

Connections Between Faith Communities and Their Non-profits

Findings from the Faith and Organizations Project Pilot Study

Authors:

Jo Anne Schneider

Katie Day

Gwynneth Anderson

With contributions from:

Kristin Doughty

Rabia Kamal

Mathew Wickens

Christy Schultze

Jill Sinha

©November 2005

National Catholic School of Social Service, Catholic University of America/
George Washington Institute of Public Policy, George Washington University

Connections Between Faith Communities and Their Non-Profits

Table of Contents

<i>Connections Between Faith Communities and Their Non-Profits</i>	i
Table of Contents	ii
<i>Executive Summary</i>	i
<i>Introduction</i>	1
<u>Research Methods</u>	5
<u>Suggestions for Future Research</u>	13
<u>Fundraising and Civic Engagement</u>	18
<u>Religious Theology and Culture</u>	19
<u>Findings from the Pilot Study</u>	40
<u>Suggestions for Future Research</u>	51
Conclusion	56
References:	58
Appendix A:	63
Appendix B: Interested Participants, Project and Advisory Committee Structure	118
Appendix C: Pilot Study Researchers	122

**Connections Between Faith Communities and Their Non-profits
Findings from the Faith and Organizations Project Pilot Study
on the Role of Religious Culture and Theology on Social and Health Services**

Executive Summary

Introduction

Renewed interest in faith community provision of social welfare and health services in the Clinton and Bush administrations has led to widespread discussion about the meaning and role of faith based service in the United States. Many U.S. social service, health care and community projects started under religious auspices, and some maintain ties to faith communities today. In some faith based organizations, links between faith and action have fostered unique programs that use the philosophy and resources of the faith community to provide service. In other cases, faith related organizations maintain few ties to founding religious communities, resembling secular non-profits. Policy makers, researchers, faith communities, and non-profits founded under religious auspices alike express confusion regarding what is considered a “faith based” organization, whether services should be provided by congregations or formal non-profits, differences between faith based and secular service provision, as well as issues related to the separation of church and state. These concerns have become even more important as Bush administration policies highlight service provision by congregations.

The Faith and Organization project evolved out of this policy milieu as a joint effort by faith communities, leaders of religious based non-profit organizations, and researchers to understand the dynamic relationship between faith communities and the organizations they create, as well as differences in the nature of services provided by organizations founded by different religions. Recognizing that little attention has been paid to the fundamental relationship between faith communities, the organizations they create, or the people they serve, the project seeks to explore these issues. Rather than subscribe to one universal typology that identifies an organization as faith based, the project expects that various religions would organize social welfare provision differently. We also speculate that the relationship between formal non-profits and congregations may vary among religions. In addition, participants recognize that race, immigrant status, and region of the county might also impact on the form of service provision and connections between faith communities and their non-profits. Finally, we anticipate that faith would be expressed differently as well, varying by religion, race, and region. Generally focusing on *how faith is made manifest through non-profit activity*, the project plans a four and a half year research/practice program aimed at two goals:

- **Helping policy makers and researchers clarify the meaning of faith based service as well as its role in social service and health provision in the United States.**
- Assisting faith communities and non-profits founded under religious auspices to:
 - **Understand the unique differences among organizations founded by different religions;**
 - **Clarify the appropriate relationship between non-profits and their founding communities for that religion and culture;**
 - **Understand ways that religious beliefs and practices are reflected in the organization and determine ways to share founding values with staff and board members who do not come from the founding religion, culture, or both;**
 - **Determine ways to best safeguard the civil rights of all program participants, regardless of religion and other characteristics;**
 - **Clarifying the meaning of separation of church and state within organizations founded by faith communities.**

Always conceived as an interdenominational effort, the Faith and Organizations project started as an initiative of Friends Board Training and Support Project, a program associated with the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers). The project team and advisory committee quickly expanded to include scholars and practitioners from Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant backgrounds. Non-profit scholars and practitioners associated with this

organization convened a series of meetings regarding formulating a research agenda on this issue starting in November 2001. Participants envisioned a program that would compare the experience of organizations from several religions, as well as agencies founded by different racial and ethnic communities. The current project includes an interdisciplinary team of scholars and practitioners from across the United States associated with several faiths working on similar issues (see project advisory committee and staffing structure, appendix B). The project focuses on four aspects of the relationship between organizations and communities:

- **The relationship between founding communities and organizations.** This research concentrates on the connection between non-profit organization mission and its faith community or secular culture, dynamic ownership of the organization by its founding community, the ways that faith influences the nature of non-profit activity, and the ways the non-profit activity affects the founding community. As such, the project examines both the impact of founding community civic engagement, spiritual, cultural, and social capital on the non-profit and the ways that service provided by the organization helps build civic engagement, social capital and cultural or religious values for its founding community. Social capital refers to networks based on reinforceable trust that enable people or institutions to access resources they need to meet their goals.
- **The relationship between the non-profit organization and the people that use their services.** Questions on this topic compare services provided to people from the same community versus people from another religion, racial, ethnic, immigrant group or class background. As such, research looks carefully at church/state questions raised by the Bush Administration's Faith Based Initiative. Research also potentially provides new insights for debates among social service academics and practitioners regarding the importance of providing services through organizations from within a particular subset of a locality like ethnic, racial, immigrant founded organizations versus service provision by larger, city-wide social service institutions.
- **The impact of founding community culture and social capital systems on non-profit mission, organizational structure, staffing, and program design.**
- **The impact of the larger socio-economic and policy systems, as well as the common strategies among non-profits providing a particular type of service, on non-profit goals and strategies.**

The project hopes to spend three years working in United States communities in an action research project that combines qualitative and quantitative methods to understand these dynamics and develop concrete educational materials and tools that policy makers, faith communities, and non-profits can use. The project also anticipates contributing to academic understandings of this issue. The national research project would compare organizations created by several religions: Catholics, Mainline Protestants, Jews, Peace Churches (Quakers, Mennonite, Brethren), Evangelical Christians, and possibly Muslims. It would also contrast ministries founded by African American, Latino, Asian and white communities. Given questions regarding organizations in marginalized communities, a secular component would compare faith based and secular organizations founded to serve particular marginalized ethnic, racial or immigrant groups. As a first step, the project engaged in a year and a half of pilot research and planning.¹ The project compares organizations providing services in three sectors with different funding mechanisms and systems: social services; health and senior services; and community based and developed services evolving from faith community organizing efforts. This report outlines results from the pilot study and suggests areas for further research. Where appropriate, sections provide specific suggestions to policy makers or practitioners.

Faith Community Service Provision: What We Know and Research Questions

Social welfare service provision in the United States has always involved civil society institutions like faith communities, with religious non-profits and congregations providing the bulk of services until recently (Cnaan, Wineberg and Boddie 1999, Hall 1990 and 2005).

¹ Funding for pilot research and planning was provided by the Louisville Institute and the Lynde and Harry Bradley foundation.

- **All religions and most congregations provide some form of social welfare support to their members and others.** Cnaan (2002) reports 93 percent of congregations in one study provided some form of social service, while his Philadelphia study reported 88 percent of congregations providing services (Cnaan and Boddie 2001). Chaves (2001) reports a significantly lower proportion of congregations providing some form of social service-- 57 percent, but still shows that the majority of congregations participate in some form of social welfare activity. The literature also consistently shows that most congregations focus on providing emergency services (food, shelter, clothing), programs for children and youth, and the elderly (Cnaan 2002, Grettenberger 2001, Chaves 2000).
- **Most congregations prefer to provide more comprehensive social services with a formally incorporated non-profit organization than take on complex social service programs themselves.** Both Cnaan(2002) and Chaves (1999, 2000) show that congregations generally contribute to the efforts of non-profits through volunteering and other forms of contributions, with a small minority choosing to provide more sophisticated services like training, welfare supports and health themselves. Given the historic role of African American congregations in social supports for their communities, African American churches appear more likely to develop formalized programs - often incorporated as separate 501c3 non-profit organizations-- than most other groups(Lincoln and Mamiya 1990).
- **Most organized religions have fostered social service and health agencies at some point in their history.** Historical research on social welfare and health shows that most faiths created organizations to provide for the health and welfare of their members and others by the early 20th century (Trattner 1994, Cnaan, Wineburg and Boddie 1999). Organizations like Catholic Charities/Catholic Social Services, Lutheran Children and Family Service, and the various Jewish and mainline Protestant organizations continue to dominate social service provision in many U.S. communities today.

Given the policy focus on congregational service provision, less attention has been paid to the nature of services offered by non-profits founded by religious bodies. Only a few scholars have looked carefully at the content of religious based service (Jeavons 1994, Bane Coffin and Higgins 2005). The Faith and Organizations project focuses on this topic in order to clarify how faith based organizations relate to their founding communities today and understand unique ways that theology, religious culture and race/ethnicity play out in organizations founded by Catholics, mainline Protestants, Jews, Muslims, Peace Churches, Evangelicals, African Americans, and Latinos.

Key Questions:

Through a year and a half long planning process, the advisory committee and core team developed four key questions that form the basis for research and analysis. These key questions built on a series of subquestions developed by the planning team and participating organizations prior to the pilot research and planning process:

1. *How do the dynamics between organization and founding community impact on the beliefs, behaviors, and resources of both organization and community? Do relationships between organization and founding community foster the ongoing development of social capital, cultural capital and civic engagement within the founding community?*
 - a. What is the relationship between the religious denomination or founding secular community and the non-profit organizations founded by that community? (governance, financial, control, volunteer participation, staffing, program content, mission). How do bridging, bonding and linking social capital ties impact on organization behavior?
 - b. How do congregations and their members relate to faith-based organizations that function under their name, and vice versa? For secular organizations, is there a constituent group that serves the same role as the faith community?
 - c. How do faith communities ensure that the faith-based organizations have a future as faith-based institutions? That their founding values and perspectives are maintained?

- d. What is the impact of the organizations' work on the faith community? On its understandings of the issues the organizations address? On its understandings of those the organizations serve? On its understandings of their faith? On its sense of identity?
 - e. Under what conditions do faith-based organizations move beyond the ethos and control of the denomination and what connection, if any, does the religious body have with an organization when this occurs?
2. What is the relationship between non-profit organizations and the people that use their services? How do these relationships differ when the people served either come from the same community as the organization or from a different background?
 - a. What is the relationship between the organization, the faith community, and those served who are not part of the same religion? Does the work of the organization lead new people to the faith community? Under what terms? How does the organization ensure that the beliefs and rights of program participants from different faith traditions or who adhere to no religion are respected? How is the relationship between those served and the founding community differ for secular organizations, particularly in organizations founded by a particular ethnic or racial group now serving others different from themselves?
 3. What is the impact of founding community culture and social capital systems on non-profit mission, organizational structure, staffing, and program design?
 - a. How does the personal religious faith of key staff reflect that of the sponsoring community and influence organizational behavior? Do the leaders of secular organizations also adhere to a set of values that reflect their founding communities, and does that influence organization behavior in similar ways? How is this similar and different between faith based and secular organizations?
 4. What is the impact of the larger socio-economic and policy system, as well as the service sector of that organization (social services, health and senior services, community development) on non-profit organizations form, function and resources?
 - a. For marginalized populations such as immigrant, ethnic, and racial groups, are there fundamental differences between faith based and secular organizations in regards to their relationships with the wider community and the way that organization mission plays out in agency programs, staffing, and other decisions?

Research Methods

As a pilot project for a national study, the Faith and Organizations project used the general methodology of comparative multi-methods ethnography envisioned for the larger study. Multi-methods ethnography combines a series of qualitative methods (participant observation, interviews, focus groups, content analysis of secondary source material) with analysis of administrative data bases, appropriate regional statistics, and survey research. Participant observation is the regular observation of events in a setting over time, with the observer playing a role in the setting that allows him or her to develop rapport with others in the organization.

The pilot study compared eleven organizations founded by Mainline Protestants, Jews, Catholics, Evangelical Christians, Muslims and African American churches through ethnographic research for between 3 and 6 months per site in Philadelphia and the Washington DC metropolitan area. In Washington DC, research included a Jewish adult day care center; two anti-poverty and adult literacy programs in a large Catholic social service agency; a Chinese Protestant organization providing an array of services; a Mennonite agency serving developmentally disabled adults; an evangelical Christian organization developed by Asian Americans to serve low income African American youth; a Lutheran housing organization; and a Muslim women's social service organization. In Philadelphia, ethnographic research was conducted in a Lutheran social service agency; two African American congregations which had programs for youth and senior citizens; a Jewish immigration

agency; and a Quaker retirement and continuing care facility. Pilot research also developed a survey instrument that was tested in organizations in both cities.

Suggestions for Future Research

This pilot study drew together two teams of researchers who conducted quasi-independent projects connected through locality specific team project meetings and occasional events that allowed opportunities for staff from the two projects to communicate with each other. Communications across sites was handled primarily through the two PIs visiting the other team. Consistency across projects came from shared training materials and ongoing conversations. While the general framework for study methods worked for the pilot project, additional types of fieldwork were necessary in order to adequately respond to all study questions. Specific additional strategies include:

- **Conduct equal amount of research in both organizations and founding faith community venues.**
- **Focus both on congregations and higher level adjudicatory bodies.**
- **Follow organizations to venues with secular counterparts in order to understand the role of these agencies in the sector.**
- **Perform comparative research with secular organizations in marginalized racial and immigrant communities in order to disentangle the role of race, immigrant status, and faith in these organizations.**
- **Institute uniform training, reporting and communication systems across sites.**

Major Themes

Several major crosscutting findings came out of the pilot study. These themes provide important hints to the ways that faith communities organize social welfare and health provision through their non-profit organizations and congregations; the relationship between faith communities, congregations and their non-profits; and the ways that theology, religious culture and religious identity are expressed in organizations founded by different religions. This next section focuses on four key dynamics that influenced faith based service provision:

- 1) **Institutional vs congregational approaches to service provision.** Various religions organize social welfare provision for their members and others in different ways. We found two different forms of service systems: *Institutional* systems (Catholics, Jews, perhaps Muslims) focus on service provision through centralized entities like an archdiocese or Jewish Federation while *Congregational* systems (Mainline Protestant, African American Christians, Evangelicals, Peace Churches) see congregations as central for fostering and maintaining religious based non-profits.

The differences between institutional and congregational approaches to social welfare service provision stemmed from religious culture. The various Protestant religions, Evangelicals, the Protestant African American congregations, and Peace Churches all see the congregation as the fundamental unit in that religion. While each of these denominations has larger adjudicatory bodies that sometimes provide support to non-profits under religious auspices, social welfare activities are generally founded either by particular congregations, or several congregations working together.

In contrast, non-profits in institutional systems responded primarily to the centralized entities in their region, and cultivated only tangential relationships with individual congregations. Fundraising and volunteering in institutionalized systems also flows through these central structures. While all organizations relied on some outside funding through government or private sources, their support from the founding faith community came from community wide systems.

Implications for Policy and Practice

- **Policy focus on congregations as the appropriate venue for faith based service may be misplaced. Instead, initiatives to promote faith community involvement in social welfare should support both congregational and institutional forms.**
- **Non-profits in institutionalized systems may find it appropriate to strengthen relationships to the faith community through their wider community systems rather than work to mimic outreach to individual congregations as in the congregational systems.**

Implications for Future Research

- **Future research should focus on comparing these two systems to further test findings from the pilot and understand differences between congregational and institutional systems better.**
 - **Research on relationships among non-profits and faith communities in institutionalized systems should pay particular attention to the role of community wide entities like the archdiocese or Federation rather than focusing on congregation/non-profit relations or the interactions between individual members of that faith and the organization.**
- 2) **The role of theology and religious culture in service provision.** Each religion had its unique understanding of the theological basis for service provision and religious culture that significantly structured that nature of service provision in organizations founded by that faith. This section provides a brief overview of the theology for social justice and social supports for Peace Churches, Catholics, Protestants, Evangelicals, African American Christians, Jews, and Muslims, the history of social justice and social welfare work for that religion in the United States, and discussion of that faith community's system for organizing worship and social welfare activities.
 - 3) **The importance of social capital to faith based non-profits:** Social capital refers to *the social relationships and patterns of reciprocal, enforceable trust that enable people and institutions to gain access to resources like volunteers, funding, or government contracts.* Social capital played a significant role for all organizations. The types of social capital among the founding faith community, the sector, and individual congregations varied among organizations. Likewise, some organizations had stronger ties to faith community institutions (congregations and higher adjudicatory bodies), government and other institutions in their sector than others. Given current stress on congregations' role in service provision stemming from the Faith Based Initiative, some non-profits coming out of institutionalized systems reached out to congregations for the first time, only to find limited social capital connections to these congregations.

All of the institutions in this study relied on social capital to secure funding, program participants, volunteers, and other resources. In general, agencies relied on social capital through the following sources:

- **Individual networks through the religious community.**
- **Organizational networks through the faith community.** In institutionalized systems, Federation and archdiocese served as major referral sources. In congregational systems, organizations were more likely to seek supports from congregations in their social capital network.
- **Staff individual and institutional connections.**
- **Sector affiliations.** All agencies except the smaller, evangelical organizations belonged to coalitions and umbrella groups of organizations providing similar services. These sector wide affiliations fostered social capital among like institutions.
- **Program participants.** Many of the organization drew additional program participants, volunteers and other resources from among the people they served, regardless of whether or not they belonged to the founding faith community.

Developing the reciprocal, enforceable trust characteristic of social capital requires ability to display the right cultural cues for that network or community. Functional social capital has two ingredients: 1) trust-based

relationships with people or organizations that have access to resources, and 2) knowledge of cultural capital cues, which indicate that an individual or organization is a member of a group and should be given access to those relationships. This definition links social capital to community culture. Organizations that have the right kinds of context-specific relationships and know the cultural-specific cues required to access resources achieve their goals.

Missing or Attenuated Social Capital: Several of these organizations had limited links to their religious community or congregations associated with their faith. In these instances, missing or attenuated social capital stemmed from the relationship between social capital and cultural capital. This took two forms. In institutional systems, congregational involvement with social service agencies went against the cultural norm of that religion. In other cases, relationships between founding communities and organizations attenuated due to disagreements within the community about culturally coded aspects of faith based service.

Implications for Policy and Practice

- **Social capital links come from several sources: religious affiliations, sector affiliations, individual networks through staff and program participants and program participant communities.** Strong organizations maintain all these forms of social capital.
- **Social capital systems are organized differently in institutionalized systems and congregational systems.** Both policymakers and agency administrators should pay attention to the appropriate targets for resources in expanding social capital links.
- **Given links between social capital and cultural capital, agency administrators should pay attention to cultural cues in efforts to expand or develop new social capital.**

Suggestions for Future Research

This pilot study suggests that the next phase of research include particular attention to the following issues:

- **Understanding differences in social capital systems between organizations sponsored by institutional vs. congregational systems.**
 - **Disentangling the connections and differences between race, immigrant status and religion for organizations founded by African American or immigrant faith communities.** Research in the pilot showed significant overlap between racial, ethnic or immigrant community networks and those of religious communities. Future research would explore this relationship through comparing organizations in these communities founded under secular vs faith based auspices.
- 4) **Forms of religious expression.** *Explicit* or *expressive* faiths (Evangelicals, African Americans) actively use god-language or references to their religion in service provision while other faiths (Jews, Peace Churches, sometimes Catholics) practiced *embedded religion* where theology and religious culture played a profound role in faith based service yet very few symbols of religion or references to faith appeared in service provision. Mainline Protestant service provision mostly appeared as embedded faith to program participants, but activities among some staff and outreach activities to congregations sometimes used expressive modes.

Implications for Policy and Practice

These differences in ways that religion is expressed impacts on interpretation of faith based service by policy makers and practitioners. The following policy and practice implications emerge from this pilot study:

- **Policy makers should be careful to avoid expectations that faith based organizations are identified by expressive language. Instead, the ways that an organization expresses its faith stem from the theology and culture of each religion. Recognizing these differences and supporting various forms would also go far to avoid church/state issues that currently dominate the debate over government sponsored service by religiously based organizations.**

- **Practitioners should carefully identify the ways that faith is appropriately expressed in their religions, shaping programming to fit appropriate beliefs and practices.**
- **Practitioners and denominational leaders in traditions more inclined to the “embedded” approach to religion should carefully consider how they can assure that religious values and motivations will be maintained over the long term in the service organization.**

Findings from the Pilot Study

The pilot study for the Faith and Organizations project provided preliminary insights into the ways that various religions organize and carry out social welfare and health services in the United States. The pilot study also raised a series of additional questions and areas for research. This section outlines key findings on project research questions. Each section provides some preliminary suggestions for policy makers and practitioners, as well as questions for future research.

Dynamics Between Founding Faith Community and Non-profit Organizations

In general, we found that most founding religious communities took steps to ensure a continuing relationship between the faith community and the organization through a series of formal mechanisms like board appointments, mission statements, and sometimes volunteering relationships and funding. However, in some cases, as organizations evolved, these measures proved insufficient to maintain strong ties between organization and faith community. However, this pilot research suggests that social and cultural capital connections between organization and community are more important than formal measures in maintaining relationships between community and organization; further research to explore this key question is needed.

We also found that institutional and congregational systems envisioned the relationship between faith community and non-profits differently, particularly in respect to direct connections to congregations and volunteering systems. In addition, the role of religiously based non-profits as an expression of the faith communities work or witness to the world on social justice and social welfare differed dramatically between these two systems. In both cases, differences tracked back to the religious culture and theology of the founding religion. Embedded and expressive religions also construed this relationship differently.

Most of the faith communities in this pilot study institutionalized their relationship to the non-profits they created through various formal mechanisms like mission statements, governance structures and other mechanisms. These strategies reflected the social and cultural capital connections between faith community and the non-profits they created. Newer non-profits and those founded by mainline Protestants and Evangelicals were less likely to formalize these relationships through board appointments and mission statements than the other faiths. This section discusses the ways these relationships were carried out in terms of governance, financial control, mission, and - to a limited extent - staffing.

Governance: Founding communities influence governance by the ways that they structure the boards of organizations and the formal and informal ties between faith community and organization. Institutionalized systems organized these relationships differently than in congregational systems.

- **In institutionalized systems, relationships stemmed from connections to the wider community structures.**
- **Organizations founded by congregational systems relied on connections to the founding congregation or congregations in order to maintain these relationships.** These relationships appeared more organic and less formalized than in the institutionalized systems.
- **Board appointments.** All of the organizations in this study maintained connections to their founding faith communities through this mechanism.
- **Choice of the executive director.** Since the executive director sets the tone for the agency, selecting someone who shares agency core values will influence the future direction for the organization. Boards usually choose executive directors, and with one exception, all of the executive directors in these

organizations were members of the founding religion. These decisions were not explicit, but it appeared that organizations chose administrative leadership that reflected their beliefs and values.

Finances, Fundraising, and In-Kind Supports: For many of these organizations, sources for funding reflected their sector rather than ties to the faith community. However, these small percentages mask the individual donations that some organizations received through requests to their faith communities. Smaller, congregationally based organizations and Muslim organizations received the bulk of these individual donations. Even though financial contributions from faith communities were small, they remained large, symbolic elements in agency budgets, signifying social capital links between organization and community. As in research on congregational social service (Cnaan 2002), faith communities also provide important in-kind supports (space, food, clothing and other in-kind goods donations) to the organizations under their care.

Volunteers: All of these organizations relied on some form of volunteering, often drawing volunteers both through the faith community and wider locality wide systems. Organizations in institutionalized systems were much less likely to rely heavily on volunteers and drew them through different mechanisms. In general, institutionalized systems recruited volunteers either through community wide systems, sister institutions, or through individual connections among staff, board and program participants. These organizations very rarely sought volunteers through congregations themselves. Organizations in congregational systems sought volunteers through constituent congregations. This was true even for larger, established organizations.

Staff: Two factors influenced connections between the faith community and the non-profit regarding staffing - 1) age and complexity of the organization and 2) firm congregational system connections to the faith community. In general, we found that the more professionalized, stable organizations relied on paid staff drawn from a number of sources. The Mennonite, Catholic, Lutheran and Jewish organizations fit this model. Organizations coming out of congregationally based systems that had strong ties to particular congregations drew most of their staff from networks associated with their founding congregations or their constituent racial or immigrant community. African American, immigrant and Evangelical based organizations were most likely to hire through faith community networks.

Mission: The agencies in this pilot study tended to refer to their religious origins in their mission statements. All of these organizations' mission and vision statements reflected the theology of social welfare or social justice from the founding faith. Mission statements for large, established social service organizations active during the many years when government refused to fund organizations considered religious had secular mission statements, but added vision or "core value" statements that explained the faith background for their work. Depending on their current orientation, agencies chose to foreground or background their religious identity through mission and value statements on their websites and in their literature.

Faith Based Coalitions and Umbrella Organizations: In addition to connections to the faith community through congregations or higher level community planning and administrative structures, many of these organizations belonged to local, regional and/or national umbrella organizations or coalitions of organizations from their faith. Umbrella groups provided a forum to discuss common issues and often became the venue to develop strategies to maintain connections to the faith community.

Relationships to Congregations: This study found profound differences in the ways that institutionalized systems and congregational systems related to congregations associated with that religion. While organizations in institutionalized systems may develop informal relationships with particular congregations, generally parishes, synagogue, Temples and individual mosques had limited relationships with the formal non-profits associated with the faith community. Congregationally based system organizations, on the other hand, eagerly sought connections to congregations. Organizations with close ties to their founding congregations had strong, organic relationships with founding congregations. The larger, established social service agencies founded by congregationally based religions also sought connections to congregations. Organizations with ties to race or immigrant based groups also reached out to their constituent communities through racial or immigrant wide networks.

Impact of the Organizations Work on the Faith Community: Given that the pilot study focused primarily on non-profits with limited research in the constituent faith communities, responses to this question are necessarily preliminary. In general, we found that faith communities viewed their organizations as their representatives in the wider community, reflecting theological beliefs and religious culture. These organizations also became a

lightning rod for disagreements within the faith community regarding interpretation of social justice teachings.

Implications for Policy and Practice

- **Connections between faith communities and organizations under their care work differ for institutional vs. congregational systems, leading to different strategies for governance, fundraising, and other mechanisms that rely on faith community social capital.** Organization leaders would do well to rely on their culturally based strategies to seek support from their faith community. Policy makers need to recognize that supports from the faith community are equally strong in both systems, but are organized differently.
- **Organizations and faith communities should seek ways to support both social capital and cultural ties between organization and founding community.**
- **Given that organizations sometimes become symbols for disagreements within faith communities over appropriate forms of faith based witness, organization and faith community leaders need to work closely together to understand these dynamics and prevent adverse impacts on the organization or attenuation of relationships with the founding community.**

Suggestions for Future Research

- **Develop research strategies that provide ample opportunities to explore relationships between faith communities and organizations through focus on this connection and research in venues that allow understanding of both dynamics.**
- **Include comparisons to secular organizations for marginalized racial and ethnic groups as well as new immigrant communities.**
- **Include both organizations with strong ties to the faith community and those that have limited connections to that community or no longer reflect its core values in order to understand the dynamics between organizations and communities when they move apart, as in subquestion e.**

Relationships between Organizations and Program Participants

The pilot study found a variety of dynamics between program participants and the agencies that served them. In general, organizations targeted particular populations based on their mission, which sometimes stipulated a connection to the faith, racial or immigrant community. African American agencies and Chinese Immigrant Services were most likely to serve people from their racial and ethnic groups, regardless of religion. Many of these programs encouraged program participants to volunteer with the agencies, give back to the religious community, and sometimes hired program participants.

Only the African American and Evangelical organizations actively used religious language and prayer in their activities, thus creating an environment where religious expression was expected. The majority of the program participants expressed comfort, even preference, for this religious environment. Only the Evangelical organizations openly proselytized or actively invited program participants to join the church family.

Implications for Policy and Practice

- **Fears of proselytizing or forcing religious practice on program participants largely appeared unfounded.** Most agencies either self-selected program participants or have created mechanisms to background religious practice or make it optional. While civil rights need to be guaranteed for participants in faith based programs, this is far less of issue than is envisioned in some policy circles. The charitable choice provision stipulates that there has to be a secular alternative to the agency readily available so that clients have a choice. This was the case with most of the agencies in the study.

Suggestions for Future Research

- **Given that established faith based and faith related organizations have developed successful strategies to both protect the religious identity and practice for those from other faiths and maintain their traditions, exploring further these strategies to identify best practices would be an important component of future research.**
- **The pilot study involved informal conversations with program participants and observations. Collection of participant thoughts on the role of faith in organizations could be further explored through adding depth interview and focus group components.**

Impact of Founding Community Culture on Organization Systems and Practice

All of the organizations in this pilot study were suffused by the religious culture and values of their founding faith. However, we found two alternative approaches to the role of faith in programming. On the one hand, African American and Evangelical organizations actively used expressive faith in their programming, and faith was clearly evident in staff practices. On the other hand, Jewish, Catholic, mainline Protestant and Peace Churches stressed tolerance for other religions in their programming and staff practices. For many staff in these agencies, faith motivated staff and the emphasis on tolerance appeared as a religious value. In these organizations, religious culture influenced all aspects of organization structure, but was embedded in programming. Finally, we had difficulty disentangling religious culture from racial or immigrant culture in the African American and Chinese organizations, leading to questions about the role of religion vs. race, ethnicity or nationality in these organizations.

Agency Structure: Religious culture profoundly affects the structure of these organizations. The organizations structure, decision making processes, and administrative systems strongly reflected both the theology and culture of that religion. Often, these aspects of religious culture were embedded in the background of the organization.

Staff: While leadership staff in all organizations came from the founding religion and most appeared active in their faith, we found two divergent patterns among other staff. African American, Evangelical and newer congregational organizations were most likely to hire staff from the same faith and often through congregation based social capital. Muslim organizations also hired exclusively Muslims, due to a combination of social capital networks for hiring and practice of traditional Islamic culture for women in these organizations. Jewish, Peace Church, mainline Protestant and Catholic organizations hired people from many faiths. Most of these organizations tried to find people that shared the general values of the organization, even if they belonged to different religions.

Programming: The contrast between embedded vs. expressive faith was most evident in programming. In the Muslim, Evangelical and African American organizations faith was everywhere in their programming. The other agencies showed the opposite tendencies. Tolerance was the rule here. It influenced the type of programming and interaction with people from other faiths. As a result, faith messages were not evident in programming, instead focusing on providing services to those in need. Nevertheless, faith influenced the shape and choice of programming.

Implications for Policy and Practice

- **Religious based organizations should evaluate their core beliefs and the way that they are expressed in their organizations as a mechanism to clarify the role of religion in organization practices.**
- **Policy makers and practitioners should understand that faith based organizations are not determined solely by the level of religious expression in programming and staff practice nor by tendencies to hire from within the faith community.** Policies and practices need to understand the diversity of experience.

Suggestions for Future Research

- **Observations of orientation programs and other mechanisms to share founding religious faith with organization staff suggest some important strategies to enable organizations to maintain their religious ethos in their organizations. Further research on more organizations will allow opportunities to understand these mechanisms and develop best practices or tools to share with other organizations.**
- **Comparisons among faith based and secular organizations serving marginalized racial and immigrant groups will provide greater insight into the roles and differences between faith based and secular organizations for these communities.**

Impact of the Sector

This pilot study revealed that faith based non-profits both responded to the ethos of their founding religious communities and reflected the exigencies of the type of service provided. In most cases, this was a careful balancing act between these two important constituencies. Sector impact was most evident in funding structures.

Both the social service agencies and health and senior services agencies in our pilot study often were leaders in their field. This was particularly true for the larger, more established entities. The active participation of these faith based institutions in secular coalitions and professional associations suggests two things. First, social capital connections to agencies providing similar services is equally important to these organization as participating in faith based networks. Rather than make a choice between providing faith based or secular services, these agencies draw from both pools of social capital and cultural capital, developing collaborations with agencies in both faith based and secular networks and using these formal and informal umbrella networks to determine best practices and appropriate standards of care. As such any dichotomy between faith based and secular organizations appears largely specious as organizations draw from both sources of support.

Second, given these strong connections between faith based and secular organizations through coalitions of similar agencies, arguments that participation in secular service provision systems dilutes the original missions of faith based organizations (Smith and Sosin 2001), may be incorrect. Instead, some of these institutions play a major role in setting standards for service provision in their field and actively lobby for government regulations that reflect the values of their founding faith communities.

Implications for Policy and Practice

- **Presumptions of fundamental differences between faith based and secular organizations may be misplaced. Instead, it may be more important for policy makers and practitioner to clarify ways that concerns related to the sector and founding community ethos interact with each other in service provision.**

Suggestions for Future Research

- **Further study of the relationship of organizations to sector based coalitions would help in understanding this dynamic.** Pilot research allowed limited opportunity to attend sector wide coalitions, another aspect of research that would enhance a larger and longer study
- **Comparisons between faith based and secular organizations for marginalized populations would allow opportunities to understand the role of race, nationality, immigrant status and religion in these institutions' activities.**

Conclusion

Our pilot study offers some important preliminary insights into the ways that religion impacts on the activities of faith based organizations. To our knowledge, this is one of few studies that uses qualitative research to understand how faith is made manifest through non-profit activity. As such, we are able to understand the important role of culture in social capital connections between faith communities and the non-profits they create.

Multi-methods ethnography shows the various aspects of relationships between faith communities and their organizations, highlighting different forms previously ignored in both the academic and practical literature on this topic.

Our preliminary findings on the impact of type of service on faith based organizations shows an intertwining for faith based and secular networks, culture, and concerns. Most of these organizations participate equally in social capital systems for their faith communities and with other secular organizations providing similar services. Likewise, both the culture of the founding religion and the standards for service provision of the secular coalitions impact on ways that organizations do business. Funding structures and government regulations also significantly influence organization form and practices. However, given that some of these faith based organizations are leaders in their fields, faith based values may in fact influence standards for secular coalitions and government.

Given the limited research time and small number of organizations participating in this pilot study, our findings are necessarily preliminary. A number of findings need further testing through research in a larger set of organizations. Future research would also look more carefully at dynamics in the larger faith communities, tracing connections between congregations, larger adjudicatory structures, and non-profits. We hope to expand this pilot study into a national project that would involve four to eight sites across the country. Finally, while our preliminary results provide some usable insights to faith based organizations, faith communities and policy makers, our proposed larger initiative would devote particular energy to creating products useful to practitioners and policy makers.

The project team welcomes interest from other researchers, faith communities and organizations. For more information, contact Jo Anne Schneider at jschneid@gwu.edu. Additional copies of this report and documents related to this study will be available at <http://home.gwu.edu/~jschneid/>.

**Connections Between Faith Communities and Their Non-profits
Findings from the Faith and Organizations Project Pilot Study
on the Role of Religious Culture and Theology on Social and Health Services**

Introduction

Renewed interest in faith community provision of social welfare and health services in the Clinton and Bush administrations has led to widespread discussion about the meaning and role of faith-based service in the United States. Many U.S. social service, health care and community projects started under religious auspices, and some maintain ties to faith communities today. In some faith-based organizations, links between faith and action have fostered unique programs that use the philosophy and resources of the faith community to provide service. In other cases, faith-related organizations maintain few ties to founding religious communities, resembling secular non-profits. Policy makers, researchers, faith communities, and non-profits founded under religious auspices alike express confusion regarding what is considered a “faith-based” organization, whether services should be provided by congregations or formal non-profits, differences between faith-based and secular service provision, as well as issues related to the separation of church and state. These concerns have become even more important as Bush administration policies highlight service provision by congregations.

The Faith and Organization project evolved out of this policy milieu as a joint effort by faith communities, leaders of religious-based non-profit organizations, and researchers to understand the dynamic relationship between faith communities and the organizations they create, as well as differences in the nature of services provided by organizations founded by different religions. Recognizing that little attention has been paid to the fundamental relationship between faith communities, the organizations they create, or the people they serve, the project seeks to explore these issues. Rather than subscribe to one universal typology that identifies an organization as faith based, the project expects that various religions would organize social welfare provision differently. We also speculate that the relationship between formal non-profits and congregations may vary among Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Peace Churches, Evangelicals, and Muslims. In addition, participants recognize that race, immigrant status, and region of the county might also impact on the form of service provision and connections between faith communities and their non-profits. Finally, we anticipate that faith would be expressed differently as well, varying by religion, race, and region. Generally focusing on *how faith is made manifest through non-profit activity*, the project plans a four and a half year research/practice program aimed at two goals:

- **Helping policy makers and researchers clarify the meaning of faith-based service as well as its role in social service and health provision in the United States.**
- **Assisting faith communities and non-profits founded under religious auspices to:**
 - **Understand the unique differences among organizations founded by different religions;**
 - **Clarify the appropriate relationship between non-profits and their founding communities for that religion and culture;**
 - **Understand ways that religious beliefs and practices are reflected in the organization and determine ways to share founding values with staff and board members who do not come from the founding religion, culture, or both;**
 - **Determine ways to best safeguard the civil rights of all program participants, regardless of religion and other characteristics;**
 - **Clarifying the meaning of separation of church and state within organizations founded by faith communities.**

Always conceived as an interdenominational effort, the Faith and Organizations project started as an initiative of Friends Board Training and Support Project, a program associated with the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers). The project team and advisory committee quickly expanded to include scholars and practitioners from Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant backgrounds. Non-profit scholars and practitioners associated with this organization convened a series of meetings regarding formulating a research agenda on this issue starting in

November 2001. Participants envisioned a program that would compare the experience of organizations from several religions, as well as agencies founded by different racial and ethnic communities. The current project includes an interdisciplinary team of scholars and practitioners from across the United States associated with several faiths working on similar issues (see project board and staffing structure, appendix B). The project focuses on four aspects of the relationship between organizations and communities:

- **The relationship between founding communities and organizations.** This research concentrates on the connection between non-profit organization mission and its faith community or secular culture, dynamic ownership of the organization by its founding community, the ways that faith influences the nature of non-profit activity, and the ways the non-profit activity affects the founding community. As such, the project examines both the impact of founding community civic engagement, spiritual, cultural, and social capital on the non-profit and the ways that service provided by the organization helps build civic engagement, social capital and cultural or religious values for its founding community. Social capital refers to networks based on reinforceable trust that enable people or institutions to access resources they need to meet their goals.
- **The relationship between the non-profit organization and the people that use their services.** Questions on this topic compare services provided to people from the same community versus people from another religion, racial, ethnic, immigrant group or class background. As such, research looks carefully at church/state questions raised by the Bush Administration's Faith-Based Initiative. Research also potentially provides new insights for debates among social service academics and practitioners regarding the importance of providing services through organizations from within a particular subset of a locality like ethnic, racial, immigrant founded organizations versus service provision by larger, city-wide social service institutions.
- **The impact of founding community culture and social capital systems on non-profit mission, organizational structure, staffing, and program design.**
- **The impact of the larger socio-economic and policy systems, as well as the common strategies among non-profits providing a particular type of service, on non-profit goals and strategies.**

The project hopes to spend three years working in United States communities in an action research project that combines qualitative and quantitative methods to understand these dynamics and develop concrete educational materials and tools that policy makers, faith communities, and non-profits can use. The project also anticipates contributing to academic understandings of this issue. The national research project would compare organizations created by several religions: Catholics, Mainline Protestants, Jews, Peace Churches (Quakers, Mennonite, Brethren), Evangelical Christians, independent Christian churches, and possibly Muslims. It would also contrast ministries founded by African American, Latino, Asian and white communities. Given questions regarding organizations in marginalized communities, a secular component would compare faith-based and secular organizations founded to serve particular marginalized ethnic, racial or immigrant groups. As a first step, the project engaged in a year and a half of pilot research and planning.¹ The project compares organizations providing services in three sectors with different funding mechanisms and systems: social services; health and senior services; and community-based and developed services evolving from faith community organizing efforts. This report outlines results from the pilot study and suggests areas for further research. Where appropriate, sections provide specific suggestions to policy makers or practitioners.

Faith-community Service Provision: What We Know and Research Questions

Social welfare service provision in the United States has always involved civil society institutions like faith communities, with religious non-profits and congregations providing the bulk of services until recently (Cnaan, Wineberg and Boddie 1999, Hall 1990 and 2005). In the United States, government slowly became involved in health and social welfare provision after the civil war, with most current government social programs developing as part of the New Deal and War on Poverty of the 1930s onward (Trattner 1994, Cnaan, Wineberg and Boddie 1999, Mapes 2004). However, as the U.S. welfare state expanded, government played an increasing role in funding and regulating social service and health provision. As a result, the current system is a partnership between government and the private sector (Salamon 1995), with health and social services provided by a combination of government, secular and religiously-based non-profits, and for profit organizations.

The increasing dominance of government in social welfare systems, the professionalization of social services, and the separation of church and state combined to lead to secularization of service provision in many non-profits since the mid 19th century (Cnaan, Wineberg and Boddie 1999, Hall 2005, Smith and Sosin 2001). Some scholars argue that government funding and regulation has turned non-profits away from their founding roots and into arms of government (Smith and Lipskey 1993). Proponents of faith-based service see involvement of religious-based organizations, particularly congregations, as returning social service to an earlier time when faith communities were more directly involved in service provision. Proponents believe that faith-based organizations would provide “better,” more caring, comprehensive services and cost less through a reliance on private funds and volunteers.

The growing body of research on faith-based service has generally focused on church/state issues (Dionne and Hsu 2001, Bane, Coffin and Theilmann 2000, Nesbitt 2001, Wineburg 2001), management issues (Queen 2000, Jeavons 1994), and the role of congregations in service provision (Cnaan 2002, Chaves 1999). While many questions remain unanswered, several points appear consistently in this literature:

- **All religions and most congregations provide some form of social welfare support to their members and others.** Cnaan (2002) reports 93 percent of congregations in one study provided some form of social service, while his Philadelphia study reported 88 percent of congregations providing services (Cnaan and Boddie 2001). Chaves (2000) reports a significantly lower proportion of congregations providing some form of social service-- 57 percent, but still shows that the majority of congregations participate in some form of social welfare activity. The literature also consistently shows that most congregations focus on providing emergency services (food, shelter, clothing), programs for children and youth, and the elderly (Cnaan 2002, Grettenberger 2001, Chaves 2000).
- **Most congregations prefer to provide more comprehensive social services with a formally incorporated non-profit organization than to take on complex social service programs themselves.** Both Cnaan (2002) and Chaves (1999, 2000) show that congregations generally contribute to the efforts of non-profits through volunteering and other forms of contributions, with a small minority choosing to provide more sophisticated services like training, welfare supports and health themselves. Given the historic role of African American congregations in social supports for their communities, African American churches appear more likely to develop formalized programs — often incorporated as separate 501(c)(3) non-profit organizations — than most other groups have (Lincoln and Mamiya 1990).
- **Most organized religions have fostered social service and health agencies at some point in their history.** Historical research on social welfare and health shows that most faiths created organizations to provide for the health and welfare of their members and others by the early 20th century (Trattner 1994, Cnaan, Wineburg and Boddie 1999). Organizations like Catholic Charities/Catholic Social Services, Lutheran Children and Family Service, and the various Jewish and mainline Protestant organizations continue to dominate social service provision in many U.S. communities today.

Given the policy focus on congregational service provision, less attention has been paid to the nature of services offered by non-profits founded by religious bodies. Some scholars observe that many non-profits founded by faith communities appear as faith-related organizations that are religious in name only (Smith and Sosin 2001), while others have attempted to create a typology of the role of faith in non-profits (Sider and Unruh 2004) ranging from faith permeated to secular organizations. The Sider and Unruh typology focuses on observable characteristics of organizations, such as references to faith in programming and mission statements, funding from faith communities, and presence of religious symbols to determine the importance of faith in an organization. This typology has gained some currency in policy and research circles (for example Tangenberg 2005).

Only a few scholars have looked carefully at the content of religious-based service (Jeavons 1994, Bane Coffin and Higgins 2005). The Faith and Organizations project focuses on this topic in order to clarify how faith-based organizations relate to their founding communities today and understand unique ways that theology, religious culture and race/ethnicity play out in organizations founded by Catholics, mainline Protestants, Jews, Muslims, Peace Churches, Evangelicals, African Americans, and Latinos. The pilot study in Philadelphia and the Washington DC metropolitan area focused on all of these groups except Latinos. In order to understand the impact of the type of service provided on the nature of service by organizations founded by various faith

communities, the project also chose to compare organizations providing three types of services: 1) social services (broadly defined); 2) health and senior services; 3) organizations that provide a concrete service in a community that evolved out of faith-based community organizing or needs assessments processes. Examples of the last category would include a senior center founded by an African American church after discussion of community needs or a housing agency developed out of a Catholic Campaign for Human Development organizing initiative. Research for both the pilot study and the proposed national project focuses on the four key questions and a series of subquestions:

Key Questions:

Through a year and a half long planning process, the advisory committee and core team developed four key questions that form the basis for research and analysis. These key questions built on a series of subquestions developed by the planning team and participating organizations prior to the pilot research and planning process:

1. *How do the dynamics between organization and founding community impact the beliefs, behaviors, and resources of both organization and community? Do relationships between organization and founding community foster the ongoing development of social capital, cultural capital and civic engagement within the founding community?*
 - b. What is the relationship between the religious denomination or founding secular community and the non-profit organizations founded by that organization (governance, financial, control, volunteer participation, staffing, program content, mission? How do bridging, bonding and linking social capital ties impact on organization behavior?
 - c. How do congregations and their members relate to faith-based organizations that function under their name, and vice versa? For secular organizations, is there a constituent group that serves the same role as the faith community?
 - d. How do faith communities ensure that the faith-based organizations have a future as faith-based institutions? That their founding values and perspectives are maintained?
 - e. What is the impact of the organizations' work on the faith community? On its understandings of the issues the organizations address? On its understandings of those the organizations serve? On its understandings of their faith? On its sense of identity?
 - f. Under what conditions do faith-based organizations move beyond the ethos and control of the denomination and what connection, if any, does the religious body have with an organization when this occurs?
2. What is the relationship between non-profit organizations and the people that use their services? How do these relationships differ when the people served either come from the same community as the organization or from a different background?
 1. What is the relationship between the organization, the faith community, and those served who are not part of the same religion?
 2. Does the work of the organization lead new people to the faith community? Under what terms?
 3. How does the organization ensure that the beliefs and rights of program participants from different faith traditions or who adhere to no religion are respected?
 4. How are the relationships between those served and the founding community different for secular organizations, particularly in organizations founded by a particular ethnic or racial group now serving others different from themselves?
3. What is the impact of founding community culture and social capital systems on non-profit mission, organizational structure, staffing, and program design?

1. How does the personal religious faith of key staff reflect that of the sponsoring community and influence organizational behavior?
 2. Do the leaders of secular organizations also adhere to a set of values that reflect their founding communities, and does that influence organization behavior in similar ways?
 3. How is this similar and different between faith-based and secular organizations?
4. What are the impacts of the larger socio-economic and policy system, as well as the service sector of that organization (social services, health and senior services, community development), on non-profit organization's form, function and resources?
1. For marginalized populations such as immigrant, ethnic, and racial groups, are there fundamental differences between faith-based and secular organizations in regards to their relationships with the wider community and the way that organization mission plays out in agency programs, staffing, and other decisions?

Research Methods

As a pilot project for a national study, the Faith and Organizations project used the general methodology of comparative, multi-methods ethnography envisioned for the larger study. Multi-methods ethnography combines a series of qualitative methods (participant observation, interviews, focus groups, content analysis of secondary source material) with analysis of administrative data bases, appropriate regional statistics, and survey research. Participant observation is the regular observation of events in a setting over time, with the observer playing a role in the setting that allows him or her to develop rapport with others in the organization. Comparative projects intentionally examine organizations and faith communities with similar characteristics, but which vary on key attributes. Given the Faith and Organization's project's concern regarding locality, the role of religion, type of service (sector), and race/ethnicity/nationality on social welfare and health services provided under religious auspices, the pilot chose to compare organizations and communities on those attributes. These two charts provide an outline of the organizations involved in the study by these major attributes. Organization names for all but one of the participating agencies have been changed to protect identity and privacy.ⁱⁱ

Philadelphia Research

Organization Matrix Philadelphia	Mainline Protestant	Evangelicals	African American	Catholics	Jews and Muslims	Peace Churches
Social Service	Lutheran Charities		Joy Ministries		Jewish Organization for the Aid of Immigrants	
Health and Senior services		Christian Adult Community Day Program	Christian Adult Community Day Program			Lakeside
Agencies arising from Community Organizing		Christian Adult Community Day Program	Christian Adult Community Day Program			

Washington DC Metropolitan Area Research

Organization	Mainline	Evangelicals	African	Catholics	Jews and	Peace
--------------	----------	--------------	---------	-----------	----------	-------

Matrix Washington DC	Protestant		American		Muslims	Churches
Social Service	The Lutheran Rehabilitation and Shelter Center			Catholic GED Program, and St. Mary's Housing Program	Muslim Charities	
Health and Senior services					Jewish Aging Services and The Cohen Adult Day Program	Jubilee Association of Maryland
Agencies Arising from Community Organizing	Chinese Immigrant Services (and Asian)	Christian Children's Inner-city Program (and Asian)	Christian Children's Inner-city Program (and Asian)			

In order to ascertain differences across localities, we compared the older industrial city of Philadelphia with the cosmopolitan, national capital, and service center metropolis of the Washington DC Metropolitan Area. We found few differences by locality through pilot research, choosing to combine analysis of organizations in each city throughout this report.

The pilot study compared the following religions: Mainline Protestants (two Lutheran organizations and a United Methodist Organization founded by members of the Chinese congregation in a multicultural church), Catholics (two programs within the larger social service umbrella institution for the Archdiocese of Washington DC), Jews (one agency in each city), African American Christian (two organizations — one Evangelical and the other a mainline Protestant denomination), Muslims (one organization plus limited work with a second organization), and Evangelicals (one African American organization and another founded by Asian Americans). Our work with two Asian immigrant communities in Washington DC provided a further comparison by nationality. Given that the Chinese mainline Protestant organization and one of the Muslim organizations was founded by, and served, immigrants, the pilot also provided data on the role of immigrant faith communities in social service provision. While we initially intended to include Catholic and African American organizations in both cities, challenges obtaining access to sites in a timely manner prevented a full comparison. However, both of the Asian organizations in Washington DC had strong links to African American faith communities.

The national study chose to compare institutions in the sectors of social services (broadly defined), senior services and health, and programs that developed out of community organizing or needs assessments due to the differences among these agencies in funding structures, size and other key attributes. The social service agencies in this pilot ranged from small programs targeted toward one population — for example the Catholic housing program for former addicts and the Chinese social service program — and large multi-service organizations that dominated social welfare provision in their communities. Social service institutions share funding systems that combine government and private funds, as well as historical connections to faith communities. The three health and senior services institutions in this study all provided some form of care to the elderly or disabled. Organizations in the health and senior services sector compete with for profit institutions to provide service and rely heavily on fee-for-service systems combined with government voucher systems like Medicaid for funding. Agencies that evolved out of community organizing efforts tend to be smaller and younger than organizations in the other two sectors. These institutions can provide any type of service, but tend to rely on community funds more than other social service or health-related organizations.

