

Appendix A

Methods in Brief

Our study utilized qualitative methods to evaluate faith-based and secular welfare service programs. Our principal method of inquiry was qualitative interviewing. This approach enabled those interviewed (agency directors, program managers, and program participants) to assess and evaluate these programs in their own words. Doing so permits interviewees to render narrative assessments of their experiences with programs in a way that is not possible with preconfigured survey responses. Such an analytical strategy enables respondents to provide more in-depth, nuanced assessments of these programs. Moreover, because the qualitative interviews utilized were semi-structured, all respondents were asked the same basic questions; yet, at the same time, semi-structured interviewing left the researcher free to probe as needed for additional insights and to pursue germane topics that surfaced during the course of the interviews.

As described in Chap. 1, our comparative case study approach provided us with the opportunity to examine variations in perceptions and practices observed across social service delivery domains and geographical locales. The beginning point for each of our investigations was the comparative case study protocol developed by the Rockefeller Institute. (The research instruments designed by the Rockefeller Institute and utilized in this study are featured in Appendix B.) Briefly, that protocol specified that no fewer than eight social service agencies should be included in the comparative case study—four agencies in each of two locales. Within each locale, four cases were to be selected as follows: one privately funded faith-based agency, two publicly funded faith-based agencies (ideally characterized by different levels of religious intensity), and one publicly funded secular agency. However, the contours of actual service provision in each of our study locales required that a number of important adaptations be made to this protocol. In the end, we were each able to achieve samples that exhibited variation in agency type and funding source.

The Faith Integration Survey administered in each agency contained 15 items designed to gauge the extent to which faith influenced the program in question (that is, the Programmatic Elements scale, items 28–42 on the survey). The survey also included a Relevance of Religious Practices scale designed to tap the intensity of religious expression in the program (items 43a–43h). Each of these scales was scored separately from the rest of the survey because the unit of analysis in this study is the program. For both scales, items were reverse coded so that a 4 (strongly

agree) represents the highest level of faith integration and 1 (strongly disagree) represents the lowest level of faith integration in the program.

To conduct this study, interviews were conducted with agency personnel and program participants. Efforts were also made to collect as much information about programs as could be gathered. Although such information was not available for all programs, we were typically able to collect some (if not all) of the following: administrative forms, curricular materials, advertisement brochures, and (in a few cases) formal program evaluations. The initial wave of interviews was conducted in two phases—first agency personnel, then program participants. This two-phase approach to interviewing was necessary to establish a rapport with several of the agencies and build trust with local personnel before being allowed to conduct client interviews. It was also designed to maximize client participation by allowing sufficient time to set up such interviews. Given the formidable impact of the Great Recession on the social service sector, follow-up interviews were conducted for the transitional housing case study (Michigan) and the addiction recovery programs (Washington-Oregon). Because the Responsible Fatherhood Initiative was no longer operational in Mississippi, no follow-up interviews could be conducted after the Great Recession.

Interviews with agency personnel (executive directors and program managers) were conducted, and then were analyzed with the following conceptual factors in mind:

- Program goals and objectives—What does the program attempt to accomplish, in terms of both specific goals and broader overarching objectives? How do agency personnel conceptualize these goals and objectives? Why are programs oriented around these particular goals and objectives?
- Program implementation and rationale—How are the stated goals and objectives pursued during the course of program administration? What specific techniques (pedagogical, programmatic) are employed in the program? Why are those particular strategies employed?
- Program evaluation—How successful has the program been? In what ways has it been effective at meeting its goals and objectives, and in what ways has it been ineffective at doing so? What teaching techniques have been effective and ineffective? When barriers to program effectiveness have been encountered, how have they been confronted, and have they been overcome?

Program participant interviews collected during the second phase of the research were also conducted. These interviews were conducted with participants who were enrolled in or had completed the programs offered by agencies. The analysis of program participant interviews was guided by the following concerns:

Program evaluation—How do participants assess the program? What program material was most helpful, and what was least helpful? What improvements, if any, would they suggest for the program?

Personal change from program participation—How, if at all, did the program affect participants' beliefs and practices? Did the program have any discernible

impact on participants' relationships with others? What, if anything, do they now do differently because they have enrolled in or completed the program?

Our data analysis was aimed at discerning three critical elements of interviews: standpoints (perceptions), strategies (motivated actions, aspirations), and stories (experiential narratives). We also paid attention to social action (practices) observed during fieldwork visits. The analysis of qualitative data is ineluctably a product, in part, of the positionality or situated perspective of social researchers. Our positionality is influenced by our disciplinary training and our historical vantage point, among a host of other factors. Our understanding of the data evolved as faith-based initiatives emerged, crested, and receded, at least in terms of the public attention it received. Our reflection on the long-term trajectory, or "arc," of faith-based initiatives was enhanced by waiting to complete this volume until after the 2016 election was decided. Thus, the subject matter exhibits an arc—or mobile trajectory—as does research positionality.

Appendix B

Research Instruments

This section features the research instruments that were used to conduct the study. The Faith Integration Survey (FIS) was initially used to categorize agency types. However, given the complex character of most organizations (except for faith-intensive or wholly secular agencies), the FIS proved to be of limited utility beyond broadly discerning clear-cut organizational identities. Nevertheless, the instrument can be used as a device to render broad categorizations. Therefore, we include it here. The interview questionnaires that follow the Faith Integration Survey were the core research instruments used to conduct our comparative case studies given our heavy reliance on in-depth interviews.

B.1 Faith Integration Survey

This survey examines the varying ways and degrees that religious faith may be incorporated or expressed in nonprofit organizations that deliver social services. The program we are interested in today is your agency's [name of program]. Whenever this survey asks about a program, we are referring to this program. Some of our questions will refer to the organization that oversees your program. For some programs this is a separate organization, for others, the program and governing organization are one and the same.

1. Is there a separate organization that operates and oversees the activities of the program?
 - (1) Yes (continue to Q. #2)
 - (2) No (skip to Q. #5)
2. What is the name of the organization that operates and oversees the program?

This questionnaire consists of a series of statements that describe how religious faith might be integrated into your organization and the services provided by the program. We are interested in the extent to which your program and organization possess each of these characteristics. Some of these questions require a "Yes" or

“No” response. Others will ask you to indicate how much you agree or disagree that a given statement accurately describes your organization or program.

B.1.1 Organizational Elements

3. Is your organization affiliated with a religious organization?
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
4. Our organization has a clearly religious name or identity.
 - (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
5. Is the program affiliated with a religious organization?
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
6. Our chartering documents, such as our incorporation papers or bylaws, contain open, clear references to religious beliefs or principles.
 - (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
7. Our organization focuses on participants as whole persons through a commitment to their physical, emotional, and spiritual well-being.
 - (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
8. Our organization’s commitment to our program participants is based on religious beliefs or convictions.
 - (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable

9. Staff members or volunteers perform their work in our organization as an expression of their religious values.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
10. Members of the board/governing body typically share the religious beliefs or convictions of our organization.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
11. Do you reserve or appoint a share of the positions on your board/governing body for individuals affiliated with your religious organization?
- (1) Yes
 - (2) No
 - (3) Not applicable (e.g., no board or governing body)

B.1.2 Administrative Elements

12. Religious values strongly influence administrative decisions in our program.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
13. The agencies that we partner with share our religious beliefs and convictions.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable

14. Our program draws on religious values and beliefs in training and motivating staff and volunteers.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
15. Support staff typically share the religious beliefs or convictions of our organization. (By support staff, we mean secretarial or clerical staff or those supporting administrative operations.)
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
16. Program staff typically share the religious beliefs or convictions of our organization. (By program staff, we mean counselors, trainers, therapists, or those with direct substantive contact with program participants.)
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
17. Executive staff typically share the religious beliefs or convictions of our organization. (By executive staff, we mean program directors, staff supervisors, or those making executive decisions about institutional direction.)
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
18. Program participants typically share the religious beliefs or convictions of our organization.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable

19. In determining eligibility for services, preference is given to program participants who share the religious beliefs or orientation of our organization.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
20. We recruit volunteers from religious sources, like congregations or other religious organizations.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable

B.1.3 Environmental Elements

21. Program participants come across religious symbols, pictures, artifacts, music, or people dressed in religious clothing in our facility.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
22. Do the services, activities, or programs offered by your program take place in a facility that is otherwise used for religious worship?
- (1) Yes
 - (2) No
23. Are religious beliefs or principles readily displayed in your organization's or program's mission statement?
- (1) Yes
 - (2) No
 - (3) Not applicable (e.g., agency does not have a mission statement)

24. Our agency's program has a clearly religious name or identity.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Disagree
- (4) Strongly disagree
- (5) Not applicable

B.1.4 Funding Elements

25. Preference is given to funding sources that would not jeopardize the religious content of program activities.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Disagree
- (4) Strongly disagree
- (5) Not applicable

26. Most of our funding comes from religious organizations.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Disagree
- (4) Strongly disagree
- (5) Not applicable

27. We promote the religious mission of our organization when making requests for funding.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Disagree
- (4) Strongly disagree
- (5) Not applicable

B.1.5 Programmatic Elements

28. Religious literature is distributed or made available to program participants.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Disagree
- (4) Strongly disagree
- (5) Not applicable

