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The Welfare Reform Bill Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 contains a section referred to as “Charitable Choice.” This section was designed to ensure that faith-based agencies were not discriminated against in the awarding of federal funding. States are not required to implement any part of the initiative, except ensuring that there is no discrimination against faith-based organizations. States have responded in a variety of ways in the hope of increasing the number of faith-based organizations receiving and competing for social services funds. Although religious groups have been receiving government funds to provide social services for much of American history, the faith-based initiative represents a new effort from both state and federal government to encourage even greater participation. There has been a tremendous amount of research on the impact of the faith-based organizations; however, very little attention has been given to the non-religious based social service organizations.
To understand the impact of the faith-based implementation on non-religious based social service agencies, the primary focus was on examining: personnel, clientele, programs and services data, as well as internal and external factors. The secondary focus was determining if the implementation of the faith-based initiative signified the “second-order of devolution.” The study focused on three NBSSOs in Washington, D.C. Interviews were conducted with agency officials and data collected from all three agencies.

While supporters argue that the faith-based initiative is about solving problems of poverty, taxing an over-burdened welfare system and violating the constitution, the researcher found that there was no impact of the faith-based initiative on non-religious based social service organizations. The participating agencies had been impacted by elected officials, public policy and federal funding, however; research also shows that there was no evidence of a “second-order of devolution.” The expected outsourcing of public services and the creation of numerous models of welfare systems with a variety of public-private partnerships that included secular non-profit organizations, for-profit organizations and religious organizations had not occurred.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Religion has played an instrumental role in American society. This force has created movements that forever changed the course of this nation, such as ending slavery, prison reform, child welfare, racial desegregation, civil rights and alcohol regulation. Religious entities have been extremely instrumental in the scope of politics and elections, providing an audience for politicians and policies.

Since the devolution of federal programs, many state, local and community-based organizations are saddled with the responsibility of social welfare. The 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act contains a section referred to as “Charitable Choice.” The objectives of Charitable Choice are to encourage and to increase the participation of non-profit organizations in the delivery of federally funded welfare programs, with specific interest in faith-based organizations by establishing them as contractors for specific social services as with other non-religious organizations.\(^1\) These laws were designed to give people in need choices among the charities offering services to them. The Charitable Choice laws apply to four Federal program areas:

---
Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF); Community Services Block Grant (CSBG); the Welfare-to-Work program; and programs for substance abuse and mental illness. The range of services faith-based organizations can provide through contracted services include: food (meals, food pantry, soup kitchens, nutrition), work (job search, job-skills, vocational education, general equivalency diploma program), community service, domestic violence counseling, medical and health service, and second chance housing.

Charitable Choice laws also impose restrictions on faith-based organizations. Organizations that receive funding must provide services to all eligible participants, regardless of those persons' religious beliefs. They also prohibit religious organizations from using federal funds to support any inherently religious activities (such as worship, religious instruction, or proselytization). The law clarifies the rights and the responsibilities of faith-based organizations that receive federal funds. The law specifies that faith-based organizations cannot be excluded from the competition for federal funds simply because they are religious. These laws also provide that faith-based organizations that receive federal funds may continue to carry out their missions consistent with their beliefs.

---


President George W. Bush presented the faith-based initiative as a top priority of his administration. Bush’s objective was aimed at expanding Charitable Choice policies throughout the federal government. Religious charities that received public funds would be allowed to selectively hire based on religion. In addition, funding could be utilized for repair and construction of buildings for religious worship. Although the President asserted that the faith-based initiative was effective and cost-effective in a series of speeches, Congress refused to adopt the President’s plan. Without Congressional approval, President Bush issued executive orders and regulatory changes implementing the majority of his faith-based agenda.

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the impact of the faith-based initiative on non-religious based social service organizations (hereafter NBSSOs) in Washington, D.C. The significance of researching the impact of the faith-based initiative on NBSSOs in Washington, D.C. was to provide scholars and policy makers with data and information in determining how the NSSBOs were affected by the implementation of the faith-based initiative. This study attempted to answer the following questions: Had services increased or decreased? Had funding increased or decreased? Had the clientele increased or decreased? The study analyzed data from three NBSSOs located in Washington, D.C. that were established prior to the implementation of the faith-based initiative.


6. Ibid.
initiative and are currently providing social services. The three NBSSOs varied in services, programs and size. The research also attempted to address R.P. Nathan and T. Gais’s theory of “second-order devolution.”

**Background**

Government funding of religious social service providers has a long history at the state and local levels. This concept of private service organizations contracting with the federal government dates to Lyndon B. Johnson’s Great Society programs. President Johnson’s programs encouraged collaborations between the government and non-profit community organizations. Lutheran Social Services and Catholic Charities were two groups that participated and took full advantage of this opportunity. Each organization created a non-profit organization and removed any religious symbols from the client service area. During this period, government financing of social service organizations increased heavily because of spending on many new federal programs focusing on social and health issues, including Medicare and Medicaid, community action agencies, community mental health centers, neighborhood health centers, and child protection agencies.

Major policy changes to federal programs such as Medicaid, Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) and Section 8 could over time reduce government funding to a

---


wide range of social service providers. The reduction of funds for social service organizations exhibits a contradictory trend. The growth of government financing of non-profits and the competition for public and private funds generates ongoing pressure for more accountability and outcome evaluation. The competitiveness for funding increases the levels of regulation in programmatic performance and transparency. The diversification of policy tools and the devolution of government programs have fostered partnerships at the state and local level. This pattern of increased regulation and devolution mirrors the fundamental principles of New Public Management: “the desire for improved performance and the goal of shifting away from large public bureaucracies toward more flexibility and decentralization in public service delivery.”

In the 1980’s, government funding of non-profit agencies increased despite a strong policy of devolution from the federal level down to the local government. The OmniBus Reconciliation Act (OBRA-1981) reduced the growth rate of federal spending and regulations on many federal social and health programs and devolved part of the responsibility of these programs to states. Initially, many non-profit agencies

---


experienced a severe cut in government funding. By 1988, many non-profit agencies recovered and in several cases funding increased substantially. State and local governments substituted their own funds for lost federal money. They refinanced their contracts with non-profit or reconfigured programs to maximize federal assistance in order to take advantage of federal programs with increasing budgets. The policy focus shifted to address specific areas such as mental health, developmental disabilities, child welfare, home health, and counseling.13

The implementation of the 1996 welfare reform legislation during the Clinton Administration signified a revision with the delivery of government services. This legislation replaced the Aid For Dependent Children (AFDC) program, with a shared federal/state program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), with wide variations in payment levels to individuals and eligibility standards nationwide. The welfare reform legislation included a Charitable Choice amendment; this encouraged states to fund faith-based agencies providing social services.14

This new legislation provided new state block grant programs and greater discretion for states to design and develop income assistance programs.15 New guidelines were implemented by federal law, and they regulated the relationship between faith-based


15. Ibid., 1480.
organizations (hereafter FBO’s) and the government. The guidelines created by Charitable Choice were developed to address two issues: the discrimination against FBO’s that wanted to compete for public funding to support their social service programs and possible threats to the religious character of FBO’s by accepting the federal funding.\footnote{16} Many FBO’s believed that by accepting government funding, regulations and restraints would be imposed on them.

The Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives (OFB) was created by President George W. Bush in 2001. The purpose of the office is to provide faith-based social service providers a greater opportunity to receive federal funding to disseminate their services. Religious organizations receive federal funding to implement and administer a “faith-based initiative.” For organizations to touch lives in lasting ways, it was believed that faith must play a vital role, according to former President George W. Bush.\footnote{17} Joe Locente of the Heritage Foundation, a strong supporter of the faith-based initiative, believed that this act drastically transformed the relationship between government and institutions of civil society that provide services to low income individuals and families. “What Bush is doing is challenging the secular status quo of


giving,” Loconte stated. A federally funded evangelical economy began during the Bush years, and continues to thrive to date. The privatization of public services is a feature of neoliberalism and has been part of the domestic and global agenda of the conservative evangelicalism. The free-market agenda of the economic elite and the interest of elite evangelicals found a common cause and opportunity during the Clinton Administration under Charitable Choice in the 1996 Welfare Reform Act. Today, that relationship continues under the Faith-Based Initiative. The redirection of financial resources was intended to politically empower religious organizations and leaders such as Rick Warren, a prominent evangelical pastor and the business-oriented network of conservative Christians known as the Family.

David Kuo, the former Deputy Director of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, contended that during his tenure less time was spent fighting social issues but instead helping direct vast amount of faith-based patronage money and activities to influence electoral outcomes. Obama promised changes during his 2008 campaign but a 2014 investigation by Andy Kopsa noted that very little had changed.


There are three broad features of the faith-based initiative; first, the policy dismantled the barriers that had historically rendered “traditional religious organizations” (hereinafter TROs) like churches, mosques, various houses of worship and temples ineligible for public funding to deliver social services. The most controversial component is the exemption of TROs receiving federal funds from civil rights prohibitions against employment discrimination based on religion. (This exemption was supported by Section 702 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.) The second objective of the executive office was to expand this initiative to a wide range of federally funded programs thereby establishing an administrative substructure within the executive branch to manage the implementation of faith-based policies. Third, the faith-based policy innovation and collaboration is not limited to the national level. The majority of states and local municipalities also created their own version of a faith-based initiative. The Center for Public Justice (CPJ) reported that over 31 states and the District of Columbia had created faith-based offices or had designated faith-based liaisons.

Less than 3% of FBO’s receive public funding, per sociologist Mark Chaves. He argued that the smallest increase in funding to FBO’s could alter the delivery of social services by NBSSOs but is not a significant matter to study. Mr. Chaves contended that


emphasis should be placed on how FBO’s respond to the faith-based initiative. This is where the research disagrees with Mr. Chaves as the funding impact on NBSSOs was critical to the organization’s delivery, structure and survival. NBSSOs and predominately religious organizations (hereafter PROs) compete for some percentage of the same sources of funding. This competitive aspect will shape the future of social services. The impact of the faith-based initiative on NBSSOs is a relevant study to academia and policy officials as FBO’s merge into the mainstream of publicly funded programs and services. This merger will increase the competitive application between FBO’s and NBSSOs. Therefore, the future of NBSSOs is unclear as FBO’s continue to compete and receive funding to deliver social service programs and services.

**Statement of the Problem**

The majority of the policy research and debate about the faith-based initiative has focused on PROs. The impetus for this study is that research examining the impact of the faith-based initiative on NBSSOs presented a significant research gap. The majority of policy research and evaluation surrounding the faith-based initiative is limited to the actual and potential outcome for PROs. The faith-based initiative did not receive a significant level of attention from political science scholars until around 2005. All

---


previous research data that was presented on the faith-based initiative focused predominately on TROs.\textsuperscript{27} Current analytical data examining the impact of the faith-based initiative on existing NBSSOs is almost nonexistent. The American Political Science Association website indicated that between the 2002 and 2013 annual meetings, only sixteen papers focused specifically on the faith-based initiative. During that period, only one paper addressed the implications of the faith-based policy on existing 501(c)(3) non-profit organizations. That paper focused on the partnerships with the government and faith-based organizations in providing welfare-to-work services.\textsuperscript{28} Jeffery Berry argued that when policy questions involving non-profits have arisen, such as President Bush’s Faith-Based Initiative, political scientists contributed very little to the public debate. The faith-initiative possesses several areas of study that can be analyzed within the discipline of political science: (1) presidential administrative power (e.g. executive orders); (2) separation of church and state and the use of public funds; (3) devolution; and (4) the relationship between public policy and the social service organizations.\textsuperscript{29}

In the context of political science, the use and growth of executive power by Presidents has long been an area of study by scholars such as Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{27} “Faith-Based Initiative,” American Political Science Association website indicates that prior to the 2005 Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C. (Sept1–4) only one paper was slated for the conference. While the paper does not focus on the impact of faith-based initiative on non-profit organizations, it analyzes how policy images of the initiative influence the civil rights agenda, last modified July 27, 2013, accessed October 28, 2013, http://www.apsanet.org.
\item \textsuperscript{28} American Political Science Association, “Faith-Based Initiative.”
\item \textsuperscript{29} Jeffery Berry, “Voice of Non-profits” (paper presented to annual American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, PA, August 28-Sepetember 2, 2003).
\end{itemize}
Frederick A. O. (“Fritz”) Schwarz, Jr., Matthew A. Crenson and Benjamin Ginsberg. All contended that presidential power has grown exponentially through acts of war, legislation or executive orders. President George W. Bush suffered successive failed attempts to get his faith-based legislation passed by Congress. This means that President Bush’s notable achievement of the faith-based initiative was enacted through executive orders. In January 2001, President George W. Bush issued two executive orders, established the Office of Faith-Based Community Initiatives, and created offices in the Departments of Labor, Justice, Health and Human Services, Education and Housing and Urban Development. This newly created Office reported directly to the President and was not infused into the policy apparatus of the White House. This separation only contributed to the lack of political and policy coordination between the White House and congressional leaders on faith-based legislation. Congress failed to enact any meaningful legislation supporting the faith-based initiative during the first term of the President G.W. Bush administration. President Bush stated that his actions for subsequent executive orders were borne out of frustration with Congress and its inability to enact any faith-based legislation.


Secondly, the faith-based initiative has generated considerable controversy because of the perceived threat to the Establishment Clause. The Framers of the Constitution crafted this clause to protect any religion that may develop in the United States. The Establishment Clause prevents the federal government from supporting any specific religion.\textsuperscript{34} Religion has provided the most controversy to this amendment because of its promulgation among children in schools. Schools provide the blueprint for the development and growth of children civically, socially, morally and rationally. Schools divide the road between family and the state, and represent the arguments about the future of this country.\textsuperscript{35}

The Establishment Clause has evolved and developed an expansive meaning over the past fifty years. The Supreme Court decision in the 1947 \textit{Everson v. Wall} case decided the “wall of separation” between church and state was built very high. In more recent years since the Everson case, the Supreme Court has lowered the “high wall,” thereby developing two meanings of the term separation. The first is strict separation – “the law and government should not touch religion in any way.” This definition is prevalent in cases such as organized prayer in schools or on-campus religious activities. The Court advanced the second definition of separation, neutrality – “possibility under

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{35} David K. Ryden and Jeffery Polet editors, \textit{SANCTIONING RELIGION? Politics, Law and Faith-Based Public Services} (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishing, 2005).
\end{itemize}
some situations for religion generally to benefit from a law or government action.”

Examples of neutrality consist of allowing the Bible to be taught in public schools if it is taught as literature or exempting churches for paying property tax.36

The *Lemon* test provides the Courts with a method for establishing if government involvement in religion might be acceptable, provided the program in review met three tests. These tests are the result of the 1971 *Lemon v. Kurtzman* decision. The government must have secular purpose in the proposed program or policy. Next, the program in question must not promote, advance or inhibit any religion. Lastly, the program cannot create any “excessive entanglement” between the government and religion. If the policy or program met all three criteria, it was deemed constitutional; however, if it failed one area of the test, the Court would rule the program or policy unconstitutional. The *Lemon* test has not escaped criticism; scholars such as Leonard Levy and Donald Laycock and Court Justices have argued that the test is unduly subjective and internally inconsistent. Although the test has never been officially overturned, the basic principles still form the dominant line of reasoning when dealing with public funds being distributed to religious non-profit organizations.37

Faith-based social services are embedded with establishment controversies because the faith element of services provided. The term “faith-based” can refer to the


location where the programs and service are provided. The faith element can be tied to employees, volunteers or managers of the agency or assistance from exclusively religious organizations. Lastly, religion could be a critical part of a treatment or rehabilitation program, encouraging clients to make religious commitments as part of their recovery. As the faith-based initiative is moved forward and partnerships are developed between TROs and the government, there must be implementation of creative policy and excessive detail of interpretation. The Establishment Clause and the boundary of the faith-based programs will eventually become clear with time but not without judicial participation.

The third area of study focused on federal and state policies that are aimed at the decentralization of social services and devolution (new federalism). Support and opposition of the decentralization of social services has been debated by politicians, economists and scholars. Although legislative changes and proposals have been enacted, there are numerous inclusive reports of devolution and faith-based provision of social services. The partnerships that exist between the government and non-profit agencies operate through an elaborate system of networks, contracting grants, loans, regulations and other indirect administrative approaches. Many justify the devolution of programs and services by contending that it allows government to respond expediently to the needs of society. Decentralization elevates political and governmental constraints in developing and implementing new programs and services in terms of hiring staff and facility

The quick and seemingly effective response improves that reputation of the government and increases societies’ level of trust. Devolution is a mixed blessing of increased flexibility with the use of federal funds, with less attention given to pitfalls and issues that may ensue. These potential issues include states choosing between raising taxes, reducing services, intensified funding competition or how to cope during an economic recession. The future is uncertain, and the full impact of the faith-based initiative is unknown; therefore, this uncertainty presents a valid study in the field of political science.

Lastly, public policy implementation typically will encompass more than just government agencies. Non-profit organizations, as institutions of civil society, also participate in the implementation of public policy. This relationship between the government and non-profit organizations has been on the rise for the last 50 years and has reached a crucial transition – a transition fueled by constitutional legality. This movement promotes contradictory trends as financing of non-profits and competition increases; pressure is generated for greater accountability and program evaluation. This type of


regulation forces the government to implement rigorous levels of performance and transparency. In addition, policies combined with the devolution of government programs and services promotes relational governance at the local level. This trend exhibits two fundamental components of New Public Management (NPM): the desire to improve performance and shift from large bureaucracies toward less restrictions and to decentralize public service delivery. Non-profit organizations, in their contracting relationships with various levels of government agencies, are then placed directly in the process of policy implementation. These organizations experience the efficacy, consequences and failures of public policy by operating in the trenches and executing policy. Non-profit organizations are providers of publicly funded social service; they implement and execute government policies as a non-formal extension of government.

Scholar Jennifer Wolch contended that non-profit organizations operate as a “Shadow State,” mediating the relationship between the government and citizens. Agencies provide a critical element of “legitimating” by building trust between social organizations, government and contributing to the stability of the democratic


institutions. Non-profit organizations participate in the implementation and legitimation indirectly operating as the public policy apparatus of the state.

