Apart from its profound political significance, there is every indication that the welfare reform legislation of 1996 (Personal Work Opportunity and Reconciliation Act, PWORA) has altered the landscape of American religion. Through Section 104 of PWORA, also known as Charitable Choice, religious congregations, interfaith ministries and denominational work relief agencies- have been thrust into the center of America’s welfare to work transition and community revitalization efforts. Charitable Choice makes it illegal for state governments to discriminate against social service providers who organization has a religious mandate.

This dissertation examines Charitable Choice- and more broadly, the changing relationship between religion and social welfare- as its primary point of departure for investigating faith-based poverty relief in the post-welfare era. This research employs a mixed methods approach to understanding the role of Protestant evangelicals in addressing the needs of the poor and specifically their role in the implementation of Charitable Choice. To accomplish this task, two national surveys, one individual and one congregational, are used to explore the role of religiosity and the creation of Protestant evangelical sub-cultures and their effects on civic engagement, volunteerism and support
for Charitable Choice. It then triangulates this data with qualitative research to develop a
clearer understanding of the issues that affect participation rates and public welfare
delivery systems. In-depth interviews of thirty-six Protestant evangelical ministers from
central Appalachia are conducted and analyzed. This research provides a more
comprehensible understanding of the complex role theological beliefs, religious culture
and religious convictions play in public policy delivery.

This research examines the wide range of religious beliefs and moral convictions
that Protestant evangelical congregations and individuals “adopt to negotiate the
countervailing ethical demands of compassion and moral rectitude” (Bartkowski and
Regis 2003, 3). This research demonstrates that social capital, in this case bridging and
bonding activities (Putnam 2000) can serve both integrative and exclusionary ends. It
pays careful attention to the role religious convictions and beliefs play in reinforcing or
transforming social and religious boundaries in matters pertaining to poverty relief and
the delivery of public policy initiatives.
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CHAPTER ONE

DISSERTATION OVERVIEW

Introduction

Debates on public policy in the United States are shaped, in part, by the moral and religious commitments of individuals and communities. Heclo (2003) writes in Religion Returns to the Public Square, “Government policy and religious matters… both claim to give authoritative answers to important questions about how people should live.” Heclo’s (2003) words apply especially to the issue of poverty and welfare reform, a matter on which the great religious traditions have much to say.

Apart from its profound political significance, there is every indication that the welfare reform legislation of 1996, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) has altered the landscape of American religion. In Section 104 of PRWORA, also known as Charitable Choice, religious congregations, interfaith ministries and denominational work relief agencies have been thrust into the center of America’s welfare to work transition and community revitalization efforts (Dilulio 1997; Bartkowski and Regis 1999; Chaves 1999; Cnaan 2000; Lockhart 2001; Walsh 2001). Charitable Choice makes it illegal for state governments to discriminate against social service providers whose organization has a religious mandate (Griener 2000; Sherman 2000).
This dissertation examines Charitable Choice- and more broadly, the changing relationship between religion and social welfare- as its primary point of departure for investigating faith-based poverty relief in the post-welfare era. Specifically, this research project adds to the current discussions of Charitable Choice- among them discussions pertaining to theological views, denominational sub-cultures, dimensions of religiosity and local cultural forces.

Guided by this premise, this research employs a mixed methods approach to understanding the role of Protestant evangelicals in addressing the needs of the poor and specifically their role in the implementation of Charitable Choice. To accomplish this task, this dissertation utilizes two national surveys, one individual (Religion and Politics 2001) and one congregational (National Congregations Study 1999), to explore the role of religiosity, the creation of Protestant evangelical sub-cultures and their effects on civic engagement, volunteerism and support for Charitable Choice. This research then triangulates this data with qualitative research to develop a clearer understanding of the issues that affect participation rates and public welfare delivery systems. In-depth interviews of thirty-six Protestant evangelical ministers from central Appalachia are conducted and analyzed using computer software (N*dust 6). Given central Appalachia’s distinctly high rates of Protestant evangelicalism and impoverishment, there is not a more ideal setting to explore the “prospects and pitfalls of poverty relief” (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 2). This research provides a more comprehensible understanding of the complex role theological beliefs, religious culture and religious convictions play in public policy delivery.
This dissertation draws together insights from five different sub-cultures within the Protestant evangelical tradition. The findings from this research demonstrate that Protestant evangelicals characterize their sub-cultural identities “with references to a commemorated past” (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 2). Moreover through programs such as Charitable Choice, Protestant evangelicals “define their moral character and social boundaries” (Odell-Scott, 2006). Protestant evangelical’s definitions of morally appropriate responses to poverty, as documented through ethnographic interviews with Protestant evangelical ministers, vary considerably from one congregation to another. This research examines the wide range of religious beliefs and moral convictions that Protestant evangelical congregations and individuals “adopt to negotiate the countervailing ethical demands of compassion and moral rectitude” (Bartkowski and Regis 20003, 3).

Lastly, this dissertation seeks to contribute to the literature on faith-based social capital and civic engagement. This research demonstrates that social capital, in this case bridging and bonding activities (Putnam 2000), can serve both integrative and exclusionary ends. It pays careful attention to the role religious convictions and beliefs play in reinforcing or transforming social and religious boundaries.

Protestant Evangelical Sub-Cultures

Protestant evangelical sub-cultures matter. Disaggregating among Protestant evangelical sub-cultures may help us to better understand the role of religion in American politics and debates over welfare reform and governmental partnerships with faith-based organizations. Protestant evangelicals can be divided into 5 subcultures: (See Table 1:1)
Table 1: Protestant Evangelical Sub-Cultures in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protestant Evangelical Sub-Cultures</th>
<th>Percentage (%) of the Protestant Evangelical Faith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant Fundamentalist</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant Evangelical</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant Mainline</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant Liberal</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant Christian</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Protestant evangelicals comprise 26.9% of the Protestant evangelical denominational category, followed by mainline Protestant evangelicals (23.3%), Protestant evangelical liberals (20.4%), protestant fundamentalists 19.4% and those that consider themselves to be simply Protestant Christians at 5.5% Each Protestant evangelical sub-culture has different behaviors and different theological beliefs and thus they should have different patterns of civic engagement (secular volunteering) and different opinions regarding welfare and Charitable Choice. Robert Putnam in *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (2000) makes broad generalizations about Protestant civic engagement and social capital, noting that Protestants are more likely to volunteer outside of their congregations when compared to Catholics and Jews. He argues that many mainline Protestants are “abandoning their religion entirely” (Putnam 2000, 76) while Protestant evangelicals “are less likely to be involved in their broader communities” (Putnam 2000, 77). Putnam (2000) however fails to disaggregate among Protestant traditions beyond Protestant evangelicals and Protestant mainliners and fails to acknowledge the differentiation among those within the different Protestant evangelical sub-cultures. Putnam (2000) in essence treats Protestants as a dichotomy and in so doing...
fails to recognize the diversity of political and theological beliefs and convictions and the public opinions that exists within each Protestant evangelical sub-culture and their effects on public policy.

This dissertation expands on Smith’s (1998) sub-cultural identity theory within the Protestant evangelical tradition to move beyond Putnam (2000). This dissertation builds on Smith’s (1998) understanding of Protestant evangelical sub-cultures and utilizes theology to illustrate the differences among the five Protestant evangelical sub-cultures in terms of 1) civic engagement/voluntary behavior and 2) preferences about welfare and the poor as measured through participation and support of Charitable Choice.

This dissertation utilizes Lam’s (2002) dimensions of religious beliefs and religious participation to distinguish among Protestant evangelical sub-cultures. Lam (2002) measures religiosity by four dimensions of individual faith: 1) formal institutional affiliation (Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, etc); 2) participation in church activities (bonding activities); 3) theological beliefs (interpretation of the Scriptures); and 4) devotional activities (frequency of prayer and attendance). Previous research has focused largely on religious behaviors within a church- church attendance; frequency of prayers, etc- but these simplistic measures fail to sufficiently distinguish among Protestant evangelical sub-cultures. Furthermore, Lam (2002) only uses the dimensions of religiosity to examine civic engagement activities outside of one’s church. This research studies volunteering behavior by examining behaviors inside and outside of one’s congregation. It moves beyond Lam’s (2002) research to examine how dimensions of religiosity affect public opinion on welfare as well.
The theoretical contribution of this research is to develop a new way of measuring variation within the Protestant evangelical sub-culture, especially in matters of civic engagement and voluntary participation, when filtered through theological beliefs and convictions. Lam (2002) analyzes religiosity and civic engagement (secular volunteering) for all religions, comparing Protestants to Jews, Catholics and Muslims while this research focuses exclusively on variation within the Protestant evangelical tradition. This has not been done before in published research. This research develops a new conceptual framework of Protestant religiosity based on four dimensions from identified Protestant evangelical sub-cultures. Specifically, this research compares religiosity and religious behavior across five Protestant evangelical sub-cultures with emphasis on religious beliefs and convictions. One of the most important questions to answer first is “Why focus on Protestant evangelicals?”

Why Protestant Evangelicals Warrant Special Attention

Understanding the importance of studying American Protestant evangelicalism and their sub-cultures is extremely important to the public policy process and for the focus of this dissertation to the chemistry of poverty relief is crucial.

First, Protestant evangelicals are everywhere. Hadden (1996) finds that those who self-identify as Protestant evangelicals total more than 46 million people in the United States. Protestant evangelicals are among the most active group of Christians in the
United States. The National Association of Evangelicals boasts memberships from 52 different Protestant evangelical denominations (NAE 2006).

Secondly, Protestant evangelicals have political allies in President Bush and a Republican controlled Congress. President Bush, a self-proclaimed born-again Protestant evangelical, created the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives in 2001 shortly after taking office aimed at creating new avenues for the participation of faith-based organizations in social service delivery programs. Furthermore, President Bush advocated a “compassion capital fund” as part of the Faith-Based and Community Initiatives Act of 2001 as he once again rallied “the armies of compassion” to combat America’s most pressing social problems (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 4)

Thirdly, Protestant evangelicals have a history of benevolence and civic engagement. While the benevolence rendered by Protestant evangelicals may not always be public, it is provided nonetheless. Campbell and Yonish (2003) find that Protestant evangelicals volunteer informally through their houses of worship and in their church 51% of the time when asked. Smidt (2003, 2) notes that Protestants, and in particular Protestant evangelicals and fundamentalists “are arguably one of the single most important repositories of social capital in America” a finding echoed by Putnam (2000).

Finally, Protestant evangelicalism is thriving by strategically embattling itself in cultural affairs. For decades, sociologists of religion have operated on the belief that cultural pluralism, social differentiation and religious diversity within a society

---

1 Green (2004) funds that Protestants make up 63% of the U.S. population followed by Catholics (24.5%), Muslims (2.2%) and Jews (1.3%). The remaining 9% are a mixture of all other religions. Within
undermined the plausibility and strength of religion. However, Smith (1998) finds that Protestantism, especially Protestant evangelicalism and fundamentalism, is thriving, not because it is shielded against these cultural differences, but because it embattles itself against the societal forces that seem to oppose it or threatened it. Indeed, Protestant evangelicalism “thrives on distinction, engagement, tension, conflict and threat” (Smith 1998, 89). At the cornerstone of these generated Protestant evangelical sub-cultures are moral boundaries and theological views. Protestant evangelical members, through the utilization of theological views, beliefs, convictions and restrictions, exhibit certain distinct patterns of thought and action (see Smith 1998, chapter 4). While these distinctive patterns of thought and action may change over time and in response to circumstances, they do not change randomly nor do they fluctuate greatly. Furthermore, socialization occurs within each of the participating sub-cultures to re-enforce the boundaries and norms distinct to that particular sub-culture (Pennington and Smidt 2002). Thus, theological convictions and beliefs serve as a direction indicator and as a solidifier of boundaries. This dissertation seeks to understand the role Protestant evangelical sub-cultures, and in particular Protestant evangelical beliefs and convictions, play in the implementation and delivery of social service programs using Charitable Choice as an example.

Protestantism, evangelicals and mainliners make up more the largest subcultures, followed by Protestant fundamentalists, liberal Protestants and Protestant Christians.
The Emergence of Charitable Choice

How did Charitable Choice find its way onto the map of American politics? The most obvious answer lies in an examination of the debates over welfare during the 1990’s. However, closer examination indicates that poverty relief in the United States is rooted in “deep philosophical transformations” (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 4). American poverty relief for much of the twentieth century was seen in a distinct two-fold manner. Public assistance and faith-based benevolence were separate and well-defined. While it is true that when confronted with persons in need, collaborations between religious leaders and social workers at local government offices occurred, the idea of church-state separation, along with cultural differences between religious organizations and governmental entities meant that public-private collaborations was minimized (see Sherman 2000; Bartkowski and Regis 2003).

PRWORA radically restructured the relationship between government agencies and faith-based service providers. The welfare-era motif of two separate and distinct service groups was replaced by the post-PRWORA principle of partnership. Savas (2000) points out that these partnerships are ideal for religious organizations who can underwrite a whole range of social service activities including food assistance, job readiness training, child-care, etc. with government funds.

Although proponents of Charitable Choice sometimes disagree on the particulars of faith-based welfare reform and the best way to implement poverty relief strategies (Olasky 1992; Center for Public Justice 1994; Sherman 2000), they generally agree on its justification (Carlson-Thies and Skillen 1996). Charitable Choice advocates call attention
to all the resources within faith communities– high standards of moral integrity, holistic views of personhood, connectedness to the local community, etc. (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 5). Many believe that these resources provide religious communities a unique role in assisting the poor and advancing welfare reform initiatives (Olasky 1992; Carlson-Thies 1996;). Consequently, most Americans agree, that when compared with government-based and secular solutions to social ills, faith-based social service providers are superior because of their moral values and the holistic goals.2

The Charitable Choice provision, by its own declaration, is designed to permit religious organizations the opportunity to collaborate with public assistance providers on social service issues on the same basis as any other non-governmental provider but without impairing their religious character and without diminishing the religious freedom of beneficiaries.3 To enable religious organizations to go from the delivery fringe to being a key player in the welfare system, Charitable Choice addresses four main areas of concern.

First, the new federal legislation obligates state and local governments not to discriminate against religious organizations when making procurement decisions. Faith-based organizations cannot be excluded from receiving federal funds simply because they

---

2 Over 75% of those surveyed by the Pew Center for the People and the Press (2001) favored faith-based partnerships with minorities favoring (81%) at a higher rate than whites (68%). The ideals of compassion and individualism are seen as 72% of those surveyed believe that religious people are more compassionate and caring than non religious service providers and 77% surveyed believe that recipients of social services should have a variety of options. Moreover, 62% cite the power of religion to “change people’s lives”- a key indicator of their support for faith-based services (Pew Center 2001).

are religious or of the wrong religion. The aim is to create a level playing field and as such faith-based organizations get no special treatment- competency and accountability is the standards to be used when awarding funds.

Secondly, Charitable Choice allows faith-based organizations to retain their independent status as organizations that are defined and guided by their religious beliefs. Organizations have the right to display religious symbols and items in the places they use to provide governmental funded services and to some degree they have the right to use moral and religious concepts and language in those services (Carlson-Thies 2001). Most importantly, by retaining their religious identity, each faith-based organization retains the right to hire only employees who agree with their religious convictions. This control insures that the mission of the organization remains intact and has the backing of both the courts and the legislative branch of government (Carlson-Thies 1999).

Third, Charitable Choice explicitly protects the religious rights of the recipient of services outlawing any form of religious coercion in exchange for assistance (Esbeck 1996). Recipients who enter a faith-based program can decline to take an active part in any religious activity offered by the sponsoring agency. And most importantly, the state or local government must be prepared to offer an alternative program to any recipient who objects to receiving services from a religious provider. This requirement ensures that recipients are not forced to violate their religious convictions, makes it clear that government is not establishing any particular faith and enables the religious organizations

---

4 States may require houses of worship to establish separate 501c- (3) organizations.
to manifest their convictions within their specific spiritual theology without fear of trampling on the rights of those receiving the services (see guide to Charitable Choice 1997).

Finally, Charitable Choice maintains the separation of church and state by requiring that faith-based organizations use the funds only for helping the needy. Faith-based organizations cannot divert the funds to pay for worship services, sectarian instruction or proselytization. Ministers, clergy and religious support staff can address religious questions poised by those receiving services but they must use private monies for activities such as Bible study, prayer groups, etc. However, to fully understand Charitable Choice and its role in welfare reform, it is vital to understand Charitable Choice through the lens of covenant and contract.

Deconstructing Charitable Choice

In a sense, Charitable Choice seeks to join two forms of social relationship- covenant and contract- that have long been at odds with one another (Bromley and Busching 1988; Elizar 1994, 2000; Williams 1994, 1999; Bartkowski and Regis 2003). John Calvin (1509-1564) approached the problem of social order and poverty through religious means. According to Calvin (see Weber [1904-5] 1958), God - the original and Absolute Sovereign- knows all things, including who will be saved and who will not. For those within the Calvinist community, ascertaining their fate was of extreme importance. Weber (1958) notes that those who adhered to the Calvinistic beliefs lived a life of

discipline, austerity and impressive economic prosperity accumulating large sums of 
wealth. Through this constant obsession with salvation, those with Calvinist beliefs 
focused on social responsibility and duty of all- the poor and the privileged- to uphold the 
general welfare of society at large. General order was understood to preserve specific 
order and give divinely ordained covenantal social hierarchies (Morgan 1958; Quigley 
1996).

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), a self-proclaimed utilitarian, however championed 
self-interest, fearing that in a state of unbridled self-interest, “society would devolve into 
a war of all against all in which life would be solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short” 
(Hobbes [1651] 1994,71). For Hobbes (1651), the Absolute Sovereign created a social 
contract in which citizens rationally bargain away some of their individual liberties for an 
orderly society governed by law (see Trattner 1999).

The passage of welfare reform suggests that we are heirs to an ambiguous 
heritage that is both Hobbesian and Calvinistic in character (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 
11). Welfare reform combines utilitarian terms such as “choice”, “competition” and 
“client”- to conceive a relationship between the state and its citizens. In this case 
language that conceives of the poor as “clients” of the state or civic agencies, and that 
legitimates “competition” between social service providers is consistent with the 
contractual logic of utilitarianism espoused by Hobbes (see Schram 1995; Schram and 
Beer 1999; Schram 2000).6

6 The Republican “Contract with America” that promised among other things to promote “individual 
responsibility” by enacting a “tough two-years and out provision with work requirements” was an explicitly 
utilitarian means of kicking off welfare debates (see Schram 1997; Schram 2000, chapter 1).
At the same time, the principle of covenant espoused by Calvin is evident in welfare reform and Charitable Choice. Very much like the covenental system of the Calvinist movement, welfare reform promotes and advocates the merits of productive labor, defined as full-time employment in the workforce. Through the usage of words such as “temporary” and “short-term”, policy makers redefined welfare from an entitlement program to a more temporary relief program.\(^7\)

PRWORA replaced Aid to Families with Dependant Children (AFDC) with Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). TANF allows states to use a specific amount of federal funds, usually in the form of block grants, to pay for no more than five-years of public assistance benefits and permits states to set shorter time limits on assistance if desired. If states choose to offer assistance to needy families beyond the five-year limit, they must do so with their own funds. TANF also requires adults to work for pay within twenty-four months after they begin to receive assistance (Weaver 2000).

A second significant change affected by PRWORA involved the methods used to disburse the temporary assistance funds. Through the devolution revolution (Nathan 1996), states now possess the capabilities to disburse welfare funds to local communities through block grants. The block grant system is predicated on the assumption that state and local officials are best positioned to determine the particular needs of citizens through this bottom-up approach. Consequently, block grants provide local officials with the discretionary authority over the disbursement of funds and impose relatively few

---

\(^7\) Aid for Families and Dependent Children (AFDC) was replaced with Temporary Relief for Needy Families (TANF). A 1990 national survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center revealed that 70% of surveyed adults favored reducing welfare benefits to make working for a living more attractive.
restrictions on the avenues through which such monies can be distributed. Indeed, Section 104, also known as Charitable Choice, identifies religious congregations as a prospective provider of social services to states interested in utilizing local faith-based communities in this manner (A Guide to Charitable Choice 1997; Amato von-Hemert 1998; Sherwood 1998; Chaves 1999; Davis and Hankins 1999; Fritz 1999).

Finally, Charitable Choice maintains the separation of church and state by requiring that faith-based organizations use the funds only for helping the needy. Faith-based organizations cannot divert the funds to pay for worship services, sectarian instruction or proselytization. Ministers, clergy and religious support staff can address religious questions posed by those receiving services but they must use private monies for activities such as Bible study, prayer groups, etc.

It would appear that in the post-welfare era, the old poor law system has made a comeback through a more sophisticated series of contracts with governmental entities. Political devolution has moved the lion’s share of responsibility for welfare programs from the federal government to local empowerment. The post-welfare era is once again a time for “experimenting in the laboratory” (see Schram 1999) as welfare reform permits state governments to partner in every sense of the word with religious organizations in order to deliver an array of social services to the disadvantaged through Charitable Choice. But Protestant evangelicals appear to be on the outside looking in.

According to the Office of Justice only about .3% of total discretionary funds—one third of one percent—was awarded to faith based organizations ($1.9 million of $626.7
million) in 2001. At the Department of Education, 25 of 1091 discretionary grants (2%) went to faith-based organizations in 2001, none of which were awarded to those representing the Protestant evangelical tradition. The Continuum for Care Program at HUD, which addresses homelessness, awarded 16% of their funds to faith-based organizations in 2001, primarily to Habitat for Humanity and Catholic charities. The Department of Labor reports that only 2% of the grant pool was awarded to faith-based organizations receiving 2% of the grant funds in 2001. And the Department of Health and Human Services highlights only 3 out of 44 grant recipients as being Protestant evangelicals. The question and focus of this dissertation is “why?” Why do Protestant evangelicals, who have a rich history of benevolence towards the poor, continue to remain on the periphery of the government sponsored social welfare programs? Why with the safeguards in place surrounding Charitable Choice, do Protestant evangelical sub-cultures refuse to get involved in Charitable Choice?

Approach

This research draws on both quantitative and qualitative data to illustrate the importance of Protestant sub-cultures in civic engagement and social capital activities and support for Charitable Choice. An important measure of distinguishing among Protestant evangelical sub-cultures is specific theological beliefs and convictions. I hypothesize that high levels of self identified conservative theological beliefs and convictions will affect patterns of civic engagement (volunteering outside of one’s
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congregation) and participation in welfare reform activities (Charitable Choice). Two primary hypotheses are developed:

- Hypothesis 1: Protestant evangelical sub-cultures with high levels of conservative theological beliefs and convictions are less likely to volunteer within their communities than those who are liberal in their theological beliefs and convictions.

- Hypothesis 2: Protestant evangelical sub-cultures, which have high levels of conservative theological beliefs and convictions, are less likely to support Charitable Choice than those Protestant evangelical sub-cultures that are foundationally moderate or liberal in their theological beliefs and convictions.

To assess the role theological conservatism plays in social service delivery programs within Protestant evangelical sub-cultures, three data sources are used: individual survey data, congregational survey data and qualitative interviews with Protestant ministers. The Religion and Politics National Survey (2001; n = 5503) and the National Congregations Study (1999; n = 1245) asks specific questions related to 1) civic engagement activities/volunteering and 2) government sponsored partnerships with faith-based organizations (churches, synagogues, mosques, temples, etc). Each survey also includes all major religious traditions and denominations. Furthermore, these two data sets allow for the incorporation of theological conservatism into the analysis. These two data sets are the only two nationally conducted survey instruments that also incorporate questions pertaining to Charitable Choice and thus are used in the analysis.
It is also important to note that while other religious scholars have developed general religious typologies (Kellstedt et al.1995; 1997; Steensland 1999) much less attention has been given to Protestant evangelical sub-cultures. Each chapter of this dissertation enhances Lam’s (2002) typology and Smiths (1998) sub-cultural identity theory by differentiating between sub-cultures uses theology as the measure. Chapter three differentiates between individual dimensions of religiosity using Lam’s (2002) framework to ask how Protestant evangelical members feel about volunteering outside of their congregation and to measure their support for Charitable Choice. Chapter four builds on these findings to measure Protestant evangelical church leaders perspectives pertaining to civic engagement and Charitable Choice and Chapter five seeks to provide a thick description of the variation that exists within each Protestant evangelical sub-culture. Interaction variables are also generated to measure specific theological beliefs and conviction levels within the various Protestant evangelical sub-cultures and their effects on volunteering and Charitable Choice. Other variables previously mentioned in published research (see as an example Smidt 2003) are included, when needed, to measure the effect of concerns over constitutionality and the size of one’s congregation. To sort out overlapping factors like age, education, gender, etc., multivariate regression methods are used.

Contributions of the Proposed Research

There are significant gaps in what is known about specific Protestant evangelical sub-cultures and the role theological conservatism plays in the public policy process. Olson and Pearl (2005) have examined the role of conservatism as it pertains to strict
rules relating to free riding while Campbell (2004) and Park and Smith (2000) examine social capital among Protestants but do not differentiate between denominational sub-cultures. Laythe et al. (2002) examines fundamentalism as a predictor of prejudice and Regnerus and Smith (1998) examine selective deprivatization among Protestants. While each of these research articles provide an overall picture of the role Protestantism plays in various issues, this dissertation will fill a void by focusing on the role theology plays within Protestantism and its ultimate effect on policy delivery. At this time, no prior published research has empirically demonstrated the impact of conservative theology on social service delivery such as welfare or Charitable Choice.

