

THE ROLE OF CONGREGATIONS IN DELIVERING HUMAN SERVICES¹

By Richard Clerkin and Kirsten Grønbjerg, Indiana University

Beginning with the “Charitable Choice” provision of the 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (e.g., welfare reform), several public policy initiatives have sought to promote the faith-based provision of human services. The arguments used to promote these faith-based initiatives emphasize the power of faith to change human behavior and assume that sacramental organizations are more effective than traditional nonprofit providers in achieving desirable outcomes (Kennedy, 2001; Kennedy & Bielefeld, 2002). These efforts, intensified under the Bush administration, raise constitutional questions about the separation of church and state (Kennedy 2001) and policy questions about the consequences for clients and traditional human service nonprofits, as well as about the capacity of congregations to deliver such services and to manage government contracts. We focus on this latter set of issues.

We draw on a recently completed survey of 2,067 of Indiana nonprofits² classified by religious status: congregations (425 or 21%), other types of faith-based nonprofits (219 or 11%), and secular nonprofits (1,423 or 69%); and by whether or not they provide human services.³ Over half of the congregations and other faith-based nonprofits (56% and 58% respectively) fall in the human services categories, compared to 33% of secular nonprofits (reflecting the inclusion of mutual benefit nonprofits in this group). We focus mainly on the three human service profiles (CongHS, FbHS, and SecHS), but also consider congregations not involved in human services (CongNO).

Little Congregational Awareness of or Interest in Government Funding

Only 35-37% of the congregations, regardless of human service status, are aware of “a national initiative to make it easier for religious organizations to obtain government funding.” That is slightly more than for FbNo (30%), but substantially less than FbHS nonprofits (64%). More-

over, the great majority of congregations (70% of CongHS, 64% of CongNO) and of FbNo (79%) say they do not intend to seek any public funding (29% of FbHS don't) and very few (13% of CongHS, 10% of CongNO, 9% of FbNo) actually receive such funding or intend to seek it (compared to 46% of FbHS). The rest don't know.⁴ More telling, among congregations aware of the charitable choice option, more (86%) say they do NOT intend to seek public funding than of those not aware of the option (67%).

Limited Human Service Involvement of Religious Congregations

As noted above, the majority of congregations and other faith-based nonprofits either provide health or human services or plan to do so. To determine the extent of their involvement in human services, we examine several indicators of service orientations. Virtually all (99%) CongHS say they target their programs and services to both their own members and to the general public. Only 64% of FbHS and 54% of SecHS do so. Apparently CongHS see themselves as filling broader service missions than do FbHS and SecHS nonprofits.

However, when asked to detail their three most important services, relatively few CongHS (17%) include human services. Youth development (22%), traditional human services (13%), or food and nutrition (3%) are the most reported types of services. FbHS reported more and a wider array of human service programs among their top three programs.⁵ CongHS resemble FbHS and SecHS nonprofits in that their top three programs include some traditional human services: personal services (21%) and child/youth services or emergency assistance (11% each). However, they are less likely (4%) to include family services than FbHS (44%) or SecHS (8%). Not surprisingly, the majority (87%) of CongHS include at least one religion based program⁶ in their top three, compared to only 27% of FbHS. Thus, while congregations provide some human services, they seem to be ancillary efforts.

Mixed Management Capacity of Religious Congregations

To assess the extent to which congregations have the management capacity to deliver complex human services, we compare the size, management structure and reliance on volunteers and donations for our major organizational profiles.

Size. Our analysis of revenues and staff size is tentative,⁷ but we find that organizations involved in human services tend to be older and larger (*see Table 1*) than their counterparts not involved in such services. On the whole, however, congregations tend to have fewer staff resources than other types of nonprofits, with FbHS nonprofits intermediary between the smaller and older CongHS and the younger and larger SecHS nonprofits.

