Wilfrid Laurier University

Scholars Commons @ Laurier

Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)

2009

Assessing Tangible Support Efforts in English Canadian Christian Church Communities

Dana M. Friesen
Wilfrid Laurier University

Recommended Citation

Friesen, Dana M., "Assessing Tangible Support Efforts in English Canadian Christian Church Communities" (2009). *Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)*. 932.
https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd/932

Library and Archives
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

NOTICE:

AVIS:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

ASSESSING TANGIBLE SUPPORT EFFORTS IN
ENGLISH CANADIAN CHRISTIAN CHURCH COMMUNITIES

by

Dana M. Friesen

Hon. B.A. Global Studies and Psychology, Wilfrid Laurier University, 2005

THESIS

Submitted to the Lyle S. Hallman Faculty of Social Work
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Social Work

Wilfrid Laurier University

2009

Dana M. Friesen © 2009

Abstract

This thesis was inspired by one family's need for support and how it came to be expressed and negotiated within their faith community. The purpose of this study was to survey English-speaking, Christian congregations across Canada in order to discover the range of tangible social supports available to congregants. Tangible supports were defined as practical (i.e. acts of service), material, and social/emotional support. An important component in this study was to identify strengths and gaps in the development and mobilization of congregational supports, as expressed by church leaders. Another important aspect included the exploration of church leaders' and their congregations' theological beliefs about the church's role in providing these supports to congregants. Participants (n = 206) included men and women aged 20 and older, from 10 provinces and two territories. All participants occupied positions of leadership or administration in their respective congregations, and represented 27 Christian denominations. A mixed-method approach combined closed- and open-ended questions in a 61-item survey about practical, material and social/emotional church ministries, potential strengths and gaps in these ministries, and related doctrinal beliefs. Participants reported a wide range of tangible supports offered by and for their own congregants. Four overarching themes emerged from the qualitative data: Values, Processes, Resources and Tangible Services. Each of these themes encompassed numerous strengths and challenges which influenced church leaders' and congregations' ability to develop and deliver supports to adequately meet church members' needs. Participants also shared a wide range of Scriptural and doctrinal beliefs to reinforce the importance of the congregation's role in helping its members in tangible ways.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Anne Westhues, for her wisdom and guidance in the midst of a challenging family situation, and numerous changes to my research design. I wish to acknowledge my other committee members, Dr. Brice Balmer, Dr. Peter Dunn, and Dr. Tom O'Connor, whose flexibility, kind support and insightful suggestions also improved my thesis and helped me to exceed my goals for this work.

This research came to life out of my parents' struggle to find support within their faith community in the midst of startlingly isolating and heartbreaking struggles. This thesis is dedicated to my parents in gratitude for their lifelong example of managing hardship with optimism and compassion, for their encouragement to think critically and inquisitively, and for the love and resilience they have infused in our family over the years. It is also dedicated to my husband, Joel, and to my brother, Jared, for the unimaginable sacrifices they have made so that this thesis could be possible. I also wish to thank those friends and extended family members who offered their time and resources in order to see my family through this process.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

"Much of what we do, we simply do out of unspoken but assumed rationale. It behoves us to consider our theology in an intentional manner as we make decisions about how and why we conduct our various ministries. Thank you for bringing this to my attention."
- A participant

A congregational declaration:

Beloved, in receiving these Christian brothers/sisters into our fellowship we do enter into solemn covenant and obligation. Let them never find occasion to be ashamed of any of us or disappointed by our lives or testimony. May they ever find this house of God a place of spiritual enrichment, encouragement and refuge. We should always be ready to receive them as brothers and sisters, bear their burdens in the love of Christ and share with them the deepest needs of life. All that the Word of God has led them to expect to find among the redeemed should be found here. We shall, by the grace of God, in receiving them into our fellowship, pledge to them in like manner as we have required them to pledge all that is consistent with a godly life. May our communion be sweet and our joy full.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Assessing Tangible Support Efforts in Canadian Churches

Local congregations remain the gathering place for sharing the good and difficult

things of life: weddings, baptisms, confirmations, bar mitzvahs, anniversaries, and

funerals. Particularly, in time of crisis, individuals, both the churched and the

unchurched, turn to the local congregation as a sustaining and enriching place in

their lives and as one of the more viable places for hope where they will find

community. (Dewey III, 1988, p. 126)

This was my family's hope when we entered a crisis four years ago. My father began to

exhibit symptoms of mercury-poisoning, leading to a series of events that negatively

affected my parents' physical, financial, and emotional well-being. My father lost his job

with only four months' severance pay, while my mother, a part-time employee in the

public education system, suddenly found herself in the position of sole bread-winner. As

she struggled to win more hours at her workplace, she realized that her husband was

increasingly unable to accomplish his usual daily tasks at home, which placed an

increasingly heavy burden on her shoulders. After two years of carrying feelings of guilt,

shame, loneliness and the desire to maintain a public image of self-sufficiency, my

parents were finally able to divulge their struggles to those in their social circles,

including friends, family, church members, neighbours, and co-workers. However, our

expectation that this new openness would result in an increase in offers of practical,

material and emotional support from my parents' community members did not come to

fruition, so their struggle against financial troubles, emotional stress, and declining health

continued. Their local church was routinely involved in programs and services to other members and the surrounding neighbourhood, yet it offered my parents no hope of reliable support through their ongoing crisis. Our family's experience begs the questions: What prevented my parents from proactively seeking support from their family and church community as soon as the crisis began? And what prevented their church community from proactively seeking ways to assist them throughout the crisis? These experiences form the primary motivation for this research.

      I have included a brief section on the epistemological perspective of this paper, where I describe a relatively new critical theory proposed by Zine (2004). My interest in this approach to social work research was sparked in a master-level class in the Cultural Analysis and Social Theory (CAST) program with Prof. Zine at Wilfrid Laurier University, in which common theories of truth and knowledge were critiqued through an anti-colonialist lens. Through these class discussions I became aware of relevant patterns in critical social work theory, upon which I expand in the Methodology section below.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Social Capital

       Defining social capital. My family's expectation of assistance from the church was rooted in the assumption that the congregation did possess resources such as time, energy, finances and materials. The church had mobilized these resources in the past to serve other needs within the congregation, such as various children's programs, fundraisers, and church-wide pot-luck meals, to name a few. We were aware that resources like these existed not only within my parents' faith community, but in others as well. The presence of such resources within a community is called 'social capital'. Saegert, Thompson, and Warren (2001) define social capital as

> the set of resources that inhere in relationships of trust and cooperation
> between people. These kinds of social assets do not alleviate poverty directly;
> rather, they leverage investments in human capital and household financial
> resources. (...) Social capital is a collective asset, a feature of communities,
> rather than the property of an individual. As such, individuals both contribute
> to it and use it, but they cannot own it. Because it is a "common good," social
> capital plays a particularly important role in ensuring those aspects of personal
> welfare that the individual alone can rarely provide (for example, security from
> crime and public health). (p. 1)

Silverman (2001) further states that social capital is formed and sustained by shared values, and "that social capital involves the mobilization of these values through

networks linked to kinship, ethnicity, occupation, class, neighborhood, and other ascribed characteristics in a manner that is flexible and responsive to local context" (p. 243).

However, there has been some disagreement surrounding the definition of social capital (e.g. Bjørnskov, 2008; Greeley, 1997). The earliest reference to social capital was by Hanifan (1916), who describes the concept as "good-will, fellowship, mutual sympathy and social intercourse among a group of individuals and families who make up a social unit" (p. 130). More recently, authors suggest that social capital centres around the potential for the mobilization of resources (e.g. Saegert, Thompson & Warren, 2001) within a social network, and that social relationships "enable cooperation for mutual benefit within societies or groups of people" (De Silva, Harpham, Huttly, Bartolini, & Penny, 2005, p. 20). Other definitions centre less on the potentiality for and enabling ability of resource mobilization within social networks, emphasizing instead the actual mobilization and use of these resources within the context of social relationships (e.g. Putnam, as cited in Young Larance, 2001).

De Silva and colleagues (2005) describe numerous additional subdivisions of social capital, such as structural social capital which "measures the quantity of social relationships, for example the number and type of social networks through group membership" (Bain and Hicks, as cited in De Silva et al., 2005, p. 20) and cognitive social capital which "measures the quality of social relationships, for example the norms of trust and reciprocity, sharing and support that characterize social networks" (p. 20).

Social capital has also been described according to various types of social relationships. For instance, it has been divided into family social capital, meaning the time, attention, energy and resources invested into children by their parents, and

community social capital, referring to the family's relationships with fellow neighbours and citizens, and with community organizations and institutions (Coleman, as cited in Ferguson, 2004). Coleman and Hoffer (as cited in Ferguson, 2004) also outline four components of community social capital as it relates to the child's well-being in the family context. These components are: 1) social support networks, 2) civic engagement in local institutions, 3) trust and safety, and 4) degree of religiosity (Coleman and Hoffer, as cited in Ferguson, 2004, p. 86). Meanwhile, numerous studies highlight the benefit of parental involvement in each of these components to children's well-being (Ferguson, 2004).

As well, social capital has been defined according to the level of familiarity in a relationship. For instance, social capital within a given social network, or between members who are similar to one another, has been referred to as bonding social capital, while social capital between members who are different from one another or are members of different networks, has been referred to as bridging social capital (Woolcock, as cited in De Silva et al., 2005, p. 20).

Lastly, the literature also describes social capital as being expressed uniquely in each socio-cultural, historical, political and economic context (e.g. De Silva et al., 2005), in which case it must also be defined and measured uniquely within each cultural context.

Faith-based social capital. From these definitions we know that the potential for social capital to develop within religious communities is great. Greeley (1997) confirms this, stating that "religion is (at least potentially) a powerful and enduring source of social capital in this country [i.e. the United States], and indeed of social capital that has socially and ethically desirable effects" (pp. 592-3). This is also true of the Canadian

context, as is illustrated by Bowen (as cited in Bibby, 2005, p. 7), for example, who states that:

> People who conclude that religious involvement is worth their while (...) give far more money to charities than other Canadians – beginning with their churches. What's more, they also are far more likely than other people to engage in community volunteer work. The 20% of highly religiously committed individuals in Canada are responsible for about 50% of all charitable donations and 40% of all volunteered hours.

Faith-based social capital has been examined in studies exploring its mobilization for the delivery of formal and informal social support in faith communities and surrounding neighbourhoods, in both religious and secular contexts (Greeley, 1997).

While social capital varies in definition and expression, its purpose remains consistent across all contexts, namely "mutual benefit within societies or groups of people" (De Silva et al., 2005, p. 20), with the key being its availability. As Boisjoly, Duncan, and Hofferth (1995) explain:

> Although similar to social exchange and social support networks, social capital differs from them in that it is the existence of the relationship that is important, not the amount of actual exchange that occurs. Social capital may exist but the need to draw on it has not arisen. Thus immediate measurable reciprocity is not a necessary condition for the existence of social capital. p. 610

The distinction between social capital and social support is a central feature of this study. While the inherent presence of social capital in a faith community holds the promise of ready access to resources for community members in times of need, social support is the

mobilization and utilization of social capital, and is therefore the actual application of that capital to the community's needs.

Social Support

  Defining social support. Social support has been defined as "a multidimensional construct encompassing a multitude of relationships, behaviors, and consequences" (Streeter & Franklin, as cited in Monahan & Hooker, 1997, p. 279) and as "a coping resource to mitigate the adverse psychological effects of stress" (Cohen & Syme, as cited in Monahan & Hooker, 1997, p. 279). As well, it "usually involves reciprocity over long periods of time" (Monahan & Hooker, 1997, p. 279).

  Social support can be divided into various subcategories, which are given different names in the literature. Some studies (e.g. Krause, 1989; Sherman, Ward, & LaGory, 1988; and Vaux, 1988) distinguish between expressed (i.e. emotional) and instrumental social support, where instrumental support includes such features as material and financial aid, as well as information and advice (Vaux, 1988) which are not merely available but actually provided during a time of need (Krause, 1989). Elsewhere, social support has been divided into three categories: instrumental, informational and emotional (Bass et. al., as cited in Majerovitz, 2001). Social support has been divided into formal and informal subcategories as well (e.g. Majerovitz, 2001). Stone, Cross, Purvis and Young (2003) also distinguish between tangible and intangible social support, both of which can be "provided in times of need by family members, friends, neighbors, colleagues, self-help groups, and others" (p. 330). In their definition, tangible support may take the form of "instrumental aid such as financial or physical assistance, emotional aid such as empathic listening, information and advice, or appraisal (verbal feedback)"

(House, as cited in Stone et al., 2003, p. 330). Meanwhile, intangible support might include "the feeling of security that results from being loved and cared for by others" (p. 330). In the present study I examine tangible social support, which I divide into three subcategories: 1) practical, 2) material, and 3) social/emotional. Both formal support (e.g. paid services, structured programs, etc.) and informal support (e.g. unstructured volunteer services) are included in this study.

Benefits of social support. The benefits of social support are substantial. It can enhance an individual's self-concept, self-esteem, perceived self-competence, positive moods, and sense of belonging (Stone et al., 2003, p. 330). Social support is also a "stress-buffer, moderating the effects of stress on both physical and mental health" (p. 330). Benefits of a strong social support network include a longer life expectancy, fewer stress-related disorders, better coping mechanisms, faster recovery from illness, and a lower risk of disease-related mortality (p. 330). Stone and colleagues (2003) and others explain that actual as well as perceived social support can have the positive effects mentioned. For instance, spouse caregivers of people living with Alzheimer's Disease are able to cope with prolonged periods of intense stress better with a social support network than those without a support network (Berkman and Syme, as cited in Monahan & Hooker, 1997). The size of the support network and frequency of contact with members of the support network also seems to be influential in decreasing mortality for individuals in prolonged, high-stress situations (Berkman and Syme, as cited in Monahan & Hooker, 1997). The benefits of strong social support are indeed far-reaching, and have been shown to improve "mental health, physical health, work outcomes, educational outcomes, and relational outcomes" (Albrecht, Burleson, & Goldsmith, as cited in Stone et al, 2003,

p. 330), as well as the life expectancy of individuals in need or in crisis. In short, the benefits of strong social support are potentially life-altering.

Benefits of social support in a faith community context. Several studies have investigated the types of social support unique to the context of faith communities, as well as their numerous benefits:

> First, religious beliefs and values offer people a framework for understanding and evaluating the stressful events they encounter. (...) Second, religion usually entails participation in some form of religious community. Such participation provides a sense of belonging as well as additional social support resources. Some researchers have concluded that the latter role—the provision of social support resources—is especially critical in stressful conditions. (McIntosh, Silver & Wortman, as cited in Stone et al., 2003, p. 331)

Furthermore, in a meta-analysis of 38 studies addressing religious commitment and mental health, "among several religious factors—including ritual, meaning, prayer, and relationship with God—social support emerged as the most-reported predictor of mental health" (Larson et al., as cited in Stone et al., 2003, p. 331).

Evidently, faith communities have the potential to provide all types of social support. In one study, Maton (as cited by Stone et al., 2003) "concluded that the church and its members provided individuals in need with two forms of support: tangible assistance such as financial aid, and intangible support such as feelings of security and belonging" (p. 331). Interestingly, these supports seem to be most effective when support recipients have the opportunity to reciprocate. Roberts and Thorsheim (1991) describe research they conducted in 1980 for the National Institute on Drug Abuse, with 10,000

participants in 24 Christian congregations. They found that social support actually increased congregants' distress if that support was uni-directional, while distress decreased when social support was two-directional. It seemed that congregants' well-being was reinforced with the opportunity to make meaningful contributions (e.g. of time, skills, etc.) to their community, which in turn supported their feeling of dignity, worth and equality with fellow congregants. One of the authors' conclusions was that the "importance of a reciprocity of support and helpfulness, versus a one-sided acceptance of help and support from others, is a core factor in successful coping with the stresses of life, even in one's relationship with God" (p. 64). This reciprocity, they found, may occur between individual congregants as well as between congregants and leaders. This interaction between leadership and laity seems to have the potential to decrease distress on an individual level and increase the congregation's sense of community as well:

> The more open and risk-taking a pastor is in allowing the congregation to be helpful and supportive to him and to others in the congregation, the greater may be the feelings on the part of the parishioners that they are an integral part of the community of the church. (p. 64)

Clearly the presence of various types of mutual social support has the potential to be exceptionally meaningful and effective in faith-based communities.

Faith-based social support in research literature. Faith communities have been involved in the development and delivery of social supports for millennia. Efforts within the Judeo-Christian faith in particular reach back to the days of ancient Israel. Scripture reports that the earliest communities of Christian believers sold their belongings to support those less fortunate (Neill, 1986). During the medieval period, Catholic churches

housed and managed hospices for their communities (Litak, 2003). Indeed, caring for marginalized populations has been and continues to be a central tenet of church doctrine (Lindberg, 1977; Reid, as cited in Thompson, 1986).

More recently, researchers have examined a broad range of topics surrounding the beliefs about, potential for and effects of faith-based social support, such as the effect of religious beliefs on opinions of social justice (Eldridge, 2007), cultural roots of social action (Barnes, 2005), faith-based contexts for social work (Garland & Bailey, 1989-1990; Netting, 1984; Sherwood, 2003), denominational differences in giving and volunteering (Foley, McCarthy, & Chaves, 2001; Himchack, 2005; Stockton-Chilson, 2004), effects of ethnic differences on church-based social support measures (Krause, 2002), motivators of congregational giving (Finke, Bahr, & Scheitle, 2006), the effect of religiosity on the use of informal and formal supports (Sherr, Shields, King, & Curran, 2005), political implications of faith-based social service programs (Garland & Chamiec-Case, 2005), and interfaith as well as para-church involvement in organizing and providing social services (Foley, McCarthy, & Chaves, 2001). For the purposes of this study, our scope is limited to social support initiatives in the context of individual Christian congregations.

Faith-based social support: Outreach. When one considers Christian social support in action, one might envision congregations providing support to their neighbourhoods and other areas, with their focus primarily on recipients who are not fellow congregants but rather residents living in adjacent areas, neighbouring cities or communities in foreign countries. Such initiatives may be referred to as "outreach".

The body of research focusing on faith-based outreach initiatives includes a wide variety of topics, such as government-funded church-run programs (Pipes & Rose Ebaugh, 2002; Singletary, 2004), organizational and planning issues encountered by government-funded faith-based social programs (Lewis, 2003; Staral, 2000), delivery of social services by church staff or at church-owned buildings (Chaves & Tsitsos, 2001; Yancey & Atkinson, 2004) such as parish nursing (Catanzaro, Meador, Koenig, Kuchibhatla, & Clipp, 2006; McGinnis & Zoske, 2008) and other health programs (Brudenell, 2003; Catanzaro et al., 2006; Chase-Ziolek & Striepe, 1999; Simpson & King, 1999).

Research has also focused on social support to specific sub-groups within the local population such as victims of violence (Thompson, 1989), single mothers (Roberts, 2006), and young mothers on welfare (Williamson, 2005). These studies cover broad as well as critical aspects of the issue of faith-based social support, including questions about best practices, funding, administration and management, program delivery, and community collaboration.

Faith-based social support: In-Reach. Research on social supports that are intended for a congregation's own members is less prevalent than outreach-related research. As the focus of this type of support is primarily inward, it may be called "in-reach". Research in this area focuses largely on congregation-run programs that address specific issues or programs that are targeted to members of specific demographic groups within the congregation. Examples of existing research in this area include the effect of religiosity and church involvement on physical health and crisis management (Holt & McClure, 2006; Krause & Wulff, 2005; Maton, 1989; Stone, Cross, Purvis, & Young,

2003; Stone, Cross, Purvis, & Young, 2004), the effect of giving and receiving help and the mortality rates of elderly church members (Krause, 2006), hospitality and support for new church members (Murray-Hayes, 2006), basic counselling support provided by lay members to fellow church members (Nelson Cherry, 2003), church-based support provided to elderly members (Cnaan, Boddie, & Kang, 2005; Filinson, 1988; Morrison, 1991; Singletary, 2004; Trinitapoli, 2005), as well as programs providing practical assistance to the widowed population (Andrews, 2005) and support to family caregivers (Filinson, 1988; Haber, 1984-1985; Sheehan, 1989).

Some research has also been conducted on social support initiatives within specific ethno-religious communities such as African American churches (Boddie, 2002; Chatters, Taylor, Lincoln, & Schroepfer, 2002; Lee, 2003; Morrison, 1991; Taylor, Lincoln, & Chatters, 2005; Walls, 1992), Hispanic American churches (Hudson Institute Faith in Communities Initiative, 2003), and Old Order Mennonite communities (Gingrich & Lightman, 2004; Gingrich & Lightman, 2006). These studies have found significant levels of emotional, material, and specialized support that members of these ethno-religious groups provide one another as a way of life. Few studies, however, have examined congregation-focused social support across demographic and life-stage categories, or national trends in these supports. Foley, McCarthy, and Chaves (2001) state, "In general, we have very little systematic evidence about the structure of social networks within congregations" (p. 220).

Purpose of This Research Study

Despite substantial involvement of Christian churches in charitable work and social justice, both locally and internationally, little is known about the extent to which

these faith-based resources are specifically mobilized for their own church members. Considering the immense social capital contained within Christian faith communities, the potential for congregations to provide social support seems to be a natural solution, at least in part, to the tangible needs experienced by their members. Given that the United States is the focus of much of the research mentioned above, this study will focus specifically on the Canadian context. A scan of congregation-initiated, member-oriented tangible supports is needed for three reasons: (1) To discover current initiatives for, common barriers to, and church leaders' goals for addressing church members' tangible needs within Christian church communities across the country; (2) to raise awareness among Christian churches about their members' tangible needs and possible methods of organizing congregational social capital to meet those needs; and (3) to contribute to social scientific knowledge regarding the current state and potential of faith-based social capital in the context of Christian faith communities. This scan will focus on the English Canadian context due in part to the limited amount of literature focusing on Christian faith-based charity in Canada, and in part to the limited scope, time, and resources of a Master's thesis.

This thesis will answer the central question: How are English Canadian Christian churches supporting their members who experience tangible needs? It will also answer the following sub-questions: (1) Upon what strengths and resources do Canadian Christian churches draw in order to meet the tangible needs of their congregants? (2) What challenges prevent Canadian churches from meeting the tangible needs of their congregants? (3) How do Christian church leaders across Canada wish to improve the tangible supports their churches provide to their respective members? (4) Is there a

relationship between church membership size, church neighbourhood, church budget and

any of the strengths or weaknesses identified by participants?

Chapter 3

Methodology

Epistemology

Positivism, closely related to naturalistic modernism (Wolfer & Hodge, 2007), has been the predominant scientific perspective during the majority of the 20th century. This perspective holds that "all phenomena can be explained by blind forces acting according to fixed laws, without reference to any transcendent" or subjective dimension (Wolfer & Hodge, 2007, p. 358). This perspective had certain implications for scientific research, limiting the scope of inquiry to "objective" and quantitatively-measurable phenomena, assuming that researchers and their tools could be value- and bias-free.

In 1973 Gergen (as cited in Dalton, Elias & Wandersman, 2001) countered this predominant positivistic philosophy in academia, stating that researchers cannot be free of bias and values, but that their work will inevitably be influenced by their culture and world view. Affirming Gergen's argument, new critical theories, such as feminist theory (Saulnier, 2000), were developed for analysis and research purposes. They successfully broadened the scope and methodologies of scientific inquiry, introducing qualitative methods, diversity, participant involvement, researchers' personal reflections and other subjective dimensions into the research process. It is because of this advancement of critical theory that I am able to speak in a first-person voice and incorporate my personal experience into this thesis. However, despite these advances in challenging this positivistic dominance, another form of epistemological hegemony, namely secularism, has come under scrutiny in recent years within academia in general (Zine, 2004), and in

social work specifically (Bowpitt, 2000; Foley, McCarthy, & Chaves, 2001; Hodge, 2002; Hodge, 2006; Wolfer & Hodge, 2007). Zine (2004) states,

> Spiritual knowledges within the academy represent subjugated knowledges that are delegitimated by the canons of secularism. Secularist knowledge masquerades as a universal standard, when in fact it represents only partial access to the multiple possibilities of knowing that exist in human societies. The dominance and perceived universality of this perspective silences other spiritual, metaphysical, and cosmological understandings. (chapter 2, p. 5)

This is a timely and crucial discussion, especially in light of the growing realization of the interrelatedness of religion and social services (Cnaan, Boddie, & Danzig, 2004; Foley, McCarthy, & Chaves, 2001), as researchers have been increasingly examining religion and spirituality in various aspects of social work, such as work with clients and communities of faith (Furman, Zahi, Benson, & Canda, 2007; Praglin, 2004; Sahlein, 2002; Zahl, 2006), incorporating faith and spirituality into social work education (Barker, 2007; Canda, 1989; Conway, 2005; Furman, Benson, Canda, & Grimwood, 2007; Hodge, 2007; Kaplan & Dziegielewski, 1999; Should social work education address religious issues, 1994; Spencer, 1961), and the experiences of practitioners and organizations of faith (Chamiec-Case & Sherr, 2006; Foley, McCarthy, & Chaves, 2001; Mattison, Jayaratne, & Croxton, 2000; Ressler & Hodge, 2005).

