

Appendix A

**Local, State, and National Donors
for the Pilot Program and the Full Program**

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table A.1

Local, State, and National Donors for New Hope's Pilot Program and Full Program

Amount and Donor	
<u>\$1,000,000 and over</u>	<u>\$25,000 to \$49,999</u>
Helen Bader Foundation	Bucyrus-Erie
John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation	Robert W. Baird and Company
Mott Foundation	Journal Communications
The Rockefeller Foundation	Marcus Corporation
State of Wisconsin	Marquette Electronics
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Steigleder Foundation
	United Wisconsin Service
	Universal Foods
	University of Michigan
<u>\$250,000 to \$999,999</u>	<u>\$5,000 to \$24,999</u>
Ameritech / Wisconsin Bell	American Express
Annie E. Casey Foundation	Andersen Consulting
Ford Foundation	Arthur Andersen LLP
William T. Grant Foundation	Birnschein Foundation
Northwestern Mutual Life	Emory Clark Foundation
Wisconsin Energy Corporation	Patrick and Ann Cudahy Foundation
	Dairyland Charitable Trust
	Harnischfeger Industries
	Helfaer Foundation
	Kohl's Corporation
	Masterlock
	Judy and David Meissner
	Midwest Express
	North Shore Bank
	Norwest Bank
	Pick Charitable Trust
	Warner Cable Communications
	Weyenburg Trust
<u>\$100,000 to \$249,999</u>	<u>Under \$5,000</u>
Firststar	35 - 40 donors
Fortis (Time) Insurance	
Johnson Controls	
Joyce Foundation	
Marshall and Ilsley	
Faye McBeath Foundation	
Milwaukee Foundation	
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development	
WICOR	
<u>\$50,000 to \$99,999</u>	
ANR Pipeline	
A.O. Smith	
Banc One	
City of Milwaukee	
Harley Davidson	
Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corporation	
Pollybill Foundation	

SOURCE: The New Hope Project.

Appendix B

**The New Hope Ethnographic Sample:
Overview of Sample and Methods**

Sample

The New Hope Ethnographic Study (NHES) began in spring 1998, during the final year of the New Hope experiment, and continued for three years thereafter, through the administration of data collection for the five-year survey. The NHES drew a stratified random sample of 60 families from the 745 families in the Child and Family Study (CFS) sample, with equal representation of both the experimental group and the control group. Of these 60 families, 45 (75 percent) were enrolled into the NHES. One family dropped out very early in the study, leaving 44 NHES families in the final sample.

The demographic profile of the NHES closely matches the profile of the entire CFS sample. The NHES sample, just like the CFS sample, is an ethnically diverse, low-income group. Slightly more than half the sample were living with a male partner or spouse just prior to the start of the study. About a quarter of the families had three or more children, and all families at the start of the study had children who were age-eligible (13 or younger) for the child care subsidies available from New Hope.

Fieldwork Methods

Fieldworkers recruited and then worked with particular families — from one to eight. When visiting families, fieldworkers used open-ended interviews to engage parents in conversations and descriptions of their lives, concerns, goals, hopes, and everyday activities. Parents “told their stories” from their points of view, in their own words, as well as telling the fieldwork team about the topics important to the study. The fieldwork team jointly developed a set of domains and topics to organize these discussions and probed for material relevant to all of them. These domains came from the central questions of the New Hope study overall, from previous research literature, and from pilot work with families. These domains — the major topics and themes which organized the fieldwork visits and field notes — are listed in Appendix Table B.1. Fieldworkers also participated in family activities (including meals, shopping, church, school, and child care visits and pickups) and talked with the children about their home lives, school, and friends. If parents did not bring up some topics, fieldworkers raised the topics and systematically probed for information, ensuring that fieldwork data are as complete as possible across all the ethnographic cases.

After each visit with NHES families, fieldworkers reviewed their notes about the conversations and observations that they had had and wrote visit summaries and more complete descriptive field notes. The field notes were based on tape-recordings made during each family visit and/or on written notes made during and after the visit.

The field notes are organized around the topics listed in Appendix Table B.1 and are stored in and accessed from a FileMaker Pro database specifically developed for this purpose,

called EthnoNotes.¹ Fieldworkers entered their notes into this EthnoNotes system as the study progressed, and they rated families' adaptation and cultural and ecological circumstances using this database. EthnoNotes is located on a secure server, so that fieldworkers in Milwaukee or at several universities where fieldworkers were based could enter data and read up-to-date field notes at any point. In preparing ethnographic research studies and the vignettes and case materials used in this report, the authors drew systematically on the data stored in EthnoNotes.

The fieldworkers for the NHES were Conerly Casey (University of California, Los Angeles), Nelle Chmielwski (University of Wisconsin, Madison), Victor Espinosa (currently Northwestern University), Christina Gibson (Northwestern University; currently Duke University), Eboni Howard (Northwestern University; currently Chapin Hall Center for Children, University of Chicago), Katherine Magnuson (Northwestern University; currently Columbia University), Andrea Robles (University of Wisconsin, Madison), Jennifer Romich (Northwestern University; currently University of Washington, Seattle), and Devarati Syam (University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee). It is only because of their outstanding collaboration with the families in the sample, and their field notes, that the NHES data could be assembled. Other NHES staff based at UCLA include Cindy Bernheimer, Helen Davis, Sonya Geis, Eli Lieber, Edward Lowe, and Karen Quintiliani. The researchers are most indebted to the families who participated in the ethnographic research.

¹Lieber, Weisner, and Presley, Forthcoming, 2003.

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table B.1

Fieldwork Domains for the New Hope Ethnographic Study: Major Categories and Themes

Major Categories/Themes	Minor Categories/Subthemes
Beliefs/goals/outlook	Future orientation
Beliefs/goals/outlook	Life goals/ambitions
Beliefs/goals/outlook	Meaning of work
Beliefs/goals/outlook	Political ideology
Beliefs/goals/outlook	Relative success standards
Beliefs/goals/outlook	Success criteria/definitions
Beliefs/goals/outlook	Work attitudes/values
Children	Child care as barrier
Children	Child care beliefs
Children	Child care ideologies
Children	Child care issues
Children	Child rearing beliefs
Children	Child rearing issues
Children	Child's peer network expansion
Children	Child's pride in parents
Children	Child's view of self
Children	Gender models/child care
Children	General children issues
Children	Local resource awareness
Children	Safety moves
Children	School involvement
Children	Sex differences
Children	Support from relatives
Children	Values in work

(continued)

Appendix Table B.1 (continued)

Major Categories/Themes	Minor Categories/Subthemes
Children	Views of children
Children	Work comparisons
Education	Education
Education	Job skills/credentials
Education	Schooling
Education	Use of training/education
Environment control/foresight	
Money/bills/budgeting	Balances/trade-offs
Money/bills/budgeting	Checking/savings account
Money/bills/budgeting	Earned Income Tax Credit
Money/bills/budgeting	Equity building
Money/bills/budgeting	New Hope exit preparation
Money/bills/budgeting	Transportation issues
Money/bills/budgeting	Unexpected expense cushion
Nonfamily support	Client's view of representative's role
Nonfamily support	Community activism
Nonfamily support	Community bridging
Nonfamily support	Expanding social networks
Nonfamily support	General New Hope participation
Nonfamily support	Reference group enhancement
Nonfamily support	Relations with case representative
Nonfamily support	Social network expansion
Physical and mental health	Alcohol/drug issues
Physical and mental health	Health/family stress
Physical and mental health	Medical care issues
Physical and mental health	Mental health
Presence of family stories	

(continued)

Appendix Table B.1 (continued)

Major Categories/Themes	Minor Categories/Subthemes
Race	Employer discrimination
Race	Role of ethnicity
Relationships with partners	Domestic violence
Relationships with partners	Family planning
Relationships with partners	Relations with partner
Relatives	Family history
Religious beliefs/practices	Particular church/faith
Religious beliefs/practices	Role of religion/spirituality
Social networks	
Stability and daily routine	Daily routine
Stability and daily routine	Family pattern adjustment
Stability and daily routine	Increased mobility
Stability and daily routine	Stability
Work	Job as resource
Work	Job barriers
Work	Job versus career
Work	Paths to employment
Work	Self-esteem impact
Work	Underground economy
Work	Work at entry
Work	Work experience
Work	Work history\values
Work	Work last year
Work	Work readiness

Appendix C

**Analysis of Nonresponse Bias
in the Five-Year Survey Sample**

Most of the impacts shown in this report were estimated from the New Hope survey sample — the 561 parents and their children who responded to the five-year survey. Not all parents and children who were eligible for the five-year survey responded to it. In fact, as shown in Figure 2.1, the larger pool of families who were eligible for the Child and Family Study (CFS) included 745 sample members who had been randomly assigned to either the program group or the control group and whose households contained age-eligible children. Thus, the survey’s response rate was 75 percent — fairly high by conventional standards but low enough, possibly, to impart nonresponse bias to the estimates of program effects.

All CFS sample members had one or more children between the ages of 1 year, 0 months, and 10 years, 11 months, at the time of random assignment. In these households, up to two children were selected as focal (that is, a subject of the study), and additional interviews were administered to the focal children and to their teachers. From this sample, 539 families (72 percent) had at least one child who responded to the child and youth surveys.¹

This appendix assesses the extent to which the survey sample is representative of the entire CFS sample and, consequently, whether the impacts that were estimated using the survey sample may be unbiased.

Response Rates

Appendix Table C.1 shows response rates — the percentages of eligible sample members in the CFS sample who responded to the five-year surveys of parents, children and youth, and teachers. Overall, 75 percent of parents and 72 percent of children in the CFS sample provided at least some responses to the five-year surveys. Some 63 percent of all children who responded had at least one teacher who responded to the five-year teacher survey.²

Appendix Table C.1 also presents response rates by research group. It is particularly important in a random assignment design that response rates be similar for the program group and the control group. Although response rates for the program and control groups differed somewhat between the two samples, none of these differences were statistically significant at conventional levels.

¹Since up to two children per household could be focal children, the total number of children who were interviewed is higher — 840 in all. The figures for children presented in this appendix are based on the number of families in which at least one child responded to the survey.

²Most nonresponse among teachers resulted from the inability to locate the right teacher rather than from nonresponse by the teachers or refusal by the parents to give permission. In cases where the child had multiple teachers, more than one teacher per child could be interviewed. Altogether, 674 teachers responded to the survey. The response rate for teachers is determined on the basis of the number of child-respondents who had at least one teacher respond on their behalf — regardless of whether more than one teacher responded.

The New Hope Project
Appendix Table C.1
Five-Year Survey Response Rates

Respondent	Sample Size	CFS Sample (%)	Program Group (%)	Control Group (%)
Parent responded	745	75.3	77.1	73.5
Any child responded	745	72.3	74.2	70.6
Any teacher responded	840	63.2	63.0	64.7

SOURCES: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope parent, child, youth, and teacher five-year surveys.

NOTE: Two-tailed t-tests applied to differences between the program and control groups revealed that none were statistically significant at the .10 level.

Comparison of Baseline Characteristics

Although three-quarters of the CFS parents responded to the five year survey, there is still a real chance that response bias exists. Appendix Table C.2 examines this issue more directly by showing selected baseline characteristics for the entire CFS sample and for respondents and nonrespondents to the five-year survey. Asterisks in the rightmost column denote instances in which the characteristics of respondents and nonrespondents differed significantly.

A comparison of the second and third columns shows that survey respondents and nonrespondents were similar in most respects, although some statistically significant differences were found. Compared with nonrespondents, survey respondents were significantly less likely to be male, more likely to have ever worked full time prior to random assignment, and more likely to have lived as a child in a household that received Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). All the estimates of program impacts control for baseline differences in the characteristics listed in Appendix Table C.2, which should eliminate most bias that might be correlated with these measured characteristics. The possibility of bias associated with unmeasured characteristics that are not correlated with these baseline measures remains.

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table C.2

Comparison of the Baseline Characteristics of the CFS Sample

Characteristic (%)	Entire CFS Sample	Respondents to the Five-Year Survey	Nonrespondents to the Five-Year Survey
Male	10.2	8.6	15.2 ***
Northside target area	48.6	49.6	45.7
Age under 25	31.7	32.1	30.4
Age 25-34	49.0	48.8	49.5
African-American, non-Hispanic	55.0	55.6	53.3
Hispanic	29.3	28.3	32.1
Household with children and one adult	83.5	84.1	81.5
Household with three or more children	45.9	47.2	41.8
Youngest child age 2 or younger	48.3	48.0	49.5
Ever worked full time	83.4	85.0	78.3 **
Received public assistance at baseline	80.7	81.1	79.3
Had high school diploma or GED	59.5	60.6	56.0
Had access to a car	44.1	43.9	44.6
In AFDC household as a child	46.7	48.9	39.6 **
Sample size	745	561	184

SOURCES: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope Background Information Form (BIF) and the five-year parent survey.

NOTE: Statistical tests of difference were conducted only between the five-year survey sample and the nonrespondents. Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Comparison of Impact Estimates from Administrative Records

Another way to assess whether analyses using the five-year survey sample are likely to be biased is to compare impacts for the entire CFS sample and for survey respondents and nonrespondents on outcomes observed for all groups. This is the case with the administrative records data on earnings, benefit receipt, and income,³ since data were gathered from all families in the CFS sample, including both respondents and nonrespondents to the five-year survey. These results are presented in Appendix Table C.3.

³Income includes earnings, AFDC payments, food stamps, supplement payments, and estimated Earned Income Tax Credits (EITCs).

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table C.3

Comparison of Impacts on the Earnings, Income, and Employment of the Entire CFS Sample and the Survey Sample

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value for Difference Across Samples ^a
<u>Entire CFS sample</u>				
Average annual earnings (\$)				
Years 1-2	7,659	6,903	756 **	
Years 3-5	10,453	9,895	557	
Average annual income (\$)				
Years 1-2	14,073	12,924	1,150 ***	
Years 3-5	14,018	13,319	699	
Average annual AFDC payment (\$)				
Years 1-2	2,647	2,796	-149	
Years 3-5	704	750	-47	
Average quarters employed (%)				
Years 1-2	3.0	2.7	0.3 ***	
Years 3-5	2.9	2.8	0.1	
Sample size	366	379		
<u>Respondents to the five-year survey</u>				
Average annual earnings (\$)				
Years 1-2	8,250	7,283	967 **	0.17
Years 3-5	11,420	10,705	715	0.35
Average annual income (\$)				
Years 1-2	14,794	13,392	1,401 ***	0.23
Years 3-5	15,428	14,263	1,164 *	0.10
Average annual AFDC payment (\$)				
Years 1-2	2,678	2,769	-90	0.92
Years 3-5	840	761	79	0.04
Average quarters employed (%)				
Years 1-2	3.1	2.8	0.4 ***	0.30
Years 3-5	3.2	3.0	0.1	0.49
Sample size	282	279		

(continued)

Appendix Table C.3 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value for Difference Across Samples ^a
<u>Nonrespondents to the five-year survey</u>				
Average annual earnings (\$)				
Years 1-2	5,662	5,929	-267	
Years 3-5	7,197	7,721	-524	
Average annual income (\$)				
Years 1-2	11,753	11,618	135	
Years 3-5	9,492	10,661	-1,169	
Average annual AFDC payment (\$)				
Years 1-2	2,653	2,779	-126	
Years 3-5	334	673	-339 **	
Average quarters employed (%)				
Years 1-2	2.5	2.4	0.1	
Years 3-5	2.2	2.2	0.0	
Sample size	84	100		

SOURCES: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year parent survey and Wisconsin unemployment insurance (UI) records.

NOTES: Two tailed t-tests were applied to differences between the program and control groups and to the differences between the CFS sample and the five-year survey sample. Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

^aA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts presented for different groups in this table were significantly different from one another. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across different panels in the table is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant.

The first two rows of each panel present impacts on average annual earnings. A direct comparison of the respondent and nonrespondent samples shows a number of differences in impact estimates. This is clearly shown in the rightmost column of the panel for respondents, which presents the results of a test that assesses whether the variation in impacts across the respondent and nonrespondent samples are statistically significant. In Years 1-2, for example, New Hope increased earnings by nearly \$1,000 for the survey respondent sample, but it de-

creased earnings by \$267 for the nonrespondent sample. The significance level of this difference was $p = .17$. The only statistically significant difference in impacts between respondent and nonrespondent samples was in the case of AFDC receipt in Years 3-5, which averaged \$79 more for program group families than control group families who responded to the five-year survey but \$339 less for program group families than control group families who chose not to respond to the survey. All in all, the administrative records data show statistically indistinguishable impacts for the survey respondent and nonrespondent samples.

Comparison of Program and Control Groups in Different Samples

To further assess whether treatment/control status was related to survey response, a regression of response status on treatment/control status — plus the demographic characteristics gathered at random assignment — was performed. As shown in Appendix Table C.4, treatment/control status was not a significant predictor of survey response for any of the samples used in the analyses.

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table C.4

Treatment/Control Status as a Predictor of Survey Response

Characteristic (%)	Parent Sample		Child Sample		Teacher Sample	
	Parameter Estimate	(Standard Error)	Parameter Estimate	(Standard Error)	Parameter Estimate	(Standard Error)
Treatment status	0.025	0.033	0.023	0.034	-0.037	0.037
Male	-0.164	0.062 ***	-0.180	0.064 **	-0.032	0.081
Northside target area	0.036	0.051	0.014	0.053	-0.047	0.055
Age under 25	0.021	0.054	0.016	0.056	-0.004	0.065
Age 25-34	-0.003	0.045	-0.017	0.047	0.028	0.052
African-American, non-Hispanic	-0.043	0.060	-0.034	0.062	-0.034	0.066
Hispanic	-0.044	0.051	-0.069	0.053	0.039	0.058
Household with children and one adult	-0.023	0.049	-0.041	0.051	-0.001	0.055
Household with three or more children	0.038	0.035	0.047	0.037	-0.055	0.041
Youngest child age 2 or younger	-0.025	0.036	-0.005	0.037	0.041	0.045
Ever worked full time	0.108	0.046 **	0.122	0.048 ***	0.015	0.055
Received public assistance at baseline	0.010	0.045	-0.007	0.046	-0.122	0.050 **
Had high school diploma or GED	0.034	0.035	0.033	0.036	-0.058	0.040
Had access to a car	-0.019	0.034	0.000	0.035	-0.013	0.039
In AFDC household as a child	0.057	0.034 *	0.043	0.036	-0.002	0.039
Child is a boy ^a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.087	0.037 **
Child's age ^a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.002	0.008
Sample size	561		539		531	

SOURCES: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope Background Information Form (BIF) and the five-year parent survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

^aChild's gender and age are excluded from the first two regressions since the unit of analysis is the family.

Appendix D

Description of Measures Used in the Study

PARENTS' CONTEXTS

Parents' Well-Being

Material Well-Being

Material Hardship. Parents responded to a summary measure of six items assessing whether they or their family members in the past 12 months had experienced any of a number of hardships (such as being without phone service or being unable to pay the full amount of rent or mortgage). Parents responded on a two-point scale (0 = "no," 1 = "yes"). The internal consistency for this scale was .69.

Financial Well-Being. Using a five-point scale (1 = "not at all true," 5 = "very true"), parents were asked to rate their level of financial well-being (for example, "I worry about having enough money in the future"). The internal consistency for this scale was .08. Deleting any of the items did not improve the scale's reliability.

Financial Worry. Several items from the interview assessed parents' feelings of worry about financial issues. Using a five-point scale (1 = "not at all," 5 = "a great deal"), respondents indicated how much they worried about paying the bills, gaining employment, having medical coverage, having money for food, and being able to afford adequate housing. Responses to the five items were averaged to compute a "financial worry" score. An internal consistency level of .90 suggests that the five items measure a unified construct.

Residential Well-Being

Neighborhood Resources. Five items assessed parents' satisfaction with aspects of their neighborhood, including "places to shop for things" and "level of children's safety." Parents indicated their satisfaction by responding on a five-point scale (1 = "very unhappy," 5 = "very happy"). The internal consistency for this scale was .72.

Collective Efficacy. Parents were asked about their level of confidence that their neighbors would respond to such neighborhood threats as "someone breaking into your home in plain sight." Parents answered on a five-point scale (1 = "very unlikely," 5 = "very likely"). The internal consistency for this scale was .85.

Parents' Coping Strategies and Instrumental Behaviors

Sustainability. Based on parents' responses during ethnographic fieldwork, five items were developed to assess such aspects of family sustainability as having enough resources and being able to manage and juggle life's daily routines. Parents were asked, for instance, "Are you

more like the people: who feel they have enough resources or those who feel they just never have enough?" Then, for the same question, they responded to the question "Is that: sort of true for you or very true for you?" This format resulted in four response options for each of the five items. The alpha for this scale was .71.

Parents' Psychosocial Well-Being

Depression. Parents' experience of depression was assessed using the Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression (CES-D) scale.¹ The 20-item self-report scale is intended as a screening instrument and has been used in many large-scale projects involving low-income adults similar to those in the New Hope study. Parents responded to nine items regarding their feelings and behaviors in the past week (for example, "I felt lonely," "I had crying spells"), using a four-point scale (1 = "rarely or none [less than 1 day]," 4 = "most or all [5 to 7 days]"). The alpha for this scale was .82.

Hope. The State Hope Scale² was used to assess parents' sense of hope, in terms of agency (belief in one's capacity to initiate and sustain actions) and pathways (belief in one's capacity to generate routes to achieve goals). Using a four-point scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree," respondents indicated their level of agreement with six items (for example, "I am meeting the goals I set for myself"). A reliability coefficient of .85 suggests that the State Hope Scale is a reliable measure of the related constructs of agency and pathways.

Substance Use/Abuse. Parents were asked five items concerning the frequency of their use of substances (including tobacco, alcohol, and other drugs) in the past month and two items about the frequency of indicators of substance abuse in the past month (for example, people complaining about their use of drugs or alcohol). Using a five-point scale ranging from "no days" to "almost every day," respondents indicated their usage of tobacco, alcohol, and other drugs during the past 30 days. An alpha coefficient of .54 was obtained. When the item "smoked cigarettes" was removed from the scale, the reliability increased to .72.

¹Radloff, 1977.

²Snyder et al., 1996.

CHILDREN'S CONTEXTS

Parenting

Effective Child Management

Parental Problems with Control. A five-item consistency scale from the Canadian evaluation of the Self-Sufficiency Project (SSP)³ was used to measure a dimension of parenting termed “control.” Using a six-point scale ranging from “never” to “all of the time,” parents were asked to indicate the frequency of five discipline events (for example, how often the child ignored the parent’s punishment). Based on pilot-testing and item analysis, the five items were selected from a larger set that was used in SSP. The scale had a reliability coefficient of .80, indicating sufficient internal consistency.

Parental Discipline. Nine items were taken from the SSP evaluation⁴ to assess how often in the past week parents had used disciplinary action with their child (for example, grounding, spanking, taking away privileges). A four-point response scale was used, ranging from “never” to “4 or more times.” An internal consistency coefficient of .83 was obtained for the scale.

Parenting Stress. Two scales that were used in the New Chance evaluation⁵ were used to assess the degree of stress or aggravation perceived by the parent in relation to interactions with the child. The first scale, a measure of general parenting stress, consisted of three items concerning negative feelings about the parental role (for example, “I feel trapped by my responsibilities as a parent”). The second scale consisted of five items designed to measure stress specifically associated with the target child (for example, “My child seems to be much harder to care for than most”). Both sets of items used a five-point response scale ranging from “not at all true” to “very true.” The internal consistency coefficients for general parenting stress and child-specific parenting stress were .61 and .79, respectively. The two measures were slightly correlated ($r = .35$), suggesting that different types of stress may be experienced by parents in relation to child-rearing.

Positive Youth-Parent Relations

Child- and Youth-Reported Positive Parent-Child Relations. The Child Evaluation of Relationship with Mother/Caregiver measure was developed as part of a study of low-income

³Statistics Canada, 1995.

⁴Statistics Canada, 1995.

⁵Quint, Bos, and Polit, 1997.

African-American families.⁶ Children aged 6 to 12 at the time of the New Hope survey indicated on a five-point scale (1 = “not at all true,” 5 = “very true”) how true 19 statements were about their parent, their relations with the parent, and interactions with the parent. Items were adapted from a rating instrument developed by Swanson⁷ and revised by McLoyd and colleagues.⁸ Two subscales were derived, one that comprised 12 items assessing perceived positive parent-child relations (for example, “Your parent spends a lot of time talking with you”) and another that comprised 7 items tapping perceived negative parent-child relations (for example, “It is hard to be pleasant and happy around your parent”). Within each of the two subscales, items were summed to create a total score, with higher scores indicating a more positive or a more negative quality, respectively.