The pilot project for the Faith and Organizations project combined several forms of qualitative methodology with a pilot for a quantitative survey. Brief descriptions of research in each of the non-profits participating in the qualitative research are provided below. While the pilot study endeavored to focus both on non-profits and their constituent communities, our research was strongest in the organizations themselves. Future research would include equal observations in faith communities and their constituent organizations.

The pilot for the survey developed a questionnaire that combined surveys previously used in other studies of faith-based non-profits with findings from the qualitative components of the pilot study. This questionnaire was piloted with several of the organizations that participated in the qualitative research component. We rapidly discovered that our questionnaire appeared too Protestant for many of the organizations and faith communities in our study. Given this feedback, we worked with the participating organizations and several advisory committee members who were faith-community and faith-based non-profit organization leaders to develop a framework for a more appropriate questionnaire. We agreed that the survey should be developed as part of the national project in order to reflect all of the faiths participating in this initiative.

The pilot project endeavored to explore the major research questions developed for the national study through short-term research in these organizations. Researchers spent between three and six months in each agency, as well as some time in its founding faith communities as appropriate. Washington DC research included both new research conducted for this study and earlier interviews and observation with some of the agencies completed during Michael Foley and Dean Hoge's Pew Charitable Trust-funded study, *Religion and the New Immigrants*. Six sites were chosen in consultation with the Co-PI and advisory board members in Washington DC to fit the matrix of religions and types of service illustrated above. Three sites represented a continuation of research from a study of social service agencies conducted by the PI as part of the *Religion and the New Immigrants Study*.ⁱⁱⁱ Sites were introduced to the study through extensive conversations with key staff as well as a host agency meeting to answer questions about the project. Site supervisors were invited to suggest dissemination products that would be useful to them from the project. Consultations with the host agency supervisors continued throughout the project.

Researchers in Washington DC came through several sources. Researchers included PhD students in social work at Catholic University of America, graduate and undergraduate students in anthropology and sociology from Catholic University of America, University of Maryland-College Park, and American University. One primary researcher spent 16 hours per week in two sites, observing activities and participating in staff and board meetings for the agency. Students in an ethnography class spent eight hours per week for two and a half months in their sites. Finally, three additional researchers each spent three months in their sites. In order to get a different perspective on larger agencies and provide more research coverage, two students worked in some sites.

In Philadelphia, the five sites were chosen by the Co-PI in consultation with the PI and advisory committee. Attention was given to maintaining diversity in religious traditions represented as well as services provided, size of agency, and racial/ethnic composition. Agencies were introduced to the project and assured that researchers would operate as participant-observers, gathering data primarily through observations and informal interviews while participating in the work of the agency itself (filing, stuffing envelopes, serving food, etc.). An additional incentive for the agencies was having access to an outside perspective on their operations and applied research that they could use.

Five researchers were selected, all of whom had an interest in religion and had some ethnographic experience. Four were doctoral students at the University of Pennsylvania and one was at the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia. One of these five students had recently completed her dissertation research and performed some additional research for this pilot project. This researcher worked closely with the organization pastor to develop her report and combined her earlier work with previously-conducted research. In their orientation to the project, Philadelphia student researchers were given the same documents and oral presentations as their counterparts in Washington, D.C. After the orientation, the four students conducting research in their sites for the first time spent three months in the agencies. They were on site at least twice a week.

The following brief descriptions provide an overview of each participating institution and also describe the research conducted at each site. Researchers participating in the pilot project have met on several occasions to discuss their findings and presented papers on their research at the Association for Research on Non-profit and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA) conference in November, 2005.

Mainline Protestant Organizations

Research in Mainline Protestant organizations was conducted in two organizations in Washington DC and one in Philadelphia. Two of these institutions were Lutheran and one United Methodist. The Philadelphia

organization, Lutheran Charities, was a large multi-service organization that had recently reinvigorated its relationship with Lutheran congregations. The organization was founded in 1922 as an agency of the church. It was operated as a program of the Pennsylvania Ministerium of the United Lutheran Church in America (a predecessor church of the ELCA). It was incorporated separately from the synod in 1965.

The agency serves a largely urban population, which is predominantly African American (80%). The denomination, in contrast, is overwhelmingly white and suburban. This demographic pattern is reflected in the staff as well. Beyond the Executive Director, who is a Lutheran clergy person but a career social service administrator, few staff members are Lutheran. Programming is diverse and non-religious in nature. Only a fraction of the overall program (5%) is of and for Lutheran congregants (a congregationally-based caregivers program). However, congregations participate actively in the refugee resettlement program and several other initiatives.

Research was conducted at this site over a period of three months, with the researcher observing approximately once a week. In addition, she interviewed key staff at the agency and participated in several congregational activities and organizational conferences. The co-PI for Philadelphia also interviewed a key staff person at the agency who was active in both the Lutheran and Jewish social service communities.

Brief observations were conducted at the Lutheran Rehabilitation and Shelter Center in Washington DC over a period of two months by one student. A former staff person at the agency provided retrospective and current data on the site as well. The organization was founded in the 1960s by an urban church in a changing Washington DC neighborhood as a witness on homelessness. The congregation gradually developed a transitional housing program as well as several shelters in partnership with other religious communities in the area. This independent non-profit has gradually moved away from the founding congregation, with its staff and board currently dominated by non-Lutherans. Its executive director is Catholic and Jews dominate the board. The organization also has developed a strong inter-denominational presence, drawing volunteers and other forms of support from various other religious institutions locally, nationally, and internationally. Nevertheless, the congregation does maintain some ties to the organization.

Participant observation was conducted primarily with the founding congregation, while additional data were provided on the organization by current staff and members of the church. Interviews were conducted with the current church pastor as well as agency staff. Staff also provided retrospective data on the relationship between the organization and its founding congregation that both belonged to the congregation and who were also employed by one of the agencies associated with the housing program.

Chinese Immigrant Services is a program of the Chinese congregation of a merged United Methodist church that now combines a historic African American AME congregation with the largest Chinese United Methodist congregation in the Washington DC area. The program has a separate EIN,^{iv} but is not a separately incorporated non-profit. The organization was created in the late 1970s when the Chinese congregation was still an independent church. It was begun by Chinese immigrants who had been in the United States for many years in order to provide support to newly arriving Chinese immigrants and other Chinatown residents. It now offers a number of programs including computer courses, ESL, business development, and crime victim services through a combination of government funding and private contributions. All of the staff and volunteers are Chinese immigrants, with key staff volunteering as a ministry from the church. The agency is located in the church social service building, which is also located in historic Chinatown. The congregation also supports a seniors program that was created by the African American congregation and continues to serve exclusively African American elderly. While worship services for the two congregations have merged, the two social service activities appear completely independent of each other. They do share a receptionist as well as space in the congregation-owned building.

The PI conducted extensive interviews with agency key staff during the *Religion and New Immigrants* project. Fieldwork was conducted at this site for six weeks by a student researcher who visited once a week as well as communicating via telephone and email with agency staff. He also attended one worship service at the congregation.

Evangelicals

Two organizations in the pilot study came out of Evangelical Christian witness. One of these organizations was also African American, and will be discussed with the African American organizations below. In Washington DC, Christian Children's Inner City Program was founded by Asian Americans who had converted to Evangelical Christianity as part of their campus, college experience. This was the only organization in this study that claimed that it had no affiliation to particular congregations nor to geographically-based faith communities. Instead it depended on networks of young adults who had participated in the Asian Evangelical campus ministries. As such, the organization drew its support from across the country as well as from Evangelical churches (Asian, white and African American) in the greater Metropolitan Washington DC area. Staff and active volunteers belonged to several area churches, some that were predominantly white and others that were African American. The organization also maintained close ties with an Evangelical African American church and its CDC. The organization founder often worshiped with the African American congregation.

Founders for this organization were the U.S.-raised children of recent Asian immigrants who had businesses in inner-city, primarily African American and Latino, neighborhoods. The organization was created as a mechanism for the Asian community to give back generosity to the neighborhoods that had provided their parents with their livelihood, as well as to uplift the at-risk members of those neighborhoods. The program focused on children and youth through an after-school tutoring program, bible study and support programs for teens, and a summer camp.

While initial interviews with the executive director/founder were conducted as part of the *Religion and the New Immigrant* Project, this site also hosted a participant observer for five months. The researcher visited the site approximately once every other week, participating in the homework club, youth programming, and staff meetings. In addition, a focus group with staff members was conducted later in the research project.

African American Christian Organizations

Two Philadelphia African American ministries participated in the pilot project. The Christian Adult Community Day Program was one ministry of an Evangelical megachurch, a seniors program that offered a variety of day activities and meals to African American seniors. This large and rapidly growing church is in a low income neighborhood in northern Philadelphia. Combining all of its congregations, it is the largest and the fastest-growing Protestant denomination in the United States. The church was founded in 1966 as a tiny store-front ministry. Today, the church's sanctuary seats 3,000 people and is located in a new and strikingly modern building of 37,000 square feet. The new sanctuary was built to share walls with a newly renovated 36,000 square-foot ministry building that houses executive offices, a chapel and approximately 35 classrooms, as well as dining and assembly halls. Currently, the church is beginning the third phase of construction, building a gymnasium as a hub for the sports-centered activities of the community.

According to their website, the church runs over seventy different ministries including family services and counseling; tutoring; adult literacy programs; home and foreign Mission outreach; a Day School; after school programs; hospital, nursing home, and prison ministry; day camps; food distribution programs; drama guild, etc. In the past, it owned and operated a full shelter for more than 190 homeless men. Other major current ministries include a full family shelter and welfare to work programs. All in all, the church and its CDC employ over one hundred full and part-time staff making them one of the largest employers in the community.

In the fall of 2002, the pastor started a program for seniors, expanding upon an informal senior citizens' group within the church. The Christian Adult Community Day Program increased the size of this informal group, the number of activities offered, and instituted a formal schedule, opening the doors to the community at large. Since its inception two years ago, the program has grown rapidly to include 92 active participants, over half of whom (52) are not members of the church. Most live nearby.

The researcher participated in the senior center as a volunteer for four months, plus some follow up contact, serving meals and otherwise providing support to the program. She also attended worship services and conducted informal interviews with staff and participants.

The other African American organization was a program of a cluster of African American United Methodist churches. The lead church is the only congregation in Pennsylvania to run a welfare-to-work program through the church with a separate EIN. At this site, the researcher had conducted research with the welfare to work and youth programs for several years. For the pilot project, the pastor and researcher worked together to

develop a report on a new initiative for youth, incorporated as a separate 501(c)(3) non-profit under the care of the cluster. The program brought together eight United Methodist congregations located in North Philadelphia in a program for at-risk youth. Of the eight churches in this cluster, three were historically white. The other five cluster churches were formed as African American Methodist Episcopal congregations.

The program was initially developed by youth associated with the founding congregation, as a teen lounge concept, and expanded into an alternative learning program for at-risk youth. Most of the staff and volunteers are associated with the founding churches, and youth tend to come from these predominantly African American neighborhoods. The researcher observed this program for two years. She also conducted interviews with youth and others involved in the project. Working closely with the pastor, her research builds on several years of previous research with other programs started by this congregation.

Catholic Organizations

Two organizations under the auspices of the greater Washington DC archdiocese umbrella social service agencies participated in the study. The umbrella organization had been interviewed as part of the *Religion and the New Immigrant Study*, providing initial background on the parent institution. In addition, the study PI interviewed executive staff in this parent institution about the relationship to the archdiocese, agency structures and the two programs that served as sites for the pilot study.

St. Mary's Housing program is a support and transitional housing program for people recovering from addictions. The clientele is primarily African American, most with Protestant African American religious backgrounds. A white nun leads the staff, but most of the counselors are African Americans who have also recovered from addictions. Research at this site was conducted for approximately four months, with the researcher going to the site one evening a week. She also interviewed key staff at the archdiocese and participated in gaining access to the umbrella agency. As such, her research provided insights both into this individual program and the structures of the larger umbrella social service agency. While this student did not perform any research in parishes, she is herself Catholic, participated in other archdiocese activities as a student in social work at Catholic University, relying on her familiarity with the archdiocese and its parish activities through her education and personal experience to supplement research in the non-profit.

The second site, a Catholic GED program, was part of a center that provided education, computer courses and emergency services for people in a particular neighborhood in Washington DC. The demographics for clients at this site were: 59% male, 41% female, 86% African American, 7% Caucasian and 4% Hispanic. The staff consists of 8 full time employees and 1 part time. One of the leaders of the program was Catholic, with family members in leadership roles in her parish, while the other was in the process of converting to Catholicism. Four of the staff are African American and the rest white. Besides the two center leaders, only one other staff person was Catholic.

Research was conducted for three months, with observations at the agency at least twice a week and visits to other locations such as various parishes in the diocese. Interviews were conducted with the director and the parenting staff. A focus group was conducted with the GED staff and some other staff members. The researcher shadowed the liaison with Catholic parishes. In addition, he input information about how homeless people use agency services into a database and to complete intakes of clients. In addition, he tutored a student preparing for the GED. He also attended the initial orientation for all new employees and volunteers at the parent organization and participated in staff meetings. Informal conversations with many of the staff provided data on how they came to the agency and their experience with it. Additionally, he spoke often with some of the clients in the computer room and his GED learner about their experience with parent organization and this site.

Jewish and Muslim Organizations

The pilot project conducted research in two Jewish organizations — one in Philadelphia and one in Washington DC metropolitan area, as well as one Muslim organization in the Washington DC area. Another Muslim organization had been the subject for research for the Religion and the New Immigrants study. While the pilot-study researcher was unable to observe at this second site, he did communicate with its executive director by telephone.

Two students conducted research in the Cohen Center over a six month period. The center is a medically certified Adult Day Care program, which provides a structured and supportive environment for aging adults suffering from physical, cognitive, or emotional problems, who are in need of social stimulation under medical supervision. It is one of many programs offered by the Jewish Aging Services, an organization founded with a mission "to help older people remain in the homes of their choice and in life's mainstream as long and as independently as possible." In addition to the Cohen Center, the parent agency offers a number of other services designed to "ensure dignity, self-determination and independent lifestyles for Jewish elders and others in the Greater Washington community." These programs include informational telephone helplines, transportation services, computer and employment skills training, as well as a senior community center.

The Center generally has approximately 85 to 90 participants enrolled in its program, and it can accommodate 55 of those participants a day. Demographically the Center's participant composition is 95% Caucasian, 1% Latina/o, 2% African American, and 2% Asian American (including individuals of Indian and Chinese descent). Religiously the Center's participants are approximately 80% Jewish and 19% Christian, with approximately 1% of the participants coming from Hindu or Muslim traditions.

Senior staff are predominantly white, and predominantly Jewish, including the current director, the assistant director, and three of the four nurses and social workers. The other two professional staff are white Christians. All but one of the activity directors and aides were phenotypically Black, most immigrants from Africa or the Caribbean. The remaining activity director was white. All of these quasi-professional staff identified as Christians, with a mix of Protestants and Catholics.

Both students worked as aides in the program, observing activities and participating as volunteers. The first student observed twice a week over two months, assisting with the seniors program. She also conducted interviews with key staff and focus groups with the remaining staff. The second student observed over two and half months, primarily working with the outreach coordinator to do presentations on the agency to synagogues, Temples, and health care institutions. This student also observed the senior program and conducted interviews and focus groups. In addition, the PI interviewed the director for the Cohen Center, the executive director for the parent organization, a key board member for the parent organization and staff at Federation. Additional content analysis of agency and Federation documents was also developed.

Originally founded as the Association for the Protection of Jewish Immigrants, the Jewish Organization for the Aid of Immigrants has provided rescue, protection, legal and technical assistance to thousands of immigrants, refugees, students, visitors, visiting scholars, temporary workers and others on behalf of Philadelphia's organized Jewish community. The organization's current name reflects its affiliation during the 1920's with JOAI, Inc. the Jewish Organization for the Aid of Immigrants. While JOAI and Council still maintains relationships through shared volunteer leadership and refugee resettlement contracts, with JOAI, Inc. (New York), JOAI and Council Migration Service of Philadelphia is a fully independent, 501(c)(3) legal aid and social service organization, funded primarily by the Jewish Federation of Greater Philadelphia, private contributions, charitable foundations and nominal client fees.

As the number of Jewish refugees declined in the 1990s, a previous executive director began to expand pre-existing immigration services to provide support for people seeking a wide array of assistance with immigration applications, asylum and other needs for immigrant communities. This work expanded the agency focus beyond the Jewish community. The current executive director has further expanded this aid to non-Jews, now working with people from many countries and religions seeking help with immigration related issues.

Research at this agency was conducted over nine weeks, with the researcher observing twice a week. She also conducted informal interviews with the executive director and other staff as well as several clients. She attended outreach events on immigration at other sites. In addition, the co-PI interviewed a former executive director as well as the current director of this agency.

Research in the two Muslim organizations started as part of the *Religion and the New Immigrant Study*. Interviews were conducted with key staff as well as some brief observation. Muslim women founded both Muslim Charities and the second organization with professional credentials as a way to support community members in need. Both provide a range of emergency services for anyone in need and adjustment assistance for new immigrants, working through a referral system within the greater Muslim community in the Washington DC area.

The Virginia-based Muslim Charities initially had a concern with domestic violence because an active volunteer had survived an abusive relationship. The organization is the only domestic violence program for Muslims in the area. In addition, the current executive director is a social worker who provides counseling and support for Muslim women with many needs. As with its sister organization, all of the staff and active volunteers with the organization are Muslim women who practice the dress codes and other religious observances of their immigrant communities. Most of these women are also professionals — social workers, doctors and other helping professionals who have worked outside of the Muslim community. The organization has offices in a social service building associated with many Muslim organizations, and was at one point housed in one of the Islamic Centers.

Its sister organization in Maryland began to address the needs of Muslim children placed in foster care. This organization also provides emergency services and other supports through the same referral network. A much smaller and more informal organization, it was founded by an African American convert to Islam who is a licensed social worker. This woman also practices the more traditional forms of Islamic dress and other religious observances. The organization is run out of her home with the support of the wider Muslim community and a few volunteers.

A student researcher conducted research for the pilot study over a period of two months. This student communicated with staff at both organizations by email and telephone to gain initial data. He observed at Muslim Charities on three occasions, but found that his access was limited as a male, non-Muslim. His research was supplemented by extensive interviews and communications conducted during the earlier *Religion and the New Immigrants* study.

Peace Churches

The pilot study conducted research in two organizations founded by Peace Churches — a retirement community founded by Quakers outside of Philadelphia and an agency that provided supportive housing and social programs for developmentally disabled adults in the greater Washington Metropolitan Area founded by Mennonites. Both organizations had been founded by one congregation and maintained ties to that congregation today.

The Mennonite organization was founded in the late 1970s out of a concern of members of a local Mennonite church who had been involved in deinstitutionalization of the developmentally disabled in Maryland. A member of the church founded the organization as a church ministry, and it initially relied on church support and volunteers. The program began through volunteer efforts of the church to found one group home meant to serve four people. After several years, the current executive director — a member of the church as well as a social work administrator — was asked by the congregation to take on the ministry.

Since that time, the organization has grown from one group house to 40 locations, including 13 group homes and additional apartments or other quasi-independent living situations. Ninety-five people are served by the organization, none of them Mennonite. The organization initially employed one staff person with the support of two Mennonite-church stipended volunteers. It now employs 120 people from a variety of racial and religious backgrounds. Only a few staff members are Mennonites. The organization is considered a leader in its field. While some families seek out the program as a Christian facility, it serves people of all faiths and has both Jews and Christians on its board. However, agency by-laws require that the majority of board members be Mennonite.

Research at this organization included participant observations at the group homes and Faith and Light — a non-denominational religious program for the developmentally disabled, over five months. The researcher visited the group homes approximately once every two weeks, attending additional Faith and Light events, agency staff meetings, and other activities sponsored by the organization. She also attended services at the founding Mennonite church. In addition, the PI and two other researchers conducted interviews and focus groups with key staff and board members. These researchers also attended the organization's orientation program for new employees as well as the Christmas party and several other events. Annual reports from the church and the organization, as well as other written materials, were reviewed for additional data.

Lakeside, which opened in 1967, is a Quaker, continuing care facility located 25 miles north of Philadelphia. Lakeside consists of a residential community of nearly 400 older adults, with an average age of 80. Residents live either in independent apartments, assisted living, or skilled care (nursing home). The Lakeside campus is self-sufficient, with dining facilities, a fitness center and pool, a hairdresser, library, pharmacy, bank, and mailroom. Employees do not live on site. Lakeside currently has a very strong reputation, and is considered to be a leader in the industry.

Demographically, one third of Lakeside residents are Quaker. The vast majority of residents are white, highly educated, and from middle to upper income levels. Aside from Quakers, there are large contingents of Episcopalians and Jews (each approximately 20%). Most residents come from the greater Philadelphia area (or Eastern Pennsylvania). In its earlier years, residents came from farther afield, as facilities like Lakeside were more rare. Now, given the boom in continuing care facilities around the country, more people move in from surrounding areas.

The vast majority of staff are not Quaker; at this time, only two members of the senior staff are Quaker, notably the CEO and Director of Nursing. Lakeside hires staff irrespective of religious faith. By contrast, the by-laws of the Board mandate that 75% of the Board be active Quakers.

Research at this site combined participant observation, interviews, and analysis of documents. The researcher spent 4-6 hours per week at Lakeside over 10 weeks. This included attending Quaker Meeting for Worship, attending a meeting of the Board of Directors, eating with residents in the dining room and the coffee shop, attending events, visiting residents in their personal apartments and rooms, as well as in the common community spaces. Given the spread-out nature of Lakeside's campus, she did not take on a particular staff role (volunteering at reception, for example), as she wanted the opportunity to move between different areas of the facility. Open-ended (semi-structured) interviews were conducted with 11 staff members and with 8 residents. These interviews each lasted from one to two hours.

Document analysis included reviewing a range of documents pertaining to Lakeside, including the Lakeside website, Lakeside promotional materials, a book written by a resident about Lakeside, literature on Quakerism, documents from Board Meetings, the Lakeside Handbook and Guidelines given to new residents, and a Resident Feedback Survey conducted in May of 2004. In addition, the Co-PI interviewed the Executive Director.

Suggestions for Future Research

This pilot study drew together two teams of researchers who conducted quasi-independent projects connected through locality specific team project meetings and occasional events that allowed opportunities for staff from the two projects to communicate with each other. Communications across sites was handled primarily through the two PIs visiting the other team. Consistency across projects came from shared training materials and ongoing conversations. While the general framework for study methods worked for the pilot project, additional types of fieldwork were necessary in order to adequately respond to all study questions. Specific additional strategies include:

- **Conduct equal amount of research in both organizations and founding faith community venues.** Given the limited scope of the pilot, all researchers performed some observations and interviews in the founding faith communities. However, truly discovering the social capital connections between non-profits and their founding communities would require regular observations at worship services, community-wide events, and other venues. Interviews and focus groups should also be conducted with members of the founding religious or secular community.
- **Focus both on congregations and higher level judicatory bodies.** As discussed in more detail below, some religions organize social welfare systems through community-wide structures like an archdiocese, a Jewish federation or a synod. Even the mainline Protestant and Peace Church organizations responded to advice, support and oversight from synods, clusters of churches, and other higher-level judicatory structures. Many of these organizations also belong to regional or national umbrella groups associated with their faiths. Understanding the role of these higher level institutions in faith-based service would provide an important additional component to the project.

- **Follow organizations to venues with secular counterparts in order to understand the role of these agencies in the sector.** The planning team for the national study considered comparing faith-based and secular organizations, ultimately deciding that focusing on faith-based institutions was sufficient in most cases. However, our pilot research also showed these organizations participating in activities with peer organizations founded by both secular communities and other faiths. Observing interactions in these events would provide data on the sector.
- **Perform comparative research with secular organizations in marginalized racial and immigrant communities in order to disentangle the role of race, immigrant status, and faith in these organizations.** Research with African American Christian, Muslim and Asian Protestant organizations raised numerous questions regarding the relative importance of providing appropriate services to the racial, ethnic and immigrant communities and the role of religion in these institutions. For example, was the Chinese church offering services to immigrants through the church as a ministry or because the church served as a mediating institution that brought together Chinese with similar concerns? How would this organization's services differ from those provided by a secular agency? Would a secular agency draw its support from different parts of the Chinese community or the same people and institutions? In order to adequately understand the complex dynamics between these factors, the project ultimately decided to include comparisons between faith-based and secular organizations in these communities.
- **Institute uniform training, reporting and communication systems across sites.** The Faith and Organizations project is meant both as independent research in local communities and as an action-research initiative with specific goals to provide useful information to practitioners and policy makers. The uniform training and communication structures of the pilot suggested some strategies to achieve these goals. The national project also envisions a core team of specialists in particular sectors and faiths that would work closely with researchers across sites to maintain consistency. The pilot experience also highlighted the need for uniform reporting and communications to ensure consistency across sites.

Major Themes

Several major crosscutting findings came out of the pilot study. These themes provide important hints to the ways that faith communities organize social welfare and health provision through their non-profit organizations and congregations; the relationship between faith communities, congregations and their non-profits; and the ways that theology, religious culture and religious identity are expressed in organizations founded by different religions. This next section focuses on four key dynamics that influenced faith-based service provision:

1. **Institutional vs. congregational approaches to service provision.** Various religions organize social welfare provision for their members and others in different ways. We found two different forms of service systems: *Institutional* systems (Catholics, Jews, perhaps Muslims) focus on service provision through centralized entities like an archdiocese or Jewish Federation while *Congregational* systems (Mainline Protestant, African American Christians, Evangelicals, Peace Churches) see congregations as central for fostering and maintaining religious-based non-profits.
2. **The role of theology and religious culture in service provision.** Each religion had its unique understanding of the theological basis for service provision and religious culture that significantly structured that nature of service provision in organizations founded by that faith. This section provides a brief overview of the theology for social justice and social supports for that religion, its history of social justice and social welfare work, and discussion of that faith community's system for organizing worship and social welfare activities.
3. **The importance of social capital to faith-based non-profits:** Social capital played a significant role for all organizations. The types of social capital among the founding faith community, the sector, and individual congregations varied among organizations. Likewise, some organizations had stronger ties to faith-community institutions (congregations and higher judicatory bodies), government and other institutions in their sector than others. Given current stress on congregations' role in service provision stemming from the Faith-based Initiative, some non-profits coming out of institutionalized systems

reached out to congregations for the first time, only to find limited social capital connections to these congregations.

4. **Forms of religious expression.** *Explicit* or *expressive* faiths (Evangelicals, African Americans) actively use god-language or references to their religion in service provision while other faiths (Jews, Peace Churches, sometimes Catholics) practiced *embedded religion* where theology and religious culture played a profound role in faith-based service yet very few symbols of religion or references to faith appeared in service provision. Mainline Protestant service provision mostly appeared as embedded faith to program participants, but activities among some staff and outreach activities to congregations sometimes used expressive modes.

Both Smith and Sosin's (2001) discussion of the varieties of religious-based organizations and the Sider and Unruh typology (2004) presume that the most religious organizations would have firm connections to congregations or higher-level judicatory bodies like an archdiocese or Jewish Federation. These typologies also presume that organizations that are more closely tied to faith would express their religion through staffing decisions, mission, funding, use of religious symbols, religious practice as part of programming or staff practices and other mechanisms that clearly denote religious affiliation. Our findings agree with Jeavons's (2004) observation that the Sider and Unruh typology is profoundly influenced by the theology and cultural expectations of Protestant faith, particularly Evangelical forms of Christianity. Our findings further challenge assumptions that faith-based service should necessarily grow out of the activities of individual congregations. The various religions in our pilot study created different systems to provide for the health and social welfare of their members and society at large, and expressed their faith in different ways.

Institutional vs. Congregational Service Provision

The policy focus on congregations as providers of social supports has led to comparisons of the levels of congregational involvement among different faiths. Mainline Protestants and African American churches generally appear most active in all forms of civic engagement, including social welfare service provision. A number of studies note that Catholic parishes appear less active than other faiths (Bane 2005, Schlozman, Verba and Brady 1995). While studies of civic engagement note that Jews are highly active (Bane 2005, Schlozman, Verba and Brady 1995), pilot study research suggested limited connections between synagogues, Temples, and non-profit organizations. While individual Muslims actively supported the non-profits we studied, relationships between mosques and these organizations were not always clear.

However, despite this apparent lack of involvement from individual congregations, all of these organizations had significant ties to their founding religions. The faiths that showed less congregational support instead connected to their faith communities through community-wide structures: Jewish Federations, Catholic archdiocese, and the Muslim *Zakat* system. This finding led us to develop a comparison between faiths that relied heavily on congregational support and those that organize social welfare provision through wider community or hierarchical structures.

Faith communities fell into two categories: Jews, Catholics and possibly Muslims organized social service provision through *institutionalized* systems (Hehir 2002) where social services are centralized through a community-wide system separate from worship communities: mosques, synagogues and Temples, parishes. In the Jewish community, social welfare services are provided through professional organizations affiliated with the Jewish Federations and councils, which is responsible for planning, fundraising and other supports for these institutions. Community-wide oversight draws on civic engagement from the faith-community through participation in Federation activities and committees. Likewise, the Catholic archdiocese holds responsibility for most social services through Catholic Social Services or Catholic Charities, agencies that are under the church hierarchical structure. Mechanisms for volunteering and for garnering support from the faith community come from the archdiocese. While organizational structures were much more nascent in the Muslim communities, similar expectations regarding social supports appeared to operate in this religion. For example, both of the social service agencies studied for this study and a related study had boards drawn from all of the area mosques, not one mosque or Islamic Center.^v Likewise, their support and referral structures drew from the entire community rather than one congregation.

The differences between institutional and congregational approaches to social welfare service provision stemmed from religious culture. The various Protestant religions, Evangelicals, the Protestant African American

congregations, and Peace Churches all see the congregation as the fundamental unit in that religion. While each of these denominations has larger judicatory bodies that sometimes provide support to non-profits under religious auspices, social welfare activities are generally founded either by particular congregations, or several congregations working together. For example, one Mennonite congregation founded Jubilee, the Mennonite facility. The current executive director is a member of that congregation who was asked to take on this ministry. Similar connections between individual congregations and organizations existed for all of the congregational organizations in the study.

In contrast, non-profits in institutional systems responded primarily to the centralized entities in their region, and cultivated only tangential relationships with individual congregations. This was most clear in the Catholic organization, which was part of the archdiocese. Further, during the study period, the archdiocese decided to reorganize its social welfare systems by combining several previously independent social welfare organizations under one umbrella structure. The archdiocese encouraged local parishes to work with this archdiocese-wide social welfare system to meet the needs of its members. While one of the programs we studied drew volunteers from a nearby parish, structures for volunteering were generally handled through archdiocese-wide structures.

Our research in the Catholic GED Program revealed this agency's preference for social welfare flowing through the archdiocese rather than the parishes working independently. For example, the archdiocese has a formal system to work with parishes to find support for people in need. While parishes might refer people who are their members, they also referred non-Catholics who came to a parish for help. On several occasions staff asserted that they preferred parishes to refer people seeking aid to the formal social service arm of the Church where they could be appropriately evaluated and monitored for services rather than try to provide support through parish resources. Likewise, the archdiocese is in the process of developing a system to link parishes to each other for social welfare support and activities, also working through the archdiocese as an organizational structure.

This organizational system with the archdiocese as the center for social welfare support may help explain why many Catholic parishes appear less active in social welfare provision than Protestant churches. If the archdiocese is considered the appropriate venue for seeking aid, volunteering, and donating funds for these kinds of activities, then individual parish initiatives would be contrary to the established system. Parish activity may be supported in addition to contributing through archdiocese sponsored activities, but they would not be the culturally appropriate first-response contact to support members or others in need.

While Jewish synagogues and Temples in the United States are generally independent of each other like in the congregationally focused religions, Jews as a cultural group and religion organize social welfare through community-wide systems. The Federation movement started with the Boston Federation in 1895 as a mechanism to rationalize and consolidate fundraising and planning for Jewish organizations. The movement quickly spread across the country. Currently United Jewish Committee (UJC) lists 189 Federations in the U.S. and Canada (www.ujc.org).

The Federation system harkens back to *Kehillah*, or the community administrative bodies in Europe that were responsible for Jewish life prior to the establishment of modern nation states. The modern Federation differs from the *Kehillah* in that Federations are voluntary organizations. Members join by donating as little as ten dollars to a Federation fundraising campaign. Not all Jewish organizations are under the umbrella of a local Federation, nor does the Federation hold administrative authority for Jewish life as the *Kehillah* did in Europe (Roseman 1974, Bogen 1917).

UJC and other Jewish national organizations differ from the Catholic structures in two important ways. First, Jewish institutions are created from the bottom up — they are professional associations for their constituent members rather than hierarchical organizations that provide guidance to lower level organizations. Second, while UJC reflects Jewish culture and religion, the religious organizations are separate from philanthropy, cultural, education, and social service agencies. As with the local Federations, synagogues and Temples are voluntary organizations formed by their members. While umbrella organizations and rabbinical training colleges exist for the various forms of Judaism in the United States, Jews lack the hierarchical religious structures of the Catholic Church and some Protestant denominations. Authority comes from the constituent members and their local leaders for both the congregations and the various non-profit organizations.

This disconnection between the religious institutions and social welfare systems influenced the relationship between individual members, the congregations, and the Jewish non-profits in the study. The Philadelphia Jewish organization maintained an ambivalent relationship with its Federation, but had no relationship with any of the synagogues or Temples. The organization had no outreach to synagogues or Temples prior to our study. Our researcher found that congregations that she contacted to schedule presentations on the organization showed little enthusiasm for congregational outreach activities. Presentations by individual social service agencies were simply outside the norm for this community.

At both the national and local level, Federations brought together a number of pre-existing organizations. Jews have maintained an obligation to care for members of their community themselves since early migration to the United States (Bogan 1917). Federations are either generally linked or merged with local United Jewish Appeal (UJA) offices, the umbrella fundraising organization for the Jewish community. Early on, synagogues and fraternal societies took care of most needs. Many larger communities had Jewish settlement houses and the precursors to Jewish Family Service before the creation of local Federations.

The Jewish Federation of Philadelphia was established in 1901 “as a way of uniting the efforts of a number of Jewish agencies which had been set up to assist people who were ill, poor, old, orphaned, or out of work, including many immigrants who had fled the pogroms of Eastern Europe” (Task force on Resettlement 1980, 7). The Washington DC metropolitan area Federation is much younger, evolving out of the local UJA and founded in the late 1970s. The Washington DC metropolitan area Jewish community has a stable core population, but also many transient members due to nature of work in the nation’s capital. While the area had a United Jewish Appeal organization for many years, it only decided recently that it had a large enough stable population for community-wide social welfare planning typical of other community Federations.

Our research among Muslims in Washington DC was insufficient to provide a clear picture of the organization of social welfare in this faith. In addition, most of the Mosques and other social welfare structures in this community had developed fairly recently, so that independent social welfare systems were just beginning to evolve. However, our research revealed several elements that suggest the beginnings of an institutionalized system similar to Islamic economic systems in other countries (Weiss 2002).

Both of the social service agencies developed in response to concerns among members of several mosques about a particular issue. One organization drew its board and supporters from several mosques. While one organization was founded by women at a particular mosque and drew much of its early support from this mosque, it still claimed to be a part of the wider Muslim community. Both organizations relied heavily on the Internet and word of mouth within the greater Muslim community to draw support, find people to serve, and provide them with assistance. While formal structures like a Federation or archdiocese did not exist, the Muslim community did show a sense of group ownership for these organizations and their activities more similar to institutional systems than congregational social service provision.

The strong relationship between congregations and non-profits even held true for the large Lutheran organization in our study. As Thiemann (2005) points out, while Lutherans are a Protestant denomination, they and the Episcopal Church both maintain closer relationships to Catholicism. While this organization was founded by the Pennsylvania ministerium in 1922, it nevertheless consistently reaches out to individual congregations to support activities like refugee resettlement and elder care. This organization represents a middle ground between congregational and institutional forms of social welfare service provision. It benefits from the strengths of both systems – drawing on the critical mass and hierarchical systems of the parent ministerium, while also developing relationships with local congregations.

At the same time, the organization also shows the weaknesses in each system. Given that decision making for the organization is independent of individual congregations through higher judicatory body and its relatively independent status, organization decisions to focus on groups like GLBT youth may not fit the ideology of the local congregations. While the organization depends on congregations to perform some services, others – like foster care and other services for children – are funded primarily through government and serve primarily non-Lutheran people. The organization was concerned to learn that few Lutherans use their services yet congregations always ask how many Lutherans are served by its programs when it attempts to reach out to local congregations. As such, the organization faces mixed expectations that it will both be a creature of the congregations and the Lutheran community as a whole.

Fundraising and Civic Engagement

Fundraising in institutionalized systems also flows through central structures. While all organizations relied on some outside funding through government or private sources, their support from the founding faith community came from community-wide systems. Jewish agencies received part of their funding through the UJA. Catholic agencies received support directly from the archdiocese and through Bishops appeals and similar fundraising efforts from the centralized archdiocese to the parishes. Saint Vincent de Paul and other donation systems also relied in part on this centralized structure. Muslim support for organizations is codified into religious law: *Zakat* is a mandatory religious obligation by Muslims to donate a percentage of their income to provide for the poor or others in need (Weiss 2002: 20-26). The bulk of the funds for the organizations studied here came through *Zakat* donations.

Fundraising in congregational systems likewise focused on individual congregations rather than faith-community-wide structures. While a large Protestant agency might use a higher judicatory body to obtain a list of congregations, fundraising was done through outreach to congregations. Lakeside, the Quaker organization, received funding from the Meeting that founded it. Lutheran Rehabilitation and Shelter Center also maintained fundraising and other ties to its founding church even as it reached out to other faiths to assist in developing its non-profit organization.

While worship communities may provide for people in need in their midst, they are far more likely to refer people in need to these formal social service structures. For example, Catholic Social Services parish outreach efforts attempted to encourage parishes to rely on this formalized system to provide for people who sought financial support from a parish. This involved a referral system, which would link people in need to Catholic Social Services formal intake system, thus potentially providing greater, more integrated support than parish donations. In the Jewish community, the adult day care center's new outreach began by providing information to synagogues about their services. Community members were more likely to turn to centralized intake through Jewish social service and aging agencies than to look directly to one of the member agencies. The Muslim organization functioned largely as a referral organization — people with a particular need asked the agency for help and the agency found someone in the larger Muslim community to address the issue. Mosques referred people in need to these agencies.

Likewise, civic engagement for the faith community often flowed through these larger structures. Catholic Social Services had a centralized volunteer system that drew on the parishes for support. For the Jewish agencies, civic engagement largely came through governance — boards and advisory committees drew from this community. Muslim organizations depended on informal networks for service provision, governance, volunteers and staff.

In contrast, congregationally organized systems directly linked to worship communities for resources and participants. Mainline Protestants, Peace Churches and Evangelicals all relied on congregational supports. For example, even though the Protestant Social Services was a large structure serving the wider community, it relied on congregations to provide refugee and aging services. Both the Quaker and Mennonite organizations were under the care of specific congregations that provided a portion of their board members as well as other resources. For example, the land for Lakeside was donated by one Meeting, maintained through rent of one dollar per year. Jubilee Association of Maryland drew the majority of its board members from the Mennonite community, particularly this congregation. Christian Adult Community Day Program was seamlessly integrated into the congregation, involving participants in larger worship services and church activities.

Only Christian Children's Inner-city Program claimed no links to a particular congregation, instead its key founders and volunteers came through a network of Asian campus evangelical organizations. Yet, despite this supposed independence, most staff and volunteers came from a couple of congregations and the organization turned to Asian Christian churches for support rather than any umbrella group.

Congregationally organized systems relied on congregations for a range of supports. In the larger agencies, fundraising was accomplished through letters to the congregations as well as individual appeals. The same was true for volunteers and staff. Christian Adult Community Day Program had a system of missionary interns that provided support for the senior center and the staff regarded their work at the agency as a ministry that paid far less than outside employment. Christian Children's Inner-City Program turned to various Asian churches and campus ministries for volunteers, interns, fundraising and board members. The Lutheran Rehabilitation and

Shelter Center relied on its founding church for volunteers as well as other resources. The key board members and staff for Chinese Immigrant Services came from the founding congregation, the organization was housed in the social service building for the church, and volunteers came from the same source.

Program participants were far more likely to give back directly to these founding congregations in a congregational system. For example, Lakeside residents contributed toward the building fund for an addition to their founding Friends Meeting. Christian Adult Community Day Program senior center participants were active in the church, including participation in worship and other activities. Christian Children's Inner-city Program participants prepared to sing at local congregations that had sponsored their activities.

The differences between institutionally and congregationally organized systems suggest that the structure of community involvement and support can look very different depending on the defining organizing principle for social support. Rather than expectations of direct links between individuals and organizations common in many of the complaints about lack of civic engagement in the U.S. (Putnam 2000), involvement in institutionalized systems is mediated through centralized structures. In this case, civic engagement is not missing; to the contrary it is expanded through a larger, less personalized system.

Implications for Policy and Practice

- **Policy focuses on congregations as the appropriate venue for faith-based service may be misplaced. Instead, initiatives to promote faith community involvement in social welfare should support both congregational and institutional forms.** This finding potentially impacts the evolution of public policy like the faith-based initiative and other efforts to enhance civic engagement. Most of these initiatives presume congregational systems, considering institutionalized social welfare systems as examples of impersonal bureaucracies. If, as this pilot study suggests, institutionalized systems represent different forms of civic engagement rather than lack of support, policy would need to adjust to accommodate both forms of engagement.
- **Non-profits in institutionalized systems may find it appropriate to strengthen relationships to the faith community through their wider community systems rather than work to mimic outreach to individual congregations as in the congregational systems.**

Implications for Future Research

- **Future research should focus on comparing these two systems to further test findings from the pilot and understand differences between congregational and institutional systems better.**
- **Research on relationships among non-profits and faith communities in institutionalized systems should pay particular attention to the role of community-wide entities like the archdiocese or Federation rather than focusing on congregation/non-profit relations or the interactions between individual members of that faith and the organization.** Comparing institutional and congregational systems calls for modifications in research design. Rather than study relationships between congregations and organizations, work in institutionalized systems would require more focus on the mediating structures: Jewish Federations, archdiocese systems, Muslim community-wide systems. In the pilot, we were surprised by the lack of connection between congregations and agencies in these institutionalized systems. This finding suggests that research should focus elsewhere, instead looking at connections between the congregations and these mediating structures.

Religious Theology and Culture

Denominational belief systems influenced every aspect of these organizations: structure, staffing programming, and relationships to participants. This section briefly outlines the major theological and religious cultural attributes of the faiths that participated in the pilot project and provides a few preliminary examples of ways that faith plays out in organization behavior. More detailed discussion of connections between faith and works are discussed later in this report. Discussion of religious values and culture and organization for each participating organization is available in Appendix A,

In this report, *theology* refers to the codified belief systems of the various faiths. We focus specifically on each religion's approach to social welfare and social justice. In addition to discussion of belief systems, this section also discusses the ways that theology plays out in the organizational structure of the religion — for example contrasting the hierarchy of the Catholic Church with the experiential, non-hierarchical structures of Peace Churches.

Religious culture refers to elements of organizational form and practice that stem from the ways that a particular faith is practiced in the United States today. We use culture in the anthropological sense of a whole way of life of a people, including its organizational systems, economy, family systems and belief systems. In a complex democracy like the United States, faith-based culture is in fact a subculture — a lifestyle that both depends on the larger structures of society, but consciously establishes variant behaviors and beliefs consistent with its separate identity. Cultures both reflect their past and grow and change over time. For example, Jewish culture reflects a combination of biblical beliefs, the Diaspora experience of Jews as a persecuted people, and modern U.S. Jewish experience as a relatively affluent, educated ethnic group within the United States. While this section focuses on the unique elements of each faith, later sections that discuss the impact of service sector on each organization show how faith-based institutions negotiate the dynamic between living as part of larger U.S. culture and socio-economic systems while attempting to maintain their faith-based identity.

Peace Churches

The historic peace churches — Quakers, Mennonites and Brethren — developed as one strand of the reaction against established state churches during the early enlightenment. While founded in different countries and with some significant variation in core beliefs these denominations share several common elements:

- An emphasis on experiential religion
- Belief that all members — not just ordained clergy — are vital members of the religious community called to live out their faith
- Communal and non-hierarchical decision-making systems and organizational structures
- Commitment to equality and respect for the beliefs, values and lifeways of everyone, regardless of religion, race, ethnicity, gender, or disability
- Central value placed on living in peace and creating a peaceful world. While Peace Churches are best known for their anti-war stance, commitment to peace includes non-violence in all aspects of life and is closely linked to the commitment to equality and respect for all peoples.

The Religious Society of Friends (Quakers^{vi}) started around 1652 in England (Punshon 1984: 53-58). A small sect of followers of George Fox, Friends base their worship and practice on “waiting upon the Lord” in silence (Brinton 1994: 1-15). Quakers have no formal creed, but share a commitment to “seek that of God in everyone.” As a religious institution, Friends have a bottom up structure, with the Monthly Meetings (congregations) as the central organizational entity. Friends practice an experiential religion, based on evolving faith through everyday activity. Central tenets of early Quaker faith include abjuring all outward signs of traditional religion such as baptism, holidays and even a formally structured worship service. There was no formal hierarchy nor were there paid ministers. These beliefs and practices are continued in “unprogrammed” Meetings today. Instead, faith and practice are based on “continuing revelation” of the word of God through the experience of believers.

Friends believe that each individual — regardless of membership in the Religious Society of Friends or any other religion — contains the light of God within himself or herself. Participants in Friends worship wait in silence for divine messages. Occasionally prompted to speak by the Spirit, any participant can rise to give a message. Worship thus consists of the voice of the spirit flowing through people engaged in the community of worship. In present day Meetings, anyone can come to worship and everyone technically has equal right to speak.

While Friends practice allows participation by everyone in attendance at a given meeting for worship or business, the community has always controlled membership and patterns of speech and behavior. Authority in

the Religious Society of Friends resides in the “Monthly Meetings”: small groups equivalent to a congregation. Individuals join a particular Meeting, one can not declare oneself a “Quaker” without first joining a Monthly Meeting.^{vii} The entire community agrees to admit a new person to membership after a committee has determined that they are “clear” about their calling to membership and understand the basic beliefs and practices of this particular meeting. Quaker communities consist of known people who participate in shared decision-making processes. People who have been part of the community longer or who are known for culturally appropriate behavior and wise council are given more “weight” in the decision-making process.

By the end of the 17th century, Friends had also developed larger structures, which played a role in maintaining the religion. The structure partially reflected boundaries created by horse and buggy modes of transportation. In the northeastern United States, “Quarterly Meetings” consisted of several Meetings in close proximity to each other which met on a quarterly bases to carry out business in common for those Meetings. Quarterly meetings are grouped together into Yearly Meetings. Both Quarterly Meetings and Yearly Meetings are creatures of the Monthly Meetings, not the other way around. While Yearly Meetings have more voice and formal functions than the Quarters, they also exist to serve the members of individual Meetings, not determine policy for the local level. As larger administrative bodies, the two Yearly Meetings in this pilot study have educational and administrative resources used by the Monthly Meetings and the social service projects under the care of those meetings.

As Friends spread across the United States, adapting to the local culture and responding to variation within society, the religious community split into several factions. “Unprogrammed” Meetings continue the practice of silent worship with no formal structure. Many of these meetings belong to the larger umbrella group of Friends General Conference (FGC). FGC functions as a resource organization to its constituent Monthly and Yearly meetings, with limited joint decision making. In some other parts of the country, particularly the Midwest and parts of the Pacific coast, Quakers adopted the belief systems and worship practices of the other Christian sects in their communities. “Programmed” meetings often resemble Methodist or Evangelical churches with paid ministers, a formal worship structure, and more Christocentric belief systems than the most liberal unprogrammed Friends. However, programmed Quakers share core beliefs and communal decision-making structures with unprogrammed Meetings. Friends United Meeting (FUM) and Evangelical Friends International are the two largest Friends conferences for programmed Meetings in the United States. Friends World Committee for Consultation (FWCC) attempts to draw together these various strands of the Quaker community in joint meetings and through providing some general resources.

Like Friends, Mennonites evolved out of the reaction to state church in the early Renaissance. Mennonites developed in central Europe in the early 1500s as one of several Anabaptist sects with a strong belief in the separation of church and state (Ediger 1983: 3-5). The more traditional forms of “Old Order Mennonites,” and their cousins the Amish, continue separatism from modern culture through limited use of modern conveniences like electricity or cars, separate schools, and largely independent governance structures (see for example Wenger 1966: 280-281). Mennonites share a bottom up structure similar to Friends where the local community determines communal practice. As a result, Mennonite practice varies widely and some Mennonite communities participate in most aspects of current culture like present day Quakers.

Mennonites are a far more Christocentric religion than some Friends, with a strong focus on all members following the teachings of Jesus. Like Quakers, Mennonites depend on group discernment of faith rather than a formal theology created by a clergy. Herr and Herr (2001: 61) comment that “Following Jesus as known through community discernment has always been more important than developing careful theological systems to direct social behavior or theological understanding.” Every member is part of the “priesthood of believers,” responsible to the faith and practicing this faith in daily life (Nuefield and Wert 1983: 259).

As with Quakers, Mennonites believe that both the laity and clergy play an equal role in faith practice and community decision making. However, Mennonites have more formal structures, with preachers, deacons and bishops chosen from among community members. Deacons focused on community support or “alms work”, preachers, the word of God, and elders or bishops administrative oversight (Wenger 1966: 278-279). Until the 1930s, preachers had little formal training, although currently several seminaries exist. Decision-making structures reside within the congregations. As with Quakers, Mennonites have joined together in various conferences, but the local congregations still hold authority. Joint decision making in the United States is handled through Mennonite General Conference, with a larger structure of Mennonite World Committee (Wenger 1966: 232-233).

“Work in the world” has long been important in the Religious Society of Friends. As with other promptings of the Spirit, individual Friends are led to work on social issues. Most Quaker social service stems from the concept that there is that of God in everyone. As with Friends like John Woolman and Lucretia Mott who sought to end injustice toward native Americans, slaves, women and the poor, this sense that everyone is equal in the sight of God leads to work to foster equality and justice for those excluded from social goods. In many cases, Friends work is characterized by one on one contact, which seeks to expand boundaries in the best sense of sharing social capital.

Quaker business practice in both Meetings and organizations that follow Friends practices rely on the theological patterns of waiting on the Lord for decisions and group discernment processes similar to worship services. A “meeting for worship for the purpose of business” involves Friends gathering together to discern the will of God regarding a particular point of community business. Quaker process calls for the group of people gathered to conduct business to develop a shared sense of Meeting on any given issue. There are no votes and all must agree or “stand aside” before the Meeting can proceed with a decision.

Members that feel called to develop a ministry bring their project to their Monthly meeting for discernment and support. Many Quaker organizations evolved out of either individual “leadings” or Meeting-wide discernment that the community should engage in a particular service. For example, Lakeside developed out of a concern for housing for Quaker seniors in one Meeting near the current facility. These “social concerns” are tested by Quaker Meetings and supported by the individual Meeting and sometimes larger structures like Quarterly or Yearly Meetings. While Friends ministries represent the will of God working through an individual or group, each ministry is operationalized through individuals who are part of an existing social structure.

As noted in earlier research (Schneider 1999), Friends values of equality and answering that of God in everyone often leads to rapidly including the people served by the organization in decision-making structures, regardless of their class, race and religious backgrounds. Pilot research suggests similar patterns for Mennonites. While organizations like Lakeside make efforts to orient staff and people served into Quaker culture and process, organizations that have been less careful to socialize outsiders into Quaker process can eventually come to resemble secular organizations dominated by people from the various groups that staff the organization or use its services (Schneider 1999, Jeavons 1994). As relationships between the Religious Society of Friends and organizations created by Quakers but largely dominated by non-Friends become attenuated, the various religious entities among Friends have questioned those connections (Schneider 1999, Fager 1988). In these instances, organizations sometimes make an effort to re-engage with Quaker practice. In other cases, the relationship between the religious community and non-profits remains conflicted with both organization staff and the wider community of Friends expressing frustration with each other due to mismatched expectations and cultural misunderstandings.

Mennonite social missions share many characteristics with Friends organizations, but maintain stronger ties to the religious community than many of the older, more established Quaker non-profits. Given separatism from state structures among traditional Mennonites, this faith began work with social concerns much later than Friends, starting with activities to support their own members in need. Redekop (1996: 107) comments that Mennonites formed few organizations before 1900. Mennonites engaged in some missionary activity in the late 19th century, which later led to work throughout the world. However, Mennonite Central Committee, the organizational entity responsible for many social welfare activities sponsored by Mennonites from North America was founded in the 1920s to aid Mennonites in south Russia during a period of famine (Redekop 1996: 108). MCC also played a key role in supporting Mennonite conscientious objectors during World War II in their work in health care and other U.S. institutions. This generation of men involved in the conscientious objector activities in turn spawned additional social welfare activities throughout the world. Redekop (1996:123) notes that participation in MCC activities has, in turn, acculturated several generations of Mennonites into the larger world, both secular and sacred.

Mennonite social welfare activities share with Friends a belief in the value of all persons, working with local communities as equals, and shared decision-making processes. However, many Mennonite non-profit institutions differ from Quaker organizations in subtle, but significant ways (Jeavons 1994). MCC organizations are under the care of this umbrella entity for Mennonite General Conference. Other Mennonite non-profits have affiliated with umbrella groups that maintain similar close connections either with individual Mennonite congregations or affiliate organizations connected to the Mennonite conferences, For Example, Jubilee

Association of Maryland draws the majority of its board from its founding Mennonite church and its executive director is an active member in that church. The organization has also affiliated with an umbrella organization for Mennonite health care institutions that is a spin off from MCC (Nuefield 1983). The umbrella organization provides administrative oversight to some of the organizations under its care and supports all of its member agencies to maintain the founding religious ethos in organization structure and programming.

Social welfare activities among Mennonites are strongly tied to the faith, as a witness to the world. Herr and Herr (2001: 58-59) comment: "We engage other communities, and those shaped by them, including government, from the context and categories of our community. Our existence is our witness.... theology is social theory." Participants in MCC activities are expected to act from their faith, with the support and discernment from their congregations. Schlabach (2000:47) notes that the most successful MCC staff "possess a modest lifestyle, social awareness, and — to sustain their commitment and struggles — an authentic Christian piety." This close connection between religious practice and social welfare activities informed the organization in our pilot study.

Experiential theology and religious cultural elements common to all Peace Churches, as well as those unique to Quakers or Mennonites, permeated the two organizations in the pilot study. A few examples include:

- Both organizations had flat organizational structures and engaged all staff in shared decision-making processes.
- Both organizations functioned as communities, with staff and participants working together to maintain community life. At Jubilee, program participants and staff worked together to perform the daily chores such as cooking in the group homes. Each group home was part of the larger community of the organization. Likewise, Lakeside participants created many of the activities at the retirement community.
- Program participants remained at the center of organization activities. In the Mennonite organization, the organizational chart consisted of a group of interlocking circles with the program participants at the center of each circle. Despite developmental disabilities, program participants were involved in all aspects of organization planning and governance. Lakeside had numerous resident committees that made decisions for the retirement community.
- In keeping with the Peace Churches emphasis on working with populations served and on equality, organizations stressed the value and rights of program participants, regardless of their physical or mental infirmities. Participants were expected to function as full members of their communities to their full capacity.

Catholics

Social welfare through Catholic institutions echoed the hierarchical structure of its parent church and reflected the various church teachings on charity and social justice. Hehir (2002) describes Catholic social welfare as institutionalized because most social welfare service provision is managed through institutions like Catholic Charities rather than local parishes. Local Catholic Charities affiliates are connected to the diocese, one of several social welfare programs under diocesan auspices. A national Catholic Charities office generates public policy positions and offers other supports to local agencies (Hehir 2000: 107). The Washington DC organization studied for this pilot project was one of several Catholic non-profits organized under one umbrella name by a recent planning and consolidation effort. The organization is under the care of the archdiocese, with board members and key staff closely affiliated with the Church.

The Catholic social service system in the U.S. reflects the concept of subsidiarity, or local control over services. This idea acknowledges a partnership between the state and organizations of civil society like Catholic social service agencies. However, private organizations should first try to help those in need themselves, only turning to government when their resources fail (Hehir 2000). In the United States, subsidiarity often meant creating separate Catholic institutions initially designed to provide religiously appropriate services to the Catholic population.

Social justice and charity have been the subject of numerous church teachings. Degeneffe, (2003: 378), quoting Kelly, states that “a Catholic specialized service agency is not just a social agency. It is an official charitable arm of the Church. Our services, therefore ...are an expression of an article of faith.” Program models theoretically stem from church teaching elaborated through doctrinal assertions of belief and statements on social policy. “The moral and social teaching in turn is embodied in the work of multiple social institutions cutting across society” (Hehir 1998, 63-64).

Proponents of social justice teachings promoted after Vatican II highlight that Catholic social activities should reflect an active laity and a vision of social change rather than simply providing for those in need (Bane 2005, Steidl-Meir 1984). However, most observers of Catholic social welfare systems and service provision through parishes note continued reliance on traditional Catholic systems in which priests establish policies that the laity follow. Catholic social welfare systems reflect various aspects of teachings on social justice and charity, with a dynamic tension existing between the more social justice-oriented programs and those that reflect traditional values of charity. Cochran (1999:32-33) identifies three forms of tension between these two approaches to social welfare as 1) internal to Catholic institutions, 2) external tensions between serving the Catholic community vs. serving others and 3) “good citizenship” by contributing to the well being of society in its current form vs. social transformation.

Traditional social welfare programs respond to church teachings on charity. Charity involves assistance to the needy, “Charity is the greatest social commandment...Charity inspires a life of self giving” (USCC 1999: 7). One Catholic theologian explains “Catholic Charities has traditionally seen itself as a very important and intimate part of the mission of the church, as a servant of the poor, and as a sacrament or sign of the church’s care and concern for the needy of the world” (Curran 1997, 101). Catholic Charities developed at the turn of the century as a formalization of the “apostolate of charity” given that needs were too great for local parishes to fulfill (USCC 1999: 12). The model for charity is the Good Samaritan who helps an injured man on the side of the road. Providing food, shelter and guidance meets enjoiners to serve the poor and needy.

More recent thinking on social welfare highlight several church teachings (Winkworth and Camilleri 2004, Cochran 1999):

- **Human dignity and human rights:** Church teachings stress that each individual is a child of God of equal value and entitled to dignity and basic human rights. Social services should reflect the inherent dignity of the individual.
- **Promoting the common good:** Catholic social teaching supports the common good over individual interests (Cochran 1999: 484).
- **Solidarity.** The concept of solidarity came out of post Vatican II teachings in reaction to the individualism of modern life. Solidarity highlights the responsibility that individuals have for each other (Stiedl-Meir 1984:303-305, Winkworth and Camilleri 2004: 318).
- **Preferential option for the poor.** This teaching suggests that the poor should be a primary concern for Catholic social institutions with an emphasis on serving those most in need. This teaching is reflected in such activities as ensuring health care for the uninsured and providing income supports for those not covered by government social programs and without sufficient resources.

These social teachings are reflected in the mission statements of Catholic welfare organizations. For example, Catholic Charities mission is “to provide services to people in need, to advocate for justice in social structures, and to call the entire Church and other people of good will to do the same.” One social service agency studied for the pilot stresses that “justice for the poor” drives it

In addition to these general principles, Catholic social welfare institutions also follow Church dictates on other aspects of social life, for example church policy on abortion, contraception, and homosexuality. These more specific issues appear in policies that affect staff — for example the agency in the pilot study did not cover birth control in staff health insurance policies due to Catholic teachings on contraception.

While Catholic social welfare and health institutions evolved as a system separate from the Protestant dominated state social welfare system and private institutions, in the present era, Catholic social welfare and health entities work closely with government and often dominate social service provision in their sector. Catholic Charities is the largest private human services network in the United States (Curran 1997, 101), yet various authors note that half to two-thirds of annual revenues come from government (Curran 1997, Monsma 1996). Cochran (1999: 480) notes that in 1997 four of the largest integrated health systems in the U.S. were Catholic and six out of ten largest non-profit systems were Catholic.

As Catholic social welfare and health systems have expanded their reach beyond their constituent community and taken federal government funds to provide social services, they have become more professionalized in their staffing structures and played down the faith base in their programming and choice of staff. Our researchers for this pilot study found a dynamic tension between an organization that reflected Catholic teachings in its structure and values, but that also hired many non-Catholic staff and played down sectarian messages in its programming. This mixing of Catholic values and secular exigencies was evident in the “core values” statement of the organization in the pilot study:

Following the example of the teachings of Jesus...we believe in the gospel message of faith, love and hope. The sacredness and dignity of all human life. Personal responsibility and social justice. Service to all regardless of race, religion or national origin. Uncompromising integrity and personal stewardship.

A few examples of Catholic teachings as reflected in this organization included:

- Hierarchical structures in staffing and decision making, with religious or active Catholic laity in key staff positions.
- Emphasis on serving the most poor and needy in the community.
- Reference to Catholic teachings in staff communications and materials.
- Structured outreach to the parishes through centralized systems.
- The organization was part of the archdiocese, relying on archdiocese administrative structures and funding for some of its programming.

Jews and Muslims

While tensions between Jews and Arabs following the creation of the state of Israel have highlighted differences between these two peoples, this pilot study revealed similarities among the social welfare teachings and systems of these two Semitic religions. In addition to similar theologies of social justice and social welfare provision, Jews and Muslims in the United States share a history as religions different from the Christian majority and as a result they have felt it necessary to set up institutions to meet their unique needs. Given that most of the U.S. Muslim population arrived after the 1960s, particularly in the Washington DC metropolitan area, social service provision in this community is in its infancy and reflects the twin concerns of supporting new immigrant communities and a marginalized religion. Since literature on social welfare systems among Muslims in the United States is almost non-existent, and our pilot research only provided limited experience with two organizations, discussion of Muslim systems outlined here remains preliminary and suggestive.

As discussed under institutionalized social welfare systems above, the U.S. Jewish community has established a community-wide system for social welfare provision through the Federations and UJA. Judaism in the U.S. functions both as a religion and an ethnic group, as Jews have maintained a separate sense of peoplehood throughout the Diaspora (Schneider 1988). The Jewish Federation of Greater Washington, for example, has financially supported and otherwise encouraged Jewish agency programs that enhance a sense of peoplehood. Jewish identity is established by birth — any child of a Jewish mother is considered part of the community. Membership in a synagogue or Temple is voluntary and many Jews consider themselves “cultural” Jews with little religious affiliation. The separation between Jewish identity and religious faith is even stronger for Jews who came to the U.S. from the former Soviet Union as few Jews practiced their religion under Soviet rule yet all were identified by the nationality of Jewish on their passports. As a generally well-educated and affluent

community that has largely assimilated into U.S. society, most of the Jewish community both maintains the separate structures of the ethnic group and participates fully in U.S. socio-economic and political systems.

Much of the Jewish social welfare system developed as an alternative to state and private social welfare systems that were fundamentally Christian in origin. In addition to a felt need to provide for Jews to protect their wellbeing and so that they would not become a burden on the state, Jewish institutions also developed to provide culturally and religiously appropriate services to members of the community. Despite a focus on serving one's own, sensitivity to being outsiders, as well as a spiritual conviction to do good and heal the world, has led many Jewish institutions to offer services to the wider society in a manner consistent with Jewish values but without stressing religion. Both of the organizations studied in the pilot project offered services to everyone, regardless of race, religion or national origin.

The Council of Jewish Federations, now known as United Jewish Communities, is the national umbrella organization for Jewish Federations in North America.^{viii} At the local level, Federations are member benefit organizations designed as the fundraising and planning arm for Jewish social service, Jewish education, and Jewish communal life in constituent communities. While Federations and their constituent agencies are separate from congregations, the religious and social welfare institutions maintain strong social capital ties, each recognizing the importance of the other. As the planning arm for the Jewish community, Federations set community priorities for social welfare, education and recreation, establish fundraising rules for constituent agencies, and provide funding and other supports to organizations under their aegis.

As mentioned under institutionalized systems, above, Muslim social welfare systems show similarities to these Jewish structures. As with Jews, Muslims do not necessarily need to join a mosque to practice their faith — in fact the development of incorporated Islamic centers and mosques in the United States in part reflects accommodation to U.S. systems for organized religion (Nimer 2002: 39-47, Leonard 2003: 108-109). Some mosques do offer a range of social services like immigrant Christian churches (Nimer 2002: 46-47, Alkhabteeb 2002: 36-40). However, many of the social service agencies appear to be established outside of the mosques, but with support of the wider Muslim community (Nimer 2002, Alkhabteeb 2002). More established or larger Muslim communities appear to be developing community-wide institutional systems. Nimer (2002: 75) reports that the Washington metropolitan area's diverse Muslim community has formed one committee for area wide Eid celebrations and our research suggests that similar structures are supporting the two non-profits studied in this project and the earlier Pew study.

Although the Jewish social welfare system began as institutions to serve Jews in a largely Christian world, many of these agencies have expanded their missions to provide services beyond the Jewish community. Like the Catholic system, many Jewish organizations receive significant government funding and provide services to anyone in need. For example, Carp (2002: 193) reports that in 1994 55 percent of the funding for Jewish hospitals, 76 percent for Jewish nursing homes, 61 percent for Jewish family services, 77 percent for Jewish vocational services, and 5 percent for Jewish community centers came from government. While nursing home payments through Medicaid may support Jewish elderly, the fact that significant funding for other social services comes from government suggests outreach beyond the core community.

Despite involvement with wider social welfare systems, concern over Christocentric approaches to social welfare systems led both Jewish agencies to strongly state that they were NOT faith-based organizations for two reasons. First, Jewish sensitivity to separation of church and state based on continuing struggles with Christian practice in the wider society leads organization staff to react against any initiative that brings religion to the forefront. Second, Jewish focus on professionalization, combined with a felt understanding that the faith-based initiative might be designed to increase the role of Christian congregations in social welfare provision, created a line in the sand where these Jewish agencies did not want to associate with a government program that went against their core values of quality, professional service.

Jewish social welfare organizations were most likely to hire trained professionals or those with experience with populations served by their agencies. While most of the leadership of the Jewish agencies tended to be Jewish, Jewish organizations also hired people from many religions and backgrounds. While the values of the Jewish agencies reflected American Jewish culture, most Jewish social welfare agencies maintained strict separation of church and state. As one non-Jewish staff person at a Jewish agency recently commented, "I as a non-Jew feel comfortable with the values in the mission (even though I am not Jewish)."

The theological basis for Jewish communal service is codified through Jewish law and practice. Carp (2002: 182) comments that “the responsibility for those in need is a Jewish requirement that is rooted at the very foundation of our communal processes...Jewish people have always understood that caring for the poor and sick was too important to be a matter of individual conscience alone.” Two concepts embody Jewish philosophy on social welfare *tikun olom* (to heal the world) and *zedakah*. While the Hebrew *zedakah* roughly translates as charity, the concept combined charity, justice, and righteous duty. As Bogen (1917, 18) explains:

...the Jewish sages laid down as the leading principles of charity on the part of the individual the duty of the more fortunate to take care of the less fortunate, and on the part of the representatives of the community the responsibility of the material and moral welfare of those dependent upon the help of others.

Earlier in Jewish history, *zedakah* served as a required tithe of 10 percent of income for communal social welfare, but requirements have long since been replaced by voluntary donations — often through organized Jewish philanthropy like the United Jewish Appeal or Jewish Federation campaigns. Jewish custom stresses that a person lives on through the good deeds done for others, leading to a practice of generous philanthropy identified through named gifts to social welfare institutions. For example, the Cohen Center is named after a major donor.

Muslim social welfare theology resembles Jewish forms, but is more concretely codified into religious law. Present day Jewish *zedakah* is probably somewhere between the two Muslim concepts of *Zakat* (mandated alms) and *Sadaqa* (voluntary charity) (Kogelmann 2002: 67). *Zakat* is the fourth pillar of Islam, a requirement to commit 2.5 percent of individual or family wealth to care for the needy. In the U.S, Islamic centers and mosques participate in collecting and distributing *Zakat*, but people can also choose their own charities to donate required alms (Nimer 2002: 5). As in the Jewish systems, *Zakat* represents community-wide support for those in need rather than individual donations. The two social service organizations in this study relied heavily on cash and in-kind *Zakat* donations for resources.

Tikun olom is currently interpreted in two contradictory ways in the Jewish community. The holocaust signified to many American Jews that their community could not depend on the non-Jews for support in a time of crisis. For these Jews, healing the world refers to providing supports for the Jewish community because others may not provide needed aid. On the other hand, many Jews interpret “healing the world” as Jewish witness to provide succor through professional, quality social and health services to anyone in need. Throughout U.S. Jewish history, this second interpretation of *tikun olom* has led Jews to participate actively in the civil rights movement and other social justice issues.

This pilot study revealed a tension between these two interpretations of *tikun olom* reflective of ongoing divisions within the Jewish community about their relationship to people of other faiths. This debate dovetails with cultural discussions of assimilation versus maintaining separate cultural identity, as well as concerns over who should be the primary constituency for Jewish social service agencies. Jews that interpret *tikun olom* as saving the Jewish community are more likely to expect Jewish institutions to target their services toward other Jews while those interpreting the concept as reaching beyond the Jewish community support non-sectarian service provision by Jewish institutions. As discussed in more detail below, the two Jewish institutions in this study found themselves in the middle of debates over this issue. The immigration agency had branched out from primarily serving Jews to providing assistance to immigrants regardless of religion while the adult day care center intentionally advertised its services to the wider community.

As with other organizations, Jewish and Muslim institutions reflected their founding religious principals and structures:

- All institutions intentionally upheld religious and cultural practices such as dietary restrictions, holidays, and — in the Muslim organizations — dress for women.
- Leadership in these organizations belonged to the founding religions as well as key staff. However, professional credentials remained an equally important value for all staff.

- All four organizations drew resources from throughout their community through community-wide systems. None appeared a creature of a particular congregation and all performed outreach primarily through the community as a whole rather than outreach to congregations.
- Underlying values of care for people in need as part of the larger community reflected core values behind *Zakat*, *tzedakah* and *tikun olom*.
- All organizations were initially founded to serve this particular religious community, but all stressed that they would provide aid to anyone. Jewish organizations paid particular attention to offering services that would be comfortable to Jewish and non-Jewish program participants alike.
- Reflecting the community-wide systems of their founding religions, organizations structures and decision-making systems were relatively non-hierarchical. However, Jewish and Muslim systems did recognize authority based on title and expertise, unlike the Peace church systems.

African American Christian

“If we in the Black Church don’t do it, who will?” is a not-just-rhetorical question often heard around African American churches when describing their community ministry programs. Whether operating a soup kitchen or organizing a housing development project, there is at the core of motivations a sense that finally only the Church can be depended upon to respond to social needs within African American communities.

A culture of self-help has been central to the African American people since slavery. In order to survive, slaves needed to rely on one another for health care, education, moral support, child care and myriad other needs. Inter-dependency in the “new” harsh world was vital, and built upon the communitarian traditions brought from their African cultures. The value of mutuality permeated social relations as freed Blacks organized both mutual aid societies and churches.

In 1787 Richard Allen and Absalom Jones, free Blacks in Philadelphia, formed the Free African Society. According to the Preamble its purpose was “to support one another in sickness, and for the benefit of their widows and fatherless children.” Allen and Jones were compelled both by their Christian faith as well as necessity—indeed there was no safety net at that time for widows and orphans of African descent. These two leaders went on to found the first African American Episcopal Church (St.Thomas) and the mother church of the first African Methodist Episcopal Church (Mother Bethel A.M.E.). These churches were on the frontlines of serving those stricken in the Yellow Fever Epidemic of 1793, after George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and most prominent leaders had fled the city. The two churches continue to the present with thriving congregations and community ministries.

Although the Free African Society was the first such mutual aid society, it was by no means alone. Such societies proliferated, as did Black churches. Growing up together, they have been described by historians as in a “symbiotic relationship. Sometimes mutual aid societies led to the formation of Black churches, and at other times these societies were organized under the rubric of the churches” (Lincoln and Mamiya 1990). The boundaries between the two institutions—the only two independent Black institutions—were permeable. Congregations quite naturally incorporated charitable works within their church life and aid societies were often so permeated by the language and forms of faith that they were considered quasi-churches themselves (Lincoln and Mamiya 1990).

We saw this same permeable relationship between the churches and social service activities in the pilot study. For example, Christian Adult Community Day program recruited its staff and volunteers from its founding church and continuously invited its program participants to attend worship services. Joy Ministries intentionally chose to remain a program of its founding church, rather than create a separate 501(c)(3) non-profit, in order to ensure a close relationship between the church and the organization.

African American churches, especially those in urban areas and in the North, have historically been responsive to the waves of migration into cities and out of the South. Churches became social brokers, finding jobs and housing for the newcomers. At the end of the 19th century W.E.B. DuBois described the high degree social capital of the African American churches in Philadelphia which enabled incorporation into the city:

The Negro churches were the birthplaces of Negro schools and of all agencies which seek to promote the intelligence of the masses; and even to-day no agency serves to disseminate news or information so quickly and effectively among Negroes as the church. Consequently all movements for social betterment are apt to center in the churches. Beneficial societies in endless number are formed here; secret societies keep in touch; cooperative and building associations have lately sprung up; the minister often acts as an employment agent; considerable charitable and relief work is done and special meetings held to aid special projects (DuBois1899: 207).

Today African American churches continue to roll up their sleeves to extend the ministry of the congregation beyond church walls. In fact, the “church walls” are not the solid social boundary that they are in other faith groups. Visitors to Black churches are often surprised by the frequent mention of social and political issues in worship services and even the accessibility political candidates have to the pulpit. Our fieldwork in African American churches revealed similar trends. For example, the church affiliated with the Christian Adult Community Day Program both supported liberal social causes and was targeted by Republicans who insisted that the church allow their candidates to speak in order to maintain “neutrality.” There is just not the same demarcation between the sacred and secular realms as there is in other Protestant churches—a characteristic of African American churches that has endured since their very inception.

Therefore it is no surprise that consistently research data show African American churches to lead other religious groups in the production of outreach ministries to their communities (Woolever and Bruce 2004: 70). Although larger congregations with bigger staffs and more resources can provide more substantial social ministries, African American churches of all sizes allocate a greater proportion of their budgets to community outreach (Cnaan 2002: 89). Beyond the more predictable programs which address the basic human needs for food and clothing, African American churches are much more likely to get involved with economic development issues (organizing credit unions, CDC’s, small business development or even commercial strips), housing (including the development of affordable housing units), health care (including mental health services), prison ministries, and education (often developing their own parochial or charter schools) (FACT 2000). Indeed, “if the Black church doesn’t do it, who will?”

The two Philadelphia Washington DC organizations and Christian Children’s Inner-city Program all reflected the connections between faith and works characteristic of the African American faith community. While Asian American Evangelicals founded Christian Children’s Inner-City Program, it was closely affiliated with an African American church and CDC with which it shared a building. Organization founders often worshiped with this church and some of the youth served by the program attended this faith community. Ties between the African American church sponsored CDC and the youth program were very close, with the executive director of the youth program commenting “We serve the children and they serve the adults in these families.”

Examples of connections between African American faith and these organizations include:

- Both African American organizations were closely tied to founding churches, and the Asian program showed some similar ties.
- Boundaries between congregation and social programs were permeable.
- The sophistication of these programs went well beyond the kinds of youth and adult programs usually sponsored by other churches. All included sophisticated programs with paid staff designed to provide a range of supports to their program participants.
- In keeping with the tendency to develop a wide range of programs targeted members of the community considered most in need of support due to class background, age or other issues. Joy Ministries programs tackled the difficult issues of welfare reform and at-risk youth that most congregations prefer to leave to professional social service agencies. Likewise, the CDC associated with the Washington DC program and the other ministries supported by the megachurch that sponsored the seniors program fit the faith-community outreach profile. The church remains the oldest and arguably most central independent institution in the Black community. African Americans have higher rates of attendance and participation in their communities of faith than do other groups. Their faith informs their outreach to others more strongly than it does for those of European descent. An added dimension to their participation in such activities is that here Black men are also more likely to learn leadership skills, such

as planning meetings and giving presentations (Harris 2003: 132). In other words, there is a double benefit for the African American community in their civic engagement: those within and outside the community benefit.

Despite the strong commitment to social ministry, which is grounded in the history and traditions of the Black churches, there are two trends, which could have an impact on their outreach. The first is that while most African American churches report that they cooperate with social service agencies and work in ecumenical coalitions, only a small percentage cross racial lines to work with white churches (Lincoln and Mamiya 1990, Day 2001). This segregation of altruistic efforts limits everyone's effectiveness.

Secondly, as middle class African Americans continue to move out of the city, urban congregations are increasingly comprised of commuters rather than folks from the immediate neighborhood. While suburban members appreciate having a vehicle for linking with the old community, and "paying back," these ministries on the frontlines of social needs have the potential to feel out of touch to the neighbors being served. If volunteerism declines with the congregation, the service can become professionalized. Efficiency might be improved, but the important human connection across social class, which has always been a mark of Black faith communities, will be limited.

African American churches have had a unique formation as faithful servants to their community. As they experience some of the same trends as their white counterparts however (suburbanization, and a plateauing of membership among most denominational groups) the future forms of their community service might change. But if the Black church doesn't respond to the social needs of the urban poor, who will?

Mainline Protestants and Evangelicals

Protestants in the U.S. have exemplified the best and the worst of faith-based social programs. They have generated theological rationales for both action and inaction, privatism and communitarianism, individual pursuit of wealth as well as altruistic service to the poor. In other words, the legacy Protestants bring to formulating community ministries is a mixed bag.

Puritan Protestants landed in America bringing their Calvinist baggage with them. While their namesake had emphasized that the world is the stage on which God's glory is made manifest (and set about designing and running his own model city in Switzerland), faith had become an individual concern. The individualism and the spiritual anxiety created by the belief in God's "election" of some (and condemnation of many more) fit hand in glove with the emerging capitalist ethic in the new country (Weber, 1930). The Calvinist communities of faith (Presbyterian and Congregational especially) taught that believers could not earn their salvation but insofar as material resources were a sign of God's blessing, it became apparent who were the sheep and who were the goats. In Weber's well-known argument, the "Protestant work ethic," came from these religious roots and came to characterize the dominant culture.

But by the early 19th century the winds of theological reform began to blow, developing from small gusts to gale-force winds. The parched piety of the austere Protestants was under assault by a second wave of revivalism. Emotionally charged preachers expounded a message in which the salvation of souls was not already sewn up in heaven but was the result of individual decision. All were guilty of sin, all were offered redemption, all could be reformed—these ideas were an explosive combination, which led to a number of unexpected outcomes including a reconsideration of the unmentionable shame of slavery. After all, all and not just some, had favor and dignity in God's eyes. Therefore mega-evangelists such as Lyman Beecher and Charles Finney preached passionately against slavery. They sought to convict slaveholders of their guilt, to lead them to repentance and into the sanctified action of releasing their slaves. The revivalism of the 19th century also acknowledged the dignity of women, so it is not surprising that the spiritual energy released found expression in the women's suffrage, as well as the anti-slavery, movements.^{ix}

Not all Protestant critics of Calvinism were comfortable with the forms of revivalism. Theologians such as Horace Bushnell, Theodore Munger and Washington Gladden were publishing books, which further explored the ideas of social reform as central to the project of living out the Christian faith. The Social Gospel Movement was most strongly articulated by a Baptist pastor-turned-seminary professor, Walter Rauschenbusch. He explored

building the “kingdom of God” as the call of the church, rather than only seeking the salvation of individual souls. Even as sin was not just a personal but also a social reality, so too was salvation to be social.

The infusion of evangelistic energy and new theological ideas oriented to social reform occurred in the context of wider social trends. Social realities such as the illiteracy of former slaves, urbanization, immigration, the consolidation of poverty, and the plight of industrial workers had gained the attention of the Mainline Protestant Churches. In wedding ministry within and without, Congregational minister Thomas Beecher re-visioned the use of physical space. Beecher added building space to his church in Elmira, NY to accommodate physical, social, and spiritual needs of those in community — lecture rooms, a library, free baths and a gymnasium. This more holistic approach to ministry utilizing the church building became a trend at the turn of the century. By one count almost 200 Mainline Protestant churches had expanded their ministry to incorporate humanitarian outreach (Hudson, 1973). Usually they were “tall steeple” churches in cities, with affluent benefactors as members whose consciences had been pricked by the preaching of the Social Gospel.

The Settlement House Movement, best known through the work of Jane Addams and Hull House in Chicago, also drew widespread denominational support. By 1910 there were over 400 settlement houses, many sponsored by Protestant groups and most staffed by volunteers from the Mainline churches. The houses not only provided food, shelter, education and social support for the poor, but also had a transformative effect on those volunteers in residence who ministered to them. Not only did they offer opportunities for middle class Protestants to cross social boundaries in ministries of charities, they also became hubs of social research and advocacy. Although they were finally overwhelmed by the Depression, as social work became a more professionalized field, settlement houses left a template for a faith-based, hands-on approach to outreach ministries.

It is important to recognize that in these early movements, both Evangelicals and those who identified with Progressive and later Social Gospel theologies, have a shared legacy. Both were reacting to a stifling Calvinism. Movements that sought to recover an understanding of the gospel message and encouraged love of and service to our neighbors inspired both. Emblematic of the two streams is the Salvation Army. Begun in 1880 in this country, “the Army” took its mission to seek and serve the lost to a new level of organization.

However old theological battles re-emerged to snuff out this brief period of kindred purpose. The debate over Darwinism became a bitter disagreement over the authority of the Bible. Lines were drawn in the theological sand, institutions split, and the Protestant house was divided. The understanding of “social salvation” developed by the Social Gospel Movement, as well as its adoption of a non-literal approach to the Bible, was incompatible with a more fundamentalist orientation, which stressed individual salvation and a “higher view of Scripture”. Amazingly the Salvation Army has been able in the last century to resist categorization in a single camp. Straddling both Evangelical and Social Gospel commitments, they continue to respond to the poor by providing for both spiritual and physical needs, although they have never taken on the role of advocacy for social change.

As the twentieth century progressed, the two trajectories continued to diverge. For Mainline Protestants, this was a time of institutionalization. Denominations bureaucratized, building not only complex administrative structures but professionalized social services as well. Lutherans, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists and some Baptists developed nursing homes and social service agencies in addition to further growing their hospitals. These were heady days for Mainline Protestants, identified as they were with the dominant culture. The establishment of these denominations was epitomized in the building of a corporate structure in New York, on land donated by John D. Rockefeller, to house the National Council of Churches as well as a number of the head offices of Mainline groups. President Eisenhower was present at the laying of the cornerstone in 1958.

Meanwhile the Evangelical groups were also building institutions, directed not at social services but furthering the evangelistic project—schools, publishing houses, mission groups, and campus evangelistic organizations proliferated. Still sidelined from the dominant culture, Evangelicals were strengthening their identity, their resources, and their social and political capital. As the Mainline Protestants began experiencing decline in number and status beginning in the 1960’s, the Evangelical movement was growing. They were poised for the organization of the Religious Right, which emerged as a political force in the 1980’s during the Reagan Era. The Mainline groups were in a period of disestablishment—denominations merged, moved from the East Coast to the Heartland, and began waves of staff cutbacks. Focus shifted from the judicatory structures and the public voice they had afforded the groups to strengthening local congregations. Evangelicals filled the void, finding a voice in advocating conservative political causes.

There are several interesting and important wrinkles in these developments:

- Congregations emerged as the predominant religious social grouping. This is where Mainline denominations focused resources and research. Evangelicals, drawing on their strong suit of recruitment, focused their attention on growing mega-churches.
- Concurrently, it became apparent that the old demarcations of liberal/conservative, Social Gospel/Evangelical could not be neatly predicted along denominational lines. Congregations aligned with conservative theological and political views within the Mainline Protestant denominations began networking. Definitive issues such as women's ordination, homosexuality, and abortion emerged as faultlines within the denominational families, reflective of the larger "culture wars".
- Evangelical groups became self-critical of their historic disengagement from social ministries. As they garnered the political capital to advocate for, and benefit from, first, charitable choice of the Clinton Administration (1996) and, then, the faith-based initiative of the Bush Administration (2000), they could appeal to a history in revivalism when salvation and social justice were linked (Smith, 1998; Sider, Olson, and Unruh, 2002).

All of this makes for a dynamic and sometimes confusing context in which to study faith-based social services. Researchers were able to sort Protestants in the U.S. neatly into four categories according to denominational affiliations: Liberal Protestant, Moderate Protestant, Conservative Protestant and Black Protestant. (Niebuhr, 1929; Roozen, McKinney, Carroll, 1984). However, data cannot be so cleanly aggregated. While much research still draws on the denominational categories, many studies sample by congregations or individual believers. An Evangelically-oriented Presbyterian church, for example, might provide their service to homeless people wrapped in the language of personal faith (a more expressive approach), while another Presbyterian church might deliver the same type of service in much the same way as a secular agency might—yet consider that they too are acting out of their faith, albeit in a more embedded way. Both have a religious impulse for their action although toward different goals: ultimately converting a client to their belief vs. serving those in need as an end in itself. Indeed theological variation also exists within the same congregations, wreaking havoc for researchers who want to categorize denominations and congregations into neat liberal/conservative categories.

The dynamic landscape of Protestantism lends itself, therefore, to often confusing research results. For example, some studies have found a high level of participation in social ministries. The FACT study, drawing on data from 14,000 congregations found 85% to be involved in some form of social ministry. Others find lower levels of participation. The Congregational Life study found that 26% of members were involved (Woolever and Bruce, 2004) and the National Congregational Study found 57% of congregations participated in social ministries coming out of their churches (Chaves, 2004).

Within that, the findings have also differed on whether theological identity makes a difference. In some studies conservative Evangelicals do not have significantly different rates of involvement in social ministries than do those from more liberal affiliations (Cnaan, 2002; Ammerman, 1997). Historically research suggested that liberal Protestants could be predicted to have higher rates of involvement in social ministries (Warner and Lunt, 1941). Some current research still finds that to be the case, with Evangelicals being drawn into evangelistic activities rather than social ministries (Roozen, McKinney, Carroll, 1984; Wuthnow, 1999; Ammerman 2002; Woolever and Bruce, 2004; Chaves, 2004). Different sample techniques and definitions of what constitutes social ministry could partially explain the variation.

What does become clear is that race matters. If African Americans are grouped with Evangelicals according to theological categories, most certainly the rates of social ministry would increase. Most studies have shown dramatic differences in the participation of Black churches in social ministry, if not in degree (Cnaan, 2002; Chaves, 2004) at least in the types of involvement. (Lincoln and Mamiya, 1990; Bartowski and Regis, 1999; FACT, 2000; Woolever and Bruce, 2004; Cnaan, 2002; Chaves, 2004). African American congregations are much more likely to provide counseling, day care, prison ministry, tutoring, healthcare, employment help, drug rehabilitation, economic development, and voter registration than are their white Protestant counterparts.

These convergences and divergences between mainline Protestants and Evangelicals were reflected in the organizations in this pilot study. For example:

- Mainline Protestant organizations stressed tolerance and often reached out to other faiths in their organizational activities. For example, Lutheran Charities downplayed their identity as a mainline Protestant organization for many years. Lutheran Rehabilitation and Shelter Center sought support from several other religions — Catholics and Jews — in developing their organizations. As a result, organizational activities often appear nondenominational, despite continuing links to the founding faith community.
- Evangelical organizations, on the other hand, maintain strong links to founding faith communities. The Asian campus ministry community and evangelical Asian churches provided the bulk of support for Christian Children's Inner City Program.
- Mainline Protestant organizations tend to background faith in their programming while Evangelical organizations express their faith in all aspects of programming. This was true of all of the organizations in the pilot study.
- Evangelical organizations are most likely to proselytize of any of the organizations in this study. This was true of both the African American and Asian organizations.
- Both Mainline Protestant and Evangelical organizations stress the importance of individual faith in seeking volunteers. Evangelicals tend to stress the personal faith commitment of their staff as well, while this varies greatly in Mainline Protestant organizations as many of these organizations seek staff from many different religious backgrounds. In Mainline Protestant organizations where faith is discussed, staff referred to personal faith. For example, several staff members at Lutheran Charities mentioned their important role of their personal faith in their work at the agency.
- Both Mainline Protestant and Evangelical organizations seek support from congregations directly rather than through larger judicatory structures for the faith community.

At this junction of studying Protestants engaged in social ministries, it is clear that the shifting alignments have to be taken into account in structuring research programs. Research is best done at the congregational level; the old theological identities can no longer be uncritically attached to denominational groups. Mainline Protestants have more Evangelical congregations than was assumed earlier. Evangelicals are moving out of the cultural sidelines into the dominant culture and finding new energy and resources for social ministries. African Americans still minister to through their churches to their own, but as congregations continue to diversify demographically, perhaps those categories will become more fluid as well. At the very least it is clear that this is an important and fascinating time in which to study the involvement of Protestants and other faith groups as they engage their social context.

Implications for Policy and Practice

- **Differences in the ways these two denominational strands of Protestantism reflect faith in their organizational structures suggest that the Sider and Unruh (2004) typology emphasis on expressive faith may not provide an accurate indication of the role of religion for all Protestant religions.**
- **Focusing on congregation/organization links is appropriate for Protestant organizations.**

Suggestions for Future Research

- **Develop a clear understanding of the way that faith plays out in mainline Protestant organizations in order to clarify whether some of these organizations have indeed moved away from their founding faith or if they have embedded faith into organization practice focused on tolerance.**
- **Clarify ways that the overwhelming emphasis on expressive faith in many evangelical organizations plays out for program participants.** This would involve understanding if participants

self-select evangelical organizations because of their comfort with expressive faith — as in the senior center in this study. It would become equally important to understand how participants from other denominations or religions feel about the religious messages of the organization. Finally, since these organizations actively proselytize, clarifying church/state issues for these organizations would be particularly important.

Social Capital

Detailed discussion of social capital in pilot study organizations will be covered under the first major study question below. This section briefly defines the concepts of social capital and cultural capital, outlining major forms of social capital found through the pilot study. Social capital refers to *the social relationships and patterns of reciprocal, enforceable trust that enable people and institutions to gain access to resources like volunteers, funding, or government contracts.*^x After publication of *Bowling Alone*, Robert Putnam's influential treatise that U.S. communities were in decline because people no longer built social capital through face to face participation in voluntary associations, social capital became an increasingly visible concept in research and policy circles. Along the way, its initial meaning has become confused. Some proponents of the faith-based initiative suggest that reliance on formal social service agencies has fueled the decline in social capital. In this view renewing congregational involvement in social welfare provision would enhance social capital in U.S. communities. As with the discussion of institutional vs. congregational forms of social welfare provision discussed earlier, pilot study findings suggest that all of these organizations rely on social capital to obtain resources, but that the forms of social capital and major sources of support vary depending on several factors.

Social capital is much more complicated than simply knowing who to contact to develop funding sources, obtain program participants, or foster partnerships with service providers to enhance organization work. A connection is defined as social capital only if it includes three elements: 1) networks, 2) trust specific to that network, and 3) the network enables access to resources. The kind of trust typical of social capital involves specific trust among network members, not generalized trust in the community or city as a whole. However, specific trust can extend to all members of a religious, racial, ethnic or disability community through known institutions. For example, Jubilee, the Mennonite group home for developmentally disabled adults, has a solid reputation among people with disabilities in the greater Washington DC metropolitan area through word of mouth referrals from people who have used agency services. As reputation of the agency spreads through the community, people seek it out without a specific referral from someone using services due to wider community knowledge of its reputation. Jubilee Association of Maryland still receives the bulk of its referral through the extended network of people with developmental disabilities and their families. However, not all members of this network know each other personally.

This definition of social capital does not require face-to-face interaction to develop relationships. Social capital links can come from wider community networks or institutional connections. For instance, the Cohen Center, the Jewish adult day care center, seeks participants through referrals from two types of institutional links. Seeking connections through its religious community, referrals come through the Federation-sponsored Jewish social service agency referral system as well as its parent agency's hotline. In this case, general trust in the agency as a member organization of Federation served as social capital necessary to garner clients.

In addition, the agency relies on sectoral affiliations to seek new clients. For example, the outreach coordinator did presentations to hospital social workers at facilities outside of the Jewish community in an effort to build relationships to area hospitals for referrals. At one of these events, one social worker who had interned at Cohen Center praised the center based on her previous experience. This connection between a non-Jewish social worker and the agency is an important element in building social capital among peers at her workplace. Her personal trust in the Cohen Center provides a bridging link between her coworkers and the center that may lead to additional referrals. As more social workers at the hospital begin to make referrals to Cohen Center based on this original individual network link, social capital can become institutionalized. In institutionalized social capital, the key gatekeepers in an organization learns that another organization can be trusted as providing quality services. Referrals become a matter of course, rather than relying on individual networks.

All of the institutions in this study relied on social capital to secure funding, program participants, volunteers, and other resources. In general, agencies relied on social capital through the following sources:

- **Individual networks through the religious community.** For example, Lakeside's original residents came from the founding Friends meeting and its networks. Muslim organizations relied on Internet-based referral networks in the greater Muslim community to find resources to meet the needs of individual program participants. Referrals to the agency also came through personal networks among Washington DC area Muslims.
- **Organizational networks through the faith community.** In institutionalized systems, Federation and archdiocese served as major referral sources. In congregational systems, organizations were more likely to seek supports from congregations in their social capital network. For instance, Christian Children's Inner-city program garnered in-kind supports, funding and volunteers from among a network of evangelical Asian churches. Lutheran charities relied on Lutheran congregations to host refugees in its refugee resettlement program.
- **Staff individual and institutional connections.** Staff used their social capital to help agencies in a variety of ways. For example, Cohen Center staff arranged for a connection between the agency and a Jewish school because a key staff person's children attended that institution. The executive director at Jewish Organization for the Aid of Immigrants used her personal connections among institutions serving immigrants in the Philadelphia area to garner funding for the organization.
- **Sector affiliations.** All agencies except the smaller, evangelical organizations belonged to coalitions and umbrella groups of organizations providing similar services. These sector-wide affiliations fostered social capital among like institutions.
- **Program participants.** Many of the organization drew additional program participants, volunteers and other resources from among the people they served, regardless of whether or not they belonged to the founding faith community. Cohen Center and its parent organization received funding and volunteer support from the families of its program participants. The participants at St. Mary's housing program continued to volunteer for the program after graduating. Sometimes, program participants were linked through race or disability rather than religion. For example, Christian Adult Community Day Program developed a network of program participants who did not belong to the church, but were part of the wider African American Christian community.

Scholars recognize three kinds of social capital, which provide access to different networks, often with different resources. Closed or Bonding social capital refers to networks within homogenous communities like a faith community or a coalition of agencies that provide similar services. Bridging social capital crosses boundaries of culture, usually among equals. For example, trust based relationships across religions — such as interfaith activities like IAF, PICO or Gamaliel organizing efforts (Wood 2002) or projects that class racial, immigrant or class lines involve bridging social capital. Finally, scholars at the World Bank (2002) identify linking social capital and trust based vertical relationships among people or organizations in different places in a power hierarchy. The relationship between a faith-based organization that contracts with government and that government agency would represent linking social capital.

Cultural Capital

Developing the reciprocal, enforceable trust characteristic of social capital requires ability to display the right cultural cues for that network or community. Functional social capital has two ingredients: 1) trust-based relationships with people or organizations that have access to resources, and 2) knowledge of cultural capital cues,^{xi} which indicate that an individual or organization is a member of a group and should be given access to those relationships. This definition links social capital to community culture. Organizations that have the right kinds of context-specific relationships and know the cultural-specific cues required to access resources, achieve their goals.

Behaving in ways considered appropriate by the people who are part of social capital networks is as important as having the right contacts. This knowledge about the correct ways to behave and speak in order to succeed is called *cultural capital*. For instance, the director of one of the Muslim organizations is an African American woman raised as Baptist who has converted to Islam. She has carefully learned the culture of Islam, maintaining the most strict dress for women and handling her daily life and organizational activities within the Muslim community according to its cultural systems. However, as a social worker from a Christian background,

she can easily switch into the speech patterns, language and understanding of non-profit management through faith-based organizations she learned in her youth. Her ability to use several forms of cultural capital has served her and her organization well when moving between the Muslim and interfaith contexts. She has used this dual cultural capital to develop bridging ties with other faith-based organizations. She actively participates in interfaith activities in her county and has garnered the holiday basket contract from interfaith for her agency.

Links between cultural capital and social capital permeated many of the critical connections for these institutions. The two Muslim institutions were supported by their community precisely because they provided culturally appropriate services. Participants in the Christian Adult Day Program shared the cultural characteristics of African American Christianity, even if they were not members of the church. Participants commented that they preferred this program to a better funded public senior center because they enjoyed the references to Christianity. Youth participants in the Christian Inner-city Youth Program also came out of this same African American Christian culture, sharing this link with agency staff even though the majority were from a different race and class background.

Cultural capital played a key role in garnering resources even in institutions that did not highlight their religious background. For instance, despite attempts by the Cohen Center to downplay its Jewish affiliation, program participants and members of the wider Jewish community supported this organization precisely because it was one of the few organizations that offered kosher meals and other Jewish cultural attributes. The same embedded culture fostered links between Chinese Immigrant Services and its participants. However, in this case, Chinese immigrant culture appeared more important than religious culture.

In some instances, the cultural reputation of an agency or cultural injunctions within the faith community led to resources. For example, Jubilee Association of Maryland drew some clients because of the positive reputation of Mennonites among the wider community. Others sought out the organization because it clearly identified itself as a Christian organization. The Catholic social service agency received funding through the Bishops appeal for the archdiocese and the Jewish agencies received support through Federation. In both cases, members of that faith donated to the wider institutional appeals because of religiously-based cultural injunctions.

Missing or Attenuated Social Capital

Several of these organizations had limited links to their religious community or congregations associated with their faith. In these instances, missing or attenuated social capital stemmed from the relationship between social capital and cultural capital. This took two forms. In institutional systems, congregational involvement with social service agencies went against the cultural norm of that religion. For instance, the Cohen Center had limited success with its outreach to congregations due to the disconnect between congregations and the social welfare system characteristic of that culture.

In other cases, relationships between founding communities and organizations attenuated due to disagreements within the community about culturally coded aspects of faith-based service. Both Jewish agencies experienced this for similar reasons. In both cases, organization directors interpreted *tikun olom* as Jewish witness to the wider community, and thus were caught up in intracommunity debates about appropriate relationships between Jewish agencies and non-Jews. The Jewish Organization for the Aid of Immigrants had recently lost most of its funding from Federation because most of the immigrants that it served were not Jewish. Agency staff explained that Federation no longer considered immigration a priority issue, but the fact that the organization had moved beyond its original mandate to serve Jewish immigrants and refugees played a key role in this decision.

Conflict between the Cohen Center's parent organization and its Federation was much milder as the organization continued to serve mostly Jews and had embedded Jewish cultural attributes in its programming. However, Federation staff complained about the organizations outreach beyond the Jewish community as well as its affiliation with outside organizations. The agency executive director reported debate within the board about whether the Jewish community should be its sole target population.

Lutheran Charities reaffirmed its relationship with local congregations after a survey revealed limited knowledge of the organization among Lutherans. This return to original cultural forms partly came out of reaction to the Faith-based Initiative's emphasis on religious values in service and congregational links. This organization experienced some conflict with its founding community over its support of programs for gay, lesbian, bisexual,

and transgendered youth. However, the programs that continued its initial form of congregational support like refugee resettlement and eldercare continued to receive support.

Implications for Policy and Practice

- **Social capital links come from several sources: religious affiliations, sector affiliations, individual networks through staff and program participants and program participant communities.** Strong organizations maintain all these forms of social capital.
- **Social capital systems are organized differently in institutionalized systems and congregational systems.** Both policymakers and agency administrators should pay attention to the appropriate targets for resources in expanding social capital links.
- **Given links between social capital and cultural capital, agency administrators should pay attention to cultural cues in efforts to expand or develop new social capital.**

Suggestions for Future Research

This pilot study suggests that the next phase of research include particular attention to the following issues:

- **Understanding differences in social capital systems between organizations sponsored by institutional vs. congregational systems.**
- **Disentangling the connections and differences between race, immigrant status and religion for organizations founded by African American or immigrant faith communities.** Research in the pilot showed significant overlap between racial, ethnic or immigrant community networks and those of religious communities. Future research would explore this relationship through comparing organizations in these communities founded under secular vs. faith-based auspices.
- **Exploring the connection between cultural and social capital for faith-based organizations.**

Embedded versus Expressive Religions

Our research also revealed significant differences in the ways that the various faiths used God language and included faith-based messages in their programming. In contrast to the assumptions of the Sider and Unruh typology (2004), the pilot study suggested that organizations could strongly rely on their faith traditions without exhibiting any of the open expressions of faith that this typology uses to identify an organization as faith-based. In fact, several of the organizations that clearly follow through on religious teachings in their programming – the two Peace Church organizations and the Jews, consciously do not use any reference to religion in their décor or programming. Organizations appeared on a continuum from Jews, where religious values were embedded in organizational practice but rarely mentioned in programming or materials to Evangelicals, where all aspects of programs were suffused with religion. In general, religions that see faith as individual commitment, such as the Evangelicals, African Americans and some mainline Protestants, were more likely to use expressive language while religions with strong focus on communal religion by birth or commitment such as Jews and some Catholics used fewer references to faith in their organizations. Thus the more institutionalized religions often relied on more embedded forms while congregational denominations used more expressive forms. In addition, the pilot study suggests that those religious traditions that strongly emphasize religious tolerance and a positive appreciation for diversity tend to embed their religious commitments more implicitly within their service organizations, rather than making those commitments explicit. This appears to be driven by a desire to avoid imposing religious views on others, independent of other factors analyzed here.