In the process of distancing itself from positivistic epistemological paradigms, critical social work theory has yet to offer a paradigm addressing the assumption of secularism as a universal truth. Indeed, "[e]ven social movements which in themselves accord with the ideals of critical theory by rejecting established ideas and values and

seeking to reinforce the lifeworld[1], can still act repressively" (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000, p. 128). This poses a problem for communities of faith whose experiences are scrutinized through a secularist lens. It also poses a problem for researchers and practitioners wishing to develop a personal and professional sense of cultural competence through their work, especially in light of specific characteristics of cultural competence, including a respect for "cultural elements without assumptions of superiority or inferiority" (Dalton, Elias, & Wandersman, 2001, p. 178) and "a professional stance of informed naiveté, curiosity, and humility" (Mock, as cited in Dalton, Elias, & Wandersman, 2001, p. 178). For instance, applying an epistemological framework that is fundamentally at odds with the researched population regarding beliefs about the nature of truth, such as applying a secular and relativist framework to a faith community with fixed beliefs about the nature of truth, reinforces the assumption of the researcher's superiority over that population. However, critical theory can and ought to be applied to "the meticulous scrutiny of apparently progressive and emancipatory social changes and ideas" (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000, p. 127). As an alternative, therefore, this study will employ Zine's (2004) Critical Faith-Centred Epistemological Framework, proposing seven foundational principles:

> 1st Principle: A philosophy of holism[2], or connection between the physical, intellectual, and spiritual aspects of identity and identification. (chapter 2, p. 12)

---

[1] "Lifeworld" refers to Habermas' use of the phenomenological term referring to "those contexts of meaning, that cultural horizon through which people seek to interpret and understand their situation and their environment. (...) ...the sphere of (always interpreted) concrete experiences, all that is close to human existence" (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000, p. 116), in his version of critical theory.

[2] this principle uncovers a hidden dynamic, namely the spiritual dynamic, of an established epistemological theory called the 'holistic perspective', described by Patton (1990).

2nd Principle: Historically and culturally situated analyses of religion and spirituality are an integral component of understanding human social, historical, and personal development[3]. (chapter 2, p. 13)

3rd Principle: An acknowledgement that religious and spiritual worldviews and/or contestations of these worldviews continue to shape human social, cultural, and political development[4]. (chapter 2, p. 16)

4th Principle: A recognition that religion and spirituality occupy a central role in the understanding of various academic disciplines and subjects relating to economics, politics, philosophy, gender, culture, education, anthropology, etc., and are valid and legitimate sites for the analysis of social, existential phenomenon. (chapter 2, p. 18)

5th Principle: An understanding of how religious and spiritual identities and identifications represent sites of oppression and are connected to broader sites/systems of discrimination based on race, class, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, and colonialism, while acknowledging that religion has at times been historically misused and become complicit in the perpetuation of these oppressions. (chapter 2, p. 21)

6th Principle: The view that religion and spirituality can be sites of resistance to injustice and oppression, providing a space for critical contestation and political engagement. (chapter 2, p. 26)

---

[3] this principle is similar to an epistemological theme which Patton (1990) calls 'context sensitivity'.

[4] this principle fits within the 'dynamic systems' epistemological theory also described by Patton (1990).

7th Principle: A working premise that not all knowledge is socially constructed, but that knowledge can emanate from Divine revelation and can have a spiritual or incorporeal origin. Beliefs in prophets, revelation, messengers, angels, spirits, jinn, etc., must be incorporated into knowledge production as part of the way faith-centred people read and make sense of the world and their place within it. (chapter 2, pp. 30-31)

It was my hope that employing this epistemological framework would result in a study that most clearly, accurately and respectfully presents the voices of participating church leaders to the scientific community, to the participants themselves, and to other faith communities who access this thesis.

Research Design

Faith-based tangible ministry can be highly programmatic and formal, involving the church leadership and other staff, and it can also be entirely grass-roots and informal, where the leaders might not even be aware of the mutual support taking place among congregants. Given the diversity among congregations of various denominations, sizes, locations, cultures and so on, and given that this study was to take an exploratory approach, a structured evaluation model would not fit the multi-congregational setting. So the chosen methodology needed to be flexible to allow a more authentic representation of participants' experiences to emerge.

It was hoped that the data obtained from this study would ultimately be of use to the participating congregations and other faith communities who wished to enhance their efforts to meet their members' tangible needs. To this end, it was necessary to gain the clearest, most valid and most authentic perspective of participants' experiences (Dalton,

Elias, & Wandersman, 2001). Given that little research has focused on the spectrum of available congregant-centred tangible ministries, I decided that a thorough understanding of the strengths, challenges and goals of Christian faith communities' tangible ministry efforts was needed, as was a profile of congregation-centred tangible services currently in use. Patton (1990) states that when great diversity exists in the implementation of similar programs (e.g. various implementation strategies and outcomes of congregational tangible supports), a mixed-method research design is able to detect this diversity better than quantitative or qualitative methods alone may accomplish. It seemed to me that a qualitative paradigm would allow participants' voices to be heard and the diversity of their experiences to be discovered, while the inclusion of quantitative elements would allow the most efficient management of a large amount of data. Therefore, a mixed-method research design was chosen for this study.

Sample

The target population consisted of English-speaking men and women who met the following criteria: (1) ages 16 and older; (2) located in any province or territory in Canada; (3) occupy leadership or administrative positions at their respective faith communities; and (4) represent any Christian denomination, or Christian non-denominational or interdenominational affiliation.

Over 24,000 Christian churches (Outreach Canada, n.d.), representing over 60 denominations (Statistics Canada, 2008), operate within Canada. A recent review of e-mail response rates suggested that a typical response rate for a survey like the one planned for this study was 20% (Sheehan, 2001). However, given that the survey was somewhat lengthy, as well as the fact that my data collection period was scheduled

during Lent, a busy season for many Christian denominations, I expected a significantly lower response rate. This directly influenced my sampling strategy. I planned the widest possible scope for recruitment in the hope of obtaining the largest and most diverse sample possible. Therefore, I decided to recruit across Canada to churches of every denomination, using Statistics Canada's list of Christian denominations (see Appendix A) as my sampling frame. The survey was open between March 1 and April 12, 2009.

I used a nonprobability sampling method called volunteer sampling (Kirby, Greaves & Reid, 2006) for this study, primarily because the participants' involvement in the survey was based on their availability and willingness to take part. Therefore, generalizations about the population cannot be drawn from this study, given that I would be unable to obtain a random sample. However, the goal of this study was not to test hypotheses, nor to reach generalizable conclusions about the target population, but rather to initiate an exploration of key issues currently affecting congregations in their tangible ministry efforts. Two hundred and six church leaders responded. Of the approximately 24,000 churches in Canada, the response rate for individual churches can be estimated at 0.9%. Of the 53 denominations that were contacted, 27 indicated an interest in participating including five that classified their denomination in the "Other" category, resulting in a denominational response rate of 46.5%.

Instrument

I created an internet-based survey as the sole data collection instrument for this study. When compared with other data collection methods, an online survey was the most efficient way to glean information from a large number of participants over a wide geographic area, and it was the most inexpensive way to accomplish these objectives

(Sheehan, 2001). Time was an especially important consideration for me given the compact schedule of my thesis. It was also a consideration for the target population, namely people in leadership positions at Christian faith communities, because from personal experience I knew that this population was extremely busy with the demands placed on their schedules. Therefore, an easily-accessible electronic survey would hopefully maximize the response rate.

Survey design. The survey consisted of 61 questions divided into eight sections (see Appendix B). The majority of the survey consisted of closed-ended questions. This provided three main benefits: (1) it allowed most of the data to be analyzed quickly; (2) it provided a systematic method of acquiring data about a broad subject that had not previously been investigated; and (3) given that this topic had not previously been examined in academic literature, it allowed for an investigation into a wide variety of areas related to the subject. Given that open-ended questions require more of the participants' time, and given that their time was limited, closed-ended questions were chosen for the majority of the survey so as to reduce the participant attrition rate.

A small number of open-ended questions were included in the survey for two reasons: (1) as closed-ended questions limit participants to a pre-determined set of answer choices and do not allow expression of important clarifications on their answers, nor deeper insights that would otherwise enrich the survey data, open-ended questions were included to supplement the quantitative data; (2) open-ended questions were also included to invite participants' feedback about the survey itself, as a means of encouraging two-way communication between the researcher and participants, and to allow possible problems in the survey to be highlighted and corrected during the data-

collection process. Approximately 40 to 70% of participants answered the survey's qualitative questions.

I structured most of the questions in multiple choice, rating or ranking format, because I was aware that participants would be motivated to complete more of the survey if the questions could be answered relatively quickly, which those three formats facilitated. However, one shortcoming of closed-ended questions is that participants are unable to express themselves in their own words, or clarify their answer choices. For this reason, I included an "Other" or "Comments" category with most multiple choice questions, as well as a "Comments" box at the end of each section of the survey where participants were invited to express any comments or questions they might have.

Some questions were adapted from a survey developed by Catanzaro and colleagues (2006) which measured church leaders' views about congregational health ministries. The adapted questions included some in the individual and congregational demographic sections (see Appendix B), some of the items in questions 26-28 in which participants were asked to report specific tangible programs and services in their congregations, question 37 which asked participants to identify positive impacts of their congregation's tangible ministries, and some of the items in questions 42 and 43 which asked participants to indicate specific challenges to developing tangible supports.

Given that the survey was somewhat lengthy I expected a proportion of participants not to complete all of the questions. To minimize the effect of the expected attrition, the eight survey sections were placed in order of priority in relation to the research question, with the most central questions appearing earlier in the survey, making

them more likely to be answered. A description of the survey and my rationale for the order of the survey sections is explained next.

The survey opened with a brief welcome message (see Appendix B) and a text field (considered question 1 of the survey) in which participants were invited to leave their email addresses if they were interested in receiving an electronic copy of this study, once complete.

Section two of the survey consisted of the consent form (see Appendix C), which contained four questions, continued from question (1) on the welcome page: (2) a check-box beside the consent statement in order to indicate participants' agreement to the consent statement; (3) a text box in which the participants were asked to type their first and last name; (4) a text box in which the participants were asked to give the name of their place of worship in order to ensure that only one survey was submitted per congregation; and (5) a check-box beside a statement with the option to grant me permission to use their anonymous quotes in research reports and presentations. Questions two through four were required, as participants were unable to proceed to the next page of the survey without indicating their consent to participate. It was necessary to request participants' names as well as the names of their congregations, in order to ensure that each participant and each congregation were represented only once in the study, thus strengthening the credibility of the data. However, in the consent form participants were ensured that all identifying information about them and their congregations would remain confidential, and that their data would be reported anonymously. Meanwhile, question five, asking participants to consider allowing their quotes to be used anonymously in reports resulting from this research, was optional.

Section three of the survey consisted of demographic questions (see Appendix B), which were included in the survey in order to examine possible relationships between sub-groups of the target population and the main survey questions. The more neutral demographic questions were placed early in the survey as a means of creating a comfortable opening for participants at the same time as collecting information for use in the comparative analysis. These included questions about congregation's province, denomination, type of neighbourhood setting, as well as the participant's job or role description at their congregation, gender, age, racial identity, marital status, highest level of education, and whether they had completed formal education in ministry or theology. Also included on this page were questions regarding the amount of time required for their work in the congregation and whether or not remuneration was received for this work, whether the participant had previously worked in an occupation other than religious ministry, whether he/she was currently working in a second job that was not in ministry, whether he/she was currently ministering to more than one congregation, whether the participant had been ordained, and whether or not the person had at any time lived or worked in a culture other than their primary culture for six months or longer. More sensitive questions (e.g. church finances) were reserved for a later section of the survey. I used Statistics Canada's list of Christian denominations (Religion (95A), 2003) in this section of the survey (see Appendix A). However, after receiving feedback from initial participants who disagreed with Statistics Canada's categorization of some Protestant denominations, I removed the three labels, "Catholic", "Protestant", and "Christian Orthodox" and listed the individual denominations alphabetically (see Appendix B).

The demographics section was followed by the main content of the survey, specifically the tangible ministry programs and services that were divided across sections four, five and six. The questions in section four were prefaced by a short description of "Key Terms" defining some of the concepts present in the survey questions. Following these definitions were questions addressing the administrative structure and types of tangible services available at the participant's church, as well as his/her perception of the congregants' degree of awareness about how to access these services.

Section five focused on staff and volunteers involved in providing formal tangible services, the congregation's partnerships with secular and faith-based organizations, congregants' awareness about the available supports, and participants' perceptions of the benefits of their services.

Section six explored the gaps and strengths in the congregation's tangible services, and the participants' perceptions of the amount of support that is provided by church leaders versus the laity (i.e. congregants who are not in leadership positions). This section had the potential to produce the richest qualitative data, as it contained three open-ended questions asking participants to explore these issues in their own words.

Section seven contained another small set of demographic questions. These questions covered the more sensitive topics, such as church budget and income levels represented in the congregation.

Section eight focused on the participants' and their respective faith communities' doctrinal orientation on the subject of tangible ministry. This set of questions was placed last in the survey, as theology did not comprise the primary focus of this study. However, it was included to provide an ideological context to the actual tangible services

themselves, which facilitated a holistic understanding of the services and underscored the epistemological framework of this study. Two questions in this section requested information about the specific Scripture passages and doctrines guiding the congregations' beliefs about tangible ministry. These were structured in an open-ended format, because too many possible answers existed to make a multiple choice option reasonable. I would not have been able to anticipate the majority of answers in order to construct a list of possible choices, and the size of the list might also have been overwhelming to participants as well. Therefore, these two questions offered the potential to collect additional rich and personalized data from participants. This section also included closed-ended questions about the dissemination of theological information to congregants, and the experiences that influenced the participants' personal views on tangible ministry.

Those participants who completed the survey in its entirety would reach a final page with a brief, personal message of thanks, as well as my contact information in case participants wished to contact me with further questions or comments.

Survey pilot test. During the design process, I consulted four church workers regarding the survey questions and layout. These advisers included: (1) a female minister from an urban Lutheran church; (2) a male pastor of a rural, conservative Mennonite church; (3) a female administrator at a suburban Vineyard Fellowship church; and (4) a male house church pastor from a Baptist background. Their answers to the survey questions and their personal feedback helped me to identify any necessary edits, additions and omissions of individual survey questions. They also advised on how to frame

concepts and word the questions with language that would be most appropriate for my target population.

I asked each adviser whether any questions seemed to be missing from the survey. Most of their suggestions related to the demographics section. Examples of their suggestions included the following questions: (1) "Have you at any time worked in a career other than religious ministry?" (question 17); (2) "If you are employed by the church, are you also working at a second job that is not in the ministry?" (question 18); and (3) "Do you minister to more than one congregation?" (question 19). After hearing their suggestions, I also decided to add a question that was influenced by my personal experience as a child of parents in cross-cultural religious work: "Have you at any time lived or worked in a culture other than your primary culture for six consecutive months or longer?" (question 21), as I was interested in whether this characteristic would result in a difference of perspective among participants.

Survey translation. During the design process I recruited several volunteers to translate the English survey into the French language, given that I wanted this research to include both French and English-speaking faith communities across the country. The two primary volunteers were bilingual university students. Their translations were edited by another volunteer who was a high school French teacher. The resulting French version of the survey was made available during the first stage of participant recruitment, and was completed by one participant. Shortly thereafter I received feedback from this participant, through her denominational office, that the translation did not meet a professional standard. Hiring a professional translator would have been unaffordable, so that was not an option. I also did not wish to communicate a sense of disrespect for French-speaking

participants by retaining the volunteers' translated version of the survey, which was clearly inappropriate for use in this study. After consulting with my advisor as well as a bilingual professor at Wilfrid Laurier University, I decided to remove the French language component from this study.

Equipment

The web-based survey was developed at a website called SurveyMonkey (www.surveymonkey.com). Descriptive statistics were also generated at this website. QSR Nvivo software was used in order to analyze the qualitative data. SPSS was used to conduct the bivariate analyses.

Procedure

As the objective was to survey as many churches as possible within a short period of time, and given that many churches carry out communications over the internet, an email recruitment strategy seemed to be the most efficient recruitment method. Although email contact information for many churches was easily located on the internet, collecting this information and contacting each individual church was not an efficient option. I also did not want to engage in activities that would be perceived as "spamming" by sending recruitment emails to a large number of recipients. This strategy would have compromised the credibility of the study. Therefore, I chose to contact the head office of each denomination on Statistics Canada's list (see Appendix A), requesting their support for and endorsement of this study to their member churches. This request was sent to the designated decision-making person or committee for each denomination's national or regional office. Their decision would determine whether the churches belonging to their denomination, either nationally or regionally, would hear about the opportunity to

participate in this study. I decided that this approach would be most respectful, would make the study seem more credible, and would therefore generate a higher response rate among individual church leaders.

I created a database of all denominational offices to be contacted, and sent a personalized recruitment letter (see Appendix D) by email to all denominations, keeping detailed notes of my correspondence with each office and contact person. In my communication with each denominational office, I committed to follow up with a telephone call approximately one week after sending my first email if I did not receive a reply from them during that time, and I drafted a telephone recruitment script for this purpose (see Appendix E).

Of the 53 denominations that I contacted, 22 expressed an interest in participating in the study. I sent the information letter for church leaders (see Appendix F) to the denominations who indicated an interest in endorsing the study to their member churches. I also attached a PDF version of the survey for distribution to their churches in case participants encountered technical difficulties while trying to access the electronic survey at SurveyMonkey.com. Meanwhile, I monitored the surveys at SurveyMonkey.com as they were being completed by participants.

Data Analysis

An inductive approach (Patton, 1990) was used to analyze the qualitative data, in order to allow the themes to emerge. The survey was open for one and a half months, starting at the beginning of March and closing on April 12. I monitored the surveys as they were completed, in order to get a sense of the data (Creswell, 1998), and had developed an understanding of the themes by the survey closing date. Once the survey

closed I used QSR Nvivo software to note themes in the data, sorting them into codes and sub-codes (Creswell, 1998). The quantitative data were mainly descriptive in nature, with preliminary chi-square analyses undertaken to answer question four.

Ethical Considerations

Confidentiality of all survey responses and anonymity of findings in any resulting research reports was stated in the survey consent form. Potential risks to participants included experiencing negative emotions while considering issues of need or related challenges within their congregations. In order to overcome these potential risks, all participants were encouraged in the consent form to speak with a friend, mentor, or local counselling agency. Potential benefits associated with participating in this study included an increased sense of community with fellow church leaders, and positive feelings from the knowledge that their input might lead to the improved support of their own or other congregations' members. This study was reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Board at Wilfrid Laurier University.

Chapter 4

Findings

Participant Demographics

A total of 206 church leaders completed the survey, including females (18%) and males (82%). The average participant was a white male, an ordained member of the clergy, married and university educated with formal training in religious ministry. Participants ranged in age from 20 to 70 and older (see Table 1), although almost half (48.8%) were in the 50-69 age category.

Table 1

Participants by Age

Age	n	%
20-34	24	11.7
35-49	71	34.6
50-69	100	48.8
70+	10	4.9
Answered Question	205	99.5
Skipped Question	1	0.5

The vast majority of participants were Caucasian (89.2%); 3% were Asian; 2% were Aboriginal, First Nations or Inuit; 1.5% identified with mixed racial identity; 0.5% were African; 0.5% were Hispanic/Latin American; 3.4% selected "Other" ; while 1.5% skipped the question (see Table 2). The majority of participants (82.9%) were members of the clergy; 4.9% were elders; 2.4% were administrators; 1.5% were coordinators; another 1.5% were church secretaries; 1.0 % were deacons; 4.4% represented "other" roles within their congregations; 0.5% skipped the question; and clerks, lay ministers,

and parish life directors were each represented by 0.5% of participants (see Table 3). The

Table 2

Participants by Racial Identity

Racial identity	n	%
Aboriginal, First Nations or Inuit	4	2.0
African	1	0.5
Asian	6	3.0
Caucasian	181	89.2
Hispanic/Latin American	1	0.5
Mixed	3	1.5
Other	7	3.4
Answered Question	203	98.5
Skipped Question	3	1.5

Table 3

Participants by Role/Job Description in the Congregation

Role/job	n	%
Administrator	5	2.4
Clergy	170	82.9
Clerk	1	0.5
Deacon	2	1.0
Elder	10	4.9
Lay Minister	1	0.5
Parish Life Director	1	0.5
Parish Nurse	0	0.0
Program Coordinator	3	1.5
Secretary	3	1.5
Stephen Ministry Leader	0	0.0
Other	9	4.4
Answered Question	205	99.5
Skipped Question	1	0.5

majority of participants (77.1%) were ordained. Most were also married (91.6%); 5.0% were single or never married; 3.0% were separated or divorced; 0.5% answered "other"; and 1.9% skipped the question.

The majority of participants (83.8%) were university educated; 27.9% had a Bachelor's degree; half of the participants (49.5%) had earned a Master's degree; and 6.4% had a Doctorate degree (see Table 4). The majority (82.0%) also reported having completed formal training in religious ministry.

Table 4

Participants by Level of Education

Highest level of education attained	n	%
Primary/Elementary School	2	1.0
Secondary/High School	8	3.9
College Degree	9	4.4
Trade School	4	2.0
Bachelor's Degree	57	27.9
Master's Degree	101	49.5
Doctorate Degree	13	6.4
None	0	0.0
Other	10	4.9
Answered Question	204	99.0
Skipped Question	2	1.0

Almost three quarters of participants (73.6%) had experienced working in a career other than religious ministry, although the majority of participants (78.4%) were not employed outside of the church at the time they completed the survey, and many (74.3%) were ministering to only one congregation. Approximately one third of participants (31.2%) had lived or worked in a cross-cultural setting for six months or more.

Congregation Demographics

Participants represented congregations from all provinces and two territories in

Canada (see Table 5). The largest group of participants was from Ontario (37.6%), while

no participants were from Nunavut.

Table 5

Congregation by Province or Territory

Province or territory	n	%
Alberta	37	18.0
British Columbia	28	13.7
Manitoba	3	1.5
New Brunswick	8	3.9
Newfoundland & Labrador	3	1.5
Northwest Territories	1	0.5
Nova Scotia	12	5.9
Nunavut	0	0.0
Ontario	77	37.6
Prince Edward Island	1	0.5
Quebec	10	4.9
Saskatchewan	24	11.7
Yukon	1	0.5
Answered Question	205	99.5
Skipped Question	1	0.5

Twenty-seven denominations were represented by participants (see Appendix G),

with the most represented being: Anglican (15.1%), Christian Reformed Church (13.7%),

Christian and Missionary Alliance (12.7%), Presbyterian (9.3%), Mennonite (8.3%),

Seventh-Day Adventist (7.3%), Church of the Nazarene (5.9%), Baptist (5.4%), Vineyard

Fellowship (3.9%), and Wesleyan (3.4%). The Roman Catholic and United Church

denominations had less than expected representation in this study in relation to the

percentage of their members in the general population.

Table 6

Congregation by Size of Average Attendance at Weekly Services

Attendance	n	%
Less than 10	1	0.5
10-49	47	25.0
50-99	47	25.0
100-499	79	42.0
500-999	10	5.3
1,000-4,999	4	2.1
5,000+	0	0.0
Answered Question	188	91.3
Skipped Question	18	8.7

Table 7

Congregations by the Racial Identities Represented Among Congregants

Racial identities	n	%
Aboriginal, First Nations or Inuit	59	31.2
African	59	31.2
Asian	76	40.2
Caucasian	176	93.1
Hispanic/Latin American	45	23.8
Mixed	42	22.2
Other	14	6.8
Answered Question	189	91.7
Skipped Question	17	8.3

Participants' congregations were located in various neighbourhoods, including Rural/Small Town (41.5%), Suburban (30.2%), Urban/Inner city (22.9%), Remote (2.4%), and "other" (2.9%). One participant skipped this question. The majority of congregations represented in this study (92.0%) were smaller in size, with an average weekly attendance of less than 500 congregants at church services (see Table 6).