The faith-based initiative has expanded the conditions of the universe whereas previously alienated PROs now have equal access to public funding. This access created a highly competitive arena for public funding. There are over 300,000 TROs in the United States; therefore, it is easy to understand the rationale of scholars and researchers’ interest in the effects of the faith-based initiative on PROs instead of NBSSOs. A small percentage of PROs received some form of public funding. A small increase in the proportion of TROs providing social services with public funding could significantly impact the landscape of social service delivery by nongovernmental organizations. A small impact on established NBSSOs that are receiving public funding is a significant study. This is as important and deserves as much attention as PROs competing for public funds.

This study provides policy makers, political scientists, social workers and social science researchers information that is useful in understanding the effects on NBSSOs because of the faith-based initiative.


47. Ibid., 16.
Research Question

The following research questions were used to guide this study to examine how the implementation of the faith-based initiative had impacted non-religious based social service organizations in Washington, D.C. The term impact, utilized as a transitive verb for this study, was defined as impinges on or direct effect.\textsuperscript{48} The following questions will address the issues associated with the impact of the faith-based initiative on non-religious based social service organizations in Washington, D.C.:

1. The underlying theoretical question was what had been the impact on three existing NBSSOs in Washington, D.C. since the implementation of the faith-based initiative. The dissertation research is bound within the context of examining the overall impact by researching decreases or increases in funding, implementation or elimination of services delivered, coupled with the growth or decline of clients for a specific time frame. This time frame provided grounded research that pre-dates the implementation of the faith-based initiative over a fifteen-year period.

This question was important because there was very little research that examines the impact of the faith-based initiative on NBSSOs. This study provides political scientists, economists and policymakers with data that is specific to understanding how the faith-based initiative had impacted three NBSSOs in Washington, D.C.

2. Did the implementation of the faith-based initiative support R. P. Nathan and T. Gais’s theory of “second-order devolution”? The authors contended that this type of devolution will create various models of welfare system and collaborations with religious organizations. This question was important because as the various models are created, each represents an interpretation of the faith-based initiative and further promulgates the collaborative relationships between religious and social service organizations. Each new model establishes a foundation for further research and analysis on the various components, relationships and impacts. As this “second-order of devolution” spreads, existing research supports that the relationship has been a major success and many people are better served. What impact does this “new” type of relationship have on existing social service organizations; will they eventually be defunded, eliminated, privatized or outsourced? The research addressed the same inquiry but focused its response on existing NBSSOs. This question was critical to the future of NBSSOs as various program funding was cut and services reduced. In addition, this study provides political scientists, public administrators and policymakers with data that is specific about the impact of the implementation and outcome of public policy in the form of devolution.

**Major Concepts and Theoretical Underpinnings**

Charitable Choice first appeared in the overhaul legislation of welfare in 1996 (Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act). Section 104 of the PRWOR Act permits public funds to be used for religiously-oriented social service

---

programs that provide services within the guidelines of the legislation. Charitable Choice language was also incorporated into the Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1998 (applied to community services block grants), the Children’s Health Act of 2000 (applied to drug abuse treatment programs administered by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration), and the Community Renewal Tax Relief Act of 2000 (applied to drug abuse and prevention programs). Charitable Choice states that religious organizations are eligible for public funding. This provision implies that any state’s refusal to contract with religious social service programs constitutes an impermissible discrimination against religion. Charitable Choice stipulates that public funds cannot be used for religious worship, instruction or proselytization; it also stipulates that the “religious character” of the organization cannot be diminished as a condition of accepting funding.50

The creators of the Faith-Based Initiative who shaped the federal law and policy were influenced by European Dutch Reformed and Catholic principles. The good works of European Christian democracies might work in America. Religious and public service partnerships could be the new way forward for American social services, providing continuity amid momentous changes.51 Alexis De Tocqueville stated that religion in America is less powerful because it fails to strive for political power, but its influence is


more lasting because it confined its activism to domains where its authority was uncontested.52

In the summer of 2000, as George W. Bush campaigned for president, he believed that it was time to end the “government discrimination” against religious organizations. The faith-based initiative was the focal point of his compassionate conservatism agenda. When George W. Bush was governor of Texas, he aggressively and successfully integrated faith-based groups into public service programs. The Faith-Based Initiative dresses up Charitable Choice in new rhetoric.53 President Bush cited the diverse and sometimes unique contributions that religiously-oriented social service programs have made to the well-being of U.S. society.

**Public Policy**

Public policy has been defined in many ways, such as the outcome of struggle in government institutions over who gets what. Thomas Dye stated that public policy is concerned with what governments do, why they do it and what difference it makes; in summation, “what the government chooses to do or not to do.” David Easton defined public policy as the “authoritative allocation of values for the whole society”, which can only authoritatively be enacted on the whole society by the government, resulting in allocation of values. The term “public policy” always refers to the actions of the


government and the intentions that determine those actions, per Clark E. Cochran. Policy making requires making a choice among goals and alternatives; choice always involves intention.\textsuperscript{54} Policy is rarely a single action but is most often a series of actions coordinated to achieve a goal. Cochran defined public policy as an intentional course of action followed by a government institution or official for resolving an issue of public concern. Such course of action must be manifested in laws, public statements, official regulations, or widely accepted and publicly visible patterns of behavior. Public policy is rooted in law and in the authority and coercion associated with the law.\textsuperscript{55}

B. Guy Peters defined public policy not by its intentions but by its effects.

Public policy is concerned with the government’s actions, or lack of, to address a public concern. All levels of government develop public policies in the form of laws, regulations, decisions and actions. Peters contended that there are three major parts of public policy; each part impacts the lives of citizen which includes: Policy choice - the decision made by politicians, civil servants, or others in authority with power to affect the lives of citizens; Policy outputs - policy choices being put into action; and Policy impacts - the effects that policy choices and policy outputs have on its citizens such as making them wealthier, healthier or safer. These impacts can be influenced by other factors in society such as education and economic productivity, but they also reflect, to some

\textsuperscript{54} Clark E. Cochran et al., \textit{American Public Policy: An Introduction} (Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2009), 1.

\textsuperscript{55} Clark E. Cochran et al., \textit{American Public Policy: An Introduction} (Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2009), 1.
degree, the failure of public policy choices and output.\textsuperscript{56} Policy making is occasionally a dispassionate, systematic analysis and synthesis designed to identify, define, and address a public concern, per Josen and Butler. More than often the process is the “muddling through,” which Charles Lindbolm called disjointed instrumentalism - a lengthy process of successive steps in which constant nibbling is a substitute for a good bite. Problems are never solved; instead, some analysis is done, a decision is made, unanticipated issues arise, additional analysis is required and decisions are made to address any issues and this repetitive cycle continues, resulting in an incremental remedy to address the initial issue. A public policy may not be a plan at all but rather a decision to neither plan nor act.\textsuperscript{57}

\textbf{New Public Management}

New Public Management is considered a broad and complex term used to describe the tsunami of public administration reforms which occurred around the world during the 1980’s. The primary idea behind New Public Management was resurrecting laissez-faire competition in the public sector, thereby creating greater cost-efficiency for governments.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 5.


New Public Management (NPM) allows for a strict managerial role of government, which is positioned to allow governments to provide a higher level of quality and efficiency in public services. This style of management also focuses on public accountability and core public service values. Key elements include various forms of decentralizing management within public services (e.g., the creation of autonomous agencies and devolution of budgets and financial control), increasing use of markets and competition in the provision of public services (e.g., contracting out and other market-type mechanisms), and increasing emphasis on performance, outputs and customer orientation. Theorists advocate treating government citizens as beneficiaries of public services like customers and shareholders in the private sector. NPM is not concerned with equitable distribution of social services but places emphasis on efficiency and quality of services.

Devolution (New Federalism)

Devolution has been defined as the transfer of rights, powers, or responsibilities to another, specifically from a central government to state or local municipality. This ideology possesses various meanings for different people. Some view it as the federal government abdicating its responsibilities, while others view it as a way for states and local governments to have greater freedom and flexibility in how they deal with issues affecting their populations. According to John Kincaid, there are many objectives of

---


devolution that distinguishes devolution from similar transformations such as “decentralization,” “delegation,” and “deregulation.” Devolution is the surrender of a function by a superior government to a subordinate government that is generally complete, permanent, and of “constitutional magnitude.” Kincaid concluded that what is currently referred to as devolution is more accurately called “restoration” or “rebalancing” of powers between the federal government and the states to conform more closely to what the authors of the Constitution had in mind.61 Gregg Easterbrook stated that New Federalism is not a bad thing ideologically and that power should be given back to the level of government that can best identify the greatest areas of need locally. There are many ways by which the federal government devolves responsibility to the state. It is found in the form of unfunded mandates, block grants with restrictions on spending, and reductions in spending that leave the state or local government responsible for an ongoing situation. State agencies in the human services area, local governments, and non-profit service providers are acutely aware of devolution but find it difficult to quantify the consequences. Other state agencies do not appear focused on the issue. In many instances, they are unable to identify any devolution issues. In either situation, budget and policy-makers tend to de-emphasize federal actions until they have already been implemented.62


Old federalism was characterized by steadily growing state-local dependence on federal aid as the nation increasingly looked to Washington to set the domestic agenda. New federalism is marked by steadily decreasing state-local reliance on federal aid as citizens expect the states and local municipalities to finance from their own funds an increasing share of their expenditure needs. Old federalism was intrusive with a growing number of federal aid “strings” and conditions designed to alter state and local budgetary priorities. New federalism, in character, is becoming partially extrusive: the federal government is pulling aid and tax resources from state and local governments to strengthen the financing of its own national programs without an adequate rollback in federal court orders and Congressional mandates. Old federalism represented a steady advance of the national government into areas that had previously been reserved for the states. New federalism represents a slow retreat from national government positions carved out during the Great Society. Old federalism called on Washington to provide extra aid to stabilize state and local finances during periods of economic recession. New federalism calls on the states to help themselves by establishing back-up funds to cushion their finances from the shock of economic troubles. This gradual decentralization process is not the orderly and swift sorting out process that reformers welcomed nor does it resemble the program swap and tax turn back proposals the Reagan administration advanced in 1982 for achieving a more orderly and decentralized allocation of responsibilities between the national government and the state-local systems.63

Theoretical Frameworks

The three theories relevant to this study were neo-institutional theory, D (hereafter RD) and Devolution (new federalism). While no theory fully explained or identified all the impacts the faith-based initiative had on NBSSOs, they were utilized for this research study.

Neo-institutional Theory

The neo-institutional theory was selected because it is analytic in nature; it focuses on the way the institutional environment shapes the non-profit sector. Neo-institutionalism explains things, not just describe them. Additionally, it does not seek to understand institutions but wants to understand the role(s) they play in the production of social occurrences (such as public policies, economic development, and democracy).

Neo-institutionalism can be divided into two general tendencies: the view of institutions as autonomous actors and the view of institutions as constraining or enabling structures. Institutional theories, old and new, stress that non-profit organizations reflect the choices and decisions of individuals that are shaped by their institutional environments.

Inappropriate or oppressive government regulation can undermine non-profit organizations and directly affect the ability and willingness of citizens to create non-profit organizations or volunteer with such organizations. Ineffective or weak governments, lack of public funding and poor leadership will profoundly affect the non-profit sector.64 In 1983, DiMaggio and Powell contributed to the evolution and

development of neo-institutional theory. The authors identified three processes in which organizations are shaped by their environments. First, the imitative or mimetic process, where organizations adopt or imitate the strategies or methods of other organizations in their field; second, the normative process by which organizations adopt norms from other sources (e.g. professional groups or associations). The third is the coercive process of conformity to technical rules and regulations from social authorities. This study examined this process of conformity as an external factor and focused on the impact of the faith-based initiative on NBSSOs.

Resource Dependence Theory

RD theory has several methodological hypotheses but only two were relevant to this study’s analytical model. The first hypothesis is that organizations are deeply embedded in their broader environment; they are aware of change and how those changes, coupled with uncertainty, can threaten their survival and efficacy. The second hypothesis is that the initial understanding of how and why organizations respond to uncertainty is at the base of their resources. The RD theory highlights four essential features of the relationship between an organization’s resource base and its impact. First, all organizations, particularly non-profit social service organizations, are not self-sufficient, and are characterized as resource dependent. Stability is the second feature and is critical in the interest of resources. This feature is derived from internal and external

---

sources. The third feature is uncertainty, which will circumscribe the stability of an organization’s flow of resources. Lastly, adaption is representative of the organizations capacity to be responsive, or adaptive, to uncertainties in their environment.\textsuperscript{66}

The RD theory is useful in understanding how organizations are impacted by uncertainty in their environment for two reasons. First, it specifies the underlying impetus for the organizations to respond to uncertainty; second, the principal modes of adaption which organizations pursue are internally- and externally-oriented responses to address uncertainty.

Several authors support the use of these two theories for analyzing social service organizations. RD theory and Neo-institutional theory are based on open systems’ perspectives that are philosophically grounded in the functional paradigm of organizational analysis.\textsuperscript{67} This represents one area where the theories overlap. Another area where the two theories overlap includes the organization’s need to seek legitimacy from the environment for survival and the influence and probable constraint of environment influences on the organization’s structure and function. Neo-institutional theory and RD theory differ in that Neo-institutional theory generally highlights the similarities among organizations within the same field resulting from their exposure to similar institutional forces while RD Theory emphasizes the variations among


organizations that result from the differences in resource dependence and organizational strategies.\textsuperscript{68}

**Devolution (New Federalism)**

The economic and political justifications and the impact of decentralizing provision of social services have been widely debated by scholars. The partnerships among for-profit and non-profit organizations and government agencies have been an important tradition in the United States since Colonial times. These partnerships have operated through an elaborate system of intergovernmental grants, loans, contracts and other indirect administrative approaches. Politicians argue that the decentralization of social services allows for a rapid response from the government to address societal needs; additionally, they contend the decentralization process increases competition and efficiency.\textsuperscript{69} In 1993, Smith and Lipsky authored *Non-profits for Hire: The Welfare State in the Age of Contracting* in which they argued that devolving responsibilities to local organizations alleviated administrative and political constraints such as hiring, locating facilities and administering new programs. The authors also stated that devolution aided in improving the government’s reputation by allowing more institutional pluralism,


thereby indirectly addressing issues of distrust and dislike of extensive government involvement.

The support of the non-profit sector has a valid and meaningful foundation, and this support has grown exponentially in scope and scale. This growth does not provide proof that the resulting partnerships are good for the government or the non-profit sector. Devolution has been a mixed blessing. The positive side shows increased flexibility in allocating funds that are coupled with block grants. The negative point of view examines the slow yearly reduction of federal aid to provide services. Decentralizing services is complicated with several important effects and factors on states, local agencies and taxpayers. The short-term impacts of devolution will be considerably different from the long-term impacts. This research attempted to determine exactly what those impacts were, if any, for three NBSSOs in Washington, D.C.

This study utilized the theory of Devolution to examine if the implementation of the faith-based initiative had any impact on NBSSOs. The impact must account for external factors that affected all interaction such as but not limited to economic recessions, war, Presidential elections, budget cuts, terrorist attacks and government shutdowns. Devolution is a critical element that impacts this study as it plays a role in how organizations are embedded in their environment [through policy implementation and fiscal changes] and how changes can affect an organization’s resources, stability and ultimate survival.

Methodology

A case study methodology was chosen to elicit more in-depth information on what impact the faith-based initiative had on NBSSOs in Washington, D.C. The case study approach utilized in this research determined what impact the faith-based initiative had on three NBSSOs in Washington, D.C. and if the implementation of the faith-based initiative was an impetus for a new wave of devolution. A case study can be defined as an empirical form of inquiry. This inquiry investigates a contemporary phenomenon and its real-life content, when the boundaries between the phenomenon and context are not clear. A single case study method was selected and utilized to address the research questions. The case study was used to determine if a theory’s proposition was correct or if an alternative set of explanations was more relevant. Using a single case study can represent a significant contribution in providing a foundation for further investigative research in an entire field. The problem of external validity has been a major obstruction in conducting case studies. Critics argue that single cases offer a weak basis for generalizing. However, such critics are indirectly comparing the situation to survey research, in which a sample is intended to generalize to a larger universe. Robert Yin contended this analogy to samples and universes as incorrect when dealing with case studies. Survey research relies on statistical generalization, and case studies rely on analytical generalization. Analytical generalization is the result of the investigator

striving to generalize a particular set of results to some broader theory. This research must account for the external factor that will impact the organizations possible decrease in federal funding by acknowledging the climate during the specific financial periods covered in the study. The study acknowledged periods of recession and surplus both which had a grave impact on the possible award amount of funds available for services.

The target population for this research was three NBSSOs in Washington, D.C. from a narrowed pool size of nine. The District of Columbia was selected because it elects a mayor and 13-member council. The United States Congress maintains authority over the city and may overturn local laws. The residents of the District of Columbia elect a non-voting, at-large congressional delegate to the U.S. House of Representatives, but has no representation in the U.S. Senate. As permitted by the Twenty-third Amendment to the United States Constitution, the District of Columbia receives three electoral votes in presidential elections. This makes the target population unique from other cities in the United States. In comparison, many states created Faith-Based Offices to manage state and local partnerships. The District of Columbia does not have a local office that facilitates or manages faith-based relationships. The oversight of the faith-based relationships in Washington D.C. remains at the federal level, making this target population unique and relevant for this study.

The District of Columbia’s Department of Human Services provided contact and preliminary information for nine social service organizations. A combination of nine NBSSOs was narrowed to three once they were reviewed and assessed based on the following research criteria: establishment date, program delivery, number of employees, and funding stream. The NBSSOs represented three of the eight wards in the District of Columbia as well as varied in primary program delivery. The three selected organizations received an official written request to participate in the study for a tentative period ranging from three to six months, to retrieve archival data and to participate in frequent weekly communication via emails, telephone calls, surveys or interviews. Each organization must have been established prior to the implementation of the Faith-Based Initiative and provide a service or services that addresses one of the core issues recognized under Charitable Choice laws: temporary assistance to needy families, community service, welfare to work or substance and mental abuse. The outcome of the selection of the organizations ultimately depended on the willingness of the organization to participate fully in the research study.