29. Program participants join in worship services as an element of our program.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
30. Program participants are invited to worship services that are separate from the program.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
31. Program participants join in group prayer—such as at the beginning or ending of meals or meetings—as an element of our program.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
32. Program participants pray or meditate as an element of our program.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
33. Program participants study religious texts as an element of our program.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
34. Program participants learn or discuss religious beliefs, values, or traditions as an element of our program.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable

35. Program participants perceive or think about our program as faith-based.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
36. Program participants are encouraged to make personal religious commitments.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
37. For our program to be effective, program participants must undergo a religious transformation.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
38. Program participants are encouraged to make personal changes in attitudes and behaviors that are based *clearly and openly* on the religious values of our organization.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
39. Program participants are encouraged to make personal changes in attitudes and behaviors *understood but unspoken* as being based on the religious values of our organization.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable

40. The faith elements incorporated into our program are clear and open.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
41. Program participants are required to participate in mandatory faith elements of our program.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
42. The faith element of our program is primarily reflected in the service and care provided by our staff.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable

B.1.6 Relevance of Religious Practices

43. The questions above asked about your own organization and program. These final questions are for more general background. Different religions may express religious faith in distinct ways. Religious practices also vary among faith-based service organizations. Practices relevant to a faith-based organization (FBO) in the Catholic tradition, for example, may not be relevant to an FBO in the Muslim tradition. Please think about the faith tradition with which your organization identifies, if any. Please tell me how strongly you agree or disagree that a service organization thoroughly integrating that faith tradition would include the following items in its programs.
- (a) Religious literature, distributed or on display.
- (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable

- (b) Worship service
 - (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
- (c) Prayer in a group setting, such as at the beginning or ending of meals or meetings.
 - (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
- (d) Individual prayer or meditation.
 - (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
- (e) Teaching/discussion of sacred texts.
 - (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
- (f) Teaching/discussion about religious values.
 - (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable
- (g) Encouraging program participants to make personal religious commitments.
 - (1) Strongly agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly disagree
 - (5) Not applicable

(h) Encouraging program participants to change attitudes or behavior based on religious values.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Disagree
- (4) Strongly disagree
- (5) Not applicable

B.2 Survey of Executive Directors

B.2.1 Organizational Attributes

1. What is the formal name of the organization? _____
2. What is the name and title of the organization’s administrator of [program]?

3. Does the organization have a mission statement? Yes No
Please describe the mission statement or the general mission of your organization. _____
4. What is the average number of clients you typically serve in a month?

5. We would like to know about the types of clients you serve. Please estimate what percentage of all clients are in each category and the average length of service for each type of client.
Children 12 and under ____ % _____ months
Teens, 13–19 ____ % _____ months
Single Male Adults ____ % _____ months
Single Female Adults ____ % _____ months
Families ____ % _____ months
6. Do you serve any special populations? Yes No
If yes, what special populations? _____
7. What kinds of services do you provide directly? _____
8. What kinds of referrals do you make (if any)? _____
9. Do you collect data on clients and outcomes? Yes No
10. How many paid full-time staff (FTEs) work in your organization?

11. How many volunteers work for your organization? _____
12. Would you call your organization a secular or faith-based organization?

13. If faith-based, are you affiliated with a particular group or denomination? Yes No
If yes, which group? _____

B.3 Interview Schedule: Executive Directors

1. Could you tell me about the history of your program?
 - Probe: I see that you (do/do not) accept government funds to support your program. Why have you chosen to do so?
 - Probe: How do you think that decision has affected the way to conduct your program?
2. In your own words, what are the goals of the program?
 - Probe: How does the program work? For example, what types of clients do you typically see?
 - Probe: How are clients usually referred to your program?
 - Probe: Once a client contacts you, what happens? Could you please walk me through the typical process for the typical client?
3. What would you say is the rationale or theory behind your program?
 - Probe: How would you define “success” in this program? What kinds of outcomes do you hope for?
 - Probe: What efforts have you made to measure the effectiveness of your program?
 - Probe: What kinds of data have you collected? If you have conducted program evaluations, could I have a copy of those?
4. To what extent do you expect the people to whom you provide these services to change their attitudes or behavior? If you do try to change their attitudes or behavior, how—in what ways—do you expect them to change?
 - Probe: How do you go about changing clients’ attitudes or behavior?
 - Probe: How do you measure changes like these?
5. What kinds of relationships do you have with other service providers in [geographic area]?
 - Probe: Are you part of a coalition? If so, how often do you meet and what usually happens when you meet with others in the coalition? Who are some of the other organizations in the coalition?
 - Probe: Do you have an external support structure outside your organization? If you do have regular contacts with regional or national organizations, could you please tell me about them?
6. Now I would like to ask you to describe your organization and how it is structured. Do you have an organizational chart that you can give to me?
 - Probe: What is your background? Training? Experience? How were you recruited for this job?

7. Who are the people who you consider members of your management team, and what kind of background and education, and experience does each one have?
 - Probe: How many front-line workers who work directly with clients do you have? Who are they and what kind of background, education, and experience does each one have?
 - Probe: How many volunteers work directly with clients? Who are they and what kind of background, education, and experience does each one have?
8. How successful do you think this program has been?
 - Probe: How do you think clients have been affected by their coming in contact with and going through your program?
9. Now I am going to show you a list of organizations in our study that provide similar services in [geographic area]. On a scale of 1–10, with 1 not being at all effective and 10 being very effective, how would you rate each of these organizations?

B.4 Interview Schedule: Program Managers/Coordinators

1. (a) First, I would like to know something about you and your program. What is your background? Training? Experience? How were you recruited for this job?
 (b) Now, Could you please tell me a bit about program? How does the program work? For example, what types of clients do you typically see? For each type of client, under what circumstances do they typically come to your program in the first place?
 - Probe: How are clients usually referred to your program?
 - Probe: Once a client contacts you, what happens? Could you please walk me through the typical process for the typical client?
2. I would like to know a bit more about the process. What do you do at intake?
 - Probe: What forms do clients fill out? Do they have to meet certain criteria to qualify for services? What are they?
 - Probe: What do you say to them? Do you have a script that you follow for each client? Do you have a procedures manual? (If so, request a copy.)
 - Probe: Do you give them any written materials? (Secure copies, if available.)
3. What happens once a client has been processed at intake and found eligible for services?
 - Probe: Is there usually a waiting list? How long do people have to wait to get into your program?
 - Probe: What do they do in the meantime?
4. Do you make referrals?
 - Probe: Do you provide services directly on site?

5. How would you define “success” in this program? What kinds of outcomes do you hope to achieve?
6. To what extent do you expect the people to whom you provide these services to change their attitudes or behavior? If you do try to change their attitudes or behavior, how—in what ways—do you expect them to change?
 - Probe: How do you go about changing clients’ attitudes or behavior?
 - Probe: How do you measure changes like these?
7. How successful do you think this program has been?
 - Probe: How do you think clients have been affected by their coming in contact with and going through your program?

B.5 Interview Schedule: Clients

B.5.1 Survey of Client Interviewees

First name and initial of last name _____

Age _____ Gender _____ Race-ethnicity _____

Do you have any children? Yes No

[If yes] How many children do you have? _____

Age of each child: _____, _____, _____, _____, _____, _____

What was the highest grade that you completed in school? _____

Marital Status: Never married Married Separated Divorced

Month and year you entered the program: _____

If you have already left the program, approximate month and year you left:

Have you ever been in this program before? Yes No

[If yes] Month and year you first entered and month and year you left:

First entered: _____ Left program: _____

Have you ever participated in other programs providing this same service?

Yes No

[If yes] Which program(s)? _____

Do you currently have a job? Yes No

[If yes] How many months have you had this job? _____

[If yes] Approximately how many hours do you work per week, on average?

[If no] Are you currently looking for work? Yes No

Are you receiving cash assistance now? Yes No Support services?
 Yes No

Are you receiving any other benefits? SSI Food Stamps Medicaid
 Unemployment

B.5.2 Client/Focus Group Questions

I. Experience with program

- (a) How did you come to be in [name of program]?
- (b) What it is like to be in this program? What it is like to go through this program?
- (c) How do you feel about the program? What do you like and don't like about it?
- (d) How does this program compare to other programs that you know about or have heard about?

II. Services

- (a) What kind of relationship do you have with the staff who work with you?
- (b) What messages is she/he sending to you?
- (c) What services have been offered to you?
- (d) How do you find out about them?
- (e) What services have you used?
- (f) What do you think about the services?
- (g) What do you like or dislike about them?
- (h) Which ones have been most helpful? Why?

III. Program effects

- (a) How have you personally been affected by going through the program? What have been some of the good effects? And what have been some not so good effects?
- (b) How have others in your household been affected by you being in the program?
- (c) How has your spouse or partner been affected? What have been some of the good effects? Not so good effects?
- (d) How have your children been affected? What have been some of the good effects? Not so good effects?
- (e) What could the staff in this program be doing that would be better for you and your household?
- (f) How have you changed by being in the program?

- (g) How have your circumstances changed? What's different today compared to the few weeks before you entered the program?

IV. The future

- (a) What are your goals for the future? Where would you like to be one year from now?
- (b) How has the program helped you move towards these goals?
- (c) What have you learned in the program that you have found most useful now or in the future?

