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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In the United States of America, social services were at first limited and most often provided by individuals and private groups (Smith & Lipsky, 1993). In the 19th and early 20th centuries, provision of services expanded when the U.S. government began supplying its citizens with many of the social services needed to address social problems (Smith & Lipsky, 1990, 1993). This included education, counseling, job training, assistance with housing, and monetary aid (Ryan, 1999). Meanwhile, the role of private charities was to “fill in the gaps” (Ryan, 1999, p. 128).

More recently, the nation’s welfare system has been restructured so that private charities are no longer just satisfying a void (Ryan, 1999). Instead, they are often the major contributors to the system of social services. This has prompted an increase in the number of organizations providing public charities. Most notable has been the growth of faith-based organizations (Ryan, 1999).

A History of Social Services in the United States

The role of the United States government in providing and aiding in the provision of human social services has seen significant changes throughout history. According to Smith and Lipsky (1993), “nonprofit organizations funded at least in part by government have played a key role in addressing social problems since colonial times” (p. 47). However, in its beginning, assistance was mostly spontaneous, voluntary, informal, and private. It was not until the 19th century that the U.S. government began to develop public institutions for education, housing assistance, and counseling (Smith & Lipsky, 1990, 1993). These institutions though did not
provide assistance for all who were in need of social services; rather, they only provided for those who were classified as “wards of the state” (Lynn, 2002, p. 60). This included those minors and incompetents who were placed under the care of government to receive housing, protection, and necessities (Garner, 2004; Lynn, 2002). So in order to fill a need, other organizations developed which were privately funded by nonprofit agencies, most often under religious sponsorship (Lynn, 2002).

Nearly a century ago, the administrative branch of government began to expand their involvement with public social service providers as well as private organizations (Lynn, 2002). One such expansion came with the ratification of the 16th amendment, known as the Tariff Act of 1913 which allowed for any corporation organized for religious, charitable, scientific, or educational purposes to be exempt from federal, state, and local taxation (Lynn, 2002). Similar changes in government funding for social services continued into the 1930s with the development of the Social Security Act which increased the participation of state government and the financial support of federal government in the provision of services (Lynn, 2002). In the 1960s, additional enactments caused the federal government to become even more involved in social services than it had been previously (Lynn, 2002). According to Lynn (2002), the most significant of these enactments were the amendments to the Social Security Act in 1962 and 1967 which further widened federal funding for state programs.

Beginning in the latter half of the 20th century though, problems with government’s involvement in social service provision began to arise (Lynn, 2002). Previous amendments to the Social Security Act had not created clear limits as to the types of services that were eligible for federal aid (Lynn, 2002). Also, loopholes allowed for acceleration in the flow of funds from
government to private charities (Lynn, 2002). As a result, Congress and the presidential administrations of the 1970s found federal spending on social services to be a waste (Lynn, 2002). In 1972, the U.S. government began to place limits on the amount of spending allowed for social services (Lynn, 2002).

The reduction in the role of government in social problem solving continued into the 1980s (Lynn, 2002). The Reagan administration further lowered federal funding and almost eliminated state matching requirements (Lynn, 2002). But unlike previous administrations which had only aimed to reduce government funding, this administration increased the participation of government in social problem solving by encouraging greater contributions from alternative institutions such as voluntary organizations, the business sector, and individual citizens (Bendick Jr. & Levinson, 1985; Lynn, 2002). Organizations once again became more private and were forced into obtaining financial support from alternative sources (Lynn, 2002).

The role of government in providing monetary assistance to nonprofit organizations changed once again in 1996 with the enactment of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (Lynn, 2002). This act authorized states to contract directly with faith-based organizations providing social services (Lynn, 2002). President George W. Bush carried on this new role by making charitable choice one of the federal government’s highest priorities (Lynn, 2002; Smith & Lipsky, 1990). Now, according to Lynn (2002), government plays a dominant role in supporting the level and direction of social service delivery in the United States, but the methods for distribution are decided upon by the organizations.
In February of 2009, while signing an executive order establishing the White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships, President Barack Obama made the following statement,

There is much that government can and must do to help people in need. But no matter how much money we invest or how sensibly we design our policies, the change that Americans are looking for will not come from government alone. There is a force for good greater than government. It is an expression of faith, this yearning to give back, this hungering for a purpose larger than our own, that reveals itself not simply in places of worship, but in senior centers and shelters, schools and hospitals, and any place an American decides. (United States Office of the Press Secretary, 2009)

Much like former President George W. Bush’s Health and Human Services Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiative, the assumption behind this executive order is that private religious charities can do as good or a better job than secular and government organizations in providing various social services (Bielefeld & Kennedy, 2003; Wuthnow, 2004; Wuthnow, Hackett & Hsu, 2004). However, more recent research demonstrated that the effectiveness of religious service organizations was not as good as nonsectarian service organizations (Bielefeld & Kennedy, 2003; Seley & Wolpert, 2003; Wuthnow, 2004; Wuthnow et al., 2004).

Rationale

According to Wuthnow (2004), the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) reported approximately 1,037,000 registered nonprofit organizations in the United States in 2003. Of those organizations, 36,575 were involved primarily in providing human services. Additionally, of those organizations offering human services, 13,532 (37%) were classified as “religious” or faith-based. However, Wuthnow (2004) implied that 37% may actually be too low of an estimate when considering that many religious nonprofits are either grouped under a single national organization or do not claim exemption through the IRS.
A common question among researchers is this: with recent orders from the executive branch encouraging the participation of faith-based organizations in providing human services, are these religious organizations more effective in aiding impoverished citizens of the United States? Or, do they merely act as complementary services to pre-existing government organizations?

Wuthnow et al. (2004) conducted a study of approximately 2,000 residents in low-income neighborhoods to determine perceptions about the effectiveness and trustworthiness of faith-based and other service organizations. They found that mean effectiveness scores were relatively high for faith-based organizations in comparison with those for the public welfare department. Further, Seley and Wolpert (2003) contended that faith-based organizations were significantly less likely than nonsectarian organizations to have not met the service needs of targeted recipients. But, Cooperman (2003) argued that a study conducted by Bielefeld and Kennedy (2003) at Purdue University in Indiana demonstrated that faith-based charities may not be better than non faith-based. According to Seley and Wolpert (2003), there is evidence to support that there is some competition; but, there is no definite conclusion as to which one is winning out over the other.

While research in this area is growing, Kissane (2007) argued that in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding, additional research is needed; research comparing different service providers, in different locales, and from multiple perspectives. By exploring recipients’ opinions of effectiveness from both faith-based and non-faith based nonprofit service providers in Dallas County and Tarrant County, this research aimed to generate findings to contributed to the mounting research.
Dallas County was founded in 1846 and Tarrant County was founded in 1849 by the state of Texas to serve as “decentralized administrative division(s)” in providing state services (Alvarez & Plocheck 2010; Tarrant County, 2007). Currently, with recent increases in the number of Dallas County and Tarrant County residents living below the poverty line, the necessity for the provision of social services remains prevalent.

As reported by Campbell and Nishimura (2010) of the Star-Telegram, the median household income in Tarrant County fell from $56,251 in 2008 to $53,726 in 2009. Likewise, the median household income in Dallas County fell from $47,155 in 2008 to $46,044 in 2009 (U.S. Census Bureau: USA, 2010). In conjunction with a decrease in the median household income, the 2009 American Community Survey, conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau, demonstrated that the number of people living below the poverty level in both Dallas County and Tarrant County had increased (Campbell & Nishimura, 2010). For 2008, the U.S. Census Bureau estimated that 13.2% of the national population lived below the poverty line. But by 2009, the poverty rate for the United States had increased to 14.3% (U.S. Census Bureau: USA, 2010). This increase was even more significant in Tarrant County where the rate of those living below poverty rose from 12.1% in 2008 to 14.7% in 2009 (U.S. Census Bureau: Tarrant County, Texas, 2010). Similarly, in Dallas County the rate of those living below poverty rose from 17.3% in 2008 to 18.7% in 2009 (U.S. Census Bureau: Dallas County, Texas, 2010).

According to Campbell and Nishimura (2010), the impact of these changes was very apparent to the Fort Worth-based Texas Food Bank Network. From 2008 to 2009, the Tarrant Area Food Bank saw an increase of almost 42% in families being served by social service agencies - from 31,234 families to 44,286. Additionally, the Tarrant Area Food Bank
experienced a 25% increase in the amount of food distributed – from 8,800 tons of food in 2009 to 11,000 tons in 2010 (Campbell & Nishimura, 2010).

In an article written by Garrett and Horner (2010) for the *Dallas Morning News*, the president of Central Dallas Ministries reported that in 2010 they were prepared to serve as many as 48,000 people. This was an increase of 11.2% from 2009 when they were prepared to serve 43,000 people and a 41.2% increase from 2008 when they were prepared to serve 34,000 people (Garrett & Horner, 2010).

The negative impact of increased poverty rates and decreased median income make the provision of social services in Dallas County and Tarrant County more necessary. The growing need for social services provided an opportunity to research recipients’ opinions of effectiveness of both faith-based and non faith-based nonprofit service providers in such a way as to contribute to the already developing research.

**Statement of Research Goal**

The purpose of the present study was to examine the effectiveness of faith-based and non faith-based anti-poverty nonprofit organizations in assisting a below poverty population. An evaluation of recipients’ responses from both service sectors in Dallas County and Tarrant County, Texas was the basis for this examination. This evaluation of recipients’ responses provided the basis for an explanation of which institution – religious or nonsectarian – had a higher rating of effectiveness; or, if they were rated similarly. Further findings from the research contributed to the debate on whether or not faith-based service organizations are more effective in providing services than government and secular nonprofit organizations (Kissane, 2007).
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Definition of Terms

Anti-poverty Nonprofit

Section 501 (c) 3 of the Internal Revenue Code defines a nonprofit organization as the following:

Corporations, and any community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary, or educational purposes, or to foster national or international amateur sports competition (but only if no part of its activities involve the provision of athletic facilities or equipment), or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, and which does not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office. (Cornell University Law School, 2008)

This definition would categorize most nonprofit hospitals, cultural organizations, traditional charities, schools, daycare centers, and foundations as falling under the title of nonprofit organization (DiMaggio & Helmut, 1990). But, the term “anti-poverty nonprofit” narrows this broad definition to include only those organizations whose core function is to provide a service that is aimed towards decreasing poverty rates. Those organizations that sponsor recreational sports competitions or aid in the prevention of cruelty to animals, although classified a “nonprofit,” would not fall under the category of “anti-poverty.” Charitable organizations which supply those living in poverty with food, clothing, support for good health, educational programs, job training, housing and energy assistance, and other basic human needs would carry this title (DCHC, 2009; Kissane, 2007; Magnuson, 2010). By meeting
the most basic needs of human beings, these organizations aim to help those in poverty to gain better financial and living conditions (Streeten, 1981).