This research was bound in a mixed approach of qualitative and quantitative studies. Qualitative studies are described as research that produces findings that are not arrived at through statistical methods or any other means of quantification. Qualitative research seeks to interpret and understand social actions. Quantitative research explains

phenomena by collecting numerical data and analyzing that information by utilizing mathematical based methods (statistics).\textsuperscript{74} Quantitative studies test hypotheses, examine cause and effect and make predictions.

The case study method is one of several approaches in conducting social science research. Case studies possess strengths and weakness. Some of the strengths of conducting the case study include allowing the investigator to research the present social phenomenon, independent of the past, and allowing for direct observation and interviews of individuals involved in the events of some significance to the study. Data collection is a major strength because it provides the opportunity to use various sources of evidence that include observations and interviews, and to explain the presumed causal links in real-life intervention. The greatest weakness of a case study is that it may support an informal manipulation of the data from the researcher. This may allow the investigator to develop or dismiss data because of individual bias. The researcher has no control over the events and may hold biased views that influence the direction of the conclusion.

Documentary information utilized for this study included reports, proposals, evaluations, formal studies and statistical data. Documentation provides several advantages and disadvantages. The advantages include comprehensive and broad coverage of events, a specific time frame, and, within the context of the aforementioned, it provides names, references, and event details. The disadvantages include blocked and

inaccessible information, irretrievable documentation and a bias toward the selectivity of
data. Documentary information is a relevant resource to every case study topic.75

**Existing Literature**

Literature concerning the topic of religious or faith-based services has been
covered in several books, studies, and journals since the late 1800s according to authors
such as M.E Marty and F.E. Netting.76 The major discourse concerning religious social
services emerged with passage of the Charitable Choice provision of the Personal
Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) and the
implementation of the faith based and community initiative by President George W.
Bush. In response to public concern, literature emerged that addressed the intentions of
the faith-based initiative and the effectiveness of faith-based social service organizations.
The effectiveness of faith-based social service providers has been highly debated and
reported by the media as successful, in terms of services rather than rigorous research and
evaluation.77 Existing empirical data concerning the effectiveness of faith-based
organizations providing social services is limited by the weakness of the research design

75. Robert Yin, *Case Study Research: Design and Methods (Applied Social Research Methods)*

and F. E Netting, “Secular and Religious Funding of Church-related Agencies,” *Social Science Review* 56,

77. Stephanie C. Boddie and Ram A. Cnaan, “Concluding Remarks: Common Findings and
and data analysis. Empirical research, focusing on factors other than effectiveness, has generally examined the faith-based organizations resources, stakeholders and services provided. Other studies have compared faith-based service providers with traditional social service providers to address the claim that faith-based service providers are substantially different. Such research is marked with conflicting results and a predominance of cross-sectional designs and limited data analysis.

Researchers that discuss the future of faith-based initiatives and their impact argued that based on historical analysis, a strong argument can be made in support of the initiatives – Americans benefit from the increased funding given to faith-based initiatives. They also contended that the future of the faith-based initiative and its full impact is uncertain because it is unknown how states or local municipalities will operate in times of recession, either by eliminating program and services or raising local taxes.


In summary, the limited nature of literature and research concerning the impact of the faith-based initiative on NBSSOs clearly suggests that there is room for additional development of knowledge. The research does not address how the NBSSOs are affected since the implementation of the faith-based initiative, instead only providing comparative analysis between religious social service providers and NBSSOs. This study sought to broaden the field by examining how NBSSOs were impacted, by developing a conceptual framework and by applying the RD and Neo-institutional theories.

**Significance of Research**

The significance of this study was to examine how the faith-based initiative impacted NBSSOs. In addition, the study examined if the implementation of the faith-based initiative was an impetus for devolution. This research was important because it addressed two key areas that many scholars, political scientists, public administrators and politicians had neglected to comprehensively examine. This study provided new research in a limited area that concentrated on the NBSSOs and their future.

Policy makers will utilize this study to gain information and to continue to improve the quality of life among recipients of social service organizations. This study raises awareness about the faith-based initiative and its effects on NBSSOs. This study also demonstrated how the President used his power through executive order, creating the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. It raises the public’s awareness about the President’s power and policies, which may encourage citizens to become active participants in the political process.
This research contributes to the research of Political Science because it encourages other scholars and policy makers to pursue further research on the faith-based initiative and NBSSOs. Public officials may become interested in this research because it provides a thorough critique of public policy and NBSSOs.

**Organization of the Dissertation**

The dissertation consists of five chapters. Chapter I includes the Introduction, Statement of the Problem, Theoretical Framework, Definition of the terms, Research Questions, Methodology; Chapter II provides a Review of the selected literature. Chapter III details Methodology while Chapter IV represents Findings; Chapter V summarizes the Research and discusses its conclusion and implications.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Religious organizations have operated and provided social services in the United States since colonial times. Caring for one’s neighbor has been a religious obligation for churches and religious volunteer agencies for years.¹ Faith-based organizations have long been an essential component of the United States safety net; congregations and religious-based social service organizations have provided emergency food, shelter, and child care to low-income Americans. Alexis De Tocqueville, during his visit to America to study the prison systems, observed and notated the strong religious contributions to democracy. He marveled at religion in America because of its avoidance of political power, but its influence was long-lasting because of its confined areas of dominated activism, areas were religious power and influence were uncontested.²

Beginning in the late nineteenth through the twentieth century, religious organizations began to address needs associated with industrialization, mass immigration and racial tension. In the mid-twentieth century, industrialization and economic

---


depression increased as well as the frequency of requests for governmental assistance from religious organizations.

**The Welfare State**

Since the passage of the Social Security Act of 1935, the welfare state has become ingrained into the American way of life. The welfare state varies with respect to how the nations manage their obligations to their citizens. The classic welfare state evolved in Europe in which the state assured essential benefits as a right of citizenship. The American welfare system has been more flexible than its European counterpart due to historical circumstances and the influence of the private sector through actions stemming from the non-profit sector.³ In *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Gosta Esping-Anderson provided three welfare state typologies: (1) socially conservative (regimes where status differences originating in sectarian beliefs are preserved through social programs); (2) socially democratic (arrangements where universal programs effectively de-commodify labor to the extent that social benefits erase class distinctions); and (3) liberal (where universal social insurance is compromised with public assistance that is rigorously means-tested in the United States, Canada and Australia). The influence of the American welfare state is circumscribed by an infrastructure of public social programs, with a strong debate regarding their proper role of private versus public, coupled with data demonstrating that program performance is often inconsistent at best. The American

---
experience represents a public institution in which citizens are ensured protection against poverty, unemployment, illness, disability and discrimination. Lawmakers developed a welfare state that included shared governance between the federal government and the state, varying benefits according to social insurance and public assistance, and non-profit and commercial providers. The middle decades of the twentieth century saw a drastic and expansive increase in social welfare programs. Government assistance grew while religious efforts did not decrease as new social issues developed and old issues were never solved. The late 1950’s marked the beginning of the civil rights movement and created a growing awareness of poverty in the South. The 1964 “war on poverty” by President Johnson sparked the development of additional social service programs. Through collaborative partnerships with religious organizations formally and informally coupled with a positive economic climate, America witnessed a reduction in poverty throughout the 1960’s through the mid 1970’s. Much of the research and literature during this period focused on the new and growing federal role, offering harsh critiques on federally supported social services, charging that the war on poverty was excessively detailed and restrictive, federal spending was too high and, lastly, poverty was more moral than social. Scholars and researchers overlooked the longstanding role of churches

and religious organizations and their contributions to aid in the “war on poverty” as well other critical areas of social services.\(^5\)

In the article “The Shadow State: Government and Voluntary Sector in Transition” by Jennifer Wolch, she contended that the non-profit volunteer sector providing social service programs developed as a powerful, but not dominant, force in the politics of social service delivery during the 1980’s. The theoretical stance of the book stated that the non-profit sector cannot be viewed as an autonomous set of institutions that operate and act independently of the state. Wolch argued that the link between the state and the non-profit volunteer sector has become so important that it may act as a shadow state apparatus. An element of the contemporary political economy is administered outside traditional democratic politics. Volunteer organizations have the responsibility of delivering services previously offered by the state but remain tightly regulated by the state. The shadow state performs functions of the state and is not restrained by the same checks and balances; however, state regulations limit the actions of the organization.\(^6\) The shadow apparatus is referred to as “state-centered,” questioning what role volunteer organizations play in the functioning of the state.

Wolch’s ideology of “shadow state apparatus” supports the New Public Management theory — “the desire for improved performance and the goal of shifting


away from large public bureaucracies toward more flexibility and decentralization in public service delivery.”

**New Public Management**

New Public Management (NPM) is the marriage of two converging concepts. The first concept is new institutional economics, specifically public choice and principal-agent theory, derived from the theory bureaucracy by Kenneth Arrow in his book *Social Choice and Individual Values*. The second concept is managerialism as defined in the context of scientific management. A high level of discretion is an essential key to success for managers to have autonomy to function at a pace in the pursuit of measured organizational goals.

This ideology allows for a strict managerial role of federal, state and local governments, which positions them to provide a higher level of quality and efficiency in public services. This style of management also focuses on public accountability and core public service values. Key elements include various forms of decentralizing management within public services (e.g., the creation of autonomous agencies and devolution of budgets and financial control), increasing use of markets and competition in the provision of public services (e.g., contracting out and other market-type mechanisms), and increasing emphasis on performance, outputs and customer orientation.

---


9. Ibid., 101.
Utilizing market approaches as the cornerstone of the New Public Management movement, theorists advocated treating government citizens as beneficiaries of public services similar to customers and shareholders in the private sector. NPM is not concerned with the equitable distribution of social services but places emphasis on efficiency and quality of services.\textsuperscript{10} Linda Kaboolian in \textit{The New Public Management: Challenging the Boundaries of the Management vs. Administrative Debate} expounded on how devolution of government services is part of the larger reform movement known as NPM, directed at government and public sectors.\textsuperscript{11} The NPM movement is ground in two arguments that are best summarized as (1) the market is the best allocator of resource, not the government and (2) individuals are the best judges of their own welfare.

\textbf{Devolution}

Devolution, also known as “new federalism,” has been defined as the transfer of rights, powers, or responsibilities to another, specifically from a central government to state or local municipality. This ideology possesses various meanings for different people. Some view it as the federal government abdicating its responsibilities, while others view it as a way for state and local governments to have greater freedom and flexibility to address issues affecting their communities. Old federalism was characterized by steadily growing state-local dependence on federal aid as the nation increasingly looked to Washington, D.C. to set the domestic agenda. New federalism is


marked by steadily decreasing state-local reliance on federal aid as the citizens expect the states and local municipalities to finance from their own funds an increasing share of their expenditure needs. Old federalism was intrusive with a growing number of federal aid “strings” and conditions designed to alter state and local budgetary priorities. The character of new federalism is becoming partially extrusive: the federal government is pulling aid and tax resources from state and local governments to strengthen the financing of its own national programs without an adequate rollback in federal court orders and Congressional mandates. Old federalism represented a steady advance of the national government into areas that had previously been reserved for the states. New federalism represents a slow retreat from national government positions carved out during the Great Society and calls on the states to help themselves by establishing back-up funds to cushion their finances from the shock of economic troubles.12 In “The devolution tortoise and the centralization hare,” John Kincaid agreed that there were many objectives of devolution. He contended new federalism was the surrender of a function by a superior government to a subordinate government that was generally complete, permanent, and of “constitutional magnitude.” Kincaid concluded that what was referred to as devolution should be more accurately called “restoration” or “rebalancing” of powers between the federal government and the state.13


Many argue the case for delegation and decentralization based on the critique that public bureaucracies are ineffective. In popular American political culture, many view decentralization as a path to revitalization of democratic participation at the local level. R.P. Nathan and T. Gais in *Implementing the Personal Responsibility Act of 1996: A First Look* suggested that reducing welfare roles and shifting people from welfare to work will be attributed to the discretionary powers at the local level. This “second order of devolution” will allow states and local municipalities to create and meet local constraints. In “50 Miniature Washingtons: The flaw in Reagan’s New Federalism,” author Gregg Easterbrook supported the ideology of shifting power to the state and local governments, where they could best identify the areas of greatest need. There are many ways by which the federal government devolves responsibility to the state. They are found in the form of unfunded mandates, block grants with restrictions on spending, and reductions in spending that leave the state or local government responsible for on-going programs and services. State agencies in the human services area, local governments, and non-profit service providers are acutely aware of devolution. In many instances, they are unable to identify any devolution issues. In either situation, budget and policy-makers tend to de-emphasize federal actions until they have already been implemented.


Jennifer Alexander in “The Impact of Devolution on Non-profits” discussed how non-profit social service agencies were faced with new challenges. Many were at risk due to historical financial dependence. The growth and decline cycles in social service delivery were reflected in state and federal spending patterns. In the 1960s when the federal government turned to non-profits to provide health and social services, the sector grew.\textsuperscript{17}

When federal government grants were cut by 20 percent during the 1980s, resulting in a loss of 30 billion dollars in funding, non-profit agencies decreased in size and number. Many responded by eliminating programs, services and staff.\textsuperscript{18} In this conscious era of accountability and outcome measures to ensure organizational efficiency and effectiveness, many organizations are experiencing government and funding pressures. Proponents of devolution asserted the community-oriented sector would serve as the last safety net regardless of federal funding but, unfortunately, the vision is optimistic at best based on predictive assessments of the non-profit sector. Welfare reform shook up the existing system. Government employees found themselves managing contractors instead of providing services, while contractors must hire and manage such broad service efforts. This results in a complex extended network of

\textsuperscript{17} Lester M. Salamon, \textit{Holding the Center: America’s Nonprofit Sector at a Crossroads} (New York, NY: Nathan Cummings Foundation, 1997).

program implementation, where no one individual or agency is in charge of everything.\(^{19}\)

The gradual decentralization process is not the orderly and swift process that reformers welcomed nor does it resemble the program swap and tax turn back proposals the Reagan Administration advanced in 1982 for achieving a more orderly and decentralized allocation of responsibilities between the federal government and the state.\(^{20}\) During the Reagan Administration, many agencies were compounded into what is described as a “triple whammy.” First, support was reduced to those agencies providing service; second, government cut or reduced services it provided and expected the existing caseloads to transfer to already over-extended community agencies; and third, tax incentives were decreased for charitable contribution by decreasing contribution to non-profit social services agencies.\(^{21}\)

In “Transformation of Governance: Globalization, Devolution, and the Role of Government,” Donald Kettl suggested that partnerships between government and nongovernmental agencies grew rapidly. The government grew “horizontally” in search of service coordination and integration with nongovernmental partners and “vertically” through multilayered federalism and hierarchical bureaucracies. The spread and increase of horizontal relationships clouded accountability and replaced hierarchical authority with networks (formal contracts, other legal agreements and informal working


relationships). In “How Do Faith-Based Organizations Compare to Secular Provider? Non-profit Directors and Poor Women Assessment of FBO’s,” Rebecca J. Kissane contended devolutions made the local context extremely critical, as states have different welfare regulations, resources, programs, mixed services providers and funding sources. NPM and devolution have resulted in greater emphasis on business practices that focus on efficacy and effectiveness between local government and non-profit social service organizations. Many agencies will be required to evolve and alter their organizational character to survive.

The political and economic justification and impact of devolution of social services have been debated throughout literature. Partnerships operate through an elaborate network of contracting, loans, indirect administrative actions, government grants and regulations. Scholars and politicians argue this method increases competition and efficiency and allows the government to provide a rapid response to address social needs, thereby improving the reputations of the government and its processes. In Partners in Public Service: Government-non-profit Relations in the Modern Welfare State by L.M. Salamon, the author explained that research provided a clear view that devolution failed to deliver the expected results; however, this was attributed to many factors – the two most impactful factors being the absence of competition among the providers and effective performance measures.

**Defining Religious and Faith-Based Organizations**

Leonard Joblove in “Special Treatment of Churches under the Internal Revenue Service Code” assumed that the public knows when an organization has a religious
character; it is self-evident, specifically in the case of seminaries, churches, and congregations. Knowing the persona and purpose of a social service agency dedicated to specific services will not aid in the identification as a faith-based organization. The courts and legislature have not provided a clear definition on what identifies a group as religious. A major challenge in understanding faith-based organizations is defining what is considered a religious or faith-based organization. The term faith-based organization is a broad term for a wide spectrum of organizations that deserve a specific definition in academic literature. In the category of faith-based organizations, many researchers and scholars have attempted to move beyond a dictionary-style definition, and they often default to a typology format to accommodate the diversity of organizations. This typology recognizes the relevance of the concept of religious integration: organizations incorporate religion in various methods and intensities. To understand the characteristics of FBO’s, many scholars have developed numerous typologies categorizing FBO’s and their expression of religion. Understanding the degrees in the importance of religion to FBO’s is the objective of typologies. Organizational variation is found in control, expression of religion, and program implementation. Typologies provide a valuable resource for scholars attempting to understand the impact of religion on social service delivery. While no single typology is uniformly accepted, the array of categorizations provides a solid foundation for


continuing the discussion about the role of religion in FBO’s and any other organizations providing social services. Government organizations are uniformly secular while for-profit and non-profit organizations may show religious orientation in variation. Many FBO’s find it challenging to maintain a religious identity due to the contract requirements with the government; others find it difficult to meet financial needs, which are powerful influences toward the secularization of FBO’s.