V. Religious content

- (a) Has any staff person in the program ever talked to you about your faith, your religious life, or your spirituality? [If yes] Who initiated the conversation?
- (b) How did you feel about that?
- (c) Do you think that some kind of religious or spiritual counseling would have helped you reach the goals that you just told me about? How?

Appendix C

Descriptions of Programs and Agencies

This appendix provides brief descriptions of programs and agencies included in the study as ascertained during the initial wave of data collection. While agency information is provided to offer context, it bears mentioning that programs are the primary unit of analysis in this study. Agency names were assigned as pseudonyms (false names) for the Michigan cases. The larger number of organizational cases in the Washington-Oregon study locale leads us to treat the agencies under relevant groupings (faith-intensive privately funded, etc.) rather than as individual programs or organizations.

C.1 Mississippi Parenting Programs

C.1.1 Faith-Intensive Privately Funded Programs

St. Andrew's Mission. Located in the southwest Mississippi town of McComb, St. Andrew's is a professional service agency affiliated with the United Methodist Church. The agency self-identifies as a faith-based organization (FBO). In fact, a Methodist church is located on the same lot as the agency. Thus, it is an FBO geographically linked with a religious organization. This affiliation notwithstanding, St. Andrew's is an interdenominational ministry. Agency personnel take pains to state that their ministry is "ecumenical." They have ten full-time employees and seven part-time workers, with fifteen volunteers supporting the various services provided by the agency. The agency seeks to provide what its staff describes as a "fill-in-the-gap, total person ministry." This approach to community service entails providing established programs coupled with a proactive effort to remain attuned to emergent community needs. St. Andrew's offers a wide range of services, including a soup kitchen and food ministry (with food delivery), a day care center and after-school program, bill payment, home repair, and medical services. In all, they serve about 2,000 clients per month. Given the size of their day care and after-school programs, they serve more preteen children than any other population.

However, just under half of their clientele is composed (in order of magnitude) of single female adults, single male adults, and families.

The parent education program at St. Andrew's Mission is run out of its Family Investment Center. St. Andrew's Mission uses the Active Parenting curriculum in its parent education class. Like most programs at St. Andrew's, this one is offered on a year-round basis. The Active Parenting program is based on the principles of building the child's self-esteem, permitting the child to reap the natural or logical consequences of his or her choices, and organizing the family's choices around the principle of democratic decision-making. Although this curriculum is not faith-based, the parent educator at St. Andrew's says that her extensive religious training and long tenure at St. Andrew's enables her to integrate scriptural references into the program. Each class is offered twice per week—once in the morning and once in the evening to make it accessible to the widest possible clientele. The program is six weeks in length, and features classroom sessions as well as home visits. Court-mandated parents (predominantly mothers) have been the norm in recent classes.

Life Renewal Ministries, Inc. The second privately funded faith-intensive parenting program included in this study is that run by Life Renewal Ministries located in Starkville, Mississippi. Starkville, situated in the east central part of the state, is best known as the hometown of Mississippi State University. Life Renewal Ministries is a faith-based organization (FBO). It is a Christian ministry organization, but it is not affiliated with any particular religious group or denomination. Life Renewal has two full-time employees and seven volunteers. The roles of executive director and parent educator are filled by the same person at this time—a female minister. Life Renewal has been a fairly small ministry in the past, focusing on providing long-term support to a limited number of typically female clients (about six per month). The intensive nature of the programs, complete with a rigorously trained mentor who remains in long-term contact with class participants and modest agency resources, has required this orientation toward parent education. However, Life Renewal had been awarded a large grant to expand many of the programs that it offers. Thus, the agency was poised to undergo some significant changes.

The agency offers several parenting programs for different clienteles, including one class for caregivers who are married and another for single parents. The director/educator has used different curricula in these programs. Active Parenting has been used in the past. However, the program is currently governed by a faith-based parenting curriculum, Families in Focus, made available through the Presbyterian Church. Life Renewal also has programs focused on employment assistance, personal counseling, and life skills classes in anger management, nutrition, and budgeting.

C.1.2 Faith-Related Publicly Funded Parenting Programs

Four faith-based parenting programs underwritten by public funds were also studied. Because state-level programming has centered on Mississippi's responsible fatherhood initiative, all of these programs were parenting classes for fathers. And all of them use the faith-based curriculum, *The 7 Secrets of Effective Fathers*, from the National Center for Fathering.

Vicksburg Family Development Service. One fatherhood program is run by Vicksburg Family Development Service in the town of Vicksburg, Mississippi. Vicksburg, widely known for featuring the best-preserved Civil War history in Mississippi, is located in the west central portion of the state. The agency is oriented around the goal of providing parents and children with knowledge, skills, and support to promote positive outcomes. Although Vicksburg Family Development self-identifies as a secular organization, the service activities of many people who work in this agency are animated by religious faith. Thus, while acknowledging that the agency's formal identity is nonreligious, the executive director of Vicksburg Family Development is quick to add, "This is a ministry. Faith is very important to the people on our staff." The agency has twelve full-time employees, five part-time staff members, and ten volunteers. Serving about 170 persons per month, the agency clientele features a fairly even mix of children (preschool, school-age preadolescent, and teenage), single adults (male and female), and families. In addition to parenting classes, Vicksburg Family Development offers prenatal classes for pregnant women, intervention programs for teen mothers, preschool programs, a mentoring program for youth aged 10–18, and life skills training. Agency personnel make referrals for such needs as financial assistance, Medicaid, food, job readiness, and educational (GED) training.

Because strengthening family relationships is at the heart of this agency's mission, parenting programs involve not just classes held onsite but regular home visits as well. Home visits are considered a vital part of the services offered by Vicksburg Family Development because periodic attendance at classes alone is seen as less likely to promote positive outcomes than a combination of classroom instruction and home visits. Thus, like other agencies in this study, Vicksburg Family Development embraces the family support model of parent education. The fatherhood program is the only faith-based parenting program offered by the agency. It is offered in partnership with a nearby congregation, and is taught by a local minister. However, a counterpart parenting program is commonly offered for mothers, who meet separately and then join fathers afterwards for refreshments. These programs meet on the same date and time with day care provided in an effort to offer a more comprehensive, multi-pronged form of family support. They are taught at the congregation's multi-purpose building, which is separate from the church's chapel.

Our House, Inc. Our House, located in Greenville, Mississippi also runs a fatherhood program. Greenville is situated in the heart of the Mississippi Delta, an area that has sometimes been called "the most Southern place on earth" given the

distinctively higher and more racialized levels of poverty in this region. Our House serves eight counties in the Delta. The executive director of Our House refuses to pigeon hole her agency as either secular or faith-based. Taking care to highlight the wide range of programs offered there, she answers tersely “both” when asked if the agency is faith-based or secular. Despite its fluid identity, Our House was in the process of completing work on a large chapel within its sprawling complex of buildings. Moreover, the agency’s mottoes have spiritual overtones (both overt and subtle): “We believe in miracles” and “A new birth to a new beginning in life.” The agency’s logo depicts a family standing next to a house with a dove flying above it. In the foreground of the logo is an open book of scripture (ostensibly, the Bible). Our House is not affiliated with a particular religious group or denomination.

Our House offers a wide variety of services beyond its parenting program to its clientele of about 350 persons per month. These programs include youth mentoring, support services for victims of sexual abuse and domestic violence, a recovery program for those who have lost family members to homicide, a parent-child substance abuse prevention program, and a 24-hour crisis hotline. The bulk of the agency’s clients are teens and single female adults, though fathers are well represented given the success of its Fatherhood Initiative. Our House has 26 full-time staff, six part-time workers, and 25 volunteers. Like the other fatherhood programs in this study, Our House’s Fatherhood Initiative is based on the 7 Secrets curriculum. It includes class meetings, social activities (e.g., father-child picnics), and home visits. The program coordinator’s actual title at Our House is that of “father advocate,” underscoring the program’s self-conscious promotion of paternal involvement and family togetherness. Given its reliance on the National Center for Fathering curriculum, this program is faith-based.

North Bolivar Family Resource Center. The third publicly funded, faith-related parent education program in this study is a fatherhood program run through a Family Resource Center affiliated with the North Bolivar School District. The mission statement of the agency is “Success in school equals success in life.” The executive director and parent educator are roles played by the same person, though the agency has a pastor who also functions as a fatherhood educator. The agency serves approximately 125 clients per month. Given its connection to the school district, it is not surprising that half of all clients are teenage youth in school. The agency has five full-time employees and 40 volunteers. It self-identifies as a secular agency.

North Bolivar runs after-school programs for youth in grades 4–8 and two types of parenting classes. One set of parenting classes, open to mothers and fathers alike, is largely secular in focus. Recently, these classes were offered with the Right from Birth curriculum. Like Parents as Teachers, Right from Birth teaches caregivers about young children’s developmental capabilities as they age and matches parenting techniques with youngsters’ developmental abilities. Although any parents can attend these classes, mothers typically attend them. At the same time, the agency offers a faith-based fatherhood program based on the 7 Secrets curriculum. Despite the secular nature of this agency, the faith component in the fatherhood program is quite robust.

Tunica Fatherhood Initiative. The office of the Tunica Fatherhood Initiative is located in Tunica, Mississippi, although funding for the program was secured by Mid-State Opportunity, Inc. quite some distance away in Charleston, Mississippi. Mid-State Opportunity provides services to a wide range of counties in northwest and north central Mississippi. One of their many programs spread across this part of the state is the Tunica Fatherhood Initiative and Mentoring Program. Thus, this fatherhood program is coupled with a youth mentoring program. In fact, men who complete the fatherhood program sometimes agree to serve as youth mentors. Given the distance between the site from which the program is run (Tunica) and the location of the funding agency (Charleston), the program coordinator (who also serves as the parent educator) enjoys some autonomy in the day-to-day running of the program. The Tunica area has been transformed by the rise of gambling along the Mississippi River, but poverty remains a pronounced risk for the disadvantaged in this community and many like it. Thus, as part of the program, the parent educator also tries to get men to enroll in local job readiness programs to improve their employment prospects and economic standing.

Like the other fatherhood programs featured in this study, the Tunica program is based on the 7 Secrets curriculum. Therefore, it is a faith-based program. A brochure provides an overview of the program and defines its purpose without mentioning the program's faith component. According to the brochure, the overall purpose of the program is "to train, educate, encourage, and assist fathers in becoming responsible fathers and in assuming responsibility for the nurturing, growth and development of their children." Its more general goal is "to assist fathers in becoming 'Team Parents.'" The brochure clearly articulates the expectation that fathers who enroll in the program "will participate in activities involving the development of their children and will identify volunteer projects in the community that the family will be involved in for one year." It continues: "Each father will dedicate a minimum number of hours with his child/children or family and the trained father in an area of the family's interest to establish or reestablish a common interest." The program brochure then presents what it describes as the "alarming statistics on fatherless children" in Mississippi and elsewhere. These statistics include the high divorce rate in Mississippi, along with the fact that 50.6% of female-headed families live below the poverty level in the state. It states that "70% of juveniles in reform institutions and long-term prison inmates come from fatherless homes," and notes the increased likelihood for developmental problems among children raised in fatherless households (teen motherhood for daughters, unemployment for sons). The brochure concludes on a high note, however: "GOOD NEWS! CHILDREN WITH INVOLVED FATHERS ARE: likely to have stronger self esteem; less susceptible to peer pressure ... likely to have increased cognitive competence ... better able to deal with frustrations ... [and] better able to gain a sense of independence and identity outside the parent/child relationship."

C.1.3 Secular Publicly Funded Parenting Programs

Emerson Family School. Emerson Family School is located in Starkville, and is affiliated with the Starkville School District. This facility includes a Family Resource Center. As described in the agency’s brochure, the mission of Emerson Family School entails the provision of “family-centered programming that encourages and supports social, emotional, physical, and educational development of the whole child and assistance in encouraging strong, healthy families.” In addition to its parenting workshops and seminars, Emerson offers preschool and after-school programs, prenatal classes, support groups, GED (General Education Development) classes, and drug prevention workshops. The organization serves more than 500 clients every month, predominantly composed of families. Emerson also serves appreciable numbers of single adults (both men and women) as well as preschool-age children. Emerson employs over 30 full-time workers and has approximately 50 volunteers at any given time. The agency is secular. There is no faith component in any of its programs, including its parenting seminars.

Emerson combines parent education workshops that teach child-rearing skills with an available program of client-specific parent training. Although many different types of parents attend the workshops, the most regular attendees are women enrolled in the agency’s Even Start family literacy program. Those who receive client-specific training are typically court-mandated—that is, they must complete the curriculum to retain or regain custody of their children. As is the case with many parent education programs, women attendees far outnumber men. In part, this imbalance reflects the larger number of mother-headed single-parent families in the area. The parent educator at Emerson has used a variety of curricula, but has typically favored behaviorist models in her one-on-one sessions. She says that this approach provides a healthy amount of structure and rules, both of which are necessary for effective parenting in these times. Behaviorism asserts that proper action is best learned through a combination of positive and negative reinforcements. At Emerson, care is taken to stress that incentives and disincentives should be appropriate to the age and developmental abilities of the child.

Neshoba Parents as Teachers Center. A Parents as Teachers (PAT) program is run through a parent center associated with the Neshoba County School District. (The program is combined with the Even Start family literacy program.) The agency is located in Philadelphia, Mississippi. This agency is secular in character, as is every one of its programs. The key goals of the agency entail the promotion of family literacy and responsible parenting. The programs offered by this agency include the Parents as Teachers program, kindergarten preparation classes for young parents, and hands-on workshops for parents who might struggle in tutoring their children on difficult subjects (e.g., algebra). The agency serves around 55 families and over 60 children in a given month.

The agency contains two divisions—one of which is a Parent Resource Center, the other of which is the Parents as Teachers Center. The combined Parents as Teachers and Even Start programs enable the agency to teach parents general

child-rearing skills (e.g., effective disciplinary techniques, enhanced parental awareness) through classroom instruction and home visits while providing exposure to interactive exercises designed to foster family literacy (e.g., reading aloud to children). The premise of the Parents as Teachers curriculum is that the parent is a child's first and best teacher in life. Both the agency director and parent educator cite this principle in describing the overall rationale of their program. Thus, the Parents as Teachers program equips parents of children from birth to age seven with the child-rearing skills necessary to be more responsible caregivers while the Parent Resource Center provides the tools (e.g., books, tapes, instructional materials) to foster positive parenting and family literacy. The key eligibility requirement for the Parents as Teachers program is enrollment in GED (General Education Development) or ABE (Adult Basic Education) classes. As part of its effort to promote family literacy, the agency offers an onsite child care facility so that teen mothers can obtain their high school diploma while receiving instruction in responsible parenting.

C.2 Michigan Transitional Housing Programs

C.2.1 Faith-Intensive Privately Funded Transitional Housing Program

Mary's House. Transitional housing and its related supports are the sole programmatic offering of the agency. Mary's House provides housing to homeless, pregnant single women over 18. The program does not receive HUD funding. Therefore, it is able to provide services to so-called "couch homeless" individuals. Surprisingly for a program for pregnant women, women in their 30s and 40s are regularly served. Up to three women live together in an older home that was renovated for this use, and each woman and baby has their own bedroom. The director's office is in the house, along with a bedroom for the house mother who stays every night. A substitute house mother provides respite for her a few nights each month. External case management has been used a couple times. The director had recently learned that women in her facility were eligible for this service and seems eager to use it more.

Although it appears there was initially a religiously related goal of preventing abortions or supporting adoption, few women are now housed for those reasons. Staff now view Mary's House as providing a safe setting for homeless women to have their babies and begin the first nine months of the infant's life. Other children a woman may have cannot be housed at Mary's House. Residency in the program may begin at any time during a pregnancy, with an additional nine months in the house following the birth of the child. Mary's House does not accept government funding, and operates on a restricted annual budget, all from church and individual donations. Much of its support comes from volunteers and from non-cash supports

and in-kind contributions from churches or individual members. Mary's House consciously includes extensive faith commitment in the organization at the board and staff levels and content in service delivery, thereby giving the agency an intensively religious character. Christian religious activities are a required element of program activities, which is specified in the program brochure given to prospective residents and other persons.

C.2.2 Faith-Related Publicly Funded and Mixed-Funding Transitional Housing Programs

Hope House. Hope House is a 16-unit transitional housing program for women with children. Hope House offices are physically located in the lower level of the apartment complex near the apartments, and program staff provide all case management services for the women. Hope House was established by its current program director, with strong support from the Junior Welfare League, a women's service organization. Only women with children in their custody are admitted. The program is a partnership with another non-profit which owns and administers the actual facility. Its umbrella organization, Church Affiliated Social Services (CASS), is a national denominationally-affiliated social service organization. CASS is a multi-service agency that provides counseling, child welfare services, and homeless services. The organization provides services to approximately 7000 total clients per year. The transitional housing program provides services to an average of 22–25 families per year.

Hope House is essentially a dual program with the transitional housing program and a concurrent United Way-supported parenting program for residents. Staff include the program manager and two case managers. The program manager appears to have less day-to-day contact with residents. The case managers work very closely with the women developing service plans and brokering needed services for residents. Some services, such as a weekly group with residents, are provided on site by the case managers. Funding for the program is almost exclusively from public sources, including HUD. Two women's service organizations and two churches provide substantial in-kind support for the program. The total budget for just the transitional housing program is about \$130,000 per year, of which only about 2% is from churches. Individual contributions are insignificant. While there is a Christian element to the mission and the agency and Hope House maintains ties to its denomination, the selection of staff and delivery of services is based on professional standards only and is secular in its form.

Faith House. Faith House provides the following services, all of which are related to homelessness: day shelter (including volunteer-supplied meals) on weekend days for women, men, and children; transitional housing for families with children; a HUD-funded employment program for homeless adults; child and family support programs; and tutoring for children and mentoring for teens This

program is open to housed as well as homeless children and youth. This program also offers parenting classes and religious education.

The transitional housing program has three houses available for families. Preference is given to larger families, as the houses are the largest available in area transitional shelter programs. Because families are located in separate houses, this program can and does accept families comprised of older males, either adult or youth. Housing male residents in families is one of the niches of this program. The intended length of stay is from 9 to 24 months. Case management services for all residents are provided through the external case manager. The agency director clearly has a relationship with residents of the programs, but does not appear to provide direct services as a rule. Some support services are provided through Faith House staff in other programs. In 2002, five families were served by the transitional housing program. Overall, the agency provides services to about 300 persons per month. Faith House's funding comes from both public sources (70%) and private sources (30%). Churches contribute less than 6% of the agency's total annual budget of \$760,000.