*Below Poverty*

According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, in 2009, the poverty level for one person was $10,830. For each additional person in a family the poverty level increased by $3,740. So, for a 4-person family, the national poverty level is $22,050.

Measurements such as the one provided by the Department of Health and Human Services are absolute. They remain constant across nations and throughout history. Absolute measures have a fixed limit and simply distinguish the poor from the non-poor (Brady, 2003). And although most sociologists rely on the official estimates provided by United States’ measure of poverty, researchers such as Brady (2003) argued that this measurement is not completely adequate. It ignores the complex nature of the hardship, deprivation, and severity that is involved with living below the poverty level (Brady, 2003).

Brady (2003), and others like him, argued that poverty should be measured in more relative terms. Rather than simply distinguishing between poor and non-poor, relative measures reflect the difference between the poor and the majority of society. They are specific to each society according to current patterns of income distribution and social exclusion (Brady, 2003).

Social exclusion is defined as having disadvantaged or limited opportunities for economic resources, political privileges, and cultural experiences (Brady, 2003). As a result, those who are excluded from participating in society have unequal access to the same status,
benefits, and understanding as the majority of citizens (Brady, 2003). Without equal access, one is made poor.

_Faith-based_

In the debate about which is more effective, faith-based or non faith-based service organizations, one fundamental question is what distinguishes faith-based social service agencies from government and secular social service agencies.

Often times, religiosity is a characteristic that is assumed to be self-evident. But, when it comes to social service agencies, simply knowing the name, purpose, or public qualities of an organization may prove insufficient in identifying it as faith-based (Ebaugh, Pipes, Chafetz, & Daniels, 2003). So, in order to examine the relative effectiveness of faith-based and non faith-based service delivery, the term faith-based must be clearly defined.

Researchers (Jeavons, 2004; Unruh, 2001; Smith & Sosin, 2001; Search for Common Ground, 2002) have outlined the following as common characteristics of religiosity among faith-based service agencies: (1) affiliation with a church, denomination, or other religious agency; (2) an environment of religiosity (e.g., religious objects, images, symbols, literature, name, building); (3) selection of board, management or staff based upon religious beliefs and/or affiliation; (4) a mission statement that has explicit religious references; (5) dependency or financial support from religious sources; and (6) religious elements or content (e.g., direct communication of a religious message, client involvement in specifically religious activities). Ultimately, a religious social service agency is one which has resources, authorities, and cultures that represent relevant faiths (Unruh, 2001).
Throughout this study, the terms faith-based organization and religious organization are used interchangeably. Also, the terms non faith-based organization, nonsectarian organization and secular nonprofit organization are used in exchange for one another.

**Faith- vs. Non Faith-Based**

Faith-based organizations differ from other types of social service providers in regards to their approaches to delivery, types of service, number of organizations in existence, and sources of funds. Overall, when compared to government and secular organizations, faith-based service organizations tend to provide fewer and more concentrated types of services, offer different types of services, have fewer organizations in existence, receive more funding from private contributors, and locate in similar neighborhoods (Ebaugh et al., 2003; Graddy, 2006; Kissane, 2007; Wuthnow et al., 2004; Seley & Wolpert, 2003; Fischer, 2003; Roberts-DeGennero & Fogel, 2007; Lewis, 2003; Bielefeld & Murdoch, 2004; and Peck, 2008).

**Delivery**

Faith-based organizations have a significant role to play in delivering social services because they appeal to a diverse population (Wuthnow et al., 2004). For example, because faith-based organizations place a strong emphasis on transitional type assistance they are more likely to service recent immigrants than are non faith-based providers (Graddy, 2006, Seley & Wolpert, 2003). Additionally, faith-based organizations tend to work one-on-one with recipients (Graddy, 2006). Since the majority of faith-based organizations do not want to compromise their religious character when providing social services, their methods of delivery draw directly from their religious influence (Ebaugh et al., 2003; Graddy, 2006). Therefore, by offering individual service, providers are better able to demonstrate their faith through behavior and
expressions of religious beliefs (Tangenberg, 2004). Also, faith-based providers take a one-on-one approach to social service delivery because their labor force is primarily made up of volunteers. According to a 2001 study conducted in Houston, Texas by Ebaugh et al. (2003), faith-based organizations had a ratio of 15 volunteers to every 1 paid employee.

While faith-based providers are major contributors to the social service sector, they are not a substitute for secular organizations. Nonsectarian organizations also play an important role in providing services (Graddy, 2006). Unlike faith-based organizations, secular and government organizations are more likely to serve blacks, Latinos, and the below poverty population (Seley & Wolpert, 2003). Also in contrast to religious organizations, non faith-based organizations tend to be greatly involved in assisting with mental health and substance abuse services (Graddy, 2006). These types of services require treatment provided by trained professionals (Graddy, 2006). Therefore, non faith-based organizations have fewer volunteers than their faith-based counterparts. Ebaugh et al. (2003) found that on average, secular agencies in Houston, Texas had a ratio of 3 volunteers for every 1 paid employee. Due to the type of service being provided and their required professionalism, non faith-based organizations tend to take a less personal approach to providing social services (Graddy, 2006).

Types of Service

Despite their differences in delivery and appeal, Wuthnow et al. (2004) argue that the same needs that propel people to seek assistance from faith-based organizations also encourage them to seek assistance from non faith-based organizations. This occurs because, according to Fischer (2003), faith-based social service programs contain many of the same fundamental elements as their non faith-based counterparts.
Seley and Wolpert (2003) provide evidence to support that faith-based and nonsectarian organizations do specialize in such a way that they act as both competitors and complementarities to each other. In 2001, Seley and Wolpert (2003) conducted a survey in New York City which asked social service providers to identify their primary service areas. Table 1 shows those areas of service that providers from each service sector, faith-based and non faith-based, felt they were most involved in. For social services and for categories of social services such as youth centers, child and youth, family counseling, and health care, faith-based organizations and non faith-based organizations did appear to act as competitors (Seley & Wolpert, 2003). They were not competitors in the sense that they were in opposition to one another, but that they were vying for the same limited number of recipients, charitable contributions, and government contracts (Seley & Wolpert, 2003).

Table 1

Religious and Nonsectarian Organization’s Participation in Human Services, New York City, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Religious Organizations</th>
<th>Nonsectarian Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competition:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services (40%)</td>
<td>Social Services (33%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Centers (27%)</td>
<td>Youth Centers (22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and Youth Services (40%)</td>
<td>Child and Youth Services (30%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Counseling (36%)</td>
<td>Family Counseling (19%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health (20%)</td>
<td>Health Care (16%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complementarities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy in Housing (21%)</td>
<td>Advocacy in Employment (15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Day Care (24%)</td>
<td>Job Training (15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Seley, John and Julian Wolpert “Secular and Faith-Based Human Services: Complementarities or Competition” Paper presented at the Spring Research Conference, Independent Sector, Washington, DC.
On the other hand, Table 1 also shows that faith-based and non faith-based organizations act in complementary ways, each satisfying a niche not filled by the other. Seley and Wolpert (2003) provided data which showed that faith-based organizations were involved in advocating housing and child day care; but, their research gave no evidence to support that a significant number of nonsectarian organizations were providing a similar service. Likewise, data showed that non faith-based organizations were involved in advocating employment and job training; while, there were no data given by Seley and Wolpert (2003) to support that faith-based organizations were actively involved in the same service areas.

As shown in Table 1, a greater percentage of faith-based organizations (40%) were involved in social services than are non-sectarian organizations (33%). The reason, according to Graddy (2006), is that faith-based organizations’ greatest focus is in areas of social service. According to Table 2, faith-based providers had a “higher than expected presence” in only 5 out of 18 service categories: food, housing and shelter, other human services, civil rights, and recreation (Graddy, 2006). On the other hand, secular nonprofit organizations had a “higher than expected presence” in 11 out of 18 service categories (Graddy, 2006). The other service categories that did not have a “higher than expected presence” from either faith-based or non faith-based providers are accounted for by public organizations that specialize in services not related to anti-poverty such as public protection and safety, education, environment and animals, recreation and job services; and, for-profit firms which provide business services, and health and mental health services (Graddy, 2006).

Faith-based organizations tend towards assistance that focuses on two types of service: those centered on emergency needs and those services that help individuals to become
self-reliant (Roberts-DeGennaro & Fogel 2007; Grady, 2006). Therefore, their services focus on assistance with food, housing, clothing, counseling services, tutoring and mentoring services, child care, and language classes (Roberts-DeGennaro & Fogel, 2007). Secular and government nonprofit organizations though, also offer these same services but additionally provide services that deal with humanitarianism and voluntarism, community improvement, youth development and mental health (Graddy, 2006).

As shown in Table 2, Graddy (2006) found through a sample study of social service providers in Los Angeles County, that faith-based organizations were most involved in food services (20.3%) and “other human services” (36.0%). Additionally, in comparison to other service sectors, faith-based organizations were more involved in providing housing and shelter (9.1%) and mental health (8.2%) (Graddy, 2006). On the other hand, Graddy (2006) found that non faith-based organizations in Los Angeles County were most involved in “other human services” (27.8%), mental health services (17.6%), general health services (12.2%) and job services (7.0%).