Charitable Choice research, limited in scope, has specifically examined staff issues (Hodge 2000), mega-church involvement (Thornburg and Wolfer 2000), constitutionality concerns (Sherwood 2000) and administrative capacities (Chaves 1999). This chapter, although not specifically interested in these measures, will utilize these findings to make inferences from an application standpoint. This dissertation will focus on the factors affecting participation in Charitable Choice using theology as the main factor and determining if Charitable Choice is an issue that Protestant evangelicals and fundamentalists are strategically prepared to become embattled over to bring vitality and distinction to their sub-culture.

Charitable Choice represents a great opportunity for faith-based organizations, including Protestant evangelicals, to address the needs of the poor, and as such the theological beliefs and convictions of Protestant evangelical sub-cultures represents a guide to development of future policy. Despite the legislative and constitutionality
concerns surrounding Charitable Choice, it remains a viable alternative to the traditional implementation and delivery strategies associated with poverty relief.

Thus, this dissertation research will advance both practice and theory by providing an understanding about the complex world of Protestant evangelicalism. Theoretically, this dissertation has the potential to increase our understanding about the role theological beliefs and convictions play in the public policy process and whether faith-based organizations can help to address the issues surrounding poverty and social welfare. To the policy maker this dissertation will provide practical information that affects policy delivery and policy evaluation. To the religious scholar and social science researcher, this dissertation serves as one brick in a larger foundation known as Protestant evangelicalism. It will provide them with a different strategy for identifying key variables associated with public policy analysis.

Chapter two discusses the changing historical relationship between faith-based poverty relief and public assistance. Poor Law formed the basis of American social welfare policy from the inception of the United States through most of the 1800’s. Religious organizations, primarily churches, were closely integrated into local efforts to address the needs of the poor during this time. Industrialization, urbanization, and large numbers of immigrants transformed cultural perceptions about the causes of poverty and religions role in combating it. Public assistance and religious benevolence found themselves on parallel tracks by the twentieth - century. By 1996, this role was reversed as partnerships where encouraged and collaborative strategies were funded. This chapter also provides a theoretical overview of the Protestant evangelical tradition highlighting
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strategies used by various groups to generate specific sub-cultures. Using welfare in a historical perspective, this chapter demonstrates how Protestant evangelicals have created their own unique sub-cultures to become embattled but also to thrive.

Chapter three draws on a unique national Pew Survey, Religion and Politics (2001), to explore at the individual level how Protestant evangelicals’ religious convictions and religion affects civic engagement and support for welfare reform through faith-based initiatives. It operationalizes Lam’s (2002) dimensions of religiosity specifically as they pertain to the Protestant evangelical faith. It then shows how these dimensions affect voluntary participation rates by Protestant evangelical sub-cultures, a vital component of Charitable Choice. It then utilizes the dimensions of religiosity to examine individual Protestant evangelical’s support levels for Charitable Choice. Using multivariate regression, emphasis is directed toward examining conservative theology and constitutionality issues.

Chapter four builds on the findings of Chapter three by examining the role Protestant evangelical clergy play in the formation of individual theological beliefs and convictions, political views and in particular Charitable Choice. Utilizing the National Congregations Study (2000), in which ministers were asked if they supported Charitable Choice, binary logistic analysis is conducted and findings are discussed. In keeping with the main research theme of this dissertation, emphasis is placed on theological beliefs and convictions through the creation of interaction variables as it pertains to Protestant evangelical sub-cultures.
Chapter five supplies interview data of thirty-six Protestant evangelical ministers that enhances the quantitative data. These interviews provide a rich description and fuller understanding of the factors, other than those investigated and seen in the quantitative portion, which affect the creation of sub-cultures, the participation levels of civic engagement activities, and ultimately support for Charitable Choice.

Finally, Chapter six provides an overview and discusses the findings as well as the policy implications obtained from the research.
CHAPTER 2

PROTESTANT SUB-CULTURES
AND HISTORY OF WELFARE

Introduction

This dissertation discussed in Chapter 1 that Protestant evangelicalism enjoys a religious vitality that is thriving (Smith 1998). Protestant evangelicalism is the largest religious sub-culture of the Protestant tradition in the United States with more than 26.9% of all Protestants in the United States self-identifying as being Protestant evangelical (Green, 2000). Whether gauged by beliefs, attitudes, opinions, commitments and/or behavior, the conclusion is the same: Protestant evangelicalism is full of vitality and strength.9

This chapter begins by elaborating a general theoretical explanation for why Protestant evangelicalism is prospering and succeeding in a modern pluralistic religious society. Sub-cultural identity theory (Smith 1998) maintains, essentially, that Protestant evangelicalism can survive and thrive in pluralistic modern society by strategically creating for itself sub-cultures that offer morally orienting collective identities, which in turn provide their adherents meaning and belonging. Furthermore, sub-cultural identity theory suggests that in a pluralistic society, the religious traditions of Protestant
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9 I recognize that there are many possible ways to conceive of “strength”. Strength for this study means going beyond church attendance and utilizing such issues as adherence to beliefs, robustness of faith, retention and recruitment of members, etc (see Smith 1998, chapter 2 for a lengthy discussion of religious strength).
evangelicalism will be stronger which “possess and utilize the cultural tools needed to create both a clear distinction from and significant engagement and tension with other relevant groups” (Smith 1998, 120). This chapter argues that Protestant evangelicalism is thriving as a whole, not because it has built a series of protective sub-cultures thereby shielding denominations from modernity, but the contrary- precisely because it is passionately engaged in direct struggle with pluralistic modernity.10

This chapter uses sub-cultural identity theory of religion to interpret Protestant evangelicalism’s striking religious strength. This chapter highlights eight features of Protestant evangelical sub-cultures “that are distinct, engaging and full of conflict and tension sustaining a unique Christian collective identity”, which serves as a primary source of individual identity for those who believe in the various sub-cultures that are created (Smith 1998, 89). This chapter then demonstrates how Protestant evangelicalism has used tradition; self-identity and beliefs to create strong cultural boundaries to establish a presence in the social welfare arena and then subsequently distance themselves from other religious groups-sometimes even those within the Protestant evangelical tradition. This chapter argues that Protestant evangelicalism’s conspicuous vitality is not the result of any protective social, demographic or geographical distance from or fundamental accommodation to modernity (Smith 1998). Rather its strength results from a combination of its religiously constructed distinctiveness, which is strategically developed (see Smith 1998).

10 Other theories of religious vitality exist notably sheltered enclave theory (Berger 1967; Hunter 1983, 1987, 1997); status discontent theory (Wood and Hughes 1984; Marshall 1996); strictness theory (Iannaccone 1992, 1994) and competitive market theory (Hunter 1983)
The purpose of this chapter is four-fold. First, it presents an overview of sub-cultural identity theory (Smith 1998) as pertains to Protestant evangelicalism. Secondly, it presents a historical analysis of the role of religion, religious beliefs, and cultural differences as it pertains to Protestant evangelicalism and faith in poverty and the welfare system of the United States. This brief analysis will show the moral framework of religious benevolence and faith, from its individualistic thread to its religious clash with secularization and communitarian worldviews. Thirdly, the chapter provides insight into Charitable Choice, a melding of two forms of social relationships- contract and covenant- in a manner that has long been at odds with each other (Bromley and Busching 1988; Elizar 1994, 2000; Williams 1994; 1999). Finally, the chapter provides an overview of the current role of Protestant evangelicals as it relates to Charitable Choice and faith-based services. This analysis relies on descriptive statistics but also presents religious and secular arguments for its conclusions.

Protestant Evangelicals Create Sub-Cultures

Just as there is much discussion about the many facets of religious identity, there is considerable debate among religious scholars concerning the religious make-up of the typical Protestant evangelical. Protestant evangelicalism has always been more than simply a theological movement, but theology has played an important role in defining Protestantism (Pennington and Smidt, 2002). Smith (1998) finds no less than eight features of “distinction, engagement and conflict embedded in Protestant evangelical sub-cultures, features which help constitute the core sensibilities of the preponderance of ordinary contemporary Protestant Christians” (124). They are as follows:
A Sense of Strong Boundaries with the Non-Evangelical World: Most Protestant evangelicals know who they are, what they are and what they are not. The implicit distinction between “us” and “them” is ubiquitous in Protestant evangelical thought and speech, which “subtly and profoundly shapes their consciousness and their discourse” (Smith 1998, 124). Through the use of symbolic markers such as “born-again” and biblical authority, many Protestant evangelicals differentiate between those “within the camp and those on the outside looking in”.11 Protestant evangelicals also have been known to establish strong boundaries between “Christians” and the world. While not wanting to be a protuberance with other religious faiths, most Protestant evangelicals are fully aware of what it means to be worldly.

A Sense of Possessing the Ultimate Truth: Unlike modernists and postmodernists who struggle with the notion of truth, Protestant evangelicals as a whole believe in a static and universal truth, which has been revealed to them through the inspired writers of the Scriptures. As an example, Pennington and Smidt (2002) note that Protestant evangelicals adhere to a “stance that the Bible is the supreme norm of truth for Christian belief and practice (171).12 Smith (1998) finds that

11 Conservative Protestant evangelicals, such as Anabaptists and Church of Christ members have often used the term “being inside the camp” to reflect those that were spiritually right with God. Old Testament Scripture shows that Miriam, the sister of Moses, was expelled from the camp and isolated because of her sin. In this symbolic manner, conservative Protestants are fully aware of “who are in” and “who are out”.
12 See also, Roger Olson, “The Future of Evangelical Theology,” Christianity Today 42 (February 9, 1998), 40.
Protestant evangelicals, compared with all other religious groups, are by far the “most likely to believe in the existence of absolute, unchanging standards as a basis for morals” (127). National surveys also show that most Protestant evangelicals read the Bible on a consistent daily basis more so than any other religious denomination (see as an example Kellstedt et al. 1996).

*A Sense of Practical Moral Superiority:* Many Protestant evangelicals are known to be realists believing that “the road to heaven” (Smith 1998, 129) is traveled by incorporating the experiential elements of the faith through spiritual discipline, and holy, effective religion (Wells 1993; Pennington and Smidt 2002). Smith (1998) finds that Protestant evangelicals are less likely to agree that people should be able to choose their own moralities and that Christian morals should be taught in public schools. Protestant evangelical theologians see changes in the moral fiber as “a softening or erosion of historic, orthodox evangelicalism” (Wells 1993, 12). This believed moral superiority has the important consequence of creating a distinction between those perceived to be living godly and those who are not.

*A Sense of Lifestyle and Value Distinctiveness:* Many Protestant evangelicals see themselves as living in a narcissistic, self-destructive world that has not only abandoned them but also abandoned the common-sense values to be absorbed into
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13 Smith finds that 91% of Protestant evangelicals believe that Christian values should be different from the world and 75% believe morals should be based on absolute, unchanging standards. Percentages for other faiths are as follows: Catholics (37%), Mainline (55%), and Liberals (34%).
the cultural mainstream (Wacker 1984; Smith 1998). Having rejected the fundamentalist strategy of isolationist separatist, many Protestant evangelicals strive to be in the world but not of the world. They strive to integrate with society while maintaining separation at the same time.

_A Sense of Evangelistic and Social Mission:_ Penning and Smidt (2002) note that one of the primary tasks of the Protestant evangelicalism is “to serve the church’s mission by bringing God’s grace to the whole world through proclamation and service” (171). Protestant evangelicals are likely to be involved in public debates over social and political issues, especially those with moral overtones, and they relish the conflict and the tension created by their posture on any given policy stance (Regenerus and Smith 1998). Overall, Smith (1998) sees Protestant evangelicalism as a whole as a tradition firmly committed to a vigorous evangelistic and social mission.

_A Sense of Displaced Heritage:_ Many Protestant evangelicals firmly believe that America was founded on Christian principles and that those principles have slowly been eroded away by mainstream institutions (social, economic and governmental). Hunter (1987) finds that many Protestant evangelical’s perceptions of hostility from the mass media, public schools and feminists result in feelings of displacement and marginalization. Protestant evangelicals are three
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14 Paul, the Apostle tells the Corinthians to be in the world but not of the world. This passage is a foundational principle in the evangelical community.
times more likely to sense hostility from these groups than other religious traditions and faiths (Smith 1998, 137-139).

*A Sense of Second-Class Citizenship:* Many Protestant evangelicals, especially fundamentalists, perceive “a double standard in American discourse that discriminates against Christians” (Smith 1998, 140) in such areas as school prayer and displaying of the Ten Commandments. A recent example in the media was the perceived alteration of the “Christmas Holiday Season” to simply a “Holiday Season.” Many Protestant evangelicals, including fundamentalists and self-identified liberals, perceived this as a media attack; “being demoted to second class citizenship, of being suppressed by a selectively liberal mainstream that lives in denial of that suppression” (Smith, 1998, 140).

*A Sense of Menacing External Threats:* Finally, some, but not all, Protestant evangelicals are concerned about the organization of groups with clearly anti-Christian agendas. Marsden (1980) notes that greater insight may be gained by viewing Protestant evangelicals, and in particular, fundamentalists and conservatives as ethnic groups. In a fashion similar to Native Americans, who “owned” America, only to be invaded and marginalized by an alien culture (Hansen 1952, Marsden 1980, Smith 1998), many Protestant evangelicals feel as though they share in this heritage.

One might get the idea that all Protestant evangelicals are scared, timid and offended. This is far from the truth. Protestant evangelicals are generators of social capital and civic
engagement (Smidt 2003), are regarded as one of the largest groups of charitable givers in the United States (Nemeth and Luidens 2003), and are actively engaged in political issues (Smidt et al. 2003). Indeed, Protestant evangelicals are arguably one of “the single most repositories of social capital in America” (Putnam 2000, 66) and as such, for the purpose of this study, several demographic factors are worth noting.

Protestant evangelicals in the United States America are predominantly white. About three-quarters (74 percent) of all Protestants in the United States are white, 15 percent are African-American and 5% are Hispanics (Pew Center 2001). They may eschew labels of formal denomination or formal identity, choosing instead to use the label “born again”, with forty eight percent (48%) percent) of Protestant evangelicals identifying as being “born-again Christians”. Those of the Baptists faith and those that identify as being “just Christians” in particular overwhelmingly self-identify as “born again” (97 percent). About 63 percent say that at least one of their parents was a “born-again” Christian when they were growing up. One-third of Protestants evangelicals are converts, that is, neither parent was a “born-again” Christian when they were growing up (Pew Center 2001).

Protestant evangelicals and Protestant fundamentalists are the fastest growing sub-cultures within the Protestant faith and have recently been the focus of attention related to such public policy issues as same-sex marriage amendments and the selection of judges to the Supreme Court. Jerry Falwell, a predominant Protestant fundamentalist minister of the twentieth-century, once described a fundamentalist as an “evangelical who is angry about something” (Marsden 1980, 1). A more precise definition would be that a
Protestant fundamentalist is “an evangelical who is militant in opposition to liberal theology in the churches or changes in cultural values or mores such as those associated with secular humanism” (Marsden, 1980, 1). Protestant fundamentalists and Protestant evangelicals emphasize strict literal interpretation of the Bible, dispensationalist theology, pre-millennial eschatology and institutional separation from apostasy (Marsden 1987, 1991; Weber 1991). Known as defensive separatism, Protestant evangelicals and Protestant fundamentalists often “erect high and strong sub-cultural walls in an attempt to preserve the purity of their faith” and in so doing they “reduce active civic engagement” (Smith 1998, 145; also see Marsden 1980, 176-195). Furthermore, pre-millennial Protestant fundamentalists have been known to withdraw from political involvement, shun efforts at social reform and abandon the surrounding culture (Smith 1998).

Ammerman’s (1997) study of Protestant fundamentalists finds that a key tenet is separation from the world. Whereas mainline Protestants thrive on a combination of both distinction from and engagement with pluralistic modernity, many Protestant evangelicals and Protestant fundamentalists often “lack the instruments needed to generate social and cultural engagement with the outside world” (Smith 1998, 147).

Race is a critical in the development and establishment of Protestant sub-cultures. It is also important that a distinction be drawn between “White Christians” (also known as white evangelicals) and “Black Christians”. With the emancipation of African-Americans following the Civil War, the institution of the black church created by freed slaves was seen as an opportunity to distance themselves from white control while establishing their own ecclesiastical independence (Marsden 1983). Many black churches
combined their history and heritage (African) with the religion of their white neighbors (Methodist, Episcopalian, and Baptist) to create African-Methodist-Episcopalian (AME) churches and National Baptist Association congregations. While borrowing from evangelical principles, Black Christians formed their “own brand of religion referring to themselves as Bible-believers instead of evangelicals” (Marsden 1982, 48-49). As such, this distinction is carried over into today’s religious world as most researchers analyze them as a separate group.\footnote{For summaries on research related to black conservative Protestants, see Lincoln and Mamiya (1990), Payne (1995) and Sernett (1991). Smidt, Green, Guth and Kellstedt in their writings all chose to “baffle out” Black Christians in their research studies a point discussed in their research.}

White Protestantism is thus a series of distinct sub-cultures grounded in theological practices and beliefs and unique in their social vision and their cultural strategies for dealing with the secular world. Each of these determinants serves as a filter for the participation levels of Protestant evangelicals in social service programs and public policy initiatives. It is easy to see that Protestant evangelical’s are not a monolith, although at one time in their history, they were very uniform in their beliefs, especially in matters pertaining to taking care of the poor. Through the generation of these various types of Protestant evangelical sub-cultures, Protestant evangelicals have wrestled with issues related to governmental partnerships to help those outside their constructed boundaries who are disenfranchised and poor. To fully understand how Protestant evangelicals have differentiated themselves into various subcultures, one can examine their role in helping address the needs of the poor from a historical perspective.
Social Welfare: A Historical Perspective

The policy developments surrounding the 1996 welfare reform legislation (PWORA Act 1996 and specifically section 104, Charitable Choice) are best understood in light of social welfare history. This section examines the evolution of welfare policy over the past four centuries paying special attention to the role of religious benevolence in poverty relief. This section highlights how key social changes have affected public assistance and religious benevolence and involvement in America. This overview is designed to highlight historical issues that are germane to this dissertation- the role of religion in the justification and delivery of services, denominationalism, and “the standards incorporated by local leaders in determining the worthy poor from their unworthy counterparts” (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 27). This section will demonstrate that contemporary debates dealing with concerns related to welfare reform are a re-working of issues with a long history in the American welfare policy arena. And, in the end, an understanding of the complex historical relationship that exists between governmental entities and religious organizations enables us to more closely scrutinize the prospects for faith-based partnerships through the Charitable Choice provision.

Poor Laws: Social Welfare in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries

Elizabethan Poor Law, first adopted and applied throughout England in 1601, grew out of a series of tensions rooted in remarkable social changes. In the early seventeenth century, a longstanding feudal order had given way to a new form of social organization- most notably, an emerging mercantile economy and the materialization of civil government (Katz 1989, 1995, 1996; Berkowitz and McQuaid 1992; Trattner 1999;
Like many political initiatives that surfaced during the seventeenth century, Elizabethan Poor Law reflected the tensions of social order in transition. Broadly, the Poor Law melded traditional feudal sensibilities, in which individuals were conceived as subjects of rulers (God, monarchs, nobles and lords) with progressive notions of citizenship and civil society (Beier 1974). The noble-subject relationship of the feudal period was defined by covenant- a series of mutual, although asymmetrical obligations between persons occupying disparate ascribed statuses.\(^\text{16}\)

Covenantal obligations were evident in the social status of persons and were seen as being divinely ordained rather than a product of social negotiation (Mollat 1986). In stark contrast, the relations of citizens within the nascent civil society were defined by social contract (Trattner 1999; Bartkowski and Regis 2003). Contractual relations emphasized the rights and liberties of autonomous individuals whose status was negotiated through the shifting sands of social law.

Interestingly enough, Elizabethan Poor Law was characterized by an odd mix of policy provisions- some remarkably compassionated, others strikingly authoritarian. Through its more benevolent statues, the Poor Law formally recognized the government’s responsibility to relieve suffering among the helpless and ensure a basic standard of living for all its citizens. The Poor Law was the first statue of its kind to establish the government’s responsibility to support citizens who were incapacitated, helpless or victims of misfortune- often defined as “impotent” and the “worthy poor” (see Katz
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\(^{16}\) Trattner (1999) notes that in all actuality during the feudal period there was little “uncared-for distress”. Most people live on feudal manors and were protected by their masters from sickness, unemployment, etc. In exchange for a strong measure of constraint on individual freedom, feudalism, in the words of Trattner, “provided a form of social insurance against the exigencies of life” (1999, 4).
1986). The worthy poor were guaranteed the right to relief of either the outdoor or indoor variety. Outdoor relief, also called home relief, provided support to the deserving poor outside a regulated institutional environment (Hands 1968; Trattner 1999). Indoor relief amounted to support provided through institutional means—specifically, the local almshouse or poorhouse for the incapacitated and the workhouse for the jobless able-bodied (Katz 1996). Apart from the worthy poor, Elizabethan Poor Law identified other classes of dependents and prescribed specific courses of action designed to readdress the unique needs of these populations. Apprenticeships were made available to needy children. And jobs were accorded to the able-bodied who lacked work opportunities.\footnote{For a more detailed analysis of poor law (see Katz, 1989; Trattner 1999).}

The Poor Law also enjoined a series of obligations on individuals much like those imposed on the subjects of feudal nobility and as such displayed a form of feudal sensibilities into the Poor Law rule structure. Charity began at home as primary economic responsibility for the disadvantaged was placed squarely at the feet of the poor person’s family. Parents and grandparents were legally charged with providing economic support to younger dependents (See Trattner 1999). Likewise, younger generations were expected and legally bounded to provide care for their elders in old age. Those who failed to do so could be jailed. The Poor Law also enforced work requirements through what today would be considered to be draconian means. Able-bodied persons who refused to work could be incarcerated, whipped, branded and even put to death (Trattner 1999).
“Vagrants” as they were called, initially had no legal recourse for challenging the verdicts and punishments meted out by overseers in the local community.\textsuperscript{18}

The Poor Law firmly established the principle of local responsibility, at the lowest level, for the care of those in need. Walter Trattner, a social historian, notes:

…the parish [local community] was to act through its church wardens and a small number of “substantial householders” who would be appointed annually by the justices of the peace to serve both as overseers of the poor and as collectors of the revenue- a wholly secular or civil position. Funds necessary carrying the act into effect were to be raised by taxing every householder in the parish, with the threat of imprisonment for those who failed to pay the taxes (Trattner 1999, 11).

American colonists distinguished between pauperism- an unwillingness to work among the able-bodied—and genuine poverty or misfortune. Katz (1996, 9) notes that the deserving poor were given “credit by local landlords and grocers until they returned to work or illness subsided”. Paupers, the undeserving poor, were scorned throughout colonial communities. Many communities began to restrict immigration or the movements of strangers. Many paupers were “warned-out” or told to leave by the selectman or overseers; those who would not go willingly were forcibly removed by the constable.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{18} Initially, vagrants did not have the right to appeal but this was overturned in 1796 (see Trattner 1999).

\textsuperscript{19} In “warning out” those likely to become dependents dealt with town officials; the town was merely exercising a right that existed because of English theory of inhabitancy, or the right to live in a certain settlement. Each town was considered a corporation established by free consent; its residents therefore, had “sovereignty” to admit or exclude their own inhabitants. “Warning out” or banishment was perceived to be especially necessary because towns had no police forces to maintain control over “dangerous” people. For more detail on warning out (see Trattner, 1999, chapter 2).
The strong commitment of colonists to local responsibility for the poor stemmed largely from Puritan theology. From a Puritan standpoint, poverty provided an opportunity for the privileged to demonstrate material and spiritual benevolence toward the less fortunate. More importantly, the exercise of such benevolence allowed each individual community the opportunity to reaffirm their commitment to order, discipline and duty. Trattner notes:

…The poor, mere pawns in a divinely destined universe and hence not responsible for their condition, were always present…not[as] a necessary evil but rather a blessing, a God-given opportunity for men to do good- to serve society and their Creator. According to God’s scheme, a well-ordered society was hierarchical; it had series of ranks ranging from top to bottom … Each had special privileges and obligations; the poor to work hard and to respect and show deference to those above them, the well-to-do to be humble and to aid and care for those below them (1999, 16-17).

Calvinism, instead of focusing on individual rights and civil liberties “placed a premium on social responsibility and the duty of all- privileged and poor alike- to uphold the general welfare of society at large” (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 31). Yet, for those of the Puritan faith, there existed contradictory imperatives pertaining to poverty and work. On one hand, local Puritan communities were obligated to demonstrate compassion toward those facing misfortune. At the same time, their Calvinistic idea about the virtue of hard work and the sin of idleness- their concepts of the “calling” made work sacred (Winthrop 1956; Morgan 1958; Quigley 1996; see also Trattner 1999). As a result, there
was little sympathy for “sturdy beggars”. As the Puritan minister, Cotton Mather put it: “For those who indulge themselves in idleness, the express command of God unto us is this: that we should let them starve” (Murdock 1926; see also Trattner 1999, 22). As the ranks of the poor multiplied, largely due in part to immigrants arriving with health issues, limited material possessions and limited employable skills, three social phenomena occurred that continue to place a public emphasis on helping the poor: the First Great Awakening, the Enlightenment and the American Revolution.