Management Structure. Other data provide a more reliable picture. *Table 2* shows the presence, by organizational profile, of four types of management structures: Information technology (IT, 6 items), staff/board policies (4 items), volunteer management (2 items), and financial controls (5 items). For each religious status category, those involved in human services appear to have more management structures in place than their counterparts. In addition, congregations and other faith-based nonprofits (in their respective human service status) report more management structures than secular nonprofits. CongHS appear to be more developed along these lines than either FbHS or SecHS.⁸

More detailed analysis shows that 92% of CongHS have computers available to key staff or volunteers compared to 79% of FbHS and 71% of SecHS. Similar patterns pertain to computerized client/member/program records (73% vs. 64% and 61%) and computerized financial record (84% vs. 75% and 61%). However, only 32% of CongHS reported having a web site compared to 48% of FbHS and 40% of SecHS, suggesting that CongHS are more likely to use IT for internal management than for interfacing with the general public.

In terms of financial management tools, CongHS are more likely to allocate reserves to capital improvement (66%) or maintenance and equipment needs (74%) than FbHS (37% and 38%) or SecHS (35% and 42%), most likely because congregations often own buildings. All three types of human service nonprofits are equally likely (71%) to report having a recent financial audit, but more SecHS (46%) have completed a recent assessment of program outcomes/impacts than CongHS (36%) and FbHS (35%). SecHS nonprofits may have faced more pressures to document their service effectiveness.

These data do not address how effectively these tools are used, nor do we control for different regulatory environments. We suspect that at least some of the differences in management structure reflect how nonprofits relate to their stakeholders. If congregation members are more attached to their congregations than members/clients of secular nonprofits, they may also be better able to insist on the accountability that financial controls/reserves and IT make possible.

We have more specific data on how our respondents rate the challenges of managing service delivery (5 items), boundary management (7 items), and technical capacities (5 items).⁹ We find again the greatest differences between CongHS compared to FbHS or SecHS nonprofits. For several dimensions, CongHS report facing more challenges than FbHS and SecHS. Thus, more (93%) CongHS indicate that strategic planning is at least a minor challenge for their organization, compared to FbHS (76%) and SecHS (79%). Similar patterns hold for delivering high quality services/programs (91% vs. 75% and 80%), attracting new members/clients (92% vs. 74% and 85%), and enhancing the visibility/reputation of the organization (91% vs. 80% and 85%).¹⁰

CongHS appears to have a somewhat easier time obtaining funding with only 46% reporting this as a major challenge compared to 62% of FbHS and 57% of SecHS. Since they resemble CongNO on this dimension, providing human services does not appear to impact a congrega-

tion's ability to raise funds. On the other hand, 71% of CongHS (and 73% of CongNO) report that managing facilities or space present at least a minor challenge for their organization, compared to only 46% of FbHS and 48% of SecHS, most likely because congregations tend to own facilities, rather than rent. Finally, while we found earlier that CongHS make extensive use of IT, a high proportion (87%) find IT at least a minor challenge (compared to 75% of FbHS and 70% of SecHS). Fewer FbHS and SecHS have IT, making it less of a challenge to them.

In general, it appears that CongHS may be at least as well equipped to deliver human services in terms of having key management structures in place as are other nonprofits involved in such services. However, they may face more extensive challenges in delivering such services, perhaps because they have fewer staff with professional training.

Reliance on Volunteers and Donations. Supporters of Charitable Choice argue that congregations are able to mobilize and rely on deeply engaged volunteers rather than depend on paid staff, thus making services more efficient (Grønbjerg and Salamon, 2002). We find support for the argument that CongHS (and CongNO) have a higher reliance on volunteers than our other organizational profiles. Virtually all (94%) report that volunteers (other than board members) are very important or essential to the work of the organization (compared to 71% of FbHS and SecHS). The rest (6%) say they are important (compared to 23% of FbHS and 17% of SecHS) and none say volunteers are not important, while 6% of FbHS and 12% SecHS do say this.