Table 2 reveals that when comparing faith-based and non faith-based service providers, non faith-based organizations are more involved in all but two areas of social service provision: food services and housing services. A larger percentage of faith-based organizations (57.2%) are involved in providing food than are non faith-based (32.2%) (Graddy, 2006). Additionally, 44.6% of faith-based organizations provide services dealing with housing and shelter as compared to 31.8% of non-faith based service providers (Graddy, 2006). As Table 2 shows, secular nonprofit organizations vary more in the types of services they offer than do faith-based providers.
Table 2

Faith-based (FBO) and Non Faith-based (NFB) Provider Service Cross-tabulation, Los Angeles County, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>FBO # of PROVIDERS</th>
<th>FBO % within PROVIDER</th>
<th>FBO % within SERVICE</th>
<th>NFB # of PROVIDERS</th>
<th>NFB % within PROVIDER</th>
<th>NFB % within SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts/Culture</td>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td>Civil Rights</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Environment/Animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>480</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Organizations

As mentioned previously, there are more non-faith-based organizations in existence than faith-based. In 2003, the IRS reported that there were approximately 36,575 registered nonprofit organizations in the United States providing human services. Of those organizations, only 37% (13,532) were classified as faith-based. Data from the IRS were also emulated in two additional studies conducted by Graddy (2006) in Los Angeles County and Seley and Wolpert (2003) in New York City. As shown in Table 3, there were 1,630 non-faith-based nonprofit organizations in Los Angeles County as compared to 388 faith-based service providers (Graddy, 2006). Additionally, in a study conducted by Seley and Wolpert (2003) in New York City, 2,797 (34%) of operating nonprofit charities dealt with human services. Of those 2,797 organizations, 37% could be classified as faith-based while 63% were classified as nonsectarian. In this study of New York City, nonsectarian nonprofit organizations outnumbered faith-based organizations by 26 percentage points (63% – 37%).

Table 3

Service Providers by Organizational Type, LA County, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faith-Based</th>
<th>Non Faith-Based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of service provider organizations</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>1630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(% of total)</td>
<td>(11.2%)</td>
<td>(47.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of services offered</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>2727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(% of total)</td>
<td>(17.3%)</td>
<td>(49.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of services offered per provider organization</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Not only is the number of non-faith-based organizations in existence greater than the number of faith-based providers, the amount of services provided by non-faith-based
organizations is also greater than that of sectarian organizations. However, as shown in Table 3, Graddy (2006) found through his research that the average number of services offered per provider was greater among faith-based than non faith-based organizations. The 388 faith-based organizations in Los Angeles County accounted for 958 (17.3%) of the total services offered (Graddy, 2006). So, on average, each faith-based organization offered two or more services. On the other hand, the 1,630 secular nonprofits accounted for 2,727 (49.2%) of the total services; meaning that on average, each non faith-based nonprofit offered less than two services per provider (Graddy, 2006). Even though faith-based organizations are less varied in the services that they provide, each sectarian service provider is more likely to offer two or more services (Graddy, 2006).

Funding

With the new initiatives for assisting religious nonprofit organizations, there has been an increase in government funding of faith-based social services (Lewis, 2003). But, when looking at government’s involvement in non-profit organizations, Seley and Wolpert (2003) found that government still had greater monetary support of non faith-based organizations. As shown in Table 4, a representative study in New York City (2001) revealed that government funding accounted for approximately 59% of the total contributions for secular organizations and direct support accounted for 37% (Seley & Wolpert, 2003). But, for religious organizations, only 39% of the total contributions were government funded, while 53% came from direct supporters (Seley & Wolpert, 2003). From this research, it would seem that although government may, in recent years, have greater support for nonprofit organizations than it did in the past, it still tends to favor secular organizations (Seley & Wolpert, 2003).
Table 4

Religious and Secular Organizations, New York City, Revenues, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>No. of Organizations</th>
<th>Direct Support</th>
<th>Government Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>$524,574,115 (53%)</td>
<td>$379,690,152 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td>$674,823,028 (37%)</td>
<td>$1,080,786,136 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,797</td>
<td>$1,199,396,934 (43%)</td>
<td>$1,460,476,211 (52%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Remaining support comes from indirect sources.
Source: Seley, John and Julian Wolpert “Secular and Faith-Based Human Services: Complementarities or Competition” Paper presented at the Spring Research Conference, Independent Sector, Washington, DC.

Ebaugh et al. (2003) further support these findings. They determined that among homeless service agencies in Houston, Texas in 2001, 16% of the faith-based agencies received half or more of their funding from government sources. On the other hand, over half (51%) of all secular agencies received 50% or more of their funding from the government (Ebaugh et al., 2003). Ebaugh et al. (2003) also discovered that 47% of faith-based organizations received little to no funding from government as compared to 20% of secular nonprofits.

Though 47% of sectarian agencies received little to no funding from government, they did receive funding from other sources (Ebaugh et al., 2003). Twenty-eight percent of the faith-based homeless agencies in Houston, Texas received half or more of their funding from religious congregations. Additionally, 62.5% of faith-based agencies received 1% to 24% of their funding from secular organizations such as non religious foundations and businesses (Ebaugh et al., 2003).

Even though nearly half of all the faith-based organizations in this study received no funding from government, 56% of faith-based agencies actually preferred funding from
religious organizations rather than from government; and, only 16% preferred government support over support from religious and secular organizations (Ebaugh et al., 2003). As concluded by Ebaugh et al. (2003) and Seley and Wolpert (2003), secular nonprofit organizations do receive greater amounts of funding from government; and faith-based providers receive greater amounts of funding from private contributors.

Location

Both faith-based and secular nonprofit organizations rely heavily upon factors that will help publicize their services to consumers. One such factor is physical location of the agency. According to Bielefeld and Murdoch (2004), location of service is one of the most important decisions a provider has to make. Nonprofit agencies must locate in such a way that they will have access to resources; as well as, employees and volunteers (Bielefeld & Murdoch, 2004). If providers do not take location into account, Bielefeld and Murdoch (2004) stated that there could be considerable consequences for the organization. These consequences include competition from other organizations in the area; lack of support from funders due to contempt for the location; and, poor access to resources, employees, volunteers and service seekers (Bielefeld and Murdoch, 2004).

In addition to organizations having to locate where they have the most access to resources and labor, they must also locate so that they are easily accessible to those seeking social services. Peck (2008) found that although there are numerous organizations available to meet social service needs, people are sometimes unable to take full advantage due to the poor location of the organization. An overwhelming amount of nonprofit organizations locate in areas of poverty where they feel they will be closest to service seekers (Bielefeld & Murdoch, 2004).
But research has found that even when locating in areas of poverty, social service providers are not ideally situated because of competition for services (Bielefeld & Murdoch, 2004; Peck, 2008). It should be noted that people are not restricted to accessing only those organizations found within their area of residence (Peck, 2008). So, being located directly within areas of poverty is not necessarily the best decision when trying to meet accessibility for all social service consumers.

Research is unclear as to whether or not faith-based and non faith-based organizations differ in regards to location; or, if one is doing better than the other due to location. Graddy (2006) conceded that faith-based organizations may in fact locate differently than other service providers, but it is difficult to determine if their location makes them more or less accessible than secular organizations.

Needs of People Seeking Social Service Assistance

As defined previously, the term “below poverty” describes more than just a homeless population. However Illustration 1, which shows the most prevalent needs of the Denton County, Texas homeless population in 2009, provides some understanding as to what are the basic needs of a below poverty level population.

Wuthnow et al. (2004) report that the need for food and shelter are more likely than any other basic need to encourage people to seek assistance from faith-based organizations and non-sectarian organizations. Although Illustration 1 does not list food as being an important need, it does show that approximately 55% of respondents reported that housing or shelter was their most pressing need (Denton County Homeless Coalition [DCHC], 2009). But again, Illustration 1 shows the needs of a homeless population. For those who are living below
poverty but are not “homeless,” housing is not the most pressing need. Rather, they are most in need of food, clothing, support for good health, educational programs, utility bill payment assistance and job training (Kissane, 2007; Magnuson, 2010).

![Figure 1. Most pressing needs of homeless, Denton County, 2009.](http://www.cityofdenton.com/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=5451) Seley and Wolpert (2003) found that recipients of service from faith-based organizations were less likely than secular organizations to report having experienced unmet service needs. But, Wuthnow et al. (2004) discovered that the perceptions of effectiveness from those seeking social services were most affected by their resources (especially income) and the extent of their problems. The scarcer a person’s resources and the harder a person’s problems are to cope with, the less likely they are to say that the organization from which the person sought assistance was “effective” (Wuthnow et al., 2004). So, when providing services to those who are seeking assistance with meeting their most basic needs for survival, it is difficult to trust
effectiveness scores because their lack of resources and the extent of their problems tend to negatively affect recipients’ opinions of social service delivery.

Despite methods of delivery, types of services, number of organizations, sources of funding, location of providers or whether an organization is classified as faith-based or non-faith based, the overarching question is, “Are people’s needs being met?” According to researchers, the only way to really know if people’s needs are being met is to ask those seeking social services (Wuthnow et al., 2004).
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the present study was to contribute to the debate of whether or not faith-based nonprofit organizations are more effective in providing services than government and secular nonprofit organizations. According to Merriam-Webster Collegiate Dictionary (2008), the term “effective” is defined as producing the result that was intended. Effective nonprofit service organizations distinguish themselves from ineffective ones by adequately providing basic needs as advertised to the target population of those living at or below poverty (Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman, 2004). Ineffective service organizations do not suitably provide for basic needs, provide for the wrong needs, or provide services that are not regulated and vary excessively among the targeted population (Rossi et al., 2004).

This study evaluated the effectiveness of anti-poverty nonprofit organizations in serving a below poverty population by examining recipients’ opinions regarding the delivery of service (Rossi et al., 2004). More specifically, this assessment sought to find if services delivered were consistent with the expectations of recipients. Recipients’ evaluation of service provision of faith-based nonprofit organizations was examined along with recipients’ assessment of non faith-based organizations. It was through the evaluation of recipients’ responses that this study aided in explaining which institution – religious or nonsectarian – had a higher rating of effectiveness; or, if they were rated similarly.

The hypotheses of this study were as follows:

H₁: Faith-based organizations are expected to be rated differently relative to non faith-based organizations in regards to effectiveness.
H$_2$: Controlling for socio-economic and demographic variables of recipients, faith-based organizations are expected to be rated differently relative to non faith-based organizations in regards to effectiveness.

Research Design

This study was a non-experimental mixed-methods analysis examining recipients’ assessment of effectiveness between faith-based and non faith-based anti-poverty nonprofit organizations in assisting a below poverty population. The organizations were selected from the 2011 Blue Book: Directory of Community Resources and the 2011 Sourcebook. The Blue Book (2011), published by 2-1-1 Texas at the United Way of Tarrant County, provided a listing of all major nonprofit organizations, both government and religious based, providing services to residents of Tarrant County. The Sourcebook (2011), published by 2-1-1 Texas at the Community Council of Greater Dallas in affiliation with the United Way of Metropolitan Dallas, also offered the same listing of all major nonprofit organizations providing services to residents of Dallas County.