Defining a religious organization is not self-evident anymore. This is especially difficult when religious organizations provide services which are not intrinsically religious in character but may not be an extension of a religious ministry. In the 1998 exploratory proposal “Identifying Characteristics of ‘Religious’ Organization,” Thomas H. Jeavons identified and delineated seven characteristics of faith-based organizations that are different in nature from their secular counterparts. The seven traits included:
(1) Religious groups often self-identify in various methods, through their name, mission and programming; (2) Participants (volunteers, clients, staff) usually are more dedicated because of shared organizational beliefs and ideals or organizational requirements; (3) Material resources (in-kind donations, money, property) are generally donated or provided by religious organizations or people; (4) Religious beliefs, experiences or activities regarding decision making and information processing; (5) Organizational services and goals are conducted based on religious values or with spiritual technologies (the use of worship, prayer, scripture); (6) The use, distribution and development of power is derived from religious sources within religious organizations which can be expressed as a requirement for the leadership to possess a theological education, be
invested in the clergy and have an active interaction with the congregation; and, (7) religious organizations tend to interact and engage with other predominately religious organizations. Jeavons argued that the seven characteristics listed above point to the relative degree of religious organization rather than argue the dichotomous ideals that separate religious and secular organizations.24 In the contemporary context, activities defined as religious have expanded well beyond the traditional scope of pulpit ministries. This expansion includes organization management and public administration. Religious organizations have increased their importance as they are now provide critical services which are no longer the sole responsibility of secular organizations and corporations.25

Religiosity is primarily related to individuals but has also been used to refer to the impact of religion on social and behavioral outcomes.26 In “Objective Hope: Assessing the Effectiveness of Faith-based Organizations-A Review of Literature” by B.R. Johnson, he utilized the term “organic religion,” which clarified the impact of religion on individuals that occurred over time from “intentional religion”— the exposure to religion a person received for a specific period and purpose. Since the beginning of the 1950s, organic or individual religiosity has been the work of Gordon W. Allport and expanded by other scholars and researchers such as J. Donahue in the Journal of Personality and


Social Psychology, “Intrinsic and Extrinsic Religiousness: Review and Meta-analysis Personality and Social Psychology,” and M.E. Maltby in the Journal of Psychology, “Personality Dimensions of Religious Orientation.” Johnson’s review of literature on organic and intentional religiosity has a specific focus on the effectiveness of faith-based organizations. H.R. Ebaugh, et al. in Social Forces, “Where’s the Faith in Faith-based Organizations? Measures and Correlates of Religiosity in Faith-Based Social Services Coalitions” supported B.R. Johnson’s position regarding the volume of literature and research on “individual religiosity” and the scarcity of research which they labeled as “organizational religiosity” (that which makes an organization religious). Religiosity is likely to influence the avenues of connectedness between organizational actors, actors and their environments, suppliers, consumers and other organizations that provide similar services. Organizations such as social services and health agencies may avoid self-identification and religious functions but by means of their financial support, services, and volunteer base still be defined as a religious organization.27

In 2001, typology authors Steven Rathgeb Smith and Michael R. Sosins’ “The Varieties of Faith-Related Agencies” rejected the term “faith-based” in favor of “faith-related.” The authors argued that “faith-based” is too common and exclusive and would preclude the typology from addressing the full range of organizations with religious connections. The authors provided three major sources of constraint: resources, authority, and culture. The data supporting the variance in degrees was derived from a

case study of social service organizations in Seattle and Chicago, where Smith and Sosin described coupling among organizations categorized by mission, service focus, and bureaucracy. All organizations identified in the study attempted to mitigate concerns about desecularization through deliberate resource choices, maintained ties with secular culture, and supported stronger government responsibility for the impoverished.28

What constitutes a religious or faith-based organization? Several authors have attempted to define what characteristics make an organization religious or faith-based. In *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, “Typology of Religious Characteristic of Social Service and Educational Organizations and Program,” authors R.J. Sider and H.R. Unruh contended that there is more than one model of what it means to be faith-based; actually, there are considerable variations. They suggested that the variations range from highly religious to highly secular. Utilizing the term faith-based organization implies one model. Based on a case study of over 30 churches, the authors described a typology of educational organizations and social service programs based on six models that scale from the most to the least faith-based: faith-permeated, faith-centered, faith-affiliated, faith-background, faith-secular partnership, and secular. The authors described categorical archetypes according to eight criteria, mission statement, financial support, board member and staff selection. All programs and projects were sorted into identical categories using the following as criteria: religious program content and religious outcome. Sider and Unruh offered the caveat that their criteria intentionally addressed the

“tangibly expressive ways” organizations solely incorporated religion and neglected to address personal issues of belief and motivation.

In their study of organization theory, H.R. Ebaugh, J.S. Chafetz, and P.F. Pipes in “Categories of Faith-Based Organizations” did not support the one-dimensional theory as put forth by the previous authors. They viewed organizational religiosity as a multidimensional phenomenon, consistent with Glock and Stark’s conceptualization of individual religiosity as a multidimensional phenomenon. They supported a three-dimensional phenomenon with extensive variations. Their research study included a national survey of faith-based social service associations to measure organizational factors which would make an organization religious. Data analysis identified three dimensions: service religiosity, the extent to which the staff incorporates religion into their interaction with the clients; formal organizational religiosity, the extent to which the “public image or face” of the association is explicitly faith-based; and, staff religiosity, the role of religion in hiring and motivating staff as well as religious belief among the staff. The authors found that the three dimensions accounted for several kinds of variations in their organizational variables in the 656 organizations of their sample.

Garland, Rogers, Singletary and Yancey, the authors of *The Faith Factor in Effective Models of Multi-Sector Collaboration: A Final Report to the PEW Charitable Trusts*, conducted a multi-method study with two-phases that included in-depth, face to face interviews with various stakeholders.
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face interviews at 16 faith-based organizations and mailed surveys to a national sample of
congregations and faith-based organizations. The analysis of the data identified faith
culture and faith identity, two dimensions of religiosity. Faith culture includes the way
organizations express faith and religion daily in its hiring; faith identity includes an
organization’s mission, both historical and current, and a faith goal for all participants.
The national samples for this study were divided into two categories, Christian and other
faiths, and then sorted into high and low rankings based on dimensions. Garland et al. and
Ebaugh et al. discovered complimentary factors of religiosity, utilizing different research
methods. Formal organizational religiosity is similar to faith identity while the faith
culture dimensions seem to embody both, using very different research methods to
identify and examine the dimensions of religiosity.

This study will define FBO’s based on the typology of “faith-related” as presented
by authors Steven Rathgeb Smith and Michael R. Sosins’ in “The Varieties of Faith-
Related Agencies.” The authors delineated agencies by the following categories:
(1) dependency on religious entities for resources; (2) affiliation with and control by a
denomination or other religious groups; and, (3) religious culture that creates a niche or
space for agencies to pursue their religious values. This study excluded any
organization that identified as “faith-related” from its research instead focusing on non-
religious social service organizations while examining their dependency on resources,
external and internal environment and agency affiliations.

In summary, conceptually, the literature concerning faith-based organizations addresses the meaning of religiosity and its application to faith-based organizations. Organizational religiosity intersects and overlaps with conceptual and theoretical literature concerning faith-based organizations.

**Faith-Based versus Secular Social Service Organizations**

Several studies have examined the differences between faith-based and secular organizations. Elizabeth A. Graddy and Ke Ye in “Faith-Based Versus Secular Providers of Social Services-Differences in What, How, and Where”\(^\text{32}\) sought to provide a better understanding of the role differences in Los Angeles County by examining delivery patterns. The study sorted and categorized 3461 organizations into four categories: faith-based, secular non-profit, public agencies, and for-profit organizations. The authors discovered through an analysis of faith-based and secular non-profit organizations that faith-based organizations provided more services but focus on providing support in five service areas (shelter, emergency food, congregate meals, financial assistance, and personal/household goods). Secular non-profit providers focused on community improvement, mental health and youth development. In addition, they provided services to support a wider geographical area. The authors contended that there were differences; faith-based organizations focused on traditional assistance, provided multiple services and relied on their unique strengths for intervention. In comparison, secular organizations offered a comprehensive set of services. In their conclusion, Graddy and Ye contended
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that faith-based service providers typically filled complementary or specialized supportive roles while secular organizations were the major providers across all services.

In “Religious Versus Secular Human Service Organizations: Implications for Public Policy,” Eric Twombly conducted a secondary analysis of a national sample of social service non-profit organizations. The organizations were identified based on submitted IRS form 900 and as a result, agencies were classified as faith-related or secular. Analysis consisted of OLS (ordinary least-squares) regression to examine the variables related to the reliance on specific type of revenue and descriptive analysis of organizational characteristics. Twombly discovered that the two types of service providers, faith-related and secular, have organizational characteristics that were similar and different. Similarities included geographical location, some sources of funding and expenditures patterns. Differences occurred in the age of faith-based and secular provider; on the average, there is a 13-year difference between the agencies with the faith-based organizations typically being the older. Secular organizations relied on government funding and contracts while faith-related organizations depended on individual donations. Finally, secular organizations focused on services targeted to families and children, housing and workforce development. Faith-related organizations focused on services for the elderly and providing multiservice programs. Authors K. Kearns, C. Park, and L. Yankoski in “Comparing the Faith-based and Secular

Community Service Corporations in Pittsburg and Allegheny County” concluded in their research that faith-based organizations received greater financial support from individual donations than government grants and contracts. Their findings were in alignment with the research of the previous authors Elizabeth Gaddy, Ye Ke and Eric Twombly. In addition, Eric Twombly suggested that the heavy dependence of faith-based providers on donor contributions would create concern surrounding the vision and reality of the faith-based initiative. Faith-based providers generally provided basic human needs (food, shelter, and youth programs) and were less involved in policy advocacy unlike their secular counterparts.

In “Where’s the Religion? Distinguishing Faith-based from Secular Social Service Agencies,” the authors compared faith-based and secular services in Houston, Texas. Their survey included 170 agencies with only 89 responding: 53 identified as secular, 4 failed to identify and 32 identified as religious providers. The sample size yielded results that identified differences and similarities that were varied across dimensions. Secular organizations predominately always had secular names and mission statements whereas faith-based organizations generally used some public component (mission, name, religious logo) to identify as faith-based. Additionally, faith-based


organizations tended to rely on volunteers as opposed to the paid staff in secular organizations. As mentioned in the previous studies, faith-based providers received very minor or no government funding in comparison to secular providers who received at least half of their operating budgets from federal funding sources. FBO’s may differentiate themselves from secular organizations by utilizing religious practices in their service delivery but were very similar in their broader social service orientation.

Rebecca J. Kissane, in “How Do Faith-Based Organizations Compare to Secular Provider? Non-profit Directors and Poor Women Assessment of FBO’s,” presented findings of how poor women and non-profit directors viewed FBO’s in Philadelphia. The differences in how FBO’s were viewed were divided into four main categories: (1) individualized care; (2) professionalization; (3) connectivity within the community; and, (4) religiosity in service delivery. The data in this study concluded that half of the surveyed non-profit directors viewed FBO’s as more capable in providing services to needy families while the other half expressed concern about the delivery of educational and employment services. The interview results from the women countered many of the assumptions made by the non-profit directors regarding FBO’s. The women did not feel the FBO’s provided a personal touch and the participants viewed religiosity infused into service delivery negatively. This interaction questions the notion of connectivity of the FBO’s within their community. The findings revealed that the various stakeholders were disconnected in their opinions and their realities when dealing with and assessing non-profit organizations. Secular providers in this community were more unlikely to
collaborate and partner with FBO’s.\textsuperscript{37} Kissane’s findings on collaboration supported R.M. Silverman in “Vying for the Urban Poor: Charitable Organizations, Faith Based Social Change and Racial Reconciliation in the Deep South City,” in which he suggested that agencies “are leery of religious organizations and may abstain from entering collaborative partnerships with them.”\textsuperscript{38}

The empirical research conducted varies in the type of data analysis and study samples but identifies similarities and differences between faith-based and secular providers. Existing evidence shows that FBO’s differ from secular organizations in their revenue sources, average age, mix of services offered, volunteers and ability to apply for grants. Both FBO’s and secular organizations receive similar effectiveness ratings from clientele and have similar expenditure patterns. Although FBO’s may differentiate themselves from their secular counterparts, they are very similar in their broader social service delivery. In “Where’s the Religion? Distinguishing Faith-Based from Secular Social Services Agencies”,\textsuperscript{39} the authors agreed that any attempt to empirically examine the effectiveness of faith-based and secular agencies must first clearly distinguish between the two types of agencies. Research on FBO’s and the faith-based initiative is
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increasing, but there is a need for more empirical research comparing the different social service providers.

**Defining Effectiveness**

The primary challenge in studying the effectiveness of social service programs is establishing a concrete definition of effectiveness. Different researchers have each defined it differently. Some have defined effectiveness based on organizational factors, others focus on factors or forces external to the organization, and some define effectiveness in terms of client evaluations of program and services while others consider products produced by social service programs (number of clients serviced, hours of counseling provided and hour of classroom instruction). Stephen Monsma expounded in “The Effectiveness of Faith-Based Welfare-to-Work Programs” that all four concepts failed to consider to what extent social service programs achieved their intended goals, ignoring the results or outcomes of the agency’s services.

Research on the effectiveness of faith-based services has been limited but is a prominent factor in the debate about the faith-based initiative. Media reports have proclaimed program successes based on general roles rather than rigorous research and evaluation. In “Outcomes Evaluation in Faith-based Social Services: Are We Evaluating Faith Accurately?” by K.M. Ferguson, Q. Wu, D. Spruijt-Metz and G. Dyrness, the authors found 29 empirical research studies. Thirteen of the studies utilized some form of quantitative method; 8 studies employed some type of qualitative design;
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4 studies utilized mixed methods; 3 conducted data analysis; and the last study used a random clinical trial experiment. The findings supported the authors’ claims that faith-based providers were effective, but they also noted methodological limitations such as failure to identify how the faith element results in positive client outcomes or dependence on cross-sectional designs and descriptive analysis. In a special edition of the *Journal of Religion and Spirituality in Social Work* focusing on faith-based program evaluation, researchers S.C. Boddie and R.A. Cnaan identified four methodological and process challenges: (1) development of a framework that distinguishes organizational characteristic between service providers; (2) a reliable and easy to use measure of organizational religiosity and its impact on service delivery; (3) specification in measurement of outcome variables; and, (4) strategies to address clientele high attrition rates and providers to reduce threats to internal and external validity of findings. The research provided baseline data for further study that examined FBO’s and desired outcomes.

B.R. Johnson in “Objective Hope: Assessing the Effectiveness of Faith-based Organizations” conducted an extensive review of literature examining the effectiveness of faith organizations. His research found 25 studies that used empirical research to examine faith-based effectiveness. Of the 25 studies, 8 were case studies; 6 were descriptive analysis; and 11 used some form of multivariate analysis. Johnson stated that research on the effectiveness of faith-based organizations was plagued by methodological issues such as uncertain quantifiable measures of key variables and small non-random samples. The author did conclude that FBO’s “appear” to have an advantage over their
secular counterparts in assisting participants overcome their circumstances, citing examples such as drug addiction and imprisonment.

Based on research presented by R. Wuthnow, C. Hackett, and B.Y. Hsu in “The Effectiveness and Trustworthiness of Faith-based and Other Service Organizations,” the authors concluded that there was no evidence that faith-based clients perceived effectiveness and trustworthiness of these organizations any different from secular providers. The findings were based on a secondary data form survey of 2,077 low income residents in Pennsylvania. Research presented at the Roundtable on Religion and Social Welfare Policy’s 2003 Conference supported the finding of R. Wuthnow, C. Hackett, and B.Y. Hsu. Authors S.R. Smith, J.P. Bartkowski and S.E. Grettenberger reported finding no significant differences in program effectiveness based on client reports. Their research included four case studies using matched-pairs of faith-based and secular service providers in five states and four different service areas.41

In “Where’s the Religion? Distinguishing Faith-based from Secular Social Service Agencies,” authors Helen Rose Ebaugh, Paula F. Pipes, Janet Saltzman Chafetz and Martha Daniels suggested that research examining the effectiveness of faith-based human service providers should follow from research that addressed the questions of what makes an organization religious (faith-based) and how they differ from secular providers. Understanding how FBO’s and secular organization function are key elements in Stephen Monsma’s “The Effectiveness of Faith Based Welfare-to-Work Programs.”

His finding elaborated on specialization: reporting some programs were good at achieving certain outcomes and goals. He contended that FBO’s were good at enabling clients to complete the programs, to maintain employment, and to foster a nurturing environment; while other agencies were effective in assisting their clients in securing full-time employment. Monsma argued that effectiveness was not easy to research but stated that neither faith-based providers nor secular organizations proved to be more effective than the other across the board. He offered two findings; first, FBO’s should not be excluded from government contracts. Second, all organizations have niche effectiveness. Most often non-profit agencies are founded to serve the needs of particular groups, such as abused women, children with health issues, and drug addiction, rather than the general welfare. These organizations provide services to their client communities along with those most like them and are usually effective, as discussed by B. O’Connell in “A Major Transfer of Government Responsibility to Voluntary Organizations? Proceed with Caution” and U. Zimmerman in Exploring the Non-profit Motive (or: What’s in it for You?).

Religious or faith-based services have been discussed in books and journals since the late 1800s. The major discourse concerning religious social services emerged with passage of the Charitable Choice provision of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) and the implementation of the faith based and community initiative by President George W. Bush. In response to public
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concern, literature and research emerged that addressed the intentions of the faith-based initiative and the effectiveness of faith-based social service organizations. The effectiveness of faith-based social service providers has been highly debated and reported by the media as successful, in terms of services rather than rigorous research and evaluation.\textsuperscript{43} Existing empirical data concerning the effectiveness of the faith-based organizations providing social services is limited by the weakness of the research design and data analysis.\textsuperscript{44} Empirical research focusing on factors other than effectiveness has generally examined the faith-based organizations’ resources, stakeholders and services provided. Other studies have compared the faith-based service providers with traditional social service providers to address the claim that faith-based service providers are substantially different. This research is marked with conflicting results and a predominance of cross-sectional designs and limited data analysis.\textsuperscript{45} Based on current
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data, FBO’s and secular social service agencies perform exceptionally well depending on their service niche, programing and community need, and, lastly, based on the definition of effectiveness, i.e. program participants, program outcomes or agency mission.