Table 8

Income Categories Represented in Participating Congregations

Income categories	n	%
Unemployed	17	8.9
Low Income	49	25.8
Middle Income	154	81.1
High Income	24	12.6
Unsure	6	3.2
Answered Question	190	92.2
Skipped Question	16	7.8

Table 9

Congregations by Approximate Budget

Budget category	n	%
Below $10,000	7	3.7
$10,000 to $99,999	53	28.0
$100,000 to $199,999	54	28.6
$200,000 to $399,999	45	23.8
$400,000 to $599,999	13	6.9
$600,000 to $799,999	5	2.6
$800,000 to $999,999	5	2.6
$1,000,000 to $2,999,999	4	2.1
$3,000,000 to $5,000,000	1	0.5
Above $5,000,000	0	0.0
Unsure	2	1.1
Answered Question	189	91.7
Skipped Question	17	8.3

Racial identities represented in participants' congregations were again primarily Caucasian (see Table 7). Meanwhile, age categories, which were not defined by specific age brackets in the survey, represented in participants' congregations were Middle Aged

(80.0%), Young Seniors (62.1%), Children and Adolescents (48.9%), Young Adults
(46.3%), and Aged Seniors (46.3%).

The full range of income categories were represented in participating
congregations (see Table 8). Congregants considered to be "Middle Income" were most
predominant, as they were represented in 81.1% of participating congregations. The
range of congregation budgets was from less than $10,000 a year to $3-5 million a year.
Almost half had budgets of less than $200,000 a year (see Table 9).

The Role of Scripture and Doctrine

When participants were asked about the theological foundation motivating their
tangible ministries, they responded with many Scripture passages and doctrines. The
Scripture passages alone, which included many chapter-and-verse passages as well as
entire chapters, would have spanned 96 pages if quoted in full. Therefore, the Scripture
passages quoted below were selected as examples of the passages within each topic,
which are then followed by a description of specific doctrines participants identified.

Humans are made in God's image. Some participants indicated that the rationale
for helping fellow congregants lay in the principle of humans being created in God's
image. They quoted Genesis 1:26-27; Psalm 8:4-5; Romans 8:28-29; 1 Corinthians 6:19-
20; and Colossians 3:10-15. For example, Genesis 1:27 says:

> God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male
> and female He created them.

Another example includes Colossians 3:10-15:

> and have put on the new self who is being renewed to a true knowledge according
> to the image of the One who created him--a renewal in which there is no

distinction between Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave and freeman, but Christ is all, and in all. So, as those who have been chosen of God, holy and beloved, put on a heart of compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness and patience; bearing with one another, and forgiving each other, whoever has a complaint against anyone; just as the Lord forgave you, so also should you. Beyond all these things put on love, which is the perfect bond of unity. Let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts, to which indeed you were called in one body; and be thankful.

Imitate righteous people. The next topic reflected in the participants' chosen Scripture passages was the imitation of positive role models. Genesis 18:1-8; Acts 9:36; and Galatians 2:10 were mentioned in relation to this topic. For example, Acts 9:36 states, "Now in Joppa there was a disciple named Tabitha (...); this woman was abounding with deeds of kindness and charity which she continually did."

Obeying God's/Jesus' commands and desires, honouring Him. The next topic frequently reflected in participants' Scripture suggestions was that of tangible ministry being a matter of obedience to God, and obedience being a central part of a life of faith. Due to the high number of passages, they are divided by Old Testament (see Table 10) and New Testament (see Table 11).

Loving community. Participants highlighted numerous passages identifying tangible ministry as a characteristic of a loving faith community. These passages included Psalm 133:1; Acts 2:44-45; 4:33-35; 6:1-4; 11:28-30; Romans 12:9-13; 1 Corinthians 11:20-22; 12:22-26; 2 Corinthians 8:1-16, 24; Ephesians 2:19-22; 3:6; 4:1-6, 15-16; 1 Timothy 3:2; Hebrews 10:24-25; 13:1-3; 1 Peter 2:17; and 1 John 2:7-11. Some

examples of these included, Psalm 133:1, "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brothers to dwell together in unity!", Acts 2:44-45, "And all those who had believed were together and had all things in common; and they began selling their property and possessions and were sharing them with all, as anyone might have need" and Romans 12:9-13:

> Let love be without hypocrisy. Abhor what is evil; cling to what is good. Be devoted to one another in brotherly love; give preference to one another in honor; not lagging behind in diligence, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord; rejoicing in hope, persevering in tribulation, devoted to prayer, contributing to the needs of the saints, practicing hospitality.

Table 10

Old Testament Passages on Obedience to God

Old Testament Passages	Selected Excerpts
• Exodus 20:12-17; 23:11	Walk in My statutes and keep My commandments so as to carry
• Leviticus 26:3, 9-13	them out (Leviticus 26:3)
• Deuteronomy 10:19; 24:12-22	
• Proverbs 14:31; 31:9	He has told you, O man, what is good; and what does the LORD
• Isaiah 58:5-7	require of you but to do justice, to love kindness (Micah 6:8)
• Micah 6:8	
• Zechariah 7:9-10	

God's/Jesus' judgement. Next, participants listed passages pertaining to God's judgement on those who intentionally refused to offer tangible support to people in need. These passages included Proverbs 19:17; Ezekiel 16:49; Micah 6:10-16; Matthew 7:21-23; 25:14-46; Mark 12:38-40; Luke 10:10-12; John 15:1-6; James 2:13; 5:1-6; 1 John 4:16-18; and Revelation 11:18; 21:8, 23-27. For example, Ezekiel 16:49 states, "Behold,

this was the guilt of your sister Sodom: she and her daughters had arrogance, abundant food and careless ease, but she did not help the poor and needy." And James 2:13 says, "For judgement will be merciless to one who has shown no mercy; mercy triumphs over judgement."

Table 11

New Testament Passages on Obedience to God

New Testament Passages	Selected Excerpts
• Matthew 7:12; 10:8; 19:16-21; 22:35-40; 28:16-20 • Mark 12:28-31 • Luke 6:31; 9:12-13; 10:25-37 • John 13:34; 14:15, 21-24; 15:10, 12-14, 17 • Romans 7:12; 12:14-21; 13:8-10 • 2 Corinthians 9:7, 12-15 • Galatians 5:6, 13-14; 6:2, 6 • Ephesians 2:10; 4:31-32 • Colossians 1:9-10 • 1 Thessalonians 5:14-15 • 1 Timothy 5:3 • Hebrews 13:16 • James 1:22, 26-27; 2:1-12 • 1 Peter 2:17; 4:10-11 • 1 John 3:11, 23; 4:20-21; 5:3	One of the scribes came and heard them arguing, and recognizing that He had answered them well, asked Him, "What commandment is the foremost of all?" Jesus answered, "The foremost is, 'Hear, O Israel! The Lord our God is one Lord; and you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength.' The second is this, 'You shall love your neighbour as yourself.' There is no other commandment greater than these." (Mark 12:28-31) Bless those who persecute you; bless and do not curse. Rejoice with those who rejoice, and weep with those who weep. (Romans 12:14-15) We urge you, brethren, admonish the unruly, encourage the fainthearted, help the weak, be patient with everyone. See that no one repays another with evil for evil, but always seek after that which is good for one another and for all people. (1 Thessalonians 5:14-15)

To be blessed. Participants referenced Scripture passages discussing the rewards of offering tangible support. These passages included Proverbs 22:9; 28:27; Isaiah 58:8-12; Jeremiah 6:16; Matthew 6:3-4; Mark 9:41; Luke 10:3-9; 2 Corinthians 9:6, 8-11;

Colossians 1:11-12; and 1 Timothy 6:17-19. Some example excerpts include, Proverbs

22:9, "He who is generous will be blessed, for he gives some of his food to the poor," and

Matthew 6:3-4:

> But when you give to the poor, do not let your left hand know what your right
>
> hand is doing, so that your giving will be in secret; and your Father who sees what
>
> is done in secret will reward you.

> *Imitating God/Jesus.* While passages about imitating positive role models were

mentioned earlier, participants also highlighted passages about imitating God. These

passages included Isaiah 61:1; Matthew 9:36; 14:14; 15:32; 20:25-28; Luke 4:18-19;

9:14-17; John 2:1-11; 3:16; 5:19; 10:10; 13:3-16, 35; 15:8; 20:21; Ephesians 5:1-2;

Philippians 2:1-5; and 1 John 3:16-18; 4:7-10, 19. An example excerpt includes Matthew

20:25-28:

> But Jesus called them to Himself and said, "You know that the rulers of the
>
> Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. It is
>
> not this way among you, but whoever wishes to become great among you shall be
>
> your servant, and whoever wishes to be first among you shall be your slave; just
>
> as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life a
>
> ransom for many."

Another excerpt was drawn from Ephesians 5:1-2 in which the Apostle Paul states,

"Therefore be imitators of God, as beloved children; and walk in love, just as Christ also

loved you and gave Himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God as a fragrant

aroma."

Proof of faith. The last Scriptural topic addressed by participants was that of tangible support being proof of one's faith. James 2:14-17 was the reference participants provided which states:

> What use is it, my brethren, if someone says he has faith but he has no works? Can that faith save him? If a brother or sister is without clothing and in need of daily food, and one of you says to them, "Go in peace, be warmed and be filled," and yet you do not give them what is necessary for their body, what use is that? Even so faith, if it has no works, is dead, being by itself.

Other. Participants mentioned other Scripture passages that did not fit into any of the tangible ministry-related topics described above. These references include Proverbs 3:5-6; Isaiah 53 and 60; Jeremiah 2:13; Matthew 8:16-17; 9:9-13; Mark 2; 9:24; Luke 6:20; John 4:3-26; 17:20-23; Romans 3:21-26, 28; 1 Corinthians 3:11; 10:31; 2 Corinthians 4:5; 5:16; Galatians 3:26-29; Ephesians 1:10; Philippians 4:13; 1 Timothy 6:3-10; 2 Timothy 2:2; and Hebrews 3:16. An example excerpt would be 2 Timothy 2:2 in which the Apostle Paul states, "The things which you have heard from me in the presence of many witnesses, entrust these to faithful men who will be able to teach others also."

When asked which doctrines guide the tangible ministries of their congregations, participants named numerous doctrines drawn from Scripture and the field of theology (see Appendix H).

Participants also referred to 15 theological position documents, including creeds, confessions, canons, catechisms and similar documents. Most participants did not quote specific sections within these documents pertaining to the topic of tangible ministry, so I

have selected relevant excerpts from as many of these documents as possible, in order to

understand whether and how each of them addresses this issue (see Appendix I).

Incorporation of doctrines into congregational policies and administration.

Participants were asked whether and how much their faith communities integrated these

theological beliefs into their governance and policy documents. Approximately two thirds

of participants (69.4%) indicated that their doctrines were incorporated into their

congregation's Mission and Vision statement, Purpose statement, or similar policy

document, while 18.3% answered "No", 7.5% answered "Not Applicable" and 4.8% were

unsure. Furthermore, approximately three quarters of participants (73.5%) indicated that

their congregation's doctrines are incorporated into their church budget, while 15.7%

answered "No", 5.9% were unsure, and 4.9% answered "Not Applicable."

Promotion of doctrines. Participants rated their congregants' degree of awareness

about their faith community's beliefs on tangible ministry. Just under half of participants

(41.3%) indicated that their congregants were "Mostly Aware", 51.4% said their

congregants were "Somewhat Aware", 5.0% indicated that their congregants were

"Mostly Unaware" and 2.2% were unsure.

Participants reported using various awareness-raising methods about theological

teachings pertaining to tangible ministry (see Table 12). The five most frequently used

methods of informing congregants about their faith community's beliefs included

sermons (80.1%), word of mouth (68.3%), verbal announcements during services

(64.5%), pamphlet-style bulletins (59.1%), and bulletin boards (40.3%). Participants were

also asked to indicate the approximate number of sermons delivered in the last year that

mentioned the topic of helping fellow congregants in times of need. No participants

Table 12

Methods of Informing the Congregation About Tangible Ministry Doctrines

Methods	%
Sermons	80.1
Word-of-Mouth	68.3
Verbal announcements during services	64.5
Bulletins (eg. distributed at services)	59.1
Bulletin Boards	40.3
E-mail communication with congregants	36.6
Website	32.8
Brochures	28.5
Newsletters	28.5
Other (please specify)	12.9
Decorative banners inside the church building	8.6
None	1.1

selected "All", 12.6% selected "The Majority", 25.7% selected "Around Half", 49.2%

indicated "A Few", and 1.6% indicated "None."

Administration of Formal and Informal Tangible Supports

For the majority of congregations (84.9%), Clergy and Lay Ministers were

identified as being responsible for coordinating tangible supports for church members.

Other groups or individuals who shared this responsibility included Elders (49.8%),

Prayer Teams/Prayer Chains (45.4%), Deacons (43.4%), Cell Groups/Care Groups

(42.4%), and Special Committees/Care Teams (41.5%). Individuals or groups identified

less often by participants were Administrators (23.4%), Other (e.g. Women's Groups,

Men's Groups; 21.0%), Program Coordinators (20.5%), and Secretaries (19.5%). "Fellow

congregants" were identified by nine participants (4.4%) as being responsible to

coordinate tangible supports for one another, Parish Nurses were identified by eight

Table 13

Type and Availability of Formal and Informal Practical Services

Duration of Support (%) / (Rank) Type of Support	Yes, 1-Time assistance	Yes, Repeated, Short-term Support	Yes, Ongoing, Long-term Support	Yes, Amount of Support Varies	Yes, Duration of Support Not Specified	Total "Yes" responses	Not Available
(1) Personal Assistance (washing dishes, running errands, etc.)	2.6	23.8	13.2	48.1	0.0	87.7	11.1
(2) Renovation / Repair / Relocation Assistance	9.4	17.8	5.2	48.2	0.0	80.6	16.8
(3) Transportation to Appointments (medical, interviews, etc.)	1.6	20.5	12.6	42.6	0.0	77.3	21.6
(4) Administrative Assistance (completing applications, etc.)	8.1	14.1	8.1	33.5	0.0	63.8	28.1
(5) Employment Assistance (resume consultation, etc.)	7.1	10.3	3.3	28.8	0.0	49.5	44.6
(6) Other Congregational Health Ministry	1.6	9.8	8.7	21.7	0.0	41.8	52.7
(7) Parish Nursing	0.0	2.2	4.4	5.5	0.0	12.1	84.2
(8) Other	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	9.7	9.7	n/a

(3.9%) participants, Stephen Ministers were identified by three participants (1.5%), and Clerks were

identified by two participants (1.0%).

Types of tangible programs and supports. For the purposes of this study, tangible

supports were divided into three categories: (1) practical support; (2) material support;

and (3) social/emotional support. Practical support referred to acts of services between

congregation members; material support incorporated the giving or lending of needed

physical resources such as money, groceries, and clothing; and social/emotional support

Table 14

Type and Availability of Formal and Informal Material Services

Duration of Availability of Support (%) / (Rank) Program	Yes, 1-Time assistance	Yes, Repeated, Short-term Support	Yes, Ongoing, Long-term Support	Yes, Amount of Support Varies	Yes, Duration of Support Not Specified	Total "Yes" responses	Not Available
(1) Meals, Informal (e.g. members cooking individual meals for fellow members who are ill, homebound, etc.)	3.5	30.7	18.1	40.2	0.0	92.5	5.0
(2) Financial Assistance (gifts and/or loans)	10.2	27.4	8.1	40.1	0.0	85.8	11.2
(3) Food Bank/Food Drives	6.6	16.3	23.0	29.1	0.0	75.0	22.4
(4) Meals, Formal (e.g. meals cooked & served at the church for numerous congregants at a time, etc.)	1.6	15.1	17.7	27.4	0.0	61.8	34.9
(5) Clothes Exchange	3.2	8.6	13.9	16.0	0.0	41.7	54.5
(6) Thrift Store	0.6	1.7	12.9	5.6	0.0	20.8	77.5
(7) Other	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	11.1	11.1	n/a

referred to positive interpersonal interaction between and among congregants.

Participants reported the formal and informal programs available to their congregants, as

well as the duration of each program's availability. As can be seen in Table 13, a variety

of practical supports were available to congregants. The most common types included

personal assistance through activities such as washing dishes and running errands

(87.7%), renovation/repair/relocation assistance (80.6%), transportation (77.3%), and

administrative assistance with tasks such as completing applications (63.8%). Meanwhile,

a variety of material supports were also currently available to the congregants represented

Table 15

Type and Availability of Formal and Informal Social/Emotional Services

Duration of Availability of Support (%) / (Rank) Program	Yes, 1-Time assistance	Yes, Repeated, Short-term Support	Yes, Ongoing, Long-term Support	Yes, Amount of Support Varies	Yes, Duration of Support Not Specified	Total "Yes" responses	Not Available
(1) Friendship (e.g. companionship for congregants who are lonely/isolated)	1.0	11.2	53.8	32.5	0.0	98.5	0.0
(2) Visitation (by clergy, deacons, or others in church leadership to ill or homebound congregants, etc.)	2.0	13.2	65.0	17.8	0.0	98.0	0.0
(3) Counselling, Pastoral	2.0	24.9	43.8	25.4	0.0	96.1	3.0
(4) Referrals to External Community Services	9.7	15.8	23.0	41.3	0.0	89.8	4.6
(5) Meaningful, self-directed inclusion of the ill, elderly and disabled in congregational activities	2.6	11.7	36.2	36.7	0.0	87.2	7.7
(6) Cell groups/Care groups	1.1	8.4	57.4	15.3	0.0	82.2	17.4
(7) Counselling, by fellow congregants	1.5	14.4	23.2	41.8	0.0	80.9	13.4
(8) Support Groups	2.1	9.3	18.0	30.9	0.0	60.3	37.1
(9) Other	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	7.0	7.0	n/a

in this study (see Table 14). The most common types of material support were informal

meals (92.5%), financial assistance (85.8), food bank/food drives (75.0%), and formal

meals (61.8%). A variety of social/emotional supports were also available to the

participants' faith communities. Seven out of eight types of social/emotional support were present in over 80% of the congregations (see Table 15).

Staff and volunteers. The majority (69.8%) of participants indicated that at least some of their staff and volunteers receive any type of training for tangible ministry work, while 20.8% of participants indicated that none of their staff and volunteers receive related training, and 8.3% answered "Unsure".

Partnership with community organizations. Participants reported collaborating with a range of partners organizations in the community (see Table 16).

Table 16

Types and Frequency of Community Partners

Types of partners with whom congregations collaborated	% of collaboration
Other faith communities, Christian	63.3
Local non-profit community organizations, faith-based	57.3
Local non-profit community organizations, secular	49.7
Denominational Agencies	46.7
National or international non-profit organizations, faith-based	37.2
Health care institutions, secular	35.7
External consultants, faith-based	30.2
Government-funded organizations	28.1
Colleges/universities, faith-based	17.6
External consultants, secular	12.6
Other faith communities, multi-faith	9.0
National or international non-profit organizations, secular	8.0
Health care institutions, faith-based	8.0
None	7.0
Colleges/universities, secular	6.5
Other (please specify)	5.0

Crisis prevention and intervention. As can be seen in Table 17, the majority of participants' congregations (92.6%) maintained either "strong emphasis" or "some

emphasis" on Crisis Intervention in the lives of their congregants, while only 66.7% gave

either "strong" or "some" emphasis to Long-term Prevention of potential crises in their

congregants' lives.

Table 17

Proportion of Supports Focused on Long-Term and Short-Term Prevention and Crisis

Intervention

Emphasis (%) / (Rank) Temporal proximity to situation of need	Strong Emphasis	Some Emphasis	Total congregations with some or strong emphasis	Little or No Emphasis
(1) Crisis intervention - Recognizing an existing crisis in a congregant's life, and taking immediate steps to find solutions and/or support the member through it	49.0	43.6	92.6	6.4
(2) Short-term prevention - Recognizing an imminent crisis in a congregant's life, and taking steps for prevention, finding solutions, and/or supporting the member through it	27.9	57.8	85.7	11.8
(3) Long-term prevention - Recognizing a potential crisis in a congregant's future, and taking long-term steps for prevention, finding solutions, and/or supporting the member through it	15.7	51.0	66.7	30.9
Means	30.8	50.8	81.6	16.3

Promotion of tangible services. Participants judged their congregants' awareness

of two issues: (1) types of tangible services available in their congregation; and (2) proper

channels of

Table 18

Congregants' Awareness of Their Faith Community's Tangible Services

Level of awareness (%) / Information	Mostly Aware	Somewhat Aware	Mostly Unaware	Unsure
Types of tangible services available in their congregation	43.6	44.0	9.4	3.0
Proper channels of accessing tangible services in their congregation	53.4	43.1	2.0	1.5

accessing tangible services in their congregation (see Table 18).

Congregations used various methods of awareness-raising about their tangible

ministry-related doctrines (see Table 19). The five most frequently cited methods used to

raise awareness about the types of services available in their congregations include word

of mouth (88.1%), verbal announcements during services (77.3%), pamphlet-style

bulletins (72.3%), sermons (55.9%), and bulletin boards (52.0%). The five most

frequently used methods of informing congregants about how to access these services

included word of mouth (86.8%), verbal announcements during services (78.5%),

pamphlet-style bulletins (68.3%), sermons (50.7%), and email communication with

congregants (47.8%).

Table 19

Methods of Informing the Congregation About Types and Access to Tangible Services

Information (%) / Method of communication (ranked by average use)	Types of tangible services available	Proper channels of accessing available services	Average use of each method of communication
Word-of-Mouth	88.1	86.8	87.5
Verbal announcements during services	77.2	78.5	77.9
Bulletins (e.g. distributed at services)	72.3	68.3	70.3
Sermons	55.9	50.7	53.3
E-mail communication with congregants	46.5	47.8	47.2
Bulletin Boards	52.0	38.0	45.0
Brochures	37.1	26.8	32.0
Newsletters	31.7	29.3	30.5
Website	31.2	28.8	30.0
Other (please specify)	5.9	8.3	7.1
Decorative banners inside the church building	3.0	2.0	2.5
None	0.0	0.0	0.0

Strengths of Participants' Faith Communities

Four overarching themes emerged as participants discussed the strengths and gaps in their congregations' tangible ministries: (1) "Values", including attitudes, beliefs, stereotypes, and so forth; (2) "Process", meaning specific features or steps in the process of developing and delivering tangible supports; (3) "Resources" needed to develop and deliver tangible supports, including personnel, capital, and so on; and (4) "Tangible Supports" such as a specific program a congregation might offer. Each of these themes encompasses numerous codes which are described below and, where possible, are illustrated with participants' quotes.

Strengths – values. Participants described thirteen major values that they had observed in their congregation's approach to tangible ministry. The first was a "Commitment to Helping". As one participant stated, "We have a strong commitment to helping members in need." Participants generally referred to commitment as the congregation's intentional effort and belief in a moral obligation to support one another.

The second positive value was "Credibility". One participant said of her congregation members, "They are very well connected and have high credibility in the community, being known for the service they give whether to fellow congregants or others in the community."

The third strength participants mentioned was "Empathy". This value was described as the congregants' ability to identify with each others' struggles and the motivation to help one another out of this shared experience. One participant explained it this way: "We are a congregation of hurting people reaching out to help hurting people.

Where they are now, we have been, where we are today, by the grace of Christ, they can be."

The next value was "Empowerment Focus". A participant explained:

Our congregation has a clear sense of loving practically in every way possible. We look for ways to do something that will help even if we cannot resolve the difficulty completely. In doing this we work hard at not enabling a person or family that might continue to 'fall into the same hole' when a little shared work at filling the hole might be more appropriate for the long term.

In other words, this value was described as a congregation's emphasis on helping someone empower themselves to address their expressed need if possible.

"Generosity" was a strength mentioned frequently by participants. One participant simply stated, "People are willing to help, and generously so." Another explained with an example saying:

We have a variety of highly skilled and caring members of our congregation who are generous is [sic] using their professional skills. For example, a Doctor in our congregation has been very willing to help people in need of her attention.

Another participant commented, "The congregation expresses real, christian [sic] love. Help is given willingly and generously."