Data Collection

The data for this mixed-methods study were obtained through a survey-questionnaire. The survey had both closed- and open-ended questions. The closed-ended questions allowed participants to rate the effectiveness of the organization while the open-ended questions allowed participants the opportunity to express their thoughts without being reduced to a standard set of answers. The open-ended questions also allowed participants to make comments regarding areas of effectiveness that may not have been taken into consideration. The combination of both quantitative and qualitative methods allowed for more comprehensive answers to the research question (Spratt, Walker, & Robinson, 2004).
This survey was administered to a convenience sample of participants seeking assistance from anti-poverty nonprofit organizations. A total of 82 participants from four different organizations (two faith-based and two non faith-based) in Dallas County and Tarrant County participated in this study. These two locations were the focus of this study because both counties saw a decrease in the median household income and an increase in the number of residents living below the poverty line from 2008 to 2009. Two organizations from each county took part in this study.

All of the organizations selected provided clothing and/or food pantry services because these are the most offered by anti-poverty nonprofit organizations in Dallas County and Tarrant County. Because faith-based organizations are more likely to offer two or more services, organizations which offered one or both of these services were chosen. Additionally, two of the four organizations in the study provided adult education classes.

Originally, the study intended to only examine organizations which offered food and/or clothing services. However, one of the only two non faith-based organizations that had agreed to participate requested that participants of their adult education classes be surveyed. The program director did not want recipients of their food and clothing services to be surveyed because past studies of these recipients had yielded negative feedback. Consequently, recipients of the education classes were surveyed because no other non faith-based organizations were willing to participate in the study.

Recipients were surveyed from one non faith-based organization in Dallas County which provided adult education classes; one non faith-based organization in Dallas County which provided assistance with food; one faith-based organization in Tarrant County which provided...
adult education classes; and, one faith-based organization in Tarrant County which provided food and clothing services. All organizations selected served a population of approximately 30,000-40,000 individuals each year.

The designated supervisor of each organization was contacted through electronic mail and given an explanation of the study. Since the administrative staff of only two non faith-based organizations gave approval for their recipients to participate in the study, those two organizations were chosen and matched with two faith-based organizations. The organizations were matched based upon size and type of service provided. A total of four organizations participated in this study. Participants were conveniently sampled from among those seeking service during the organizations’ operational hours. First, each person entering the organization was given a flyer explaining the purpose of the study and qualifications for participation. To be eligible for this study, participants had to meet the following criteria: (1) be an adult (age 18 and older) and (2) have received assistance from the organization. Those individuals who expressed interest in participating received a more detailed explanation of the purpose of the study. Each participant was then given an informed consent form. The form indicated that (1) the study concerned an evaluation of effectiveness in faith-based and non faith-based anti-poverty nonprofit organizations in assisting a below poverty population in Dallas County and Tarrant County, (2) the participants were not required to contribute to this study, and (3) if they did participate, they could withdraw from the study at any time. The questionnaire took approximately 20 minutes to complete. Participants were compensated with a candy bar for taking part in this research study.
The survey questionnaires were administered in person on a printed piece of paper. Whenever participants had questions, the principle investigator was on site to assist them in completing the survey. Once the participant had completed their survey, the person returned it to the principal investigator. In addition to the written answers of participants, the principal investigator also recorded participants’ qualitative responses in order to obtain more detailed answers. Questionnaires and recordings were void of participants’ names. Each questionnaire that was returned was placed in a marked envelope for that particular organization.

Sample

Originally for this study, a convenience sample consisting of 120 participants from three faith-based and three non faith-based organizations was to be used. Because of the limited number of organizations willing to participate, 82 participants seeking assistance from two faith-based and two non faith-based nonprofit organizations were involved in this study. The sample size was composed of about 20 service seekers from each of the four different organizations and included both female and male participants who were over the age of 18.

Instrumentation

In this analysis of anti-poverty nonprofit organizations in assisting a below poverty population in Dallas County and Tarrant County, relative effectiveness was measured by participants’ responses to a closed- and open-ended questionnaire. Questions were drawn from the literature and adapted for the use of this study. This survey instrument was divided into three groups. The first group of questions asked for the demographic information about the participant. The second group of questions measured the types of services sought by the participant in comparison to the types of services actually received. The third group of
questions measured participants’ effectiveness ratings of the organization from which they were seeking service.

In this study, seven different dependent variables were used to assess the relative effectiveness of anti-poverty nonprofits in providing assistance to a below poverty population. Five of the dependent variables evaluated opinions of effectiveness based upon the respondents’ answers to a series of Likert-scale questions. The variable “return” was measured by recipients’ responses to the statement, “I am likely to return to the organization for future assistance.” The variable “needs met” was measured by recipients’ responses to the statement, “My needs and/or the needs of my family were met by the organization.” The variable “recommend” was measured by recipients’ responses to the statement, “I would recommend the organization to a friend or relative.” The variable “sufficient” was measured by recipients’ responses to the statement, “The services offered by this organization are sufficient for my needs.” The variable “effective” was measured by recipients’ responses to the statement, “This organization effectively serves those in need.” The response categories for each of these questions were coded as follows: strongly disagree = 1, disagree = 2, no opinion = 3, agree = 4, and strongly agree = 5.

Another of the seven dependent variables used to assess opinions of effectiveness was “grade.” Respondents were asked to rate the organization, in terms of effectiveness, by assigning it a grade of A, B, C, D, E, or F. A grade of “A” was coded as “very effective” and a grade of “F” was coded as “not at all effective.”

The seventh dependent variable, called “services received,” was created to assess whether or not participants received all of the services that they had been seeking from the
organization. This measurement compared the total number of services desired and the total number of services received by each recipient. For each respondent, a total count of services which motivated them to visit the organization and a total count of services which they actually received were obtained. The total number of services sought by each participant was then subtracted from the total number of services received. If the total was equal to or greater than zero, then the recipient received all of the services they came for. If the total was below zero, then the recipient did not receive all of the services they sought from the organization.

Two questions from the survey were used to obtain the data for the seventh dependent variable. The questions asked respondents to report the number and type of services which motivated them to visit the organization; and, the number and type of services they actually received from the organization on the day the survey was administered. The first question asked: “What services motivated you to visit this nonprofit organization today?” Having used the Dallas County Sourcebook (2011) and the Tarrant County Blue Book (2011) as a guide, respondents were given a list of 31 different services from which to choose (automobile donation, bus passes, clothing, electric bill payment, employment, food pantries, food stamps, furniture/household items, gas bill payment, gas money, GED instruction, heating fuel bill payment, homeless services, literacy, low income/subsidized rental, housing, meals, medical expense assistance, personal/grooming needs, prescription payment assistance, rent payment assistance, resume preparation assistance, rooming/boarding houses, sack lunches/dinner, school supplies, thrift shops, transitional housing/shelter, transportation, free/low cost, utility bill payment, water bill payment, other, please specify). Respondents were asked to mark as many services as applied to their needs. Immediately following the question about services
desired, respondents were also asked, “What services did you receive while you were here today?” For this question, respondents were given with the same list of 31 services provided by nonprofit organizations in Dallas County and Tarrant County and were asked to mark all that they had received.

The independent variables in this study were faith-based and non faith-based. This categorization was a nominal variable and was coded as follows: faith-based = 0 and non faith-based = 1. Organizations were classified based upon their own public proclamation as being either faith-based or non faith-based. Another independent variable in this study was type of service received: food and/or clothing services and adult education classes. This categorization was a nominal variable and was coded as follows: food and/or clothing services = 0 and adult education classes = 1. The other controlled variables in this study were age, gender, race/ethnicity, highest level of education, yearly household income, and marital status.

Operationalization of Variables

Dependent Variable

Drawing from the literature, a series of five Likert-scale questions were used to determine the dependent variables “return,” “needs met,” “recommend,” “sufficient,” and “effective.” These included three direct questions: “I am likely to return to this organization for future assistance”; “My needs and/or the needs of my family were met by this organization”; and, “The services offered by this organization are sufficient for my needs.” The other two questions indirectly asked recipients the following: “I would recommend this organization to a friend or relative” and “This organization effectively serves those in need.” According to Fisher (1993) and Jo et al. (1997), respondents would be less likely to answer in a socially desirable
way when asked to respond to the question from the perspective of another person or group. Asking recipients about how the organization would seem to others provides a more accurate measure of their opinions of effectiveness (Fisher, 1993; Jo, Nelson, & Kiecker, 1997).

The five questions had Likert-scale type answer choices: *strongly disagree* = 1, *disagree* = 2, *no opinion* = 3, *agree* = 4, and *strongly agree* = 5. Each of these five questions was used to examine participants’ views of effectiveness for the nonprofit organizations. Despite the use of indirect questioning respondents tended to agree; therefore, the agreeable responses were combined and the disagreeable responses were combined and recoded as follows:

1 = at least agree

0 = at least disagree

The last category, “at least disagree,” was used as the contrast.

Following the example of previous researchers who also sought to determine the effectiveness of faith-based and other service organizations using recipients’ perceptions (Wuthnow et al., 2004), the dependent variable “grade” was ascertained with the following question: “If you were to rate this organization in terms of effectiveness would you give a grade of A, B, C, D, E, or F (‘A’ being ‘very effective’ and ‘F’ being ‘not at all effective’)?” Wuthnow et al. (2004) stated that this question gave respondents the freedom to think about effectiveness in their own way rather than being confined to prepared statements. However, much like the previous Likert-scale questions, participants’ tended to answer this question favorably. No participant gave a grade below a C. Therefore, the categories were recoded as follows:

1 = A

0 = at least B
The last category, “at least B,” was used as the contrast.

The other dependent variable, “services received” was measured by subtracting the total number of services received by the participant from the total number of services which had motivated them to visit the organization. The questions used to determine this variable did not directly ask about effectiveness but were indicative of effectiveness. Since the questions were indirectly related to opinions of effectiveness, recipients’ responses were not influenced by their tendencies toward yea-saying and social desirability. The categories for this variable were:

1= at least received services desired

0= did not receive services desired

The category, “did not receive services desired,” was used as the contrast.

*Independent Variable*

Type of organization- Based upon their own public statement, each organization was categorized as one of the following:

1= non faith-based

0= faith-based

The last category, “faith-based,” was used as the contrast.

Type of service- Based upon their own proclamation, each organization was also categorized as providing the following services:

1= adult education classes

0= food and/or clothing

The last category, “food and/or clothing,” was used as the contrast.
Control Variables

Age - In the survey, respondents were asked their age. Responses ranged from age 18 to age 64. Therefore, age was recoded as follows:

1= less than 50
0= 50 and over

The last category, “50 and over,” was used as the contrast.

Gender – Participants were asked their gender. The categories for this variable were:

1= Male
2= Female

Race – In the survey, respondents were asked their race/ethnicity. There were six response categories: white non-Hispanic, African American, Hispanic/Latino, Asian or Pacific Islander, Native American or Alaskan Native, and other. The responses were recoded into the following categories:\(^1\):

1=African American
2=Hispanic/Latino
3=White

Education – For education, respondents had nine categories from which to choose: less than high school, high school/GED, some college, 2-year college degree (Associates), 4-year college degree (BS, BA), master’s degree, doctoral degree, professional degree (MD, JD), and

---

\(^1\) The race/ethnicities, Asian or Pacific Islander and Native American or Alaskan Native, were not included in the recoding because no respondents indicated that they were Asian or Pacific Islander and only two respondents indicated that they were Native American or Alaskan Native in addition to being white non-Hispanic. Because those two respondents also indicated that they were white non-Hispanic, they were grouped as white.
other. Because so few respondents reported having higher than some college, the variable was reclassified into:

1 = less than high school
2 = high school diploma/GED
3 = at least some college

Yearly Household Income – Participants were asked to indicate their yearly household income. In the survey, income was categorized as the following:

0 = less than 10,000
1 = 10,000 – 19,999
2 = 20,000 – 29,999
3 = 30,000 – 39,999
4 = 40,000 – 49,999
5 = 50,000 – 59,999
6 = 60,000 – 69,999
7 = 70,000 – 74,999
8 = more than 75,000

Since this study involved individuals living at or below poverty, the majority of respondents (53.1%) reported a yearly household income less than $10,000. Therefore, the variable was recoded into the following categories:

1 = less than $10,000
0 = $10,000 or more

The last category, “10,000 or more,” was used as the contrast.
Marital Status – For this variable, the survey provided participants with seven categories (single, never married, married, separated, divorced, widowed, and other) which were recoded as follows:

1= married
2= not currently married
3= never married

Procedure

As previously stated, two faith-based and two non faith-based anti-poverty nonprofit organizations were selected for the purposes of this study; therefore, the questionnaire was administered in four separate organizations. On each occasion, the survey was administered during a time when those organizations participating in this research were in service. Participants were conveniently selected during these times. A convenient selection, though not necessarily random, allowed for less bias from the organization relative to the administrative staff of the organizations selecting recipients to be surveyed.

After being selected, participants from each of the four organizations were asked to sign a consent form prior to answering the questionnaire. The consent form did not only act to ensure the participant of their anonymity but, it also described the purpose and the procedure of the study. All participants were required to sign the form in order to participate. In order to maintain confidentiality, the questionnaire did not require information that could compromise participants’ identity. Only demographic questions regarding participants’ age, gender, race/ethnicity, marital status, family structure, and income were required.
Next, participants were provided with a printed questionnaire and adequate space for completing the survey in order to further ensure their confidentiality. Each organization made available a room, away from service providers, to allow for privacy. After each participant had completed the survey, they were given an opportunity to ask any further questions they may have had regarding the survey.

Data Analysis

To test the research hypotheses, the quantitative data obtained from the survey-questionnaire were coded and analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science). The qualitative data were first transcribed then inductively analyzed. Several themes and concepts related to effectiveness were generated. These themes and concepts were then analyzed and compared with the quantitative results.

Binary logistic regression was used to examine how recipients of service rated the effectiveness of nonprofit organizations; controlling for type of organization, type of service, and demographics of participants (age, race, highest level of education, yearly household income, and marital status).
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The findings from this study were attained through the use of mixed methods approach. Mixed methods are most often used when addressing a complex research question (Morse & Niehaus, 2009). This study combined qualitative and quantitative data collection to more comprehensively answer the research question regarding opinions of effectiveness. If only qualitative data had been collected, there would have been a need for measurement. Likewise, if only quantitative data were gathered, there would have been a need for description (Morse & Niehaus, 2009).

The findings from this study were also obtained through the incorporation of Likert-scale type questions, direct questions, and indirect questions. In quantitative research, data collected by Likert-scale questions are more reliable because they provide a usable measure of attitudes (Kidder & Judd, 1986). Additionally, the use of indirect questions along with direct questions aids in controlling for social desirability bias (Jo et al., 1997).

Demographics

The characteristics of the sample are shown in Table 5. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 64 and the mean age was 39.02 years. The majority, 73.2%, were less than 50 years old and 26.8% were 50 years old or older. The sample comprised 30.5% male and 69.5% female. About 51.2% reported less than a high school education, 25.6% had either a high school degree or GED, and 23.2% had at least some college education. The majority, 57.3% reported a yearly household income of less than $10,000 and 41.5% reported a yearly household income of $10,000 and above. About 23.75% were married, 38.75% were not currently married, and
37.50% were never married. The sample was comprised of 24.4% African Americans, 39.0% Hispanic/Latino, and 36.6% White.

Table 5

*Sample Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25 (30.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57 (69.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than HS</td>
<td>42 (51.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS diploma/GED</td>
<td>21 (25.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least some college</td>
<td>19 (23.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50</td>
<td>60 (73.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and above</td>
<td>22 (26.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>20 (24.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>32 (39.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30 (36.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>19 (23.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently married</td>
<td>31 (38.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>30 (37.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than $10,000</td>
<td>47 (57.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 and above</td>
<td>34 (41.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Results

This study demonstrates that when asking for opinions of effectiveness, it is necessary to gather both quantitative and qualitative responses. Though the quantitative data from this survey-questionnaire showed that participants felt the organizations were highly effective in providing services to meet basic needs, the qualitative responses revealed a somewhat differing opinion. The responses revealed some trends of dissatisfaction with the location and
restrictions of the organizations. Other common trends in the qualitative data were needs not met by the organization and the need to visit other organizations for services. There were also cases where respondents were dissatisfied with hours of operation (3 respondents) and clothing services (2 respondents). The least mentioned frustration was the inadequate selection of food pantry items (1 respondent).

Location

Five participants (5.9%) expressed that the location of the organization was inconvenient because it was not located near their place of residency and it was sometimes difficult to find adequate transportation. One respondent, who was getting an adult education from a non-faith-based organization in Dallas County, stated the following in regards to the location of the organization:

Well, (the location of the organization is) not really (convenient). It’s kind of a little far for me. And for the first three times (that I visited the organization), I got lost...But it would be better for me, if there was a place near where I live like downtown or somewhere where I could say okay I’m going to take the bus cause I know exactly where I’m going.

Despite this respondent stating that the location of the organization was not convenient, he proceeded to give the organization a grade of an “A” for overall effectiveness. When asked why he gave the organization this grade, he made the following statement in regards to one of the instructors:

Because he’s a good person; he’s a good instructor. I think you can learn a lot quicker from him cause I’ve had instructors before (at other organizations) and they uh it’s hard to grasp what they’re, they’re talking way above my, my understanding. And, he’s good to understand. He’s a great teacher.
Restriction

Restrictions regarding the number of times recipients could visit an organization for services was another factor that some respondents disliked. Thirteen participants (15.3%) agreed that it would be helpful if organizations did not restrict the amount of services they provide. The following comment, given by a recipient of food pantry services from a non faith-based organization in Dallas County, reflected the sentiments of participants:

I think it’s (the restriction is) like 6 (times per year). It’s just like this month, my light bills are from 177 last month to 304 dollars this month so there’s no way if I buy food that I’m going to be able to pay all my bills. And I have to have electricity cause I, like I was saying...I have a daughter that’s 17. And then um...she has to have a place to live and electricity and food and water, ya know? I mean I’ll go...I've gone from a size 16 to a size 10 because I haven't been eating. I make sure she eats. And if I don’t eat that’s fine. I just honestly think that they...the people that really need help...they (the organization) should help more cause there’s people that lie and get...ya know what I’m saying? And that’s just very wrong. Like for me, cause I’m not that kind of a person. I feel bad even doing it now cause I feel like that poor old gentlemen I saw out there a minute ago that was homeless could use it more than I could. I’m not homeless but...ya know what I mean. So, I just think that they should, they need to figure out a way to give more. I mean, I understand that it’s hard because like even when I first got laid off I wasn't gettin...I was waitin' for unemployment and I wasn’t gettin’ any money at all and they, every time they’d say well call at the beginning of the month. Well, you call and you can’t get any help they’re already out of money for utilities, for rent, and I don’t do...I don’t drink, do drugs. I don’t do any of the things and you see people like they’re buying like 5 to 600 dollars worth of food stamps. And I can’t even get help for me and my daughter. I had to go to Mission Arlington before to get food. My friends would help me, I go to churches and I don’t like that because I’m very independent. So that’s just wrong. They need to...but I don’t know how you would do that ya know to where it would help more people.

Though this respondent only spoke on the ineffectiveness of the organization, she proceeded to give the organization a grade of a “C.” When asked why she gave the organization this grade, the respondent stated the following:

Because like I said, I think that they (the organization) really should...like with me...the restrictions...they need to really look at them and see you know like me, and I’m a single parent on top of, I don’t have my husband. And her dad is disabled...my daughter’s dad. So...um...I really think that they should look at all of that more closely. Then work out a level
of where they can help at a higher level. Yea, (so instead of just looking at whatever...bills, your housing situation...they need to look at the whole picture.) I don’t have any one to help me like a lot of people have a husband that works. I don’t have that luxury. Since we got divorced about eleven years ago, I’ve about raised my daughter on my own. Meanwhile, he does nothing. So, um...those things should be taken into consideration.

Visiting Other Organizations

Some of the participants, not having received the services they came for, had to look elsewhere for additional help. Seventeen recipients (20%) stated that they would be visiting other organizations during the month for services not provided by the organization they were visiting at the time of the survey. One recipient, who was receiving adult education classes from a non faith-based organization in Dallas County, made the following statement in regards to having received services from other organizations to meet all of his needs:

Well cause, see they (this organization) don’t help you with gas and I pick up cans. Sometimes I can’t pay my bills and he (referring to the case manager) will give me a list or he’ll refer me somewhere where somebody can help me pay my bills cause they don’t help me pay my bills.

When asked what other organizations he would be visiting that month, he proceeded with the following:

The Red Cross, Salvation Army, White Rock Hope Church...something like that. (They provide me with) clothes, bills (payment assistance), and they’ll give you bus pass...not monthly.

