

**Table 8: Logit Regression Results Predicting Tightened Eligibility Criteria by Social Service Providers, 1995**

	<i>Tightened Eligibility (Standard Error)</i>
Faith-based, Non-profit	2.41** (1.17)
Age of the Organization (year since founding)	.03* (.02)
Number of Township Trustees in Network	.01 (.06)
Number of Religious Organizations in Network	-.06 (.01)
Percent of Expenditures on Human and Social Services	-.02 (.01)
Percent of Expenditures on Housing and Community Development	-.04 (.04)
Percent of Expenditures on Legal Aid and Advocacy	.02 (.02)
Constant	-2.18** (.95)
<b>Pseudo R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>.25</b>

Note: N=59; \*\*\*p<.01; \*\* p<.05; \*p<.10.

### **Discussion and Implications**

Descriptive analyses found that both TANF and control group members receiving public assistance are very needy and most of these needs are not being met. Those who express needs have fewer adults in the household, are less likely to be working, and have lower incomes. Further, respondents who expressed needs were more likely to report behaviors and events that indicate serious deprivation. While TANF per se did not increase neediness, those currently receiving welfare benefits and those forced off by time limits expressed more needs than did individuals with “child-only” cases and those who had been sanctioned. Thus, the consequences of TANF on general neediness are far from benign for large portions of the former and current caseload.

It is in this context that we look at the impact of TANF on the demand for social services from FBOs by current and former public assistance recipients. Those who actually receive help from FBOs do not share the same characteristics as those who expressed needs but did not receive FBO assistance. First, those getting help from religious groups are less likely to be non-white and have never married. We cannot tell from our data whether this finding is a consequence of self-selection on the part of religious organizations or welfare recipients; this is clearly an important area for further research. Additionally, those receiving help from religious groups were among the most disadvantaged of the welfare caseload with considerably higher rates of hunger, homelessness, panhandling, health/disability problems, and drug addictions.