Emerging in the late 1720’s, the First Great Awakening was marked by a period of religious revival centered on distinct evangelical principles: faith, repentance and above all regeneration or being born again- “a concrete ascertainable conversion experience” (Bernhard 1976). The theological beliefs of the First Great Awakening had political and sociological implications in the social welfare arena as well. The First Great Awakening, with its emphasis on shared salvation for all believers regardless of social class, fostered “humane attitudes and popularized philanthropy at all levels of society (Cowing 1971). Bremner (1960) notes that it transformed “do-goodism from a predominate upper and middle-class activity – half-responsibility, half recreation- into a broadly shared genuinely popular avocation (20). Mohl (1967) notes that “pious men everywhere seemed to transcend interest in their own souls in an aggressive concern for the salvation of others” (7).

20 Most scholars believe that the first Great Awakening started in the late 1720’s and reached a climax about fifteen years later. See Trattner (1999: 32-34) for a detailed description of the First Great Awakening.
The Enlightenment, which resulted mainly from the growth of science, stated that people possess reason and therefore are or can be equal; that through the use of their reason they can test social institutions by virtue of their reason and reform them based on the knowledge they obtain. Social reform and caring for the poor through humanitarian efforts followed. Mohl (1969) notes that:

… groups were formed for every imaginable… purpose: to assist widows and orphans, immigrants and Negroes, debtors and prisoners, aged females and young prostitutes; to supply the poor with food, fuel and medicine, [and] employment…; to promote morality, temperance, thrift and industrious habits; to educate poor children in free schools, Sunday schools and charity schools; to reform gamblers, drunkards and juvenile delinquents.

The line between public and private responsibility was not easily drawn as overseers of the poor frequently called on churches for special collections (Bremner 1988:23). Churches representing all types of denominations and beliefs addressed the needs of the poor in partnership with local government entities. Trattner (1999) notes that the separation of church and state had a significant effect on church councils and local municipalities: with the absence of a state religion, all types of churches could flourish

---

21 Newton established the notion of a mechanical harmonious, law-governed universe which could be understood by human reasoning; Locke’s treatises on psychology contended that people were born without any original sin and that they could be molded by their environments; see Trattner 1999, Chapter 3.

22 In Boston, the Society for Encouraging Industry and Employing the Poor was created (Nash 1976). A society to relieve “every poor person without distinction” was founded in South Carolina in 1764 (James 1963). The Society for Inoculating the Poor Gratis was organized in 1774 in Philadelphia (Alexander 1980). Marine societies to aid disabled seaman was also created along the East coast (Coll 1966). See also Trattner 1999, 15-46.
and those groups were extremely interested in maintaining orphanages, hospitals and aid societies.

Finally, the Revolutionary War enhanced the cause for benevolence (Bremner 1988, chapter 2; Trattner 1999 chapter 3). The war left many colonists in poverty through massive social dislocation. The new states were left with an abundance of disabled veterans, widows and orphans of soldiers killed in battle and transient populations that had lost their homes (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 34). But victory also increased American’s commitment to democratic, populist and humanitarian causes. Municipal authorities worked with local churches and religious organizations to reinforce local responsibility for the provision of social welfare.

From the Poor Law to the Poor House: Nineteenth-Century U.S. Poverty Policy

By the dawn of the nineteenth century, colonists had become disgruntled with poor laws. Some critics charged that poor laws were inequitable while others noted that poor communities could not generate the needed funds to address the plethora of welfare cases. Furthermore, another group of critics charged that public assistance programs under poor laws were inefficient, encouraged corruption and were motivated more by cronyism than a genuine sense of need (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 35). Finally, economists of the day attacked poor laws believing that poverty was a natural-state of the wage-earning class. Possessions and the accumulation of wealth, they argued, was a “natural right”, with which the state must not interfere; the poor law, an artificial erosion of the state which taxed the well-to-do for the maintenance and care of the needy,
violated that right and was morally wrong (Trattner 1999, 49; see also Rose 1966, 1971).

On the heels of massive demographic, economic and ideological changes, nineteenth century Americans began to see poverty and the poor through a different lens than their forefathers.²³ No longer part of the Calvinist pre-destined order, poverty was interpreted as clear evidence of deficient character and a lack of moral virtue. In the language of classical economics and contractual relations, poverty was the result of citizens who were devoid of Lockean virtues and as such they “were not entitled to public assistance but the natural consequences of their immoral character- meager compensation at the wages set by market forces” (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 36). The rise of this individualistic ideology was fueled by the Second Great Awakening, which “rejected rigid predestination” (Trattner 1999, 54) and focused on personal factors of salvation—diligence, virtue and conversion. “Poverty and damnation were personal matters: only the individual could overcome them” (Trattner 1999, 55).

This confluence of forces gave rise to the poorhouse and the scientific charity movements of the nineteenth century (see Bremner 1988; Katz 1996, chapters 2-4; Trattner 1999, chapters 4 and 5; Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 36-39:). Poorhouses were envisioned as a compassionate form of institutional assistance. Poorhouses would teach the able-bodied poor how to engage in respectable forms of labor such as farm-work, weaving and small-scale industry. Also known as workhouses, poorhouses were viewed as being more equitable for each township and municipality in that each entity shared the

²³ These changes would include the proliferation of laissez-faire capitalism which facilitated the rise of contractual relationships. Contractual relations are predicated “not on the principles of duty, responsibility and obligation, but rather on the precepts of individual rights, self-interest and civil liberty” (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 35-36).
expenses associated with the maintenance and upkeep of the institution (Trattner 1999).

Overseers of the poorhouses, in addition to having close proximity to those in need, could
“inoculate virtue in those that refused to work” (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 38).

Personal addictions such as alcoholism could be addressed as well. Intemperance was
believed to be caused “by an absence of religion” (Katz 1996, 11) so “exposure to
religious doctrine was deemed essential to the project of effecting moral reform among
the poor” (Trattner 1999, 49).

Many reputable historians today agree that poorhouses were a failure (Katz 1996;
Bartkowski and Regis 2003; see also Trattner 1999, chapter 4-6). Poorhouses, in addition
to being expensive to establish and maintain, became over-crowded, understaffed and
plagued with cohabitation issues among the under-deserving and the deserving. Workers
were afforded no professional training, given meager pay and resources and supplied
with minimal staff. As Katz concludes, poorhouses were caught between:

… the incompatibility of deterrence and compassion: the spread of fear and the
kindly treatment of poverty could not coexist. One or the other always
prevailed… poorhouses were not supposed to do more than keep old and helpless
inmates from starvation. They existed to deter the impotent as well as the able-
bodied poor from seeking their shelter… By the close of the nineteenth century, at
the latest, dread of the poorhouse was nearly universal. In the end, deterrence won
(34-35).

With the mid-nineteenth-century recognition that the poorhouse was not fulfilling its
expectations, advocates of scientific charity emerged on the scene (Bremner 1988,
chapter 6; Katz 1995, chapter 3; Trattner 1999, chapter 5). Scientific charity professionalized poverty relief and gave it a new name—“charity.” The shifting of language from relief to charity is of major significance. The concept of relief calls attention to the burdens besetting the poor and highlights the privileged class’s obligation to give assistance to the poor (Bartkowski and Regis 2003). Charity, on the other hand, focused attention away from the recipient by underscoring the goodwill and voluntary acts of kindness. Katz (1996) notes that three major themes stand out in the history of the relationship between scientific charity and poverty relief: (1) the organized response to social and economic crisis; (2) the role of evangelical Protestantism, especially before 1840; and (3) the response of the Catholic Church.

The early 1800’s witnessed a tremendous influx of immigrants to the United States. Furthermore by the middle of the century, the United States was sharply divided over the issue of slavery—a issue that would only be resolved following the Civil War. Like all wars, the War between the States created enormous relief problems, not only for the wounded and disabled soldiers, but for the bereaved families who lost their male breadwinners during the conflict—problems which could not be blamed on individuals or families involved. As a result, public officials and private citizens responded accordingly; in fact he war aroused charitable energies of the American people as never

24 Charity comes from the Latin word *caritas* (or *carus*), or *love* (brotherly love), although there is some evidence that it maybe derived from the Greek word *haris* (or *harteis*) which technically means grace but may imply brotherly love or its equivalent (Stillman 1975)

25 The Confederacy may have suffered even more than the Union in this regard. One scholar has gone so far as to suggest that the welfare problem was so great in the region that it contributed to desertion in the army and disaffection with the war. See Paul D. Escott, “The Cry of Sufferers: The Problem of Welfare in the Confederacy”, *Civil War History* 23 (September 1977): 228-40.
before. Warnings of unwise giving were forgotten as public and private groups showered assistance on the needy throughout this conflict through the creation of charitable societies. The creation of the United States Sanitary Commission in 1861, the Freeman’s Society, the Samaritan Society, the General Committee of the Benevolent Associates for the relief of the Poor, the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor and numerous Charity Boards across states went into action (see Katz 1996; Trattner 1999). The impetus of many of these organizations was to instill a sense of value and respect in the recipient. Cammisa (1998) notes that the real aim of charitable societies were embodied in middle-class Protestantism beliefs that focused on:

…helping people to help themselves… The poor man or woman should have the road cleared so that they may themselves march on to success- that their brains maybe released from ignorance, their hands freed from the shackles of incompetence, their bodies saved from the pains of sickness, and their souls delivered from the bonds of sin (33).

Many of these organizations were formed on the heels of the Second Great Awakening that swept across the country in the early nineteenth century. Beginning with the late 1780’s and 1790’s, a wave of Protestant evangelical revivals spread across America resulting in thousands of conversions and the creation of numerous missionary societies (Smith, 1971). Known as the Second Great Awakening, this movement stressed evangelical piety, “not for the elect alone but for all men” (Boyer 1978) and it encouraged all Christians to practice “universal benevolence and dedication to human improvement in imitation of divine example” (Katz 1996, 62). Protestant evangelicals
went into poor districts to distribute Bibles, forming the American Bible Society in 1825 and focused on individual families. However, this type of benevolence mixed with religious theology “put it squarely at odds with Catholic immigrants who had recently arrived from Ireland and Germany (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 41). Protestant reformers “found the new Catholic immigrants to be lazy, indolent, prone to drink and far to ready to accept public relief” (Cammisa 1998, 34).26 For many Protestant charities the answer to the perceived “Catholic” problem was to convert those undeserving poor Catholics to Protestantism (Barkowski and Regis 2003, 41). So as Protestant charities began to distribute food, clothing, rental payments, they also distributed Bible tracts to the poor.27

Catholics countered by forming their own benevolence organizations including Catholic schools, orphanages, hospitals and young women’s homes. Boyer (1978) notes that Catholic organizations and in particular schools “deliberately and explicitly attempted to promote deferential and disciplined patterns of behavior based on an image of society as a stable, orderly and securely hierarchial” (33-34).

Many Protestant believers failed to “win the trust of many local religious organizations” (Katz 1996, 78). Cammisa (1998) notes that white Protestant missionaries:

… had a difficult time absorbing the newly freed black slaves and immigrant populations into their midst. At the worse, social reformers… viewed the new

---

26 Interestingly, these same labels are applied to African-Americans and Hispanics by proponents of welfare reform.

27 Bible tracts have often been referred to as cliff-note summaries distilling key sections of the Bible (see Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 40-41). The American Tract Society was started in 1846 and by 1850, it produced more than five million tracts a year (Boyer 1978).
population as sub-human and incapable of being reformed. Even at their best, these (Protestant) reformers often had paternalistic attitudes toward both blacks and immigrants, wanting to rehabilitate them by inculcating middle-class protestant values to which the poor did not necessarily aspire… Rather than accounting for cultural or religious differences, they tried to create middle-class Protestants out of poor Catholic immigrants, many of whom resented their efforts (33-34).

Fearing that religious zeal would inflame rivalries across religious traditions, many charitable organizations prohibited the proselytizing of the poor and advocating a business-like model of operations. Many religious groups found the “cool-detachment” of the scientific business model unpalatable (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 43). An example of this detachment was the newly formed Salvation Army which directly challenged the bureaucratic model of outreach (Winston 1999). For Salvationists, benevolence had to thrust into the “cathedral of the open air and as such, they undertook indiscriminate street-level benevolence complete with street parades and outdoor services” (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 43). While other established Protestant evangelical groups were more subdued, they were nonetheless critical of charitable organization societies (see Trattner 1999). John Reed, an outspoken critic of charitable societies wrote, “There is nothing of Christ the compassionate in the immense business of organized charity; it’s objective is to get efficient results- and that means, in practice to just keep vast numbers of servile, broken- spirited people” (as quoted in Katz 1996, 87).

---

28 This became the first cardinal principle of Gurteens Handbook of Charity Organization (1882).
Poet John Boyle O’Reilly was even more succinct and damning (in Katz 1998, 86), “That organized charity, scrimped and ice, in the name of a cautious statistical Christ”.

From Welfare State to Post-Welfare Era: The Twentieth Century

The twentieth century saw remarkable changes in social welfare policy. With the decline of scientific charity, interdenominational relief agencies grew dramatically (Skocpol 2000; Theiman, Herring and Perabo 2000). The Salvation Army boasted a following four times that of its 1890 membership roles while the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA) grew from 10,000 volunteers in 1865 to more than 263,000 by the turn of the century. By 1915, the YMCA eclipsed more than 720,000 volunteers. Overall membership in American religious communities boomed, with national rates of religious affiliation doubling and the number of churches blossoming from 75,000 to 225,000 (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 44-45). Two major movements fueled this growth and brought about major changes pertaining to social welfare policy: The Progressive Era and the Social Gospel Movement.

Many reformers of the Progressive Era reacted strongly against the institutionalization of the poor that had taken place through over the previous fifty-plus years (Handler and Hasenfield 1991, 50-81; Berkowitz and McQuaid 1992, chapter 2 Trattner 1999, chapter 10). Reformers attempted to rectify the situation by teaching immigrants about American culture, teaching them a range of practical skills, providing

29 Other religious organizations such as the Independent Order of Good Templars, a Bible-based organization and the Catholic Knights of Columbus are classic examples of groups forming (see Skocpol 2000).
them with child-rearing advice and preaching the good health that could be obtained by following hygienic practices” through the creation of settlement houses (Chambers and Hiding 1968, 96-101). These large neighborhood homes served as centers for instruction, recreation and fellowship (Davis 1967). Several key social policy innovations coincided with the Progressive era: mothers’ pensions and Civil War Veterans benefit program.  
States also took a more active role in determining who received benefits and who did not (Bartkowski and Regis 2003).

Social Gospel Christianity also thrived during this period (Schwartz 2000, 121-130). Advocates of the Social Gospel Movement sought to promote social transformation through the application of biblical principles about social justice and progressive change. Bartkowski and Regis (2003) note that Social Gospel reformers lobbied for better factory conditions, the right to a living wage for American workers and the abolition of child labor. It is important to note that both the Progressive Era and the Social Gospel Movement understood poverty as a systematic inequality—inequality that could be remedied through progressive reform of social welfare policy that was rooted in religious arguments about social justice (see Trattner 1999, chapters 9-12).

The stock market crash of 1929 ushered in the Great Depression from which emerged revolutionary New Deal programs (Handler and Hasenfield 1991, 85-106; Berkowitz and McQuaid 1992, chapters 5 and 6; Katz 1996, chapter 8; Trattner 1999,

---

30 Federal Civil War benefits programs were given to Union soldiers not Confederate soldiers. By 1910, one third of the men in the North aged sixty-two and older received payments from the federal government that were considered very generous (Skocpol 2000, 26).
chapter 13). With high unemployment, little cash-flow, flagging church donations and a sharp decline in local tax bases, Depression-era Americans began looking to the federal government for relief. And out of the ashes of the Great Depression rose of the phoenix of federal welfare policy (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 48). President Roosevelt in 1932 revolutionized the American social welfare system and incorporated many reforms of the Progressive Era into the New Deal. These reforms included the establishment of unemployment compensation, aid to farmers, a massive public works program, federal regulation of the stock market, a revamped social welfare system and categorical assistance for children in families that lacked a breadwinner (see Trattner 1999, chapter 13). 31 States for the first time worked in concert with the federal government to fund many of these programs (Bartkowski and Regis 2003). Over the course of forty years, responsibility for social welfare provision had moved on a steady course from being implemented predominately by local government entities, then by the state and now by a cooperative partnership between the state and the federal government.

The New Deal continued to involve certain religious organizations in the social welfare delivery system. Winston (1999) discusses in detail how the Salvation Army collaborated extensively with the federal government and with the state of New York. Catholic priests worked with steel workers to form the Steel Workers Organizing Committee (Heineman 1999). From the 1930’s to the middle decades of the twentieth century some of the social programs established during the New Deal were expanded and

---

31 Social Security was originally called Old Age Insurance and Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) helped children with no father, etc.
reformed. Social Security now included a worker’s family and widows originally covered under Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) which were also covered under Social Security. At the same time, ADC expanded to include unwed mothers, widows and never married mothers (Quadagno 1994; see also Bartkowski and Regis 2003). 32

The 1960’s brought further expansion of welfare programs by the federal government as President Johnson declared a War on Poverty. Johnson once again returned social welfare delivery programs to local communities through the creation of community action agencies. 33 Cammisa (1998) notes that “community involvement was encouraged at all levels and many programs required that boards be set up containing not only local officials but also members of the population that would be served” (49-50). Religious organizations with established records of broad-based social service provision such as Catholic Charities and Lutheran Social Services also expanded their programs and services. The case of Catholic Charities is particularly intriguing (Brown and McKeown 1997). The Catholic principle of “subsidiarity” recognizes the joint responsibility of various social actors- in this case religious and governmental partnerships- for the poor and conceives of the person has being both sacred and social (Hehir 2000). This view, along with the inclusive Vatican II vision of serving the poor, made Catholic Charities a particularly attractive partner with government contracting (Theimann, Herring and Perabo 2000).

32 Earlier recipients of A.D.C. were dependent white children with widowed mothers, but an increasing number of those who received such funds were now single black mothers with illegitimate children. This provision outraged many religious leaders and conservatives (Trattner 1999, 309).

33 Community Action Agencies were created under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and created the Office of Economic Opportunity (see Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 53).
By the 1980’s, America had retreated from its War on Poverty and began waging what some have called a “war on welfare” (Katz 1989, Katz 1996, chapter 10; Trattner 1999, chapter 16) while others simply refer to it as a “war against the poor” (Gans 1995). States began to take a more active role in the welfare delivery strategies and often made up their own rules as they went (O’Connor 2001, 289-290). Many states formulated innovative means of distributing welfare and many received governmental waivers to pursue newer, innovative strategies for dealing with the sharp rises in the caseloads of welfare recipients. Bartkowski and Regis (2003) along with Weaver (2000) note that these innovations included the adoption of mandates requiring teen welfare mothers to live with their parents, academic performance levels for continued receipt of welfare benefits, the withdrawing of welfare benefits for those who had additional children while on welfare and the expanded privatization of welfare service delivery through the disbursement of public, monies to private non-profit providers. States began to expand their public-private partnerships as the architects of devolution promised a leaner form of governance- including a get tough approach to welfare abuse and dependency (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 57).

In the post-welfare era, then, the old poor law system has made a comeback- though now as a more sophisticated contractual order with private organizations as welfare shifts from the federal government back to state and local groups. The devolution revolution (Nathan 1996) has strangely enough thrust us back into “poor laws and local
oversight- if not local overseers (Bartkowski and Regis 2003, 57). The post-welfare era is a time for experimenting in the laboratory that is American democracy. And one of the ways that this experimentation is taking shape is through the Charitable Choice initiative.

Charitable Choice: An Overview

While there is much discussion about the merits of Charitable Choice, there is little debate about what Charitable Choice is. With the passage of Public Law 104-196, Section 104, faith-based organizations and churches are afforded the opportunity to receive state funding to underwrite a wide range of social service programs including job readiness, training programs, hunger relief, child care, education and crime prevention (Cnaan 1999; Sherman 2000; Bartkowski and Regis 2003;). Charitable Choice protects the freedom of religious expression for faith-based organizations that receive public funds. Previously religious organizations that received governmental funding had to “secularize” themselves by removing all religious symbols, languages and practices from their secular services (Sherwood 2000). Charitable Choice permits provisions of government services in 1.) actual houses of worship; 2.) allows contractors to display religious “art, icons, scripture and other symbols” in areas where government services are provided and 3.) allows religious contractors to discriminate against employees on the basis of their religious beliefs (Carlson-Thies 1999, 17).

This legislation however, continues to ban the use of government funds for sectarian worship, religious instruction and proselytization by requiring states to provide

---

34 Trattner’s (1999) last chapter of his book entitled, From Poor Law to Welfare State is appropriately entitled “Looking Forward or Looking Backward”.
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an alternate secular provider for any aid recipient who does not wish to receive services through a religious institution. Charitable Choice also provides and insures that those that participate in the services, provided by the religious organization or church, are not forced to engage in religious practices as a prerequisite for receiving those services. Thus, the civil and religious liberties of clientele are safe guarded. Much of the debate surrounding Charitable Choice focuses on the separation of church and state and the ability of each state to implement comprehensive programs that meet the overall needs of the poor thorough faith-based service providers (see Esbeck, 1996).

Charitable Choice is not without its critics. Charitable Choice assumes that religious organizations can compete on a level playing field with other non-governmental providers, who have long cultivated a governmental relationship. Charitable Choice does not take into account issues of race, class or gender when assuming that clients can freely move from one organization to another (Carlson-Thies, 1999). Critics also argue that Charitable Choice does not take into account the religious freedom of recipients or the constitutionality of service provider contracts to religious entities.

As a result of these concerns, Charitable Choice has set off a firestorm of criticism (Boston 1998; Connolly 1999; Fritz 1999; Pinkerton 1999; Raasch 1999; Rogers 1999; Stack 1999; American Civil Liberties Union 2001; Americans United for the Separation of Church and State 2001). Issues pertaining to the constitutionality of Charitable Choice have surfaced along with concerns over hiring practices, moral agendas, proselytizing, etc. Others worry about the administrative capacities of faith-based organizations, especially small churches, which are viewed to be naïve and
impractical (Wolfe 1993). Specifically, two major hurdles have arisen pertaining to Charitable Choice that effect faith-based organizations, and in particular smaller Protestant evangelical congregations.

First is the question pertaining to faith-based organizations, many with small staff resources and administrative capacity: Will they be able to comply with the numerous federal and state regulations while accomplishing their mission of proselytizing? Others express concerns over the ability of faith-based organizations to prove that the monies they received were used correctly (Tanner 2003). The Charitable Choice legislation contains provisions requiring charities receiving funds to submit to a government audit. Specifically, the provision allows for federal officials to access “the books, records, accounts and other sources of information and its facilities as may be pertinent to ascertain compliance” (Carlson-Thies 1999, 27). As a result, the government will have to enter the religious space of faith-based organizations- an act in and of itself viewed to be a violation of privacy, especially among traditional Protestant evangelicals.

Many large charities have avoided regulatory compliance standards by setting up separate arms of their religious organization to handle their social service programs.35 Many worry that small Protestant evangelical churches may not possess the administrative capacity, size or the adequate pool of volunteers to implement long-term social service programs. Horowitz (1999) notes that the average Protestant evangelical church in the United States, as an example, has a congregation of only 75 members with less than 1% of all Protestant evangelical congregations in the United States having more
than 900 members and less than 10 percent (10%) have congregations exceeding 250 people. He also notes that the average annual church budget of these congregations is only $55,000 (Horowitz 1999). Faith-based programs, not associated with specific churches are also quite small, with budgets averaging $120,000 annually. On average, they have only two full-time and two part-time employees. For these smaller churches and organizations, compliance comes with a high price. Horowitz (1999) concludes by revealing a troublesome fact, especially for social service providers and recipients of welfare assistance- religious leaders of these organizations “are likely to spend more time reading the Federal Register than reading the Bible” (27). Even if churches and faith-based organizations can step-over the first hurdle, the perceived issues of constitutionality and the availability of funds becomes the second big hurdle to address.

While the phrase “separation of church and state” does not occur in the U.S. Constitution, it does say that “Congress shall make no law establishing religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and the courts have long held that it prohibits government funding of sectarian religious activities (Tanner 2003). The general rule is known as the “Lemon Test” after the 1971 Supreme Court decision Lemon v. Kurtzman. Under the Lemon Test, government can provide aid to a religious organization provided it meets three criteria: (1) the government program must have a secular purpose; (2) it

---

35 Many churches utilize 501-c-3 organizations although it is not mandatory for a church to do so in order to receive federal funds (Esbeck 1996).
must not have a primary effect of either advancing or inhibiting religion; and (3) it must not foster “excessive entanglement” between the church and state (Levy 2001).

Clarification of the Lemon Test was revealed in *Hunt v. McNair*, in which the court concluded, “aid may normally be thought to have a primary effect of advancing religion when it flows to an institution in which religion is so pervasive that a substantial portion of its functions are subsumed into the religious mission or when it funds a specifically religious activity in an otherwise substantially secular setting” (Esbeck 1996, 37). That has been generally taken to mean that such activities as prayer, Bible study, and proselytizing—cornerstones of the Protestant evangelical faith—may not be included with government funds, but the provision of social services—food, clothing, shelter—may be.