Another major positive value was "Genuine Care". Participants defined it as a "true love of God by loving people. (...) [driven] by a deep desire to be congruent with our vision of 'Love God, Love People, Lives Transformed,'" "ready to step in and help at moments [sic] notice," "This spontaneously generates efforts to help from the laity". Another participant explained with an example:

The fact that the congregation really do [sic] care for one another and are [sic] interested in one another--not in a gossipy or invasive way. Rather in a way that says, I am here to help, how can I do that for you. [sic] Recently a member of the congregation died unexpectedly of a massive heart attack. Members of the congregation set up [rotations] to cook meals, answer the phone, help the young widow deal with arrangements. And those same people and others have continued to enquire on a weekly basis how things are going for she [sic] and her two boys. And all this was congregational driven. As the congregation's minister, I did not have to suggest any of this. People just did it!

A third participant shared an example from his/her congregation's experience:

Our faith community is [extremely] compassionate and caring. (...) just recently I watched as a male member of our church shaved a fellow member who had become too ill to it for himself. Another member has personally paid for someone's electricity so she wouldn't be cut off ...and this person and her family were not members of our church but had reached out to me for help. Members [sic] drugs have been paid for when they fell between the cracks of the social system; dentures bought; fuel paid for; roofs shingled; drives to doctors and hospitals for treatment.

And another participant shared this example:

There is a strong sense of 'family' among the people of the congregation. They care about one another and keep in touch during the week. (...) Our youth have included, as part of their mandate, an [intentional] outreach to help the seniors in the congregation with household/yardwork [sic] chores.

Participants shared many more examples about the genuine care their congregants had for one another. This positive value was mentioned frequently throughout the study.

The next value-related strength that participants mentioned was a "Strong Work Ethic", which was explained by one participant this way: "Ethnically Dutch this congregation has a [strong] work ethic and is task oriented. As such, when a [tangible] task is before the people, the people will rise to the occasion and see it to completion."

Numerous participants commented on the next positive value, which was a "Helping Culture". Some of their comments included, "Caring for and about one another is in our culture!" as well as the following description:

Over the years we have fostered a culture of caring for each other and the wider community in which we find ourselves situated. This culture of caring means that congregants are sensitive to needs in the congregation and neighbourhood and are conditioned to responding positively.

Other participants cited specific ethnic or regional cultures, such as Mennonite and Newfoundland culture, as influencing their congregation's emphasis on helping one another.

The next strength participants mentioned was "Inclusiveness, Sensitivity and Diversity". One participant explained, "The importance of "Loving One Another" is highlighted in our mission statement and we are constantly [endeavouring] to apply it without [judgement], prejudice, or condemnation." Another participant reflected, "I believe the congregants have become more sensitive to the needs around them as they involve themselves in ministering to those in need."

"A Lifestyle of Faith and Worship" was another value identified by participants. As one participant explained, "The strength of our community is its devotion and dedication to the Gospel. (...) for the few people who are there, their dedication to the community and to Christ is admirable."

The next value participants mentioned was "Others Centred and Focused", which was described as being aware of fellow congregants and their lives, and a feeling of care for one another.

Another value mentioned was "Prioritize People over Possessions", which participants described as a "Selfless attitude - which opens the door for service" where congregants were "willing to sacrifice personal comfort & finances to help someone in need."

The last value-related strength participants identified was a "Willingness to Help" which was described as congregants' positive attitude toward helping one another. Participants stated about their congregations, "Though we are a small community numerically we have a large heart: a need encountered is an opportunity to act," "People are willing to help, and generously so," "Willing to take a risk," "willingness to help no matter what else is going on in their own lives," "Willingness to give help to others, even people they don't know," and "they willingly step up and serve when someone needs help." Another participant added some detail to their description:

> Considering the 80/20 rule (20% of the people do 80% of the work), it is more than reasonable to say that at [our faith community], 70% of the people do 90% of the work. When help is needed for any task, people step forward to offer assistance in whatever way they are able.

Another participant provided specific examples of this value:

> the sabbath [sic] lunch program, cooking for families in need due to illness,
> [bereavement], new birth, helping families move from one home to another,
> financial aid for those who are in a time of crisis or desiring to better their
> [circumstances] through training, are ministries that flourish [because] of
> members [sic] willingness to help where needed.

These 13 values were followed by the next major theme exhibiting the strengths of participants' congregations, namely "Process".

Strengths – process. The first positive process participants mentioned was "Communication of Existing Needs". Participants made many comments about this topic, saying "Without 'gossiping' we keep each other informed of [parishioners'] needs," "We know each others' needs quite well, and many of us have time to help each other in a very sensitive way," "We have an opportunity for group and informal sharing each week, so that personal needs are pretty well known and dealt with to the extent we can," and "There's a strong communication base, and some very motivated core care-givers."

The second process-related strength was a "Grass-roots, Informal Approach", which was described by participants as the majority of tangible supports being coordinated by congregants who were not in leadership positions. One participant described "grassroots, informal help from neighbours" as their congregation's strength, while another explained that lay members were taking leadership of all ministries during the time that they did not have a paid pastor on staff.

The third process-related strength was called "Leaders Care and Help". In this case, participants gave examples of tangible supports that were often carried out by specific leaders in their congregation. One participant explained:

Our pastors and leaders will wrestle individually with people, with compassion to try to care for and help them. This may take a great deal of time and some times [sic] ends in frustration but every now and then we actually end up really making a difference in someone's life, and it is very satisfying so we keep going and trying!

Some other examples include, "We have also a strong deacons group and some individuals who are committed to caring for specific individuals," "We provide spiritual support (pastor and elders), emotional support (pastor and other members), financial support (deacons), and practical support (meals, do farm work, give rides)," and "The leadership (currently 2 others) have been very generous with church funds to direct them towards immediate financial needs."

The next process-related strength was "Modelling Helping Behaviours" which one participant simply described as "teaching by example." Another participant provided a personal example of this type of modelling:

I watched my parents and acquaintances meet others [sic] needs in ways that have made it a part of my family's lifestyle. Now I am seeing my children doing the same. This activity is something that is better caught than taught.

Another helpful process participants mentioned was that "People Draw Together in Need", which referred to a congregation's tendency to rally together during challenging times, rather than to withdraw from each other during those times.

The next process was called "Reciprocal Giving and Receiving", which was explained by one participant as, "Givers and receivers of help are the same people at different times."

Another process participants highlighted was "Relationship-Based Helping". Participants explained the relationship-based helping with examples such as, "They are relational based so the delivery is a love foundation rather than a task one. This communicates belonging and love," and "The reality is, people who are in relationship with others in our church are well cared for, because the people who they have a relationship with step up and help." Numerous participants described a type of relationship-based helping that took place within a small group setting (small groups were also referred to as care groups, or cell groups), saying "Organically organized small groups care for each other's practical needs well - meals, errands - anything in a crisis or transition situation," and "Our congregation runs almost all of its tangible ministries though cell groups. For this reason we have many volunteers. This is our greatest strength. Having many volunteers means being able to address many needs more efficiently."

Many participants mentioned the next type of process which was a strength for their congregations, namely "Responsiveness to Needs". As one participant put it, "They see a need and meet it, it's about the simple," and another stated, "Understanding, empathy, love, support, help here and now!" One participant shared this perspective:

When the need is articulated, and they are made aware, they respond quickly, with immediate crisis intervention, and with a look into the possibilities of what might be acceptable, and needful for bringing about new or refreshed stability in the life

of the person who is seeking/needing assistance, or the establishment of long-term arrangements, if needed.

Another process participants highlighted was "Support of Initiative-Takers". This was described by a participant as, "a very strong support for each other in helping members when they need it. Affirmation for who ever takes the lead in helping is always there." Another participant noted, "The members come to me with a burden to begin a ministry and they go and lead out in that ministry with lots of support from congregation [members]."

The last process-related strength participants identified was "Well Organized". As one participant put it, "We are very generous, and well organized."

Strengths – resources. The next theme participants outlined was "Resources", which formed another strength within their congregations. The first resource was "Access to Denominational Supports". One participant gave an example from the Mennonite denomination:

> Mennonites have developed a strong network of caring and built it into the
>
> practical tradition of community and congregational life. Joint efforts like
>
> Mennonite Disaster Service and Mennonite Central Committee efforts to help
>
> [those] in need are part of the organizational aspects promoted in the
>
> congregation, teaching by example, that it is a vital part of doctrine and also
>
> [practise], to help those in need.

Congregants were able to draw upon denominational resources such as these during a crisis or situation of need.

Another highlighted resource was an "Awareness of a Biblical Mandate" to help one another in times of need. As one participant put it, "Knowing that because Jesus cares for others, we must also care for others."

The next resource participants highlighted was an "Awareness of Personal Capacity" to help. As one participant explained, "Our understanding that all members can give and receive help in time of need is also a strength."

Another resource was the aspect of "Connections". As one participant explained, congregants "are always there and are willing to draw in friends who are outside of the congregation as well."

"Education and Experience" was the next resource-based strength mentioned about several congregations. As one participant explained, their congregation was "experienced and educated to respond to needs".

The next resource many participants discussed was "Personnel and Capital". Numerous examples were also given under this category. One participant wrote,

> Our strength is not just focused on us, but that we are to care for everyone, all those within the city. We have organized a group (...) which has moved people, provided meals, house renovations (everything from fixing leaking taps to complete house makeover), auto renovations and providing clothes and furniture. We also have money we use to assist needs in paying bills, and to assist with professional counseling [sic].

Another participant gave this example:

> Our congregation (...) are [sic] particularly good at doing practical things such as cooking meals, fixing things (cars, plumbing, etc) and finding ways to meet the

need (e.g. finding a truck to move a family). They will readily visit and stand by as needed.

And still others gave the following examples about their congregations saying, "We offer shelter, clothing, food, showers for the homeless, assisted poor and working poor. We have a soup kitchen. Our strength is our people and our building," "We have funds in our budget for tangible ministry and the decisions for those expenditures are made by those in the church who carry the most responsibility for hands-on care," "We have several 'early' retired people who have the [time] and energy to devote to helping others,"

"Relationships" was the next resource about which participants spoke, citing "friendships" and "strong families" as the two types of relationships that strengthened their congregations.

Lastly, numerous participants identified a "Small Congregation Size" as a resource. One participant explained it, saying,

> One of our faith community's strengths is that we are SMALL. We know each other. We know where everyone lives, and what situation each person is in. We know whether they live alone, how they are doing (ie health), and if they have any children near them who are HELPFUL.

Others illustrated this strength with statements such as, "We are a small community, in which everybody knows each other and also knows when help is needed," "One strength is our 'lack' of numbers. We all know everyone else, so when one shares they need a bed, everyone is on the look out," "As a small family-based church, everyone is usually in touch with most other congregants and is aware of needs as they arise," "Since our community is small it is easy to contact someone for help," "Personal knowledge of other

persons/families. A small congregation makes that possible," and "Our group is small, committed to being family to each other - not perfectly, but on and [sic] on-going basis." These eight resource-based strengths were closely associated with the last theme, namely "Tangible Services".

Strengths – tangible services. Participants listed numerous types of tangible supports as strengths exhibited by their congregations, including counselling, moral and emotional support, prayer, mindfulness of homebound, hospitalized and other "shut in" members who were not able to attend congregational gatherings, visitation, and formal programs such as a "Community Services Centre", "compassionate ministry centre", parish nursing and social work services, as well as "Men's Ministry" and "Women's Ministry" programs. In addition to naming the tangible supports, many participants also provided examples, of which three are quoted below:

> one member was fired without cause and after [a year] was re-instated into the
> position. In the mean time members provided [financial support] so the person
> could keep her apartment, pay for her food and necessities and walked with her
> through all the emotional turmoil this caused her. In another situation, one
> member was dying of cancer after a long struggle to sponsor her son to come to
> this country. We helped her find a cheap flight home to be with family when she
> died, but before she left, our congregation drove about 110 kms to her home to
> have communion. She valued the spiritual and emotional support a great deal as
> did her children who lived in another continent. We have held memorial services
> with members [whose] parents, brothers or sisters have died in other countries,
> even though we have no direct connection to these persons.

Another participant shared:

> One member who is mentally challenged has a lot of people looking out for him,
> helping him with employment and including him in their family gatherings. In
> turn he has helped others by doing cleaning and offering rides in his van for our
> less mobile members. We are all gifts to each other.

And another wrote:

> One area of strength is assisting and support [sic] persons in transitions. Support
> for the aging members as they head toward long term care is a key ministry.
> Many of our seniors are either single or have [no] family locally. Many times our
> church through the Parish Nurse, Care Team, elders and/or others act as family,
> surrogate support community. This is also the case in times of job loss, moves,
> new baby arrivals and many other times.

Table 20

Benefits of Tangible Ministries Observed by Participants

Observed benefits of tangible ministries	%
Congregants are more committed to caring for each other	85.1
Congregants received help they would not have otherwise received	77.7
Elderly, ill, disabled and other isolated congregants have been more included in congregational life	67.3
Congregants are more involved in caring for others not of our congregation	55.4
Congregants' transition experiences went more smoothly than they would have otherwise been	53.5
Congregants have made health-promoting lifestyle changes	44.6
Congregants were able to delay moving into a nursing home	20.8
Other (please specify)	4.5
I have observed no positive impact	2.5
Not applicable	0.5

Strengths – observed benefits of tangible ministries. Participants reported, through

a multiple-choice style question, numerous benefits of the tangible ministries provided by

their congregations (see Table 20).

Areas for Improvement in Participants' Faith Communities

Challenges to developing and delivering tangible supports. As can be seen in

Table 21 participants rated the following issues from "1 - Most Challenging" to "5 -

Least Challenging". Results are ranked in that order.

Participants were also asked to consider which of the above challenges, if

overcome, would have the greatest influence in prompting them to expand their faith

community's tangible supports. In Table 22, results are listed from greatest to least by the

proportion of participants selecting each option.

Involvement from leadership versus laity. Participants were asked to give their

opinion on the proportion of tangible ministry activities that were being carried out by

Table 21

Gaps Rated From Most to Least Challenging

Scale (%) / (Rating) Type of challenge in order of most to least challenging	1 – Most Challenging	2	3	4	5 – Least Challenging	N/A	Mean Rating
(1) Lack of time	23.3	39.4	16.7	13.3	5.0	2.2	2.36
(2) Lack of skilled staff/volunteers	11.8	33.9	28.0	14.5	10.2	1.6	2.77
(3) Lack of funds	20.0	21.1	24.3	18.9	14.6	1.1	2.87
(4) Lack of information	4.3	22.7	32.4	22.7	16.2	1.6	3.24
(5) Concerns regarding liability	5.5	14.4	20.4	19.3	34.8	5.5	3.67
(6) Lack of support from the congregation	3.8	10.8	23.2	28.1	31.4	2.7	3.74
(7) Lack of support from the leadership	2.2	4.9	12.5	27.2	47.3	6.0	4.20

Table 22

Challenges Most Likely to Prompt Development of Supports if Overcome

Type of challenge	%
Lack of skilled staff/volunteers	63.8
Lack of funds	55.3
Lack of time	54.3
Lack of support from the congregation	39.9
Lack of information	23.9
Concerns regarding liability	12.2
Lack of support from the leadership	10.6
Other	10.1

church leaders versus the proportion of similar activities being carried out by lay

members (see Table 23).

Table 23

Ratio of Tangible Ministry Activities Carried out by Leadership vs. Laity

Ratio	Existing % of tangible ministry carried out by leadership vs. laity	Participants' desired % of tangible ministry carried out by leadership vs. laity
Leadership 100% - Laity 0%	1.5	2.5
Leadership 90% - Laity 10%	0.0	1.3
Leadership 80% - Laity 20%	10.3	2.5
Leadership 70% - Laity 30%	11.8	1.3
Leadership 60% - Laity 40%	16.2	6.3
Leadership 50% - Laity 50%	22.1	18.8
Leadership 40% - Laity 60%	6.6	11.3
Leadership 30% - Laity 70%	16.2	18.8
Leadership 20% - Laity 80%	5.9	16.3
Leadership 10% - Laity 90%	8.1	20.0
Leadership 0% - Laity 100%	1.5	1.3

Participants highlighted areas for improvement in each of the four themes, Values, Process, Resources and Tangible Resources. These findings are elaborated below.

Areas for improvement – values. Participants identified several major values that provide opportunities for improvement within their congregations. The first was a "Greater Interest in Helping One Another". As one participant put it,

> By pursuing continued learning in terms of what kinds of responses, supports and assistance might be most appropriate, based on new research, new resources, etc. This would require the level of personal interest in this pursuit to be enhanced - a "change of heart" would be needed, in that regard, to determine to be intentional about this continuing education pursuit.

Another participant wrote,

> The issue in our congregation doesn't seem to be so much a lack of time (mostly retired people), so much as a lack of desire or interest in others. When it comes to praying for others in the community, they show care and are active during the service. But many of our attendees stay on the periphery of involvement and choose to let others meet the needs practically.

Other participants explained, "peoples [sic] attitudes are hardened in their help for others" and "It is difficult to offer support etc. if their isn't a strong committment [sic] from congregation [sic] both in time/money/participation."

The second value-improvement participants highlighted was "Less Individualism and Self-Absorption". One participant stated, "Too often we are self-centered," while another put it this way, "We tend to live in our own little world, so caught up in

struggling with our own problems and wrestling with time constraints that we have little vision of the needs of others and our ability to assist." Another expressed the need for a specific type of ministry that would encourage more community-mindedness within the congregation:

> Having a focused outreach ministry will enable each individual to not be so self focused in saying "poor me" and start doing things for others. As when you are focused outward "me" is forgotten. The vision of working as a team for God.

"Less Pride" was mentioned by numerous participants as being a significant need within their congregation, both on the part of those needing tangible support yet not wishing to ask for it, as well as those whose pride prevented them from offering tangible support to those in need. As a participant said,

> At times the personal pride or self reliance of a person in need is the biggest challenge to overcome. We need to continue to work on fostering an understanding that although it may be more [blessed] to give than to receive, it is also at times a blessing to receive.

Another participant stated, "We need to [become] more [comfortable] in being able to request help and also in being able to offer help when needed. Pride can get in the way."

"More Appreciation for Volunteers" was another problem identified by participants. As someone mentioned, "Volunteers are not always appreciated for their efforts. A thank you from recipients would go a long way in revitalizing volunteers."

The next value improvement highlighted by participants was "More Focus on Faith", referring to the relationship between faith and actions. Participants mentioned that

less compromise and greater focus on one's relationship with God would lead to more helping behaviours within their congregations.

Participants identified the need for a "More Positive Attitude" One participant reported "a culture of negativity" within their congregation, while another stated that "many [congregants] don't lift a finger and some even turn their backs."

The last value participants mentioned was "Prioritizing Life to Put Needy First". When asked what improvements one's congregation could make to its tangible support of members, one participant reflected:

> as I have seen many times before there is a nice purpose statement which sounds good but may not actually reflect the sense of mission of the current congregation. This is [what] they know they should be, perhaps wished they would be, but is it really what they strive to be? It's not always easy to say. In connection with that, the budget is a logical reflection of what we actually believe (as opposed to what we say or want to believe). Giving itself is conditioned by what we [believe] and then [allocate] within the budget. I believe that our budget reflects what we actually believe. The main issue though is not money, but manpower. There is no point having more money allocated where there are no volunteers to spend it for what it is designated for.

Other participants answered, "By being committed to living a simpler lifestyle, thereby freeing up time and resources that could be allocated to ministering to others," "It is the continual reorganization of life to help those in need," "Sacrificing personal leisure time for the sake of others," "More committment [sic] than only attending worship services - be open to sharing their time/resources/talents as needed/required."

The next value some participants identified was that their congregations should "Prioritize Certain Issues More". One participant specified, saying, "I think there are many areas of life that we as a faith community are not addressing as well as we ought to; including but not limited to divorce care, depression support; marital struggles, aging parents."

The "Need for Equity and Compassion" was also mentioned by participants. As one participant described,

Caring for someone with more difficult & on going problems, takes more time and is riskier. So what is really blocking our expansion in this kind of ministry/action is, in my mind both a lack of deep compassion and an unwillingness to move out of our comfort zone into risky situations. I am sure part of that comes as well from people not feeling they have the skills/training/gifts and part of that comes as well from not quite knowing how to move into such situations without being overwhelmed &/or swamped with the need. I also don't think we as leaders model that very well.

"Fear and Uncertainty" was another problem that participants identified as preventing congregants from supporting one another in times of need. As one participant explained,

I am sure part of that comes as well from people not feeling they have the skills/training/gifts and part of that comes as well from not quite knowing how to move into such situations without being overwhelmed &/or swamped with the need. I also don't think we as leaders model that very well.

Areas for improvement – process. "Better Modelling of Helping Behaviours" was an area for improvement that a few participants mentioned. One stated, "I think we as leaders could do a much better job of modeling [sic] how to give tangible help. I do this in terms of making visits, but not much more."

"Build Relationships" was another need participants observed in their congregations. One participant noted that their congregation needed an:

increased sense of the congregation as a parish family where they encounter each other and the visitor, rather than visiting primarily with those they know. The challenge of being connected to each other, so that in times of need, a supportive response would be take [sic] place in the context of relationship. For example, visitors are greeted but often left on their own in the parish hall.

Another wrote:

Sometimes I wish that it could be done more cross generationally to help build up the fellowship in a different dimension. That is, that older women assist younger families (mothers) when they have newborns, for instance, and that the meals aren't just provided for by the young mother's peer group. Likewise, older individuals and couples who have needs generally get assistance from their peers for rides, moving, shopping, etc.; it would be nice to see younger adults take some of this on as well.

Here are some other comments participants submitted in the survey: "People who don't have many relationships are not helped as much," "the problem with formal ways of dealing with need is that it can become non relational," "Members who have been members of this community for a long time seem to be better cared-for by their fellow

members than those who are newer to the community; there is an unspoken priority given to the people who are best known."

Participants also said their congregations needed to "Close the Gaps". One participant said of the congregation's tangible ministry, "So much happens informally. But the problem with informality is that it often has gaps in it."

Several participants said their congregants needed to make "Fewer Assumptions" about the perceived need for their personal involvement in meeting others' needs. One participant reported:

> I think there are 2 things that are the most challenging for us. One is that we do not sense the need to act (someone else will surely do it) and two, we have not found a way to make needs known in such a way that congregants can see how they might meet those needs.

As another participant put it, "people assume that others are taking care of a situation of need."

"Incorporate Supports into Church Life" is another needed improvement mentioned by participants. This referred to the idea that tangible support should be part of every aspect of a congregant's experience within the church family, rather than one compartmentalized aspect of church family life.

"Less Hesitation and Worry" was another problem highlighted by participants. One reported that:

> Issues of privacy and confidentiality are at times presented as a stumbling block for our ministries. Some of our elders constantly raise privacy issues as a way to

deflect us from broadening our direct care for others. While understanding the importance of this matter it seems to be a barrier to care too frequently. Another participant mentioned, "It seems there is a great willingness to help those in need, but there's uncertainty about what would be most helpful - is there a program that works? Can we maintain such a program without burning out our members?"

Some participants said their congregation's programs needed to be "Less Institutional" and more informal. As one participant put it:

We're too institutional. Everything has to go through the church. Life groups/cell groups are a great way to increase Christian love and sharing life. We see church to [sic] much as a place to gather on Sunday and worship as opposed to a place to reach out.

A need identified by a large number of participants was "More Communication and Awareness". Some of their remarks indicated the need for, "Better administration of prayer 'chain' and care systems for all, not just those who are well connected," "Better communication between leadership and laity," "being more deliberately aware of what's happening in the lives of the people, sharing more about what's going on in our own lives and encouraging others to be a blessing to each other," "We need to be more open and honest with each other--with a little less pride," "One of our biggest challenges is that sometimes people don't tell us of a need. We hear about it long after the need has passed," "Often there is a significant time delay in sharing a need. This limits awareness, and in most cases means that a problem has become severe before it is known and can be addressed," "I think that peer visitation would go a long way in making leaders more aware of the needs of the members and they would be more willing to help,"

One participant expanded on this problem:

> Many times people don't want to "bother" anyone so don't say anything about
> their need. Only after the issue we here [sic] about it and by then it is reactionary
> and often to [sic] late. This is improving as we create an environment of safety
> and hope. Better communication is always needed as well. We had a lady who
> was sick and the person who did know didn't say anything to anyone including
> leadership and so the lady felt abandoned in her time of need. If the funds were
> available I would want a paid positions [sic] whose only job is to advocate for
> those who need help.