This respondent gave the organization a grade of a “B.” When asked to justify the grade, he only talked about the classes and stated nothing more about having to seek assistance outside of the organization. This was his statement:

It’s pretty good learning something I don’t know. They’re (the teachers at this organization are) pretty friendly and nice.
Needs Not Met

Surprisingly, few participants clearly commented on needs not being met. Nine participants (10.6%) expressed that their needs for bus passes, food, clothing, and various other services were not met by the organization. A recipient from a non faith-based organization, which provides food pantry services in Dallas County, gave the organization a grade of a “B.” Though this respondent gave the organization this grade for being effective, she also made the following statement about not having all of her needs met:

They (the organization) were pretty effective today. I’d say, (I give them a grade of) a B. They were effective…I just, ya know we didn’t get everything that we needed to take care of cause there’s a waiting list. (We didn’t get what we needed) for like help with our rent, and they don’t use our electric company just Energy that we’re gonna need help with (our bill).

Hours

Fewer people were dissatisfied with the hours of operation. Three participants (3.5%) agreed that the organization would be more effective in providing services if they had longer hours of operation. One recipient, who received adult education classes from a faith-based organization in Tarrant county, stated the following regarding the organization’s hours of operation:

I would think that they (the organization) could have a little bit longer hours maybe until uh…9 pm. I guess I’m involved in another nonprofit organization that is more classroom and teaching based and they tend to go ‘til 9 o’clock for ya know people that they know do hold a full time job that’s during the day that they can go to afterwards. I think the main hours that are here primarily fit for somebody that either works part time (or) isn’t currently employed.

This respondent gave the organization a grade of a “B” even though he felt that they would be more effective in serving those in need by extending their hours of availability for those individuals who are working but still need assistance with getting their GED.
Clothing Services

Few recipients remarked that they were displeased with the clothing services. Two recipients (2.4%) stated that they were dissatisfied with the cost and lack of clothing services. A service seeker, receiving food pantry and clothing services from a faith-based organization in Tarrant County, began by giving the organization a grade of an “A” but then changed her response to a “B” after being asked to give an explanation for her previous grade. She started justifying her grade as follows:

They’re (the organization is) really good and they provide. They always try to help us out. (I) wish like just like that the prices (for clothing) were just a little lower cause they’re kinda expensive for (me). And all the people, like the ladies, think they’re kinda expensive.

When asked if she would give them a lower grade because of the expense of the clothing pantry, she proceeded with this statement:

B, because all the ladies that come here they want like the prices to be a little lower.

Food Pantry Services

Only one participant expressed that there was not enough selection in the food pantry. Though this respondent was at the faith-based organization in Tarrant County to further her education, she had also received food pantry services from the organization and made the following comment:

Well, they...they (the organization) limit your times to come to the pantry. I guess due to the...could be that um...the high demands. Um...but yea, still it would be more useful if we could have more. But uh...and more selective items. And I mean selective by um...those basic needs. And not just what they wanna throw in there but...As far as the basic needs, I don’t necessarily think that it’s something more additional than that...but just the basic needs.
This respondent gave the organization a grade of a “B” and explained further why the organization was not completely effective in meeting her needs in regards to the food pantry, utility bill payment, and transportation assistance:

Well, that is due to the previous comment of uh...the pantry and uh...the selection. Too for example, the assistance of the utility payment. Um...also, the...you have to go through a lot of discretionary uh...qualifications or questions so, and sometimes that is...uh...more like my income is like way below even the $9,000 but I still don’t, probably don’t qualify for that (assistance) cause I tried it and, uh...I don’t qualify for it so....Being said that...uh, that’s why there’s, I’m thinking it’s just...I can’t give them the A but I’m thankful for I’m getting, considering. They have, they give some like transportation allowance money uh for like gas and stuff and on that it’s the same case. They use this umm...I’m sure they have their reasons but it can be more to open to more discretionary to help some more additional people. But uh...I really at this point I myself haven’t been benefit from that yet. (Money for transportation) would help me, for me to expand myself and go around because I’m looking for a job.

Overall, it seems that the high ratings from participants stem from their willingness to overlook what services they did not receive and appreciate what they were given. Instead of being critical, they tried to justify their needs not being met at times with phrases such as “there is a waiting list,” “I am thankful for what I am getting,” and “they always try to help.” The qualitative data revealed that respondents’ qualitative responses did not necessarily always correspond with their quantitative responses.

Quantitative Results

Participants tended to rate the organizations highly as shown in Table 6. While only a few (3.7% – 8.5%) “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with the each of the five Likert-scale type statements regarding effectiveness, the majority of participants (82.9% – 89.0%) “agreed” or “strongly agreed.”
Table 6

Responses of Social Service Recipients to Effectiveness Measures, Dallas and Tarrant County, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At least disagree</th>
<th>At least agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am likely to return to this organization for future assistance.</td>
<td>7 (8.5%)</td>
<td>68 (82.9%)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Needs Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My needs and/or the needs of my family were met by this organization.</td>
<td>6 (7.3%)</td>
<td>69 (84.1%)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sufficient</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The services offered by this organization are sufficient for my needs.</td>
<td>5 (6.1%)</td>
<td>72 (87.8%)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommend</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend this organization to a friend or relative.</td>
<td>3 (3.7%)</td>
<td>76 (92.7%)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization effectively serves those in need.</td>
<td>3 (3.7%)</td>
<td>73 (89.0%)</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 7 shows, participants under the age of 50 were more likely than those ages 50 and older to report that they “at least agreed” with the statement, “the services offered by this organization are sufficient for my needs.” Fifty-five recipients (98.2%) under the age of 50 “at least agreed” as compared to 17 recipients (81.0%) ages 50 and older. Also, those respondents ages 50 and older were more likely to report that they “at least disagreed” with the same statement regarding sufficiency of the organization than those under the age of 50. One recipient (1.8%) under the age of 50 stated that they “at least disagreed” while 4 recipients (19.0%) ages 50 years and older “at least disagreed.”
Table 7

Cross-tabulation of "Sufficient" and Recipients’ Age, Dallas County and Tarrant County, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>At least disagree</th>
<th>At least agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>55 (98.2%)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and older</td>
<td>4 (19.0%)</td>
<td>17 (81.0%)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 8, respondents also tended to give the organization high grades. Most respondents (81.7%) gave the organization a grade of an “A.” A similar percentage of respondents (89.0%) reported that they “at least agreed” that the organization is effective in serving those in need. Likewise, 3.7% of recipients gave the organization a “C.” The same percentage of respondents, 3.7%, reported that they “at least disagreed” with the statement regarding the effectiveness of the organization. These data show that participants’ responses to both the Likert-scale type questions and the question regarding grade were consistent.

Table 8

Frequency Distribution of Grades Given to Nonprofit Organizations by Social Service Recipients, Dallas County and Tarrant County, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No recipient gave a grade below “C”

By comparing the total number of services desired and the total number of services received by each recipient, these data revealed that many people’s needs were not actually “met” despite the majority of respondents reporting that they “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that “their needs or the needs of their family were met.”
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As shown in Table 9, 68.3% (56) of respondents received the same amount or more of the services they had needed from the organization. Yet, 31.7% (26) of recipients surveyed did not receive all of the services that had motivated them to seek assistance. As shown previously in Table 6, only 7.3% of respondents “at least disagreed” with the statement that the organization met their needs. When comparing the number of recipients who did not receive all of the services that had motivated them to seek assistance with the number of recipients who “at least disagreed” that they the organization met their needs, there is a difference of 24.4 percentage points (31.7% - 7.3%).

Table 9

*Frequency Distributions of Services Received by Recipients, Dallas County and Tarrant County, 2011*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least received services desired</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not receive services desired</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 10, those respondents with a high school degree/GED were more likely to report that they received services desired as compared to those with less than a high school degree and those with at least some college. Seventy-six percent (16) of respondents with a high school degree/GED reported receiving at least the same number of services as motivated them to seek out assistance as compared to 66.7% (28) of those with less than a high school degree and 63.2% (12) with at least some college.
Table 10

Cross-tabulation of Services Received and Recipients’ Education, Dallas County and Tarrant County, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At least received services desired</th>
<th>Did not receive services desired</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than HS</td>
<td>28 (66.7%)</td>
<td>14 (33.3%)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS degree/GED</td>
<td>16 (76.2%)</td>
<td>5 (23.8%)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least some college</td>
<td>12 (63.2%)</td>
<td>7 (36.8%)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 also shows that those with less than a high school degree were more likely than those with at least some college to report that they received at least the same amount of services or more than had motivated them to visit the organization. Twenty-eight respondents (66.7%) with less than a high school degree reported receiving more services than motivated them to seek assistance, as compared to 12 (63.2%) with at least some college. Further, those with at least some college were more likely than those with less than a high school degree to report that they did not receive all of the services they had desired from the organization. Seven respondents (36.8%) with at least some college and 14 respondents (33.3%) with less than a high school degree reported that they did not receive all of the services they sought from the organization.

As seen in Table 11, a greater number of recipients (32) from non faith-based organizations indicated that they at least received all of the services desired than recipients of faith-based organizations. Twenty-four (58.5%) recipients from faith-based social service organizations and 32 (78.0%) recipients from non faith-based social service organizations
reported that they received the same number of services or more than had motivated them to seek assistance.

Table 11

_Cross-tabulation of Services Received and Sector of Social Service, Dallas County and Tarrant County, 2011_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At least received services desired</th>
<th>Did not receive services desired</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FB</td>
<td>24 (58.5%)</td>
<td>17 (41.5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFB</td>
<td>32 (78.0%)</td>
<td>9 (22.0%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likewise, more recipients of service from faith-based organizations indicated that they did not receive all of the services desired than did recipients of service from non-faith based organizations. Seventeen (41.5%) recipients from faith-based social service organizations and 9 (22.0%) recipients from non faith-based social service organizations reported that they received fewer services than had motivated them to seek assistance.