On the one hand, there were those in the pilot study that literally packaged service delivery in expression of their religious beliefs. At Christian Adult Community Day Program, for example, there was a seamless relationship between the congregation — and its language, culture, and beliefs — and the senior day care program. Although less than half of the program participants were church members, the program had the same cultural flavor as the worshipping community. What made the program distinctive for participants was that they could attend a day time program which afforded them not just physical and social nourishment, but spiritual as well. Therefore at a weekday luncheon, they prayed, sang and discussed the Bible, much as they would on a

Sunday. From the congregation's perspective, the program (as well as others within their 501(c)(3) umbrella) was a direct extension of the ministry of the megachurch. At the heart of the church's theology are exclusivist claims to the truth, that is, Jesus is the only way to salvation and those who do not believe in him are "lost." Therefore it is an essential matter of integrity to "share the good news" with all the lives touched by the church.

Similar connections between faith and programming were evident at Christian Children's Inner City Program. Here, youth development activities also started and ended with prayer, and counseling focused on encouraging "god-like" behavior among program participants. For the middle-school-aged children that were part of this program, religious messages had less currency than for the seniors in the Philadelphia program. However, the program did also play on the strength of religion as part of participants' background culture, particularly for children whose parents attended the evangelical African American church located in the same building.

There were also several case studies of agencies, which were much less verbally expressive of the tenets of their faith tradition, yet were no less motivated and guided by them. Their core beliefs were much more embedded in the ways they carried out their mission. Often "religious tolerance" was at the very heart of their faith. For mainline Protestant agencies, such as Lutheran Charities and the Lutheran Rehabilitation and Shelter Center, and the agencies coming out of the Historic Peace Churches, such as Lakeside and Jubilee, a conscious commitment to a more inclusive view of truth led to very different practices. While significant portions of their boards and senior staff represented the religious bodies, which originally sponsored them, their program staff and participants were much more demographically diverse. Therefore the religious culture of the sponsoring tradition did not predominate in the iconography, language, holiday celebrations or day-to-day practices of service delivery. However, we found that rather than attributing such practices to encroaching secularization, the leadership of the organizations clearly articulated these practices as being faithful, that is, generated out of the tradition.

Embracing diversity as part of faith-based practice clearly played out in both Jubilee and the Jewish adult day care center. Jubilee Association of Maryland residents were encouraged to practice their religion, in fact several parents commented that they had sent their children to this program because of the Christian values and support for religion that was evident in its programming. However, Mennonite faith played a small part in the religious values within the organization. Instead, participants were encouraged to participate in a non-denominational program — Faith and Light — which originally was founded by a Catholic Priest. Jews, Catholics and Protestants participated in this program.

The Jewish adult day care center carefully asserted that it was open to everyone, even though 80 percent of its participants were Jewish, it served kosher food, and offered a brief Sabbath service on Fridays. Tolerance for other faiths was particularly evident in decorations around December holidays, where "happy holidays" banners proclaimed celebration for Christmas and Kwanza in addition to Chanukah. Non-Jewish participants' families felt comfortable at the center and commented that religion was not an issue here. Despite the emphasis on inter-faith tolerance, the program also showed a careful attention to the prevalence of Christian beliefs in U.S. traditions. This was particularly evident at Valentine's Day, which was transformed into "sweet heart" celebrations. Our fieldworker was reminded that it was Saint Valentine's Day, a Christian holiday, when explaining this change. However, this attention to the Christian roots of this holiday also reflected the interfaith tolerance of the organization as it showed sensitivity to the needs of the Jewish residents similar to that for non-Jews expressed through other holiday traditions. Moreover, it is important to note that not all Jews share an awareness or concern for the Christian roots of such secularized holidays as Valentine's Day. Similar attention to the needs of non-Jews played out in attention to diet — two Hindu participants were vegetarian — and other practices.

We envision a continuum of faith-based practices in which some are more expressive of the particulars of their faith tradition while in other agencies beliefs and practices are more embedded in the why and how of their social services. Between the purer forms there is a lot of variation. For example at one Jewish agency, Jewish Organization for the Aid of Immigrants in Philadelphia, the religious identity was conflicted, with the broader issues of Jewish identity emerging as conflict around the practices of the agency. The sponsoring Jewish Federation felt the agency should be more expressive of the religious tradition by primarily serving Jews. However the current director and staff had a more embedded vision of their mission, which placed a belief of religious and ethnic tolerance at its core. This agency would therefore be somewhere in the middle of our conceptual continuum.

Implications for Policy and Practice

These differences in ways that religion is expressed impacts on interpretation of faith-based service by policy makers and practitioners. The following policy and practice implications emerge from this pilot study:

- **Policy makers should be careful to avoid expectations that faith-based organizations are identified by expressive language. Instead, the ways that an organization expresses its faith stem from the theology and culture of each religion. Recognizing these differences and supporting various forms would also go far to avoid church/state issues that currently dominate the debate over government sponsored service by religiously based organizations.**
- **Practitioners should carefully identify the ways that faith is appropriately expressed in their religions, shaping programming to fit appropriate beliefs and practices.**
- **Practitioners and denominational leaders in traditions more inclined to the “embedded” approach to religion should carefully consider how they can assure that religious values and motivations will be maintained over the long term in the service organization.**

Suggestions for Future Research

What would influence the shape of a social service agency vis-à-vis its faith base? Are there identifiable variables that significantly impact whether an agency is more overtly expressive of its faith tradition or intentionally embeds its faith orientation in its practices? Several possibilities emerged in the pilot study that should be pursued in the next stage of research:

- **Certainly the weight given to the value of tolerance, or inclusivity, as a religious commitment seems to be central. But how and why does this value come to be central?**
- **Does the age range of the clientele influence their receptivity to more overt religious practices?** Are older clients more amenable to, say, prayer in the context of service delivery than young adults might be? The data at this point is not clear, but suggestive that generational effects might be at work.
- **What is the role of race and ethnicity as an important influence on shaping how faith operates in faith-based programs?** When there is ethnic correspondence between the sponsoring organization, the social agency staff and the clientele, the likelihood of a more naturally expressive mode of religious practices seemed to increase. However, when there is a disconnect demographically between sponsors and staff and clientele, our limited data suggest that it is more likely that tolerance will become an important value and religious beliefs will become more embedded.
- **How does socioeconomic class function in shaping service delivery?** Certainly at a service such as Lakeside which has some religious diversity among residents but who are overwhelmingly white and economically secure if not privileged, tolerance is universally affirmed. But are more economically disadvantaged participants in other programs more receptive to sectarian services? Class can be an elusive variable to tease out but is so influential that it needs to be pursued.
- **Finally in the pilot study the role of the Executive Director emerged as a critical factor in every agency.** For some agencies, they were intentional representatives of the sponsoring faith tradition, even when few on staff were. Here their role was both symbolic and interpretive. Even in agencies committed to tolerance, diversity and embedding religious values, it seemed to be important that the executive director be a visible link to the sponsoring group. In the two Jewish agencies studied here, the Executive Director bore the conflict between the expressive expectations of the sponsoring group and his or her own inclinations to embeddedness. Executive Directors must balance the quality of social services with fund raising. This often means being torn between two different constituencies, their Boards/donors and their clients, representing two different agendas. In the next stage of research, these ED's deserve particular attention. Their role is critical in forming the religious practices in faith-based 501(c)(3)s.

Findings from the Pilot Study

The pilot study for the Faith and Organizations project provided preliminary insights into the ways that various religions organize and carry out social welfare and health services in the United States. The pilot study also raised a series of additional questions and areas for research. This section outlines key findings on project research questions. Each section provided some preliminary suggestions for policy makers and practitioners, as well as questions for future research.

Dynamics Between Founding Faith Community and Non-profit Organizations

1. *How do the dynamics between organization and founding community impact the beliefs, behaviors, and resources of both organization and community? Do relationships between organization and founding community foster the ongoing development of social capital, cultural capital and civic engagement within the founding community?*

In general, we found that most founding religious communities took steps to ensure a continuing relationship between the faith community and the organization through a series of formal mechanisms like board appointments, mission statements, and sometimes volunteering relationships and funding. However, in some cases, as organizations evolved, these measures proved insufficient to maintain strong ties between organization and faith community. However, this pilot research suggests that social and cultural capital connections between organization and community are more important than formal measures in maintaining relationships between community and organization; further research to explore this key question is needed.

We also found that institutional and congregational systems envisioned the relationship between faith community and non-profits differently, particularly in respect to direct connections to congregations and volunteering systems. In addition, the role of religiously based non-profits as an expression of the faith communities work or witness to the world on social justice and social welfare differed dramatically between these two systems. In both cases, differences tracked back to the religious culture and theology of the founding religion. Embedded and expressive religions also construed this relationship differently.

Responses to the subquestions illuminate various aspects of this relationship. This section focuses exclusively on dynamics between organization and community. While we touch on staffing issues here, the impact of these dynamics on internal structures like programming is discussed under question three, below.

2. *What is the relationship between the religious denomination or founding secular community and the non-profit organizations founded by that organization? (Governance, financial control, volunteer participation, staffing, program content, mission). How do bridging, bonding and linking social capital ties impact on organization behavior?*

Most of the faith communities in this pilot study institutionalized their relationship to the non-profits they created through various formal mechanisms like mission statements, governance structures and other mechanisms. These strategies reflected the social and cultural capital connections between faith community and the non-profits they created. Newer non-profits and those founded by mainline Protestants and Evangelicals were less likely to formalize these relationships through board appointments and mission statements than the other faiths. This section discusses the ways these relationships were carried out in terms of governance, financial control, mission, and — to a limited extent — staffing.

Governance

Founding communities influence governance by the ways that they structure the boards of organizations and the formal and informal ties between faith community and organization. Institutionalized systems organized these relationships differently than in congregational systems. In institutionalized systems, relationships stemmed from connections to the wider community structures. For instance, the chair of the board for the umbrella Catholic organization was the local archbishop, and administrative structures for the organization were managed by the archdiocese. Both of the Jewish organizations were members of their local Federations, and both stipulated that their board members must make financial contributions to the Federation as well as to the organization. This rule came out of a time when board members were generally appointed to the organization by Federation.

Organizations founded by congregational systems relied on connections to the founding congregation or congregations in order to maintain these relationships. These relationships appeared more organic and less formalized than in the institutionalized systems. In some cases, it appeared as if these congregations presumed a long-term relationship between congregation and a mission project. For instance, neither Christian Children's Inner-city Program or the Lutheran Rehabilitation and Shelter Center instituted a formal system to connect faith community to organization through administrative structures or board appointments. In both cases, the organizations drew on a strong group of ministers that shared a faith commitment and vision for the organization for its initial board.

As with other mainline Protestant organizations (Hall 2005), Lutheran Rehabilitation and Shelter Center did not create their organization strictly as a ministry by and for Lutherans. While the program began as a ministry of this one congregation, it quickly reached out to other faith communities to carry out its work. At the time of the current study, the founding pastor had moved on, and the organization had grown and evolved to a point where it drew from a much wider faith-based community to sustain its efforts — including Jews, Catholics and other mainline Protestants. While the founding congregation did appear to continue informal relationships to the non-profit across the street, people of other faiths dominated the governance structures of the organization.

Christian Children's Inner City Program intentionally draws from many congregations as it came out of Asian-American campus ministry networks rather than one congregation. Board appointments and access to resources come through social capital ties in this system and among Evangelicals in the Washington DC metropolitan area. Every aspect of the organizations systems and structures reflect Evangelical culture and theology. To our knowledge, the organization has not felt the need to formalize this connection through stipulating board appointments or other mechanisms.

Other organizations founded by congregational systems have created more formal systems to back up the strong organic ties between congregation and ministry. In the organizations directly created by founding congregations, these relationships come out of the ongoing administrative support of that congregation as well as physical proximity. For instance, its founding church appoints Chinese Immigrant Services advisory committee and its administrative systems are under that congregations' care. Likewise, Christian Adult Community Day Program is identified as the Pastor's idea and is administrated by the Congregation's CDC. Both programs are housed in congregation owned service buildings.

Large, older social service agencies founded by mainline Protestants had the hardest time maintaining social capital ties to congregations, but did create formal governance structures that assured some relationship to the founding religion. For instance, 51 percent of the board for Lutheran Charities was appointed by the local synod. When an organization survey of local congregations revealed limited connections between the organization and congregations, it formed a larger umbrella organization with several other Lutheran non-profits as a mechanism to address this issue and instituted a series of activities to reconnect with its founding beliefs and local congregations.

Other congregational system organizations continue strong informal social capital connections to their founding communities but have also formalized these relationships through board appointments. For example, Jubilee's by-laws dictate that the majority of its board members are Mennonite, and that the majority of the Mennonite board members come from the founding congregation. Joy Ministries board is appointed by the eight congregations in the cluster that created the 501(c)(3). Lakeside requires that 75 percent of its board be active Quakers, but does not stipulate that these people come from the founding Meeting. However, some board members continue to come from this Meeting, joining due to personal conviction rather than formal obligations for the Meeting to appoint the board. As such, these appointments represent continuing social capital connections between founding congregation and organization.

Board appointments remained the most obvious formal way to create a connection between organization and founding faith community. All of the organizations in this study maintained connections to their founding faith communities through these mechanisms. Many of these organizations formalized this relationship through their by-laws, but informal social capital remained a strong factor in influencing who gets invited to agency boards. For example, while Muslim Charities has no formal stipulation that Muslims govern the organization, all of its board members are members of this faith and one Imam serves on the board. At Jewish Aging Services, boards by tradition are very large — including lifetime members, most of whom are large donors. The current board consists of 92 people, three panels of 12 plus 9 officers who are responsible for many matters of agency

governance, as well as Past Presidents, life members, honorary members and representatives from other select agencies. While the organization would like to include non-Jews on the board, only a small fraction of the board members are Christians. Both informal social capital and the overwhelmingly Jewish culture of board discussions limit outreach beyond the founding community. The executive director comments:

So of that board, currently of our executive committee, one hundred percent are Jewish. The executive committee about to be installed in October, one of the eleven is not Jewish. Of the big board, currently, two are not Jewish and of the board coming in, two are not Jewish. Frankly, the organization would like to welcome more non-Jews to the board, but we find that many non-Jews in the past have felt uncomfortable being what they felt was a token. It wasn't intended as such, but they would sometimes be turned to in the meetings: what do all the Christians say about this kind of thing? And it is uncomfortable! You know, I can squirm and others can, but the question gets asked.

Another common way to ensure relationships between the faith community and its organization is through the choice of the executive director. Since the executive director sets the tone for the agency, selecting someone who shares agency core values will influence the future direction for the organization. Boards usually choose executive directors, and with one exception, all of the executive directors in these organizations were members of the founding religion. These decisions were not explicit, but it appeared that organizations chose administrative leadership that reflected their beliefs and values. In the one case where the executive director came from another religion — Lutheran Rehabilitation and Shelter Center — the board was not dominated by the founding faith and appeared to be moving away from its founding congregation.

These executive directors, in turn, tended to hire key staff that reflected the religious-based values of the organization, which sometimes meant that they also belonged to the founding faith community. For example, the Director of Nursing at Lakeside was also Quaker and key staff at the various Catholic organizations (some of them founders of formerly independent programs) also were members of the founding religion with strong ties to the faith. However, particularly in professionalized, institutionalized organizations practicing embedded faith, key staff may share the general values of that faith without actually belonging to the same religion. This was true of the previous director of the Cohen Center and many current Jubilee Association of Maryland staff, as well as senior staff at the Lutheran and Catholic organizations. Sometimes, interactions between senior staff and members of the founding faith community through governance activities drew them to the founding faith or fostered an appreciation for it. For example, the development director at Jubilee Association of Maryland joined the Mennonite congregation after learning about it through her job. Other key staff at the Lakeside, the Quaker organization, expressed appreciation for the values of the religion learned through their activities.

The importance of religious culture and social capital in key staff appointments become glaringly apparent for Jewish Organization for the Aid for Immigrants when it hired a non-Jew as development director. This person had problems raising funds from the Jewish community both because she was unfamiliar with the social capital networks and did not know appropriate cultural capital cues. A board member commented:

We need somebody who is really in touch with and understands the Jewish community. That's what I think you need...you need to know, if you want to raise funds from the Jewish community. If you have access to money in the general population, and you have those contacts, and you know how to approach that, then it doesn't have to be Jewish. I'm just saying, where are you going? You know part of any fund-raising is you have to solicit your own board members and the people that you know.

Governance and fundraising processes showed the clearest connection between faith community and organization. Social capital influenced who was selected for the board and key staff positions. Agency boards also relied on cultural capital to decide who would represent their organization. As this example shows, choosing someone for a position that interacts regularly with the faith community who does not have the social and cultural capital to draw resources for the organization can become a clear mistake. As with The Lutheran Rehabilitation and Shelter Center, JOAI and a Quaker organization in an earlier study (Schneider 1999), many organizations have boards that combine members of the faith community with people either from other religions or other constituencies associated with the organization. If these outsider board members gain control of the organization, it can begin to lose connections to the founding faith community. This attenuation of social and cultural capital can impact on fundraising, which in turn, impacts on internal operations for the organization.

Finances, Fundraising, and In-Kind Supports

For many of these organizations, sources for funding reflected their sector rather than ties to the faith community. Discounting the African American evangelical project that was directly tied to its church, donations from religious organizations and umbrella groups formed a small part of these agencies' budgets. Most received less than five percent of their budgets from their faith community and the largest percentages were 11 percent from Federation for Jewish Aging Services and 20 percent for Chinese Immigrant Services.

However, these small percentages mask the individual donations that some organizations received through requests to their faith communities. Smaller, congregation-based organizations and Muslim organizations received the bulk of these individual donations. For example, Christian Children's Inner-City Program received 40 percent of its income from individual donors, many who found the organization through the evangelical networks or Asian churches. Muslim Charities received 52 percent of its income from *Zakat* donations, as Muslims fulfilled their religious obligation to support those in need.

Even though financial contributions from faith communities were small, they remained large, symbolic elements in agency budgets, signifying social capital links between organization and community. As with other aspects of social welfare provision through faith communities, institutionalized and congregational systems sought funds differently. Institutional systems used community-wide mechanisms to raise funds: Federation, archdiocese wide fundraising campaigns and *Zakat*. While *Zakat* donations are considered individual donations by the agency, in fact Mosques collected *Zakat* envelopes from the faithful and distributed funds to agencies named by the donor, much like a United Way donor-advised fund. Congregational systems solicited donations directly through congregations. For instance, the fieldworker assigned to Lutheran Charities commented that most parishes she visited had a poster for her agency on their bulletin board and she recalled a donations envelope attached to that poster.

Financial support also signified the faith community's understanding that the organization carried out theological teaching and cultural understandings of social justice and social welfare. In many cases, funds provided by faith community donations — either through individuals or institutions — allowed an organization to provide unique programming in keeping with their values. For example, Chinese Immigrant Services was able to teach new immigrants computer skills on state-of-the-art computer equipment because they had additional funds with no government contract strings attached.

In other cases, faith-community funds were strongly connected to carrying out cultural interpretations of appropriate social welfare. For example, the Jewish Organization for the Aid of Immigrants had recently lost most of its funding from Federation because it no longer primarily served Jews. Staff understood that by moving outside of the major concerns of the Federation to care for its community, they were no longer considered a priority agency for funding. By breaking the cultural capital rules of this Federation, the agency lost an important social capital link to community funds.

As in research on congregational social service (Cnaan 2002), faith communities also provide important in-kind supports to the organizations under their care. The most prevalent one was space — almost all of the organizations in this study either relied on their faith community for space or had used space associated with that religious body at one time. Lakeside is located on land donated by its founding Friends Meeting, and the adjacent Friends Meeting house provided space for memorial services when residents pass away—whether Quaker or not. With the exception of Jubilee Association of Maryland and the Lutheran Rehabilitation and Shelter Program — both housing programs that developed with the support of their faith communities, all of the organizations has some programs housed in buildings owned by their founding congregation or the community-wide system like the archdiocese or Federation.

In addition to space, organizations relied on their faith communities for a wide array of in-kind donations such as food, clothing, holiday baskets and other resources. For example, the Muslim organizations collected food and clothing for a thrift shop as well as providing directly to families in need. Other organizations offering emergency services also collected goods from their constituent congregations or through community-wide systems. Other necessary items — like camp and school supplies for Christian Children's Inner City Program came from the faith communities.

Volunteers

Another key in-kind resource for these agencies was volunteers. Volunteers are considered a key indicator of civic engagement. All of these organizations relied on some form of volunteering, often drawing volunteers both through the faith community and wider locality wide systems. For instance, Christian Children's Inner City Program ran primarily through volunteer labor, drawing volunteers primarily through the Asian-American campus ministries and local churches, but also advertising through the city-wide volunteer-match system. Chinese Immigrant Services drew most volunteers through their congregation, but also attracted people from other backgrounds interested in learning more about Chinese Immigrants.

Organizations in institutionalized systems were much less likely to rely heavily on volunteers and drew them through different mechanisms. In general, institutionalized systems recruited volunteers either through community-wide systems, sister institutions, or through individual connections among staff, board and program participants. These organizations very rarely sought volunteers through congregations themselves. For instance, the Catholic organizations drew most of its volunteers through archdiocese wide recruitment systems. While the GED program claimed that it had many volunteers from a nearby parish, our researcher found no advertisement for volunteering in the program in the parish or its bulletins.

The Cohen Center and its parent organization also drew some volunteers through Federation wide networks. However, the Cohen Center primarily created relationships with other Jewish organizations. For instance, a Jewish day school had a relationship with the Center. In most cases, these collaborations developed because staff had ties to the other organization. Thus volunteers came through a combination of individual social capital and institutionalized city-wide systems.

Muslim organizations relied on widest range of volunteer supports — regularly seeking help for people in need from professionals in the wider Muslim community. For example, Muslim doctors were asked to provide free services to low income families without insurance. These in-kind donations also represented a form of *Zakat*. In many ways, professional supports were similar to mentoring and other donated services within the Jewish community as it resettled Soviet refugees in the 1970s and 1980s. Research in the immigration organization during that time revealed Jewish professionals providing supports to their fellow Jews with similar backgrounds to aid in their resettlement (Schneider 1988). As such, this type of volunteering represents a clear sense of community responsibility for their own, encouraging those in need to have the same resources as the rest of the community and eventually share in the same prosperity as more successful members.

Organizations in congregational systems sought volunteers through constituent congregations. This was true even for larger, established organizations — Lutheran Charities relied on volunteers from congregations for several of its programs. Congregation-based organizations also tended to use more volunteers than those in institutional systems. Recruiting volunteer aid through congregations was a major form of outreach to the faith community, and provided a venue for civic engagement to members of these congregations. As organizations grew and became more professional, they relied more on paid staff than religious volunteers, however congregation-based volunteers remain important to the organization. For instance, Jubilee Association of Maryland began through the efforts of Mennonite church volunteers, but quickly switched to paid staff as the organization stabilized. However, members of the founding church still volunteer at the organization.

This partly reflected different cultural and theological aspects of these faith traditions. The Christian denominations in the congregational systems viewed volunteering as ways for individuals to express their faith. While the institutionalized religions all valued individual faith commitments, support came through board service or participation in Federation rather than an injunction to volunteer. For both Jews and Catholics, this apparent lack of participation from individuals actually reflected the perspective that the entire community — through the institutionalized structures of Federation and the archdiocese — were responsible for social welfare. As Carp (2002: 183) comments “[Solomon] Schechter taught that the Jewish people have always understood that caring for the poor and sick was too important to be a matter of individual conscience alone.” Catholics also were encouraged to volunteer, but as in other research on this religion (Bane 2005), wider community structures such as the archdiocese sponsored organizations were seen as primarily responsible for caring for those in need.

Staff

Agency staffing structures will be discussed in more detail under question three. Here, we briefly outline the social capital connections between the faith community and staffing. Two factors influenced connections between the faith community and the non-profit regarding staffing — 1) age and complexity of the organization

and 2) firm congregational system connections to the faith community. In general, we found that the more professionalized, stable organizations relied on paid staff drawn from a number of sources. The Mennonite, Catholic, Lutheran and Jewish organizations fit this model. While embedded faith played a role in selecting executive directors, staff members in these organizations were chosen due to their professional credentials for the job rather than religious background. However, congregation-based organizations had started out relying on staff from the faith community, gradually evolving into diverse, paid staff systems. For example, Jubilee, the Mennonite group home, relied on paid staff and stipended volunteers from Mennonite sources in its first few years, switching to paid staff that had credentials necessary for work with the developmentally disabled as finances stabilized.

Organizations coming out of congregationally-based systems that had strong ties to particular congregations drew most of their staff from networks associated with their founding congregations or their constituent racial or immigrant community. African American, immigrant, and Evangelical-based organizations were most likely to hire through faith-community networks. For instance, at Joy Ministries 83 percent of the staff were members of the founding congregations. All of the staff at Christian Adult Community Day Program came from the congregation. Chinese Immigrant Services hired from a combination of the congregation and Chinese community networks. All of these agencies combined paid staff and volunteers to fulfill their staffing needs.

Mission

An agency mission is a declaration of its founding values. The agencies in this pilot study tended to refer to their religious origins in their mission statements. Sometimes references reflected the original target populations, for example both of the Jewish agencies' mission statements said that they were chartered to serve Jews, then added that they were available to serve people of other faiths. All of these organizations' mission and vision statements reflected the theology of social welfare or social justice from the founding faith. Mission statements for large, established social service organizations active during the many years when government refused to fund organizations considered religious^{xii} had secular mission statements, but added vision or "core value" statements that explained the faith background for their work. For example, the mission statement for Lutheran Charities was largely secular, but added a vision statement reflecting Protestant theology:

The Mission of Lutheran Charities is to serve children and families in need.

Lutheran Charities commits itself to serve vulnerable children and families in community through culturally competent ministries of care, nurturing, shelter, advocacy, and counseling, including but not limited to foster care, adoption, family preservation, education, resettlement, and job development.

Because Christ first loved us and calls us to follow, we have undertaken the mission of building up diverse communities of caring people through the provision of integrated, community-based services which enable the most vulnerable individuals and families to overcome barriers for participation in a more just and peaceful world.

Depending on their current orientation, agencies chose to foreground or background their religious identity through mission and value statements on their websites and in their literature. For instance, the researcher at Lutheran Charities commented that during her study period the organization redid its website, moving from an explanation of mission to one that focused more on the programs that the agency offered. Content analysis of several agency websites over time showed a tension between focusing on services and proclaiming identity. In the case of two large social service agencies, organizations became more visibly faith based soon after the President's faith-based initiative stated that "faith-based organizations" should get preference for contracts.

Faith-based Coalitions and Umbrella Organizations

In addition to connections to the faith community through congregations or higher level community planning and administrative structures, many of these organizations belonged to local, regional and/or national umbrella organizations or coalitions of organizations from their faith. Organizations also collaborated with other organizations from their faith. For example, in Washington DC the Jewish organizations worked together on some projects. The Cohen Center was located in a facility owned by another Jewish aging organization, and originally had a formal partnership with them. Marketers suggested that the formal relationship should end, but

informal collaboration continues. In Philadelphia, refugee resettlement was accomplished through a partnership among JOAI, the Jewish social service agency, and the Jewish employment agency.

Umbrella groups provided a forum to discuss common issues and often became the venue to develop strategies to maintain connections to the faith community. For example, both the Mennonite and Quaker facilities belonged to national umbrella organizations of faith-based organizations from that religion that provided similar services. Besides creating a forum to discuss concerns related to serving the aged and disabled, these organizations provided such tools as board and staff training materials to orient staff from different religious background to the core values of the institution. Conferences and meetings for these groups offered opportunities to discuss issues of concern, including maintaining religious values within the institution and connections to the faith community. Similar organizations existed for Catholic, Jewish and Mainline Protestant organizations. African American and Evangelical organizations were least likely to belong to these faith-based professional organizations.

Summary

This section focuses on the ways that agencies and faith communities use closed social capital and cultural capital to maintain connections. However, most of these organizations also rely on bridging ties to organizations and communities of people served and other organizations offering services. Linking social capital exists within faith communities — for example connections between the Jewish organizations and Federation. In addition, the umbrella organizations or community-wide planning and administrative systems serve as linking agents between these faith-based organizations and entities outside of the faith community like government or other institutions that influence agency funding and programming. For example, the umbrella organization for the Quaker retirement communities developed liability insurance for its member agencies. The archdiocese umbrella organization managed government contracts.

Research in these agencies highlighted the equal importance of closed, bridging and linking social capital to maintain strong, well managed organizations. Organizations that moved beyond the closed networks of its community in significant ways found themselves facing tensions in identity that impacted on funding and other issues. As with JOIA and the Lutheran Rehabilitation and Shelter agency, sometimes these tensions were inevitable as organizations grew. However, they also meant changes in the relationship to the founding faith community.

3. *How do congregations and their members relate to faith-based organizations that function under their name, and vice versa? For secular organizations, is there a constituent group that serves the same role as the faith community?*

This study found profound differences in the ways that institutionalized systems and congregational systems related to congregations associated with that religion. While organizations in institutionalized systems may develop informal relationships with particular congregations — for example the parent organization for the Cohen Center ran computer seminars for seniors out of one synagogue, generally parishes, synagogue, Temples and individual mosques had limited relationships with the formal non-profits associated with the faith community. This disconnect between congregations and organizations was most apparent in outreach activities for the Cohen Center. Our researcher, volunteering as the person contacting congregations for the agency, described her interactions with congregation staff and volunteers as ranging from puzzlement to confusion over why the Center would want to do a presentation there. Congregation staff was willing to put a notice regarding agency services in their newsletters, but few were interested in direct presentations. As discussed earlier, direct connections between congregations and organizations went against the norm in this religion.

Congregation-based system organizations, on the other hand, eagerly sought connections to congregations. Organizations with close ties to their founding congregations — the African American organizations and the Chinese organization — had strong, organic relationships with founding congregations. The other Evangelical organization developed ties to Asian, white and African American Evangelical congregations — as well as few mainline Protestant churches — to provide volunteers, in-kind supports and financial resources. The larger, established social service agencies also sought connections to congregations. For instance, Lutheran Charities regularly relied on congregations to provide services for refugees and a program for the elderly, as well as presenting information on the agency to congregations. Regular mailings of agency newsletters and materials also connected agency and congregations.

Organizations in institutionalized versus congregational systems also connected to congregations for different reasons. In institutionalized systems, organizations primarily sought to inform congregations of services available to them rather than seek supports directly from congregations. For instance, the Cohen Center outreach activity focused on informing synagogues and Temples about their services. Catholic GED program wanted to work with parishes to encourage them to send people needing emergency services to this social service agency rather than handling requests for aid through parish benevolence funds. The manager for the Catholic Program stressed that relying on the formal social service agency would encourage more professional and holistic assessments of need as well as stretch religious community aid farther. Requests for volunteers and funding were handled through higher level judicatory bodies of the archdiocese and Federations.

Congregation-based organizations, on the other hand, interacted with congregations directly both to solicit support and to advertise services. Organizations targeted primarily toward serving people outside of the faith community, such as Christian Children's Inner City Program, focused on the role of this agency as a witness to those in need in communities connected in some way to the faith community. For this organization, the children served by the agency came from neighborhoods where many of the faithful had businesses. Likewise, the Mennonite congregation that started Jubilee Association of Maryland had a long term witness on providing quality, caring homes for the developmentally disabled. While congregation-based systems first connected with congregations from their faith, they were also likely to reach out to other congregations as well. For example, the Lutheran agencies included other mainline Protestant, Catholic and even Jewish congregations in their outreach activities.

Organizations with ties to race or immigrant-based groups also reached out to their constituent communities through racial or immigrant-wide networks. For instance, Joy Ministries activities sought both program participants and staff from the surrounding African American neighborhoods. Chinese Immigrant Services developed collaborations with secular Asian serving organizations as well as the Chinese émigré community. Since the pilot study focused exclusively on faith-based organizations, we had no way to understand the relative role of race, ethnicity or immigrant status vs. faith communities for these organizations. For this reason, we hope to compare faith-based and secular organizations for marginalized communities in future research.

4. *How do faith communities ensure that the faith-based organizations have a future as faith-based institutions? That their founding values and perspectives are maintained?*

Faith communities primarily relied on strategies to control governance, fundraising, volunteers and creation of formal and informal social capital links to organizations as described under subquestion "a" above. Some organizations, in turn, developed internal programs and structures to reinforce the founding ethos of the organization. These strategies will be discussed under question 3, below. Please also see subquestion "e", below.

5. *What is the impact of the organizations' work on the faith community? On its understandings of the issues the organizations address? On its understandings of those the organizations served? On its understandings of their faith? On its sense of identity?*

Given that the pilot study focused primarily on non-profits with limited research in the constituent faith communities, responses to this question are necessarily preliminary. In general, we found that faith communities viewed their organizations as their representatives in the wider community, reflecting theological beliefs and religious culture. In congregational based systems for religions where individual religious witness was important such as in mainline Protestant and Evangelical communities, these organizations provided opportunities for faith-community members to enact their faith-based calls to service. For example, staff at the Christian Adult Community Day Center stressed that their work was a ministry (often underpaid), not a "job job." Likewise, volunteers at Christen Children Inner City Program volunteered both to share their faith with at-risk children and to perform personal calls to service.

Injunctions to provide for those in need took a more institutionalized form for Catholics, Jews and Muslims. Islam's dictates to support the poor and those in need led community members to provide both funding and in-kind service through these faith-based organizations. Donations to the Jewish Federation and support for archdiocese fundraising, goods collections, and volunteer drives fulfilled similar faith-community calls to support those in need in these two communities.

These organizations also became a lightning rod for disagreements within the faith community regarding interpretation of social justice teachings. This was most obvious for the two Jewish organizations, both of which interpreted *tikun olom* as a witness to the wider community. These organizations became the subject of debate in the Jewish community. At Jewish Aging Services, occasional discussion continued on the board even after the agency had made a decision to reach beyond the Jewish community. Federation staff noted with dismay that the organization was different from other Federation member agencies in its orientation outside of the Jewish community. Both key staff at the agency and Federation complained that this different orientation created tensions between the organization and Federation.

JOAI experienced more extreme sanctioning from Federation as more of its clientele came from outside of the Jewish community. While this was most evident in loss of Federation funds, the debate also surfaced in other relationships with other Jews. In response, the agency turned more toward people and organizations interested primarily in immigration rather than the Jewish community.

Regardless of orientation toward institutionalized or congregational social welfare systems, many of the organizations in the pilot study sought to educate their faith communities about the issues that they dealt with. Opportunities for education included volunteering experiences, presentations at faith-community forums and written materials. Different organizations put more or less emphasis on educating their founding faith community versus providing services or outreach to the locality based community. The nature of educational outreach deserves additional study.

6. *Under what conditions do faith-based organizations move beyond the ethos and control of the denomination and what connection, if any, does the religious body have with an organization when this occurs?*

None of the organizations in the pilot study had moved completely beyond the ethos and control of the denomination, making it difficult to respond to this question. The two Jewish agencies very much reflected the values of their founding faith, but were sometimes caught up in internal debates within U.S. Jewry. Lutheran Rehabilitation and Shelter Center also appeared to be moving beyond its congregational roots, but that may have been intentional all along, following well established patterns among Protestant organizations (Hall 2005).

We did note that the organizations experiencing some conflict with their faith community or expanding beyond its mandate, tended to draw board members that reflected new points of view. For instance, JOAI increasingly recruited its board from people interested in immigration as opposed to the traditional Federation volunteers who focused on supporting the Jewish community:

And the other thing about the agency is unlike many other Federation-affiliated agencies, many...I would say most of our board are...well, they're not as...I don't know how to say it, I mean, some of them are Federation people...they're really well-connected...but these people don't really affiliate with Federation, they affiliate with JOAI, which is a big difference. They believe in immigration, and that is their love (interview).

This primary connection to the organization as opposed to the faith community also appeared at Lutheran Rehabilitation and Shelter Center, where the board was described as dominated by people who did not belong to the founding congregation. As a result, the new executive director came from another faith, unlike any of the other organizations. The organization was engaged in internal planning activities that reflected this leadership change during the study period.

Implications for Policy and Practice

- **Connections between faith communities and organizations under their care work differ for institutional vs. congregational systems, leading to different strategies for governance, fundraising, and other mechanisms that rely on faith-community social capital.** Organization leaders would do well to rely on their culture-based strategies to seek support from their faith community. Policy makers need to recognize that supports from the faith community are equally strong in both systems, but are organized differently.

- **Organizations and faith communities should seek ways to support both social capital and cultural ties between organization and founding community.**
- **Given that organizations sometimes become symbols for disagreements within faith communities over appropriate forms of faith based witness, organization and faith-community leaders need to work closely together to understand these dynamics and prevent adverse impacts on the organization or attenuation of relationships with the founding community.**

Suggestions for Future Research

- **Develop research strategies that provide ample opportunities to explore relationships between faith communities and organizations through focus on this connection and research in venues that allow understanding of both dynamics.**
- **Include comparisons to secular organizations for marginalized racial and ethnic groups as well as new immigrant communities.**
- **Include both organizations with strong ties to the faith community and those that have limited connections to that community or no longer reflect its core values in order to understand the dynamics between organizations and communities when they move apart, as in subquestion e.**

Relationships between Organizations and Program Participants

1. *What is the relationship between non-profit organizations and the people that use their services? How do these relationships differ when the people served either come from the same community as the organization or from a different background?*
 - 1a. *What is the relationship between the organization, the faith community, and those served who are not part of the same religion? Does the work of the organization lead new people to the faith community? Under what terms? How does the organization ensure that the beliefs and rights of program participants from different faith traditions or who adhere to no religion are respected? How is the relationship between those served and the founding community differ for secular organizations, particularly in organizations founded by a particular ethnic or racial group now serving others different from themselves?*

The pilot study found a variety of dynamics between program participants and the agencies that served them. In general, organizations targeted particular populations based on their mission, which sometimes stipulated a connection to the faith, racial, or immigrant community. African American agencies and Chinese Immigrant Services were most likely to serve people from their racial and ethnic groups, regardless of religion. As in other studies of programs serving African Americans (Reynolds and Winship 2005), most African American program participants shared a deep, expressive Christian background, which made them comfortable with religious expression at these agencies. This was particularly true in the program serving the elderly.

The religious background of those served by the Chinese organization was less clear, but all shared a country of origin. The agency officially served people from any Asian group, but, due to social networks to the agency and the fact that staff only spoke several Chinese dialects, the majority of program participants also came from China. While both Muslim agencies claimed that they were non-sectarian, the strong social capital systems within the Muslim community, plus the use of Muslim cultural practices within the agency, meant that the majority of people served were also Muslim.

Both of the Jewish organizations had been founded originally to provide primarily for Jewish elderly or immigrants, with the understanding that other organizations did not provide culturally appropriate services to this population. This was most clear at Cohen Center, which offered kosher meals and a voluntary Sabbath service on Fridays. Eighty percent of its program participants were Jewish. However, both Jewish agencies currently had a commitment to serve anyone. While only a few of Cohen Center's participants were not Jewish, all felt comfortable in this environment where staff bent over backwards to welcome all faiths through such actions as holiday displays celebrating many religious observances and special diets for Hindu program participants. At

JOIA all participants received the same services, although, as discussed under question 3, some staff members were ambivalent about serving Palestinians.

In fact, resistance to Jewish practice at these agencies most often came from Jewish participants. Some participants were culturally Jewish, but averse to religious practice. Arguments about appropriate levels of religious practice were most likely to occur among Jewish program participants, as they continued dialogue about variations on Judaism common throughout the U.S. Jewish community. Russian Jews commented that the religion was not actively practiced in the former Soviet Union, expressing their affinity for cultural connections to the Jewish community rather than the religion.

As with these two Jewish agencies, organizations in institutionalized systems and those founded by Peace Churches and mainline Protestants tended to background religious expression and culture in their programming. They all also actively sought to serve anyone, regardless of race, nationality and religion. The more established, larger institutions like Catholic Ministries and the two Lutheran organizations predominantly served people who were low income or met other specific program criteria such as refugees or GLBT youth. There was very little reference to religion in organization practice and no active effort to include prayer or religious practice in the organization. Diversity was celebrated at these organizations. For example at the family shelter at Lutheran Shelter and Rehabilitation, the researcher reported:

The families from the program were invited to come... and a Jewish woman who is on the staff presented a Passover meal. They're all participated together in the Passover meal to learn about the Jewish tradition... the Islamic family presented a meal and taught the children something about Muslim tradition. Two or three Muslims families in the building, in the program who are from Sudan, West Africa.

Peace Churches also consciously provided ecumenical services, although clearly stating the religious background of the community. As discussed under question 3, below, Peace church practices of communal decision making suffused these organizations, as did their emphasis on the value of different beliefs and abilities. As a result, both organizations served people from a wide array of backgrounds, welcoming Jewish residents as well as other Christians. People chose these services because of this background. For example, some of the parents of Jubilee Association of Maryland residents stated that they valued the Christian nature of the organization, while Jewish families equally participated in both activities offered by Jubilee Association of Maryland and Faith and Light. While early Lakeside residents came primarily from Quaker backgrounds due to social capital, now only 30 percent are Quaker. The remaining residents share the liberal values and emphasis on simplicity characteristic of the organization.

Only the African American and Evangelical organizations actively used religious language and prayer in their activities, thus creating an environment where religious expression was expected. The majority of the program participants expressed comfort, even preference, for this religious environment. Joy Ministries did include prayer as one aspect of its programming, but appeared to be careful to offer to pray with participants only when they asked. As such, it maintained a balance between expressive religious culture and nonsectarian service. Only half of the youth involved in the program knew that prayer was an option, and none expressed negative reactions to being prayed for or openly religious practice.

Only the Evangelical organizations openly proselytized or actively invited program participants to join the church family. This was most evident in Christian Adult Community Day Program, where several participants in the seniors program joined the church and all were encouraged to participate in worship. The teen program at Christian Children's Inner City Program regularly included prayer, bible study and traditional Evangelical Christian values in its programming, but did not encourage participants to join any one church. The participants seemed generally comfortable with religious expression, although occasionally making faces regarding values statements. However, this acting out appeared more in keeping with young teens responding to authority than reactions to religious statements.

Many of these programs encouraged program participants to volunteer with the agencies, give back to the religious community, and sometimes hired program participants. The two Catholic agencies had a particular reputation for hiring former program participants, and all encouraged active volunteering among participants. Both Peace Church organizations encouraged program participants to play active role in organization activities and governance. Lakeside functioned through many participant fostered committees, and these residents also gave back to the founding faith community through raising funds for the founding Meeting's expansion and other

activities. These residents also created a mentoring program for area youth. Likewise, the Christian Adult Day Program participants provided some services to a nursing home as part of their programming. Christian Children Inner City Program participants sang at area churches, and Jubilee Association of Maryland participants participated in agency activities and governance, as they were able.

Implications for Policy and Practice

- **Fears of proselytizing or forcing religious practice on program participants largely appeared unfounded.** Most agencies either self-selected program participants or have created mechanisms to background religious practice or make it optional. While civil rights need to be guaranteed for participants in faith-based programs, this is far less of an issue than is envisioned in some policy circles. The charitable choice provision stipulates that there has to be a secular alternative to the agency readily available so that clients have a choice. This was the case with most of the agencies in the study.

Suggestions for Future Research

- **Given that established faith-based and faith-related organizations have developed successful strategies to both protect the religious identity and practice for those from other faiths and maintain their traditions, exploring further these strategies to identify best practices would be an important component of future research.**
- **The pilot study involved informal conversations with program participants and observations. Collection of participant thoughts on the role of faith in organizations could be further explored through adding depth interview and focus group components.**

Impact of Founding Community Culture on Organization Systems and Practice

2. *What is the impact of founding community culture and social capital systems on non-profit mission, organizational structure, staffing, and program design?*

2a. *How does the personal religious faith of key staff reflect that of the sponsoring community and influence organizational behavior? Do the leaders of secular organizations also adhere to a set of values that reflect their founding communities, and does that influence organization behavior in similar ways? How is this similar and different between faith-based and secular organizations?*

All of the organizations in this pilot study were suffused by the religious culture and values of their founding faith. However, we found two alternative approaches to the role of faith in programming. On the one hand, African American and Evangelical organizations actively used expressive faith in their programming, and faith was clearly evident in staff practices. On the other hand, Jewish, Catholic, mainline Protestant and Peace Churches stressed tolerance for other religions in their programming and staff practices. For many staff in these agencies, faith motivated staff and the emphasis on tolerance appeared as a religious value. In these organizations, religious culture influenced all aspects of organization structure, but was embedded in programming. Finally, we had difficulty disentangling religious culture from racial or immigrant culture in the African American and Chinese organizations, leading to questions about the role of religion vs. race, ethnicity or nationality in these organizations. Since mission has been discussed under question one, this section focuses on the role of religious culture and theology in agency structure, staffing and programming.

Agency Structure

As mentioned earlier, religious culture profoundly affects the structure of these organizations. This is evident when looking at organizational charts. For example, the Catholic agency was extremely hierarchical while the Peace Church organizations showed almost no hierarchy, and included the program participants as active parts of the agency structure. Jewish organizations showed some hierarchy, but much less formal top down decision making than in the Catholic institutions. While we did not have formal organizational charts for the smaller congregationally-based organizations, religious and cultural practice played a key role here too. For example,

as is common in the African American church (Day 2001), pastors played a prominent role in starting ministries, their shape and administration.

Denominational structure also played a role in the decision-making culture of each organization. While the Catholic agencies encouraged discussion of programming and administrative decisions at the program level, administrative staff dominated the conversation in staff meetings. In contrast, decision making at the Peace Church sponsored organizations actively involved everyone, and functioned by consensus. Jewish organizations appreciated contributions from staff in decision making, although some hierarchy was recognized in these organizations.

Religious culture was evident in the behind the scenes administrative structures and holiday decisions of all of these organizations. For example, the student placed at Catholic Ministries reported constant notices of mass and requests to pray for staff on the agency email system. Jewish Aging Services kept all of the Jewish holidays, but allowed non-Jews to take their own holidays off. Discussion of religious values was most likely to occur in staff meetings or agency written materials than in any other form. Mainline Protestant and Evangelical organizations sponsored prayer times for staff.

Overall, religious culture served as a background element in all of these organizations. Sometimes it was literally on the walls, through religious art, in the Jewish community — reference to donors,^{xiii} and religious program materials or literature prominently displayed. At Lutheran Charities, the Muzak on the telephone system played “A mighty fortress is our God.” At Lakeside, there were cross-stitches of Quaker sayings on the walls amidst art that reflected the Quaker emphasis on nature and the environment. While all staff recognized the religious background of their founding organization, the role of religion in programming and staffing diverged among embedded and expressive organizations beyond these background elements.

Staff

As mentioned earlier, while leadership staff in all organizations came from the founding religion and most appeared active in their faith, we found two divergent patterns among other staff. African American, Evangelical and newer congregational organizations were most likely to hire staff from the same faith and often through congregation-based social capital. Muslim organizations also hired exclusively Muslims, due to a combination of social capital networks for hiring and practice of traditional Islamic culture for women in these organizations. Jewish, Peace Church, mainline Protestant and Catholic organizations hired people from many faiths.

Most of these organizations tried to find people that shared the general values of the organization. If, as was the case for Jews, mainline Protestants, and Peace Churches, tolerance and equality for all were core values, hiring decisions focused on evidence of similar values. Both Jews and Muslims stressed professional credentials, and appropriate education and experience appeared a key factor in hiring here. Personal faith commitment was most important in the African American and Evangelical organizations.

Some of these organizations taught the culture and belief system of the founding religion to new hires through their orientation processes. For example, Jubilee Association of Maryland devoted about 1/3rd of its new staff orientation to discussion of Mennonite history, belief systems, and approaches to care for the developmentally disabled. Catholic Ministries explained that church teachings influenced their work, noting that staff should not talk about abortion and contraception as well as explaining that reproductive services were not covered in the health plan for this reason. Very little discussion of Catholic theology of social justice or charity occurred during these orientations. We did not witness any formal orientations in other organizations, but got the impression that Jewish agencies and many of the mainline Protestant organizations had no formal orientation but were willing to informally share belief systems.

In a few cases, staff reacted to the religious culture of the organization. For example, following the dictates of the Mennonite board and leadership, Jubilee Association of Maryland stresses abstinence among their unmarried program participants. However, some staff disagree with this policy and tell their clients about contraception anyway. Reproductive policy was also a touch point at the Catholic organizations. One staff member commented:

At that time I thought, no way would I want to work for Catholic Ministries. I had some political issues with it. I'm not Catholic and I am pro choice. So that was not an option for me. But I got involved in DC's

adult education program and adult basic education program and realized that the work going on here was really great. I had to put aside all my political concerns and dig in and do the work.

While many staff at these organizations spoke of religious values, the mainline Protestant and Evangelical organizations were most likely to encourage open religious expression among their staff, as well as staff prayer times and religious expression by staff in programming. This emphasis on personalized religion was in keeping with the beliefs and culture of those denominations.

In contrast, Jews were least likely to openly mention their faith — stressing the importance of embedded religion and tolerance in organizations. The only time that this did not occur was in JOIA. One Jewish staff person expressed concern about working with Palestinians based on conflict with Israel while another found herself making it clear to a Muslim participant that this was a Jewish organizations, indicating that Jews were helping members of this other faith.

Programming

The contrast between embedded vs. expressive faith was most evident in programming. In the Muslim, Evangelical and African American organizations faith was everywhere in their programming. At Christian Children's Inner City program, children were exhorted to behave in God-like manner whenever they acted out, and particularly around promiscuous dress or sexualized language. Both this organization and the African American Evangelical organization sponsored bible studies and consciously included faith components in programming. Joy Ministries also used faith in programming, but less often. Muslim dress patterns and prohibitions about interacting with men profoundly influenced work at Muslim Charities.