Another member wrote, "Members don't always 'see' needs; if they are directed to them,
they will willingly help. But sometimes situations of trouble go unnoticed or
uncommented upon, because people don't want to pry or meddle,"

"More Timely Intervention" was the last process-related problem that emerged
from the data. While the need for quicker intervention was alluded to in previous themes,
one participant mentioned this specific need without relating it to other process issues
such as communication, for instance. Given that a slow response to fellow congregants'
needs could have numerous causes not mentioned in the data, this issue was considered
an independent finding.

Areas for improvement – resources. Participants mentioned a number of resource-
related areas for improvement. The first issue participants mentioned was a need for
"More Awareness of Personal Capacity to Help", referring to leaders' and congregants'
awareness of their ability to make a meaningful contribution in someone's life. As one
participant said, "we have little vision of the needs of others and our ability to assist."

"Greater Participation" was a resource-oriented improvement that many participants mentioned. This referred mainly to the latent potential in non-participating congregants for providing various types of tangible support. One participant expressed their observations as, "many don't lift a finger and some even turn their backs." Another framed it as the need to "Get people out of their pews and doing the things that God has called them to do." Other participants expressed it this way: "I wish we had a more organized group of laity able to give practical support. As it is, individuals easily burnout, I think that if the burden of a particular need was shared burnout would happen less often," and "Support is often expressed for the goals but not always in volunteering and specifically in long-term commitments. Many volunteers don't mind helping once in a while but a greater commitment base is required to run established initiatives."

One participant mentioned the need to "Identify and Involve People" who might already be predisposed to involvement in tangible ministry. The participant expressed it as the need "to recognize those whose passion and spiritual giftings lend to this type of ministry and get them more involved in these areas of ministry."

"Less Busyness" was the next need mentioned by participants. One church leader expressed it this way: "time is a huge issue - we are all too busy with our own lives to leave much room for spontaneous helping of others."

"Awareness of Biblical Mandate on Helping" was a resource-related need mentioned by participants. One survey respondent wrote of the need for congregants to "Become more aware of their baptismal responsibility to be the eyes, ears and heart of Christ [in] the world." Another participant mentioned the need for additional "Preaching on serving and recognizing needs and how to address and help."

The next resource-related need was "More Dedicated Staff and Volunteers" for tangible ministry. One participant expressed the need for "more than one bi-vocational lead pastor." Another church leader said, "If the funds were available I would want a paid positions [sic] whose only job is to advocate for those who need help." Other expressed needs included, "a co-ordinator or contact person who could spearhead getting the info out & getting help in place greater awareness by the people to express their need," an "office for pastoral counselling," and "more volunteers trained and able to do [hospital] visits." "We are very small congregation," expressed one participant, "[w]e do what we can, but are often overworked. We just can't respond to everything." Another church leader shared this story in the survey:

> At times the support needed contiunes [sic] after the volunteers have burntout [sic]. We have had two major circumstances where famlies [sic] needed support for long term and volunteers have used resources beyond their time and financial abilities. It was good for the families needing help but no support for the many volunteers who exceeded their capabilities.

"More Partnership with Community Services" was another area for improvement in some participants' faith communities. One church leader spoke of "Connecting people intentionally with community resources to give those in need a 'hand up'," while another participant shared this experience: "Today I'm ministering (together with the lay leaders) to the third family of the suicide victim. (...) We need help and support from persons/institutions specialised in this area of ministry."

Numerous participants named "More Training" as another needed improvement in their faith communities. One participant mentioned that a "Lack of energy, or inner

resources sometimes make this difficult, when there are some who are convinced that they are beyond 'learning new things'." Another specifically mentioned the need for "training how to best help them to move forward rather than enabling them to stay where they are," while another participant suggested that "Leadership development would help our faith community do a better job."

"More Understanding of Difficult Issues" was also mentioned by participants as an area for improvement within their congregation. One church leader mentioned his congregation's need to be "more aware of how addictions are hurting the lives of others and be willing to stand alongside these individuals in overcoming their addiction with accountability of phone calls/meetings together."

"Funding" was mentioned by a few participants as a needed improvement. Several names were used to describe it, including "emergency fund", "benevolence fund", and "discretionary fund." All participants who mentioned this need stated that such funding either did not exist at all within their congregation, or if it had already been established it was still too meagre.

Lastly, "More Focused Use of Limited Resources" was mentioned as another needed improvement, which referred to the need for an intentional coordination of existing resources in order to make the most efficient use of these resources in the midst of a shortage.

Areas for improvement – tangible supports. Participants mentioned several improvements needed by their congregations' existing tangible supports. The first improvement many of them emphasized was "Commitment and Sustainability":

Just yesterday, a young family was overwhelmed with help as they moved their

belongings to a new home. Today, more people arrived to help them unpack and

get the new house cleaned and ready to live in. As in many congregations, we

love to help with a short term need. Long term needs are more of a test for us.

Other church leaders reported, "Our long-term help could be better" and "Support is often

expressed for the goals but not always in volunteering and specifically in long-term

commitments."

Numerous participants mentioned the need for "More Formal Support Programs",

such as targeted interventions for "people caught in the grip of addictions and poverty,"

and Parish Nursing programs. As one church leader explained, "Since our congregation is

made up principally of older seniors, the greatest need is in the area of health care. We

could implement a Parish Nurse program since we have quite a number of retired nurses

in our congregation."

An informal type of support some participants highlighted was "More

Hospitality". One participant expressed the need for "Improved openness in our homes

for those elderly who would enjoy being a guest. More interaction in our homes to

improve a sense of extended family."

Lastly, "Prayer" was a needed improvement mentioned by some participants. This

participant explained, "Our prayer ministry has been non-existent in a formalized way for

some time. I as a pastor could see ministry greatly improved as needs of the congregation

were more regularly prayed for."

Chi-square Analysis

A chi-square analysis was completed on all of the qualitative themes under the four overarching categories, Values, Process, Resources and Tangible Supports, in order to determine whether a relationship existed between any of these themes and one of the following three demographic characteristics: 1) church membership size (see Appendices J and K), 2) church neighbourhood (see Appendices L and M), and 3) church budget (see Appendices N and O). All of the significant results reported below, however, had an expected cell count of less than five, therefore these relationships may not be statistically robust, however they are noteworthy.

Membership size. There was a significant association between church membership size and whether or not participants mentioned "counselling" as a strength $\chi^2(3) = 25.12$, $p < .001$. This result seems to show that church leaders from congregations with an average of 500 or more members are 10.67 times more likely to mention counselling as a strength than leaders from smaller churches (see Appendix J).

There was a significant association between church membership size and whether or not participants mentioned "more timely intervention" as a need $\chi^2(3) = 12.50, p < .01$. This result seems to show that church leaders from congregations with an average of 500 or more members are 5.26 times more likely to mention this theme as a gap in their tangible ministry than leaders from smaller churches (see Appendix K).

There was a significant association between church membership size and whether or not participants mentioned "funding" as a need $\chi^2(3) = 9.15, p < .05$. This result seems to show that church leaders from congregations with between 50 and approximately 100 members are 8.47 times more likely to mention this theme as a gap in their tangible ministry than leaders from other churches (see Appendix K). Interestingly, exactly the

same result was found for churches with the same membership size for the theme "more formal support programs" $\chi^2(3) = 9.15$, $p < .05$. This result indicates that church leaders from congregations with between 50 and approximately 100 members may be 8.47 times more likely to mention this theme as a gap in their tangible ministry than leaders from other churches (see Appendix K).

There was a significant association between church membership size and whether or not participants mentioned "more dedicated staff and volunteers" as a need $\chi^2(3) = 7.81$, $p < .05$. This result indicates that church leaders from congregations with 500 or more members are 4.91 times more likely to mention this theme as a gap in their tangible ministry than leaders from smaller churches (see Appendix K). Similarly, there was a significant association between church membership size and whether or not participants mentioned "more focused use of limited resources" as a need $\chi^2(3) = 12.50$, $p < .01$. This result indicates that church leaders from congregations with 500 or more members are 5.26 times more likely to mention this theme as a gap in their tangible ministry than leaders from smaller churches (see Appendix K).

Neighbourhood setting. There was a significant association between church neighbourhood and whether or not participants mentioned "a lifestyle of faith and worship" as a strength $\chi^2(3) = 11.41$, $p < .01$. This result seems to show that church leaders from congregations in remote neighbourhoods are 8.55 times more likely to mention this theme as a strength than leaders from churches in other neighbourhoods (see Appendix L).

There was a significant association between church neighbourhood and whether or not participants mentioned "responsiveness to needs" as a strength $\chi^2(3) = 9.63$, $p <$

.05. This result seems indicates that church leaders from congregations in urban/inner city and rural/small town neighbourhoods may be 11.75 times more likely to mention this theme as a strength than leaders from churches in other neighbourhoods (see Appendix L).

Church budget. There was a significant association between church budget and whether or not participants mentioned "counselling" as a strength $\chi^2(3) = 11.48, p < .01$. This result seems to show that church leaders from congregations with a church budget of $400,000 or more are 7.72 times more likely to mention counselling as a strength than leaders from churches with lower budgets (see Appendix N).

There was a significant association between church budget and whether or not participants mentioned "relationship-based helping" as a strength $\chi^2(3) = 8.07, p < .05$. This result indicates that church leaders from congregations with higher budgets, especially $400,000 and higher, may be 8.84 times more likely to mention relationship-based helping as a strength than leaders from churches with lower budgets (see Appendix N).

In summary, while the chi-square analysis did not result in statistically robust relationships within the data, the qualitative findings did bring significant areas of interest to light regarding the strengths and challenges to congregant-centred tangible support. A diverse set of Canadian, English-speaking congregations reported offering a vast assortment of formal and informal tangible supports. They also emphasized many of their congregations' strengths in regards to meeting members' needs, as well as numerous challenges or hindrances to their tangible ministry goals.

Chapter 5

Discussion

In this thesis I sought to answer the central question: How are English Canadian Christian churches supporting their members who experience tangible needs? Church leaders outlined many programs and services, both formal and informal, which their congregations make available to members in times of need. I also posed the following sub-questions: (1) Upon what strengths and resources do Canadian Christian churches draw in order to meet the tangible needs of their congregants? (2) What challenges prevent Canadian churches from meeting the tangible needs of their congregants? (3) How do Christian church leaders across Canada wish to improve the tangible supports their churches provide to their respective members?

The church leaders who took part in this study provided valuable insights into each of these questions. Many described certain "Values" at which their congregations excelled, while others described a need for certain values to improve within their congregations. The same was true for the "Process" of developing and delivering tangible support to congregants, the various "Resources" needed to adequately address members' needs, and was also true for specific "Tangible Support" programs that were either strongly represented or lacking within the congregations. The last sub-question to be answered was (4) Is there a relationship between church membership size, church neighbourhood, church budget and any of the strengths or weaknesses identified by participants? The chi-square analysis did not result in any robust significant findings because of the high number of cells with expected frequencies of less than 0, but instead these findings pointed to some interesting potential leads for future research.

Congregational Social Capital and Social Support

According to Boisjoly, Duncan, and Hofferth (1995), social capital is differentiated from social support in that the existence of social relationships or social networks implies the inherent presence of social capital, whereas social support is the actual application of social capital to existing needs. As Greeley (1997) and others state, Christian congregations are important sites of social capital, which church communities may choose to utilize for the benefit of congregants, neighbours, and others. Even small congregations inhabit valuable social capital, as Hanifan (1916) also exhibited in his description of the potential for social capital to develop in small communities. This potential was also confirmed by church leaders of small congregations who responded to this study. As this study has shown (see Tables 13 - 15), all types of church communities across Canada are translating their social capital into social support in many ways and with varying degrees of effectiveness. Those leaders who reported observing benefits of their congregation's existing tangible support ministries confirm the many benefits described in the literature (e.g. Berkman & Syme, as cited in Mohahan & Hooker, 1997; Stone et al., 2003).

Regardless of a congregation's success at providing tangible support to congregants, it has been shown that they do have the potential to provide a ready source of social support, and from the data it seems that the size of a congregation is not as influential in providing social support as is the proportion of members actively providing support within that congregation. As Berkman and Syme report (as cited in Monahan & Hooker, 1997), it is not the size of the congregation itself, but the size of the support network and frequency of contact with that network that benefits individuals

experiencing high-stress situations. The more members within a congregation who become involved in ongoing, reciprocal friendship and support activities, the more a faith community can improve the quality of life and even prolong the life span of its struggling members (Berkman and Syme, as cited in Monahan & Hooker, 1997).

The chi-square revealed no robust significant relationships between membership size, neighbourhood setting, or church budget and the various themes brought forth by church leaders in the qualitative sections of the survey. It is quite possible these results indicate that similar challenges are experienced by congregations and their leaders regardless of the three demographic characteristics examined (membership size, neighbourhood setting, and church budget). This finding might facilitate greater collaboration among diverse congregations in order to problem-solve and overcome these similar challenges to their tangible ministries.

Division of Labour between Leadership and Laity

A major challenge encountered by church leaders is a lack of volunteers to help meet congregants' tangible needs. The average participating church leader indicated that, in their opinion, the church leadership takes responsibility for 50% of the congregation's tangible ministries while the laity is responsible for the other 50% (the mean and mode were both at the 50-50 mark). Next, when asked to indicate their ideal division of tangible ministry work, the majority of participants indicated a smaller role for leadership and larger role for laity (the mean was set at "Leadership 30% - Laity 70%", while the mode was "Leadership 10% - Laity 90%). Keeping in mind that the number of individuals in church leadership (e.g., clergy, elders, deacons, administrators, etc.) consist of a fraction of the congregation's total membership, it is understandable that leaders

would find a 50-50 division of tangible ministry work quite heavy, given the specialized work for which they are also responsible (e.g. preparing and delivering sermons, teaching Sunday School or Bible Study classes, visitation and pastoral counselling, leading mid-week programs and committee meetings, and so forth).

This disproportionate amount of involvement between leadership and laity in meeting the congregation's tangible needs seems to be related to the larger problem of a lack of involvement from congregation members, other than the usual attendance at Sunday morning services. In one comment, a leader touched on what seems to be a common and frustrating aspect of church life: the "80/20 rule (20% of the people do 80% of the work)." I also heard of this "rule" during the years my dad worked as a church pastor, so it would be reasonable to expect that others in church leadership have made similar observations, and that it would surface during the course of this research as well. Numerous church leaders commented in the survey that their ideal situation would be one in which all able and available congregants identify and respond to fellow congregants' needs through relational bonds. Unfortunately, however, this does not seem to be the norm in most cases, and the reasons for this could be related to every possible combination of the challenges that church leaders identified in the survey.

Short-Term to Long-Term Support

For various reasons, duration and sustainability of tangible support seems to be another significant challenge for church leaders. In other words, congregations have difficulty providing tangible support that is long-term. This is clearly expressed in the answers to question 29 in the survey, "How much emphasis is given to the following strategies by your faith community's tangible supports?" in which participants reported

the emphasis that their congregation gives to "Long-term prevention" (i.e., "Recognizing

a potential crisis in a congregant's future, and taking long-term steps for prevention,

finding solutions, and/or supporting the member through it"), "Short-term prevention"

and "Crisis intervention" (i.e., "Recognizing an existing crisis in a congregant's life, and

taking immediate steps to find solutions and/or support the member through it"). The data

reveals a clear emphasis on crisis intervention and a lack of emphasis on prevention and

long-term support. Almost half (49.0%) of participants reported a "Strong Emphasis" on

crisis intervention, while only 15.7% reported a "Strong Emphasis" on long-term

prevention. This could be due to a lack of funding, volunteers, and other resources that

many churches experience. Taking a deeper look, one might find that it is influenced by

some of the troubling perspectives and problematic values reportedly existing within

many congregations, including fear and hesitation from church leaders and would-be

volunteers, a culture of individualism, or a lack of awareness or understanding about the

critical need for prevention and long-term supports. Each of these challenges is unique to

each congregation, and can only be understood, and therefore fully solved within each

congregation's theological, demographic and geographic context. However, participants

have already made suggestions in the survey regarding various ways to begin the

problem-solving process. For example, in question 60 of the survey, participants were

asked about factors that had influenced their own beliefs about tangible ministry. Some of

the most notable answers included, "Bible/theology studies," "Observing an acquaintance

in need," "A personal experience of need," "My cultural values," and positive role

models. These ideas could be further developed in order to foster an increased awareness

of tangible ministry within the congregation, and will be explored in the following

section.

Overcoming the Challenges

It may be that when church leaders consider the challenges they face in improving

tangible ministries for their congregants, they might come to believe that their

congregation does not have social capital. However, the literature shows that

communities naturally inhabit social capital, therefore the main challenges seem to be: 1)

finding effective ways of identifying the resources that do exist within the congregation;

2) engaging and motivating congregants to participate in the process; and 3) developing

effective strategies for developing and delivering social support. While this thesis cannot

encompass the many possibilities of addressing the challenges outlined by participants, it

can outline a few examples that have been shared by participants and the literature.

Bible/theology studies. In the survey participants were asked to indicate notable

influences on their opinion of tangible ministry. A number of them selected "Bible and

theology studies" as one of those influences, which can also be a possible method of

drawing congregants' attention to its denomination's or faith community's doctrines and

values on the subject. This option might be especially helpful for church leaders who, like

some participants in this study, believe that their congregation requires greater

understanding of the Biblical mandate to support one another tangibly. Stoltzfus (2006),

for instance, noted a similar need in his clinical work with individuals struggling with

addictions, who were also members of a Christian faith community. He perceived a belief

in numerous congregations which he called "instant delivery theology", describing the

idea that most of the time God will instantly and miraculously alleviate the struggle of

addiction from an individual's life. This belief may lead to individualism, self-absorption, lack of participation in mutual support activities, and related problems that were identified by participants in this study. Instead, Stoltzfus says, Scripture and experience indicate that:

> The miracle (...) includes the people whom God brings into the life of the recovering addict in order that they may offer support. When listening to the testimonies of people who have come out of addiction, they are nearly unanimous in citing the intervention of other humans who walked beside them through the difficult early days. God, as a relational deity, usually chooses to work miracles through human relationships. (p. 146)

The tangible ministry theme, therefore, could be initiated as a study topic in Sunday school classes, group devotions, a sermon series, and Bible study groups.

Personal stories. Participants also indicated in the survey that experiencing a personal situation of need or observing an acquaintance in need strongly influenced their beliefs on this subject. Bringing personal stories into the spotlight, then, could also have a positive influence on congregants. Hearing someone's experience about living through a difficult situation, as well as how tangible supports were crucial in helping them through that situation, can easily engage listeners while simultaneously communicating valuable information in a memorable way. These personal stories could be shared by members of the congregation, excerpted from books or articles, shared by guest speakers, and so on.

Community partnerships. Collaborating with external organizations is also a possible way to bring critical information and training to congregants. Because of the large number organizations in existence, it might be helpful to focus on those that address

pressing concerns within one's congregation. Examples include counselling agencies,

cultural organizations, local shelters, or organizations that support and educate around

specific health or life transition issues, such as autism, divorce, cancer, unemployment,

and dementia, to name a few. Having representatives speak to the congregation could

raise awareness about some of the struggles and needs that may exist within the church

family. They could also educate church leaders to recognize indicators of specific

problems in church members' lives and about helpful or even necessary kinds of spiritual

support for those situations (e.g. Robinson, Ewing, & Looney, 2000; Tompkins & Sorrell,

2008). Community partners can also alert church leaders about the appropriate times to

refer congregants to professional and specialized supports (e.g. Polson & Rogers, 2007),

such as addictions counsellors. And most importantly, sessions like these can be useful in

dispelling myths and fears that might be preventing congregants from helping one

another through difficult challenges, such as how to respond to a member who is living

with a mental illness, and so on.

Values, process, resources and tangible services. Church leaders and congregants

can also begin to address challenges by evaluating the values, processes, resources and

tangible services within their congregations. One example might be to critically examine

the influence of the wider culture on the congregation's tangible ministries. Numerous

researchers have documented (e.g. Bibby, 2005, p. 6) the trend of increasing

individualism and busyness in Canada throughout the last several decades, saying "as the

twentieth century wore down, time-conscious Canadians were not only feeling extremely

busy; they also were increasingly consumer-minded (...) They were also placing a very

high level on personal freedom" (Bibby, 2005). Openly and collaboratively exploring the

potential influence of socio-cultural dynamics on the lived experience of the church family might effectively move the congregation over those hurdles towards a more intentional and effective flow of mutual support.

Another example might be to focus on the influence of role modelling among members. As numerous leaders mentioned throughout the survey, they lack positive role models and recognize that equipping more congregants to be positive role models would encourage fellow congregants to follow their example, which might result in more tangible needs being met. For instance, if the Stephen Ministry program were to be introduced into the congregation, those congregants volunteering to take part would begin to model the helping role to other congregants. Role modelling would provide congregants with examples of the way that giving and receiving tangible support might look in their own lives. It might also lend a sense of authenticity and credibility to other efforts, such as Bible studies, being utilized by church leaders to encourage greater member participation in supporting one another. Role modelling could also take place among leaders of several churches, especially between those who are interested in learning methods of engaging and encouraging their congregations to become more involved in tangible ministries.

Another useful example of evaluating a congregation's process of tangible support-giving is presented in the literature by Roberts and Thorsheim (1991). They found that social support is more empowering to congregants and enhances a sense of community in the congregation when church members have the opportunity to not only receive but also reciprocate support-giving. Openness and reciprocity of support between leaders and laity was also suggested to encourage an atmosphere of compassion and

support within the congregation. Therefore, it would be useful for church leaders to consider incorporating awareness of and opportunities for mutual support into any tangible support initiative for the congregation.

Meanwhile, an example of reviewing resources might include taking account of congregants' training and skills, whether professional or otherwise, which they may be willing to use for the congregation's benefit. One method of accomplishing this might be to create or adapt a resource inventory, such as the inventory tool developed by DuralReach (2005). This approach has also been mentioned in other studies as well (e.g. Tompkins & Sorrell, 2008), in which church leaders described the way they incorporated congregants' professional skills to benefit and encourage fellow members, as well as informal skills (e.g. cooking, driving, and so on) to assist other congregants through difficult personal challenges.

Example program #1: Stephen Ministries. A few congregations represented in this study identified Stephen Ministries as one of the supports available to their church members. This program was initiated in 1975 by Rev. Kenneth C. Haugk, a clinical psychologist, who designed it for his congregation. His congregants' enthusiasm for it led to the establishment of a training program for other church leaders and laity, so that it could be implemented in their congregations as well. Congregants who volunteer to be "Stephen Ministers" receive 50 hours of care giving training (Stephen Ministries, 2008), on topics such as:

listening, feelings, assertiveness, confidentiality, and ministering to people in specific situations such as divorce, terminal illness, grief, and childbirth. Stephen Ministers also are trained to recognize when a care receiver's needs go beyond the

care a Stephen Minister can provide and where and how to refer the care receiver

for additional care. (p. 2)

As of 2008, more than 55,000 clergy, church staff and laity have been trained as Stephen

Leaders worldwide, while over 500,000 lay people have been trained as Stephen

Ministers (Stephen Ministries, 2008). In Canada over 300 congregations representing a

wide spectrum of denominations, have enrolled in the Stephen Ministries program

(Stephen Ministries, 2008). Introducing a successful program such as Stephen Ministries,

which may involve as many congregants as would like to volunteer, might provide an

opportunity for church members to learn about the important need for tangible support

within their church family, as well as ways to provide access to those supports. The

opportunity to try different types of caregiving may help encourage congregants to test

and develop their skills in order to effectively match them with different types of needs.

Example program #2: parish nursing. Eight of the congregations represented in

this survey reportedly offer parish nursing support to congregants, while several other

participants indicated their desire to implement it in their faith community. Parish nursing

is an example of a more specialized program that can be offered to congregants.

According to the International Parish Nurse Resource Centre (2009), parish nursing grew:

from the USA where it was revived by Granger Westberg, and is now practiced in

23 countries around the world. While each country adapts the program to its

specific culture, nursing practice and needs, the core model of faith and health

ministry to body, mind and spirit remains the same throughout these countries.

According to the Canadian Association for Parish Nursing Ministry (CAPNM, n.d.), a

parish nurse is "a registered nurse with specialized knowledge who is called to ministry

and affirmed by a faith community to promote health, healing and wholeness." Parish

nurses must meet professional standards, and provide "health advocacy, health

counselling, health education and resource referral" in the faith context (CAPNM, n.d.).