A fact worth noting, the idea of faith-based partnerships between government entities and religious organizations is extremely popular among the general public. Over 75% of those surveyed by the Pew Center for the People and the Press (2001) favored faith-based partnerships with minorities favoring (81%) at a higher rate than whites (68%). The ideals of compassion and individualism are seen as 72% of those surveyed believe that religious people are more compassionate and caring than non religious service providers and 77% surveyed believe that recipients of social services should have a variety of options. Moreover, 62% cite the power of religion to “change people’s lives”—a key indicator of their support for faith-based services (Pew Center 2001).
The Dilemma Facing Protestants

The focus of the remainder of this dissertation examines questions pertaining to the dilemma facing the Protestant evangelical tradition as it pertains to participating in Charitable Choice. As President George Bush continues to appeal to the Religious Right to build “faith-based-government partnerships”, are the concerns over having to compete for a limited amount of federal funds with other religious groups and the concern over the anti-proselytization clause driving Protestant evangelicals’ away (Jewish News 1999; Pinkerton 1999, Raasch 1999)? Are the concerns over the First Amendment restricting Protestant evangelicals desire to participate in social service programs? Do Protestant evangelicals possess the administrative capacity (volunteers, staff, etc) to successful wade through governmental regulations and bureaucracy? Or are they content with the status quo- serving and ministering to their own members while being in the world but not of the world? Are the characteristics and theological values, which define Protestant evangelical sub-cultures, hindering their perceived moral responsibility to feed and clothe the poor? These questions will be further explored in greater detail in the remaining chapters.
CHAPTER 3

RELIGIOSITY, VOLUNTEERING AND CHARITABLE CHOICE PARTICIPATION

Introduction

Religiosity is a multi-dimensional concept (Fukuyama 1961; Williams 1962; King 1967; Fitcher 1969; King and Hunt 1972; Lam and Rotolo 2000; Yam 2002; Smidt 2003) yet few researchers have distinguished the different dimensions of theology in the study of religion and civic engagement. While it is true that scholars have recognized the importance of religion in civic engagement (Putnam 2000) and political participation (Verba, Schlozman and Brady 1995; Kellstedt et al. 2000; Smidt 2002) by examining religious traditions in the broadest of terms, they have recently begun to view religious participation as a gateway to other forms of civic engagement (Ammerman 1997; Wuthnow 1999; Yam 2002). As the “devotion revolution” (Donahue 1997) continues to push once federally managed programs for the poor and disadvantaged to state governments and local communities, religious congregations and faith-based organizations are enjoying a renaissance of sorts as they are being called upon to “rally the armies of compassion” and feed the poor.

This dissertation is now prepared to formulate more precisely a sub-cultural identity theory of Protestant evangelical religious strength by operationalizing Lam’s (2002) dimensions of religion. The goal is to extend Lam’s (2002) typology of religiosity
specifically to the Protestant evangelical faith and the various sub-cultures that utilize devotional and participatory practices along with theological beliefs and convictions to create various denominational affiliations of evangelical Protestantism.

Sub-cultural identity theory shares with Finke (1989), Starke (1970), Ianaccone (1990) and Smith (1998) the view that religious pluralism strengthens the Protestant evangelical tradition. Sub-cultural identity theory requires that we not only pay attention to Protestant evangelical’s participatory and devotional strategies but also to the actual theological beliefs, convictions and practices of distinct Protestant evangelical sub-cultures. This chapter argues that theological beliefs and convictions, in addition to the other dimensions of religiosity (Lam 2002), actually matter. This requires us to engage in cultural and political analysis of the impact of these sub-cultures. Moreover, this dissertation mandates that when it comes to the sub-cultural identity theory individual beliefs and convictions be analyzed. I operationalize Lam’s (2002) typology at the grassroots level- examining how ordinary Protestant evangelicals utilize their religious sub-culture’s beliefs and convictions to construct distinctive meaningful denominations and thus demonstrate how Protestant evangelical sub-cultures are shaped.

One of the ways evangelical Protestantism can strategically generate various sub-cultures using Lam’s (2002) dimensions of religiosity are through their civic engagement activities. Often referred to as social capital, Putnam (2000, 22) recognizes that there are diverse forms of social capital differentiating between bonding social capital and bridging social capital. Bonding social capital is necessarily inward looking, reinforcing exclusive identities and homogeneity. Bridging social capital is outward looking and encompasses a
diverse group of people. Whereas bonding social capital has beneficial aspects of “undergirding specific reciprocity and mobilizing solidarity”, it can have certain negative consequences should it also foster “out-group antagonism” (Putnam 2000, 23; see also Smidt 2003).

Putnam (2000) argues that Protestants are more likely than Catholics “to be involved in volunteering and service in the wider community” (76). Yet Putnam (2000) fails to disaggregate Protestantism into Protestant evangelical sub-cultures choosing instead to treat Protestantism as a monolith. Putnam (2000) also chooses to differentiate Protestants from other religious groups solely on attendance at church and participation in civic organizations. This chapter advances Putnam’s (2000) findings by incorporating Lam’s (2002) four dimensions of religiosity (participatory, devotional, affiliative and theological) to show how the creation of sub-cultures within the Protestant evangelical tradition affect voluntary association patterns. It then advances these initial findings to show how religiosity and sub-cultures within the Protestant evangelical faith affect support for the Charitable Choice initiative.

The outline of this chapter is as follows. First, this chapter provides an overview of the role religiosity plays in voluntary association participation. Secondly, this chapter combines the four dimensions of religiosity (affiliative, theological, participatory, and devotional) developed by Lam (2002) and operationalizes the role these four dimensions will have on voluntary participation rates within the Protestant evangelical sub-cultures (fundamentalists, evangelicals, mainline, liberal and “just Christian”). Thirdly, this

36 Levi (1999) refers to this as the dark side of social capital.
chapter combines the four dimensions of religiosity (Lam 2002) with perceived constitutionality issues and other administrative factors to examine the support of Charitable Choice from individual evangelical Protestants representing each specific sub-culture. Finally, this chapter concludes by raising several research questions pertaining to the theological convictions and beliefs and their relationship to voluntary participation and Charitable Choice.

Religion and Voluntary Participation

Decades ago, Moberg (1962) recognized that regular churchgoers are more likely than non-churchgoers to engage in secular society through some form of volunteering. Research, however, has demonstrated that using religious identification as a causal variable for explaining the relationship between religious organizations and voluntary association produces findings that are both unpredictable as well as unreliable. For example, Thomson and Knoke (1980) note that Catholics have a higher voluntary participation rate than Protestants; a finding contested by Lazerwitz (1962), Peterson and Lee (1976), and Smith (1994). These three studies find the opposite to be true: Protestants volunteer at a much higher rate than Catholics and those with no religious preference. Putnam (2000) concurs noting that Protestants volunteer outside of their church at a higher rate than Catholics and other religious groups.

Sociologists have also turned their attention to investigating the relationship between civic engagement and religiosity. Campbell (2004) finds that the more someone attends church the more likely they are to volunteer while Jackson et al. (1995) finds that
active members in church activities volunteer more often but “activeness” does not necessarily equate to attendance.

All of this research raises important questions pertaining to the target population of this dissertation, namely Protestant evangelicals and their respective sub-cultures and their willingness to engage the civic community by volunteering for Charitable Choice. As noted in Chapter 2, religious institutions, in particular Protestant evangelical denominations have generated a series of unique sub-cultures that utilize a form of rational choice institutionalism, strategically using their church and religion to address key issues related to religion, theology and public policy matters. Through this conflict and embattlement, they thrive (Smith 1998). One of the underlying questions of this dissertation is, “Will Protestant evangelicals expend their religious capital to volunteer for the poor? And more importantly, “Will Protestant evangelicals support Charitable Choice, an embattled and often controversial program which combines “covenant with contract”, and if not why not? Is Charitable Choice a public policy initiative that Protestant evangelicals are willing to draw the line in the sand and become embattled in an attempt to thrive? To answer the first of these questions, this chapter will utilize the dimensions of religiosity postulated by Lam (2002) and specifically address Protestant evangelical sub-cultures.

37. Rational choice institutionalism see institutions as rules for strategic games played by rational actors. An institution gives individuals information about how other individuals are likely to act. Social institutionalism takes a broader perspective examines cultural rules and ideas. In contrast with rational choice, it points out that individuals often form institutions because they seem culturally valid, not necessarily because it actually benefits them materially. Historical institutionalism, with emphasis on path dependence examines how the nature of earlier institutions strongly influences new institutions. (See Weingast, Barry. 2005. Preferences and Situations: Points of Intersection between Historical and Rational Choice Institutionalism, Thousand Oaks, CA: Russell Sage Press).
Dimensions of Religiosity and Participation in Voluntary Associations

Protestant evangelicalism is known in religious circles for its diversity, its variation and at times, its awkwardness (Marsden 1991). However, through the utilization and analysis of individual survey data specific attitudes, beliefs and behaviors pertaining to Protestant evangelicalism and volunteering can be better understood.

The first dimension of religiosity posited by Lam (2002) is the *affiliative* dimension. Tocqueville ([1840]1945) was moved when he saw the value of religious groups in the United States. In the last two decades, researchers have increasingly recognized the role of religious traditions as it pertains to political and social activities (Green et al. 1996; Hart 1996). According to Park and Smith (2000), Protestants have high levels of religious volunteering but low levels of secular volunteering when compared to other faiths. Hammond (1991) finds that certain sub-cultures of Protestantism tend to lag behind other religious traditions in community participation while Hunter (1983) finds that community involvement is not a priority for some Protestant sub-cultures. Hunter (1983, 4) finds that 19.2% of liberal Protestants felt that community involvement was a priority compared to Protestant evangelicals with only 6.2% feeling this was a priority. As far as Catholics were concerned, 17.3% felt it was a priority.

This analysis will involve utilizing five recognized Protestant evangelical subcultures: fundamentalists, evangelicals, mainline, liberals and those who have created a sub-culture known as simply “Christians”. Black Christians are not included in the analysis. While the religious-meaning system and the social organization of the Black
Church are similar to those found in white Protestant denominations, African Americans emphasize different aspects and nuances of Christian doctrine, especially the importance of freedom and the quest for justice (Roof and McKinney 1987; Lincoln and Mamiya 1990). The social experience of African-Americans has “subtly changed their theological doctrines and has more explicitly influenced the social and economic implications they draw from them” (Steensland et al. 2000, 294). This chapter follows other scholars of religion and public life by acknowledging the differences between black and white religious traditions (Roof and McKinney 1987; Wald 1987; Smidt 2003) and recognizing the denominational tradition of Black Christians are separate and apart from white Protestants.\(^{38}\) Consistent with the focus of this research, the following hypothesis will be tested:

**Affiliative Hypothesis:** Protestant evangelicals will be less likely to participate in voluntary associations than other Protestant evangelical sub-cultures as theorized by the sub-culture identity theory.

The next dimension of religiosity advocated by Lam (2002) and incorporated into this study is the *theological dimension*. Belonging to a specific religious tradition does not indicate to what degree an individual agrees with their specific denominational or sub-cultural stand on different social and community issues. Case in point: within the Protestant tradition, Protestant fundamentalists are the most conservative viewing the Bible as “literal” while Protestant mainliners and Protestant liberals often view the Bible as having both a figurative and literal interpretation (Marsden 1991; Hunter 1998; Smidt

---

\(^{38}\) See Chapter 2 for a more detailed explanation of the differences that exist between Black Christians and White Protestants.
2003). Some Protestants believe that the Bible should be adhered to word for word.\textsuperscript{39} Others do not. To measure the theological dimension, two variables are selected: the belief that ones’ religion is important in their life and the Bible is to be taken word for word.\textsuperscript{40} Some research has given the impression that factors related to social networks (traditional community orientation and modern community orientation) have more to do with an individual engaging in their community than their personal (traditional-individual and modern individual) religious convictions (Putnam, 2000; Becker and Dhingra 2001).

Smith (1998) finds that the variations related to religious convictions and networks within the created sub-cultures are often divided by one’s interpretation of the Bible. As such, research related to with the importance of religion in one’s life and their view of the Bible generates the following hypothesis for the exploration of the role theology plays in the voluntary participation rate of Protestant evangelicals:

\textbf{Theological Hypothesis:} Protestant evangelicals who have a strict interpretation of the Bible are less likely to participate in voluntary associations outside of their congregation.

Lam (2002) then turns his attention to the participatory dimension of religiosity. While it is true that churches are “the single most egalitarian imparter of civic skills in society” (Ammerman 1997, 212) and they serve as “networks for social relations” (Wilson and

\textsuperscript{39} Religion and Politics (2000) finds that 23% of those surveyed felt that the Bible was inspired by God and as such should be strictly adhered to indicating that it should be obeyed “word for word”.

\textsuperscript{40} Hammond (1991,165) classified theological orientation toward the activities of the church and its members as it relates to the community involvement as being: (1) theo-centric (traditional-community) orientation; (2) socio-centric (modern community) orientation; (3) ecclesia-centric (traditional-individual) orientation and (4) egocentric (modern-individual) orientation. This classification has meaning for the foundational principles of the sub-cultural theory.
Janoski 1995, 138), they also serve as “potential competition for commitment between religious and secular organizations” (Lam 2002, 407). Individuals are sometimes asked to choose between “bridging activities” and “bonding activities”. Putnam (2000) differentiates between bonding activities and bridging activities in the following manner: bonding occurs within the confines of the religious institution whereas bridging activities involves working with “other” groups’ outsides one’s religious setting. Uslaner (2002) refers to those who bond as “particularized trusters”, who are very selective about whom they engage with whereas “generalized trusters” (bridgers) are more outgoing and not as selective. Putnam (2000) argues that participation in religious services may preclude them from participating in other voluntary activities (Wuthnow 1999). As such, the level and type of bonding activities (religious participation) will have different effects on bridging activities (voluntary association participation). Often church attendance has been used as the main indicator of the participatory domain (Wuthnow 1991; Cnaan et al. 1993; Wilson and Musick 1997; Hoge et al. 1998; Putnam 2000). Researchers have also argued that church activity participation is a useful means of learning skills that can be transferred into other contexts like community volunteering (Hodgkinson et al. 1990; Ammerman 1997)\textsuperscript{41}. The participation variables will focus on bonding activities: frequency of attendance at church meetings and volunteering within one’s place of meeting. Serving as a volunteer at church indicates a certain degree of time commitment and support to the church or group (Campbell and Yonish 2002) and as such serves this

\textsuperscript{41} This chapter recognizes the strong possibility that church attendance may overlap with volunteering with one’s church but a valid argument can be made that these two items tap two different experiences in the minds of the respondents by virtue of the phrasing of the question.
dimension well. From this participatory dimension of religiosity, the following hypotheses will be tested:

**Participatory Hypothesis 1**: Higher levels of church attendance will positively influence Protestant evangelicals volunteering behavior.

**Participatory Hypothesis 2**: Greater participation in church activities within one’s congregation (bonding) will positively influence Protestant evangelicals formal volunteering behavior outside (bridging) one’s church.

Finally, Lam (2002) focuses on the fourth dimension, known as the *private* (devotional) dimension. Social scientists have demonstrated that the personal aspects of religiosity, such as religious saliency and devotionalism, have significant impact on political behavior and political engagement (Guth and Green 1993; Kellstedt et al. 2003). While reading the Bible or prayer can be done outside the confines of a religious institution, Nelson and Dynes (1976) assert that these types of devotional activities are important “symbolic reinforcement” of individual religiosity. By the same token, praying on a regular basis or reading one’s Bible, “apart from the participatory dimension of religiosity, do not necessarily reinforce one’s religious values and motivate involvement in community activities” (Yam 2002, 408). For this dimension, the variables to be included in the analysis include frequency of Bible reading and the frequency of prayer. The hypothesis to be tested for this dimension is:

**Devotional Hypothesis**: Protestant evangelicals, who have a higher level of devotional religiosity, as measured through Bible reading and frequency of prayer will be more likely to participate in voluntary associations.
To test these dimensions of Protestant religiosity within each sub-culture on civic behavior (secular volunteering) and support for Charitable Choice, this dissertation turns to the most comprehensive and recent survey data available.

Data and Methodology

The Religion and Politics Survey (2001) is part of the larger Public Role of Mainline Protestantism Project, which is coordinated through Princeton University's Survey Research Center and funded by the Pew Charitable Trust. The survey addresses respondents' views on political, social, and religious issues, their political actions, beliefs, and affiliations, and their religious actions, beliefs, and affiliations. Random generation of the last two digits of telephone numbers selected on the basis of their area code, telephone exchange (the first three digits of a seven digit telephone number), and bank number (the fourth and fifth digits) ensured equal representation of all (listed and unlisted) residential households. The area code, telephone exchange, and bank number were selected proportionally by county and by telephone exchange within county. There were at least ten attempts to reach each sampled phone number and the person over eighteen with the most recent birthday was asked to participate in the interview. This statistical method resulted in 5603 cases with 143 variables being included in the survey. Questions asked throughout the survey allowed for testing of the four hypotheses.

To test the relationship between voluntary participation rates and the dimensions of religiosity at the individual level, it is necessary to use multivariate regression analysis to control for other explanations of participation rates. Because this model predicts the outcome of dichotomous variables—whether or not an individual volunteers outside of
their church- logistic regression is used using the Software Program for Social Sciences (SPSS). This statistical method determines the effect of each explanatory variable when the outcome has only two possibilities. Explanatory variables measure the four dimensions of religiosity (affiliation, theological, devotional and participatory) and demographic factors of the respondents.

The dependent or outcome variable in the initial analysis that will be used to test the first four hypotheses deals with voluntary participation in the community. In the “Religion and Politics 2001 Survey”, respondents were asked if they ever volunteered outside of their congregation. This variable was coded as a dichotomous variable and coded yes = 1 and no = 0.

As seen by Lam (2002), the four different dimensions of religiosity should affect secular voluntary participation rates among individuals. To compare across Protestant evangelical sub-cultures, religious affiliation is coded into five categories: Protestant fundamentalists, Protestant evangelicals, mainline Protestants, liberal Protestants and Protestant Christians.42 Liberal Protestants, who have demonstrated high levels of civic engagement and political participation (Campbell and Yonish, 2002; Smidt 2003; Wuthnow 2004) serves as the reference category. As indicated by label, each denominational category carries with it a certain degree of conservatism with Protestant fundamentalism being the most conservative and liberal Protestants being the least conservative theologically (see Guth and Green 2000; Smidt 2003). All explanatory

---

42 In the Religion and Politics 2001 Survey, everyone is coded into a religious tradition from the onset. Questions were only asked of those who indicated they considered themselves to be religious. Those that indicated they were Protestant were asked to select from one of the five categories that best fit their theological traditions.
variables are coded so that higher score values equal higher levels of theological conservatism.

Second, the theological dimension of religiosity is measured using survey questions, “what is your view of the Bible” and “how important is religion in your life?” The ordinal variable pertaining to the view of the Bible is collapsed into a binary variable to measure intensity associated with the theological aspect with (1) being the Bible is to be taken word for word and (0) all other views. Religious importance is measured so that higher values measure whether religion is important in one’s life: (1) not very important, (2) somewhat important, (3) important and (4) very important.

To measure the devotional dimension, two variables were selected for the analysis: frequency of the prayer ritual and frequency of Bible reading. Both the frequency of prayer and frequency of Bible readings are divided into five categories: (1) never, (2) occasionally, (3) once a month, (4) once a week and (5) once a day.

Finally, to examine the impact of the participatory dimension, variables related to “frequency of attendance at Sunday services (besides wedding and funerals) and “have you volunteered inside your church” are inserted into the equation. Frequency of church attendance is measured as (1) never, (2) occasionally, (3) once a month, (4) once a week and (5) more than once a week. Volunteering implies a commitment and support of the activities inside the church (Lam 2002) as opposed to just attending. The volunteering within one’s congregation is coded as a binary (1= yes, 0= no) variable.

An additional variable is included under the category other religious variables. Ram (1999) and Chaves (2001) find that the size of a congregation affects participation
levels in activities outside the church, especially in areas of social concern. For this analysis, size of the congregation is an interval variable ranging from less than 100 to more than 2000.

Researchers have also noted that volunteering is related to individual characteristics such as socio-economic status: gender, marital status, age, education, work status and political ideology (See Knoke 1984; Smith 1994 and Lam 2002 for a review). Therefore, as control variables, this section includes gender (male = 1; female = 0), marital status (married = 1, non-married = 0), age (in years), and age-squared. Including age squared allows the model to account for curvilinear effect of age. It is probable that while there is a generally monotonic increase in volunteering as someone ages, volunteering falls off sharply for the elderly as they become less physically able to perform volunteer work.

In lieu of political party affiliation, a variable that takes into account the variations of conservatism that exist within each political party is included. This variable provides a different view of the impact of political ideology that is not limited strictly to political party and as such is coded (1) very liberal, (2) liberal, (3) moderate, (4) conservative and (5) very conservative. Employment status is measured (fulltime = 1; otherwise = 0). Education is also measured on an ordinal scale ranging from (1) high school only, (2) some college, (3) college graduate, and (4) post-college. Income is omitted because it was not included in the survey. Each of these variables is listed in the appendix.
Results: Volunteering and Protestant Conservatism

The theories surrounding sub-cultural identity begin to take shape as the variation within the affiliative dimension of religiosity is clearly seen with the Protestant evangelical tradition. The more conservative members become, in this case indicated by the fundamentalist and evangelical sub-cultures, the less likely they are to volunteer outside their congregation when compared to Protestant liberals. Those who prefer to be labeled Christians are also less likely to volunteer outside of their congregation or church. Denominational affiliation is not a factor for Protestant mainliners who volunteer. Protestant fundamentalists, evangelicals and Christians are less likely to volunteer in their communities than Protestant mainliners and liberal Protestants.

In the theological dimension of religiosity, the findings from Table 3.1 are consistent with the findings from the affiliative dimension, as the more theologically conservative a Protestant evangelical individual self-identifies, as measured through their strict interpretation of the Bible on an individual level, the less likely they are to participate in voluntary activities outside the confines of their church. This finding validates Campbell and Yonish (2003) who note that within certain faiths, religion takes upon itself a very “individualistic cast” resulting in the person spending most if not all of their time working on their own salvation. The more conservative theologically a Protestant evangelical becomes, when compared to Protestant evangelical liberals, the less likely they are to engage in the secular community through volunteering.

Confirming the prediction of the participatory hypotheses, the results indicate that as participation levels for activities within the church increases, attendance measures
Table 3.1 Volunteer Participation Rates among Protestant Evangelical Sub-Cultures Outside of One’s Church (Do you volunteer for activities on outside of your church?)

|                             | Beta  | Standard Error | P > |z| | Exp (B) |
|-----------------------------|-------|----------------|------|---|----------------|
| **Affiliation Dimension**   |       |                |      |   |                |
| Protestant Fundamentalists  | -.389 | .201           | .051 |   | .678           |
| Protestant Evangelicals     | -.401 | .194           | .038 |   | .670           |
| Protestant Mainliners       | -.252 | .208           | .226 |   | .777           |
| Protestant “Christians”     | -.391 | .159           | .014 |   | .695           |
| Control: Protestant Liberals|       |                |      |   |                |
| **Theological Dimension**   |       |                |      |   |                |
| Bible: Word for Word        | -.544 | .126           | .000 |   | .580           |
| Importance of Religion      | -.078 | .092           | .401 |   | .925           |
| **Participatory Dimension** |       |                |      |   |                |
| Frequency of attendance     | -.063 | .015           | .000 |   | .939           |
| Volunteer (inside)          | -.061 | .025           | .013 |   | .940           |
| **Devotional Dimension**    |       |                |      |   |                |
| Frequency of Prayer Ritual  | .043  | .067           | .522 |   | 1.044          |
| Frequency of Bible Reading  | -.091 | .102           | .368 |   | .913           |
| **Other Variables**         |       |                |      |   |                |
| Age                         | -.004 | .017           | .825 |   | .996           |
| Age²                        | .000  | .000           | .726 |   | 1.000          |
| Married                     | -.078 | .169           | .643 |   | .925           |
| Education                   | .058  | .040           | .000 |   | 1.294          |
| Work Full-Time              | .166  | .128           | .194 |   | 1.181          |
| Political Conservatism      | .048  | .040           | .233 |   | 1.049          |
| Male                        | -.206 | .119           | .082 |   | .814           |
| Constant                    | -.346 | .643           | .591 |   | .707           |
| -2 log likelihood           | 1893.685 |            |      |   |                |
| Nagelkerke R-Square         | .221  |                |      |   |                |
| N                           | 1586  |                |      |   |                |

or volunteering within their church, secular volunteering rates in the community
decrease.

Findings from Table 3.1 indicate that individual devotional patterns have no effect
on volunteering. Frequency of praying and frequency of Bible reading had no effect on
volunteer participation rates. This could be due in part to the fact that praying and Bible
reading takes up very little time unless taken to extremes and is performed by many who
do not belong to a particular faith or tradition (Smidt 2002).