*Binary Logistic Regressions*

To test hypothesis H₁, faith-based organizations are expected to be rated differently relative to non faith-based organizations in regards to effectiveness, binary logistic regression was used. The type of organization (faith-based and non faith-based) was regressed on each of the dependent variables developed from the 5 Likert-scale type questions: “return,” “needs met,” “sufficient,” “recommend,” and “effective.” Also, the type of organization was regressed on the dependent variable “grade” and “services received.” There was no significant relationship between the dependent and independent variables.
Binary logistic regression was also used to test hypothesis H2, controlling for socio-economic and demographic variables of recipients, faith-based organizations are expected to be rated differently relative to non faith-based organizations in regards to effectiveness. Controlling for age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, yearly household income, and marital status; type of organization (faith-based and non faith-based) was regressed on each of the dependent variables developed from the 5 Likert-scale type questions: “return,” “needs met,” “sufficient,” “recommend,” and “effective.” Controlling for the same demographic variables, type of organization was also regressed on the other measures of effectiveness: “grade” and “services received.” There was a significant relationship between “sufficient” and age as shown in Table 12. Respondents who are less than 50 were about 13 times more likely to report that “the services offered by this organization are sufficient for my needs” relative to those who are age 50 and older.

Table 12

*Binary Logistic Regression Results for Sufficiency of Social Services for Recipients’ Needs, Dallas County and Tarrant County, 2011*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory Variables</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50</td>
<td>12.941*</td>
<td>1.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and above</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(−) Reference category

(*) p < 0.05

Additionally, type of organization and education significantly correlated with “services received” as shown in Table 13. Having visited a faith-based organization reduces the odds of recipients reporting that they at least received services desired by about 73% (1-0.274 *100) as
Table 13

*Correlation Test Results for Services Received, Dallas County and Tarrant County, 2011*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory Variables</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB</td>
<td>0.274*</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Clothing</td>
<td>2.395</td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Classes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.663</td>
<td>0.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than HS</td>
<td>5.096</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS diploma/GED</td>
<td>8.820*</td>
<td>1.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least some college</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50</td>
<td>1.227</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and above</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1.849</td>
<td>0.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently unmarried</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(—) Reference category
(*) $p < 0.05$
compared to those who visited a non faith-based organization. Additionally, respondents with a high school diploma/GED are approximately 9 times more likely to report that they received the services desired relative to respondents with at least some college.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

This study examined the effectiveness of faith-based and non faith-based anti-poverty nonprofit organizations in assisting a below poverty population by evaluating recipients’ responses from both service sectors in Dallas County and Tarrant County, Texas. The purpose of the present study was to further contribute to the debate of whether or not faith-based nonprofit organizations are more effective in providing services than government and secular nonprofit organizations. The data for this study were collected through a survey-questionnaire which had both closed- and open-ended questions. The survey was administered to a convenience sample of participants seeking assistance from four different nonprofit organizations (two faith-based and two non faith-based). All of the organizations selected provided clothing and/or food pantry services. Additionally, two of the four organizations in the study provided adult education classes.

Demographics

The study sample consisted of a total of 82 participants who ranged in age from 18 to 64 and the mean age was 39.02 years. The majority of participants, 73.2%, were less than 50 years old and 26.8% were 50 years old or older. The sample comprised 30.5% male and 69.5% female. About 51.2% reported less than a high school education, 25.6% had either a high school degree or GED, and 23.2% had at least some college education. The majority, 57.3% reported a yearly household income of less than $10,000 and 41.5% reported a yearly household income of $10,000 and above. About 23.75% were married, 38.75% were not currently married, and
37.50% were never married. The sample was comprised of 24.4% African Americans, 39.0% Hispanic/Latino, and 36.6% White.

Hypotheses

For this study, two hypotheses were tested:

\( H_1 \): Faith-based organizations are expected to be rated differently relative to non faith-based organizations in regards to effectiveness.

The first hypothesis was not confirmed. Faith-based organizations were not rated differently relative to non faith-based organizations in regards to effectiveness.

\( H_2 \): Controlling for socio-economic and demographic variables of recipients, faith-based organizations are expected to be rated differently relative to non faith-based organizations in regards to effectiveness.

The second hypothesis was confirmed. Faith-based organizations were rated differently relative to non faith-based organizations in regards to effectiveness when controlling for socio-economic and demographic variables of recipients.

These data revealed that when controlling for socio-economic and demographic variables of recipients, non faith-based organizations are rated as more effective contrary to previous literature which indicates that faith-based organizations are more effective in providing social services to recipients.

The executive branch of the United States government has stated that faith-based organizations can do a better job of providing social services. As a result, researchers continue to study nonprofit organizations to find out if one service sector is truly more effective than the other. Previous studies conducted in California (Graddy, 2006), Indiana (Bielefeld & Kennedy, 2003), and New York (Seley & Wolpert, 2003), aimed to aid in explaining which institution – religious or nonsectarian – has a higher rating of effectiveness. The studies in Los Angeles...
County, California (Graddy, 2006) and New York, New York (Seley & Wolpert, 2003) supported the claims of the executive branch and showed that faith-based organizations were more effective in providing social services and were less likely than non faith-based organizations to have not met the service needs of recipients. However, the research at Purdue University in Indianapolis, Indiana revealed that religious charities did not always do a better job of providing social services than non religious charities (Bielefeld & Kennedy, 2003). This present study supported those findings from researchers at Purdue University. Non faith-based organizations in Dallas County and Tarrant County were better at meeting the needs of respondents than faith-based organizations.

Though the executive branch has been encouraging greater involvement of religious charities, this study revealed that increased participation of faith-based organizations does not equate to more effective provision of services. There are a greater number of faith-based organizations than non faith-based organizations in both Dallas County and Tarrant County; yet, the religious organizations included in the sample for this study were less likely to meet the needs of recipients. As defined previously by Rossi et al. (2004), ineffective organizations do not suitably provide for basic needs, provide for the wrong needs, or provide services that are not well regulated. Though this research did not seek to find if organizations were less effective due to providing the wrong needs or as a result of not regulating the services provided, it does show that faith-based organizations did not suitably provide for all the needs of recipients.

In addition to confirming the H2 hypothesis and finding that faith-based organizations are not necessarily better than non faith-based organizations at providing for human services; this study revealed that variables other than whether the respondent received services from a
faith-based or non faith-based organization correlate with one’s opinion of effectiveness. Though previous research regarding the effectiveness of anti-poverty nonprofit organizations did not report that age affects one’s opinions, the research from this study indicated that a person’s age may be a major contributing factor to their attitudes of effectiveness. Those under the age of 50 were more likely to report that the services provided by the organization were sufficient for their needs.

Education is a factor that correlated with one’s opinion in regards to services received. Those with a high school diploma/GED were more likely to report that they at least received services desired than those with at least some college. Adversely, those with at least some college were less likely to report that they at least received all of the services that they had desired. Perhaps one reason for this was that those with a higher education had expectations that exceeded what organizations were able to provide. Or, it could be that the type of services desired by those who were less educated were more frequently provided for by nonprofit organizations. As with age, previous literature does not discuss education as a factor affecting opinions about the effectiveness of nonprofit organizations.

Limitations

Sample Size

Rather than survey all possible service seekers in regards to their opinions of effectiveness for each of the anti-poverty nonprofit organizations in Dallas County and Tarrant County, this study aimed for a sample of approximately 120 participants from six organizations. Due to a number of limiting factors, the actual sample size for this study was 82 participants.
from four organizations. A relatively small sample size is limiting because most or all of the perceptions for the population surveyed may not have been collected.

The sample size was limited to those organizations which agreed to participate in the study. Although 95 anti-poverty nonprofit organizations were contacted – 27 from Dallas County and 68 from Tarrant County – only 11 organizations expressed interest in allowing recipients to complete a questionnaire regarding the effectiveness of services provided. Of those 11 organizations willing to participate in the study, nine were faith-based and two were non faith-based. The original intent was to survey participants from three faith-based and three non faith-based organizations. However, because only two non faith-based organizations responded positively, only two of each type of organization – faith-based and non faith-based – were chosen for this study. Therefore, this research is limited to the responses of participants from those four organizations which agreed to participate and met the criteria for selection. Six organizations said “no,” four organizations said “maybe,” and 74 organizations did not respond at all. It is unclear as to whether the other organizations simply did not want to participate or they feared that participants would rate their services as ineffective.

This study was further limited to those who were actually seeking services during the time the survey was being administered. While a random sample would have been desired, participants were chosen with convenience sampling and may not have entirely reflected the population of anti-poverty nonprofit service seekers in Dallas County and Tarrant County. This study was not able to survey all those who could have potentially received service or those who had received services in the past.
Social Desirability

This study is subject to the limitation of social desirability because it relied heavily upon respondent’s self-reported opinions. Research that is largely based upon self-reporting is likely to produce data that are biased toward respondent’s perceptions of what is socially acceptable (Fisher, 1993). Though respondents were informed of the procedures for maintaining confidentiality, social desirability could have still occurred. According to Phillips and Clancy (1972), respondents may answer questions based upon what they feel others would find favorable even though they have been guaranteed anonymity. “Others” can include interviewers and observers (Phillips & Clancy, 1972). Though respondent’s were told that their answers would be kept anonymous and that the research was for a purpose separate from the organization, respondents may have still answered opinion questions based upon what they thought would be desirable to employees and volunteers. Because the questionnaires were administered onsite, respondents may have been unable to disassociate the researcher from the nonprofit organization.

It is also likely that self-reported data were biased towards the respondent’s tendency to say “yes” despite the question being favorable or unfavorable (Couch & Keniston, 1960). Couch and Keniston (1960) refer to these types of respondents as yea-sayers. While social desirability is common among data collection involving questionnaires and interviews, yea-saying frequently occurs with Likert-type scales that contain responses varying from strongly agree to strongly disagree (Couch & Keniston, 1960). This may have been the case with these data because the qualitative responses from this study somewhat indicated that respondents were not as satisfied as the quantitative responses revealed.
Though social desirability and yea-saying can occur in nearly all social science research, this study may have been more susceptible due to the population it seeks to study (Fisher, 1993). According to Phillips and Clancy (1970; 1972) there is an inverse relationship between class and desirability; as well as between class and a tendency to yea-saying. Therefore, respondents of a lower social or economic class, have a higher tendency towards both.

Due to the population surveyed for this study, respondent’s answers to questions may have also been influenced by their lack of expectations. According to Couch and Keniston (1960), yea-sayers tend to be characterized as unreflective, quick to act, easily influenced, and unable to tolerate delays in gratification. Because yea-sayers tend to be unreflective, they may have had lower expectations regarding the services they hoped to receive. Further if they cannot tolerate delays in gratification, then any service received may be satisfying to respondents even if not entirely what was desired. This may have been the case with this study. The qualitative findings show that even though some of the respondents did not receive all of the services they came for, they justified their needs not being met with phrases such as “there is a waiting list,” “I am thankful for what I am getting,” and “they always try to help.”