As is evidenced in the literature, faith communities are concerned about the health of

their congregation, both spiritually and physically, and have long been engaged in

addressing both. Meanwhile, as participants indicated in this survey, the theological basis

for basic forms of health care is emphasized in Scripture and in various doctrines. As

Westberg (1990) indicates, "A nurse on the church staff as a representative of the health

sciences is a visible symbol of the close tie between one's faith and one's health" (p. 18).

As with Stephen Ministries, introducing parish nursing as a form of tangible support to

the congregation would provide another opportunity for congregants to be informed

about real needs that may exist within their membership, as well as helping them to

visualize concrete ways to meet these needs that have been implemented successfully in

other congregations.

Combining efforts. Filinson (1988) reported on a church-based project in which

congregations were recruited for two purposes: 1) to host information sessions and

support groups surrounding a specific health challenge, and 2) to recruit volunteers from

within their congregations to provide social support to victims of this particular health

challenge and their families. Program coordinators observed the most positive response

from congregants when their initiative addressed several objectives and strategies, and

specifically when the new initiative: 1) drew on the expertise of existing volunteers, 2)

attracted people who were new to volunteering, 3) was incorporated into existing

programs in the church that were already successful and supported by members, 4) had

strong support from clergy and lay members, 5) was developed in the context of

partnership with other faith-based or community-based organizations, 6) was developed

in a church whose mission statement incorporated a tangible support component, 7) was

well-organized, specifically during the process of identifying members' needs and

connecting them with available supports, 8) incorporated a strong support and

communication base for volunteers. Combining efforts such as those briefly examined

above may help church leaders foster a culture of compassion within their congregations,

in which members begin to feel naturally compelled to make tangible support an

expression of their faith in everyday life.

Limitations

Certain demographic factors of participants and their congregations might have

limited this study in a number of ways. The fact that most participants were white,

middle-aged and well-educated males would certainly bring only a few of many possible

perspectives and experiences into the spotlight. While church leaders from every

province and territory except Nunavut took part in this study, only four provinces

(Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario and Saskatchewan) were represented with 20 or more

participating churches. The territories as well as provinces east of Ontario were under-

represented in this study. Also, while 26 denominations were represented in this study,

only three (Anglican, Christian and Missionary Alliance, and the Christian Reformed

Church) were represented by 20 or more participating churches.

The scope of my research posed another limitation to the study. There were

several possible ways to carry out a scan of national church-based initiatives for

congregants: (1) collect information from faith community leaders such as clergy,

administrators, deacons, etc.; (2) collect information from the laity, that is, congregation members who are generally not in leadership roles at their faith community, or; (3) combine the previous two methods for a more complete picture of congregant-focused tangible ministries. Option (1) provided information from the leaders' perspectives, which necessarily involved their assumptions and biases about the programs and services available to their congregants. Option (2) involved the perspectives, assumptions and biases of the laity about tangible ministries available to them. Only the third option would provide the most complete understanding of tangible supports coordinated and accessed within church congregations. However, given the time and financial constraints of this study, I needed to select a target population that would produce a manageable amount of data. Therefore, I chose option (1), collect information from faith community leaders. This option, as opposed to option (2), provided several advantages for this thesis. Given my upbringing as the child of a minister and having been exposed to the lives of other families in church leadership, I have an "insider's" view of the average leader's lifestyle and involvement in tangible support of the congregation. This first-hand perspective has provided me with a keen interest in learning from leaders of Christian faith communities about their experience of coordinating these services. It has also provided me with the insights necessary for adding specific questions to the survey instrument, addressing unique angles of tangible ministry, such as the perspective of leader-to-laity involvement in congregation care (questions 40 &41). It is my hope that I can continue research on this topic, after my thesis is complete, in which I examine the laity perspective of tangible ministry, so that the picture obtained from this study can be triangulated with other data.

The recruitment strategy was another limiting factor on the results of this study. My ideal was for all 24,000 churches across Canada to receive my recruitment letter. However, I was aware that certain barriers would prevent this ideal from being realized. Several factors limited the scope of my recruitment strategy. Firstly, not all denominations were registered with Statistics Canada. Again, given the time limit of this study, I was not able to search for denominations not listed by Statistics Canada, so churches belonging to those denominations would be missed by my recruitment emails. As well, not all denominations that I contacted wished to endorse my research to their member churches, meaning that my recruitment emails would not be sent to churches belonging to their denominations. The language barrier also limited the scope of this research. Given that I was not able to use the French translation of the survey, all primarily French-speaking churches were excluded from my study. Also, not all churches had internet access or used email for their communication, meaning that those churches would also not be contacted during my recruitment phase. These factors presented the most significant limits to my recruitment efforts as well as the final sample size.

Lastly, it is also very possible that self-selection bias influenced the data and limited the scope of this research. It is possible that church leaders who already had an interest in my research topic were more likely to complete a survey, thus skewing the data in such a way that is significantly different from those church leaders who declined to participate.

Future Research

This data has the potential to raise an incredible number of options for future research. Given the preliminary indication of differences between churches on the basis

of congregation size, budget and location, these should be studied more closely in order

to help church leaders better understand the strengths and challenges specific to their

congregations. Future research should also examine the reasons that few congregations

provide long-term or prevention-oriented support, in order to aid church leaders and their

congregations to understand the benefits of long-term support on their members' health

and well-being and the challenges they may need to overcome in seeking to develop this

type of support. Another area for study is the perspective of both leaders and laity about

the proportion of tangible ministry that should be provided by church leaders versus

fellow lay members; from an educational and practice perspective, uncovering potentially

hidden expectations may foster dialogue and increased participation in tangible ministries

within faith communities. Further studies could be conducted on each of the strengths and

gaps highlighted by participants in this study; for instance, investigating the role of pride

in preventing congregation members from requesting support from one another, or

examining effective versus ineffective communication of congregants' needs, may lead to

initiatives that can help congregations overcome common challenges to adequate support

of their members. It would also be helpful to build an understanding of congregational

characteristics that facilitate the successful implementation of established services such as

Stephen Ministries and parish nursing. Possibly one of the most pressing issues to

examine is the potential that congregation members living with negatively-stigmatized

challenges, such as mental illness and addiction, receive less tangible support than those

living with what are perceived to be more socially acceptable challenges. If research were

to find such a difference, then church leaders, researchers and lay members interested in

congregational tangible ministry could begin the process of awareness-raising and the

development of approaches to better support marginalized populations within their faith

communities.

Chapter 6

Conclusions

Tangible ministry is a central feature of the Christian faith, and is an important expression of this faith at the congregational and individual levels. This study has briefly outlined some of the ways in which faith communities minister to their members' tangible needs, the strengths and weaknesses they encounter, and the goals expressed by church leaders in overcoming these challenges. As has been shown in this thesis, congregations across Canada offer a wide variety of supports that are designed to meet members' tangible needs. They develop and access a range of resources, wrestle against formidable challenges, and find innovative and authentic ways to overcome these challenges. Church leaders struggle to find ways of developing and coordinating effective tangible ministry strategies for their congregations. They also struggle to find ways of inspiring, informing and equipping more members to participate in these efforts. Taking a closer look at a congregation's Values, Process, Resources, and Tangible Supports can reinforce existing strengths within the congregation, and reveal gaps and weaknesses needing to be addressed.

It is hoped that this research has demonstrated the benefits that individual congregations can provide one another simply through the act of sharing experiences and ideas, such as those shared by participants in this study. Church leaders are clearly not alone in the challenges they face, nor do they need to address these challenges in isolation. Networking with fellow congregations, or with community organizations can provide church leaders with fresh ideas, resources and support.

Appendix A

Statistics Canada List of Christian Denominations in Canada

Catholic
    Roman Catholic
    Ukrainian Catholic
    Polish National Catholic Church
    Other Catholic
Protestant
    Adventist
    Anglican
    Apostolic Christian Church
    Associated Gospel
    Baptist
    Brethren in Christ
    Charismatic Renewal
    Christadelphian
    Christian and Missionary Alliance
    Christian Congregational
    Christian or Plymouth Brethren
    Churches of Christ, Disciples
    Church of God, n.o.s.
    Church of the Nazarene
    Doukhobors
    Evangelical Free Church
    Hutterite
    Jehovah's Witnesses
    Latter-day Saints (Mormons)
    Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints
    Reorganized Church of Latter-day Saints
    Lutheran
    Mennonite
    Methodist Bodies
    Evangelical Missionary Church
    Free Methodist
    Methodist, n.i.e.
    Mission de l'Esprit Saint
    Moravian
    New Apostolic
    Pentecostal
    Presbyterian
    Quakers
    Reformed Bodies
    Christian Reformed Church
    Canadian and American Reformed Church

Dutch Reformed Church
Reformed, n.i.e.
Salvation Army
Spiritualist
Standard Church
Swedenborgian (New Church)
Unitarian
United Church
Vineyard Christian Fellowship
Wesleyan
Worldwide Church of God
Non-denominational
Interdenominational
Protestant, n.o.s.
Christian Orthodox
Antiochian Orthodox Christian
Armenian Orthodox
Coptic Orthodox
Greek Orthodox
Romanian Orthodox
Russian Orthodox
Serbian Orthodox
Ukrainian Orthodox
Orthodox, n.i.e.
Christian, n.i.e.

*Note: This list was obtained from Statistics Canada's website at:
http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census01/products/standard/themes/RetrieveProductTable.cfm?Temporal=
2001&PID=55822&APATH=3&GID=431515&METH=1&PTYPE=55440&THEME=56&FOCUS=0&AI
D=0&PLACENAME=0&PROVINCE=0&SEARCH=0&GC=99&GK=NA&VID=0&VNAMEE=&VNA
MEF=&FL=0&RL=0&FREE=0

Appendix B

Survey Questionnaire

Section 1: Welcome!

Hello and thank you for taking part in this study. My name is Dana Friesen, and I am completing a thesis for my Master of Social Work degree at Wilfrid Laurier University in Waterloo, Ontario.

The following **confidential** survey will only take 20 - 30 minutes to complete. It is open to clergy and people in other leadership/administrative positions at Christian churches across Canada. Once the study is complete, I would be happy to send you a report of the findings, tentatively titled "Tangible Ministry Efforts in Canada".

This survey covers the subject of "Tangible Ministry", which refers to practical, material and social/emotional support that is provided **to congregants** formally through church-run programs and informally by fellow congregants. Your contribution will help to piece together a picture of the doctrines and methods of Tangible Ministry that are in place across the country, and—through the ideas and experiences that are shared—your input may help fellow congregations support their members in times of need.

Please submit only one (1) survey on behalf of your faith community. You must be 16 years of age or older to participate. If you do not feel you have been at your church long enough to complete this survey, please pass the link to this survey to another leader in your congregation:

Survey Link: http://www.surveymonkey.com/TangibleMinistry

On the next page is a standard consent statement, as well as more details about this survey.

Thanks again!
Dana

1. If you would like to receive a summary of research findings from this study, please type the e-mail address below to which I should send your copy. Thank you! [TEXT BOX]

Section 2: Consent Form (contains questions 2-5; see Appendix C)

Section 3: Demographics

Any information you provide on this page will remain confidential and will only be used in collective form with the demographic information provided by other participants.

6. In what province or territory is your congregation located?

○ Alberta
○ British Columbia
○ Manitoba
○ New Brunswick
○ Newfoundland & Labrador
○ Northwest Territories
○ Nova Scotia
○ Nunavut
○ Ontario
○ Prince Edward Island
○ Quebec
○ Saskatchewan
○ Yukon

7. Please select your congregation's religious affiliation/denomination from the drop-down menu:

Anglican
Apostolic Christian Church
Armenian Orthodox
Associated Gospel
Baptist
Brethren in Christ
Canadian and American Reformed Church
Charismatic Renewal
Christadelphian
Christian and Missionary Alliance
Christian Congregational
Christian or Plymouth Brethren
Christian Reformed Church
Churches of Christ Disciples
Church of God
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints
Church of the Nazarene
Coptic Orthodox
Doukhobors
Dutch Reformed Church
Evangelical Free Church
Free Methodist
Greek Orthodox
House Church
Interdenominational

Jehovah's Witnesses
Lutheran
Mennonite Church Canada
Mennonite, other
Methodist, other
Moravian
New Apostolic
Non-denominational
Pentecostal
Polish National Catholic Church
Presbyterian
Roman Catholic
Quakers
Reformed, other
Reorganized Church of Latter-day Saints
Romanian Orthodox
Russian Orthodox
Salvation Army
Serbian Orthodox
Seventh-Day Adventist
Standard Church
Swedenborgian (New Church)
Ukrainian Catholic
Ukrainian Orthodox
United Church
Vineyard Christian Fellowship
Wesleyan
Worldwide Church of God
Other (please specify): [TEXT BOX]

8. In what type of neighbourhood/setting is your congregation located?

○ Urban/Inner city
○ Suburban
○ Rural/Small Town
○ Remote
○ Other (please specify): [TEXT BOX]

9. What is your position at your current faith community?

○ Administrator
○ Clergy
○ Clerk
○ Deacon

○ Elder
○ Lay Minister
○ Parish Life Director
○ Parish Nurse
○ Program Coordinator
○ Secretary
○ Stephen Ministry Leader
○ Other (please specify): [TEXT BOX]

10. What is your gender?

○ Female
○ Male

11. What is your age?

○ 16-19
○ 20-34
○ 35-49
○ 50-69
○ 70+

12. With which racial identity do you most closely associate?

○ Aboriginal, First Nations or Inuit
○ African
○ Asian
○ Caucasian
○ Hispanic/Latin American
○ Mixed
○ Other (please specify): [TEXT BOX]

13. What is your marital status?

○ Single/Never Married
○ Married
○ Separated/Divorced
○ Widowed
○ Other (please specify): [TEXT BOX]

14. What is your highest level of education attained?

○ Primary/Elementary School
○ Secondary/High School
○ College Degree
○ Trade School
○ Bachelor's Degree
○ Master's Degree
○ Doctorate Degree
○ None
○ Other (please specify): [TEXT BOX]

15. Have you completed formal education in ministry or theology?

○ Yes
○ No

16. Select the category that best describes your position at your current faith community:

○ Full-time, paid
○ Part-time, paid
○ Retired, paid
○ Full-time, unpaid
○ Part-time, unpaid
○ Retired, unpaid
○ Other (please specify): [TEXT BOX]

17. Have you at any time worked in a career other than religious ministry?

○ Yes
○ No
○ Not applicable

18. If you are employed by the church, are you also working at a second job that is not in the ministry?

○ Yes
○ No
○ Not applicable

19. Do you minister to more than one congregation?

○ Yes
○ No

20. Have you been ordained?

○ Yes
○ No
○ Not applicable

21. Have you at any time lived or worked in a culture other than your primary culture for 6 consecutive months or longer?

○ Yes
○ No

22. If you have any comments about the questions on this page, please enter them here:

[TEXT BOX]

Section 4: Tangible Ministry: Programs & Services

<u>**Key Terms:**</u>

Faith communities have many ways of understanding themselves, their members, and their roles and responsibilities. A few key terms are defined below, which clarify the intended meaning of the survey questions that follow.

<u>Goal of this survey</u>: To understand the role of **Tangible Ministry** for congregants in Christian, Bible-believing faith communities across Canada.

1) "Tangible Ministry" is defined as **practical, material** and **social/emotional** support that is provided formally through church-run programs and informally by congregants to fellow congregation members who experience a **situation of need**.

2) Faith community **"members"** are...
- those who regularly attend services
- those who attended regularly in the past, are currently unable to attend (e.g. due to illness, etc.), and still consider it their "home" faith community
- ministry to congregants could be called "in-reach", as compared to ministry to surrounding neighbourhoods which is often called "outreach"

3) "A situation of need" is when outside resources (e.g. social services, family resources, etc.) do not sufficiently alleviate a practical, material, or social/emotional burden of a congregant

4) The following are only a few examples of **practical, material** and **social/emotional** support that a faith community may provide to its congregants:

Examples of **PRACTICAL** support include:
- Helping someone move into a new home
- Fixing a broken stove or repairing a car
- Helping someone fill out an application form
- Running an errand for someone who's sick and shut in at home...

Examples of **MATERIAL** support include:
- Cooking a meal for someone who just had a baby or is ill
- Giving someone a gift-certificate towards a much-needed item or service
- Giving bus tickets to a student who doesn't have funds for his/her own transportation...

Examples of **SOCIAL/EMOTIONAL** support include:
- Encouraging someone who's struggling with an illness, grief, unemployment or a personal crisis
- Welcoming newcomers at church
- Befriending a church member who is lonely and isolated
- Supporting someone through a time of change or transition...

Any information you provide on this page will remain confidential and will only be used in collective form with the information provided by other participants.

23. Which individuals, groups, or committees has your faith community designated to coordinate its response to congregants' tangible needs? (Select all that apply.)

○ Administrator(s)
○ Cell Groups / Care Groups
○ Clergy / Lay Ministers
○ Deacon(s)
○ Clerk(s)
○ Elder(s)
○ Parish Nurse(s)
○ Prayer Team / Prayer Chain
○ Program Coordinator(s)
○ Secretary(ies)
○ Stephen Ministry Leader(s)
○ Special Committee / Care Team
○ Not applicable

o Other (please specify): [TEXT BOX]

24. In your opinion, how aware is the congregation of the appropriate person(s) to contact in times of need?

o Very Aware
o Somewhat Aware
o Not Aware
o Unsure

25. How are congregants made aware of the appropriate ways to access your church's tangible supports? (Select all that apply.)

o Brochures
o Bulletin Boards
o Bulletins (eg. distributed at services)
o Decorative banners inside the church building
o E-mail communication with congregants
o Newsletters
o Sermons
o Verbal announcements during services
o Website
o Word-of-Mouth
o None
o Other (please specify): [TEXT BOX]

26. What services does your faith community offer that address your congregants' PRACTICAL needs? (Note: These could be formal programs organized by the congregation or informal supports offered by individual congregants to one another.)

	Yes, 1-Time assistance	Yes, Repeated, Short-term Support	Yes, Ongoing, Long-term Support	Yes, Amount of Support Varies	Not Available	Unsure
1) Administrative Assistance (completing applications, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2) Employment Assistance (resume consultation, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3) Parish Nursing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4) Other Congregational Health Ministry	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5) Personal Assistance (washing dishes, running errands, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6) Renovation/ Repair/	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Yes, 1-Time assistance	Yes, Repeated, Short-term Support	Yes, Ongoing, Long-term Support	Yes, Amount of Support Varies	Not Available	Unsure
Relocation Assistance						
7) Transportation to Appointments (medical, interviews, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (please specify)	[TEXT BOX]					

27. What services does your faith community offer that address <u>your congregants'</u> MATERIAL needs? (<u>Note</u>: These could be formal programs organized by the congregation or informal supports offered by individual congregants to one another.)

	Yes, 1-Time assistance	Yes, Repeated, Short-term Support	Yes, Ongoing, Long-term Support	Yes, Amount of Support Varies	Not Available	Unsure
1) Clothes Exchange	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2) Financial Assistance (gifts and/or loans)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3) Food Bank/Food Drives	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4) Meals, Formal (e.g. meals cooked & served at the church for numerous congregants at a time, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5) Meals, Informal (e.g. members cooking individual meals for fellow members who are ill, homebound, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6) Thrift Store	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (please specify)	[TEXT BOX]					

28. What services does your faith community offer that address <u>your congregants'</u> SOCIAL/EMOTIONAL needs? (<u>Note</u>: These could be formal programs organized by the congregation or informal supports offered by individual congregants to one another.)

	Yes, 1-Time assistance	Yes, Repeated, Short-term Support	Yes, Ongoing, Long-term Support	Yes, Amount of Support Varies	Not Available	Unsure
1) Cell groups/Care groups	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2) Counselling, Pastoral	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3) Counselling, by fellow congregants	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4) Friendship (e.g. companionship for congregants who are lonely/isolated)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Yes, 1-Time assistance	Yes, Repeated, Short-term Support	Yes, Ongoing, Long-term Support	Yes, Amount of Support Varies	Not Available	Unsure
5) Meaningful, self-directed inclusion of the ill, elderly and disabled in congregational activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6) Referrals to External Community Services	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7) Support Groups	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8) Visitation (by clergy, deacons, or others in church leadership to ill or homebound congregants, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (please specify)	[TEXT BOX]					

29. How much emphasis is given to the following strategies by your faith community's tangible supports?

	Strong Emphasis	Some Emphasis	Little or No Emphasis	Unsure
1) **Long-term prevention** - Recognizing a potential crisis in a congregant's future, and taking long-term steps for prevention, finding solutions, and/or supporting the member through it	☐	☐	☐	☐
2) **Short-term prevention** - Recognizing an imminent crisis in a congregant's life, and taking steps for prevention, finding solutions, and/or supporting the member through it	☐	☐	☐	☐
3) **Crisis intervention** - Recognizing an existing crisis in a congregant's life, and taking immediate steps to find solutions and/or support the member through it	☐	☐	☐	☐

30. If you have any comments about the questions on this page, please enter them here:

[TEXT BOX]

Section 5: Tangible Ministry: Programs & Services

Any information you provide on this page will remain confidential and will only be used in collective form with the information provided by other participants.

31. Please indicate...

	0-5	6-9	10-14	15-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50+
1) The total # of paid staff at your faith community	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	0-5	6-9	10-14	15-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50+
2) The # of <u>paid staff</u> involved in formal tangible ministry to congregants	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

32. Please indicate...

	0-5	6-9	10-19	20-39	40-59	60-79	80-99	100+
1) The total # of <u>volunteers</u> at your faith community	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2) The # of <u>volunteers</u> involved in formal tangible ministry to congregants	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

33. Do at least some of the staff and volunteers involved in tangible ministries at your faith community receive training for this work?

○ Yes
○ No
○ Unsure
○ Not applicable

34. Does your faith community collaborate with any of the following organizations or individuals to run any of its congregant-focused tangible ministries? (Select all that apply.)

○ Colleges/universities, secular
○ Colleges/universities, faith-based
○ Denominational Agencies
○ External consultants, secular
○ External consultants, faith-based
○ Government-funded organizations
○ Health care institutions, secular
○ Health care institutions, faith-based
○ Local non-profit community organizations, secular
○ Local non-profit community organizations, faith-based
○ National or international non-profit organizations, secular
○ National or international non-profit organizations, faith-based
○ Other faith communities, Christian
○ Other faith communities, multi-faith
○ None
○ Other (please specify): [TEXT BOX]

35. In your opinion, how aware is your congregation of the services provided by your faith community?

o Mostly Aware
o Somewhat Aware
o Mostly Unaware
o Unsure

36. How are congregants made aware of your faith community's tangible ministries programs and services? (Select all that apply.)

o Brochures
o Bulletin Boards
o Bulletins (eg. distributed at services)
o Decorative banners inside the church building
o E-mail communication with congregants
o Newsletters
o Sermons
o Verbal announcements during services
o Website
o Word-of-Mouth
o None
o Other (please specify): [TEXT BOX]

37. From your personal observation, what are the positive impacts of the tangible ministries that are provided to your congregants? (Select all that apply.)

o Congregants have made health-promoting lifestyle changes.
o Congregants received help they would not have otherwise received.
o Congregants were able to delay moving into a nursing home.
o Congregants' transition experiences went more smoothly than they would have otherwise been.
o Congregants are more committed to caring for each other.
o Congregants are more involved in caring for others not of our congregation.
o Elderly, ill, disabled and other isolated congregants have been more included in congregational life.
o I have observed no positive impact.
o Not applicable.
o Other (please specify): [TEXT BOX]

38. If you have any comments about the questions on this page, please enter them here: [TEXT BOX]

Section 6: Tangible Ministry: Gaps & Strengths in Tangible Ministry Efforts

Any information you provide on this page will remain confidential and will only be used in collective form with the information provided by other participants.

39. In your opinion, what are your faith community's strengths when it comes to helping its members in times of need? If you wish, please include a brief example from your experience or observations. [TEXT BOX]

40. In your opinion, how much of your congregation's tangible needs are addressed by the leadership vs. the laity?

○ Leadership 100% - Laity 0%
○ Leadership 90% - Laity 10%
○ Leadership 80% - Laity 20%
○ Leadership 70% - Laity 30%
○ Leadership 60% - Laity 40%
○ Leadership 50% - Laity 50%
○ Leadership 40% - Laity 60%
○ Leadership 30% - Laity 70%
○ Leadership 20% - Laity 80%
○ Leadership 10% - Laity 90%
○ Leadership 0% - Laity 100%

41. Ideally, how much of your congregation's tangible needs <u>would you want</u> to be addressed by the leadership vs. the laity?

