

Running Head: THE DISTRIBUTION OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

**Faith-based Organizations and the Distribution of Social Responsibility:
A Look at Black Congregations**

**Stephanie C. Boddie, Ph.D.
Washington University in St. Louis
George Warren Brown School of Social Work
One Brookings Drive
St. Louis, MO 63130
314-935-9449**

Abstract

This paper explores the extent that African American congregations in the United States share social responsibility relative to their interracial and White counterparts. Are African-American congregations more involved than their interracial and White counterparts in the provision of social and community programs? By addressing this question, this paper outlines the social and financial contribution of congregations and identifies the factors that predict their participation.

Faith-based Organizations and the Distribution of Social Responsibility: A Look at Black Congregations

The enactment of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) (P.L. 104-193) drastically changed the benefits for welfare assistance, mandating personal responsibility for recipients and creating a need for more community involvement. The federal entitlement program, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) became the time-limited Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program. From 1996-1999, caseload trends for African American and White families appeared to be diverging; that is, Whites continued to have a substantially lower poverty rate and the number of White recipient families were falling faster (50.6% decline) as compared to African American families (39.6% decline) (Lower-Basch, 2000). Under this Welfare Reform legislation states would assume greater responsibility for the poor. Each state would receive block grants to operate their own welfare and work programs. Section 104 of this legislation, also known as Charitable Choice encouraged faith-based organizations to also share responsibility for caring for the poor. Charitable Choice specifically encouraged faith-based organizations to play a larger role in social service delivery by reducing barriers for “pervasively sectarian” social service providers to access public funds and technical assistance.

As welfare has ended as we have known it in the United States under the Clinton Administration, the Bush administration has called upon the “armies of compassion” to assume greater social responsibility. To rally these armies President Bush has called on Congress to pass legislation that provides incentives for charitable giving and builds the financial and technical capacity of faith-based and other community-serving groups serving the most vulnerable populations. Under the Bush Administration, both the

individual responsibility of those in need and the social responsibility of citizens, community groups, and faith-based organizations are stressed. The tension arising from this approach begs the question: Who carries the burden of meeting the social responsibility? Are African-American community-serving organizations shouldering a greater portion of the social responsibility? To explore this question, this paper will examine to what extent African American congregations in the United States are sharing social responsibility through their faith-based social and community services as compared to their interracial and White counterparts. This paper will outline the social and financial contribution of congregations through faith-based community programs and identifies the factors that predict their participation in social and community services.

**SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY:
THE SOCIAL AND FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION OF
CONGREGATIONS**

In the United States, the burden of social welfare has never rested squarely with the federal or state government. Instead, reminiscent of the Elizabethan Poor of 1601, individuals, the family, and the local community have shouldered the social responsibility for the poor. Hence, the religious sector and other private charitable sector organizations have played significant roles in caring for the needs of the poor. However, not since the New Deal era have faith-based and other community organizations assumed a prominent position in the provision of social services. With the political climate shifting toward a more socially and fiscally conservative stance favoring fewer publicly administered social programs, the limelight has fallen on community-serving, faith-based organizations, particularly African-American congregations as providers of social

services.

With the government seeking to partner with congregations that can transform communities and the lives of their residents, particularly the most vulnerable ones, one could not forget that this new wave of faith-based social service provision stems from an old tradition of African-American church work, which dates as far back as the eighteenth century with Richard Allen and the first African Methodist Church, Mother Bethel African Methodist Episcopal of Philadelphia. The expectation that African-American congregations can fill the void in social service provision left by government retrenchment is not surprising considering the mutual aid, social uplift, outreach, and community development tradition of African-American churches. For more than 300 years, African-American congregations have provided for a wide range of social needs and established outlets for cultural, social, political, and religious expression (Baer & Singer, 1992). In each era of American history, African-American congregations like Mother Bethel African Methodist Episcopal (Philadelphia), Abyssinian Baptist (New York), Tindley Temple United Methodist (Philadelphia), Wheat Street Baptist (Atlanta) and Allen Methodist Episcopal (New York) have risen to serve those beyond the walls of the church. African-American congregations have been positioned differently relative to the mainstream social service system from its inception (Quadagno, 1994). For example, African-Americans were excluded from the core programs of the Social Security Act of 1935. Hence, African-American congregations have assumed greater social responsibility for their communities. This fact is largely due to their distinct evolution within a racially segregated society and a reluctant welfare state. Quadagno (1994) suggested that the War on Poverty was an effort to resolve the contradictions of American liberty, justice,

and equality that racially biased policies embodied. As the laws have changes and the racial boundaries have shifted, the U.S. is seeking a more color blind approach in its policies and social service provision (Skrentny, 1995). However, disparities persist between African American and White access to health and human services as well as health, educational, and employment outcomes. The needs of African-Americans that were to be increasingly addressed in the secular, private, or public sector post-Civil Rights era continue to be met on some level within the religious sector.