With the exception of education, all other variables within the control group are
truncated by the variables contained within the dimensions of religiosity (Lam 2002). As
educational attainment levels increase, volunteer participation rates outside of one’s
church by Protestant evangelicals’ increase, a finding supported by Park and Smith

So, as far as Protestant evangelicals are concerned, volunteering in one’s
community hinges greatly on the theological convictions and beliefs and the participatory
dimensions of their religiosity especially for fundamentalists and evangelicals. This is a
far cry from those who advocate that attendance is the primary variable associated with
volunteering on behalf of religious individuals. This analysis shows that there is more to
it than simply “just getting them to go to church” to “get the ball rolling”. Furthermore,
the findings from Table 3.1 suggest that the theological convictions and beliefs and the
participatory dimensions of religiosity serve to channel participation into a different
direction: towards church activities as opposed to outside church activities. While Verba,
Scholzman and Brady (1995, 291) provide evidence for the somewhat accurate cliché, “if
you want something done, get a busy person”, this analysis suggests that if you are asking a Protestant evangelical to volunteer outside their church, they maybe busy volunteering within their church. But are they so busy at church that they will not advocate and support a program that seeks to address one of the core foundational principles of Christianity- feeding the poor?

Protestants and Charitable Choice

As previously noted, Charitable Choice relies heavily on volunteering and civic engagement skills. Jonker and Koopman (2000) demonstrate how Michigan’s Project Zero utilizes religious volunteers because “people of faith have high motivation and commitment and a wide range of resources, including spiritual to provide to clients” (168). Amato von-Hemert (2000) shows through ethnographic case studies that four churches in Georgia and Colorado rely extensively on volunteering activities of church members to provide in-kind matches for social service delivery programs.

To investigate the willingness of Protestant evangelicals to participate in Charitable Choice, this section replicates the models from the previous section: the affiliative, the theological, the participatory and the devotional dimensions of religiosity. Earlier, we demonstrated that affiliative, participatory and theological dimensions all played roles in who is willing to provide the foundational groundwork (volunteering) for Charitable Choice. Now, this section will address the administrative dimension as well.

The administrative dimension is measured by two additional variables being added to logistic regression equation: separation of church and state and the size of the congregation.
Chaves (1999) finds that the size of the congregation determines if the church is willing to participate in Charitable Choice- the larger the congregation the more likely their willingness. This is due, in part, to their ability to meet daily budgetary needs, their administrative capacity and their willingness to offer programs to their members and to others. This is particularly important to Protestant evangelicals, our focus group. Smith (2003) finds that due to the small size of many traditional Protestant evangelical churches and their independent autonomy, members as “forced” into leadership roles to assist with services. The linkage in this case is simple. Based on our previous finding, if a member assumes a more active leadership role through volunteering within their church, the participatory dimension expands resulting in less time to volunteer. The variable is measured with a survey question asking respondents, “What is the size of your congregation or church” with values ranging from 50 to 5000+.

The final variable inserted into this analysis deals with the concern over the separation of church and state. In spite of the specific provisions of the legislation intended to prevent it, many religious leaders representing all traditions and faiths, are concerned about the role of government in affairs of the church (Sherman, 2000; Sherwood, 2000; Amato von Hemert, 2000). For many it appears to be based on theological beliefs and convictions- Jesus said you cannot serve two masters (Sherwood, 2000). For others, it is more secular- a simple violation of the constitution (Jonker and Koopman 2000). For some it is particularly hard to differentiate that you are considered by many to be religious enough to “instill virtues of responsibility, care for dependents and work”, while at the same time one must avoid being “so religious as to impart God’s
word through proselytizing” (Sherwood, 2000, 105). The ordinal variable for this analysis ranges from (1) not concerned, (2) somewhat concerned, (3) concerned and (4) very concerned about constitutionality issues.

Hypotheses for Support of Charitable Choice

Taking into account that certain Protestant sub-cultures are less likely to volunteer in their communities when the theological and participatory dimensions are considered, we now analyze support for Charitable Choice using the following developed hypotheses relative to each dimension of religiosity (Lam 2002):

**Affiliative Hypothesis** Protestant evangelicals will be less likely to participate in Charitable Choice than other Protestant sub-cultures.

**Congregational Hypothesis:** The larger the membership of a Protestant evangelical congregation, the more likely they are to support Charitable Choice.

**Administrative Hypothesis:** Protestant evangelical sub-cultures who feel that there should be a strong separation between church and state will be less likely to support Charitable Choice than those who do not feel that separation of church and state is a concern.

Results/Findings: Charitable Choice and Protestants

Table 3.2 reveals the findings from the logistic regression. Once again, the Religion and Politics Survey 2001 is used for the analysis. The variables within the Protestant denominational sub-culture indicate that the more conservative Protestants become (in this case fundamentalists and evangelical), the less likely they are to support Charitable Choice, consistent with the findings of the affiliative dimension. Coupled with this finding, this data indicates that the more literal one views the Bible, the
Table 3.2: Protestant Evangelical Sub-Cultures and Faith-Based Funding: Do you support the awarding of government funds to religious groups?

|                          | Beta  | Standard Error | P > |z|  | Exp (B) |
|--------------------------|-------|----------------|------|---|------------------|
| **Affiliation Dimension**|       |                |      |   |                  |
| Protestant Fundamentalists| -0.660| 0.209          | 0.002|   | 0.517           |
| Protestant Evangelicals  | -0.563| 0.202          | 0.005|   | 0.570           |
| Protestant Mainliners    | -0.140| 0.214          | 0.513|   | 0.869           |
| Protestant “Christians”  | -0.146| 0.175          | 0.403|   | 0.864           |
| Control: Protestant Liberals|       |                |      |   |                  |
| **Theological Dimension**|       |                |      |   |                  |
| Bible: Word for Word     | -0.070| 0.034          | 0.400|   | 0.932           |
| Importance of Religion   | 0.192 | 0.076          | 0.011|   | 1.212           |
| **Participatory Dimension**|       |                |      |   |                  |
| Frequency of attendance  | 0.116 | 0.059          | 0.107|   | 0.499           |
| Volunteer/Leadership    | -0.305| 0.138          | 0.802|   | 0.966           |
| **Devotional Dimension**|       |                |      |   |                  |
| Frequency of Prayer Ritual| 0.022| 0.070          | 0.749|   | 1.023           |
| Frequency of Bible Reading| -0.006| 0.054          | 0.916|   | 0.994           |
| **Other Religious Variables**|       |                |      |   |                  |
| Size of Congregation    | -0.087| 0.032          | 0.006|   | 0.916           |
| Constitutionality Concerns| -0.259| 0.068          | 0.000|   | 0.772           |
| **Other Variables**      |       |                |      |   |                  |
| Age                      | -0.068| 0.016          | 0.070|   | 0.935           |
| Age²                     | 0.000 | 0.000          | 0.089|   | 1.000           |
| Married                  | 0.601 | 0.201          | 0.003|   | 1.824           |
| Education                | -0.225| 0.042          | 0.000|   | 0.799           |
| Work Full-Time           | 0.094 | 0.139          | 0.502|   | 1.098           |
| Political Conservatism   | -0.186| 0.044          | 0.000|   | 0.831           |
| Male                     | -0.291| 0.126          | 0.021|   | 0.748           |
| Constant                 | 5.592 | 0.862          | 0.000|   | 268.252         |
| -2 log likelihood        | 1703.544|                |      |   |                  |
| Nagelkerke R-Square      | 0.195 |                |      |   |                  |
| N                        | 1555  |                |      |   |                  |

reading, church attendance, prayer and volunteering. It would appear as though it also
less likely they are to support Charitable Choice. Together with the previous analysis,
there is strong support that Protestant fundamentalist and Protestant evangelicals have
different volunteering behaviors and opinions on welfare policy. The analysis indicates a
differentiation between religion being important in one’s life and the literal interpretation
of the Bible. Those who view religion as being important are more likely to support
Charitable Choice but this idea of religion being important encompasses more than Bible
involves the moral responsibility of feeding the poor.

The two added variables warrant special consideration. Pertaining to the issue of
the separation of church and state, this analysis shows that those with constitutionality
concerns are less likely to support Charitable Choice than those who have no concern.
For many it appears that the Supreme Court’s First Amendment decisions have “gone too
far in its attempts to avoid the establishment of religion, resulting in the marginalization,
even on the infringing of religion, especially as it pertains to proselytization” (Sherwood
2005, 105). This finding shows levels of conservative theological convictions and beliefs
matter.

The size of the congregation matters as well. Table 3.2 indicates that individuals
from smaller congregations are less likely to support Charitable Choice. Again, this
analysis indicates that Protestant evangelical churches, small in size, many averaging less
than 150 people (Chaves 2000), will face a uphill battle if they wish to participate in
Charitable Choice. The control variables are in the expected direction. Married
individuals, perhaps recognizing the dynamics and needs of those within the family are
more likely to support Charitable Choice than those who are not married. Males are less likely to support Charitable Choice than females. The more educated an individual becomes, the less likely they are to support Charitable Choice and the more politically conservative an individual becomes, the less likely they are to support the initiative as well.

Discussion

This chapter has combined the sub-cultural identity theory of religious strength with Lam’s (2002) dimensions of religiosity to examine Protestant’s civic engagement and voluntary capacity, especially Protestant fundamentalists and Protestant evangelicals, relative to mainline and liberal Protestants. The Protestant evangelical tradition flourishes on difference, engagement, tension, conflict and threat (Smith 1998, 153). Its strength therefore, should be understood as the result of the combination of its socially constructed cultural distinction vis-à-vis and vigorous socio-cultural engagement with society as measured through dimensions of religiosity. The analysis provides evidence that Protestant evangelical sub-cultures matter and they are important differentiators of civic engagement activities and attitudes pertaining to welfare policy within the Protestant evangelical tradition. Beyond this, religiosity matters, specifically, theological beliefs, convictions and levels of conservatism.

There is no doubt religious groups are enjoying increased attention from public officials, sociologists and political scientists. This renewed attention “probably does not represent increased appreciation of religion qua religion- spirituality, theology, worship and other core concerns” (Chaves, Giesel and Tsitos 2002, 108). Rather, the amplified
awareness pertaining to religious organizations has to do with what these groups may contribute to the social world outside the confines of the mosque, synagogue, temple and church. Many now see religion and religious organizations, especially Protestant evangelicals, as springs of volunteerism, community resources and services (see Chaves, Giesel and Tsiotos 2002). Charitable Choice is a primary example.

Through faith-based partnerships with governmental entities at the local and state level, religious individuals representing all types of traditions and movements are being called upon to feed and clothe the poor through voluntary associations and through volunteering through their church and/or faith-based organization. This chapter, with its focus on voluntary participation and specifically Charitable Choice, can be placed in the context of this wider concern with religion’s role in civic engagement activities and specifically programs for the disadvantaged by Protestant evangelical denominations representing the five Protestant sub-cultures.

As demonstrated in this chapter, those within the different Protestant evangelical sub-cultures vary on the extent which they value, pursue or encourage public activities (Ammerman 2002; Chaves, Giesel and Tsiotos 2002; Verter 2002; Wuthnow 2002). This chapter shows that among the Protestant evangelical sub-cultures, this variation is tied to the long-standing differences among Protestant fundamentalists, Protestant evangelicals, mainline Protestants, liberal Protestants and Protestant Christians. Protestant fundamentalists and evangelicals are not inclined to support governmental partnerships with faith-based organizations aimed at helping the poor. This is not to suggest that Protestant fundamentalists and Protestant evangelicals are not helping the poor within
their church or those within their communities. It would appear as though they are not interested in helping others, however, if the helping is predicated upon cooperating with the government to deliver the services.

Thus far, this dissertation has examined the ability of Protestant evangelicals to strategically generate sub-cultural identities to advance their specific religious convictions and beliefs. This chapter has shown that individual Protestant evangelicals utilize various tools to determine to what extent they will become involved in community activities by volunteering and supporting various programs and initiatives. Theological convictions and beliefs play a major factor in the generation of opinions related to volunteering outside of one’s congregation, interacting with other members of the community (bridging) and ultimately supporting programs such as Charitable Choice.

Like any good research question, when findings are obtained, additional questions arise. Specifically, recognizing the limited involvement of Protestant evangelicals in civic engagement activities and programs such as welfare reform and poverty relief, is Charitable Choice an embattlement issue that certain Protestant evangelicals use to separate themselves from the world? Is it a matter strictly a matter of constitutionality, theology or practicality? Are the views of individual Protestant evangelicals, as measured in the individual national survey data, reflective of the Protestant evangelical sub-cultures of which they belong? What role do Protestant evangelical ministers play in propagating these various forms of sub-cultural identity and how do Protestant evangelical ministers perceive Charitable Choice? Chapter four investigates and attempts to answer these questions.
CHAPTER 4

CHURCHES, VOLUNTEER RATES AND CHARITABLE CHOICE

Introduction

Religion and civic life are not static. A multitude of factors can affect an individual’s religious or civic life, modifying or erasing previous patterns that characterized levels of participation and commitment. The previous chapters of this dissertation have analyzed an individual’s dimensions of religiosity (Lam 2002) through the disaggregation of the Protestant faith into five distinct subcultures: Protestant fundamentalist, Protestant evangelical, mainline Protestant, liberal Protestants and Protestant Christians. Chapters two and three have argued that Protestant evangelicalism capitalizes on its culturally pluralistic environment to socially construct sub-cultural distinction, tension and engagement between itself and relevant out-groups and that this enhances the strength and vitality of the Protestant evangelical tradition. This dissertation agrees with Smith (1998) that the creation of Protestant evangelical subcultures flourishes on “difference, tension, conflict and threat” (153). The strength of the Protestant evangelical tradition, therefore, should be understood as the result of a combination of its socially constructed distinctiveness and its limited cultural engagement with society using theology as one of the key determinants.

In Chapter three, this dissertation continued the investigation of Protestant evangelical sub-cultures by exploring ways in which some of the very same factors that
strengthen Protestant evangelicalism may also have a paradoxical effect of undermining Protestant evangelical’s responsibility to assist in feeding the poor through civic engagement activities. Utilizing Lam’s (2002) dimensions of religiosity, findings show that the often perceived strengths of Protestant evangelicalism, in this case theological conservative beliefs and convictions and participatory activities, have negative affects on civic engagement activities and support for Charitable Choice. Findings thus far demonstrate that not only do theological convictions and beliefs matter in the creation of sub-cultures within the Protestant evangelical faith, but the more conservative the theological convictions and beliefs become; the less likely Protestant evangelicals are to engage in civic and political activities. This analysis has demonstrated that there are important differences, theologically and culturally across Protestant evangelical sub-cultures. Yet, individuals from some Protestant evangelical sub-cultures may exhibit a high level of conservatism and cohesion in their theological views but greater diversity in terms of the civic engagement and poverty views, while individuals from other Protestant evangelical sub-cultures maybe relatively liberal in their views of theology but more cohesive in the cultural positions they hold (see Smidt 2004). At the center of the creation of these Protestant evangelical sub-cultures within Protestant evangelicalism, is the Protestant evangelical minister.

Protestant evangelical clergy have long been important forces in the religious communities of America meshing religion and politics. From their public pronouncements during the Revolutionary War to their championing benevolent societies during the Second Great Awakening and their efforts in the civil-rights era of the 1960’s,
Protestant evangelical ministers representing all types of sub-cultures and sub-cultures of sub-cultures, have been involved in the framing and delivery of public policy issues (Smidt 2004).

This chapter advances the findings of Chapters two and three by examining Protestant evangelical minister’s views pertaining to volunteering outside their church, congregation or synagogue and investigating their opinions related to Charitable Choice. Utilizing the National Congregations Survey 2000, this chapter further investigates the creation of the sub-culture identity theory by offering alternative explanations for Protestant evangelicals’ apparent unwillingness to participate in Charitable Choice. From the view of the Protestant evangelical minister does it have to do with church organization? Or is the lack of interest strictly theological? Does the requirement of collaborating with those outside of the sub-culture threaten the very strengths of Protestant evangelical sub-cultures resulting in Protestant evangelical ministers creating a systematic form of organizational closure?

This chapter attempts to answer these questions in the following manner. First, this chapter investigates the political role of clergy/ministers highlighting the potential importance of political clergy activism from a brief historical perspective. Secondly, this chapter examines the political significance of minister’s role within the church showing the relationship between theology, political involvement and the theory of organizational closure. Thirdly, utilizing survey data obtained from more than 1200 ministers, this chapter focuses on the two major tenets and research questions of Chapter three from the Protestant evangelical minister’s perspective, what factors affect volunteering in the civic
community and what factors affect the support and endorsement of Charitable Choice? However, unlike Chapter three, this analysis examines the answers to these questions from the church leadership perspective. Finally, this chapter concludes by discussing the implications of the findings and asking important questions still needing to be answered.

Clergy and the Creation of Religious Subcultures

Protestant evangelical ministers, as church leaders, set the stage for the creation of religious sub-cultures. Through their administrative positions and based on their perceived place in the religious hierarchy of the church, Protestant evangelical ministers have the opportunity to become involved in a mixture of social and political activities and programs.

Members of the Protestant evangelical clergy can be active in civic engagement and politics in a variety of roles. They may choose to support programs such as Habitat for Humanity, join political parties, and exercise their democratic right to vote, run for political office or join ministerial associations with specific goals and objectives in mind. In so doing, ministers enjoy the same privileges of citizenship as other American citizens (Smidt 2004).

Second, Protestant evangelical clergy by the very nature of their positions, may be political activists in their local congregations. The fact that many congregational members gather weekly enhances the minister’s ability to politicize and mobilize their flocks, thereby expanding the opportunities to educate their parishioners politically and advance their particular agendas. Vidich and Bensman (1968, 239) note that “the nature of the congregation, the pastors skill in dealing with the congregation and the pastors
personality” are all factors related to the ability of the minister to shape the views of his congregation. Protestant evangelical clergy, in fact, recognize their influence and have indicated that they can exert much political influence over their congregations, should they desire to do so (Guth et al. 1997; Djupe and Gilbert 2001).

Finally, Protestant evangelical clergy may become political activists by virtue of their role as religious or church professionals. Through interacting with other religious professionals, printing and distributing weekly bulletins, statements or declarations, Protestant evangelical clergy may collectively seek to influence and shape the course of political affairs, whether with regard to church matters (doctrinal stands on various issues) or matters that they perceived to be shaped by their religious convictions (speaking out on behalf of the poor or disenfranchised).

Regardless of the particular role they adopt, Protestant evangelical ministers constitute being political actors because of two main reasons: they have unprecedented opportunities to influence others and they possess important theological and political resources. Through the use of these resources, Protestant evangelical ministers have the opportunity to shape a distinct sub-culture, which strategically aligns them for maximum growth and opportunity. Most Americans claim church affiliation and according to Wilson (1989, 363) “more than 40% report attending worship services on a weekly basis”. Ministers, including evangelical ministers, can take advantage of this participatory dimension of religiosity exhibited by individuals, to interpret Biblical passages into political and social action as attendees become conditioned to getting their political and social guidance from their pastor (Leege, Kellstedt and Wald 1990).
In addition to possessing unique political opportunities, ministers possess important resources, which they can mobilize for political and social reasons if they so choose. Ministers are viewed by their members as individuals who are aware of and concerned about, the moral conditions of the world around them. They are not expected therefore to “sit passively by while moral standards decline; rather, it is assumed that pastors should take a stand and draw lines between that which should be embraced and that which should be shunned” (Smidt 2004, 6). Indeed, Buddenbaum (2001) finds that congregation members may give greater credence to stances taken by their pastor than they would to a position heard or read about in some news medium. In many cases, this respect is not limited to the church setting. Wald et al. (1988) finds that the political and social messages ministers transmit will likely be given a respectful hearing and given substantial credibility as well resulting in political action taken on behalf of particular issues (e.g. Tays 1990).

For the purpose of this study, and as it relates to the creation of Protestant sub-cultures, civic engagement and the support of Charitable Choice, Protestant evangelical ministers are politically significant in that they are in the business of connecting particular theological and religious beliefs to political attitudes and orientations. As theorized in Chapter 2 and empirically validated in Chapter three, Protestant evangelical sub-cultures operate within the domain of religious beliefs steeped in theological convictions and beliefs, which provide individual Protestant evangelicals with a worldview which they use to understand and approach civic engagement activities and social service programs. Protestant evangelical ministers “are in the business of
connecting particular theological and religious beliefs to political attitudes and dimensions” (Smidt 2004, 8) for their members.

And important point needs to be made at this juncture of the chapter. Wuthnow (1989) notes that many parishioners lack theological sophistication and as such they often adopt the same religious beliefs of their clergy. In many cases, they are less likely to fully understand and appreciate the social and political ramifications of these tenets. Hence, to understand how particular religious beliefs may shape civic and social activities, this study is strengthened by examining the theological beliefs and social activities of Protestant evangelical clergy as well as parishioners. In order to fully understand the role Protestant evangelical ministers have played the creation of various types of Protestant evangelical sub-cultures, one of the major determinants in participation levels related to civic engagement and in particular Charitable Choice, a brief historical account is helpful.

A Historical Account of Protestant Ministers Propagating New Sub-Cultures

As the twentieth century became a reality, important tensions and divisions were emerging in American Protestantism that affected the nature and involvement of clergy in the social and political realm. Two of the major embattlement zones centered on German high criticism of the Bible and the teachings of Charles Darwin.

German high criticism argued that the “gospel” was much more complex than the “simple gospel” as read by the laity. This perspective not only challenged the literalism in biblical interpretation but also the inerrancy of biblical texts in historical and scientific matters. Darwinism added gas to an already hot fire as he challenged the integrity of the Bible and scriptural teachings by ministers through his origin of the species (Smidt 2004).
Many Protestants adopted these theories and became known as Protestant liberals, who sought to reconcile the Word of God with modern, scientific understandings. Those who adopted a more conservative stance became known as Protestant fundamentalists and Protestant evangelicals. Most, however, tended to adopt viewpoints somewhere between the extremes and became known as “Protestant Mainliners” (Hoge 1976).

A spectrum of theological positions continued to be evident within American Protestantism until the 1920’s (Handy 1955) when fundamentalists and evangelicals launched a strong attack on liberal forces. When the perceived victory in the Scopes Monkey Trial back-fired due to the public outcry related to the treatment of the defendant by conservative Protestants, many of these Protestant fundamentalists and Protestant evangelicals retreated, withdrew and re-grouped. As a result, two new sub-cultures emerged as Protestant ministers “became to operate independent congregations, agencies and institutions which rejected politics in favor of efforts aimed toward individual conversion and sanctification” (Smidt 2004, 11). Major denominations created and maintained their own sub-cultures grounded in modernist forces embracing politics and social change.

Consequently, when scholars study civic engagement and political activism of clergy during the 1960’s and 1970’s they find unique sub-cultures within the Protestant tradition. Political participation and civic engagement seems to be the domain of Protestant liberals and mainliners (Hadeen 1968; Quigley 1974) while Protestant fundamentalists and evangelicals largely shunned social and political activity (Koller and Retzer 1980; Nelsen and Baxter 1981). Indeed, “so rare was their social involvement that
some researchers contend only ‘sounds’ of silence emanated from conservative ministers” (Smidt 2004, 12). Stark et al. (1970) attributes this lack of involvement by conservative Protestant evangelical ministers to their “otherworldly theology”: miraculous and otherworldly solutions to human problems. By the 1980’s researchers had concluded that clerical activism in the political and social realm was related in part to theological perspective (Koller and Retzer 1980; Beatty and Walter 1989).

Thus, it is easy to see how Protestant evangelical ministers have capitalized on theological beliefs and social movements to generate specific sub-cultures within the Protestant evangelical faith. It is easy to see how select Protestant evangelical traditions strategically chose specific issues, which they are willing to confront in an attempt to become distinct and thrive (Smith 1998). So, the major question needing to be asked relevant to this chapter is whether Charitable Choice is an issue Protestant evangelical ministers are willing to rally around to help the poor? Or is it an issue of embattlement that strategically is not supported in an attempt to differentiate one Protestant evangelical sub-culture from another.

As seen in Chapters two and three, the theological and participatory dimensions of religiosity that exists within Protestant evangelical sub-cultures have negative effects on voluntary participation rates and an individual Protestant evangelical’s support for Charitable Choice. This chapter focuses specifically on the Protestant evangelical minister and his congregation. As such, the following two hypotheses were be tested in this section of Chapter 4:
**H1:** Protestant evangelical ministers and their church members are less likely to volunteer outside of their congregation than other Protestants.

**H2:** The more bonding activities Protestant evangelicals engage in, the less likely they are to volunteer outside of their church.

Data and Methodology

The National Congregation Survey (1999) is a survey of a nationally representative sample of congregations. The 1998 General Social Survey- a representative sample of English speaking adults in the United States- included a set of questions asking respondents who say they attend religious services more than never to report the name and the location of their religious congregation. Inspired by the insight that organizations attached to a random sample of individuals comprise a random set of organizations, this procedure is the most representative sample of congregations in existence (Tsitos 2003). It is therefore possible to generate a representative sample of organizations even in the absence of a sampling frame that comprehensively lists the units in the organizational population. This procedure, known as hyper-networking or multiplicity sampling, was first described by McPherson (1982) and has been used to sample employment organizations (Parcel et al. 1991; Bridges and Villemenz 1994; Kalleberg et al. 1996) and voluntary organizations (McPherson 1982). The National Congregations Survey (1999) is the first study implementing hyper-network sampling for religious congregations.