○ Leadership 100% - Laity 0%
○ Leadership 90% - Laity 10%
○ Leadership 80% - Laity 20%
○ Leadership 70% - Laity 30%
○ Leadership 60% - Laity 40%
○ Leadership 50% - Laity 50%
○ Leadership 40% - Laity 60%
○ Leadership 30% - Laity 70%
○ Leadership 20% - Laity 80%
○ Leadership 10% - Laity 90%
○ Leadership 0% - Laity 100%

42. Consider the challenges involved in developing and delivering tangible supports to congregants in your faith community - Please rate the following issues from "Most

Challenging" to "Least Challenging". (<u>Note</u>: Two or more challenges may be given the same rate if you wish.)

	1 - Most Challenging	2	3	4	5 - Least Challenging	N/A
Concerns regarding liability	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of funds	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of information	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of support from the leadership	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of support from the congregation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of skilled staff/volunteers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of time	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (please specify):	[TEXT BOX]					

43. Which of these challenges, if alleviated, would prompt you to want to expand your faith community's tangible ministries for congregants?

o Additional funding
o Liability concerns resolved
o Additional information
o Increased support from the leadership
o Increased support from the congregation
o Additional skilled staff/volunteers
o Additional time
o None
o Other (please specify): [TEXT BOX]

44. <u>Other than the challenges mentioned above</u>, in what ways could your faith community improve when it comes to helping its congregants in times of need? If you wish, please include a brief example from your experience or observations.

[TEXT BOX]

45. Under what circumstances, <u>other than the challenges mentioned above</u>, are congregants not provided with available supports from your congregation?

[TEXT BOX]

46. If you have any comments about the questions on this page, please enter them here:
[TEXT BOX]

Section 7: Congregation Demographics

Any information you provide on this page will remain confidential and will only be used in collective form with the demographic information provided by other participants.

47. Income categories represented by the majority of the congregation: (Select all that apply.)

o Unemployed
o Low Income
o Middle Income
o High Income
o Unsure

48. Approximate budget of your faith community:

o Below $10,000
o $10,000 to $99,999
o $100,000 to $199,999
o $200,000 to $399,000
o $400,000 to $599,000
o $600,000 to $799,000
o $800,000 to $999,000
o $1,000,000 to $2,999,999
o $3,000,000 to $5,000,000
o Above $5,000,000
o Unsure

49. Average attendance at weekly service(s):

o Less than 10
o 10-49
o 50-99
o 100-499
o 500-999
o 1,000-4,999
o 5,000+

50. Racial identities represented in your congregation: (Select all that apply.)

o Aboriginal, First Nations or Inuit
o African
o Asian

o Caucasian
o Hispanic/Latin American
o Mixed
o Other (please specify): [TEXT BOX]

51. Age categories represented by the majority of your congregation: (Select all that apply.)

o Children & Adolescents
o Young Adults
o Middle-Aged
o Young Seniors
o Aged Seniors

52. If you have any comments about the questions on this page please enter them here: [TEXT BOX]

Section 8: Tangible Ministry: Doctrine & Values

Any information you provide on this page will remain confidential and will only be used in collective form with the information provided by other participants.

53. Which Scripture passages guide your congregation's beliefs about helping one another in times of need?

[TEXT BOX]

54. Which doctrines guide your congregation's beliefs about helping one another in times of need?

[TEXT BOX]

55. Are your congregation's beliefs on this topic explicitly incorporated into its Mission and Vision statement, Purpose statement, or similar policy document?

o Yes
o No
o Unsure
o Not Applicable

56. Are your congregation's beliefs on this topic explicitly reflected in the budget (e.g. funds delegated to tangible ministry for congregants)?

○ Yes
○ No
○ Unsure
○ Not Applicable

57. In your opinion, how aware is the congregation of your faith community's doctrinal position on this topic?

○ Very Aware
○ Somewhat Aware
○ Not Aware
○ Unsure

58. How are church members made aware of your congregation's beliefs about tangible ministries? (Select all that apply.)

○ Brochures
○ Bulletin Boards
○ Bulletins (eg. distributed at services)
○ Decorative banners inside the church building
○ E-mail communication with congregants
○ Newsletters
○ Sermons
○ Verbal announcements during services
○ Website
○ Word-of-Mouth
○ None
○ Other (please specify): [TEXT BOX]

59. During the last year, approximately how many sermons have mentioned the topic of helping fellow congregants in times of need?

○ None
○ A Few
○ Around Half
○ The Majority
○ All
○ Unsure

60. What has influenced your personal beliefs on this topic (select all that apply)?

○ A personal experience of need
○ Observing an acquaintance in need
○ Bible/Theology studies
○ My cultural values
○ Experience in a previous vocation
○ I don't have a personal opinion on this issue
○ I align my views with those of my faith community and/or denomination
○ Other (please specify): [TEXT BOX]

61. If you have any comments about the questions on this page, or about the rest of the survey, please enter them here: [TEXT BOX]

Appendix C

Survey Informed Consent Form

Wilfrid Laurier University Informed Consent Statement

Assessing Faith-Centred Social Capital Within a Church Community

Principal Investigator: Dana Friesen, MSW Candidate
Supervisor: Dr. Anne Westhues, Wilfrid Laurier University

INFORMATION
Thank you for your interest in contributing to our study! This survey is internet-based, and will take about 20 - 30 minutes to complete. Please alert Dana by email (frie7530[at]wlu.ca) if you prefer to complete a paper copy of the survey, and she will email a copy to you which can be printed and returned by mail.

RISKS
We are required to let you know about potential risks associated with this study. Any potential risks are very minimal. Generally, anyone who takes part may experience sadness, frustration or other negative emotions as they consider their answers to questions about our topic. If you happen to experience this, we encourage you to speak with a friend, mentor, or to contact a local counselling agency.

BENEFITS
There are many significant benefits to taking part in our study! Your contribution will help to piece together a picture of the doctrines and methods of Tangible Ministry that are in place across the country, and—through the ideas and experiences that are shared—your input may help fellow congregations support their members in times of need. You may also feel a greater sense of community with fellow faith communities across Canada who contribute to this survey together.

CONFIDENTIALITY
We value your privacy. The survey is open to all church clergy and other church leaders ages 16 and older, and these surveys will be kept completely anonymous and confidential. Only Dana and her supervisor will have access to names and demographic information that is given. All survey responses will be kept in a password-protected file, and any printed materials will be stored in a locked compartment, and will later be destroyed. The study's results will be reported without the names of participants or churches, or other personally-identifying information, and demographic information will only be reported in aggregate form.

CONTACT
If you have questions about the study, (or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study), you may contact the researcher, Dana Friesen, at frie7530[at]wlu.ca.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the University Research Ethics Board. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this letter, or that your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Bill Marr, Chair, University Research Ethics Board, Wilfrid Laurier University, (519) 884-0710, extension 2468.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary, and you may decline to participate without consequence. If you decide to participate, you can withdraw from the study at any time, also without consequence. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed, your data will be deleted, and will not be used in our research. You also have the right to omit any question(s) that you choose.

FEEDBACK AND PUBLICATION

The results of this study will be reported in a thesis, and a summary will be made available to all participants expressing an interest in receiving a copy, and may also appear in publications such as an academic journal, or in presentations.

CONSENT

2. If you wish to proceed with the survey please click the button next to the consent statement.

o I have read and understand the above information, and I agree to participate in this study. I will print this webpage if I wish to keep a copy for my records.

3. To indicate your consent to participating in this study, please type your first and last name in the text box below. Your name will be kept completely confidential.

[TEXT BOX]

4. To ensure only one survey is submitted per congregation, please indicate the name of your congregation in the text box below. It will be kept completely confidential.

[TEXT BOX]

5. Sometimes in qualitative research the findings are aided by the use of participants' quotes. If you leave comments in this survey, Dana may wish, only with your permission, to include some of your anonymous quotes in publications or presentations related to this study; no identifying information will be used in these quotes (e.g. if there are any names, cities, organizations, etc. in the quotes they will be altered). This step is optional, and is not required in order to participate in this research.

If you wish to allow quotes from your comments to be used in publications or presentations related to this study, please click the button next to the consent statement. (optional)

○ I understand that granting use of my quotes is optional. I agree to allow my quotes to be used anonymously in presentations or publications resulting from this study.

Appendix D

Information Letter for Denominational Head Offices

Hello <Name of Contact>,

My name is Dana Friesen and I am a Master of Social Work candidate at Wilfrid Laurier University (Ontario, Canada) studying the methods that Canadian faith communities have developed to support their congregants in times of need.

I am inviting clergy and other church leaders of Christian faith communities from numerous denominations to share their thoughts in a confidential survey about "Tangible Ministry" - These are the practical, material and social/emotional supports provided to congregation members in times of need. I am wondering if you would consider sending my survey by email to all clergy/church leaders across Canada who are associated with your office?

Your help will facilitate the improved ability of many congregations to support their members in times of need. Once the study is completed in June, I will gladly send you and all participating church leaders an exclusive report on *Tangible Ministry Efforts in Canada.*"

The Survey: I am including the survey in PDF format (attached), so that you can review the questions before making a decision. The survey that clergy/church leaders would complete is online, and can be found at:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/TangibleMinistry

I have also prepared a Recruitment Letter which you may send to your church leaders if you prefer. All of my research documents, including the survey, have been approved by the Wilfrid Laurier University Research Ethics Board.

As this survey is for my Master's Thesis, and as my school schedule is quite tight, this survey needs to be distributed to church leaders by Tuesday, March 31. I know that your time is valuable as well: The survey takes only a few minutes to review, and will take the church leaders only 20 - 30 minutes to complete. Please don't hesitate to email me with any questions/comments you may have.

As this study is the basis of my Thesis for my Master's degree in Social Work – I personally thank you for your time. It is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dana Friesen
frie7530@wlu.ca
Department of Social Work
Wilfrid Laurier University

Appendix E

Telephone Recruitment Script for Denominational Head Offices

Hello. My name is Dana Friesen. I am a student in the Master of Social Work program at Wilfrid Laurier University in Waterloo, Ontario.

For my thesis I am interested in distributing a survey to churches across Canada. I am interested in learning about the ways churches have developed to support their congregation members in times of need.

I was wondering if you would consider sending this survey by email to your churches across Canada? I would be happy to send you the Information Letter, Consent Form, and the survey questions so that you may review them before making a decision.

Thank you for your time. Good-bye.

Appendix F

Survey Information Letter for Church Leaders

Hello!

I am inviting clergy/church leaders to share your thoughts in a confidential survey about your church's "Tangible Ministries". These are the practical, material and social/emotional supports provided to congregation members, both formally and informally.

Your contribution will help to piece together a picture of the methods and doctrines of Tangible Ministry that are in place across Canada and—through the ideas and experiences that are shared—your input may help fellow congregations support their members in times of need.

If you are able to participate, please complete the survey in the next two weeks. The survey will only take 20 - 30 minutes to fill out. Once the study is complete in June, we will be glad to send you an exclusive report on "Tangible Ministry Efforts in Canada."

Survey Link: http://www.surveymonkey.com/TangibleMinistry

A PDF version of the survey is also available, in case the online survey doesn't work, or in case you have a slow internet connection and would prefer to complete the survey off-line. If you would like the PDF survey, please send me an email at: frie7530@wlu.ca.

Please submit only one (1) survey on behalf of your church/parish. You must be 16 years of age or older to participate. If you do not feel you have been at your church long enough to complete this survey, please pass this email to another leader in your congregation.

As this is the basis of my Thesis for my Master's degree in Social Work – I personally thank you for your time. It is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dana Friesen
frie7530@wlu.ca
Department of Social Work
Wilfrid Laurier University

Appendix G

Contacted Congregations by Denomination

Denomination	n	% of total responses
Anglican	31	15.1
Apostolic Christian Church	3	1.5
Armenian Orthodox	0	0.0
Associated Gospel	0	0.0
Baptist	11	5.4
Brethren in Christ	0	0.0
Canadian and American Reformed Church	4	2.0
Charismatic Renewal	1	0.5
Christadelphian	0	0.0
Christian and Missionary Alliance	26	12.7
Christian Congregational	0	0.0
Christian or Plymouth Brethren	0	0.0
Christian Reformed Church	28	13.7
Churches of Christ Disciples	0	0.0
Church of God	0	0.0
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints	0	0.0
Church of the Nazarene	12	5.9
Coptic Orthodox	0	0.0
Doukhobors	0	0.0
Dutch Reformed Church	2	1.0
Evangelical Free Church	3	1.5
Free Methodist	0	0.0
Greek Orthodox	0	0.0
House Church	1	0.5
Interdenominational	0	0.0
Jehovah's Witnesses	0	0.0
Lutheran	1	0.5
Mennonite Church Canada	14	6.8
Mennonite, other	3	1.5
Methodist, other	0	0.0
Moravian	0	0.0
New Apostolic	0	0.0

Non-denominational	0	0.0
Pentecostal	0	0.0
Polish National Catholic Church	0	0.0
Presbyterian	19	9.3
Quakers	4	2.0
Reformed, other	3	1.5
Reorganized Church of Latter-day Saints	0	0.0
Roman Catholic	3	1.5
Romanian Orthodox	0	0.0
Russian Orthodox	0	0.0
Salvation Army	0	0.0
Serbian Orthodox	0	0.0
Seventh-Day Adventist	15	7.3
Standard Church	0	0.0
Swedenborgian (New Church)	0	0.0
Ukrainian Catholic	0	0.0
Ukrainian Orthodox	0	0.0
United Church	1	0.5
Vineyard Christian Fellowship	8	3.9
Wesleyan	7	3.4
Worldwide Church of God	0	0.0
Other	5	2.4
Answered Question	205	99.5
Skipped Question	1	0.5

Appendix H

Theological Doctrines Related to Tangible Ministry Provided by Participants

Doctrines and Concepts
Atonement
The Beattitudes
Body of Christ / Communion of Saints / Priesthood of Believers
Compassion
Doctrine of Christ
Doctrine of Creation
Doctrine of Forgiveness
Doctrine of Faith
Doctrine of Grace
Doctrine of Holiness
Doctrine of Hope
Doctrine of Humanity
Doctrine of Justification
Doctrine of Mercy
Doctrine of Providence
Doctrine of Sin
Doctrine of the Trinity
Ecclesiology
Eschatology / Second Coming
Faith Sharing
"Feed the Hungry" verses
Following Jesus
God is Love
The Gospel
Great Commission
Hospitality
Humans created in God's image
Inspiration of Scripture
Justice
Kingdom Theology
Love for others
New Testament Parables
Old Testament Stories
"One another verses" (e.g. "do unto others...")
Relational Characteristic of God
Sanctification
Servanthood
Soteriology / Salvation
Spiritual Gifts
Stewardship
Summary of the Law / Greatest Commandments

Appendix I

Excerpts of Guiding Doctrines

Doctrinal Documents	Excerpts
Anglican Doctrines	(no related excerpt found)
Apostle's Creed	I believe in the Holy Spirit, the holy catholic Church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Amen.
Athanasian Creed	And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.
Belgic Confession	But all people are obliged to join and unite with it, keeping the unity of the church by submitting to its instruction and discipline, by bending their necks under the yoke of Jesus Christ, and by serving to build up one another, according to the gifts God has given them as members of each other in the same body.
Belhar Confession	that this unity of the people of God must be manifested and be active in a variety of ways: in that we love one another; that we experience, practice and pursue community with one another; that we are obligated to give ourselves willingly and joyfully to be of benefit and blessing to one another (...) together know and bear one another's burdens, thereby fulfilling the law of Christ that we need one another and upbuild one another, admonishing and comforting one another
Canons of Dort	Reflecting on this benefit provides an incentive to a serious and continual practice of thanksgiving and good works, as is evident from the testimonies of Scripture and the examples of the saints.
Catholic Catechism	The apostle St. Paul reminds us of this: "He who loves his neighbor has fulfilled the law. The commandments, 'You shall not commit adultery, You shall not kill, You shall not steal, You shall not covet,' and any other commandment, are summed up in this sentence, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' Love does no wrong to a neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." (Part 3, Section 2, Chapter 2)
Eucharistic Fellowship	(no related excerpt found)
Heidelberg Catechism	Question 55. What do you understand by "the communion of saints"? Answer: (...) secondly, that every one must know it to be his duty, readily and cheerfully to employ his gifts, for the advantage and salvation of other members.
Luther's Small Creed (aka: Luther's Small Catechism)	For All in Common. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.
Mennonite / Anabaptist Doctrines	We believe that it is the will of God for Christians to refrain from force and violence in human relations and to show Christian love to all men.
Nicene Creed	(no related excerpt found)
Quaker Testimony	The testimony of community is extremely important to Conservative Friends, particularly in this age of individualism. Friends take seriously Jesus' admonition to love each other, as well as Paul's admonition to subject ourselves to each other. If we really are the body of Christ, and all the parts need one another as the Gospel says, then it isn't right for

one part to be off doing its own thing separate from the body. The Lord can and does do a lot through people as individuals. But the real power of the Gospel shows itself when we function as a united body witnessing to the world what God has done among us.

Reformed Doctrines	(no related excerpt found)
Westminster Confessions of Faith	Of the Communion of Saints I. All saints that are united to Jesus Christ their head, by his Spirit and by faith, have fellowship with him in his graces, sufferings, death, resurrection, and glory: and, being united to one another in love, they have communion in each other's gifts and graces, and are obliged to the performance of such duties, public and private, as to conduce to their mutual good, both in the inward and outward man.

Appendix J

Congregational Strengths by Membership Size

Church size* / Strengths	< 10 (N = 1)	10-49 (N = 47)	50-99 (N = 47)	100-499 (N = 79)	500-999 (N = 10)	1000-4999 (N = 4)
	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)
Visitation	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.4%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Moral Support	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.4%)	1 (2.1%)	3 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Prayer	0 (0.0%)	4 (8.5%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Targeted Interventions	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Formal Programs	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.3%)	2 (2.5%)	2 (20.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Counselling***	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (10.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Serve Isolated and Shut-In Congregants	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Small Congregation Size	0 (0.0%)	7 (14.9%)	5 (10.6%)	2 (2.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Education and Experience	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Awareness of Personal Capacity	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Connections	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Awareness of Biblical Mandate	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Personnel and Capital	1 (100%)	3 (6.4%)	3 (6.4%)	7 (8.9%)	2 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Access Denominational Supports	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Relationships	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	3 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Willingness to Help	1 (100%)	6 (12.8%)	8 (17.0%)	9 (11.4%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Hard Working	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Empowerment Focus	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Helping Culture	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.3%)	1 (2.1%)	3 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Inclusiveness, Sensitivity and Diversity	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Credibility	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Empathy	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Genuine Care for One Another	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	5 (10.6%)	8 (10.1%)	1 (10.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Others-Centered and Focused	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Generosity	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.3%)	4 (8.5%)	5 (6.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Lifestyle of Faith and Worship	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	2 (4.3%)	2 (2.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Commitment to Helping	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Prioritize People Over Possessions	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.3%)	1 (2.1%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Relationship-Based Helping	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	4 (8.5%)	9 (11.4%)	2 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Support Initiative-Takers	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Responsiveness to Needs	0 (0.0%)	7 (14.9%)	10 (21.3%)	11 (13.9%)	2 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Communication of Existing Needs	0 (0.0%)	5 (10.6%)	3 (6.4%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Modelling Helping Behaviours	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Well Organized	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Leaders Care and Help	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	1 (2.1%)	4 (5.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Reciprocal Giving and Receiving	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Grass-Roots, Informal Approach	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	2 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
People Draw Together in Need	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

*Note: by average weekly attendance
Chi-square tests were run, two tailed; * = p≤ .05, ** ≤ .01, *** p≤ .001

Appendix K

Congregational Gaps by Membership Size

Church size* / Gaps	< 10 (N = 1)	10-49 (N = 47)	50-99 (N = 47)	100-499 (N = 79)	500-999 (N = 10)	1000-4999 (N = 4)
	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)
More Positive Attitude	0 (0.0%).	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Less Individualism and Self-Absorption	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Greater Interest in Helping One Another	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.4%)	2 (4.3%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Focus on Faith	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Prioritize Life to Put Needy First	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.3%)	4 (5.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Less Pride	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.3%)	3 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Appreciation for Volunteers	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Communication and Awareness	0 (0.0%)	4 (8.5%)	12 (25.5%)	12 (15.2%)	1 (10.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Build Relationships	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	2 (4.3%)	3 (3.8%)	1 (10.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Close the Gaps	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Fewer Assumptions	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Less Hesitation and Worry	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Incorporate Supports Into Church Life	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Timely Intervention**	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Better Modelling of Helping	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Less Institutional	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Less Busyness	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)
More Awareness of Biblical Mandate to Help One Another	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Awareness of Personal Capacity to Help	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Partnership With Community Services	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Greater Participation in Supporting Fellow Congregants	0 (0.0%)	4 (8.5%)	4 (8.5%)	2 (2.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Funding**	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Dedicated Staff and Volunteers**	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.3%)	2 (4.3%)	3 (3.8%)	2 (20.0%)	1 (25.0%)
More Training	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.3%)	5 (6.3%)	1 (10.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Identify and Involve People with Gift of Helping	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Focused Use of Limited Resources**	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (10.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Understanding of Difficult Issues	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Hospitality	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Commitment and Sustainability	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.3%)	2 (2.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Formal Support Programs**	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Prayer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

*Note: by average weekly attendance
Chi-square tests were run, two tailed; * = p≤ .05, ** ≤ .01, *** p≤ .001

Appendix L

Congregational Strengths by Neighbourhood

Neighbourhood (total participants in each neighbourhood) / Strengths	Urban/ Inner City (N = 47)	Suburban (N = 62)	Rural/ Small Town (N = 85)	Remote (N = 5)
	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)
Visitation	1 (2.1%)	4 (6.5%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Moral Support	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.2%)	4 (4.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Prayer	0 (0.0%)	5 (8.1%)	2 (2.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Targeted Interventions	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Formal Programs	2 (4.3%)	4 (6.5%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Counselling	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Serve Isolated and Shut-In Congregants	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.6%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Small Congregation Size	3 (6.4%)	1 (1.6%)	8 (9.4%)	1 (20.0%)
Education and Experience	1 (2.1%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Awareness of Personal Capacity	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Connections	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Awareness of Biblical Mandate	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Personnel and Capital	7 (14.9%)	4 (6.5%)	5 (5.9%)	0 (0.0%)
Access Denominational Supports	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Relationships	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.2%)	2 (2.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Willingness to Help	2 (4.3%)	9 (14.5%)	12 (14.1%)	2 (40.0%)
Hard Working	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.6%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Empowerment Focus	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Helping Culture	1 (2.1%)	2 (3.2%)	2 (2.4%)	1 (20.0%)
Inclusiveness, Sensitivity and Diversity	1 (2.1%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Credibility	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Empathy	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Genuine Care for One Another	4 (8.5%)	3 (4.8%)	8 (9.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Others-Centered and Focused	2 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Generosity	5 (10.6%)	3 (4.8%)	3 (3.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Lifestyle of Faith and Worship**	3 (6.4%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	1 (20.0%)
Commitment to Helping	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Prioritize People Over Possessions	2 (4.3%)	1 (1.6%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Relationship-Based Helping	4 (8.5%)	6 (9.7%)	5 (5.9%)	0 (0.0%)
Support Initiative-Takers	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Responsiveness to Needs**	9 (19.2%)	3 (4.8%)	19 (22.4%)	0 (0.0%)

Communication of Existing Needs	0 (0.0%)	3 (4.8%)	6 (7.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Modelling Helping Behaviours	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Well Organized	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Leaders Care and Help	2 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (4.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Reciprocal Giving and Receiving	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Grass-Roots, Informal Approach	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (3.5%)	0 (0.0%)
People Draw Together in Need	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)