One of the first headliner congregations signaling this new wave of faith-based social services was First African Methodist Episcopal (FAME) Church. In 1992, the beating of Rodney King by Los Angeles police motivated FAME to move to the frontline of community development and community action (DePriest & Jones, 1997). As a result, FAME assumed leadership in tackling problems of unemployment, homelessness, AIDS, and drug addiction in its community. With business savvy leaders and private and public funding, FAME developed a credit union and 13 other community programs and corporations, which included housing development, assistance to the homeless, counseling, and education awareness on such issues as AIDS, health care, and child care (Billingsley, 1993; DePriest & Jones, 1997). While congregations like FAME appear to be getting more than their equal share of attention for providing social services as compared with other congregations, they may also bear a significant share of the social responsibility for the needs of local communities and their residents when compared to their interracial and White counterparts.

Congregations have traditionally been a part of the pluralistic welfare system in the United States. The core services provided by congregations have been those that

assist the hungry, the homeless, the sick, the orphaned, the widowed, and the imprisoned. As the government actively fosters privatization and community-based services, the provision of schools, after school programs, childcare services, senior housing, and senior centers have become more visible service components in the urban areas (Cavendish, 2000; Chaves, 1999; Chaves & Higgins, 1992; Cnaan, Wineburg, & Boddie, 1999; Hill, 1998; Lincoln & Mamiya, 1990). Congregations have also become active in the Empowerment Zone program, conflict resolution, investment groups, school drop out prevention, and services for adjudicated youth (Cavendish, 2000; Cnaan & Boddie, 2001; Hill, 1998).

Studies of congregation-based social services have generally reported that nine out of ten congregations provide social services (Billingsley, 1999; Grettenberger & Hovmand, 1997; Hill, 1998; Hogkinson, Weitzman, Kirsch, Noga, & Gorski, 1993; Jackson, Schweitzer, Blake, & Cato, 1997; Silverman, 2000). In one of the first national surveys of congregations, Hodgkinson and colleagues (1993) found similar results. However, when program types were considered, 90 % of the responding congregations reported visitation to the sick and other health related programs; 62% reported international relief; 53% reported educational activities; 50% reported art and cultural activities; and 40% reported programs for the environment; and 30% reported food distribution programs. Less than 18% of the congregations engaged in other services. Chaves' (1999) national study provided different results. He reported that, overall, only 57% of the responding congregations reported providing social services. He found food distribution to be the primary type of service with 33% of the congregations reporting this

activity. In sum, congregations appeared to provide more short-term immediate assistance than the long-term services that have the capacity to replace government services.

Previous research solely on African-American congregations yielded results that reported lower rates than most studies of congregation-based social service involvement and a higher rate than Chaves' findings. Lincoln and Mamiya found that 71% of African-American congregations studied reported providing social services. Hill's (1998) study of congregations in Maryland reported 86% involvement in social services. Billingsley's (1999) study of north central cities reported 66% involvement, and his study of northeast cities reported 69% involvement. Billingsley found that African-American congregations were most involved in the following services: food and shelter (40%), counseling (18%), education (18%), recreation (10%), and health (8%). Research has also documented African-American congregations as providing family support programs (Caldwell, Greene, & Billingsley, 1992), home health and health education programs (Thomas, Quinn, Billingsley, & Caldwell, 1994; Williams & Williams, 1984), community development (Billingsley, 1992; Lincoln & Mamiya, 1990), services for senior citizens (Walls, 1992), youth programs (Rubin, Billingsley, & Caldwell, 1994), and teen parenting programs (Allen-Meares, 1989). One of the most recent studies found that African-American congregations are more involved in providing education, mentoring, substance abuse, and job training or job assistance programs than White congregations (Chaves & Tsitsos, 2001). In 1992, Chaves and Higgins suggested that White congregations have taken a different course. They have receded into a religious niche while providing a limited range of social services geared to family support and international relief. African-American congregations were established for a different

purpose and, by design, have social service patterns to meet a broad range of services for their communities.

In addition to the history of social service provision by African American churches, the differences in social service delivery are to be expected given that such problems as poverty, unemployment, homelessness, HIV/AIDS, and substance abuse disproportionately impact the African-American community and are reported by African-American clergy as significant problems addressed by their congregations (Cnaan & Boddie, 2001; Chang, Williams, Griffith, & Young, 1994; Thomas, Quinn, Billingsley, & Caldwell, 1994). With the chipping away of basic services provided by the government, such as welfare assistance (now called Temporary Assistance to Needy Families) and Medicare, programs such as emergency food, clothing, shelter, financial aid or employment assistance can be considered the first line of assistance needed. Family support services, such as after-school programs, childcare, domestic abuse programs, child abuse services, day care for older adults, family counseling, financial counseling, parenting skills, programs for prisoners and their families, programs for youth offenders, teen pregnancy counseling, and recreational and educational programs for children, are the second line of services regarded as an important part of the safety net. Congregation-based educational services have become more important as the tax base of many urban areas has diminished with the divestment of local businesses and the exit of middle-income residents. These services can be considered the third line of social services needed. The need for health services have taken on greater importance as the occupational benefits that once existed are protracted, Medicare benefits are cut for those re-entering the labor force, and managed care has limited the services available. This,