Data about each congregation was collected through a one-hour interview with a key informant, such as a minister, priest, rabbi or staff member. Ninety-two percent of the interviews were conducted by phone. Overall, data were collected from 1236
congregations, a response rate of 80%. For the purposes of this chapter, it is important to note that there is no discernable bias in the sample with respect to religious tradition as each tradition is represented at the percentages consistent with research in the social science field (Steensland et al. 2000; Kellstedt et al. 1996).

The dependent variable for the regression analysis is “does your group participate in voluntary activities outside of your congregation?” The real test of the relationship between voluntary participation rates and self-identified theological beliefs and religious traditions at the congregational level is to include a number of independent explanatory variables to predict voluntary participation rates. Because these two models predict the outcome of dichotomous variables- whether or not a congregation volunteers outside of their church - logistic regression is used using STATA. (STATA is used in lieu of SPSS to allow for clarify probability simulations to be analyzed later in the chapter). This statistical technique will determine the effect of each explanatory variable when the outcome has only two possibilities. This model includes fourteen independent variables previously identified as determinants of participation rates. They are divided into four categories; religious traditions, religious theology, church organization and community involvement. 43

The primary independent variables in the religious affiliation category are a) Protestant fundamentalist; b) Protestant evangelical; c) mainline Protestant; d) Protestant Christian with Protestant liberals serving as the reference group. These religious

43 Due to data limitations, the NCS unfortunately does not address the constitutionality/separation of church and state issues as does the Religion and Politics Survey utilized in Chapter 3. This issue will be addressed in Chapter 5 in the qualitative portion of the dissertation through the interview process.
traditions were classified in standard fashion (Kellstedt et al. 1996; Steensland, et al 2000).

This analysis also includes a measure of self-reported congregational theological conservatism. The justification for including this variable is simple: although much of the conservative theological variation that exists among Protestant congregations is represented by differences in denominational based religious tradition, there is a substantial amount of theological variation within Protestant sub-cultures (Wuthnow 1988) prompting the use of this term. Four interaction variables are also created to measure the effects of increased conservatism within the theology dimension of each Protestant sub-culture. They are: conservative theology x Protestant fundamentalists, conservative theology x Protestant evangelicals, conservative theology x mainline-Protestants and conservative theology x Protestant Christians. Their theological conservatism ranges from very liberal (1) to moderate (2) to very conservative (3).

Chaves (1999) finds that churches that possess certain administrative qualities are more likely to support community projects through volunteering. By possessing key administrative characteristics, congregations are more likely to apply for external funding, collaborate with outside agencies and engage in community projects. This analysis advances Chaves (1999) findings by examining key variables as it pertains to Protestant sub-cultures. Independent variables selected for this analysis include: number of adults that are members (range from 50-2000+); belonging to a council of churches (0= no; 1= yes); number of full-time staff (range from 0 to 10+) and 501 C-3 status (0= no; 1= yes). Each of these variables have been shown to affect political participation rates
(Beterlein and Chaves 2003; Smidt 2003), participation rates in social service programs
Park and Smith 2000), perceived participation in Charitable Choice (Chaves
1999; Cnaan 2000) and trust levels related to congregational life (Welch et al. 2004). This analysis also combines the findings related to the subculture identity theory (chapter 2) to examine what extent congregations separate themselves from the rest of society through the creation of strong social boundaries (see Smith 1998). As such, a series of variables are utilized that indicate outside participation and social service partnerships: collaboration with another religious group, within group (0 = no; 1 = yes); collaboration with a secular organization, without group (0 = no; 1 = yes) and have you conducted a community needs assessment (0 = no; 1 = yes). Finally, a variable indicating direct involvement with social programming is included: “how you ever had a speaker from a social service organization speak at your church? This variable is coded as a binary variable (0 = no; 1 = yes).

Findings/Results

Not surprisingly, Table 4.1 indicates that Protestant evangelical sub-cultures by themselves have no affect on volunteer participation rates outside of church by individual members. Yet, Table 4.1 demonstrates that the more conservative Protestant evangelicals become the less likely they are to volunteer for civic engagement activities. These results confirm the findings of Putnam (2000) and Finke and Stark (1992) who note that their community than those who do not conduct a needs assessment or invite a guest speaker.
Table 4.1 Volunteer Participation Rates, Theological Convictions and Evangelical Sub-Cultures (Congregational Level Data). Have you organized a group of your members and volunteered outside of your congregation?

| Religious Tradition | Beta | Standard Error | P>|z| | Exp (B) |
|---------------------|------|----------------|--------|--------|
| Control: Protestant Liberals | | | | |
| Protestant Fundamentalists | -.726 | .456 | .111 | .484 |
| Protestant Evangelicals | -.035 | .466 | .940 | .965 |
| Mainline Protestants | -.508 | .524 | .332 | .602 |
| Protestant Christians | -.511 | .443 | .249 | .600 |
| Theology | | | | |
| Conservative Theology | -.254 | .041 | .000 | .799 |
| Fund x Conservative Theology | -.258 | .067 | .000 | .772 |
| Evans x Conservative Theology | -.224 | .121 | .043 | .800 |
| Main. x Conservative Theology | .211 | .352 | .549 | 1.234 |
| Christian x Conservative Theology | .262 | .383 | .494 | 1.299 |
| Church Organization | | | | |
| Number of adults | .307 | .076 | .000 | 1.448 |
| Belong to Council of Churches | .003 | .007 | .616 | 1.003 |
| Full-time staff | .006 | .008 | .461 | 1.006 |
| IRS Status- 501C-3 | -.209 | .180 | .244 | .811 |
| Community Involvement | | | | |
| Social Service Speaker | .031 | .216 | .001 | 1.329 |
| Collaborate with Secular Agency | .053 | .207 | .000 | 2.347 |
| Collaborate with Religious Group | .156 | .178 | .381 | 1.168 |
| Conduct Community Assessment | -.055 | .181 | .761 | .946 |
| Constant | .370 | .067 | .000 | 1.448 |
| Nagelkerke R-Squared | .149 | | |
| N= | 918 | | |

Note: Binary Logistic Regression. All test results are for a two-tailed test. Source: National Congregations Study 1999.
from outside the church. Those that collaborate with social service providers in a project in their community are more likely to support become civically engaged than those that do not work outside their congregations. Outside contact has a positive effect on those within the closed-knit sub-cultures of the Protestant evangelical tradition.

Protestant Evangelical Ministers and Charitable Choice

To this point, the data shows that traditional religious variables such as denominational affiliation, once believed to be the major determinant in civic engagement activities, actually takes a back seat to conservative theology, the size of the congregation and exposure to forces outside of one’s congregation as it pertains to volunteering by Protestant evangelicals. These findings lay a foundational cornerstone for the main thesis of this chapter. Are these same variables, which stress and highlight the involvement of church members with community leaders, which is in direct contradiction to the separatist values of the many of the evangelical Protestant sub-cultures, the driving force behind the low participation rates of Protestant evangelicals in the Charitable Choice initiative? Are the findings of Chapter three, specifically the strong theological conservative convictions and beliefs, being used as strategic tools for embattling modernity? To answer these questions, the following hypotheses will be tested:

**H3:** ministers and their members from theologically conservative Protestant evangelical congregations, who engage in community involvement projects, are more likely to support Charitable Choice than those who do not engage in their community.

**H4:** The more conservative Protestant fundamentalists and evangelicals become, the less likely they are to support Charitable Choice.
Congregational Support for Charitable Choice

The National Congregations Survey (Chaves 1999) allows for specific analysis of the Charitable Choice initiative through three specific survey questions. Many researchers have long contended that congregations and religious traditions may not be aware of Charitable Choice and as such may not be participating in the initiative (Sherman 2000). Others content that church policies may prohibit participation in state-sponsored programs (Kennedy 2003). Utilizing descriptive statistics and cross-tabulations from data obtained from the National Congregations Survey (1999), preliminary answers to these questions can be provided. Table 4.2 reveals that most religious congregations are not aware of faith-based programs and governmental partnership.

Protestant fundamentalist-evangelicals have very limited knowledge of faith-based programs ranking them lowest in the list, when compared to other Protestant subcultures. It is important to note that Protestant as a whole are not that aware of Charitable Choice (36.5% average) with one in five Protestant fundamentalist-evangelical clergy being aware of the program compared to almost one in two Protestant Christians and one in three Protestant mainline-liberal clergy being aware of the program. Over 21.4% of Protestant fundamentalist-evangelicals that are aware of faith-based partnerships have policies in place against receiving federal funds- a number almost 200% lower than other Protestant subcultures. Interestingly, 67% of the evangelical-fundamentalist ministers surveyed that do not presently have a policy in place pertaining to accepting Charitable Choice funds, still would not apply for the monies if given the opportunity. The question is why? To answer this question, a logit regression analysis is performed, changing the
Table 4.2: Descriptive Statistics Related to Charitable Choice and Religious Congregations among Protestant Evangelical Sub-Cultures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Have you heard about faith-based partnerships? (yes)</th>
<th>Does your congregation have a policy against receiving federal/state funds? (yes)</th>
<th>Given the opportunity, would your congregation apply for charitable choice monies? (yes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentalists-Evangelical</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline-Liberal Protestants</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just Christians</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Congregations Survey 1999. Note: Those asked if they would apply were asked only if they did not have a policy in place.

dependent variable from volunteering outside of one’s congregation to: Would your congregation apply for Charitable Choice Funding?

Table 4.3 reveals that there is more to the participation rates of Protestant fundamentalists and Protestant evangelicals in Charitable Choice than originally perceived. First, examining Charitable Choice through the lens of the Protestant sub-cultures, the findings show that Protestant fundamentalists and Protestant evangelicals are less likely to support Charitable Choice than Protestant liberals. Table 4.3 also indicates that the more conservative a Protestant evangelical congregation becomes in their theological views, as expressed by the minister, the less likely they are to support Charitable Choice when compared to Protestant liberals, the control group.

Secondly, the lack of collaboration with various groups by Protestant sub-cultures has an effect on participation and support of Charitable Choice. Conservative Protestant evangelical sub-cultures, which often have limited out-group contacts, proved to be a
Table 4.3: Impact of Protestant Evangelical Sub-Cultures and Theological Beliefs on Participation in Charitable Choice at the Congregational Level (Given the Opportunity, Would Your Congregation Apply for Federal Funds (Charitable Choice)?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Tradition</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>S. E</th>
<th>P &gt;</th>
<th>z</th>
<th></th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control: Protestant Liberals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant Fundamentalists</td>
<td>-1.914</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>6.784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant Evangelicals</td>
<td>-3.41</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>1.374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline Protestants</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>1.207</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant Christians</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>1.540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Theology                    |      |      |     |   |   |         |
| Conservative Theology       | -.071 | .033 | .040 | .932 |
| Fund x Conservative Theology| -1.163 | .292 | .000 | .313 |
| Evans x Conservative Theology| -.551 | .270 | .041 | .577 |
| Mainline x Conservative Theology| .376  | .136 | .126 | 1.102 |
| Christians x Conservative Theology| .413  | .214 | .139 | 1.119 |

| Church Organization         |      |      |     |   |   |         |
| Number of adults             | .444  | .157 | .005 | 1.560 |
| Belong to Council of Churches| .370  | .150 | .014 | 1.448 |
| Full-time staff              | .016  | .007 | .030 | .984 |
| IRS Status- 501C-3           | -.003 | .187 | .986 | .997 |

| Community Involvement        |      |      |     |   |   |         |
| Group Volunteer Activities   | .444  | .157 | .005 | 1.560 |
| Social Service Speaker       | .307  | .076 | .000 | 1.448 |
| Collaborate with Secular Agency| .349  | .180 | .052 | 1.417 |
| Collaborate with Religious Group| -.210 | .186 | .259 | .810 |
| Conducted Community Assessment| .242  | .159 | .233 | 1.274 |

| Constant                    | -.576 | .410 | .012 | .562 |
| Nagelkerke R-squared        | .196   |      |      |      |
| N=                          | 1021   |      |      |      |

Note: Binary Logistic Regression. All test results are for a two-tailed test. Source: National Congregations Study 1999.
factor as it pertains to supporting Charitable Choice: collaborating with other religious
groups through a council or with a social service provider does enhances a minister or
church’s willingness to engage in Charitable Choice. Not surprisingly, the larger the
congregation and the more staff employed, the more likely the congregation is to support
Charitable Choice, a finding supported by Chaves (2000).

Participation by Protestant evangelical sub-cultures has a negative effect as it
pertains to supporting Charitable Choice. Conservative theology matters as Protestant
evangelicals become more conservative, their support for Charitable Choice decreases.

The logit regression analysis demonstrates that conservative theological beliefs
and convictions matters as it pertains to Charitable Choice. By further advancing
Iannaccone’s (1988, 1994) research on the role of conservatism Protestant evangelical
sub-cultures, a clearer picture concerning the role of conservative theological beliefs and
convictions can be measured as it pertains to Charitable Choice. As indicated by Table
4.3, the more conservative Protestant evangelicals become, the less likely they are to
support Charitable Choice. To provide a clearer understanding as to what degree
conservative beliefs and convictions matters, Clarify software is used.

Clarify software developed by King, Tomz and Wittenberg (2000) allows for the
“extraction of new qualities of interest from statistical models, thereby enriching the
substance” and allows for the “removal of often ambiguous findings” that are hard to
understand and apply. Utilizing Clarify simulations, Protestant evangelical sub-cultures
can be isolated and measured as it pertains to their community involvement and
conservative theological beliefs. This software also allows for the addition of variables to
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the original equation by “turning on” measures of civic engagement and seeing the impact on the participation levels of Charitable Choice.

Table 4.4 supports and enhances the findings of Tables 4.1- 4.3. Specifically, when Protestant evangelical congregations and their ministers assume a more liberal theological stance and engage in community activities such as volunteering, conducting a needs assessment or collaborating with other secular organizations, their support for Charitable Choice increases. In the case of Protestant fundamentalists, this support rises by 37% and within Protestant evangelicals the support for Charitable Choice increases by 27%.

Discussion

This dissertation began in Chapter two by noting that Protestant evangelicalism capitalizes on its culturally pluralistic environment to socially construct sub-cultural distinction, tension and engagement between itself and relevant out-groups and that this enhances the strength and vitality of the Protestant evangelical tradition. This dissertation agrees with Smith (1998) that the creation of Protestant evangelical sub-cultures flourish on “difference, tension, conflict and threat” (153). Chapter 3 utilized individual data from Protestant evangelicals to operationalize Lam’s (2002) dimensions of religiosity to further demonstrate how Protestant evangelicals use a combination of socially constructed distinctiveness to limit cultural engagement with society. Key determinants were the theological convictions and beliefs and participatory dimensions of religiosity (Lam 2002).
Table 4.4 Support for Charitable Choice Based on Community Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Liberal Theology</th>
<th>Liberal theology + Volunteer</th>
<th>Liberal theology + Volunteer + Community Assessment</th>
<th>Liberal theology + Volunteer + Community Assessment + Secular Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant Fundamentalist</td>
<td>33.80%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>49.65%</td>
<td>60.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant Evangelicals</td>
<td>44.87%</td>
<td>56.06%</td>
<td>61.15%</td>
<td>71.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline Protestants</td>
<td>70.11%</td>
<td>78.50%</td>
<td>81.79%</td>
<td>87.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant Christians</td>
<td>62.11%</td>
<td>71.97%</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
<td>83.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This chapter has bolstered the findings of Chapter three by demonstrating how Protestant evangelical clergy can use their theology to not only limit, even if subtly, their congregation’s role in civic affairs but also have a limited awareness of programs such as Charitable Choice. Furthermore, this chapter shows that conservative theological beliefs and convictions plays a key role in participation levels among Protestant evangelicals.

While this data provides substantial findings pertaining to explaining the absence of Protestant evangelicals in welfare reform, it only scratches the surface as the specific reasons. It does not explain specific theology beliefs and convictions that matter, how those convictions and beliefs addresses the issues surrounding helping the poor with governmental partnerships and the role of Protestant evangelicals in meeting the needs of the poor in their local communities.

To fully understand the Protestant evangelical sub-culture as it pertains to Charitable Choice, further investigation is required. Through the use of ethnographic
interviews, new information can be obtained combining the findings of Chapter three and
Chapter four to develop a thick description of the relationship between Protestant
evangelicals and the federal government program known as Charitable Choice.
CHAPTER 5

PROTESTANT EVANGELICAL MINISTERS OPINIONS
ABOUT WELFARE AND CHARITABLE CHOICE

Introduction

The chapter seeks to explore how theological beliefs and convictions impede support for Charitable Choice among Protestant evangelicals. Previous chapters (Chapters three and four) clearly demonstrate that theological convictions and beliefs coupled with the creation of a sophisticated, specialized sub-culture is the strongest predictor of a Protestant evangelical’s willingness to embrace government sponsored-religiously based social service programs such as Charitable Choice. An attempt to understand the role these theological convictions and beliefs play in the formation of political and social views requires a closer examination of the nuances of the various sub-cultures within the Protestant evangelical faith. This examination and analysis is important for two main reasons.

First, this chapter examines the diversity of the Protestant evangelical tradition using central Appalachia as a backdrop. The complex religious landscape of central Appalachia is full of numerous Protestant evangelical sub-cultures, rich in theological variation, religious signs and theological perceptions. Geertz (1973) describes these religious sub-cultures as “historically transmitted patterns of meaning embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by meanings in
which (persons) communicate, perpetuate and develop their knowledge about life” (89). These sub-cultures are also ridden with poverty and the need for government assistance. By peering into these various sub-cultures, this chapter will provide a much clearer explanation as to why many government assistance programs, not just Charitable Choice, are not being maximized to their full potential.

Secondly, this chapter’s qualitative approach through interviews allows one to uncover the reasoning processes that lead many Protestant evangelical sub-cultures and their leadership away from support for Charitable Choice as well as the less frequent reasoning processes employed by more liberal Protestant evangelical clergy supportive of Charitable Choice. Furthermore, using a triangulated research design method supplements the quantitative analysis of Chapters three and four with interviews from Chapter 5 thereby ensuring the reliability and validity of the data.\footnote{Methodological triangulation involves the process of playing each method off against the other so to maximize the validity and reliability of the field efforts (Denzin 1978, 304).} This combined mixed methods approach allows a “thicker description” of the gradation between the various types of theological views, conservative and liberal, and its impact on public policy issues.

This chapter identifies the necessary components needed to develop an appropriate case for uncovering the reasoning processes of Protestant evangelical ministers from Appalachian that makes theological convictions so important in their developed sub-cultures. Issues to be examined include the brief history of the Protestant evangelical tradition in Appalachia, the role poverty has played in the social and religious
culture of Appalachia and how variation among Protestant evangelical denominations has systemically chosen to create sub-cultures conducive to their mission.

Appalachia itself is not one region but many; it is not a culture but is composed of a multiplicity of cultural and social experiences, ideals and subgroups (Leonard 1999) that cannot survive “without a legitimate impetus provided by religion” (Hill 1972, 34). Albanese (1981, 221-222) notes that the residents of Appalachia share many ingredients “from a general religio-cultural synthesis of the nation but combine these ingredients in its own way and also add other components”. In this sense, the creation of religious sub-cultures in some measures “becomes a function of the spatial location of the Appalachian people and the history of the spatial location together” (Leonard 1999, xx). Appalachia, in essence, is both culturally and religiously traditional but transitioning into new cultures and sub-cultures providing an overarching frame within which religion and social life comes together (Albanese 1981). As such, the selection of Appalachia to generate a sample population is a perfect fit for this study.

Appalachia lends itself to the study of poverty. Poverty in central Appalachia manifests itself in many ways: low income levels, dilapidated and crowded housing; a lack of plumbing and clean running water; limited access to public utilities, social services, and medical care; geographic isolation born of poor transportation systems; and inadequately staffed and poorly funded schools. Not surprisingly, poverty in the region has often run in families—passed along through successive generations connected by the common threads of low education, few job skills, and the lack of good jobs (see Weber
Among the Appalachian poor, 44.5 percent received cash public assistance in 2000 (Black and Sanders 2004).

While the people of Appalachia maybe poor in monetary goods, they are rich in religious pluralism, especially within the Protestant faith. The Protestant landscape of Appalachia is saturated with small churches, representing many different Protestant subcultures and specific levels of theological conservatism. Daughtery (1989) offers the following approach:

*Mountain churches* constitute a distinct expression of religion in Appalachia and are considered unique to the region. These numbers include a variety of Baptists (Old Regular, Primitive and Free Will) as well as numerous independent Holiness congregations. Independent in nature and often connected with a form of Protestant evangelicalism, their services are often characterized by certain religious traditions such as outdoor baptisms by immersion, speaking in tongues, foot washing, snake handling and Spirit-lead preaching. Many ministers are bivocational and often have limited formal education. They are linked to the mountain culture in powerful ways, through grassroots constituency and kinship relations, as well as a pervasive piety and spirituality (Kimbrough 1995).

*Pentecostal churches* include the Church of God (Cleveland Tennessee), the Assemblies of God, Fire-Baptized Holiness and a variety of Pentecostal holiness.

---

Drawing from the Acts 2 account of the Day of Pentecost, they place a strong emphasis on the baptism of the Holy Spirit, as evidenced by tongue speaking, healings and other spiritual manifestations. Ministers are less likely to be college-trained and some congregations accept both men and women in leadership roles. Worship service is often marked by "outbursts of the Holy Spirit", singing and praying and social concerns relate more to personal than corporate morality. Evangelical in nature and tradition, Pentecostal churches call believers to a life of holiness in response to the depravity of human life as a strong sense of other worldliness prevails.

*Evangelical* churches include various types of Baptists, Nazarenes, the Churches of Christ, Bible Churches and other non-denominational, non-Pentecostal churches. Many of the ministers are bi-vocational, accepting very little church money for their service. Congregational autonomy is paramount. Individual conversion, a "born-again experience", often involves a form of baptismal cleansing or immersion. Social concerns tend towards issues of personal morality, traditional family values and what has become known as new religious political agendas. Conservative religious theology is a powerful influence in these groups.

*Mainline churches* include Episcopal, United Methodist, Presbyterians, American Baptists, USA; Lutheran; United Churches of Christ and the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ). They tend to be more denominationally oriented, with seminary trained ministers and worship that is more elaborate liturgically, seeking
to reach each person through the nurturing sacramentalism of the church. They are apt to stress overt social action in response to political and cultural concerns.

While attempting to classify or cluster religious traditions in Appalachia is beneficial it fails to expose the wide variation that exists within each religious tradition. Social scientists turn to a process which identifies certain broad controlling ideas, symbols and beliefs which characterize the theological and pragmatic identity of the churches, whatever their specific religious traditional beliefs.\(^{46}\) Leonard (1999) notes that these broad beliefs, symbols and ideas are found in examining certain polarities around which belief systems, doctrines and practices take place- "the unity and diversity, continuity and discontinuity evident in various Protestant evangelical groups in Appalachia" (xxii).

While most of these ideas are not unique to Appalachia, they nonetheless take peculiar shape in this specific cultural setting. Specifically, Protestant evangelical ministers create sub-cultures, which are reflected in the category/denominations listed above and within each denominational grouping listed above, around three basic tenets. Each of these tenets is a study in contrast as denominations carve out their own niche in a crowded religious landscape.

First, while Protestant evangelicals universally agree that God’s Word is the complete authority in their lives, the interpretation of the Word and its application to the social problems of their communities is anything but predictable. *People of the Book* have created a sub-culture by attempting to re-construct the New Testament Church by

\(^{46}\) See also Deborah Stone (2000) who discusses the role of symbols and symbolic language in the political and social process.
defining the church as a *community of believers* (Leonard 1999). *People of the Spirit* respond to contemporary culture through inclusiveness by responding directly to the poor and broken in spirit through addressing political and social structures which oppress and manipulate Appalachian people and their culture (McCauley 1995).

A second factor involved in the creation of Protestant evangelical sub-cultures involves the idea of church. Many sub-cultures, self-identified as “People of God”, believe that they are called to cooperate with other churches and secular organizations as well (Welch 1999). On the other hand those who believe that they are “God’s Only People” and that evangelicalism involves not only winning secular sinners to the “true church” but also proselytizing religious sinners away from false religions (Leonard 1999).

A third and final tenet that generates controversy among Protestant evangelical churches in Appalachia centers on the idea of ministry and leadership within the church. Many Protestant evangelical sub-cultures adhere to autonomous governance, a key characteristic of sub-culture identity theory (see Chapter two), while others belong to church councils and religious conventions.

These distinct differences resulting in the creation and maintenance of numerous denominational sub-cultures within the Protestant evangelical faith in central Appalachia combined with the oppressive poverty, truly makes central Appalachia, a living data-set for the ethnographer. Numerous questions are begging to be asked from the findings of Chapters three and four. Interviews with Protestant evangelical ministers representing
these various sub-cultures can begin to get at these questions and provide rich answers. These issues and questions include, what is the impact of theological beliefs and convictions on poverty and welfare programs? Can Protestant evangelical churches retain distinctiveness and respond to the needs of the poor through Charitable Choice? Through interviewing Protestant evangelical ministers and clergy representing various levels of theological beliefs and convictions, a clearer understanding of the ability of Charitable Choice to be effective can be obtained.