Chi-square tests were run, two tailed; * = p≤ .05, ** ≤ .01, *** p≤ .001

Appendix M

Congregational Gaps by Neighbourhood

Neighbourhood / Gaps	Urban/ Inner City (N = 47)	Suburban (N = 62)	Rural/ Small Town (N = 85)	Remote (N = 5)
	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)
More Positive Attitude	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Less Individualism and Self-Absorption	0 (0.0%)	4 (6.5%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Greater Interest in Helping One Another	1 (2.1%)	2 (3.2%)	3 (3.5%)	0 (0.0%)
More Focus on Faith	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Prioritize Life to Put Needy First	1 (2.1%)	4 (6.5%)	2 (2.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Less Pride	2 (4.3%)	1 (1.6%)	3 (3.5%)	0 (0.0%)
More Appreciation for Volunteers	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
More Communication and Awareness	6 (12.8%)	10 (16.1%)	14 (16.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Build Relationships	2 (4.3%)	2 (3.2%)	2 (2.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Close the Gaps	1 (2.1%)	1 (1.6%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Fewer Assumptions	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Less Hesitation and Worry	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Incorporate Supports Into Church Life	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Timely Intervention	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Better Modelling of Helping	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Less Institutional	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Less Busyness	0 (0.0%)	3 (4.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Awareness of Biblical Mandate to Help One Another	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Awareness of Personal Capacity to Help	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Partnership With Community Services	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Greater Participation in Supporting Fellow Congregants	3 (6.4%)	4 (6.5%)	4 (4.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Funding	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (3.5%)	0 (0.0%)
More Dedicated Staff and Volunteers	3 (6.4%)	3 (4.8%)	2 (2.4%)	1 (20.0%)
More Training	1 (2.1%)	5 (8.1%)	2 (2.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Identify and Involve People with Gift of Helping	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Focused Use of Limited Resources	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Understanding of Difficult Issues	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
More Hospitality	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Commitment and Sustainability	0 (0.0%)	3 (4.8%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)
More Formal Support Programs	0 (0.0%)	3 (4.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Prayer	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Chi-square tests were run, two tailed; * = p≤ .05, ** ≤ .01, *** p≤ .001

Appendix N

Congregational Strengths by Budget

Budget / Strength	< $10k (N = 7)	$10-99k (N = 53)	$100-199k (N = 54)	$200-399k (N = 45)	$400-599k (N = 13)	$600-799k (N = 5)	$800-999k (N = 5)	> $1mil (N = 5)
	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)
Visitation	1 (14.3%)	2 (3.8%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)
Moral Support	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.8%)	3 (5.6%)	1 (2.2%)	1 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Prayer	2 (28.6%)	2 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.2%)	1 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)
Targeted Interventions	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (2.2%)	1 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Formal Programs	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (1.9%)	2 (4.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (40.0%)	1 (20.0%)
Counselling**	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	1 (20.0%)
Serve Isolated and Shut-In Congregants	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Small Congregation Size	0 (0.0%)	8 (15.1%)	5 (9.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Education and Experience	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Awareness of Personal Capacity	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Connections	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Awareness of Biblical Mandate	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Personnel and Capital	1 (14.3%)	2 (3.8%)	5 (9.3%)	4 (8.9%)	1 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	1 (20.0%)
Access Denominational Supports	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Relationships	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.7%)	2 (4.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Willingness to Help	1 (14.3%)	7 (13.2%)	11 (20.1%)	3 (6.7%)	2 (15.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Hard Working	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Empowerment Focus	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Helping Culture	0 (0.0%)	3 (5.7%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Inclusiveness, Sensitivity and Diversity	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Credibility	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Empathy	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Genuine Care for One Another	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.8%)	9 (16.7%)	3 (6.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Others-Centered and Focused	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (1.9%)	2 (4.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Generosity	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	4 (7.4%)	4 (8.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Lifestyle of Faith and Worship	1 (14.3%)	2 (3.8%)	2 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Commitment to Helping	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Prioritize People Over Possessions	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (1.9%)	2 (4.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Relationship-Based Helping**	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	4 (7.4%)	6 (13.3%)	3 (23.1%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)
Support Initiative-Takers	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Responsiveness to Needs	0 (0.0%)	10 (18.9%)	12 (22.2%)	5 (11.1%)	1 (7.7%)	1 (20.0%)	1 (20.0%)	1 (20.0%)
Communication of Existing Needs**	1 (14.3%)	6 (11.3%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Modelling Helping Behaviours	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Well Organized	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Leaders Care and Help	1 (14.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	3 (6.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Reciprocal Giving and Receiving	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Grass-roots, Informal Approach	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	2 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
People Draw Together in Need	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Chi-square tests were run, two tailed; * = $p \leq .05$, ** $\leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$

Appendix O

Congregational Gaps by Budget

Budget / Gaps	< $10k (N = 7)	$10-99k (N = 53)	$100-199k (N = 54)	$200-399k (N = 45)	$400-599k (N = 13)	$600-799k (N = 5)	$800-999k (N = 5)	> $1mil (N = 5)
	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)	n (% of N)
More Positive Attitude	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Less Individualism and Self-Absorption	2 (28.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Greater Interest in Helping One Another	2 (28.6%)	1 (1.9%)	2 (3.7%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Focus on Faith	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Prioritize Life to Put Needy First	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (7.4%)	2 (4.4%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Less Pride	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (1.9%)	3 (6.7%)	1 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Appreciation for Volunteers	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Communication and Awareness	0 (0.0%)	8 (15.1%)	10 (18.5%)	9 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (40.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (40.0%)
Build Relationships	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (5.6%)	3 (6.7%)	1 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Close the Gaps	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)
Fewer Assumptions	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Less Hesitation and Worry	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (2.2%)	1 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Incorporate Supports Into Church Life	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Timely Intervention	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)
Better Modelling of Helping	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Less Institutional	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Less Busyness	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.7%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Awareness of Biblical Mandate to Help One Another	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Awareness of Personal Capacity to Help	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

More Partnership With Community Services	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Greater Participation in Supporting Fellow Congregants	2 (28.6%)	1 (1.9%)	3 (5.6%)	3 (6.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Funding	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (5.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Dedicated Staff and Volunteers	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.8%)	1 (1.9%)	4 (8.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	1 (20.0%)
More Training	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (5.6%)	2 (4.4%)	2 (15.4%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Identify and Involve People with Gift of Helping	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Focused Use of Limited Resources	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Understanding of Difficult Issues	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Hospitality	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Commitment and Sustainability	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	2 (4.4%)	1 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Formal Support Programs	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
More Prayer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Chi-square tests were run, two tailed; * = p≤ .05, ** ≤ .01, *** p≤ .001

References

Alvesson, M., & Sköldberg, K. (2000). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research.* London: Sage Publications.

Andrews, E. E. (2005). Caring for widows during the first year of bereavement. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 65*(9-A), 3597.

Barker, S. L. (2007). The integration of spirituality and religion content in social work education: Where we've been, where we're going. *Social Work & Christianity, 34*(2), 146-166.

Barnes, S. L. (2005). Black church culture and community action. *Social Forces, 84*(2), 967-994.

Bibby, R. W. (2005, April). *The untold story of the role of women in the fall and rise of religion in Canada.* Presented at the annual meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association, Portland, OR.

Bjørnskov, C. (2008). Social capital and happiness in the United States. *Applied Research Quality Life, 3,* 43-62.

Boddie, S. C. (2002). Fruitful partnerships in a rural African American community: Important lessons for faith-based initiatives. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 38,* 317-333.

Boisjoly, J., Duncan, G. J., & Hofferth, S. (1995). Access to social capital. *Journal of Family Issues, 16*(5), 609-631.

Bowpitt, G. (2000). Working with creative creatures: Towards a Christian paradigm for

    social work theory, with some practical implications. *British Journal of Social*

    Work, 30, 349-364.

Brudenell, I. (2003). Parish nursing: Nurturing body, mind, spirit and community. *Public*

    Health Nursing, 20(2), 85-94.

Brydon-Miller, M. (1997). Participatory action research: Psychology and social change.

    Journal of Social Issues, 53, 657-666.

Canda, E. R. (1989). Religious content in social work education: A comparative

    approach. *Journal of Social Work Education, 25*(1), 36-45.

CAPNM. (n.d.). *Parish nurse fact sheet.* Retrieved April 30, 2009, from

    http://www.capnm.ca//fact_sheet.htm

Catanzaro, A. M., Meador, K. G., Koenig, H. G., Kuchibhatla, M., & Clipp, E. C. (2006).

    Congregational health ministries: A national study of pastors' views. *Public*

    Health Nursing, 24(1), 6-17.

Chamiec-Case, R., & Sherr, M. (2006). Exploring how social work administrators

    integrate spirituality in the workplace. *Social Work & Christianity, 33*(3), 268-

    287.

Chase-Ziolek, M., & Striepe, J. (1999). A comparison of urban versus rural experiences

    of nurses volunteering to promote health in churches. *Public Health Nursing,*

    16(4), 270-279.

Chatters, L. M., Taylor, R. J., Lincoln, K. D., & Schroepfer, T. (2002). Patterns of

    informal support from family and church members among African Americans.

    Journal of Black Studies, 33, 66-85.

Chaves, M., & Tsitsos, W. (2001). Congregations and social services: What they do, how they do it, and with whom. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 30*, 660-683.

Chavis, D. M., Hogge, J. H., McMillan, D. W., & Wandersman, A. (1986). Sense of community through Brunswik's Lens: A first look. *Journal of Community Psychology, 14*, 24-40.

Cnaan, R. A., Boddie, S. C., & Danzig, R. A. (2004). Teaching about organized religion in social work: Lessons and challenges. *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work, 23*(3), 67-84.

Cnaan, R. A., Boddie, S. C., & Kang, J. J. (2005). Religious congregations as social service providers for older adults. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 45*, 105-130.

Conway, E. M. (2005). Collaborative responses to the demands of emerging human needs: The role of faith and spirituality in education for social work. *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work, 24*(1-2), 65-77.

Dalton, J. H., Elias, M. J., & Wandersman, A. (2001). *Community psychology: Linking individuals and communities.* Toronto: Wadsworth.

De Silva, M. J., Harpham, T., Huttly, S. R., Bartolini, R., & Penny, M. E. (2005). Understanding sources and types of social capital in Peru. *Community Development Journal, 42*(1), 19-33.

Dewey III, D. (1988). When a congregation cares: Organizing ministry to the bereaved. *Death Studies, 12*, 123-135.

DualReach. (2005). *Missionary services inventory and welcome basket.* Retrieved

October 5, 2008, from http://www.dualreach.org/missions/bm~doc/mc-t8-2.doc

Eldridge, R. A. (2007). Relationships between religious orientation, religious beliefs, and

social justice. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and*

Engineering, 67(8-B), 4737.

Ferguson, K. M. (2004). Measuring and indigenizing social capital in relation to

children's street work in Mexico: The role of culture in shaping social capital

indicators. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 31*(4), 81-103.

Filinson, R. (1988). A model for church-based services for frail elderly persons and their

families. *Gerontologist, 28,* 483-486.

Finke, R., Bahr, M., & Scheitle, C. P. (2006). Toward explaining congregational giving.

Social Science Research, 35(3), 620-641.

Foley, M. W., McCarthy, J. D., & Chaves, M. (2001). Social capital, religious

institutions, and poor communities. In S. Saegert, J. P. Thompson, & M. R.

Warren (Eds.), *Social capital and poor communities* (pp. 215-245). New York:

Russell Sage Foundation.

Furman, L. D., Benson, P. W., Canda, E. R., & Grimwood, C. (2007). A comparative

international analysis of religion and spirituality in social work: A survey of UK

and US social workers. *Social Work Education, 24*(8), 813-839.

Furman, L. D., Zahi, M., Benson, P. W., & Canda, E. R. (2007). An international analysis

of the role of religion and spirituality in social work practice. *Families in Society,*

88(2), 241-254.

Garland, D. R., & Chamiec-Case, R. (2005). Before—and after—the political rhetoric: Faith-based child and family welfare services. *Social Work & Christianity, 32,* 22.43.

Garland, D. R., & Bailey, P. L. (1989-1990). Effective work with religious organizations by social workers in other settings. *Social Work and Christianity, 16-17,* 79-95.

Gingrich, L. G., & Lightman, E. (2004). Mediating communities and cultures: A case study of informal helpers in an Old Order Mennonite community. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services, 85,* 511-520.

Gingrich, L. G., & Lightman, E. (2006). Striving toward self-sufficiency: A qualitative study of mutual aid in an old order Mennonite community. *Family Relations: Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, 55,* 175-189.

Greeley, A. (1997). Coleman revisited: Religious structures as a source of social capital. *American Behavioral Scientist, 40*(5), 587-594.

Haber, D. (1984-1985). Church-based mutual help groups for caregivers of noninstitutionalized elders. *Journal of Religion & Aging, 1,* 63-69.

Hanifan, L. J. (1916). The rural school community centre. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 67,* 130-138.

Himchack, M. V. (2005). Social justice and social services within the Catholic church. *Social Work and Christianity, 32,* 232-247.

Hodge, D. R. (2002). Working with Muslim youths: Understanding the values and beliefs of Islamic discourse. *Children & Schools, 24*(1), 6-20.

Hodge, D. R. (2006). Advocating for the forgotten human right: Article 18 of the

Universal Declaration of Human Rights -- religious freedom. *International Social Work, 49*(4), 431-443.

Hodge, D. R. (2007). The spiritual competence scale: A new instrument for assessing

spiritual competence at the programmatic level. *Research on Social Work Practice, 17*(2), 287-295.

Holt, C. L., & McLure, S. M. (2006). Perceptions of the religion-health connection

among African American church members. *Qualitative Health Research, 16*(2), 268-281.

Hudson Institute Faith in Communities Initiative. (2003). The community serving

activities of Hispanic Protestant Congregations. Charlottesville, VA: Sherman, A. L.

International Parish Nurse Resource Centre. (2009). *International parish nursing: About parish nursing.* Retrieved April 30, 2009, from

http://www.parishnurses.org/InternationalParishNursing_229.aspx.

Kaplan, A. J., & Dziegielewski, S. F. (1999). Graduate social work students' attitudes and

behaviors toward spirituality and religion: Issues for education and practice. *Social Work & Christianity, 26*(1), 25-39.

King, P. E., & Furrow, J. L. (2008). Religion as a resource for positive youth

development: Religion, social capital, and moral outcomes. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality, S*(1), 34-49.

Kirby, S. L., Greaves, L., & Reid, C. (2006). *Experience research social change:*

Methods beyond the mainstream. Toronto, ON: Broadview Press.

Krause, N. (1989). Issues of measurement and analysis in studies of social support, aging

and health. In K. Markides & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Aging, stress and health* (pp.

43-66). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Krause, N. (2002). Exploring race differences in a comprehensive battery of church-

based social support measures. *Review of Religious Research, 44*, 126-149.

Krause, N. (2006). Church-based social support and mortality. *Journals of Gerontology:*

Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 61B(3), S140-S146.

Krause, N., & Wulff, K. M. (2005). Church-based social ties, a sense of belonging in a

congregation, and physical health status. *International Journal for the Psychology*

of Religion, 15(1), 73-93.

Lee, S. (2003). The church of faith and freedom: African-American Baptists and social

action. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 42*(1), 31-41.

Lewis, B. M. (2003). Issues and Dilemmas in Faith-Based *Social* Service Delivery: The

Case of the Salvation Army of Greater Philadelphia. *Administration in Social*

Work, 27, 87-106.

Lindberg, C. (1977). "There should be no beggars among Christians": Karlstadt, Luther,

and the origins of Protestant poor relief. *Church History, 46,* 313-334.

Litak, S. (2003). The Catholic Church's Care of the Poor and Sick in the Pre-Partition

Period. *Acta Poloniae Historica, 87,* 5-30.

Majerovitz, S. D. (2001). Formal versus informal support: Stress buffering among

dementia caregivers. *Journal of Mental Health and Aging, 7*(4), 413-423.

Maton, K. I. (1989). Community settings as buffers of life stress? Highly supportive

churches, mutual help groups, and senior centres. *American Journal of*

Community Psychology, 17, 203-232.

Mattison, D., Jayaratne, S., & Croxton, T. (2000). Social workers' religiosity and its

impact on religious practice behaviors. *Advances in Social Work, 1*(1), 43-59.

McGinnis, S. L., & Zoske, F. M. (2008). The emerging role of faith community nurses in

prevention and management of chronic disease. *Policy, Politics & Nursing*

Practic, 9(3), 173-180.

McKillip, J. (1987). Need analysis: Tools for the human services and education (Vol. 10).

In L. Bickman & D. Rog (Eds.), *Applied social Research Methods Series.*

Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

McMillan, D. W., & Chavis, D. M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory.

Journal of Community Psychology, 14, 6-23.

Monahan, D. J., & Hooker, K. (1997). Caregiving and social support in two illness

groups. *Social Work, 42*(1-3), 278-287.

Morrison, J. D. (1991). The black church as a support system for black elderly. *Journal of*

Gerontological Social Work, 17, 105-120.

Murray-Hayes, M. M. (2006). As Christ has welcomed you: Hospitality and the

movement from stranger to member at Maple Grove United Church (Ontario).

Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences,

67(4-A), 1395.

Neill, S. (1986). *A history of Christian missions* (Rev. ed.). New York: Penguin Books.

Nelson Cherry, S. D. (2003). The development and training of Christian lay leaders to

provide pastoral counseling for the members of Living Waters Christian

Fellowship, in Newport News, Virginia.

Netting, F. E. (1984). Church-related agencies and social welfare. *Social Service Review,*

58, 404-420.

Outreach Canada Ministries Inc. (n.d.). *ChurchMap Canada.* Retrieved March 29, 2009,

from http://churchmap.ca/Default.aspx?tabid=1133

Patton. M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods.* London: Sage

Publications.

Pipes, P. F., & Rose Ebaugh, H. (2002). Faith-based coalitions, social services and

government funding. *Sociology of Religion, 63,* 49-68.

Polson, L. M., & Rogers, R. K. (2007). Counseling and mental health referral practices of

church staff. *Social Work & Christianity, 34*(1), 72-87.

Posavac, E. J., & Carey, R. G. (2003). *Program evaluation: Methods and case studies*

(6th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Praglin, L. J. (2004). Spirituality, religion, and social work: An effort towards

interdisciplinary conversation. *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work,*

23(4), 67-84.

Questionnaire design. Retrieved March 27, 2009, from

http://www.cc.gatech.edu/classes/cs6751_97_winter/Topics/quest-design

Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (Eds.). (2001). *Handbook of action research: Participative*

inquiry and practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Religion (95A), Age Groups (7A) and Sex (3) for Population, for Canada, Provinces,

Territories, Census Metropolitan Areas and Census Agglomerations, 1991 and

2001 Censuses - 20% Sample Data. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, June 17, 2003.

2001 Census of Canada. Catalogue number 97F0022XCB2001002.

Ressler, L. E., & Hodge, D. R. (2005). Religious discrimination in social work:

Preliminary evidence. *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work, 24*(4),

55-74.

Reviere, R. (1996). *Needs assessment: A creative and practical guide for social*

scientists. Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.

Roberts, B. and Thorsheim, H. (1991). Reciprocal ministry: A transforming vision of

help and leadership. In R. E. Hess, K. I. Maton, & K. I. Pargament (Eds.) *Religion*

and Prevention in Mental Health: Community Intervention, 10(1), New York:

Haworth Press, 51-67.

Roberts, S. J. M. (2006). Creating an intergenerational support system in an African

American church. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and*

Social Sciences, 67(6-A), 2193.

Robinson, K. M., Ewing, S., & Looney, S. (2000). Clergy support and caregiver

expectations for support: A replication study. *American Journal of Alzheimer's*

Disease, 15(3), 180-189.

Saegert, S., Thompson, J. P., & Warren, M. R. (2001). The role of social capital in

combating poverty. In S. Saegert, J. P., Thompson, & M. R. Warren (Eds.), *Social*

Capital and Poor Communities (pp. 1-28). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Sahlein, J. (2002). When religion enters the dialogue: A guide for practitioners. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 30*(4), 381-401.

Saulnier, C. F. (2000). Incorporating feminist theory into social work practice: Group work examples. *Social Work with Groups, 23*(1), 5-25.

Sherman, S. R., Ward, R. A., & LaGory, A. (1988). Women as caregivers of the elderly: Instrumental and expressive support. *Social Work, 34*, 164-167.

Sherr, M. E., Shields, G., King, W., & Curran, M. A. (2005). Informal vs. formal support networks among the elderly and the role of religion. *Social Work & Christianity, 32*(4), 341-353.

Sherwood, D. (2003). Churches as contexts for social work practice: Connecting with the mission and identity of congregations. *Social Work and Christianity, 30*, 1-13.

Simpson, M. R., & King, M. G. (1999). God brought all these churches together: Issues in developing religion-health partnerships in an Appalachian community. *Public Health Nursing, 16*(1), 41-49.

Singletary, J. (2004). Baptist perspectives on faith-based initiatives and religious liberty. *Journal of Religious Gerontology, 16*(1-2), 81-98.

Sheehan, K. (2001). E-mail survey response rates: A review. Journal of Computer-mediated Communication. Retrieved online May 1, 2009 at http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol6/issue2/sheehan.html

Sheehan, N. W. (1989). The Caregiver Information Project: A mechanism to assist religious leaders to help family caregivers. *Gerontologist, 29*, 703-706.

Should social work education address religious issues? (1994). *Journal of Social Work Education, 31*(1), 7-17.

Silverman, R. M. (2001). CDCs and charitable organizations in the urban south: Mobilizing social capital based on race and religion for neighborhood revitalization. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 30*(2), 240-268.

Spencer, S. W. (1961). What place has religion in social work education. *Social Service Review, 35*(2), 161.

Staral, J. M. (2000). Building on mutual goals: The intersection of community practice and church-based organizing. *Journal of Community Practice, 7,* 85-95.

Statistics Canada. (2008). *Classification of religious denomination.* Retrieved March 29, 2009, from http://www.statcan.gc.ca/concepts/concepts/def/8102852-eng.htm.

Stephen Ministries. (2008). *Media fact sheet.* Retrieved April 29, 2009, from http://www.stephenministries.org/PDFs/SSMediaFactSheet.pdf

Stephen Ministries. (2008). *Stephen Ministry statistics.* Retrieved April 29, 2009, from http://www.stephenministries.org/PDFs/SSstats.pdf

Stockton-Chilson, K. E. (2004). A comparative study of giving and volunteering patterns among adults with Seventh-day Adventist and other Christian religious identities. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 64*(7-B), 3586.

Stoltzfus, K. M. (2006). An elephant in the sanctuary: Denial and resistance in addicted Christians and their churches. *Social Work & Christianity, 33*(2), 141-163.

Stone, H., Cross, D., Purvis, K., & Young, M. (2003). A study of the benefit of social and religious support on church members during times of crisis. *Pastoral Psychology, 51,* 327-340.

Stone, H., Cross, D., Purvis, K., & Young, M. (2004). A study of church members during times of crisis. *Pastoral Psychology, 52*(5), 405-421.

Taylor, R. J., Lincoln, K. D., & Chatters, L. M. (2005). Supportive relationships with church members among African Americans. *Family Relations, 54*(4), 501-511.

Thompson, C. (1989). Breaking through walls of isolation: A model for churches in helping victims of violence. *Pastoral Psychology, 38*, 35-38.

Thompson, J. E. (1986). Life care ministry: The church as part of the elderly support network. *Journal of Religion & Aging, 2-3*, 65-76.

Trinitapoli, J. (2005). Congregation-based services for the elders: An examination of patterns and correlates. *Research on Aging, 27*(2), 241-264.

Tompkins, C. J., & Sorrell, J. M. (2008). Older adults with Alzheimer's Disease in a faith community. *Journal of Psychosocial Nursing, 46*(1), 22-25.

Tsai, W., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital and value creation: The role of intrafirm networks. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*(4), 464-476.

Vaux, A. (1988). *Social support: Theory, research, and intervention.* New York: Praeger.

Walls, C. T. (1992). The role of church and family support in the lives of older African Americans. *Generations: Journal of the American Society on Aging, 17*, 33-36.

Westberg, G. E. (1990). *The parish nurse: Providing a minister of health for your congregation.* Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg.

Williamson, S. (2005). She saw something in me: Relationships between faith community volunteers and mothers leaving welfare. *Social Work and Christianity, 32*, 151-167.

Wolfer, T. A., & Hodge, D. R. (2007). Epistemology and social work: Toward a Christian critique. *Social Work & Christianity, 34*(4), 356-375.

Yancey, G. I., & Atkinson, K. M. (2004). The impact of caring in faith-based social service programs: What participants say. *Social Work and Christianity, 31,* 254-266.

Yeich, S. (1996). Grassroots organizing with homeless people: A participatory research approach. *Journal of Social Issues, 52,* 111-122.

Young Larance, L. (2001). Fostering social capital through NGO design: Grameen Bank membership in Bangladesh. *International Social Work, 44*(1), 7-18.

Zahl, M. (2006). Incorporating a spiritual dimension in social work practice. *Socialno Delo, 45*(3-4), 127-133.

Zine, J. (2004). Staying on the straight path: A critical ethnography of Islamic schooling in Ontario. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Sociology and Equity Studies in Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto.