skills designed to lead to independence and permanent housing. There was seemingly less focus on the relationship as the basis for change. Instead, Hospitality adopted a pragmatic approach as reflected in the executive director's comments: "Our goal is for people to be as stable and successful and independent as possible." Hospitality House staff consistently pointed to behavioral change as the primary program goal, with little mention of how participants might experience their time in the program or their interactions with workers. Perhaps reflecting a professional intervention model oriented to measureable outcomes and certainly reflecting a different theory of change, its first executive director described this approach:

> It is easier to change their behavior and hope that then their attitude changes. We focus on self-esteem building and encouragement. We work on finding ways to praise them for their successes. We give them the chance to contact us if they have questions or problems, but balance that with the need for them to do it on their own. We also work on having goals in writing and giving the feedback [about their progress].

Hospitality's case worker at the second data collection wave saw her role as helping her clients learn basic skills.

> Maybe not so much [changes in] attitude as lifestyle. A lot of them, they know what they want. They are excited about what they want. But it's a matter of changing their actual lifestyle to accomplish that. When I spend all this money here, it takes away from my housing budget … It's more a matter of [the person] just making that decision, [of learning skills such as] budgeting, money management, time management. It's equipping them with the tools they need. That might be going over a budget fifty million times. It's a lot of repetition.

It seems clear that all the programs, secular and faith-based, seek to improve the lives of participant families. The faith-based programs have an additional interest, that of offering programs which are strongly reflective of the religious values they hold, particularly the value of caring as an expression of faith. Thus, these faith-based programs are explicitly concerned with how their programs offer services, seeking to help people feel valued through an atmosphere of deep caring and even love, while the secular program's focus is on client outcomes directly related to self-sufficiency and stability, supported by caring.

In one final difference between the various programs, Mary's House—the sole privately funded program—diverged from the other faith-based programs as the only program with explicitly religious client outcomes, with staff at both data collection points identifying such objectives. Along with finishing high school and holding a job, the staff person whose job title is "house mother" pointed to one resident as a success for continuing to attend church and getting married. More recently, her successor expressed her delight that one resident "just accepted the Lord two weeks ago." According to the director of Mary's House, women have been affected by the program in that "they develop knowledge of God that they just can't forget about Him." Not surprisingly given the constraints of funding and their different faith traditions, these overtly religious hopes for participants were not expressed in the other programs that received public funds.

*****

The transitional housing programs featured in this chapter form a cooperative network of agencies whose common interest is to improve and stabilize the lives of people, particularly families, who are homeless. Faith-based programs of various sorts are active participants in this network. Faith-related programs—those with more modest degrees of religious expression—engage in various strategies to temper the dosage of religion that they provide. In these programs, faith acts as an undercurrent and is available in a manner that can be calibrated to match client preferences. In such programs, Bibles are available on bookshelves, but there are no mandatory Bible studies.

The opposite ends of this continuum are anchored, respectively, by faith-intensive Mary's House and secular Hospitality House. At Mary's House, the strict rules about religious observance, social visits, curfews, and other facets of life would likely merit considerable scrutiny if public funding was pursued. Consequently, Mary's House intentionally chooses not to bid for public monies. Leaders at Mary's House willingly accept its more limited revenue stream of private donations to run programs as they see fit. At Mary's House, the financial value of public funds is of diminished importance compared to the cultural value of private donations. In this sense, programmatic content is driven by the values at the center of a privately funded organization's culture. The private funding stream permits faith to permeate nearly every facet of programming mandates at this agency. Relying solely on private donations leaves Mary's House free to require client participation in religious activities.

On the other end of the spectrum is secular Hospitality House. This agency readily accepts government funding and is pleased to use such funds to serve a wider swath of the city's homeless population than it could address without such resources. It is willing to adhere to the additional strictures of public funding to maintain and even enhance the viability of their service offerings. Program impact at Mary's House and Hospitality House is thus conceived of in quite different terms. Both agencies aim to cultivate high-quality relationships with clients, though the elements that constitute high-quality relationships are decidedly different.

The cases presented here lend further credibility to the argument that social service organizations often purposefully choose their funding stream to match their organizational culture and programmatic content. In this sense, funding is not really transformative. Rather, it simply reinforces preexisting organizational orientations. So, rather than finding overt mechanisms of exclusion in the solicitation of grant applications or the awarding of funds (highly religious agencies need not apply), we observed a process of self-selection (highly religious agencies choose not to apply). While we need to be careful not to draw sweeping generalizations from a handful of cases presented in this chapter and the one before it, there does seem to be an elective affinity between the degree of faith in an organization and the prospective funding avenues the agency is willing to consider. To what degree will this pattern hold as we turn our attention away from transitional housing and instead examine addiction recovery programs? With this question in mind, we now turn to our final case study.

References

Aron, Laudan Y., and Patrick T. Sharkey. 2002. *The 1996 National Survey of Homeless Assistance Providers and Clients: A comparison of faith-based and secular non-profit programs*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. http://www.urban.org/publications/410496.html.

Bass, Ben G. 2009. Faith-based programs and their influence on homelessness. *Family Community Health* 32: 314–319.

Biggar, Heather. 2001. Homeless children and education: An evaluation of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act. *Children and Youth Services Review* 23: 941–969.

Burt, Martha R. 2006. *Characteristics of transitional housing for homeless families*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.

Casey, Roger. 2007. *Utilization of community-based transitional housing by homeless veteran populations diagnosed with a mental illness: The association between predisposing, enabling, and need factors with program outcomes.* Unpublished paper, University of South Florida, Tampa.

Culhane, Dennis P., Stephen Metraux, and Trevor Hadley. 2002. Public service reductions associated with placement of homeless persons with severe mental illness in supportive housing. *Housing Policy Debate* 13: 107–163.

Ferguson, Kristin M., Neela Dabir, Karl Dortzbach, Grace Dyrness, and Donna Spruijt-Metz. 2006. Comparative analysis of faith-based programs serving homeless and street-living youth in Los Angeles, Mumbai and Nairobi. *Children and Youth Services Review* 28: 1512–1527.

Ferguson, Kristin M., Qiaobing Wu, Grace Dyrness, and Donna Spruijt-Metz. 2007. Perceptions of faith and outcomes in faith-based programs for homeless youth. *Journal of Social Service Research* 33: 25–43.

Goggin, Malcolm L., and Deborah A. Orth. 2002. *How faith-based and secular organizations tackle housing for the homeless*. Albany, N.Y.: Rockefeller Institute of Government. http://www.religionandsocialpolicy.org/docs/research/10-23-2002_grand_rapids_study.pdf.

Groton, Danielle. 2013. Are housing first programs effective? A research note. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 40: 51–63.

Haskett, Mary E., Jeanna M. Armstrong, and Jennifer Tisdale. 2016. Developmental status and social–emotional functioning of young children experiencing homelessness. *Early Childhood Education Journal* 44: 119–125.

Institute for Children, Poverty and Homelessness. 2016. *Aftershocks: The lasting impact of homelessness on student achievement*. Retrieved 19 Oct 2016 from http://www.icphusa.org/PDF/reports/Aftershocks_2_3_A_FIN.pdf.

Masten, Ann S., Donna Miliotis, Sandra Graham-Bermann, Mary Louise Ramirez, and Jennifer Neemann. 1993. Children in homeless families: Risks to mental health and development. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 61: 335–343.

Michigan State Housing Development Authority. 2010. *Michigan's campaign to end homelessness: 2010 summary*. Retrieved 19 Oct 2012. http://www.thecampaigntoendhomelessness.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=u-3nzB5r2dc%3d&tabid=68.

Pearson, Carol L., Gretchen Locke, Ann Elizabeth Montgomery, and Larry Buron. 2007. *The applicability of housing first models to homeless persons with serious mental illness.* U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research.

Rynearson, Sarah, Blake Barrett, and Colleen Clark. 2010. *Housing first: A review of the literature.* Prepared for the National Center on Homelessness among Veterans. Tampa, Florida: Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute.

Thiele, Debbie C., and Sharon McDonald. 2012. *Ending family homelessness: National trends and local system responses*. Washington, D.C.: National Alliance to End Homelessness.

The Campaign to End Homelessness. 2010. *Regional data: Region 7*. Retrieved 19 Oct 2012. http://www.thecampaigntoendhomelessness.org/MichigansCampaign/TheData.aspx.

Tsai, Jack, Robert A. Rosenheck, Wesley J. Kasprow, and James F. McGuire. 2011. Do faith-based residential care services affect the religious faith and clinical outcomes of homeless veterans? *Community of Mental Health Journal* 48: 682–691.

Washington, Thomas A. 2002. The homeless need more than just a pillow, they need a pillar: An evaluation of a transitional housing program. *Families in Society* 83: 183–188.

Weber, Max. 2001. *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (New introduction and trans. S. Kalberg). Chicago: Roxbury Publishing.

Zima, Bonnie T., Kenneth B. Wells, and Howard E. Freeman. 1994. Emotional and behavioral problems and severe academic delays among sheltered homeless children in Los Angeles county. *American Journal of Public Health* 84: 260–264.

Chapter 5
Addiction Recovery: Residential Drug and Alcohol Treatment Programs in the Pacific Northwest

Steven Rathgeb Smith and Benjamina Menashe

The final stop on our journey through America's service provision landscape takes us to the Pacific Northwest. Here, we examine faith-based drug and alcohol treatment programs in comparison with their secular counterparts. To ensure comparability in programmatic content and structure, we examine only *residential* recovery programs for adults. We excluded outpatient and intensive outpatient drug treatment programs from consideration because they offer services in a manner quite different from residential programs and because they serve a different clientele. Consistent with the approach used in the previous two chapters, we contrast secular programs with two types of faith-based programs, namely, the more explicitly religious faith-intensive programs and the more moderately religious faith-related programs. This comparative approach permits us to consider variations in organizational culture among agencies that are secular, faith-intensive, and faith-related. And, quite notably, this chapter's set of cases permits us to compare an even wider array of publicly and privately funded programs, with no fewer than twenty programs examined here.

The Pacific Northwest provides an excellent ecological counterpoint to the South and the Midwest. The political climate in the Pacific Northwest is considerably more progressive than that found in our two previous study locales. The public presence of religion in this part of the country—the greater Puget Sound region of Washington state as well as Portland, Oregon—is more muted than it is in the rural South or the American heartland. This chapter also introduces some novel insights where ecological context is concerned. Our shift of venue to the Pacific Northwest introduces a large-scale change in ecological—in this case, regional—context. But we also turn our attention to ecological context in a more circumscribed sense, that

S. R. Smith (✉)
American Political Science Association and McCourt School of Public Policy, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA
e-mail: smithsr@apsanet.org

B. Menashe
Seattle Hebrew Academy, Seattle, Washington, USA

J. P. Bartkowski and S. E. Grettenberger, *The Arc of Faith-Based Initiatives*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90668-3_5

is, networked organizations situated in local communities. Residential substance abuse treatment providers are strongly influenced by their relationships with partner organizations and entities that include courts, prisons, insurers, congregations, and nearby twelve-step programs. In fact, addiction recovery is the lone policy domain in which faith-based service providers have, for quite some time, enjoyed considerable prominence. Twelve-step programs such as Alcoholics Anonymous were among the first major players in this field and continue to be a formidable conduit for the provision of treatment services. This context is, in turn, shaped by the history of substance abuse treatment, which we recount in an abbreviated fashion to begin this chapter. The domain of residential substance abuse treatment therefore provides many new insights into our three C's approach to studying social service delivery (programmatic content, organizational culture, and ecological context).

Table 5.1 identifies the programs featured in this chapter. We continue to draw distinctions between faith-intensive programs that strongly emphasize robust religious elements and their faith-related counterparts in which religious elements are present but are deemphasized in one or more ways. (The method used to arrive at these distinctions is discussed in Chap. 2 and Appendix A.) And, as was the case with the programs featured in the two previous chapters, no faith-intensive program is publicly funded. Two of the three faith-related programs are publicly funded. Nine of the twelve secular programs are privately funded, while three of these secular programs are underwritten by public funds. It bears mentioning that it can be quite difficult to find purely secular addiction recovery programs, that is, programs that are incapable of offering any spiritual component. Several programs call themselves secular (and we retain that designation here) even as they offer spiritual counseling and education through one of various means if clients request spiritual components. This pattern of hybridization among principally secular programs is described more fully in this chapter. (This circumstance is also addressed in Appendix C through program and agency descriptions.) Three agencies preferred not to be identified, as indicated by the references to agency names being withheld in Table 5.1. Select data from these unnamed agencies were gathered and figured into the analysis provided in this chapter. And yet, out of respect for the desire not to divulge the identities of these agencies, we make only generic reference to them where warranted. (Some of the organizations included have since changed their names or are no longer in existence. The initial data collection for this study was completed in 2004-2006, with follow-up in 2010-2011, and information is accurate as of that time.)

5.1 The Evolving Context of Substance Abuse Treatment and Related Research

Before examining program dynamics in these agencies, some attention to the changing context of substance abuse treatment is warranted. Historical developments continue to loom large in this service provision domain and are, therefore, briefly

Table 5.1 Drug treatment programs in Washington-Oregon

Faith-based	Faith-intensive	Publicly funded	No public funding
			Open House Ministries
			Salvation Army Adult Rehabilitation Center-Seattle
			City Team Ministries
			Salvation Army Adult Rehabilitation Center-Portland
			Union Gospel Mission
	Faith-related	Providence Hospital	Agency name withheld (Hospital-based program)
		Agency name withheld (Adult treatment program)	
Secular		DePaul Treatment Center	Agency name withheld (Adult treatment program)
		Volunteers of America	Pacific Ridge
		Tulatin Valley Center	Highline Recovery Services
		Residence XII	
		Sundown M Ranch	
		Drug Abuse Prevention Center	
		Highland Courte	
		Center of Alcohol and Drug Treatment	
		Sea-Mar Residential Treatment Center	

recounted here.[1] Until the 1970s, Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) and its twelve-step, self-help approach to addiction was virtually the only treatment option available for alcoholics or people with other addictions. From the time it was founded in 1935, AA was organized through local chapters that were prohibited from accepting government funding or employing professional staff. The treatment in these groups entailed individual work on each of the twelve steps within a social support context of fellow alcoholics and addicts who aimed to stay "clean and sober." AA groups have tended to be skeptical of professional health and social welfare personnel who are sometimes seen as incapable of really understanding addiction and the recovery process.

Given the prevalence of drug experimentation during the 1960s, the science of addiction began to gain considerable ground in the decade that followed. This shift was facilitated, in part, by the rising profile of the American Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM). This development also was linked to the establishment of federal research institutes on addiction and treatment, including the National

[1]Among various works on the historical, cultural, and organizational dimensions of substance abuse and substance abuse treatment see: Durrant and Thakker (2003), Mignon (2015), Shaw (2002).

Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) and the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA). To this day, NIDA and NIAAA remain formidable entities within the National Institutes of Health.

During the 1970s, two types of residential programs started to proliferate, partly due to the availability of new funds. First, intensive long-term treatment programs called therapeutic communities flourished. Typically, these therapeutic communities entailed aggressive, confrontational group therapy and a behavioral approach requiring program participants to earn their privileges. Perhaps the most well-known and controversial therapeutic community was Synanon[2], which was eventually closed amidst scandal and charges of program participant maltreatment. However, there remained many who believed in the long-term treatment approach while rejecting the excesses exhibited by Synanon.

Second, shorter-term treatment programs modeled on the twelve-step AA approach began to gain traction during the 1970s. These programs varied greatly but usually aimed to stabilize the addicted person, often with a detoxification unit. They also offered a treatment program of less than a month's duration, commonly around 28 days. The content of these programs was organized around "working the steps" as expressed in the key tenets of the AA philosophy. Consistent with the culture of AA at the time, these programs also exhibited skepticism toward health and social welfare professionals, especially with respect to staff who were not in recovery themselves. The availability of these programs was very uneven across the country, partly because funding for these programs was scarce. Public funders such as Medicaid and private insurance companies generally did not reimburse for these programs.

The institutionalization of addiction science was further advanced by the evolving role of insurance agencies in health care provision and the emerging definition of addiction as a public health problem. Insurance reimbursement for inpatient drug treatment programs became more prevalent in the 1980s. However, to contain costs, most reimbursement stipulations limited clients' inpatient program involvement to a twenty-eight day maximum. This policy led to the proliferation of twenty-eight day twelve-step programs offered by nonprofit—and even a few for-profit—providers. At this time, some profit-minded companies adopted a gold rush mentality to addiction recovery service provision, but were later found to be delivering ineffective services.

These problems along with media exposés of service provision deficiencies caused funders to shift direction again and enact very stringent guidelines for admittance into residential substance abuse treatment programs. Many programs closed with this change in reimbursement. Most of the large for-profit companies collapsed into bankruptcy and left the field entirely. By the early 1990s, the surviving inpatient programs tended to be nonprofit programs with a local or regional base, along with high-end programs such as Hazelton or the Betty Ford Treatment Program in California.

Fallout from the programming deficiencies of the 1980s continues to affect the residential addiction field in a profound way. First, many of the programs that grew rapidly were hospital-based programs, including for-profit companies such as

[2]Janzen (2001).

Charter. But the shift in reimbursement procedures meant that many nonprofit community hospitals expanded their inpatient addiction units. These community programs commonly provided quality services. However, they were tarnished by their prior association with for-profit partners, and the shift in reimbursement away from inpatient services severely curtailed admittance to these programs. Reimbursement levels for inpatient programs have remained stagnant or have declined ever since and the advent of managed care has further restricted the availability of inpatient care. Overall, then, hospital-based programs have been shrinking since the early 1990s. Many programs have closed and the remaining programs have often been forced to reduce the number of beds. Other programs have survived by entering into exclusive agreements with public or private funders whereupon the hospital agrees to take all of the patients referred by a particular insurance company or public agency, such as one serving a large urban county.

Interestingly, the decline of hospital-based inpatient units has affected the mix of secular and faith-based residential drug treatment programs available to prospective clients. In some communities, faith-affiliated hospitals are the only faith-based programs available to local residents. To be sure, the actual treatment in these programs tends to be quite professional but spiritual counseling is also often available. The serious quality problems of the 1980s also prompted major re-evaluations of treatment and its effectiveness, spurring a shift away from the traditional twelve-step recovery model, though unevenly across states and communities. A key principle of the traditional twelve-step model is an initial openness to anyone who declared that they needed treatment. AA chapters therefore strive to have few barriers to entry, and everyone is treated in a similar and equitable fashion in the group. AA volunteer leaders are individuals in recovery themselves. Inpatient programs based on an AA model initially were similarly structured with staff who tended to be in recovery themselves. Indeed, some agencies required that all staff actually go through the agency's entire treatment program before being considered for a staff position.

Yet, the new thinking about treatment ushered in by addiction science has given greater attention to a client's presenting symptoms and has generated stronger efforts to match clients with programs that will best serve them. Indicative of this change is the widespread adoption by addiction programs of client admittance criteria developed by the American Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM). Eligibility for public funding or private insurance reimbursement now largely hinges on the appropriate application and utilization of the ASAM criteria and the presenting symptoms in the form of a medically defined substance use disorder. These stringent criteria require that each admitting facility evaluate the appropriateness of each individual for inpatient (residential) care and, in practice, the implementation of ASAM criteria means that most clients entering inpatient programs today must have failed in less intensive settings such as outpatient treatment. Individuals referred for inpatient programs tend to have much more serious addiction problems than comparable populations of referrals from twenty years ago, and often people have histories of years of substance abuse and failures in multiple outpatient or inpatient treatment settings.

The widespread adoption of ASAM criteria and the shift in the residential drug treatment client population has also created a demand for staff with bolstered credentials and more extensive technical expertise. In the 1970s and 1980s, many programs did not have certified chemical dependency counselors on staff (although many staff persons were in recovery). At that time, more programs required chemical dependency certification, usually a two-year degree program, for their staff. At present, many substance abuse programs frequently hire master's level counselors. A ripple effect of this shift is a markedly different staff mix. Prior to these changes, most programs employed people in recovery. However, present-day programs tend to employ a mix of recovering and non-recovering staff.

These developments have been coupled with a rise in third-party gatekeepers to treatment. In the earlier years of inpatient programs, individuals with adequate public or private insurance could enter programs with the knowledge that their treatment costs would be covered. Today, individuals very rarely enter a program without the approval or referral of a third-party managed care firm or a government agency. (The exceptions are smaller faith-intensive programs and the high-end inpatient programs.) Indeed, third parties are increasingly critical to the selection of programs. For publicly funded clients, these third-party intermediaries are often parole officers, judges, and court personnel. They will usually recommend their favored programs and suggest that individuals select from among these programs, which constrains choice. For individuals with spouses or family members, additional investigation will often follow and the ultimate program choice will be influenced by the reputation of the program. Of course, choice is also constrained by the extremely limited number of programs in many communities due to the decline in inpatient reimbursement.

The treatment protocols in current inpatient programs have also been greatly influenced by the outpouring of research on effective substance abuse treatment. This research emphasis is a reflection of the broader evidence-based practice (EBP) movement in social and health services. The EBP movement strives to base program interventions as much as possible on rigorous scientific research, and even seeks to validate program effectiveness with regard to particular populations served (men or women, specific racial-ethnic groups, rural or urban community residents, etc.). A key precept of this new practice style is the matching of individuals—and their specific substance use disorder—with treatment plans and interventions that have been proven to be effective for their condition.

Combined with funding and reimbursement influences, program staff's widespread enthusiasm for evidence-based practices has pushed programs away from an almost exclusive reliance on the traditional twelve-step program model toward much greater diversity in program models. The most prevalent model among inpatient programs at this time is a cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) approach to drug treatment. Typically, these programs still have an active AA meeting component to their program curriculum but it is a more segmented and restricted element than was previously the case. Importantly, the shift to evidence-based practice tends to reduce the length of treatment. Many programs describe their program as offering a variable length of stay, even among programs where their target is twenty-eight days or twenty-one days. Long-stay programs including the classic therapeutic community that often required a length of stay of two or more years have fallen into disfavor. A long-stay program is now six to nine months and these programs are increasingly rare, partly because of funding constraints.

This mix of historical developments, funding factors, and the rise of addiction science strongly influences the delivery of drug treatment services today. One additional piece of this larger puzzle remains. Specifically, what does the research on current drug treatment programs reveal? Research on substance abuse treatment has been extensive, and various approaches have proven to be effective. Empirical evidence underscores the efficacy of cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) as a proven means for combating substance abuse.[3] A form of semi-directive counseling called motivational interviewing (MI) is also quite prevalent given its positive track record in scientific research.[4] Both of these approaches are designed to provide clients with a compelling rationale for embracing persistent abstinence from substances to which they are addicted. More recently, some programs emphasize the role of community support in the form of family therapy and sobriety partners as well as supportive social circumstances such as stable employment and housing.[5]

Some research on faith-based drug treatment programs exists. Early research provided useful program overviews (e.g., philosophical orientation and financial standing) while not focusing heavily on programming dynamics.[6] A few studies have offered more in-depth examinations of program rationales and service delivery strategies. Faith-based substance abuse programs tend to conceive of addiction as an attempt to fill spiritual voids while viewing recovery as being best fostered by spiritual development (e.g., sense of salvation) and the establishment of a stable relationship with God.[7] Addicts with greater faith and spirituality are less inclined to relapse and some research attributes these outcomes to the stress-buffering role of spirituality, religiosity, life meaning, and the social supports that such orientations often provide.[8] Other research has pointed to the unique spiritual mechanisms evident in faith-based substance abuse treatment programs, namely, forgiveness and life purpose.[9] Consequently, some charge that faith-based drug treatment programs operate quite differently than their secular counterparts, particularly where spiritually motivated forgiveness as a core value is concerned.[10] However, other scholars have argued that faith-based interventions are not altogether different than secular

[3]Hoffmann et al. (2012), McHugh et al. (2010).

[4]Smedslund et al. (2011), Barnetta et al. (2012; See also Rollnick and Miller 1995).

[5]Rowe (2012), Mueser et al. (2011), Smith et al. (2011).

[6]Hodge and Pittman (2003).

[7]McCoy et al. (2008).

[8]Jarusiewicz (2000), Laudet et al. (2006).

[9]Lyons et al. (2010).

[10]Webb et al. (2006).

programs because both draw on common mechanisms of behavioral change that include peer influence, role modeling, and social reinforcement.[11]

Studies of twelve-step programs have revealed some positive effects on prolonged abstinence for frequent meeting attenders (weekly or more often), but less favorable results for infrequent attenders.[12] Such research indicates that twelve-step programs, many of which have spiritual elements given their emphasis on a higher power, can be an effective form of aftercare—that is, sobriety support following treatment program completion—for those who are regularly involved in such groups. However, it is worth noting that there are great variations in the conceptualization and actual role of a higher power in twelve-step programs.[13] Given the rather generic reference to a higher power and wide latitude in the actual use of this concept, the degree to which twelve-step programs can be considered genuinely faith-based is certainly open to debate. Complicating matters even further is the fact that many secular programs feature spiritual elements in the services they provide, largely because of the pervasiveness of twelve-step approaches to addiction recovery.[14]

More specific studies of Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) have produced mixed results. Frequent attendance at AA meetings has been associated with prolonged abstinence in some studies, but other investigations point to very inconsistent effects and methodological problems in some of this research.[15] Therefore, it is possible that the social support provided through frequent involvement in AA meetings and selectivity factors such as a recovering addict's willingness to change are more influential than the unique features of AA's approach to recovery. In short, there are vexing issues about the comparability of twelve-step programs given their diverse manifestations. And there are ongoing scholarly debates about the effectiveness of AA and similar programs for the addicted population at large.

Several other important considerations emerge where research on faith-based drug treatment programs is concerned. First, there is a broader research literature that associates religious involvement with less drug use and diminished deviant behavior.[16] However, because such research is focused on the general population rather than persons addicted to substances, this research is of limited value in settling ongoing debates about faith-based substance abuse treatment programs. Second, there are some indications that segments of the addicted population seek greater spirituality as part of their recovery, often despite an aversion to traditional religion, and that some people experience a spiritual awakening during the recovery process.[17] This research underscores the potential value of faith-based providers for the spiritually motivated segment of the addicted population while also indicating

[11]Neff and MacMaster (2005, 2008).

[12]Fiorentine (1999).

[13]Finnegan and McNally (1995), Arnold et al. (2002), Nealon-Woods et al. (1995).

[14]Davis (2014).

[15]Kaskutas (2009), Kownacki and Shadish (1999).

[16]Kelly et al. (2015).

[17]Arnold et al. (2002), Green et al. (1998), Pardini et al. (2000).

the need to determine the recovery goals of those receiving services. Faith-based services are likely to work more effectively for those prioritizing spiritual development as part of their recovery.

Finally, scant empirical research exists on the effectiveness of faith-based approaches to substance use treatment. And the findings that emerge from such research defy tidy characterizations.[18] Some research suggests that the integration of spiritual components into conventional addiction treatment services does not necessarily produce improved outcomes and may even have detrimental effects.[19] And while faith-based treatment providers may be effective at retaining moderately addicted clients in treatment or fostering program completion, those with more severe addictions are likely to fare better in conventional programs that offer medical and professional mental health services.[20] One interesting head-to-head comparison of faith-based and secular substance abuse treatment programs used focus groups and concept mapping techniques to reveal notable differences and similarities between these two program types, with seven programs compared in all.[21] Faith-based programs were organized more centrally around spiritual activities, beliefs, and rituals. These same programs also placed a greater emphasis on programmatic structure and discipline. The traditional substance abuse programs more strongly emphasized work readiness than did their faith-based counterparts. Also quite noteworthy were the many similarities exhibited among these seven programs. Mentoring, role modeling, and social cohesion were prioritized across program types. And both types of programs valued the provision of a safe and supportive environment.

5.2 Comparing Faith-Based and Secular Addiction Recovery Programs: Broad Patterns

What, then, do we learn from the faith-based and secular addiction recovery programs located in the Puget Sound and Portland areas that participated in our study? Overall, a careful comparison of these programs indicates that the sharp distinctions often suggested in scholarship on faith-based and secular social services are not evident in these organizations. In most of the faith-based programs—specifically those that are faith-related—the role of faith operates in a quite subtle fashion. The most dramatic distinctions across programs, in fact, lie elsewhere. Faith-intensive drug treatment programs are quite different from their faith-related counterparts.

[18]Stoltzfus (2007).

[19]Miller et al. (2008).

[20]Gais et al. (2010).

[21]Neff et al. (2006).

Faith-intensive treatment programs all offer extensive instruction in the Bible, including formal Bible study classes.[22] And, given the fact that these programs receive no public funding, they are all in a position to require worship service attendance among their clients—literally, church attendance, given their explicitly Christian commitments. Generally, church attendance is offered—and mandated—on the organization's premises, thereby permitting the agencies to monitor clients' degree of commitment to the program through participation in core activities. Intensive exposure to religion is also provided through counseling offered by staff. This counseling has a strong spiritual focus and, under some circumstances, is provided by chaplains or other religious personnel.

Distinctions among faith-based organizations and their treatment programs are also evident in terms of their ties to the external world of the courts, judges, parole officers, and other government agencies and personnel. Faith-intensive Open House Ministries and City Team Ministries do not have strong and ongoing relationships with third-party government referral entities such as the courts. And, perhaps because of this, these two programs have a blurry line between their shelter program and their addiction program. More specifically, Open House Ministries offers an eight-week alcohol and drug recovery curriculum that is scripturally (biblically) based. This program is available to anyone in the shelter, including individuals without any history of serious substance abuse. Many shelter residents take this eight-week curriculum more than once because they find it so helpful in their efforts to improve their lives. Clients with addictions participate in most of the other shelter activities, including the work program, with other shelter residents.

Although Open House Ministries' curriculum is eight weeks in duration, residents with addictions are expected to stay at the shelter for at least a year or longer and take the curriculum as many times as is deemed advisable by the staff. For example, one of the clients interviewed had arrived at the shelter with his wife after losing custody of his children. He had a long history of addiction problems. When interviewed, he and his wife had been at the shelter for almost two years and had regained custody of their children. (The shelter has an active and thriving child-care program on site.) This couple is now part of the shelter staff. At Open House Ministries, individuals in the treatment program live and interact extensively with the other men in the shelter. They also participate collectively in many other activities during their multi-phase, twenty-seven month treatment program, except for specialized group and individual counseling on addiction that is scripturally based.

Thus, the two smaller programs have the longest treatment duration of any secular or faith-based programs examined here. This program model reflects the emphasis on individual transformation to a new lifestyle based on personal responsibility and Christian teachings. However, the long program duration means

[22]Efforts to find non-Christian residential drug treatment programs in the Pacific Northwest met with limited success. One secular program, Residence XII, does offer instruction on meditation and Eastern religions. The virtue of having Christian programs in our sample of faith-based programs is the comparability that a homogenous sample affords.

that only a very small segment of the addicted population is suited for this model. Very few people are willing to commit to this type of long-term, transformational program.

The somewhat larger yet still faith-intensive Union Gospel Mission (UGM) takes a different approach with two clearly distinct and identifiable addiction programs. One program includes, in addition to Bible studies, the following activities: mandatory outside AA or NA (Narcotics Anonymous) meetings at least four times per week, a Christian-based AA meeting on site, and mandatory work therapy every day. Overall, this program integrates religious instruction with elements of a traditional twelve-step recovery model. The other UGM program places greater emphasis on Bible study, religious instruction, and the acquisition of vocational skills. It is a highly structured program with a behavioral approach that offers clients progressively greater responsibility as they move through the nine-month program. They have also established a Christian Service Intern program that encourages program graduates to intern elsewhere within the Mission and embrace Christian service as an avocation. This program has extensive, ongoing partnerships with evangelical churches in the local community.

Despite differences in focus and emphasis, all of the faith-intensive programs emphasize the positive aspects of religion. In these programs, addiction is not viewed as a moral failing or something shameful. Instead, addiction is regarded as learned behavior reflecting very poor life choices. Religion is seen as a positive replacement for drugs. Moreover, given the Christian focus of these programs, the teachings of Jesus Christ in particular are viewed as offering essential guidance on proper living and a means to avoid addictive behavior.

Guided by this philosophy, strong-armed proselytizing is absent. Instead, the decision to accept Jesus Christ is left up to the individual. Religious transformation is not a condition of staying in the program. However, each client has to participate in the required activities, including Bible studies and regular worship (attendance at church services). In this vein, the executive director of Union Gospel in Seattle observed that he would regard it as a success if a person remained clean and sober after leaving the program but had not undergone a religious conversion. To be sure, he firmly believed that staying clean would be far easier if a person embraced Jesus Christ. But he did not view this spiritual outcome as absolutely necessary. This positive interpretation of religion is no doubt influenced to an extent by the widespread presence of recovering people within these faith-based programs. But it also represents the interaction between these programs and the external world, including the support for individual choice and dignity of all individuals.[23]

The remaining (non-faith-intensive) agencies studied here can be divided into two categories: secular agencies and two faith-related hospital-based programs. The actual organization and duration of these programs vary substantially. However,

[23]Smith and Sosin (2001).

this variation masks important commonalities in treatment approach, including: (1) a general reliance on cognitive behavioral therapy as the central intervention strategy[24]; (2) the importance of AA and NA meetings, usually on-site but sometimes off-site; (3) broad opposition to confrontational group therapy that was a common characteristic of many programs in the 1970s and 1980s; and (4) a daily schedule of tasks and responsibilities based upon a behavior modification system of graduated privileges, especially for the longer programs. Reflecting the continuing influence of AA, abstinence is the stated goal and recovery is regarded as a lifelong process. Essential to this recovery is connecting with an AA or NA group after a client leaves the program. Many residential programs aim to link clients with outpatient treatment at least for the initial period after discharge. Increasingly, programs offer specific classes and skills training on strategies to cope with life after inpatient treatment, including classes in relapse prevention, communication skills, and anger management, the last of which is considered a very serious problem for many addicts. Interpersonal skill development and job training also receive attention in these programs. Due to the influence of public and private funding agencies, all clients are required to have an individual treatment plan tailored to their own addiction and treatment history. In a sense, the addiction field has steadily moved in the last twenty years toward a more holistic approach to recovery that views addiction as a multi-faceted problem whose remedy lies in a diverse and comprehensive intervention strategy.

Consistent with support for individual choice and empowerment, all programs are open to voluntary expressions of religiosity by clients such as Bible study groups. Most of the larger programs allow clients to go outside of the agency to organized worship at a local church subject to scheduling and logistical constraints. However, few clients actually attend outside church services. In general, then, this emphasis on choice and voluntarism reflects the commitment of program staff to avoid favoring one religion over another or giving certain religious practices within a program more space than others. This position, in turn, reflects the worry among program staff about accusations of religious discrimination, however inadvertent. But this respect for religious diversity also indicates the very real practical concern that open displays of religious practice within a group of individuals of diverse religious persuasions can be very disruptive, thereby presenting serious program management issues. As a result, the general policy is to leave the decision to clients and discourage clients from displays of religious practice that would directly interfere with the treatment program (such as proselytizing by clients or the building of sweat lodges on site for Native American religious worship.)

[24]Only one of these programs does not rely on cognitive behavioral therapy as its central intervention strategy.

5.3 Holistic Treatment Services and Organizational Culture

As noted in previous chapters, some have asserted that faith-based organizations can offer a more holistic, personal, and caring approach to their clients than comparable secular organizations. Assessing the extent to which faith-based providers offer services that are more personal and caring than secular organizations is complicated by general trends within the field of substance abuse. Twenty years ago, most people entering an inpatient treatment program would have received the same basic twelve-step intervention model. The treatment program would have largely involved working the steps, including a variety of homework assignments and group meetings on each of the steps. So any person, regardless of the presenting symptoms and situation, would have received a similar approach. Programs did not try to build a truly individualized set of services to support the client that went beyond the twelve steps. This general point applied to faith-based and secular programs alike.

In recent years, the rethinking of substance abuse treatment has precipitated a more comprehensive approach to treatment that is much more individualized. In short, the field has moved decidedly toward more personalized treatment plans. Still, variations in individualized treatment exist among secular and intensively faith based programs. Most secular programs offer a diverse set of support groups, counseling, and classes, with the underlying assumption that addicts need help with job training, anger management, and interpersonal skills if they are to remain successfully clean and sober after leaving the program. In addition, these programs try to link clients with outpatient support groups and counseling in an effort to ease the transition from the inpatient program to living in the community.

Many secular programs go beyond encouraging the acquisition of specific skills such as anger management to focus on spiritual development and transformation. In this sense, many substance abuse programs embrace a holistic approach to treatment. One high-end secular privately funded program has three full-time pastoral counselors. This secular program, Residence XII, is located outside Seattle and has many publicly funded clients. This program places great importance on addressing the spiritual needs of their clients, including instruction on Eastern religions and meditation. The secular Drug Prevention Action Center generally serves publicly supported clients, but a volunteer minister offers weekly group classes and the opportunity for individual counseling. At the Center for Alcohol and Drug Treatment, two ministers alternate the offering of spiritual counseling to clients. Several programs, including Sundown Ranch and Pacific Ridge, have a chaplain on staff that offers group and individual spiritual counseling. To be sure, some secular programs do not have chaplains on staff and do not offer spirituality classes. But even in these programs, the requirement to participate in AA and NA meetings means that discussion of a higher power and spiritual transformation frequently occurs. In such programs, then, faith-based services function as a sort of hip-pocket approach to service delivery. These programs are principally secular, but the fact that they can offer faith components to clients who prefer them makes these organizations quite nimble and broadens their base of prospective clients.

An examination of the approach used by the five faith-intensive organizations to their clients also demonstrates the difficulty of defining comprehensive and holistic services in the context of contemporary substance abuse programs. For instance, faith-intensive programs require Bible study and religious worship, although they do not require a person to actually convert in order to be in the program. So, the person could simply sit in on a worship service. However, the scarcity of resources and focus on religion means that faith-intensive programs do not include many components of comprehensive treatment programs such as job readiness, relapse prevention, and anger management classes. The Salvation Army ARC programs in Portland and Seattle require forty hours a week of work in the thrift stores and related support activities. So, in this sense, they strive to provide job readiness through work itself rather than classes or instruction. And, the smaller the program, the less likely it is to offer services other than Bible study and religious worship in addition to required work in the program.

In short, faith-intensive organizations tend to require involvement in religious activities such as worship services and Bible studies, or strongly urge their clients to become more religious. But the emphasis on spirituality and spiritual transformation in a more generic sense is not related to the organizational auspices of the treatment program. Furthermore, many secular and hospital-based faith-related programs offer a very comprehensive set of services to their clients. Depending upon the program, this set of services can include a strong emphasis on addressing the spiritual needs of their clients.

Of course, clients may still believe that faith-based agencies offer a more personal and holistic approach, even if services are less comprehensive. And, if clients feel that programs are treating them in a more holistic manner, they might be more responsive to program interventions and more likely to stay clean and sober once they leave treatment. Client focus group interviews do not provide definitive evidence on this point since the focus groups were not completely representative of the various programs. However, a comparison of client responses across the different agencies is revealing. In general, clients were positive about their current programs and believed that the programs tended to respect them as individuals and did not try to force them into a standardized treatment model. But many clients offered very critical remarks concerning prior treatment experiences. Also, in general, more negative comments were offered by clients of secular programs with a standardized approach that lacked the more comprehensive and individualized model that is now quite common in the addiction field.

The differences and similarities among programs are also affected by the institutional history and development of the agency. We have referred to these factors as the second C in our three C's model, namely, organizational culture. In drug treatment programs examined for this study, a founder's vision for the agency and program can persist in its organizational influence despite changing external circumstances. For example, one high-end, secular nonprofit treatment organization was initially founded by a wealthy philanthropist as a for-profit agency.

This founder was strongly committed to spirituality as a central component of the program. This organization is now part of a national nonprofit treatment organization, thus having transitioned from the for-profit sector into the nonprofit world, but the key role of spirituality in the treatment process remains. Similarly, Tulatin Valley Center's program for women was founded by an entrepreneurial woman who had a vision of a women's program that included care for children under the age of six. That particular bundle of services persists in the agency. And a person in recovery created an Oxford House style self-help program for men with alcohol problems. The focus on this particular clientele using an Oxford House style model remains as the centerpiece in this this program. In short, despite the changing dynamics of the addiction field, the strong imprint of the founding vision infused into an organization's culture can position an agency on a long-term stable trajectory.

5.4 Distinct Clienteles and Diverse Paths into Treatment Programs

In our two other study locales (Mississippi and Michigan), information from and about program clients was difficult to secure. By contrast, clients in the Washington-Oregon agencies focused on addiction recovery were quite ready to share their reflections. And service providers were quite forthcoming about the types of clients they commonly serve as well as their reasons for doing so. Thus, one of the essential contributions of this particular case study within our larger investigation entails examining issues related to clienteles and understanding the perspectives of clients.

Individuals seeking inpatient substance abuse treatment are, in one sense, quite diverse. These clients bring many different backgrounds, religious experiences, motivations, family situations, and work experiences to treatment. Nonetheless, this study reveals some important patterns in terms of the similarities and differences between clients in secular and faith-based addiction programs. To begin, for what reasons do clients seek treatment? Most people with serious addiction problems experience years of denial that includes convincing themselves that they can handle their addiction without sustained intervention such as inpatient treatment. Even when users seek help, they often opt for outpatient treatment instead of inpatient services. The decision to seek inpatient help is typically precipitated by a crisis such as an overdose, serious family problems, and/or jail (or threatened jail time).

Individuals supported by public funds are usually in treatment because they are required to be there. They may have been discharged from prison with treatment serving as a condition of parole. They may have been arrested and be presented with treatment as an alternative to prison time. Or, a parent—typically a mother—may have lost custody of a child or children due to an addiction. In this last circumstance, treatment is a condition of having the child or children returned. Few people supported by public funds are truly voluntary clients. Of course, many of these clients may have a strong desire to be in treatment. However, they rarely go to treatment without the intervention of third-party gatekeepers such as parole officers and judges. By contrast, private pay and insurance patients tend to enter treatment due to pressure from spouses, physicians, or colleagues at work. Court involvement in such situations is considerably less common. Private pay and insurance patients tend to have tried outpatient treatment or self-help programs through AA or NA and found that this strategy did not work to overcome their addiction. Thus, inpatient treatment is a more drastic measure to get clean and sober.

Especially noteworthy is the dependence of faith-intensive programs—which do not receive public funds or private insurance—on court and prison referrals. For example, the faith-intensive Union Gospel Mission in Seattle has a significant religious component and over seventy-five percent of their referrals are from the courts. The Salvation Army ARC programs have a similar clientele. The importance of the courts for referrals is a reflection of larger (ecological) changes in the treatment system and the criminal justice system. Judges routinely have drug-related cases where the individual in question has a serious addiction problem. This person may have scarce treatment options due to a lack of bed availability and the client's ineligibility for various public or private benefit programs. Consequently, the judge may refer a person to an established faith-intensive program as a diversion program from prison, if the client is willing, with the recognition that these faith-intensive programs are free to the client and thus do not present the cost problems of secular, certified programs. Thus, many clients in faith-based programs are not looking for a spiritual experience per se but are seeking to avoid a prison term. The small faith-intensive programs are an exception to this general referral pattern. The small programs rely on word of mouth and self-referrals, often via homeless shelters. In general, these programs do not have extensive and enduring relationships with other community organizations or entities. They may raise money from the community but it is generalized fundraising and not specifically for their addiction recovery program.

Substantial similarities exist between clients in faith-related programs (those that are not faith-intensive) and individuals in secular programs. This pattern reflects, in part, the impact of the widespread adoption of ASAM (addiction science) admittance criteria as well as the indirect influence of judges, parole officers, protective service workers, and publicly appointed assessment personnel who make recommendations for treatment. Individuals supported with public funds tend to have had multiple failures in less intensive treatment settings, frequent failures in other inpatient settings, some type of court involvement, a checkered work history, and a lack of college education. Most people are between twenty and forty years old and have been using for years, although not always on a continuous basis. A minority of these persons is married. The widespread use of ASAM admittance criteria means that many people in inpatient programs tend to have a similar behavioral history, including rebelliousness at an early age, difficulty with authority, inability to enjoy recreational pursuits, and frequent brushes with the law.

Despite these client similarities, the intensively faith-based programs tend to have clients who are poorer with fewer life options. Many of these clients have burned so many bridges that they are quite isolated from family and friends and have very limited work histories. As a result, individuals entering intensively faith-based programs—which are free, but are longer term than most secular programs—tend to be in more desperate life situations. Individuals in treatment programs that are funded through insurance or self-pay present a quite different profile. Typically, these people have jobs or a work history. They are more likely to be married. Also, older patients are more likely to be privately funded. In the study sample, virtually all of the clients are in their fifties and sixties, and they are privately funded.

Finally, important differences exist between programs in the seriousness of the client's addiction. During the explosion of inpatient facilities in the 1980s, many people who entered inpatient programs did not have serious addiction problems. Many of them could have been successfully treated in a less intensive setting such as day treatment or outpatient counseling. With the changed admittance criteria, individuals entering inpatient treatment today often have far more complicated and extensive addiction problems, frequently coupled with serious mental health disorders (called a co-occurring disorder). In general, publicly funded programs take clients with more involved presenting problems including chronic mental illness. Some of the public programs in the sample also take sex offenders and people convicted of violent crime (as opposed to drug-related criminal offenses). The five intensively faith-based agencies are not in a position to address individuals with complicated problems, including serious mental illness, adequately. As a result, these patients are not admitted or they tend to leave the program, either voluntarily or because they are dismissed.

Clients' goals for substance abuse treatment are relatively straightforward. Clients want to learn the life skills necessary to stay clean and sober after they leave the program. Based on client interviews, spiritual transformation or a religious experience proved not to be central to their goals. The lone exception to this general pattern was clients at one small shelter program with a small recovery program. In this case, clients appeared to be choosing a program with an explicitly religious component. For example, one client mentioned that he had "fallen away from God." He believed that this spiritual circumstance had contributed to his problems in fighting addiction. He concluded that he needed to "accept Christ" if he was going to become clean, so he decided to enter this faith-based program. However, all of the other faith-intensive programs tended to reflect the more practical realities experienced by the clients: due to their court involvement, they needed to be in treatment. So they decided to go to a faith-based program because it was free and they lacked other options.

This penchant for not prioritizing spiritual matters in recovery reflects the frequently problematic relationship between addicts and organized religion. Many clients who participated in focus group interviews described their own negative experiences in the context of organized religion. For some, addictive behaviors were linked to their rebellion against religious strictures. Other felt treated harshly by religious leaders, their professional staff, or congregants. Some addicts discussed feeling guilt and shame that, whether intentionally or unintentionally, were reinforced by organized religion. Regardless, many addicts reported avoiding organized religion or leaving a faith community after negative incidents.

Not surprisingly, then, many individuals entering addiction programs are not typically thinking about religious or spiritual concerns. Instead, addicts entering faith-based programs accept a tradeoff: the opportunity to participate in a treatment program and thus avoid jail or the streets exceeds the costs of listening to a religious message. Of course, the staff and volunteers of these programs hope that participation in treatment will lead to a spiritual transformation that many of them regard as essential, or at least very beneficial, to the recovery process. And, to be sure, some clients come to embrace religion during their stay at these programs. But many are initially skeptical or even hostile to the religious components of the program. For this reason, the faith-intensive agencies also tended to have a relatively small potential client pool. For instance, City Team Ministries, with its twenty-seven month program, had only one client graduate during a three-year period. The Salvation Army ARC programs in Portland and Seattle are open to virtually anyone. However, many people who enter the program are unable to cope with the regimented schedule, work expectations, and faith component program. They often end up leaving the program within the initial months.

Partly due to clients' negative experiences with organized religion, many are quick to draw distinctions between religion and spirituality. The overwhelming majority of clients are comfortable with discussions of spirituality and spiritual transformation. Indeed, many clients have had these discussions in previous treatment programs or in AA self-help groups. Most clients endorse the concept of a higher power and recognize its importance to recovery, even if they do not fully accept its implications in all facets of life. However, interviewed clients tend to oppose the introduction of religion into programs because that may involve proselytizing with the goal of converting someone to a particular denomination or congregation. Clients in both secular and faith-based programs express the desire to have the option of pursuing their own spiritual or religious path without feeling coerced to believe or act in a particular fashion.

5.5 Staffing Considerations, Programmatic Adaptations, and Resource Streams

Significant differences in credentials and qualifications exist between the secular and the intensively faith-based programs. All of the secular programs and the two faith-related, hospital-based programs are state certified programs. Consequently, these programs are required to abide by certain professional staffing requirements. Such programs look quite similar in terms of the qualifications and credentials that their staff must hold when hired. These staff must also maintain their certification through the accrual of continuing education units (CEUs). By contrast, the five faith-intensive programs are not state certified. Because these programs do not need to meet state criteria, they have much greater flexibility with respect to program staffing. For instance, Open House Ministries, the Salvation Army programs, and City Team Ministries do not, by choice, have any certified addiction counselors on staff. Union Gospel Mission has two sizable addiction programs, but has only a few certified staff.

Nevertheless, staff composition in the faith-intensive programs masks important shifts underway in them. As noted, the Union Gospel Mission and the Salvation Army programs rely at least in part on judges, parole officers, and other criminal justice personnel for referrals. However, these criminal justice professionals are increasingly concerned about referring individuals to uncertified programs. Although the precise source of these concerns is difficult to pinpoint, it is clear that the evidence-based practice movement has raised concerns about uncertified programs. In response, uncertified faith-intensive programs are trying to adapt. Union Gospel Mission is seeking certification for their outpatient programs and is moving toward hiring certified counselors. The agency's other program has changed their treatment protocols significantly by adding a more formal professionalized component. This shift is a sharp contrast to the previous treatment model, one that relied heavily on Bible studies and worship service attendance for daily activities. Reflecting this program shift, the agency recently hired a new program director that is dually credentialed as an ordained minister and a certified chemical dependency counselor. This new program director has many years of experience in the addiction field. Similarly, the Salvation Army programs have radically restructured the curriculum for their ARCs, moving from a fairly loose and laissez-faire programmatic approach to a highly structured curriculum oriented around work and faith. For its part, Open House Ministries outside Portland recently talked with state officials about the possibility of obtaining certification. They ultimately decided against proceeding with certification because they were concerned that they would lose control over their hiring process. Nonetheless, this effort demonstrated that even small faith-intensive programs are feeling pressure to adapt their programs in response to changing expectations among funders, clients, addiction professionals, and justice system workers.

There are no striking differences between secular and faith-based programs or between publicly funded and privately funded programs on the mix of recovering and non-recovering staff. A few programs continue to rely almost exclusively on people in recovery, but most feature an eclectic mix of counselors. It is rare for a program to have less than half of the staff in recovery. Program managers continue to be predominantly people in recovery, thereby reflecting the norms of the addiction field at the time that they entered the field. One reason for the continued importance of recovery in the hiring process—albeit at a reduced level—is the widespread belief among executive directors and program managers that staff who are in recovery have the passion and life experience to work with the very difficult clients in inpatient addiction programs. Employment in the field of addiction recovery can be emotionally draining and success is often elusive. Importantly, the still substantial percentage of staff in recovery means that a predisposition to discuss spirituality and the role of a higher power in recovery exists. So despite professionalization, spirituality remains an important aspect of agency programs across the spectrum.

Not too surprisingly, religion plays an important role in the hiring process in the faith-intensive programs. The private funding sources on which these programs rely give them latitude to hire people with attention to religious convictions. In several faith-intensive programs, the direct program staff are screened for their belief in the evangelical Christian faith shared by the leaders of these agencies. However, religion is not commonly used as a screen for non-program staff. All of these programs had volunteers and staff of other faiths. The importance attached to faith as a criterion for hiring is also evident in the resistance of the Union Gospel residential program and Open House Ministries to undergo the formal certification process for an addiction program. These agencies were very concerned that certification would prevent them from using religion as a hiring screen. Looking for certified counselors would inevitably yield changes in their applicant pools and would restrict their hiring preferences. It was reasoned that far fewer applicants are likely to share the religious commitment of the organization and have certification in chemical dependency counseling.

Where resource streams are concerned, inpatient addiction programs are expensive to operate, especially in comparison to alternatives such as outpatient and day treatment. To survive, programs need to be creative and cost-conscious, especially in the current funding environment. In terms of resources, agencies can theoretically rely on public contracts, private insurance, self-pay, private donations, or earned income such as the sale of services. In-kind donations of clothing and other goods and volunteers are other potential assets to an agency or program. In the study sample, the mix of revenues varied greatly but the sharpest differences existed between faith-intensive organizations and all other programs.

All of the faith-intensive addiction recovery programs are part of organizations that operate homeless shelter programs. These faith-intensive programs are free and largely serve people with addictions who are poor and/or homeless. Union Gospel Mission, Open House Ministries, and City Team Ministries addiction programs are funded through the general fundraising appeals of the parent agency. These programs do not have specialized appeals for the addiction program. They do not receive any public funds, private insurance, or self-pay revenues. The Salvation Army in Seattle relies entirely on its thrift store revenues to support its programs. By contrast, the Portland Salvation Army program does receive a subsidy from the regional Salvation Army organization.

The faith-intensive addiction programs are also beneficiaries of the donations of goods such as food and clothing given to the agency. The parent agencies rely extensively on volunteer help for a variety of tasks. However, volunteers are generally absent from direct program roles in the addiction programs except for community volunteers who lead AA meetings available to clients. Union Gospel Mission did have close partnerships with several local churches whereupon volunteers helped with the renovation of their treatment facility. Significantly, in longer-term programs, clients are used in support positions such as maintenance and kitchen help. Indeed, in one women's program, all of the support positions are filled by clients.

The resource mix of the faith-related and secular programs was significantly different than the faith-intensive programs. Faith-related and secular programs tend to share several characteristics pertaining to their resources: (1) a reliance on income from public entities and private insurers along a broad continuum from mostly public to mostly private insurance and private pay revenues; (2) virtually no private, cash donations for operations and no fundraising campaigns specifically to support the addiction program; and (3) very limited private pay by individuals. The lack of private fundraising and volunteers is related to several factors, including the controversial and polarizing character of substance abuse and the remote location of many inpatient addiction programs. There is also a reticence to put forth a major public profile, given the concern of many local residents about the potential deleterious effect of addiction programs on their community. These programs also have lean administrative staffs and are invested in the self-help and individual empowerment philosophy of addiction programs. The only exceptions to this general pattern on fundraising were high-end treatment programs that successfully raised large sums of money for capital projects.

Overall, funding for addiction in the study region (and broader U.S.) is quite scarce and competitive, especially for public funds. Furthermore, agencies primarily dependent upon public dollars are shifting to a mix of public and private patients. In doing so, agencies can use private insurance money to cross-subsidize the money-losing public patients. The high-cost, faith-related hospital programs adopt two other strategies in response to funding constraints: (1) reducing beds or even closing the inpatient substance abuse unit entirely or (2) drastically changing the type of patient admitted in order to ensure higher reimbursement levels. The latter option might include changing the patient orientation to dual-diagnosis patients who qualify for higher payment levels. In Oregon, many publicly funded programs reduced the number of beds and laid off employees in response to state funding cutbacks in the early 2000s. In 2002 alone, over 600 people who worked in substance abuse programs lost their jobs due to state cutbacks.

In this lean fiscal environment, agencies also have been creative with efforts to lower costs or ensure steady revenue streams. Most agencies, especially the longer-term programs, are very lean, almost Spartan operations. Many programs have special arrangements that substantially lower their overhead. For example, the Center for Alcohol and Drug Treatment is housed in a rent-free county facility. Other agencies rely on clients to perform many of the routine tasks, so their staff salary expenses are much lower than normally would be the case. Sundown Ranch has expanded substantially in recent years but it only expands when it has the capital to be debt-free at the end of the expansion. Pacific Ridge, a for-profit agency, is owned by the core employees through a profit-sharing arrangement that gives them extra money if that agency does well financially, thus allowing the agency to have lower base staff salaries. And one of the hospital-based programs negotiated a sole source contract with an HMO, guaranteeing a steady flow of clients and income.

In the current fiscal climate, it might be argued that faith-based organizations dependent on private donations or thrift store revenue have an advantage. However, these agencies still face the facility problem and the substantial costs of running an addiction program which—on the continuum of health and social welfare services—is unusually complicated and fraught with substantial financial risk. The lack of profitability for substance abuse programs is also evident in the conversion of one agency in the sample from for-profit to nonprofit status while another for-profit considered this change. In short, treatment programs can only exist today if they can devise creative solutions to the cross-subsidization problem. For-profits are not in a position to take advantage of grants and many types of contracts or donated goods, materials and buildings. In the current environment, this places them at a competitive disadvantage when compared with other types of programs.

5.6 Community Ties Among Drug Treatment Programs

Are faith-based drug treatment programs better networked in their local communities than their secular counterparts? In the study sample, the external relations of faith-based and secular organizations are quite different but in unexpected ways. First, the two small faith-intensive treatment programs, Open House Ministries and City Team Ministries, tend to be quite insular programs, such that they had relatively little contact with the community, including external funding agencies. Larger faith-intensive programs including Union Gospel Mission and the Salvation Army have ongoing relationships with referral agencies including the courts. Both of these agencies also raise money from the community to support their programs. None of these faith-intensive agencies is engaged in the broader professional addiction community of funders and providers.

The community relationships of the publicly funded secular and faith-based agencies are notably different. These agencies have many different connections to the community and other public and private organizations. In particular, the executive directors and program staff of these agencies are active in provider associations that advocate for public funding of substance abuse programs. Relatedly, many senior agency staff persons participate on state task forces and commissions pertaining to substance abuse. Some of the larger programs also have contact with federal officials and foundation personnel through grant and research projects. They also tend to be active in national addiction organizations such as the National Association of Addiction Treatment Providers (NAATP).

Publicly funded programs also have ongoing contact with the courts, including judges and parole officers, as well as child protective services (on custody cases). Informal linkages exist between treatment providers with respect to client referrals and post-treatment planning. For instance, a client might be assessed as a poor fit for a short-term program. Thus, the staff person might refer the client to a longer stay program. These programs also have regular contact with local AA and NA (Narcotics Anonymous) chapters. However, the staff of these agencies tend to have little ongoing contact with other community organizations such as the Rotary or local congregations.

The networks of the privately funded secular providers are different yet. They have their own provider groups and associations and fewer community ties to the courts, other social and health providers and community institutions like churches. Community ties are also related to an extent to the size of the resource base. The agencies with the most extensive connections in the local community are diversified, multi-service agencies with large boards and many staff and volunteers (of which the addiction program is only one component). This particular point applies to faith-intensive and secular treatment organizations. For example, Volunteers of America in Portland has a diversified funding base with many different programs and extensive relationships to local and statewide organizations. Union Gospel Mission in Seattle raises most of its money through direct appeals to the community and has numerous connections with local congregations and organizations.

In short, faith—in and of itself—confers no special advantages to an agency in its community connections. Indeed, an agency that is solely dependent on a particular congregation for funding (that is, tightly coupled) is not likely to have extensive community ties.[25] Faith, however, may help an agency raise money and gain volunteers from the community as demonstrated by Union Gospel Mission and the Salvation Army. Further, some addiction programs are isolated, by design, from the community. Such isolation is especially evident in long-term, therapeutic community programs. And, addiction programs tend to be wary of the community given the frequent opposition to the siting of community addiction programs.

5.7 Assessments of Drug Treatment Programs: The Thorny Question of Effectiveness

What, then, can be said about the effectiveness of faith-based versus secular programs? This issue is more complex than it might seem at first blush. Perceptions of program success depend heavily on how effectiveness is defined by organizations and the clients they serve. Such definitions vary among groups, with program staff sometimes envisioning success quite differently than clients. Perceived effectiveness is also a product of the degree to which agencies collect information about their program—and what types of information are gathered—to examine effectiveness.

Turning first to agency personnel definitions of effectiveness, every program embraces a similar understanding of overall success. Agency representatives in each program state that their primary goal was getting their clients clean and sober. This shared overarching objective among faith-intensive organizations and other agencies represents the profound influence of the twelve-step recovery model on

[25]Smith and Sosin (2001).

addiction programs, even among programs that have moved away from an exclusive focus on this model. This general approach contrasts markedly with European-style harm reduction programs. Harm reduction programs have an ultimate goal of getting addicts clean but they tend to be far more accepting of continued drug use post-treatment as long as the individual is making progress and engaged in outpatient counseling and working or moving toward gainful employment. This harm-reduction philosophy is absent from the programs featured here.

Beyond these programs' broad commitment to getting addicts clean and sober, several noteworthy nuances are apparent. First, faith-intensive organizations tend to embrace a definition of effective programming that entails an aspiration for spiritual and religious transformation among clients during their stay in the program. In faith-intensive programs, spiritual transformation could be seen as the pinnacle of program success and the strongest bulwark against relapse. As a leader at one of the Salvation Army ARC programs states, "God can do for us what we can't do for ourselves. With a healthy spiritual life, there is no need for drugs and alcohol. People have to surrender to God. If you just reach out, God will help you." Interestingly, similar themes emerged from secular programs that featured a robust spiritual component for clients who desired it. A representative from Sundown Ranch offers the following appraisal: "A spiritual approach is still integral to success. We are a secular agency, but our clients still need the strong spiritual component." Given these programs' elevation of spiritual transformation, drug treatment programs with a faith focus tend to be a bit longer in duration. To a person, however, representatives of such programs are quick to add that spiritual transformation is not a precondition of remaining in the program.

Second, program duration is a key driver in definitions of success. As noted above, programs with a strong faith element tend to be longer, with the expectation that deeper forms of change (including spiritual transformation) take time. By contrast, many of the purely secular programs are shorter in duration and embrace a set of somewhat different second-order objectives beyond the overarching clean and sober goal. These secular programs last anywhere from fourteen to twenty-eight days and are oriented toward client stabilization. Hence, the more truncated duration of these programs drives a definition of success that is founded on realistic short-term achievements. And any achievements obtained within the context of these shorter, stabilization-oriented programs are viewed as only one initial step in a much larger and longer process. For example, Pacific Ridge in Oregon works aggressively to link their clients with family and community support networks. This organization adopts a forward-thinking orientation from day one of treatment, developing plans for regular outpatient treatment after departure upon intake.

Finally, funding sources can be an important influence on definitions of success within drug treatment programs. Some publicly funded programs note that success in their program is defined by objective, measurable criteria that are clearly articulated in the contracts they have with funders. For instance, the secular agency, Volunteers of America in Portland, has two different programs underwritten by contracts with the Multnomah County Correctional Department. The Correctional

Department defines success as no arrests for one year after leaving residential treatment. This approach often permits funders to rate the relative degrees of success among their various grantees, thereby assisting them in making strategic decisions about best practices and how to redirect funds, if needed, to high-performing organizations that will maximize the impact of the Correctional Department's financial investment in treatment programs. Fortunately, Volunteers of America generally receives superlative reviews in the regular evaluation of their contracts by the Correctional Department. They are considered a model program. So, while the clean and sober goal is at the core of every program, some programs—more often than not, publicly funded secular ones—must arrive at discrete ways of measuring their achievements so their performance can be rated year by year and can be gauged against other funded programs.

What, then, do clients think of the inpatient drug treatment programs featured here? In the broadest of terms, clients are generally positive about the inpatient programs that deliver drug treatment services. Like staff, clients define success broadly as living a clean and sober life. It is, of course, important to note that our research protocol did not entail talking to individuals who had left the programs before graduating from them, or tracking clients well after their graduation from programs to examine longer-term evaluations. Therefore, there might be a bit of selectivity (positive response) bias exhibited in the feedback we received. This response bias could stem from the optimism of those who remained involved in drug treatment programs, as opposed to the potentially disgruntled clients who left programs early because they perceived the services to be subpar. This potential selectivity bias concern aside, clients generally note that the programs respected them as individuals and, for the most part, did not try to force them into a standardized treatment model. Nevertheless, many clients were quite critical of prior treatment experiences, which is not altogether surprising because this subsample of individuals had, by virtue of our access to them, required additional treatment services to overcome a relapse.

Beyond these broad similarities in client assessments of programs, some intriguing differences emerge. First, secular programs that lean somewhat more heavily on a standardized approach to treatment service delivery elicited more negative reactions from clients when compared with those that offered a more individualized approach. Criticisms of the standardized—or, more accurately, semi-standardized—approach underscore the degree to which drug addicted clients have internalized expectations for treatment that is carefully tailored to their life circumstances. These expectations would explain why programs that remain even somewhat wedded to a standardized approach were not assessed in as favorable terms as those that featured very flexible offerings.

Second, in some cases, clients' distinctive orientations toward faith yielded different program assessments. At the two small faith-intensive programs, clients expressed a view that their goals for the future included living life according to God's will. For these clients, recovery is perceived to be inextricably linked to spiritual transformation. And in contrast to secular programs that offered a hip-pocket spiritual component for those clients desiring it, spiritual transformation in these faith-intensive programs is understood as "accepting Jesus Christ" as opposed to a more universal conception of God or a higher power. For these clients, spiritual transformation is often seen as essential to recovery, and is perceived to be the foundation that will allow them to get their lives back together. The views were more mixed at the larger faith-intensive programs such as the Salvation Army and Union Gospel Mission, partly because (as noted above) these programs attract a wide diversity of individuals. Many of these clients are not necessarily seeking a faith-based treatment program, but have entered these because their other options were limited.

5.8 Program Effectiveness: Struggles, Strategies, and Relative Successes

Given the subjective assessments of drug treatment programs featured above, a vitally important question might be posed. Why not pursue more objective evaluations of these programs? In this last section, we consider this issue. However, one major caveat bears some elaboration. As program administrators and evaluators familiar with the world of drug treatment know, evaluating residential addiction programs is very complicated. Recall that the uniform commitment to the clean and sober goal places a premium on post-treatment abstinence. And yet, assessing a person's post-treatment drug use requires the careful tracking of clients. Tracking former drug treatment clients is difficult due to lifestyle issues (frequent moves) and confidentiality (the challenges of safeguarding health-related data and potential criminal activity such as illicit drug use). Further, a program would have to conduct random drug tests to assess a person's drug use status in a definitive fashion. The tracking and drug-testing of former clients is both time-consuming and expensive. Government and private insurance companies usually do not provide funding for this type of evaluation, despite their expressed interest in program outcomes. This set of circumstances leaves the burden on the programs to find the funds to undertake meaningful evaluations. And such agencies are generally not awash in funds.

Nevertheless, some general observations emerge about strategies that drug treatment programs enlist in an attempt to address treatment effectiveness questions. First, some publicly funded programs are required to have their programs evaluated. In some cases, the funder has a research division that is charged with the task of evaluating programs. And, in fact, the two programs that have contracts with the Correctional Department rely, in part, on evaluations conducted by the research division of that department.

Second, program size influences the ability to track clients. On this point, some counterintuitive patterns present themselves. Smaller programs, by virtue of their size, often find it easier to collect outcomes data. Open House Ministries is a good example of a small, faith-intensive program that is capable of tracking clients due to the program's small size. This particular agency even publishes data featuring success rates on its website. Because recovering addicts can be a transient population, collecting outcomes data from a large number of former clients can prove to be quite difficult. Of course, the small size of these programs prevents them from engaging in any sophisticated statistical analysis with such data. (Small samples sizes cannot be trusted to produce valid statistical results.) But the logistics of small-scale data collection are more manageable with this population.

Third, given the broader push for rigorous evaluation data in the human services arena, a number of agencies utilize innovative techniques to measure effectiveness and collect data that address the impact of their programs. Many agencies initiated new outreach strategies such as surveys of former clients, alumni gatherings, and special events as a way of tracking client outcomes. This particular type of innovation, while potentially valuable for the program and alumni, is imperfect because it only reaches a select sample of the client population. Again, the selectivity bias factor looms large because those with success stories are more likely to remain in touch and return for such events. Some programs have innovated in data collection by developing proxy (substitute) measures for outcomes. For example, some programs track their drop-out rates from the program, reasoning that if they can minimize drop-outs (program attrition), this indicator would serve as a proxy for client satisfaction and indirectly indicate positive prospects for recovery. However, some evaluation-minded review panels reject retention rates as a genuine measure of outcomes because they do not directly point to client change and can be highly biased by program duration. Simply put, shorter-term programs have higher retention and graduation rates because they do not require the same time investment of a client, they develop a departure plan immediately at intake, and court-mandated clients with few alternative options are common. For example, for three years prior to the first wave of fieldwork for this study, City Team Ministries' twenty-seven month program had yielded one graduate. Some of the faith-intensive Salvation Army ARC programs in Portland and Seattle, while open to virtually anyone, are not only long in duration. They also impose requirements (religious attendance, mandatory work programs) that, after a brief stay, clients may find unsuitable. These types of programs tend to have high attrition rates, especially in the initial month or two.

Finally, what insights can be drawn about the comparative effectiveness of programs, particularly for faith-based versus secular programs? Previous research underscores the potential peril at drawing definitive conclusions about drug treatment programs that are very different in terms of structure (long-term, short-term), client motivations for seeking treatment (court-mandated versus voluntary), client resources (insured versus uninsured), and a host of other factors.[26] With this caveat in mind, however, some conclusions about comparative effectiveness can be drawn based on the data collected from the faith-based and secular treatment programs in

[26]Etheridge and Hubbard (2000), Gerstein and Harwood (1990).

the Seattle and Portland areas. And, as is turns out, these findings resonate broadly with other treatment program comparative effectiveness studies.[27]

A previous comparison of faith-based and secular treatment programs has revealed that organizational and management factors can play a key role in the implementation of best practices that promote effective treatment.[28] The Washington and Oregon agencies examined in this study highlight a similar pattern. Specifically, the secular treatment agencies and the faith-related hospital programs have much greater organizational capacity and infrastructure than the five faith-intensive programs. As such, the former are able to offer much more extensive support services, counseling, classes, and individualized treatment plans. The faith-intensive programs have very lean budgets and staff, although larger faith-intensive programs strive to increase their support services and enhance their treatment curriculum when feasible.

Consequently, the secular and faith-related hospital programs are much better matches for a broader set of patients and clients than the faith-intensive programs. For example, faith intensive programs are not well-positioned to deal with clients with intense needs such as serious mental illness (that is, dual-diagnosis clients) and sex offense histories. These clients are unlikely to be admitted to these programs and, in the event that they are admitted, are unlikely to complete them.

Furthermore, infrastructure problems may affect a client's motivation for treatment and the likelihood of success. Motivation plays an important role in the success of many social service programs. In substance abuse treatment, motivation is a particularly complicated issue because of the involvement of third parties such as correctional officials and the judicial system in the decision to seek treatment. This pattern again raises the limitations of choice when a court is requiring treatment for an individual with the alternative of prison time. As a result, many clients are in treatment because of external pressure or requirements rather than their own internal motivation to change. Yet, even when clients voluntarily enter treatment, they are often very ambivalent about changing the behavior and ridding themselves of their addiction. To engage clients in treatment and increase their motivation for change, a strategy of motivational interviewing—that is, a "directive, client-centered counseling style for eliciting behavior change and resolv[ing] ambivalence"—has been used.[29] Motivational interviewing (or a variant thereof) is widely practiced in outpatient and inpatient settings, including most of the secular programs and faith-related hospital programs in the study sample. But the staffing issues of the faith-intensive programs make it quite difficult for these programs to use this strategy or those like it to increase clients' motivation to change. Put another way, faith-intensive programs need highly motivated clients in order to be

[27]Heinrich and Lynn (2002).

[28]Heinrich and Lynn (2002).

[29]Rollnick and Miller (1995).

successful, and it is not easy to compare apples to apples when one group of programs employs a strategy that another group cannot employ due to staffing restrictions.

The secular programs in this study tend to treat a broad mix of clients, as long as they met the ASAM admittance criteria. Some of these clients may be unmotivated or ambivalent with respect to the program's goals. By contrast, the religious aspects of faith-intensive programs can act as a screen, as can their relatively austere environments. These features may spur unmotivated or ambivalent individuals to either leave the program or avoid admittance altogether.

To be sure, the faith-intensive programs do appeal to some clients. But these clients tend to be the small subset of addicts who are looking for a religious treatment experience or clients who do not have any other options and see these programs as their last best hope to cure their addiction. In this sense, faith-intensive programs play a role historically filled by faith-related organizations. Many of their clients are poor and many have been homeless or in prison. Some of the publicly funded programs (both secular and faith-related) have some of these clients as well. But the clients of the faith-intensive programs are disproportionately poor and often have lengthy histories of addiction. To the extent that public and private funding for treatment is reduced, it is more likely that middle-class clients and the working poor will seek help from the faith-intensive agencies because these programs are free.

The infrastructure and capacity issues noted in previous comparative effectiveness studies[30] are also consequential for policy and practice because they influence the judgment of third party gatekeepers who are, as noted, especially influential in substance abuse treatment. Third parties include judges, parole officers, police, child protective service workers, state addiction specialists, the personnel in managed care firms, physicians, outpatient counselors, and homeless shelter staff. These professionals compare addiction programs based on their own personal experience, as well as client feedback and the post-treatment experiences of the clients that they often personally observe. They are aware of the importance of adequate capacity for the ability of programs to implement best practices. Sufficient capacity greatly helps with the ability of treatment programs to respond effectively to these third parties. As a result, Union Gospel Mission has trained addiction counselors, a more comprehensive curriculum, and established relationships with public and private referral agencies. The Salvation Army has restructured and enhanced its curriculum as well.

Treatment programs develop a reputation over time based on the personal experience of these third parties and their perception of what constitutes a quality treatment program. These third parties then make referrals to programs with good reputations and results. Viewed from this perspective, the small faith-intensive programs tend to be viewed with skepticism since they do not have the infrastructure of the larger programs and do not have all of the components of what is regarded as quality treatment. By design, the small faith-intensive programs remain small since they are not likely to receive many referrals from the professional third

[30]Heinrich and Lynn (2002).

parties. Instead, they rely on individuals seeking help in their shelter programs or individuals who self-refer.

A definitive judgment on the comparative effectiveness of faith-based organizations and secular treatment organizations must await a long-term longitudinal study. From the cases examined here, it appears clear that intensively faith-based organizations are effective with a subset of individuals with substance abuse problems who are seeking a specifically religious experience, but are not in a position to address the often very complicated needs of many addicts seeking treatment today. Policymakers would thus be well-advised to support public investment in secular and faith-based professional treatment that meets the increasing demand for treatment.

*****

This chapter has compared faith-based and secular drug treatment programs in Washington and Oregon. The evidence presented here lends yet further credibility to the organizational self-selection argument initiated in the previous two chapters. Faith-intensive programs often have requirements that leave them unwilling to consider applying for public funding. In the case of faith-intensive drug treatment programs, these requirements include mandatory work programs (for example, at Salvation Army thrift stores) and attendance at religious activities such as church services or Bible studies, even if outright conversion is not required to remain in the program. Moreover, while some clients in faith-intensive programs have a genuine desire to enhance their spirituality, many are court-mandated. These court-mandated clients accept admission into privately funded faith-intensive programs to avoid prison sentences which, in turn, yields considerable cost savings for states that have significantly reduced their public investment in drug treatment programs. This constellation of factors, at the very least, complicates the idea of choice that is supposed to undergird Charitable Choice programs.

It was also difficult to find a purely secular drug treatment program. And, for their part, faith-related drug treatment programs often blended scientific approaches to addiction therapy with faith elements designed to promote recovery. In short, hybridized treatment modalities are abundant in secular and faith-related programs. Many secular drug programs use cognitive behavioral therapy as their primary form of intervention, but have religious resources that they can enlist in a hip-pocket fashion at the request of their clients. Some secular programs retain a chaplain on staff to provide spiritual counseling to clients that desire it. And, given the dominance of twelve-step programs in this service domain, secular programs commonly partner with Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous within the context of their treatment service delivery or as part of their after-care services. Faith-related programs recognize the merits of addiction science models and often mix spiritual messages with cognitive behavioral therapy. Hybridization has likely been amplified by the rise of client-centered individualized approaches to drug treatment and the continued dominance of both addiction medicine and twelve-step programs within this field. We also found that nearly all programs consider themselves to offer holistic services, and are generally viewed as such by their clients, though definitions of holism vary across provider type.

A post-script is also in order with respect to the programs featured here. Nonprofits have long faced funding challenges.[31] Yet, following the initial wave of fieldwork for this study, the Great Recession occurred. Follow-up contacts after the economic downturn provided information that shed further light on these programs. The trying economic times ushered in by the Great Recession have posed serious challenges to drug treatment programs in the Pacific Northwest. Several of the original agencies surveyed were forced, due to economic constraints and reduced government funding, to close their doors or reduce their services. And, for those that survived, the unfortunate consequence of decreased government funding was a dramatic decrease in services and beds available for treatment and permissible stay durations, just as the need for beds and services increased. Sea-Mar, which previously ran forty-three beds out of two locations and offered residential stays up to six months, is now only able to offer eighteen beds with a maximum stay of thirty days.

Faith-based and secular agencies have both been adversely affected by economic constraints, but in different ways. Secular agencies that previously had offered comprehensive (that is to say, bundled) services are now less able to do so. In this sense, secular agencies' efforts to deliver services they define as holistic (substance abuse recovery coupled with job skills training, life skills programs, etc.) were recalibrated to be less comprehensive than before. Some have adopted more of a detox model while offering little in the way of support services.

However, these agencies were not passive actors as the economy contracted. Many agencies innovated by cross-subsidizing their funding through collaboration with other agencies. The Drug Abuse Prevention Center (DAPC) actively examined the possibility of a merger with a local health care center since they are convinced that free-standing residential programs will find it difficult to survive in the new healthcare environment. Agencies have also realized the importance of diversifying their revenue stream. Some organizations that previously drew on public funds began to rely more heavily on donations (car donations, thrift stores) to fund themselves. Open House Ministries was able to bring in over $50,000 through an increased emphasis on their bike repair and thrift store sales. However, a much tighter market for donations was also evident. For example, the Salvation Army had a difficult time competing with for-profit agencies for donations of clothes and cars. Many citizens do not discern between nonprofit and for-profit and just donate at outlets that are most convenient.

Partly due to the scarcity of public and private resources, several examples of creative partnerships between treatment agencies and government/businesses are evident. For instance, Seattle provided one agency with a contract to turn an empty firehouse into a homeless shelter during the winter months. The agency is in discussions to renew the contract for the next several years. Also, Union Gospel Mission began a program named Morning Watch whereupon they contract with

[31]Smith and Lipsky (1993).

certain downtown businesses to pick up individuals loitering in front of the shops and take them to a detoxification facility.

There has also been a significant shift in the faith aspect of some of the programs. Previously, some of the more religiously intensive programs required a serious commitment to the core religious values espoused by the organization. With the increased need for beds and services and decrease in funding, some of the agencies no longer require the commitment of faith and attendance at Bible study classes. Instead, attendance at a twelve-step program or an avowed faith in a higher power will qualify someone for the program. For instance, at Union Gospel Mission, clients are exposed to a Christian message but they have a more structured and professionalized curriculum with an emphasis on life skills than was the case prior to the Great Recession.

In sum, then, it has been a tumultuous time for many agencies. Some agencies have closed and others have adapted by the diversification of revenue sources, new partnerships, changes in mission, and strategic agency assessment. As the Executive Director of Sundown Ranch bluntly described the new economic reality “Flat is the new up!” Put differently, the act of simply keeping one’s doors open and maintaining operations (“flat”) is now seen as a measure of success (“the new up”).

References

Arnold, Ruth M., S. Kelly Avants, Arthur Margolin, and David Marcotte. 2002. Patient attitudes concerning the inclusion of spirituality into addiction treatment. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment* 23: 319–326.

Barnetta, Elizabeth, Steve Sussman, Caitlin Smith, Louise A. Rohrbach, and Donna Spruijt-Metz. 2012. Motivational Interviewing for adolescent substance use: A review of the literature. *Addictive Behaviors* 37: 1325–1334.

Davis, Margot Trotter. 2014. Religious and non-religious components in substance abuse treatment: A comparative analysis of faith-based and secular interventions. *Journal of Social Work* 14: 243–259.

Durrant, Russil, and Jo Thakker. 2003. *Substance use and abuse: Cultural and historical perspectives*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Etheridge, Rose E., and Robert L. Hubbard. 2000. Conceptualizing and assessing treatment structure and process in community-based drug dependency treatment programs. *Substance Use and Misuse* 35: 1757–1795.

Fiorentine, Robert. 1999. After drug treatment: Are 12-step programs effective in maintaining abstinence? *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse* 25: 93–116.

Finnegan, Dana G., and Emily B. McNally. 1995. Defining God or a higher power: The spiritual center of recovery. *Journal of Chemical Dependency Treatment* 5: 39–48.

Gais, Thomas L., Amelia Arria, and Kimberly Caldeira. 2010. Understanding the roles of faith and faith-based organizations in the delivery of drug treatment services: An analysis of merged program and client data. Albany, New York: Rockefeller Institute of Government. http://www.rockinst.org/pdf/faith-based_social_services/2010-04-Data_Analysis_Substance_Abuse_Treatment.pdf. Accessed 2 Jan 2017.

Gerstein, Dean R., and Henrick J. Harwood (eds.). 1990. *Treating drug problems*, vol. 1. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Green, Lesley L., Mindy Thompson-Fullilove, and Robert E. Fullilove. 1998. Stories of spiritual awakening: The nature of spirituality in recovery. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment* 15: 325–331.

Heinrich, Carolyn J., and Lawrence E. Lynn. 2002. Improving the organization, management, and outcomes of substance abuse treatment programs. *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse* 28: 603–624.

Hodge, David R., and Jason Pittman. 2003. Faith-based drug and alcohol treatment providers: An exploratory study of Texas providers. *Journal of Social Service Research* 30: 19–40.

Hoffmann, Stefan G., Anu Asnaani, Imke J.J. Vonk, Alice T. Sawyer, and Angela Fang. 2012. The efficacy of cognitive behavioral therapy: A review of meta-analyses. *Cognitive Therapy and Research* 36: 427–440.

Janzen, Rod A. 2001. *The rise and fall of Synanon: A California utopia*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Jarusiewicz, Betty. 2000. Spirituality and addiction: Relationship to recovery and relapse. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly* 18: 99–109.

Kaskutas, Lee Ann. 2009. Alcoholics anonymous effectiveness: Faith meets science. *Journal of Addictive Diseases* 28: 145–157.

Kelly, P.Elizabeth, Joshua R. Polanin, Sung Joon Jang, and Byron R. Johnson. 2015. Religion, delinquency, and drug use: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice Review* 40: 505–523.

Kownacki, Richard J., and William R. Shadish. 1999. Does Alcoholics Anonymous work? The results from a meta-analysis of controlled experiments. *Substance Use and Misuse* 34: 1897–1916.

Laudet, Alexandre B., Keith Morgan, and William L. White. 2006. The role of social supports, spirituality, religiousness, life meaning and affiliation with 12-step fellowships in quality of life satisfaction among individuals in recovery from alcohol and drug problems. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly* 24: 33–73.

Lyons, Jeffrey C.B., Frank P. Deane, and Peter J. Kelly. 2010. Forgiveness and purpose in life as spiritual mechanisms of recovery from substance use disorders. *Addiction Research & Theory* 18: 528–543.

McCoy, Lisa K., John A. Hermos, Barbara G. Bokhourm, and Susan M. Frayne. 2008. Conceptual bases of Christian faith-based substance abuse rehabilitation programs. *Substance Abuse* 25: 1–11.

McHugh, R.Kathryn, Bridget A. Hearon, and Michael W. Otto. 2010. Cognitive behavioral therapy for substance use disorders. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America* 33: 511–525.

Mignon, Sylvia I. 2015. *Substance abuse treatment: Options, challenges, and effectiveness*. New York: Springer.

Miller, William R., Alyssa Forcehimes, Mary O'Leary, and Marnie D. Lanoue. 2008. Spiritual direction in addiction treatment: Two clinical trials." *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment* 35: 434–442.

Mueser, Kim T., Kikuko Campbell, and Robert E. Drake. 2011. The effectiveness of supported employment in people with dual disorders. *Journal of Dual Diagnosis* 7: 90–102.

Nealon-Woods, Michele A., Joseph R. Ferrari, and Leonard Jason. 1995. Twelve-step program use among Oxford House residents: Spirituality or social support in sobriety? *Journal of Substance Abuse* 7: 311–318.

Neff, James Alan, and Samuel A. MacMaster. 2005. Applying behavior change models to understand spiritual mechanisms underlying change in substance abuse treatment. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse* 31: 669–684.

Neff, James Alan, and Samuel A. MacMaster. 2008. Spiritual mechanisms underlying substance abuse behavior change in faith-based substance abuse treatment. *Journal of Social Work Practice in the Addictions* 5: 33–54.

Neff, James Alan, Clayton T. Shorkey, and Liliane Cambraia Windsor. 2006. Contrasting faith-based and traditional substance abuse treatment programs. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment* 30: 49–61.

Pardini, Dustin A., Thomas G. Plante, Allen Sherman, and Jamie Stump. 2000. Religious faith and spirituality in substance abuse recovery: Determining the mental health benefits." *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment* 19: 347–354.

Rollnick, Stephen, and William R. Miller. 1995. *Motivational interviewing*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Rowe, Cynthia L. 2012. Family therapy for drug abuse: Review and updates 2003–2010. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy* 38: 59–81.

Shaw, Victor N. 2002. *Substance use and abuse: Sociological perspectives*. Westport: Praeger.

Smedslund, Geir, Rigmor C. Berg, Karianne T. Hammerstrom, Asbjorn Steiro, Kari A. Leinknes, Helene M. Dahl, and Kjetil Karlsen. 2011. Motivational interviewing for substance abuse. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 5 (Wiley).

Smith, Steven Rathgeb, and Michael Lipsky. 1993. *Nonprofits for hire: The welfare state in the age of contracting*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Smith, Steven Rathgeb, and Michael R. Sosin. 2001. The varieties of faith-related agencies. *Public Administration Review* 61: 651–670.

Smith, Douglas C., Susan H. Godley, Mark D. Godley, and Michael L. Dennis. 2011. Adolescent Community Reinforcement Approach outcomes differ among emerging adults and adolescents. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment* 41: 422–430.

Stoltzfus, Kenneth M. 2007. Spiritual interventions in substance abuse treatment and prevention: A review of the literature. *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work* 26: 49–69.

Webb, Jon R., Elizabeth A.R. Robinson, Kirk J. Brower, and Robert A. Zucker. 2006. Forgiveness and alcohol problems among people entering substance abuse treatment. *Journal of Addictive Diseases* 25: 55–67.

Chapter 6
Does Faith Matter? Client Transformation in Parenting, Housing, and Addiction Recovery Programs

Having surveyed the contours of service provision in three different locales across the United States, we next turn to questions of change and transformation. These issues are at the heart of current debates over social service provision. Regardless of the particular policy domain in which social service agencies are situated or the type of provider in question, these organizations inhabit a political world in which results and performance are the paramount criteria by which their activities are evaluated. And, in the wake of welfare reform, performance is typically gauged in terms of the numbers of lives changed and the measurable scope of community transformation. Yet, despite the virtues of statistical measurement, a myopic focus on numbers leaves the social processes responsible for client and community change unexamined.

In this chapter, we use qualitative data from our case studies to explore how faith-based and secular providers define and aim to foster change among their individual clients, local institutions, and communities at large. We also explore how public versus private funding influences the organizational strategies utilized to facilitate such transformations. Our analysis reveals that providers of all sorts seek to foster change, but that organizational strategies and personal experiences related to change differ, often dramatically, among faith-based and secular organizations. Definitional, programmatic, and experiential dynamics related to change vary along a number of different axes among faith-based and secular providers, including social service domains, regional religious ecologies and, in many cases, funding sources.

Given the complexity and context-specific character of this issue, we adopt a site-by-site analytical strategy, beginning with parent education programs in Mississippi. Our comparative analysis of Mississippi agencies reveals that faith-based organizations aim for a values-based change of heart while their secular counterparts focus on a knowledge-based change of head. We then turn to transitional housing in Michigan, where we find that faith-based and secular agencies' efforts are directed at a shared instrumental goal, namely, securing permanent housing for client families. Interestingly, faith-based transitional housing agencies

J. P. Bartkowski and S. E. Grettenberger, *The Arc of Faith-Based Initiatives*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90668-3_6

more readily enlist values inculcation than their secular counterparts, though several noteworthy differences are also observed among faith-based organizations. Lastly, we explore how client change is conceptualized, pursued, and experienced in residential drug treatment programs in Washington and Oregon. This case is particularly intriguing because the pervasiveness of twelve-step programs has made faith-based approaches to addiction recovery a dominant force in this policy domain long before the advent of Charitable Choice. Consequently, distinctions between faith-based and secular providers are less obvious in this domain. Instead, reliance on government referrals and funding strongly influence program dynamics. Moreover, distinctive strategies are used to promote client change—namely, recovery from addiction—among faith-intensive programs and their more modestly religious counterparts.

6.1 In Pursuit of Better Parenting: Change and Transformation in Mississippi

Recall from Chap. 3 that parent education programs in Mississippi were quite distinct in the objectives they sought. Secular parent education programs aimed to equip parents with the skills deemed necessary to become effective caregivers. Among these organizations, good parenting was defined as a matter of technical proficiency. By contrast, faith-based programs defined parenting as a moral endeavor, one rooted more in heartfelt values than technical skills. Closely linked to these divergent visions of good parenting, secular and faith-based programs vary in the manner through which change is facilitated.

6.1.1 Distinctive Transformation Goals: Change of Head Versus Change of Heart

Consistent with the skills-oriented training undertaken in secular programs, educators in such courses seek to change parenting techniques rather than values. Their programs are designed to equip clients with new skills. Disciplinary techniques and child-rearing strategies, especially those that are evidence-based and validated by scientific inquiry, are emphasized in secular parent education programs. Thus, parent educators in secular programs spend a great deal of time focusing on the how-to's of consistent, often non-physical, forms of discipline. Promoting change on this front is a formidable challenge given the strong support for corporal punishment throughout the South.

Secular parent educators also seek to transform the repertoire of parenting techniques at the disposal of caregivers, often placing a premium on active listening. On this front, educators seek to change parents' ideas about what it means to listen to children, and how such listening should occur. Parents are taught that listening is not simply an auditory activity—that is, exhibiting attentiveness to children's stated desires. Tactical parenting also involves listening in a way that includes correctly interpreting the child's actions. As noted in Chap. 3, secular parenting educators present these techniques as skills that, with practice, any parent can apply and master. Such skills are often modeled and mirrored during courses to promote knowledge transfer, the sine qua non of client change in secular parenting programs. In this sense, secular programs seek to effect what might be best described as a change of head—the enhancement of parenting knowledge—in their clientele.

The emphasis that secular programs place on the transfer of childrearing knowledge and cultivation of tactical parenting skills does not mean that such courses lack a holistic vision of client change or that they are austere in character. Quite the contrary, secular programs seek to transform both parenting techniques and life circumstances, as evidenced by how services are bundled in such interventions. Thus, it is not uncommon for secular parenting programs to be coupled with GED classes. Moreover, warm relationships often develop between clients and staff in secular parenting programs. Nevertheless, change in such programs steers away from value-driven pursuits (what we have identified as substantive rationality or value-rational action). Instead, secular parenting programs focus on the attainment of tangible, measurable objectives (instrumental rationality or goal-rational action).

Consider the Neshoba Parents as Teachers Center. Despite the warm attachments that develop between staff, parents, and children in this program, secular agency directors conceive of change and transformation in an instrumental fashion. Here, change is demonstrated not through an inward transformation in values but through outward signs such as a demonstration of parenting skills and intellectual development as gauged—that is, measured—through educational advancement. When asked about the types of changes the program seeks to foster in clients, the agency's director describes how "teen moms … are able to complete their high school education while quality programs and people are taking care of and training their infants." The idiom she uses to describe the change-oriented goals of the program is that of skills and resources, the language of instrumental rationality: "Finish[ing] high school seems to mean a great deal to these parents who have few parenting skills. These are typically teen moms … who don't have much support at home. Some of them don't have transportation to even bring the children … They don't have financial support from the father in a lot of cases. They don't have jobs. They are struggling to finish high school."

Educational advancement for mothers and intellectual development among children are among the benchmarks and outcomes against which the impact of the program is evaluated. This agency director went on to describe how one senior during the previous year "just voluntarily wrote a letter [of appreciation] … about how much the program meant to her," telling program staff that "without the program, she could not have finished high school." The staff was "extremely proud of her" because she subsequently won a scholarship to attend a local community college.

Notwithstanding the feelings embedded in this account, what is most striking is the attainment of instrumental goals (e.g., GED, college preparation) that secular parenting programs provide. Of course, this program is intentionally geared to meet instrumental goals because teen mothers who are enrolled in the Even Start/Parents as Teachers program must be working on their GED to receive parent education classes. But such obviation misses the point. The crucial point is that there is an elective affinity between the content and rationale of secular programs on the one hand and outwardly manifested, measurable change on the other. In secular programs, skills are acquired from the outside in, and transmitting knowledge that improves a client's technical competency in parenting is privileged over a change in personal values.

By contrast, faith-based parent education programs were designed to alter the values held by participants, thereby promoting personal change from the inside out. Thus, faith-based parenting programs have their own definition of what it means to facilitate holistic change, and operate according to the logic of substantive rationality (values-driven action). Consider the faith-based fatherhood program at Vicksburg Family Development. When asked about change in this program, the agency director replies:

> One of the things to come out of this [program] is that it's more of a healing. How these fathers were fathered has a direct impact. I know that's not rocket science. But I think a lot that has come out of it has been a healing and a recognition of the role that that man's own father had in his life, just in the stories that they tell. And also it's been a healing for the mothers. Because if they did not have a good relationship with their fathers, if their father was absent, then that affects how she's going to receive the fathering … The same thing with the kids. If they're already feeling angry that all of sudden he wants to make a change, there needs to be some healing on that end too, because they don't trust. He's hurt them too many times before. Like, what's this new thing? So, to move that family unit forward, it couldn't be just working with the dads … It's got to be the whole family moving together.

In this narrative and others from faith-based program providers, problems such as fatherlessness are thrust upon children, but change ("healing") must emerge from within. Personal values are altered, healing is initiated, and this inner transformation yields outward changes in parenting styles, thereby breaking the cycle of fatherlessness. This change is then viewed as putting the whole family and, ultimately, whole communities on a more positive trajectory. In such accounts, the goal is to promote a change of heart (convictions) rather than a change of head (knowledge).

6.1.2 Divergent Pathways: Altering Institutions Versus Changing Individuals

Secular and faith-based parenting programs vary not only in terms of their change-based objectives, but also differ in the pathways through which they pursue these goals. Secular programs focus on building linkages with other secular institutions. Neshoba Parents as Teachers Center relies on educational institutions at the local and state level to carry out its programs. Many of their programs are underwritten by federal "flow-through funds" from the Department of Education. The agency director trumpets the fact that the woman who staffs the agency's impressive library has decades of teaching experience. And, of course, the bundling of GED programs with parenting curricula requires formal organizational ties between their nonprofit and educational institutions in the local area. Thus, institutions are considered a key conduit for promoting client change in secular parenting programs.

By contrast, the pathway for facilitating change in faith-based parenting programs is the individual and not any particular social institution. As the director of one publicly funded faith-based program stated overtly: "As far as measuring success, I think that's measured the most in individual lives. When you can see a family [for whom] it's really been life-changing. That's the biggest impact." The more individualistic orientation exhibited by faith-based parent education providers does not entail a wholesale neglect of institutional alliances, because religious organizations are often critical partners for such programs. Moreover, faith-based personnel are quick to recognize the structural sources of social problems such as fatherlessness and abusive parenting, including intergenerational influences. However, faith-based providers are more apt to describe the solution to such problems as an individual change of heart, which resonates with an inside-out transformation in subjective values.

How are views of change expressed by publicly funded faith-based providers of parent education? Interestingly, the focus on values transformation is apparent in both publicly and privately funded faith-based parenting programs. However, given the mainline religious backgrounds of privately funded faith-based workers interviewed (United Methodist, Presbyterian Church-USA), these parent educators view change as a combination of individual initiative and social circumstances. The director of Life Renewal Ministries, a privately funded religious agency, articulates this middling position. She asserts that "all people can change if they're given the right set of circumstances to change." Yet, at the same time, she argues that "educating a person is very important—understanding why they do what they do. Most people continue to do what they do because they don't know any other way to do it. And I think that when we teach them and show them that you can do this differently, that there is another way to look at this … But I really believe that people can change in life, that they can be educated to a different way, a different value, a different standard."

To summarize, client change within faith-based parenting programs is conceptualized as an inner conversion—in values if not spirituality—that begins at the "core" (heart, soul) of the person and then reveals itself in outward manifestations that include improved parent-child relations. Transforming the inner values of the client to effect outward change in his or her family relationships, of course, resonates strongly with the evangelical ethos that is dominant in the rural South, which is where these programs are situated. Evangelical Christianity, the tradition from which many of the faith-based parent educators are drawn, tends to promote a distrust of institutional solutions to social problems and instead focuses on effecting change "one soul at a time."[1] This individualistic approach to social change was tempered somewhat in privately funded parenting programs, which were staffed by mainline Protestants.

The values-oriented, inside-out approach to client transformation exhibited within faith-based parent education programs in Mississippi is also likely influenced by the traditional conceptualizations of family that remain quite dominant in the rural South. Overt attempts to transform values could be expected in parent education programs given cultural conceptualizations of home being "where the heart is" and the family's status as a "haven in a heartless world." Such an orientation may not be so well received in a job training program whose goals are inherently more instrumental.

6.1.3 Parents' Perspectives: Experiential Changes Among Program Clients

The experiences of parents themselves lend further credibility to the distinctions drawn between secular and faith-based parent education programs. When asked about the personal impact of the program in their lives, parents in secular programs generally stressed goal-rational (that is, instrumental) changes that they had experienced from program entry to program exit. Parenting classes had equipped them with the tools to become more effective caregivers. One participant's remarks were telling: "It helped me to understand children better, and understand why they do what they do … And they tell you how to deal with it better." Several interviewees mentioned the importance of using time-outs, with one reciting a formula for the length of a time-out based on the child's age. This instrumental orientation was also evidenced quite clearly in one woman's response when asked what she found most helpful in the secular program she completed. In fact, the instrumental approach to parent education in this program had given her a new perspective on her role as the parent:

> [It taught me] how to react to the child when the child acts a certain way towards you. And how to stay on a positive note. One thing it really helped me [with] was where I can try to separate [being] the parent and the love I have for my child. I am a really giving, loving person. And it was really hard for me to say, "No, you can't have McDonald's right now. We're not going to eat at McDonald's." And then she would throw a fit and I am like, "Oh, what I am going to do? She is going to hate me if I don't let her eat at McDonald's." Now I know I would have to say, "Look, we're going home. I've got hamburgers cooked at home

[1]Bartkowski (2004). Of course, considerable care needs to be taken in interpreting these patterns. It would be a mistake to assume that faith-based organizations writ large or even religiously based parenting programs ineluctably privilege values over more instrumental concerns. Case studies are known to have outstanding internal validity, yielding confidence about the particular patterns observed; however, they are less trustworthy in producing generalizable knowledge.

that taste a lot better than McDonald's and are healthier." [I could now] just make all these scenarios to her and be able to control her to where she won't throw a fit.

A graduate of another secular parenting program offered this assessment:

They hit on a whole lot of things that you don't think of being a parent. You don't think of little things like why a child is crying, or [the importance of] reading to them or talking to them so their brain will mature. You don't think of that as a parent. You might think they're too young to understand, but they really do … So, as a parent, that's very good. Because when I came, I was like, "OK, I need to start reading to my son more … I need to start doing these things so my child can start understanding and start learning.

Describing the effects of secular programs as instrumental—that is, focused on the acquisition of technical expertise in household rules, child management, and preschooler pedagogy—is not to say that these courses were at all impersonal. Participants in secular parent education programs obviously cared a great deal about their children. During interviews, they spoke in loving and enthusiastic ways about the youngsters under their charge, and had developed a deep affection for those caring for their kids in those programs that provided day-care services. Moreover, there were plenty of instances in which secular programs had yielded effects that were considered quite personal to the parents who had enrolled in such programs or graduated from them. One mother explained that she used to discipline in anger but no longer does so, thereby underscoring the profound personal change that program participation yielded for her: "I used to scream at my kids. And [the program] showed me a way to calm down and tell them, 'This is the way that I want you to do it. I don't want you to do it your way.' And now, since I have been going to these classes, it made me become a better person. It showed me that you don't have to scream, that you can talk to them in a calmer way. It's different now."

Several clients of a secular program underscored its therapeutic aspects, with one stating outright: "It gave me more self-esteem." Others suggested that the skills they learned in such courses made them "more comfortable" with being a parent. In several cases, parents were able to pick up valuable information about the developmental abilities of their child specific to the youngster's age, thereby leading to greater confidence in their parenting abilities. A mother of a young son remarked that the parent educator who pays home visits brings her son things like a flashing light or ball to perform "little tests on him." She liked this aspect of the program and has been thrilled to see her son move ahead of the developmental curve for children his age: "He's to the point where he is eleven months old but he is doing one-year-old things." The home visitor also shows interest in her educational progress and the whole family: "She asks me when I am going to take my GED test, and asks about everybody in the house."

The vast majority of participants in secular programs simply shook their heads to indicate "no" when asked if they would have liked a faith component in their program or would have preferred a faith-based program. They were pleased with their participation and had a hard time conceiving of the program being structured differently when it seemed to meet their needs as well as it did. Interestingly, there was one participant in a secular program who had expressed a desire that a faith component be made available in the program. For over two years, Katie's daughter, Jane, had been removed from her home and placed in foster care by the Mississippi Department of Human Services. With great enthusiasm, Katie articulated her hope for having Jane returned to her soon after completing a parent education course at a local agency. She was rather dismayed that it had not yet happened. At the same time, she recognized that her reunification with Jane would be quite a transition for the both of them. As Katie explains, "I saw her for twelve hours all of last year … It's been two-and-a-half years. I still think of her in the little bitty dresses I put her in." Katie has a local church, but it does not offer support services to parents in any substantial measure. And in the metropolitan area in which she previously lived, the local First Baptist Church offered an array of resources for parents (classes, counseling, and support groups). Given the challenges of her situation, Katie remarked that she would have benefited from having a class with a faith component in it.

> *Bartkowski*: *Would a faith-based program have helped you to reach your goals?*
>
> Yes, it would have been nice.
>
> *Bartkowski: What would have been nice about that?*
>
> To be able to see things in more of a healthier base, a Christian base. A healthier manner of looking at things. More of a Christian way of looking at things. Not being so emotional about everything, but looking at it more [pause]. I don't know how to say it. Just a Christian way.
>
> *Bartkowski: Is faith important to you?*
>
> Oh yes. Yes it is.
>
> *Bartkowski: Will faith influence your parenting from now on?*
>
> Oh yes … Yes, it would help me stay focused on our Christianity. So my daughter would see things in a different way. Maybe if a kid at school was mean to her, I could give her a story out of the Bible of what they did to Job or somebody. So she could see things in another way. But I don't know if they would ever let you do that [here at this secular agency]. Would they?

Interestingly, Katie talks about faith in an instrumental fashion. Faith is a rational "way of looking at things." She views it as a tool to comfort children in times of need. Yet, Katie has difficulty engaging faith in a more value-oriented way. Although one can only speculate, faith might have a different meaning—a more substantive meaning—for her had she completed a faith-based parenting program.

Parents affiliated with faith-based programs talked about changes in their values brought about through program participation rather than technical skills they had acquired. In this sense, faith-based parent education programs can be seen as holistic. That is to say, such programs aim to treat what they define as "the whole person." And, for the most part, they were perceived as successful in achieving this goal. This holistic, value-oriented approach became apparent when participants were asked how the program had helped them. Cecil described how he learned to express feelings and experiences that he hadn't previously shared with anyone:

> There were some things that I talked to them about that I couldn't talk to no one else about … [The teacher said that what we discussed] was confidential and that it wouldn't go nowhere else, that it couldn't go nowhere else. So I talked about it and got it off my chest. It felt a whole lot better … Before I got into this program, I couldn't [pause]. I really wasn't the type of guy [who got personal]. But after I learned and prayed [pause]. They prayed with me. And I become a better person because I could feel it in myself.

For Robert, "sharing" was also the key. But, for him, such sharing took the form of learning how to share his self and his time with other family members since he completed the fatherhood program. Here again, the theme of ethical imperatives—even moral urgency—is raised relative to family relationships: "One thing, I have become more aware of sharing. There are times when you think that it's going to be OK—that the kids can take care of themselves. But I have begun to share more as a result of the program. You don't know if you're going to be here tomorrow. You think, well, these [bad] things aren't going to happen. But you need to share this month, and do all you can to just share with your family."

Dave offered this perspective, suggesting how his overall values and demeanor as a man have changed as a result of the program:

> The program itself has helped me personally. I come from a single-parent family. My mom raised all of us because my father died when we were young. But it made me focus in on a lot of things, because I am always on the go. As everybody else has said, a lot of times we just don't sit down and take the time and just do things with [children]. Just doing things with them has some value to it … [The program] has caused me to think about things that I probably would not have focused on … One thing I picked up indirectly is that, as men, we've got to be willing to change. There are a lot of things that go on out there that we might not do because they are not manly or because they might make us look soft or whatever. But when it comes down to your kids, you really need to be flexible and do some things that you probably wouldn't do. When asked [to do something] by my daughter, I might have said, "Well, that's something your momma' would do." We have got to be willing to change and accept change … When it comes to your kids, you really have to be flexible … Everything doesn't have to be so serious all the time. Men—they can be hard and tight. But you just have to have fun and stuff. So I picked that up.

When asked about his goals for the future and how the program might have influenced those, Dave confessed that he had not been the most involved father to this point in his life. And with the imminent arrival of his first grandchild, he vowed to change. Words that he had spoken to his wife in the past—namely, "that's your baby"—were something he would never consider again where grandparenting was concerned.

Some men and couples who attended faith-based classes together also noted changes in their relationship because of the religious values they had been taught. Cecil described the changes in his relationship with his female partner not only in terms of general values, but also in terms of religious conviction with hints of a resurrection theme: "My girlfriend … changed a whole lot. She started reading her Bible. She was full of the world, you know. But she's coming back to life now. I just keep on praying [for her]." Others noted clear changes in their behavioral patterns, and traced those changes to the religious teachings in faith-based programs. One man talked quite personally about the positive changes he observed in himself, and how they manifested themselves in closer family relationships:

> If you don’t have prayer, things will go bad. It’ll go sour. [The change] won’t last long, and [life] won’t work out.
>
> *Bartkowski*: *So did the spiritual component [of the program] have an effect on you…?*
>
> Yes … It taught me how to think better. I’m not going to lie. I was kind of an abusive person. I mean, I used to drink a lot—heavy. And then the reverend [parent educator] used to come by the house and I used to be full. I mean, [I was] full of the alcohol and stuff. And he got me together one day. And he said, “We’re going to go to this thing—the fatherhood [class].” He started talking to me about it. He started coming by the house and talking about it. And I just slowly, slowly, slowly eased my way away from drinking because I knew it was pushing my girlfriend away, pushing the family off from me. So we talked about that and he told me what to do. So I went on and gave it to God. He helped me out a whole lot.

Underscoring these remarks about values and religious commitments is not to say that skills training was wholly absent from faith-based programs. The Active Parenting program at St. Andrew’s Mission uses a skills-based curriculum (e.g., active listening, democratic decision-making, building children’s self-esteem) in combination with faith-based motivations for better parenting (e.g., scriptural mandates to “train up a child”). Thus, this program can be presented as offering the best of both worlds—skills training with values reorientation. And, the fatherhood programs also taught men basic parenting skills—“how to deal with your children,” as one participant put it. Yet the key here is that such skills training was inevitably coupled with value-based motivations often rooted in faith or, more broadly conceived, moral responsibility for the welfare of one’s family. The comments of participants in the fatherhood program support this interpretation. Marcus now sees himself as the “priest” or spiritual leader in his household:

> I think [the program] taught me how to communicate more with my teenage daughter. To let her unwind and be able to listen. I knew about the role of the father as far as being the priest, and leading my daughter and my family. But I think the most important thing that I learned is that a father could be present in the home, but he still could be absent … He could be involved with a lot of activities like hunting, fishing, vehicles, or football. He might be in the home, bringing home all of the money and paying all of the bills, but still he’s absent from being a father figure.

Marcus said that although he disliked being away from his family an additional weeknight every week during the eight-week course, his wife and daughter encouraged him to attend. He ended up making up for the time lost with his daughter by telling her what he was learning and then learning about things that were important to her.

> And if I would say, “Look, I have had a hard day. Why don’t you kind of like be quiet for a minute.” And she would say, “Daddy, you’re supposed to learn how to relax and listen to me.” So she kind of like reminded me of what I had been through in the program.
>
> *Bartkowski: Can I ask how you reacted to that?*
>
> I have been praying for patience, to get patience with a fifteen year-old.
>
> *Bartkowski: And have your prayers been answered?*

> They had a bomb threat the first week of school, so I was able to hear her reaction. And I asked her if she prayed for anybody during the bomb threat that didn't know God. The most important thing I was able to learn from this is to spend quality time with my daughter and to respect her as a teenager. But I still can talk to her about adult issues that are going on, like the bomb threat or events that go on in the news. She might ask me a question for something I don't have the answer for. Then I have to find the answer for her and give her the answer.

The distinction between goal-oriented development privileged in secular programs and value-oriented transformation sought after in faith-based programs points once again to different ways of conceiving of motivations for personal change. As the foregoing accounts illustrate, personal change is seen as emerging from the inside out among participants in faith-based programs. Here, religious concepts such as conversion and redemption are understood as a "rebirth from within" and loom large. Yet, personal change does not end with the individual—it begins in the heart and soul and then turns outward to influence social relationships. Thus, several men in fatherhood programs who talked about the personal changes unleashed in them also described how those personal transformations facilitated broader changes. A police officer and fire fighter in one focus group commented that the program helped him realize the extent to which kids in the community "looked up to" him. A deeper awareness of his status as a role model gave him a more profound sense of responsibility to all the children in his community. Later in this same focus group, Kendall picked up on this theme of social responsibility:

> Basically, we have got to be there for all those kids. We have got to be there for all those kids, not just our biological children. We have got to be there for the community as a whole. And not just for the boys. Nine times out of ten, people say that we've got to be role models for the males. But, hey, we've got to be role models for the females. We've got to. Because the female parent, there are times she will say, "Hey, you see Mr. John Doe over there? When you grow up, that's the kind of father I want you to be."

In contrast to such value-oriented accounts, assessments of personal change from secular program participants are decidedly more instrumental. To be sure, genuine and dramatic change seems to occur in secular programs; however, it takes a different form. Secular programs confer upon clients the skills needed to become a more effective parent, often by expanding opportunities in other spheres of social life. In narratives from clients in secular programs, change from without occurs as skills are taught, modeled, and ultimately acquired.

6.2 Shared Goals, Different Means: Transitional Housing in Michigan

Given that distinct change of head versus change of heart orientations emerged, respectively, among secular and faith-based providers of parent education in Mississippi, are these same patterns observed among transitional housing initiatives in Michigan? As illustrated below, there is some evidence that skills-based versus values-based orientations surface in this policy domain as well. That being said, moving from one policy domain, religious ecology, and regional locale to another —namely, from parent education in evangelical Mississippi to transitional housing in the somewhat more religiously diversified (Protestant and Catholic) setting of Michigan—underscores how the interplay of skills and values inculcation changes across social settings.

6.2.1 Setting the Stage: The Fight Against Homelessness

All of the transitional housing programs in the Michigan case study focused, in some measure, on skills development among program clients, and all recognized that client changes needed to be both tangible (e.g., stable employment) and intangible (e.g., enhanced self-esteem). In transitional housing programs, practical changes in clients' life situations are the focus of social service agencies' efforts. The critical measure of success in these programs, whether faith-based or secular, is the extent to which a client is able to gain and retain housing, along with the safety and security that a residence can provide. Ancillary objectives include increasing clients' educational attainment and improving their financial situation.

The instrumental, and readily measurable, nature of these goals underscores one critical point of distinction between transitional housing programs and parent education programs. In service domains where objectives are complicated, abstract, and even a bit fuzzy, such as parent education, stark distinctions surface in the ways in which program goals are conceptualized and the types of changes that are sought by providers. By contrast, social service arenas characterized by more clearly discernible, even quantifiable, goals such as stable housing, educational advancement, and increased income lend themselves to fewer goal-oriented distinctions between faith-based and secular programs.

Yet, while the goals of transitional housing programs are remarkably similar, the means for achieving those goals vary considerably among provider types. In the fight against homelessness, provider-based differences are manifested not in terms of the goals that are sought, as all can agree on the value of putting a roof over the head of a homeless person or family. Rather, the question becomes by what *means* should those who are enlisted in this cause seek to achieve this goal. As demonstrated by the case study featured in this section, faith-based transitional housing programs are more inclined to use values-oriented methods of service delivery to promote client transformation than are their secular counterparts. And yet, faith-based transitional housing organizations are not monolithic in their efforts to eradicate homelessness. Faith-based providers employ a number of different strategies to promote transformation in the lives of their clients.

6.2.2 *Faith-Intensive Versus Secular Approaches: Mary's House and Hospitality House*

Governing concepts such as home and family are defined in quite holistic terms within faith-based transitional housing agencies. Mary's House serves as an excellent case in point. The efforts to place clients in stable housing at Mary's House are undertaken with the assumption that a home is "more than just a roof over a family's head." At Mary's House, workers understand a home as a haven or protected place in which relationships of trust, love, and commitment can be nurtured. Indeed, the concept of family that pervades Mary's House places a premium on collective responsibility for the welfare of each person in the family. This idea resonates quite strongly with progressive approaches to social justice, which favor collective responsibility for the homeless, despite the fact that Mary's House is affiliated largely with conservative churches. Nevertheless, this commitment to the welfare of all is linked quite closely with requirements about regular religious worship at Mary's House. In this faith-intensive organization, which is not underwritten by government funding, clients are expected to participate in worship services and devotional activities as part of their involvement in the agency's transitional housing program.

The workers at Mary's House conceive of a family as something much more than a group of individuals who share the same residence. Family relationships are covenantal, which is to say that they are characterized by enduring responsibilities, both social and spiritual. Interestingly, faith-based transitional housing programs that share this vision frequently offer parent education and family counseling classes for just this very reason. Here again is evidence of a holistic, comprehensive orientation toward service provision, one in which various services are bundled together to minister to the whole person and the panoply of relationships present in many households (e.g. parent-child, husband-wife).

Thus, a principal focus of the work undertaken at faith-based agencies such as Mary's House is to reflect God's love to those who are served by its programs, that is, women who are pregnant and unmarried. When asked to characterize the aims of their programs, the executive director of Mary's House explains that staff persons seek "to show God's love to the girls, knowing they can change and [have] a strong family unit. [We want to] give hope. Women find it's a real peaceful place to be. We want to give that to them while they are in the program and get them back on their feet … Their ability to parent is improved. They've seen Christianity worked out. They experience the love of Christ through us."

So as not to dismiss these patterns mistakenly as idiosyncratic to a faith-intensive (highly religious), privately funded agency such as Mary's House, it is noteworthy that this same values-based approach to transformation was observed at other faith-based organizations, absent the requirements for worship service attendance. For example, the executive director of Charity House, a faith-based transitional housing agency that has sought government funding, stressed how their mission is to provide love and compassion for their "guests"—tellingly, they reject the term "clients"—who are homeless and "hurting."

It might be reasonably expected that faith-based organizations, and particularly faith-intensive agencies such as Mary's House, would focus quite heavily on promoting a change of heart and inculcating values. There is indeed evidence of this priority at Mary's House, as interviews with agency staff are peppered with terms like "love" and "acceptance" when discussions turn to the agency's principal mission, and are coupled with references about promoting "healthy relationships." In the words of the executive director at Mary's House, the agency strives "to provide a safe place for girls while they are pregnant. For them to feel love and acceptance, as many have been rejected. For them to have healthy babies. To learn healthy parenting."

However, this not to say that there is an overly narrow focus on values at Mary's House and other faith-based transitional housing agencies. More often than not, these agencies exhibit a dual focus in which values (substantive rationality) are the priority, but skills (instrumental rationality) are not neglected. For example, on the heels of references to "love and acceptance," the executive director at Mary's House adopts the more goal-rational language of pragmatic achievement and outcomes-based measurement: "I want [the young women at Mary's House] to go to college, and [we] stress the GED [to get them into college]. There is a higher likelihood of them becoming homeless without college." She also mentions that building self-esteem and enhancing the goal-setting capacities of their clients are among the benefits of program participation. This marriage of substantive and instrumental forms of rationality in which love and acceptance are coupled with a more pragmatic emphasis on education and the likelihood of achieving particular outcomes is due, in part, to the preeminent goal shared by transitional housing agencies, namely, permanent placement in a home. It is also connected to the difficulty associated with achieving this goal. As put by the executive director of Mary's House, "I'd like them to be in permanent housing [when they leave], although that is unrealistic."

Secular and religious providers of transitional housing aim to provide the same service to their clients, namely, short-term stable housing. However, the means by which they seek to achieve this goal vary considerably. So do their approaches to client transformation. A secular agency, Hospitality House, provides an excellent counterpoint to many of the patterns observed at faith-intensive Mary's House. To begin, secular transitional housing agencies such as Hospitality House adopt a more explicitly instrumental approach to their work than do their counterparts at faith-based organizations. Secular agency directors and case workers prioritize skills-first solutions to homelessness. Hospitality House's executive director articulates their approach quite succinctly, "The goal is for people to be as stable and successful and independent as they can be." She explains that because many clients at Hospitality House "have not learned the skills … or had the opportunities to make progress," simply teaching the skills associated with independent living is considered a victory in this agency. Interestingly, then, the covenantal vision of family life embraced at faith-based agencies such as Mary's House contrasts with the more independence-oriented definition of family (self-sufficiency) at secular organizations such as Hospitality House. In this respect, secular providers embrace the culturally dominant ideal of personhood in the United States, focusing as it does the autonomy and responsibility of the individual.

Pressed to talk about whether programs at Hospitality House seek to foster changes in values, skills, or both, the agency director's response resonates with the skills-based approach toward change that was also evidenced in secular parent education programs. She charges that "it is easier to change their behavior and hope then [that] their attitude changes." As was the case with secular parenting programs, then, outward signs of change (behavioral evidence of skills and competencies) in secular transitional housing agencies are seen as preceding inward change (subjective dispositions, psychological well-being). Thus, distinctive visions regarding the directionality of change—client change from the inside out among faith-based providers versus client change from the outside in among secular providers—is observed in both parent education and transitional housing. In fact, the very nature of clients' inner lives is conceptualized quite differently at Mary's House and Hospitality House. The emphasis on nurturing *values* (e.g., demonstrating love and acceptance) at Mary's House contrasts markedly with the goal of promoting altered *attitudes* (e.g., teaching the principle of self-reliance) at Hospitality House.