Data Collection and Sample Selection

Data obtained through interviews best examines the relationship between theological beliefs and convictions, political views and support for Charitable Choice. Qualitative interviewing is a form of a “guided conversation” (Kvale 1996, 4) in which the researcher carefully listens “so as to hear the meaning” of what is being conveyed (Rubin and Rubin 1995, 7). Spradley (1979, 8) extends the concept to “include distinctly disciplinary concerns noting that the purpose of an interview is to allow the researcher to make cultural inferences- thick descriptions of a given social world analyzed for cultural patterns and themes”. These are of typically anthropological interests in that they expand upon what people communicate and the ways they act and the artifacts they use.

The interactive interview occurs when the interviewer assumes that emotions and personal meanings are legitimate topics of research (Anderson et al. 1987). As a result, interactive interviews explore sensitive topics that are intimate, maybe personally discrediting, and normally shrouded in secrecy (Renzetti and Lee 1993). Reflexive dyadic interviews follow the typical protocol of the interviewer asking questions and the
interviewee answering them “but the interviewer typically shares personal experience
with the topic at hand and reflects on the communicative process of the interview” (Ellis
and Berger 2001, 853-854). In this case the researcher’s disclosures are more than tactics
to encourage responses. The interview is conducted more like a conversation between
two equals than a distinctly hierarchical question and answer exchange and the
interviewer tries to tune in to the interactively produced meanings and emotional
dynamics within the interview itself (Gubrium and Holstein 1997). The objective of this
chapter is to bring out the best of what qualitative interviews were meant to do by
addressing the sensitive issues surrounding personal beliefs and theological views in a
sensitive, professional manner. Many Appalachian Protestant evangelical ministers and
people of Appalachia in general are suspect of outsiders, who often vilify their beliefs
(Leonard 1999). In this case, the interviewer went to the interviewees, established a
rapport and met with them one-on-one.

Researcher involvement can also close the hierarchical gap between researchers
and respondents that traditional interviewing encourages (Bergen 1993; Cook and Fonow
1986; Douglas 1985; Oakley 1981) thus promoting dialogue rather than interrogation
(Bristow and Esper 1988). O’Brien (2002) demonstrates this by showing how developed
relationships led to the examination of the differentiation of group solidarity between
hotel workers. Instead of insisting on a rigid separation of interviewer and interviewee,
researchers recognize the interview “as an active relationship occurring in a context
permeated by issues of power, emotionality and interpersonal process” (Ellis and Berger
2001, 851; see also Holstein and Gubrium 1995). Not only do these practices insure an
atmosphere conductive for enriching the interview process, they also heighten the internal validity of the findings regarding the research propositions.

The methodology to be utilized in this chapter involves the in-depth interviewing of 36 Protestant ministers representing various religious traditions in Appalachia. The selection of an appropriate sample design is one of the key decisions that influence the types of conclusions that one can draw later during the data analysis (Gubrium and Holstein 1997). In attempting to draw a sample of Appalachia’s Protestant ministers, a systematic non-probability sampling technique was utilized. This chapter utilizes a stratified random sampling technique, in which the strata were defined by degree of theological conservatism within the Protestant faith. As indicated from the binary logistic regression procedures of Chapters three and four, conservative theological beliefs and convictions serves as a key determinant at both the individual and congregational level as it pertains to support of Charitable Choice. Utilizing the Religion and Politics Survey (2001) and the National Congregation Survey (2000), cross tabulations were conducted and religious traditions were matched with self-identified conservative theological levels and Protestant evangelical denominations were extrapolated. Each survey also provides a list of more than 40 different religious denominations, which are then cross-referenced, with the degree of theological conservatism as self-identified by the respondents.

National church directories were obtained from national headquarters via online and cross-referenced with directories from state associations to obtain a sample frame for each denomination. For each Protestant evangelical denomination- mainline, liberal and conservative-, congregations were grouped as being central Appalachian or non-
Appalachian using the Appalachian Regional Commissions guidelines for Appalachian counties and cross-checked with a Rand McNally Atlas. Thus, the sampling frame is derived from all central Appalachian churches, which is then stratified into denominations representing the Protestant evangelical faith and then classified according to levels of theological conservatism. This technique generated the sample frame of 487 Protestant evangelical congregations from the available lists.\(^{47}\) Utilizing a computerized research randomizer obtained from the Internet (www.randomizer.org), seventy-two congregations were initially selected. All (72) were initially contacted, an over-sampling of 100%, and 29 expressed interest in being interviewed generating a response rate of 42%. Subsequently, through snow-balling an additional seven were identified by ministers during the interview process.\(^{48}\) In four of the seven, ministers steered the interviewer towards other local ministers in the community not affiliated with their respective denomination. Each minister that agreed to be interviewed was forwarded a preliminary questionnaire that allowed them to share pertinent information pertaining to the church and its organizational structure, etc. that was then sent back to the interviewer. The interviewer then contacted each respondent and established an interview time, date and location.

\(^{47}\) There are more congregations that the sample population indicates. However, many small congregations elect not to be included in directories and as such this offers an explanation as to the number of congregations included.

\(^{48}\) Warren and Levy (1991) conduct snow-balling sampling techniques when attempting to interview nursing home workers. Colleagues and acquaintances provide the sample population based on personal experiences.
Thirty-two (32) interviews took place at the interviewee’s church. This setting provided additional opportunities to probe and to provide the interviewee with a level of comfort further ensuring internal validity. Four (4) interviews occurred at the minister’s home. Interviews consisted of ten to twelve (10-12) topic questions covering three main areas: theological beliefs, Charitable Choice and government welfare. Both open-ended questions and structured questions were used. Open-ended questions “often make it difficult for the researcher to make reasonable and valid comparisons across informants” (Johnson and Wheeler 2001, 499). Structured questions address this potential issue by proving closed-ended questions that were presented to all respondents in the same order. This technique insures reliability and validity (Johnson and Wheeler 2001). All interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed with the minister’s consent. Additional notes were also taken by hand. Interviews lasted approximately thirty to forty-five minutes. Because most evangelical ministers in central Appalachia are bi-vocational, many interviews had to be re-scheduled to accommodate their busy schedules. Several were held in the early morning hours and following work.

Coding and Data Analysis

Transcribing of each interview resulted in over 250 pages of single-spaced text. Utilizing QSR N*DIST (N6), a computer software package for qualitative analysis, data is “sorted into themes so that all the stuff about a theme is in one place” and can be viewed and compared from one vantage point (Gahan and Hannibal, 1998, 3). Coded
units could range from one word to a whole sentence to the whole interview. Most coded units were 2-5 lines.

Interview text was first coded using levels of theological conservatism. Ministers were asked a closed-ended question *(Do you consider yourself to be theologically conservative, moderate or liberal?)* followed by an open-end question *(And by that you mean?)*. Nineteen (19) ministers identified themselves as being theologically conservative, five (5) identified as being theologically moderate and twelve (12) identified as theologically liberal. Through this self-reporting of theological conservatism this procedure cross-checks the self-identified conservative values identified in Chapters 3 and 4 and enhances the various Protestant sub-cultures discussed in Chapter two.

In order to fully understand the role theological conservatism plays in addressing welfare and poverty it is vital to understand how ministers feel about welfare. This is accomplished in two ways. First, an open-ended question is asked – *“when you heard the term government welfare, what comes to mind?”* This is followed by a closed-ended question, *“Do you feel that people on welfare lack moral responsibility and a work ethic?”* The answers to these questions were coded resulting in the creation of 5 different categories (tree-nodes) and 14 sub-groups (sub-nodes) for later analysis. An additional tree node was created for the purpose of addressing the perceived stigmatization of those on welfare. A closed-ended question was asked of ministers pertaining to whether or not welfare was a race issue *(In you opinion is welfare a race issue?)*. Nine (9) of the ministers indicated that welfare was a race-based program while twenty-seven said race was not a factor in determining who received welfare and who did not.
The previous two coding strategies was followed by the coding of two additional questions which relate directly to the subject matter question at hand and relates to the questions asked in Chapter three and four: *Would you apply for Charitable Choice given the opportunity? If not, why not?* From the first question, which is closed-ended, twenty-one (21) ministers indicated they would not apply, eight (8) indicate they would and seven indicated maybe, pending the availability of more information. The opened-ended question, if not why not, created an additional seven (7) sub-nodes for analysis.

Additional free nodes were created that addressed questions related to long-term and short-term activities sponsored by the ministers sponsoring churches, political ideology and views of mega-churches and their attempts to offer social service programs. While not all of these concepts were of significance in Chapter three and four, they serve as supporting evidence for this data analysis and future research.

Starting with Theological Beliefs

Chapters two, three and four showed churches within the Protestant evangelical tradition create sub-cultures to differentiate themselves from other religious denominations that many times they find to be contradictory to their biblical theology. Through a combination of factors (See Chapter two), Protestant evangelicals strategically choose when to become embattled and on what issues they will engage. As indicated by the findings of Chapters three and four, theological convictions and beliefs serve as one of the main determinants in civic engagement and political activism. When asked, eleven (11) of the interviewees indicated that they were theologically conservative. It is
important to note that an additional five (5) indicated that were theologically conservative but they preferred to think of themselves as being “spiritual” instead of theologically conservative and four (4) wished to be thought of as being “biblically correct”. The subculture identity theory is further seen in that several ministers took great pride in the fact they were “spiritual” and that others were not spiritual. Joy, an experienced elderly minister from the mountains of Eastern Kentucky described it this way:

We speak where the Bible speaks and we are silent where the Bible is silent. We don’t add anything to what the Bible says, it’s wrong to do so. Others may do that to “water down the truth” and to attract non-believers and I guess in their mind they are theological, but not to real Bible truth seekers. Furthermore, the Bible teaches us to be “spiritual” and in order to do that we have to follow the word of God. After all, the Bible teaches us that “all scripture is inspired so that the man of God might be complete, thoroughly furnished for all good works”. That being the case, we don’t need to add anything to it. We are simply spiritual. We are what you would call Bible-based.

Those who viewed themselves as being liberal theologically indicated that their liberal stance was more of a reflection of their views when compared to others within their faith than it was a question of biblical principle. At the complete other end of the theological spectrum and numerous Protestant evangelical subcultures away, Nitz provides us with a view from the Protestant evangelical theological liberal cluster:

I’d probably be labeled a liberal by others in my faith. However, again, I don’t believe these labels serve us well. If we are going to find common ground and
new solutions, we are going to have to step outside of our boxes, which have bound us to unimaginitive ways of treating the world. God teaches us to love all people and sometimes we hide behind scriptures.

Those who are theological moderates do not receive the label simply because they do not have strong views from of a spiritual sense. Quite the contrary as seen in Tursi, a Protestant evangelical theological moderate, who states:

I consider myself to be a moderate spiritually in the sense that I am traditional in my core beliefs but radical in the application of those beliefs. I believe that Jesus was a liberal and a radical when it came to the proclamation of the reign of God and the application of the love and justice of God in his ministry. I think that this label speaks of one who is in favor of liberalism (in its original meaning) and tempered by Christian values of compassion, justice, mercy and freedom.

It is important to note that not only do theological beliefs generate various types of subcultures within the Protestant evangelical faith; they also serve to formulate how one views the world (See Smith 1998) and ultimately their role in the public policy process. One of the key tenets of the sub-cultural identity theory is a sense of lifestyle and value distinctiveness. Various sub-cultures within the Protestant evangelical tradition see themselves as “embracing traditional, common sense values in a broader culture that has abandoned them in pursuit of narcissistic, licentious and self-destructive values and lifestyles” (Smith 1998, 131). This abandonment has resulted in many Protestant evangelical sub-cultures aligning around conservative politics or not participation in
politics at all. PJ, a member of the Pentecostal community is representative of the many conservative Protestant evangelicals interviewed:

PJ: I have a hard time figuring out how anybody can serve God and be a political liberal or moderate. The stance of the liberal agenda is mind-boggling. They support the right to choose (abortion), they support policies that limit God in schools, that do not support censorship and it would appear as though they support a lot of things that are anti-family.

E: You said anti-family issues. Such as?

PJ: Homosexuality, same-sex marriages, and gays in the military. God initiated a family as being a unit and that union is between a man and a woman, husband and a wife. It seems as though we have forgotten those principles, especially certain political groups.

TM, another Pentecostal preacher from Ohio notes:

We consider ourselves to be conservative, myself included. We have teased each other in years past that “Brother Rush” leads us. We believe in the sanctity of life, and we do believe that it is wrong to kill, not just babies but also the death penalty. We believe in the sanctity of life for everyone. If you kill someone, you should be locked up for good. We believe that people should work that they should maintain jobs; children should have a mom and a dad.

Four interviewees (4) indicated that they would prefer to think of themselves as being non-political or they did not feel that Christians should be engaged in the political process but if asked they would consider themselves to be politically conservative. Once again,
Joy, an elderly minister from the mountains of West Virginia notes, “I don’t think Christians should be involved in the political process. I do vote however; I feel that most political issues are best left up to the politicians. If you pressed me, I’d say that I was a Republican who is opposed to abortion and homosexuality and other moral issues”.

Strickland, a minister from eastern Kentucky, echoes the comments of Joy. He notes:

While our denomination recognizes government as God’s provision and is not opposed to any specific political party, we do refrain from becoming wrapped up in party politics or promoting a particular system of government for many reasons. The essence of the church is not earthly and temporal but spiritual and eternal. The priority of the Church is to teach Christ exclusively. The mission of the Church is to proclaim the Gospel. Historically, when the church has become involved in partisan politics, the outcome has been disastrous for both the Kingdom of God and the system of government it promoted or attacked.

LT offers yet another different view noting that he “identifies as a political moderate. I am able to see the views of the other side, even if I do not agree”. It is apparent from all the interviews that the major issue differentiating components of civic engagement and political ideology rests in one’s level of theological conservatism. This interview data serves to enrich the quantitative findings from Chapter three and four and distinct patterns that arise from these finding that distinguish and magnify the variation that exists within each Protestant evangelical sub-culture.

On one side of the theological-cultural divide is the conservative fundamentalist theological subculture, “whose values are based on a culturally conservative impulse
rooted in a transcendent metaphysic that is more or less universally binding” (Hunter 1996, 245). These values, rooted in goodness and universalistic truth, lead to cultural isolation (Chapter two) as exhibited by a lack of civic engagement (Chapter three) and a lack of support for government programs such as Charitable Choice at the individual and congregational level (Chapter four). Every minister that self-identified themselves as a theological conservative also identified as a conservative in the political ideology spectrum.

At the other end of the theological spectrum is the Protestant evangelical theological liberal sub-culture which “espouses a culturally progressive impulse that grounds moral authority in human experience” (Hunter 1996, 245) by rejecting universals and embracing contingent standards. These values are demonstrated in the quantitative analysis section of this dissertation: the more liberal Protestant evangelicals become the more likely they are to volunteer (Chapter three) and support Charitable Choice (Chapters three and four). Forty-one percent (41%) of those Protestant evangelicals, who identified as being theologically liberal, also identified themselves as being politically liberal. An additional forty-one percent (41%) identified as being politically moderate.

In the middle of the continuum, those who are theologically moderate, adhere to both a mixture of conservatism and modernity. Often referred to as “free-style” evangelicals or “neo-evangelicals”, this sub-culture relishes selected traditional stances (opposition to gay marriage and abortion) but rejects the notion that all scripture is relevant to the time choosing instead to be selective of which Bible verses are applicable (Smidt 2002). All the Protestant evangelical ministers who identified themselves as being
theologically moderate also identified themselves as being politically moderate in ideology choosing which issue to focus in on and which issues do not warrant the spending of religious capital. Thus, it is easy to see how theological convictions and beliefs drive culture and politics.

Furthermore, Meirer (1994) notes that the theological dimensions imposed on cultural practices and public policy issues create a concern among religious individuals. This concern is seen in that their “deeply held values are being threatened, leading to passionate highly salient styles of politics, in which both sides engage in simplified and value based discourse” (7-8). Herein lies the paradox. The biblical context strongly endorses caring for the poor and the disadvantaged by religious people of all faiths yet consistent with the findings seen in the previous chapters; conservative Protestant evangelicals do not support Charitable Choice. What role does conservative theology have on welfare policy? Do Protestants evangelicals, and in particular, conservative Protestant evangelicals, consider welfare to be a moral issue?

Welfare Politics and Protestants: A Moral Responsibility to Assist Others?

One of the underlying questions to be addressed before we can understand the nuances between Charitable Choice and conservative Protestant evangelical sub-cultures deals with the minister’s view of welfare. As noted in Chapter four, Protestant evangelical clergy have the opportunity and the resources to serve as political activists due in part to their pew-cues and perceived high moral character. Protestants have a proven track record of assisting the poor through individual acts of kindness and
congregational giving. However, when asked to partner with government, the enthusiasm for the poor appears to wane.

Reasons for this lack of support is evident in a multiple reasoning process utilized by Protestant evangelical ministers representing various Protestant evangelical sub-cultures to determine if this warrants the expenditure of religious capital or if they should reject the notion of working with government to address the needs of the poor. This multiple reasoning process focuses on three tenets: theological (interpretation of the scripture), productivity (work focused) and race (minority focused).

How one views themselves on the conservative theological scale has a major impact on how they view government welfare. The more conservative one’s theological convictions and beliefs are, the harsher they view those on welfare. In more than 80% of the interviews conducted with conservative Protestant evangelical ministers, Bible verses were quoted when asked to express their views on welfare. Seven noted that Jesus said “you will always have the poor with you” signifying they were not responsible for fixing the problems of poverty. Pringle is representative of the Protestant evangelical conservative theological mindset:

When I hear the word welfare I think of people who cannot help themselves. We have welfare all wrong. It is meant for people who cannot help themselves. Welfare as God intended it is short-term assistance not a life-style. Jesus said you will always have the poor among you so we can’t solve every problem.

However, among those with a liberal theological viewpoint, this verse is appears to be a rallying cry for helping the poor. Maroni notes:
Welfare is a good thing. Jesus said you will always have the poor among you and it is our job as Christians to help people in trouble. Is it abused? You bet! But when a kid is hungry, a kid is hungry. We need to educate our children. We need to teach them reading and math, not sex education. The more we educate the more we deplete our welfare system and the better it is. It’s really just that simple.

A second tenet for interpreting Protestant evangelical ministers feeling for welfare centers on the question of productivity. In this case, one can see the meshing of the theological tenet and the productivity tenet as Protestant evangelical conservative ministers express displeasure with those on the welfare rolls. Four ministers quoted the passage from II Thessalonians 3:10: “He that worketh not neither let him eat”. Clyde, a self-identified theological conservative exemplifies this feeling in the following conversation:

C: I think the first word that comes to mind when I hear the word “welfare” is actually two words, “government abuse”.

E: Really? In what ways?

C: Well, there are lots of people that are on welfare that do not belong there. You see them buying all kinds of things in a grocery store using food stamps and then they get into fairly nice cars. Something in that equation doesn’t make sense. Now, don’t get me wrong, a lot of those people on welfare can’t help it but some can—they choose to live that way. We have a lot of people in this area that have been on welfare all their lives. Paul said that “he that worketh not, neither let him eat”. That’s how it is supposed to be. It’s not meant to be the other way.
Andrew, from a conservative Protestant evangelical denomination in Ohio adds:

Some descriptive words to describe welfare are “abuse of the system”, “laziness”, “irresponsibility” and “degrading”. Welfare should be a form to actually help people back on their feet, not something to encourage laziness. It is especially prominent in families that have many teen pregnancies. These teens and their families feel that they can abuse the system by having more children. In the end it is nothing more than a bad habit.

The variation within Protestant sub-cultures is plainly visible when one considers the thoughts of Tursi, the theological moderate:

T: Welfare to me can mean government handouts “to the poorest among us” but in its essence it still means to me an attempt to distribute the goods of the plentiful to those most in need. In recent years, the reform of welfare has been an attempt to regulate the injustices of the system.

E: Do you think that people on welfare lack moral guidance and a work ethic?

T: Sometimes this is very true. When I was a social worker I found out that welfare provided an “out” for persons to avoid responsibility to family and society. While the reforms of the welfare system have been attempts to rectify the abuses of the system, I still meet many good and fine people who use welfare to provide a sustainable level of living as they pursue work and educational goals.

Indeed, “B”, a liberal Protestant evangelical concurs noting that when they think of welfare they think of “single mothers and poor people. I also feel badly when I think about welfare, because I think it is a great cause and a good idea but many take advantage
of the system”. Wright a self-proclaimed Protestant evangelical liberal concurs noting, “I am old enough to remember when welfare programs started in our area. It was a welcome relief for many… it helps millions, many people who truly need and depend on the welfare system cannot make it day to day without help.” Wright’s and B’s comments and feelings are representative of the sample population as a whole with exception of the conservative Protestant evangelicals. Twenty-six of the respondents (72%) primarily Protestant evangelical moderates and liberals feel that a lack of morality or lack of a work ethic is not an issue related to welfare.

The third and final tenet in the reasoning process focuses on race. Nine (9) of the Protestant ministers, who self-identified as being either spiritual, biblical correct or theologically conservative, also felt that race was a major issue in government welfare. Emerson and Smith (2000) contend that it is the conservative Protestants emphasis on individualism, free will and personal relationships that makes invisible the pervasive injustice that perpetuates racial inequality. In the case of Emerson and Smith (2000), they find that their subjects expressed the idea that repentance and the conversion of the sinful individuals at fault could solve problems of race. Watchman, a self-proclaimed “biblical/spiritual” Protestant evangelical conservative from Kentucky states:

Well, most of the people in this area are white and they work real hard and they do not have housing projects to live in. All we see a lot of the time is a minority on welfare living in the inner city so I guess many times the natural instinct is to associate welfare with minorities. All we saw following Katrina was stories on
how blacks were disadvantaged and how poor they are. We got poor people right here in the mountains and nothings been done for them.

CC, from central West Virginia adds:

Well, I’m not racist and I don’t mean to sound “mean” but a lot of people in this area that are on welfare as minorities and have no problem asking for assistance. A lot of people in Small-town$^{49}$ are very proud people and they are willing to work but just can’t find a job so they have to turn to the government. Others just turn to the government all the time.

To the nine (9) conservative Protestant evangelicals, welfare is clearly a violation of the Protestant work ethic, either causing people to lack individual motivation and responsibility, or catering to the human tendency to look for the easy road. It is also important to note that in several of the cases, government was also to blame as one contributing to the race issue. As C.C. noted, “it has to be blamed on the government. The government pays people to stay home and have babies.”

It is easy to see that for all Protestants ministers, welfare is a moral issue. For many conservative Protestants, primarily fundamentalists and evangelicals, welfare epitomizes and eroding away of the moral fabric of the country. To Protestant evangelical liberals and moderates, it is a moral issue of Christian responsibility. But does working in concert with the government to address the needs of the poor create new obstacles and division for Protestant evangelicalism regardless of their theological conservatism?

---

$^{49}$ To maintain confidentiality, the original name of the town has been changed to Smalltown.
Many religious groups, faith-based organizations and church leaders have expressed reservations about forming partnerships with the government through welfare reform programs such as Charitable Choice (Jewish News 1999; Pinkerton 1999; Raasch 1999; Berger 1996). Some fear that government assistance will lead to rivalries (Sherman 2000). Others are clearly concerned about the prospect of political regulation that might accompany public funding (Wuthnow 2004). And given the anti-proselytization clause that accompanies the Charitable Choice initiative, fears have arisen that acceptance of public funds will hamper the true mission of the church (Carlson-Thies, 1999). Coded interview data from the 36 ministers reveals that many of the issues that generate subcultures are prevalent in their reasoning processes as well.

First, all nineteen (19) self-identified conservative Evangelical ministers indicated concerns pertaining to the Charitable Choice Program. Those who preferred the descriptive terms “spiritual” or “biblical” all indicated that they objected to the government partnerships with churches on spiritual grounds. Watchman is representative of this group. He states:

Watchman: The Scriptures talk about giving to Caesar what is Caesars and giving to God what is God’s. There was a separation then and I think there should be a separation today. When the government gets involved they start regulating what you can and cannot do. Our mission is to preach the gospel- we cannot do that with Big Brother standing over us. Government can also be “dirty money”.

*What do you mean by dirty money?*
Watchman: Dirty money always leaves a sense of obligation… kinda like the Mafia or selling yourself out. It means you were bought out to someone else.

CC, a self-identified “spiritually correct” minister echoes these comments. He notes:

Well, we believe that there should be a separation of church and state. The church has a specific mission: to bring people to Christ. Government does government things. There is a big difference. Now that doesn’t mean we don’t care about the government. The Bible teaches us we should obey the government as long as it doesn’t violate God’s Word but the Church has the job of saving souls first and foremost. I think Charitable Choice violates God’s Word.

All conservative Protestant evangelical ministers (19) indicated either a concern over the separation of church and state, that it wasn’t biblical or that the real mission of the church is to teach and preach the Gospel first and foremost. Not surprisingly however, all nineteen (19) ministers indicated that their church presently engaged in a short-term relief program for those in need with stipulations. When queried, each minister indicated that they had different requirements for providing assistance- most were very informal.

Williams, a “spiritual” minister described the stipulations and circumstances in this manner:

*If someone comes to your church requesting assistance, how do you go about helping?*

WW: If they are members, we already have a general idea about their well being. We try to help them before the situation gets too bad.