The other agencies showed the opposite tendencies. Tolerance was the rule here. It influenced the type of programming and interaction with people from other faiths. As a result, faith messages were not evident in programming, instead focusing on providing services to those in need. Nevertheless, faith influenced the shape and choice of programming. For example, a key Lutheran Charities staff person explained the decision to develop a GLBT program as follows:

[staff person's] vision of the relationship between the agency and the church is that [the agency] is accountable to congregations, but at the same time it has a prophetic role in speaking back to congregations, showing them the needs of the world.

These two contrasting approaches to the role of faith in programming suggest that typologies that focus on expressive faith will miss the prominent role of religion in organizations practicing embedded faith. As such, it remains important to understand each organization in the context of its founding religion. This also appeared true when assessing the impact of the type of services provided by the organization.

Cultural practices in Chinese Immigrant Services reflected the needs of immigrants from this culture rather than faith background. Since this program came out of a mainline Protestant tradition, it is difficult to tell if this tendency reflects religious values or simply the importance of immigrant culture. Comparisons with secular organizations will allow the opportunity to clarify this issue.

Implications for Policy and Practice

- **Religious-based organizations should evaluate their core beliefs and the way that they are expressed in their organizations as a mechanism to clarify the role of religion in organization practices.**
- **Policy makers and practitioners should understand that faith-based organizations are not determined solely by the level of religious expression in programming and staff practice nor by tendencies to hire from within the faith community.** Policies and practices need to understand the diversity of experience.

Suggestions for Future Research

- **Observations of orientation programs and other mechanisms to share founding religious faith with organization staff suggest some important strategies to enable organizations to maintain their religious ethos in their organizations. Further research on more organizations will allow opportunities to understand these mechanisms and develop best practices or tools to share with other organizations.**
- **Comparisons among faith-based and secular organizations serving marginalized racial and immigrant groups will provide greater insight into the roles and differences between faith-based and secular organizations for these communities.**

Impact of the Sector

3. What is the impact of the larger socio-economic and policy system, as well as the service sector of that organization (social services, health and senior services, community development), on non-profit organizations form, function and resources?
 - 3a. For marginalized populations such as immigrant, ethnic, and racial groups, are there fundamental differences between faith-based and secular organizations in regards to their relationships with the wider community and the way that organization mission plays out in agency programs, staffing, and other decisions?

This pilot study revealed that faith-based non-profits both responded to the ethos of their founding religious communities and reflected the exigencies of the type of service provided. In most cases, this was a careful balancing act between these two important constituencies. Sector impact was most evident in funding structures. In keeping with a sector dominated by fee-for-service structures and where competition with for-profits is a real issue, the health and retirement organizations drew most of their income from participant fees or through government voucher systems. For example 76 percent of Lakeside's revenue came from participant fees, Jubilee Association of Maryland drew 78 percent from government voucher programs for housing for the developmentally disabled, and while only 20 percent of the budget for the parent organization of the Cohen Center came from participant fees, most of the Center's revenues came from this source. The parent Jewish Aging Services had the most diversified funding portfolio of any agency participating in the pilot, but also drew 25 percent of its revenue from government and foundation contracts.

Health and senior services agencies also felt competition from for-profits and other non-profits most keenly. For example, the outreach coordinator for the Cohen Center gave away bags of chocolates tagged with the agency contact information at presentations to hospitals. She expressed concern that her little gifts could not compare to the incentives these social workers received from for profits and pharmaceutical companies on a regular basis. The hospital social workers, on the other hand, appeared not to care — sometimes taking the tags off of the bags of chocolate as a way to remember the agency and returning the gifts to the outreach coordinator because they felt that they didn't need them. Lakeside discussed offering larger or fancier residences to compete with for-profit continuing care communities.

Both the social service agencies and health and senior services agencies in our pilot study often were leaders in their field. This was particularly true for the larger, more established entities like Lutheran Charities, Catholic Ministries, and Jubilee Association of Maryland which were some of the largest players among agencies providing this kind of service and played an active role in the umbrella groups for agencies providing similar services. Lakeside is also considered a leader in the industry, and regularly receive awards and visits from other agencies (both Quaker and not, some from outside the United States) wanting to model their standards and setups. Regardless of size, all of the social service agencies and health and senior services agencies were active in coalitions of organizations providing similar services, often belonging to professional associations that worked with government to set standards and address issues related to government funding. As such, religious-based organizations played an active role in setting the tone for service provision in their locality. Since some of these organizations also belonged to regional or national umbrella organizations, drawing information on best practices from these larger institutions, informing them of their own innovations and needs, and participating in establishing standards for service.

The active participation of these faith-based institutions in secular coalitions and professional associations suggests two things. First, social capital connections to agencies providing similar services is equally important

to these organization as participating in faith-based networks. Rather than make a choice between providing faith-based or secular services, these agencies draw from both pools of social capital and cultural capital, developing collaborations with agencies in both faith-based and secular networks and using these formal and informal umbrella networks to determine best practices and appropriate standards of care. As such any dichotomy between faith-based and secular organizations appears largely specious as organizations draw from both sources of support.

Second, given these strong connections between faith-based and secular organizations through coalitions of similar agencies, arguments that participation in secular service provision systems dilutes the original missions of faith-based organizations (Smith and Sosin 2001), may be incorrect. Instead, some of these institutions play a major role in setting standards for service provision in their field and actively lobby for government regulations that reflect the values of their founding faith communities. For example, Catholic institutions have lobbied for more universal health care based on Church teachings (Cochran 1999). As Hall (2005) suggests, through participation in secular systems, faith-based institutions inculcate their religious-based values into the wider society. The predominantly Protestant expectations of the faith-based initiative and many of the studies of faith-based service are only one example of this tendency. Future research should look carefully at this issue.

The relative importance of faith vs. secular community concerns was also unclear for organizations that came out of community organizing or community needs assessment activities. These organizations were least likely to participate in coalitions of service providers offering a similar service, but appeared equally active in secular coalitions from the same racial or ethnic communities. For example, the African American organizations worked with other African American institutions and Chinese Immigrant Services both actively participated in the Washington DC Chinese community and collaborated with other agencies providing social services for Asians. For example, the organization partnered with secular Laotian and Vietnamese organizations on a government contract to provide crime victim services for the Asian community in Washington DC.

As with the organizations in other sectors, these community based institutions participated both in faith-based and secular social capital systems associated with their constituency. However, the lines between the culture of faith communities and racial, ethnic or immigrant communities appeared far more intertwined for these agencies than for organizations in the social service or health and senior services sectors. Likewise social capital resources stemmed from networks that overlapped between faith communities and racial, ethnic or immigrant communities. In large part, these differences come out of the strategic importance of faith communities for both African Americans and immigrants (Lincoln and Mamiya 1990, Ebaugh and Chafetz 2000). Our future research strategy of comparing faith-based and secular organizations for organizations in this sector will hopefully clarify these issues.

Given the focus of our pilot research on connections between faith communities and organizations, our results only hint and the impact of the sector on these institutions. Future research would concentrate more on these issues as a way to truly assess relative impact. However, our early findings suggest that the values and social capital systems of faith-based and secular organizations are far more intertwined than previous research suggests. Understanding this dynamic would be an important goal of future work.

Implications for Policy and Practice

- **Presumptions of fundamental differences between faith-based and secular organizations may be misplaced. Instead, it may be more important for policy makers and practitioner to clarify ways that concerns related to the sector and founding community ethos interact with each other in service provision.**

Suggestions for Future Research

- **Further study of the relationship of organizations to sector-based coalitions would help in understanding this dynamic.** Pilot research allowed limited opportunity to attend sector wide coalitions, another aspect of research that would enhance a larger and longer study
- **Comparisons between faith-based and secular organizations for marginalized populations would allow opportunities to understand the role of race, nationality, immigrant status and religion in these institutions' activities.**

Conclusion

Our pilot study offers some important preliminary insights into the ways that religion impacts on the activities of faith-based organizations. To our knowledge, this is one of few studies that uses qualitative research to understand how faith is made manifest through non-profit activity. As such, we are able to understand the important role of culture in social capital connections between faith communities and the non-profits they create. Multi-methods ethnography shows the various aspects of relationships between faith communities and their organizations, highlighting different forms previously ignored in both the academic and practical literature on this topic.

Our methods also allow us to understand the ways that theology and culture play out in day-to-day operations within organizations. Different denominations and religions highlight varying aspects of their religious values. Some faith communities embed their religious culture and theology in the background structures of their organizations so deeply that superficial analysis or studies presuming that faith should be expressed opening would presume that these are secular institutions. Nevertheless, faith-community ethos and values inform all aspects of organizational activities. In other organizations, faith-community culture and theology is openly expressed in all aspects of organization staffing or programming.

Research focus on the dynamics between program participants and the organizations that serve them allows a clearer understanding of ways that program participants understand the role of religion in these organizations. Conversations with participants allow us to assess their reaction to the faith-based elements embedded or openly expressed in service provision. While findings are preliminary, they offer insights important to ongoing discussions of the separation of church and state raised by the faith-based initiative.

Our preliminary findings on the impact of type of service on faith-based organizations shows an intertwining for faith-based and secular networks, culture, and concerns. Most of these organizations participate equally in social capital systems for their faith communities and with other secular organizations providing similar services. Likewise, both the culture of the founding religion and the standards for service provision of the secular coalitions impact on ways that organizations do business. Funding structures and government regulations also significantly influence organization form and practices. However, given that some of these faith-based organizations are leaders in their fields, faith-based values may in fact influence standards for secular coalitions and government.

Given the limited research time and small number of organizations participating in this pilot study, our findings are necessarily preliminary. A number of findings need further testing through research in a larger set of organizations. Future research would also look more carefully at dynamics in the larger faith communities, tracing connections between congregations, larger judicatory structures, and non-profits. In addition, future research would consciously include organizations that faith communities believe have moved beyond faith-community control to assess these relationships and clarify remaining dynamics between faith community and organization. Future research would also pay additional attention to the impact of the sector on these organizations. Research on the sector would clarify the dynamic impact of larger society factors on these organizations while, at the same time, assessing the ways that faith-community values and lobbying efforts impact on U.S. society as a whole.

Finally, research in two cities on the East Coast does not provide enough data to understand the impact of regional differences on faith-based service provision. Future research would also compare rural communities to metropolitan areas in order to understand these differences. Comparing different parts of the country and different types of communities would allow us to understand the impact of locality on service provision. What factors of service provision are common across the country and how do locality specific systems impact differently on service provision?

We hope to expand this pilot study into a national project that would involve four to eight sites across the country. A growing number of scholars and practitioners have expressed interest in participating in this study (see appendix C). The number of sites and depth of future research will depend on amount of funding available for this initiative. Each site would include a larger range of organizations than in the pilot study. Research across the country would be connected through a core team of scholars/practitioners that will work with local site directors to maintain research consistency and clarify findings across sites. Participating organizations and

researchers would meet regularly to share insights as the study progresses. Finally, the larger project would also include a quantitative study, developed by all participating organizations and researchers that would see if key qualitative findings are generalizable to a larger sample of organizations. As such, our study design combines quantitative and qualitative methods to provide a complete picture of the dynamics between faith-based organizations and the various constituencies — faith community, participants, and sector — that impact on their work.

Finally, while our preliminary results provide some usable insights to faith-based organizations, faith communities, and policy makers, our proposed larger initiative would devote particular energy to creating products useful to practitioners and policy makers. Working with faith-community umbrella group representatives and our participating agencies, we hope to create a number of fact sheets, tools and products of use to these organizations. We are also developing relationships with a wide array of umbrella organizations to disseminate our outcomes to their constituent agencies after this project ends. A policy component of the project would provide insights to policy makers.

The project team welcomes interest from other researchers, faith communities and organizations. For more information, contact Jo Anne Schneider at jschneid@gwu.edu. Additional copies of this report and documents related to this study will be available at <http://home.gwu.edu/~jschneid/>.

References:

- Alkhabteeb, Maha B. (2002) Muslim Congregations Final Report. Unpublished manuscript produced for the Religion in the New Immigrants Project. Catholic University: Life Cycle Institute.
- Ammerman, Nancy. (1997) *Congregation and Community*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- (2002). "Connecting Mainline Protestant Churches with Public Life." In *The Quiet Hand of God: Faith-Based Activism and the Public Role of Mainline Protestantism*. Ed. by Robert Wuthnow and John H. Evans. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press:129-158.
- Bane, Mary Jo (2005) *The Catholic Puzzle: Parishes and Civic Life*. In Mary Jo Bane, Brent Coffin, Richard Higgins editors. *Taking Faith Seriously*. (pp. 63-93). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Bane, Mary Jo, Brent Coffin and Richard Higgins (2005) *Taking Faith Seriously*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Bane, Mary Jo, Brent Coffin, Ronald Thiemann (2000) *Who Will Provide The Changing Role of Religion in American Social Welfare*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press
- Bartowski, J.P., and Regis, H. (1999) *Religious Organizations, Anti-poverty Relief, and Charitable Choice: A Feasibility Study of Faith-Based Welfare Reform in Mississippi*. Arlington, VA: Pricewaterhouse-Coopers Endowment.
- Brinton, Howard (1994) *Friends for 300 Years*. Wallingford, PA: Pendle Hill Publications.
- Bogan, Boris (1917). *Jewish Philanthropy: An Exposition of Principles and methods of Jewish Social Service in the United States*. New York: Macmillan Company.
- Bourdieu, Pierre.1986. The forms of capital. In *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*, ed. John G. Richardson. Trans. Richard Nice. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Loic J.D. Wacquant. 1992. *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Carp, Joel M. (2002)*The Jewish Social Welfare Lobby in the United States*. In *Jewish Policy and American Civil Society*. (pp. 181-234) Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Chaves, Mark (1999). "Congregations= Social Service Activities." *Charting Civil Society*, No. 6. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, December.
- (2001). "Religious Congregations and Welfare Reform." *Society*, January/February: 21-27.
- (2004) *Congregations in America*, Cambridge, MA and New York: Harvard University Press.
- Chaves, Mark and William Tsittos. (2000). *Congregations and Social Services: What they Do, How they Do It, and With Whom*. Unpublished paper presented at the ARNOVA meetings.
- Cnaan, Ram A. (2002). *The Invisible Hand: American Congregations and the Provision of Welfare*. New York: New York University Press.
- Cnaan, Ram, and Stephanie Boddie (2001) *Philadelphia Census of Congregations and Their Involvement in Social Service Delivery*. *Social Services Review*: 559-580.
- Cnaan, Ram, Bob Wineberg and Stephanie Boddie (1999). *The Newer Deal: Social Work and Religion in Partnership*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cochran, Clarke E. (1999) *Institutional Identity; Sacramental Potential: Catholic Healthcare at Centuries End*.

Christian Bioethics 5(1)26-43

Curran, Charles (1997). The Catholic Identity of Catholic Institutions. *Theological Studies*, 58: 90-108.

Day, Katie (2001). *Prelude to Struggle: African American Clergy and Community Organizing for Economic Development in the 1990's*. New York: University Press.

Degeneffe, Charles Edmund (2003) What is Catholic about Catholic Charities. *Social Work* 48(3) 374- 383

Dionne, E.J. and Ming Hsu Chen (2001) *Sacred Places, Civic Purposes: Should Government Help Faith-Based Charity?* Washington: Brookings Institution.

DuBois, W.E.B. (1899/1967) *The Philadelphia Negro*, New York: Schocken Books.

Ebaugh, Helen Rose and Janet Saltzman Chafetz (2000). *Religion and the New Immigrants: Continuities and Adaptations in Immigrant Congregations*. New York: Altamira Press.

Ediger, Elmer M. (1983) *Roots*. In Vernon H. Neufeld editor. *If We Can Love The Mennonite Mental Health Story*, (pp. 3-30) Newton Kansas: Mennonite Press

FACT Study (2000) <http://fact@hartsem.edu>, accessed 10/5/05.

Fager, Chuck (1988) *Quaker Service at a Crossroads*. Falls Church, Virginia: Kimo Press.

Grettenberger, Susan (2001). *Churches as a Community Resource and Source of Funding for Human Services*. Aspen Institute Working Paper Series.

Hall, Peter Dobkin (1990) *The History of Religious Philanthropy in America*. In Robert Wuthnow, Virginia Hodgkinson and Associates (Eds). *Faith and Philanthropy in America*. (38-62). San Francisco: Josey Bass.

(2005) *The Rise of Civic Engagement Tradition*. In Bane, Mary Jo, Brent Coffin and Richard Higgins editors. *Taking Faith Seriously*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press: 21-60.

Harris, F. (2003) *Ties that Bind and Flourish: Religion as Social Capital in African-American Politics* IN C.Smids (ed.) *Religion as Social Capital: Producing the Common Good* (pp. 121-138), Waco,TX: Baylor University Press.

Hehir, J. Bryan (1998) *Social Values and Public Policy: A Contribution from the religious Tradition*. In Milton Carrow, Robert Churchill and Joseph Cordes editors, *Democracy, Social Values and Public Policy*. London: Praeger.

(2000). *Religious Ideas and Social Policy: Subsidiarity and Catholic Style of Ministry*. In Mary Jo Bane, Brent Coffin and Ronald Thieman editors. *Who Will Provide: The Changing Role of Religion in American Social Welfare*. 97-120. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

(2002) *The Legacy and Future of Catholic Charities: Challenges within the Church and Within Society*. Daughters of Isabella lecture, Life Cycle Institute, Catholic University of America. Washington DC, October 8th.

Herr, Judy Zimmerman, Robert Herr (2001) *Living Rightly in the Land: Reflection on MCC Service in a Postmodern Era*. *The Conrad Grebel Review* 19(3) 54-76

Hudson, Winthrop, and John Corrigan (1992) *Religion in America : an historical account of the development of American religious life*. New York : Maxwell Macmillan International.

Jeavons, Thomas (1994). *When the Bottom Line is Faithfulness: Management of Christian Service Organizations*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

(2004) *Religious and Faith-Based Organizations Do We Know One When We See One?* Nonprofit and

Voluntary Quarterly 33(1)140-145

Kogelmann, Franz (2002). Sidi Fredj: A Case Study of a Religious Endowment in Morocco under the French Protectorate. In Holger Weiss editor, *Social Welfare in Muslim Societies in Africa*. Stockholm: Elanders Gotab.

Leonard, Karen (2003) *Muslims in the United States The State of Research*. New York: The Russell Sage Foundation.

Lincoln, Eric and Lawrence Mamiya (1990). *The Black Church in the African American Experience*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Mapes, Mary L. (2004). *A Public Charity*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Monsma, Stephen (1996). *When sacred and Secular Mix: Religious nonprofit Organizations and Public Money*. London: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Nesbitt, Paul (2001) *Religion and Social Policy*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Niebuhr, H.R. (1929). *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*, New York: Henry Holt.

Nimer, Mohamed (2002). *The North American Muslim Resource Guide Muslim Community Life in the United States and Canada*, New York: Routledge.

Neufeld, Vernon H. (1983) *Mennonite Mental Health Services*. In Vernon H. Neufeld editor. *If We Can Love The Mennonite Mental Health Story*, (pp. 31-56) Newton Kansas: Mennonite Press

Neufeld, Vernon H., Donald M. Wert (1983) *The Church and the Centers*. In Vernon H. Neufeld editor. *If We Can Love The Mennonite Mental Health Story*, (pp. 251-266) Newton Kansas: Mennonite Press.

Portes, Alejandro. 1998. Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 1–24.

Punshon, J. (1984) *Portrait in Grey. A short history of the Quakers*, London: Quaker Home Service.

Putnam (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Queen, Edward editor (2000) *Serving Those in Need: A Handbook for Managing Faith-Based Human Services Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Redekop, Calvin (1996) The "MCC Ethos" and the Organizational Revolution. *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 107- 132.

Reynolds, Amy, Christopher Winship (2005) *Faith, Practice and Teens: Evaluating Faith-Based Programs*. In Mary Jo Bane, Brent Coffin, Richard Higgins editors. *Taking Faith Seriously*. (pp. 245-276). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Roseman, Kenneth (1974). *Jewish Community Institutions in their Historical Context*. *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 16 (1) 25-38.

Roozen, D., McKinney, W., Carroll, J. (1985) *Varieties of Religious Presence*, Grand Rapids, Pilgrim Press.

Salamon, Lester (1995) *Partners in Public Service: Government, Non-profit Relations in the Modern Welfare State*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Schlabach, Gerald W. (2000) In the Belly of a Paradox: Reflections on the Dubious Service of Reflecting on Service. *The Conrad Grebel Review* 19(3) 7-53
- Schneider, Jo Anne (1988) In the Big Village: Economic Adjustment and Identity Formation for Eastern European Refugees in Philadelphia, PA. PhD Dissertation, Temple University Anthropology Department.
- (1999). Trusting that of God in Everyone: Three Examples of Quaker Based Social Service in Disadvantaged Communities. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28(3): 269-295.
- 2006 .*Social capital and Welfare Reform: Government, Non-profits, Congregations and Community in Pennsylvania and Wisconsin*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Scholman, Kay, Sidney Verba, and Henry Brady (1999) Civic Participation and the Equity Problem. In *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*, Theda Skocpol and Morris Fiorina Editors. Washington DC and New York: Brookings Institution Press and Russell Sage Foundation: 427-460.
- Sider, Ronald J., Heidi Rolland Unruh (2004) Typology of Religious Characteristics of Social Service and Educational Organizations and Programs. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 33(1)109-134
- Sider, R., Olson, P., Unruh, H.R. (2002). *Churches that make a difference*, Grand Rapids: Baker Books.
- Smith, C. (1998) *American Evangelicalism: Embattled and thriving*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, Stephen and Michael Lipsky (1993). *Nonprofits for Hire: the Welfare State in the Age of Contracting*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Smith, Stephen and Michael Sosin (2001) The Varieties of Faith Related Agencies. *Public Administration Review* 61 (6): 651-670.
- Steidl-Meir (1984) *Social Justice Ministry Foundations and Concerns*. New York: Le Jacq Publishing Inc.
- Tangenberg, Karen (2005) Faith-Based Human Services Initiatives: Considerations for Social Work Practice and Theory. *Social Work* 50(3) 197-206
- Task Force on Resettlement (1980). *Handbook for Soviet Jewish Immigrants in Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: Federation of Jewish Agencies of Greater Philadelphia.
- Thiemann, Samuel Herring, and Betsy Perabo (2005) Risks and Responsibilities for Faithbased Organizations. In Mary Jo Bane, Brent Coffin, Samuel Herring Thiemann *Who Will Provide?* Pp 51-72
- USCC (1999) *In All Things Charity: A Pastoral Challenge for the New Millennium*. Washington DC: United States catholic Conference.
- Trattner, Walter (1994) *From Poor Law to Welfare State*. New York: The Free Press.
- Warner, W.L. and Lunt, P. (1941) *The Social Life of a Modern Community*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Weber, M. (1930/2002) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, first published London: Allen and Unwin; later edition New York, Routledge.
- Wenger, J.C. (1966) *The Mennonite Church in America*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press.
- Weiss, Holger (2002) *Social Welfare in Muslim Societies in America*, Stockholm, Elanders.
- Wineburg, Bob (2001). *A Limited Partnership: The Politics of Religion, Welfare and Social Service*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Winkworth, Gail, Peter Camilleri (2004) Keeping the Faith: The Impact of Human Services Restructuring on Catholic Social Welfare Services. *Australian Journal of Social Services Issues*, 39(3): 315-326

Wood, Richard (2002). *Faith in Action: Religion, Race, and Democratic Organizing in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Woolever, C. and Bruce, D. (2004) *Beyond the Ordinary: Ten Strengths of U.S. Congregations*, Louisville and London: Westminster John Knox Press.

World Bank. 2001. *World development report 2000/2001*. Available at www.worldbank.org/poverty/wdrpoverty/report.

Wuthnow, R. (1999) Mobilizing Civic Engagement IN *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*, Skocpol T. and Fiorina, M. (ed), pp. 331-363. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press and New York: Russell Sage.

Appendix A:

Washington DC Sites:

1. Catholic Ministries	69
2. Jewish Aging Services and The Cohen Center	73
3. Jubilee Association of Maryland	78
4. The Christian Children's Inner-City Program Urban Ministry	83
5. Chinese Immigrant Services	87
6. Muslim Organizations	90

Philadelphia Sites:

7. Lutheran Charities	93
8. Jewish Organization for the Aid of Immigrants (JOAI) Research Summary	94
9. Christian Adult Community Day Program	105
10. Lakeside	115
11. Joy Ministries	123

Washington Sites:

1. Catholic Ministries Downtown Family Center in Washington DC

Primary Research Questions

a. How do the dynamics between organization and founding community impact on the beliefs, behaviors, and resources of both organization and community? Do relationships between organization and community foster social capital, cultural capital and civic engagement in the founding community?

The relationship between Catholic Ministries and the Catholic Church is clear. The church plays a strong role in administering Catholic Ministries. For example, the archdiocese provides the health insurance for the employees of Catholic Ministries. One staff member commented, "The insurance is through the archdiocese, so therefore it doesn't cover birth control." She and others were complaining about the health insurance. Catholic Ministries and its employees who disagree with key teachings of the church have deemed these values to be sensitive and do not talk about them. The downtown family center relies on volunteers from off the street and the parish next-door. While I looked for a connection between the downtown family center and the church, none was readily apparent.

The staff is diverse, but power is very hierarchical

90% of all volunteers are Catholic and either came to the downtown family center through a connection to the church or from St. Patrick's. Most of their activities are funded through the Catholic Church and grants. The Cardinal's Appeal, a large fundraiser conducted via the parishes raises large funds for Catholic Ministries.

From a content perspective, Catholic Ministries balances a line between professionalism and faith. Catholic ethics dominate and everyone is aware of them, but an effort is made to maintain a professional atmosphere. Numerous times staff members have pointed out what can be discussed in the classroom and what cannot.

The staff orientation contained numerous references to Catholic values GED teachers and Parent education staff limited discussions avoiding topics such as abortion, evolution and birth control.

Emails include requests for prayers and include Catholic prayers and quotes from the Bible

b. What is the relationship between non-profit organizations and the people that use their services? How does this differ between faith-based and secular organizations? How do these relationships differ when the people served come either from the same community as the organization or from a different background?

While Catholic Ministries will help everyone, being Catholic can help one receive more funds through knowing the priest who will help a parishioner.

In the tenants' empowerment program, a housing and recovery program for former drug users, the staff were a

combination of two white nuns and African American counselors, some of which appeared to have come through the program or have recovered from substance abuse themselves. Here, the participants were African American women who may or may not have been Catholic. Counselors in this program stressed “spirituality” rather than “religion where God might sit in judgment of you.” It is unclear if this distinction was meant to make nonreligious people feel more welcome, or suggest a different kind of religion.

Race and class issues were clear issues at Catholic Ministries, with distinctions made between staff and participants, with the inference that participants were lower class or had made bad choices. Several incidents were recorded of white staff saying or doing something that indicated that they felt that their non-white participants or staff that came out of the community served did not have the same values or skills as the white Catholic staff. For example, in one incident white staff refused to give an African American staff person who had come out of the community venison because they presumed that she wouldn’t know how to cook it. On the other hand, an African American staff person reported that some participants viewed the nun running the program as “white and stupid” (meaning not street smart) while she presumed the nun thought the participants were “stupid” (i.e. not knowing middle class strategies for saving money, etc.)

Building connections between Catholic Ministries and parishes in D.C. has led to effort to build bridges and networks among various parishes. This project has yet to develop fully, but given time, this effort could lead to less hierarchy outside of Catholic Ministries and more connections between the parishes. Barbra facilitates this when she contacts one parish and asks for help with a member of another parish, but as long as these connections flow through outreach coordinator. They will flow through Catholic Ministries and be monitored. The success of these networks is contingent on these connections not flowing through Catholic Ministries. This was a common concern. For example, when trying to raise money for the tenants’ group, many of the volunteers were concerned with keeping the money away from the CEO of Catholic Ministries. To the best of my knowledge, all of the volunteers were Catholic. They did not want him and Catholic Ministries general fund to receive the money they raise for their organization.

Some examples:

While Catholic Ministries GED and emergency services center will serve everyone, most of its clients are not Catholic. People who use their services do not view Catholic Ministries as a Faith-based Organization, but the staff and the founding organization do.

c. What is the impact of founding community culture and social capital systems on non-profit mission, organizational structure, staffing, and program design?

The influence of the Catholic Church is strong here as well. One center focuses on helping homeless men with the GED, Parent Education and emergency aid via a social worker and a staff member. The mission and program are not strictly based on Catholic ideals, but follow them. Staff members who run these programs are not all Catholic, but do make sure the programs follow Catholic teachings.

The staff is diverse. There is an even mix of African American and white staff members and religious background is mixed. However most of staff agrees the Catholic Ministries does good work and are united behind the idea of doing something good for the community.

These connections are still strong, but slightly less visible at the tenant empowerment program. In that program, lead staff were both nuns, an indication of strong Catholic presence. On the other hand, all of the artwork and symbols referred to African sayings and related materials that were spiritual, but not Catholic.

d. What is the impact of the larger socio-economic and policy system, as well as the service sector of that organization (social services, health and senior services, community development) on non-profit organizations form, function and resources?

Further research is necessary to answer this question adequately.

The organization has received a substantial government grant as a result of the governmental faith-based initiatives. While the organization is not congregationally based, it supports congregations through its parish outreach office and is supported by parishes. The Cardinal’s Appeal supports Catholic Ministries and the

archdiocese works closely with Catholic Ministries by providing infrastructure like the loaning the headquarters building for \$1 a year.

Sub Questions

1. What is the relationship between the religious denomination and the non-profit organizations founded by that organization? (Governance, financial, control, volunteer participation, staffing, program content, mission). What role does social and cultural capital play in those relationships?

This question has been addressed in “a” of the “Big Questions” section. The organization is run by separately from the Catholic Church, but the Catholic Church has a large presence. For example, the Archbishop serves as the head of Catholic Ministries. The relationship with the church influences governance, finances, volunteer participation staffing, program content and mission. Catholic Ministries funds come from a combination of grants and private donations.

At Catholic Ministries, social capital comes alive at meetings when a GED teacher suggests alternative avenues of funding for the parenting program and when volunteers from the neighboring Catholic Church feel comfortable with Catholic Ministries to walk over and ask about volunteering.

2. How does the personal religious faith of key staff reflect that of the sponsoring community and influence organizational behavior?

In Catholic Ministries, religion does play a key role for the staff. Many of the staff members identify themselves as “spiritual” and they share conversations about their faith. The director openly discussed her experience at a meeting and remarked at the end of a meeting that she is, according to Catholic doctrine “living in sin,” because she divorced her first husband in the 1970s. For example, outreach coordinator and the social worker are openly Catholic and the other staff members are aware of their religion. The director is not Catholic, but openly discusses her faith and is in the process of becoming Catholic. In sum, at the downtown family center the religion of the director is not influential, but higher up the hierarchy religion is important and does influence organizational behavior.

At the tenant empowerment program, key staff refer to spirituality as opposed to Catholicism. This program interweaves African American spiritual traditions with those a more generalized spirituality. A key staff person who has recovered from substance abuse herself, talked to program participants about the importance of spirituality in her recovery, indicating that participants should look for similar spirituality.

3. How do congregations and their members relate to faith-based organizations that function under their name, and vice versa? Does social and cultural capital influence interactions between congregations and organizations?

The relationship between Catholic Ministries and the Catholic congregations is maintained via the Parish Liaison and newsletters about the work Catholic Ministries does for the community. Cultural and Social capital do influence these interactions. For example, a priest who heard about her work through another priest contacted the parish liaison.

4. How do faith communities assure that the faith-based organizations have a future as faith-based institutions? That their founding values and perspectives are maintained?

This question cannot be fully answered with the current research.

5. What is the impact on the faith community of their organization’s work? On its understandings of the issues, the organizations address? On its understandings of those the organizations serve? On its understandings of their faith? On its sense of identity?

This question cannot be answered fully at this time. More research focusing on how various parishes and their members view Catholic Ministries is needed. However, the Cardinal’s Appeal and the strong relationship between some parishes and Catholic Ministries would indicate a healthy working relationship.

Part of the work by the parish liaison was to maintain contacts at various parishes and to use them when assisting clients from parishes. For example, she might tell one parish about available resources like a large food pantry at a larger wealthier parish. In this case, the outreach coordinator offered to pay half of one month's rent and after consulting with the social worker who was interpreting, the parish would pay the other half.

6. What is the relationship between the organization, the faith community, and those served who are not part of the same religion? Does the work of the organization lead new people to the faith community? Under what terms? How does the organization ensure that the beliefs and rights of program participants from different faith traditions or those who adhere to no religion are respected?

This question cannot be fully addressed at this time. Catholic Ministries does not lead new people to the Catholic Church directly. Some staff members might convert, but religion is discussed. Catholic Ministries does not have any particular mechanisms to maintain respect of other religions, but GED teachers work to create a balanced classroom.

An African American GED teacher brought up these themes. She said that during her class one student wanted to try to convert the other students to his religion. She told him this was not the place for talking about religion and changed the topic. This perspective is quite common at Catholic Ministries.

7. Under what conditions do faith-based organizations move beyond the ethos and control of the denomination, and what connection, if any, does the religious body have with an organization when this occurs?

This question cannot be addressed with the current research as this organization is firmly connected to the denominational structures.

8. Do different faith traditions work toward distinctive goals (personal transformation or social change, for example)?

Yes. Catholic Ministries is strongly influenced by the Catholic Church's ideas of social justice. The Catholic Church shapes the goals and projects undertaken by Catholic Ministries. For example, only projects and work the fits within their goals are undertaken.

2. Jewish Aging Services and the Cohen Adult Day Program

a. How do the dynamics between organization and founding community impact on the beliefs, behaviors, and resources of both organization and community? Do relationships between organization and community foster social capital, cultural capital and civic engagement in the founding community?

The Jewish Aging Services and the Cohen Adult Day Program, one of its many programs, has a unique and professional relationship with the Jewish community. It was founded in 1973 through a grant from the United Jewish Appeal, now the Jewish Federation, with the intent of helping a segment of the Jewish population who were most in need of services, senior citizens. Although it was founded to specifically help the aging Jewish community, the JAS has always been open to people of all faiths, and backgrounds. In fact the majority of JAS participants served through its many programs do not come from a Jewish background. The Cohen Center is one exception to this trend however as 80% of its participants are Jewish.

Through many of its uniquely Jewish services the JAS and The Cohen Center are providing the Jewish community with services that cannot be received from any other organizations in the area.

All of the JAS programs are closed on major Jewish Holidays.

- The Cohen Center, an adult day program, in particular caters to the beliefs, culture, and customs of the Jewish community. All food served and prepared for participants is Kosher. Every Friday afternoon an

optional Shabbat service is held for the participants, and Jewish holidays are recognized and celebrated through special activities.

- Periodically Jewish community members will participate in Cohen Center activities. A Jewish elementary school brought students to the center for a one-time arts and crafts activity. A rabbi from a local synagogue periodically leads discussions on current events and spirituality from a non-sectarian perspective. A music leader from a local synagogue also performs music for the participants on a regular basis.
- The Cohen Center has offered Holocaust survivor support groups for its participants who are survivors. This service in particular highlights the unique needs of the aging Jewish community, and helps to illustrate why a Jewish center for Jewish people would be so comforting and important to much of the aging Jewish population.

The Jewish community's relationship with the JAS is very professional in its nature. Community and volunteer involvement within the organization tends to take on two specific trends, financial donations, and board membership. Non-professional volunteer participation from the Jewish community is less frequent.

The JAS has over 100 individuals involved in its organization as volunteer board and committee members. The majority of these individuals are Jewish and come from professional backgrounds. Committee members of the Cohen Center's advisory committee in particular also held professions in the elder care industry. Other committee members include the adult children of Cohen participants.

Interestingly research at The Cohen Center revealed that, while the Jewish community is very involved with the JAS and Cohen Center on an individual basis, particularly through board membership and individual financial donations, Jewish congregations seem reluctant to become involved. A culture of professionalism within the Jewish community seems to encourage individuals to seek information and help from trained experts rather than from their spiritual community.

- The Cohen Center's Outreach Coordinator recently conducted an outreach program to area synagogues and Jewish congregations. The outreach effort was designed to raise awareness about the Cohen Center's services through publications in congregational bulletins and through organized talks. On a whole, contacted representatives from the congregations seemed reluctant to become involved with the Cohen Center. Generally representatives would agree to print an article or announcement for the Center in a monthly bulletin. The organized talks on the other hand never materialized. People seemed to assume that information of the kind the outreach coordinator wanted to present was better sought through other avenues, such as professional social workers, and not through religious congregations.
- A new Cohen Center participant came from a family that attended the same Orthodox Jewish congregation as the Center's Assistant Director. The Assistant Director was a friend of the new participant's family, and the participant's family was aware of her involvement with the Cohen Center. Interestingly however when the new participant's family was seeking information on elder care services they did not seek the information from the assistant director. Instead, they sought the information from the well-known Jewish Social Service Agency.

It is also important to note the JAS has developed a number of social capital relationships with other professional Jewish organizations. On a whole these organizations are connected to each other through the Jewish Federation. These large Jewish community organizations, such as the Jewish Social Service Agency and the Hebrew Home, are also referral sources for the Cohen Center.

b. What is the relationship between non-profit organizations and the people that use their services? How does this differ between faith-based and secular organizations? How do these relationships differ when the people served either come from the same community as the organization or from a different background?

There is a strong historically based belief within the organization and the Jewish community that as a people the Jewish population must provide for its own members when they are in need. This desire to provide for their own

members should in no way be interpreted as a desire to exclude other groups. The JAS and its many programs have been open to people from all backgrounds and faiths since inception. Staff and volunteers involved with the JAS are on a whole very proud of this openness and regularly emphasize the organization's non-sectarian status. The Center's name has even been changed from "Cohen Center for Jewish Senior Day Care" to the "Cohen Adult Day Center". This change stemmed from a desire to be more open to people of differing backgrounds.

All Cohen Staff members frequently emphasize the Center's non-sectarian status with pride. Religion, ethnicity, and background truly are a non-issue for Cohen staff members. Although the majority of the Center's participants come from Jewish backgrounds, approximately 20% do not. The Center currently serves individuals who come from Protestant, Catholic, and Hindu traditions. They also cater to people of varying ethnicities and nationalities. All participants at The Cohen Center are respected, loved, and cared for equally.

Although The Cohen Center is proud of its inclusive nature there continues to be debate over when and how the cultural and religious backgrounds of non-Jewish participants will be recognized through official activities. At the heart of this debate is whether the organization on a whole is designed to serve the Jewish community primarily or the greater community. Current research suggests that no one directly affiliated with the JAS or The Cohen Center believes that services should be denied to non-Jewish individuals, but there appears to be a debate over the level at which Jewish customs and practices will be sacrificed for the inclusion of other people's traditions.

- The celebration of non-Jewish religious holidays continues to be a point of discussion at the Cohen Center. Traditionally non-Jewish religious holidays such as Christmas have not been celebrated at the Cohen Center. Recently, however, Christmas decorations, as well as Kwanza decorations were put up with Hanukkah decorations during the winter months. Cohen staff members continue to discuss what level of recognition these non-Jewish holidays should receive in the program content.
- Each year as well an annual holiday party and gift exchange is held, which is designed to be non-religious in nature. At the same time, however, a Menorah is officially lit each year in celebration of Hanukkah.

Interestingly the Center's past director, who was not Jewish, believed that she had a responsibility to exclusively focus on Jewish traditions and holidays in the Center's program content. In contrast, the Center's current director, who is Jewish, feels that it is her responsibility to actively include non-Jewish holidays and traditions in some of the programs content in an effort to reach out to participants who are not Jewish.

c. What is the impact of founding community culture and social capital systems on non-profit mission, organizational structure, staffing, and program design?

It is interesting to note that on a whole The Cohen Center staff had an aversion towards the term "faith-based". Many of the Center's staff members viewed the term as being representative of evangelical Christian organizations that focus significantly on proselytization as a primary goal. The Cohen staff, particularly the director and assistant director who are both Jewish, view goals of that nature in a negative light and want to distance The Cohen Center from any comparison to them. When conducting interviews with key staff members, the director even requested that the term faith-based be replaced in questions with "non-sectarian organization affiliated with the Jewish community." This aversion to the term faith-based stems from a fear that the term denotes organizations that actively discriminate in hiring practices, and other operating areas on the basis of faith orientation. The Cohen Center and JAS are opposed to these practices and so chose to distance themselves from the term "faith-based". This aversion also seems to spring from the Jewish community's desire to distinguish itself from the dominant Christian culture of the United States.

Jewish culture also greatly affects the staffing trends of the JAS and the Cohen Center. Roughly half of the JAS' staff members are of Jewish heritage, while the other half come from a variety of backgrounds. Religious or ethnic background is not a determining factor when making hiring decisions for the JAS. On the whole a person's level of expertise tends to be the primary factor in hiring decisions. Interestingly, few if any low pay positions within the organization are staffed by Jewish individuals. From a socio-economic perspective the Jewish community in the Washington DC region tend to be composed of members from higher economic brackets, which gives them access to education in professional fields. Due to this socio-economic and professional standing attracting the Jewish population to low paying, low status jobs is difficult.

Social capital through the Jewish community is diffuse and clearly lacking in some instances. For example, we saw few social capital links through the congregations, but staff did rely on their own social networks to bring in volunteers and programming to the organization. On the other hand, the institutional structures of the Jewish community – JSSA, the major social service agency, the Jewish Community Center of Greater Washington, Federation, and Cohen center's parent organization—Jewish Aging Services -- providing significant social capital for this program.

Please look to questions A and B for further information related to question C.

d. What is the impact of the larger socio-economic and policy system, as well as the service sector of that organization (social services, health and senior services, community development) on non-profit organizations form, function and resources?

The JAS and particularly The Cohen Center are largely impacted by the sector in which they operate. The Cohen Center in particular has developed very strong relationships with other non-profits, for-profits, and public agencies that operate within the same sector. Many of the Cohen Center's top referral sources come from private doctors, care managers, and rehabilitation hospitals. Recognizing this strong connection with the professional sector the Cohen Center particularly targets its outreach efforts at organizations and individuals from within the sector rather than to the Jewish community.

The Cohen Center is also keenly aware of the other elder care service organizations with which it competes. The Cohen Center prides itself on being the best adult care center in the region. The Center is in close communication with the other service providers in the region and attends many networking meetings to maintain these relationships.

The center also competes with other programs for clients and thinks that it needs to rely on marketing techniques characteristic of the for profit elements in healthcare to compete for clients. For example, in one presentation to hospital social workers, the outreach coordinator was very concerned that the candies that she was handing out were not good enough incentives. To the contrary, some of the social workers did not want the candy, and one – who had long experience with Cohen — became the social capital voice during the presentation by praising the program to her coworkers.

Sub Questions

1. What is the relationship between the religious denomination and the non-profit organizations founded by that organization? (Governance, financial, control, volunteer participation, staffing, program content, mission). What role does social and cultural capital play in those relationships?

Please look to questions A, B, and C.

2. How does the personal religious faith of key staff reflect that of the sponsoring community and influence organizational behavior?

A number of the staff members at The Cohen Center are from Jewish backgrounds. Currently, both the director and assistant director of The Cohen Center are Jewish, although it is important to note that the last director for many years was not Jewish, as it is not a requirement for employment. The director and assistant director's Jewish identity undoubtedly plays an important role in the Cohen Center's program, however the Assistant director in particular plays a very visible role in the continuation of the Center's Jewish identity.

The assistant director is the only Orthodox Jew on staff at the Center, and as such she takes on the responsibility of monitoring and maintaining the kosher status of the Center's kitchen. She also takes on the responsibility of orienting non-Jewish staff members with Jewish customs and traditions, and leads Shabbat services each week. The Assistant Director is also the self-reported predominant voice at the Center against the celebration of non-Jewish holidays. Her desire to exclude non-Jewish traditions from the Center's programs is in no way linked to a desire to exclude non-Jewish participants from the Center's services, as she fully believes it is the Center's moral and ethical duty to be accepting of everyone. The Assistant Director simply feels however that as a Jewish center supported by the Jewish community it is the Center's prerogative and

responsibility to cater to the unique cultural needs of the Jewish community.

3. How do congregations and their members relate to faith-based organizations that function under their name, and vice versa? Does social and cultural capital influence interactions between congregations and organizations?

Please refer to question A.

4. How do faith communities assure that the faith-based organizations have a future as faith-based institutions? That their founding values and perspectives are maintained?

The Jewish community's continued support of the Organization through substantial financial donations, as well as through board membership helps to keep the JAS firmly connected to the Jewish community it was first designed to serve.

5. What is the impact on the faith community of their organization's work? On its understandings of the issues the organizations address? On its understandings of those the organizations serve? On its understandings of their faith? On its sense of identity?

Further research is needed to address this question.

6. What is the relationship between the organization, the faith community, and those served who are not part of the same religion? Does the work of the organization lead new people to the faith community? Under what terms? How does the organization ensure that the beliefs and rights of program participants from different faith traditions or those who adhere to no religion are respected?

Please look to questions A, B, C, and D.

7. Under what conditions do faith-based organizations move beyond the ethos and control of the denomination, and what connection, if any, does the religious body have with an organization when this occurs?

Further research is needed to address this question.

8. Do different faith traditions work toward distinctive goals (personal transformation or social change, for example)?

The Jewish faith tradition and the Jewish community have a very strong connection to community service and social activism. In particular however Jewish community outreach tends to be historically targeted at other Jewish community members.

Cohen Center service also fits the Jewish model for social welfare provision in several ways. First, this is institutionalized social welfare provision through Cohen, JAS, JSSA and the other formal institutions rather than congregational based service. Families seeking care for an elderly relative went through these formal channels in the Jewish community rather than talk to congregation members who worked at the organization. Cohen's outreach to synagogues and temples chiefly focused on making these congregations aware of Cohen services, not seeking donations or volunteers. Fundraising from the Jewish community occurs through the Jewish Federation, other Jewish organizations, and through the JAS' personal fundraising methods. Second, the organization stresses professionalism in its service provision, a hallmark of Jewish social service. This is clear both in hiring strategies and office procedure. Third, Cohen programs emphasize the dignity of the individual – there were many examples of staff talking about what a person had done before they developed dementia for example. Finally, the tensions within the Center regarding serving the Jewish community vs. serving others reflect differing cultural and religious strands within the U.S. Jewish community. On the one hand, some parts of the community feel that they have an obligation to "heal the world" through social justice and quality service – activities like participation in the civil rights movement as well as programs like this Center. On the other hand, another part of the community feels that Jews remain a persecuted and excluded culture and should provide a safe, culturally and religiously appropriate venue for their older, at-risk community members.

3. Jubilee Association of Maryland, Mennonite Housing for developmentally disabled adults

Primary Research Questions

a. How do the dynamics between organization and founding community impact on the beliefs, behaviors, and resources of both organization and community? Do relationships between organization and community foster social capital, cultural capital and civic engagement in the founding community?

Jubilee has a very strong relationship with its founding Mennonite community and specifically its founding congregation. Although it is financially independent, receiving 90% of its funding from the State, and 10% of its funding from program fees, Jubilee has worked to develop a close connection with its founding congregation, and by working to maintain this strong connection Jubilee has fostered numerous social capital and cultural capital relationships.

- Initially Jubilee's staff members were volunteers found through the Church's social networks. Volunteers were recruited from the Church and staff members were recruited from Mennonite colleges and agencies.
- Jubilee's bylaws dictate that a majority of its governing board members be of the Mennonite faith, and a majority of the board members coming from the Mennonite faith are required to be members of the founding congregation. The current executive director is also a member of the founding congregation. He uses this position to recruit Church members to Jubilee's board.
- The founding congregation's youth group conducts projects for Jubilee's participants, such as singing Christmas Carols.
- Once a year the founding congregation holds a Disability Awareness Sunday. The service is led and organized by Jubilee staff and volunteers, and the organization's participants are actively involved.
- Jubilee offers a general orientation program for staff and volunteers to introduce them to the Mennonite faith.
- The organization is actively connected to Mennonite Health Services, an umbrella group for Mennonite non-profits providing similar services. Through their connection to this organization Jubilee's understanding of itself as a faith-based program has been reinforced. The executive director in particular feels that their connection to Mennonite Health Services has helped him to better understand how to implement his own personal Mennonite convictions in his work at Jubilee.

Jubilee's program content and behavior is also strongly affected by its connection to a Mennonite congregation. Jubilee does not require that its staff members, board members, volunteers or participants be of a Christian faith. In fact a number of the organization's participants, staff, board members, and volunteers are not of a Christian faith. This has caused some small conflicts within the organization.

- Many staff members feel that Jubilee should celebrate and acknowledge other faith traditions through organized activities. Some staff members have suggested for example that the annual Christmas party be expanded into a holiday party to include Chanukah, and other religious and cultural traditions practiced by participants, but not practiced by the Mennonite Church. As of the present however these suggestions have not been implemented by the board, which feels that as a Mennonite organization they have the prerogative to make program decisions in light of their religious connection.
- Another conflict has arisen within the organization about the religious affiliation of staff members. One staff member in particular is not comfortable with the inclusion of non-Christian staff members. In some incidences this staff member has openly told non-Christian staff members that she/he is uncomfortable with their involvement in the organization. These incidences, while they are important to acknowledge, appear to be infrequent and limited to only this one individual. The organization on a whole appears to be very open to people from non-Christian traditions.

Participants admitted to the program are not required to be of a Christian faith, and many of them are not. Participants are also generally not members of Jubilee's founding congregation. Jubilee openly encourages its participants to maintain their own cultural and faith traditions, and proselytization is not a part of Jubilee's mission. This openness to other religions and cultures is characteristic of this arm of Mennonite faith. Spirituality is however openly encouraged by Jubilee.

- A large minority of the participants are involved in Faith and Lights, an ecumenical Christian movement designed for developmentally disabled adults. This organization is run and organized by the parents of one of Jubilee's clients. The organization meets once a month and shares prayer, and scripture lessons. Although this organization is supported by Jubilee, Jubilee's participants are not required to become a part of it, and the majority of them chose not to.
- Staff members are required and encouraged to help participants connect with the faith communities of their choice.
- Staff members are expected to reserve time for prayer before meals.

b. What is the relationship between non-profit organizations and the people that use their services? How does this differ between faith-based and secular organizations? How do these relationships differ when the people served either come from the same community as the organization or from a different background?

Jubilee has a very strong, supportive, and nurturing relationship with their participants and their participant's families. As one participant's mother and the leader of the faith and light organization explained in an interview, "it was a difficult time for us and they stepped right in and made us feel very welcome." This same woman also explained that Jubilee's connection to the Christian faith was comforting and attractive to her since she was Catholic and wanted her disabled son to be in a nurturing Christian environment.

The researcher's notes also emphasize the participant's enthusiasm and appreciation for the program. Throughout the researcher's notes frequent reference is made to participants voicing their approval and gratitude for the program. Many participants, it appears, believe that Jubilee has given them freedoms and opportunities they did not think they would ever be able to enjoy.

As an organization that serves developmentally disabled adults, Jubilee must grant their participants many adult freedoms, while continuing to nurture and support them as dependant individuals. This fine-balance appears to be well maintained by Jubilee. The participants are treated with respect, and included in decision making processes, while they are also guided, supported, and monitored by live in counselors.

- The advisory board is required to have at least one participant serve as a representative.
- Jubilee holds workshops for its participants. At these workshops participants are encouraged to discuss their likes and dislikes in the program. They are also encouraged to create "wish lists" of things they would like to see included or like to see changed in the Jubilee program. Further research is necessary to see how the participant's ideas and comments are implemented or considered by the governing board.
- The parents of Jubilee residents are actively involved in the organization, regardless of their religion, serving on the board, suggesting programs and otherwise supporting the organization.
- The Jubilee participants are treated in many respects as independent adults. They are expected to maintain jobs, and are encouraged to pursue personal interests. Participants are involved in vocational activities; in fact they are required to work and are helped to find jobs through vocationally focused organizations for the developmentally disabled. Some participate in art or poetry classes, and some also enjoy activities such as bike riding.
- Some of the participants are actively involved in romantic relationships as well. Jubilee will generally not allow unmarried couples to cohabit and strictly maintains this rule in accordance with Christian principals of chastity. One couple however, who currently live together with a Jubilee counselor, are not legally married, but have had a religious commitment ceremony. The couple wants to be legally married but would lose financial support from the state if they did so. Recognizing this difficult situation Jubilee was flexible and allowed the couple to cohabit within the program following the commitment ceremony.

As mentioned above Jubilee participants are also closely monitored, guided, and supported by Jubilee counselors. From the researcher's perspective the counselor's actions were often interpreted as being unnecessarily condescending, while in other incidences the counselor's actions were viewed as clearly necessary and appropriate. Institutionally Jubilee also maintains policies that limit the participant's freedoms, in hopes of creating a more secure and supportive environment for the developmentally disabled adults.

- In one incident a participant became impatient with a McDonald's worker, and directed a number of racial slurs at the worker. The participant's live in counselor was able to ameliorate the situation before it dangerously escalated. She apologized to the worker and reprimanded the participant, making it clear why such behavior was not only inappropriate, but also highly offensive and malicious.
- In another incident described by the researcher a participant was scolded in a sense for voicing his dislike for his current job. The participant felt overworked by his current job and believed that it was preventing him from pursuing many of his hobbies. The counselor quickly reproached the participant for complaining. She used her own work for Jubilee as an example of how hard and dedicated a person should be to their work.
- The participants are given a weekly allowance to spend as they wish on fast food or other entertainments. If a participant spends all of their allowance the counselor is not allowed to give them additional money. Through this policy the participants' finances are monitored and controlled.

c. What is the impact of founding community culture and social capital systems on non-profit mission, organizational structure, staffing, and program design?

Mennonite culture and its effects on the organization are evident at Jubilee. The researcher frequently observed that the Jubilee program was specifically dedicated to community development and human dignity. This dedication can be directly linked to Mennonite theology, which as with other Peace Churches, is very focused on these goals. Group activities are an important part of the Jubilee program. Participants not only gain a place to live through Jubilee, but they also have the opportunity to develop friendships and community.

- Participants experience communal living, and are each responsible for chores or other household responsibilities, such as taking out the garbage, or washing the dishes. These responsibilities help to foster a sense of importance and belonging in the participant's lives. In one observed incident a participant remained behind from an outing to a park in order to complete his chores. This incident indicates that the responsibilities of mature communal living are very real for the participants in the Jubilee program.
- Program design is based entirely on consensus, non-hierarchical processes typical of Mennonite faith.
- Social capital relationships currently come mostly through board relationships, though one staff member has joined a Mennonite congregation because of her positive experience with Jubilee.
- Birthday parties are held for the participants. At these parties participants are able to dance and socialize with one another and with other participants from different Jubilee group homes.
- Participants often share meals together and eat in a communal setting.
- As was discussed before involvement in organizations such as Faith and Lights also helps to build community and respect each individual's dignity.

As was discussed before Jubilee employs and serves many individuals who are not from Christian backgrounds. The founding congregation does however maintain significant control over Jubilee through bylaws mandating that a significant number of board members must be members of the Church and the Mennonite faith.

Also in terms of the Mennonite faith's cultural influence on the Jubilee program it is important to note that Jubilee encourages openness and equality. One board member, who is herself a Catholic, described Jubilee's board as being representative of the Mennonite faith. "Just the atmosphere, the fairness, the openness," she said, "it's a very comfortable atmosphere." The same women also insisted that this atmosphere was carried over into the

board's decision making. She described the board as being genuinely open and interested in everyone's ideas.

d. What is the impact of the larger socio-economic and policy system, as well as the service sector of that organization (social services, health and senior services, community development) on non-profit organizations form, function and resources?

Jubilee, as discussed before, is financially supported by the government. Jubilee has been receiving funds from the government for its program since it began 27 years ago. It has been in the past 10 years however that the program has received such a substantial portion of its revenue from the government.

Jubilee is a highly respected agency within the community of organizations serving the developmentally disabled and their families. As such, they follow all national standards for care, staffing and program style, often exceeding them. They have served in leadership roles in encouraging changes in state policy.

Further research is necessary to see how other non faith-based programs in its sector affect this organization.

Sub Questions

1. What is the relationship between the religious denomination and the non-profit organizations founded by that organization? (Governance, financial, control, volunteer participation, staffing, program content, mission). What role does social and cultural capital play in those relationships?

Please look to question "A" for the answer to this question.

2. How does the personal religious faith of key staff reflect that of the sponsoring community and influence organizational behavior?

As was discussed above, while the staff members of Jubilee are not generally from the founding community the executive director and the board members on a whole are. The prevalence of Mennonite members on the board insures that the founding congregation will continue to maintain control over Jubilee. Please look to sections A, B, and C for examples of how this influence manifests itself.

3. How do congregations and their members relate to faith-based organizations that function under their name, and vice versa? Does social and cultural capital influence interactions between congregations and organizations?

Please look to section A for examples of how the founding congregation interacts with Jubilee.

4. How do faith communities assure that the faith-based organizations have a future as faith-based institutions? That their founding values and perspectives are maintained?

The founding congregation ensures that Jubilee has a future as a faith-based organization by maintaining control over the organizations decision-making board. Through this control, as well as through their staff orientation talks the organization works to maintain its Mennonite identity.

5. What is the impact on the faith community of their organization's work? On its understandings of the issues the organizations address? On its understandings of those the organizations serve? On its understandings of their faith? On its sense of identity?

Further research is necessary to completely address this question. The founding congregations continued involvement with the Jubilee program is evidence of the Mennonite dedication to social work, and outreach to the vulnerable. Organizational program design, decision-making patterns and structures directly reflect the

founding community. Please look to sections A, B, C and D for examples of how Jubilee is representative of the founding community's culture and identity.

6. What is the relationship between the organization, the faith community, and those served who are not part of the same religion? Does the work of the organization lead new people to the faith community? Under what terms? How does the organization ensure that the beliefs and rights of program participants from different faith traditions or those who adhere to no religion are respected?

As has been discussed above many of Jubilee's participants do not practice the Mennonite faith. Jubilee is equally open to these participants as it is to participants from the Christian faith. As was discussed in section A, however, there appears to be some resistance among some board and staff toward the celebration of non-Christian religious traditions. However, the executive director and other staff actively encourage people from other religions to carry out their beliefs and at one point the board chair was Jewish.

7. Under what conditions do faith-based organizations move beyond the ethos and control of the denomination, and what connection, if any, does the religious body have with an organization when this occurs?

Further comparative research is necessary.

8. Do different faith traditions work toward distinctive goals (personal transformation or social change, for example)?

Clearly Jubilee's program demonstrates that the Mennonite faith works to preserve human dignity, and is specifically focused on the creation of community and the defense and protection of the vulnerable. The unique organizational structure, with the client at the center and teams of staff working with them to achieve their goals – a completely non-hierarchical model, also reflects this particular faith tradition.

4. Asian Evangelicals in Washington DC: The Christian Children's Inner-City Program

Primary Research Questions

a. How do the dynamics between organization and founding community impact on the beliefs, behaviors, and resources of both organization and community? Do relationships between organization and community foster social capital, cultural capital and civic engagement in the founding community?

The Christian Children's Inner-City Program was founded as an independent community outreach program and is not officially linked to any specific denomination or congregation. It was however founded by two evangelical Christians of Asian-American descent who met through Asian Evangelical Christian campus centers. The program draws heavily on volunteers through the evangelical Asian student network, as well as other Asian Christian churches. It is unique in that it is a national, pan-Asian network which also draws from several Washington DC based Asian churches – Chinese as well as Korean. The founders belong to an evangelical church that appears to be white dominated and worship with the largely African American evangelical church located in the same building as the organization. The organization continues to be predominantly controlled and dominated by evangelical Asian-American Christians.

- Board of directors is almost entirely comprised of Asian American evangelical Christians. Two members are Caucasian. Everyone of the board comes from a protestant background.
- 90% of all volunteers are Asian American evangelical Christians.
- Approximately 10% of their budget comes from Church donations, primarily Korean and Chinese evangelical churches. The rest of their budget comes from private donations, government grants, and a few business donations. An African American church also donates space and provides volunteers.

From a content perspective The Christian Children's Inner-City Program is highly influenced by Evangelical

Christian values and beliefs. The researcher's notes reveal countless instances when the organization's staff and volunteers make reference to evangelical Christian theology and values in their interactions with the children. Improper behavior is condemned as "un-god-like" and the male and female participants are encouraged to become "god-like" men and women. The researcher's notes make reference to wall decorations in the organization's locations which encourage children to behave as good Christians and abstain from behaviors such as saying swear words.

- The researcher's notes reveal that activities are generally opened and closed with a group prayer.
- The organization runs children's bible studies and a Christian children choir.
- In the words of the researcher, it seems that the organization is constantly working towards the "distinctive goal of personal transformation". During activities such as homework club the volunteers and staff members make a distinct effort to point out inappropriate behavior. They also address personal issues that the children have faced, such as school fights or failing to treat others with respect. Throughout these constant lectures and discussions the staff and volunteers seek to reinforce evangelical Christian values in the children's lives. They also seek to encourage and condone proper behavior. In one activity for example children were asked to write lists of ways they could share love with other people in their lives.
- At one of the organization's board meetings The Christian Children's Inner-City Program' dedication to proselytizing was heavily emphasized. At the board meeting the members discussed plans for the upcoming summer camp. The planning focused heavily on the camp's Christian theme. Conflict even arose between two board members over the proper transmittal of their Christian message. One member wanted to open the camp with a specific lecture focused on the importance of a personal relationship with God. The other board member disagreed with this plan because he feared that using a lecture for the introduction of a religious theme would be off putting for the children. He wanted to ease into the camps Christian theme through methods more linked to pop culture.

The Organization's effect on the community they are serving cannot fully be addressed with the limited research available. It is clear however that the community's children heavily use the services offered by the organization. The children's opinion of the organization's services and Christian identity cannot be determined from the current research. The opinion of the children's families, and other members in their community who do not use the services offered by The Christian Children's Inner-City Program are also unknown at this time.

It is important to note that the community being served is predominantly African-American and locally based. Children of immigrants, including El Salvadorian immigrants and African immigrants, are also served but make up a small minority.

Relationships between the founding community and the organization do foster social capital, and cultural capital relationships. Clearly the organizations solid link to the Evangelical Asian-American tradition has helped it to foster relationships with numerous Asian-American churches that in turn supply volunteers and some funds. In turn its relationship with evangelical Christianity has helped it to gain office space from a number of non-Asian American churches as well, including the African American community Church that the executive director and his wife attend, and other predominantly Caucasian churches.

- The organization has the support of a California church that seems to have been developed through a social capitol relationship developed by one of the organizations Asian-American volunteers, as well as a co-founder of the organization that moved to California to start another ministry.
- An Asian-American evangelical college group from NC spent its spring break volunteering at The Christian Children's Inner-City Program.

b. What is the relationship between non-profit organizations and the people that use their services? How does this differ between faith-based and secular organizations? How do these relationships differ when the people served either come from the same community as the organization or from a different background?

The relationship between The Christian Children's Inner-City Program and the people who use their services is still unclear. Clearly the children who participate in the organization's activities continue to return and seem to enjoy themselves while greatly benefiting from the services. Churches from the community are also involved in the Organization, however the only church that appears to be a member of the community being served is the small African –American church that the executive director and his wife attend. It is important to note however that this very small congregation gives The Christian Children's Inner-City Program office space for very low rent costs, and is also attended by some of the children who participate in The Christian Children's Inner-City Program. Also, the organization is helping a community that is drastically different from its founding community, ethnically, culturally, and socio-economically.

- In one example from the researcher's notes a staff/volunteer member at the organization scolded a group of girls for using race as a distinguishing descriptive factor when interacting with each other. Using "race" as an identifying feature was considered "un-godlike" because it promoted bigotry and prejudice.
- It is also important to note that the organization was founded by the children of Asian small business owners who have businesses in African American communities as a way to give back to those communities and provide the children of those communities opportunities like those enjoyed by the founders. As such, there would be potentially either tension between the founders and the community members due to a long standing pattern of tension between Asian store owners and the communities they serve and an insider's understanding of these communities as the founders grew up working in these neighborhoods and interacting with community members. Both sides of these tensions were visible in the interactions between program participants and volunteers. Negatives appeared mostly in the way that program staff and volunteers constantly tried to improve the children through mechanisms that implied superiority. However, notes reveal many positive relationships as well.

c. What is the impact of founding community culture and social capital systems on non-profit mission, organizational structure, staffing, and program design?

Again, the organization's Evangelical Asian-American connections are extremely evident. The organization's mission is to help improve the lives of low-income children who are generally neglected and ignored by society. A major part of the services the organization offers to meet this goal are distinctly religiously motivated. Proselytization is a major part of the organization's mission.

From a staffing perspective the organization is still staffed and controlled by Asian American evangelical Christians.

d. What is the impact of the larger socio-economic and policy system, as well as the service sector of that organization (social services, health and senior services, community development) on non-profit organizations form, function and resources?

Further research is necessary to adequately answer this question.

- The organization has received a substantial government grant as a result of the governmental faith-based initiatives.
- While the organization is not congregationally based it functions as such do to its small size and dependency on personal, private, and church donations. The organization's values and goals continue to remain closely tied to evangelical Christianity. This adds to the organizations easy acceptance by a number of supporting Christian groups.

Sub Questions

1. What is the relationship between the religious denomination and the non-profit organizations founded by that organization? (Governance, financial, control, volunteer participation, staffing, program content, mission). What role does social and cultural capital play in those relationships?

This question has been addressed in “a” of the “Big Questions” section. Again the organization is privately run, however it is controlled by Evangelical Asian-American Christians, which deeply affects its program content, staffing, volunteer participation, and mission. The majority of the organizations funds appear to come from private donations. No reference to the backgrounds of these private donors can be found in the current research. The organization’s governance seems to be predominantly controlled by members of the board and the executive director. Again, the board dominated by individuals who are evangelical Asian-American Christians

Social and cultural capital does play a role in these relationships. Please look to the last part of section “a”.

2. How does the personal religious faith of key staff reflect that of the sponsoring community and influence organizational behavior?

All three paid staff members at this organization are Evangelical Asian-American Christians. It is important to note that at the time the interview was conducted with the executive director one of the paid staff members was Asian American, but had been adopted by a Caucasian family as a young child. The executive director seemed hesitant to include her in the “Asian American” category since she had been culturally raised by a white family.

3. How do congregations and their members relate to faith-based organizations that function under their name, and vice versa? Does social and cultural capital influence interactions between congregations and organizations?

In the case of The Christian Children’s Inner-City Program the organization appears to have a good relationship with other evangelical churches in the area, from which it receives donations and volunteers. Social and cultural capital does play a role in these relationships. Please look to the last part of section “a”.

4. How do faith communities assure that the faith-based organizations have a future as faith-based institutions? That their founding values and perspectives are maintained?

This question cannot be fully answered with the current research.

5. What is the impact on the faith community of their organization’s work? On its understandings of the issues the organizations address? On its understandings of those the organizations serve? On its understandings of their faith? On its sense of identity?

In the interview with the Organization’s executive director he makes reference to the fact that he and others from his organizations sometimes give lectures at local churches to educate them about their mission. Clearly this helps to educate the faith community about the issues The Christian Children’s Inner-City Program seeks to address.

At this time the Organization’s impact on its own founding Asian-American Evangelical community is unknown. The staff and volunteers involved in the organization appear to be deeply motivated by their faith to help others and improve the community.

6. What is the relationship between the organization, the faith community, and those served who is not part of the same religion? Does the work of the organization lead new people to the faith community? Under what terms? How does the organization ensure that the beliefs and rights of program participants from different faith traditions or those who adhere to no religion are respected?

This question cannot be fully addressed at this time. The organization’s services are clearly faith saturated, yet no incidence where the prevalence of the Christian faith came into conflict with a participant’s own faith is noted in the research. It could be hypothesized that the community in which the organization serves is predominantly of Christian background so no conflict has yet arisen. Given that some of the children served by the organization attend the same African American evangelical church as the founders and that is located in the same building, children in the program may in fact share the same faith tradition.

7. Under what conditions do faith-based organizations move beyond the ethos and control of the denomination, and what connection, if any, does the religious body have with an organization when this occurs?

This question cannot be addressed with the current research on The Christian Children's Inner-City Program.

8. Do different faith traditions work toward distinctive goals (personal transformation or social change, for example)?

I believe that the research on the Christian Children's Inner-City Program helps to show that evangelical Christianity is often primarily concerned with proselytization and a clear linkage between specific religious faith and daily life. As the Christian Children's Inner-City Program demonstrates the services viewed as being inseparable from Christian proselytizing.

This organization also had a clear pattern of behavior that it wanted to instill in the children in its program. "God like" behavior involved chaste behavior (limiting sexuality until adulthood, not wearing provocative clothes, boys and girls programs were separate), no swearing or other "street" behavior, and related behavior. The program used constant references to "godlike" behavior as well as sanctioning to encourage correct behavior.

5. Chinese Mainline Protestant: Chinese Immigrant Services

This summary draws from a combination of participant observation from the Faith and Organizations Project and interviews done with staff and both organizations as part of the Religion and the New Immigrants Study (Foley and Hoge).

Primary Research Questions

a. How do the dynamics between organization and founding community impact on the beliefs, behaviors, and resources of both organization and community? Do relationships between organization and community foster social capital, cultural capital and civic engagement in the founding community?

This organization was founded by the major Chinese Methodist church in Washington DC by established Chinese immigrants (most government workers who had come over after the communist take over of the Chinese government in the 1950s in 1977 in order to serve a new wave of Chinese immigrants. It is located in the parish service hall for its sponsoring congregation. While the organization is located in DC's historic Chinatown and serves primarily new Chinese immigrants who live nearby, most congregation members live in the suburbs. The organization is located in a national register property – originally an AME church, but which is now a combined congregation of whites, African Americans, and this Chinese church. The parent church also sponsors a seniors program that serves mostly African Americans, and the two programs appear to operate completely separately.

Fieldwork and interviews revealed that the project is a seamless connection between the church and the ministry. The ministry does not have a separate 501c3, but does have a separate EIN and accounts in order to maintain government accounting standards. Most of the employees and active volunteers are active members of the congregation, and fieldworkers found that staff and volunteers participated with the organization in order to help their community and "do their civic duty".

Likewise, we found that church homilies and other statements clearly stated that members should participate in social justice and social service activities, and these ministries were a key way to do this.

b. What is the relationship between non-profit organizations and the people that use their services? How does this differ between faith-based and secular organizations? How do these relationships differ when the people served either come from the same community as the organization or from a different background?

It is difficult to disentangle the connections between the congregation and the immigrant community in answering this question. Most of the people served by the organization are Chinese immigrants, who may or

may not be members of this particular congregation. As such, it provides a linguistically and culturally appropriate home for Chinese immigrants needing an array of services. On paper, the organization also serves other Asian groups – namely Vietnamese and Cambodians – through collaborations among three ethnically based social service organizations for joint contracts for crime victim services and several other programs. However, the director told our fieldworker and me on several occasions, that each ethnic group serves its own.

Even though the organization is highly integrated into its faith community, it operates as a secular social service organization founded by a particular immigrant group. This raises a number of questions regarding the boundaries between faith-based and secular orgs for immigrant founded faith-based non-profits.

c. What is the impact of founding community culture and social capital systems on non-profit mission, organizational structure, staffing, and program design?

As stated in question A above, the Chinese immigrant community had a profound impact on this organization. While they provided emergency services, resettlement services, training programs for adults and youth and crime victims' assistance services similar to those provided by other communities, the style of service largely reflected Chinese culture and mainline Protestant religious belief.

- All staff and volunteers are Chinese who are members of the church.
- Service is offered through Chinese cultural style, for example serving tea, etc.
- The organization was created in order to provide Chinese immigrants with the services that they needed to thrive in their new country through people who had succeeded in the U.S. system before them. Programs are provided in language appropriate for the community and use appropriate cultural systems.
- The organization is supported through the social and physical capital of the church, and draws its volunteers from among those served as well as church members.

d. What is the impact of the larger socio-economic and policy system, as well as the service sector of that organization (social services, health and senior services, community development) on non-profit organizations form, function and resources?

This organization was created when non-profits could not be faith based and receive government funds, and maintains a strictly secular taint to its services for this reason. The organization actively seeks funding from government and other citywide sources, and participates in coalitions of other organizations providing similar services to targeted ethnic and racial populations.

Sub Questions

1. What is the relationship between the religious denomination and the non-profit organizations founded by that organization? (Governance, financial, control, volunteer participation, staffing, program content, mission). What role does social and cultural capital play in those relationships?

This question has been addressed in "a" of the "Big Questions" section. This organization is significantly embedded in its founding church. However, it appears that while the ministers have succeeded in merging the three founding congregations, the service activities remain completely separate, drawing on different racial groups within the congregation for each separate ministry and serving a racially distinct populations. This is an issue to explore in a larger study. Chinese church members staff all oversight committees and all staff come to the organization through community social capital.

2. How does the personal religious faith of key staff reflect that of the sponsoring community and influence organizational behavior?

All paid staff members at this organization are members of the church and use their beliefs in the way that they perform their work. We heard much about civic engagement and responsibility to ones community at this site.

3. How do congregations and their members relate to faith-based organizations that function under their name, and vice versa? Does social and cultural capital influence interactions between congregations and organizations?

Limited research does not provide enough data to answer this question at this time.

4. How do faith communities assure that the faith-based organizations have a future as faith-based institutions? That their founding values and perspectives are maintained?

This question cannot be fully answered with the current research.

5. What is the impact on the faith community of their organization's work? On its understandings of the issues the organizations address? On its understandings of those the organizations serve? On its understandings of their faith? On its sense of identity?

It is hard to disentangle the needs of the immigrant community vs. the needs of the religious community. The organization was created as a social ministry in order to provide adjustment services, advancement services and other services to its constituent community. New services were added more based on the needs of the immigrant community than religious values.

6. What is the relationship between the organization, the faith community, and those served who are not part of the same religion? Does the work of the organization lead new people to the faith community? Under what terms? How does the organization ensure that the beliefs and rights of program participants from different faith traditions or those who adhere to no religion are respected?

This question cannot be fully addressed through the pilot research.

7. Under what conditions do faith-based organizations move beyond the ethos and control of the denomination, and what connection, if any, does the religious body have with an organization when this occurs?

This question cannot be addressed as the organization is firmly tied to the Faith community.

8. Do different faith traditions work toward distinctive goals (personal transformation or social change, for example)?

The organization reflected both mainline Protestant belief systems about providing support for those in need, a social justice mission in keeping with the founding faith, and the concerns of a successful immigrant community for its newest members.

6. Muslim Organizations: Muslim Charities and 2nd Organization

This summary draws from a combination of participant observation from the Faith and Organizations Project and interviews done with staff and both organizations as part of the Religion and the New Immigrants Study (Foley and Hoge)

Primary Research Questions

a. How do the dynamics between organization and founding community impact on the beliefs, behaviors, and resources of both organization and community? Do relationships between organization and community foster social capital, cultural capital and civic engagement in the founding community?

Both organizations were founded specifically in order to have services available to Muslims (particularly women)

that would fit their cultural needs. As such, the organization's staffing and behaviors reflect the cultural systems of the community. The organizations also draw heavily on social capital resources from among the various mosques and the general Muslim community

- Both organizations had Muslim women as staff who wore traditional religious garb and were very careful to respect current traditions regarding behavior toward women, hospitality and other matters
- Both organizations consisted of a combination of referral networks and as a mechanism to provide to the needy in the community. The transactions of giving and receiving service involved individuals contacting the agency for help, and the agency contacting members in the greater Muslim community to provide aid. As such the organizations were mediating structures relying heavily on social capital to perform their work.
- Both organizations fulfilled Muslim religious injunctions to provide a certain percentage of their income to help those in need through donations. They relied heavily on in-kind and cash donations from the wider Muslim community for their work.

b. What is the relationship between non-profit organizations and the people that use their services? How does this differ between faith-based and secular organizations? How do these relationships differ when the people served either come from the same community as the organization or from a different background?

Participant observation at Muslim Charities did not include much observation of people receiving service. While both organizations claimed that they served everyone in the community, they also stated that they were designed to serve Muslims and that this was their primary population served. Given limited observations, the pilot and earlier research could not answer this question.

c. What is the impact of founding community culture and social capital systems on non-profit mission, organizational structure, staffing, and program design?

As stated in question A above, the Muslim community had a profound impact on these organizations. While they provided emergency services, resettlement services, and domestic violence assistance services similar to those provided by other communities, the style of service largely reflected Muslim belief and culture.

- All staff are Muslim women, drawn to the agency from among the various Mosques, some quitting jobs in other social service agencies to work in these religiously based organizations
- Service is offered through Muslim cultural style, for example one fieldworker noticed that a meeting with clients included snacks common in Middle Eastern countries. A male fieldworker was instructed not to shake the hand of women staff people.

d. What is the impact of the larger socio-economic and policy system, as well as the service sector of that organization (social services, health and senior services, community development) on non-profit organizations form, function and resources?

Further research is necessary to adequately answer this question, however, pilot research suggests that the organization maintains a balance between secular social service expectations and culturally appropriate service.

- Most of the staff at both organizations are trained social workers or related professionals who bring their professional standards and habits into the organization. For example, domestic violence interviews and other counseling and referral sessions were conducted in strict confidentiality.
- Muslim Charities had gone through an evolution during the two research projects, changing executive directors and locations several times. During the pilot fieldwork, it had relocated from facilities in one of the Mosques to a commercial building that housed several Muslim organizations. The last executive director – while stating that she had left a mainline Protestant social service agency in order to work in a

Muslim organization – told our field worker that this was not a faith-based organization and that it served everybody.

- Muslim Charity's domestic violence program was tied to the county domestic violence system and participated actively in the coalition of domestic violence agencies.
- Both organizations offered similar services to other U.S. emergency services agencies, and Muslim Charities used a thrift store mechanism, similar to the Salvation Army and Good will to raise funds.

Sub Questions

1. What is the relationship between the religious denomination and the non-profit organizations founded by that organization? (Governance, financial, control, volunteer participation, staffing, program content, mission). What role does social and cultural capital play in those relationships?

This question has been addressed in “a” of the “Big Questions” section. These organizations are significantly embedded in the wider Muslim communities and connected to the Mosques in both formal and informal ways. One organization draws its board from Mosque members while the other is less formal, but all board members are Muslim and an Imam at one mosque was instrumental in founding the organization. This organization was housed in a mosque for a period of time. All staff come to the organization through community cultural capital.

2. How does the personal religious faith of key staff reflect that of the sponsoring community and influence organizational behavior?

All paid staff members at this organization are Muslims and use their beliefs in the way that they perform their work.

3. How do congregations and their members relate to faith-based organizations that function under their name, and vice versa? Does social and cultural capital influence interactions between congregations and organizations?

Most relationships between these organizations and congregations were through mosque created email lists, the mosque newsletters, and donations through the charity systems set up through the mosques. As such, congregation members contributed to the organizations individually more than mosques as corporate entities supported the organizations. Social and cultural capital relationships were essential to these connections and to the work of the agencies.

4. How do faith communities assure that the faith-based organizations have a future as faith-based institutions? That their founding values and perspectives are maintained?

This question cannot be fully answered with the current research.

5. What is the impact on the faith community of their organization's work? On its understandings of the issues the organizations address? On its understandings of those the organizations serve? On its understandings of their faith? On its sense of identity?

In both cases, it is hard to disentangle the needs of the immigrant community vs. the needs of the religious community. However, both organizations clearly stated that they were founded based on beliefs of community support for those in need in the Koran in order to provide culturally appropriate service for community members. Both organizations were started in order to address the needs of community members, and have added programs to address these needs as they arose:

- One organization was founded to provide for Muslim immigrants in an appropriate way
- The other organization was founded when Muslim children ended up in the foster care system and community members were concerned that Muslim homes would not be available for children in need.

- Muslim Charities developed its domestic violence program when a woman in a key founding Mosque was a victim of domestic violence. In order to support her and others, they supported founding this program so that other Muslim women would have a comfortable place to turn if they needed help. The organization also became this woman's job, providing material aid as well as allowing her to move forward with what had become a religiously motivated cause.

6. What is the relationship between the organization, the faith community, and those served who are not part of the same religion? Does the work of the organization lead new people to the faith community? Under what terms? How does the organization ensure that the beliefs and rights of program participants from different faith traditions or those who adhere to no religion are respected?

This question cannot be fully addressed through the pilot research.

7. Under what conditions do faith-based organizations move beyond the ethos and control of the denomination, and what connection, if any, does the religious body have with an organization when this occurs?

This question cannot be addressed as the organization is firmly tied to the Faith community.

8. Do different faith traditions work toward distinctive goals (personal transformation or social change, for example)?

The organization reflected Muslim beliefs about providing for those in need in the community and providing support through the community.

Philadelphia Sites

7. Lutheran Charities

a. How do the dynamics between organization and founding community impact on the beliefs, behaviors, and resources of both organization and community? Do relationships between organization and community foster social capital, cultural capital and civic engagement in the founding community?

Lutheran Charities is one of the oldest faith-based social service agencies in the country, and currently the second largest (to Catholic Ministries) Founded in 1922, originally it was a mission to orphans. In the last 80+ years it has diversified programs to serving a wide range of at risk populations on all points of the life cycle. The relationship between Lutheran Charities and the major Lutheran body (ELCA) is essentially an institutional one. There is Lutheran symbolism on the website, in communications, etc. The ELCA continues to promote the work of the Lutheran Charities as a mission arm of the church. This is also true in the Lutheran Charities of Philadelphia. In fact, it is now housed institutionally with two other Lutheran organizations under a single umbrella (Liberty Lutheran). However, there are strong indications of distinction between the local agency and its Lutheran sponsors:

- 1) Lutheran Charities serves a largely urban population, which is predominantly African American (80%). The denomination, in contrast, is overwhelmingly white and suburban.
- 2) This demographic is reflected in the staff as well. Beyond the Executive Director who is a Lutheran clergy person but a career social service administrator, few staff members are Lutheran. Religious holidays from a variety of traditions are honored (for example, staff are given the choice of taking either Good Friday or MLK Day off).
- 3) Programming is diverse and non-religious in nature. Only a fraction of the overall program (5%) is of and for Lutheran congregants (a congregation-based caregivers program). Besides the demographic difference, programs tend to be pitched to those whose life experience is very different than the Lutheran membership, including foster care and even an anti-torture program. In the case of a new program for gay teens, program can also be perceived as being in contradiction to Lutheran commitments.

- 4) The Board is half Lutheran but even so is more reflective of the urban population they serve than the demographics of the sponsoring body.
- 5) Further indication of a weak link to congregations is that few send volunteers except in the area of refugee resettlement. Currently a staff person has begun an initiative to increase links with local churches.
- 6) Lutheran Charities receives an amazingly low percentage of its hefty budget from the Lutheran Church. Of their \$14.5mbudget, they expect only 2% to come from the denomination.

The Lutheran Charities in Philadelphia is well networked, but primarily with peer-agencies of other faith traditions as well as larger networks of Lutheran social services. Since they receive about 85% of their funding from the government, they do have a lot of interaction with local and state government agencies.

The primary contribution of the faith community is in the area of social and cultural capital. First of all, the overwhelming proportion of clients comes through referrals. On closer inspection, these often are internal referrals—former refugees who have been resettled by the agency come back for follow up services.

Occasionally Lutheran Charities does have internal conversation about whether to keep the Lutheran moniker. They finally do because it provides a sense of “trust” for both clients and funding sources.

The core beliefs, which most impact the operations of Lutheran Charities, are commitments to the dignity of all people. As this belief gets operationalized, it means that the agency is intentionally non-religious in all its practices, from hiring to service delivery. However, the large proportion of government funding suggests that there are other sources of the non-sectarianism.

b. What is the relationship between non-profit organizations and the people that use their services? How does this differ between faith-based and secular organizations? How do these relationships differ when the people served either come from the same community as the organization or from a different background?

The clientele is largely urban and African American. Refugee resettlement is declining in scope. The agency is absolutely committed to nondiscrimination.

8. Jewish Organization for the Aid of Immigrants (JOAI) Research Summary

1. How do the dynamics between organization and founding community impact on the beliefs, behaviors, and resources of both organization and community? Do relationships between organization and community foster social capital, cultural capital and civic engagement in the founding community? What is the relationship between the religious denomination and the non-profit organizations founded by that organization? (Governance, financial, control, volunteer participation, staffing, program content, mission). What role does social and cultural capital play in those relationships?

The manner in which services are provided at JOAI and to whom is part of a larger struggle that JOAI is facing in relationship to its ‘parent’ organization, the Jewish Federation of Philadelphia. Many consider the Jewish Federation to be the representative of the Jewish community of Philadelphia. As a constituent agency of the Federation, traditionally JOAI received a majority of its funding from this Jewish philanthropy. However, recently the Federation has gone under a complete restructuring process and an evaluation, and JOAI has been determined to be an agency that does not meet the priority needs of the Jewish community. Thus, JOAI’s funds from the Federation have been cut drastically. When I asked various staff members their opinion on the matter, there were some interesting patterns in the responses that I received. The executive director, who is bearing the brunt of this cut in funding, was blunt in her opinion that the Federation was essentially cutting funds because they did not like the fact that JOAI was helping non-Jewish immigrants and clients. Her response indicated a major tension between JOAI and the Federation, not only illustrating a difference in philosophy between the two entities, but also the possibilities of a severance in affiliation. My interview with the ex-president of the board revealed an interesting distinction in the relationship that JOAI had developed with the Federation as compared to other constituent agencies:

“And the other thing about the agency is unlike many other Federation-affiliated agencies, many...I would say most of our board are...well, they’re not as...I don’t know how to say it, I mean, some of them are Federation people...they’re really well-connected...**but these people don’t really affiliate with Federation, they affiliate with JOAI, which is a big difference. They believe in immigration**, and that is their love, and so we’re not...I always say we’re not a glitzy organization. You know, we don’t fundraise with black-tie balls and fashion shows to get the people to support us. You know, the people that are of this agency really truly believe that this is the most important thing. So, you have very committed and very bright people, and they’re not just there to say, as many people I think that give of their time in the community.... they’re not just in it to say that this is another board I’m on...I mean, they really believe in the mission.” (Fieldnotes #13)

This comment indicated some interesting things about the nature of Jewish philanthropic work. It seemed that JOAI was a ‘black sheep’ in some regards because unlike other agencies that emphasized being Jewish first and social networking, it seemed that those who were affiliated with JOAI had over time placed the immigration element of the organization over and above the Jewish aspect of its affiliation. This has obviously contributed to tensions between JOAI and the Jewish community at large.

Other staff members were not so direct in their comments on the relationship between agency and the Federation, and many tried to defend the Jewish Federation while simultaneously bemoaning the cut in funding. One of the board members tried to explain the Federation’s decision:

“Because, Federation is a *Jewish* philanthropy...it’s what it is. There are limited funds, and the idea is they’re raising funds to help Jews. In the heyday, when JOAI received a lot of money, with the exodus of Jews from Russia, the exodus of Jews from Ethiopia...there were just so many Jews that had to be rescued, that there was just so much, so much for JOAI to do. And, I think the disconnect is, they [meaning, the Federation] think that the majority of Jews are here, or in Israel.” (Fieldnotes # 13)

She further explained that there were many contemporary concerns within the Jewish community of maintaining Jewish education, culture and religious traditions, “because Jews tended to assimilate so easily nowadays”. Thus, in some ways the fact that the Federation chose to fund those organizations that were focusing on Jewish people was justified. However, other staff said that while they understood what the Federation was doing, the problem was that after a certain point in time, the number of Jewish immigrants from the former Soviet Union died down, and the demography of immigrants to the United States changed. Thus, now there were non-Jewish refugees from Africa and the Far East that needed help. Also, according to some of the staff members, the nature of immigration has changed drastically due to new, stricter immigration laws. Thus, the type of the work at JOAI has also changed. According to the supervisor of caseworkers, during the time of Russian Jewish immigration, JOAI did a lot of resettlement work with refugees. Now, their work had become more technical, related to immigration law, and some social work, due to a decrease in the influx of Jewish refugees. She said that during her earlier days at JOAI, there were no immigrant attorneys at all in the JOAI staff. However, due to changing needs, over time they have hired several such lawyers. Thus, on the basis of the changing nature of work and from various staff member’s recollections, the nature of JOAI’s services has changed as a result of changing needs. I think one of the major tensions that always lay just under the surface was the question that if JOAI now helped mostly non-Jewish clients, did that mean that it’s identity as a Jewish organization was compromised? While for some breaking away from Jewish Federation would disconnect JOAI from its Jewish affiliation, the executive director did not believe so. She felt that JOAI could still maintain its Jewish values and drives and uphold its history as an organization that helped Jewish people while still helping people of different religious and ethnic backgrounds.

2. What is the relationship between non-profit organizations and the people that use their services? How do these relationships differ when the people served either come from the same community as the organization or from a different background? What is the relationship between the organization, the faith community, and those served who are not part of the same religion? Does the work of the organization lead new people to the faith community? Under what terms? How does the organization ensure that the beliefs and rights of program participants from different faith traditions or those who adhere to no religion are respected?

While this project was limited in its access to the people who used JOAI's services, I did get a sense of some of the issues that arose surrounding serving people from a different community or religious background than the organization. The organization's ethos of "helping" was rooted in the fact that Jewish people needed care because of the discrimination they faced in the past and continue to face today. However, this value of support and help within the Jewish community has been taken in two different directions depending on your perspective. One resulting viewpoint has been that because nobody helped Jewish people during the Holocaust, some people in the Jewish community today believe that they too should not help anybody else except their own. On the other hand, there are some that have argued the opposite logic. They say that their background has allowed them to empathize with those in need, and thus, they feel it is their duty to help others, regardless of their religious background. This notion may perhaps have deeper roots within the Jewish tradition, one that links social responsibility with the era of Hebrew slavery in Egypt. According to Jewish thought, just as God answered the Hebrews' cries for help during their oppression in Egypt, God expects the Hebrews to answer the cries of others in need (Cnaan et al 1999:93).

On my first day at JOAI, this divide within the Jewish community regarding helping non-Jewish people came up in an interview with the executive director. She said the more conservative end believed that the Jewish community, with its limited resources, should only help itself. The more liberal-minded believed that everyone, regardless of religion, should be helped if they are in need. Thus, depending on whether one identified themselves as more orthodox Jewish or reform/reconstructionist Jewish, there were different values and beliefs upheld. Of course, these two forms of Jewish identity are not the only types that exist, but are portrayed as two extremes along a continuum. The executive director believed that her work was motivated by two specifically-Jewish "calls" or values—*tikkun olum*, a Hebrew word meaning "repair the world", and an idea borrowed from the Old Testament of welcoming strangers and providing them sanctuary. However, she said that these calls were interpreted in many different ways, and she chose to apply them to the Jewish and non-Jewish worlds/strangers alike. As a result of her perspective on Jewish values and the manner in which this translated and influenced JOAI's services, many people in the more orthodox community expressed disapproval of the way JOAI was run.

One of the younger Jewish American attorneys that I spoke to had a very different rationale for her belief in helping people, whether they were Jewish or not. She claimed that she didn't know any Jewish family or person in America that really needed help, because in today's world all Jews had been helped or were helped by people in their own community. Thus, she argued, it only made sense that JOAI should aid people in need in today's world, even if that meant helping non-Jews. Then there are those people that I interviewed who took a middle stance, arguing that it was first and foremost JOAI's responsibility to help Jewish people, and then if they could help others, that would be fine. One long-time staff member stated, "I liked the idea of working for an organization that helped my people. Not that I didn't want to help other people, but that was the purpose of the agency and I liked the idea that someone was helping Jewish people" (Fieldnotes #5).

Given the diversity of the staff, it is interesting to look at the dynamic ways in these concepts are played out, how one positions oneself within the Jewish organization, how the identity of the organization as *being* Jewish is changing, how sometimes values and identity do not necessarily coincide (or to varying degrees), and what the boundaries are in terms of accepting non-Jewish staff and clients. Furthermore, it is interesting to identify the significance and interrelationship between how each of these variables may differ situationally. For example, in interacting with me as an obvious outsider, as someone researching JOAI, and perhaps as a Muslim, the way in which various staff members articulated their Jewish identity may have been different than if they were talking to someone who was Jewish. Many times, when asked about helping "other" non-Jewish people, I would always get examples of when Muslims were helped by JOAI. I wasn't sure whether that was the case because I myself was Muslim, or because the "other" was defined as Muslim in the case of being Jewish as a result of the on-going conflict in the Middle East. Also, I sensed that the Jewish staff felt they needed to defend themselves and their community, even though my questions were not accusatory in any manner. This defensiveness sometimes resulted in contradictory claims, where a person would strongly defend the Jewish right to help themselves because they had been discriminated against in the past, while at the same time quickly adding, "That doesn't mean that Jewish people are biased against others or anything" (or something to that effect). One interesting example of how the Jewish identity was expressed situationally was when I was speaking to the supervisor of caseworkers at JOAI. She narrated the following incident to me:

"We have many Muslim clients. I don't know how they feel about it or whether they know it's a Jewish

agency. But I do know we brought in, this summer, two families...I don't know if anybody mentioned to you, but they were the *Meskhetian* Turks...they were from the former Soviet Union...they're Muslim...Judy must have told you about them. And I was driving the families home...the bus had dropped them off...and I *wanted* them to know we were a Jewish agency...I made a specific point explaining who we are.... you know, different agents were asked by the government to help these families...and I just told them we were from a Jewish agency. I wanted them to know we help other people and that you know, so that they would understand it's not that you only stick to your own." (Fieldnotes #9)

It was interesting in this case that she felt the need to emphasize to the Muslim family that JOAI was a *Jewish* agency. The supervisor of caseworkers said that both her Jewish identity and values influenced her choice and her work at JOAI. She believed that helping her people was important. However, she felt that since due to present circumstances (where there were less Jewish refugees coming to America as compared to earlier times), JOAI should be able to help the present immigrant and refugee population, regardless of whether they were Jewish or not. In some cases, she seemed to identify "Jewishness" or being Jewish as opposed to being Muslim. Again, I do not know whether this is because she knew that I was Muslim or not, or just because of the political tensions between Jews and Muslims in the Middle East. I say this because when I asked her if JOAI helped non-Jewish immigrants she said, "Sure, we help everybody, *even* Muslims." However, later she also illustrated where her ideological boundaries lay, when she indicated rather explicitly that although she was willing to help Muslim clients, she could not "bring herself" to help Palestinian families. She explained, "Palestinians are the only group I personally feel uncomfortable working with. Otherwise, I don't care about anybody's religion. Working with Palestinians just rubs me wrong, because there is just such antagonism to Israel. And being Jewish you take it personally, not that every Palestinian obviously feels the same way, but that's the only group that I have difficulty with" (Fieldnotes #5). It seemed that according to her, being Jewish automatically meant strongly identifying with Israel, which came hand in hand with distrust and dislike for Palestinians. This fact was exemplified in another stark incident in the office when one of the staff members, who was of Eastern European origin, expressed with great emotion her dislike for Yasser Arafat, the recently deceased leader of the Palestinian Liberation Front. Although there are many ways to analyze this sense of Israeli patriotism, I feel that I would need to gain more data in order to substantiate an interesting potential claim that perhaps this nationalism may be a focal point for some sort of diasporic imagination. Unfortunately, time did not allow me to explore this further.

3. What is the impact of founding community culture and social capital systems on non-profit mission, organizational structure, staffing, and program design?

Since 1882, the primary mission of JOAI & Council Migration Service of Philadelphia has been to rescue, relocate and resettle Jews and peoples of all religion and nationalities who are fleeing persecution and discrimination. JOAI and Council provides law-related immigration services to the foreign born and their families who seek asylum, family reunification, permanent legal status and citizenship in the U.S. JOAI and Council offers refugee counseling and processing assistance, acculturation, education and advocacy to, and on behalf of, prospective refugees, immigrants, their families, and friends in the Delaware Valley and the Tri-State region². JOAI and Council Migration Service's staff of four attorneys, three accredited representatives, one paralegal and three caseworkers offers legal and immigration services. As a non-profit agency authorized by the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) to provide legal immigration assistance, JOAI and Council Migration Service is required to keep service fees at nominal levels. Clients providing evidence of inability to pay even the lowest fees qualify for free service.

While JOAI and Council serves clients from all over the world without regard to gender, race, religion, ethnic group, national origin, physical disability or sexual orientation, the agency has a special interest and expertise in the area of Jewish migration, and in particular, in migration from and human rights in the former Soviet Union. The JOAI and Council professional staff receives ongoing training in U.S. immigration and nationality law and policy, refugee processing, post-Soviet emigration laws and human rights, etc., and has a good reputation and working relationships with the Philadelphia District Office of the United States immigration and Citizenship services (USCIS formally INS). JOAI and Council coordinates the provision of immigration and migration services with the Jewish Federation's network of resettlement services and services to New Americans which

² Refer to Appendix A (Figures 1 and 2)

includes Jewish Family and Children's Service of Philadelphia's resettlement program, and the Jewish Employment and Vocational Service's (JEVS) Center for New Americans and Jewish Community Centers of Greater Philadelphia.

JOAI's diverse staff that can be categorized in a number of different ways. The twelve people that make up the core of the permanent staff (not including volunteers) are all female. Their ages range from around twenty-five years to some in their late fifties. The staff is divided up into caseworkers (both accredited and those who are non-accredited resettlement workers³) and attorneys specializing in immigrant law. Ethnically and religiously, there are several categories. There are second, third, or fourth generation American Jews, first generation Eastern European (Latvian, Russian, Ukrainian) immigrants of Jewish heritage, a first-generation refugee from Thailand who is Buddhist, an Afro-British woman (whose religion I do not know), a Caucasian-American Christian (did not specify her denomination/sect) and an American woman whose father is Jewish and whose mother is Protestant⁴. The executive director is second-generation American-Jewish but is married to a non-Jewish man. The five attorneys include the executive director, a young third-generation Jewish-American, the half-Jewish/half-Protestant young woman, the Afro-British woman, and the Caucasian-American Christian. Two of the Eastern-European first generation immigrants are caseworkers, while the third is a newly hired secretary. The Thai woman was initially hired as a receptionist and was later promoted to office manager. The head caseworker is third or fourth-generation American-Jewish. Finally, there is an internee working at JOAI who recently graduated from the School of Social Work at Penn whose background I have not had a chance to find out about. I can only identify her as young and Caucasian-American (American because of her accent, although this again may be problematic).

Since JOAI is a Federation constituent agency, it is mandated that all board members must contribute to the Jewish Federation of Greater Philadelphia. In the past, board members would be called from the Jewish community by the HR department of the Federation. More recently, the present executive director of JOAI and the president of the board have sought to solicit those persons that work with immigrants and have contacts in the immigrant community. The current board consists of people from a wide range of backgrounds, including influential businesspeople, immigrant lawyers, and a rabbi.

4. What is the impact of the larger socio-economic and policy system, as well as the service sector of that organization (social services, health and senior services, community development) on non-profit organizations form, function and resources

Employees of JOAI have indicated that the government's immigration policy has always affected both the number and kinds of clients that JOAI receives (i.e. immigrants vs. refugees, vs. asylum-seekers). Further research on this topic is needed.

Sub Questions

-How does the personal religious faith of key staff reflect that of the sponsoring community and influence organizational behavior? What is the impact on the faith community of their organization's work? On its understandings of the issues the organizations address? On its understandings of those the organizations serve? On its understandings of their faith? On its sense of identity?

The fact that JOAI is the *Jewish* Organization for the Aid of Immigrants definitely brings to the forefront questions of incorporated Jewish values and the identity of the people that are involved with JOAI, whether it be staff, board members, patrons, or clientele. The fact that the JOAI office is located within the Jewish Social Services Building, was founded by Jewish people specifically for the purpose of helping Jewish refugees come to America, that the mission statement clearly states that its primary goal is to resettle Jews (and *then* mentions people of other religions and nationalities), and is related to the Jewish Federation all conjure up an explicit identity. *However*, recent tensions in the organization have called this identity into question (this is further

³ The difference is that accredited representatives may represent immigrants in court (do not need to pass a bar exam, because it is specifically an immigrant court), versus resettlement workers who work at JOAI but are not able to represent clients in court.

⁴ I find the way that I have constructed these categories as interesting and definitely not unproblematic.

discussed below). It is interesting to see how “being Jewish” or not, and how the “Jewish values” of the organization are or are not presented by the staff to the researcher in the present contentious and changing climate at JOAI.

Perhaps one of the most significant patterns that emerged from my research was the notion of how people’s Jewish identity influenced their choice to work at JOAI and their perspective on what JOAI was all about. After talking with the staff and one of the board members, it became apparent to me that there are inherent deep structures surrounding the Jewish identity. This was evidenced in the fact that whenever people spoke about their Jewish identity, they defined it over and against the dominant culture, talking about how “their people” were persecuted and continue to be discriminated against today. One interviewee made this explicit when she said, “And we *never* know in the world where Jews will need us next, because, you know, by far anti-Semitism has not been extinguished, so there is that need” (Fieldnotes #13). While there are many references in the Old Testament regarding helping others and social responsibility, when talking about their Jewish identity in the context of helping others, people I interviewed tended to refer to history rather than religion. Referring to the Holocaust and the history of persecution that Jewish people had suffered, some of the staff members argued that they joined JOAI because they believed in helping others in need. An example of the way in which the Jewish identity and its history of persecution was linked to helping others is illustrated in a quote by ex-president of the board and a current board member when she said:

“And, as a Jew, having people in my family that I never knew being wiped out by the Holocaust and reading about what the United States didn’t do and what the other countries didn’t do...to me, as a *Jew*, you can’t *not* help other immigrants in similar situations. Because, had one person, of many, stood up during World War II, 6 million people *might* not have died. And there are countless stories where somebody could have saved 1,000 people or somebody could have saved 500 people. So to me, that’s kind of *our* history, and if you believe in helping people, I think that’s kind of the cornerstone of JOAI.” (Fieldnotes # 13)

Another example of the diverse manner in which “being Jewish” was defined within the organization was the case of the two Eastern European caseworkers that I interviewed. They saw their Jewish identity as more of an ethnicity than a religion. Both of them commented on this aspect explicitly on two separate occasions, in a more informal setting as well as in the interviews. Being Jewish to them was an ethnic identity, because they said that Russian Jews (an umbrella term for people of Jewish descent in the former Soviet Union) were not very religious and also because during the Soviet era they were identified not as Tajik, Ukrainian, or by any other nationality, but just as “Jewish” (in their passports, etc.). They were targeted on the basis of religion regardless of their ethnic background, in a sense “naturalizing” Jewishness as an ethnicity. They brought this idea with them when they immigrated to America. For one of them, working at JOAI meant helping fellow Eastern European Jews. However, again because of the decline in Eastern European Jewish refugees to America, she was now open to helping others. However, at a later point I heard her say something which clearly indicated her dislike for Palestinians, thus categorizing those “non-Jewish” groups she was unwilling to help. Again, this was based more on the ethno-political conflict translated into a conflict between two religions (Israel/Jews and Palestine/Muslims), rather than tensions between two faiths, as she insisted that she herself was not very “practicing”. The other Eastern European caseworker said that although she still saw being Jewish as an ethnic identity, coming to America changed this a bit, because here “being” Jewish was seen more as a faith than an ethnicity. She now actively practiced the Jewish religion, and deemed her work at JOAI as a way to pay back the Jewish community that had helped her when she arrived in America as a refugee.

The two lawyers who could be identified as Jewish (or part Jewish), I felt that because they were younger and also because of their personal experiences, being Jewish was very different for them. While the young woman whose parents were both Jewish had been inculcated while growing up with a strong Jewish religious identity (she went to a school that was attached to a synagogue and sang both the American and Israeli national anthems each morning), she said that when she became more independent as an adult, her ideas about her religion changed. Although she claimed that she still strongly identified as being Jewish, she became less religious and also disagreed ideologically with some Jewish beliefs. She seemed to have developed an independent set of ideas, some borrowed from the Jewish faith and some not, but still considered herself to be Jewish. She specifically said that she realized that some of the rhetoric that she had been exposed to as a child was clearly biased. For her, the work she did at JOAI did not encapsulate anything “Jewish”. She said that most of her clients were in fact not Jewish, and that she made it a point to keep her faith/identity/ethnicity separate from her work. However, she did tell me that she thought that people who were Jewish “were treated differently”

at JOAI than those who were not. She indicated a strong ideological divide between the Eastern European Jews and the American Jews. She said that the other young lawyer who was half-Jewish was more welcomed into the fold because her last name was Jewish and because she had strong connections with the Jewish community through her father. Interestingly, when I spoke to this latter individual, she indicated that she had been raised “without religion” as she was growing up and that working for JOAI was “the first time that she had had any exposure to Judaism”. She also worked with mostly non-Jewish clients.

The other staff at JOAI, who were non-Jewish by faith/identity, indicated a general ambivalence to the Jewish “nature” of JOAI. They did not identify any feelings or instances of marginalization either of themselves or non-Jewish clients, emphasizing that they helped clients of all backgrounds. It seemed to me that for them, the Jewish identity of the organization was latent, and they were mostly concerned with helping immigrants resettle. However, I feel that maybe they were uncomfortable to reveal how they felt about underlying “politics” to me, because that could perhaps be read as a critique of the organization’s Jewish identity. Also, it is interesting to note that one of the newer Jewish staff members told me during one of our conversations that she believed that the non-Jewish staff were treated “differently”, saying that there was “an underlying tension in the office around who’s Jewish and who’s not. You know, I’ve heard people who aren’t Jewish, you know, aren’t treated the same as those who are.” It must be kept in mind that this person was relatively new to JOAI, and therefore her observation may be flawed. As yet I cannot come up with any solid evidence to further substantiate this claim. However, from my conversations with the non-Jewish staff, they have never indicated any such discrimination. I would need to spend much more time at the office in order to determine these nuanced subtleties in relationships and interactions between Jewish and non-Jewish staff.

The relationship between “being Jewish”, Jewish values, and the identity of the organization is a complex and dynamic one. The fact that some people said they were open to helping all people regardless of their religion/nationality but then indicated some hesitancy or dislike of particular groups was interesting. The underlying ideological differences between staff members based on ethnicity and perhaps a generational divide indicated how “being Jewish” differed and how certain “Jewish values” were appropriated/or not appropriated into individual work ethics. In the case of JOAI, how one articulated “being Jewish” depended on past experiences, differences in nationality/where one was raised, different forms of appropriation, and to what extent one viewed how faith was incorporated into the services offered. The present metamorphosis of and larger tensions that are at play regarding JOAI’s position as a Jewish organization make it a particularly interesting context in which to examine the process of change and negotiation of this emic concept.

-How do congregations and their members relate to faith-based organizations that function under their name, and vice versa? Does social and cultural capital influence interactions between congregations and organizations?

This research study was limited in its access to Jewish congregations in Philadelphia or to the members of the Jewish Federation.

-How do faith communities assure that the faith-based organizations have a future as faith-based institutions? That their founding values and perspectives are maintained? Under what conditions do faith-based organizations move beyond the ethos and control of the denomination, and what connection, if any, does the religious body have with an organization when this occurs?

The very obvious presence of tension in the relationship between JOAI and the general Jewish faith community under the Jewish Federation regarding the nature of the organizations’ services and faithfulness to its mission illustrates some of the “stakes” at hand. It highlights the resistance to organizational metamorphosis that could potentially lead to JOAI moving away from being “faith-based”.

While this tension may remain unresolved, the wavering relationship between JOAI and the Federation has influenced the former’s organizational culture. The cut in funding has caused JOAI to become under-resourced and to face a lot of financial pressure⁵. My interview with the ex-president of the board brought out the fact that

⁵ Refer to Appendix A (Figure 3) and Appendix B

without a secure funding base, JOAI's services and efficient response to the cyclical trends of immigration would be greatly hampered. Her comments on this issue also illustrated that the manner in which the executive director runs the office greatly influences JOAI's organizational culture. She said that the reason that JOAI is currently surviving and continuing to persevere has a lot to do with the present executive director. Her statements further illustrated that the philosophy and drive of the organization changed when directors were changed. Thus, the present executive director's values are essentially internalized within the organization. The relentless search for the money, the belief that all people should be helped regardless of religion, and the constant activity within the office all reflect the executive director's personality position. Particularly those staff that have been hired under her tenure have displayed concurrence with the belief that refugees and immigrants should be helped regardless of whether they are Jewish or not. This may reflect the fact that the executive director is predominantly responsible for hiring new employees, and she looks for people with a similar sense of unbiased caring and concern. The executive director's beliefs stem from the fact that she is from the Reconstructionist movement within Judaism, one of the most liberal movements that promotes interfaith values and is seen by many of the more conservative orthodox Jews as a "secularized" movement. Even membership criteria of the board have changed as a result of the new executive director's approach. This is illustrated by the answer given to me when I asked the ex-president of the board what the criteria is for choosing board members:

Since JOAI is a Federation-constituent agency, it's mandated that all board members must contribute to the Jewish Federation of Greater Philadelphia. With all the boards of Federation, each board sets the minimum contribution each year by the board members to the Federation. So basically you have to contribute to Federation and you have to be willing to give them a board donation. I think in the past, board members would be called from the Jewish community, people who they thought were active in the community that could be put on the JOAI board. With Judy, it's been a different thrust. We've really looked for people that work with immigrants, have contact with the immigrant community...and business people that might not necessarily have been connected to Federation, but because they would be interested and JOAI would contribute to the Federation, they would become members of our board. But Judy and some of us actively seek out people that we think would contribute. And we try and get *really* successful businesspeople that work with immigrants...that would have a real feel for what we're doing. We have a lot of immigration lawyers too. Um, we have somebody on the board whose father or grandfather...I forget exactly, but he was one of the first board members. So, there are some of the older people on the board, their parents came to the United States with the help of JOAI, so they feel a particular kinship the organization. Yeah, it varies, but we as a board right now really outreach ourselves to identify those people. (Fieldnotes #13)

The present executive director also influences two other important aspects of JOAI's organizational culture. Firstly, the importance of networking within the Jewish community for support has come out in varying instances. When speaking to one of the members of the board about the executive director, she said, "Judy brings a unique perspective to this organization in the fact that she's not only a lawyer, but is a social worker. And her experiences have always been in the non-profit community, and she knows *everybody* in the city. *Every* immigrant community-based organization, *every* minority-based organization, *every* social needs organization...she *just knows* everybody, and has helped in *so many* different venues that it's an *amazing* integration of what she's been able to accomplish" (Fieldnotes #13). In another instance, I was told about how the board had hired someone to help raise funds for JOAI, but she had been rather unsuccessful because she was not a member of the Jewish community and was thus not able to reach out and network appropriately. This comment really gave me a sense of the importance of networking in order to particularly get financial support for a Jewish non-profit. There are cultural differences in networking within the Jewish community that influence how you approach and connect with people in order to solicit funds. The board member continued by saying:

"We need somebody who is really in touch with and understands the Jewish community. *That's* what I think you need...you need to know, if you want to raise funds from the Jewish community. If you have access to money in the general population, and you have those contacts, and you know how to approach that, then it doesn't have to be Jewish. I'm just saying, where are you going? You know part of any fund-raising is you have to solicit your own board members and the people that you know." (Fieldnotes #13)

In terms of the organizational structure of JOAI, staff members have pointed out both positive and negative aspects of the way it is run under the current executive director. Every staff member that I spoke to said that working at JOAI made him or her feel like they had a second family. The friendly atmosphere at JOAI fosters a

lot of interaction and advise-giving across the board. New employees are always warmly welcomed, and many of the staff members have been working at JOAI for over a decade, despite the low pay. The fact that all the staff are female is perhaps another reason why the environment is so comfortable and familiar. There is little competition, and people are very open with each other. The staff eat lunch together and are always joking around and laughing. I have also heard them talking very openly with each other and me about personal issues and getting advice from each other on such matters.

Another reason why I feel that JOAI's atmosphere is family-like is because of the nature of the work that they do. Helping refugees and immigrants involves some sort of nurturing and caring, as people are aided and essentially taught how to "assimilate" and be self-sufficient after escaping a difficult life. Since some of the staff members themselves are refugees, they obviously can empathize with those looking for asylum or leaving their home country to come to America. In addition, for those staff who are Jewish, they see their identity linked to a history of Diaspora and discrimination. As one of the interviewees said, explaining her Jewish roots, "Immigration is the core of who we are" (Fieldnotes #7). Thus, many of the JOAI staff are sensitive to feelings of dislocation and believe in caring and helping others in such situations.

While all the staff emphasized that JOAI had a "family" atmosphere and environment that made it a wonderful place to work at, the lack of organizational structure and training was identified as a major weakness. The executive director explained that JOAI did not have a solid, hierarchical corporate structure because the office was under-resourced. She said that although the staff enjoyed their relative independence in working in a decentralized environment, "there should be departments...I should be overseeing two or three people and then they should be overseeing people." However, she claimed, "I don't have the resources to pay a senior manager, or book-keep. I mean I should have someone internal doing the bookkeeping...I don't have that, I have to contract that out. If I had to start it from scratch, I would not do it this way" (Fieldnotes #8). Generally, the lack of structure at JOAI is a result of a lack of time on the part of the staff to organize itself. While this unstructured atmosphere allows everyone to help the maximum number of clients possible and fosters flexibility, it detracts from the efficiency of record keeping and updating the database. As the caseworker supervisor put it:

"As far as keeping up with paperwork and documenting you know notes and things, which we *should* be doing more, we've always put...I don't know how to say it...the interest of the client or maybe just serving clients better and faster and more people...you don't have time to do all that paperwork. But I think it really is important in this world, as Judy has shown us. Unless you can document why you're so busy, you can't apply for more *money*, and that's our weak point." (Fieldnotes #9)

Thus, an interesting issue that ultimately arose out of my research was the question of whether JOAI is a faith-based organization at all. As I have mentioned in the literature review, there is a serious need to re-evaluate how we categorize organizations as "faith-based" or not. The Jewish example is particularly illustrative of the need to challenge the Protestant Christian origins of the predominant typology used to identify and study faith-based organizations. It was interesting to note that many of the staff members at JOAI did not see the organization as faith-based because they associated such organizations with proselytization. In one of the conversations I had on this topic with a few of the staff members over lunch, they vehemently differentiated themselves from Catholic and Lutheran social services, saying that in Judaism, "we don't believe in proselytizing." I myself would argue after researching JOAI that in many ways faith does permeate the organizational culture in subtle ways. Jewish ideology and values influence the ethos of JOAI's mission and identity. I believe that the current tensions between JOAI and the Jewish Federation embody some of the very crucial issues surrounding the redefinition of what a faith-based organization is. When I asked the ex-president of the board if she thought JOAI was faith-based, she said no, arguing that although the organization's driving ethos is borrowed from Judaism:

"But that's not tied in with your belief in *God*, and your religion. I mean, it's a *value*. I mean, to me that's the conundrum with Judaism. I mean, you know, we don't proselytize Judaism. It's a religion, but for many of us, it's really an ethnicity...it's who you are, it's [pauses]...when I say I'm Jewish, I really think it's different than when somebody is Catholic. I mean, I'm *really* not religious in any way. And most of the people...I mean, there are plenty of Jews that are that are involved in the Federation, but I'm just saying...and there are plenty of people on the board that are religious too, but we just don't see this like, 'Look what the Jews are doing for you, so therefore support us.' This is what we have to do as good citizens, as good people." (Fieldnotes #13)

Again, I believe that the way in which society defines what a faith-based organization is carries with it negative stereotypes of proselytization and discrimination on the basis of religion. These are the very labels that JOAI is trying to escape. As researchers, we must thus reconsider the parameters that are used to define faith-based organizations, particularly with the present federal administration's "faith-based initiative" in mind.

-Do different faith traditions work toward distinctive goals (personal transformation or social change, for example)?

While I would be hesitant to make general statements about the distinctive goals upheld by various faith traditions, I believe that a dominant theme that pervades the Jewish tradition (and that has been and continues to be contested and highlighted in the goals of many Jewish organizations), is the issue of helping migrants in the context of the history of the Jewish people. Whenever people spoke about their Jewish identity, they defined it over and against the dominant culture, talking about how "their people" were persecuted and continue to be discriminated against today. One interviewee made this explicit when she said, "And we *never* know in the world where Jews will need us next, because, you know, by far anti-Semitism has not been extinguished, so there is that need" (Fieldnotes #13). While there are many references in the Old Testament regarding helping others and social responsibility, when talking about their Jewish identity in the context of helping others, people I interviewed tended to refer to history rather than religion. Referring to the Holocaust and the history of persecution that Jewish people had suffered, some of the staff members argued that they joined JOAI because they believed in helping others in need. An example of the way in which the Jewish identity and its history of persecution was linked to helping others is illustrated in a quote by ex-president of the board and a current board member when she said:

"And, as a Jew, having people in my family that I never knew being wiped out by the Holocaust and reading about what the United States didn't do and what the other countries didn't do...to me, as a *Jew*, you can't *not* help other immigrants in similar situations. Because, had one person, of many, stood up during World War II, 6 million people *might* not have died. And there are countless stories where somebody could have saved 1,000 people or somebody could have saved 500 people. So to me, that's kind of *our* history, and if you believe in helping people, I think that's kind of the cornerstone of JOAI." (Fieldnotes # 13)

Thus, the notion of "helping" was rooted in the fact that Jewish people needed care because of the discrimination they faced in the past and continue to face today. However, this value of support and help within the Jewish community has been taken in two different directions depending on your perspective. One resulting viewpoint has been that because nobody helped Jewish people during the Holocaust, some people in the Jewish community today believe that they too should not help anybody else except their own. On the other hand, there are some that have argued the opposite logic. They say that their background has allowed them to empathize with those in need, and thus, they feel it is their duty to help others, regardless of their religious background. This notion may perhaps have deeper roots within the Jewish tradition, one that links social responsibility with the era of Hebrew slavery in Egypt. According to Jewish thought, just as God answered the Hebrews' cries for help during their oppression in Egypt, God expects the Hebrews to answer the cries of others in need (Cnaan et al 1999:93).

On my first day at JOAI, this divide within the Jewish community regarding helping non-Jewish people came up in an interview with the executive director. She said the more conservative end believed that the Jewish community, with its limited resources, should only help itself. The more liberal-minded believed that everyone, regardless of religion, should be helped if they are in need. Thus, depending on whether one identified themselves as more orthodox Jewish or reform/reconstructionist Jewish, there were different values and beliefs upheld. Of course, these two forms of Jewish identity are not the only types that exist, but are portrayed as two extremes along a continuum. The executive director believed that her work was motivated by two specifically-Jewish "calls" or values—*Tikkun Olam*, a Hebrew word meaning "repair the world", and an idea borrowed from the Old Testament of welcoming strangers and providing them sanctuary. However, she said that these calls were interpreted in many different ways, and she chose to apply them to the Jewish and non-Jewish worlds/strangers alike. As a result of her perspective on Jewish values and the manner in which this translated and influenced JOAI's services, many people in the more orthodox community expressed disapproval of the way JOAI was run.

9. Christian Adult Community Day Program

a. How do the dynamics between organization and founding community impact on the beliefs, behaviors, and resources of both organization and community? Do relationships between organization and community foster social capital, cultural capital and civic engagement in the founding community?

The Christian Adult Community Day Program is profoundly affected by its relationship to its supporting church. The program is founded by and tightly connected to its African American evangelical church, which provides the bulk of financial resources, space for program activities, staff, volunteers, and the driving force or mission for the program, which infuses the program with a particular spirit and energy that is regularly commented upon by staff and participants alike. The Christian Adult Community Day Program provides services to more members of the community at large than to members of its particular faith community, though all participants share a similar Evangelical Christian religious background and similar practices of prayer, song, oral testimony, evangelization, etc. Many seniors participated in the Church's worship services as a result of their participation in the program, (indeed, some formal activities of the program involved participation in worship services) and of these, many expressed a desire to formally join the church body. A few seniors actually did join the Church formally, though only a few, as most preferred to remain loyal to their long-time church communities.

Some program activities influenced by founding religious institution (as well as by the shared religious identity of participants which is broader than the particular sponsoring church): [This list is not exhaustive but provides an idea of the character of the program and how it is shaped by the founding religious community]

- Meals (breakfast and lunch are served each day) are initiated with group prayer led by staff and participants alike
- Greetings: staff and participants greet and take leave of each other using religious language [e.g. "How are you?" "—Good, by the grace of God"]
- Intimate concern for one another is fostered by staff and participants and expressed in numerous ways [e.g. participant will pray as a group and individually for those who are suffering health problems or other difficulties.] Along these lines, first names are used and titles of respect and fictive kinship such as "Mother," "Brother," and "Sister" emphasize the intimacy, devotion and love of family as all are understood to be members together in God's family.
- Activities: songs sung: spirituals, Christmas carols, gospel music; "Hand Praise" group: this activity, led by one of the senior participants and a member of Mt Airy COGIC involves choreographed hand motions to accompany gospel music, performed at various events including special worship services of The Church.
- Information: health information sessions led by a Nurse-Missionary of The Church opened and closed with prayer and emphasized the importance of physical and spiritual wellbeing.
- Bible studies led by a volunteer member of The Church each Monday morning. Some seniors came to the Christian Adult Community Day Program only on Mondays just for this event.

b. What is the relationship between non-profit organizations and the people that use their services? How does this differ between faith-based and secular organizations? How do these relationships differ when the people served either come from the same community as the organization or from a different background?

My experiences at The Christian Adult Community Day Program provide some interesting insights into this question. Just a few blocks down Ogontz Avenue from the Church where the Christian Adult Community Day Program is housed, there is a publicly run seniors center, providing similar services as The Christian Adult Community Day Program, though in a more extensive manner. Funded by the Philadelphia Corporation for the Aging, the West Oak Lane Center serves more seniors, five days a week (instead of M, W, Friday, as The Christian Adult Community Day Program), has new, more extensive facilities, and a more numerous and professionally trained staff. When speaking of their feelings and impressions about The Christian Adult Community Day Program, many seniors naturally drew a comparison between their experiences there and West Oak Lane. In these responses, a pattern emerged. Seniors contrasted the "warmth" and community they felt at

The Christian Adult Community Day Program to the “colder” atmosphere of the secular organization down the street. They praised the state of the art facilities and the services provided by the secular organization, but felt that the staff was cold, harsh, and that there was not the same degree of harmony and camaraderie among participants as they felt at The Christian Adult Community Day Program. They mentioned that the Christian Adult Community Day Program staff was composed of people who receive little or no financial compensation for their work, and that this insured that they were devoted to their work on a different level. Seniors claimed that they could feel this difference in their interactions with staff. They also explained that the shared faith of participants of the Christian Adult Community Day Program led to a different feeling of warmth and caring among the participants as well. Also noted were the many things that the seniors received, all for no fees. Many seniors I spoke to explained that for these reasons of warmth and comfort they had abandoned participation in the publicly run program.

c. What is the impact of founding community culture and social capital systems on non-profit mission, organizational structure, staffing, and program design?

- Mission of Christian Adult Community Day Program grows out of and is directly tied to that of founding church community [See attached mission statement]
- Organizational structure: the Bishop of The Church appoints board of directors. Board members are appointed for life but may withdraw if they so choose.
- Staff is appointed by head of the Bethesda Programs or on suggestion from the Bishop or other church leader. Many regular staff members are volunteers. All staff members of The Christian Adult Community Day Program are members of the founding religious group.
- Program design contains many elements of the church mission including promoting community of faithful, spiritual and physical well being and self discovery, expansion and enrichment.
- [See also above comments about “atmosphere” and examples of program activities, etc.]

d. What is the impact of the larger socio-economic and policy system, as well as the service sector of that organization (social services, health and senior services, community development) on non-profit organizations form, function and resources

Sub Questions

1. What is the relationship between the religious denomination and the non-profit organizations founded by that organization? (Governance, financial, control, volunteer participation, staffing, program content, mission). What role does social and cultural capital play in those relationships?

[See responses to a-c]

2. How does the personal religious faith of key staff reflect that of the sponsoring community and influence organizational behavior?

Paid Staff

There are only three paid staff members that work exclusively for The Christian Adult Community Day Program: the program director; the activities coordinator; and the cook. These three staff members earn what one Church leader described as “salaries” but which the employees themselves describe as “stipends.” Their pay is for part-time work and is quite modest- more of a token of appreciation than the actual amount of compensation they are due for the nature of skills and commitment required for their jobs.

Regular Volunteers

Two other regular workers at the Christian Adult Community Day Program come to the Christian Adult Community Day Program on a fully volunteer basis. They spoke to me of their work in the program as a “ministry” and they come as “servants” [of both God and the seniors] and not as people in search of paychecks. One volunteer works every day of the program in the kitchen, helping the cook, to prepare, serve and clean up after the meals. She has been working as a volunteer in the program without lapse since its inception over two years ago. The second volunteer has also been with the program since its inception but has since moved to

Delaware, south of Wilmington. She continues to remain devoted to the seniors, but only comes one day each week because of the distance.

Other volunteers:

Other volunteers come and make presentations or prepare special activities for the seniors on a less regular basis. The program director expressed amazement at the outpouring of volunteer support coming from members of the congregation. She told me that people are always approaching her with ideas for activities and projects to work on with the seniors, asking if they can come and be of help. One particular activity that arose in such a way was a creative writing project. A member of the church who is a writer offered to come in and work with the seniors on autobiography writing projects. This program was a great success and the Christian Adult Community Day Program director raved about the finished written works the seniors produced and the outcome for them personally.

Other temporary staff come for periods of up to two months as part of their training for ministry at one of the church's theological schools or training programs. One woman participated as a full-time volunteer with The Christian Adult Community Day Program for the months of September and October as part of her "rotations" with various ministries. As an aspiring missionary, this is part of her training program with MARTI (Mount Airy Religious Training Institute) run by The Church.

Another volunteer from the church that is formally trained as a nurse and is also a Nurse/Missionary within the church comes the second Wednesday of each month to give a presentation about a health-related topic. Her presentations focused on current issues such as the flu vaccine, holiday eating, and self-pampering. Other volunteers from Mt. Airy church have come in to lead arts and crafts activities and bible study sessions, prepare packages of canned goods for the seniors, or to help with special events such as the annual Thanksgiving or Christmas dinners.

Volunteers and the shape of the Christian Adult Community Day Program:

Generating ideas and aiding with the organization and presentation of programs for the seniors, volunteers from the Mt. Airy church community provide a significant pool of human resources for the program. Though volunteers are not paid, the program's director and coordinator make sure that their generosity is recognized, and in this way, help to ensure the continued outpouring of generous support in the future. At the end of each year, during the annual Christmas luncheon for the seniors, the program director takes the opportunity to publicly thank regular volunteers with a speech and with a tangible token of appreciation. The two regular "staff volunteers" each receive a "Christmas bonus" check from the program budget as a show of appreciation. This year, the program director presented other volunteers with personalized, wrapped gifts.

The significant presence of volunteers on staff affects the nature of the director's job in many ways. First of all, other publicly-run seniors programs have extensive staff, which allows the director to perform a mainly administrative role behind the scenes and to remain remote from the actual program activities and participants. At The Christian Adult Community Day Program, the scarcity of staff leads the program director to be very actively involved in running discussion sessions and other activities with the seniors. On most days I attended the seniors program, the director was present in the room for all or most of the day. She led the group in singing spirituals, in extended open-forum discussions about certain issues such as exercise and spiritual and physical fitness, and often took on the task of making announcements and organizing upcoming activities with sign-up sheets. Small numbers of permanent staff at The Christian Adult Community Day Program results in the program being quite vertically integrated.

The director also takes a very open approach to organizing and planning program activities. Reliant upon volunteers, she makes it clear to program staff and to members of the Mt. Airy Church that she is open to their ideas and suggestions for program content. Being very "open to suggestions" is one way in which the program's director garners support and resources from church members and other volunteers. The program director also takes a very open approach to program administration. She often took a very leadership style with her staff and volunteers. First of all, the staff are comfortable approaching her with their concerns. Also, I watched her mediate some conflicts and lead brainstorming sessions with staff where they all sat together at an impromptu meeting where she took charge of the proceedings, but not the content. The program director encouraged and solicited everyone present to contribute ideas and then she took immediate action on these

thoughts, implementing them so that they came into effect the very next week. The director used a communal “we” conceiving of herself as an active part of the group: [“now what were we saying?”] Her manner and orientation encouraged the participation and the input of everyone present. This openness characterized her leadership of the program in general, and was influenced greatly by the program’s reliance upon volunteers.

The program benefits greatly from the presence of volunteers on staff. The desire they have to work there positively influences the orientation they take towards their tasks and their relationships with the seniors. However, there are also negative aspects to having a staff composed mostly of volunteers. Without pay, volunteers are not bound by legally formalized expectations contained within a contract. The program director pointed out that there is less consistency in the staff because volunteers will commit and give of themselves for a period of time, and then leave if they find a full-time job, if other commitments arise, or if their original surge of dedication wanes. The inconsistency in staff, she noted, results in a general stagnation of the program since they’ve had to re-train and re-orient new volunteers and staff members each time there is a change.

As a director overseeing mostly volunteer staff, the program director also faces challenges for managing existent staff. She told me that one of the most difficult things for her to do is to fire staff members, but she has had to do this a few times. Once she fired a van driver who didn’t treat the seniors with the appropriate respect and a cook who repeatedly arrived late. With staff members who are fully volunteers, there is a greater limitation on control and retribution. She explained that in order to effectively manage volunteer staff, she said she tries to foster “general respect for one another” among the staff and participants and to “try to keep the atmosphere fun”⁶.

3. How do congregations and their members relate to faith-based organizations that function under their name, and vice versa? Does social and cultural capital influence interactions between congregations and organizations?

[My research did not directly address this question]

4. How do faith communities assure that the faith-based organizations have a future as faith-based institutions? That their founding values and perspectives are maintained?

[My research did not directly address this question]

5. What is the impact on the faith community of their organization’s work? On its understandings of the issues the organizations address? On its understandings of those the organizations serve? On its understandings of their faith? On its sense of identity?

The Christian Adult Community Day Program’s grows out of the mission of the church. Like the church, a principle guiding force and source of inspiration and support comes from Bishop Ernest C. Morris.

One important notion that I noted is tied to these questions is that of “ministry.” The program brochure describes The Christian Adult Community Day Program as “A Ministry of Mount Airy Church of God in Christ.” The notion of “ministry” is a key concept that ties the program tightly to the founding church body and its mission, shapes the orientation of the staff, the expectations of the participants, the content of the program, the shape of the organization and the actions of all involved.

Ministry and staff motivation:

Staff at all levels of The Christian Adult Community Day Program mentioned again and again the notion of “ministry” when describing their work there. Almost without exception, the staff characterized the nature of their activity at The Christian Adult Community Day Program as “ministry” to the seniors. Conceiving their work as “ministry” dramatically shapes the staff’s orientation to their work, and to each other as a team engaged in collective activity.

All of the staff members and volunteers of the Christian Adult Community Day Program are members of the

⁶ interview, Barbara Morgan, 11/03/04

Church. By describing their participation in the Christian Adult Community Day Program as “ministry,” they directly connect the work contribute to the program to their identity as members of a particular faith community. By engaging in ministry, these staff and volunteers are fulfilling their duties as faithful members of the church.

One aspect of ministry is to give of oneself without expecting to receive financial compensation in return. The fact that even paid staff of The Christian Adult Community Day Program receive only modest “stipends” leads to the fact that program relies on a spirit of volunteerism which contributes subtly yet powerfully to the nature of the program on many levels. Staff members and volunteers conceive of their work with The Christian Adult Community Day Program as a “ministry,” contrasting this to the standard notion of “job” and “work,” which they characterize as secular and devoid of any spiritual purpose. Thus, the attraction they feel to work there is based in a spiritual “calling” that goes well beyond a utilitarian need for money.

The Christian Adult Community Day Program director and the activities coordinator are both retired from well-paid, full-time, office-based careers. They do not see their work with The Christian Adult Community Day Program as a step up on a career ladder, but as a part of an expanded and renewed spiritual journey enabled by the financial freedom that has come with retirement from well-paid careers.

One way ministry differs from simple work is that it is an expression of love. This love for other manifests itself in many ways in the interactions of staff and volunteers with The Christian Adult Community Day Program participants. Upon meeting in the morning and departing in the afternoon, staff members usually greet the seniors by name, exchanging hugs or clasping hands in prolonged handshakes. The staff keep up with and express concern for the small details of the seniors’ personal lives. The staff are familiar with the particular medical and dietary needs of The Christian Adult Community Day Program participants, and they also know many seniors personally the way a close friend might. This aspect of their intimacy is clear when staff members ask participants about particulars of their lives upon greeting: (“How is your granddaughter doing?”; “How did that doctor’s appointment go yesterday?”; “We missed you on Monday!” etc.) The staff’s love and concern for The Christian Adult Community Day Program participants serves as a fount of patience and compassion that surface in interpersonal interactions.

Yet, the notion of ministry, at its heart is not primarily about giving. Consistent with the Christian notion of ministry emphasized in the church, working at The Christian Adult Community Day Program is not only a way staff and volunteers serve God and fulfill their responsibility as good Christians to meet the needs of others in the community. Participation in this ministry is also a means through which staff can fulfill their *own* needs- for it is through this action of giving of themselves in order to minister to others that they *receive* the benefits and blessings of God.

Staff experience at The Christian Adult Community Day Program is intimately shaped by their Christian identity and the particular way in which being a Christian is emphasized at the Church. The Christian Adult Community Day Program staff and volunteers explained that they reap rich rewards personally and spiritually from their service to the seniors. To them, the rewards they receive from involvement far outweigh the time and effort they invest.

Thus, for staff and volunteers of The Christian Adult Community Day Program, their involvement in the program is part of a very deeply personal spiritual process in which they are engaged. For them, working at The Christian Adult Community Day Program brings multiple rewards of which financial compensation, if there is any at all, is merely secondary. As the program director explained, it is this type of genuine “passion” and “love”: like a mother’s love for her child that guides the program staff in what they do⁷. And, she explained, it is this aspect of the staff’s underlying motivations that makes the Mt. Airy senior’s program different from the public seniors’ program run by the Philadelphia Council for the Aging just down the street: “You see? THAT’S what makes it different . . . Because it’s caring. And that passion for caring for that individual drives whatever need that might be . . .”⁸

Ministry- Community Outreach

The Christian Adult Community Day Program produces a brochure that advertises the existence of the program

⁷ interview, Barbara Morgan; 11/03/04

⁸ *ibid.*

to seniors outside of the immediate church community. As part of a vision from Bishop Ernest Morris to create programs that meet “meaningful needs” in the community, the Christian Adult Community Day Program was initiated under the churches CDC “Bethesda Programs.” Distributed at community centers, apartment complexes, assisted living centers and other locations where senior citizens in the surrounding community frequent, the brochure widens the reach of the church’s message. It thus is a tangible artifact pointing to the program’s mission to reach out into the wider community.

The majority of the 92 registered participants of the program come from outside of the Mt. Airy church community. Fifty-two participants or fifty-seven percent of the total registered participants of the Christian Adult Community Day Program are *not* members of the sponsoring church. Most of the participants I spoke with learned about the program through “word of mouth” passed through lines of friendship or family. Most who were not already members did not have plans to join the church. In this sense, the Christian Adult Community Day Program is a ministry to the community, thereby fulfilling the ninth statement of the church’s mission statement, “to carry out the Great Commission, to go to the neighborhoods, communities, cities, states, countries and the world with the Good News of Jesus Christ.”

This mission statement is only partially met by the Christian Adult Community Day Program program, however, since participants, for the most part, are already part of the “community of saints.” In fact, the explicitly religious orientation of the program is one of the major factors attracting seniors to participation. In this respect, the program also meets the seventh statement “to preach the Gospel, teach the Bible, [and to] create community among the saints and to show compassion to the needy.”⁹ This mission is stated explicitly inside the program’s brochure as the first goal of the program: “to promote a sense of belonging, purpose, dignity and connection of older members of our community who have felt disconnected, isolated or alone in their senior years.

Program staff emphasized this aspect of the program’s impact on the lives of participants in conversations with me. They explained that many seniors live alone in large homes, being largely neglected or even abused (emotionally, verbally, or physically) by their children.

The Christian Adult Community Day Program ministry serves to fulfill another of the church’s stated missions. The eighth objective of the church’s mission statement is “to use every resource at our disposal; to transform people’s lives through authentic Christian Ministry.” These kinds of transformation stories abounded. While I was participating in the program, one senior became engaged to a man at the Baptist church where she is a member. This news was exciting to all who heard it. Her companions in the program made an announcement to the group at large, at which time she received enthusiastic applause.

In sum, Christian Adult Community Day Program is a true ministry, fulfilling many of the church’s missions.

Ministry- Program Content

The structure and content of The Christian Adult Community Day Program is clearly tied to the church’s notion and goal of ministry. Inside the program brochure, under the heading “Mission” is the following statement:

The Christian Adult Community Day Program is a community outreach program designed to promote the social, physical, spiritual and emotional well being of our Seniors throughout the city of Philadelphia. The Christian Adult Community Day Program is a well-rounded program of social, recreational and educational activities.

The notion of ministry as meeting the needs of the whole person is clearly inscribed in the goals outlined in this document. Similarly, this notion of ministry shapes the formalized structure and content of The Christian Adult Community Day Program.

The Christian Adult Community Day Program operates three days a week: Monday, Wednesday and Friday. Each day is structured similarly, with a continental breakfast in the morning and a hot lunch served at mid-day. Seniors begin arriving at around 10:00 a.m. and van drivers return to pick them up at around 2:00 p.m. Each day of the week is devoted to meeting a particular aspect of the program’s goals: Mondays to bible study; Wednesdays to Arts & Crafts, music and exercise videos, and Fridays to “walking club,” bowling and special

⁹ see mission statement, attached.

outings.

- “Promoting spiritual well-being”: e.g. bible studies on Mondays (“Monday School”)
- “Promoting physical well being”: e.g. exercise videos, walking club, “Health Matters” sessions
- “Promoting emotional well being” (and outward ministry):

Program staff are proud to note the impact that The Christian Adult Community Day Program has on the emotional well being of seniors. When talking to me of the program’s importance for seniors, staff members shared anecdotes of seniors whose lives had been transformed by their regular attendance. On my first visit to the program, the program coordinator told me that before coming to The Christian Adult Community Day Program “some of our seniors were contemplating suicide . . . most of them live alone . . . their kids are off and rarely come to take care of them.”¹⁰ The director then chimed in:

This program really turns around their lives. They tell us how excited they get waiting for the next day to come here. They get involved in friendships here and really come alive.¹¹

Simply by attending regularly, becoming part of a community, and forming social ties with people of their age group, many seniors are able to rise out of isolation and depression gaining, as Winifred Morris put it, “a new lease on life.”¹²

- Foster pride in African-American identity. (E.g. wall posters of famous and influential African-American historical figures; game: “Famous African American Jingo.”)

- “Expanding horizons”. (E.g. outings and special trips to area museums cultural events; annual extended retreat to a center in Connecticut; Arts & Crafts period on Wednesdays to foster creative talents; opportunities to develop talents and display/perform)

6. What is the relationship between the organization, the faith community, and those served who are not part of the same religion? Does the work of the organization lead new people to the faith community? Under what terms? How does the organization ensure that the beliefs and rights of program participants from different faith traditions or those who adhere to no religion are respected?

Less than half of the participants in The Christian Adult Community Day Program are members of the church. Though I never once saw any staff member explicitly promote or try to persuade one of the seniors to join the church, there is a subtle, yet powerful pull toward church membership that comes simply through participation in the program. The Christian Adult Community Day Program’s explicit mission, however, did not involve actively seeking the membership of participants. When this occurred it was seen as welcome and understandable, and an occasion for celebration, but was not an active objective of the program.

A few members of The Christian Adult Community Day Program are recently joined members of the church who learned of the program after they entered into its founding religious community. Several others have joined the Church since they began attending The Christian Adult Community Day Program, and as a result of their participation in the program. It was my feeling that the close ties of The Christian Adult Community Day Program to The church lead participants to feel a subtle compulsion towards church membership. This became clear in my interviews and conversations with seniors. When I asked seniors if they were members of The Church, most non-members responded by providing justification for their membership in another church.

One woman, for instance, told me that although she comes to the Church to worship so often that she no longer feels like a visitor, she does not feel she can join: “I just don’t feel comfortable with it . . . I have too many ties, you know, with my other church. I still go there. That’s my home.”¹³ Another participant explained that she was

¹⁰ notes, 10/13/04

¹¹ *ibid.*

¹² Interview, Mother Morris 12/15/04

¹³ Interview, Margaret Worthy, 10/22/04

a member of a Baptist church but then immediately told me that, though she would like to join the Church, she can't. She said, "You know, I just *can't* leave my pastor there. I *love* my pastor, that's why I haven't left to join Mt. Airy."¹⁴ As if to justify herself further, she then narrated a long story about suffering a hit and run accident and lying in the hospital in a coma for five days. Her daughter called their pastor and they both came in to the hospital to pray. "They prayed for me, and the Lord listened, and I woke up! So, you know, I *can't* leave that church."¹⁵

The fact that seniors repeatedly offered up such unsolicited accounts to justify their membership at another church, strongly suggests that there is an underlying draw or pressure to join the Church that comes from program participation. This is not a maliciously seductive force, but one that arises naturally from the tight integration of church event in The Christian Adult Community Day Program activities. Because informal conversations during meals often included references to phrases or messages from Sunday or Wednesday night worship services, church membership leads to an enhanced feeling of community or belonging. My participation in worship services even led me to experience a feeling of in-group belonging when I was able to pick up on references to worship content, acknowledge my awareness of the reference, and contribute to the "church gossip."

Added to this element of worship context awareness in social interactions, the ethic of reciprocity, discussed above, also contributes to a feeling of compulsion to join the church. Since the program members receive everything at The Christian Adult Community Day Program free of charge, this may lead some to feel a sense of indebtedness to the Church's faith community.

7. Under what conditions do faith-based organizations move beyond the ethos and control of the denomination, and what connection, if any, does the religious body have with an organization when this occurs?

[This question cannot be addressed based on the current research]

8. Do different faith traditions work toward distinctive goals (personal transformation or social change, for example)?

Mission Statement

[from website at <http://www.mtairycojic.com/html/MissionStatement.htm>]

- To know Him and make Him known.
- To reach the lost at any cost.
- To save the unsaved, through faith in Jesus Christ and to support those who are saved.
- To worship our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.
- To love God by loving His people.
- To exalt, edify, equip and evangelize.
- To preach the Gospel, teach the Bible, create community among the saints and to show compassion to the needy. The fulfillment of Luke 4:18.

¹⁴ Transcript, Christmas dinner, 12/18/04

¹⁵ *ibid.*

- To use every resource at our disposal; to transform people's lives through authentic Christian Ministry.
- To carry out the Great Commission, to go to the neighborhoods, communities, cities, states, countries and the world with the Good News of Jesus Christ.
- To live out the Great Commandment, "Love One Another."
- To pursue the Great Commander, Jesus Christ, our Lord.

10. Lakeside

a. How do the dynamics between organization and founding community impact on the beliefs, behaviors, and resources of both organization and community? Do relationships between organization and community foster social capital, cultural capital and civic engagement in the founding community?

Lakeside is a Quaker continuing care facility located outside of Philadelphia. Lakeside consists of a residential community of nearly 400 older adults, with an average age of 80. Residents live either in independent apartments, assisted living, or skilled care (nursing home). The Lakeside campus is self-sufficient, with dining facilities, a fitness center and pool, a hairdresser, library, pharmacy, bank, and mailroom. Employees do not live on site. Lakeside currently has a very strong reputation, and is considered to be a leader in the industry.

Members of the Quaker Meeting that founded Lakeside in 1967 deliberated for a decade before deciding to use the land that had been donated to create a pioneering living facility for seniors. It was the first retirement community of its kind. Lakeside's direct mission statement, core philosophy, and initial sense of community came directly out of the core values of the Quaker Meeting members at the time, many of whom were the first residents of Lakeside. Now, nearly 40 years later, those values have been maintained through a careful process of institutionalization of formal processes and informal norms. (See Sub-question 4 for more detail on these processes.)

Lakeside maintains close ties with Quakerism. The Board is mandated in its by-laws to have 75% of its members from the faith tradition. There are few Quakers on staff, although the Executive Director and Director of Nursing are. About one third of residents are Quaker, followed by Jews and Episcopalians who each represent one fifth of the residents. The residential population is almost exclusively white and affluent.

There is a high degree of congruence between how Quaker beliefs and values were discussed Quakers and non-Quakers. Through literature, training and every day interaction, a consistent set of values could be identified as Quaker: tolerance (non-proselytizing), respect for all, equality/non-hierarchical, consensual decision-making, committed to peace (including racial justice), non-violence, savvy financial management, and simplicity. There was some ambiguity among the Quakers whether they were "Christian." Those of the Christian (and other faiths) felt welcome, although they did not consider Quakerism to be a branch of Christianity. Because a major commitment of the religion is tolerance for all, the Quaker ethos was easily accommodated by non-Quakers who in no detectable way expressed a feeling of coercion.

For such a large faith-based organization, there was a surprising level of the tradition-specific ethos in the community culture. Quaker values are transmitted intentionally as well as unconsciously. (See sub-question 4 for more detail on the institutionalization and transmission of Quaker values.)

- The 25% of Board members who are not Quaker receive training in Quaker values. Decision-making is by consensus and values of tolerance, dignity, and independence are on the forefront of policy-making.
- Staff members are recruited and hired according to their compatibility with Quaker values. They go through a formal orientation process at a retreat center. They are trained in treating residents according to Quaker values, maintaining their dignity and independence. Further,

hierarchies are minimal; staff are given opportunities for continuing education and lateral mobility.

- Residents are also screened for compatibility to Quaker values. Through orientation by staff and enculturation by other residents they learn the version of Quakerism lived out at Lakeside. Further, religious services (“meeting for worship”) are held twice a week. There is also a close relationship with the Lower Gwynnedd Meeting, including memorial services of residents who die.
- The physical space and facilities carry Quaker values as well in creating a peaceful, natural and well-maintained environment. All residents are expected to maintain the Quaker tradition of not displaying religious and political signage or symbols. Therefore holiday decorations are limited to natural wreaths, for example.

Lakeside is not-for-profit. It has an endowment, and receives money through residents paying for services. It does not receive public funding, nor does it apply to private foundations for grants. Therefore it is not required to comply with government regulations and is not dependent on foundation mandates in influencing its operations. On the other hand, in order to attract paying residents, it needs to remain competitive within the broader market of continuing care facilities.

There seem to be few organizational links between Lakeside residents and the broader Quaker community. Those links that exist are there on an individual level. There are social capital networks between Lakeside employees and professional organizations of Quaker continuing care facilities. Further research within the Quaker community as a whole would be needed to identify whether the existence of Quaker retirement facilities has an impact on social or cultural capital or civic engagement within the Quaker community.

b. What is the relationship between non-profit organizations and the people that use their services? How does this differ between faith-based and secular organizations? How do these relationships differ when the people served either come from the same community as the organization or from a different background?

There is a close relationship between the residents at Lakeside and the staff. This is largely because the employees work in the residents’ homes, so there is little room for separation. Non-Quaker residents hesitated to characterize Lakeside as a “faith-based organization”, suggesting instead that while the values that made Lakeside unique may be called “Quaker” by some, they are also consistent with many other faith and secular traditions. Their close loyalty to Lakeside and the Lakeside employees was a function of shared values, not of identification with a faith tradition.

Many staff members positioned Lakeside as distinct from for-profit environments in which they had worked. They suggest that the key difference is that at Lakeside, it is all about community and the residents, not “all about the money.” The majority of the non-Quaker staff in fact characterized Lakeside as a “non-profit” rather than as a “faith-based organization”, suggesting that the humanistic bottom line was more important to them than the explicit faith values. More research is needed to see how a non-profit, secular, good-reputation continuing care facility differs, to help flesh out how Quakerism in particular is different from other approaches that deviate from capitalist, money-making bottom line.

If the Lakeside community was entirely Quaker, I hypothesize that there would be more explicit identification of the values as “Quaker” rather than as humanistic or “best practice” for community living (as people currently identify them).

c. What is the impact of founding community culture and social capital systems on non-profit mission, organizational structure, staffing, and program design?

Quaker values permeate all aspects of the organization, as mentioned previously. For example, the organizational structure is deliberately flat, as a reflection of Quaker emphasis on non-hierarchy. Hiring and firing policies, as well as employee training and development, reflect Quaker values, as discussed more below. The Quaker practice of consensus-based decision-making is institutionalized in the Board of Directors’ by-laws, and in senior staff norms. Quaker values also shape the philosophy of the health care delivery at Lakeside, as well as the community norms and expectations among residents.

Please see the discussion under sub-question 4 below, where I provide examples of the ways Quaker values have been taken up in formal policies and informal norms, as well as how they are transmitted over time.

d. What is the impact of the larger socio-economic and policy system, as well as the service sector of that organization (social services, health and senior services, community development) on non-profit organizations form, function and resources?

Existing market forces within the continuing care facilities sector largely impacts Lakeside. When Lakeside was founded, it was the first continuing care facility in the area. Over time, this market has become increasingly crowded, and therefore increasingly competitive. Lakeside's revenue stream is entirely from residents' fees; therefore, to stay afloat, Lakeside must attract new residents. This impacts operational decisions that are made to attract new residents, including the upgrading or construction of new facilities, changing of meal plans, and provision of additional amenities that are seen as "standard" elsewhere in the market. Some of these decisions, however, are seen by residents or employees as conflicting with a core Quaker value of "simplicity".

This came through most clearly in dynamics around the current construction project. For all its Quaker emphasis on simplicity and community and non-hierarchy, Lakeside is now building a new set of large homes, which, residents point out to me, have their own living rooms, basements, and garages, and as such are seen as decidedly fancier and wealthier than the current living accommodations. Some residents express concern that this will change the dynamics around hierarchy, wealth, and simplicity, while Lakeside staff contends that they are merely responding to the demands of the market in order to stay afloat, and providing what new residents seek.

Overall, Lakeside sees much of their competitive advantage as being their community culture, the ways that Quaker values are embodied. Therefore in order to remain attractive to current and new residents, staff and residents continue to emphasize and maintain the lived practices of their core values.

Sub-questions:

1. What is the relationship between the religious denomination and the non-profit organizations founded by that organization? (Governance, financial, control, volunteer participation, staffing, program content, mission). What role does social and cultural capital play in those relationships?

Lakeside was built on land adjacent to and donated by a Friends Meeting. Members of the Meeting deliberated for nearly two decades before deciding to use the land to build Lakeside. It remains affiliated with Religious Society of Friends. The Board is 75% Quaker as mandated in its bylaws. The founding Meetinghouse, while located next door, is not officially involved in any of the operations or oversight of Lakeside, except through those individuals who are on the board—but those individuals are Board Members in their own capacity, not as representatives of the Meeting House. The residents are currently approximately 30% Quaker, though that is not mandated anywhere. Lakeside is an equal opportunity employer, and few staff are Quaker. At present, the CEO who has been there for 19 years is Quaker, though that is not required. The content and mission of the organization reflect core Quaker values.

There is a Sunday morning ("First Day") meeting held weekly as well as a mid-week service. There is openness to non-Quakers attending these meetings. Many Quakers, on the other hand, attend their local Meeting instead. No other religious services are held with such frequency on campus.

The Quaker community provides the social capital through which Lakeside finds new Board members. As well, residents tap into their own social capital networks to attract new residents—the vast majority of new residents knew someone at Lakeside already—though only a portion of those are Quaker.

2. How does the personal religious faith of key staff reflect that of the sponsoring community and influence organizational behavior?

The current CEO is Quaker. Residents and staff all noted that his leadership and communication style are critical to the culture of the organization, and provide important modeling for the tone of the community. He suggests that while he is motivated by his Quaker beliefs, he is also following a leadership style that works for

him but which could change without impacting the organization. That is, if he is replaced by someone who is not Quaker, and who, for example, does not keep an “open door” policy, that will not necessarily dilute the community-based culture of the organization. The current head of nursing is also Quaker. She reports that her Quaker values impact how she interacts with, trains, and evaluates staff, as well as how she interacts with residents. Overall, the senior staff are all very conversant in the core Quaker values, whether or not they are practicing Quakers, and weave these into official and unofficial policies in a variety of ways, as discussed below, particularly around: on what criteria employees are hired; how employee performance issues are handled; how job advancement is created in a lateral organization; and how values are modeled. Those employees who are not Quaker indicated that most Quaker values are very consistent with their own religious values, and therefore they felt no tension.

More detail on these issues is included below under sub-question 4, where I discuss how the values have been formalized in the organization such that they will continue into the future,

3. How do congregations and their members relate to faith-based organizations that function under their name, and vice versa? Does social and cultural capital influence interactions between congregations and organizations?

There are three particularly strong links between Lakeside and the Religious Society of Friends. First, this is within the Board, in the active recruitment of Board members from neighboring Quaker Meetings. Second, this is through the assistance funds that help Friends move to Lakeside. Third, this is through the mission of Lakeside, which came out of the local Meeting in the initial development of Lakeside. There is little overlap in the rest of staffing.

Lakeside staff does participate in professionalization networks that are Quaker, which link Lakeside with other Quaker continuing care facilities. This certainly strengthens social capital, by providing a network of people in similar occupations who are also guided by similar values.

4. How do faith communities assure that the faith-based organizations have a future as faith-based institutions? That their founding values and perspectives are maintained?

Lakeside has extensive formal and informal processes to create and maintain their unique culture. This includes formal processes, such as staff trainings and recruitment policies, as well as informal norms of conduct. In addition they have formalized aspects of their by-laws—such as composition of the Board and decision-making processes—that ensure Quaker values are front and center. Overall, they ensure that residents, employees and board members learn and maintain the core values of the organizational culture, as follows:

Recruiting residents:

- Potential residents read literature on Lakeside that explains the core Quaker values. They also do a pre-admission screening, which involves talking with residents and staff. Those who are unlikely to fit in tend to “opt out”, resulting in a self-selection of people whose values are concordant with Lakeside values.
- Potential residents also must have an interview with the social worker, who gauges whether they are likely to be a good fit. If not, they are not invited to join (though this rarely occurs).
- Residents are required to pass a medical exam that indicates that they are fit to live independently for at least a year. This ensures a critical mass of “independence” on campus, seen as one of the core values.
- There are two financial assistance funds that help ensure there are a critical mass of active Quakers at Lakeside.

Enculturating new residents:

- New residents are assigned a “sponsor” to help them get adjusted. They also join Resident Committees, to get to know people, and to participate in some of the activities that embody core values (volunteerism, mutual support, etc.)

- New residents are given a handbook in which many of the community norms and values are explicitly described.

Maintaining culture among residents

- There are Quaker meetings on site, which both Quakers and non-Quakers attend.
- The philosophy of the health care system at Lakeside is explicitly built around Quaker values, particularly respecting the individual's right to independence and choice around their own care plan, respect for human dignity, and clear channels of communication.
- Residents moderate each other's behavior.
 - They come up with their own rules about parking infractions.
 - They reign in people who are seen as excessively partisan in positions intended to be neutral.
- Residents bring about change in the community—modeling proactiveness, independence, and equality with the staff.
 - Lobbying for a swimming pool.
 - Lobbying to have the chairs recovered instead of replaced because it was cheaper.

Maintaining culture among employees

- The administration's hiring philosophy, on top of evaluating task-specific skills, screens primarily for values linked to Quakerism, including a willingness to be a "team player" (which involves communication, equality, and respect), as well as a facility and comfort interacting with residents.
- Senior administrators help employees with job development. Particularly since Lakeside is a relatively flat organization, which therefore offers minimal room for advancement over the course of a career (and most employees stay for many years, often several decades), senior administrators have created paths through which employees can move laterally through the organization. The administration has also proven their willingness to elevate people to the few senior-level administrative positions that exist, through unconventional job paths.
 - For example, the current receptionist began as a dietary aid, working in the nursing home.
 - The CEO's executive secretary previously worked in health services and human resources.
 - The current head of admissions, for example, was so eager to work at Lakeside (based on time spent there as a volunteer, and based on his wife's experience as a nurse there) that when an opening came in the maintenance department, he took it. Years later when the post of Director of Admissions opened, which suited his background, it was offered to him.
- Employees attend an orientation held by Human Resources about the Lakeside mission and Quaker values. This is a space to explicitly formalize how the organization sees itself as Quaker, and how employees can enact that in their work.
- Some employees also attend a separate all-day orientation session on Quakerism, sponsored twice a year by the Friends Services for the Aging. It is held at Pendle Hill, a Quaker meditation center in Media.
- Values are transmitted through modeling, where people lead by example. This appears to be a significant way that the tone is set, and people learn quickly to emulate the behaviors of others around them. Employees described this as consistent throughout the organization, citing the Board (in how they make decisions through consensus, and support the staff in their work), how the CEO models these behaviors, how the supervisors model for their employees.
 - In the health care facility, both the nurses and the aides provide care together, rather than splitting it into two hierarchical levels. This helps set the tone of a level playing field in which all jobs are important.
 - People described how the CEO walked around the Skilled Care facility with a tool belt hanging pictures and carrying furniture shortly before it was opened, and that on snowy days, if others have trouble getting to work, he'll go in and start the toast in the coffee shop. This sets a

standard that there are not territorial lines around particular tasks, and no job is beneath anyone. This is linked to an openness in communication, in which people feel comfortable sharing information. This was explicitly linked to Quaker values of truth telling and transparency.

- Quaker values are transmitted in how performance problems are dealt with. The Quaker philosophy of seeing God's light in everyone leads to a practice of working long and hard with each individual to address performance problems. Employees are only let go as a last resort, after a long process of repeated attempts to change.

Institutionalization of leadership style among CEO the Board.

- The current CEO holds regular "town meetings" with the residents to allow for open communication and discussion. He emphasizes that all decisions ultimately come down to what is best for the community as a whole. He suggests that these values run deeper than his particular leadership style. He indicated that a new CEO who replaced him could change aspects of personal style while still maintaining the emphasis on community, open communication, equality, etc., and that in the event that he/she did not do so, the Board would intervene to adjust it.
- The Board is 75% Quaker, as mandated in its by-laws. It makes all decision through consensus, not voting. There was an ongoing debate to remove the word "vote" from the bylaws as part of an effort to ensure this process would not change. All Board Members are seen as acting as individuals, not representing constituencies.
- Board members who are not Quaker have the opportunity to attend a session on Quaker values and decision-making.

The physical environment conveys Quaker values.

- The facility attempts to convey warmth, simplicity, and inclusion through its architecture and decoration.
- Equality and inclusion are modeled through the mixing of homes of different sizes (so that there is not a "gold coast").
- The assisted living and skilled care facilities are in the center of campus, so that those residents are seen as included, not "shunted off".

How decisions are made and conflict is handled.

- The way in which decisions are made at Lakeside—collectively, with input from everyone—is an important means for transmitting values of Quakerism.
 - This team-approach influences decisions around when individuals move from their apartments to Assisted Living. Residents are involved, as well as care givers. This is a means of allowing residents to retain control over their own lives, while also valuing the expertise of the staff.
- But the focus on getting input and consensus-based decision making should not be confused with decisions being democratic. While the organization is relatively flat, and people's opinions are valued, at the end of the day, there are systems in place for who can make decisions. Among those decision-making groups—for example, the Board, or a group of department heads—there must be consensus, but that consensus does not extend across the community.
- The example of the way this conflict over growth is playing out at Lakeside suggests to me that the Quaker values are predominant, and will be maintained, for a number of reasons. The decision around growth was made in a careful, consensus-based way at the Board level, which even the most opposed residents recognize (that is, they respect the process even as they disagree with the outcome). The reasons for the decision have been communicated clearly, in Town Meetings and memos and discussions, and residents appear to be aware and respect those decisions, even as many are nervous about the implications. As well, the fact that residents are wary of culture shifts due to the influx of new residents suggests they will not be caught off guard if this occurs, but that they can choose proactively to address issues as they come up. Employees and residents also noted that there were concerns

around earlier construction projects several years ago, but now they are seen as welcome additions to the community. They anticipate this same trend will likely occur.

Challenges to maintaining culture in the future:

- **Mission versus market:** As the market for continuing care facilities becomes more competitive, can Lakeside stay financially viable without giving in on its core values, particularly of simplicity? Is there a conflict between the Quaker mission/values and forces of the capitalist market?
- **Diversity:** Lakeside values diversity among their residents and staff, along lines of economic status, religion, race, and educational background. However what are the ways the community culture will be influenced, as there are increasing numbers of people, and perhaps increasing difference among those members? How and when does diversity challenge the faith-based identity? How might this lead to new or different boundary setting around what the Lakeside community means, or what it means to be a Quaker community?

There is a balance between the impact of individuals on the Quakerness of Lakeside, versus the degree to which it is institutionalized. Some of the actual individuals in the community make a significant contribution to the Quaker quality of Lakeside. The last of the “pioneering residents” (original residents when Lakeside opened) have passed away, but there are still people who were part of the Meeting when the land was donated. So as decades pass and those people pass, there will no longer be individuals with lived memory of the “origin myth” of Lakeside in the same way. Similarly, people talked about the importance of specific individuals, particularly the CEO, in shaping the culture of the organization. At the level of staff, that is a significant issue as well in terms of turnover. If in a period of five years Lakeside were to simultaneously lose 80% of its senior staff, then that would open up the chance for a lot of change. It appears that changes in significant personnel are staggered, happening slowly and not all simultaneously among the senior staff team, so there appears to be enough overlap for people to model behaviors and maintain consistency.

At the same time, there are clearly structures in place that institutionalize these aspects of Quaker philosophy. The CEO and Board have paid careful attention to secession planning and by-laws. Basically, it appears that because there are a wide range of formal and informal ways that the Quaker culture is maintained, at the level of management philosophy, expectations, and community norms, shifting particular individuals will not necessarily unravel the established culture. At the same time, maintaining the current cultural norms will require that these new individuals learn and reproduce those same patterns among themselves and the next generation. While I do not think the Quakerness will disappear at the CEO’s retirement, I believe it requires active attention throughout the community for it to remain in place.

5. What is the impact on the faith community of their organization’s work? On its understandings of the issues the organizations address? On its understandings of those the organizations serve? On its understandings of their faith? On its sense of identity?

Additional research within the Quaker community outside of Lakeside will be necessary to answer this question.

6. What is the relationship between the organization, the faith community, and those served who are not part of the same religion? Does the work of the organization lead new people to the faith community? Under what terms? How does the organization ensure that the beliefs and rights of program participants from different faith traditions or those who adhere to no religion are respected?

Quakerism does not emphasize proselytizing or conversion. No one mentioned concerns about trying to be converted, and in fact residents emphasized that they did not feel pressured to practice a faith. This is codified in a section in the Lakeside Resident Guidebook that reads: “Solicitations of opinion which bring any kind of political or religious pressure to bear upon residents of Lakeside are contrary to the spirit of this place.” The values of tolerance and diversity and respect for the individual seem to ensure an open and accepting climate is in place. The non-Quaker staff and residents seem quite comfortable with the atmosphere at Lakeside. They suggest that the core values embodied in the mission and culture of the community are consistent with their own values, both religious and secular. Many employees and residents suggest being increasingly attracted to the Quaker values and beliefs as they learn more about them during their time at Lakeside, though none described

having “converted.”

7. Under what conditions do faith-based organizations move beyond the ethos and control of the denomination, and what connection, if any, does the religious body have with an organization when this occurs?

The Board and CEO make operational decisions in the best interest of Lakeside as an organization and community. Given their need to be attentive to market forces, some could interpret their decisions as moving beyond the scope of particular Quaker values. Since Lakeside is not under the direct oversight of a particular Quaker Meeting, though, it is up to the discretion of the individual Board Members and the leadership to make their own decisions. More research would be needed to address this question in more detail.

8. Do different faith traditions work toward distinctive goals (personal transformation or social change, for example)?

Further research is needed to address this question.

11. Joy Ministries

Primary Research Questions

a. How do the dynamics between organization and founding community impact on the beliefs, behaviors, and resources of both organization and community? Do relationships between organization and community foster social capital, cultural capital and civic engagement in the founding community?

Denomination (UMC)

The district supervisor (DS) and district play an important if removed role in the success of the program: The DS appoints and re-appoints pastors to the congregation and approves requests for money from the next tier of the denomination. Having a good relationship with one’s DS makes it possible for the DS to support a congregation’s requests and pass along supportive information about in-kind support and other sources of funding that arise. The Eastern Pennsylvania Conference and Annual Conference have local funds to support programs for youth and young adults. The Cluster has received \$5,000 from the Annual Conference for a Congregational Transformation grant and \$5,000 for an Urban Ministry Grant.

Other connections between the denomination and Joy Ministries are minor. When drawing up its policy manual, Joy Ministries used a policy manual developed by the denomination on which to model and modify their own policies. The denomination was investigated as an umbrella source of health insurance but this has not yet occurred. A more significant source of support was the Eastern Pennsylvania Conference’s provision of new boilers for three Cluster congregations during the winter of 2004. One other type of support will be mentioned later. The Cluster used a consultant for the youth program who was also an important figure in the district. This consultant was paid less than her market price as a result of her connection to the program through the district.

In response to Research Question 3, I will look at the role of the congregation members in the program. In response to Research Question 7, I look at how the Cluster program was networked to other community partners.

b. What is the relationship between non-profit organizations and the people that use their services? How does this differ between faith based and secular organizations? How do these relationships differ when the people served come either from the same community as the organization or from a different background?

The lead Pastor’s influence on spearheading and implementing the program, as well as the “character” of the program is notable: Jones’ philosophy of ministry and of social outreach includes “prophetic social action” over against what she termed “reactionary or needs-based ministry.” Thus, the programs she leads are committed to individual and community development and engage the faith community in addressing structures in the community and city, not merely “relief” type ministries.

Most Joy Ministries staff are members of the eight black United Methodist churches and thus share very similar religious and cultural heritage. A handful of the key staff were *not* members of an Joy Ministries congregation (less than one-quarter). In the past several years, a few of the staff who were not members of a Cluster church have actually joined the church UMC. Given that so many staff of the youth program were members of a congregation, and understood they worked for a faith-based endeavor, or were members of the same congregations, I make the observation that “church” relationships permeated the way that staff related to one another and performed their jobs. Staff also felt that their jobs were as much or more of a “ministry” than just a job.

Despite the fact that many of the staff and volunteers are motivated for religious reasons to work with the program, the program is also clear that they are providing a contracted service that is not “religious” in nature. During an organizational meeting in late July of 2003, the Project Director made it clear that the Cluster is “doing a job”. The program blended its identity as both a ministry as well as a contracted service which had to meet contract specifications such as clearly defined job responsibilities.

The program was committed to creating an atmosphere of trust and safety. Without exception, youth who were interviewed said they felt they could trust the staff. The social values of trust and respect were created in part through the caring attitudes and commitment of staff: Staff’s prayers, frequently given hugs, bus fare, lunch money, umbrella’s, and calls and visits to students’ homes spoke volumes that the youth program was motivated by genuine compassion as well as educational goals. In a Joy Ministries Cluster meeting in January, 2004, staff member opened the meeting with a short devotional on the importance of never losing compassion as they serve, no matter how frustrating the task or how unlovable a person may be at that moment. Along with high occurrences of individualized attention for students, staff and Peer Counselors modeled healthy conflict resolution options and encouraged the use of these options among students and Teen Lounge youth.

In interviews with youth, some recalled seeing or hearing the staff pray, but not all. There was a period during the fall of 2003 when staff were encouraged to pray together in the building before the start of the “school” day. For unknown reasons, this practice lasted just a few weeks and was not re-started during the year that I observed the program. On the other hand, several staff remarked to me that they pray for all the students. Several staff (including teachers) mentioned that they not only prayed for individual students, but prayed for such qualities as wisdom, insight, and patience in carrying out their jobs.

The Pastor feels that the faith of key staff has affected organizational behavior. She feels that if the staff were not so serious about their faith that the project would not still be happening at the Cluster level. In particular, Jones felt that the staff’s level of faith helps them to get along and to resolve conflict over management issues. Jones also felt that staff’s belief in students comes from their strong personal faith. Similarly, Jones feels that staff rely on their faith to provide them with insight and patience on how to deal with different youth and with situations that arise during day to day running of the program. Jones recalled when she overrode another staff person’s decision about how to handle a situation with a youth, and the though the other staff person disagreed with Donna’s decision, the person merely said in a meeting, “I’ll pray about it.” Jones attributed this response to a mature level of faith and the common faith that the staff has that God will guide all of them in such decisions.

On the other hand, a value that arises from the staff’s faith tradition is that of valuing “people over paperwork.” That is, it may be that the “faith-based” culture of the program inadvertently contributed to a work place ethic that was less formal. However, late or not fully completely record-keeping and timeliness has been an issue that the Cluster addressed. Slack expectations about work habits and such work ethics as being on time, being in the office unless an official vacation has been scheduled, and doing paperwork in a thorough and timely manner seemed to be related to the program’s focus on providing such friendly and personalized service. While the Pastor feels that they as a staff value the personalized and caring emphasis of staff, they have had to take measures to encourage the staff to take work expectations more seriously. One of the tactics the Cluster used was to hire an outside consultant to emphasize work expectations. This consultant happened to fulfill another esteemed position in the denomination, as conference lay leader. The conference lay leader is an office which provides balance to the bishop, and who represents the lay people of the conference to the Bishop. As such, the consultant was taken seriously and was able to reinforce expectations that other Cluster leaders were not. The Cluster project has also been assigned a monitor from the Department of Human Services and that has helped to put more clear expectations for paperwork in place.

c. What is the impact of founding community culture and social capital systems on non-profit mission, organizational structure, staffing, and program design?

As mentioned, most of the staff in the program (over two-thirds total) were also members of a cluster congregation. Other unpaid staff included the pastors of three churches. The program communicated its successes and needs to the congregations in the cluster via a newsletter and through the pastors and members during regular morning worship and cluster wide religious events.

Another important aspect of social and cultural capital were the proportions of church members who lived within one mile of the church properties. In the eight churches that made up Joy Ministries, 75 to 99 percent of their members resided within a one mile radius. Often, these were the same neighborhoods where youth in the program lived. Such ties add to a youth's sense of continuity, caring, and accountability in their neighborhood. This is an important aspect for conceptualizing the available social capital (both bridging and closed) that the Cluster congregations brought to the program. The volunteers and staff who provided services were familiar both with the barriers and context that neighborhood youth faced, as well as the community services and resources at hand. Cluster pastors and staff have been public school teachers, police officers, employees of welfare agencies, office managers, and corporate sales representatives.

I present here a few examples of direct, "non-programmatic" contact between congregation members and youth or youth's families who became associated because of the youth program program:

- Several relatives of Teen Lounge and youth program youth came at least once to Sunday worship at a congregation;
- One youth's father and younger brother showed up at Sunday worship at Zoar UMC;
- A youth who lived at the Residential placement was recognized by his grandfather who came to the church to apply for the maintenance position. He hadn't seen his grandson since he was a baby;
- The family of another youth who attended class at Mt. Zion used to come regularly to church and the teacher at this location thus had a prior relationship with the student and her family
- The women's craft group at Mt. Zion, (the Crafty Ladies) which consisted of a highly active group of older women, used the basement of Mt Zion several days a week. They began to talk with and befriend youth in the program. Youth would make a point to go down to the craft room to visit with the women. The women brought in small gifts for youth, supplies such as books, pencils and notepads, and began contributing materially to the program by providing lunch or snacks for the youth.
- A number of youth program youth attended one or more retreats that Cluster youth sponsored;
- Some youth program youth used the Teen Lounges that were operated at Cluster churches; or attended the weekly youth Bible Study or youth worship nights at the church.
- The Executive Director reminded youth to take off their hats in the building, and reprimanding anyone she overheard use swear words, "Excuse me?" (B. H., personal communication, January 28, 2004).
- In a heavy rain storm, staff provided umbrellas and rides home for students and students invariably asked for and received money for lunch or tokens for the bus.
- During a monthly Cluster meeting, when one student's need for a place to stay was raised, the pastor of Zoar UMC was quick to offer an extra bedroom to any youth who needed it (A. A., personal communication, January 9, 2004).
- Lead pastor Jones housed one to two of the youth in the program and for one of the youth, began the process of officially adopting the teen.

- A neighbor of the church UMC who was not a member donated hotdogs and hamburgers from a meat outlet store.
- Several times, congregation members cooked special meals for the youth program youth and staff.
- A few the church members made it a point to drop by the church during program hours and would assist on an as-need basis: some tutored a youth for a while in a particular subject, some provided snacks, some graded papers for the teacher

While direct contact between congregation members and youth in the program was limited, I believe congregation members were supportive of the program and began to consider the youth as part of their extended community via the churches. If the congregations and the programs were not located in the same neighborhoods where youth and their families resided, it is unlikely that these types of interactions would have occurred. Both the location and the reputation of Joy Ministries program seem to lend it a level of trust as well as accessibility, within the communities which surround the congregation buildings.

Despite the level of volunteer support, several staff of Joy Ministries program indicated the need for further volunteer support. A telling remark made by pastor Jones at a staff meeting was the need for volunteer “care teams” from congregation: [Jones] said, ‘We’re learning, “precious, sometimes disturbing” things about these youth,’ and “we don’t have enough arms to wrap around them.” She also said, “We can’t underestimate the impact we’re having.”

d. What is the impact of the larger socio-economic and policy system, as well as the service sector of that organization (social services, health and senior services, community development) on non-profit organizations form, function and resources?

Despite the fact that Joy Ministries is seeking a 501-c-3 for this program, the action as purely project-driven and not as expressing any intent to carry on Joy Ministries project indefinitely. There are no formal plans to provide a charter school or any more “institutionalized” form of the current program. Because of this limited very practical nature of the Cluster project, no energy or discussion has occurred around maintaining certain values or perspectives.

As of fall 2004, the Cluster had formed a board of directors and written their bylaws. At a Cluster meeting in January, 2004, seven of the eight pastors from the Cluster were present for the first time. The retiring United Methodist District Supervisor had been invited and talked about the seriousness of forming a board, and of following through, and of raising the standard for accounting and policy setting. This conversation and the actions of the Cluster indicate their seriousness about maintaining and developing the program.

Sub Questions

1. What is the relationship between the religious denomination and the non-profit organizations founded by that organization? (Governance, financial, control, volunteer participation, staffing, program content, mission). What role does social and cultural capital play in those relationships?

The fact that the staff share their religious and cultural heritage clearly influences the way the program is run (administration) and thus flavors the program (services). As noted, the majority of the staff are members of Cluster congregations – primarily because staff positions have been filled by word of mouth via current staff or congregation members rather than open searches. This unintentional hiring process ensures that most of the staff operate from similar theological backgrounds.

On the other hand, how the staff express their faith has become more implicit over time. That is, the use of religious language or the explicitness of the religious nature of the program has changed. The program handbook and orientation process make it very clear to youth that there are no mandatory religious components to the program. The handbook also stated that the program is faith-based, but the staff are consistent in defining “faith-based” as a program which respects all faiths not merely a Christo-centric program. This will be discussed further under Question 6. However, one part time instructor talked about the change in how explicit staff were to be in talking about matters of faith. The program, in his opinion, had become more sensitive about when and

how it was appropriate for staff to share their faith with clients.

Another example shows the concern of Joy Ministries staff to both hold on to their faith and religious beliefs, while remaining respectful of the religious rights of their clientele and not make anyone feel “pressured” to behave any differently just because the program is faith-based. The program welcomes youth who come from varied life experiences and may have engaged in behaviors that the adult church staff would find “immoral.” The staff discussed how to react with compassion and without judgment while at the same time to share good values and positive life choices with students. Clearly, staff’s values are influenced by their shared beliefs in being created with purpose, treating the body as a temple, not engaging in extra-marital sex, etc. But during a staff training, staff were reminded to always react with compassion and by listening rather than judging youth for their behaviors. It was clear that the staff were to react first as professionals, to refer students to appropriate people and courses of action and only informally as Christians, such as by offering to pray with a student.

Many African American youth are connected via family members to a local congregation but they themselves may attend infrequently. The lead Pastor suggested that if a family member dies, even though that person did not attend a congregation, through an immediate or extended relative or neighbor, the deceased’s family may be connected to a local congregation by association or by proxy. Staff and Cluster members gained a new appreciation of how important it is for worship to be relevant to younger people if they are to attract and sustain relationships with youth. Congregation members’ perceptions of youth changed in another way: after the program had been in place for over a year, some congregation members attended a “workshop” about the Cluster’s program and they reflected that their perceptions of youth had changed for the better. A few members said they used to be more afraid of teens or stereotyped all teens as “punks” but after meeting youth in the program, they realized that these adult-looking teens were just like their own grandchildren/nieces/nephews and needed positive attention from adults.

2. How does the personal religious faith of key staff reflect that of the sponsoring community and influence organizational behavior?

As noted, the lead congregation’s original program used to refer to itself as has moved as a “christ-centered” program (from their student handbook) and now presents itself more as a faith-centered program which is inclusive of and respectful of all faiths, even while not rejecting its Christian affiliation. The program did not have mandatory religious elements, and though many students did not perceive the program as explicitly religious, there was evidence of transactions which fit the definition of “spiritual capital” (See Appendix at end).

Interactions of prayer or discussion of scripture or moral issues occurred during class time or during program time but never as part of the formal curriculum. Of the 20 youth who were interviewed, only four youth described the program as explicitly “religious.” Comments about the program’s religiousness were most often related to the fact that staff were perceived as “Christians” or as religious. Youth who used the Teen Lounges were more likely to say that their personal religious beliefs or behavior were impacted than were youth who primarily used the education program.

Students were invited to religious programs that were offered by congregations (not by the program). A number of program youth attended a youth retreat that was clearly spiritual in intent, including a sermon/message about God’s love, worship songs, and prayer. Interviews with youth revealed ways in which some youth’s spirituality was impacted by coming to the Teen Lounges or by connecting to a congregation including: getting a new view of Christians; being in the church building and around the staff and thinking about God more often; attending a congregation. The reflections of these youth suggest that the context and community which were voluntarily available to them through Joy Ministries program influenced their personal religious experience and beliefs. These examples suggest that Joy Ministries program displayed “spiritual capital” during service provision.

Whether program staff intentionally “lead new people to the faith community” is more difficult to answer. Certainly, this section and previous ones indicate that staff and volunteers are aware that they are providing a service that was explicitly “faith-based” and yet they are sensitive to the religious freedoms of their clients and do not wish to be coercive in the way the service is provided. (In my opinion,) one of the most remarkable findings of this case study was the delicate balance which was maintained between the lawful and appropriate use of public funding, respect for the religious freedoms of participants, and voluntary access to spiritual capital within the program. Interviews with youth and observation confirmed that youth did not feel coerced or pressured in any way to attend or interact with religious elements or activities in the program (see Appendix A).

Several youth mentioned that all faith traditions were alluded to in a respectful manner. Youth were not overly conscious of religious items displayed in the buildings, nor did any youth indicate that their behaviors or attitudes were adversely affected by attending a program in a church building.

At that same time, youth who chose to access “spiritual” help or guidance could and did so, in the form of prayer; conversations or counsel with staff, Peer Counselors, or pastors about religious questions; or by attending a worship service, Bible study, or retreat sponsored by the Cluster or a congregation.

3. How do congregations and their members relate to faith-based organizations that function under their name, and vice versa? Does social and cultural capital influence interactions between congregations and organizations?

The Cluster was well connected within its denomination and in the wider Philadelphia community. The Cluster congregations have partnered with community organizations like Master Peace, North Philadelphia Youth Opportunity Centers, Freedom Theater, and the Neighborhood Action Bureau. Members of the congregations had professional and informal affiliations with public and private agencies that served youth and their families, such as: Philadelphia Citizens for Children and Youth (PCCY), Metropolitan Christian Council of Philadelphia (MCCP), The African American Interdenominational Ministries (AAIM), Methodist Services for Children and Families, the Eastern Methodist Conference, and private foundations. These institutions supported Joy Ministries program in various ways: PCCY provided grants to renovate and furnish two Teen Lounges and MCCP served as Joy Ministries program fiduciary.

The Joy Ministries collaborated in some way, with numerous local or city organizations. (This is conceptualized slightly differently than the Cluster’s access to marginalized populations via congregation members and location.) In addition to their connection to the regional Methodist denomination, the Cluster partnered with a local group home for teenaged boys and received referrals from the Philadelphia Department of Human Services. The program’s web of connectedness continued to grow from 2001 to 2004 in order to provide quality services to youth. The Joy Ministries program used its embeddedness in the local community to foster relationships with other agencies and programs which were interested in promoting youth development.

The Joy Ministries’ arrangement with their fiduciary is of interest. Through an existing professional relationship, the Cluster reached an agreement with the Metropolitan Christian Council of Philadelphia (MCCP) set up a unique non-profit 501(c)(3) or go through the denomination. The presence of a mission-sensitive but independent fiduciary ensured impartiality among the Cluster congregations and made the cluster more attractive to outside funders who preferred working with an established intermediary that had a financial management track record. The Joy Ministries’s partnership with fiduciary MCCP, afforded Joy Ministries an independent and trustworthy source of financial accounting, and MCCP took a smaller than normal percentage as a service fee. On occasion, MCCP floated cash to the program while it waited for its government funds to come in and offered resources, such as new books or certain types of equipment.

The program has a good relationship with the Director of Community-Based Prevention Services, who was pleased with the program’s attendance rate and success. The program staff consciously cultivated wider relationships in the community through The Neighborhood Action Bureau (NAB) meetings for local businesses and SHARE Prosperity meetings. Neighbors were concerned about the youth from the program smoking and hanging out, outside the building. Jones and another church member explained what the program was, and said that the youth were from North Philadelphia and gained support from neighbors.

4. How do faith communities assure that the faith-based organizations have a future as faith-based institutions? That their founding values and perspectives are maintained?

The United Methodists emphasize being “connectional:” congregations are encouraged to collaborate. At same time, they are dependent on a good relationship with district to retain the pastors in the Cluster over time, or conversely, to influence the district supervisor to move pastors who do not support the Cluster endeavors. Methodists also have a “both-and” heritage of not only providing the message of individual salvation and personal faith in a Savior, but also of ushering in the “new creation.” The lead pastor quoted the passage, “If anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation.” She used this quote to point out that the new creation is not just within individuals but the church is to foster this in the community and world as well.

Another distinctive here, as noted, is the heritage of the Black church and of Black United Methodists in addition to the UMC influence. Donna's observation was that White Methodists are often involved in advocacy for community initiatives but are less likely to create local grassroots programs. The Pastor remembered White Methodists' support of Peacenik; the good schools Philadelphia initiative, involvement in boycotts and lobbies, and sending money to other urban initiatives. Black Methodists, The Pastor believes, have long seen the model that for the Black community to survive and thrive, the church is a central actor. In particular, The Black Church has a historic involvement when it comes to providing alternative education pre-civil rights when access to education was denied to Blacks. This Cluster's programmatic outreach to truant and other youth in their communities was consistent with findings that Black churches value and support education and a concern for youth development (Johnson, 1999; Lincoln & Mamiya, 1990; Williams, Griffith, Young, Collins, & Dodson, 1999).

It may be that one of the strengths of this demonstration was the mutual denominational identity of the eight congregations in the collaboration. Black churches are more likely than non Black churches to provide services which are resource-intensive, long-term as opposed to relief services, and which include mentoring and recreational programs for youth (Cnaan & Boddie, 2001). As the research confirmed, providing the youth program program and Teen Lounges required intensive, extensive, and sustained effort on the part of staff, church members and leaders, Peer Counselors, and volunteers. While individual NPC congregations continued to provide relief programs such as community dinners and clothing closets, much more of their resources were invested in programs which promoted youth development. In addition to the Teen Lounges, one or more Cluster congregations provided or supported after school tutoring, Rites of Passage programs for youth, choirs or step groups, and a local Scouts troop. One of the congregations has adopted a local elementary school.

Finally, Black church programs have tended to engage more disadvantaged segments of the surrounding community. The demographics of north Philadelphia suggest that many African American youth in these communities were more likely to be exposed to poverty, underemployment, overburdened school systems, truancy, physical violence and crime, drug use or trafficking, and lack of exposure to conventional role models. The urge to reach out to community youth, which was envisioned first by three young men at the church UMC, and then embraced and implemented by Joy Ministries, displayed the remarkable insight, practical wisdom, compassion, and commitment that Joy Ministries had for the "least of these" in their communities.

Table of Religious Interactions

The following table indicates the type and number of religious interactions that were reported by respondents. The cells in the table indicate the number of "yes" occurrences which were given out of all responses. Percents of the "yes" occurrences are indicated in the parentheses. Religious activities were non-youth program events that a participant could voluntarily attend or carry out privately, and included: morning devotion in class, private devotion, worship with a congregation, Bible Study, Teen Lounge, and youth group meetings.

Table 3. Summary of Religious Interactions by Position Type

Position Type	Personal Conversation	Prayer	Religious Talk	Religious Activity
Youth	26/51 (51%)	14/49 (29%)	23/50 (46%)	13/50 (26%)
Teacher/Social Worker	13/15 (87%)	8/15 (53%)	13/15 (87%)	10/15 (67%)
Peer Counselor	28/58 (48%)	35/57 (61%)	33/57 (58%)	40/57 (70%)

Administrative Staff	6/10 (60%)	4/9 (44%)	4/9 (44%)	3/10 (30%)
TOTAL	73/134 (54%)	61/130 (47%)	73/131 (56%)	66/132 (50%)

Overall, about half of the collected observation checklists reported the four types of interactions as having occurred in the past seven days (bottom total line of table). Line 1 indicates that youth (51 observations) reported far less occurrences of prayer (29%) and less frequent attendance at non-program religious activities (26%) than other participants who filled out the observation checklist.

Teachers and Social Workers (15 observations on Line 2) reported the highest frequency of occurrence in both "Personal conversations" (87%) and "Religious Talk" (87%). Peer Counselors (58 observations on Line 3) reported the most frequent occurrence of "Prayer" (61%) and "Religious Activity" (70%). Administrative Staff (10 observations) reported a high frequency of "Personal Conversation" (60%), and lower frequency of "Religious Activities" (30%).

Table 2 suggests that teachers and social workers reported conversing with youth about very personal issues, and about religious issues more often than other staff or Peer Counselors. Given that social workers met individually with students for case management, they naturally would have opportunities to have conversations with youth participants. Peer Counselors reported more incidences of praying, but it must be noted, that interactions were not limited to only youth participants, but included prayer with other staff, family members, and youth not in the youth program. Nonetheless, the implication is that Peer Counselors engaged more frequently in prayer than other staff or youth, and this in itself is an interesting finding.

Two very general observations that the data supports are: 1) that peer counselors reported more frequent interactions than the other participants, and 2) that youth program youth reported the least frequent number of "religious interactions" including prayer, religious talk, and attending a religious activity. This data seems to support the qualitative data that youth program youth were not pressured or coerced to learn about or talk about religious topics or attend non-programmatic voluntary religious activities. As will be seen in a later discussion, interviewed youth often did not perceive the program as "religious."

Appendix B: Interested Participants, Project and Advisory Committee Structure

Alan Benjamin is Research Associate with the Population Research Institute and the Department of Anthropology and Affiliate Professor of Jewish Studies at The Pennsylvania State University. Benjamin received his Ph.D. in anthropology from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (1997) and recently published *Jews of the Dutch Caribbean: Exploring ethnic identity on Curaçao* (2002, Routledge).

Reverend Jeffrey L. Brown is the Pastor of Union Baptist Church, Cambridge, MA. He has held the position since 1988. Brown is a co-founder of the Boston's Ten Point Coalition, a nationally known group of clergy and lay leaders that in the 90s played a key part in the drastic reduction of homicides in the inner city. Brown also started Ten Point International, consulting with cities around the world and eventually developing a training conference for the World Council of Church's Peace to the City Campaign. Brown is also the creator of the Positive Edge street outreach program in Cambridge, the project historian for the Cambridge Black History Trail, and on the founding coalition of the city's Benjamin Banneker Charter School. Reverend Brown is a Master of Divinity graduate of the Andover Newton Theological School, and holds an appointment as Denominational Counselor and lecturer of Baptist History and Polity at the Harvard Divinity School. With three children, the Browns live in Dorchester, MA

Wolfgang Bielefeld is Professor of Public and Environmental Affairs, Adjunct Professor at the Center on Philanthropy, and Adjunct Professor of Sociology at Indiana University - Purdue University, Indianapolis. He coauthored, with Joseph Galaskiewicz, *Nonprofit Organizations in an Age of Uncertainty: A Study of Organizational Change* (Aldine de Gruyter, 1998). His is co-editor of *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*.

Gretchen Castle: Director of Leadership Development and Training for Friends Services for the Aging, Gretchen works with both boards and staff for the 28 member organizations. Castle served as Director of the Friends Board Training and Support Project and did non-profit organization consulting and training for nineteen years. She also serves as Clerk of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting

Eric Clay, M.Div. (Union Theological Seminary), Ph.D.(City and Regional Planning, Cornell University, 2002) is a practitioner and scholar, who works as a mentor to leaders involved in personal and organizational change and a consultant to congregations and communities in crisis or transition through Shared Journeys, Inc. which he co-founded. His dissertation examines leading practitioners of holistic community and economic development in the United States: *That All People May Flourish: The Practice of Faith and Local Economic Development Planning*. He received the Hitchcock Prize in Church History for work on politics of congregational life in 1986.

Ram Cnaan is a professor at the University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work. Dr. Cnaan has published numerous articles in scientific journals on a variety of social work issues. He is the author of: *The Newer Deal: Social Work and Religion in Partnership* (Columbia University Press, 1999) and: *The Invisible Caring Hand: American Congregations and the Provision of Welfare* (New York University Press, 2002).

Katie Day is Professor of Church & Society, Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia. She is a sociologist with research interests in urban issues, race, religion. She is currently finishing a 4 year study funded by Lilly: "Church Rebuilding Research Project." *Prelude to Struggle* (University Press, 2001) and *Difficult Conversations* (Alban, 2001).

Linda Plitt Donaldson is an Assistant Professor at the Catholic University of America National Catholic School of Social Service. Prior to teaching at NCSSS, Dr. Donaldson worked for ten years in a community-based homeless services agency in Washington, D.C, providing direct service, directing programs in advocacy, social justice, family services, and developing affordable housing.

Michael Foley (Ph.D. California-Davis, 1986) is Associate Professor of Politics, Catholic University of America. He is the author of many articles on agrarian politics and the "new peasant movement" in Mexico, civil society and the peace process in El Salvador, and "social capital". He is currently co-director of the Religion and the New Immigrants project, a Pew sponsored Gateway Cities project examining the role of faith communities for new immigrants. Recent publications include articles on civil society and social capital in the *Journal of Democracy* and in the *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, and *Social Capital, Religious Institutions and Poor Communities* with John D. McCarthy and Mark Chaves.. With Bob Edwards, he co-edited

two special issues of *American Behavioral Scientist* and a book *Beyond DeToquville: Civil Society and the Social Capital Debate in Comparative Perspective* (University Press of New England Press, 2001) on social capital, civil society and contemporary democracy. His research has been supported by the Social Science Research Council, the United States Institute of Peace, the Pew Charitable Trust, the Aspen Institute, the Lily Endowment, and other institutions of the Religious Society of Friends.

David N. Gamse, a gerontologist with undergraduate degrees in psychology and sociology, is the Executive Director of the Jewish Council for the Aging (JCA) and, concurrently, the Chief Executive Officer of the National Center for Productive Aging, a JCA affiliate. Prior to joining JCA's staff in 1990, he was a senior manager at AARP, responsible in different positions for the development of new AARP educational and service programs and for AARP programs related to the aging work force. He is a frequent speaker on aging and nonprofit association management and is a member of the Executive Council of Jewish Agencies in the Greater Washington, D.C. region.

Peter Dobkin Hall is Hauser Lecturer on Nonprofit Organizations at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard and Visiting Research Fellow at the Yale Divinity School. Hall's published work includes, *Inventing the Nonprofit Sector: Essays on Philanthropy, Voluntarism, and Nonprofit Organizations* (1992). He co-edited *Sacred Companies: Organizational Aspects of Religion and Religious Aspects of Organizations* (1998) and the chapter on voluntary, nonprofit, and religious entities and activities for the forthcoming *Millennial Edition of Historical Statistics of the United States*.

Simon J. Craddock Lee, MPH is a doctoral candidate in the UC San Francisco/Berkeley Joint Program in Medical Anthropology. Prior to graduate school, he managed the programs of a national association of foundation and corporate-giving program executives working in HIV/AIDS philanthropy. A Yale graduate, he received his masters in public health policy and administration (ethics) from the University of California, Berkeley. His dissertation fieldwork in the ethics and social values of Catholic healthcare was supported by grants from the National Science Foundation and the Social Science Research Council, with analysis and writing made possible through a health services research dissertation grant from the Agency for Healthcare Research & Quality. Related work on the transformation of hospital chaplaincy and the evolution of spiritual care services is reported in a forthcoming issue (2003) of *Health Care Analysis*.

William H. Lockhart is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at Baylor University. His Ph.D. in Sociology was earned at the University of Virginia in 2001. His dissertation, entitled *Getting Saved From Poverty: Religion in Poverty-to-work Programs*, was supported by dissertation research grants from HUD, the Louisville Institute, and two smaller research centers. Prior to his studies at the University of Virginia, Bill directed a mainline Presbyterian urban ministry in Wheeling, West Virginia for ten years, working with community organizations, low-income families, homeless persons, and at-risk children and youth.

John G. Messer is a scholar-practitioner who has studied and published research on faith-based organizations as well as designing, implementing and evaluating such organizations which address poverty, domestic violence, homelessness, substance abuse and AIDS, for several decades.

Carl Milofsky is Professor of Sociology at Bucknell University, a former editor of the *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, and a founding member of Yale's Program on Nonprofit Organizations with a specialty in community organizations.

Maurine Pyle: Serving as Field Secretary of Illinois Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends and as a member of the Traveling Ministries Program for Friends General Conference (Quakers). She has served as presiding clerk for Illinois Yearly Meeting. Her areas of professional specialization are: leadership development, change management, adult education/training, conflict resolution and community development.

Edward Queen, Ph.D., J.D. is Provost of Indianapolis College--International Division and Senior Researcher, Charitable Choice Implementation Project.

Jo Anne Schneider is an urban anthropologist focusing on the role of government, non-profits, churches and communities in social welfare policy, opportunity structures for marginalized populations, and inter-group relations. She is currently a Research Associate at the National Catholic School of Social Services, Catholic

University of America and an American Association for the Advancement of Science Science and Technology Policy fellow at NIH. Recent publications include lead editor, *American Anthropologist* special issue forum on welfare reform (2001), *The Kenosha Social Capital Study* (2001), and her forthcoming book *Social Capital and Welfare Reform: Government, Non-profits, Churches and Community in Pennsylvania and Wisconsin* (Columbia University Press).

Jill Witmer Sinha, M.Div.Ph.D., recently completed her PhD in the Social Welfare program at the University of Pennsylvania, School of Social Welfare. She is currently in a post-doctoral position at Princeton. Jill conducted ethnographic case studies of two congregations in North Philadelphia for the Communities, Congregations, and Leadership Development Project during 1999-2000. Her publications include: *Cookman United Methodist Church and Transitional Journey: A Case Study in Charitable Choice* (2000), and "Churches and public funds: risks or rewards?" *Prism*, 6(3), 11-13 (2001) with co-author Heidi Rolland Unruh.

Jon Van Til is professor of urban studies at Rutgers University in Camden. An active scholar and writer in the field of voluntary action, his most recent book is *Growing Civil Society* (Indiana University Press, 2000).

Joyce Keyes Williams is the Senior Research Associate for the Roundtable on Religion and Social Welfare Policy, part of the Urban and Metropolitan Studies Division at the Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government. Her research investigates issues around nonprofit management and public policy in general, and in particular the interorganizational collaboration between faith-based organizations and state and local government agencies in human service delivery. She is currently a doctoral candidate at the Rockefeller College of Public Affairs in the Public Administration and Policy department at the State University of New York at Albany.

Rhys H. Williams is Professor and Department Head of Sociology at the University of Cincinnati. He is co-author of *A Bridging of Faiths: Religion and Politics in an American City* (Princeton 1992) and co-editor of *Sacred Companies: Organizational Aspects of Religion and Religious Aspects of Organizations* (Oxford, 1998). He is editor of the *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*.

Warren Witte serves as Executive Director of Friends Services for the Aging (FSA), an association of 25 Quaker-governed senior service organizations. Prior to coming to FSA, he served in a variety of program and management roles in the American Friends Service Committee for 30 years, including, from 1984 - 1992, the role of Associate Executive Director for Information and Interpretation in the organization's national office in Philadelphia.

Richard Wood has studied and written on community organizing for twelve years, most recently in *Faith in Action: Religion, Race, and Democratic Organizing in America* (2000, University of Chicago Press). His current research focuses on the impact of political engagement on congregations, in collaboration with the Ford Foundation and Interfaith Funders. He is an associate professor of sociology at the University of New Mexico.

James Zabora is Dean of the National Catholic School of Social Service and Associate Professor of Social Work, Catholic University of America. Dr. Zabora is editor of the *Journal of Psychosocial Oncology* and author of numerous papers and book chapters on cancer prevention, psychosocial screening, quality of life and problem-solving education.

Interested Organizations

Friends Society for the Aging

Dissemination Partners

Alban Institute

Center for Public Justice

Project Staff /Committee Structure as of November 2005

The Faith and Organizations Project staff structure consists of an advisory committee, a overall PI team, and site coordinators for various locations. While staff positions are evolving, some individuals have committed to particular roles. Additional people will define appropriate activities at a later date.

Advisory Committee

Ram Cnaan (co-chair)
 Gretchen Castle (co-chair)
 Reverend Jeffrey L. Brown
 Michael Foley
 David Gamse
 Peter Dobkin Hall
 Maurine Pyle
 Rhys Williams
 James Zabora

Core PI Team (*provides continuity to overall project. Social service, Health/Senior Services and Community Organizations PI s provide guidance to local researchers focusing on those topics*)

Overall PI:	Jo Anne Schneider
Survey PI:	Wolfgang Bielefeld
Social Service Agencies PI:	Jo Anne Schneider
Health/Senior Services:	
Community Organizing:	Richard Wood

Site Coordinators: (*most sites will be determined through a combined negotiation among interested researchers and a selective RFP process. We have decided to definitely have one site in Philadelphia to date*)

Philadelphia Site Coordinator: Katie Day

Appendix C: Pilot Study Researchers

Washington DC:

Jubilee Housing of Maryland (Mennonite, housing for developmentally disabled adults)	Joyce Hermoso
Catholic Ministries, GED program and St Mary's Housing Program (Catholic, General social services)	Heather Larkin, Matthew Wickens
The Christian Children's Inner-City Program Urban Ministry (Asian, evangelical youth program for African Americans)	Joyce Hermoso
Jewish Aging Service, Cohen Adult Day Center (Jewish, adult day care)	Jordan Yanoshick, Gwynneth Anderson
Chinese Immigrant Services (Chinese Methodist, Immigrant adjustment, youth, crime victims services)	Chris Neubauer
The Lutheran Rehabilitation and Shelter Center (Mainline Protestant, Housing for the homeless)	Godlif Sianipar
Muslim Charities (Muslim, resettlement, referral and domestic violence agency)	Godlif Sianipar

Philadelphia:

Lakeside (Quaker retirement community)	Kristin Doughty
JOAI (Jewish, immigrant resettlement agency)	Rabia Kamal
Lutheran Charities (Mainline Protestant, general family social service agency)	Jane Marson
Christian Adult Community Day Program (African American, congregation-based elder day care program)	Christy Schultze
Joy Ministries (African American, congregation-based youth education program)	Jill Sinha

ⁱ Funding for pilot research and planning was provided by the Louisville Institute and the Lynde and Harry Bradley foundation.

ⁱⁱ Jubilee Association of Maryland chose to use its real name.

ⁱⁱⁱ This project was led by Michael Foley and Dean Hoge as part of the Pew Charitable Trust's Gateway cities project. The study consisted primarily of interviews with selected social service agencies either founded by immigrant faith communities or that served new immigrants targeted by the larger study. Qualitative research was combined with statistical analysis of the immigrant faith communities that partnered with selected non-profits to gain a view of the relationship between immigrant faith communities and these non-profits.

^{iv} An EIN is a separate tax ID number for the federal government. With an independent EIN, the organizations generally maintains separate bank accounts and book keeping systems for the social welfare activity, but it remains under the institutional control of the founding congregation. Two congregations in this project ran their social welfare activities through a separate EIN rather than incorporate a separate 501(c)(3).

^v An earlier study of two Muslim organizations, one which also participated in the Faith and Organizations project pilot study, was conducted by Jo Anne Schneider as part of the Religion and the New Immigrants Study.

^{vi} The label “Quakers” was applied by outsiders based on the fact that some people would shake as they delivered messages.

^{vii} While an individual admitted to the Religious Society of Friends are considered members of Quarterly, Yearly and affiliated regional bodies, people can not enter the society by joining these larger groups. People who move away from their Monthly Meetings or become estranged from their local communities sometimes become “unaffiliated members”, but the expectation is that they will maintain a connection to their home meeting or transfer to another meeting close to where they live.

^{viii} UJC was created through a merger of Council of Jewish Federations, United Jewish Appeal and United Israel Appeal. All three agencies were responsible for fundraising campaigns to promote Jewish life and assist Jews around the world. At the local level UJA and Federation generally ran combined campaigns prior to the national merger. See www.ujc.org for details on this organization.

^{ix}The goal of the revivalists was to persuade individuals to turn against slavery. They were not advocating structural, legislative change to end slavery, as were the abolitionists.

^x Definitions of social capital used in this paper draw on Portes (1998) and Bourdieu (1986). Detailed discussion of this definition of social capital as it applies to families and community based organizations is available in Schneider 2006, chapter 1.

^{xi} Small aspects of a culture, class faction or subculture, like a dialect, ways of dressing or decorating an office, or format for presenting a grant proposal, become key symbols that indicate that someone is a member of a group and should have access to its resources. These cultural elements become cultural capital cues. See Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992 for more academic discussion of cultural capital.

^{xii} See Cnaan, Wineberg and Boddie 1999 for discussion of the professionalization of faith-based social service organizations during the 20th century.

^{xiii} Jewish theology stresses that people live on through the good works they do for others. Donating to a program, sponsoring buildings, or buying furniture or art serves as one way to recognize good works. Donors are usually identified by name or items are bought as a memorial for a loved one.