Donations show a similar pattern, with the great majority of CongHS (85%) reporting very high reliance (75% or more of revenues) on donations, compared to only 24% of FbHS and 12% of SecHS. At the other extreme, 4% of CongHS report that they receive no donations, compared to 20% of FbHS and 29% of SecHS. While these are stark contrasts, our data do not allow us to determine the use of volunteers or donations and the extent to which they are devoted to worship

or human services. We suspect the former.¹¹ A slightly higher (but not significantly so) reliance on donations by CongHS compared to CongNO suggests that congregations are currently able to deliver human services without increasing their reliance on public funds.

Limited Engagement in Community and Policy Environments

If congregations and other faith-based organizations are to increase their delivery of human services, they must be located in communities where service needs are extensive and be willing to participate in collaborations with other service providers and manage the competition involved. They must also be aware of key policy developments affecting them or people they wish to serve and be prepared to become involved in advocacy on issues that are important to them. We turn now to an examination of these issues.

Changing Community Conditions. The communities served by CongHS appear to be similar on several key dimensions to those served by FbHS and SecHS. All report a decrease in employment and business opportunities (40%), mixed changes in family household income (25% increase and 25% decrease), increases in ethnic/racial diversity (41%), and increasing population (50%). However, CongHS report a much lower incidence (14%) of growing crime and violence than do SecHS (25%) and especially FbHS (39%). They also report decreasing tension between different groups in their communities (7%), while 12% of FbHS report increasing tensions.¹² In general, these data indicate that CongHS do not serve neighborhoods as disadvantaged as those served by SecHS.

Targeting Disadvantaged Groups. Our analysis on the extent to which the congregations involved in human services target disadvantaged groups, particularly low income and racial or ethnic minorities, is incomplete at this point, pending further review of response categories. Preliminary results (see *Table 3*), suggest that CongHS are less likely than FbHS and SecHS to provide services that are targeted to the poor¹³ (18% vs. 38% and 30%) and racial/ethnic minorities

(14% vs. 33% and 18%). CongHS do appear likely to target specific genders (60%, most likely related to men's/women's groups/bible-study), youth (85%, most likely related to youth groups), and – not surprisingly – people of a particular faith (67%).

Involvement in Collaborations. *Table 4* shows that a majority of those involved in human services participate in some form of networking with other organizations. But the nature of the networking differs. CongHS are disproportionately (44%) involved in informal networks (e.g., cooperating, coordinating, and working together with other organizations) compared to FbHS (29%) and SecHS (33%). They are least involved (12%) in formal collaborations (e.g., legal, fiscal, administrative, or programmatic exchanges) (12% vs. 22% of FbHS and 25% of SecHS), suggesting that they are less firmly linked to other human service nonprofits. However, CongHS are better linked than CongNO with 45% of the latter reporting not being involved in any collaborations or networks compared to 29% of CongHS (we still need to determine potential denominational influences on these differences).

When CongHS are involved in networks, these involve mainly other congregations (98%) or other faith-based organizations (86%), as is also the case with FbHS nonprofits. SecHS nonprofits are most likely to be involved with other SecHS or government agencies (see *Table 5*).¹⁴ Even so, CongHS are much more involved than CongNO with secular nonprofits (61% vs. 19%), advocacy organizations (25% vs. 7%), mutual benefit organizations (21% vs. 2%), and business organizations (18% vs. 7%). Clearly, involvement in human services broadens the range of organizations with which congregations interact, compared to those not involved in such services.

On the other hand, involvement in these networks appears to be less beneficial to CongHS than to other human service nonprofits, perhaps reflecting their more informal types of collaborations. While some CongHS organizations report that these relationships make it easier to secure

key resources, the benefits accrue to fewer CongHS than is the case for FbHS and SecHS. Thus CongHS are less likely to find that collaborations make it easier to obtain funding (20% vs. 55% and 44%), recruit/retain board members (5% vs. 33% and 18%), recruit/retain volunteers (23% vs. 42% and 26%), meet client needs (41% vs. 72% and 55%), or enhance their visibility or reputation (56% vs. 90% and 70%). Only when it comes to recruiting or retaining staff does this pattern shift with 12% of FbHS reporting that inter-organizational networks make it harder to recruit/retain staff, compared to only 1% of CongHS and 3% of SecHS.