Yet, here again, this prioritization of behavioral change coupled with the secondary goal of fostering attitudinal change does not mean that services are provided in a cool or detached fashion at Hospitality House. As indicated by its director, this agency seeks to foster "self-esteem building" and regularly provides "encouragement" to help clients cultivate the skills they need to develop for independent living: "We work on finding ways to praise them for their successes. We give them the chance to contact us if they have questions or problems." And yet the goal of self-sufficiency is always present at Hospitality House. The director explains: "But [we] balance that [encouragement] with the need for them to do it on their own."

Further evidence of the dominance of goal-oriented (instrumentally rational) service provision at Hospitality House is found in the method through which they promote self-sufficiency. The director recounts that they "work on having goals in writing and giving them feedback" about their progress. Instrumental rationality is principally concerned with the strategic achievement of goals, and offers clearly defined "benchmarks" designed to measure progress along the way. Such is certainly the case as Hospitality House. Although clients' written goals are by no means a legally binding document, they do form somewhat of a contract between provider and client. Written goals also provide a measuring stick against which progress can be gauged, with feedback designed to foster incentives for the continued pursuit of those goals or necessary course corrections. At Hospitality House, such evaluative mechanisms are not as formal as performance reviews in the workplace. And yet, there are similarities, such that staff can evaluate and monitor clients' progress toward the goals they have set for themselves through periodic interviews.

6.2.3 Faith-Based Diversity in Transitional Housing

One of the clearest patterns to surface in the domain of transitional housing is the variety of faith-based strategies of service provision aimed at promoting client change. In some faith-based organizations, a commitment to specific values—or at least particular practices that are interpreted as evidence of commitment to those values on the part of clients—is required to participate in the program. By contrast, other faith-based agencies seek to provide an environment in which religious orientations may develop among clients, though these organizations stop short of requiring devotional activities or compliance with particular behavioral standards to remain in the program. Not surprisingly, these distinctions broke down largely along the lines of public funding and faith intensity, such that privately funded faith-intensive programs could institute restrictions on clients that publicly funded faith-related programs chose not to impose.

A comparison of Mary's House and Hope House serves as an excellent example of the diversity of faith-based approaches to transitional housing. Mary's House and Hope House are both faith-based organizations. Both of these agencies desire to create an ethos that is supportive of religious orientations among clients. And they both share the same target clientele, namely, unmarried pregnant women. Yet, this is where the similarities between these two agencies end.

Mary's House, which is affiliated with and underwritten by several conservative churches in its local community, *requires* participation in Christian worship on Sundays. This particular expectation is non-negotiable at Mary's House, even for persons who embrace non-Christian faiths. Interestingly, what counts as Christian is defined narrowly enough at Mary's House to tag as out-groups such denominations as Jehovah's Witnesses, which most observers of American religion would recognize as Christian. Beyond regular Sabbath observance, staff persons at Mary's House also expect clients to engage in individual religious study. As explained by the executive director at Mary's House: "We ask them to do personal devotions, [and then to] read scripture when they show more interest in God. I believe that all people can change on their own. But it's easier when you have hope and believe in God's love."

Mary's House is quite favorably disposed toward organized religion and congregational partnerships because, as its director explains, "Strength from the church is an extra support." While the term "support" here is obviously intended to describe the benefits of the integration of clients into congregational networks, it is worth noting that church support lends itself to another interpretation—namely, the financial support that Mary's House draws from its underwriters, local congregations. The affinity between Mary's House and local conservative Christian congregations is therefore not only ideological. It is financial. Still, the director at Mary's House is careful not to define success in purely religious terms. She trumpets the fact that changes in clients are commonly manifested regardless of the religious values ultimately embraced by their clients: "I don't say they aren't successful if they *don't* [join a church] … If they come here, eighty percent change whether they even accept Christianity."

Consistent with the requirement for religious worship at Mary's House, there are also some behavioral expectations to which clients must agree. During the interview, the agency's executive director explains that Mary's House "impose[s] a no-sex rule" for the young women in their program. On the face of it, a "no-sex rule" would seem to be the most values-oriented posture toward clients that an agency could adopt. Yet, when asked to explain the reason for the imposition of a no-sex rule, the director at Mary's House does not cite traditional religious indictments concerning the sinfulness of premarital sex or conventional religious arguments about the immorality of childbirth outside the bonds of marriage. Instead, she couples an appeal to psychological well-being with pragmatic reasoning.

First, she explains that the no-sex rule teaches young women to feel complete without being sexually or romantically involved with a man, which is an essential component of building the self-esteem of the young women that they serve. Second, she asserts that involvement with selfish or manipulative men can undermine a new mother's ability to parent effectively, thereby underscoring the utility of the no-sex rule. To help young women accommodate to the no-sex rule and achieve the goals associated with it, they collectively read a self-help book, *Mr. Wrong/Mr. Right*. This book is designed to teach young women at Mary's House to evaluate most carefully the men with whom they associate, and aims to have them ask critical questions about partner compatibility once they begin to date men and consider marriage.

Consequently, the program at Mary's House simultaneously stands against premarital sex and stands for marriage while avoiding conventional religious condemnations of pregnancy outside of marriage. To be sure, this program can be accurately characterized as strict in terms of its requirements for religious devotion and sexual abstinence. However, at Mary's House, client change is fostered by combining mandates for religious devotion and sexual abstinence with the cultivation of staff-client relationships that are characterized by love, compassion, and closeness. As stated pointedly by its director, the young women at Mary's House "deserve love no matter what they've done or how they act."

In contrast to the religious mandates and behavioral restrictions evident at Mary's House, Charity House and Hope House are faith-based (in fact, faith-related) organizations that also stress the role of faith in promoting client change but very intentionally provide significantly more latitude to clients in this regard. Charity House has sought government funding, which was possible due to its commitment to the more flexible "guest"-centered character of its programs: "We ask people what they need. We do not define success [for them] … We don't try to change them. We provide a place where changes can take place by the person themselves." When asked how the program goes about doing that, he adds, "By maintaining a peaceful, nurturing, supportive environment. We remove hostility and violence [from their lives]. One woman [told us] this was the first time in two and a half years she had slept without a knife under her pillow."

For her part, the program director at Hope House substitutes the word "spiritual" for the term "religious" when discussing the role of faith in its programs, targeted as they are at pregnant young women: "We ask about her spiritual belief." Spiritual beliefs, of course, can include a generic belief in God or particular religious principles (e.g., the Golden Rule) without entailing formal affiliation with a religious organization. In this way, Hope House's first point of contact with its clients is quite different from that of Mary's House. Formal religious involvement is expected at Mary's House, whereas more broadly spiritual convictions are welcome at Hope House.

Other faith-based transitional housing agencies also stressed the desirability of enlisting spiritual resources in their cause, and suggested that faith-based case workers have more tools in their service provision repertoire than their counterparts in secular agencies because faith is not off limits for them. A case manager at Charity House said that she was "elated this is a faith-based ministry. It's a place where I can say the word God without being pulled aside and told it's inappropriate. It's okay to pray with guests. It's okay, if a demon comes in here to work that out and it wouldn't be held against me."

Nondenominational references to God, prayer, and even demons notwithstanding, staff persons at agencies such as Hope House and Charity House are not hostile toward organized religion. In fact, they frequently refer clients to local houses of worship and can recount specific instances of having done so. Hence, these sorts of faith-based organizations are willing to seize on the durability of the social networks found in religious congregations, a resource that involvement in a temporary social service program, such as those offered by transitional housing agencies, cannot itself provide. Still, for various reasons, including a desire to avoid imposing religion on their clients and to maintain eligibility for public funding, such agencies stop well short of making religious worship a mandatory component of their program.

Interestingly, the relationship between the moderately religious faith-related organizations and local congregations is more complicated than the positive posture faith-intensive Mary's House adopted toward Christian churches. In a point of convergence among all faith-based transitional housing agencies, the encouragement to consider a religious congregation was predicated on the social and familial benefits of congregational participation. As a Hope House agency director stated, "We encourage them … [to see that] belonging to the church [can be a] support system and a positive environment for their kids." By identifying the membership rewards of congregational affiliation, all faith-based transitional housing agencies enlisted the logic of instrumental rationality with reference to religious participation.

And yet, beyond this shared instrumental rationale for religious affiliation, there were some remarkably different dispositions that faith-based transitional housing organizations exhibited toward the formation of partnerships with religious congregations. Faith-intensive, privately funded Mary's House generally exhibited trust toward the religious congregations in its orbit. This finding is not terribly surprising. The network ties between Mary's House and its supporting religious congregations were not only social in character (referral of clients), but financial as well (reliance on funding and significant in-kind donations to assist residents).

Yet, faith-related transitional housing agencies that were more independent of religious congregations, and perhaps less reliant on the resources that such congregations can provide (money, volunteers), were often critical of practices that they had observed in some churches. In fact, directors and staff at the moderately religious faith-based organizations were quick to recount negative experiences they had seen when partnering with some congregations. Among such criticisms, case workers at faith-related agencies called out congregations with judgmental attitudes toward the homeless or self-serving, manipulative orientations. The program director of Hope House, who herself has successfully referred clients to local congregations, explained how she learned to be quite careful in doing so: “We have seen church[es] with off-the-track ideas, like the woman whose minister told her to pray about her depression. [He] told her it was her fault because she was sinful. He discouraged her from taking her meds. She’s still homeless.”

Of course, some faith-based agencies that utilize volunteers from local congregations can determine, through the very availability and performance of congregational volunteers, which faith communities embrace the goals of the transitional housing agency and which do not. An executive director at one such agency has winnowed down his congregational referral list through a combination of negative and positive experiences he has had with leaders and adherents in local houses of worship. Now, he only recommends congregations to clients if he knows the faith community quite well: “I am hesitant to connect people to churches unless I know them. Too many of our people have been sucked dry [by churches they attend]. One resident was [encouraged to continue] tithing at the same level [after she became homeless] as before she became homeless. They knew she was homeless.”

The distinctions between faith-based organizations’ efforts to eradicate homelessness and those of local congregations are also magnified by government funding. The comments offered by the executive director of one publicly funded faith-based agency indicate his wariness of privately funded religious efforts at providing transitional housing: “The only condition of [government funding] is not to proselytize. [But we are] not in the business of saving souls. It’s not a philosophy or theology. Clients are manipulated enough by others. They don’t need to be manipulated spiritually.” In short, faith-based transitional housing organizations generally embrace more values-oriented means to achieve their goals than do secular agencies, even as diversity in ideology and programming is readily apparent among different types of faith-based providers in this social service domain.

6.3 Client Transformation in Addiction Treatment Programs in the Northwest

To this point, we have seen that the move across policy domains—namely, from parent education to transitional housing—is marked by number of important differences in faith-based versus secular social service provision. Nevertheless, one key similarity in these policy domains should not escape our attention. In parent education, faith-based organizations are recent additions to the social service provision arena. In transitional housing, faith-based providers have long been involved but could not be described as dominant in the field. In turning our attention now to drug and alcohol treatment programs, the character of service provision looks quite different indeed. In fact, faith-based providers have long been seen as legitimate competitors and, in many respects, are a dominant force in addiction recovery. In the case study that follows, we observe fewer stark differences between faith-based and secular providers of addiction treatment services than was evident in either of our previous case studies. And yet, several noteworthy distinctions emerge along the lines of faith intensity (highly religious versus moderately religious programs), and with respect to the influence of government referrals and public funding.

6.3.1 Stepping to Recovery: Transformation and the Twelve-Step Model

Personal transformation is a central component of twelve-step programs that, as noted, are a formidable presence in the addiction treatment domain. In the twelve-step model, personal transformation is defined as recovery from alcoholism and drug abuse, and this approach has shaped treatment strategies in both religious and secular agencies. Given the early arrival of twelve-step programs in this policy domain, the language of recovery was widely adopted by formal nonprofit and for-profit treatment programs during the last half of the twentieth century. Although treatment programs have become more diverse in recent years, the twelve-step philosophy remains pervasive in many programs.

The twelve-step movement dates to the founding of Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) by Bill Wilson and Bob Smith in 1935. The twelve steps to recovery were subsequently published in a book in 1939 that detailed the recovery process and provided vivid stories of individual transformation. Seizing on the momentum of the self-help movement and the rise of therapeutic culture during the twentieth century, countless volumes on twelve-step approaches to substance abuse have been published in the decades since this initial volume appeared. This genre has expanded to occupy a formidable portion of self-help sections in bookstores throughout the U.S. and much of the world, and the twelve-step approach has been transposed to address personal difficulties that now go far beyond substance abuse itself (e.g., family dysfunction, sexual addiction, and eating disorders).

The twelve-step approach to addiction recovery is predicated on the goal of personal transformation (recovery), initially conceived as the product of intentionally turning one's life over to God or a higher power. Not surprisingly, then, several of the specific steps within this framework make reference to God or, more commonly these days, a higher power. For instance, step two in AA materials suggests that recovery occurs when an individual comes "to believe that a Power greater than ourselves could restore us to sanity." Step six suggests that another essential step in recovery takes place when an individual is "entirely ready to have God remove all these defects of character." Although Alcoholics Anonymous materials use the terms God and Power interchangeably, the latter of these terms has come to be more commonly used in twelve-step programs today because it can be interpreted in a broad, universal way.

As was evidenced in our case study of transitional housing, the difference between religion and spirituality is noteworthy. Generic references to deity as a higher power accommodate individual and programmatic variations in images of God, permit outreach to those who might otherwise reject organized religion, and place a premium on the diverse paths a recovering addict can take to achieving personal transformation. Moreover, defining success in twelve-step programs as recovery employs a broader, more inclusive framework than is permitted by conventional metaphors of religious conversion, namely, rebirth. Thus, apart from being able to avoid defining an addict's transformation through the narrow lens of religious conversion, the concept of recovery through connection with a higher power broadens the definition of success in overcoming addictive behaviors. By this broader measure, success includes those who have had a spiritual transformation that prompted a reordering of priorities and restructuring of relationships with others. And, as was the case with transitional housing, in contexts where the trappings of organized religion might be off-putting to prospective clients, more benign references to spirituality serve a valuable purpose and broaden the appeal of programs.

Among the social service organizations included in this case study, most programs—whether secular or faith-based—offer twelve-step classes and stress personal transformation as the primary avenue for overcoming addiction. The secular programs and most faith-based programs approach personal transformation as a unique, highly personal experience. Thus, a general premium is placed on inner change. Some programs also encourage individual clients to attend Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) meetings, off-site, to build supportive relationships with community members who at one time also had an active substance abuse problem.

Two secular agencies infused the twelve-step approach throughout their entire program, thus blurring the dichotomy between secular and faith-based that is often used to characterize agencies or the programs they run. In the case of addiction treatment, the faith-based programs run by secular agencies required extensive reading of twelve-step material and encouraged individuals to work through the twelve steps as a method for pursuing recovery. Such blurred lines were also observed in parent education, where secular agencies sometimes offered faith-based programs. Clearly, the fact that this pattern was observed in multiple case studies raises important questions about the dichotomous, tidy categorization of agencies as either secular or faith-based.

This blurring of the boundaries between secular and faith-based notwithstanding, diverse interpretations of a higher power are evident in these alcohol and drug treatment programs. In some of the secular programs, a higher power (intentionally lower-case) is understood as the bonds that are formed with fellow alcoholics.

In such cases, affective attachment and social solidarity among AA members who meet regularly is designed to serve as the impetus to overcome addiction. The community of fellow addicts essentially is the higher power. Yet, in many of the faith-based programs, the Higher Power (intentionally upper-case) conforms to a more conventional religious interpretation of God who prompts a spiritual rebirth or conversion. Thus, the concept of higher power is quite flexible, capable of serving secular or religious ends.

6.3.2 Integrating Faith: Programmatic Distinctions and Contextual Influences

The programs included in this case study exhibit a number of different approaches to integrating faith into addiction treatment. On this front, one of the most striking differences is manifested between faith-intensive (that is, highly religious) programs and their faith-related (modestly religious) counterparts. In most residential treatment programs with a faith component, voluntary religious participation is offered as an option. And, yet, the expectation of religious participation is part of the treatment modality at four of the faith-intensive programs: Union Gospel Mission, the Salvation Army Adult Rehabilitation Center, Open House Ministries, and City Team Ministries.

Encouraged or, in some cases, mandated attendance served a number of purposes. Most importantly, programs that were large or featured diverse clienteles in terms of faith traditions, social backgrounds, and histories of substance abuse could use collective participation in religious activities as a means for forging meaningful bonds among clients. Care was generally taken to exhibit sensitivity to religious and spiritual diversity, and publicly funded programs needed to steer clear of trading services for religious participation.

For larger faith-based programs, the challenge of balancing a desire for treatment group cohesion and respect for diversity was magnified by the sheer numbers they served and the nature of addiction. Larger program cohorts amplify diversity within the group and could make meaningful bonds more difficult to forge. Respect for diversity thus becomes one key to building trust within treatment groups or cohorts. Moreover, the difficulty in overcoming addiction need not be compounded by intolerance or insensitivity to clients' needs, religious or otherwise. Client-centered orientations were also driven by the fact that many of these programs needed to cater to diverse clienteles if they hoped to attract and retain a sufficient number of clients while shepherding them through the recovery process. Rigid approaches to religious participation could lead to high client attrition, which of course then reduces the impact and success of a treatment program.

Other programmatic and contextual factors also influenced the presence, absence, and intensity of faith in addiction treatment programs. The programs' reliance on government agencies for referrals and remuneration, commonly in the form of reimbursement for court-ordered clients, loomed large. Secular treatment programs were quite dependent on government agencies for client referrals and were underwritten, in large part, by public funds. Consequently, these programs needed to watch their attrition rates quite carefully. If a secular program has a high attrition rate, government agencies would likely reduce the number of referrals and, hence, reduce the reimbursements they are willing to pay.

These same factors of referrals and funding influenced faith-based agencies, although the concern was not only with attrition rates but with the prospective clientele they could attract in the first place. Faith-based programs that rely on government referrals or reimbursements needed to be careful that they were not too religious. Simply put, if these programs could not serve sufficient numbers because of an overemphasis on faith, their very existence would be in jeopardy. Consequently, larger programs such as those offered by Union Gospel Mission and the Salvation Army, which at once draw on government referrals and the funding of private donors, demonstrated adaptability in their program design and a flexible orientation in their approach to religious participation and client transformation.

Several other faith-based treatment programs were deliberately smaller, such as Open House Ministries and City Team Ministries. These programs only accepted a few clients and screened clients for their religious affiliation and willingness to consider religious conversion. These programs also did not receive public funding and did not have formal or informal relationships with public officials regarding referrals. Thus, smaller programs of this sort sought to avoid a dependency on government referrals and reimbursements. In short, the most distinctive differences among treatment programs concerning client transformation tended to be between small faith-intensive organizations on the one hand and larger programs (both modestly religious and secular) on the other.

In at least this sense, then, the larger drug treatment programs adopted a goal-rational orientation that elevated serving a greater number of clients and did so in exchange for reliance on government referrals and reimbursements, factors that affected the intensity of faith they could deliver. By contrast, smaller faith-based programs chose a more value-rational path in which their independence from government agencies diminished their capacity to serve more clients but left them able to deliver more faith than their larger counterparts.

6.3.3 Transformation, Program Structure, and the Causes of Addiction

A careful examination of the structure of two faith-intensive programs also reveals another important difference in their approach to transformation. Both faith-intensive programs were very long in duration when compared with their secular and modestly religious counterparts. A typical secular program lasts about thirty days, although some programs can be four to six months in duration.

By contrast, the two faith-intensive programs were much longer in duration, with one program taking as long as twenty-seven months to complete.

Why are there such variations in program duration? Several reasons are apparent. First, variations in program length are closely connected to markedly different philosophies of transformation, that is, recovery. The two faith-intensive programs regarded recovery as a long and difficult journey that requires a fundamental transformation of a person's entire system of beliefs and values. To achieve this goal, individuals are expected to live and work in these programs so treatment is complete and all consuming. As clients progress in treatment, they are rewarded through various incentives such as compensation for work rendered, improved living quarters, and greater discretionary time. Thus, these programs are characterized by both values-based components (substantive rationality) in the form of belief system reconstruction and goal-rational components (instrumental rationality) in terms of an incentive system designed to promote steady progress through the program.

Second, the duration of these treatment programs is influenced by contextual factors, especially the reimbursement policies of government agencies and private funders. As noted above, agencies that are run according to a reimbursement model must serve more clients to remain financially viable. And, of course, these agencies can serve a larger number of clients with shorter treatment programs. While it cannot be said that the financial bottom line is the sole impetus for the duration of treatment in such programs, the goal-rational concerns of programming costs and available resources clearly play a role in the duration of such treatment programs.

In actual practice, though, very long faith-intensive programs are not quite as distinct from other faith-based and secular programs as might be presumed. For example, the Salvation Army and Union Gospel Mission have much shorter programs, typically lasting from ninety days to six months. However, these programs encourage clients who have successfully progressed in their recovery to remain with the organization as a paid employee. This recipient-becomes-provider strategy for addiction recovery is a creative organizational tactic that implicitly recognizes the length and difficulty of client transformation while acknowledging the need for the person to be immersed in a supportive environment long-term to navigate a successful recovery. This strategy is also an effective pedagogical tool for teaching addiction recovery. The former client who has become a member of the service provider team continues on his or her path of personal transformation by leading a new cohort of addicts through the process. At the same time, the new cohort of addicts can get a glimpse of future possibilities for themselves should they aspire to become part of the service provider team. Consequently, in some programs, the formal treatment component of the program is much shorter, yet the individual's involvement in the program, whether formally or informally, may outlast the duration of the program itself.

Likewise, some of the secular programs began as very long treatment programs. For example, the Drug Prevention and Action Center (DPAC) began as a therapeutic community in 1971 in which individuals were immersed in a highly structured community of fellow addicts and alcoholics. As individuals progressed in their recovery, they were rewarded with more responsibility in the community. Over time, the length of the program has been shortened due to changing public reimbursement policies, yet the basic philosophy remains. Thus, DPAC is similar to Open House Ministries in recognizing the centrality of personal transformation, and acknowledging the difficulty of achieving this goal. However, this agency departs from Open House Ministries' avowedly religious version of personal transformation.

Interestingly, DPAC and some of the other secular programs trace the cause of addiction to excessive individualism (that is, a lack of social integration). This diagnosis is shared among faith-intensive programs such as Union Gospel Mission or City Team Ministries, though the prescriptions adopted by secular and faith-intensive programs vary. In secular venues, tracing addiction to individualism leads to programs that require the alcoholic or addict to live their life in terms of external and objective roles and responsibilities. The isolated, disconnected addict becomes integrated into a community that both values them and depends on them. The key difference between secular and faith-based programs is that the substance of external obligations in secular programs is non-religious in nature (e.g., deference to community codes of conduct, the responsible discharge of one's obligations to the group). The transformation process within a treatment program thus entails a person accepting the need to live by certain universal rules and obligations. DPAC, as a secular program, uses the community of fellow clients as the central strategy to achieve this transformation. The social support structure and community norms of acceptable behavior promote behavioral change that, over time, are supposed to lead to lasting internal change in a person's belief system.

Faith-intensive programs such as City Team Ministries and Union Gospel Mission use the support of the religious community to achieve the same ends. However, these faith-intensive programs also utilize the idea of religious conversion so a person puts his or her faith in God who, as the ultimate authority figure and role model, is seen as directing one's life and according it real value. Moreover, remaining sober in such contexts is seen as both a blessing from God and a product of sacrifice and self-discipline on the part of the recovering addict.

6.3.4 Facilitating Transformation: Externalized Standards Versus Individualized Treatment

A reliance on externalized standards in which authority is located in the community rather than the individual can thus be conceptualized as one end of a transformation continuum in drug treatment programs. On this end of the continuum are small faith-intensive organizations like City Team Ministries as exemplars of a reliance on religion and God, as well as the affiliated congregational community. Union Gospel Mission and the Salvation Army exhibit an openness to a wider set of external, universal standards. Community-oriented secular organizations like

DPAC exist at this same end of the continuum inasmuch as they are also beholden to universal standards of behavior and integration. However, these agencies create strong communal ties and an external locus of authority through secular means. Interestingly, given the popularity of twelve-step programs, even communalistic secular organizations in this policy domain offer individual clients an opportunity for religious expression as a supplemental strategy to assist them in the recovery process.

On the other end of this continuum are more individualized approaches to addiction treatment in which the locus of authority remains largely with the individual client. (As noted in Chap. 5, this approach has become the dominant model in addiction recovery.) Several secular and most of the modestly religious programs that are shorter in duration can be placed on this end of the continuum. These programs tend to be less reliant on universal standards and more accepting of individual approaches to transformation. Moreover, among faith-based providers whose programs fit this mold, highly personalized spiritual transformation is privileged over community-inspired religious conversion. While no substance abuse treatment agencies in this case study represented a pure example of this emphasis on spirituality, the distinction was apparent. Indeed, personnel in many secular and moderately religious programs noted their recent shift to incorporate a greater focus on spirituality in their programs. For example, several programs offer a wide range of options to promote spiritual expression and transformation, including meditation, yoga and Native American rituals. These secular and modestly religious programs increasingly stress the value of individualized treatment plans that seek to match a comprehensive treatment strategy with the specific needs and history of a client. This individualized approach is a sharp contrast with a therapeutic community or long-term religious program whose approach is predicated on the need for an individual to accept the value and authority of these external standards.

Arguably, this shift to individualized treatment plans is encouraged by the overall movement toward professionalization, performance assessment, and accountability within drug and alcohol treatment programs. However, the shift toward more individualized approaches with a greater emphasis on spirituality—and its many manifestations—also reflects contemporary cultural shifts in which the individual self is elevated in importance. Thus, programs risk client attrition or avoidance if they strictly adhere to the external standards approach.

Importantly, the use of community, broadly defined, to support client transformation is also evident in these more individualized programs. Even in highly individualized treatment programs, family support and participation in the treatment process is viewed as a crucial component of recovery. Also, these programs strive to connect the individual client with twelve-step programs in the local community. Moreover, many secular and modestly religious programs use group therapy techniques as part of the treatment process. However, these family and group approaches tend to be embedded within an individualized treatment plan whose underlying assumptions reflect a rejection of the externalized standards and expectations evident in the faith-intensive programs or long-term therapeutic communities.

*****

This chapter has explored how client change and community transformation were manifested in secular and faith-based parent education, transitional housing, and addiction treatment programs. Where parenting programs were concerned, we observed that providers and clients used very different idioms to describe how such programs fostered better parenting. Providers and participants in secular programs generally talked about program-inspired personal change in terms of skills acquisition. Parents were perceived as becoming better caregivers to the extent that they internalized and applied the technical skills that they learned in classes. We described this process as a change of head, and contrasted it with the change of heart for which faith-based parenting programs strived. Providers and clients in faith-based programs discussed personal change in terms of values—either a transformation or reinforcement of values. In such programs, better parenting is believed to be attained through an inner transformation, that is, a marked enhancement of one's moral fiber and heartfelt convictions.

Some similarities were observed in transitional housing programs located in Michigan, such that faith-based programs, particularly the faith-intensive program, tended to define home and family in more collectivist and covenantal terms than their secular counterparts. Consequently, service delivery in faith-based transitional housing programs tended to be more value-oriented (e.g., showing God's love to clients, teaching them how to form meaningful family relationships). By contrast, secular programs were more goal-oriented in nature (e.g., teaching skills designed to foster self-sufficiency, tracking client progress). Yet, whereas little variation was found among faith-based providers in parent education, faith-based transitional housing programs came in a number of different stripes. Among the most interesting patterns to surface along these lines was the fact that privately funded faith-based organizations were generally more receptive to collaborating with religious congregations even as publicly funded faith-based agencies were more wary of broad congregational partnerships.

In substance abuse treatment programs, approaches to client transformation did not break down so neatly by provider type. Given the enduring prominence of the twelve-step model in this domain, all programs defined recovery as an inner transformation and even secular programs typically offered an optional faith component as a service supplement. Differences across programs were affected, among other factors, by the extent to which agencies relied on government referrals and funding. Secular and faith-related (moderately religious) programs generally relied on government agencies for client referrals and reimbursement, and consequently offered programs of shorter duration to more clients. Faith-intensive (highly religious) programs tended to be smaller and of longer duration. These programs aimed for the cultivation of religious convictions and often championed affiliation with a faith community, both of which were viewed as vital to a successful recovery from addiction.

Chapter 7
Conclusion: Promising Partners or Strange Bedfellows? Faith-Based Providers and Government Funders

Our volume has set out to examine the dynamics of social service delivery with a principal focus on faith-based organizations. Our qualitative and comparative approach has analyzed the contours of welfare service provision across different social service domains (family, housing, addiction recovery), provider types (faith-intensive, faith-related, secular), and locales (Mississippi, Michigan, and Washington-Oregon). A consistent analytical theme has also been explored throughout this volume in the form of the three C's of social service provision. Using what we called a layered case study approach, we have been mindful of programmatic *content* (service delivery dynamics), organizational *culture* (agency mission, values, etc.), and ecological *context* (community environment, religious landscape, etc.).

While we cannot examine the influence of public funding on promoting changes of one sort or another in specific agencies, we have been able to explore the loose coupling between funding sources and the manner in which services are provided to various populations. We have situated our analysis within a conceptual framework that recognizes faith as a dynamic resource capable of being enlisted to accomplish organizational aims. Our approach stands in contradistinction to perspectives that understand faith as a static organizational characteristic. This resource-oriented approach to faith has led us to consider its source, expression, intensity, and prevalence. The findings of this wide-ranging investigation defy a simple summary. Nevertheless, there are some broad patterns that we have discerned, and several noteworthy implications associated with what we have learned. In what follows, we describe what we view as the core insights to be derived from our engagement with welfare service provision. It is our hope that these insights will stimulate further discussion on this vitally important topic rather than be seen as final, definitive answers.