*What about non-members?*
WW: Well, we would have a business meeting of the men and see what the situation was and what they felt was appropriate. If the feeling was they would abuse the money, we probably wouldn’t give them cash money.

By abusing the money, you mean?

WW: Purchasing cigarettes or beer. I would feel bad knowing my money went to purchase those kinds of things.

Williams’ feelings were uniform across the Protestant evangelical conservative spectrum with those indicating stronger levels of conservatism being more concerned about their generosity being abused. Pring added, “We would help them spiritually by teaching them the Word of God and we would help them physically by addressing their needs within reason”. It is important to note that this feeling of being taken advantage of is not limited strictly to the high levels of theological conservatism. Pastor Hall, from Ohio, noted that in his area there were “professional beggars who jump from church to church on a monthly basis” while “Bible M” discussed that his congregational leadership was considering an application process for assistance.

There is a huge difference between Protestant evangelicals who consider themselves conservative theologically and those who consider themselves to be theologically moderate or liberal when it pertains to Charitable Choice. Eleven (11) out of the 17 ministers interviewed indicated they would support Charitable Choice and four (4) indicated they would provisional support it, with only two (2) indicating they would not. Tursi, a self-identified theological moderate Protestant evangelical describes his reasons for supporting Charitable Choice in this manner:
I believe that churches could do a better job in food distribution and the sharing of resources than the government. I do have concerns about the type of churches that would be involved. Churches that use a “carrot on a stick” approach to distributing food to those that repent, etc. would cause me great concern. Yet, the traditional charitable church organizations manage these programs in a fitting and responsible manner.

Morales, identified as a theological liberal confirms the feelings of Tursi when interviewed:

I feel that it is a great idea for the use of government money. The government is not giving the money to the church; it is giving it to the poor. The church is simply a helpful group that is organizing it and giving their time. They are not giving it only to the poor people of their faith. They are giving it to all people who are hungry. I believe that this is such a great way to help out. I now that other people will say that a line is crossed between separation of church and state, but I do not believe so. If the government were giving the church money for their church programs, this would be a boundary crossed. However, the church is simply helping the poor. Poor people in general do not have one certain faith.

The four (4) that indicated they would support it provisionally indicated that if the issues of church and state were addressed providing clearer boundaries they would endorse Charitable Choice while the two (2) that said they would not support it provided these reasons:
Kraemer: In addition to the concerns over separation of church and state, we really have to ask ourselves if this isn’t becoming a substitute for church work to begin with. Isn’t this what we should be doing without government assistance?

Oblak: Pretty soon, government will be taking over the church. They say there is not a separation issue but I don’t believe it. It would be a major concern for our congregation.

Findings: Conservative Theology Leads to Lack of Interest and Support

The evidence from the 36 interviews indicates that increased levels of conservative theology lead to a form of secularization and a lack of support for Charitable Choice. These findings are further bolstered by the logistical regression analysis conducted in Chapters three and four, which should that theological convictions and beliefs, serves as a major determinant in participation levels and support for Charitable Choice. Nineteen (19) of the thirty six (36) Protestant evangelical ministers identified as being theological conservative and all nineteen (19) indicated their lack of support for Charitable Choice. Furthermore, of those that self identified as being theologically liberal, nine (9) of the twelve (12) ministers endorsed the concept and partnership with government entities but did not use scripture. These findings lend support for the role theological conservatism/liberalism plays as it pertains to the Charitable Choice Program. The depth of the interviews allows for this to occur.

The interviews also show how theology serves as the foundational basis for perceptions pertaining to government and culture. As noted in this chapter and evident in
Chapters 3 and 4, Protestants mesh their theological views to determine levels of civic engagement and political action in varying degrees. Fifteen (15) of the nineteen (19) conservative Protestant evangelical ministers (79%) specifically mention not supporting Charitable Choice based on theological or scriptural grounds. Two (2) of the those self-identified as being theologically moderate (40%) and only 16% of those identified as being theologically liberal identified scriptural reasons for not supporting Charitable Choice. All ministers that opposed Charitable Choice did so by combining their theological beliefs with government insecurity regardless of their levels of conservatism.

Nitz, a minister with liberal views states the following:

I’m somewhat leery of government money. Often there are strings attached. Our churches, colleges and camps do not receive government money due to this. I realize President Bush has tried to assist faith-based charities and I commend him for this. If we’d accept the money for a food program, would they bury us in paperwork? Would they allow us to speak out against cohabitation, homosexuality or other spiritual/moral issues? Would force us to alter our sanctuary? Would they have us eliminate a presentation of the Gospel?

Andrews, a Protestant evangelical pastor with conservative theological beliefs raises the same concerns as Nitz:

Our church feels that its primary focus needs to be evangelism. We run ideas and suggestions through that as a filter in deciding what to do and what not to do. There are many “good causes” but if there’s a risk of the cause becoming the focus then we don’t want to cloud our mission. We do participate in benevolent
programs but they are funded with charity and personal contributions. I think
Jesus acknowledges government in his day but he didn’t take up a crusade for the
slaves or the poor—he helped them along the way.

And finally Gjerde, a theologically moderate Protestant evangelical notes:

I am concerned about the separation of church and state. For the same reasons that
we do not pay property taxes on churches and parsonages, we ought not to receive
money for charitable programs. More importantly, if we receive money from the
government, we become dependent on the funding and it ties our hands in such a
way to limit us from speaking prophetically against the government if and when
God calls us to do so.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided a ‘thick description’ behind the reasons conservatism
matter as it pertains to certain social service programs such as Charitable Choice.
Furthermore, this chapter adds texture and richness to the finding of the quantitative
results found in Chapters three and four. Conservative theological beliefs and practices
serve as a driving force behind the creation of Protestant sub-cultures and the degree of
community involvement each Protestant evangelical sub-culture is willing to engage in.
Based on the findings from Chapters three, four and five, it would appear that Charitable
Choice is not viewed by many to be a program that warrants strategic intervention.
Furthermore, this data suggests that conservative theological beliefs and practices, while
it continues to be an issue of embattlement for many; it is viewed by the Protestant
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This chapter examined how Protestant evangelical ministers feel about government/faith-based partnerships and the role theological conservatism and political ideology might play in the process. Two main findings emerged. First, perceptions of governmental programs are measured through theology affect one’s support for that program. While upfront that seems self-explanatory, one can see the “richness of contextual images” (Gubruim and Holsten 1997) through the views expressed by the interviewees of the existing welfare program. The perception that welfare is a minority program, that it is a question of morality and that it violates biblical scripture demonstrates the situational context in which welfare is viewed. Secondly, and perhaps most important, levels of conservative theology play a major role in public policy delivery and implementation. Substantiated and triangulated from findings in Chapters three and four, levels of theological conservatism affect participation levels of Charitable Choice.

These conclusions are not limited to the study of Charitable Choice. It is common sense that religious theology, whether conservative or liberal, gives people a stable, ultimate, core identity, a major trait that “defines the person in all social settings whether we see and hear the trait or not” (Litcherman 2005, 218; see also Ammerman 2003, 1997). Conservative theology matters as it pertains to religious identity, especially in the group setting as developed by the minister or leader. That does not invalidate people’s own perception of group identity and denominational influence. It does, however, suggest
that public policy entrepreneurs can and should learn new things when one’s level of theological conservatism is examined. Instead of viewing Protestant evangelicals as a monolith, we should be aware of their religious diversity. Instead of taking for granted the common view that theology is a silent, static body of religious denominational identity that is ever present for people religious people, we can learn that conservative theology is “a collection of potentially different kinds of cultural expressions” (Litcher 2005, 218) for different types of public policy programs.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Conclusion

This dissertation has investigated the relationship between Protestant evangelical sub-cultures and Charitable Choice. This valuable examination possesses future policy implications, especially in light of the sweeping reforms presently being implemented in the social welfare policy arena at the federal and state level. Moreover, because Charitable Choice has been promoted as an opportunity to “level the playing field” between government entities and faith-based organizations; findings here have potential implications for whether faith-based welfare reform policies, in this case, community churches and religious non-profits, can be effective in addressing the needs of the poor. As noted in the introduction, there has been serious and often-contentious debate about the role religious institutions should play in social service delivery. Prior programs such as the Johnson’s War on Poverty, Nixon’s Family Assistance Plan and Carter’s Program for Better Jobs and Incomes, failed to materialize into the revolutionary welfare reform initiatives that had been visualized. The existing literature on welfare reform and Charitable Choice indicates that there are numerous multifaceted and interrelated factors associated with the effectiveness of programs aimed and eliminating poverty and feeding the poor. Comprehensive solutions, which address the multifaceted and interconnected aspects, are required but little is truly known about the desires and abilities of religious
organizations, particularly those of the Protestant evangelical tradition, to fully meet the needs of the poor. Given the non-monolithic characteristics of the Protestant evangelical tradition and their historical track record of assisting the poor, there remains a question concerning Protestant evangelical sub-cultures and the role their theological convictions and beliefs play in their desire to actively engage in government sponsored social service programs such as Charitable Choice.

To explore these issues, I conducted a mixed-methods approach using quantitative analysis of two national surveys, Religion and Politics Survey (2001) and the National Congregations Survey (2000). Using binary logit regression analysis, Chapters three and four evaluated variables related to volunteer participation at the individual and congregational levels, inside and outside of one’s church. This analysis served as foundational groundwork as subsequent analysis focused on individuals and congregations’ willingness to endorse and participate in Charitable Choice, a welfare reform program that relies heavily on individual and congregational support for existence. Next, through the use of interactive interviews, thirty-six evangelical leaders were queried about their theological and political beliefs as it pertained to their perception of welfare and government sponsored programs for the poor. Finally, questions were asked that probed their perspective of Charitable Choice and investigated their potential conflicts in participation.

Much of the literature related to the involvement of religious entities in the civic engagement activity focuses on the mainline Protestant faith, their administrative capacity and the success of services rendered. Primarily through quantitative approaches,
research indicates that political ideology; educational attainment and religiosity serve as major determinants in participation levels and commitment. This dissertation demonstrates that in addition to these variables, the level of theological conservatism meshed with one’s interpretation of the Scriptures provides some support for the variation in different levels of support for social service programs. Protestant evangelical fundamentalists and Protestant evangelicals with strict interpretation of the Scriptures, coupled with high levels of theological conservatism, are significantly more likely to oppose existing governmental welfare programs and the collaborative partnerships offered through the Charitable Choice initiative. Also, residing in areas of high concentrations of poverty, such as central Appalachia, had little effect on increasing the urgency of addressing the needs of the poor through faith-based collaborative partnerships with the government.

At first glance, there appears to be a profusion of research, which examines the role of faith-based organizations, and the effectiveness of Charitable Choice. However, upon closer analysis, findings indicate that there is limited research on factors related to the success of Charitable Choice and partial findings on the variation that exists in participation levels between and within various denominations. Furthermore, although theological conservatism and interpretation of the Scriptures is the key explanatory variable in explaining the plethora of religious denominations, this dissertation is the only research I am aware of which attempts to understand the relationship between theological conservatism and the perceived moral responsibility of feeding the poor.
The Relationship of Protestant Evangelicals to Charitable Choice

As a precursor to analyzing the relationship between Protestant evangelical sub-cultures and Charitable Choice, Chapter two focused on the evolution of the welfare state and the historical relationship between religious entities and poverty relief. Chapter 2 notes that poor laws have made a comeback—though now through a more sophisticated contractual order. Welfare reform legislation of 1996 pushed not only the “devolution revolution” (Nathan 1996) but strangely enough thrust us back into the Elizabethan past of poor laws and local oversight— if not overseers. Through the experimentation “in the laboratory of American democracy” (see Schram 1999), welfare reform permits state governments to partner with religious organizations in every sense of the word to deliver a wide variety of social services to the disadvantaged through Charitable Choice. In addition to highlighting the role of mainline Protestant denominations willingness to feed the poor through charitable societies, congregational programs and philanthropic services, this chapter noted the willingness of conservative Protestant sub-cultures to strategically position themselves on the fringe of social service programming due to a perceived conflict in theological secularization. Chapter two concluded by noting that the Charitable Choice relies upon huge amounts of volunteering and local support requiring conservative Protestant evangelical sub-cultures to reposition themselves moving from the fringe of social service programming to a more active role in the center.

Chapter three then focused on the willingness and participatory levels of five Protestant evangelical sub-cultures to volunteer. Although there have been numerous articles written describing volunteering and religious individuals, including Protestants
(Djupe and Gilbert 2006; Campbell 2004; Uslaner 2002; Park and Smith 2000), this research is the first to examine specific sub-cultures within the Protestant evangelical faith and to incorporate Lam’s (2002) dimensions of religiosity. Findings from the initial analysis show that the participatory, theological and affiliative dimensions of religiosity affected voluntary participation levels. Not surprisingly, the more conservative Protestant evangelicals become, the more likely they are to isolate themselves from society, a chief characteristic of a conservative Protestant evangelical sub-culture and as such, the less likely they are to volunteer. This chapter then made the linkage between volunteering and Charitable Choice. Once again, two major determinants surface that have major impacts on support for Charitable Choice- the level of conservative theology and a concern for the separation of church and state (constitutionality). The policy implications of chapter three are profound- Protestant evangelical sub-cultures, who use conservative beliefs and practices as a basis for differentiation from other sub-cultures with the Protestant and religious world, are less likely to support government programs that involve some form of partnership.

Chapter four centered on the role of the Protestant evangelical minister in the creation of the opinions pertaining to civic engagement/volunteering activities and Charitable Choice. Ministers have demonstrated a keen awareness about community, political and social issues and have served as advocates for change for generations. Utilizing the National Congregations Survey (2000), ministers representing the five sub-cultures of the Protestant evangelical faith were asked questions pertaining to community involvement and Charitable Choice. Findings show that two Protestant evangelical sub-
cultures, Protestant fundamentalists and Protestant evangelicals, were less likely to support civic engagement activities and programs requiring collaboration with government officials than were liberal Protestants. The two key determinants identified were conservative theology and a concern over the constitutionality of faith-based programs. Findings show that the more conservative Protestant evangelicals become, the less likely they are to support welfare reform programs such as Charitable Choice. Concerns over the violation of biblical laws and issues pertaining to the ‘biblical worthiness’ of recipients serves as key issues within the conservative Protestant evangelical sub-cultures.

Chapter five utilized the findings from Chapters three and four to better understand the role theology and governmental resistance plays as it pertains to faith-based partnerships and Protestant evangelical sub-cultures. Through the conducting of thirty-six interviews, conservative Protestant evangelical ministers indicated that their unwillingness to participate in Charitable Choice was attributed to their strict interpretation of the Bible, their belief that welfare, in many cases as presently structured, was not biblical and their concern over the intrusion of government into their mission of teaching and saving the lost.

The research design of this dissertation provides a sound empirical demonstration of a mixed methods approach of social science inquiry. Through the utilization of individual level data obtained from a national survey and combined with national congregational data, this dissertation offers a view into the world of Protestant evangelical sub-cultures in matters pertaining to meeting one’s perceived moral
responsibility of feeding the poor and utilizing government programs to fulfill those obligations. By using qualitative research, the interviewing of thirty-six Protestant evangelical ministers, the quantitative findings are triangulated with qualitative research to develop a thick description of the role theology and Protestant evangelical sub-cultures play in addressing the needs of the poor.

Policy Implications

Charitable Choice programs are unique given their local flexibility and control, their religious involvement and their substantial governmental financial assistance. In essence, Charitable Choice seeks to improve the quality of life for those who are disadvantaged through partnering of local religious organizations and churches with exiting governmental institutions and service delivery agencies. At the center of the wealth of local social capital and volunteer capacity rests the local Protestant evangelical church or congregation. This dissertation shows that while the Protestant faith, as a whole, is a repository of social capital, sub-cultures within the Protestant evangelical tradition, have differences of opinion as it pertains to church involvement in governmental and community programs such as Charitable Choice.

As a result of this study, I have begun to sort out some of the ambiguities of how theology matters for programs related to poverty relief and ultimately others policy outcomes. Previous research has treated the Protestant evangelical tradition as a monolith accepting the notion that all Protestant evangelicals believed in the same manner and that these specific beliefs resulted in a uniform approach to government policy and governmental programs. This dissertation finds that new Protestant
evangelical sub-cultures are being generated on a regular and frequent basis with the
interpretation of biblical scriptures and theology serving as the filter. This dissertation
finds that Protestantism, especially protestant evangelicalism is a myriad of sub-cultures
further divided into numerous other sub-cultures and that Protestant evangelicalism is not
a monolith rather it is a mosaic.

Furthermore, this dissertation’s findings bring about additional questions
regarding governmental programs aimed at addressing effective poverty programs. Given
the empirical results that show that variation is present within various Protestant
evangelical sub-cultures organizations and churches in their support for governmental
sponsored partnerships, we see that their exists a concern over the legality and
constitutionality of Charitable Choice. While bottom-up strategies of program
implementation appear to be effective in other matters of public policy, it is clear that the
concerns surrounding Charitable Choice are real; a more concerted effort needs to be put
forth by local officials and policy-makers regarding the components and opportunities
involving Charitable Choice and faith-based programs. Given the limited amount of
research on the role of theology in the implementation of public policy programs such as
Charitable Choice, conservative theology and Protestant evangelical sub-cultures, with
their complexity and interrelated factors, warrant specific situational approaches with
substantial input from Protestant evangelical ministers and members to continually
develop programs that are effective and sensitive to the beliefs of those asked to
implement said services.
Because Charitable Choice involves a conglomeration of resources at the local level (financial, human and in-kind) that are required to collaborate in some manner, close attention is to be paid to the theological beliefs and values as it pertains to the service delivery components of faith-based programming. Can the voucher system be expanded to eliminate the exchange of funds between churches and government entities? Can Protestant evangelical churches, conservative and liberal alike, serve as referral agencies in lieu of service delivery sites? Can additional program adjustments be made that alleviate the concern over constitutionality issues? Finally, can the “armies of compassion” muster up support to engage in the war on poverty while continuing to address their core needs of the Protestant evangelical?

The picture that emerges from these results shows that those who live in the poorest communities of Appalachia experience the least positive effects of Charitable Choice. Just as concentrated poverty areas in Appalachia are confined to the geographical restrictions of mountains and hilly terrain, the high levels of conservative Protestantism prevalent in the multitude of churches appears to magnify the limited availability of jobs and social mobility. This suggests that not only should poverty relief programs be targeted with specific Protestant evangelical sub-cultures and other religious faiths in mind but in the long-term, however, the present structure of faith-based programs will not address the many facets of poverty relief in conservative Protestant evangelical communities. To address the role of conservative beliefs and practices in the delivery of poverty relief programs in rural communities, residents need to recognize the role of ALL churches in meeting the needs of the poor and government officials need make a
concerted effort to work with ALL churches in a flexible manner. After all, Protestant evangelical churches are a mosaic not a monolith and government programs need to be developed accordingly.
APPENDIX A

VIEWS OF PROTESTANT MINISTERS
AS IT PERTAINS TO WELFARE AND THOSE ON WELFARE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Ideology</th>
<th>Views Pertaining to Welfare</th>
<th>Lack Moral Guidance</th>
<th>Welfare a Race Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daughtery</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Negative; abuse by participants</td>
<td>some do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible M</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Negative; abuse and dependency</td>
<td>most lack moral guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belling</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Negative; abuse and dependency</td>
<td>Yes- worketh not neither let him eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Negative; it’s a choice to be on welfare</td>
<td>Yes- worketh not neither let him eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Negative; bureaucracy</td>
<td>Some do; by choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pring</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Negative: people choose not to work</td>
<td>Yes: worketh not, neither let him eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strick</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Negative: system of abuse and dependency</td>
<td>Not always; some “good people” on welfare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Negative; people chose not to work</td>
<td>Some do; moral wrong not to work, he that worketh not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchman</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Should be a short-term program; creates abuse</td>
<td>Yes; lack moral strength and teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Negative: overstretched and abused</td>
<td>Some circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.C.</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Government Program; abuse and dependency</td>
<td>Yes; Lack guidance and are often lazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Negative; people who chose not to work</td>
<td>Yes; He that worketh not neither let him eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyder</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Should only be for the “real” needy</td>
<td>Some do; Lack of education and spiritually poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shue</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Abuse of Government; not intended to be a life-style</td>
<td>Yes; most lack a moral foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Views of Protestant Ministers as it Pertains to Welfare and Those on Welfare (Continued)

|        |            |                        |                                              |  
|--------|------------|------------------------|----------------------------------------------|---|
| Sass   | Conservative | Negative; abuses and entitlements | Some; Often chose not to work; wrong to have this attitude | No |
| Pastor Pete | Conservative | Way of life; sad; abuse | Some do; others don’t | No |
| PJ     | Conservative | Abuse; on-going         | Some do, some can’t help it                   | No |
| Pastor Hall | Conservative | Recently it is being abused; we “owe” them | Some make bad choices; others choose | No |
| WW     | Conservative | Negative; often abused  | Most of the time                              | No |
| Bevill | Conservative | Needed; provides assistance | No; poor choices does not make them immoral. | No |
| Maroni | Conservative | Great program; needed   | NO, immorality and poverty are not equal      | No- (Most that I know are white.) |
| Gjerde | Moderate    | People struggling; can be abused | No                                      | No |
| Tursi  | Moderate    | Government helping the poorest | Some do; most cannot help their situation | No |
| Wright | Moderate    | Culture of dependency   | No                                      | No |
| LT     | Moderate    | Often portrayed as lazy but not always | Not necessarily; that’s what we choose to look at | No |
| Mitchem| Moderate    | Great asset; we have a jaded perception | Some maybe; third generation is not good. | No |
| Bran   | Moderate    | Very good program; empowers people to succeed | Some do; most do not | No |
| Kenreigh | Moderate   | Program for the poor    | No, very few maybe.                        | No |
| Oblak  | Moderate    | Helping those disadvantaged | Some maybe; most do not.                    | No |
Views of Protestant Ministers as it Pertains to Welfare and Those on Welfare (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Assistance to the poor</th>
<th>Some may be; most are not lacking values.</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Government programs; WIC, etc.</td>
<td>No; children cannot help it.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraemer</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Bureaucracy; welfare</td>
<td>Some do</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyn</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Sad that program exists</td>
<td>No, no way!</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morales</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Compassion for the needy; valuable</td>
<td>No, dangerous to typecast people.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitz</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Government programs for the poor</td>
<td>No- not usually the case</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“B”</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Very good opportunity for people; good program</td>
<td>Some do; always a bad apple in the barrel</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

VIEWS OF PROTESTANT MINISTERS
AS IT PERTAINS TO CHARITABLE CHOICE
Views of Protestant Ministers as it Pertains to Charitable Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Theology-</th>
<th>Concerns of Charitable Choice</th>
<th>Support Charitable Choice</th>
<th>Presently Providing Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daughtery</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Reliance Forms; Dependency</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible M</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Government Partnership can be costly</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beling</td>
<td>Conservative (biblical; spiritual)</td>
<td>Violates scripture; not the function of the church to partner. Dirty money</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde</td>
<td>Conservative (biblical; spiritual)</td>
<td>Scripturally wrong; separation of church and state is an issue.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Conservative (biblical; spiritual)</td>
<td>Separation of church and state; mission of the church?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pring</td>
<td>Conservative (spiritual)</td>
<td>Church mission is to teach Christ</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strick</td>
<td>Conservative (spiritual)</td>
<td>Concern over Church and State</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Could be dirty money; separation of church and state</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchman</td>
<td>Conservative (scriptural; biblical)</td>
<td>Partnerships are not Biblical</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Conservative (spiritual)</td>
<td>Concern over Churches role with government</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.C.</td>
<td>Conservative (spiritually correct)</td>
<td>Separation; take money you are controlled, not church role</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Not churches job to partner with government</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td>Views</td>
<td>Support for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyder</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Government restrictions hurt delivery of Gospel.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shue</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Wrong to partner; government needs to be separate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sass</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Wrong to mix church and state; churches mission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor Pete</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Separation of church and state</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Separation of Church and State</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor Hall</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Separation Issues</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Separation Concerns</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gjerde</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Separation of Church and State</td>
<td>Maybe- separation issues addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tursi</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Great idea; would support</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Yes; we should already be doing it.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Can we fulfill our mission? If so, all for it.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchem</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Separation of Church and State</td>
<td>Maybe- separation issues addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bran</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Finally, good use of government $$</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“B”</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Separation of Church and State</td>
<td>Doubtful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevill</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Great idea!</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Separation of church and state a concern</td>
<td>Maybe- need more specifics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Views of Protestant Ministers as it Pertains to Charitable Choice (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Issues Addressed</th>
<th>Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Strings attached?</td>
<td>Maybe- separation issues addressed</td>
<td>Short-term and long term programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraemer</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Substitute for church doing what it should be?</td>
<td>No- separation issues addressed</td>
<td>Short-term and long term programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyn</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Will it create an alliance?</td>
<td>Maybe- separation issues addressed</td>
<td>Short-term and long term programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morales</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Great idea.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Short-term and long term programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitz</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Great idea but have to be careful</td>
<td>Yes-with caution</td>
<td>Short-term and long term programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblak</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Church is taken over by government?</td>
<td>No- separation issues addressed</td>
<td>Short-term Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenreigh</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Great if workable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Short-term and long term programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maroni</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Yes, great idea!</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Short-term presently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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