The future of faith-based initiatives and their impact provides a strong argument in support of the initiatives. Americans will benefit from the increased funding of faith-based initiatives. They also contend that the future of the faith-based initiative and its full impact is uncertain because it is unknown how states or local municipalities will operate in times of recession – either by eliminating program and services or raising local taxes.\(^\text{46}\)

In summary, the limited nature of literature and research concerning the impact of the faith-based initiative on NBSSOs clearly suggests that there is room for additional development of knowledge. The research in this area is very limited and does not address how the NBSSOs have been affected since the implementation of the faith-based initiative, instead providing comparative analysis between religious social service providers and NBSSOs. Therefore, examining the effectiveness of NBSSOs was based on the ideology provided by Stephen Monsma’s “The Effectiveness of Faith Based Welfare-to-Work Programs,” focusing on services provided (niche) and surrounding community. This study sought to broaden the field by examining how three NBSSOs in Washington, D.C. have been impacted, by developing a conceptual framework and by applying RD

and Neo-institutional theories. The research is critical because it addresses two key areas that many scholars, political scientists, public administrators and politicians have neglected to comprehensively examine. The underlying principle of the Faith-Based Initiative was a functional improvement to social services but presented several issues. The primary issue was religious freedom, while a secondary issue was a competitive funding stream coupled with the strings of devolution. Overall, the researcher would argue this is good policy with poor implementation. In “Faith Without Works” by Amy Sullivan, she stated the faith-based initiative could have been a truly innovative social policy but has failed live up to the expected results.\textsuperscript{47} The policy is plagued with accountability issues for faith-based grantees as well as taxation inconsistencies for grantees and donors. The literature argues in support for and against devolution, but the findings all agree that the “second coming” of devolution has not yielded the anticipated results and the impact of devolution on NBSSOs and their future is yet unknown.

CHAPTER III

METHODODOLOGY

This chapter presents details concerning the purpose of the study and research questions. In addition, it encompasses the research design and methods used to collect data and examine the study’s research questions.

Research Purpose and Questions

The purpose of the research study was to examine how the implementation of the faith-based initiative has impacted non-religious based social service organizations in Washington, D.C. This study sought to contribute to the development of knowledge on this issue by exploring two broad questions concerning NBSSOs in Washington, D.C.

1. The underlying empirical question is what has been the impact on three existing NBSSOs in Washington, D.C., since the implementation of the faith-based initiative.

2. Does the implementation of the faith-based initiative support R. P. Nathan and T. Gais’s theory of “second-order devolution”?1

Research Design

A case study methodology was chosen to elicit more in-depth information on what impact the faith-based initiative had on NBSSOs in Washington, D.C. The case
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study approach was chosen to determine what impact the faith-based initiative had on three NBSSOs in Washington, D.C., and if the implementation of the faith-based initiative served as an impetus for a new wave of devolution. A case study can be defined as an empirical form of inquiry. This inquiry investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, when boundaries between the phenomenon and context are not clear.\footnote{Robert Yin, \textit{A Case Study Research: Design and Methods (Applied Social Research Methods)} (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Inc., 2009), 13.} A single case study method was selected and was utilized to address the research questions. The case study was used to determine if a theory’s proposition was correct or if an alternative set of explanations would be more relevant. Using a single-case study can represent a significant contribution in providing a foundation for further investigative research in an entire field. However, the problem of external validity has been a major obstruction in conducting case studies. Robert Yin contended this is incorrect when dealing with case studies. Survey research relies on statistical generalization, and case studies rely on analytic generalization. Analytical generalization is the result of the investigator striving to generalize a particular set of results to some broader theory.\footnote{Ibid., 15.}

Impact can be considered the consequences of an action. Impact does not necessarily have to be beneficial or intended. It is possible to make a distinction between scientific and societal consequences of research. Scientific consequences examine how the advancement of knowledge and the research landscape are influenced. Societal

---
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consequences address such questions as, what does society gain in the form of (1) better products, (2) services and (3) welfare. Impact on society can include every important aspect of society.\(^4\) This research accounted for the external factors that also impact the organizations possible decrease in federal funding, by acknowledging the climate during the specific financial periods covered in the study.

This case study was bound in a mixed approach of qualitative and quantitative studies. Qualitative approaches derive from a phenomenological perspective and are described as research that produces findings that are not arrived at through statistical methodology.\(^5\) Qualitative research seeks to interpret and understand social actions. Quantitative research explains phenomena by collecting numerical data and analyzing that information utilizing mathematical based methods (statistics). Quantitative studies test hypotheses, examine cause and effect, and make predictions. The mixed-methods approach allowed the researcher to base knowledge claims on pragmatic grounds. Mixed-methods research is defined as a class of research where quantitative or qualitative research techniques and approaches are mixed or combined. This method exercises strategies of inquiry that involve collecting data simultaneously or sequentially to best understand research problems. Collecting data also involves gathering both numeric


information as well as text information; the results represent quantitative and qualitative information. A mixed methods design captures the best of both quantitative and qualitative approaches. This method can serve a larger, transformative purpose to change and advocate for marginalized groups, such as racial minorities, women, impoverished and members of the gay and lesbian community. These reasons for mixing methods prompted the researcher and scholars globally to develop procedures for mixed methods’ strategies of inquiry and to take the numerous terms found in the literature (such as integrated, multi-method, convergence) and combine and shape procedures for research. In these situations, the advantages of collecting both closed-ended quantitative data and open-ended qualitative data prove advantageous to best understand a research problem.

There are substantial advantages as well as weaknesses to the mixed methods approach. Implementing this method offsets the weaknesses of both quantitative and qualitative research. It provides a broader and comprehensive understanding of the research problem. Mixed method allows for the development of more context specific instruments (words, pictures and narratives can be used to add meaning to numbers and numbers can be used to add precision to words, pictures and narratives). This method provides stronger evidence for a conclusion through convergence and corroboration of


the findings and more complete knowledge necessary to inform theory and practice. A notable weakness of mixed-methods is that the scope of the research can be overwhelming. The factor of overwhelming translates into many categories such as: time, size, resources, complexity and cost.⁹ Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of mixed-methods research allows the researcher to utilize the fundamental principles of mixed research. This principle supports the ideology that researchers should collect multiple data utilizing different strategies, methods, and approaches in a way that the combination results in non-overlapping weaknesses and strengths that are complementary.¹⁰ The aforementioned supports the rationale to administer surveys as well as conduct face-to-face interview with each organization.

**Study Population**

The target population for this study was non-religious social service organizations in Washington, D.C. The District of Columbia was selected because the United States Congress maintains authority over the city. The residents of the District of Columbia elect a non-voting, at-large congressional delegate to the U.S. House of Representatives, but have no representation in the U.S. Senate. This makes the target population different from all other cities in the United States. Many states have created Faith-Based Offices that manage state and local partnerships, but the District of Columbia does not have an
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office of this capacity. The oversight of the Faith-Based relationships in Washington D.C. remains at the federal level and makes this target population relevant for study. For this study, the social service provider population examines public non-profit organizations and excludes religious and for-profit service religious providers and any agency that was not established prior to the implementation of the faith-based initiative.

The participants for this study evolved from the DC One Fund database. The DC One Fund originated to afford DC government employees a full opportunity to participate in charitable giving in their community. The DC government seeks to achieve the objectives of an effective and efficient single campaign among DC government employees for the support of worthy, charitable causes with minimal disruption to the work force. The DC One Fund lists more than 800 non-profit organizations. The District of Columbia government authorized the United Way of the National Capital Area and the United Black Fund, Inc. to serve as administrators. The participants for this research study came from two online databases of Washington, D.C. service providers.

The United Way of the National Capital Area was chartered in 1975, based upon the same model as the national organization, working organizations that distributed funds to local member charities. United Way of the National Capital Area has worked to change the lives of people and families in the local area. They are committed to helping the local communities. Today, they mobilize a network of hundreds of volunteers, donors, non-profits and change agents that help people in the District of Columbia, Maryland and Northern Virginia address some of the biggest challenges in their lives. United Way NCA non-profit members are locally-focused non-profit organizations,
providing programs and services in the Washington metropolitan area. Members are represented in the public and private sectors and each year, organizations much reapply to renew their membership status. The United Way of the National Capital Area database contains over 700 organizations that cover a wide range of services. The database can be searched based on the criteria of zip code, location, and keyword or service category. The National Capital Area Information and Referral Center collects and maintains organization information such as name, telephone, fax, email, web address, service area and contact person.

The United Black Fund, Inc. was founded by Calvin and Wilhelmina Rolark. Their effort paved the way for thousands of agencies to participate in campaigns across the nation. Today, United Black Fund, Inc. proudly works with agencies engaged in a daily struggle to combat conditions that dehumanize and reduce men, women and children. The United Black Fund, Inc. database contains over 100 organizations that cover a wide range of services. The website provided a short list of 20 associated agencies with email contact information. The entire list of participating agencies can be obtained by contacting United Black Fund, Incorporated directly or reviewing the DC One Fund booklet.

The agencies listed in the DC One Fund are a culmination of the agencies that patterned with The United Way of the National Capital Area and United Black Fund Inc. Collectively; the two agencies publish the “DC One Fund. Each One. Give One.” booklet which lists over 800 agencies located in the Washington Metropolitan Area, including Virginia and Maryland.
The use of preexisting social service provider databases creates potential limitations for the broad population of social service organizations. There may be organizations that failed to register, participate or have enough community presence to be included in the information collection process for building the database. Unfortunately, the Washington, D.C. government does not provide a comprehensive list of existing social service organizations. This presented an initial issue in collecting and selecting agencies for participation in this study. Further research discovered the DC One Fund campaign and the resource material outlining agencies in the Washington Metropolitan area. In effort to balance the information, the decision was made to use the databases provided individually by United Black Fund Inc. and the United Way of the National Capital Area and collectively in the “DC One Fund” booklet. This database was easily accessible and designed to include the various types of organizations that are the focus of this research.

**Sample Selection**

The three resource providers were cross-referenced using geographic localities, and zip codes and keywords consistent with direct delivery services to families and individuals for the eight wards in Washington, D.C. Based on the agency cross-reference analysis, organizations were excluded that could be defined or identified as religious-based, for-profit and any other social service agency that was established after the implementation of the faith-based initiative. The decision was made to focus on organizations with program delivery services specific to the focus areas of the faith-based initiative. The range of services included: food (meals, food pantry, soup kitchens, and
nutrition), work (job search, job-skills, vocational education, and general equivalency diploma program), community service, domestic violence counseling, medical and health service, and second chance housing.11 Ten organizations were randomly selected based on the following criteria: establishment pre-implementation of the faith-based initiative program and service delivery and organization identification. Each organization was contacted formally to participate in the case study. Only three were selected to participate; each was asked to participate in the study and complete a survey.

Instrumentation

Data collection was conducted by utilizing a self-administered paper or web-based survey and individual agency interviews. The questions for the survey and interview were based on previous questions from prior research studies similar to this topic such as “Where’s the Religion? Distinguishing Faith-Based from Secular to Social Service Agencies” by Ebaugh et al., and S.V. Monsma’s “The Effectiveness of Faith-Based Welfare-to-Work Programs: A Story of Specialization.” The survey stated the purpose and intended audience, i.e. social service providers that service individuals or families in the community. The questionnaire consisted of fifteen questions, eight of which were closed ended questions and the remaining seven were open ended questions essential to the study. A critical question asked the completer(s) to specify their role and tenure with the organization, providing some level of validity to their responses. Questions 14 and 15 were open-ended as well, but asked the respondents to provide

statement and statistical data addressing any potential impact as result of the implementation of the faith-based initiative in Washington, D.C.

Questionnaires and interviews are commonly utilized in research and even more often in mixed methods studies. Questionnaires often provide evidence of patterns in large populations and qualitative interviews data provide insight into a participant’s thoughts, rationale behind actions and attitudes. According to research methods’ literature, questionnaires and interviews are viewed as having different and complementary strengths and weakness.\(^\text{12}\)

Survey and interview questions were modified based on the research presented in the literature review that identified various factors that impact social service organizations. The factors were divided into two categories: Internal Environment and External Environment. Various questions were designed to measure resource dependencies, and partnerships, sociopolitical elements/impacts, organization life cycles, and human resources.

The initial decision to submit the survey as only paper-based via regular mailed was changed because of the potential increase for higher response rate by including a web-based survey method as well. Although mail survey reaches a broader population, the cost is much higher than web-based surveys.\(^\text{13}\) Web-based surveys are typically easier to administer and more cost effective. The potential concerns with Internet and computer

---


access for smaller agencies prompted the rationale to offer dual survey formats. Evidence suggests utilizing web and mailed surveys may enhance the coverage of the survey to a broader mix of participants because providers responding electronically can be somewhat different from those responding to a mail survey. In “The Effect of Mode on Response Rates and Data Quality in a Survey of Physicians” by Losch, Thompson, and Lutz, they discovered when given a choice and opportunity to respond, participants were more likely to respond to the web version. Again, this suggests that the web and mail combination might enhance the responding sample by allowing participants to respond to their preferred data collection method.14

The web-based adaptation of the survey was designed utilizing SurveyMonkey software. This platform is a feedback system that continually collects and analyzes data. SurveyMonkey has the unique capacity to collect feedback through multiple channels (email, Web, print) and accumulate those responses in a central database for analysis and action.

**Data Collection**

The survey instruments were tested prior to notification and introduction. In addition, the questions and applicability of questions and instructions (content validity) were reviewed by knowledgeable individuals who have experience in conducting this type of research.

---

Data collection began with a mailed letter of identification and participation request in March 2015, followed-up by a phone call and email within a two-week period. The telephone calls served as a follow-up regarding the receipt of the identification and participation request letter, and a preliminary attempt to set-up the face to face interviews. Emails describing the research project coupled with an attached copy of the letter of identification and participation request were sent as a reminder as well. Once three organizations agreed to participate and were vetted to ensure they met the research requirements, each organization received the following: (1) a welcome letter; (2) a paper-based survey questionnaire via mail and a link with instructions to complete the web-survey questionnaire via email with a timeline of two weeks (each participant was instructed to choose to complete only one medium, paper or web-based; (3) and scheduled time to meet for a face-to-face interview with the principal researcher. The estimated timeframe for this process was thirty days from the initial date of the received signed participation agreement letter.

**Reliability and Validity Measurement**

Generally, in research, measurement quality refers to the reliability and validity of the measurement. Reliability refers to the ability of the instrument to yield the same result when used with the same subjects. Validity addresses the ability to measure what is intended to be measured by the instrument. The validity of the survey instrument is based on the face validity as a result of wording and variables evident in prior research.

---

such as “Where’s the Religion? Distinguishing Faith-Based from Secular to Social Service Agencies” by Ebaugh et al.,¹⁶ and S.V. Monsma’s¹⁷ “The Effectiveness of Faith-Based Welfare-to-Work Programs: A Story of Specialization.” Most of the survey and interview questions sought to discover discrete information about organizational character and any potential operational changes and their causes.

**Data Analysis Plan**

The Statistical Package of the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to create the dataset and conduct all quantitative statistical analysis. All data received was entered into the database by the principal researcher. SPSS Miner is a Windows based program that can be used to perform data entry and analysis and to create tables and graphs. This software package is capable of handling large amounts of data and can perform all of the analyses necessary. SPSS is commonly used in the business world and in social science research.¹⁸ All web-based results from Survey Monkey and transcribed interview notes were imported into QDA Miner. QDA Miner is a qualitative data analysis software package for coding, annotating, retrieving and analyzing various sized collections of documents and images. QDA Miner qualitative data analysis tool may be used to analyze

---


interview or focus group transcripts, journal articles, speeches and surveys as well as photographs and other types of visual documents.\textsuperscript{19}

The statistical analysis was conducted in two phases: univariate and multivariate. The data from the participant surveys was analyzed consistent with the methods of univariate analysis, identifying descriptive information about organizational characteristics. Univariate analysis is the simplest form of quantitative analysis, and is conducted with the description of a single variable in terms of the applicable unit of analysis. There are two methods of analyzing univariate data, a numeric and a graphic method. The numeric method involves using descriptive statistics to summarize the main features of the data in table form. The graphic method involves using various graphs and charts to visualize the main aspects of the variable. Univariate analysis is primarily utilized for descriptive purposes, most commonly displayed in frequency tables, graphs and descriptive statistics. This form of analysis is used to find out specific information relating to each variable; examples include range, median, mode, mean, and standard deviation.\textsuperscript{20} Multivariate data analysis is a statistical technique used to analyze data that surfaces from more than one variable. This analysis examines internal and external variables that impact participating agencies. Multivariate analysis can be used to process the information in a meaningful fashion.\textsuperscript{21} Multivariate analysis are used in studies that


\textsuperscript{21} Waltraud Kessler, \textit{Multivariate Datenanalyse} (Germany: Wiley-Verlag Gmbh, 2006), 260.
involve more than one dependent variable, also known as the outcome or phenomenon of interest. This type of analysis is favorable as the outcome of interest is affected or influenced by more than one variable.  

The univariate analysis examined the impact of federal funding before and after the implementation of the faith-based initiative. This analysis will factor in major influencers to the federal budget such as recessions, war and elections (Presidential and Mayoral). Multivariate analysis examined the following sub variables impacting non-religious social service organizations: personnel, programs, and program participants. The result provided from the univariate and multivariate analysis provided the necessary data needed to address both research questions.

---

CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of the faith-based initiative on NBSSO’s. This chapter provides an overview of findings from the mixed-methods analysis of online surveys, face-to-face and telephone interviews with three non-religious social service agencies in Washington, D.C. In addition, this chapter also presents quantitative findings from internal and external factors such as each agency’s personnel, program, services, participants and operating budget.

Agency officials (Chief Executive Officer/ President and Executive Directors) shared a historical overview about their agency, the faith-based initiative and their future. Each official participated in the initial phase by completing a required survey. The next two phases included the submission of the requested data for analysis and an interview.

**Qualitative Analysis Research Finding**

The agency case studies included the following components as listed below.

- Community Characteristics – population size, education rates, unemployment rate, poverty rates and race/ethnicity
- Agency Overview – mission, history, number of staff employed
- Scope of Services – range of services provided
- Funding Sources – where agencies receive their funding
• Survey and Interviews

• Resource Data (number of programs, number of clients served, number of staff members and budgetary information)

The three identified agency officials that completed the survey were the individuals required to participate in the second phase, the interview. Each agency identified as a non-profit NBSSO in Washington, D.C. that was established prior to 2001, and each agency receives at least forty percent in federal funds for programs and services. Two agency officials identified their position as Executive Directors and the third as CEO/President.