J. P. Bartkowski and S. E. Grettenberger, *The Arc of Faith-Based Initiatives*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90668-3_7

7.1 Fixed or Fluid Organizational Identities? Beyond the Faith-Based/Secular Divide

To begin, when faith is conceived as a dynamic cultural resource rather than a static organizational characteristic, the complex—and even fluid—character of social service agencies and the programs they offer becomes readily apparent. Our ethnographic study underscores the perils of dichotomous categories such as faith-based versus secular. To be sure, we are hardly the first to make such a claim. Scholars before us have developed additional categories in an effort to provide a more well-rounded understanding of the wide gamut of social service agencies. Some have drawn distinctions between faith-saturated and faith-segregated social service agencies, while others have contrasted congregationally or denominationally run social service providers with their more independent, free-standing faith-based counterparts (see Chap. 2). We appreciate the merits of efforts to capture more adequately the organizational nuance evident in the faith sector. However, our argument goes even further by charging that additional categories do not fully capture the complexity of the faith factor.

Social service agencies are mobile actors situated in an evolving organizational field. To the extent that categorical frameworks are utilized to understand social service agencies, we encourage the use of fuzzy boundaries in defining them much like we have done in this study. The actual operational dynamics of social service organizations demand this more fluid perspective. Our approach underscores how organizational identities, much like personal identities, are not static things that can be neatly captured by a list of easily categorized characteristics. Rather, organizational identities are highly subject to negotiation. And, quite often, faith is part of that negotiated process.

The term "faith-based," then, is a useful concept, but should be recognized as a practical accomplishment rather than a definitive label. Put differently, a faith-based agency or program is perhaps best understood as the result of organized activities and strategies that mobilize cultural resources commonly understood as religion or spirituality (e.g., references to God or a higher power, the use of sacred texts). In this sense, a faith-based organizational identity is achieved or accomplished, much like individual religious identities are a product of practical actions that may or may not mark one as a member of a particular faith community. This argument grows out of the *doing religion* perspective, to which we would add that faith-based—and its concomitant expressions as faith-related or faith-intensive—is very much a product of organizational doings.[1] It is for this reason that while we initially used the Faith Integration Survey to catalog organizations with respect to their faith-based or secular character, our study ultimately ran up against problems with hard and fast delineations of organizational types.

[1] Avishai (2008).

The provision of family support services among Mississippi agencies provided a number of interesting examples along these lines. As indicated in Chap. 3, Our House is one of the most explicitly faith-based organizations among those studied in Mississippi. People who work at the organization are certainly animated by faith convictions, as many of them testified openly during interviews. And the agency publicly and unabashedly brandishes its faith convictions. Its logo is a dove flying in front of a church-shaped window featuring a cross inset within the window. The Our House website proclaims "We believe in Miracles!" and describes itself as "A Place of Peace, Health, and Ministry." One of its hotlines, quite tellingly, is listed as 662-332-LOVE. And yet, despite these overt references to faith, interviews with Our House staff clearly indicated that it does not wish to be pigeon-holed merely or solely as a faith-based organization. Indeed, the director sometimes writes in "Both" when confronted with an application form that provides dichotomous response options (faith-based or secular) with respect to organizational type. Our House even has an auditorium-like multi-purpose space that can be used for teaching as well as worship. To be sure, they are very careful to discern and adhere to all rules governing any publicly funded programs that they administer (e.g., non-proselytization). However, organizations like Our House are capable of both drawing quite directly on faith as a resource and subduing their faith convictions as needed to accomplish their principal mission, which, in their case, is the elimination of domestic and sexual violence.

Fuzzy-boundary complexity in organizational identity was not evident only in Mississippi. It also surfaced in our other study locales. Hybridization was one of the overarching themes that emerged in our examination of addiction recovery programs in Washington state and Oregon. In this sense, otherwise secular programs can be infused with elements of faith, even somewhat tangentially through strong referrals in which secular agencies partner closely with faith-based service providers. In the field of addiction recovery, secular courts often form close partnerships with faith-based organizations to whom they may refer clients as an alternative to time spent in jail. These alternatives—typically called diversion programs because they keep drug offenders out of the criminal justice system—are particularly valued if the client lacks insurance coverage. So, given recent reductions in the availability of public funds to cover drug treatment, diversion programs are an attractive—and inexpensive—option for courts and some drug offenders. In fact, even at the beginning of what is often called the continuum of care in addiction recovery, formidable relationships have been cultivated among secular and faith-based entities.

In addiction recovery, a heavy emphasis is also placed on wrap-around services located later within the continuum of care. Wrap-around services typically involve the provision of social support designed to remain with the client on his or her long (even lifelong) road to recovery. What is remarkable is that the emphasis on wrap-around services often entails close partnerships between faith-based and secular service providers. So, a recovering addict emerging from a secular program will undoubtedly receive referrals to after-care programs, many of which are faith-based because of the ongoing prominence of Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, and other twelve-step programs. Such programs often include a faith component, albeit in generically theistic terms bereft of any sectarian trappings.

Even more, elements of faith are often available in a hip-pocket fashion in addiction recovery programs that otherwise embrace a secular treatment modality such as cognitive-behavioral therapy. Thus, it is generally more accurate to refer to *principally secular* addiction recovery programs than purely secular programs (see Appendix C). This hip-pocket enlistment of faith, which is often provided only upon client request in such programs, is again due to the prominence of twelve-step programs in the addiction recovery field. The approach has also been fostered by the new—and competitive—landscape ushered in by Charitable Choice, that is, the legal support that faith-based providers now enjoy in competing for government service contracts. These organizational actors have become highly adaptive. They are capable of serving different client niches by building bridges across the faith-based/secular divide. In this sense, faith-based initiatives might be deemed somewhat of a success. It seems to have spurred greater collaboration, innovation, and responsiveness to client needs.

However, sweeping claims about the success of faith-based initiatives are not supported by our comparative case studies. Within Mississippi, the state that some saw as a faith-based initiative trailblazer given its Faith and Families program, public funding for faith-based approaches to parent education was episodic. Mississippi's Responsible Fatherhood Initiative no longer is supported by public monies and all but disappeared when the funding was gone. So, the soft-money approach to support responsible fatherhood in Mississippi did not produce enduring changes in the state's funding of this type of family support program. Similarly, funding dynamics in Washington and Oregon did not change with the rise of faith-based initiatives. Both before and after these initiatives, Catholic hospitals running secular programs were publicly funded while a faith-intensive agency like Union Gospel was not. The same pattern was generally evident in Michigan's transitional housing programs, where faith-intensive Mary's House remained privately funded before and after faith-based initiatives. The remaining faith-based organizations continued to run small programs using a mix of public and private funding.

This is not to say that the move to incorporate faith-based agencies into social service provision was a failed enterprise. For their part, faith-intensive agencies like Union Gospel and Mary's House did not seek public funding because monies drawn from such a source would interfere with their preference to proselytize or require some religious elements in their programs. So, rather than faith-based initiatives reinforcing lines of exclusion among agencies, the process of self-selection is evident in our study. Faith-intensive organizations have often consciously positioned themselves in a niche that fits with their organizational culture and programming preferences. Still, faith-based initiatives did not create changes in funding among the vast majority of organizations featured in our case studies.

The strategic enlistment of faith in the welfare service provision process reflects the infusion—some might say, intrusion—of marketplace logic into virtually all facets of contemporary social life. Those who are in the business of providing welfare services aim to deliver a desirable product on behalf of funders to their clients. After all, within the context of capitalism, it is the customer who is king. To be sure, there are potential problems with a wholehearted embrace of market models for welfare service provision. The choices of welfare clients are considerably more limited than those of the typical American consumer. Economic constraints, limited transportation, and other structural barriers place significant boundaries on the decisions that many welfare clients can legitimately make. And in rural areas, having access to reasonably comparable faith-based and secular service providers from which a client is to choose can be difficult to ensure.[2] But what is unmistakable is that faith-based initiatives amplified the dynamic role that faith can play in the provision of welfare services.

Why would social service agencies step up their efforts to negotiate the faith-based/secular divide in an era of faith-based welfare service provision? Two explanations seem especially compelling. First, from a purely practical standpoint, the ability to secure funds and thereby provide a wide range of services to a broader swath of clients is enhanced by taking a both/and approach to the question of a faith-based versus secular organizational identity. In a world where applications increasingly ask organizations to identify themselves as faith-based or secular, and where additional points were sometimes awarded to faith-based organizations given their alleged historical exclusion from the contract bidding process, organizations were wise to play up their faith-based credentials, or at least to be able to do so as circumstances demanded. However, this same asset can, in some cases, become a liability. Questions have been raised about the capacity of faith-based organizations to deliver services effectively or to provide services to an adequate number of clients. Concerns have also been expressed about the overly sectarian quality of faith-based organizations that could be unable—or unwilling—to comply with mandates against imposing faith on their clients. The both/and approach to organizational identity permits social service agencies to present themselves as offering funders and clients alike the best of both worlds. And additional trust might be engendered not only about the service delivery capacity of these both/and organizations, but about their ability to address the needs of a wide variety of clients, that is, those with secular and faith-based sensibilities. Our work suggests that organizations unwilling to do the nuanced negotiating of a both/and approach chose to stay away from public funding.

Second, beyond these practical programmatic considerations, a lot of organizations strive to create a cultural environment within their agencies that is characterized by both competence and compassion. Broader social debates about faith-based and secular social service providers have often broken out precisely along these lines. Secular organizations are presumed to have the structures in place (e.g., rigorous policies, review procedures, accreditation standards) that ensure competent, high-capacity service delivery. In this sense, the secular nonprofit social

[2]Bartkowski and Regis (2003).

service sector has attempted or was sometimes forced to borrow a page from the book of the for-profit world. The recent push to have all government programs evaluated based on performance indicators—often with impact documented statistically through pretest, post-test, and follow-up surveys featuring validated national outcome measures—has accelerated the professionalization of the human services field. Of course, some might argue that this change reflects a pattern of institutional isomorphism wherein the nonprofit sector is being asked to follow trends that initially developed in the for-profit world. And yet, the delivery of social services is far from identical to the corporate mandate of delivering a product, particularly given potential differences in organizational motives. While the phrase "goods and services" is common parlance, the delivery of a good (a functional product or commodity) is not the same as the provision of a service (in this case, meeting core human needs) to people who lack the means to secure that service on their own dime. We are certainly not the first researchers to identify the underlying distinctions between competence and compassion. The classical sociologist Max Weber described these distinctions as core differences between goal-rational action driven by efficiency considerations and value-rational action motivated by moral commitments or ethical concerns. The essential point is that both/and organizations position themselves as simultaneously competent and compassionate amidst the debates about the role of faith-based service provision with public monies. Both/and organizations are not one-trick ponies. And in a competitive funding landscape, agility and adaptability are highly valued attributes among social service organizations, those who consider funding them, and their prospective clients.

7.2 Context Counts: Programming Strategies, Service Domains, Regional Subcultures, and Religious Ecologies

One virtue of our comparative investigation pertains to social context. Our study of a diverse array of social service programs situated in three very different locales has revealed how programming dynamics vary by service domain, regional subcultures, and religious ecologies. We examined how welfare programs are implemented across three different social service domains, namely, family services, transitional housing, and addiction recovery. Our comparative investigation of these different types of services demonstrated that the contours of welfare service provision are, in many cases, specific to a particular service type. Faith-based programs have long been a dominant player in the field of addiction recovery (e.g., twelve-step programs), whereas faith-based approaches to parenting have not enjoyed a status that is comparable to their secular counterparts. Family service provision, including parent education, is an especially intriguing social service domain because many congregations feature family ministry programs as a key element of the services they provide. And yet, these congregations would not draw on public funding to support their family ministry programs because such programs often enlist explicitly religious and even denominationally specific rationales for family living. The provision of supportive housing services for homeless persons is a long-standing tradition in faith communities who understand their mission as providing care to the poor and marginalized. In this way, many free-standing housing programs still have deep roots and connections with the religious congregations in their communities. In short, programmatic dominance by a faith-based paradigm is seemingly most pronounced in addiction recovery and least pronounced in parent education. Transitional housing is situated in the middle of this continuum of faith-based influence.

The key point here is this. Broad-brushed generalizations about faith-based service providers or the faith sector without reference to particular programming or social service domains risk running roughshod over a very heterogeneous landscape. Faith-based programming in one social service domain (e.g., residential drug treatment) is often quite different than faith-based programming in others (e.g., family support and transitional housing). And these differences can stem from various sources, including the market share of congregations in a particular service domain (they already provide family support services) as well as the nature of the service provided (transformation-oriented addiction recovery may be a more natural market for faith-based organizations than practical-minded welfare-to-work programs). Hence, the already complex character of faith-based organizations is further complicated by the particularities evident across service provision domains. The expression of faith, and even the ability of faith-based providers to offer a feasible alternative to secular programs, can differ dramatically from one type of social service to another. In short, global arguments about the nature and impact of faith-based initiatives would do well to be tempered by caveats such as, "In this specific programming domain …."

There is also a broader lesson to be learned here about the complexity of social context. Social service organizations and programs are nestled within larger social contexts that include regional subcultures, community dynamics, and religious ecologies. The distinctions that we observed across study regions (Mississippi, Michigan, and Washington-Oregon) are not solely reducible to differences in service types (family support, transitional housing, and addiction recovery, respectively). Regional and religious subcultures evident throughout the U.S. create palpable cultural differences between, for example, the rural South and the urban Northwest. The Northwest has a reputation for progressive politics that is quite different from the political conservatism manifested throughout much of the South. And these political distinctions are closely linked to the religious divergences that characterize these different regions of the country. The Bible-based fatherhood programs that were prevalent in the predominantly evangelical Christian climes of Mississippi would probably not be as well received, either by those reviewing programming proposals or by their intended client beneficiaries, in the less religious and more culturally diverse Northwest. For that matter, the relatively progressive mainline Christian Protestant denominations and Catholicism found in much of Michigan are quite different than the Baptist-infused evangelical Christianity that is the dominant faith tradition throughout much of Mississippi or even the Reformed Protestantism (historical heir of Calvinism) that pervades some parts of Michigan. So, even though all of these traditions are Christian, there are noteworthy differences among them.

Our focus on the intersecting influences of service type, regional subcultures, and religious ecologies is not merely an effort to underscore—or even generate an appreciation for—cultural difference evident throughout the U.S. While an appreciation of such differences is laudable, there is an even more practical conclusion to draw from our comparative investigation. Programming strategies that prove to be highly effective in one locale may be terribly ineffective in others. In this sense, attention to contextual factors is vital for effective programming to be conducted by social service providers. The transposition of best practices from one milieu to another is likely to have greatest success if done in a culturally competent manner.

Consequently, a parent education program that addresses issues of importance for rural Southerners may not resonate at all with caregivers situated elsewhere in the nation. For example, a number of faith-based programs in rural Mississippi focused on child disciplinary strategies other than physical discipline and even argued against spanking, doing so with specific scriptural references drawn from the Bible (that is, a shepherd's rod is used to guide, not beat, the sheep). The preoccupation with discipline manifested in faith-based Mississippi parent education programs is clearly linked to the widespread support that corporal punishment enjoys throughout much of the South. It is this *ecological context* factor that drives the *programmatic content* focus to provide compelling rationales for disciplinary alternatives to spanking. Because the Bible is held in such high esteem throughout the South, scientific arguments against spanking are likely to be viewed with some suspicion in this context. It is far more compelling, in this particular setting, to combat biblically-based rationales for spanking by revealing such scriptural understandings to be rooted in faulty interpretations of "God's Word" than to question the veracity of the Bible. Fight fire with fire, as the saying goes. However, such considerations are not likely to go very far in the Northwest, where the religious market is not dominated by Bible-believing Baptists and where politically progressive values create a social climate that is considerably less hospitable toward the physical discipline of children or argumentation rooted solely in the Bible.

So, it is quite possible that general programming strategies (e.g., frequency of meetings, bundling of needed services) might be effective across faith-based programs situated in different locales. However, the particular content of programs might need to be adapted to suit the cultural sensibilities prevalent in specific locales. For example, the gendered idea of God as loving father may play well in Mississippi, particularly in programs targeted at men. And biblical references to this effect are likely to be viewed as sound justifications among men in the South. But God may be better conceived as a loving parent, perhaps with scriptural texts drawn from diverse faiths or less of an emphasis on scriptural rationales altogether, in the more religiously diverse and politically progressive Northwest. And, for its part, the Midwest presents an interesting amalgam of religious conservatism—though less evangelical than the South—and progressive politics, partly a residue of trade unions that emerged in the industrialized heartland. In short, there is a breathtaking degree of cultural diversity exhibited across our study locales. Therefore, efforts to find a silver bullet set of programs that will work effectively across very different communities without much adaptation will likely be a failed enterprise. A critical implication of our study is that the adoption of a one-size-fits-all public policy that treats all service domains and regions the same will quite likely miss the mark. An approach that is encouraged or mandated by a policy might be very appropriate for one domain or region while potentially undermining the effective delivery of services in another.

It is also important to be aware that the magnitude and quality of market competition varies across social service domains and local communities. Here again, an appreciation for complexity is in order. Given the work-first orientation of welfare reform, there has been considerably more competition in the welfare-to-work service domain than in any of the programs examined here (parent education, transitional housing, and addiction recovery). And, there is understandably more market competition in urban areas than rural communities. So, within a small rural town, there may be one single faith-based program, even as urban areas may offer a variety of faith-based options. Markets also vary somewhat based on the type of service program. Faith-based parent education programs are competing within a broader religious marketplace composed of congregations that feature parenting support programs in the context of their family ministry programs. As noted, Life Renewal Ministries in Mississippi intentionally seeks to combat some religious misperceptions about child discipline that commonly circulate in local religious congregations by taking a stand against corporal punishment. In this way, Life Renewal Ministries can position itself as decidedly different from the common fare offered by local congregations in rural Mississippi. Niche markets are also evident in transitional housing and addiction recovery. Within the substance abuse recovery service domain, public funding and private insurance money have been declining, thereby shrinking a market that was already quite small. Faced with a restricted prospective client base, many organizations have carved out their own specific niche. Some agencies take only clients whose private insurance will pay for the costs of their recovery. In the case of Union Gospel Mission, court referral diversions from prison sentences into their privately funded no-cost program provide a steady, though not overwhelming, supply of clients. Regardless of the particular clientele each of these different types of organizations serve, they have found a way to stake their claim to a specific slice of the market that they can call their own.

And yet, despite agencies' efforts to a find a comfortable home through niche specialization, the service provision landscape is not static. As noted, the public funding of faith-based parenting programs in Mississippi was episodic. So, privately funded faith-based programs faced competition from their publicly funded counterparts. But such competition was only temporary. Health care reform brought about changes to the field of addiction recovery by expanding public funding for such services. But ongoing efforts to reverse key provisions in the Affordable Care Act raise questions about the longevity of such changes. So, although organizations strive to settle into a particular niche that suits their mission and provides a reliable supply of clients, the service provision landscape is characterized by dynamic qualities that require strategic adaptation on the part of local agencies.

7.3 Public Funding: Sustainability or Strings Attached?

One of the key points of comparison explored in this volume entailed a careful examination of how publicly and privately funded faith-based programs differ from one another. Among faith-based providers, we discovered that publicly funded programs tended to be larger than privately funded programs in terms of the number of clients served. And privately funded faith-based programs tended to exhibit stronger expressions of faith than their publicly funded counterparts. For example, in Chap. 4, we discussed the elective affinity between funding, organizational capacity, and intensity of faith expression among faith-based transitional housing programs in Michigan. An elective affinity can be understood as the coupling or co-occurrence of social phenomena that stops short of definitively stating that factor X causes factor Y. (We do not aim to make causal claims using qualitative data. Moreover, we did not collect data prior to an agency's receipt of public funding.) In the Michigan case study, faith was infused into nearly every facet of a program run by privately funded Mary's House. The selection and retention of clients into this program, as well as the hiring of staff, were affected by the organization's strong emphasis on faith. And this program was fairly small when compared with their publicly run peers. This pattern also surfaced in Mississippi and Washington-Oregon.

So, publicly funded programs in our study tended to be larger and capable of greater capacity, which is to say serving more clients at any particular point in time. On the face of it, the connection between the type of funding source and the capacity or programming scale is not altogether stunning. Privately funded faith-based programs tend to stress faith more so than their publicly funded counterparts, and the former are generally smaller in size. What is important is the human intentionality that is responsible for the coupling of funding source, the degree of faith expression, and organizational capacity. Privately funded faith-based programs tended to be smaller, and were often intentionally so. These programs did not wish to compromise what they viewed as their core mission. Privately funded faith-based programs therefore accept a trade-off. These agencies are willing to remain smaller in exchange for the freedom to run their programs as they see fit, that is, with no external restrictions. In this sense, public funding can be seen as a *threat* to the agency's existing organizational culture rather than an *opportunity* for program expansion.

To again lean on the goal-rational (instrumental) versus value-rational (ethical) orientations detailed by Max Weber, small privately funded agencies have self-consciously opted for the latter over the former. Again, Weber drew comparisons between the more traditional focus on ethics and morals (value-rational action) and the more modern preoccupation with efficiency and utility (goal-rational action). Many of the small faith-based programs have purposefully chosen to remain small and avoid the strings that are attached to government funding. This pattern, then, speaks to some nonprofits' concerns about how taking government "shekels" (public funding) can create government shackles (federal mandates that constrain program implementation). Mary's House in Michigan is an excellent example of an agency that aims to develop close personal relationships with their homeless female clients. Life Renewal Ministries in Mississippi, which runs privately funded faith-based parent education programs, is quite similar. The size of these ventures entails the elevation of quality (life transformation) over quantity (numbers served). At the same time, freedom from government strictures also provides such programs with the ability to retain practices that would be viewed with suspicion at best in a government-funded program. Mary's House has rules governing (essentially prohibiting) their women residents' sexual activity. It would be difficult to imagine such a policy, with the possible ramifications of a client being removed from the program, operating as part of a government-funded initiative.

So, there are diverse forms of freedom that surface when one considers the funding dimension of welfare service provision. In some agencies, the receipt of government funds gives them the freedom to serve more clients, to offer a greater panoply of services, and to tap into a funding stream that supports a highly prized goal in much of the non-profit world, namely, program sustainability. And yet, with this freedom come certain tradeoffs. Publicly funded agencies cannot proselytize, must adopt nondiscrimination policies in terms of whom they serve, and must be mindful of such factors as numbers served and other measurable outputs or outcomes that are typically demanded by the government. Indeed, the requirement to deliver the program to a certain number of people while engaging in performance monitoring is commonly written into RFPs (requests for proposals) authored by government agencies. In short, while we found a connection between larger programs and government funding, the key insight to emerge from our study is the intentional effort of some privately funded agencies to remain small so they can enjoy the freedom to deliver services as they prefer. These same programs also prize the avoidance of government strictures they view as impersonal, limiting, or otherwise at odds with their organizational values.

7.4 Holistic Is in the Eye of Beholder

Another of the clearest takeaways from our comparative study is related to the diverse ways in which holistic services can be defined and delivered. In the early stages of discussions and debates about faith-based initiatives, some charged that faith-based providers—as the "armies of compassion"— could deliver services in a more holistic fashion. Based on this understanding, faith-based organizations could address the needs of the whole person, from physical or material needs to emotional or spiritual concerns, because of their religious convictions. Our study reveals that the truth is much more complicated. The very concept of holistic service provision is, as it turns out, quite elastic. And because there are so many ways to define holistic care, the safest conclusion to draw is that virtually all service providers aim to deliver holistic programs, but do so in diverse ways. To be sure, some faith-based providers are quick to point to the faith components of their program as addressing needs that may be unmet in secular programs. However, as noted above, one of the key lessons of this study is that terms like secular and faith-based are slippery. In fact, secular should not be misunderstood to mean austere or dispassionate. Furthermore, secular organizations may make available spiritual services, either because clients seek them or because including such services are seen as the best way to serve a broad base of clients.

Several workers at even the most secular publicly funded Mississippi parenting program discussed how faith convictions animated their efforts to promote educational advancement and teach healthy caregiving to teen mothers. In fact, hanging behind the desk of the Neshoba agency's executive director was the famous Heilige Schutzengel picture of two young children—an older girl accompanied by a young boy—crossing an old wooden bridge while being watched by a female guardian angel who is wearing white flowing robes and is illuminated by an aura of light from behind. The holy guardian angel (which is the literal English translation of heilige schutzengel) in this painting is even replete with large white wings. Through various visits to this secular agency in rural Mississippi, their workers' concern—even their love—for the young women in their program became quite evident. The heartfelt connections that develop between providers and clients in many secular programs beg the question: Are not these workers part of America's armies of compassion as well? Compassion is not the sole province of faith-based service providers.

The secular Neshoba parenting program discussed above and others that were found in Michigan and Washington-Oregon could also be characterized as holistic in another sense. Many secular programs bundled services together so clients could receive not only housing or addiction recovery, but employment referrals, life skills courses, and other programs that, when mixed together in the way they were, could be seen as eminently holistic. And, for their part, even secular addiction recovery programs that aimed to provide services along the continuum of care typically began with psychological counseling (often cognitive-behavioral therapy), but then gradually moved clients toward supportive social networks (generally, a twelve-step program) coupled with employment and housing referrals.

We are not the first to suggest that the term holistic is problematic in terms of describing service delivery. In their nationwide study of service provision to homeless populations, Aron and Sharkey[3] found that service provision to the homeless may include shelter, food, health care, and other services. They further discovered a division of labor of sorts between provider types, such that faith-based

[3]Aron and Sharkey (2002).

agencies focused on food provision even as other providers focused more on housing. Only government-run homeless agencies provided health services in addition to housing and food provision. So, in a twist that runs contrary to the charge that government services are bureaucratic, impersonal, and thus not holistic, the government-run programs could be seen as the most holistic—if holism entails addressing a wide variety of needs presented by a population. Other studies have portrayed faith-based homeless organizations as more holistic because of the caring demeanor exhibited by their staff.[4] It is not our intent to adjudicate these debates. Rather, our qualitative investigation reveals that the term holistic is a characterization that many agencies understandably embrace but one that defies a clear definition.

The ambiguous meaning of the term holistic is, quite likely, a result of the increasingly diverse service provision landscape that non-profit agencies inhabit. At the outset of this chapter, we argued that divisions between faith-based agencies and their secular counterparts were often blurry. And, our study has lent additional credibility to the conclusion drawn by a number of scholars: faith-based programs themselves are a diverse lot.[5] Even programs run by local congregations exhibit striking diversity in terms of the types of services offered and the manner in which they are provided.[6] So, the question of which type of provider—faith-based or secular—is more holistic than the other begs the rejoinder: Precisely how is holistic service provision to be defined? In any number of ways, as it turns out. The only definitive finding on this score is that no agency wants to be seen as lacking in holistic service provision.

7.5 Final Thoughts, Last Words … and the Fate of Faith-Based Initiatives

These notes of ambiguity and complexity, then, are fitting ones on which to end our contribution to the ongoing conversations over welfare reform and faith-based initiatives. Rather than striving to offer hard and fast conclusions about social services delivered under the auspices of faith-based initiatives, our comparative investigation has suggested that social service organizations are agile actors in a fast-changing landscape. Agencies in general seek to transform the lives of their clients. However, the strategies they use to pursue transformation vary considerably, even among faith-based organizations and certainly across service domains. Agencies can agree that holistic programming is desirable, and virtually all of them pursue it. But the precise meaning of the term holistic is very difficult, if not impossible, to pin down.

---

[4]Goggin and Orth (2002).

[5]Campbell (2002), Lockhart (2005), Monsma (2004), Pipes and Ebaugh (2002).

[6]Bartkowski and Regis (2003), Farnsley (2007), Unruh and Sider (2005), Wuthnow (2004).

The observations and interviews we have conducted in many different agencies suggest that the categories designed to parse out different types of organizations, whether faith-based, secular, or (quite often) some amalgam of the two, would do well to be defined in flexible enough terms to recognize the dynamic and even polymorphous quality of these organizations. To this end, we have suggested that faith is best understood as a resource that agencies can enlist to complete the work they have before them rather than a static category of organizational identity. In other words, being faith-based is much more of a practical accomplishment—which is to say a product of the way organizations use faith to pursue their goals—than it is a definitive label that separates religious social service organizations from their secular peers. As is sometimes colloquially said about love, faith is an action word. And it is one that can be enacted quite differently depending on the community context and organizational actor in question. This non-objectified, dynamic view of faith-as-resource means that social researchers interested in faith-based programming continue to have their work cut out for them. Our aim here has been to begin to chart the variegated ways in which faith can be marshaled in the social service delivery process. Faith-based service delivery can be conducted through explicit sectarian practices or in a more implicit, even hip pocket, fashion. Faith can be enlisted as an agency-wide resource. Or, alternatively, it can be confined to a particular program. The point is that the permutations are many, and they defy tidy categorization.

Such complexities are evident not only on the American scene. For some time now, researchers have examined a range of dynamics associated with faith-based organizations worldwide, and have generated rich comparisons of faith-based programming across national contexts.[7] Faith-based organizations have long been involved in international development initiatives, worldwide humanitarian relief, and efforts to bring peace to conflict-stricken areas around the world. The three C's framework that we have developed in this volume—focused on programmatic content, organizational culture, and ecological context—would seem to be a promising analytical lens through which scholars might continue to compare the strategies and activities of religious nonprofits worldwide. In fact, the three C's conceptual framework initiated here would likely achieve its full comparative flowering if utilized as a common frame of reference among scholars of international faith-based initiatives. It is reasonable to suspect that the forms of variability that we discovered in our study would be significantly magnified in a broader, worldwide setting. Variability in ecological context (e.g., different legal statutes governing faith-based organizations across nations) could be among the most intriguing points of comparison in international research. The prospects for success in this line of inquiry would likely be enhanced if funding mechanisms and key points of contrast with secular organizations could be incorporated to such work.