combined with the continued disparity of health outcomes between African-American and Whites, makes health services a necessary service for African-American congregations to consider as the fourth line of social services. Recipients of welfare assistance are typically residents of communities highly segregated by race and socio-economic status. Hence, these communities are often composed of under-developed neighborhoods with limited government and business interventions to preserve community safety and develop community infrastructure. Therefore, these communities are left to develop their own strategies for community development. Community development can be considered the fifth line of social services. To change the policies and practices that do not act in the best interest of all U.S citizens, particularly persons of color and the poor, advocacy continues to be an essential service. This can be considered the sixth line of social service.

How African-American Congregations Different? Seven Hypotheses

While many challenges confront African-American, interracial, and White communities and their congregations, these problems tend to be compounded within African-American communities. Without their congregations, many African-Americans may experience limited ways to address their needs regardless of their economic status. Those that are low-income earners may seek congregations to lift them out of poverty while the middle-income earners may seek opportunities to reconnect with their culture or to give back to their old neighborhood. The social responsibility assumed by White and interracial congregations is expected to be less than their African American counterparts. The differences in social service provision will be noted with respect to the types of services, the scope of services, the structure of services, the time investment in

services, the financial investment in services, and the number of collaborative partnerships.

Research Methods

Data

This research is based on data from two phases of a cross-sectional study on congregations from 1996 to 1999 (Cnaan et al., 2002). The original data of 111 congregations housed in historic properties were collected in Chicago (16), Indianapolis (25), New York (15), Mobile (15), Philadelphia (24), and San Francisco (16). The 111 congregations were randomly selected from a list from a local historic preservation or assistance organization. Newer congregations were targeted for the second wave of data to offset the bias toward congregations founded before 1940. Using multiple lists, the sample was more inclusive of small, storefront, and non-mainline congregations. This second wave of data was selected from congregations in Chicago (5), Houston (24), Indianapolis (29), Mobile (25), Philadelphia (39), and San Francisco (11). This sample reflects some of the diversity of the estimated 350,000 U.S. congregations as it is a sample from seven cities representing each region of the country, different religious traditions, and various size congregations.

Study Design

Trained interviewers collected data as a part of 3-to-15 hour in-depth interviews with clergy, administrators, and program leaders. A three-part survey instrument was administered to more than one person in each congregation and written materials were collected (i.e. annual reports, church history, program reports, program brochures, and weekly bulletins) that documented the congregation's history and social service activities.

Congregation leaders were asked questions related to: (a) the congregation's history and membership profile, (b) the congregation's governance and resources, (c) the nature and scope its social and community services, and (d) up to 5 specific services and its resources and staffing patterns. The data collected were entered into a paradox database for data management and converted to a SPSS10 file for data analysis.

Sample

Of the 251 congregations in the total sample, 228 were selected when the sample was limited to those congregations with 75% or more African-American members (70, 31%), 75% or more White members (122, 54%), and those with less than 75% of any one racial or ethnic group. The congregations without a predominant racial or ethnic group were classified as interracial (36, 16%). This sample has more African-American congregations than other studies of this kind. For example, the Chaves and Higgins (1992) study included 1,529 (96%) White congregations and 58 (4%) African-American congregations.

Sample Characteristics

This sample of congregations is diverse across a range of categories. These congregations ranged from storefront churches with 20 members and 5 regular attendees to mega-churches with 17,600 members and 7,000 regular attendees. Overall, African-American congregations ($M = 413$) and White congregations ($M = 414$) had approximately the same number of regular attendees, as compared to the interracial congregations ($M = 272$) with fewer regular attendees. Across the groups, African-American had most evangelical congregations (44.4%), followed by interracial (37.5%), and White (29.9%). However, politically, congregations were more moderate (43.4%, 99)

with a significant percentage of moderate African-American congregations (51.5%) and moderate interracial congregations (54.3%). White congregations were predominately conservative (42.1%).

All congregations were primarily composed of people 35-64 years of age: African-American (34.5%) and interracial (35.3%), and White (37.4%) congregations. Of the adult members, overall, 34.7% were single. Over fifty percent (50.4%, 115) of the congregations reported attracting more younger members, which represented 57.4% of the African-American congregations, 44.4% of the interracial congregations, and 50.4% of the White congregations. Most members also commuted more than one mile; as such, only 37.0% of the African-American congregants, 49.1% of the interracial congregants, and 36.5% of the White congregants live in the local community of the congregation's primary facility.

Most of the congregations were established before 1955 (68.4%); 61.2% of the African-American congregations, 51.4% of the interracial congregations, and 66.0% of the White congregations were established before 1955. More than 32% of the congregations had annual budgets between \$100,001 and \$500,000; however, African-American (36.2%) and interracial (34.3%) congregations primarily had budgets under \$100,000 as compared to White congregations (78.6%) that primarily had budgets over \$100,000. The socioeconomic composition of congregations in this sample was primarily lower-middle class (32.1%); African-American congregations had 35.1% members with lower incomes (incomes less than \$25,000), whereas interracial (38.1%) and White (30.5%) congregations members were primarily lower-middle class (incomes \$25,001-50,000).

In terms of leadership, 51.8% of the congregations had one paid clergy, and 15.4% had two paid clergy. Overall, the congregations in this sample had a mean of full-time equivalents (FTEs) of 7.3. By racial group the following was found: African-American congregations 6.6 full-time equivalents (FTEs), interracial congregations 3.8 full-time equivalents (FTEs), and White congregations 8.8 full-time equivalents (FTEs). Overall, African-American congregations had 7.8 community leaders in the congregation; interracial congregations had 3.5, and White congregations had 6.4 community leaders in the congregation.

Is Race the Most Salient Factor?

African-American congregations have continued their heritage of social service provision from the slavery era into the welfare reform era of the third millennium to meet the continuing needs of their communities. While race is the primary independent variable in this study, other explanatory variables must be considered to examine the factors related to social responsibility. Previous studies have found the following factors to indicate the degree of social and community involvement: congregational resources (Billingsley, 1992; Chaves, 1999; Chaves & Tsistos, 2000; Cnaan, et al., 2002; Dudley & Van Eck, 1992; Thomas, Quinn, Billingsley, & Caldwell, 1994; Iannaccone, Olson, & Stark, 1995; Mock, 1992; Ward, Billingsley, & Burris, 1994), congregational leadership (Cnaan et al., 2002; Thomas, Quinn, Billingsley, & Caldwell, 1994; Ward, Billingsley, & Burris, 1994), congregational characteristics (Billingsley, 1992; Cavendish, 2000; Chang, Williams, Griffith, & Young, 1994; Chaves & Higgins, 1992; Dudley & Van Eck, 1992; Harris, 1995; Verba, Kay, Scholzman, & Brady, 1993), and membership characteristics

(Ammerman, 1997; Billingsley, 1992; Chaves, 1999; Chaves & Tsistos, 2001; Dudley & Van Eck, 1992; Thomas, Quinn, Billingsley, & Caldwell, 1994).

Measurement of the Extent of Social Responsibility: The Dependent Variables

To determine the extent to which African-American congregations as compared to interracial and White congregations share the social responsibility for providing Social and community services, the following five measures were used: a) the number of formal services by types of services, b) the number of beneficiaries, c) time investment in social and community services, d) financial investment in social and community services, and e) the number of collaborators. Each measure reflects the extent that congregations assume social responsibility for providing services. While each measure has its own limitations, it is expected that this composite measurement renders a more complete view that improves our understanding of the social responsibility assumed by congregations in engaging in social and community services.

The Types and Number of Formal Social Services

Based on Billingsley's (1999) research that classified congregation-based social services, six types of social services were clustered from Cnaan's (1997) 190-item social and community involvement inventory: a) basic needs services, b) family support service, c) educational services, d) health services, e) community development services, and f) advocacy services. Respondents were asked to identify, from a list of 190 services, which services they offered during the last 12 months and to indicate whether they sponsored services on or off the congregation's site. This recognition method established a more

consistent and reliable measure while minimizing the possibility of overlooking service areas that some congregations considered as services and others considered a part of their tradition or religious ministry. The mean score of formal social services from the total number for each services area was tabulated.

The Number of Beneficiaries

The second measure is the number of beneficiaries that served on a monthly basis. For each program, respondents were asked to report the number of beneficiaries that served monthly that were members of the congregation, as well as the number of beneficiaries served monthly that were not members of the congregation. The numbers reported are conservative estimates based on the maximum of five reported programs and not the total number of programs provided by each congregation.

Time and Financial Investment for Programs

The third measure, the congregation's time investment, is the frequency of social service provision. Respondents were asked how often each of the services they reported was provided. The possible responses included: daily, weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, and seasonally.

The fourth measure, financial investment by congregations, captured the percentage of the congregation's overall budget allocated to social services. The percentage of the budget allocated for social services, assessed the congregation's financial investment by asking respondents for this value. By using the percentage rather than the raw number (in dollars), the size of financial contribution was independent of the size of the membership and the resource base of the congregation.