Charity House. Charity House's agency provides services to the homeless through three programs: an emergency overnight shelter for up to 15 days for homeless men, women, and children; James's House, transitional housing for single men; and Charity House, transitional housing for women with children. Charity House has the capacity to house up to three family units totaling ten persons. Typically, there are three single women with one or two children each. However, there are occasions when the house is occupied by two women with enough children to require use of the additional unit. Nearly all children served are under the age of 12. An average of 27 clients per month are served by the organization. The actual facility used is a house adjoining a second larger house where the emergency shelter and the ministry offices are located. The women are assigned bedrooms for their families, while the living area and kitchen are shared space. With up to ten people living in the house at any given time, living arrangements can be quite crowded.

The current staff for the program consists of the agency director, who seems to have contact with clients of all programs due to the size of the agency, and an advocate. The advocate connects the residents with needed services. This agency had engaged the services of the external case manager for residents in the past. That relationship was discontinued for reasons that are unclear. Women in the house often lost previous housing as a result of domestic violence. Women may be quite young—one of the current two residents is 19, with three children—but are often older. For those who complete the program, stays in the house are for six to 24 months. The program does not receive HUD funding directly, and the executive director did not know the original sources of other governmental funding. The annual agency budget is \$260,000. Church contributions account for less than 6% of the budget, with over one third of the budget coming from individual contributions.

C.2.3 Secular Mixed-Funding Transitional Housing Program

Hospitality House. This agency has no faith content in its organizational structure or service delivery. Hospitality House provides the following services for homeless families: emergency shelter; transitional housing; supportive services; and tutoring and language arts for children. The transitional housing program provides services to families with children who were formerly housed in the agency's shelter. On average, the agency provides services to about 40 clients per month, 11 of them in transitional housing. Hospitality House also provides around the clock emergency shelter to homeless families for up to 28 people at a time. Hospitality House's transitional housing is provided in two forms. The initial program was developed to assist each family in securing and maintaining permanent housing. This was the first program to offer post-emergency shelter shelter in this community. Intensive case management is provided to the families who are enrolled in the program. The other more traditionally defined transitional housing program is funded by HUD and is for families where one of the heads of household has a disability.

The primary staff person for transitional housing services is a case manager who works very closely with residents, provides support to them, and brokers needed services from other providers. This program has also occasionally accessed an external case manager for services for residents. Funding for Hospitality House comes from both public (40%) and private (60%) sources. The agency receives a small portion of its funding from churches. It does not receive funding directly from HUD, but does have state housing funds. The agency's total annual budget is about \$350,000.

C.3 Washington-Oregon Residential Addiction Recovery Programs

C.3.1 Faith-Intensive Privately Funded Addiction Recovery Programs

Five organizations fit into this category. All of the programs are part of agencies with large emergency shelter programs for the homeless and the poor. **Union Gospel Mission** in Seattle is part of an extensive multi-service agency affiliated with the international gospel mission movement. Its budget during the first wave of data collection was \$11 million, including over \$10 million in private donations. This agency, founded in 1932, provides food and shelter for the homeless, job training, health and dental services for the poor, and a prison ministry. It has two residential addiction treatment programs: (1) One program is for men and has 36 beds. The duration of the treatment program is nine months and a person can sign up for another year if he is enrolled in a work program or is going to school. This

program is directed by an ordained minister who is a certified alcohol and drug counselor. (2) The second program is also directed by an ordained minister. It has 45 beds for men and it is a nine-month program. The two addiction programs started as low-intensity programs about 15 years ago and have evolved into more formal addiction programs.

City Team Ministries in Seattle is connected with a national mission organization with sites in six cities, primarily on the West Coast. This agency program has a long history dating to the early part of the twentieth century. However, the organization experienced serious financial problems in the 1980s and 1990s. To stave off complete program closure, the agency approached a national organization for a friendly takeover, which occurred in 1998. The shelter is entirely for men and has about 80 beds; the alcohol and drug program has about eight slots and the men in the program stay with the other men in the shelter. The shelter and the program are directed by an ordained minister. The duration of the addiction program range from nine to twenty-seven months.

Open House Ministries was founded in 1986 through the efforts of a local philanthropist. It has a 107-bed shelter built in 1997. The agency is located in Vancouver, Washington, just north of Portland, Oregon. The agency offers an eight-week curriculum and an individualized plan for people with addictions. This curriculum is available to anyone currently in the shelter. The shelter does not take single men. The agency is directed by an ordained minister who worked for many years for the Salvation Army.

The Salvation Army (SA) in Seattle operates many different programs for the poor and homeless. Like many SA chapters, the Seattle chapter operates an Adult Rehabilitation Center (ARC) with 101 total beds including 14 beds for women in a separate facility from the downtown men's program. The agency embraces the structured work-oriented curriculum of the national Salvation Army organization. Thus, residents of the ARC are required to work 40 hours per week in the SA thrift store and related activities. The ARC program is self-supporting from the revenues earned in the thrift store. The program expects that residents will stay at least six months and a maximum of one year.

The Salvation Army (SA) in Portland also operates an Adult Rehabilitation Center (ARC) with 73 beds for men only. The SA in Portland employs the same basic work-oriented curriculum used at the Seattle SA. Unlike the Seattle program, this thrift store does not generate enough income to cover all of the ARC costs. So, the program relies on subsidies from the regional chapter of SA.

C.3.2 Faith-Related Privately Funded Addiction Recovery Program

This program (name withheld) is part of a hospital that is, in turn, part of a chain of hospitals controlled by a Protestant denomination. The addiction program is about twenty years old and provides eighteen beds (both inpatient and detoxification).

Like hospital-based programs nationwide, this program has been contracting for years and almost closed in the late 1990s. It was saved by the establishment of an exclusive agreement with a large HMO that requires all of the patients in the addiction program to be referred by the HMO. As a result, the program is entirely dependent on private insurance for revenue. The duration of the program is fourteen days. Staff and leadership do not consider this program to be a spiritual or religious program, but the Faith Integration Survey indicated some such elements.

C.3.3 Faith-Related Mixed-Funding Addiction Recovery Programs

One addiction program (name withheld) in this group represents the merger of two hospital-based programs in the early 1990s. The program is part of a hospital that in turn is part of a chain of Catholic hospitals and health facilities on the West Coast. At the time of the merger, the program shifted from a traditional recovery, twelve-step model to a more cognitive and behavioral approach. The program has 22 beds with an average stay of about fourteen days. Eighty percent of its beds are publicly funded with the remaining beds private pay or private insurance. The program does not consider itself to be a spiritual program, although the Faith Integration Survey warranted it being placed in the faith-related category. The program is now in the process of phasing out its substance abuse program and converting the program to a behavior disorder unit.

Providence Hospital Systems has a chemical dependency inpatient unit in Portland. It has 24 beds with the average stay of five days. The focus is on co-occurring disorders. Spirituality is emphasized and a chaplain is available from the parent hospital. Stabilization of clients is a key focus of this program.

C.3.4 Principally Secular Publicly Funded and Mixed-Funding Addiction Recovery Programs

Several programs accept government funds, private insurance reimbursement, and varying levels of private support. A brief description of these agencies and programs follows. Unless otherwise noted, these agencies and programs are nonprofit organizations. Principally secular programs are those that have a sufficiently low level of faith integration to not be included in the faith-related grouping. Often, these programs are hybridized such that they generally provide secular therapy but can offer faith components at the client's request. This hip-pocket strategy that integrates spirituality into otherwise secular service provision is rather unique to addiction recovery. This approach is described in Chap. 5.

Residence XII opened in 1981 as an Oxford House-type recovery program for women, based on the twelve steps of Alcoholics' Anonymous. It is located in

Kirkland, Washington, outside of Seattle. In the 1990s, at the behest of state government, the agency began an outpatient and then a more intensive inpatient treatment program. Currently, this agency has 25 inpatient beds with a variable length of stay (usually between 21 and 45 days). Like many programs, they limit the number of publicly funded beds because of low reimbursement levels from the state. Spirituality, with a special emphasis on the unique spiritual needs of women, is a central aspect of the program.

The Center for Alcohol and Drug Treatment in Wenatchee, Washington was also started in the late 1970s as an Oxford House-type recovery program for men and women. In 1993, the program model was changed dramatically. Instead of the twelve-step recovery model, the executive director revised the curriculum to emphasize choice therapy, a cognitive behavioral approach pioneered by William Glasser. Currently, the agency has 30 intensive inpatient beds and eight detoxification beds. Most of the funding is public (24 out of 30 beds) with the remainder private pay or private insurance. Although the program warrants being placed in the secular category, local ministers volunteer in the program and offer periodic spirituality classes.

The Drug Abuse Prevention Center (DAPC) was established in 1970 as a twelve-bed, long-term residential treatment program. It is located in Kelso, Washington, about midway between Portland and Seattle in a rural part of the state. Reflecting the trends of the time, it was a therapeutic community program characterized by aggressive confrontational group therapy. Initially, the program duration was two years. In 1979, an outpatient program was added and, in 1998, the agency moved to its current facility. This facility allowed an expansion to 40 beds. The agency has essentially two different programs: a long-term program (six months) and a shorter term, intensive inpatient program for up to thirty days. Almost all of its funding is from the government. It has retained some aspects of the therapeutic community model but it has been modified to offer a more supportive treatment environment. Like the Center for Alcohol and Drug Treatment, a minister volunteers in the program and a number of clients have undergone religious conversion. Thus, while this program warranted being placed in the secular category, spiritual components can be made available at clients' request.

Highland Courte was initially established as a residential program for Alzheimer's patients. It was owned by a for-profit company with multiple sites. Some time ago, the owners converted the program to a residential alcohol and drug treatment program. At that time, it only took publicly funded clients. But the program soon encountered serious financial problems and almost closed. It has been revived under the current leadership and takes a mix of publicly funded and private insurance/private pay clients. It operates separate women's and men's programs within the same physical facility. The total number of beds is now about 40 (with only 12 publicly funded beds). The length of stay is variable and usually falls between 21 and 40 days. It remains a program within a for-profit company with other types of residential programs. Spirituality is connected to the concept of a higher power.

DePaul Treatment Center in Portland was started by a Catholic social service agency in 1975 but was spun off from this agency in 1978 as a separate, secular nonprofit agency offering addiction services. It is a sizable program by today's standards with 82 beds. The agency operates separate men and women's programs. Historically, the agency saw its mission as ministering to the disadvantaged, so almost all of its beds were publicly funded. With recent cutbacks in government funding, the agency has been reconsidering this commitment and it is moving slowly toward less reliance on public sector funding. The treatment model was initially based on the twelve-step recovery model but was drastically changed several years ago to include a heavy reliance on cognitive behavioral interventions. The length of stay can be up to 6–8 months with the average around 95 days. AA and NA meetings remain an important component of the program.

Sundown M Ranch, located in Selah, Washington near Yakima, is one of the largest residential addiction programs on the West Coast. It was founded in 1968 as a recovery house for alcoholics. Over the years, it has evolved into a large multi-service, nonprofit addiction program with residential programs for youth, families, and adults (both men and women). It has over 170 staff. The program model continues to be heavily focused on the 12 steps, and spirituality is important as part of the process of working the 12 steps. It has a full-time chaplain on staff. The average length of stay is about 28 days.

Tualatin Valley Centers with headquarters just outside of Portland was established in 1961 as a child guidance clinic. Over the years, it has evolved into a very comprehensive health and social welfare nonprofit agency with many programs. It started an outpatient addiction program in the early 1970s and established a residential addiction program for women and their children in 1991. It has 10 beds and women are required to bring their children with them to treatment. Only children under six are allowed. The program duration is about six months. Spirituality is connected to discussions of a higher power. Like many longer-term programs, the treatment is divided into different phases with progressively more responsibility as a client moves through the phases.

Volunteers of America in Portland was originally part of a national, faith-related organization. It has had operations in the Pacific Northwest for over 100 years. The local organization is a separately incorporated nonprofit agency providing an array of services to the poor and disadvantaged. Its additional program has 85 treatment beds with about 50 for men and 35 for women in different physical locations. The treatment program is designed to be six months in duration with four months of intensive treatment and two months of transition. The program is entirely funded by government and it has contracts with the county to serve offenders. So, most of the clients in the program have either been in jail or are at risk of going to jail if they refuse to go into treatment. The emphasis of the treatment program is on evidenced-based practice and cognitive behavioral therapy. Spirituality is expressed through a strong commitment to client empowerment and personal recovery supported by the staff and the group of individuals in the program.

Sea-Mar Residential Treatment Center is located in Tacoma, Washington. This program was founded in 1993 and has gone through a variety of changes over the years. It currently is part of Sea-Mar Community Health Centers, a large multi-service nonprofit organization based in Seattle. The treatment center has 36 beds and specializes in services to Hispanic adults. Their staff persons are bilingual and many of the clients do not speak English. They are completely reliant on state funding.

C.3.5 Principally Secular Privately Funded Addiction Recovery Programs

One of these organizations (name withheld) was established in 1988 as a for-profit entity, with an AA twelve-step program model. From the beginning, this program has focused on health professionals; thus, it tended to rely upon private insurance and self-pay patients. Like many residential programs, it encountered financial struggles in the 1990s with the changes in private insurance and managed care. Thus, a friendly takeover was engineered in 1998 whereupon this organization was brought under the corporate wing of a large national nonprofit addiction treatment organization. It currently has 44 inpatient beds and six detoxification beds. It continues to rely upon private insurance and private pay patients, as well as private donations. Spiritual counseling and education are important components of this otherwise secular program, which typically lasts about 4–6 weeks with some patients moving to transitional housing in the community for an intensive day-treatment program.

Pacific Ridge is a for-profit agency founded in 1995 by two individuals with a long history in the recovery field. They have 27 beds and a variable length of stay (around 14 days). They take men and women and run their groups together. A part-time, retired minister offers spiritual counseling and education. The program is based loosely on a twelve-step model that has been adapted in light of the changes in the addiction field. Revenue is derived from private pay and private insurance.

Highline Recovery Services is part of Highline Community Hospital, located in Tukwila, Washington, south of Seattle. This program was started in 1974 and has undergone many changes and permutations in the intervening years. During the heyday of hospital inpatient addiction programs, it had as many as 40 beds (intensive inpatient and detoxification). But with the changes in managed care and public funding, the number of beds has declined to 18. The agency tries keep only 12 beds full at any one time. The program also has six detoxification beds and has increased its outpatient and day-treatment offerings. It incorporates the twelve-step model into its program and offers spirituality education and classes. The length of stay is variable but usually about ten days for the intensive inpatient and then they are referred to outpatient. All patients are privately funded through self-pay or private insurance.

Index

A

Abstinence education, 2
Active parenting, 46, 58, 62, 138, 194
Addiction recovery or treatment, 7, 9–11, 21, 22, 25, 37, 38, 70, 92, 96, 98, 103, 109, 110, 113, 114, 130, 148, 152, 154, 157, 159, 160, 162, 163, 165, 168, 174
Addiction science, 98, 99, 101, 110, 124
ADHD, 55
Administration, 1–4, 6, 12, 23, 171, 174
Advisory Council on Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships (Obama era), 2
Affordable Care Act, 165
African American, 43, 44, 48, 55, 56, 88
After-care, 23, 64, 65, 124, 159
Agency directors, 12, 17, 42, 46, 85, 131, 142, 173
Alcoholics Anonymous, 96, 102, 124, 148, 149, 159
American Society of Addiction Medicine, 97, 99
Atheist, 60
Attitudes, 22, 33, 80, 87, 143, 147, 184, 187, 188, 190
Attrition, 53, 121, 150, 151, 154
Axes of faith integration, 32, 33, 84

B

Bannon, Steve, 4
Baptists, 41, 164
Benchmarks, 17, 55, 66, 131, 143
Best practices, 54, 119, 122, 123, 164
Betty Ford Treatment Center, 98
Bible, 4, 21, 32, 57, 58, 62, 63, 79, 83, 84, 91, 104–106, 108, 113, 124, 126, 136, 137, 163, 164, 196
Bible Belt, 7, 41, 69
Bielefeld, Wolfgang, 27, 31

Bonding capital, 28
Bridging capital, 27, 28
Buddhism, 38
Budget, 74–79, 90, 199–202
Bundling of services, 51–53
Bush, George W. (and presidential administration), 1–4, 6, 17, 19, 171

C

Carson, Ben, 4
Case study, 11–13, 15, 17, 21, 25, 33, 34, 36, 37, 42, 69, 70, 92, 109, 140, 148–150, 154, 166, 173, 174
Catholic, 4, 10, 140, 160, 185, 204, 206
Causal and causation, 9, 14, 18, 20, 31, 37, 166
Cella, Joseph, 3
Center of Alcohol and Drug Treatment, 97
Change of head, 22, 129–132, 139, 155
Change of heart, 22, 129, 130, 132, 133, 139, 142, 155
Charisma News, 3
Charitable Choice, 1–3, 5, 6, 16, 22, 25, 67, 124, 130, 160, 171
Charity House, 13, 70, 76, 77, 80, 83, 84, 86–88, 141, 145, 146, 201
Chicago, 26, 27
Child discipline, 57, 66, 165
Christ and Jesus Christ, 62, 105, 120
Christianity, 4, 7, 54, 79, 89, 133, 136, 141, 145, 163
Christian Reconstructionism, 4
Church Affiliated Social Services (CASS), 75–78, 80, 84, 89, 200
Church of God in Christ, 41
City Team Ministries, 13, 97, 104, 112–114, 116, 121, 150, 151, 153, 203
Cleveland, 31
Clients of programs, 7, 17, 18, 22, 118, 151, 152, 155

Clinton, Hillary, 3
 Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, 100, 101, 106, 124, 206
 Compassion, 1, 22, 28, 63, 80, 88, 142, 145, 161, 162, 167, 168, 171
 Compassionate conservatism, 3
 Compassion Capital Fund, 1
 Congregations, 8, 10, 15, 29, 30, 32, 37, 41, 44, 45, 69, 70, 85, 96, 117, 144, 146, 147, 155, 162, 163, 165, 169, 181
 Conscience and Religious Freedom Division (DHS), 4, 48
 Consumerism, 16
 Content (programmatic content), 49, 71
 Context (ecological context), 36, 54–56, 64, 66, 69, 71, 95, 96, 157, 164, 170
 Continuing education units, 112
 Co-occurring disorder, 111
 Corporal punishment, 7, 57, 58, 66, 130, 164, 165
 Couplings, 18
 Courts, 62, 64, 96, 104, 110, 116, 117, 159
 Creaming, 19
 Crime and criminal justice, 113, 159
 Culture (organizational culture), 18, 20, 28, 35, 36, 42, 46, 54, 59, 66, 71, 74, 75, 78, 79, 85, 86, 91, 95, 96, 108, 157, 160, 166, 170

D
 Dallas, 26, 27
 De-industrialization, 69
 Denomination, 32, 41, 42, 112, 187, 194, 196, 200, 203
 Department of Education, 133
 Department of Health and Human Services, 4
 Department of Housing and Urban Development, 75
 Department of Justice, 1, 29, 113, 141
 DePaul Treatment Center, 13, 97, 206
 Devolution (political devolution), 4, 16
 DeVos, Betsy, 4
 Diversion program, 110
 Doing religion, 158
 Donations, 9, 12, 30, 31, 36, 70, 74, 75, 77–79, 91, 114–116, 125, 146, 199, 202, 207
 Drug experimentation, 97
 Drug Prevention Action Center, 97, 107
 Drug rehabilitation, 7
 Drug testing, 120
 Drug treatment, 13, 14, 21, 95, 97–104, 107, 108, 115–121, 124, 125, 130, 149, 151, 153, 159, 163, 172, 205

E

Ebaugh, Helen Rose, 28
 Ecology or ecological, 20, 35, 42, 54, 62, 140
 Education, 4, 45, 48, 50, 52, 53, 60, 61, 66, 87, 96, 110, 131, 142, 189, 198, 199, 201, 207
 Elective affinity, 37, 73, 74, 78, 92, 132, 166
 Emerson Family School, 13, 43, 47, 61, 64, 198
 Environment, 12, 35, 50, 72, 79, 88, 89, 103, 114–116, 125, 144–146, 152, 157, 161, 205
 Evaluation, 15, 17, 18, 34, 44, 64, 65, 119–121, 174
 Evangelical or evangelicalism, 3, 4, 7, 10, 35, 44, 54, 62, 105, 114, 133, 163, 164
 Even Start Program, 55
 Evidence-based programs and evidence-based practices, 15, 44, 54, 66, 100
 Executive director, 46, 51, 59–61, 65, 80, 81, 85, 86, 88–90, 105, 126, 141, 142, 144, 145, 147, 168, 194–196, 201, 205
 Expression of faith, 32, 84, 90, 163

F

Faith and Cultural Advisory Committee, 3
 Faith and Families Program, 41, 160
 Faith as resource, 33
 Faith-based, 1–12, 14–16, 18–23, 25–37, 41–57, 59–64, 66, 67, 70–73, 75, 77–79, 82–91, 95–97, 99, 101–105, 107–113, 116, 117, 120–122, 124, 125, 129, 130, 132–155, 157–173, 175, 184, 185, 187, 193–197
 Faith-based inertia, 2
 Faith House, 13, 70, 76, 77, 81, 200, 201
 Faith-integrated program, 26, 27
 Faith Integration Survey, 11, 12, 15, 31, 42, 43, 62, 158, 173, 177, 204
 Faith-intensive programs, 12, 14–16, 21, 32, 42, 74, 95, 96, 100, 105, 108, 110–116, 118–120, 122–124, 130, 144, 150–154
 Faith-related programs, 12, 43, 74, 82, 91, 95, 96, 108, 110, 124, 144
 Faith-saturated programs, 16, 158
 Faith-segmented programs, 26, 32
 Family, 3, 10, 13, 19, 35, 37, 41–48, 50–54, 56, 61, 64, 66, 82, 83, 100, 101, 109, 111, 118, 132–135, 137, 138, 141–143, 148, 154, 155, 157, 162, 163, 165, 194–199, 201, 202
 Family support, 7, 9, 15, 22, 37, 43, 50, 51, 154, 159, 160, 163, 172, 195, 200

- Fatherhood, 2, 12, 13, 41, 43, 44, 48, 50–53, 55, 56, 63, 67, 132, 137–139, 160, 163, 174, 195–197
- Focus on the Family, 45
- Food assistance and food distribution, 1, 28, 41, 73
- Fordice, Kirk, 41
- For-profit providers, 35
- Frontline workers, 17, 42
- Funding source (public, private, or mixed), 76, 114
- Fuzzy boundaries, 158
- G**
- GED, 47, 50, 52, 53, 66, 131–133, 135, 142, 195, 198, 199
- Gender, 43, 50, 52, 71, 190
- Generalizability, 14
- Geographical context, 5, 7, 11, 15, 17, 22, 27, 36, 70, 172, 173
- German, 2, 74
- Goal-rational action, 18, 30, 131, 162, 167
- God, 9, 21, 32, 55–57, 59, 63, 66, 67, 83, 84, 86, 88, 89, 91, 101, 111, 118–120, 138, 139, 141, 144, 146, 148–150, 153, 155, 158, 164
- Goggin, Malcolm, 28
- Golden Rule, 146
- Grand Rapids, Michigan, 28, 72
- Great Recession, 4, 75, 76, 125, 126, 174
- Greek, 57
- Grettenberger, Susan, 21, 86
- H**
- Harm reduction, 118
- Hazelton Drug Treatment Program, 98
- Health care, 4, 28, 29, 35, 98, 125, 165, 168
- Hebrew, 57
- Heilige Schutzengel, 168
- Higher power, 9, 102, 107, 112, 114, 120, 126, 148–150, 158, 205, 206
- Highland Courte, 13, 97, 205
- Highline Recovery Services, 97, 207
- Hinduism, 38
- Holistic services and holistic programs, 6, 108, 124, 167, 168
- Hope House, 13, 70, 75, 76, 78, 80, 82, 83, 87, 89, 90, 144–147, 200
- Hospitality House, 13, 70, 76, 77, 81, 82, 86, 90, 91, 141–143, 202
- Housing and transitional housing, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 21, 22, 25, 37, 38, 67, 69–73, 75, 78, 80, 82, 86, 87, 91, 92, 129, 139–144, 146, 147, 149, 155, 163, 166, 199, 200, 202, 207
- Housing First model, 73
- Houston, Texas, 28
- Hybridization, 96, 124, 159
- I**
- Indiana, 27, 45
- Individualism, 16, 153
- Inside out change, 132, 139, 143
- Institutional isomorphism, 162
- Institutionalized religion, 63
- Instrumental rationality, 18, 57, 131, 142, 143, 146, 152
- Insurance and insurers, 14, 98–100, 110, 111, 114, 115, 120, 159, 165, 204, 205, 207
- Intensity of faith expression, 166
- Intensive outpatient and outpatient programs, 95, 113
- International development initiatives, 170
- Interpretive approach, 15
- Interviews, 15, 17, 42, 45, 70, 74, 82, 83, 87, 108, 111, 135, 142, 143, 159, 170, 173–175, 177
- IRS, 77
- Islam, 38
- J**
- Job placement and employment programs, 1, 26, 27, 29, 41, 52, 53
- Judaism, 38
- Judges, 100, 104, 110, 113, 116, 123
- K**
- Kennedy, Sheila, 27
- L**
- Labor unions, 69
- Laudan, Aron, 28
- Layered case study, 34–36, 157
- Life Renewal Ministries, 13, 43, 46, 48, 49, 57, 58, 60, 62, 64, 65, 133, 165, 167, 194
- Life skills training, 41, 195
- Lockhart, William, 27
- Los Angeles, 26, 27
- M**
- Mary's House, 13, 70, 74–76, 78–80, 83, 84, 87–91, 141–146, 160, 166, 167, 199, 200
- Massachusetts, 27
- McDonald's, 134, 135
- Memoranda of understanding (MOU's), 10

- Mental illness, 71, 82, 111, 122
 Metropolitan, 14, 21, 136
 Michigan, 6, 7, 10, 13–15, 21, 22, 25, 37, 38, 67, 69–71, 73, 74, 76, 86, 109, 129, 139, 140, 155, 157, 160, 163, 164, 166–168, 174, 193, 199
 Midwest, 10, 69, 95, 164
 Mississippi, 6, 7, 10–15, 21, 22, 25, 35, 37, 38, 41–43, 45, 49, 54, 57, 61, 66, 67, 69–71, 109, 129, 130, 134, 139, 140, 157, 159, 160, 163–168, 174, 193–195, 197, 198
 Mississippi Department of Human Services, 136
 Mississippi Faith and Families Program, 67
 Monsma, Stephen, 26, 27, 32
 Morning Watch, 125
 Mothers of Preschoolers, 45
 Motivational interviewing, 101, 122
 Mr. Wrong/Mr. Right curriculum, 145
 Multnomah County Correctional Department, 118
 Muslim, 10, 185
- N**
 Nagel, Alexander, 18, 30
 Narcotics Anonymous, 105, 116, 124, 160
 National Association of Addiction Treatment Providers, 116
 National Catholic Prayer Breakfast, 3
 National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 98
 National Institute on Drug Abuse, 98
 National Institutes of Health, 98
 National Review, 4
 Native American, 106, 154
 Neshoba County Parents as Teachers Center, 43
 Neshoba Family Center, 13
 New institutionalism, 18
 Nondenominational, 146
 Nonprofits, 2, 8, 9, 15, 16, 27, 30, 36, 37, 54, 70, 73, 74, 125, 167, 170
 North Bolivar Family Resource Center, 43, 196
 North Carolina, 27
- O**
 Obama, Barack (and presidential administration), 2–6, 17, 19, 171
 Office of Public Liaison, 1
 Olasky, Marvin, 22
 Open House Ministries, 13, 97, 104, 113, 114, 116, 120, 125, 150, 151, 153, 203
 Oregon, 6, 7, 10, 13–15, 21, 22, 25, 37, 38, 67, 70, 95, 97, 109, 115, 118, 122, 124, 130, 157, 159, 160, 163, 166, 168, 174, 193, 202, 203
 Organizational identity, 9, 30, 42, 77, 158, 159, 161, 170
 Organized religion, 18, 22, 32, 33, 111, 112, 144, 146, 149
 Orth, Deborah, 28
 Our House, Inc., 13, 43
 Outcomes, 6, 9, 15, 17, 18, 25, 37, 44, 55, 72, 75, 81, 87, 90, 101, 103, 120, 121, 131, 142, 167, 171, 187, 188, 190, 195
 Outside in change, 15, 30, 33, 86, 87, 113, 132, 143, 188, 205
 Outsourcing, 16
 Oxford House, 109, 204, 205
- P**
 Pacific Northwest, 10, 14, 38, 95, 104, 125, 206
 Pacific Ridge Adult treatment program, 97
 Parent education, 7, 9, 10, 21, 22, 25, 37, 38, 42–45, 47, 49, 51, 53–55, 59, 61, 62, 65–67, 71, 129, 130, 132–136, 139–141, 143, 147–149, 155, 160, 162–165, 167, 194–196, 198
 Parent Effectiveness Training, 43
 Parent Resource Center, 52, 198, 199
 Parents as Teachers Program, 52, 58, 66, 132, 198, 199
 Parole officers, 100, 104, 110, 113, 116, 123
 Paul (biblical apostle), 63
 Pence, Mike, 4
 Pennsylvania, 28
 Pentecostals, 41
 Performance monitoring, 167, 171
 Perry, Rick, 4
 Pew Charitable Trust, 19
 Philadelphia, 26, 27, 198
 Political science, 19
 Poverty, 1, 2, 8, 11, 28, 41, 171, 196, 197
 Prayer, 26, 32, 74, 80, 84, 138, 146, 183, 186
 Presbyterian Church, 133, 194
 Prevalence of faith, 33, 51
 Prison and jail, 96, 109, 110, 112, 122–124, 159, 165, 197, 202, 206
 Programmatic content, 20, 34, 36, 42, 45, 47, 49, 64, 66, 69, 71, 73, 74, 82, 91, 95, 96, 157, 164, 170
 Protestant and Protestantism, 7, 134, 140, 163
 Providence Hospital, 13, 97, 204
 Public administration, 19
 Public-private partnerships, 5, 171
 Puget Sound, 95, 103

Q

Qualitative data and research, 6, 15–18, 42, 129, 166, 175

R

Raleigh, 27
 Reformed Protestantism, 164
 Religious conversions, 2, 105, 149, 151, 153, 154, 205
 Religious convictions, 12, 32, 60, 61, 75, 114, 137, 155, 168
 Requests for proposals (RFPs), 167
 Residence XII, 13, 97, 104, 107, 204
 Richmond, 27
 Rockefeller Institute of Government, 11, 19
 Rotary, 117
 Roundtable on Religion and Social Welfare, 11
 Rural South, 7, 95, 133, 134, 163
 Rust Belt, 69

S

Sabbath, 144
 Salvation Army, 13, 97, 108, 110, 112–114, 116–118, 120, 121, 123–125, 150–153, 203
 Same-sex marriage, 3
 Sea-Mar Treatment Center, 13
 Sect and sectarian, 15, 86, 160, 161, 170
 Secular, 1, 2, 5–16, 18–23, 25–37, 41–43, 45–47, 49–51, 53–58, 60–62, 64, 66, 67, 70–72, 76, 77, 81, 82, 84, 87, 88, 90, 91, 95–97, 99, 101–105, 107–113, 115–119, 121–125, 129–136, 139–143, 146–155, 157–163, 168–170, 173, 177, 187, 195, 196, 198, 200, 202, 204–207
 Secularization, 18
 Selectivity bias and self-selection, 92, 119, 121, 160, 171
 Self-help, 44, 97, 109, 110, 112, 115, 145, 148
 Self-sufficiency, 87, 90, 143, 155
 Separation of church and state, 2, 81
 Service provision marketplace, 20, 27, 35, 42
 Sex, 21, 83, 111, 122, 145
 Sex education, 2
 Sharkey, Patrick, 28
 Shelter, 10, 28, 29, 37, 82, 86, 104, 111, 114, 123–125, 168, 200–203
 Sider, Ronald, 8
 Smith, Bob, 148
 Smith, Steven Rathgeb, 21
 Social capital, 27
 Social safety net, 5, 11, 171
 Social service domains, 7, 9, 11, 15, 35, 129, 157, 162, 163, 165

Social work, 19, 89
 Sociology, 19
 Source of faith, 33, 113
 South, 10, 57, 95, 130, 163, 164, 207
 Southern evangelical, 10, 21, 37
 Spirituality, 18, 30, 61–63, 67, 89, 101, 102, 107–109, 112, 114, 124, 133, 149, 154, 158, 192, 204–207
 Spiritual transformation, 30, 32, 107, 108, 111, 112, 118–120, 149, 154
 Standardized approach to service delivery, 108, 119
 St. Andrews Mission, 13, 43, 46, 49, 59, 62, 64
 Standpoints, 8, 16–18, 21, 34, 175
 State University of New York at Albany, 19
 Stigma, 22
 Stories, 16, 18, 21, 66, 121, 132, 148, 175
 Strategies, 7, 9, 10, 16, 19, 20, 28, 31, 35, 37, 44, 45, 47, 71, 91, 101, 106, 115, 120, 121, 129, 130, 140, 144, 148, 158, 162, 164, 169, 170, 174, 175
 Subcultures, 162–164
 Substance abuse treatment, 14, 22, 67, 96–98, 100–103, 107, 109, 111, 122, 123, 154, 155
 Substantive rationality, 19, 57, 131, 132, 142, 152
 Success for programs, 64
 Sundown M Ranch, 13, 97, 206
 Supreme Court, 3
 Surveys, 15, 121, 162
 Sustainability, 76, 90, 166, 167
 Synanon, 98

T

Teen sexual risk, 11
 Theory, 18, 36, 90, 188
 The 7 Secrets of Effective Fathering, 63
 Third-party gatekeepers, 100, 110
 Three C's model or paradigm (content, culture, context), 108
 Thrift store, 114, 116, 125, 203
 Towey, Jim, 4
 Trump, Donald, 3, 4
 Trumpism, 20
 Trust, 22, 46, 49, 132, 141, 146, 150, 161, 174
 Tulatin Valley Center, 13, 97, 109
 Tunica Fatherhood Initiative, 43, 48, 52, 63, 197
 Twelve-step programs, 7, 9, 22, 37, 96, 98, 102, 124, 130, 148, 149, 154, 160, 162

U

- Union Gospel Mission, 13, 97, 105, 110, 113, 114, 116, 117, 120, 123, 125, 126, 150–153, 165, 202
 United Methodist, 46, 62, 133, 193
 United Way, 79, 200
 Unruh, Heidi Rolland, 8
 Urban, 1, 4, 10, 38, 69, 85, 99, 100, 163, 165

V

- Value-rational action, 19, 30, 57, 131, 162, 167
 Values, 6, 20, 27, 29, 30, 35, 42, 54, 57, 60–62, 67, 69, 72, 74, 75, 78, 79, 86, 88–91, 126, 129–134, 136–138, 140–145, 147, 152, 153, 155, 157, 164, 167, 179, 180, 183, 184, 186, 187
 Vicksburg Family Development Service, 51, 195
 Volunteers, 12, 15, 28, 32, 48, 70, 80, 84, 112, 114, 115, 117–119, 147, 179–181, 187, 189, 193–196, 198, 199, 205
 Volunteers of America, 13, 97, 117, 206

W

- Wal-Mart, 65
 Washington, 6, 7, 10, 13–15, 21, 22, 25, 37, 38, 67, 70, 95, 97, 109, 122, 124, 130, 157, 159, 160, 163, 166, 168, 174, 193, 202, 203, 205–207
 Weber, Max, 19, 57, 74, 162, 166
 Welfare, 1, 3–5, 8, 9, 11, 15–17, 19–21, 25–28, 30, 32, 34, 35, 37, 41, 42, 56, 67, 72, 77, 97, 98, 116, 129, 138, 141, 157, 160–163, 165, 167, 169, 171, 173, 200, 206
 West Coast, 35, 203, 204, 206
 White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives (Bush era), 4
 White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships (Obama era), 2, 4
 Wilson, Bill, 148
 Worship, 3, 26, 33, 74, 79, 84, 104–106, 108, 113, 141, 144–147, 159, 181, 183, 186
 Wrap-around services, 159
 Wuthnow, Robert, 29, 30