Previous research demonstrates that data that are influenced by social desirability and yea-saying can provide misleading research results (Fisher, 1993). But though this sample size may have been influenced by both desirability and the tendency to agree, the qualitative answers provided by respondents do give better insight into the opinions of recipients of social service.
Future Research

Further research is needed in order to study the topic of relative effectiveness of anti-poverty nonprofit organizations in assisting a below poverty population. Future research should consist of representative samples which include a larger and more diverse population in order to find which factors really correlate with effectiveness. Further, respondents should be sampled from a larger number of organizations. This study was restricted to only those few organizations which were willing to participate in the study. A greater sampling of organizations is necessary to finding which factors correlate with effectiveness.

More research is needed in order to contribute to the debate of whether or not faith-based service organizations are more effective in providing assistance than government and secular nonprofit organizations. While this research intended to add to earlier findings, future research in different locations and from various perspectives is still needed. This study coincides with the research at Purdue University (Bielefeld & Kennedy, 2003) but contradicts those studies in California (Graddy, 2006) and New York (Seley & Wolpert, 2003). More research from other areas and from different population samples may help to provide a more thorough explanation as to which social service sector – faith-based or non faith-based – is better at providing assistance with basic needs.

Future research should use questions which specifically ask about the effectiveness of the organization as a whole. Because this study did not make this specification, recipients tended to judge the effectiveness of only one aspect of the organization. Generally they focused on the services that were received and did not factor in those aspects which did not fully meet their needs.
Finally, more qualitative studies on this topic should be used in future research. As shown by this study, quantitative responses may not fully reveal the opinions of recipients. Though the quantitative data from this study showed that participants felt the organizations were highly effective in providing services to meet basic needs, the qualitative responses showed some trends of dissatisfaction.
APPENDIX A

FLYER
Effectiveness of Anti-Poverty Nonprofit Organizations

I am conducting a study on the relative effectiveness of anti-poverty nonprofit organizations in Dallas County and Tarrant County. To be eligible for participation you must

- be an adult (age 18 and older) and
- have received assistance from this organization

If you meet these requirements, I would love for you to complete my survey. The survey may take up to 20 minutes of your time. Please let me know today if you would be willing to participate. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at UNT.

Thank you for your help. You will remain anonymous.

Callie Gregory
Master’s Student
Department of Sociology
University of North Texas
APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT FORM
Before agreeing to participate in this research study, it is important that you read and understand the following explanation of the purpose, benefits and risks of the study and how it will be conducted.

**Title of Study:** Relative Effectiveness of Anti-Poverty Nonprofit Organizations in Assisting a Below Poverty Population in Dallas County and Tarrant County: Recipients of Faith-Based and Non Faith-Based Organizations

**Principle Investigator:** Ami R. Moore, Ph.D., University of North Texas (UNT) Department of Sociology.

**Key Personnel:** Callie Gregory, Master’s Student, University of North Texas (UNT) Department of Sociology.

**Purpose of the Study:** You are being asked to participate in a research study that will examine recipient’s opinions of effectiveness of faith-based and non faith-based anti-poverty nonprofit organizations.

**Study Procedures:** You will be asked to participate in a survey questionnaire which will require approximately 20 minutes to complete.

**Foreseeable Risks:** The foreseeable risks are minimal. There is a possibility that you may experience thoughts of sadness, anxiety, or regret when answering survey questions. To reduce the potential for risk, you reserve the right to withdraw from this study at any time without any penalty.

**Benefits to the Subjects or Others:** This study is expected to benefit the organization from which you are seeking assistance. If this organization is found to be providing services which are perceived as not very effective, then they may begin to find better ways to serve those seeking assistance. This may in turn have indirect benefits for you and other service seekers as providers may improve their services.

**Compensation for Participants:** You will receive a candy bar as compensation for your participation once you have completed the survey.
Procedures for Maintaining Confidentiality of Research Records: In order to maintain confidentiality, the questionnaire will not ask any questions which could reveal your identity. Confidentiality of each individual’s information will be maintained in any publications or presentations regarding this study.

Questions about the Study: If you have any questions about the study, you may contact Ami R. Moore at (940) 565-4267 or Callie Gregory at (940) 565-2296.

Review for the Protection of Participants: This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-3940 with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.

Research Participants’ Rights: Your signature below indicates that you have read or have had read to you all of the above and that you confirm all of the following:

- Ami R. Moore, Ph.D. or Callie Gregory has explained the study to you and answered all of your questions. You have been told the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or discomforts of the study.
- You understand that you do not have to take part in this study, and your refusal to participate or your decision to withdraw will involve no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The study personnel may choose to stop your participation at any time.
- You understand why the study is being conducted and how it will be performed.
- You understand your rights as a research participant and you voluntarily consent to participate in this study.
- You have been told you will receive a copy of this form.

____________________________________
Printed Name of Participant

____________________________________
Signature of Participant ____________________ Date

For the Principle Investigator or Designee:

I certify that I have reviewed the contents of this form with the subject signing above. I have explained the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or discomforts of the study. It is my opinion that the participant understood the explanation.

____________________________________
Signature of Principal Investigator or Designee ____________________ Date
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE
Recipient of Service Survey
Please take a few minutes to fill out this survey regarding the services you have received from this nonprofit organization.

Demographic Information

1. What is your age? __________

2. What is your gender?
   ○ Male
   ○ Female
   ○ Other; please specify: ____________

3. What is your race/ethnicity?
   ○ White, non-Hispanic
   ○ African American
   ○ Hispanic/Latino
   ○ Asian or Pacific Islander
   ○ Native American or Alaskan Native
   ○ Other; please specify: ______________

4. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   ○ Less than High School
   ○ High school/GED
   ○ Some College
   ○ 2-Year College Degree (Associates)
   ○ 4-Year College Degree (BS, BA)
   ○ Master’s Degree
   ○ Doctoral Degree
   ○ Professional Degree (MD, JD)
   ○ Other; please specify: ____________

5. What is your employment status?
   ○ Employed full time
   ○ Employed part time
   ○ Self-employed
   ○ Unemployed / Looking for work
   ○ Unemployed/ Not currently looking for work
   ○ Retired
   ○ Unable to work
   ○ Other; please specify: ____________

6. What is your total yearly household income?
   ○ Less than 10,000
   ○ 10,000 – 19,999
   ○ 20,000 – 29,999
   ○ 30,000 – 39,999
   ○ 40,000 – 49,999
   ○ 50,000 – 59,999
   ○ 60,000 – 69,999
   ○ 70,000 – 74,999
   ○ More than 75,000
   ○ Other; please specify: ____________

7. What is your marital status?
   ○ Single, never married
   ○ Married
   ○ Separated
   ○ Divorced
   ○ Widowed
   ○ Other; please specify: ____________

8. How many people are in your household? ____________

9. Specify relationship to each member of your household:
   1. _________________
   2. _________________
   3. _________________
   4. _________________
   5. _________________
   6. _________________

10. Which best describes your current living situation? (Mark all that apply)
    ○ House, apartment or mobile home
    ○ Owned by you or someone in this household with a mortgage or loan.
    ○ Owned by you or someone in this household without a mortgage or loan.
    ○ Rented for cash rent
    ○ Occupied without payment of cash rent
    ○ Assisted Living
    ○ Shelter
    ○ Other; please specify: ____________
**Services Received**

11. Is this your first time to visit this nonprofit organization? ___Yes ___No

12. If no, how many times do you usually visit this organization each year?
   ___Less than once a year ___2 or 3 times ___4 or 5 times ___More than 5 times ___Other; please specify: __________

13. Does this organization restrict the number of times you can receive services each month? ___Yes ___No

14a. If yes, how do you feel about it? Why do you feel the way you do?
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________

14b. If no, how do you feel about it? Why do you feel the way you do?
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________

15. Is the location of this nonprofit organization convenient for you? ___Yes ___No

16a. If yes, why is the location convenient for you?
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________

16b. If no, why is the location inconvenient for you?
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________

17. Is this the only organization you will be visiting this month? ___Yes ___No

18. If no, what other organization will you be visiting? ________________________________

19. What does this other organization provide to you?
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
20. What services motivated you to visit this nonprofit organization today? (Check all that apply)

- Automobile Donation
- Bus Passes
- Clothing
- Electric Bill Payment
- Employment
- Food Pantries
- Food Stamps
- Furniture/Household Items
- Gas Bill Payment
- Gas Money
- GED Instruction
- Heating Fuel Bill Payment
- Homeless Services
- Literacy
- Low Income/Subsidized Rental
- Housing
- Meals
- Medical Expense Assistance
- Personal/Grooming Needs
- Prescription Payment Assistance
- Rent Payment Assistance
- Resume Preparation Assistance
- Rooming/Boarding Houses
- Sack Lunches/Dinner
- School Supplies
- Thrift Shops
- Transitional Housing/Shelter
- Transportation, Free/Low Cost
- Utility Bill Payment
- Water Bill Payment
- Other, please specify:
  ______________________

21. What services did you receive while you were here today? (Check all that apply)

- Automobile Donation
- Bus Passes
- Clothing
- Electric Bill Payment
- Employment
- Food Pantries
- Food Stamps
- Furniture/Household Items
- Gas Bill Payment
- Gas Money
- GED Instruction
- Heating Fuel Bill Payment
- Homeless Services
- Literacy
- Low Income/Subsidized Rental
- Housing
- Meals
- Medical Expense Assistance
- Personal/Grooming Needs
- Prescription Payment Assistance
- Rent Payment Assistance
- Resume Preparation Assistance
- Rooming/Boarding Houses
- Sack Lunches/Dinner
- School Supplies
- Thrift Shops
- Transitional Housing/Shelter
- Transportation, Free/Low Cost
- Utility Bill Payment
- Water Bill Payment
- Other, please specify:
  ______________________
**Effectiveness Rating**

Rate the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5, one being “Strongly Disagree” and five being “Strongly Agree.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. I am likely to return to this organization for future assistance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My needs and/or the needs of my family were met by this organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I would recommend this organization to a friend or relative.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The services offered by this organization are sufficient for my needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. This organization effectively serves those in need.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. If you were to rate this organization in terms of effectiveness, would you give it a grade of A, B, C, D, E, or F? (A being “very effective” and F being “not at all effective”)

O O O O O O
A B C D E F

28. Why did you give the organization this grade?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.
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