Collaborative Partnership

The fifth measure is the number of collaborative partnerships congregations maintain to provide services. For each of the services reported, respondents stated whether programs were provided solely by the congregation or in collaboration with one of the following: other congregations, community groups, coalitions, diocese/ judicatory organizations, human service organizations, government agencies, and other organizations.

Are There Any Differences?

The Number and Types of Formal Services

Chi-square tests and analysis of variance were used to examine the extent that congregations were different across groups when considering the types of services, the time and financial investment, and collaborative partnerships. A series of ordinary least square (OLS) regression analyses were performed to explore alternative explanations for differences in the social responsibility reflected by provision of six service areas.

Preliminary analysis of differences by the provision of six service areas across the three groups of congregations revealed the following: at the program level, of the 901 programs reported, 647 were clustered into the six categories: basic needs services, family support services, educational services, health services, community development services, and advocacy service. When examining the relationship of the predominate race of the congregation to six social service programs areas, chi-test results showed that African-American, interracial, and White congregations were statistically different with respect to the number of programs across the six types of programs, $X^2 (2, N= 901) =$

33.41, $p < .001$ (Table 1). African-American congregations were more involved than their counterparts in providing educational programs and community development programs.

The first model (Table 2) measures social service involvement as the total number of community development services. Race and active membership size (logged) were the predictors for involvement in community development services. Twelve percent of the variance was explained with this model ($R^2 = .12$). African-American congregations and congregations with larger congregations were more likely to have more community development services.

[TABLE 2 HERE]

The detailed results of the other five regressions can be obtained from the author of this paper. These results can be summarized as follows: (1) Race and annual budget were the only variables that predicted the extent of social responsibility for basic needs services; (2) Active membership size (logged) and the number of positions predicted the extent of social responsibility related to family support services; (3) The percentage of single adults predicted the extent of social responsibility for educational services; (4) Race, active membership size (logged), and annual budget predicted the extent of social responsibility for health services; and (5) Race and annual budget were the best predictor variables for advocacy services.

Number of Beneficiaries

Table 3 shows that statistical significance emerged across African-American, interracial, and White congregations for the number of non-congregation members benefiting from the services for the 901 programs reported. For the congregation

members benefiting, there were no significant differences across the three groups: African-American congregations ($M = 32.9$, $SD = 73.1$), interracial congregations ($M = 32.5$, $SD = 75.6$) and White congregations ($M = 38.4$, $SD = 84.3$). The analysis of variance test was not significant, $F(2, 226) = .54$, $p = .58$. The mean scores for non-congregation members benefiting from the services were African-American ($M = 78.1$, $SD = 126.7$), interracial ($M = 108.5$, $SD = 164.8$), and White ($M = 103.4$, $SD = 155.0$) congregations. The analysis of variance test was significant, $F(2, 226) = 3.01$, $p < .05$. The Bonferroni post hoc tests for the comparison of the number of non-congregation members benefiting from social services was found to be significantly different across all three groups at the .05 level.

[TABLE 3 HERE]

Time Investment for Programs

Table 4 presents percentages for programs provided daily, weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, or seasonally for African-American, interracial, and White congregations. The frequency of service provision was reported per program as follows for daily services: African-American (33.2%), interracial (26.2%), and White (27.0%) congregations. Weekly services were reported: African-American (36.5%), interracial (42.6%), and White (34.2%) congregations. For those services offered bi-weekly, 12.7% were African-American, 17.7% interracial, and 10.6% White congregations. Monthly services were as follows: African-American (0.4%), interracial (0.7%), and White (1.1%). Seasonal services were provided by African-American (17.2%), interracial (12.8%), and White (27.2%) congregations. The chi-square test reached significance, $\chi^2(8, 226) = 23.6$, $p < .001$.

[TABLE 4 HERE]**Financial Investment for Programs**

The mean scores for the percentage allocated for the social budget for the three groups of congregations were African-American ($M = 25.8$, $SD = 21.7$), interracial ($M = 24.3$, $SD = 19.2$) and White ($M = 19.9$, $SD = 16.7$) congregations. The analysis of variance test was not significant, $F(2, 226) = 2.25$, $p = .11$. Table 4 presents the seventh model. The measure of the extent of social responsibility is the percentage of the social budget allocated for community programs. The annual budget and the percentage of low-income members (less than \$25,000) are the variables that best predict the percentage of social budget invested in community development programs. Fourteen percent of the variance was explained with this model ($R^2 = .14$). Congregations with larger budgets and those with higher percentage of low-income members were more likely to invest greater amounts of their budget for community development programs.

[TABLE 5 HERE]**Collaborative Partnerships**

Collaborative partnerships were established to deliver many of the 901 community programs reported. The percentage of social service collaborations with other congregations was reported as the following: African-American (11.3%), interracial (11.6%), and White (11.9%) congregations. For those programs provided in collaboration with human service organizations, the following percentages were reported: African-American (8.6%), interracial (9.6%), and White (13.3%) congregations. Community programs provided in collaboration with community groups were African-American

(10.5%), interracial (8.2%), and White (7.2%) congregations. Community programs provided in collaboration with a judicatory or diocese reported the following percentages: African-American (3.4%), interracial (4.8%), and White (3.1%). The percentage of community programs provided in collaborations with coalitions was reported as the following: African-American (4.9%), interracial (5.5%), and White (3.9%) congregations. For those services in collaboration with other organizations, the following percentages were reported: African-American (9.8%), interracial (13.7%), and White (11.0%) congregations. None of these chi-square tests were significant at the $< .05$ level. However, the percentages of collaborations with government agencies were reported as follows: African-American (8.6%), interracial (3.4%), and White (3.9%) congregations. This chi-square test reached significance, $\chi^2(2, 226) = 9.03, p < .01$. Congregations reported collaborating with the following government organizations: Mayor's office, Police Department, Department of Education, Department of Recreation, and Department of Human Services. Comparatively, the percentage of congregations that were the sole sponsors of social service programs was: African-American (67.7%), interracial (63.0%), and White (55.6%) congregations. This chi-square test also reached significance, $\chi^2(2, 226) = 10.95, p < .001$.

Table 6 presents the model measuring the extent of social responsibility as the total number of collaborative services (i.e. services housed and funded). The aging of the membership, the growth of the membership, and the polity of the congregation were three variables that predicted social involvement for collaborative services. Eleven percent of the variance was explained with this model ($R^2 = .11$). Congregations that are non-hierarchical, those attracting older members, and those that are getting smaller were more

likely to provide collaborative services.

[TABLE 6 HERE]

Conclusions

These cross-sectional findings do provide some compelling evidence to support the view that African-American congregations provide a broad range of different set of needs than their counterparts. Overall, African-American congregations are more involved in four of the six social service types: basic needs, health, community development, and advocacy. The fact that race effect did not emerge in the case of the family support services may be attributed to the universality of religious beliefs that stress honoring and preserving family relationships. Hence, one would expect congregations across all groups to be involved in services for families. While religious teachings also stress the welfare of the poor, basic needs services did emerge as significantly different across the three groups of congregations. Two of the basic needs services, food pantries and clothing closets, were the services most congregations provided. The greater supply of basic needs services by African-American congregations might suggest the disproportionate demand for services. However, in terms of the number of beneficiaries served, these findings indicate that African –American congregations serve fewer members and non-members. The needs for services relative to the supply of services should be further explored as well as the capacity of these congregations relative to the demand for services in their communities.

While these results do not support that African-American congregations are more involved in all services, these results can be qualified by stating that African-American congregations provided a greater range of social services (see table 7) but with fewer

financial resources. This suggests that African-American congregations are not providing services out of a surplus of resources but instead give a significant portion (25.8%) of their annual budget to serve while balancing their own needs to maintain their congregation's facility and membership concerns. Relative to their resource base and capacity, African American congregation appear to take on a greater responsibility to serve those in need.

As the government seeks to engage faith-based organizations in partnerships, these findings also document the collaborative relationships congregations have with the public and private sectors. Overall, congregations were found to go beyond their congregations to engage non-congregation members to share in the responsibility of providing social services. However, African-American congregations reported significantly fewer non-member social service providers than their counterparts. Overall, African-American congregations also reported fewer collaborations that involved financial support and volunteers. Conversely, African-American congregations were found to collaborate more with government than interracial and White congregations. These findings also suggest that African-American congregations provide their services in different ways and are primarily the sole providers of many of their services. Most importantly, these findings support the need to consider African-American congregations in urban areas as a vital part of the mainstream social service network that are both sole providers of social services that assume the social and financial responsibility for meeting various social and community needs. African-American congregations share in the social responsibility for caring for the poor by collaborating with public and private sector organizations.

References

- Allen-Meares, P. (1989). Adolescent sexuality and premature parenthood: Role of the black church in prevention. *Journal of Social Work and Human Sexuality*, 8(1), 133-142.
- Ammerman, N. T. (1997). *Congregation & community*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Baer, H. A. & Singer, M. (1992). *African-American religion in the twentieth century*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press.
- Billingsley, A. (1992). *Climbing Jacob's ladder: The enduring legacy of African-American families*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Billingsley, A. (1999). *Mighty like a river: The black church and social reform*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Caldwell, C. H., Greene, A. D., & Billingsley, A. (1992). The Black church as a family support system: Instrumental and expressive functions. *National Journal of Sociology*, summer, 22-40.
- Cavendish, J. C. (2000). Church-based community activism: A comparison of black and White Catholic congregations. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 39(3), 371-384.
- Chang, P., Williams, M.Y., David, R., Griffith, Ezra H. E., & Young, J. (1994). Church-agency relationships in the black community. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 23, 91-106.
- Chaves, M. (1999, December). Congregations' social services activities. *Charting Civil Society*, No. 6. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Chaves, M., & Higgins, L. M. (1992). Comparing the community involvement of black and White congregations. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 31(4), 425-440.
- Chaves, M., & Tsistos, W. (2001). Congregations and social services: What they do, how they do it, and with whom. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(4), 660-683.
- Cnaan, R. A. (1997). *Social and community involvement of local religious congregations: A neglected community practice arena*. Philadelphia: School of Social Work, University of Pennsylvania.

- Cnaan, R. A., & Boddie, S. C. (2001). *Black church outreach: Comparing how black and other congregations serve their needy neighbors*. University of Pennsylvania. Center for Research on Religion and Urban Civil Society.
- Cnaan, R. A., & Boddie, S. C. (2001) Philadelphia census of religious congregations' involvement in social service delivery. *Social Service Review*, 75(4), 559-580.
- Cnaan, R. A., Boddie, S. C., Handy, F., Yancey, G., & Schneider, R. (in press). *The invisible caring hand: American congregations and the provision of welfare*. New York: New York University Press.
- Cnaan, R. A., Wineburg, R. J., & Boddie, S. C. (1999). *The newer deal: Social work and religion in partnership*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- DePriest, T., & Jones, J. (1997, Feb.). Economic deliverance through the church. *Black Enterprise*, 27 (7), 195-200.
- Dudley, C. S., & Van Eck, T. (1992). Social ideology and community ministries: Implications from church membership surveys. In K. B. Bedell, & A. M. Jones, (Eds.), *Yearbook of American and Canadian churches*, (pp. 5-11). Nashville, TN: Abingdon.
- Grettenberger, S., & Hovmand, P. (1997, December). *The role of churches in human services: United Methodist churches in Michigan*. Paper presented at the ARNOVA Conference, Indianapolis, Indiana.
- Harris, F. C. (1999). *Something within: Religion in African-American political activism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hill, R. B. (1998). *Report on study of church-based human services*. Baltimore, MD: Morgan State University, Institute for Urban Research.
- Hodgkinson, V. A., Weitzman, M. S., Kirsch, A. D., Noga, S. M., & Gorski, H. A. (1993). *From belief to commitment*. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.
- Iannaccone, L., Olson, D. V. A., & Stark, R. (1995). Religious resources and growth. *Social Forces*, 74 (2), 705-731.
- Jackson, M. C., Jr., Schweitzer, J. H., Cato, M. T., & Blake, R. N. (1997). *Faith-based institutions' community and economic development programs serving black communities in Michigan*. Kalamazoo, MI: Michigan State University.
- Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1969). *Developing organizations: Diagnosis and action*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Lincoln, C. E., & Mamiya, L. H. (1990). *The black church in the African-American experience*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Lower-Basch, E. (2000). "Leavers" and Diversion studies: Preliminary analysis of racial difference in caseload trends and leavers outcomes. Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning Evaluation. [Electronic version]. Retrieved: <http://asp.hhs.gov/hsp/leavers99/race.htm>
- Mays, B. E., & Nicholson, J. W. (1933). *The Negro church*. New York: Russell and Russell.
- Mock, A. K. (1992). Congregational religious styles and orientations to society: Exploring our linear assumptions. *Review of Religious Research*, 34 (1), 20-33.
- Putnam, R. (2001). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Rubin, R. H., Billingsley, A., & Caldwell, C. H. (1994). The role of the black church in working with black adolescents. *Adolescence*, 29(114), 251-267.
- Salamon, L. M. (1995). *Partners in public service: Government-nonprofit relations in the modern welfare state*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Silverman, C. (2000). Faith-Based communities and welfare reform: California religious community capacity study: Quantitative Findings and Conclusions. Pp. 66-84 in *Can we make welfare reform work? California religious community capacity study*. Sacramento, CA: California Council of Churches.
- Skrentny, J. D. (1995). *The ironies of affirmative action: Politics, culture, and justice in America*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Thomas, S. B., Quinn, S. C., Billingsley, A., & Caldwell, C. H. (1994). The characteristics of northern black churches with community health outreach programs. *American Journal of Public Health*. 84 (4), 575-579.
- Walls, C. T. (1992). The role of church and family support in the lives of older African-Americans. *Generations* 16(3), 33 (4).
- Ward, N., Billingsley, A., Simon, A., Burris, J. C. (1994) Black churches in Atlanta reach out to the community. *National Journal of Sociology*, summer, 49-74.
- Williams, C. & Williams, H. B. (1984). Contemporary voluntary associations in the urban black church: The development of growth of mutual aid societies. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*, 13(4), 21-29.

Table 1

*Comparing African-American, Interracial, and White Congregations:
The Number of Social Service Programs*

Variable	African-American Congregations <i>n</i> = 70	Interracial Congregations <i>n</i> = 36	White Congregations <i>n</i> = 122
Total number of basic need programs	58 (82.9%)	32 (88.8%)	83 (68.0%)
Total number of family support programs	69 (98.6%)	33 (91.0%)	121 (99.1%)
Total number of educational programs	29 (41.4%)	6 (16.7%)	31 (25.4%)
Total number of health programs	29 (41.4%)	19 (52.8%)	31 (48.8%)
Total number of community development	21 (30.0%)	8 (22.2%)	13 (10.7%)
Total number of advocacy programs	3 (4.3%)	3 (8.3%)	16 (13.1%)

Note. X^2 (2, N= 901) = 33.41, $p < .001$

Table 2

*Comparing African-American, Interracial, and White Congregations:
The Regression Predicting Level of Social Responsibility Across Community
Development Services*

Variable	B	SEB	B
Constant	1.93	1.17	
Race White	-1.14	.39	-.17**
Active membership (logged)	1.21	.43	.24**
Political Orientation	-.26	.32	-.06
Theological orientation	-.44	.21	-.15
Membership trend: Growth → larger	-.45	.34	.09
Income of members (\$50,001 - \$75,000)	-1.33-E10 ²	.01	.09
Percentage of members under 12	-3.31-E10 ²	.02	-.08

Note. $R^2 = .12$ ($N = 228$, $p < .01$)

Table 3

*Comparing African-American, Interracial, and White Congregations:
The Regression Predicting Level of Social Responsibility related to Percentage of their
Social Budget Allocated for Services*

Variable	B	SEB	B
Constant	2.63	4.23	
Annual budget	3.88	.99	3.91***
Polity	-6.48	2.35	-2.76
Income of members (less than \$ 25,000)	1.69	.05	3.43***

Note. $R^2 = .14$ ($N = 228$, $p < .01$)

Table 4

*Comparing African-American, Interracial, and White Congregations:
Number of Beneficiaries*

Variable	African-American Congregations (1)		Interracial Congregations (2)		White Congregations (3)		<i>Post hoc tests</i> $1=2=3$
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Number of congregation members benefiting from services	32.9	73.1	32.5	75.6	38.4	84.3	
Number of non- congregation members benefiting from services	78.1	127.6	108.5	164.8	103.4	155.0	1<3,2

Note: The highest possible value was 500. Those that may have reported over 500 were typically seasonal programs such as health fairs or concerts.

Table 5

*Comparing African-American, Interracial, and White Congregations:
The Frequency of Service Provision Per Program*

Variable	African- American Congregations n = 70	Interracial Congregations n = 36	White Congregations n = 122
Percentage of programs offered daily	33.2% (81)	26.2% (37)	27.0% (120)
Percentage of programs offered weekly	36.5% (89)	42.6% (60)	34.2% (152)
Percentage of programs offered bi-weekly	12.7% (31)	17.7% (25)	10.6% (47)
Percentage of programs offered monthly	0.4% (1)	0.7% (1)	1.1% (5)
Percentage of programs offered seasonally	17.2% (42)	12.8% (18)	27.2% (121)
Total number reported programs	244	141	445

$\chi^2(8, N= 830) = 23.6, p < .01$

Table 6

*Comparing African-American, Interracial, and White Congregations:
The Regression Predicting Congregations Providing Social Services in Collaboration*

Variable	B	SEB	B
Constant	14.62	4.25	
Polity	-6.48	2.35	-2.76**
Membership trend: Aging → younger	4.41	1.64	2.69**
Membership trend: Growth → larger	-4.91	-1.69	2.09**

Note. $R^2 = .11$ ($N = 228$, $p < .01$)

Table 7

*Comparing African-American, Interracial, and White Congregations:
Primary Types of Social Service Areas*

Variable	African- American Congregations <i>n</i> = 70	Interracial Congregations <i>n</i> = 36	White Congregations <i>n</i> = 122	χ^2
Food pantries	50.0% (35)	36.1% (13)	29.5% (36)	8.04**
Clothing closet	44.3% (31)	33.3% (12)	15.6% (19)	19.34***
Single parents program	28.6% (20)	16.7% (6)	13.1% (16)	7.16**
Tutoring for children & youth	40.0% (28)	25.0% (9)	17.2% (21)	12.18***
Health education	27.1% (19)	13.9% (5)	12.3% (15)	7.23**
Drug and Alcohol program	27.1% (19)	13.9% (5)	12.3% (15)	7.92**
Voter registration	41.4% (29)	25.0% (9)	14.8% (18)	17.09***
Cooperation with police	32.9% (23)	25.0% (9)	11.5% (14)	13.24***
Space for police & other community meetings	31.4% (22)	11.1% (4)	12.3% (15)	12.41***

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$