Still, inter-organizational networks appear to benefit CongHS more so than CongNO on a couple of dimensions. Thus, 23% of CongHS vs. 7% of CongNO reported that these relationships made it easier to recruit/retain volunteers and 56% of CongHS vs. 43% of CongNO reported that these relationships enhanced the organization's visibility/reputation.

Competition. While collaborations may bring benefits, the greater involvement with other organizations can also increase competition. We examine the extent to which CongHS compete with other types of organizations for financial resources, staff/volunteers, board members, clients, or in delivering services.¹⁵ Reflecting their more intense involvement with other religious organizations, CongHS report competing with religious organizations most frequently, ranging from 19% for recruiting board members to 78% for attracting clients. SecHS nonprofits indicate that they compete with other secular nonprofit organizations and business organizations at higher percentages than any other group. FbHS organizations are intermediary between secular and congregational organizations with over one-third reporting that they compete with both religious and secular nonprofits in all five areas. Overall, these are relatively low rates of competition. We do not know whether this reflects specialization in particular client and funding niches or if they are not very aware of other organizations operating in these niches.

Changes in the Regulatory Environment. Perhaps reflecting their more limited reliance on public funding, relatively few CongHS, compared to FbHS and SecHS, report stricter government regulations of contracts (5% vs. 16% and 22%) or client eligibility requirements (6% vs. 26% and 23%). CongHS are also less affected than FbHS and SecHS by tighter professional licensing requirements (8% vs. 24% and 28%) or personnel/legal requirements (4% vs. 21% and 26%). There were few differences in reports of stricter workplace safety requirements (23% vs. 28% and 36%). Finally, very few organizations of any type reported decreases in their regulatory environments. At best, these results suggest that Charitable Choice has not yet reduced regulatory pressures on congregations, as much as it has not increased pressures to the same extent as those faced by other human services-providing nonprofits.

Activism and Advocacy Issues. Finally, we examine the extent of involvement in advocacy activities and the types of policy issues or groups involved. We find no difference by religious status for human service nonprofits in terms of whether they are engaged in political activity: roughly 25% of CongHS, FbHS, and SecHS report that they promote positions on policy issues, 20% promote interests relevant to certain groups, and 3% promote the interests of political groups. However, while SecHS organizations are more likely to advocate for health and youth issues, CongHS and FbHS tend to advocate on issues traditionally associated with religious organizations: issues relating to the poor, youth, pro-life, anti-gambling, and the church-state relationship (*see Table 6*). CongNO are involved in issues similar to those of CongHS, but are less active than CongHS in advocating policy issues (13% vs. 24%) or promoting the interests of certain groups (9% vs. 18%).

We find a few somewhat ambiguous differences in the nature of resources these organizations devote to advocacy activities. CongHS and SecHS organizations are most likely to devote

volunteer (76% and 87% respectively) or financial resources (78% and 82% respectively) to these activities, while FbHS organizations are most likely to use staff resources (78%).

Conclusion

Overall, we are somewhat surprised by the large proportion of congregations (more than half) who report that they already provide some type of health or human services – these are the congregations that presumably are likely to be most directly affected by Charitable Choice initiatives. In general, it appears that these congregations (CongHS) may have as many key management structures in place as other human service nonprofits and therefore in principle be reasonably well equipped to deliver such services. However, their organizational capacities seem primarily geared toward running churches not social services. These capacities may not be easily transferable. Moreover, CongHS provide a narrower range of services, consider these services a lower priority, and seem to face more extensive challenges in delivering such services.