[7]For an excellent comparison of faith-based organizations across national contexts, see Clarke and Jennings (2008).

Beyond these lessons learned and promising avenues for additional research, the arc of faith-based initiatives from which this volume draws its title reflects the rise, apex, and uncertain future of this policy innovation in the U.S. Since the departure of the George W. Bush administration, public discussions and debates about faith-based initiatives have receded quite dramatically. An argument could be made that the funding of faith-based organizations has become so routine that it is now taken for granted and no longer warrants discussion. However, on the federal level, that argument is less than compelling. And state-level funding of faith-based organizations has long been uneven. For good or for ill, the Obama administration did not foster faith-based social service organizations in any way comparable to its presidential predecessor. Some scholars have justifiably questioned whether faith-based initiatives were little more than a bait and switch effort designed to dismantle the welfare state under the banner of religious compassion—especially of the conservative religious variety—while leaving the social safety net in tatters.[8] We cannot fully resolve such questions here. Still, careful consideration of these questions and the larger trajectory of faith-based initiatives—from the early beginnings of Charitable Choice to its cresting under the Bush era expansion to a now uncertain future—is certainly warranted. Of course, long before anyone uttered the phrase Charitable Choice, faith-based providers have been hard at work to relieve poverty and reverse social disadvantage. How these efforts will continue in the apparent wake of faith-based initiatives where government underwriting may be at low ebb remains to be seen and is deserving of continued study. Some have also argued, quite convincingly, that the concept of "public-private partnerships" was a semantic tool[9] that was strategically deployed to foster the privatization of welfare responsibility, the erosion of the social safety net, and the destruction of what some alt-right advocates have disparagingly called the "deep state."[10]

The agencies likely to be hit hardest by a retraction of government partnerships with religious service providers, if that turns out to be a continuing trend, are those we have called faith-related. These moderately faith-based organizations tend to be larger, professionally run, and welcomed the expanded service opportunities that were yielded by successfully securing public funds. While we do not have pre-funding data from such organizations, the information provided by them indicated that the culture within these agencies fit well with public funding mandates. Faith-related agencies pursued government funding because they had already accepted ideas about accountability, efficiency, performance monitoring, outcomes measurement, and the like. This is not to say that exclusionary mechanisms are absent in applications for or awards of government contracts. But the organizations featured here participated in a self-selection process through which they either opted to pursue government funding or avoided it altogether. So, if the apparent decline in faith-based initiatives is more than a temporary blip due to other political concerns, it is these

[8]See Wineburg (2007), Sager (2010).

[9]Nagel (2013).

[10]Porter (2017).

faith-related agencies that will bear the brunt of such decline. Of course, not all faith-related providers will be similarly affected. The epidemic of opioid addictions, overdoses, and deaths may leave faith-related residential drug treatment programs with government-funded options not afforded to housing, family support, or other service domains. Regardless of what the future holds, researchers would do well to keep their finger on the pulse of faith-based initiatives—whether government funded, privately supported, or mixed—across a range of social policy domains, geographical locales, and political contexts.[11]

References

Avishai, Orit. 2008. "Doing religion" in a secular world: Women in conservative religions and the question of agency. *Gender & Society* 22: 409–433.

Bartkowski, John P., and Helen A. Regis. 2003. *Charitable choices: Religion, race, and poverty in the post-welfare era*. New York: New York University Press.

Campbell, David. 2002. Beyond Charitable Choice: The diverse service delivery approaches of local faith-related organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 31: 207–230.

Clarke, Gerald, and Michael Jennings (eds.). 2008. *Development, civil society and faith-based organizations: Bridging the sacred and the secular*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Farnsley, Arthur E., III. 2007. Faith-Based Initiatives. Pp. 345–356 in *The Sage Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*, edited by James A. Beckford and N.J. Demerath, III. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage; Unruh and Sider 2005.

Goggin, Malcolm L., and Deborah A. Orth. 2002. *How Faith-Based and Secular Organizations Tackle Housing for the Homeless*. Albany, N.Y.: Rockefeller Institute of Government.

Lockhart, William H. 2005. Building Bridges and Bonds: Generating Social Capital in Secular and Faith-Based Poverty-to-Work Programs. *Sociology of Religion 66*: 45–60.

Monsma, Stephen V. 2004. *Putting faith in partnerships: Welfare-to-work in four cities*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press.

Nagel, Alexander-Kenneth. 2013. Agents, armies, allies: Semantics of public-private partnerships in US welfare reform. *Journal of Religion in Europe* 6: 175–200.

Porter, Tom. 2017. Deep state: How a conspiracy theory went from political fringe to mainstream. *Newsweek*. August 2.

Pipes, Paula F., and Helen Rose Ebaugh. 2002. Faith-Based Coalitions, Social Services, and Government Funding. *Sociology of Religion 2002*: 49–68.

Sager, Rebecca. 2010. *Faith, politics, and power: The politics of faith-based initiatives*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Unruh, Heidi Rolland, and Ronald J. Sider. 2005. *Saving souls, serving society: Understanding the faith factor in church-based social ministry*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wineburg, Bob. 2007. *Faith-based inefficiency: The follies of Bush's initiative*. New York: Praeger.

Wuthnow, Robert. 2004. *Saving America? Faith-Based Services and the Future of Civil Society*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

[11]One of our regrets is that, despite the wealth of agency-level data we were able to collect and analyze for this volume, securing interview data from program participants in sufficient numbers to warrant sustained analysis proved to be quite difficult and was restricted largely to Chap. 6. As work on this front continues, we hope that the insights that have emerged from our extensive interactions with social service workers can be complemented by an even wider range of perspectives—aspirations and frustrations alike—from those these programs are designed to serve. For an excellent treatment of recipients of faith-based services, see Chap. 6 of Wuthnow (2004).

Appendix A
Methods in Brief

Our study utilized qualitative methods to evaluate faith-based and secular welfare service programs. Our principal method of inquiry was qualitative interviewing. This approach enabled those interviewed (agency directors, program managers, and program participants) to assess and evaluate these programs in their own words. Doing so permits interviewees to render narrative assessments of their experiences with programs in a way that is not possible with preconfigured survey responses. Such an analytical strategy enables respondents to provide more in-depth, nuanced assessments of these programs. Moreover, because the qualitative interviews utilized were semi-structured, all respondents were asked the same basic questions; yet, at the same time, semi-structured interviewing left the researcher free to probe as needed for additional insights and to pursue germane topics that surfaced during the course of the interviews.

As described in Chap. 1, our comparative case study approach provided us with the opportunity to examine variations in perceptions and practices observed across social service delivery domains and geographical locales. The beginning point for each of our investigations was the comparative case study protocol developed by the Rockefeller Institute. (The research instruments designed by the Rockefeller Institute and utilized in this study are featured in Appendix B.) Briefly, that protocol specified that no fewer than eight social service agencies should be included in the comparative case study—four agencies in each of two locales. Within each locale, four cases were to be selected as follows: one privately funded faith-based agency, two publicly funded faith-based agencies (ideally characterized by different levels of religious intensity), and one publicly funded secular agency. However, the contours of actual service provision in each of our study locales required that a number of important adaptations be made to this protocol. In the end, we were each able to achieve samples that exhibited variation in agency type and funding source.

The Faith Integration Survey administered in each agency contained 15 items designed to gauge the extent to which faith influenced the program in question (that is, the Programmatic Elements scale, items 28–42 on the survey). The survey also included a Relevance of Religious Practices scale designed to tap the intensity of religious expression in the program (items 43a–43h). Each of these scales was scored separately from the rest of the survey because the unit of analysis in this study is the program. For both scales, items were reverse coded so that a 4 (strongly

J. P. Bartkowski and S. E. Grettenberger, *The Arc of Faith-Based Initiatives*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90668-3

agree) represents the highest level of faith integration and 1 (strongly disagree) represents the lowest level of faith integration in the program.

To conduct this study, interviews were conducted with agency personnel and program participants. Efforts were also made to collect as much information about programs as could be gathered. Although such information was not available for all programs, we were typically able to collect some (if not all) of the following: administrative forms, curricular materials, advertisement brochures, and (in a few cases) formal program evaluations. The initial wave of interviews was conducted in two phases—first agency personnel, then program participants. This two-phase approach to interviewing was necessary to establish a rapport with several of the agencies and build trust with local personnel before being allowed to conduct client interviews. It was also designed to maximize client participation by allowing sufficient time to set up such interviews. Given the formidable impact of the Great Recession on the social service sector, follow-up interviews were conducted for the transitional housing case study (Michigan) and the addiction recovery programs (Washington-Oregon). Because the Responsible Fatherhood Initiative was no longer operational in Mississippi, no follow-up interviews could be conducted after the Great Recession.

Interviews with agency personnel (executive directors and program managers) were conducted, and then were analyzed with the following conceptual factors in mind:

- Program goals and objectives—What does the program attempt to accomplish, in terms of both specific goals and broader overarching objectives? How do agency personnel conceptualize these goals and objectives? Why are programs oriented around these particular goals and objectives?
- Program implementation and rationale—How are the stated goals and objectives pursued during the course of program administration? What specific techniques (pedagogical, programmatic) are employed in the program? Why are those particular strategies employed?
- Program evaluation—How successful has the program been? In what ways has it been effective at meeting its goals and objectives, and in what ways has it been ineffective at doing so? What teaching techniques have been effective and ineffective? When barriers to program effectiveness have been encountered, how have they been confronted, and have they been overcome?

Program participant interviews collected during the second phase of the research were also conducted. These interviews were conducted with participants who were enrolled in or had completed the programs offered by agencies. The analysis of program participant interviews was guided by the following concerns:

Program evaluation—How do participants assess the program? What program material was most helpful, and what was least helpful? What improvements, if any, would they suggest for the program?

Personal change from program participation—How, if at all, did the program affect participants' beliefs and practices? Did the program have any discernible impact on participants' relationships with others? What, if anything, do they now do differently because they have enrolled in or completed the program?

Our data analysis was aimed at discerning three critical elements of interviews: standpoints (perceptions), strategies (motivated actions, aspirations), and stories (experiential narratives). We also paid attention to social action (practices) observed during fieldwork visits. The analysis of qualitative data is ineluctably a product, in part, of the positionality or situated perspective of social researchers. Our positionality is influenced by our disciplinary training and our historical vantage point, among a host of other factors. Our understanding of the data evolved as faith-based initiatives emerged, crested, and receded, at least in terms of the public attention it received. Our reflection on the long-term trajectory, or "arc," of faith-based initiatives was enhanced by waiting to complete this volume until after the 2016 election was decided. Thus, the subject matter exhibits an arc—or mobile trajectory—as does research positionality.

Appendix B
Research Instruments

This section features the research instruments that were used to conduct the study. The Faith Integration Survey (FIS) was initially used to categorize agency types. However, given the complex character of most organizations (except for faith-intensive or wholly secular agencies), the FIS proved to be of limited utility beyond broadly discerning clear-cut organizational identities. Nevertheless, the instrument can be used as a device to render broad categorizations. Therefore, we include it here. The interview questionnaires that follow the Faith Integration Survey were the core research instruments used to conduct our comparative case studies given our heavy reliance on in-depth interviews.

B.1 Faith Integration Survey

This survey examines the varying ways and degrees that religious faith may be incorporated or expressed in nonprofit organizations that deliver social services. The program we are interested in today is your agency's [name of program]. Whenever this survey asks about a program, we are referring to this program. Some of our questions will refer to the organization that oversees your program. For some programs this is a separate organization, for others, the program and governing organization are one and the same.

1. Is there a separate organization that operates and oversees the activities of the program?
   (1) Yes (continue to Q. #2)
   (2) No (skip to Q. #5)
2. What is the name of the organization that operates and oversees the program?

   ____

This questionnaire consists of a series of statements that describe how religious faith might be integrated into your organization and the services provided by the program. We are interested in the extent to which your program and organization possess each of these characteristics. Some of these questions require a "Yes" or

J. P. Bartkowski and S. E. Grettenberger, *The Arc of Faith-Based Initiatives*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90668-3

"No" response. Others will ask you to indicate how much you agree or disagree that a given statement accurately describes your organization or program.

B.1.1 Organizational Elements

3. Is your organization affiliated with a religious organization?
   (1) Yes
   (2) No
4. Our organization has a clearly religious name or identity.
   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Agree
   (3) Disagree
   (4) Strongly disagree
   (5) Not applicable
5. Is the program affiliated with a religious organization?
   (1) Yes
   (2) No
6. Our chartering documents, such as our incorporation papers or bylaws, contain open, clear references to religious beliefs or principles.
   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Agree
   (3) Disagree
   (4) Strongly disagree
   (5) Not applicable
7. Our organization focuses on participants as whole persons through a commitment to their physical, emotional, and spiritual well-being.
   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Agree
   (3) Disagree
   (4) Strongly disagree
   (5) Not applicable
8. Our organization's commitment to our program participants is based on religious beliefs or convictions.
   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Agree
   (3) Disagree
   (4) Strongly disagree
   (5) Not applicable

9. Staff members or volunteers perform their work in our organization as an expression of their religious values.
   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Agree
   (3) Disagree
   (4) Strongly disagree
   (5) Not applicable
10. Members of the board/governing body typically share the religious beliefs or convictions of our organization.
   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Agree
   (3) Disagree
   (4) Strongly disagree
   (5) Not applicable
11. Do you reserve or appoint a share of the positions on your board/governing body for individuals affiliated with your religious organization?
   (1) Yes
   (2) No
   (3) Not applicable (e.g., no board or governing body)

B.1.2 Administrative Elements

12. Religious values strongly influence administrative decisions in our program.
   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Agree
   (3) Disagree
   (4) Strongly disagree
   (5) Not applicable
13. The agencies that we partner with share our religious beliefs and convictions.
   (1) Strongly agree
   (2) Agree
   (3) Disagree
   (4) Strongly disagree
   (5) Not applicable

14. Our program draws on religious values and beliefs in training and motivating staff and volunteers.
    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable

15. Support staff typically share the religious beliefs or convictions of our organization. (By support staff, we mean secretarial or clerical staff or those supporting administrative operations.)
    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable

16. Program staff typically share the religious beliefs or convictions of our organization. (By program staff, we mean counselors, trainers, therapists, or those with direct substantive contact with program participants.)
    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable

17. Executive staff typically share the religious beliefs or convictions of our organization. (By executive staff, we mean program directors, staff supervisors, or those making executive decisions about institutional direction.)
    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable

18. Program participants typically share the religious beliefs or convictions of our organization.
    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable

19. In determining eligibility for services, preference is given to program participants who share the religious beliefs or orientation of our organization.
    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable
20. We recruit volunteers from religious sources, like congregations or other religious organizations.
    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable

B.1.3 Environmental Elements

21. Program participants come across religious symbols, pictures, artifacts, music, or people dressed in religious clothing in our facility.
    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable
22. Do the services, activities, or programs offered by your program take place in a facility that is otherwise used for religious worship?
    (1) Yes
    (2) No
23. Are religious beliefs or principles readily displayed in your organization's or program's mission statement?
    (1) Yes
    (2) No
    (3) Not applicable (e.g., agency does not have a mission statement)

24. Our agency's program has a clearly religious name or identity.
    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable

B.1.4 Funding Elements

25. Preference is given to funding sources that would not jeopardize the religious content of program activities.
    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable
26. Most of our funding comes from religious organizations.
    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable
27. We promote the religious mission of our organization when making requests for funding.
    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable

B.1.5 Programmatic Elements

28. Religious literature is distributed or made available to program participants.
    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable

29. Program participants join in worship services as an element of our program.

    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable

30. Program participants are invited to worship services that are separate from the program.

    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable

31. Program participants join in group prayer—such as at the beginning or ending of meals or meetings—as an element of our program.

    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable

32. Program participants pray or meditate as an element of our program.

    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable

33. Program participants study religious texts as an element of our program.

    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable

34. Program participants learn or discuss religious beliefs, values, or traditions as an element of our program.

    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable

35. Program participants perceive or think about our program as faith-based.

 (1) Strongly agree
 (2) Agree
 (3) Disagree
 (4) Strongly disagree
 (5) Not applicable

36. Program participants are encouraged to make personal religious commitments.

 (1) Strongly agree
 (2) Agree
 (3) Disagree
 (4) Strongly disagree
 (5) Not applicable

37. For our program to be effective, program participants must undergo a religious transformation.

 (1) Strongly agree
 (2) Agree
 (3) Disagree
 (4) Strongly disagree
 (5) Not applicable

38. Program participants are encouraged to make personal changes in attitudes and behaviors that are based *clearly and openly* on the religious values of our organization.

 (1) Strongly agree
 (2) Agree
 (3) Disagree
 (4) Strongly disagree
 (5) Not applicable

39. Program participants are encouraged to make personal changes in attitudes and behaviors *understood but unspoken* as being based on the religious values of our organization.

 (1) Strongly agree
 (2) Agree
 (3) Disagree
 (4) Strongly disagree
 (5) Not applicable

40. The faith elements incorporated into our program are clear and open.

    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable

41. Program participants are required to participate in mandatory faith elements of our program.

    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable

42. The faith element of our program is primarily reflected in the service and care provided by our staff.

    (1) Strongly agree
    (2) Agree
    (3) Disagree
    (4) Strongly disagree
    (5) Not applicable

B.1.6 Relevance of Religious Practices

43. The questions above asked about your own organization and program. These final questions are for more general background. Different religions may express religious faith in distinct ways. Religious practices also vary among faith-based service organizations. Practices relevant to a faith-based organization (FBO) in the Catholic tradition, for example, may not be relevant to an FBO in the Muslim tradition. Please think about the faith tradition with which your organization identifies, if any. Please tell me how strongly you agree or disagree that a service organization thoroughly integrating that faith tradition would include the following items in its programs.

    (a) Religious literature, distributed or on display.

        (1) Strongly agree
        (2) Agree
        (3) Disagree
        (4) Strongly disagree
        (5) Not applicable

(b) Worship service

(1) Strongly agree
(2) Agree
(3) Disagree
(4) Strongly disagree
(5) Not applicable

(c) Prayer in a group setting, such as at the beginning or ending of meals or meetings.

(1) Strongly agree
(2) Agree
(3) Disagree
(4) Strongly disagree
(5) Not applicable

(d) Individual prayer or meditation.

(1) Strongly agree
(2) Agree
(3) Disagree
(4) Strongly disagree
(5) Not applicable

(e) Teaching/discussion of sacred texts.

(1) Strongly agree
(2) Agree
(3) Disagree
(4) Strongly disagree
(5) Not applicable

(f) Teaching/discussion about religious values.

(1) Strongly agree
(2) Agree
(3) Disagree
(4) Strongly disagree
(5) Not applicable

(g) Encouraging program participants to make personal religious commitments.

(1) Strongly agree
(2) Agree
(3) Disagree
(4) Strongly disagree
(5) Not applicable

(h) Encouraging program participants to change attitudes or behavior based on religious values.

(1) Strongly agree
(2) Agree
(3) Disagree
(4) Strongly disagree
(5) Not applicable

B.2 Survey of Executive Directors

B.2.1 Organizational Attributes

1. What is the formal name of the organization? _______________
2. What is the name and title of the organization's administrator of [program]? _______________
3. Does the organization have a mission statement? ○ Yes ○ No
   Please describe the mission statement or the general mission of your organization. _______________
4. What is the average number of clients you typically serve in a month? _______________
5. We would like to know about the types of clients you serve. Please estimate what percentage of all clients are in each category and the average length of service for each type of client.
   Children 12 and under ____ % _____ months
   Teens, 13–19 ____ % _____ months
   Single Male Adults ____ % _____ months
   Single Female Adults ____ % _____ months
   Families ____ % _____ months
6. Do you serve any special populations? ○ Yes ○ No
   If yes, what special populations? _______________
7. What kinds of services do you provide directly? _______________________
8. What kinds of referrals do you make (if any)? _______________
9. Do you collect data on clients and outcomes? ○ Yes ○ No
10. How many paid full-time staff (FTEs) work in your organization? _______________
11. How many volunteers work for your organization? _______________
12. Would you call your organization a secular or faith-based organization? _______________
13. If faith-based, are you affiliated with a particular group or denomination? ○ Yes ○ No
    If yes, which group? _______________

B.3 Interview Schedule: Executive Directors

1. Could you tell me about the history of your program?
   - Probe: I see that you (do/do not) accept government funds to support your program. Why have you chosen to do so?
   - Probe: How do you think that decision has affected the way to conduct your program?
2. In your own words, what are the goals of the program?
   - Probe: How does the program work? For example, what types of clients do you typically see?
   - Probe: How are clients usually referred to your program?
   - Probe: Once a client contacts you, what happens? Could you please walk me through the typical process for the typical client?
3. What would you say is the rationale or theory behind your program?
   - Probe: How would you define "success" in this program? What kinds of outcomes do you hope for?
   - Probe: What efforts have you made to measure the effectiveness of your program?
   - Probe: What kinds of data have you collected? If you have conducted program evaluations, could I have a copy of those?
4. To what extent do you expect the people to whom you provide these services to change their attitudes or behavior? If you do try to change their attitudes or behavior, how—in what ways— do you expect them to change?
   - Probe: How do you go about changing clients' attitudes or behavior?
   - Probe: How do you measure changes like these?
5. What kinds of relationships do you have with other service providers in [geographic area]?
   - Probe: Are you part of a coalition? If so, how often do you meet and what usually happens when you meet with others in the coalition? Who are some of the other organizations in the coalition?
   - Probe: Do you have an external support structure outside your organization? If you do have regular contacts with regional or national organizations, could you please tell me about them?
6. Now I would like to ask you to describe your organization and how it is structured. Do you have an organizational chart that you can give to me?
   - Probe: What is your background? Training? Experience? How were you recruited for this job?

7. Who are the people who you consider members of your management team, and what kind of background and education, and experience does each one have?
   - Probe: How many front-line workers who work directly with clients do you have? Who are they and what kind of background, education, and experience does each one have?
   - Probe: How many volunteers work directly with clients? Who are they and what kind of background, education, and experience does each one have?
8. How successful do you think this program has been?
   - Probe: How do you think clients have been affected by their coming in contact with and going through your program?
9. Now I am going to show you a list of organizations in our study that provide similar services in [geographic area]. On a scale of 1–10, with 1 not being at all effective and 10 being very effective, how would you rate each of these organizations?

B.4 Interview Schedule: Program Managers/Coordinators

1. (a) First, I would like to know something about you and your program. What is your background? Training? Experience? How were you recruited for this job? (b) Now, Could you please tell me a bit about program? How does the program work? For example, what types of clients do you typically see? For each type of client, under what circumstances do they typically come to your program in the first place?
   - Probe: How are clients usually referred to your program?
   - Probe: Once a client contacts you, what happens? Could you please walk me through the typical process for the typical client?
2. I would like to know a bit more about the process. What do you do at intake?
   - Probe: What forms do clients fill out? Do they have to meet certain criteria to qualify for services? What are they?
   - Probe: What do you say to them? Do you have a script that you follow for each client? Do you have a procedures manual? (If so, request a copy.)
   - Probe: Do you give them any written materials? (Secure copies, if available.)
3. What happens once a client has been processed at intake and found eligible for services?
   - Probe: Is there usually a waiting list? How long do people have to wait to get into your program?
   - Probe: What do they do in the meantime?
4. Do you make referrals?
   - Probe: Do you provide services directly on site?

5. How would you define "success" in this program? What kinds of outcomes do you hope to achieve?
6. To what extent do you expect the people to whom you provide these services to change their attitudes or behavior? If you do try to change their attitudes or behavior, how—in what ways—do you expect them to change?
   - Probe: How do you go about changing clients' attitudes or behavior?
   - Probe: How do you measure changes like these?
7. How successful do you think this program has been?
   - Probe: How do you think clients have been affected by their coming in contact with and going through your program?

B.5 Interview Schedule: Clients

B.5.1 Survey of Client Interviewees

First name and initial of last name ________________

Age ______ Gender ____________ Race-ethnicity ___________________

Do you have any children? ○ Yes ○ No

[If yes] How many children do you have? ________

Age of each child: _____, _____, _____, _____, _____, _____

What was the highest grade that you completed in school? _______

Marital Status: ○ Never married ○ Married ○ Separated ○ Divorced

Month and year you entered the program: ______________

If you have already left the program, approximate month and year you left: ___________

Have you ever been in this program before? ○ Yes ○ No

[If yes] Month and year you first entered and month and year you left:

First entered: _______________ Left program: _________________

Have you ever participated in other programs proving this same service? ○ Yes ○ No

[If yes] Which program(s)? _______________

Do you currently have a job? ○ Yes ○ No

[If yes] How many months have you had this job? _________

[If yes] Approximately how many hours do you work per week, on average?
____

[If no] Are you currently looking for work? ○ Yes ○ No

Are you receiving cash assistance now? ○ Yes ○ No Support services? ○ Yes ○ No
Are you receiving any other benefits? ○ SSI ○ Food Stamps ○ Medicaid ○ Unemployment

B.5.2 Client/Focus Group Questions

I. Experience with program

(a) How did you come to be in [name of program]?
(b) What it is like to be in this program? What it is like to go through this program?
(c) How do you feel about the program? What do you like and don't like about it?
(d) How does this program compare to other programs that you know about or have heard about?

II. Services

(a) What kind of relationship do you have with the staff who work with you?
(b) What messages is she/he sending to you?
(c) What services have been offered to you?
(d) How do you find out about them?
(e) What services have you used?
(f) What do you think about the services?
(g) What do you like or dislike about them?
(h) Which ones have been most helpful? Why?

III. Program effects

(a) How have you personally been affected by going through the program? What have been some of the good effects? And what have been some not so good effects?
(b) How have others in your household been affected by you being in the program?
(c) How has your spouse or partner been affected? What have been some of the good effects? Not so good effects?
(d) How have your children been affected? What have been some of the good effects? Not so good effects?
(e) What could the staff in this program be doing that would be better for you and your household?
(f) How have you changed by being in the program?

(g) How have your circumstances changed? What's different today compared to the few weeks before you entered the program?

IV. The future

(a) What are your goals for the future? Where would you like to be one year from now?
(b) How has the program helped you move towards these goals?
(c) What have you learned in the program that you have found most useful now or in the future?

V. Religious content

(a) Has any staff person in the program ever talked to you about your faith, your religious life, or your spirituality? [If yes] Who initiated the conversation?
(b) How did you feel about that?
(c) Do you think that some kind of religious or spiritual counseling would have helped you reach the goals that you just told me about? How?

Appendix C
Descriptions of Programs and Agencies

This appendix provides brief descriptions of programs and agencies included in the study as ascertained during the initial wave of data collection. While agency information is provided to offer context, it bears mentioning that programs are the primary unit of analysis in this study. Agency names were assigned as pseudonyms (false names) for the Michigan cases. The larger number of organizational cases in the Washington-Oregon study locale leads us to treat the agencies under relevant groupings (faith-intensive privately funded, etc.) rather than as individual programs or organizations.

C.1 Mississippi Parenting Programs

C.1.1 Faith-Intensive Privately Funded Programs

St. Andrew's Mission. Located in the southwest Mississippi town of McComb, St. Andrew's is a professional service agency affiliated with the United Methodist Church. The agency self-identifies as a faith-based organization (FBO). In fact, a Methodist church is located on the same lot as the agency. Thus, it is an FBO geographically linked with a religious organization. This affiliation notwithstanding, St. Andrew's is an interdenominational ministry. Agency personnel take pains to state that their ministry is "ecumenical." They have ten full-time employees and seven part-time workers, with fifteen volunteers supporting the various services provided by the agency. The agency seeks to provide what its staff describes as a "fill-in-the-gap, total person ministry." This approach to community service entails providing established programs coupled with a proactive effort to remain attuned to emergent community needs. St. Andrew's offers a wide range of services, including a soup kitchen and food ministry (with food delivery), a day care center and after-school program, bill payment, home repair, and medical services. In all, they serve about 2,000 clients per month. Given the size of their day care and after-school programs, they serve more preteen children than any other population.

J. P. Bartkowski and S. E. Grettenberger, *The Arc of Faith-Based Initiatives*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90668-3

However, just under half of their clientele is composed (in order of magnitude) of single female adults, single male adults, and families.

The parent education program at St. Andrew's Mission is run out of its Family Investment Center. St. Andrew's Mission uses the Active Parenting curriculum in its parent education class. Like most programs at St. Andrew's, this one is offered on a year-round basis. The Active Parenting program is based on the principles of building the child's self-esteem, permitting the child to reap the natural or logical consequences of his or her choices, and organizing the family's choices around the principle of democratic decision-making. Although this curriculum is not faith-based, the parent educator at St. Andrew's says that her extensive religious training and long tenure at St. Andrew's enables her to integrate scriptural references into the program. Each class is offered twice per week—once in the morning and once in the evening to make it accessible to the widest possible clientele. The program is six weeks in length, and features classroom sessions as well as home visits. Court-mandated parents (predominantly mothers) have been the norm in recent classes.

Life Renewal Ministries, Inc. The second privately funded faith-intensive parenting program included in this study is that run by Life Renewal Ministries located in Starkville, Mississippi. Starkville, situated in the east central part of the state, is best known as the hometown of Mississippi State University. Life Renewal Ministries is a faith-based organization (FBO). It is a Christian ministry organization, but it is not affiliated with any particular religious group or denomination. Life Renewal has two full-time employees and seven volunteers. The roles of executive director and parent educator are filled by the same person at this time—a female minister. Life Renewal has been a fairly small ministry in the past, focusing on providing long-term support to a limited number of typically female clients (about six per month). The intensive nature of the programs, complete with a rigorously trained mentor who remains in long-term contact with class participants and modest agency resources, has required this orientation toward parent education. However, Life Renewal had been awarded a large grant to expand many of the programs that it offers. Thus, the agency was poised to undergo some significant changes.

The agency offers several parenting programs for different clienteles, including one class for caregivers who are married and another for single parents. The director/educator has used different curricula in these programs. Active Parenting has been used in the past. However, the program is currently governed by a faith-based parenting curriculum, Families in Focus, made available through the Presbyterian Church. Life Renewal also has programs focused on employment assistance, personal counseling, and life skills classes in anger management, nutrition, and budgeting.

C.1.2 Faith-Related Publicly Funded Parenting Programs

Four faith-based parenting programs underwritten by public funds were also studied. Because state-level programming has centered on Mississippi's responsible fatherhood initiative, all of these programs were parenting classes for fathers. And all of them use the faith-based curriculum, The 7 Secrets of Effective Fathers, from the National Center for Fathering.

Vicksburg Family Development Service. One fatherhood program is run by Vicksburg Family Development Service in the town of Vicksburg, Mississippi. Vicksburg, widely known for featuring the best-preserved Civil War history in Mississippi, is located in the west central portion of the state. The agency is oriented around the goal of providing parents and children with knowledge, skills, and support to promote positive outcomes. Although Vicksburg Family Development self-identifies as a secular organization, the service activities of many people who work in this agency are animated by religious faith. Thus, while acknowledging that the agency's formal identity is nonreligious, the executive director of Vicksburg Family Development is quick to add, "This is a ministry. Faith is very important to the people on our staff." The agency has twelve full-time employees, five part-time staff members, and ten volunteers. Serving about 170 persons per month, the agency clientele features a fairly even mix of children (preschool, school-age preadolescent, and teenage), single adults (male and female), and families. In addition to parenting classes, Vicksburg Family Development offers prenatal classes for pregnant women, intervention programs for teen mothers, preschool programs, a mentoring program for youth aged 10–18, and life skills training. Agency personnel make referrals for such needs as financial assistance, Medicaid, food, job readiness, and educational (GED) training.

Because strengthening family relationships is at the heart of this agency's mission, parenting programs involve not just classes held onsite but regular home visits as well. Home visits are considered a vital part of the services offered by Vicksburg Family Development because periodic attendance at classes alone is seen as less likely to promote positive outcomes than a combination of classroom instruction and home visits. Thus, like other agencies in this study, Vicksburg Family Development embraces the family support model of parent education. The fatherhood program is the only faith-based parenting program offered by the agency. It is offered in partnership with a nearby congregation, and is taught by a local minister. However, a counterpart parenting program is commonly offered for mothers, who meet separately and then join fathers afterwards for refreshments. These programs meet on the same date and time with day care provided in an effort to offer a more comprehensive, multi-pronged form of family support. They are taught at the congregation's multi-purpose building, which is separate from the church's chapel.

Our House, Inc. Our House, located in Greenville, Mississippi also runs a fatherhood program. Greenville is situated in the heart of the Mississippi Delta, an area that has sometimes been called "the most Southern place on earth" given the distinctively higher and more racialized levels of poverty in this region. Our House serves eight counties in the Delta. The executive director of Our House refuses to pigeon hole her agency as either secular or faith-based. Taking care to highlight the wide range of programs offered there, she answers tersely "both" when asked if the agency is faith-based or secular. Despite its fluid identity, Our House was in the process of completing work on a large chapel within its sprawling complex of buildings. Moreover, the agency's mottoes have spiritual overtones (both overt and subtle): "We believe in miracles" and "A new birth to a new beginning in life." The agency's logo depicts a family standing next to a house with a dove flying above it. In the foreground of the logo is an open book of scripture (ostensibly, the Bible). Our House is not affiliated with a particular religious group or denomination.

Our House offers a wide variety of services beyond its parenting program to its clientele of about 350 persons per month. These programs include youth mentoring, support services for victims of sexual abuse and domestic violence, a recovery program for those who have lost family members to homicide, a parent-child substance abuse prevention program, and a 24-hour crisis hotline. The bulk of the agency's clients are teens and single female adults, though fathers are well represented given the success of its Fatherhood Initiative. Our House has 26 full-time staff, six part-time workers, and 25 volunteers. Like the other fatherhood programs in this study, Our House's Fatherhood Initiative is based on the 7 Secrets curriculum. It includes class meetings, social activities (e.g., father-child picnics), and home visits. The program coordinator's actual title at Our House is that of "father advocate," underscoring the program's self-conscious promotion of paternal involvement and family togetherness. Given its reliance on the National Center for Fathering curriculum, this program is faith-based.

North Bolivar Family Resource Center. The third publicly funded, faith-related parent education program in this study is a fatherhood program run though a Family Resource Center affiliated with the North Bolivar School District. The mission statement of the agency is "Success in school equals success in life." The executive director and parent educator are roles played by the same person, though the agency has a pastor who also functions as a fatherhood educator. The agency serves approximately 125 clients per month. Given its connection to the school district, it is not surprising that half of all clients are teenage youth in school. The agency has five full-time employees and 40 volunteers. It self-identifies as a secular agency.

North Bolivar runs after-school programs for youth in grades 4–8 and two types of parenting classes. One set of parenting classes, open to mothers and fathers alike, is largely secular in focus. Recently, these classes were offered with the Right from Birth curriculum. Like Parents as Teachers, Right from Birth teaches caregivers about young children's developmental capabilities as they age and matches parenting techniques with youngsters' developmental abilities. Although any parents can attend these classes, mothers typically attend them. At the same time, the agency offers a faith-based fatherhood program based on the 7 Secrets curriculum. Despite the secular nature of this agency, the faith component in the fatherhood program is quite robust.

Tunica Fatherhood Initiative. The office of the Tunica Fatherhood Initiative is located in Tunica, Mississippi, although funding for the program was secured by Mid-State Opportunity, Inc. quite some distance away in Charleston, Mississippi. Mid-State Opportunity provides services to a wide range of counties in northwest and north central Mississippi. One of their many programs spread across this part of the state is the Tunica Fatherhood Initiative and Mentoring Program. Thus, this fatherhood program is coupled with a youth mentoring program. In fact, men who complete the fatherhood program sometimes agree to serve as youth mentors. Given the distance between the site from which the program is run (Tunica) and the location of the funding agency (Charleston), the program coordinator (who also serves as the parent educator) enjoys some autonomy in the day-to-day running of the program. The Tunica area has been transformed by the rise of gambling along the Mississippi River, but poverty remains a pronounced risk for the disadvantaged in this community and many like it. Thus, as part of the program, the parent educator also tries to get men to enroll in local job readiness programs to improve their employment prospects and economic standing.

Like the other fatherhood programs featured in this study, the Tunica program is based on the 7 Secrets curriculum. Therefore, it is a faith-based program. A brochure provides an overview of the program and defines its purpose without mentioning the program's faith component. According to the brochure, the overall purpose of the program is "to train, educate, encourage, and assist fathers in becoming responsible fathers and in assuming responsibility for the nurturing, growth and development of their children." Its more general goal is "to assist fathers in becoming 'Team Parents.'" The brochure clearly articulates the expectation that fathers who enroll in the program "will participate in activities involving the development of their children and will identify volunteer projects in the community that the family will be involved in for one year." It continues: "Each father will dedicate a minimum number of hours with his child/children or family and the trained father in an area of the family's interest to establish or reestablish a common interest." The program brochure then presents what it describes as the "alarming statistics on fatherless children" in Mississippi and elsewhere. These statistics include the high divorce rate in Mississippi, along with the fact that 50.6% of female-headed families live below the poverty level in the state. It states that "70% of juveniles in reform institutions and long-term prison inmates come from fatherless homes," and notes the increased likelihood for developmental problems among children raised in fatherless households (teen motherhood for daughters, unemployment for sons). The brochure concludes on a high note, however: "GOOD NEWS! CHILDREN WITH INVOLVED FATHERS ARE: likely to have stronger self esteem; less susceptible to peer pressure … likely to have increased cognitive competence … better able to deal with frustrations … [and] better able to gain a sense of independence and identity outside the parent/child relationship."

C.1.3 Secular Publicly Funded Parenting Programs

Emerson Family School. Emerson Family School is located in Starkville, and is affiliated with the Starkville School District. This facility includes a Family Resource Center. As described in the agency's brochure, the mission of Emerson Family School entails the provision of "family-centered programming that encourages and supports social, emotional, physical, and educational development of the whole child and assistance in encouraging strong, healthy families." In addition to its parenting workshops and seminars, Emerson offers preschool and after-school programs, prenatal classes, support groups, GED (General Education Development) classes, and drug prevention workshops. The organization serves more than 500 clients every month, predominantly composed of families. Emerson also serves appreciable numbers of single adults (both men and women) as well as preschool-age children. Emerson employs over 30 full-time workers and has approximately 50 volunteers at any given time. The agency is secular. There is no faith component in any of its programs, including its parenting seminars.

Emerson combines parent education workshops that teach child-rearing skills with an available program of client-specific parent training. Although many different types of parents attend the workshops, the most regular attendees are women enrolled in the agency's Even Start family literacy program. Those who receive client-specific training are typically court-mandated—that is, they must complete the curriculum to retain or regain custody of their children. As is the case with many parent education programs, women attendees far outnumber men. In part, this imbalance reflects the larger number of mother-headed single-parent families in the area. The parent educator at Emerson has used a variety of curricula, but has typically favored behaviorist models in her one-on-one sessions. She says that this approach provides a healthy amount of structure and rules, both of which are necessary for effective parenting in these times. Behaviorism asserts that proper action is best learned through a combination of positive and negative reinforcements. At Emerson, care is taken to stress that incentives and disincentives should be appropriate to the age and developmental abilities of the child.

Neshoba Parents as Teachers Center. A Parents as Teachers (PAT) program is run though a parent center associated with the Neshoba County School District. (The program is combined with the Even Start family literacy program.) The agency is located in Philadelphia, Mississippi. This agency is secular in character, as is every one of its programs. The key goals of the agency entail the promotion of family literacy and responsible parenting. The programs offered by this agency include the Parents as Teachers program, kindergarten preparation classes for young parents, and hands-on workshops for parents who might struggle in tutoring their children on difficult subjects (e.g., algebra). The agency serves around 55 families and over 60 children in a given month.

The agency contains two divisions—one of which is a Parent Resource Center, the other of which is the Parents as Teachers Center. The combined Parents as Teachers and Even Start programs enable the agency to teach parents general child-rearing skills (e.g., effective disciplinary techniques, enhanced parental awareness) through classroom instruction and home visits while providing exposure to interactive exercises designed to foster family literacy (e.g., reading aloud to children). The premise of the Parents as Teachers curriculum is that the parent is a child's first and best teacher in life. Both the agency director and parent educator cite this principle in describing the overall rationale of their program. Thus, the Parents as Teachers program equips parents of children from birth to age seven with the child-rearing skills necessary to be more responsible caregivers while the Parent Resource Center provides the tools (e.g., books, tapes, instructional materials) to foster positive parenting and family literacy. The key eligibility requirement for the Parents as Teachers program is enrollment in GED (General Education Development) or ABE (Adult Basic Education) classes. As part of its effort to promote family literacy, the agency offers an onsite child care facility so that teen mothers can obtain their high school diploma while receiving instruction in responsible parenting.

C.2 Michigan Transitional Housing Programs

C.2.1 Faith-Intensive Privately Funded Transitional Housing Program

Mary's House. Transitional housing and its related supports are the sole programmatic offering of the agency. Mary's House provides housing to homeless, pregnant single women over 18. The program does not receive HUD funding. Therefore, it is able to provide services to so-called "couch homeless" individuals. Surprisingly for a program for pregnant women, women in their 30s and 40s are regularly served. Up to three women live together in an older home that was renovated for this use, and each woman and baby has their own bedroom. The director's office is in the house, along with a bedroom for the house mother who stays every night. A substitute house mother provides respite for her a few nights each month. External case management has been used a couple times. The director had recently learned that women in her facility were eligible for this service and seems eager to use it more.

Although it appears there was initially a religiously related goal of preventing abortions or supporting adoption, few women are now housed for those reasons. Staff now view Mary's House as providing a safe setting for homeless women to have their babies and begin the first nine months of the infant's life. Other children a woman may have cannot be housed at Mary's House. Residency in the program may begin at any time during a pregnancy, with an additional nine months in the house following the birth of the child. Mary's House does not accept government funding, and operates on a restricted annual budget, all from church and individual donations. Much of its support comes from volunteers and from non-cash supports and in-kind contributions from churches or individual members. Mary's House consciously includes extensive faith commitment in the organization at the board and staff levels and content in service delivery, thereby giving the agency an intensively religious character. Christian religious activities are a required element of program activities, which is specified in the program brochure given to prospective residents and other persons.

C.2.2 Faith-Related Publicly Funded and Mixed-Funding Transitional Housing Programs

Hope House. Hope House is a 16-unit transitional housing program for women with children. Hope House offices are physically located in the lower level of the apartment complex near the apartments, and program staff provide all case management services for the women. Hope House was established by its current program director, with strong support from the Junior Welfare League, a women's service organization. Only women with children in their custody are admitted. The program is a partnership with another non-profit which owns and administers the actual facility. Its umbrella organization, Church Affiliated Social Services (CASS), is a national denominationally-affiliated social service organization. CASS is a multi-service agency that provides counseling, child welfare services, and homeless services. The organization provides services to approximately 7000 total clients per year. The transitional housing program provides services to an average of 22–25 families per year.

Hope House is essentially a dual program with the transitional housing program and a concurrent United Way-supported parenting program for residents. Staff include the program manager and two case managers. The program manager appears to have less day-to-day contact with residents. The case managers work very closely with the women developing service plans and brokering needed services for residents. Some services, such as a weekly group with residents, are provided on site by the case managers. Funding for the program is almost exclusively from public sources, including HUD. Two women's service organizations and two churches provide substantial in-kind support for the program. The total budget for just the transitional housing program is about $130,000 per year, of which only about 2% is from churches. Individual contributions are insignificant. While there is a Christian element to the mission and the agency and Hope House maintains ties to its denomination, the selection of staff and delivery of services is based on professional standards only and is secular in its form.

Faith House. Faith House provides the following services, all of which are related to homelessness: day shelter (including volunteer-supplied meals) on weekend days for women, men, and children; transitional housing for families with children; a HUD-funded employment program for homeless adults; child and family support programs; and tutoring for children and mentoring for teens This program is open to housed as well as homeless children and youth. This program also offers parenting classes and religious education.

The transitional housing program has three houses available for families. Preference is given to larger families, as the houses are the largest available in area transitional shelter programs. Because families are located in separate houses, this program can and does accept families comprised of older males, either adult or youth. Housing male residents in families is one of the niches of this program. The intended length of stay is from 9 to 24 months. Case management services for all residents are provided through the external case manager. The agency director clearly has a relationship with residents of the programs, but does not appear to provide direct services as a rule. Some support services are provided through Faith House staff in other programs. In 2002, five families were served by the transitional housing program. Overall, the agency provides services to about 300 persons per month. Faith House's funding comes from both public sources (70%) and private sources (30%). Churches contribute less than 6% of the agency's total annual budget of $760,000.

Charity House. Charity House's agency provides services to the homeless through three programs: an emergency overnight shelter for up to 15 days for homeless men, women, and children; James's House, transitional housing for single men; and Charity House, transitional housing for women with children. Charity House has the capacity to house up to three family units totaling ten persons. Typically, there are three single women with one or two children each. However, there are occasions when the house is occupied by two women with enough children to require use of the additional unit. Nearly all children served are under the age of 12. An average of 27 clients per month are served by the organization. The actual facility used is a house adjoining a second larger house where the emergency shelter and the ministry offices are located. The women are assigned bedrooms for their families, while the living area and kitchen are shared space. With up to ten people living in the house at any given time, living arrangements can be quite crowded.

The current staff for the program consists of the agency director, who seems to have contact with clients of all programs due to the size of the agency, and an advocate. The advocate connects the residents with needed services. This agency had engaged the services of the external case manager for residents in the past. That relationship was discontinued for reasons that are unclear. Women in the house often lost previous housing as a result of domestic violence. Women may be quite young—one of the current two residents is 19, with three children—but are often older. For those who complete the program, stays in the house are for six to 24 months. The program does not receive HUD funding directly, and the executive director did not know the original sources of other governmental funding. The annual agency budget is $260,000. Church contributions account for less than 6% of the budget, with over one third of the budget coming from individual contributions.

C.2.3 Secular Mixed-Funding Transitional Housing Program

Hospitality House. This agency has no faith content in its organizational structure or service delivery. Hospitality House provides the following services for homeless families: emergency shelter; transitional housing; supportive services; and tutoring and language arts for children. The transitional housing program provides services to families with children who were formerly housed in the agency's shelter. On average, the agency provides services to about 40 clients per month, 11 of them in transitional housing. Hospitality House also provides around the clock emergency shelter to homeless families for up to 28 people at a time. Hospitality House's transitional housing is provided in two forms. The initial program was developed to assist each family in securing and maintaining permanent housing. This was the first program to offer post-emergency shelter shelter in this community. Intensive case management is provided to the families who are enrolled in the program. The other more traditionally defined transitional housing program is funded by HUD and is for families where one of the heads of household has a disability.

The primary staff person for transitional housing services is a case manager who works very closely with residents, provides support to them, and brokers needed services from other providers. This program has also occasionally accessed an external case manager for services for residents. Funding for Hospitality House comes from both public (40%) and private (60%) sources. The agency receives a small portion of its funding from churches. It does not receive funding directly from HUD, but does have state housing funds. The agency's total annual budget is about $350,000.

C.3 Washington-Oregon Residential Addiction Recovery Programs

C.3.1 Faith-Intensive Privately Funded Addiction Recovery Programs

Five organizations fit into this category. All of the programs are part of agencies with large emergency shelter programs for the homeless and the poor. **Union Gospel Mission** in Seattle is part of an extensive multi-service agency affiliated with the international gospel mission movement. Its budget during the first wave of data collection was $11 million, including over $10 million in private donations. This agency, founded in 1932, provides food and shelter for the homeless, job training, health and dental services for the poor, and a prison ministry. It has two residential addiction treatment programs: (1) One program is for men and has 36 beds. The duration of the treatment program is nine months and a person can sign up for another year if he is enrolled in a work program or is going to school. This program is directed by an ordained minister who is a certified alcohol and drug counselor. (2) The second program is also directed by an ordained minister. It has 45 beds for men and it is a nine-month program. The two addiction programs started as low-intensity programs about 15 years ago and have evolved into more formal addiction programs.

City Team Ministries in Seattle is connected with a national mission organization with sites in six cities, primarily on the West Coast. This agency program has a long history dating to the early part of the twentieth century. However, the organization experienced serious financial problems in the 1980s and 1990s. To stave off complete program closure, the agency approached a national organization for a friendly takeover, which occurred in 1998. The shelter is entirely for men and has about 80 beds; the alcohol and drug program has about eight slots and the men in the program stay with the other men in the shelter. The shelter and the program are directed by an ordained minister. The duration of the addiction program range from nine to twenty-seven months.

Open House Ministries was founded in 1986 through the efforts of a local philanthropist. It has a 107-bed shelter built in 1997. The agency is located in Vancouver, Washington, just north of Portland, Oregon. The agency offers an eight-week curriculum and an individualized plan for people with addictions. This curriculum is available to anyone currently in the shelter. The shelter does not take single men. The agency is directed by an ordained minister who worked for many years for the Salvation Army.

The Salvation Army (SA) in Seattle operates many different programs for the poor and homeless. Like many SA chapters, the Seattle chapter operates an Adult Rehabilitation Center (ARC) with 101 total beds including 14 beds for women in a separate facility from the downtown men's program. The agency embraces the structured work-oriented curriculum of the national Salvation Army organization. Thus, residents of the ARC are required to work 40 hours per week in the SA thrift store and related activities. The ARC program is self-supporting from the revenues earned in the thrift store. The program expects that residents will stay at least six months and a maximum of one year.

The Salvation Army (SA) in Portland also operates an Adult Rehabilitation Center (ARC) with 73 beds for men only. The SA in Portland employs the same basic work-oriented curriculum used at the Seattle SA. Unlike the Seattle program, this thrift store does not generate enough income to cover all of the ARC costs. So, the program relies on subsidies from the regional chapter of SA.

C.3.2 Faith-Related Privately Funded Addiction Recovery Program

This program (name withheld) is part of a hospital that is, in turn, part of a chain of hospitals controlled by a Protestant denomination. The addiction program is about twenty years old and provides eighteen beds (both inpatient and detoxification).

Like hospital-based programs nationwide, this program has been contracting for years and almost closed in the late 1990s. It was saved by the establishment of an exclusive agreement with a large HMO that requires all of the patients in the addiction program to be referred by the HMO. As a result, the program is entirely dependent on private insurance for revenue. The duration of the program is fourteen days. Staff and leadership do not consider this program to be a spiritual or religious program, but the Faith Integration Survey indicated some such elements.

C.3.3 Faith-Related Mixed-Funding Addiction Recovery Programs

One addiction program (name withheld) in this group represents the merger of two hospital-based programs in the early 1990s. The program is part of a hospital that in turn is part of a chain of Catholic hospitals and health facilities on the West Coast. At the time of the merger, the program shifted from a traditional recovery, twelve-step model to a more cognitive and behavioral approach. The program has 22 beds with an average stay of about fourteen days. Eighty percent of its beds are publicly funded with the remaining beds private pay or private insurance. The program does not consider itself to be a spiritual program, although the Faith Integration Survey warranted it being placed in the faith-related category. The program is now in the process of phasing out its substance abuse program and converting the program to a behavior disorder unit.

Providence Hospital Systems has a chemical dependency inpatient unit in Portland. It has 24 beds with the average stay of five days. The focus is on co-occurring disorders. Spirituality is emphasized and a chaplain is available from the parent hospital. Stabilization of clients is a key focus of this program.

C.3.4 Principally Secular Publicly Funded and Mixed-Funding Addiction Recovery Programs

Several programs accept government funds, private insurance reimbursement, and varying levels of private support. A brief description of these agencies and programs follows. Unless otherwise noted, these agencies and programs are nonprofit organizations. Principally secular programs are those that have a sufficiently low level of faith integration to not be included in the faith-related grouping. Often, these programs are hybridized such that they generally provide secular therapy but can offer faith components at the client's request. This hip-pocket strategy that integrates spirituality into otherwise secular service provision is rather unique to addiction recovery. This approach is described in Chap. 5.

Residence XII opened in 1981 as an Oxford House-type recovery program for women, based on the twelve steps of Alcoholics' Anonymous. It is located in

Kirkland, Washington, outside of Seattle. In the 1990s, at the behest of state government, the agency began an outpatient and then a more intensive inpatient treatment program. Currently, this agency has 25 inpatient beds with a variable length of stay (usually between 21 and 45 days). Like many programs, they limit the number of publicly funded beds because of low reimbursement levels from the state. Spirituality, with a special emphasis on the unique spiritual needs of women, is a central aspect of the program.

The Center for Alcohol and Drug Treatment in Wenatchee, Washington was also started in the late 1970s as an Oxford House-type recovery program for men and women. In 1993, the program model was changed dramatically. Instead of the twelve-step recovery model, the executive director revised the curriculum to emphasize choice therapy, a cognitive behavioral approach pioneered by William Glasser. Currently, the agency has 30 intensive inpatient beds and eight detoxification beds. Most of the funding is public (24 out of 30 beds) with the remainder private pay or private insurance. Although the program warrants being placed in the secular category, local ministers volunteer in the program and offer periodic spirituality classes.

The Drug Abuse Prevention Center (DAPC) was established in 1970 as a twelve-bed, long-term residential treatment program. It is located in Kelso, Washington, about midway between Portland and Seattle in a rural part of the state. Reflecting the trends of the time, it was a therapeutic community program characterized by aggressive confrontational group therapy. Initially, the program duration was two years. In 1979, an outpatient program was added and, in 1998, the agency moved to its current facility. This facility allowed an expansion to 40 beds. The agency has essentially two different programs: a long-term program (six months) and a shorter term, intensive inpatient program for up to thirty days. Almost all of its funding is from the government. It has retained some aspects of the therapeutic community model but it has been modified to offer a more supportive treatment environment. Like the Center for Alcohol and Drug Treatment, a minister volunteers in the program and a number of clients have undergone religious conversion. Thus, while this program warranted being placed in the secular category, spiritual components can be made available at clients' request.

Highland Courte was initially established as a residential program for Alzheimer's patients. It was owned by a for-profit company with multiple sites. Some time ago, the owners converted the program to a residential alcohol and drug treatment program. At that time, it only took publicly funded clients. But the program soon encountered serious financial problems and almost closed. It has been revived under the current leadership and takes a mix of publicly funded and private insurance/private pay clients. It operates separate women's and men's programs within the same physical facility. The total number of beds is now about 40 (with only 12 publicly funded beds). The length of stay is variable and usually falls between 21 and 40 days. It remains a program within a for-profit company with other types of residential programs. Spirituality is connected to the concept of a higher power.

DePaul Treatment Center in Portland was started by a Catholic social service agency in 1975 but was spun off from this agency in 1978 as a separate, secular nonprofit agency offering addiction services. It is a sizable program by today's standards with 82 beds. The agency operates separate men and women's programs. Historically, the agency saw its mission as ministering to the disadvantaged, so almost all of its beds were publicly funded. With recent cutbacks in government funding, the agency has been reconsidering this commitment and it is moving slowly toward less reliance on public sector funding. The treatment model was initially based on the twelve-step recovery model but was drastically changed several years ago to include a heavy reliance on cognitive behavioral interventions. The length of stay can be up to 6–8 months with the average around 95 days. AA and NA meetings remain an important component of the program.

Sundown M Ranch, located in Selah, Washington near Yakima, is one of the largest residential addiction programs on the West Coast. It was founded in 1968 as a recovery house for alcoholics. Over the years, it has evolved into a large multi-service, nonprofit addiction program with residential programs for youth, families, and adults (both men and women). It has over 170 staff. The program model continues to be heavily focused on the 12 steps, and spirituality is important as part of the process of working the 12 steps. It has a full-time chaplain on staff. The average length of stay is about 28 days.

Tualatin Valley Centers with headquarters just outside of Portland was established in 1961 as a child guidance clinic. Over the years, it has evolved into a very comprehensive health and social welfare nonprofit agency with many programs. It started an outpatient addiction program in the early 1970s and established a residential addiction program for women and their children in 1991. It has 10 beds and women are required to bring their children with them to treatment. Only children under six are allowed. The program duration is about six months. Spirituality is connected to discussions of a higher power. Like many longer-term programs, the treatment is divided into different phases with progressively more responsibility as a client moves through the phases.

Volunteers of America in Portland was originally part of a national, faith-related organization. It has had operations in the Pacific Northwest for over 100 years. The local organization is a separately incorporated nonprofit agency providing an array of services to the poor and disadvantaged. Its additional program has 85 treatment beds with about 50 for men and 35 for women in different physical locations. The treatment program is designed to be six months in duration with four months of intensive treatment and two months of transition. The program is entirely funded by government and it has contracts with the county to serve offenders. So, most of the clients in the program have either been in jail or are at risk of going to jail if they refuse to go into treatment. The emphasis of the treatment program is on evidenced-based practice and cognitive behavioral therapy. Spirituality is expressed through a strong commitment to client empowerment and personal recovery supported by the staff and the group of individuals in the program.

Sea-Mar Residential Treatment Center is located in Tacoma, Washington. This program was founded in 1993 and has gone through a variety of changes over the years. It currently is part of Sea-Mar Community Health Centers, a large multi-service nonprofit organization based in Seattle. The treatment center has 36 beds and specializes in services to Hispanic adults. Their staff persons are bilingual and many of the clients do not speak English. They are completely reliant on state funding.

C.3.5 Principally Secular Privately Funded Addiction Recovery Programs

One of these organizations (name withheld) was established in 1988 as a for-profit entity, with an AA twelve-step program model. From the beginning, this program has focused on health professionals; thus, it tended to rely upon private insurance and self-pay patients. Like many residential programs, it encountered financial struggles in the 1990s with the changes in private insurance and managed care. Thus, a friendly takeover was engineered in 1998 whereupon this organization was brought under the corporate wing of a large national nonprofit addiction treatment organization. It currently has 44 inpatient beds and six detoxification beds. It continues to rely upon private insurance and private pay patients, as well as private donations. Spiritual counseling and education are important components of this otherwise secular program, which typically lasts about 4–6 weeks with some patients moving to transitional housing in the community for an intensive day-treatment program.

Pacific Ridge is a for-profit agency founded in 1995 by two individuals with a long history in the recovery field. They have 27 beds and a variable length of stay (around 14 days). They take men and women and run their groups together. A part-time, retired minister offers spiritual counseling and education. The program is based loosely on a twelve-step model that has been adapted in light of the changes in the addiction field. Revenue is derived from private pay and private insurance.

Highline Recovery Services is part of Highline Community Hospital, located in Tukwila, Washington, south of Seattle. This program was started in 1974 and has undergone many changes and permutations in the intervening years. During the heyday of hospital inpatient addiction programs, it had as many as 40 beds (intensive inpatient and detoxification). But with the changes in managed care and public funding, the number of beds has declined to 18. The agency tries keep only 12 beds full at any one time. The program also has six detoxification beds and has increased its outpatient and day-treatment offerings. It incorporates the twelve-step model into its program and offers spirituality education and classes. The length of stay is variable but usually about ten days for the intensive inpatient and then they are referred to outpatient. All patients are privately funded through self-pay or private insurance.

Index

J. P. Bartkowski and S. E. Grettenberger, *The Arc of Faith-Based Initiatives*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90668-3

U

V

W