Table 1. Agency Community Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Demographics</th>
<th>Agency 1</th>
<th>Agency 2</th>
<th>Agency 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agency 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agency 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agency 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>20001</td>
<td>20001</td>
<td>20012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>39,296</td>
<td>39,296</td>
<td>13,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>9.8% (3,581)</td>
<td>9.8% (3,581)</td>
<td>12% (1,603)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>19% (7,466)</td>
<td>19% (7,466)</td>
<td>13% (1,737)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>86% (33,795)</td>
<td>86% (33,795)</td>
<td>88% (11,758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>29% (11,396)</td>
<td>29% (11,396)</td>
<td>21% (2,806)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>55% (21,613)</td>
<td>55% (21,613)</td>
<td>65% (8,685)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8.3% (3,262)</td>
<td>8.3% (3,262)</td>
<td>11% (1,470)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7.67% (3,014)</td>
<td>7.67% (3,014)</td>
<td>2.4% (321)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agency 1-Community Characteristics

In 2013, the zip code 20001 (Ward 2) where Agency 1 is located reported a population of approximately 39,296 and is in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. The unemployment rate was 9.8% for 20001 zip code. The percentage of individuals with
income below the poverty level was 19%, similar to 18.6% for the city. This zip code had a high school diploma educational attainment rate of 86%.\textsuperscript{1} It reported for racial/ethnic groups that 29% were white, 55% African American, 8.3% Hispanic, and 7.67% Asian.\textsuperscript{2}

Agency 1 Overview

Mission: To alleviate the conditions of poverty in order to help ensure positive outcomes for youth, adults and families in the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan area.\textsuperscript{3}

“The Northwest One Corridor” concept was created because of urban renewal. Northwest One was created to transform the area into a mixed-income community where residents will have quality housing, economic opportunities and access to amenities and resources for high-quality urban living. This area’s section of K Street was to become the neighborhood’s main street with direct access to the office and retail promenade of Mount Vernon Triangle.\textsuperscript{4}

Community activists for affordable housing found allies in appointed Mayor Walter Washington, former director of the DC Housing Agency, and Horace B. McKenna, founder of S.O.M.E. (So Others Might Eat) and advocate of the Sursum Corda Cooperative. In the 1970’s, the junior high school was closed and the Tyler House

\textsuperscript{1} “Neighborhood Info DC,” The Urban Institute and the National Neighborhood Indicators Partnership, last modified November 19, 2014, accessed November 1, 2015, http://www.neighborhoodinfodc.org/.

\textsuperscript{2} Ibid.


housing complex was built. In 1982, DC contractors converted the junior high school into office space. Community leaders developed a proposal for turning the site into a health and community service center. Seed money was provided to Sursum Codra, Inc., Center City Community Corporation (4Cs), and North Capitol Neighborhood Development (NCND).5

A poverty study conducted by DC’s Urban Institute found Northwest One to be one of the chronically poor areas in the city. In 1991, community residents created this agency and the community-initiated and controlled non-profit agency started raising money to renovate the building.

The goal of Agency 1 is to guide clients in realizing their goals and aspirations to have better lives and brighter futures for themselves and their families. To further its mission, the agency rents building space to other non-profit service providers, making the facility the most comprehensive human services center in Washington, D.C. Although each organization is autonomous, they all collaborate in addressing problems of chronic poverty in the North Capitol St. area of Washington, D.C.6 Based on the data received and reported in 2013 from Agency 1, they have a staff size of 32 full-time employees and facilitate 12 community services programs with a participation total of 885 clients. The primary funding source (60%) is based on private donations; the remaining 40% is federally funded. Agency 1 provides an empowerment services that includes job training,


counseling and placement, GED, tax assistance, financial management, adult computer
learning, resume development, and individual development. Their youth development
services provide a continuum of services to develop and educate youth from ages 3 to 18.
Lastly, the social services programs work with clients to help them become more self-
sufficient through adult and youth counseling, parenting and family strengthening,
family-to-family mentoring, fatherhood initiative program, housing assistance, life skills
and emergency assistance.\textsuperscript{7}

Agency 2-Community Characteristics

In 2013, the zip code 20001 (Ward 2) where Agency 2 is located reported a
population of approximately 39,296 and is in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area.
The unemployment rate was 9.8\% for 20001 zip code. The percentage of individuals with
income below the poverty level was 19\%, similar to 18.6\% for the city. This zip code had
a high school diploma educational attainment rate of 86\%.\textsuperscript{8} It reported for racial/ethnic
groups that 29\% were white, 55\% African American, 8.3\% Hispanic, and 7.67\% Asian.\textsuperscript{9}

Agency 2 Overview

This agency was established December 10, 1962 to plan, coordinate, and
implement human services programs for low-income residents in the Nation’s Capital.
The agency’s mission is: Uniting people with opportunities. For over 50 years, it has been

\textsuperscript{7} Perry School, “About Us.”

\textsuperscript{8} “Neighborhood Info DC,” The Urban Institute and the National Neighborhood Indicators
http://www.neighborhoodinfodc.org/.

\textsuperscript{9} The Urban Institute, “Neighborhood Info DC.”
in the forefront of the war on poverty. As the catalyst for economic security and growth for all Washington, D.C. residents, Agency 2 laid the groundwork for innovative social service programs such as weatherization and energy conservation, Head Start, workforce development training and youth development. The agency provides residents with comprehensive resources for early childhood education; employment and training; family and community services; case management and referrals to other supportive services. Agency 2 continues to gain strength and determination to reduce poverty, empower families and build stronger communities.\textsuperscript{10} Based on the reports and data received, Agency 2 has a staff size of 235 full and part time employees and provides 6 community services programs with a participation pool of 75,549 clients. Fifty percent of the funding source is based on donations; the remaining 50\% is federally funded.

Agency 3-Community Characteristics

In 2013, the zip code 20012 (Ward 4) where Agency 3 is located reported a population of approximately 13,361 and is in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. The unemployment rate was 12\% for the 20012 zip code. The percentage of individuals with income below the poverty level was 13\%, less than the 18.6\% for the city. This zip code had a high school diploma educational attainment rate of 88\%.\textsuperscript{11} It reported for

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{10} “About Us,” United Planning Organization, accessed February 18, 2016, http://www.upo.org/about/.
\item \textsuperscript{11} “Neighborhood Info DC,” The Urban Institute and the National Neighborhood Indicators Partnership, last modified November 1, 2015, accessed November 19, 2015, http://www.neighborhoodinfodc.org/.
\end{itemize}
racial/ethnic groups that 21% were white, 65% African American, 11% Hispanic, and 2.4% Asian.¹²

Agency 3 Overview

The final agency (3) was founded on June 19, 1991 to fulfill the Consortium requirements of what was then Title II of the Ryan White CARE Act.¹³ Its mission is to provide support to PLWH (People Living with HIV) and their families and collaborate with service providers to enhance the delivery and quality of HIV/AIDS services in Washington, D.C. Title II provided formula funding to all states and territories to improve the quality, availability, and organization of health care and support services for PLWH. AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP) also provides funding to make medications available to people with HIV. Both the grantee and statewide and/or regional Title II planning bodies called consortia have needs assessment responsibilities.¹⁴ As a Title II Consortium, Agency 3 was responsible for planning and coordinating a range of medical and support services for People Living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA) in the District of Columbia based on needs identified through a formal needs assessment process and a comprehensive plan.¹⁵


The agency had a membership of 65 health care providers and community-based organizations by the end of the first decade. Agency 3 has provided consumer advocacy and training programs, in addition to planning and coordinating a variety of medical and support service. However, since the end of the Consortium requirement for Ryan White Part B funding, Agency 3 has focused on supportive services for the HIV service system. Currently, they administer two consumer assistance programs: Emergency Financial Assistance (EFA), which provides rental and utilities assistance and food and hygiene vouchers, and the Insurance Premium Assistance Program (IPAP). The agency supports PLWH and their families through emergency financial assistance, training programs, and by supporting the HIV/AIDS service delivery workforce.16

Agency 3 reported their primary funding source (50%) is based on donations and partnerships; the remaining 50% is obtained through federal funds. In addition, they have staff size of 9 full-time employees and facilitate 4 community services programs with a participation rate of 885 clients based on 2013 data and annual reports.

**Key Themes**

The following presents the key themes that emerged from the data analysis of the three participating agencies. The primary theme is federal funding and the need to increase the amount of funds for social services. The second is the politicization of social services and its impact on the social service agencies.

---

Federal Funding

The research identified three factors that may impact federal budget allocations based on survey and interview responses. The three external factors as explicated in the findings are recession, elections (presidential, congressional and mayoral) and war.

Most of the federal budget deficit since 2008 is a direct result of the recession. A recession is defined as a period of temporary economic decline during which trade and industrial activity are reduced and generally identified by a fall in gross domestic product (GDP) in two successive quarters. This recession left millions of workers unemployed or underemployed, reducing tax receipts and requiring increased safety net spending. The temporary policy response to the recession such as the Recovery Act (2009) has added to the deficit, but will be withdrawn once the economy recovers.

The President of the United States influences the federal budget while individual congressmen bargain over the territorial distribution or redistribution of funds. This is critical because it determines how resources are distributed to their constituents. In relation to the city of Washington, D.C., the Mayor plays a critical role in the distribution of resources. The DC Fiscal Policy Institute reported that D.C. Mayors identify key issue areas to address and fund with each budget cycle. The research shows that in 2008, Mayor Vincent Gray prioritized funding for childcare, education, employment training,


energy assistance, health care, housing, interim disability assistance and temporary assistance for needy families. In 2013 and 2015 Mayors Gray and Bowser prioritized all the aforementioned, except child care while adding homeless services as a key issue. This supports the politicization of social services argument and how agencies are impacted based on mayoral elections in the District of Columbia.\(^\text{19}\) As local and federal elections occur, the focus on social services may change. U.S. Presidents are also tactical in the distribution of federal funds to the states. States that display large support for the presidential party tend to be rewarded. States where the governor belongs to the same party of the president receive more funds, while states that have a delegation in the House which is predominantly opposed to the President tend to be penalized.\(^\text{20}\)

In 2008, shortly after winning the Presidential Election, President Obama enacted the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, an economic stimulus package. The purpose of the act was to end the 2008 recession quickly by invigorating consumer spending, saving between 900,000 to 2.3 million jobs. Economic growth improved immediately and added 2.4 million private sector and 1.7 million government jobs in the first 18 months.\(^\text{21}\) The stimulus provided unprecedented fiscal relief to states and local agencies during the recession and its aftermath. The 2009 stimulus package awarded


approximately $145 billion to help states fill their budget gaps. The stimulus package also provided funds for highways infrastructure as well as education and other programs. The federal funds did not offset state and local revenue losses. States and localities relying on federal funds raised taxes, cut spending, or utilized reserved funds to close budget gaps. Most states cut spending; the areas predominantly impacted were education, health, and social services. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities reported that between fiscal years 2008-09 and 2010-11, 29 states cut services to the elderly and disabled, 31 states lowered health care expenditures, 34 states reduced expenditures in K-12 education, 43 states cut college and university expenditures, and 44 reduced employee compensation.22

An important impact of federal spending on the Iraq and Afghanistan wars has been to raise the nation’s indebtedness. The increased military spending following 9/11 was financed almost entirely by borrowing. Rising deficits have resulted in higher debt and higher debt-to-gross domestic product ratio. A good indicator of the sustainability of government spending is the ratio of federal debt held by the public to national income, or gross domestic product. This ratio increased over 36 percentage points between 2001 and 2011. The United States has funded its wars through debt and taxpayers have been burdened, or private sector and investments have been constrained. As a result, negative effects include higher taxes, larger budget deficits, and inflation. The overall macroeconomic effect on the economy tends to be negative, regardless of how a war is

The cost and the impact of the war against Iraq hit when most local and state governments were dealing with huge budget cuts. States and localities found themselves with a total of $40 billion in estimated current-year revenue shortfalls and a projected $60 billion shortfall for the next budget year. Many states scrambled to find funds to cover resources from Medicaid to mass transit, and from highways to basic social services.

The identified external budgetary factors were coupled with the corresponding years that indicate an increase or decrease in the federal budget. The researcher does not contend that this is an exhaustive list of factors that impacts the federal budget but does acknowledge the aforementioned are relevant to this study. Understanding the impact of the external factors provides some context that may explain budget surpluses and deficits. The impacts on the federal budget are considered consequences of an action and the identified actions in this study are recession, elections and war. This research highlights external factors by acknowledging the climate during the specific fiscal years covered in the study. Figure 1 represents the Federal Budget Authority by Function and Sub-function (Social Services/Education) from 1998 to 2013. The data is presented annually

---


with budget totals of percentage increases or decreases, and corresponding economic impact factors based on the study.

Figure 1. Federal Budget Authority by Function and Sub-function

| Federal Budget Authority by Function and Sub-function (Social Services/Education) |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| **Budget Totals** | **% (+/-)** | **Economic Impact Factors** |
| 1998 | $ 56,677.00 | 6% | DC Mayoral Election |
| 1999 | $ 55,491.00 | -2% | |
| 2000 | $ 49,477.00 | -12% | Recession/Presidential Election |
| 2001 | $ 63,509.00 | 22% | Recession |
| 2002 | $ 79,882.00 | 20% | War/DC Mayoral Election |
| 2003 | $ 87,652.00 | 9% | War |
| 2004 | $ 92,016.00 | 5% | War/Presidential Election |
| 2005 | $ 99,978.00 | 8% | War |
| 2006 | $ 125,802.00 | 21% | War/DC Mayoral Election |
| 2007 | $ 93,363.00 | -35% | Recession/War |
| 2008 | $ 91,344.00 | -2% | Recession/War/Presidential Election |
| 2009 | $ 167,555.00 | 45% | Recession/War |
| 2010 | $ 95,155.00 | -76% | War/DC Mayoral Election |
| 2011 | $ 76,539.00 | -24% | War |
| 2012 | $ 91,653.00 | 16% | War |
| 2013 | $ 71,170.00 | -29% | War |

To examine the research questions, survey and interview responses were coded and indexed utilizing QDA Miner software. Federal funding was identified as the independent variable for the qualitative analysis. Among the three participating agencies, two responded that 50% of their operating budget is based on federal funding. The third agency responded that 40% of its operating budget is federally funded. Survey and interview questions were developed to assess the impact of the faith-based initiative. The response from all three agencies emphasized funds/funding. The general concern is not focused on FBO’s but the limited amount of funds allotted for social services and the

https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/Historicals
saturated pool of agencies competing for those funds. The participating agencies stated that they have not witnessed any impact due to the faith-based initiative, direct or indirect, nor do they foresee any competition for funding. The greatest challenge is that there is an increase in the number of competitive entities seeking a limited amount of money and the politicalizing of social service issues.

**Politicalize**

The term politicalize is defined as to make become political. The participating agencies agree that often social services issues are politicalized, especially during elections. Social service funding may be redirected or reduced based on the focus of the elected officials. The preference of politicians for “pork barrel” or targeted spending has a long-documented history here in the United States. Officials use these direct resources to provide targetable resources (i.e. AIDS Research, Cancer Research) rather than high quality social services, and service delivery typically suffers. Electoral competitions and political decision-making have large effects on social services providers. Agencies elaborated on their greatest external challenges and the responses ranged from local to federal public policy. Agency 1 discussed how the New Communities initiative under Mayor Williams impacted the organization primarily through economics and gentrification. The agency saw a decline in participants from 5000 to 2500 due to

---


neighborhood changes. Agency 3 is currently examining how it will operate in the future due to the Affordable Healthcare Act, requiring healthcare coverage nationwide, thereby reducing the funding for preventive programs and services. Agency 2 expounded how New Federalism created a process for states to cipher “administrative fees” off the top, which basically served as an incentive for states to agree to go into block grant mode, thereby creating the question “what are administrative fees” and who gets them - the state or local operator/agency. The Obama administration has issued a federal mandate that states using federal funds must “assume” the administrative fees. This is a more direct impact. The potential impact of external forces on organizations was an important factor in examining the external factors in this study. Relationships with external entities can paint a different picture in connecting the agencies with the broader context of the environment. Agencies were asked to report any memberships in any national, state or local professional organizations or program certifications by a national or regional body. Two agencies in this study reported that 1 or more of their programs have local, state or national certification. The third agency reported no certification on any level. The two agencies with national/regional certification both reported a ten percent increase in funding. The research suggests that local, regional, state or national affiliations may provide larger financial support to agencies participating or providing specific programs and services.

In examining the theory of the “second-order devolution” through the implementation of the faith-based initiative, two agency officials indicated that they were familiar with the concept of devolution while one official was not. The idea of
“Devolution” being effective was not a concern shared among the participating agencies. Based on their responses, agency officials welcome the collaboration or partnership with FBO’s. All three agencies agree and do not foresee FBO’s assuming the majority of responsibility of social services. They are unanimous that providing services is a shared responsibility for all types of social service providers. All three agencies have worked with FBO’s and plan to continue to do so in the foreseeable future, even as the FBO’s continue to grow and potentially may compete for funding. Agency 2 and 3 contend that the Faith-Based initiative provides a unique method for social service delivery, while Agency 1 dissents. Agencies indicated that they are plagued with other factors that are more immediate than the faith-based initiative. Each agency has outlined the greatest socio-economic factors that impact their agencies. Agencies 1 and 2 had similar factors such as public policy, education/training, and economics. In addition, Agency 1 also indicated gentrification. Agency 2 stated the ability to get funders to pay for overhead, global economy and the technological boom. All three agencies emphasized elections and the recession. The study sought to identify internal as well as external factors that may impact the agencies’ operations and uncovered demographic shifts. The shifts are relevant to agencies’ programs and funding. Agencies 1 and 2 have experienced significant changes in organizational operations and clientele participation, specifically with the elimination of public housing and the current impact of gentrification. Agency 1 has experienced the greatest impact, resulting in the loss of more than half of their clients, programs and staff. Agency 1 is currently restructuring in an attempt to expand their service delivery beyond their intended community. Because a nearby elementary school
closed, the agency lost a pivotal afterschool program and the associated funding due to the lack of student participation.

Examining the personnel data provided by all three agencies, they each contend that any reduction in staff has no relationship to the faith-based initiative. Internal and external factors unrelated to the faith-based initiative have resulted in the elimination of programs, personnel and a reduction in funding. This is a critical element in analyzing the increases or decreases relevant to an agency’s funding. All three agencies contend that poor public education/training and organizational changes such as staff termination, leadership tenure and institutional knowledge are the primary factors that result in reduction of staff, funding and program elimination. In addition, agencies were asked if they lost funds for a specific program or if they decided not apply due to new federal or state regulations/guidelines. The researcher did not ask the participating agencies how many grants they receive pre- and post-implementation of the faith-based initiative. However, only two agency officials stated that during their tenure, they each have opted not to reapply for at least one grant – Agency 1: the 21 Century Grant, due to other reasons not related to FBI (gentrification-loss of local community participants) and Agency 2: the DC Office on Aging Grant because in 2009, the office reduced the original award and promised supplemental funding that never arrived. The agency lost 60 staff people who were hired by another non-profit that accepted the award and has since gone out of business.

The reduction in programs, services, funding and personnel with the participating agencies in this study share similar causal links. There is an overwhelming similarity and
acknowledgement of events that have shaped the outcomes of each agency. Several contributing factors such as elected officials and funding have an overwhelming impact on NBSSO’s. While there were many complex factors that could have an impact on NBSSO, the participating agencies all agree that the faith-based initiative is not a contributing factor. However, the data analysis highlights two dominant themes: federal funding and the politicization of social services.

The influence of elected officials has impacted all three agencies. Agency 1 explained how in 2005, during the tenure of Washington D.C. Mayor Anthony Williams, 14 areas were identified as “hot spots” under the New Communities Initiative. Agency 1 is in one of those spots, and as result of the initiative, community public housing was closed, residents dispersed and a local community school was closed. As Darrow Montgomery noted in a Washington City Paper article on October 29, 2014, “the initial plan to relocate current residents back into the area has not occurred and the initiative has failed.” The changes within the community resulted in lower clientele participation and reduction of programs, services and staff.

Agency 2 emphasized that bureaucratic decisions and processes impact agency operations, particularly the assessment of “administrative fees” in awarding block grants. This type of fee impacts the agency by reducing the amount of actual funds received to provide the necessary services, resulting in less staff being hired and fewer clients being served. However, agencies should receive relief as President Obama has issued a federal mandate requiring that states using federal funds must assume the administrative fees. Government policies too often impede, rather than enhance, collaborative efforts. This
was evident in the implementation of the Affordable Healthcare Act, which has decreased the clientele for Agency 3. Because of the implementation, many more people are getting the necessary healthcare needed earlier, thereby relying less on the programs and services of Agency 3. The Affordable Healthcare Act has forced the agency to seek and expand the services it provides. There are enough conclusive links that exist between the federal funding and the politicization of social services to deduce that there is a significant connection. However, the research does not present any findings or evidence that is linked to the faith-based initiative.

Several researchers supported the use of RD theory and Neo-institutional theory for analyzing social service organizations. The theories are based on open systems perspectives that are philosophically grounded in the functional paradigm of organizational analysis. This represents one area where the theories overlap. Another area where the two theories overlap includes the organizations need to seek legitimacy from the environment for survival and the influence and probable constraint of environmental influences on the organization. This study, utilizing RD theory, supports the hypothesis that organizations are deeply embedded in their broader environment. All three agencies have expressed how they have been impacted based on external and internal factors. The factors impacted who the agencies service, the type of services provided and the level of efficiency in providing those services. They are aware of change, and how changes coupled with uncertainty can threaten their survival and

efficacy. Second, agencies provided data that explicate how and why they respond to uncertainty based on their resources, staff and program reduction/elimination, leadership changes or organizational restructuring.

The neo-institutional theory was utilized because it is analytic in nature and it focuses on how the institutional environment shapes the non-profit sector. Neo-institutionalism seeks to explain things, not just describe them. The participating agencies explained how they have been impacted based on elections, politicization and budgetary constraints. Secondly, it does not seek to understand institutions, but does want to understand the role(s) they play in the creation of social occurrences such as public policies and economic development. Per the analysis, the participating agencies contend that they do not play or have a cemented role in the creation of social occurrences.

**Quantitative Analysis**

Quantitative analysis was also performed and conducted in several steps and all tests were performed at the 95% confidence level ($\alpha = .05$). To investigate the research question, “What is the impact of the federal faith-based initiative on non-religious based social service organizations in terms of budget, staff, programs and participants?” descriptive statistics were calculated and statistical tests were performed. ANOVA and multiple regression analysis were used to investigate this research question.

Yearly data was collected from three non-religious based social service organizations, including their budget totals, total personal employed, the number of operating programs, and clientele participation. The yearly federal budget allotment for social service programs was also collected. Data was collected during the three periods of

Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, were calculated for each dependent variable, including budget totals, total personnel employed, the number of operating programs, and clientele participation for three non-religious based social service organizations, Agency 1, Agency 2, and Agency 3.

Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations during the pre-implementation, implementation, and post-implementation periods. No data was available for Agency 1 during the four-year pre-implementation period, from 1998 to 2001. For Figure 1, the mean annual budget for Agency 1 for the implementation period from 2002 to 2007 was $54,268 (SD = $21,091). Additionally, the mean annual budget for Agency 1 for the post-implementation period, from 2008 to 2013, was $165,906 (SD = $157,060). No data was available on the number of personnel employed by Agency 1 during the pre-implementation and implementation periods. During the post-implementation period, there was an annual mean of 34.5 employees employed by Agency 1 (SD = 2.5). No data was available on the number of programs at Agency 1 for the pre-implementation period. There was a yearly mean of 18.8 programs (SD = 1.8) programs at Agency 1 during the implementation period and a yearly mean of 14.5 programs (SD = 5.0) at Agency 1 during the post-implementation period. During the pre-implementation period, there was a yearly mean of 349.0 participants (SD = 203.6), during the implementation period, there was a yearly mean of 1739.8 participants (SD = 1119.9), and during the post-implementation period, there was a yearly mean of 1351.3 participants (SD = 350.8).
The mean annual budget for Agency 2 during the pre-implementation period was $13,758,829 (SD = $1,487,238). During the implementation period and the post-implementation period, the mean annual budget for Agency 2 was $18,300,443 (SD = $646,347) and $20,660,878 (SD = $2,700,580), respectively. No data was available on the number of personnel employed at Agency 2 during the pre-implementation and implementation periods. There was an annual mean of 371.0 (SD = 27.5) personnel employed by Agency 2 during the post-implementation period. There was no data on the number of programs at Agency 2 during the pre-implementation period. During the implementation and post-implementation periods, the mean number of programs at Agency 2 was 6.8 (SD = .4) and 6.2 (SD = .4), respectively. There was no data on the number of participants at Agency 2 during the pre-implementation and the implementation periods. The mean number of annual participants at Agency 2 during the post-implementation period was 89870.6 (SD = 8452.3).

The mean annual budget for Agency 3 during the pre-implementation period was $2,600,860 (SD = $1,791,881). During the implementation period and the post-implementation period, the mean annual budget for Agency 3 was $1,625,266 (SD = $327,199) and $1,511,176 (SD = $382,454), respectively. No data was available on the number of personnel employed at Agency 3 during the pre-implementation and implementation periods. There was an annual mean of 6.5 (SD = .9) personnel employed by Agency 3 during the post-implementation period. There was no data on the number of programs at Agency 3 during the pre-implementation period. During the implementation and post-implementation periods, the mean number of programs at Agency 3 was 1.5 (SD
108

= .5) and 2.7 (SD = .8), respectively. There was no data on the number of participants at Agency 3 during the pre-implementation and the implementation periods. The mean number of annual participants at Agency 3 during the post-implementation period was 107.6 (SD = 63.8).

Table 2. Description of the Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Implementation</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Post-Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 1</td>
<td>$54,268</td>
<td>$21,091</td>
<td>$165,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 2</td>
<td>$13,758,829</td>
<td>$1,487,238</td>
<td>$18,300,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 3</td>
<td>$2,600,860</td>
<td>$1,791,881</td>
<td>$1,625,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 1</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 2</td>
<td>371.0</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>371.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participants in Those Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 1</td>
<td>349.0</td>
<td>203.6</td>
<td>1739.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 2</td>
<td>89870.6</td>
<td>8452.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 3</td>
<td>107.6</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete data for all three periods was available for the annual budgets for Agency 2, and Agency 3, the number of programs for Agency 1, and the number of participants for Agency 1; ANOVA was used to determine if there were statistically significant differences in these variables between the pre-implementation, implementation, and post-implementation periods.

ANOVA was performed to determine if there were statistically significant changes in the budgets of Agency 2 and Agency 3 among the pre-implementation, implementation, and post-implementation periods. First, the changes in annual budgets for Agency 2 were analyzed. According to Levene’s test, data met statistical requirements for ANOVA analysis, $F(2,11) = 1.82, p = .21$. Table 2 shows the results of the ANOVA
analysis. ANOVA analysis revealed that there were statistically significant differences in the annual budget among the pre-implementation, implementation, and post-implementation periods, $F(2, 11) = 7.81, p = .008$. Post-Hoc pair-wise Least Significant Differences t-tests were performed. There was a statistically significant increase in the annual budgets of Agency 3 between the pre-implementation and the post-implementation periods, $p = .003$ and a statistically significant increase between the pre-implementation and implementation periods, $p = .03$. However, there were no statistically significant differences between the implementation and post-implementation periods, $p = .06$.

Table 3. ANOVA Table for Agency 2 Budget Between the Pre-Implementation, Implementation, and Post-Implementation Periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F$ - statistic</th>
<th>$p$ - value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency 2 Budget</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences in annual budgets for Agency 3 were analyzed between the pre-implementation, implementation, and post-implementation periods using ANOVA. According to Levene’s test, data met statistical requirements for ANOVA analysis, $F(2, 11) = .47, p = .64$. Table 3 shows the results of the ANOVA analysis. ANOVA analysis revealed that there were no statistically significant differences in the annual budget among the pre-implementation, implementation, and post-implementation periods, $F (2, 11) = .17, p = .85$. 
Table 4. ANOVA Table for Agency 3 Budget Between the Pre-Implementation, Implementation, and Post-Implementation Periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F-statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency 3 Budget</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences in the number of programs for Agency 3 were analyzed between the pre-implementation, implementation, and post-implementation periods using ANOVA. According to Levene’s test, data met statistical requirements for ANOVA analysis, $F(2,11) = .97, p = .61$. Table 4 shows the results of the ANOVA analysis. ANOVA analysis revealed that there were no statistically significant differences in the number of programs among the pre-implementation, implementation, and post-implementation periods, $F(2,11) = 2.27, p = .15$.

Table 5. ANOVA Table for Agency 1 Number of Programs Between the Pre-Implementation, Implementation, and Post-Implementation Periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F-statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency 1 Number of Programs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences in the number of participants for Agency 1 were analyzed between the pre-implementation, implementation, and post-implementation periods using ANOVA. According to Levene’s test, data met statistical requirements for ANOVA analysis, $F(2,11) = 2.49, p = .13$. Table 5 shows the results of the ANOVA analysis. ANOVA analysis revealed that there were no statistically significant differences in the
number of participants among the pre-implementation, implementation, and post-implementation periods, $F(2,11) = 2.31, p = .15$.

Table 6. ANOVA Table for Agency 1 Number of Participants Between the Pre-Implementation, Implementation, and Post-Implementation Periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F$-statistic</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency 1 Number of Participants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression analysis was also performed to determine if there were statistically significant differences in annual budgets for Agency 2 and Agency 3, the number of programs for Agency 1, and the number of participants for Agency 1, controlling for the size of the yearly federal budget allotment for social service programs. First, differences in the budgets of Agency 2 among the pre-implementation, implementation, and post-implementation periods, controlling for the federal budget, were investigated. Regression analysis with the budget of Agency 2 as the dependent variable and the implementation period and federal budget allotment as the independent variables was performed. The model was statistically significant, $R^2 = .74$, $F(3,12) = 11.09, p = .001$. There was a statistically significant increase in annual budgets between the pre-implementation period and the post-implementation period controlling for the annual federal budget allotment, $\beta = .93, t(12) = 3.98, p = .002$. There was also a statistically significant increase in annual budgets between the pre-implementation period and the implementation period controlling for the federal budget allotment, $\beta = .58, t(12) = 2.52, p = .03$. However, there was no statistically significant difference in annual
budgets between the implementation period and the post-implementation period controlling for the annual federal budget allotment, $\beta = .35$, $t(12) = 2.13, p = .05$.

Second, differences in the budgets of Agency 3 among the pre-implementation, implementation, and post-implementation periods, controlling for the federal budget allotment, were investigated. Regression analysis with the budget of Agency 3 as the dependent variable and the implementation period and federal budget allotment as the independent variables was performed. Neither the implementation period nor the federal budget allotment was statistically significant, $R^2 = .49$, $F(3,12) = 1.26, p = .33$.

Third, differences in the number of programs in Agency 1 among the pre-implementation, implementation, and post-implementation periods, controlling for the federal budget allotment, were investigated. Regression analysis with the number of programs in Agency 1 as the dependent variable and the implementation period and federal budget allotment as the independent variables was performed. Neither the implementation period nor the federal budget allotment was statistically significant, $R^2 = .30$, $F(3,10) = 1.26, p = .29$.

Finally, differences in the number of participants for Agency 1 among the pre-implementation, implementation, and post-implementation periods, controlling for the federal budget allotment, were investigated. Regression analysis with the number of participants in Agency 1 as the dependent variable and the implementation period and federal budget allotment as the independent variables was performed. Neither the implementation period nor the federal budget allotment was statistically significant, $R^2 = .33$, $F(3,10) = 1.65, p = .24$. 
Results

The qualitative and quantitative analyses in this chapter are consistent with a basic methodological assumption of RD theory, namely that an organization’s resource dependence relationship to its broader environment is an important factor in understanding how it responds to external and internal factors. Neo-institutionalism theory seeks to explain how the participating agencies have been impacted. The findings in this study detail how the agencies contend they have been impacted based on elections, politicization and budgetary constraints. However, the analyses suggest that agency responses to internal and external impacts are not completely reducible to an agency’s resources.

The qualitative findings of this study indicate that there is no direct or indirect impact on the NBSSOs since the implementation of the faith-based initiative. In addition, the analysis discovered two overarching themes embedded in the study: federal funding (the need to increase the amount of funds for social services) and the politicization of social services (its impact on the social service agencies). However, the agencies contend that with the influx of social service providers competing for limited funds that it is imperative to increase funding for social services programming. Although FBO’s have a unique place as social service providers, the participating agencies do not support the ideology of shifting majority services to FBO’s. The findings also indicate that a “second-order of devolution” is unsupported.

Data was also analyzed quantitatively. Descriptive statistics for study measures were calculated. Relationships were also investigated using ANOVA and regression
analyses were performed for those measures for which data from all three periods, pre-implementation, implementation, and post-implementation, was available. Complete data was obtained for the following measures: annual budgets for Agency 2 and Agency 3, the number of programs for Agency 1, and the number of participants for Agency 1.

ANOVA showed there was a statistically significant increase in the annual budgets of Agency 3 between the pre-implementation and the post-implementation periods, and a statistically significant increase in annual budgets between the pre-implementation and implementation periods. However, there was no statistically significant difference in annual budgets between the implementation and post-implementation periods. There were also no statistically significant differences in annual budgets of Agency 2 among the implementation periods. Additionally, there were no statistically significant differences in the number of programs for Agency 1 or the number of participants for Agency 1 among the implementation periods.

Regression analysis was performed to examine the relationship between implementation period and the dependent variables, while controlling the effects of annual federal allotment. There was a statistically significant increase in annual budgets between the pre-implementation period and the post-implementation periods, controlling for the federal annual budget allotment. There was also a statistically significant increase in annual budgets between the pre-implementation period and the implementation period, controlling for the federal annual budget allotment. However, there was no statistically significant difference in annual budgets between the implementation period and the post-implementation period, controlling for the annual federal budget allotment.
Additionally, there were no statistically significant differences in the annual budgets for Agency 3, the number of programs for Agency 1, and the number of participants for Agency 1, while controlling for the federal annual budget allotment.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine the impact of the faith-based initiative on three NBSSOs in Washington D.C. The impetus for this study was that research examining the impact of the faith-based initiative on NBSSOs presents a significant research gap. The public policy research and evaluation surrounding the faith-based initiative was limited to the actual and potential outcomes for predominately religious organizations.¹ Political science scholars did not place significant focus on the faith-based initiative until around 2005. The study is warranted because of the lack of research into how the NBSSOs have been affected since the implementation of the faith-based initiative. This research on the faith-based initiative and its impact provides scholars and policy makers with data and information in determining how the NSSBOs have been affected by the implementation of the faith-based initiative and if this policy signifies the “second-order of devolution.” Through the perspective of the agencies’ leadership, the research exposed contextual themes, which frame the impact of the faith-based initiative and expound on the “second-order of devolution theory.”

In this chapter, the structure begins with a general overview of the study, summarizes the research conducted by re-establishing the major findings, delves deeper into specific findings, and articulates mixed methods, future research and conclusion.

**Findings**

The mixed method analysis is consistent with the basic methodological assumption of RD theory and Neo-institutionalism theory. The analysis indicates that agency responses to internal and external impacts are not completely reducible to an agency’s resources. The data did not reveal any evidence or effect of the Faith-Based initiative on NBSSOs in Washington, D.C. Only two of the three agencies interviewed were familiar with the faith-based initiative. While all participants acknowledged the benefits of the initiative, none experienced any of the potential effects of the initiative: competition or loss of funding, reduced clientele or programs and services. The data in this study also revealed that there are two important factors which affect NBSSOs: politicization and federal funding. Politicization can result in funds and programming being shifted based on the agenda of elected officials. Federal funding allocations can determine agency operations: staffing, programs and services.

All interviews except for Agency 3 were conducted face-to-face. The attempt to meet with Agency 3 was exhaustive and only after several missed appointments was the telephone interview option offered to move toward the completion of the interview process.

The survey used presented some challenges that were discovered during pretesting such as the number of questions asked and the detailed response needed to
answer the questions. They may have posed a problem for some participants, contributing to the missing data in the responses. Missing data was a notable problem during the survey as well as during the case study research. Initially, all questions were required to be answered completely before completion, but this was revised during pretesting to allow for greater participation and quicker completion. Although some questions were skipped during the interview, the researcher would repeat the skipped questions during the face-to-face interviews to document a formal response. In addition to missing responses on the web-based survey, the researcher encountered some difficulty in collecting the necessary statistical data needed. The agencies participating in the study each expressed issues with the lack of funding and capacity to maintain effective records management. Although federal mandate requires all agencies who receive federal funding to maintain records for a period up to seven years, the participating agencies did not retain comprehensive data for the specified periods.

The overall findings in the study do not support the “second-order of devolution” as suggested by R. P. Nathan and T. Gais. The authors contended that this “second-order of devolution” would create various models of welfare system and collaborations with religious organizations. The research finds that the creation of various models of welfare systems and collaborations has not occurred. The primary rationale is the lack of faith-based organizations willing to participate in the faith-based initiative. The organizations

---

contend that with receiving government funding comes government restraints.\textsuperscript{3} Devolution is complicated with additional factors such as term limits for elected officials that potentially result in reduced legislative expertise and experience and the creation of untested policies.\textsuperscript{4}

**Specific Findings**

The study revealed that the election of public officials has impacted the agencies’ operations ranging from resource allocation to social service issue prioritization. Elections (local and federal) have impacted several areas but specific to this study, the impacted areas are federal funding and public policy. Elected officials, as mentioned by the agencies, have the power to shift funding from existing programs and propose/create policy specific to their platform. Agency 3 elaborated on how the Affordable Healthcare Act reorganized the delivery of healthcare, but the Act also reduced funding to provide social services.

Public policy, as defined by Thomas Dyes, is what governments do, why they do it and what difference it makes.\textsuperscript{5} All three agency officials discussed the implications of public policy on their respective agencies. The public policies mentioned in the study


were implemented to help the community, but the research shows predominance in creating barriers for agencies’ operations. Agency 1 suffered clientele loss and program elimination due to the redevelopment under “New Communities” and gentrification. Agency 2 acknowledged that policies surrounding administrative fees from block grants (and who is responsible for the administrative fees) have impacted agency operations and program implementation. Lastly, Agency 3 discussed how the Affordable Healthcare Act has forced the agency to examine other areas of social service delivery because of mandated nationwide insurance coverage with people receiving care, thereby reducing the agency’s clientele and services. Research indicates that due to political influence and lack of collaboration between social service and government agencies, the participants have all endured a steady decline in clients, programs and services.

Policymakers typically operate within sub-committees, departments, and agencies that result in loyalty to specific issues and funding streams. Not all problems are resolved by narrow, targeted responses; many are better addressed through simultaneous action by multiple offices. Government agencies working in silos are counterproductive. Moreover, policymakers lack clear information about what types of collaborative actions are even allowed. Non-profit organizations implement and legitimize public policy indirectly by operating as a public policy apparatus of the state and executing government policies as a non-formal extension of government. Social service agencies operate as a “Shadow State,” mediating the relationship between the government and citizens.6

Many scholars argue that TANF, under the system of New Federalism, could be labeled the most effective example of contemporary social services. TANF has been a rare bright spot in US anti-poverty policy as programs have generated strong gains in poverty reduction and employment. Its block grants and federal-state partnership approach recognizes the federal government’s obligation to help tailor responses to address the local needs of constituents. The program’s extensive requirement of state accountability, performance, and expanded administrative flexibility helped to raise the labor force from 59.5 percent in 1995 to 73.8 for unwed mothers in 2001, as well as reduced the poverty rate from 51 percent to 38.5 percent during the same period.

TANF is not solely funded by the federal government but also by the states, which must document a certain amount of nonfederal funding to avoid losing part of their state family assistance allotments. States can receive federal support through the contingency fund if they spend more than their allotment. To meet TANF’s goal in 2013, states reported spending about $15 billion of nonfederal money on service. State and federal funds support the same array of TANF services. The states have considerable latitude in determining the mix of cash assistance, work support, and other services that it provides. However, states can lose federal funding if families receiving cash assistance in work-related activities participation rate is low. Therefore, states impose work
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requirements on recipients of cash assistance. In addition, recipients who receive federal funds are subject to federal limits on how long they are eligible for cash assistance. The time and work requirements are intended to achieve one of TANF’s goals: ending recipients’ dependence on government benefits.9 This study expounds on the impact that New Federalism has had on social service agencies. Agency 2 was specific in citing that New Federalism is marred in bureaucratic processes that have adverse effects on the overall operations of the agency. New Federalism is a mixed blessing with increased flexibility of federal funds and less attention given to pitfalls and issues. Public attention has focused on the opportunity devolution presents for states to creatively meet their expanding needs as well as acknowledge issues such as choosing between raising taxes, reducing services, and intensified funding competition.10 The problem with how states address their policies is complicated by several other factors including potential term limits for legislators and the subsequent reduction of legislative expertise and reduced familiarity of policy making while enhancing the opportunity for the adoption of new, untested policies. Most states have constitutional or statutory spending or revenue limits, and the limitations could present formidable barriers to state efforts to offset reduced

---


dependence on federal funds.\textsuperscript{11} The findings expound on the political elements of politicization, federal funding, public policy and devolution (new federalism).

**Mixed-Methods**

Overall, the qualitative findings from this study support the quantitative findings in the data results. The survey results showed that 100\% of the participating agencies were not impacted by the faith-based initiative. The case study findings supported the results that all participants were impacted by politicization and federal funding. The data shows the factors that impact the agencies the most are external, which will eventually affect internal operations. The results show a clear path of causal links and how those links have impacted the agencies, ranging from program elimination to services and staff reduction.

This research study contributes new knowledge about the impact of the faith-based initiative and expounds on the "second order of devolution." It is not a surprise that the faith-based initiative has had no impact on NBSSOs. Per author Steven Gold, religious organizations are hesitant to receive government funding; therefore, competition for funding is limited and the effects of devolution minimal. Faith-based agencies are reluctant to receive federal funds for fear of federal regulations and constraints.\textsuperscript{12}


\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
addition, the federal budget for social services is steadily decreasing. The researcher does not contend to provide an exhaustive list of factors that impact the federal budget, but does acknowledge the three external factors relevant to this study: recession, elections (presidential, congressional and mayoral) and war (foreign policy). As a result, agencies are forced to evolve and alter their organizational operations to survive as indicated by the participants.

This study revealed that the impact on NBSSOs is based on their external environment, not relative to the faith-based initiative. This finding means that the agencies are not involved in the broader decision making environment. All participants expressed how they have been impacted by either local or federal public policies. The findings support that social service agencies join policy networks. These networks consist of public, private, voluntary, or community-based organizations that interact to determine and to implement public policy on substantive issues. Network members may include elected or appointed officials, policy analysts, lobbyists, staff members, business leaders, professional associations and other non-profit organizations. Policy network members typically share a common belief system or at least a common understanding of the underlying nature of the policy problem they are attempting to resolve.

Policy networks have been a new intervention of the inclusive governance between state agencies and other sectors to increase participation in the policy process at the local level. The multi-


stakeholders all react positively to optimize their performance together. Evidence finds that policy networks can alter the behavior of both federal and state agencies by changing their attitude and their method of working from a top-down approach to a bottom up approach.\textsuperscript{15} The civic and social service groups that participate in policy networks have transformed their relationship with federal and state regulators. These networks have resulted in the transformation of local governance by promoting civic and public participation, enhancing local accountability and creating direct political opportunity. Policy networks can complement federal regulations and enhance bureaucratic outputs in areas that impact social service agencies.\textsuperscript{16} Research shows that policy network performance can be effective and assessed by dividing it into three dimensions: product, process and perception of performance.\textsuperscript{17}

Examining the effectiveness of the faith-based initiative is a challenge, primarily because researchers have each defined it differently. Research on the effectiveness of faith-based services has been limited, but is a prominent factor in the debate about the faith-based initiative. Media reports have proclaimed program successes based on general roles rather than rigorous research and evaluation.\textsuperscript{18} Scholars argue that faith-based


providers are effective, but they also note methodological limitations such as failure to identify how the faith element results in positive client outcomes, dependence on cross-sectional designs and descriptive analysis. The impact of the faith-based initiative is varied based on circumstances such as but not limited to local or state implementation, funding and participating agencies.

The theory of the “second-order devolution” through the implementation of the faith-based initiative provides no support of being effective. The findings of the study support the decrease of clients, services, and programs that are irrelevant to the faith-based initiative; however, it does find a correlation to politicization and federal funding. Based on participant responses, they welcome collaborations and partnerships. Society has very little faith in federal bureaucracy today and puts more trust in their state and local officials. The public resents big-government but resists giving up government programs and benefits. The fiscal imperatives of devolution, coupled with deregulation and privatization, will force states to work more closely with local governments, businesses, civic leaders, non-profit institutions, and other states. Devolution and its focus on decentralization have been a recent expression of how power should be divided.


This may increase lobbying in state capitols, county courthouses, and city halls as state and local governments assume more policy and fiscal responsibility.\textsuperscript{21}

There are political, administrative, and philosophical reasons devolution has proven to be ineffective, which are explicated in this study. All devolutionary plans would create winners and losers. State officials are a powerful group with much to lose, especially if devolution proves to be effective because of the uncertainty of federal assistance provided to the states. Many may persuasively argue that economically and/or constitutionally, the programs should be developed and administered at the state or local level. Unfunded mandates are particularly appealing to elected federal policymakers because they further popular cause without requiring the federal taxpayers to pay for compliance.\textsuperscript{22}

There is no evidence of wide-scale devolution although there are signs indicating a restoration of some state powers and balancing federal-state relations. It is difficult to predict the outcome if such rebalancing occurs. There is no rationale to expect that substantial devolution will occur at the anticipated rate as proposed by Congressional Republicans.\textsuperscript{23}


**Future Research**

This dissertation examines the impact of the faith-based initiative and the foretelling of devolution. Subsequently, the research presents several opportunities to expand on this research in the future. The researcher presents three considerations that could contribute to an expansion of research on the impact of the faith-based initiative.

1. Increasing the research population size would be beneficial in enhancing the external validity of the findings. The current research design included three NBSSOs that were carefully selected and offered differences because of location, services and variation in size. Study expansion in number and location would allow for further investigations of the impact of the faith-based initiative on NBSSOs.

2. Another potential path for further research would be to narrow the research population and conduct a more detailed case study in one geographic location. This study would include multiple face-to-face structured interviews with clients, staff and leadership over a 2-month period. Utilizing participant-observation strategies in a case-study may provide greater familiarity with the organizational culture and assessing the impact of the faith-based initiative.

3. Lastly, researchers may consider conducting a state-to-state or city-to-city comparison. Several states and cities have faith-based offices and have established specific guidelines for faith-based initiatives. Since states use different methods to implement social service programs, it would be interesting to examine the contrasts, if any exist.
This dissertation addresses a gap in the study of examining the impact of the faith-based initiatives of NBSSOs. While the research findings enhance our understanding of the implication of politicization and federal funding in Washington, D.C. on NBSSOs, each of the proposed future options would support a more complete assessment of the impact of the faith-based initiative.

**Conclusion**

Once again, the purpose of this study was to examine the impact of the faith-based initiative on NBSSOs, in addition to determining if the proposed theory “second-order of devolution” is evident. The research was bound within the context of examining the overall impact by researching decreases or increases in funding, implementation or elimination of services delivered, coupled with the growth or decline of clients for a specific time frame. This timeframe provided grounded research that pre-dates the implementation of the faith-based initiative over a fifteen-year period. Survey responses and reports submitted by agency officials supplied the data for this study. The ANOVA and multiple regression analysis were used to report the results pertaining to this study.

There were two main findings regarding the first research question. The agencies were impacted by politicization and federal funding. The second research question provided no evidence of the creation of various models of welfare systems and collaborations; therefore, the theory of the “second-order of devolution” has no momentum to be effective. Findings from this study may assist public policy makers and scholars as they work to implement and examine public policies. This study finds that there is no impact from the implementation of the faith-based initiative on NBSSOs. The
faith-based initiative is a viable and creative policy that is needed in an effort to provide services to underserved communities. However, it should not attempt to replace or reduce traditional social services organizations. The impetus should be to collaborate and partner with existing organizations and not perpetuate the fear of the elimination of services or create a tax burden for states, local municipalities or individuals. There is a strong need to strengthen traditional social services. The former Director of the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, Jim Towey, stated that the primary objective of the faith-based initiative was to “change the culture of how religious groups are treated in the public square” and therefore, the initiative has succeeded. The researcher disagrees with Towey’s statement of success and instead agrees with Steven Gold that devolution has not yielded the anticipated results at the rate hoped by Republicans. Most of the programs and agencies identified for elimination survived with some reduced funding. Medicaid was not block granted and the main core programs of the welfare state, Social Security and Medicare, were not threatened in any important way.\textsuperscript{24} In addition, faith-based organizations, as stated previously, remain hesitant to apply for federal funds for fear of federal regulations. The policies and practices that make up the faith-based initiative at the state level have not accomplished what was originally promised. Success is measured by the creation of symbolic policies, political alliances and new political

relationships. Many people view the relationship between church and state as a new phenomenon; however, it is not. The federal government has supported various agencies throughout history such as the American Missionary Association and the Freedman’s Bureau who worked closely with religious organizations. In the 1899 case of Bradford v. Roberts, the Supreme Court ruled that because the proposed hospital would serve a secular purpose and service all people that its religious affiliation didn’t matter thereby allowing the use of the appropriated funds from the District of Columbia to construct isolation wards for a Catholic Hospital. The relationship between government and religious agencies continued to develop in the form of programs such as disaster and famine relief. Government assistance to religious agencies took various forms such as development grants, reimbursement of shipping cost for relief materials, and gifts of government surplus food and property. In the 1960’s, the World Church Service that operated within the National Council of Churches reported a budget of 41 million dollars and sixty-five percent was funded by the federal government. President Bush’s faith-based initiative builds on the various forms of social programs that have existed for over two centuries in America. History demonstrates the cooperation between government and religious organizations prior to the implementation of the faith-based initiative.


The future of the faith-based initiative is truly uncertain as it has been met with resistance from Congress and legal challenges, where the status quo between church and state was interrupted by the media and intense public scrutiny. The research presented in this study provides no evidence of impact on non-religious social service organizations, but it does acknowledge the space for FBO’s to operate. More importantly, the study provided an argument in support of the initiative and the need for cross collaborations and partnerships. Americans may benefit from the increased services provided by faith-based organizations. The future of the faith-based initiative and its full impact are uncertain because it is unknown how states or local municipalities will operate in times of recession – by eliminating programs and services or raising local taxes.\footnote{27. House Budget Committee, The Potential Impact of Devolution on State Government Programs and Finance, Steven Gold, Washington, D.C., March 5, 1996, accessed August 1, 2013, http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/70306/900290-The-Potential-Impacts-of-Devolution-on-State-Government-Programs-and-Finances.pdf; Ryan Houston, “Jefferson, Washington & The Future of Faith-Based Initiatives” in A Dialogue on Presidential Challenges and Leadership, ed. Alex J. Douville and Parry K. Vanlandingham (Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress: Washington, D.C. 2010), 398.} The variables are endless and the outcome unpredictable.
APPENDIX A

PERMISSION TO CONDUCT STUDY LETTER

Dear Mr. X:

I am writing to request permission to conduct a research study at Inter City Family Service. I am currently enrolled in the Political Science Degree at Clark Atlanta University in Atlanta GA, and am in the process of writing my dissertation. The study is currently entitled The Impact of the Faith-Based Initiative on Non-Religious Social Service Organizations.

I hope that you will allow me to review archival financial, employment, service delivery data and conduct interviews, as well as surveys.

If approval is granted, participants will complete the survey in a quiet setting on site. The survey process should take no longer than 10-15 minutes. The survey results will be pooled for the dissertation project and individual results of this study will remain absolutely confidential and anonymous. Should this study be published, only pooled results will be documented. No costs will be incurred by either your school/center or the individual participants.

Your approval to conduct this study will be greatly appreciated. I will follow up with a telephone call next week and would be happy to answer any questions or concerns that you may have at that time. You may contact me at my email address: hatchett71@aol.com.

If you agree, kindly sign below and return the signed form in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. Alternatively, kindly submit a signed letter of permission on your institution’s letterhead acknowledging your consent and permission for me to conduct this survey/study at your institution.

Sincerely,

Timothy L. Hatchett
Ph.D. Candidate
Clark-Atlanta University

Enclosures

Approved by:

_________  ___________  ______
Print your name and title here  Signature  Date
APPENDIX B
AGENCY SURVEY AND INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Since religious organizations are eligible for social service funding, how has your organization been impacted since the implementation of the Faith-Based Initiative?

2. What is the greatest challenge in the competition of funds between social service and religious organizations?

3. Has your organization ever elected not to re-apply for federal funds that they were receiving? If so, please explicate when and why?

4. Do you see faith-based organizations providing the majority of the responsibility of social services? Who should be responsible and why?

5. What is the potential impact of your agency on the community you service and where do you see your organization?

6. What is the five to ten-year outlook for your organization?

7. What are the internal factors that have impacted your organization the most? Are any relative to the Faith Based Initiative or New Federalism (return of services to the state)?

8. What are the external factors that have impacted your organization the most? Are any relative to the Faith-Based Initiative or New Federalism (return of services to the state)?
9. What is your primary position in the organization?

10. How many years have you been with this agency?

11. What percentage of your programing or operational budget is supported with direct or indirect federal funds?

12. Is your organization classified as a Non-religious (social service) organization?

13. Which best describes the nature of your organization? (Check only one response)
   a. Non-profit Incorporated in Washington, DC
   b. Non-profit with 501(3) Internal Revenue status only
   c. Non-profit not Incorporated and without 501 (3) status
   d. Government or Quasi-governmental
   e. Other

14. Is your organization, or any program of your organization, affiliated or a member of any national or local professional organization (i.e. Community Development Alliance, etc.)?

15. Does your organization or any programs have national, regional or local certifications?

Face-to-Face Interview Questions

1. Are you familiar with the Faith-Based Initiative under Charitable Choice? Were you aware that some churches/FBO’s compete for social service program funding?

2. Has your Agency partnered with any Faith-Based Agency or have any plans to do so in the future?
3. In your understanding of New Federalism/Devolution, do you view this as a viable method to service the people?

4. Based on your initial survey response, please explain what you view as the greatest impacts to the federal budget.

5. Where can I locate the following: Mission, Historical Overview and Agency Demographics?
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