CongHS face similar community issues as other human service nonprofits and are involved in collaborative relationships with other nonprofits. These relationships tend to be both less formal and less intense, as indicated by a relative absence of competitive pressures. CongHS also appear to be less affected by the policy environment but equally involved in political activities. They are, however, more involved in all of these types of external relations than are congregations not involved in human services.

In the final analysis, however, the extent to which relatively few congregations are aware of national initiatives to make public funding available to congregations to deliver human services is shocking. We are particularly struck by the even smaller percentages that already obtain public funding or are interested in pursuing it and by the fact that those aware of the national funding initiatives are least likely to pursue it.

Table 1:**Median Age and Size of Indiana Nonprofits by Religious and Human Service Status**

Religious and Human Service Status	Years Since Established	Total Revenues	# of Full-time Employees	# of Part-time Employees	Total Compensation
Congregations w/ Human Services	76* (n=208)	140,991** (n=152)	1 (n=183)	3 (n=165)	65,000 (n=154)
Congregations w/ NO Human Services	56* (n=173)	80,253** (n=131)	1 (n=127)	2 (n=107)	35,603 (n=132)
Other Faith-Based w/Human Services	25 (n=95)	146,099* (n=83)	5 (n=67)	4 (n=59)	98,050 (n=60)
Other Faith-Based w/ NO Human Services	31 (n=85)	5,000* (n=62)	3 (n=32)	2 (n=35)	62,000 (n=34)
Secular Nonprofits w/Human Services	32 (n=417)	67,218* (n=312)	9** (n=192)	5* (n=181)	139,029* (n=210)
Secular Nonprofits w/ NO Human Services	27 (n=798)	19,655* (n=616)	2** (n=221)	2* (n=203)	50,000* (n=258)
All Respondents	34 (n=1,776)	49,663 (n=1,356)	3 (n=822)	3 (n=751)	60,000 (n=848)

Note: While we show statistical significance (* for $\alpha=.05$ and ** for $\alpha=.1$), these are based on difference of means test (comparing HS and No organizations for each religious status group, e.g., Cong, Fb, and Sec). Their statistical utility is questionable because of the skewed distributions involved. We use them only to indicate potential differences. The quantities in parentheses are the number of respondents for that category.

Table 2:
Average Number of Management Structures for Indiana Nonprofits
by Religious and Human Service Status

Religious and Human Service Status	Information Technology	Staff/Board Policies	Volunteer Policies	Financial Controls	Total
Congregations w/ Human Services	4.2 (n=224)	2.7 (n=224)	0.6 (n=223)	3.2 (n=224)	10.7 (n=224)
Congregations with NO Human Services	3.0 (n=172)	2.3 (n=171)	0.3 (n=171)	2.7 (n=171)	8.3 (n=172)
Other Faith-Based w/Human Services	4.2 (n=104)	2.6 (n=103)	0.7 (n=104)	2.6 (n=104)	10.0 (n=104)
Other Faith-Based w/ NO Human Services	2.9 (n=91)	2.2 (n=91)	0.2 (n=91)	2.1 (n=91)	7.3 (n=91)
Secular Nonprofits w/Human Services	3.5 (n=420)	2.6 (n=419)	0.6 (n=417)	2.6 (n=415)	9.2 (n=420)
Secular Nonprofits w/ NO Human Services	2.7 (n=829)	1.9 (n=831)	0.2 (n=816)	2.1 (n=828)	6.8 (n=832)
All Respondents	3.2 (n=1,840)	2.2 (n=1,840)	.4 (n=1,821)	2.4 (n=1,834)	8.2 (n=1,844)

Note: The quantities in parentheses are the number of respondents for that category. All difference of means are statistically significant at $\alpha=.001$.

Table 3:
Percent Targeting by Type of Target Population
Indiana Human Service Nonprofits by Religious Status

Type of Target Population	Congregations w/ Human Services	Other Faith-Based w/Human Services	Secular Nonprofits w/Human Services	All Human Service Nonprofits
Gender ($\alpha=.001$)	60% (n=195)	43% (n=81)	34% (n=353)	43% (n=629)
Age ($\alpha=.001$)	85% (n=201)	76% (n=84)	66% (n=370)	73% (n=655)
Race ($\alpha=.001$)	14% (n=185)	33% (n=81)	18% (n=323)	19% (n=589)
Income ($\alpha=.001$)	18% (n=185)	38% (n=81)	30% (n=349)	27% (n=615)
Faith ($\alpha=.001$)	67% (n=198)	48% (n=90)	9% (n=327)	33% (n=615)
Geographic Area (Not Significant)	63% (n=196)	59% (n=90)	65% (n=346)	63% (n=632)
Occupation ($\alpha=.005$)	9% (n=181)	19% (n=74)	21% (n=335)	17% (n=590)
Other ($\alpha=.005$)	19% (n=177)	22% (n=73)	33% (n=318)	27% (n=568)

Note: Quantities in parentheses are the number of total respondents in the organizational profile for the specific target group. Significance figures are based on χ^2 value for cross-tabulations of each target group with the three human services-providing profiles.

**Table 4:
Forms of Collaborations and Networks for Indiana Human Service Nonprofits
by Religious Status**

Collaboration/Network Response Categories	Congregations w/ Human Services	Other Faith-Based w/Human Services	Secular Nonprofits w/Human Services	All Human Service Nonprofits
Yes, involved in one or more formal collaborations	12%	22%	25%	21%
Yes, involved in one or more informal networks	44%	29%	33%	36%
Yes, involved in formal collaborations & informal networks	15%	16%	20%	18%
No, not involved in collaborations or networks	29%	33%	22%	26%
Total	100% (n=225)	100% (n=110)	100% (n=402)	100% (n=737)

Note: Relationships are significant at $\alpha=.001$. The numbers in parentheses are the number of respondents for that category.

**Table 5:
Types of Organizations Involved in Collaboration/Network Relationships for
Indiana Human Service Nonprofits by Religious Status**

Types of Organizations Involved in Collaboration or Network Relationships	Congregations w/ Human Services	Other Faith-Based w/Human Services	Secular Nonprofits w/ Human Services	All Human Service Nonprofits
Religious Congregation ($\alpha=.001$)	98% (n=153)	89% (n=63)	19% (n=256)	54% (n=472)
Other Religious Organization ($\alpha=.001$)	86% (n=138)	68% (n=56)	17% (n=255)	45% (n=449)
Secular Nonprofit (not significant.)	61% (n=105)	56% (n=54)	66% (n=281)	63% (n=440)
Nonprofit Advocacy Organization ($\alpha=.01$)	25% (n=99)	46% (n=55)	41% (n=271)	38% (n=425)
Nonprofit Mutual Benefit Organization ($\alpha=.01$)	21% (n=91)	31% (n=51)	41% (n=254)	35% (n=396)
Government Agency ($\alpha=.001$)	24% (n=97)	40% (n=58)	51% (n=272)	43% (n=427)
Business/For-Profit Organization ($\alpha=.001$)	18% (n=94)	53% (n=57)	40% (n=253)	36% (n=404)

Note: The quantities in parentheses in the body of the table refer to the number of respondents for that question. Significance levels for differences among types of human service organizations are reported in the far left column. Normally, α should be .05 or smaller for differences to be significant.

**Table 6:
Percentage of Indiana Human Service Nonprofits Involved in Advocacy
that Identify Particular Advocacy Issues by Religious Status**

Advocacy Issues	Congregations w/ Human Services	Other Faith-Based w/ Human Services	Secular Nonprofits w/Human Services	All Human Service Nonprofits
Health Care	7% (2%)	6% (2%)	24% (7%)	16% (5%)
Low Income Populations	18% (6%)	3% (1%)	5% (2%)	9% (3%)
Youth	14% (4%)	9% (3%)	18% (5%)	15% (5%)
The Environment or Environmental Issues	1% (<1%)	17% (5%)	9% (3%)	8% (2%)
Pro-Bible Issues	12% (4%)	26% (8%)	0% (0%)	7% (2%)
Pro-Life	35% (11%)	31% (9%)	0% (0%)	15% (5%)
Anti-Gambling	16% (5%)	0% (0%)	0% (0%)	5% (2%)
Church-State Relationship	0% (0%)	9% (3%)	0% (0%)	1% (<1%)
Listed Any Issue/Group	(34%)	(30%)	(30%)	(31%)

Note: The top percentages are based only on those organizations that indicated they advocate for any issue. The numbers of respondents are as follows CongHS (n=74), FbHS (n=35), SecHS (n=131), and HS Total (n=241). The quantities in parentheses are based on the total number of organizations in each profile; CongHS (n=228), FbHS (n=116), SecHS (n=438), and HSTotal (n=782).

Works Cited

- Grønbjerg, Kirsten A. & Brent Never. 2002. "Performing Different Types Of Volunteer Work: The Role Of Religious And Other Networks." Paper presented at the 2002 Annual Meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion. Salt Lake City, UT: October 31 – November 3.
- Grønbjerg, Kirsten A. & Salamon, Lester M. 2002. "Devolution, Privatization and the Changing Shape of Government-Nonprofit Relations." In Lester M. Salamon (Ed.), The State of the Nonprofit Sector. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Kennedy, Sheila Sues. 2001. "Constitutional Competence of Nonprofit Managers." Paper presented at the 2001 Annual Meetings of ARNOVA. Miami, FL: November 28 – December 1.
- Kennedy, Sheila Sues & Bielefeld, Wolfgang. 2002. "Government Shelves without Government Shackles? The Administrative Challenges of Charitable Choice." Public Administration Review 62 (1): 4-11.

Endnotes

¹ We express our deep-felt gratitude to the many Indiana nonprofits that completed our survey. Without their cooperation, we would have nothing to report. We are also grateful to the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University for its major financial support of the survey of Indiana nonprofits on which this analysis is based and to the Aspen Institute's Nonprofit Sector Research Fund and the Central Indiana Community Foundation (through its support of the Efrogmson Chair in Philanthropy) for their support of the survey follow-up, data analysis, and dissemination efforts. Additional funding and in-kind support has been provided by WBH Evansville, Inc.; The Center for Urban Policy and the Environment at I.U.P.U.I.; the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University on the Bloomington, Indianapolis, South Bend, Northwest, and Fort Wayne campuses; Ball State University; and the University of Southern Indiana. The survey instrument was based on key concepts developed by the Donors Forum of Chicago. Laurie Paarlberg did much of the initial work in developing the survey instrument and we received much valuable feedback on several versions of the instrument from a large number of individuals. We also acknowledge the work by Ange Cahoon, Amy Horst, Hun Myoung Park, Allison Leeuw, Julie Schaefer, and Erin Nave in carrying out a variety of follow-up tasks to the survey and by the Center for Survey Research at Indiana University for managing the survey process itself. The support and efforts of all of these strengthened this work enormously and we are grateful to them all. Of course, any remaining problems remain our responsibilities entirely.

² The survey was conducted in the winter and early spring of 2002 and included congregations, charities, advocacy, and mutual-benefit nonprofits. The sample was drawn from a master database of Indiana nonprofits developed from IRS-registrations under section 501(c), state nonprofit incorporations, yellow page listings of congregations, and a variety of local listings (see Grønbjerg, 2002). For a description of the "Indiana Nonprofit Sector: Scope and Community Dimensions" project, see www.indiana.edu/~nonprof. The design involved the use of a stratified sample to allow for comparisons among communities and database listings. The analysis presented here is based on the weighted sample for the state of Indiana. A total of 2,148 organizations responded to the survey, representing a response rate of slightly over 30% – the exact percentage is not yet determined since we are still tracking non-respondents to determine whether they are active or defunct.

³ For information on religious status, we relied primarily on a self-report of being a congregation, other faith-based organization, or a secular organization, a description of the organization's mission and primary activities, the organization's name, and a review of the organization's web-site (if available). For information about human service status, we relied on a question about whether the organization was currently involved in providing health or human

services, or had plans to do so within the next two years. Only those organizations that currently provide such services are included in the Human Services profiles because they are likely to be most directly affected by Charitable Choice initiatives. Organizations that do not currently provide services; but indicate an interest in providing services, are grouped with those that do not intend to provide such services because there were too few of them to warrant any separate analysis.

⁴ These differences are statistically significant at $\alpha = .001$ for χ^2_{15} (Pearson Correlation).

⁵ These include traditional human services programs (27%), youth development or housing (9% each), sports/recreation (8%), legal/law related services (7%), food/nutrition (3%), and employment programs (1%).

⁶ Somewhat surprisingly, this is not 100% of CongHS. 3% of CongHS do not list at least one religion based program or activity and 10% do not provide us with any programs or activities. 52% of CongHS list ONLY religion based programs or activities.

⁷ Unfortunately, our data on employment and financial characteristics suffer from fairly large non-response problems. We are currently in the process of contacting roughly 900 of our over 2,100 respondents to collect this missing information. Also, given the relatively large standard deviations for these responses (due to the presence of many small organizations), we report only median values for age, revenues, employees, and compensation.

⁸ While the differences in means are statistically significant at the $\alpha=.001$ level, the analyses explain only 6% of the variance in Information Technology, 7% in Staff/Board Policies, 8% in Volunteer Policies, 7% in Financial Controls, and 11% of the variance in the Total number of reported management structures. Organizational size as measured by Total Revenue generally explains greater levels of variance in the data: 42% of the variance in Information Technology, 39% in Staff/Board Policies, 7% in Volunteer Policies, 26% in Financial Controls, and 53% of the variance in the Total number of reported management structures. When comparing the means of only the HS organizations, the difference in means for the Staff/Board Policies and Volunteer Management categories are no longer statistically significant.

⁹ Comparing the extent of management challenges by organizational profile present some analytical challenges since almost all differences are statistically significant, but the analyses explain only small proportions of the variation.

All the relationships reported are statistically significant at the $\alpha=.05$ level or better.

¹⁰ Attracting new members/clients appears to be equally challenging for CongHS (92%) and CongNO (94%) organizations, but CongNO are significantly less likely to find maintaining the visibility or reputation of their organization a challenge (84% vs. 91%) suggesting that while all congregations may find it difficult to attract new members, human service congregations may find it more difficult to manage their image to external stakeholders.

¹¹ Some support for this supposition can be gathered from Grønbjerg & Never's (2002) analysis of volunteer activities in Indiana, where a greater percentage of respondents indicate they assist with religious services than in delivering human services. Their results rank-order activities as: fundraising (>25%), assisting with religious services (14%), leading/managing nonprofit organizations (12%), and delivering direct human services (12%).

¹² CongHS and CongNO communities appear to be quite similar, except that those served by CongHS are more likely to face greater ethnic/racial diversity (41% vs. 26% of CongNO) and higher incidence of changes in tensions between community groups (increasing for 6% of CongHS and 4% of CongNO, decreasing for 7% of CongHS and 1% of CongNO).

¹³ The survey question used in this analysis only asks if the program is targeted to "People of a particular income level." A cursory review of open-ended responses to this question indicates that most of these programs target people of low income; we are in the process of performing a more rigorous analysis of these data. Although a finer-grained analysis must be done we are fairly confident that the data support our argument that only a small percentage of CongHS respondents target their programs to low-income people.

¹⁴ We have some concern that the validity of these responses may be circumspect since relatively few CongHS responded to certain components of the question, e.g., 91 for mutual benefit organizations vs. 153 for religious congregations.

¹⁵ To control for non-response biases, we include only those organizations that compete with at least one type of organization for any of the five arenas examined here.