McLoyd and colleagues⁹ reported high levels of internal consistency for the positive and negative relations subscales: The alphas were .91 and .81, respectively. In New Hope’s five-year survey sample of 9- to 12-year-olds, internal consistency coefficients were .90 for Perceived Positive Relations and .66 for Perceived Negative Relations. Children were more consistent in their responses to items about positive interactions with their parent than items about negative interactions.

Youth-Reported Parental Acceptance and Involvement. Children aged 9 to 16 reported the degree to which their parents made them feel accepted and were involved in their lives, by responding to nine items from the “acceptance/involvement” subscales of the Authoritative Parenting Measure.¹⁰ A four-point response scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” was used, and a mean score was calculated for each subscale. An example from this scale is “Your parent says you shouldn’t argue with adults.” The internal consistency for this subscale was .69.

Youth-Reported Parental Monitoring. Children aged 9 to 16 reported on their parents’ monitoring by assessing the extent to which their parents knew about their activities and their friends (for example, “Does your parent know what you are doing after school?”). Children answered on a four-point scale (1 = “strongly disagree,” 4 = “strongly agree”). The alpha for this scale was .71.

⁶McLoyd, Jayaratne, Ceballo, and Borquez, 1994.

⁷Swanson, 1950.

⁸McLoyd, Jayaratne, Ceballo, and Borquez, 1994.

⁹McLoyd, Jayaratne, Ceballo, and Borquez, 1994.

¹⁰Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, and Darling, 1992.

Negative Youth-Parent Relations

Child- and Youth-Reported Negative Parent-Child Relations. See the section above entitled “Child- and Youth-Reported Positive Parent-Child Relations.”

Youth-Reported Parental Autonomy Granting. Children aged 9 to 16 reported on the degree to which they felt that their parents granted them autonomy, by responding to nine items from the “psychological autonomy granting” subscale of the Authoritative Parenting Measure.¹¹ A four-point response scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” was used, and a mean score was calculated for each subscale. An example from the autonomy granting subscale is “When you get a poor grade in school your parent encourages you to try harder.” The internal consistency for this subscale was .62.

Warm and Structured Parenting

Self-Reported Parental Warmth. Parents reported on their displayed warmth during interactions with their children using a three-item “warmth scale” from the Canadian evaluation of the Self-Sufficiency Project.¹² Using a six-point response scale ranging from “never” to “many times each day,” parents indicated the frequency of their praise, focused attention, and special activities involving their child. The three items were averaged to compute a scale score. The internal consistency for the three-item scale was .82, indicating that parents responded similarly across the items.

Observer-Reported Parental Warmth. Parental warmth was also assessed by observers using two items from the HOME measure: the extent to which parents “conveyed positive feelings about their children” and “spontaneously praised or talked about their children’s good qualities or behavior.”¹³ The reliability coefficient for these items was .92.

Regularity of Family Routines. Parents were asked six questions assessing the frequency with which their family participated in regular activities, including how often “children did homework around the same time at night” and whether family members “ate dinner or supper together most nights of the week.” The internal consistency for this scale was .80.

Parenting Behavior

Parent-Reported Monitoring. To measure parents’ monitoring of children’s activities, six items were taken from the five-year follow-up to parent and child assessments in the Job Op-

¹¹Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, and Darling, 1992

¹²Statistics Canada, 1995.

¹³Caldwell and Bradley, 1984.

portunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program.¹⁴ Items assessed parents' knowledge about their child's TV viewing, who their child was with when away from home, where their child was when away from home, and how many of their child's friends they knew by first or last name. For children aged 12 and older, parents were also asked three items about curfews. A six-point response scale ranging from "never" to "always" was used. The monitoring scale had an internal consistency level of .86, suggesting that parents were consistent in their responses to its items.

Prevention-of-Harm Strategies. Parents were asked the degree to which they used different parenting strategies to prevent their children from getting into trouble (for example, getting their child involved in organized activities, enforcing rules). Parents were asked six questions on a five-point scale ranging from "almost never" to "very often." The reliability coefficient for this scale was .73.

Children's Activities

Children's and Parents' Reports of Activities. Both parents and children were asked about children's use of time and participation in structured, out-of-school activities during the school year and the summer. Parents and children responded on a five-point scale (1 = "never," 5 = "about every day") to report how frequently the children participated in such activities as organized sports, clubs, and lessons. The alpha for parents reports of children's activities during the school year was .53, and the alpha was .54 for the summer. For children's reports of activities, the alpha was .58 for the school year and .63 for the summer.

Parental Approval of Children's Activities. Parents responded on a five-point scale (1 = "not at all," 5 = "a lot") to report the extent to which they considered participation in five activities to be beneficial or harmful for their child. The activities were lessons, sports with a coach, clubs and youth groups, recreation centers, and working for pay. The reliability for this scale was .84.

CHILDREN'S OUTCOMES

Education

All measures of achievement were administered to the entire age range studied.

¹⁴U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Web site: <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/JOBS>.

Standardized Achievement Test Scores

To assess reading and mathematical competencies, children completed four individually administered scales from the Woodcock-Johnson Achievement Battery.¹⁵ Two of these — Letter-Word Identification and Passage Comprehension — measure reading skills; the sum of these two is the Broad Reading score. The other two scales — Applied Problems and Calculation — measure mathematics skills; the sum of these two is the Broad Math score. The total score is the sum of all four scales. The Woodcock-Johnson was selected because its normative sample is large and representative and because the sample includes children from diverse ethnic groups and diverse types of schooling. The standard score for each scale is obtained by comparing the child's score with norms for his or her chronological age group. The mean standard score for the population as a whole is 100; the standard deviation is 15. Standard reliabilities for the Broad Math and Broad Reading scores were each .95.

Parents' Ratings of Achievement

Based on their knowledge of recent report cards, parents evaluated their child's performance in reading, mathematics, and written work, using a five-point scale ranging from "not at all well" to "very well." The alpha for this scale was .87.

Teachers' Ratings of Achievement

Mock Report Card. Teachers used a mock report card to rate children's performance in reading, oral and written language, math, social studies, and science. Teachers responded on a five-point scale (1 = "below average," 5 = "excellent"). This measure was adapted from one used in the NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development.¹⁶ The alpha for this scale was .90.

Academic Subscale. Teachers responded to the 10-item academic subscale of the Social Skills Rating System.¹⁷ They used a five-point scale (1 = "lowest 10 percent of class," 5 = "highest 10 percent of class") to compare children's performance with others in the same classroom; they assessed reading skills, math skills, intellectual functioning, motivation, oral communication, classroom behavior, and parental encouragement. The alpha for this scale was .94.

Classroom Behavior Scale. Teachers completed the Classroom Behavior Scale, which contains items concerning children's study skills, conformity to classroom rules and routines, ability to work and complete tasks independently, and ability to make transitions without be-

¹⁵Woodcock and Johnson, 1990.

¹⁶NICHD, 2002.

¹⁷Gresham and Elliot, 1990.

coming distracted.¹⁸ Teachers responded on a five point scale (1 = “almost never,” 5 = “almost always”). The alpha for this scale was .97.

Teachers’ Expectations for a Child. Three items measured teachers’ expectations for the focal child’s educational attainment. Using a five-point scale ranging from “not at all” to “very,” teachers indicated how sure they were that the child would finish high school, go to college, and finish college. These three items were summed to produce one score. The combined alpha for the items was .92.

Children’s Motivations and Beliefs

Competency Beliefs

Competency Beliefs and Task Values for Reading and Math. Items were adapted from the Self and Task Perception Questionnaire¹⁹ and contained questions assessing children’s self-concept of ability, expectations for success, extrinsic and intrinsic utility value, and attainment value regarding English/reading and math (for example, “How good at English are you?” “How useful is what you learn in math?”). The alphas for the English/reading and the math items were .82 and .85, respectively.

Children’s Efficacy. Children’s hope was assessed using the Children’s Hope Scale.²⁰ The scale contains two subscales — pathways and agency. — each of which includes three items (for example, “I think I’m doing pretty well”; “Even when others want to quit, I know I can find ways to solve the problem”). Children rated the items using a six-point response scale (1 = “none of the time,” 6 = “all of the time”). For the entire scale, the reliability was .81.

School Engagement. Children aged 9 to 16 reported their perceptions of the extent to which they felt engaged at school, as assessed through five items (for example, “You feel close to others at your school”). Children responded on a five-point scale ranging from “not true at all” to “always true for you.” Items were adapted from the Adolescent Health Study.²¹ The alpha for this scale was .84.

Values for the Future

Children’s Attitudes About Work. Children’s attitudes about work (for example, “You expect work to be a very central part of your life”) were obtained using five items taken

¹⁸Wright and Huston, 1995.

¹⁹Eccles et al., 1983; Eccles and Wigfield, 1995.

²⁰Snyder et al., 1996.

²¹<http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth>, 1998.

from the Monitoring the Future report.²² Children answered on a five-point scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” The alpha for this scale was .46.

Importance of Future Achievements. Children were asked seven general questions about the importance of future achievements, using items adapted from Flanagan and colleagues.²³ Children used a five-point scale (1 = “not at all important,” 5 = “very important”) to answer such questions as “How important to you is being close to your family?” The alpha for this scale was .43.

Children’s Social Behavior

Positive Behavior

The Positive Behavior Scale was developed for the New Chance survey,²⁴ a study of more than 2,000 low-income mothers and their children. A parallel version for teachers contains similar or identical items. Its 25 items can be divided into three subscales: compliance/self-control (for example, “thinks before he/she acts,” “usually does what I tell him/her”); social competence and sensitivity (for example, “gets along well with other children,” “shows concern for other people’s feelings”); and autonomy (for example, “tries to do things for him/herself,” “is self-reliant”). The parent or teacher responds on a five-point scale ranging from “never” to “all of the time.”

The Positive Behavior Scale was chosen for this study instead of a similar set of items from the Social Skills Rating System because it was judged by the investigators and community representatives in Milwaukee as more appropriate for the populations being studied and because it had been standardized on a multiethnic sample of mothers who had low incomes. Items for adolescents were adapted to be age-appropriate. For the New Chance sample, the internal consistency of the total score was .94 for parents’ ratings (internal consistencies for the subscales ranged from .77 to .88). In New Hope’s CFS sample, the internal consistency for the total score was .91 for parents’ ratings and .96 for teachers’ ratings. The consistencies within subscales ranged from .71 to .86 for parents and from .81 to .92 for teachers; that is, both parents and teachers were fairly consistent in their descriptions of these qualities in children.

²²<http://www.monitoringthefuture.org>, 1995.

²³Flanagan et al., 1998.

²⁴Quint, Bos, and Polit, 1997.

Problem Behavior

To assess children's negative social behavior, the Problem Behavior Scale from the Social Skills Rating System was administered to both parents and teachers.²⁵ Parents received two components: externalizing problems and internalizing problems. *Externalizing problems* include aggression and lack of behavior control (for example, "is aggressive toward people or objects," "has temper tantrums"). *Internalizing problems* include social withdrawal and excessive fearfulness (for example, "appears lonely," "acts sad or depressed"). Teachers completed the externalizing and internalizing items as well as a *hyperactivity* component (for example, "is easily distracted," "disturbs ongoing activities"). Teachers also reported how often they had to discipline the child for misbehavior. The internal consistencies for parents' ratings were .77 for the total score and .61 to .81 for the components. Internal consistencies for teachers' ratings ranged from .78 to .92.

Social Relationships

Perceived Quality of Peer Relationships and Friendships. The Loneliness and Social Dissatisfaction Questionnaire measures the child's perceptions of peer relations and friendships.²⁶ It contains 16 items that loaded on one factor in the standardization sample of 200 children in grades 3 through 6 (for example, "It's hard for me to make new friends"). Children aged 6 to 8 answered on a three-point scale, and those aged 9 to 12 answered on a five-point scale (1 = "always true," 5 = "not true at all"). The internal consistency for this scale was .89. Scores for 6- to 8-year-olds were prorated to be equivalent to the older children's scores, by multiplying each item by 5/3.

Intent Attribution. The Intent Attributions and Feelings of Distress Measure²⁷ is a hypothetical provocation instrument used to assess children's intent attributions and feelings of distress when in ambiguous relational and instrumental provocation situations. The measure consists of four stories and two questions about each. Children's choices reflect their perceptions of the actor in the story as having either "hostile" or "benign" intent. For intent attributions, the alpha was .80.

Peer Group Conventional Behaviors. This instrument from the Pittsburgh Youth Study²⁸ assesses conventional activities of friends and includes nine items (for example, "In the past 12 months how many of your close friends have been involved in school sports?"). Chil-

²⁵Gresham and Elliot, 1990.

²⁶Asher and Wheeler, 1985; Cassidy and Asher, 1992.

²⁷Crick and Dodge, 1996.

²⁸<http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ccd/pittsburgh.html>.

dren responded to the items using a five-point scale ranging from “none of them” to “all of them.” The alpha for this scale was .77.

Risky Behavior

Delinquent Behavior. Adapted from LeBlanc and Tremblay’s 27-item measure assessing adolescents’ self-reported deviant behavior, for New Hope this measure was shortened to 15 items and used modified wording.²⁹ Children responded on a five-point scale ranging from “never” to “5 or more times” to answer such questions as “During the past 12 months did you take part in a gang fight?” There are four subscales: fighting, stealing, vandalism, and drugs. The total scale has been validated on more than 6,000 teenagers in Quebec.³⁰ The alpha for this scale was .66.

Peer Group Delinquent Activities. Adapted from LeBlanc and Tremblay’s 27-item measure of adolescents’ reports of peers’ deviant behavior, for New Hope this measure was shortened to 15 items and used modified wording.³¹ Children responded on a five-point scale ranging from “none of them” to “all of them” to answer such questions as “In the past 12 months how many of your close friends had a fistfight with another person?” There are four subscales: fighting, stealing, vandalism, and drugs. The alpha for this scale was .69.

²⁹LeBlanc and Tremblay, 1988.

³⁰LeBlanc and Tremblay, 1988.

³¹LeBlanc and Tremblay, 1988.

Appendix E

Supplementary Tables to Chapters 4, 5, and 6

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table E.4.1

Impacts on Parental Well-Being, by Number of Potential Barriers to Employment

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
<u>No potential barriers</u>							
Material well-being							
Family income: survey report (\$)	23,554	23,891	-337	0.919	-1.4	-0.02	0.641
Standard of living	3.8	3.7	0.0	0.867	0.8	0.03	0.685
Material hardship	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.791	-5.3	-0.04	0.172
Food security	3.4	3.4	0.0	0.899	-0.5	-0.02	0.580
Financial well-being	16.4	16.8	-0.5	0.559	-2.7	-0.09	0.360
Financial health	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.907	-0.9	-0.02	0.554
Financial support to others	14.5	9.6	4.9	0.379	50.8	0.16	0.087 †
Financial worry	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.974	-0.3	-0.01	0.193
Residential well-being							
Number of moves in past 3 years	1.2	0.9	0.2	0.253	26.9	0.16	0.590
Satisfaction with housing	3.0	3.1	-0.1	0.662	-2.1	-0.07	0.268
Bad housing conditions	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.682	-1.1	-0.06	0.771
Crowded housing	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.966	0.3	0.01	0.776
Neighborhood good to raise children	3.0	2.9	0.1	0.617	2.9	0.08	0.793
Neighborhood resources	3.6	3.5	0.0	0.754	1.4	0.05	0.409
Collective efficacy	4.0	3.9	0.1	0.596	2.8	0.09	0.871
Housing safety: observer	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.781	1.1	0.05	0.518
Neighborhood problems: observer	9.4	8.9	0.5	0.369	5.2	0.15	0.317
Physical well-being							
Physical health	3.6	3.4	0.2	0.181	7.2	0.21	0.648
Health condition hinders work (%)	19.1	21.4	-2.4	0.727	-11.0	-0.06	0.783
Hospitalizations in last year	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.873	-9.2	-0.01	0.100 †
Substance use/abuse	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.859	-0.9	-0.03	0.240
Coping strategies and instrumental behaviors							
Sustainability	3.2	3.0	0.2	0.181	5.3	0.20	0.343
Pursuing any goals (%)	78.5	83.5	-5.0	0.454	-6.0	-0.13	0.772
Achieving any goals (%)	75.0	62.2	12.7 *	0.096	20.4	0.28	0.214
Awareness of helping resources	2.0	1.9	0.1 *	0.095	6.2	0.27	0.938
Community involvement	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.822	-0.8	-0.04	0.395
Married and living with spouse (%)	21.1	14.0	7.1	0.229	50.9	0.17	0.587
Not married and living with partner (%)	30.1	25.4	4.7	0.560	18.6	0.11	0.561
Discouragement of working	2.7	2.5	0.2	0.278	8.2	0.19	0.189
Practical supports for working	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.790	1.4	0.04	0.981
Used EITC last year (%)	67.6	62.6	5.0	0.535	7.9	0.11	0.526
Aware of EITC last year (%)	94.7	95.7	-1.0	0.779	-1.1	-0.04	0.242

(continued)

Appendix Table E.4.1 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
Psychosocial well-being							
General life stress	2.4	2.5	-0.1	0.340	-5.2	-0.15	0.118
Time pressure	3.2	3.5	-0.3	0.118	-7.3	-0.24	0.122
Job quality	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.671	-4.0	-0.07	0.376
Difficult life circumstances	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.818	3.0	0.03	0.926
Depression	14.1	16.7	-2.6	0.163	-15.6	-0.24	0.830
Religiosity	3.7	3.6	0.1	0.384	2.6	0.13	0.478
Hope	3.0	3.1	-0.1	0.297	-2.8	-0.16	0.139
Influence of close others	3.8	3.7	0.1	0.316	3.4	0.16	0.124
Availability of supportive others	3.2	3.1	0.1	0.621	2.2	0.08	0.754
Perception of life now versus 5 years ago	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.974	0.1	0.01	0.881
Sample size	129	101					
One potential barrier							
Material well-being							
Family income: survey report (\$)	23,495	21,325	2,170	0.310	10.2	0.13	
Standard of living	3.9	3.8	0.1	0.463	2.6	0.09	
Material hardship	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.241	-19.3	-0.16	
Food security	3.5	3.5	0.0	0.989	0.0	0.00	
Financial well-being	16.4	16.2	0.2	0.707	1.5	0.05	
Financial health	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.890	0.9	0.02	
Financial support to others	10.4	6.5	3.9	0.304	60.6	0.13	
Financial worry	2.5	2.7	-0.2	0.307	-6.0	-0.13	
Residential well-being							
Number of moves in past 3 years	1.4	1.6	-0.2	0.230	-12.9	-0.13	
Satisfaction with housing	3.0	3.2	-0.2	0.113	-5.9	-0.20	
Bad housing conditions	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.478	-1.6	-0.09	
Crowded housing	1.5	1.5	0.0	0.475	-2.6	-0.08	
Neighborhood good to raise children	2.8	3.0	-0.2	0.197	-5.7	-0.17	
Neighborhood resources	3.5	3.6	0.0	0.865	-0.6	-0.02	
Collective efficacy	3.9	4.0	0.0	0.877	-0.6	-0.02	
Housing safety: observer	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.282	3.3	0.15	
Neighborhood problems: observer	8.8	9.1	-0.4	0.393	-4.2	-0.12	
Physical well-being							
Physical health	3.5	3.5	0.0	0.755	1.3	0.04	
Health condition hinders work (%)	20.2	21.7	-1.5	0.786	-7.1	-0.04	
Hospitalizations in last year	0.1	0.8	-0.6 *	0.058	-81.6	-0.36	
Substance use/abuse	1.4	1.3	0.1 **	0.017	10.5	0.31	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.4.1 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
Coping strategies and instrumental behaviors							
Sustainability	3.0	3.0	0.1	0.587	1.9	0.07	
Pursuing any goals (%)	78.1	82.0	-3.9	0.476	-4.7	-0.10	
Achieving any goals (%)	69.0	71.6	-2.6	0.670	-3.6	-0.06	
Awareness of helping resources	2.0	1.9	0.1	0.120	4.8	0.21	
Community involvement	1.4	1.3	0.0	0.471	2.0	0.09	
Married and living with spouse (%)	25.4	26.3	-0.9	0.867	-3.5	-0.02	
Not married and living with partner (%)	22.4	26.1	-3.7	0.583	-14.2	-0.08	
Discouragement of working	2.4	2.7	-0.2	0.126	-9.1	-0.23	
Practical supports for working	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.562	2.5	0.08	
Used EITC last year (%)	74.3	65.8	8.5	0.182	12.9	0.18	
Aware of EITC last year (%)	94.5	88.2	6.3 *	0.088	7.2	0.23	
Psychosocial well-being							
General life stress	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.887	-0.7	-0.02	
Time pressure	3.3	3.3	0.0	0.943	0.3	0.01	
Job quality	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.896	-1.1	-0.02	
Difficult life circumstances	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.444	9.2	0.10	
Depression	13.9	15.4	-1.5	0.274	-9.5	-0.14	
Religiosity	3.7	3.7	0.0	0.840	-0.5	-0.03	
Hope	3.0	3.0	0.1	0.314	2.5	0.13	
Influence of close others	3.8	3.5	0.2 **	0.043	6.0	0.28	
Availability of supportive others	3.1	3.1	-0.1	0.647	-1.7	-0.06	
Perception of life now versus 5 years ago	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.823	0.7	0.03	
Sample size	183	181					
Two potential barriers or more							
Material well-being							
Family income: survey report (\$)	21,543	18,001	3,542	0.145	19.7	0.22	
Standard of living	3.7	3.8	-0.1	0.598	-2.4	-0.09	
Material hardship	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.151	30.8	0.24	
Food security	3.3	3.5	-0.2	0.216	-4.7	-0.21	
Financial well-being	15.4	16.5	-1.2	0.124	-7.2	-0.25	
Financial health	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.214	-11.4	-0.20	
Financial support to others	4.8	13.6	-8.8 *	0.081	-64.7	-0.30	
Financial worry	2.7	2.4	0.3	0.136	11.9	0.24	
Residential well-being							
Number of moves in past 3 years	1.6	1.3	0.3	0.451	20.2	0.17	
Satisfaction with housing	3.0	2.8	0.1	0.384	5.3	0.16	
Bad housing conditions	1.2	1.1	0.0	0.709	1.2	0.07	
Crowded housing	1.5	1.5	0.0	0.791	1.0	0.03	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.4.1 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
Neighborhood good to raise children	2.9	2.8	0.1	0.622	2.9	0.08	
Neighborhood resources	3.5	3.3	0.2	0.111	7.3	0.26	
Collective efficacy	3.7	3.7	0.0	0.993	0.1	0.00	
Housing safety: observer	1.5	1.4	0.1 *	0.068	7.1	0.32	
Neighborhood problems: observer	7.7	8.2	-0.6	0.285	-6.7	-0.18	
Physical well-being							
Physical health	3.5	3.3	0.2	0.281	6.3	0.18	
Health condition hinders work (%)	23.2	19.3	3.8	0.585	19.9	0.09	
Hospitalizations in last year	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.316	119.4	0.13	
Substance use/abuse	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.561	3.3	0.11	
Coping strategies and instrumental behaviors							
Sustainability	2.9	3.0	-0.1	0.429	-3.8	-0.15	
Pursuing any goals (%)	86.3	85.4	0.9	0.879	1.1	0.02	
Achieving any goals (%)	68.5	72.0	-3.5	0.644	-4.8	-0.08	
Awareness of helping resources	2.0	1.9	0.1	0.123	6.7	0.29	
Community involvement	1.4	1.3	0.1 *	0.081	5.9	0.27	
Married and living with spouse (%)	22.9	22.1	0.8	0.898	3.6	0.02	
Not married and living with partner (%)	26.7	34.5	-7.8	0.398	-22.7	-0.18	
Discouragement of working	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.875	-1.1	-0.03	
Practical supports for working	2.2	2.1	0.1	0.619	2.8	0.09	
Used EITC last year (%)	68.2	71.3	-3.1	0.703	-4.3	-0.07	
Aware of EITC last year (%)	93.0	85.6	7.4	0.129	8.6	0.27	
Psychosocial well-being							
General life stress	2.7	2.4	0.3 *	0.064	11.0	0.30	
Time pressure	3.4	3.2	0.2	0.186	7.6	0.22	
Job quality	0.5	0.7	-0.1 *	0.076	-20.1	-0.34	
Difficult life circumstances	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.551	8.2	0.11	
Depression	14.8	15.9	-1.1	0.541	-7.0	-0.10	
Religiosity	3.7	3.6	0.2	0.174	4.3	0.21	
Hope	2.9	3.1	-0.2	0.136	-4.9	-0.28	
Influence of close others	3.6	3.7	-0.1	0.331	-3.5	-0.17	
Availability of supportive others	3.0	3.0	-0.1	0.679	-1.9	-0.07	
Perception of life now versus 5 years ago	4.2	4.3	-0.1	0.651	-1.9	-0.08	
Sample size	125	148					

(continued)

Appendix Table E.4.1 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Table 4.1 presents the range of outcomes reported in this table.

Actual sample sizes for individual measures may vary as a result of missing data.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project
Appendix Table E.4.2
Impacts on Parental Well-Being, by Ethnicity

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Ethnicities ^b
<u>African-American</u>							
Material well-being							
Family income: survey report (\$)	19,928	19,661	266	0.869	1.4	0.02	0.436
Standard of living	3.7	3.6	0.2	0.173	4.9	0.17	0.414
Material hardship	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.804	-3.4	-0.03	0.268
Food security	3.4	3.4	0.0	0.726	-1.0	-0.04	0.139
Financial well-being	16.2	16.2	-0.1	0.890	-0.5	-0.02	0.516
Financial health	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.502	-3.9	-0.07	0.660
Financial support to others	10.3	12.4	-2.0	0.592	-16.5	-0.07	0.904
Financial worry	2.4	2.4	0.1	0.645	2.5	0.05	0.418
Residential well-being							
Number of moves in past 3 years	1.1	1.0	0.1	0.674	8.6	0.05	0.999
Satisfaction with housing	2.9	2.9	0.0	0.995	0.0	0.00	0.384
Bad housing conditions	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.172	-2.6	-0.16	0.068 †
Crowded housing	1.5	1.6	0.0	0.671	-1.7	-0.05	0.850
Neighborhood good to raise children	3.0	2.9	0.1	0.444	3.0	0.09	0.819
Neighborhood resources	3.5	3.3	0.2 *	0.091	5.7	0.20	0.600
Collective efficacy	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.865	-0.6	-0.02	0.613
Housing safety: observer	1.5	1.4	0.0	0.554	1.5	0.07	0.960
Neighborhood problems: observer	8.4	8.0	0.4	0.212	5.4	0.14	0.293
Physical well-being							
Physical health	3.6	3.4	0.2	0.160	5.4	0.16	0.070 †
Health condition hinders work (%)	20.9	19.8	1.0	0.829	5.3	0.03	0.958
Hospitalizations in last year	0.1	0.5	-0.4 *	0.086	-77.2	-0.22	0.227
Substance use/abuse	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.456	2.9	0.09	0.575
Coping strategies and instrumental behaviors							
Sustainability	3.0	2.9	0.1	0.248	3.7	0.14	0.531
Pursuing any goals (%)	84.1	85.2	-1.0	0.805	-1.2	-0.03	0.005 †††
Achieving any goals (%)	73.2	70.4	2.8	0.593	4.0	0.06	0.875
Awareness of helping resources	2.0	1.9	0.1	0.120	4.1	0.18	0.428
Community involvement	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.542	1.4	0.07	0.929
Married and living with spouse (%)	16.9	15.0	1.9	0.644	12.4	0.04	0.676
Not married and living with partner (%)	22.0	25.0	-3.0	0.583	-12.0	-0.07	0.468
Discouragement of working	2.5	2.5	0.1	0.639	2.5	0.06	0.780
Practical supports for working	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.928	-0.3	-0.01	0.513
Used EITC last year (%)	71.2	69.6	1.6	0.769	2.3	0.03	0.462
Aware of EITC last year (%)	97.5	92.3	5.2 **	0.041	5.6	0.19	0.986

(continued)

Appendix Table E.4.2 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Ethnicities ^b
Psychosocial well-being							
General life stress	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.650	-1.8	-0.05	0.493
Time pressure	3.4	3.3	0.1	0.551	2.3	0.07	0.003 †††
Job quality	0.6	0.7	-0.1	0.161	-9.7	-0.17	0.127
Difficult life circumstances	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.452	-6.3	-0.09	0.025 ††
Depression	14.8	16.4	-1.6	0.199	-9.7	-0.15	0.231
Religiosity	3.8	3.8	0.1	0.213	2.4	0.13	0.932
Hope	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.742	-0.7	-0.04	0.121
Influence of close others	3.7	3.6	0.1	0.382	2.2	0.10	0.708
Availability of supportive others	3.1	3.0	0.0	0.652	1.5	0.05	0.847
Perception of life now versus 5 years ago	4.3	4.2	0.0	0.841	0.6	0.02	0.894
Sample size	253	228					
Hispanic							
Material well-being							
Family income: survey report (\$)	27,878	22,988	4,889	0.135	21.3	0.30	
Standard of living	3.9	4.0	-0.1	0.568	-2.2	-0.09	
Material hardship	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.687	10.4	0.06	
Food security	3.5	3.5	-0.1	0.486	-2.2	-0.10	
Financial well-being	16.5	17.2	-0.7	0.361	-4.0	-0.14	
Financial health	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.542	4.6	0.09	
Financial support to others	6.0	7.0	-1.0	0.823	-13.7	-0.03	
Financial worry	2.9	3.0	-0.1	0.666	-3.1	-0.07	
Residential well-being							
Number of moves in past 3 years	1.4	1.3	0.1	0.504	10.3	0.09	
Satisfaction with housing	3.0	3.2	-0.3 *	0.098	-7.8	-0.28	
Bad housing conditions	1.1	1.1	0.1 *	0.084	5.1	0.29	
Crowded housing	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.705	1.8	0.06	
Neighborhood good to raise children	3.4	3.6	-0.2	0.176	-6.1	-0.22	
Neighborhood resources	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.995	0.0	0.00	
Collective efficacy	4.0	3.8	0.2	0.388	4.7	0.15	
Housing safety: observer	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.495	2.8	0.12	
Neighborhood problems: observer	9.0	9.6	-0.5	0.357	-5.6	-0.17	
Physical well-being							
Physical health	3.5	3.6	-0.2	0.365	-4.7	-0.15	
Health condition hinders work (%)	19.3	16.7	2.6	0.683	15.5	0.06	
Hospitalizations in last year	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.965	3.2	0.01	
Substance use/abuse	1.3	1.2	0.1	0.222	6.9	0.20	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.4.2 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Ethnicities ^b
Coping strategies and instrumental behaviors							
Sustainability	3.1	3.1	0.0	0.828	-0.8	-0.03	
Pursuing any goals (%)	70.6	91.7	-21.1 ***	0.002	-23.0	-0.55	
Achieving any goals (%)	69.5	67.2	2.3	0.769	3.4	0.05	
Awareness of helping resources	2.0	1.8	0.2 **	0.012	10.3	0.43	
Community involvement	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.646	1.6	0.08	
Married and living with spouse (%)	32.6	27.0	5.6	0.441	20.7	0.14	
Not married and living with partner (%)	39.3	34.7	4.7	0.637	13.4	0.10	
Discouragement of working	2.5	2.6	-0.1	0.688	-3.0	-0.07	
Practical supports for working	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.892	0.8	0.02	
Used EITC last year (%)	66.2	63.5	2.7	0.753	4.3	0.06	
Aware of EITC last year (%)	85.6	81.4	4.2	0.476	5.1	0.15	
Psychosocial well-being							
General life stress	2.5	2.3	0.2	0.314	6.6	0.17	
Time pressure	3.2	3.2	0.0	0.831	1.2	0.04	
Job quality	0.7	0.7	0.1	0.298	11.4	0.19	
Difficult life circumstances	0.2	0.1	0.1 ***	0.009	53.8	0.40	
Depression	15.4	14.4	1.0	0.595	7.0	0.09	
Religiosity	3.8	3.6	0.1	0.231	3.7	0.18	
Hope	3.0	3.2	-0.2 **	0.031	-6.3	-0.37	
Influence of close others	3.7	3.7	0.0	0.773	-1.0	-0.05	
Availability of supportive others	3.1	3.1	0.0	0.894	-0.6	-0.02	
Perception of life now versus 5 years ago	4.4	4.4	0.0	0.833	-0.8	-0.03	
Sample size	125	126					
White							
Material well-being							
Family income: survey report (\$)	24,762	24,759	3	1.000	0.0	0.00	
Standard of living	4.1	3.9	0.1	0.594	3.4	0.13	
Material hardship	0.1	0.2	-0.1	0.111	-43.6	-0.45	
Food security	3.6	3.3	0.3 *	0.073	10.3	0.45	
Financial well-being	16.3	15.2	1.1	0.436	7.2	0.23	
Financial health	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.874	2.6	0.05	
Financial support to others	7.7	12.8	-5.1	0.537	-39.9	-0.17	
Financial worry	2.2	2.5	-0.4	0.241	-14.2	-0.29	
Residential well-being							
Number of moves in past 3 years	1.4	1.3	0.1	0.779	10.2	0.08	
Satisfaction with housing	3.2	3.2	0.0	0.877	-0.8	-0.03	
Bad housing conditions	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.424	-3.5	-0.21	
Crowded housing	1.5	1.5	0.0	0.953	0.5	0.02	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.4.2 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Ethnicities ^b
Neighborhood good to raise children	3.7	3.4	0.3	0.350	8.1	0.27	
Neighborhood resources	3.9	3.8	0.1	0.709	2.2	0.09	
Collective efficacy	4.1	4.2	-0.2	0.634	-3.8	-0.14	
Housing safety: observer	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.851	1.1	0.05	
Neighborhood problems: observer	9.4	9.9	-0.5	0.640	-4.6	-0.15	
Physical well-being							
Physical health	3.4	2.9	0.5 **	0.039	18.8	0.48	
Health condition hinders work (%)	32.2	27.6	4.7	0.729	16.9	0.11	
Hospitalizations in last year	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.522	80.6	0.08	
Substance use/abuse	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.656	-2.9	-0.11	
Coping strategies and instrumental behaviors							
Sustainability	3.0	2.8	0.2	0.327	7.5	0.27	
Pursuing any goals (%)	81.1	60.6	20.5	0.127	33.8	0.53	
Achieving any goals (%)	70.1	60.7	9.5	0.453	15.6	0.21	
Awareness of helping resources	1.9	1.9	0.0	0.739	2.2	0.10	
Community involvement	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.877	-1.0	-0.05	
Married and living with spouse (%)	27.6	34.2	-6.6	0.577	-19.2	-0.16	
Not married and living with partner (%)	33.0	16.4	16.6	0.326	100.8	0.37	
Discouragement of working	2.7	2.8	-0.1	0.734	-3.7	-0.10	
Practical supports for working	2.2	2.0	0.2	0.226	10.1	0.31	
Used EITC last year (%)	78.1	59.5	18.6	0.149	31.2	0.40	
Aware of EITC last year (%)	99.9	94.6	5.3	0.255	5.7	0.19	
Psychosocial well-being							
General life stress	2.5	2.6	-0.1	0.667	-3.6	-0.11	
Time pressure	3.0	3.8	-0.8 ***	0.001	-21.3	-0.75	
Job quality	0.5	0.7	-0.2	0.159	-24.8	-0.45	
Difficult life circumstances	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.562	-12.3	-0.16	
Depression	11.5	16.2	-4.8	0.112	-29.3	-0.44	
Religiosity	3.3	3.1	0.1	0.520	4.8	0.21	
Hope	2.9	2.9	0.1	0.472	2.9	0.15	
Influence of close others	3.8	3.7	0.1	0.540	3.4	0.16	
Availability of supportive others	3.2	3.3	-0.1	0.721	-2.3	-0.09	
Perception of life now versus 5 years ago	4.2	4.3	-0.1	0.699	-2.2	-0.10	
Sample size	44	66					

(continued)

Appendix Table E.4.2 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Table 4.1 presents the range of outcomes reported in this table.

Actual sample sizes for individual measures may vary as a result of missing data.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table E.5.1

Impacts on Parenting and Parent-Child Relations, by Number of Potential Barriers to Employment

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
<u>No potential barriers</u>							
Effective child management	4.0	3.9	0.0	0.904	0.3	0.02	0.799
Problems with control	2.2	2.2	-0.1	0.693	-2.6	-0.06	0.201
Frequency of discipline	1.9	1.9	0.1	0.349	4.8	0.14	0.148
Parenting stress	1.7	1.8	-0.1	0.495	-4.6	-0.11	0.958
Prevention-of-harm confidence	3.8	3.7	0.1	0.718	1.4	0.06	0.834
Positive youth-parent relations							
Child-reported positive relations	4.1	4.2	-0.1	0.418	-2.0	-0.15	0.199
Child-reported acceptance and involvement	4.4	4.4	0.0	0.853	-0.4	-0.03	0.843
Child-reported monitoring	3.4	3.4	-0.1	0.337	-2.4	-0.18	0.298
Child-reported monitoring	3.1	3.2	0.0	0.687	-1.5	-0.07	0.312
Negative youth-parent relations							
Child-reported negative relations	2.7	2.6	0.1	0.286	4.6	0.19	0.364
Child-reported negative relations	2.6	2.5	0.1	0.362	4.5	0.13	0.909
Child-reported autonomy	2.5	2.6	-0.1	0.558	-2.2	-0.10	0.957
Warm and structured parenting							
Parent-reported warmth	3.9	3.9	0.1	0.599	1.4	0.08	0.926
Parent-reported warmth	4.6	4.6	0.0	0.948	-0.3	-0.01	0.259
Observer-reported warmth	2.5	2.5	0.1	0.464	2.9	0.11	0.094 †
Regularity of family routines	3.7	3.7	0.0	0.708	1.2	0.06	0.700
Parenting behavior							
Monitoring	3.2	3.2	0.0	0.975	-0.1	0.00	0.744
Prevention-of-harm strategies	3.9	3.9	0.0	0.740	-0.8	-0.04	0.100

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.1 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
<u>One potential barrier</u>							
Effective child management	4.0	3.9	0.1	0.282	2.1	0.14	
Problems with control	2.1	2.4	-0.3 **	0.028	-12.5	-0.30	
Frequency of discipline	1.9	1.9	0.0	0.835	0.8	0.03	
Parenting stress	1.7	1.8	-0.1	0.378	-4.4	-0.10	
Prevention-of-harm confidence	3.7	3.7	0.0	0.943	-0.2	-0.01	
Positive youth-parent relations							
Child-reported positive relations	4.3	4.1	0.2	0.119	3.9	0.27	
Child-reported acceptance and involvement	4.4	4.4	0.0	0.843	0.3	0.02	
Child-reported monitoring	3.5	3.4	0.1	0.336	2.2	0.16	
	3.3	3.1	0.2 *	0.078	6.1	0.28	
Negative youth-parent relations							
Child-reported negative relations	2.8	2.8	0.0	0.639	-1.7	-0.08	
Child-reported autonomy	2.6	2.5	0.0	0.648	1.8	0.06	
	2.4	2.5	0.0	0.623	-1.7	-0.08	
Warm and structured parenting							
Parent-reported warmth	4.0	3.9	0.1	0.442	1.7	0.10	
Observer-reported warmth	4.7	4.8	-0.1	0.559	-1.8	-0.08	
Regularity of family routines	2.4	2.3	0.1	0.240	4.9	0.17	
	4.0	3.8	0.1	0.238	2.9	0.15	
Parenting behavior							
Monitoring	3.2	3.3	-0.1	0.353	-2.2	-0.13	
Prevention-of-harm strategies	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.987	-0.1	0.00	
<u>Two potential barriers or more</u>							
Effective child management	3.9	3.8	0.1	0.536	1.7	0.11	
Problems with control	2.3	2.3	0.0	0.870	-1.2	-0.03	
Frequency of discipline	2.0	2.1	-0.1	0.170	-6.5	-0.22	
Parenting stress	1.8	1.8	0.0	0.712	-2.4	-0.06	
Prevention-of-harm confidence	3.7	3.6	0.1	0.621	2.3	0.09	
Positive youth-parent relations							
Child-reported positive relations	4.2	4.2	0.0	0.905	0.3	0.02	
	4.4	4.5	0.0	0.569	-0.9	-0.07	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.1 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
Child-reported acceptance and involvement	3.4	3.3	0.1	0.412	2.0	0.14	
Child-reported monitoring	3.2	3.1	0.1	0.552	2.2	0.10	
Negative youth-parent relations	2.9	2.8	0.1	0.262	4.7	0.21	
Child-reported negative relations	2.6	2.5	0.1	0.442	3.5	0.11	
Child-reported autonomy	2.3	2.4	-0.1	0.388	-3.3	-0.15	
Warm and structured parenting	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.837	0.6	0.03	
Parent-reported warmth	4.7	4.5	0.2	0.187	5.2	0.20	
Observer-reported warmth	2.2	2.4	-0.1	0.230	-6.4	-0.23	
Regularity of family routines	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.958	0.2	0.01	
<u>Parenting behavior</u>							
Monitoring	3.1	3.2	-0.1	0.487	-2.4	-0.13	
Prevention-of-harm strategies	4.0	3.7	0.2 **	0.045	6.5	0.32	

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Table 5.1 presents the ranges of outcomes reported in this table.

For the group with no potential barriers, parent reports were available for 222 children; and child reports were available for 222 children. For the group with one potential barrier, parent reports were available for 345 children; and child reports were available for 345 children. For the group with two potential barriers or more, parent reports were available for 263 children; and child reports were available for 263 children. Actual sample sizes for individual measures may vary as a result of missing data.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table E.5.2

Impacts on Parenting and Parent-Child Relations, by Ethnicity

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Ethnicities ^b
<u>African-American</u>							
Effective child management	3.9	3.8	0.1 **	0.023	3.8	0.24	0.059 †
Problems with control	2.2	2.5	-0.2 **	0.019	-10.1	-0.26	0.114
Frequency of discipline	2.0	2.1	-0.1	0.146	-4.5	-0.16	0.306
Parenting stress	1.8	1.9	-0.1	0.154	-5.9	-0.15	0.406
Prevention-of-harm confidence	3.7	3.6	0.2	0.107	4.2	0.17	0.203
Positive youth-parent relations	4.2	4.2	0.1	0.411	1.5	0.10	0.446
Child-reported positive relations	4.4	4.5	0.0	0.693	-0.5	-0.04	0.741
Child-reported acceptance and involvement	3.4	3.4	0.0	0.400	1.4	0.10	0.591
Child-reported monitoring	3.2	3.1	0.1	0.115	4.2	0.19	0.120
Negative youth-parent relations	2.8	2.7	0.1	0.413	2.4	0.10	0.770
Child-reported negative relations	2.6	2.5	0.1	0.327	3.2	0.10	0.536
Child-reported autonomy	2.4	2.5	-0.1	0.283	-2.9	-0.13	0.822
Warm and structured parenting	3.9	3.8	0.1	0.359	1.8	0.11	0.954
Parent-reported warmth	4.7	4.6	0.1	0.531	1.8	0.07	0.759
Observer-reported warmth	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.742	1.1	0.04	0.203
Regularity of family routines	3.8	3.7	0.1	0.235	3.0	0.15	0.051 †
Parenting behavior							
Monitoring	3.2	3.1	0.0	0.454	1.5	0.08	0.014 ††
Prevention-of-harm strategies	4.0	3.8	0.1 **	0.042	3.8	0.19	0.036 ††
<u>Hispanic</u>							
Effective child management	4.0	4.1	-0.1	0.374	-2.0	-0.13	
Problems with control	2.1	2.0	0.1	0.602	3.9	0.08	
Frequency of discipline	1.8	1.7	0.1	0.567	2.9	0.08	
Parenting stress	1.7	1.6	0.0	0.708	2.4	0.05	
Prevention-of-harm confidence	3.7	3.9	-0.1	0.455	-3.2	-0.14	
Positive youth-parent relations	4.2	4.3	0.0	0.697	-0.9	-0.07	
Child-reported positive relations	4.3	4.4	-0.1	0.411	-1.8	-0.13	
Child-reported acceptance and involvement	3.4	3.4	-0.1	0.492	-1.5	-0.11	
Child-reported monitoring	3.2	3.3	-0.1	0.624	-1.8	-0.09	
Negative youth-parent relations	2.8	2.8	0.0	0.921	-0.4	-0.02	
Child-reported negative relations	2.6	2.5	0.2	0.248	6.4	0.19	
Child-reported autonomy	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.999	0.0	0.00	
Warm and structured parenting	4.0	3.9	0.0	0.655	1.2	0.07	
Parent-reported warmth	4.8	4.6	0.2	0.374	3.8	0.15	
Observer-reported warmth	2.4	2.3	0.1	0.550	2.7	0.09	
Regularity of family routines	3.9	4.0	-0.1	0.228	-3.4	-0.18	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.2 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Ethnicities ^b
Parenting behavior							
Monitoring	3.2	3.4	-0.3 **	0.030	-7.4	-0.44	
Prevention-of-harm strategies	3.7	3.9	-0.1	0.366	-3.5	-0.18	
White							
Effective child management							
Problems with control	3.9	3.8	0.1	0.467	2.9	0.18	
Frequency of discipline	2.3	2.4	-0.1	0.575	-4.7	-0.11	
Parenting stress	1.9	1.9	0.0	0.952	-0.4	-0.01	
Prevention-of-harm confidence	1.8	2.0	-0.1	0.360	-7.2	-0.19	
Prevention-of-harm confidence	3.8	3.6	0.2	0.516	4.3	0.18	
Positive youth-parent relations							
Child-reported positive relations	4.0	4.2	-0.2	0.362	-5.1	-0.37	
Child-reported acceptance and involvement	4.4	4.3	0.0	0.757	0.9	0.06	
Child-reported monitoring	3.4	3.3	0.1	0.584	2.5	0.18	
Child-reported monitoring	2.9	3.3	-0.4	0.116	-11.0	-0.53	
Negative youth-parent relations							
Child-reported negative relations	2.9	2.7	0.2	0.575	5.9	0.26	
Child-reported negative relations	2.6	2.7	-0.1	0.613	-3.7	-0.12	
Child-reported autonomy	2.4	2.5	0.0	0.799	-1.9	-0.09	
Warm and structured parenting							
Parent-reported warmth	3.9	3.9	0.0	0.842	0.8	0.05	
Observer-reported warmth	4.7	4.4	0.2	0.293	5.6	0.22	
Observer-reported warmth	2.3	2.6	-0.3	0.200	-10.5	-0.41	
Regularity of family routines	3.9	3.7	0.2	0.141	6.8	0.33	
Parenting behavior							
Monitoring	3.3	3.3	0.0	0.787	1.1	0.06	
Prevention-of-harm strategies	3.6	3.8	-0.2	0.322	-5.4	-0.27	

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Table 5.1 presents the ranges of outcomes reported in this table.

For African-Americans, parent reports were available for 462 children; and child reports were available for 462 children. For Hispanics, parent reports were available for 236 children; and child reports were available for 236 children. For whites, parent reports were available for 109 children; and child reports were available for 109 children. Actual sample sizes for individual measures may vary as a result of missing data.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project
Appendix Table E.5.3
Impacts on Child Care Use and Monthly Child Care Costs, by Number of
Potential Barriers to Employment

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
<u>No potential barriers</u>							
During the prior school year, number of months spent in							
Any formal care	3.3	1.3	2.0 ***	0.003	151.0	0.51	0.052 †
Any home-based care:	3.3	4.2	-0.9	0.223	-21.3	-0.21	0.882
In child's home	1.9	2.7	-0.7	0.287	-27.2	-0.18	0.156
In caregiver's home	1.9	2.3	-0.5	0.462	-19.6	-0.13	0.499
Any unsupervised care:	2.0	2.8	-0.8	0.188	-28.8	-0.22	0.436
Care by a minor	0.7	0.9	-0.2	0.571	-26.6	-0.09	0.161
Self-care	1.3	1.7	-0.4	0.410	-25.7	-0.16	0.211
Cared for sibling(s)	0.7	1.1	-0.5	0.255	-43.0	-0.18	0.710
During the prior summer, number of months spent in							
Any formal care	1.0	0.6	0.5 **	0.034	81.0	0.36	0.656
Any home-based care:	1.3	1.5	-0.3	0.284	-18.1	-0.19	0.839
In child's home	0.8	1.2	-0.4	0.104	-34.9	-0.29	0.722
In caregiver's home	0.7	0.8	-0.1	0.705	-10.7	-0.07	0.824
Any unsupervised care:	0.5	0.8	-0.3 *	0.098	-40.3	-0.26	0.413
Care by a minor	0.2	0.2	-0.1	0.667	-24.7	-0.07	0.111
Self-care	0.3	0.5	-0.2	0.270	-34.4	-0.20	0.648
Cared for sibling(s)	0.2	0.4	-0.2	0.106	-58.9	-0.26	0.389

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.3 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
During the prior year, number of months spent in							
Any formal care	4.3	1.9	2.4 ***	0.003	123.7	0.52	0.113
Any home-based care	4.6	5.6	-1.0	0.279	-17.6	-0.19	0.693
Any unsupervised care	2.5	3.5	-1.0	0.177	-29.1	-0.22	0.385
Out-of-pocket child care costs in prior month (\$)	56.6	22.6	34.0 **	0.036	150.2	0.29	0.098 †
Sample size	124	94					
<u>One potential barrier</u>							
During the prior school year, number of months spent in							
Any formal care	3.2	2.5	0.7	0.172	27.3	0.17	
Any home-based care:	3.3	4.5	-1.2 **	0.043	-27.0	-0.28	
In child's home	2.2	4.1	-1.9 ***	0.002	-45.6	-0.47	
In caregiver's home	1.8	1.7	0.1	0.833	6.4	0.03	
Any unsupervised care:	1.9	1.9	0.0	0.938	-2.0	-0.01	
Care by a minor	0.9	0.7	0.2	0.676	21.3	0.06	
Self-care	1.0	1.0	-0.1	0.876	-5.9	-0.02	
Cared for sibling(s)	0.6	0.8	-0.2	0.593	-22.0	-0.06	
During the prior summer, number of months spent in							
Any formal care	1.1	0.5	0.6 **	0.011	110.6	0.44	
Any home-based care:	1.3	1.7	-0.4	0.128	-20.9	-0.24	
In child's home	1.0	1.3	-0.3	0.261	-21.0	-0.19	
In caregiver's home	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.995	-0.2	0.00	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.3 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
Any unsupervised care:	0.5	0.9	-0.4 *	0.087	-40.8	-0.30	
Care by a minor	0.2	0.5	-0.4 **	0.020	-70.8	-0.45	
Self-care	0.2	0.2	-0.1	0.575	-26.5	-0.06	
Cared for sibling(s)	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.943	-3.5	-0.01	
During the prior year, number of months spent in							
Any formal care	3.7	3.1	0.6	0.403	20.8	0.14	
Any home-based care	5.1	6.9	-1.8 **	0.032	-25.9	-0.34	
Any unsupervised care	2.7	3.8	-1.1	0.166	-28.5	-0.23	
Out-of-pocket child care costs in prior month (\$)	44.2	44.1	0.1	0.997	0.2	0.00	
Sample size	173	171					
<u>Two potential barriers or more</u>							
During the prior school year, number of months spent in							
Any formal care	2.9	2.7	0.2	0.754	8.1	0.06	
Any home-based care:	3.9	5.2	-1.3 *	0.055	-24.7	-0.30	
In child's home	2.8	3.5	-0.7	0.279	-19.9	-0.17	
In caregiver's home	2.2	2.7	-0.6	0.365	-21.0	-0.16	
Any unsupervised care:	2.2	2.9	-0.6	0.317	-22.5	-0.17	
Care by a minor	1.1	1.9	-0.8	0.126	-43.6	-0.30	
Self-care	0.3	1.1	-0.8 **	0.023	-73.2	-0.29	
Cared for sibling(s)	1.3	1.8	-0.5	0.393	-27.9	-0.18	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.3 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
During the prior summer, number of months spent in							
Any formal care	1.1	0.5	0.6 **	0.011	110.6	0.44	
Any home-based care:	1.3	1.7	-0.4	0.128	-20.9	-0.24	
In child's home	1.0	1.3	-0.3	0.261	-21.0	-0.19	
In caregiver's home	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.995	-0.2	0.00	
Any unsupervised care:	0.5	0.9	-0.4 *	0.087	-40.8	-0.30	
Care by a minor	0.2	0.5	-0.4 **	0.020	-70.8	-0.45	
Self-care	0.2	0.2	-0.1	0.575	-26.5	-0.06	
Cared for sibling(s)	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.943	-3.5	-0.01	
During the prior year, number of months spent in							
Any formal care	3.7	3.1	0.6	0.403	20.8	0.14	
Any home-based care	5.1	6.9	-1.8 **	0.032	-25.9	-0.34	
Any unsupervised care	2.7	3.8	-1.1	0.166	-28.5	-0.23	
Out-of-pocket child care costs in prior month (\$)	44.2	44.1	0.1	0.997	0.2	0.00	
Sample size	117	145					

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Actual sample sizes for individual measures may vary as a result of missing data.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table E.5.4

Impacts on Child Care Use and Monthly Child Care Costs, by Ethnicity

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Ethnicities ^b
<u>African-American</u>							
During the prior school year, number of months spent in							
Any formal care	3.0	2.5	0.5	0.269	20.4	0.13	0.729
Any home-based care:	4.0	4.3	-0.3	0.541	-6.9	-0.07	0.035 ††
In child's home	2.5	3.2	-0.6	0.191	-19.8	-0.15	0.017 ††
In caregiver's home	2.3	2.1	0.1	0.745	6.7	0.04	0.323
Any unsupervised care:	2.2	2.7	-0.5	0.282	-17.9	-0.13	0.101
Care by a minor	0.9	1.1	-0.2	0.519	-18.3	-0.08	0.200
Self-care	0.9	1.6	-0.6 *	0.057	-41.9	-0.24	0.071 †
Cared for sibling(s)	1.0	1.2	-0.2	0.594	-16.0	-0.07	0.009 †††
During the prior summer, number of months spent in							
Any formal care	0.9	0.6	0.3 **	0.047	49.5	0.24	0.995
Any home-based care:	1.4	1.6	-0.2	0.327	-10.3	-0.11	0.294
In child's home	1.0	1.1	-0.2	0.355	-13.9	-0.11	0.026 ††
In caregiver's home	0.8	0.8	0.0	0.860	-3.3	-0.02	0.553
Any unsupervised care:	0.6	0.8	-0.2	0.174	-24.5	-0.17	0.124
Care by a minor	0.2	0.3	-0.1	0.156	-45.4	-0.16	0.187
Self-care	0.3	0.4	-0.1	0.298	-26.4	-0.12	0.383
Cared for sibling(s)	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.824	-7.7	-0.03	0.024 ††
During the prior year, number of months spent in							
Any formal care	3.5	2.8	0.7	0.167	25.7	0.16	0.614
Any home-based care	5.3	5.8	-0.5	0.376	-8.9	-0.10	0.043 ††
Any unsupervised care	2.8	3.5	-0.7	0.200	-20.0	-0.15	0.078 †
Out-of-pocket child care costs in prior month (\$)	41.0	45.9	-4.9	0.719	-10.7	-0.04	0.234
Sample size	246	217					

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.4 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Ethnicities ^b
Hispanic							
During the prior school year, number of months spent in							
Any formal care	2.6	1.3	1.3 *	0.057	97.4	0.33	
Any home-based care:	3.5	4.6	-1.1	0.169	-23.5	-0.26	
In child's home	2.5	3.4	-0.9	0.276	-25.2	-0.21	
In caregiver's home	1.9	2.3	-0.4	0.572	-16.8	-0.11	
Any unsupervised care:	2.0	1.8	0.2	0.760	9.5	0.05	
Care by a minor	1.0	1.1	-0.1	0.882	-6.1	-0.02	
Self-care	0.7	0.4	0.2	0.489	58.9	0.09	
Cared for sibling(s)	1.0	0.7	0.2	0.532	33.1	0.09	
During the prior summer, number of months spent in							
Any formal care	1.0	0.7	0.3	0.241	36.5	0.20	
Any home-based care:	1.3	1.6	-0.4	0.160	-22.1	-0.25	
In child's home	0.9	1.3	-0.4	0.117	-31.2	-0.28	
In caregiver's home	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.802	8.0	0.04	
Any unsupervised care:	0.5	0.6	-0.1	0.460	-21.4	-0.12	
Care by a minor	0.2	0.4	-0.2	0.211	-44.3	-0.23	
Self-care	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.672	29.0	0.07	
Cared for sibling(s)	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.669	29.5	0.07	
During the prior year, number of months spent in							
Any formal care	4.0	2.6	1.5 *	0.060	58.3	0.32	
Any home-based care	4.8	6.1	-1.3	0.169	-21.6	-0.25	
Any unsupervised care	2.4	2.4	0.1	0.930	2.6	0.01	
Out-of-pocket child care costs in prior month (\$)	60.1	31.2	28.8	0.169	92.4	0.25	
Sample size	119	123					

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.4 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Ethnicities ^b
White							
During the prior school year, number of months spent in							
Any formal care	2.3	1.6	0.7	0.493	44.8	0.19	
Any home-based care:	2.8	5.8	-3.0 **	0.016	-50.9	-0.69	
In child's home	1.9	5.5	-3.6 ***	0.004	-65.4	-0.90	
In caregiver's home	1.4	2.5	-1.1	0.315	-43.6	-0.30	
Any unsupervised care:	1.2	3.0	-1.8 **	0.018	-60.9	-0.49	
Care by a minor	0.1	1.4	-1.2 **	0.020	-90.4	-0.46	
Self-care	1.0	1.6	-0.6	0.409	-35.3	-0.21	
Cared for sibling(s)	0.1	2.0	-1.9 ***	0.002	-96.0	-0.69	
During the prior summer, number of months spent in							
Any formal care	1.0	0.6	0.4	0.245	68.8	0.33	
Any home-based care:	1.1	1.8	-0.7 *	0.085	-38.1	-0.47	
In child's home	0.8	1.9	-1.1 ***	0.005	-57.0	-0.75	
In caregiver's home	0.3	0.6	-0.3	0.363	-44.9	-0.23	
Any unsupervised care:	0.3	1.0	-0.7 ***	0.003	-73.5	-0.60	
Care by a minor	0.0	0.5	-0.5 ***	0.006	-99.8	-0.58	
Self-care	0.3	0.5	-0.2	0.326	-44.5	-0.23	
Cared for sibling(s)	0.0	0.4	-0.5 ***	0.006	-103.0	-0.54	
During the prior year, number of months spent in							
Any formal care	3.1	2.1	1.0	0.383	50.9	0.23	
Any home-based care	3.8	7.6	-3.8 **	0.015	-49.5	-0.72	
Any unsupervised care	1.4	4.0	-2.6 ***	0.007	-64.5	-0.55	
Out-of-pocket child care costs in prior month (\$)	20.1	17.6	2.5	0.908	14.2	0.02	
Sample size	42	63					

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.4 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Actual sample sizes for individual measures may vary as a result of missing data.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table E.5.5

Impacts on Children's Activities, by Number of Parent's Potential Barriers to Employment

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
<u>No potential barriers</u>							
Structured activities - school year							
Total structured activities: parent report	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.849	1.1	0.03	0.584
Lessons	2.1	2.1	-0.1	0.795	-2.5	-0.04	0.631
Sports with a coach	2.3	2.3	0.0	0.854	1.7	0.03	0.366
Club/youth group	2.3	2.3	0.1	0.760	3.0	0.05	0.567
Religious class or activity	2.9	2.8	0.1	0.795	1.9	0.04	0.470
Community center	2.4	2.3	0.1	0.780	2.7	0.04	0.831
School-related programs: parent report							
Program to help with school	2.3	2.2	0.1	0.762	3.4	0.05	0.023 ††
Before/after-school program	2.2	1.9	0.3	0.266	15.1	0.17	0.721
Total structured activities: child report	2.6	2.4	0.2	0.199	8.7	0.25	0.466
Lessons	2.6	2.4	0.2	0.437	8.7	0.13	0.315
Sports with a coach	2.7	2.6	0.1	0.774	3.5	0.06	0.604
Club/youth group	2.3	2.2	0.1	0.830	2.9	0.04	0.761
Religious class or activity	3.2	2.7	0.5 **	0.037	20.6	0.39	0.181
Community center	2.5	2.3	0.1	0.580	6.4	0.09	0.892
School-related programs: child report							
Program to help with school	1.8	2.1	-0.4	0.190	-16.4	-0.23	0.320
Before/after-school program	1.9	1.4	0.5 **	0.049	36.8	0.41	0.262
Structured activities - summer							
Total structured activities: parent report	2.1	2.2	0.0	0.776	-2.1	-0.05	0.373
Lessons	1.6	1.8	-0.2	0.293	-11.5	-0.17	0.430
Sports with a coach	1.8	2.0	-0.2	0.487	-7.9	-0.11	0.437
Club/youth group	2.0	2.1	-0.1	0.735	-3.5	-0.05	0.052 †
Religious class or activity	2.8	2.7	0.2	0.489	5.7	0.11	0.648
Community center	2.3	2.3	0.0	0.902	1.3	0.02	0.813
School-related programs: parent report							
Summer school	2.2	2.1	0.1	0.800	3.6	0.05	0.306
Daycamp	1.9	1.7	0.2	0.346	13.3	0.15	0.113
Total structured activities: child report	2.1	2.0	0.1	0.488	5.2	0.12	0.918
Lessons	1.5	1.6	-0.1	0.509	-8.0	-0.10	0.868
Sports with a coach	1.9	2.1	-0.1	0.609	-6.3	-0.08	0.632
Club/youth group	1.9	1.5	0.4 *	0.098	25.1	0.27	0.750
Religious class or activity	3.0	2.4	0.6 **	0.018	26.2	0.44	0.199
Community center	2.0	2.2	-0.3	0.404	-11.5	-0.16	0.832
School-related programs: child report							
Summer school	1.7	2.1	-0.4	0.227	-18.2	-0.23	0.204
Daycamp	1.7	1.6	0.1	0.791	4.9	0.05	0.790

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.5 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
Service and work for pay - school year							
Service and volunteer: parent report	1.7	2.0	-0.3 *	0.071	-14.3	-0.26	0.035 ††
Service and volunteer: child report	2.1	1.8	0.3	0.356	16.0	0.23	0.600
Work for pay: parent report	1.5	1.6	-0.1	0.691	-3.6	-0.06	0.252
Work for pay: child report	2.3	1.7	0.7 **	0.015	39.7	0.47	0.378
Service and work for pay - summer							
Service and volunteer: parent report	1.7	1.6	0.1	0.362	9.2	0.15	0.581
Service and volunteer: child report	1.7	1.6	0.1	0.706	6.0	0.08	0.642
Work for pay: parent report	1.4	1.6	-0.2	0.232	-10.1	-0.17	0.175
Work for pay: child report	2.7	1.5	1.2 ***	0.001	81.3	0.76	0.002 †††
Parent approval of participation	3.0	2.9	0.1	0.565	3.4	0.09	0.541
Social activities - school year							
Shop or eat out with adult: parent report	3.2	3.4	-0.1	0.270	-4.2	-0.17	0.638
Hang out with friends: parent report	2.7	2.9	-0.1	0.543	-4.9	-0.09	0.467
Shop or eat out with adult: child report	3.4	3.3	0.1	0.446	3.8	0.15	0.779
Hang out with friends: child report	3.7	3.6	0.2	0.531	5.2	0.12	0.536
Social activities - summer							
Shop or eat out with adult: parent report	3.3	3.4	-0.1	0.411	-3.1	-0.12	0.843
Hang out with friends: parent report	2.9	2.8	0.1	0.742	3.0	0.05	0.329
Shop or eat out with adult: child report	3.6	3.4	0.2 *	0.096	7.4	0.27	0.866
Hang out with friends: child report	3.9	3.7	0.2	0.415	6.4	0.15	0.764
Television - school year							
Watch TV (hours/day): parent report	2.6	2.6	0.0	0.724	1.3	0.05	0.563
Watch TV (hours/day): child report	3.1	2.9	0.2	0.150	7.7	0.29	0.036 ††
One potential barrier							
Structured activities - school year							
Total structured activities: parent report	2.4	2.3	0.1	0.588	2.6	0.06	
Lessons	2.0	2.2	-0.3 *	0.084	-11.8	-0.20	
Sports with a coach	2.3	2.4	0.0	0.845	-1.5	-0.02	
Club/youth group	2.3	2.3	0.1	0.695	3.3	0.05	
Religious class or activity	3.0	2.7	0.3 *	0.064	12.1	0.24	
Community center	2.4	2.2	0.2	0.285	9.5	0.14	
School-related programs: parent report							
Program to help with school	2.0	2.3	-0.3	0.184	-11.6	-0.17	
Before/after-school program	2.0	1.8	0.1	0.464	8.2	0.09	
Total structured activities: child report	2.6	2.6	0.0	0.819	-1.1	-0.03	
Lessons	2.3	2.6	-0.2	0.281	-9.5	-0.16	
Sports with a coach	2.9	2.7	0.2	0.371	7.7	0.13	
Club/youth group	2.3	2.5	-0.2	0.495	-6.3	-0.10	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.5 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
Religious class or activity	2.9	3.0	0.0	0.829	-1.5	-0.03	
Community center	2.5	2.4	0.1	0.636	4.3	0.06	
School-related programs: child report							
Program to help with school	2.0	2.1	-0.1	0.638	-4.8	-0.07	
Before/after-school program	1.5	1.4	0.1	0.707	4.3	0.05	
Structured activities - summer							
Total structured activities: parent report	2.3	2.2	0.1	0.529	3.3	0.07	
Lessons	1.8	1.7	0.0	0.868	1.4	0.02	
Sports with a coach	2.1	2.3	-0.1	0.437	-6.5	-0.11	
Club/youth group	2.0	2.1	-0.1	0.617	-4.1	-0.06	
Religious class or activity	2.8	2.5	0.4 **	0.043	14.5	0.26	
Community center	2.5	2.3	0.2	0.350	8.1	0.12	
School-related programs: parent report							
Summer school	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.920	-1.0	-0.01	
Daycamp	1.7	1.9	-0.3	0.192	-13.7	-0.18	
Total structured activities: child report	2.2	2.1	0.1	0.492	3.9	0.10	
Lessons	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.973	-0.4	0.00	
Sports with a coach	2.3	2.1	0.2	0.392	9.6	0.13	
Club/youth group	2.0	1.8	0.2	0.449	9.0	0.12	
Religious class or activity	2.9	2.9	0.1	0.690	2.8	0.06	
Community center	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.837	-2.2	-0.03	
School-related programs: child report							
Summer school	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.988	0.2	0.00	
Daycamp	1.8	1.7	0.1	0.737	4.6	0.06	
Service and work for pay - school year							
Service and volunteer: parent report	1.6	1.5	0.2	0.110	12.5	0.17	
Service and volunteer: child report	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.931	-1.2	-0.02	
Work for pay: parent report	1.4	1.3	0.1	0.415	6.4	0.09	
Work for pay: child report	2.0	1.9	0.1	0.784	4.0	0.05	
Service and work for pay - summer							
Service and volunteer: parent report	1.5	1.3	0.2 *	0.057	16.5	0.22	
Service and volunteer: child report	1.5	1.7	-0.2	0.370	-12.5	-0.18	
Work for pay: parent report	1.4	1.3	0.1	0.196	10.6	0.14	
Work for pay: child report	2.2	2.0	0.2	0.583	9.7	0.12	
Parent approval of participation	2.7	2.8	-0.1	0.583	-2.8	-0.07	
Social activities - school year							
Shop or eat out with adult: parent report	3.4	3.4	0.0	0.993	0.0	0.00	
Hang out with friends: parent report	2.8	2.9	-0.2	0.333	-6.0	-0.12	
Shop or eat out with adult: child report	3.4	3.4	0.0	0.911	0.4	0.02	
Hang out with friends: child report	3.8	3.6	0.1	0.495	4.2	0.10	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.5 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
Social activities - summer							
Shop or eat out with adult: parent report	3.4	3.6	-0.2 *	0.092	-5.3	-0.22	
Hang out with friends: parent report	2.8	2.9	-0.1	0.432	-5.0	-0.09	
Shop or eat out with adult: child report	3.5	3.3	0.1	0.323	4.1	0.15	
Hang out with friends: child report	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.913	-0.7	-0.02	
Television - school year							
Watch TV (hours/day): parent report	2.6	2.7	-0.1	0.401	-2.7	-0.11	
Watch TV (hours/day): child report	3.1	3.2	-0.2	0.192	-4.8	-0.20	
Two potential barriers or more							
Structured activities - school year							
Total structured activities: parent report	2.5	2.3	0.2	0.237	8.8	0.21	
Lessons	2.2	2.3	-0.1	0.604	-5.1	-0.09	
Sports with a coach	2.4	2.1	0.3	0.173	15.5	0.22	
Club/youth group	2.5	2.2	0.3	0.190	14.6	0.22	
Religious class or activity	2.9	2.6	0.3	0.191	10.9	0.21	
Community center	2.6	2.4	0.2	0.397	9.6	0.15	
School-related programs: parent report							
Program to help with school	2.7	2.3	0.5 *	0.068	19.9	0.30	
Before/after-school program	2.5	2.1	0.4	0.191	16.9	0.22	
Total structured activities: child report	2.7	2.6	0.0	0.752	1.8	0.06	
Lessons	2.6	2.4	0.2	0.436	8.2	0.13	
Sports with a coach	2.7	2.8	-0.1	0.613	-5.0	-0.09	
Club/youth group	2.3	2.2	0.1	0.810	2.7	0.04	
Religious class or activity	3.2	3.1	0.1	0.615	4.7	0.10	
Community center	2.5	2.6	0.0	0.927	-1.0	-0.02	
School-related programs: child report							
Program to help with school	2.2	2.0	0.2	0.458	10.0	0.13	
Before/after-school program	1.5	1.5	0.1	0.812	3.7	0.04	
Structured activities - summer							
Total structured activities: parent report	2.4	2.1	0.2	0.241	10.3	0.23	
Lessons	1.8	1.8	0.1	0.769	3.5	0.05	
Sports with a coach	2.1	1.9	0.1	0.568	7.4	0.10	
Club/youth group	2.6	2.1	0.5 *	0.062	23.7	0.34	
Religious class or activity	2.9	2.6	0.4	0.111	14.1	0.26	
Community center	2.5	2.4	0.1	0.841	2.3	0.04	
School-related programs: parent report							
Summer school	2.0	2.4	-0.4	0.136	-16.2	-0.23	
Daycamp	1.7	2.0	-0.3	0.191	-15.8	-0.22	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.5 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
Total structured activities: child report	2.4	2.2	0.2	0.206	7.0	0.19	
Lessons	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.902	1.4	0.02	
Sports with a coach	2.5	2.4	0.2	0.535	6.7	0.10	
Club/youth group	2.0	1.8	0.2	0.418	9.5	0.13	
Religious class or activity	3.2	2.7	0.5 *	0.063	17.8	0.34	
Community center	2.5	2.6	-0.1	0.819	-2.6	-0.04	
School-related programs: child report							
Summer school	1.9	2.6	-0.7 **	0.016	-25.5	-0.39	
Daycamp	1.7	1.8	-0.1	0.656	-6.6	-0.08	
Service and work for pay - school year							
Service and volunteer: parent report	1.8	1.6	0.2	0.205	11.9	0.18	
Service and volunteer: child report	1.7	1.8	-0.2	0.534	-9.5	-0.14	
Work for pay: parent report	1.5	1.3	0.3 *	0.059	20.2	0.27	
Work for pay: child report	2.0	1.8	0.2	0.508	11.4	0.15	
Service and work for pay - summer							
Service and volunteer: parent report	1.7	1.4	0.3 **	0.038	24.5	0.35	
Service and volunteer: child report	1.7	1.7	0.1	0.864	4.3	0.06	
Work for pay: parent report	1.4	1.3	0.1	0.286	10.7	0.15	
Work for pay: child report	1.8	2.4	-0.6 *	0.078	-25.3	-0.38	
Parent approval of participation	2.8	2.7	0.1	0.500	4.5	0.10	
Social activities - school year							
Shop or eat out with adult: parent report	3.3	3.4	0.0	0.719	-1.4	-0.06	
Hang out with friends: parent report	3.0	2.9	0.1	0.613	3.7	0.07	
Shop or eat out with adult: child report	3.5	3.4	0.1	0.316	3.9	0.16	
Hang out with friends: child report	3.8	4.0	-0.2	0.489	-4.4	-0.11	
Social activities - summer							
Shop or eat out with adult: parent report	3.3	3.5	-0.2	0.147	-5.5	-0.22	
Hang out with friends: parent report	3.1	2.9	0.2	0.295	7.9	0.14	
Shop or eat out with adult: child report	3.4	3.2	0.2	0.222	6.4	0.22	
Hang out with friends: child report	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.931	0.6	0.01	
Television - school year							
Watch TV (hours/day): parent report	2.8	2.9	-0.1	0.394	-3.3	-0.14	
Watch TV (hours/day): child report	3.0	3.2	-0.2 *	0.061	-7.2	-0.30	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.5 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Table 5.6 presents the ranges of outcomes reported in this table.

For the group with no potential barriers, parent reports were available for 222 children; and child reports were available for 222 children. For the group with one potential barrier, parent reports were available for 345 children; and child reports were available for 345 children. For the group with two potential barriers or more, parent reports were available for 263 children; and child reports were available for 263 children. Actual sample sizes for individual measures may vary as a result of missing data.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project
Appendix Table E.5.6
Impacts on Children's Activities, by Ethnicity

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Ethnicities ^b
<u>African-American</u>							
Structured activities - school year							
Total structured activities: parent report	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.924	0.4	0.01	0.714
Lessons	2.1	2.3	-0.2 *	0.095	-10.2	-0.18	0.850
Sports with a coach	2.2	2.3	0.0	0.826	-1.4	-0.02	0.567
Club/youth group	2.5	2.4	0.0	0.839	1.3	0.02	0.458
Religious class or activity	3.2	2.9	0.2	0.106	8.1	0.18	0.542
Community center	2.6	2.5	0.1	0.676	2.8	0.05	0.783
School-related programs: parent report							
Program to help with school	2.5	2.3	0.2	0.239	9.0	0.13	0.121
Before/after-school program	2.2	2.1	0.1	0.565	4.9	0.06	0.406
Total structured activities: child report	2.7	2.7	0.0	0.894	0.5	0.02	0.343
Lessons	2.5	2.5	-0.1	0.733	-2.6	-0.04	0.700
Sports with a coach	2.8	2.9	-0.1	0.510	-4.4	-0.08	0.567
Club/youth group	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.922	-0.8	-0.01	0.669
Religious class or activity	3.2	3.0	0.2	0.180	8.2	0.18	0.320
Community center	2.6	2.6	0.0	0.866	1.3	0.02	0.587
School-related programs: child report							
Program to help with school	2.2	2.1	0.1	0.602	4.8	0.07	0.241
Before/after-school program	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.976	0.3	0.00	0.614
Structured activities - summer							
Total structured activities: parent report	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.831	1.1	0.03	0.274
Lessons	1.8	1.9	-0.1	0.383	-6.4	-0.10	0.220
Sports with a coach	2.0	2.2	-0.2	0.219	-8.8	-0.13	0.602
Club/youth group	2.4	2.3	0.1	0.632	3.5	0.06	0.571
Religious class or activity	3.1	2.8	0.4 **	0.021	13.0	0.26	0.184
Community center	2.6	2.7	0.0	0.827	-1.5	-0.03	0.167
School-related programs: parent report							
Summer school	2.2	2.4	-0.3	0.176	-10.9	-0.16	0.545
Daycamp	1.8	2.2	-0.4 **	0.022	-19.0	-0.28	0.062 †
Total structured activities: child report	2.3	2.2	0.0	0.636	2.1	0.06	0.466
Lessons	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.919	-0.9	-0.01	0.980
Sports with a coach	2.2	2.3	-0.1	0.740	-2.7	-0.04	0.896
Club/youth group	2.0	1.8	0.2	0.306	10.0	0.13	0.122
Religious class or activity	3.2	2.9	0.3	0.120	9.8	0.20	0.994
Community center	2.3	2.5	-0.2	0.440	-6.3	-0.10	0.510

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.6 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Ethnicities ^b
School-related programs: child report							
Summer school	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.827	-2.0	-0.03	0.006 †††
Daycamp	1.7	1.8	-0.2	0.407	-8.6	-0.11	0.507
Service and work for pay - school year							
Service and volunteer: parent report	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.936	0.5	0.01	0.742
Service and volunteer: child report	1.9	1.8	0.1	0.590	6.5	0.09	0.047 ††
Work for pay: parent report	1.5	1.4	0.1	0.176	9.4	0.14	0.905
Work for pay: child report	2.2	2.0	0.2	0.373	10.3	0.15	0.767
Service and work for pay - summer							
Service and volunteer: parent report	1.7	1.5	0.2 **	0.049	15.1	0.23	0.707
Service and volunteer: child report	1.7	1.8	-0.2	0.469	-8.6	-0.13	0.453
Work for pay: parent report	1.5	1.4	0.1	0.587	3.6	0.05	0.988
Work for pay: child report	2.2	2.1	0.1	0.742	4.3	0.06	0.145
Parent approval of participation							
	2.8	3.0	-0.2 *	0.092	-6.8	-0.17	0.008 †††
Social activities - school year							
Shop or eat out with adult: parent report	3.3	3.2	0.1	0.451	2.3	0.09	0.019 ††
Hang out with friends: parent report	2.9	2.9	0.0	0.982	-0.1	0.00	0.073 †
Shop or eat out with adult: child report	3.3	3.3	-0.1	0.454	-2.4	-0.10	0.176
Hang out with friends: child report	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.896	0.6	0.02	0.956
Social activities - summer							
Shop or eat out with adult: parent report	3.2	3.4	-0.1	0.237	-3.5	-0.14	0.222
Hang out with friends: parent report	3.0	2.9	0.0	0.780	1.5	0.03	0.248
Shop or eat out with adult: child report	3.4	3.2	0.1	0.215	4.5	0.16	0.773
Hang out with friends: child report	3.9	3.9	0.0	0.993	0.0	0.00	0.474
Television - school year							
Watch TV (hours/day): parent report	2.7	2.9	-0.1 *	0.059	-5.1	-0.22	0.098 †
Watch TV (hours/day): child report	3.2	3.2	-0.1	0.442	-2.2	-0.09	0.067 †
Hispanic							
Structured activities - school year							
Total structured activities: parent report	2.3	2.2	0.1	0.518	4.2	0.10	
Lessons	1.9	2.1	-0.2	0.313	-9.0	-0.14	
Sports with a coach	2.4	2.3	0.1	0.715	3.8	0.06	
Club/youth group	2.2	2.0	0.3	0.245	13.1	0.18	
Religious class or activity	2.7	2.6	0.1	0.701	3.6	0.07	
Community center	2.1	1.9	0.2	0.364	11.8	0.15	
School-related programs: parent report							
Program to help with school	2.0	2.4	-0.3	0.167	-14.4	-0.22	
Before/after-school program	2.0	1.9	0.1	0.753	4.7	0.05	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.6 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Ethnicities ^b
Total structured activities: child report	2.4	2.6	-0.2	0.280	-7.6	-0.24	
Lessons	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.996	-0.1	0.00	
Sports with a coach	2.6	2.9	-0.3	0.282	-11.2	-0.20	
Club/youth group	2.1	2.3	-0.3	0.370	-11.8	-0.18	
Religious class or activity	3.1	3.2	-0.1	0.724	-3.1	-0.07	
Community center	2.0	2.3	-0.3	0.315	-12.6	-0.19	
School-related programs: child report							
Program to help with school	1.8	2.3	-0.5 *	0.078	-20.9	-0.32	
Before/after-school program	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.849	-3.2	-0.04	
Structured activities - summer							
Total structured activities: parent report	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.998	0.0	0.00	
Lessons	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.791	2.6	0.03	
Sports with a coach	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.836	2.5	0.04	
Club/youth group	1.9	2.0	-0.1	0.569	-6.2	-0.09	
Religious class or activity	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.967	0.4	0.01	
Community center	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.977	0.4	0.00	
School-related programs: parent report							
Summer school	2.1	2.2	-0.1	0.754	-4.3	-0.06	
Daycamp	1.8	1.7	0.1	0.688	6.0	0.07	
Total structured activities: child report	1.9	2.1	-0.2	0.298	-8.1	-0.21	
Lessons	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.938	-1.2	-0.02	
Sports with a coach	2.0	2.1	-0.1	0.651	-5.8	-0.08	
Club/youth group	1.5	1.9	-0.4 *	0.093	-20.8	-0.28	
Religious class or activity	2.9	2.6	0.3	0.364	10.1	0.19	
Community center	1.8	2.3	-0.5 *	0.095	-21.8	-0.31	
School-related programs: child report							
Summer school	1.5	2.7	-1.2 ***	0.000	-45.1	-0.73	
Daycamp	1.8	1.7	0.1	0.694	7.7	0.09	
Service and work for pay - school year							
Service and volunteer: parent report	1.7	1.5	0.1	0.353	8.6	0.12	
Service and volunteer: child report	1.3	1.9	-0.6 **	0.019	-33.0	-0.50	
Work for pay: parent report	1.3	1.2	0.1	0.483	5.9	0.08	
Work for pay: child report	1.8	1.7	0.1	0.778	4.8	0.06	
Service and work for pay - summer							
Service and volunteer: parent report	1.6	1.4	0.2 *	0.089	17.3	0.24	
Service and volunteer: child report	1.3	1.7	-0.3	0.289	-19.4	-0.28	
Work for pay: parent report	1.3	1.2	0.1	0.597	4.9	0.06	
Work for pay: child report	2.3	1.7	0.5	0.202	29.7	0.32	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.6 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Ethnicities ^b
Parent approval of participation	2.8	2.5	0.4 *	0.053	15.1	0.32	
Social activities - school year							
Shop or eat out with adult: parent report	3.4	3.6	-0.3 *	0.070	-7.1	-0.31	
Hang out with friends: parent report	2.2	2.6	-0.4 *	0.061	-16.5	-0.29	
Shop or eat out with adult: child report	3.6	3.5	0.2	0.294	4.7	0.19	
Hang out with friends: child report	3.5	3.4	0.0	0.847	1.4	0.03	
Social activities - summer							
Shop or eat out with adult: parent report	3.4	3.7	-0.3 *	0.052	-7.2	-0.31	
Hang out with friends: parent report	2.2	2.6	-0.3	0.170	-13.2	-0.22	
Shop or eat out with adult: child report	3.7	3.4	0.3 *	0.053	8.3	0.31	
Hang out with friends: child report	3.6	3.2	0.4	0.200	12.8	0.26	
Television - school year							
Watch TV (hours/day): parent report	2.5	2.4	0.1	0.383	3.3	0.12	
Watch TV (hours/day): child report	3.0	2.9	0.0	0.739	1.6	0.06	
White							
Structured activities - school year							
Total structured activities: parent report	2.2	2.0	0.2	0.364	8.0	0.17	
Lessons	2.0	2.0	-0.1	0.800	-3.1	-0.05	
Sports with a coach	2.4	2.1	0.3	0.308	15.7	0.22	
Club/youth group	1.7	1.9	-0.1	0.558	-7.8	-0.10	
Religious class or activity	2.4	2.0	0.5	0.140	23.6	0.34	
Community center	2.3	2.1	0.2	0.491	10.2	0.14	
School-related programs: parent report							
Program to help with school	2.0	1.9	0.2	0.568	8.3	0.10	
Before/after-school program	2.0	1.4	0.6	0.130	39.4	0.34	
Total structured activities: child report	2.6	2.3	0.3	0.322	12.1	0.33	
Lessons	2.9	2.5	0.5	0.322	18.2	0.29	
Sports with a coach	2.4	2.1	0.3	0.567	16.2	0.21	
Club/youth group	2.3	2.1	0.2	0.676	10.1	0.14	
Religious class or activity	3.0	2.3	0.6	0.153	27.9	0.46	
Community center	2.2	2.5	-0.3	0.519	-10.6	-0.17	
School-related programs: child report							
Program to help with school	1.8	1.8	-0.1	0.876	-3.7	-0.04	
Before/after-school program	1.7	1.2	0.4	0.294	35.5	0.36	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.6 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Ethnicities ^b
Structured activities - summer							
Total structured activities: parent report	2.0	1.7	0.3 *	0.063	18.4	0.32	
Lessons	1.7	1.4	0.3	0.137	23.9	0.27	
Sports with a coach	2.0	2.0	-0.1	0.816	-3.9	-0.06	
Club/youth group	1.9	1.7	0.2	0.502	11.5	0.14	
Religious class or activity	2.4	1.9	0.6 *	0.067	30.0	0.41	
Community center	2.1	1.6	0.6	0.116	36.0	0.37	
School-related programs: parent report							
Summer school	2.1	2.0	0.2	0.742	8.0	0.09	
Daycamp	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.911	1.9	0.02	
Total structured activities: child report	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.965	-0.5	-0.01	
Lessons	1.4	1.5	-0.1	0.749	-6.7	-0.08	
Sports with a coach	2.4	2.2	0.2	0.740	9.4	0.13	
Club/youth group	1.8	1.6	0.2	0.553	15.7	0.18	
Religious class or activity	2.6	2.4	0.2	0.690	9.8	0.16	
Community center	2.0	2.6	-0.6	0.191	-23.6	-0.38	
School-related programs: child report							
Summer school	1.5	2.1	-0.6	0.179	-27.6	-0.34	
Daycamp	1.7	1.4	0.3	0.558	19.7	0.19	
Service and work for pay - school year							
Service and volunteer: parent report	1.6	1.5	0.1	0.610	8.2	0.11	
Service and volunteer: child report	2.4	1.8	0.6	0.316	30.0	0.43	
Work for pay: parent report	1.6	1.5	0.1	0.798	3.9	0.06	
Work for pay: child report	1.6	2.0	-0.3	0.604	-17.0	-0.24	
Service and work for pay - summer							
Service and volunteer: parent report	1.3	1.2	0.1	0.552	7.8	0.10	
Service and volunteer: child report	1.7	1.3	0.4	0.399	33.6	0.37	
Work for pay: parent report	1.6	1.5	0.1	0.607	5.8	0.09	
Work for pay: child report	1.7	2.8	-1.1 *	0.091	-40.1	-0.71	
Parent approval of participation							
	3.0	2.7	0.3	0.241	10.8	0.25	
Social activities - school year							
Shop or eat out with adult: parent report	3.7	3.5	0.2	0.126	6.8	0.29	
Hang out with friends: parent report	3.6	3.3	0.4	0.309	10.8	0.24	
Shop or eat out with adult: child report	3.6	3.2	0.5	0.174	14.7	0.56	
Hang out with friends: child report	4.0	3.8	0.2	0.739	5.9	0.14	
Social activities - summer							
Shop or eat out with adult: parent report	3.7	3.6	0.1	0.599	2.9	0.12	
Hang out with friends: parent report	3.5	3.4	0.2	0.608	5.4	0.11	
Shop or eat out with adult: child report	3.6	3.4	0.1	0.678	4.2	0.15	
Hang out with friends: child report	4.0	3.8	0.2	0.802	4.3	0.10	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.5.6 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Ethnicities ^b
Television - school year							
Watch TV (hours/day): parent report	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.827	-1.0	-0.04	
Watch TV (hours/day): child report	2.6	3.3	-0.7 ***	0.009	-21.4	-0.92	

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Table 5.6 presents the ranges of outcomes reported in this table.

For African-Americans, parent reports were available for 462 children; and child reports were available for 462 children. For Hispanics, parent reports were available for 236 children; and child reports were available for 236 children. For whites, parent reports were available for 109 children; and child reports were available for 109 children. Actual sample sizes for individual measures may vary as a result of missing data.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table E.6.1

Impacts on Children's Achievement and School Progress, by Age

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Age Groups ^b
<u>Ages 6-8</u>							
Woodcock-Johnson test of achievement							
Total standard score	102.0	99.2	2.9	0.136	2.9	0.19	0.737
Broad reading score	103.0	100.3	2.8	0.133	2.7	0.17	0.714
Letter-word score	100.9	96.8	4.1 *	0.051	4.2	0.21	0.606
Comprehension	105.8	104.3	1.4	0.452	1.4	0.09	0.763
Broad math score	101.0	98.2	2.8	0.230	2.9	0.17	0.649
Calculation	102.8	100.3	2.5	0.257	2.5	0.13	0.881
Applied problems	100.3	97.7	2.7	0.345	2.7	0.16	0.638
Parent ratings of achievement							
Overall achievement	3.9	4.0	-0.1	0.396	-2.7	-0.10	0.085 †
Reading	3.8	3.5	0.2	0.131	6.3	0.19	0.356
Math	3.9	3.8	0.1	0.347	2.8	0.10	0.301
Teacher ratings of achievement							
Social Skills Rating System academic subscale	3.3	3.3	0.0	0.825	-1.0	-0.03	0.306
Mock report card - total	3.0	3.1	0.0	0.808	-1.2	-0.04	0.870
Mock report card - reading	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.982	0.1	0.00	0.411
Mock report card - math	3.0	3.1	-0.1	0.668	-2.2	-0.06	0.769
Classroom Behavior Scale	3.7	3.7	0.0	0.828	-0.8	-0.03	0.694
Teacher expectations for child	3.0	3.1	0.0	0.779	-1.5	-0.04	0.779
School progress							
Positive school progress: parent report	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.336	9.6	0.12	0.973
Receives gifted services: teacher report	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.505	4.2	0.10	0.616
Negative school progress: parent report	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.823	5.0	0.02	0.120
Receives remedial services: teacher report	1.4	1.3	0.1	0.341	7.3	0.14	0.367
Time absent: teacher report	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.918	-0.9	-0.01	0.801
Time tardy: teacher report	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.837	-2.3	-0.03	0.644
<u>Ages 9-12</u>							
Woodcock-Johnson test of achievement							
Total standard score	95.2	93.9	1.4	0.426	1.4	0.09	
Broad reading score	97.6	95.3	2.4	0.234	2.5	0.14	
Letter-word score	98.0	95.1	2.8	0.251	3.0	0.14	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.6.1 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Age Groups ^b
Comprehension	97.3	95.4	1.9	0.319	2.0	0.12	
Broad math score	92.8	92.5	0.2	0.892	0.3	0.01	
Calculation	86.6	85.3	1.3	0.514	1.6	0.07	
Applied problems	99.0	99.4	-0.3	0.855	-0.3	-0.02	
Parent ratings of achievement							
Overall achievement	3.7	3.8	-0.1	0.425	-2.6	-0.09	
Reading	3.6	3.5	0.1	0.633	1.8	0.05	
Math	3.6	3.7	-0.1	0.424	-2.6	-0.09	
Teacher ratings of achievement							
Social Skills Rating System academic subscale	3.1	3.2	0.0	0.759	-1.5	-0.05	
Mock report card - total	2.8	2.8	-0.1	0.728	-1.9	-0.06	
Mock report card - reading	2.8	2.8	-0.1	0.702	-2.3	-0.06	
Mock report card - math	2.7	2.8	-0.1	0.694	-2.5	-0.06	
Classroom Behavior Scale	3.7	3.8	0.0	0.830	-0.9	-0.03	
Teacher expectations for child	2.8	2.8	-0.1	0.747	-2.0	-0.05	
School progress							
Positive school progress: parent report	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.328	8.3	0.11	
Receives gifted services: teacher report	1.1	1.2	-0.1	0.449	-4.8	-0.13	
Negative school progress: parent report	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.680	7.3	0.05	
Receives remedial services: teacher report	1.4	1.5	-0.1	0.361	-6.7	-0.16	
Time absent: teacher report	1.7	1.6	0.1	0.430	7.5	0.11	
Time tardy: teacher report	1.4	1.5	-0.2	0.235	-10.8	-0.15	
<u>Ages 13-16</u>							
Woodcock-Johnson test of achievement							
Total standard score	88.8	88.0	0.9	0.657	1.0	0.06	
Broad reading score	91.8	91.6	0.2	0.935	0.2	0.01	
Letter-word score	92.2	92.2	0.1	0.986	0.1	0.00	
Comprehension	90.8	91.2	-0.3	0.895	-0.4	-0.02	
Broad math score	85.9	84.4	1.5	0.412	1.8	0.09	
Calculation	79.1	76.4	2.7	0.236	3.5	0.14	
Applied problems	93.0	92.3	0.6	0.726	0.7	0.04	
Parent ratings of achievement							
Overall achievement	3.6	3.4	0.3 *	0.067	8.4	0.26	
Reading	3.7	3.4	0.3 **	0.019	10.4	0.30	
Math	3.5	3.3	0.2	0.226	5.5	0.17	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.6.1 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	Impact	% Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Age Groups ^b
Teacher ratings of achievement							
Social Skills Rating System academic subscale	3.2	2.9	0.3	0.135	10.3	0.30	
Mock report card - total	2.8	2.7	0.1	0.718	3.5	0.09	
Mock report card - reading	2.9	2.6	0.3	0.210	11.7	0.28	
Mock report card - math	2.6	2.5	0.1	0.614	5.3	0.12	
Classroom Behavior Scale	3.7	3.5	0.2	0.420	4.8	0.16	
Teacher expectations for child	2.7	2.5	0.1	0.564	5.2	0.12	
School progress							
Positive school progress: parent report	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.551	7.5	0.08	
Receives gifted services: teacher report	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.881	-1.0	-0.02	
Negative school progress: parent report	0.2	0.3	-0.1 **	0.035	-25.7	-0.30	
Receives remedial services: teacher report	1.4	1.5	0.0	0.805	-2.3	-0.05	
Time absent: teacher report	2.5	2.5	0.1	0.791	2.7	0.06	
Time tardy: teacher report	2.0	1.9	0.1	0.714	4.7	0.08	

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Table 6.1 presents the ranges of outcomes reported in this table.

For ages 6 to 8, test results were available for 279 children; parent reports were available for 279 children; and teacher reports were available for 191 children. For ages 9 to 12, test results were available for 303 children; parent reports were available for 303 children; and teacher reports were available for 193 children. For ages 13 to 16, test results were available for 234 children; parent reports were available for 234 children; and teacher reports were available for 142 children. Actual sample sizes for individual measures may vary as a result of missing data.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table E.6.2

Impacts on Children's Achievement and School Progress, by Number of Parent's Potential Barriers to Employment

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
<u>No potential barriers</u>							
Woodcock-Johnson test of achievement							
Total standard score	95.1	96.9	-1.8	0.446	-1.8	-0.12	0.104
Broad reading score	98.1	97.6	0.6	0.814	0.6	0.03	0.414
Letter-word score	98.0	96.0	2.0	0.445	2.1	0.10	0.645
Comprehension	97.7	99.5	-1.8	0.521	-1.8	-0.11	0.148
Broad math score	93.5	94.4	-0.8	0.736	-0.9	-0.05	0.469
Calculation	88.9	88.7	0.3	0.926	0.3	0.01	0.751
Applied problems	98.2	101.0	-2.8	0.288	-2.8	-0.17	0.074 †
Parent ratings of achievement							
Overall achievement	3.8	4.0	-0.2	0.201	-4.2	-0.16	0.412
Reading	3.9	3.8	0.1	0.744	1.4	0.04	0.352
Math	3.8	3.8	0.1	0.559	2.3	0.08	0.737
Teacher ratings of achievement							
Social Skills Rating System academic subscale	3.3	3.1	0.2	0.369	5.8	0.18	0.328
Mock report card - total	3.0	2.9	0.0	0.863	1.2	0.04	0.358
Mock report card - reading	3.0	2.9	0.1	0.735	2.3	0.06	0.073 †
Mock report card - math	2.8	3.0	-0.2	0.386	-6.6	-0.18	0.729
Classroom Behavior Scale	3.7	3.6	0.0	0.861	1.0	0.03	0.605
Teacher expectations for child	3.1	3.0	0.1	0.739	2.6	0.07	0.235
School progress							
Positive school progress: parent report	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.119	20.1	0.23	0.712
Receives gifted services: teacher report	1.2	1.1	0.0	0.831	1.9	0.05	0.976
Negative school progress: parent report	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.461	17.8	0.10	0.360
Receives remedial services: teacher report	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.997	0.0	0.00	0.655
Time absent: teacher report	1.7	2.0	-0.3	0.153	-15.3	-0.28	0.106
Time tardy: teacher report	1.5	1.8	-0.2	0.276	-13.7	-0.22	0.261
<u>One potential barrier</u>							
Woodcock-Johnson test of achievement							
Total standard score	97.8	96.4	1.4	0.376	1.5	0.10	
Broad reading score	99.1	98.1	1.0	0.572	1.1	0.06	
Letter-word score	98.9	97.0	1.9	0.438	2.0	0.10	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.6.2 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
Comprehension	99.5	99.7	-0.1	0.932	-0.2	-0.01	
Broad math score	95.2	93.5	1.7	0.335	1.8	0.10	
Calculation	92.5	90.0	2.4	0.190	2.7	0.13	
Applied problems	98.2	97.7	0.4	0.823	0.5	0.03	
Parent ratings of achievement							
Overall achievement	3.7	3.7	0.0	0.771	1.0	0.03	
Reading	3.8	3.4	0.3 ***	0.006	10.2	0.30	
Math	3.7	3.7	0.0	0.778	-0.9	-0.03	
Teacher ratings of achievement							
Social Skills Rating System academic subscale	3.4	3.2	0.2 *	0.083	7.3	0.23	
Mock report card - total	3.1	2.8	0.2	0.104	7.8	0.22	
Mock report card - reading	3.1	2.7	0.4 **	0.016	13.5	0.34	
Mock report card - math	2.9	2.9	0.0	0.782	1.5	0.04	
Classroom Behavior Scale	3.9	3.7	0.2	0.253	4.3	0.15	
Teacher expectations for child	3.0	2.8	0.1	0.414	4.6	0.11	
School progress							
Positive school progress: parent report	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.281	9.8	0.12	
Receives gifted services: teacher report	1.2	1.1	0.0	0.483	4.1	0.10	
Negative school progress: parent report	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.632	-6.8	-0.05	
Receives remedial services: teacher report	1.4	1.5	-0.1	0.311	-6.7	-0.15	
Time absent: teacher report	1.9	1.8	0.0	0.776	2.3	0.04	
Time tardy: teacher report	1.6	1.6	-0.1	0.776	-3.1	-0.05	
<u>Two potential barriers or more</u>							
Woodcock-Johnson test of achievement							
Total standard score	94.9	90.6	4.4 **	0.036	4.8	0.30	
Broad reading score	96.4	92.0	4.4 *	0.098	4.7	0.27	
Letter-word score	95.6	90.7	5.0	0.115	5.5	0.25	
Comprehension	97.5	93.3	4.2 *	0.087	4.5	0.26	
Broad math score	92.4	89.4	3.0	0.167	3.4	0.18	
Calculation	88.4	85.9	2.6	0.206	3.0	0.13	
Applied problems	97.3	92.3	5.0 *	0.056	5.4	0.29	
Parent ratings of achievement							
Overall achievement	3.7	3.6	0.1	0.558	2.4	0.08	
Reading	3.5	3.3	0.2	0.160	6.8	0.19	
Math	3.6	3.5	0.1	0.529	2.6	0.08	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.6.2 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
Teacher ratings of achievement							
Social Skills Rating System academic subscale	3.0	3.1	-0.1	0.629	-3.0	-0.09	
Mock report card - total	2.7	2.8	-0.1	0.586	-3.7	-0.11	
Mock report card - reading	2.6	2.8	-0.2	0.347	-7.2	-0.18	
Mock report card - math	2.7	2.7	0.0	0.986	0.1	0.00	
Classroom Behavior Scale	3.5	3.6	-0.1	0.706	-1.6	-0.06	
Teacher expectations for child	2.4	2.7	-0.3	0.188	-9.7	-0.23	
School progress							
Positive school progress: parent report	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.624	5.9	0.07	
Receives gifted services: teacher report	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.637	2.6	0.06	
Negative school progress: parent report	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.213	-19.5	-0.16	
Receives remedial services: teacher report	1.5	1.5	0.0	0.749	2.6	0.06	
Time absent: teacher report	2.1	1.8	0.3	0.150	15.2	0.25	
Time tardy: teacher report	1.7	1.5	0.2	0.264	14.0	0.19	

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Table 6.1 presents the range of outcomes reported in this table.

For the group with no potential barriers, test results were available for 216 children; parent reports were available for 222 children; and child reports were available for 222 children. For the group with one potential barrier, test results were available for 341 children; parent reports were available for 345 children; and child reports were available for 345 children. For the group with two potential barriers or more, test results were available for 259 children; parent reports were available for 263 children; and child reports were available for 263 children. Actual sample sizes for individual measures may vary as a result of missing data.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table E.6.3

Impacts on Children's Achievement and School Progress, by Ethnicity

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Differences Across Ethnicities ^b
<u>African-American</u>							
Woodcock-Johnson test of achievement							
Total standard score	95.1	93.9	1.2	0.372	1.3	0.09	0.775
Broad reading score	97.5	94.9	2.6	0.134	2.8	0.16	0.935
Letter-word score	96.3	93.3	3.0	0.164	3.2	0.15	0.997
Comprehension	98.7	96.8	1.8	0.252	1.9	0.11	0.847
Broad math score	92.7	92.3	0.4	0.758	0.5	0.03	0.296
Calculation	88.3	87.6	0.7	0.641	0.8	0.04	0.487
Applied problems	97.4	96.9	0.5	0.765	0.5	0.03	0.252
Parent ratings of achievement							
Overall achievement	3.7	3.7	0.1	0.388	2.4	0.08	0.446
Reading	3.7	3.4	0.3 ***	0.005	9.6	0.28	0.497
Math	3.7	3.6	0.1	0.318	2.7	0.09	0.106
Teacher ratings of achievement							
Social Skills Rating System academic subscale	3.2	3.1	0.2	0.155	6.1	0.18	0.157
Mock report card - total	2.9	2.8	0.1	0.527	3.0	0.08	0.720
Mock report card - reading	2.8	2.8	0.1	0.609	2.6	0.07	0.889
Mock report card - math	2.7	2.7	-0.1	0.696	-2.0	-0.05	0.617
Classroom Behavior Scale	3.7	3.6	0.1	0.265	3.7	0.13	0.237
Teacher expectations for child	2.9	2.9	0.0	0.901	-0.6	-0.02	0.890
School progress							
Positive school progress: parent report	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.147	10.7	0.14	0.842
Receives gifted services: teacher report	1.2	1.1	0.0	0.690	2.2	0.06	0.329
Negative school progress: parent report	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.355	-11.4	-0.09	0.659
Receives remedial services: teacher report	1.5	1.5	0.0	0.902	0.7	0.02	0.435
Time absent: teacher report	1.8	1.8	0.0	0.801	-1.8	-0.03	0.093
Time tardy: teacher report	1.6	1.7	-0.2	0.285	-8.9	-0.14	0.081
<u>Hispanic</u>							
Woodcock-Johnson test of achievement							
Total standard score	98.3	96.6	1.8	0.414	1.8	0.12	
Broad reading score	100.5	98.4	2.1	0.320	2.2	0.13	
Letter-word score	101.8	98.8	3.1	0.247	3.1	0.16	
Comprehension	99.8	98.0	1.8	0.475	1.9	0.11	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.6.3 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Differences Across Ethnicities ^b
Broad math score	95.0	93.5	1.5	0.565	1.6	0.09	
Calculation	93.2	89.6	3.7	0.161	4.1	0.19	
Applied problems	97.0	98.6	-1.6	0.615	-1.6	-0.09	
Parent ratings of achievement							
Overall achievement	3.9	3.8	0.1	0.387	3.0	0.11	
Reading	3.8	3.7	0.1	0.453	2.9	0.09	
Math	4.0	3.6	0.3 **	0.025	8.8	0.30	
Teacher ratings of achievement							
Social Skills Rating System academic subscale	3.4	3.3	0.1	0.564	3.1	0.10	
Mock report card - total	3.1	3.1	0.0	0.846	1.1	0.03	
Mock report card - reading	3.1	3.0	0.1	0.424	4.8	0.13	
Mock report card - math	3.2	3.0	0.1	0.510	4.5	0.12	
Classroom Behavior Scale	3.7	3.9	-0.1	0.535	-3.1	-0.12	
Teacher expectations for child	2.9	2.8	0.1	0.658	3.2	0.08	
School progress							
Positive school progress: parent report	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.642	5.9	0.07	
Receives gifted services: teacher report	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.826	-1.6	-0.04	
Negative school progress: parent report	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.216	-24.7	-0.17	
Receives remedial services: teacher report	1.3	1.4	-0.1	0.375	-7.6	-0.16	
Grade retention: teacher report	1.8	1.9	-0.1	0.241	-5.5	-0.26	
Time absent: teacher report	2.0	2.0	0.1	0.680	4.9	0.09	
Time tardy: teacher report	1.8	1.6	0.1	0.587	8.1	0.12	
White							
Woodcock-Johnson test of achievement							
Total standard score	97.0	93.0	4.0	0.266	4.3	0.28	
Broad reading score	96.3	95.0	1.3	0.657	1.4	0.08	
Letter-word score	94.9	92.2	2.7	0.438	2.9	0.14	
Comprehension	97.4	97.7	-0.3	0.928	-0.3	-0.02	
Broad math score	96.6	89.8	6.8 *	0.072	7.6	0.41	
Calculation	92.1	87.4	4.8	0.223	5.5	0.25	
Applied problems	100.7	93.6	7.2	0.130	7.7	0.42	
Parent ratings of achievement							
Overall achievement	3.5	3.7	-0.3	0.215	-7.0	-0.24	
Reading	3.6	3.4	0.3	0.268	8.3	0.24	
Math	3.4	3.7	-0.3	0.168	-7.9	-0.28	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.6.3 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Differences Across Ethnicities ^b
Teacher ratings of achievement							
Social Skills Rating System academic subscale	2.8	3.2	-0.4 *	0.089	-11.7	-0.37	
Mock report card - total	2.9	2.6	0.3	0.315	10.9	0.28	
Mock report card - reading	2.8	2.6	0.2	0.426	8.1	0.19	
Mock report card - math	2.8	2.6	0.2	0.436	7.4	0.17	
Classroom Behavior Scale	3.4	3.7	-0.3	0.165	-9.0	-0.33	
Teacher expectations for child	2.7	2.7	0.0	0.893	-1.3	-0.03	
School progress							
Positive school progress: parent report	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.848	3.9	0.04	
Receives gifted services: teacher report	1.0	1.1	-0.1	0.227	-7.3	-0.17	
Negative school progress: parent report	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.775	8.1	0.07	
Receives remedial services: teacher report	1.5	1.3	0.2	0.282	14.8	0.30	
Time absent: teacher report	2.3	1.6	0.7 ***	0.009	41.8	0.62	
Time tardy: teacher report	1.5	1.0	0.5 *	0.080	43.8	0.41	

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Table 6.1 presents the ranges of outcomes reported in this table.

For African-Americans, test results were available for 458 children; parent reports were available for 462 children; and teacher reports were available for 284 children. For Hispanics, test results were available for 229 children; parent reports were available for 236 children; and teacher reports were available for 156 children. For whites, test results were available for 108 children; parent reports were available for 109 children; and teacher reports were available for 76 children. Actual sample sizes for individual measures may vary as a result of missing data.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project
Appendix Table E.6.4
Impacts on Children's Beliefs and Motivation, by Age

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Age Groups ^b
<u>Ages 6-8</u>							
Competency beliefs							
Child's self-perceived ability							
English	5.7	5.8	-0.1	0.378	-2.1	-0.12	0.387
Math	6.0	6.1	-0.1	0.481	-1.4	-0.08	0.912
Aspirations and expectations							
Occupational aspiration	61.4	62.1	-0.7	0.788	-1.2	-0.04	0.883
Occupational expectation	61.4	60.3	1.1	0.684	1.8	0.05	0.641
Sample size	140	136					
<u>Ages 9-12</u>							
Competency beliefs							
Child's self-perceived ability							
English	5.9	5.9	0.0	0.925	-0.2	-0.01	
Math	5.9	5.9	0.0	0.918	-0.2	-0.01	
Child efficacy (Hope Scale)	4.8	4.8	0.0	0.942	0.2	0.01	
School engagement	4.2	4.2	0.1	0.502	1.7	0.08	
Aspirations and expectations							
Educational expectations							
Complete high school	4.5	4.5	0.0	0.715	0.9	0.05	
Attend college	4.5	4.5	0.0	0.927	-0.2	-0.01	
Complete college	4.4	4.2	0.1	0.303	3.5	0.13	
Occupational aspiration	68.0	67.8	0.2	0.948	0.2	0.01	
Occupational expectation	69.1	65.6	3.5	0.188	5.3	0.17	
Values for the future							
Work attitude	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.817	-0.5	-0.03	
Future beliefs - individual	3.9	3.8	0.1	0.379	1.6	0.11	
Future beliefs - community	4.6	4.7	-0.1	0.225	-1.6	-0.16	
Sample size	137	163					
<u>Ages 13-16</u>							
Competency beliefs							
Child's self-perceived ability							
English	5.8	5.7	0.1	0.303	2.6	0.14	
Math	5.3	5.4	-0.1	0.765	-1.0	-0.05	
Child efficacy (Hope Scale)	4.6	4.4	0.2 *	0.089	5.0	0.24	
School engagement	3.8	3.6	0.3 *	0.056	7.4	0.28	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.6.4 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Age Groups ^b
Aspirations and expectations							
Educational expectations							
Complete high school	4.8	4.7	0.1	0.567	1.1	0.07	
Attend college	4.3	4.0	0.3 *	0.069	6.9	0.28	
Complete college	4.2	3.8	0.4 **	0.023	9.7	0.34	
Occupational aspiration	69.7	68.5	1.2	0.668	1.8	0.06	
Occupational expectation	64.7	65.0	-0.3	0.931	-0.4	-0.01	
Values for the future							
Work attitude	4.2	4.2	0.1	0.496	1.4	0.09	
Future beliefs - individual	4.1	4.1	0.0	0.716	0.6	0.04	
Future beliefs - community	4.6	4.4	0.2 **	0.013	4.1	0.38	
Sample size	129	103					

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Table 6.3 presents the ranges of outcomes presented in this table.

Actual sample sizes for individual measures may vary as a result of missing data.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table E.6.5

Impacts on Children's Beliefs and Motivation, by Number of Parent's Potential Barriers to Employment

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
<u>No potential barriers</u>							
Competency beliefs							
Child's self-perceived ability							
English	5.7	5.9	-0.2	0.354	-2.6	-0.15	0.311
Math	5.5	6.0	-0.4 ***	0.003	-7.5	-0.43	0.006 †††
Child efficacy (Hope Scale)	4.8	4.8	0.0	0.973	-0.1	-0.01	0.507
School engagement	4.0	3.8	0.1	0.471	3.3	0.13	0.692
Aspirations and expectations							
Educational expectations							
Complete high school	4.7	4.6	0.1	0.591	1.9	0.11	0.898
Attend college	4.3	4.4	-0.1	0.644	-2.4	-0.11	0.423
Complete college	4.3	4.1	0.2	0.503	4.5	0.17	0.590
Occupational aspiration	66.8	69.3	-2.5	0.406	-3.6	-0.13	0.448
Occupational expectation	64.3	69.0	-4.6	0.126	-6.7	-0.23	0.139
Values for the future							
Work attitude	4.2	4.3	-0.1	0.381	-2.7	-0.18	0.399
Future beliefs - individual	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.982	-0.1	0.00	0.902
Future beliefs - community	4.6	4.5	0.1 *	0.092	2.9	0.27	0.515
Sample size	124	95					
<u>One potential barrier</u>							
Competency beliefs							
Child's self-perceived ability							
English	5.9	5.8	0.1	0.364	1.8	0.10	
Math	5.9	5.9	0.0	0.784	-0.5	-0.03	
Child efficacy (Hope Scale)	4.7	4.8	0.0	0.900	-0.4	-0.02	
School engagement	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.771	-0.9	-0.04	
Aspirations and expectations							
Educational expectations							
Complete high school	4.7	4.6	0.0	0.633	1.1	0.06	
Attend college	4.4	4.3	0.1	0.271	3.4	0.15	
Complete college	4.3	4.1	0.2	0.300	4.1	0.15	
Occupational aspiration	65.8	63.8	2.0	0.423	3.2	0.10	
Occupational expectation	65.6	62.0	3.5	0.181	5.7	0.17	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.6.5 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
Values for the future							
Work attitude	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.883	-0.3	-0.02	
Future beliefs - individual	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.795	0.5	0.03	
Future beliefs - community	4.6	4.6	0.0	0.701	0.6	0.06	
Sample size	172	168					
<u>Two potential barriers or more</u>							
Competency beliefs							
Child's self-perceived ability							
English	5.9	5.7	0.1	0.352	2.4	0.13	
Math	5.8	5.6	0.2	0.169	3.7	0.20	
Child efficacy (Hope Scale)	4.7	4.4	0.2	0.179	5.0	0.24	
School engagement	4.0	3.9	0.1	0.588	2.5	0.10	
Aspirations and expectations							
Educational expectations							
Complete high school	4.6	4.5	0.1	0.399	3.0	0.17	
Attend college	4.4	4.2	0.2	0.249	5.1	0.22	
Complete college	4.4	4.0	0.4 **	0.034	10.2	0.37	
Occupational aspiration	67.2	66.0	1.2	0.644	1.8	0.06	
Occupational expectation	64.2	63.2	1.1	0.731	1.7	0.05	
Values for the future							
Work attitude	4.3	4.2	0.1	0.410	2.6	0.17	
Future beliefs - individual	3.9	3.8	0.1	0.512	1.6	0.11	
Future beliefs - community	4.5	4.5	0.0	0.861	0.5	0.04	
Sample size	117	142					

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Table 6.3 presents the range of outcomes reported in this table.

Actual sample sizes for individual measures may vary as a result of missing data.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table E.6.6

Five-Year Impacts on Children's Beliefs and Motivation, by Ethnicity

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Differences Across Ethnicities ^b
<u>African-American</u>							
Competency beliefs							
Child's self-perceived ability							
English	5.9	5.9	0.0	0.919	0.2	0.01	0.921
Math	5.9	5.9	0.0	0.890	0.2	0.01	0.825
Child efficacy (Hope Scale)	4.8	4.6	0.2	0.103	3.9	0.20	0.212
School engagement	3.9	3.8	0.1	0.401	2.6	0.11	0.605
Aspirations and expectations							
Educational expectations							
Complete high school	4.7	4.6	0.1	0.501	1.2	0.07	0.913
Attend college	4.6	4.4	0.2 **	0.045	4.8	0.21	0.934
Complete college	4.4	4.1	0.3 **	0.034	6.9	0.26	0.803
Occupational aspiration	67.8	66.8	1.1	0.616	1.6	0.05	0.417
Occupational expectation	66.9	64.0	2.9	0.182	4.5	0.14	0.177
Values for the future							
Work attitude	4.3	4.2	0.0	0.616	1.0	0.07	0.092 t
Future beliefs - individual	4.0	3.9	0.1	0.392	1.4	0.10	0.935
Future beliefs - community	4.6	4.5	0.1	0.446	1.1	0.11	0.922
Sample size	240	216					
<u>Hispanic</u>							
Competency beliefs							
Child's self-perceived ability							
English	5.7	5.8	-0.1	0.726	-0.9	-0.05	
Math	5.6	5.7	-0.1	0.675	-1.2	-0.06	
Child efficacy (Hope Scale)	4.7	4.8	-0.1	0.492	-2.1	-0.11	
School engagement	4.1	4.1	0.0	0.750	-1.0	-0.04	
Aspirations and expectations							
Educational expectations							
Complete high school	4.7	4.6	0.1	0.489	1.9	0.11	
Attend college	4.3	4.2	0.1	0.529	3.1	0.13	
Complete college	4.3	4.1	0.2	0.289	5.9	0.22	
Occupational aspiration	65.8	63.8	2.0	0.468	3.1	0.10	
Occupational expectation	63.6	61.7	1.9	0.548	3.0	0.09	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.6.6 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Differences Across Ethnicities ^b
Values for the future							
Work attitude	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.864	-0.5	-0.03	
Future beliefs - individual	4.0	3.9	0.0	0.746	0.7	0.05	
Future beliefs - community	4.6	4.6	0.0	0.616	0.7	0.07	
Sample size	113	119					
White							
Competency beliefs							
Child's self-perceived ability							
English	5.6	5.7	-0.1	0.806	-1.3	-0.07	
Math	5.7	5.8	-0.1	0.575	-2.1	-0.11	
Child efficacy (Hope Scale)	4.4	4.7	-0.3	0.387	-6.5	-0.34	
School engagement	4.0	4.2	-0.2	0.550	-3.8	-0.17	
Aspirations and expectations							
Educational expectations							
Complete high school	4.5	4.3	0.2	0.551	5.4	0.29	
Attend college	4.2	4.0	0.2	0.592	5.5	0.23	
Complete college	4.2	3.6	0.6	0.148	16.2	0.53	
Occupational aspiration	63.9	68.8	-5.0	0.219	-7.2	-0.26	
Occupational expectation	62.9	69.7	-6.8 *	0.095	-9.8	-0.34	
Values for the future							
Work attitude	4.0	4.6	-0.6 ***	0.009	-12.4	-0.87	
Future beliefs - individual	3.9	3.9	0.0	0.940	-0.5	-0.03	
Future beliefs - community	4.5	4.6	0.0	0.947	-0.2	-0.02	
Sample size	45	62					

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Table 6.3 presents the ranges of outcomes reported in this table.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table E.6.7

Impacts on Children's Social and Risky Behavior, by Age

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Age Groups ^b
<u>Ages 6-8</u>							
Positive Behavior Scale							
Parent report	3.9	3.9	0.0	0.709	0.6	0.05	0.421
Teacher report	3.7	3.7	-0.1	0.601	-1.5	-0.08	0.556
Problem Behavior Scale							
Total: parent report	2.3	2.3	0.0	0.837	-0.6	-0.02	0.504
Total: teacher report	2.3	2.3	0.0	0.967	0.2	0.01	0.800
Externalizing: parent report	2.2	2.3	-0.1	0.282	-3.9	-0.13	0.907
Externalizing: teacher report	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.930	0.6	0.01	0.753
Internalizing: parent report	2.4	2.3	0.1	0.215	4.2	0.15	0.032 ††
Internalizing: teacher report	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.802	1.2	0.04	0.972
Disciplinary action: teacher report	2.9	2.5	0.4 *	0.071	15.4	0.28	0.132
Social relationships							
Peer relationships: child report	4.2	4.3	-0.1	0.487	-1.4	-0.09	0.318
Hostile intent total: child report	2.9	3.0	-0.1	0.698	-3.3	-0.05	0.896
Hostile intent - physical	1.1	1.3	-0.2	0.131	-17.4	-0.17	0.807
Hostile intent - social	1.8	1.7	0.1	0.529	6.3	0.08	0.511
Risky behavior							
Trouble index: parent report	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.269	-32.1	-0.07	0.559
<u>Ages 9-12</u>							
Positive Behavior Scale							
Parent report	3.9	3.8	0.1	0.370	1.6	0.11	
Teacher report	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.947	0.2	0.01	
Problem Behavior Scale							
Total: parent report	2.3	2.4	-0.1 *	0.088	-4.9	-0.21	
Total: teacher report	2.3	2.2	0.1	0.552	2.6	0.10	
Externalizing: parent report	2.3	2.4	-0.1	0.250	-4.2	-0.14	
Externalizing: teacher report	2.1	2.1	0.1	0.587	3.8	0.09	
Internalizing: parent report	2.3	2.4	-0.2 **	0.022	-7.0	-0.27	
Internalizing: teacher report	2.3	2.3	0.1	0.620	2.7	0.09	
Disciplinary action: teacher report	2.3	2.5	-0.2	0.320	-8.3	-0.15	
Social relationships							
Peer relationships: child report	4.1	4.0	0.1	0.188	2.8	0.16	
Hostile intent total: child report	3.2	3.5	-0.3	0.279	-7.5	-0.13	
Hostile intent - physical	1.3	1.4	-0.1	0.432	-9.4	-0.10	
Hostile intent - social	2.0	2.1	-0.1	0.353	-6.9	-0.11	
Peer conventional behaviors	3.4	3.5	-0.1	0.274	-2.7	-0.12	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.6.7 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Age Groups ^b
Risky behavior							
Trouble index: parent report	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.572	12.0	0.05	
Delinquent behavior: child report	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.130	4.1	0.17	
Peer delinquency	1.4	1.3	0.1	0.343	4.4	0.11	
Ages 13-16							
Positive Behavior Scale							
Parent report	3.9	3.7	0.1 **	0.043	3.9	0.28	
Teacher report	3.5	3.4	0.1	0.356	3.8	0.18	
Problem Behavior Scale							
Total: parent report	2.4	2.5	0.0	0.684	-1.4	-0.06	
Total: teacher report	2.3	2.3	0.0	0.707	-1.8	-0.07	
Externalizing: parent report	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.659	-1.8	-0.06	
Externalizing: teacher report	2.0	2.1	-0.1	0.586	-3.8	-0.09	
Internalizing: parent report	2.4	2.5	-0.1	0.456	-3.0	-0.12	
Internalizing: teacher report	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.787	1.3	0.05	
Disciplinary action: teacher report	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.990	0.1	0.00	
Social relationships							
Peer relationships: child report	4.2	4.2	0.0	0.821	-0.5	-0.03	
Hostile intent total: child report	3.0	3.2	-0.2	0.544	-5.6	-0.09	
Hostile intent - physical	1.1	1.1	-0.1	0.692	-6.2	-0.05	
Hostile intent - social	1.9	2.0	-0.1	0.599	-5.2	-0.08	
Peer conventional behaviors	3.2	3.1	0.1	0.358	3.3	0.13	
Risky behavior							
Trouble index: parent report	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.956	1.1	0.01	
Delinquent behavior: child report	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.470	2.5	0.11	
Had sex: child report	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.974	-0.3	0.00	
Got pregnant: child report	1.1	1.0	0.1	0.315	4.9	0.18	
Peer delinquency: child report	1.5	1.5	-0.1	0.560	-3.3	-0.10	

(continued)

Table E.6.7 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Table 6.5 presents the ranges of outcomes reported in the table.

For ages 6 to 8, teacher reports were available for 191 children; parent reports were available for 279 children; and child reports were available for 279 children. For ages 9 to 12, teacher reports were available for 193 children; parent reports were available for 303 children; and child reports were available for 303 children. For ages 13 to 16, teacher reports were available for 142 children; parent reports were available for 234 children; and child reports were available for 234 children. Actual sample sizes for individual measures may vary as a result of missing data.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table E.6.8

Impacts on Children's Social and Risky Behavior, by Number of Parent's Potential Barriers to Employment

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
<u>No potential barriers</u>							
Positive Behavior Scale							
Parent report	3.9	3.8	0.0	0.653	0.9	0.07	0.312
Teacher report	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.805	0.9	0.05	0.222
Problem Behavior Scale							
Total: parent report	2.3	2.3	0.0	0.615	-1.6	-0.07	0.794
Total: teacher report	2.2	2.3	-0.1	0.590	-2.9	-0.11	0.620
Externalizing: parent report	2.2	2.3	-0.1	0.487	-2.9	-0.09	0.897
Externalizing: teacher report	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.969	-0.3	-0.01	0.926
Internalizing: parent report	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.953	-0.2	-0.01	0.598
Internalizing: teacher report	2.2	2.3	-0.1	0.298	-5.5	-0.19	0.456
Disciplinary action: teacher report	2.4	2.5	-0.1	0.780	-2.9	-0.05	0.702
Social relationships							
Peer relationships: child report	4.2	4.1	0.1	0.619	1.2	0.07	0.955
Hostile intent total: child report	2.8	3.0	-0.2	0.506	-6.7	-0.10	0.158
Hostile intent - physical	1.0	1.1	-0.1	0.642	-8.2	-0.07	0.371
Hostile intent - social	1.8	1.9	-0.1	0.554	-5.7	-0.08	0.300
Peer conventional behaviors	3.4	3.3	0.1	0.410	3.3	0.14	0.058 †
Risky behavior							
Trouble index: parent report	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.757	-7.1	-0.03	0.900
Delinquent behavior: child report	1.2	1.1	0.1 *	0.084	7.4	0.31	0.482
Had sex: child report	1.3	1.2	0.1	0.513	9.1	0.15	0.647
Got pregnant: child report	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.383	-2.4	-0.08	0.394
Peer delinquency: child report	1.4	1.3	0.0	0.678	3.4	0.09	0.929
<u>One potential barrier</u>							
Positive Behavior Scale							
Parent report	4.0	3.8	0.1 **	0.030	3.7	0.27	
Teacher report	3.7	3.6	0.1	0.146	3.9	0.20	
Problem Behavior Scale							
Total: parent report	2.3	2.4	-0.1	0.158	-4.3	-0.18	
Total: teacher report	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.922	-0.4	-0.01	
Externalizing: parent report	2.3	2.4	-0.1	0.211	-4.6	-0.15	
Externalizing: teacher report	2.0	1.9	0.1	0.553	3.8	0.09	
Internalizing: parent report	2.3	2.4	-0.1	0.170	-4.5	-0.18	
Internalizing: teacher report	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.908	-0.6	-0.02	
Disciplinary action - teacher report	2.4	2.3	0.1	0.758	2.4	0.04	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.6.8

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
Social relationships							
Peer relationships: child report	4.2	4.2	0.0	0.830	0.4	0.03	
Hostile intent total: child report	3.2	3.2	0.1	0.780	2.1	0.03	
Hostile intent - physical	1.2	1.3	-0.1	0.580	-6.7	-0.07	
Hostile intent - social	2.0	1.9	0.1	0.414	6.7	0.10	
Peer conventional behaviors	3.2	3.4	-0.2	0.108	-5.4	-0.24	
Risky behavior							
Trouble index: parent report	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.786	6.6	0.03	
Delinquent behavior: child	1.2	1.1	0.0	0.468	2.6	0.11	
Had sex: child report	1.3	1.4	-0.1	0.551	-6.6	-0.12	
Got pregnant: child report	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.854	-1.0	-0.04	
Peer delinquency: child report	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.745	1.8	0.05	
Two potential barriers or more							
Positive Behavior scale							
Parent report	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.884	0.3	0.02	
Teacher report	3.5	3.6	-0.1	0.277	-3.3	-0.17	
Problem Behavior Scale							
Total: parent report	2.4	2.5	-0.1	0.383	-3.5	-0.15	
Total: teacher report	2.4	2.3	0.1	0.339	3.8	0.15	
Externalizing: parent report	2.3	2.5	-0.1	0.277	-5.1	-0.18	
Externalizing: teacher report	2.3	2.2	0.1	0.655	2.9	0.07	
Internalizing: parent report	2.4	2.5	-0.1	0.430	-3.5	-0.13	
Internalizing: teacher report	2.4	2.3	0.1	0.441	4.1	0.14	
Disciplinary action - teacher report	2.7	2.4	0.2	0.285	9.7	0.17	
Social relationships							
Peer relationships: child report	4.1	4.1	0.0	0.586	1.2	0.07	
Hostile intent total: child report	2.9	3.5	-0.6 **	0.024	-17.5	-0.30	
Hostile intent - physical	1.1	1.5	-0.4 **	0.025	-26.4	-0.30	
Hostile intent - social	1.8	2.0	-0.2	0.210	-11.0	-0.17	
Peer conventional behaviors	3.4	3.2	0.2	0.183	5.9	0.25	
Risky behavior							
Trouble index: parent report	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.839	-4.8	-0.03	
Delinquent behavior: child	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.931	0.5	0.02	
Had sex: child report	1.3	1.4	0.0	0.983	-0.3	-0.01	
Got pregnant: child report	1.1	1.0	0.1	0.332	11.2	0.38	
Peer delinquency: child report	1.5	1.5	0.0	0.944	-0.5	-0.01	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.6.8 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Table 6.5 presents the range of outcomes reported in this table.

For the group with no potential barriers, teacher reports were available for 139 children; parent reports were available for 222 children; and child reports were available for 222 children. For the group with one potential barrier, teacher reports were available for 224 children; parent reports were available for 345 children; and child reports were available for 345 children. For the group with two potential barriers or more, teacher reports were available for 167 children; parent reports were available for 263 children; and child reports were available for 263 children. Actual sample sizes for individual measures may vary as a result of missing data.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table E.6.9

Five-Year Impacts on Children's Social and Risky Behavior, by Ethnicity

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Differences Across Ethnicities ^b
<u>African-American</u>							
Positive Behavior Scale							
Parent report	3.9	3.8	0.1 *	0.071	2.5	0.18	0.721
Teacher report	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.781	0.7	0.04	0.782
Problem Behavior Scale							
Total: parent report	2.3	2.4	-0.1 **	0.024	-5.4	-0.23	0.259
Total: teacher report	2.3	2.3	0.0	0.805	0.8	0.03	0.667
Externalizing: parent report	2.3	2.4	-0.2 **	0.033	-6.5	-0.22	0.496
Externalizing: teacher report	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.985	-0.1	0.00	0.414
Internalizing: parent report	2.3	2.5	-0.1 *	0.078	-4.6	-0.18	0.233
Internalizing: teacher report	2.3	2.2	0.1	0.533	2.5	0.08	0.627
Disciplinary action: teacher report	2.4	2.5	-0.1	0.731	-2.2	-0.04	0.065 †
Social relationships							
Peer relationships: child report	4.2	4.2	0.0	0.485	1.2	0.07	0.021 ††
Hostile intent total: child report	3.0	3.3	-0.3	0.117	-9.4	-0.15	0.224
Hostile intent - physical	1.1	1.3	-0.1	0.329	-10.0	-0.10	0.472
Hostile intent - social	1.8	2.0	-0.2	0.152	-9.1	-0.14	0.134
Peer conventional behaviors	3.4	3.4	0.0	0.592	1.4	0.06	0.193
Risky behavior							
Trouble index: parent report	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.873	-2.4	-0.01	0.908
Delinquent behavior: child report	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.880	-0.4	-0.02	0.440
Peer delinquency	1.4	1.5	-0.1	0.384	-8.6	-0.17	0.039 ††
Got pregnant: child report	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.744	-1.5	-0.05	.
Peer delinquency: child report	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.548	-2.6	-0.07	0.639
<u>Hispanic</u>							
Positive Behavior Scale							
Parent report	4.0	3.9	0.0	0.715	0.7	0.06	
Teacher report	3.7	3.7	0.0	0.811	-0.8	-0.04	
Problem Behavior Scale							
Total: parent report	2.3	2.3	0.0	0.773	1.3	0.05	
Total: teacher report	2.3	2.1	0.1	0.286	5.4	0.19	
Externalizing: parent report	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.821	-1.1	-0.03	
Externalizing: teacher report	2.0	1.9	0.1	0.375	6.5	0.14	
Internalizing: parent report	2.4	2.4	0.1	0.547	2.9	0.11	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.6.9 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Differences Across Ethnicities ^b
Internalizing: teacher report	2.3	2.1	0.2	0.181	7.4	0.23	
Disciplinary action: teacher report	2.4	2.1	0.2	0.346	10.6	0.16	
Social relationships							
Peer relationships: child report	4.0	4.2	-0.1	0.138	-3.4	-0.20	
Hostile intent total: child report	3.1	3.0	0.1	0.788	2.8	0.04	
Hostile intent: physical	1.1	1.2	-0.1	0.660	-7.2	-0.07	
Hostile intent: social	2.0	1.8	0.2	0.326	11.2	0.15	
Peer conventional behaviors	3.2	3.4	-0.2	0.104	-7.0	-0.31	
Risky behavior							
Trouble index: parent report	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.784	-9.5	-0.03	
Delinquent behavior: child report	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.607	2.1	0.09	
Had sex: child report	1.1	1.2	-0.1	0.438	-7.6	-0.13	
Got pregnant: child report	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.657	1.9	0.07	
Peer delinquency: child report	1.4	1.3	0.0	0.586	3.4	0.09	
White							
Positive Behavior Scale							
Parent report	3.8	3.7	0.1	0.319	3.2	0.22	
Teacher report	3.5	3.6	-0.1	0.459	-3.0	-0.15	
Problem Behavior Scale							
Total: parent report	2.4	2.5	-0.1	0.389	-4.0	-0.17	
Total: teacher report	2.4	2.3	0.1	0.294	6.2	0.23	
Externalizing: parent report	2.5	2.6	-0.1	0.726	-2.3	-0.08	
Externalizing: teacher report	2.2	1.9	0.3	0.184	16.5	0.36	
Internalizing: parent report	2.3	2.4	-0.1	0.274	-5.2	-0.20	
Internalizing: teacher report	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.787	-2.0	-0.07	
Disciplinary action: teacher report	2.9	2.0	0.9 ***	0.002	45.1	0.66	
Social relationships							
Peer relationships: child report	4.3	4.0	0.3 ***	0.001	8.6	0.49	
Hostile intent total: child report	2.8	3.6	-0.8 **	0.042	-23.2	-0.41	
Hostile intent - physical	1.0	1.5	-0.5 *	0.069	-34.9	-0.40	
Hostile intent - social	1.8	2.3	-0.4 *	0.091	-19.8	-0.33	
Peer conventional behaviors	3.1	3.4	-0.2	0.372	-6.6	-0.29	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.6.9 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Differences Across Ethnicities ^b
Risky behavior							
Trouble index: parent report	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.606	17.8	0.11	
Delinquent behavior: child report	1.3	1.1	0.2	0.126	15.1	0.64	
Had sex: child report	1.7	1.0	0.7 **	0.036	64.9	0.89	
Got pregnant: child report	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.000	0.0	0.00	
Peer delinquency: child report	1.6	1.5	0.1	0.634	9.3	0.26	

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

For African-Americans, parent reports were available for 462 children; teacher reports were available for 284 children; and child reports were available for 462 children. For Hispanics, parent reports were available for 236 children; teacher reports were available for 156 children; and child reports were available for 236 children. For whites, parent reports were available for 109 children; teacher reports were available for 76 children; and child reports were available for 109 children. Actual sample sizes for individual measures may vary as a result of missing data.

Table 6.5 presents the ranges of outcomes reported in this table.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project
Appendix Table E.6.10
Impacts on Children's Health, by Age

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Age Groups ^b
<u>Ages 6-8</u>							
General medical conditions							
General health problems	1.3	1.2	0.1	0.284	4.8	0.14	0.746
General behavior problems	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.590	2.3	0.07	0.430
Other health condition	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.789	0.9	0.03	0.323
Overall health	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.975	-0.1	0.00	0.059 †
Health in past year							
Overnight hospital stay	1.0	1.1	0.0	0.381	-2.3	-0.12	0.121
Diagnosed illness	1.2	1.1	0.1	0.236	4.5	0.14	0.538
Received prescription drug	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.678	1.5	0.05	0.619
Received counseling or therapy	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.696	1.3	0.04	0.876
Health care facilities							
Used particular health care facility	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.627	-1.2	-0.05	0.955
Received medical advice over phone	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.239	5.6	0.17	0.622
Time between medical visits							
Time since last doctor visit	5.4	5.5	-0.1	0.471	-1.3	-0.08	0.850
Time since last dentist visit	4.7	4.7	0.0	0.801	-0.9	-0.03	1.000
Sample size	143	141					
<u>Ages 9-12</u>							
General medical conditions							
General health problems	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.906	0.6	0.02	
General behavior problems	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.722	-1.5	-0.04	
Other health condition	1.1	1.2	0.0	0.540	-2.5	-0.08	
Overall health	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.921	-0.3	-0.01	
Health in past year							
Overnight hospital stay	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.106	2.9	0.14	
Diagnosed illness	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.731	1.4	0.04	
Received prescription drug	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.397	-3.5	-0.11	
Received counseling or therapy	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.440	2.7	0.09	
Health care facilities							
Used particular health care facility	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.574	-1.8	-0.08	
Received medical advice over phone	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.629	1.9	0.06	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.6.10 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Age Groups ^b
Time between medical visits							
Time since last doctor visit	5.3	5.4	-0.1	0.581	-1.1	-0.07	
Time since last dentist visit	4.8	4.8	0.0	0.793	-0.8	-0.03	
Sample size	139	165					
<u>Ages 13-16</u>							
General medical conditions							
General health problems	1.3	1.2	0.0	0.777	1.4	0.04	
General behavior problems	1.3	1.2	0.1	0.189	6.4	0.19	
Other health condition	1.2	1.1	0.1	0.249	5.9	0.20	
Overall health	4.4	4.0	0.4 **	0.013	9.1	0.39	
Health in past year							
Overnight hospital stay	1.0	1.1	0.0	0.274	-3.1	-0.16	
Diagnosed illness	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.624	-2.1	-0.07	
Received prescription drug	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.578	-2.3	-0.07	
Received counseling or therapy	1.2	1.1	0.0	0.362	3.9	0.13	
Health care facilities							
Used particular health care facility	0.9	1.0	0.0	0.544	-2.4	-0.11	
Received medical advice over phone	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.898	-0.7	-0.02	
Time between medical visits							
Time since last doctor visit	5.2	5.4	-0.1	0.269	-2.8	-0.17	
Time since last dentist visit	4.7	4.8	0.0	0.804	-0.9	-0.04	
Sample size	134	109					

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Table 6.7 presents the ranges of outcomes reported in this table.

Actual sample sizes for individual measures may vary as a result of missing data.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Appendix Table E.6.11

Impacts on Children's Health, by Number of Parent's Potential Barriers to Employment

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
<u>No potential barriers</u>							
General medical conditions							
General health problems	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.621	-3.0	-0.08	0.205
General behavior problems	1.3	1.1	0.2 ***	0.001	17.9	0.47	0.000 †††
Other health condition	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.842	-1.0	-0.03	0.727
Overall health	4.4	4.1	0.3 *	0.056	6.7	0.30	0.079 †
Health in past year							
Overnight hospital stay	1.0	1.1	-0.1 *	0.064	-6.9	-0.37	0.064 †
Diagnosed illness	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.962	-0.2	-0.01	0.695
Received prescription drug	1.1	1.2	-0.1	0.294	-4.7	-0.15	0.818
Received counseling or therapy	1.1	1.2	-0.1	0.116	-6.3	-0.23	0.043 ††
Health care facilities							
Used particular health care facility	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.924	-0.3	-0.01	0.216
Received medical advice over phone	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.732	2.1	0.06	0.448
Time between medical visits							
Time since last doctor visit	4.9	5.4	-0.5 ***	0.002	-8.8	-0.55	0.001 †††
Time since last dentist visit	4.7	4.8	-0.1	0.663	-1.9	-0.08	0.100 †
Sample size	128	100					
<u>One potential barrier</u>							
General medical conditions							
General health problems	1.3	1.2	0.0	0.721	1.8	0.05	
General behavior problems	1.2	1.3	-0.1	0.146	-6.4	-0.20	
Other health condition	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.641	-1.6	-0.05	
Overall health	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.952	0.2	0.01	
Health in past year							
Overnight hospital stay	1.1	1.0	0.0	0.327	2.0	0.10	
Diagnosed illness	1.2	1.1	0.0	0.231	3.8	0.11	
Received prescription drug	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.771	-1.1	-0.04	
Received counseling or therapy	1.2	1.1	0.1 *	0.073	6.5	0.22	
Health care facilities							
Used particular health care facility	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.730	1.0	0.05	
Received medical advice over phone	1.0	0.9	0.1	0.106	8.1	0.24	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.6.11 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Difference Across Barrier Groups ^b
Time between medical visits							
Time since last doctor visit	5.4	5.4	0.0	0.768	0.6	0.04	
Time since last dentist visit	4.8	4.9	-0.1	0.575	-1.7	-0.07	
Sample size	179	175					
Two potential barriers or more							
General medical conditions							
General health problems	1.3	1.2	0.1	0.178	8.7	0.25	
General behavior problems	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.636	2.7	0.08	
Other health condition	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.700	2.4	0.08	
Overall health	4.2	4.3	-0.1	0.496	-2.5	-0.11	
Health in past year							
Overnight hospital stay	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.622	0.9	0.05	
Diagnosed illness	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.937	-0.3	-0.01	
Received prescription drug	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.557	-2.6	-0.08	
Received counseling or therapy	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.353	3.9	0.13	
Health care facilities							
Used particular health care facility	0.9	1.0	-0.1	0.154	-5.5	-0.25	
Received medical advice over phone	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.703	1.6	0.05	
Time between medical visits							
Time since last doctor visit	5.5	5.4	0.1	0.341	2.2	0.13	
Time since last dentist visit	4.8	4.5	0.3	0.134	6.8	0.26	
Sample size	122	147					

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Table 6.7 presents the range of outcomes reported in this table.

Actual sample sizes for individual measures may vary as a result of missing data.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project
Appendix Table E.6.12
Impacts on Children's Health, by Ethnicity

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Differences Across Ethnicities ^b
<u>African-American</u>							
General medical conditions							
General health problems	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.873	0.6	0.02	0.359
General behavior problems	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.547	2.4	0.07	0.923
Other health condition	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.771	-1.1	-0.04	0.057 †
Overall health	4.3	4.2	0.1	0.376	2.2	0.10	0.857
Health in past year							
Overnight hospital stay	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.733	-0.6	-0.03	0.746
Diagnosed illness	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.717	-1.1	-0.03	0.432
Received prescription drug	1.1	1.2	-0.1	0.159	-4.5	-0.14	0.365
Received counseling or therapy	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.479	-1.8	-0.06	0.097 †
Health care facilities							
Used particular health care facility	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.669	-1.4	-0.06	0.865
Received medical advice over phone	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.401	3.4	0.10	0.638
Time between medical visits							
Time since last doctor visit	5.3	5.4	-0.1	0.327	-1.9	-0.11	0.598
Time since last dentist visit	4.6	4.7	-0.1	0.489	-2.0	-0.08	0.251
Sample size	250	223					
<u>Hispanic</u>							
General medical conditions							
General health problems	1.3	1.2	0.1	0.146	8.9	0.25	
General behavior problems	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.469	4.1	0.11	
Other health condition	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.387	-3.8	-0.12	
Overall health	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.937	0.3	0.01	
Health in past year							
Overnight hospital stay	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.534	-2.2	-0.11	
Diagnosed illness	1.2	1.1	0.0	0.597	2.4	0.08	
Received prescription drug	1.1	1.2	0.0	0.904	-0.5	-0.02	
Received counseling or therapy	1.1	1.1	0.1 *	0.053	7.9	0.26	
Health care facilities							
Used particular health care facility	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.251	-3.0	-0.14	
Received medical advice over phone	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.869	0.8	0.02	

(continued)

Appendix Table E.6.12 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value for Difference	% Impact	Effect Size ^a	P-Value for Differences Across Ethnicities ^b
Time between medical visits							
Time since last doctor visit	5.3	5.5	-0.2	0.200	-3.2	-0.20	
Time since last dentist visit	5.0	5.0	-0.1	0.631	-1.6	-0.07	
Sample size	120	125					
White							
General medical conditions							
General health problems	1.4	1.3	0.1	0.574	5.2	0.16	
General behavior problems	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.959	0.4	0.02	
Other health condition	1.3	1.1	0.1	0.109	12.6	0.41	
Overall health	4.1	4.1	0.0	0.849	1.0	0.04	
Health in past year							
Overnight hospital stay	1.0	1.1	0.0	0.338	-3.8	-0.19	
Diagnosed illness	1.3	1.2	0.1	0.177	9.0	0.29	
Received prescription drug	1.4	1.3	0.1	0.411	6.5	0.22	
Received counseling or therapy	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.683	3.9	0.15	
Health care facilities							
Used particular health care facility	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.558	-2.6	-0.12	
Received medical advice over phone	1.0	0.9	0.1	0.389	10.1	0.30	
Time between medical visits							
Time since last doctor visit	5.5	5.5	0.0	0.884	0.5	0.03	
Time since last dentist visit	4.9	4.4	0.4	0.226	10.2	0.38	
Sample size	44	64					

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the New Hope five-year survey.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as *** = 1 percent, ** = 5 percent, and * = 10 percent.

Table 6.7 presents the ranges of outcomes reported in this table.

^aThe effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

^bA statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts differed significantly across the subgroup dimensions featured in this table. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across each of these dimensions is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

References

- Achenbach, T. 1991. *Manual for the Child Behavior Checklist 4-18 and 1991 Profile*. Burlington, VT: Child Behavior Checklist.
- Ashenfelter, O. 1978. "The Labor Supply Response of Wage Earners." In J. Palmer and J. Pechman (eds.), *Welfare in Rural Areas: The North Carolina-Iowa Income Maintenance Experiment*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Ashenfelter, O., and M. W. Plant. 1990. "Nonparametric Estimates of the Labor-Supply Effects of Negative Income Tax Programs." *Journal of Labor Economics* 8 (Pt. 2).
- Asher, S. R., and V. A. Wheeler. 1985. "Children's Loneliness: A Comparison of Rejected and Neglected Peer Status." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 53: 500-505.
- Berlin, G., W. Bancroft, D. Card, W. Lin, and P. K. Robins. 1998. *Do Work Incentives Have Unintended Consequences? Measuring "Entry Effects" in the Self-Sufficiency Project*. Ottawa: Social Research and Demonstration Corporation.
- Bernheimer, L. P., T. S. Weisner, and E. D. Lowe. Forthcoming, 2003. "Impacts of Children with Troubles on Working Poor Families: Experimental and Ethnographic Evidence." *Mental Retardation*.
- Benoit, D. 1996. *The New Hope Offer: Participants in the New Hope Demonstration Discuss Work, Family, and Self-Sufficiency*. New York: MDRC.
- Blau, D. 2000. "Child Care Subsidy Programs." Working Paper 7806. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. Web site: <http://papers.nber.org/papers/w7806.pdf>.
- Blau, D. M., and E. Tekin. 2001. *The Determinants and Consequences of Child Care Subsidy Receipts by Low-Income Families*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, Department of Economics.
- Bos, J. M., and R. C. Granger. 1999. *Estimating the Effects of Day Care Use on Children's School-Readiness: Evidence from the New Chance Demonstration*. New York: MDRC.
- Bos, J. M., A. C. Huston, R. Granger, G. Duncan, T. Brock, and V. McLoyd, with D. Crosby, C. Gibson, V. Fellerath, K. Magnuson, R. Mistry, S. Pogliinco, J. Romich, and A. Ventura. 1999. *New Hope for People with Low Incomes: Two-Year Results of a Program to Reduce Poverty and Reform Welfare*. New York: MDRC.
- Bos, J. M., and C. Michalopoulos. 2001. "Maternal Employment and Changes in Adolescent Outcomes: Evidence from Two Evaluations of Programs That Promote Work." Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Minneapolis.
- Broberg, A., H. Wessels, M. E. Lamb, and C. P. Hwang. 1997. "Effects of Day Care on the Development of Cognitive Abilities in 8-Year-Olds: A Longitudinal Study." *Developmental Psychology* 33: 62-69.

- Brock, T., F. Doolittle, V. Fellerath, and M. Wiseman. 1997. *Creating New Hope: Implementation of a Program to Reduce Poverty and Reform Welfare*. New York: MDRC.
- Brown-Lyons, M., A. Robertson, and J. Layzer. 2001. *Kith and Kin — Informal Child Care: Highlights from Recent Research*. New York: Columbia School of Public Health, National Center for Children in Poverty.
- Caldwell, B. M., and R. H. Bradley. 1984. *Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment*. Little Rock: University of Arkansas.
- Card, D., and P. K. Robins. 1996. "Do Financial Incentives Encourage Welfare Recipients to Work?: Evidence from the Canadian Self-Sufficiency Experiment." NBER Working Paper 5701. Pages 1–56 in Solomon W. Polachek (ed.), *Research in Labor Economics* [17]. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Carnegie Corporation. 1992. *A Matter of Time: Risk and Opportunity in the Out-of-School Hours*. New York: Carnegie Corporation.
- Cassidy, J., and S. R. Asher. 1992. "Loneliness and Peer Relations in Young Children." *Child Development* 63: 350–365.
- Chase-Lansdale, P. L., and L. D. Pittman. 2002. "Welfare Reform and Parenting: Reasonable Expectations." *Future of Children* 12: 167–183.
- Cohen, J. 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cook, T. D., M. B., Church, S. Ajanaku, W. R. Shadish Jr., K. Jeong-Ran, and R. Cohen. 1996. "The Development of Occupational Aspirations and Expectations Among Inner-City Boys." *Child Development* 67: 3368–3385.
- Crick, N. R., and K. A. Dodge. 1996. "Social Information-Processing Mechanisms on Reactive and Proactive Aggression." *Child Development* 67: 993–1002.
- Danziger, S., R. Haveman, and R. D. Plotnick. 1981. "How Income Transfer Programs Affect Work, Savings and Income Distribution: A Critical Review." *Journal of Economic Literature* 19: 975–1028.
- Dearing, E., K. McCartney, and B. A. Taylor. 2001. "Change in Family Income-to-Needs Matters More for Children with Less." *Child Development* 72: 1779–1793.
- Dubow, E. F., and M. F. Ippolito. 1994. "Effects of Poverty and Quality of the Home Environment on Changes in the Academic and Behavioral Adjustment of Elementary School-Age Children." *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology* 23: 401–412.
- Duncan, G. J., and J. Brooks-Gunn. 1997. "Income Effects Across the Life Span: Integration and Interpretation." Pages 596–610 in G. J. Duncan and J. Brooks-Gunn (eds.), *Consequences of Growing Up Poor*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Duncan, G. J., J. Brooks-Gunn, and P. K. Klebanov. 1994. "Economic Deprivation and Early Childhood Development." *Child Development* 65: 296–318.
- Duncan, G., J. Brooks-Gunn, W. Yeung, and J. Smith. 1998. "How Much Does Childhood Poverty Affect the Life Chances of Children?" *American Sociological Review* 63: 406–423.
- Eccles (Parsons) J., T. E. Adler, R. Futterman, S. B. Goff, C. M. Kaczala, J. L. Meece, and C. Midgley. 1983. "Expectancies, Values, and Academic Behaviors." Pages 75–146 in J. T. Spence (ed.), *Achievement and Achievement Motives: Psychological and Sociological Approaches*. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Eccles, J. S., and B. L. Barber. 1999. "Student Council, Volunteering, Basketball, or Marching Band: What Kind of Extracurricular Involvement Matters." *Journal of Adolescent Research* 14: 10–43.
- Eccles, J. S., and A. Wigfield. 1995. "In the Mind of the Actor: The Structure of Adolescents' Achievement Task Values and Expectancy-Related Beliefs." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 21 (3): 215–225.
- Edin, K., and L. Lein. 1997. *Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive Welfare and Low-Wage Work*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Ehrle, J., K. Seedfelt, K. Snyder, and P. McMahon. 2001. *Recent Changes in Wisconsin Welfare and Work, Child Care, and Child Welfare Systems*. Assessing the New Federalism. State Update No. 8 (September). Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Emlen, A. C., P. E. Koren, and K. H. Schultze. 1999. *From a Parent's Point of View: Measuring the Quality of Child Care*. Portland, OR: Portland State University.
- Entwisle, D. R., K. L. Alexander, and L. S. Olson. 1997. *Children, Schools, and Inequality*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Flanagan, C., J. Bowes, B. Jonsson, B. Csapo, and E. Sheblanova. 1998. "Ties That Bind: Correlates of Adolescents' Civic Commitments in Seven Countries." Pages 457–475 in C. Flanagan and L. Sherrod (issue eds.), "Political Development: Youth Growing Up in a Global Community." *Journal of Social Issues* 54 (3); P. Katz (general ed.).
- Fulbright-Anderson, K., A. Kubisch, and J. Connell (eds.). 1998. *Theory, Measurement, and Analysis*, vol. 2: *New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute.
- Fuller, B., S. L. Kagan, G. Caspary, and C. A. Gauthier. 2002. "Welfare Reform and Child Care Options for Low-Income Families." *Future of Children* 12: 97–119.
- Garrett, P., N. Ng'andu, and J. Ferron. 1994. "Poverty Experiences of Young Children and the Quality of Their Home Environments." *Child Development* 65: 331–345.
- Gennetian, L., G. Duncan, V. Knox, W. Vargas, E. Clark-Kauffman, and A. London. 2002a. *How Welfare and Work Policies for Parents Affect Adolescents: A Synthesis of Research*. New York: MDRC.

- Gennetian, L., A. Huston, D. Crosby, Y. Chang, E. Lowe, and T. Weisner. 2002b. *Making Child Care Choices: How Welfare and Work Policies Influence Parents' Decisions*. New York: MDRC.
- Gibson, C., and T. S. Weisner. 2002. "'Rational' and Ecocultural Circumstances of Program Take-Up Among Low-Income Working Parents." *Human Organization* 61: 154–166.
- Greenberg, M. H., J. Levin-Epstein, R. Q. Hutson, T. J. Ooms, R. Schumacher, V. Turetsky, and D. M. Engstrom. 2002. "The 1996 Welfare Law: Key Elements and Reauthorization Issues Affecting Children." *Future of Children* 12: 27–57.
- Gresham, F. M., and S. N. Elliott. 1990. *Social Skills Rating System Manual*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.
- Guo, G., and K. Harris. 2000. "The Mechanisms Mediating the Effects of Poverty on Children's Educational Achievement." *Demography* 37: 431–447.
- Hofferth, S. L. 1999. "Child Care in the First Three Years of Life and Preschoolers' Language and Behavior." Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM.
- Huesmann, L. R., K. Lagerspetz, and L. D. Eron. 1984. "Intervening Variables in the TV Violence-Aggression Relation: Evidence from Two Countries." *Developmental Psychology* 20: 746–775.
- Huston, A. C. 1991. *Children in Poverty: Child Development and Public Policy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Huston, A. C. 2002. "Reforms and Child Development." *Future of Children* 12 (1): 59–78.
- Huston, A. C., G. J. Duncan, R. C. Granger, J. M. Bos, V. C. McLoyd, and R. S. Mistry. 2001. "Work-Based Anti-Poverty Programs for Parents Can Enhance the School Performance and Social Behavior of Children." *Child Development* 72: 318–336.
- Isaacs, J. 2002. "Mothers' Work and Child Care." Chapter 12 in D. J. Besharov (ed.), *Family Well-Being After Welfare Reform*. College Park: Maryland School of Public Affairs, Welfare Reform Academy.
- Kerr, M., and H. Stattin. 2000. "What Parents Know, How They Know It, and Several Forms of Adolescent Adjustment: Further Support for a Reinterpretation of Monitoring." *Developmental Psychology* 36: 366–380.
- Killingsworth, M. R. 1976. "Must a Negative Income Tax Reduce Labor Supply? A Study of the Family's Allocation of Time." *Journal of Human Resources* 11: 354–365.
- Kubisch, A. C., C. H. Weiss, L. B. Schorr, and J. P. Connell. 1995. "Introduction," in J. Connell (ed.), *New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives: Concepts, Methods, and Contexts*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute.

- Lamb, M. E. 1997. "Nonparental Child Care: Context, Quality, Correlates, and Consequences." Pages 73–134 in I. Sigel and K. A. Renninger (eds.), *Child Psychology in Practice* (5th ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Layzer, J., and A. Collins. 2000. *National Study of Child Care for Low-Income Families: State and Community Substudy. Interim Report*. Prepared for Richard Jakopic and Gilda Morelli, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. Boston: Abt Associates.
- Layzer, J., and A. Collins. 2002. *National Study of Child Care for Low-Income Families: Interim Findings from the State and Community Substudy*. Boston: Abt Associates.
- LeBlanc, M., and R. Tremblay. 1988. "A Study of Factors Associated with the Stability of Hidden Delinquency." *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth* 1: 269–291.
- Lieber, E., T. S. Weisner, and M. Presley. Forthcoming, 2003. "EthnoNotes: An Internet-Based Fieldnote Management Tool." *Field Methods*.
- Lowe, T., and T. S. Weisner. 2001. "You Have to Push It — Who's Gonna Raise Your Kids?: Situating Child Care in the Daily Routines of Low-Income Families." Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Minneapolis.
- Lowe, T., and T. S. Weisner. Forthcoming, 2003. "You Have to Push It — Who's Gonna Raise Your Kids? Situating Child Care in the Daily Routines of Low-Income Families." *Children and Youth Services Review*.
- Lowe, T., T. S. Weisner, and S. Geis. 2003. "Instability in Child Care: Ethnographic Evidence from Working Poor Families in the New Hope Intervention." Manuscript in preparation. Los Angeles: University of California, Center for Culture and Health.
- Lytton, H. 1990. "Child and Parent Effects in Boys' Conduct Disorder: A Reinterpretation." *Developmental Psychology* 26: 683–697.
- Magnuson, K., and G. Duncan. 2002. "Economics and Parenting." *Parenting: Science and Practice* 2: 437–450.
- McLoyd, V. C. 1990. "The Impact of Economic Hardship on Black Families and Children: Psychological Distress, Parenting, and Socioemotional Development." *Child Development* 61: 311–346.
- McLoyd, V. C. 1998. "Socioeconomic Disadvantage and Child Development." *American Psychologist* 53: 185–204.
- McLoyd, V. C., T. E. Jayaratne, R. Ceballo, and J. Borquez. 1994. "Unemployment and Work Interruption Among African American Single Mothers: Effects on Parenting and Adolescent Socioemotional Functioning." *Child Development* 65: 562–589.
- Michalopoulos, C., D. Tattrie, C. Miller, P. K. Robins, P. Morris, D. Gyarmati, C. Redcross, K. Foley, and R. Ford. 2002. *Making Work Pay: Final Report on the Self-Sufficiency Project*

- for Long-Term Welfare Recipients*. Ottawa: Social Research and Demonstration Corporation.
- Miller, B. M., S. O'Connor, and S. W. Sirignano. 1995. "Out-of-School Time: A Study of Children in Three Low-Income Neighborhoods." *Child Welfare* 74: 1249–1280.
- Moore, K. A., and A. K. Driscoll. 1997. "Low-Wage Maternal Employment and Outcomes for Children." *Future of Children* 7: 122–127.
- Morris, P. A., A. C. Huston, G. J. Duncan, D. A. Crosby, and J. M. Bos. 2001. *How Welfare and Work Policies Affect Children: A Synthesis of Research*. New York: MDRC.
- Mussen, P. H., J. J. Conger, J. Kagan, and A. C. Huston, 1990. "Intelligence and Achievement." Pages 335–377 in *Child Development and Personality* (7th ed.). New York: Harper and Row.
- Nakeo, K., and J. Treas. 1994. "Updating Occupational Prestige and Socioeconomic Status Scores: How the New Measures Measure Up." Pages 1–72 in Peter Marsden (ed.), *Sociological Methodology*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell for the American Sociological Association.
- Newman, K. 2000. *No Shame in My Game: The Working Poor in the Inner City*. New York: Knopf and Russell Sage Foundation.
- NICHD [National Institute of Child Health and Development] Early Child Care Research Network. 2000. "The Relation of Child Care to Cognitive and Language Development." *Child Development* 71: 960–980.
- NICHD. 2002. "Early Child Care and Children's Development Prior to School Entry: Results from the NICHD Study of Early Child Care." *American Educational Research Journal* 39: 133–164. Web site: <http://secc.rti.org>.
- Olson, K., and L. Pavetti. 1996. *Personal and Family Challenges to the Successful Transition from Welfare to Work*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Parcel, T. L., and E. G. Menaghan. 1997. "Effects of Low-Wage Employment on Family Well-Being." *Future of Children* 7: 116–121.
- Pawasarat, J., 2000. "Analysis of Food Stamp and Medical Assistance Caseload Reductions in Milwaukee County: 1995–1999." Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin, Employment and Training Institute. Web site: <http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/ETI/barriers/fsmasum.htm>.
- Pettit, G. S., J. E. Bates, and K. A. Dodge. 1997. "Supportive Parenting, Ecological Context, and Children's Adjustment: A Seven-Year Longitudinal Study." *Child Development* 68: 908–924.
- Phillips, D. A., and A. Bridgmann. 1995. *Child Care for Low-Income Families: Summary of Two Workshops*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

- Poglinco, S. M., J. Brash, and R. C. Granger. 1998. *An Early Look at Community Service Jobs in the New Hope Demonstration*. New York: MDRC.
- Posner, J. K., and D. L. Vandell. 1994. "Low-Income Children's After-School Care: Are There Beneficial Effects of After-School Programs?" *Child Development* 65: 440–456.
- Posner, J. K., and D. L. Vandell. 1999. "After-School Activities and the Development of Low-Income Urban Children: A Longitudinal Study." *Developmental Psychology* 35: 868–879.
- Quint, J. C., J. M. Bos, and D. F. Polit. 1997. *New Chance: Final Report on a Comprehensive Program for Young Mothers in Poverty and Their Children*. New York: MDRC.
- Quint, J. C., D. F. Polit, J. M. Bos, and G. Cave. 1994. *New Chance: Interim Findings on a Comprehensive Program for Disadvantaged Young Mothers and Their Children*. New York: MDRC.
- Radloff, L. 1977. "The CES-D Scale: A Self-Report Depression Scale for Research in the General Population." *Applied Psychological Measurement* 1: 385–401.
- Robins, P. K., M. C. Keeley, R. G. Spiegelman, and R. W. West. 1978. "The Labor Supply Effects and Costs of Alternative Negative Income Tax Programs." *Journal of Human Resources* 13: 3–36.
- Robins, P. K., R. G. Spiegelman, S. Weiner, and J. G. Bell (eds.). 1980. *A Guaranteed Annual Income: Evidence from a Social Experiment*. New York: Academic Press.
- Robins, P. K., and R. W. West. 1983. "Labor Supply Response to the Seattle and Denver Income Maintenance Experiment." Pages 91–198 in *Final Report of the Seattle-Denver Income Maintenance Experiment*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Romich, J. L., and T. S. Weisner. 2000. "How Families View and Use the EITC: Advance Payment Versus Lump Sum Delivery." *National Tax Journal* LIII 4: 1245–1265.
- Scarr, S. 1998. "American Child Care Today." *American Psychologist* 53: 95–108.
- Scarr, S., and K. McCartney. 1983. "How People Make Their Own Environments: A Theory of Genotype Environmental Effects." *Child Development* 54: 424–435.
- Schultze, S. 2001. "Reforms of W-2 Postponed Until July; Slow Economy, Opposition to Changes Prompt Delay." *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, November 17.
Web site: www.jsonline.com/news/Metro/welf19111801a.asp.
- Smith, K. 2000. "Who's Minding the Kids? Child Care Arrangements." *Current Population Reports*, P70-70. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Economics and Statistics Administration.
- Snyder, C. R., S. C. Sympson, F. C. Ybasco, T. F. Borders, M. A. Babyak, and R. L. Higgins. 1996. "Development and Validation of the State Hope Scale." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 70: 321–335.
- Stack, C. 1974. *All Our Kin*. New York: Harper and Row.

- State of Wisconsin, Department of Workforce Development. 2001. *DWD Response to Milwaukee W-2 Partners*. Madison: State of Wisconsin.
- State of Wisconsin, Department of Workforce Development. 2002a. *Wisconsin TANF Fact Sheet*. Web site: www.dwd.state.wi.us/dws/tanf/pdf/tanffactsheet.pdf.
- State of Wisconsin, Department of Workforce Development. 2002b. *How Has Wisconsin Welfare Spending Changed?*
Web site: www.dwd.state.wi.us/dws/tanf/pdf/welfarespending.pdf.
- Statistics Canada. 1995. *Self-Sufficiency Project: Self Complete Questionnaire, Parents*. Montreal: Statistics Canada.
- Steinberg, L., S. D. Lamborn, S. M. Dornbusch, and N. Darling. 1992. "Impact of Parenting Practices on Adolescent Achievement: Authoritative Parenting, School Involvement, and Encouragement to Succeed." *Child Development* 63: 1266–1281.
- Swanson, G. E. 1950. "The Development of an Instrument for Rating Child-Parent Relationship." *Social Forces* 50: 84–90.
- Vandell, D. L., and J. Ramanan. 1992. "Effects of Early and Recent Maternal Employment on Children from Low-Income Families." *Child Development* 63: 938–949.
- Watson, J. E., R. S. Kirby, K. J. Kelleher, and R. H. Bradley. 1996. "Effects of Poverty on Home Environment: An Analysis of Three-Year Outcome Data for Low Birth Weight Premature Infants." *Journal of Pediatric Psychology* 21: 419–431.
- Weisner, T. S. 1984. "A Cross-Cultural Perspective: Ecocultural Niches of Middle Childhood." Pages 335–369 in A. Collins (ed.), *The Elementary School Years: Understanding Development During Middle Childhood*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Weisner, T. S. 1996. "Why Ethnography Should Be the Most Important Method in the Study of Human Development." Pages 305–324 in R. Jessor, A. Colby, and R. Shweder (eds.), *Ethnography and Human Development: Context and Meaning in Social Inquiry*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Weisner, T. S., L. Bernheimer, V. Espinosa, C. Gibson, E. Howard, and K. Magnuson. 1999. "From the Living Rooms and Daily Routines of the Economically Poor: An Ethnographic Study of the New Hope Effects on Families and Children." Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM.
- Weisner, T. S., L. P. Bernheimer, E. Lieber, C. Gibson, E. Howard, K. Magnuson, J. Romich, D. Syam, V. Espinosa, and E. Chmielewski. 2000. "Understanding Better the Lives of Poor Families: Ethnographic and Survey Studies of the New Hope Experiment." *Poverty Research News* 4: 10–12.
- Weisner, T. S., C. Gibson, E. D. Lowe, and J. Romich. 2002. "Understanding Working Poor Families in the New Hope Program." *Poverty Research News* 6: 3–5.
- Wiseman, M. *Who Got New Hope?* 1997. New York: MDRC.

- Woodcock, R. W., and M. B. Johnson. 1990. *Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery — Revised*. Allen, TX: DLM Teaching Resources.
- Woods, M. B. 1972. “The Unsupervised Child of the Working Mother.” *Developmental Psychology* 6: 14–25.
- Wright, J. C., and A. C. Huston. 1995. *Effects of Educational TV Viewing of Lower Income Preschoolers on Academic Skills, School Readiness, and School Adjustment One to Three Years Later*. Lawrence, KS: Center for Research on the Influences of Television on Children.
- Yoshikawa, H. 1999. “Welfare Dynamics, Support Services, Mothers’ Earnings, and Child Cognitive Development: Implications for Contemporary Welfare Reform.” *Child Development* 70: 779–801.
- Zaslow, M. J., J. L. Brooks, K. A. Moore, P. A. Morris, K. Tout, and Z. A. Redd. 2002. “Experimental Studies of Welfare Reform and Children.” *Future of Children* 12: 79–98.
- Zaslow, M. J., R. Dion, and D. R. Morrison. 1997. *Effects of the JOBS Program on Mother-Child Relations During the Early Months of Program Participation*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.
- Zaslow, M. J., and C. A. Emig. 1997. “When Low-Income Mothers Go to Work: Implications for Children.” *Future of Children* 7: 110–115.
- Zaslow, M. J., S. M. McGroder, G. Cave, and C. L. Mariner. 1999. “Maternal Employment and Measures of Children’s Health and Development Among Families with Some History of Welfare Receipt.” Pages 233–259 in R. Hodson and T. L. Arcel (eds.), *Research in the Sociology of Work*, vol. 7: *Work and Family*. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Zaslow, M. J., S. M. McGroder, K. A. Moore, and S. Le Menestral. 1999. “Behavior Problems and Cognitive School Readiness Among Children in Families with a History of Welfare Receipt: Diverging Patterns and Their Predictors.” Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM.
- Zaslow, M. J., B. A. Rabinovich, and J. T. D. Suwalsky. 1991. “From Maternal Employment to Child Outcomes: Preexisting Group Differences and Moderating Variables.” Pages 237–282 in J. V. Lerner and N. L. Galambos (eds.), *Employed Mothers and Their Children*. New York: Garland.

Recent Publications on MDRC Projects

Note: For works not published by MDRC, the publisher's name is shown in parentheses. With a few exceptions, this list includes reports published by MDRC since 1999. A complete publications list is available from MDRC and on its Web site (www.mdrc.org), from which copies of MDRC's publications can also be downloaded.

Reforming Welfare and Making Work Pay

Next Generation Project

A collaboration among researchers at MDRC and several other leading research institutions focused on studying the effects of welfare, antipoverty, and employment policies on children and families.

How Welfare and Work Policies Affect Children: A Synthesis of Research. 2001. Pamela Morris, Aletha Huston, Greg Duncan, Danielle Crosby, Johannes Bos.

How Welfare and Work Policies Affect Employment and Income: A Synthesis of Research. 2001. Dan Bloom, Charles Michalopoulos.

How Welfare and Work Policies for Parents Affect Adolescents: A Synthesis of Research. 2002. Lisa Gennetian, Greg Duncan, Virginia Knox, Wanda Vargas, Elizabeth Clark-Kauffman, Andrew London.

ReWORKing Welfare: Technical Assistance for States and Localities

A multifaceted effort to assist states and localities in designing and implementing their welfare reform programs. The project includes a series of "how-to" guides, conferences, briefings, and customized, in-depth technical assistance.

After AFDC: Welfare-to-Work Choices and Challenges for States. 1997. Dan Bloom.

Work First: How to Implement an Employment-Focused Approach to Welfare Reform. 1997. Amy Brown.

Business Partnerships: How to Involve Employers in Welfare Reform. 1998. Amy Brown, Maria Buck, Erik Skinner.

Promoting Participation: How to Increase Involvement in Welfare-to-Work Activities. 1999. Gayle Hamilton, Susan Scrivener.

Encouraging Work, Reducing Poverty: The Impact of Work Incentive Programs. 2000. Gordon Berlin.

Steady Work and Better Jobs: How to Help Low-Income Parents Sustain Employment and Advance in the Workforce. 2000. Julie Strawn, Karin Martinson.

Beyond Work First: How to Help Hard-to-Employ Individuals Get Jobs and Succeed in the Workforce. 2001. Amy Brown.

Project on Devolution and Urban Change

A multiyear study in four major urban counties — Cuyahoga County, Ohio (which includes the city of Cleveland), Los Angeles, Miami-Dade, and Philadelphia — that examines how welfare reforms are being implemented and affect poor people, their neighborhoods, and the institutions that serve them.

Big Cities and Welfare Reform: Early Implementation and Ethnographic Findings from the Project on Devolution and Urban Change. 1999. Janet Quint, Kathryn Edin, Maria Buck, Barbara Fink, Yolanda Padilla, Ollis Simmons-Hewitt, Mary Valmont.

Food Security and Hunger in Poor, Mother-Headed Families in Four U.S. Cities. 2000. Denise Polit, Andrew London, John Martinez.

Assessing the Impact of Welfare Reform on Urban Communities: The Urban Change Project and Methodological Considerations. 2000. Charles Michalopoulos, Johannes Bos, Robert Lalonde, Nandita Verma.

Post-TANF Food Stamp and Medicaid Benefits: Factors That Aid or Impede Their Receipt. 2001. Janet Quint, Rebecca Widom.

Social Service Organizations and Welfare Reform. 2001. Barbara Fink, Rebecca Widom.

Monitoring Outcomes for Cuyahoga County's Welfare Leavers: How Are They Faring? 2001. Nandita Verma, Claudia Coulton.

The Health of Poor Urban Women: Findings from the Project on Devolution and Urban Change. 2001. Denise Polit, Andrew London, John Martinez.

Is Work Enough? The Experiences of Current and Former Welfare Mothers Who Work. 2001. Denise Polit, Rebecca Widom, Kathryn Edin, Stan Bowie, Andrew London, Ellen Scott, Abel Valenzuela.

Readying Welfare Recipients for Work: Lessons from Four Big Cities as They Implement Welfare Reform. 2002. Thomas Brock, Laura Nelson, Megan Reiter.

Welfare Reform in Cleveland: Implementation, Effects, and Experiences of Poor Families and Neighborhoods. 2002. Thomas Brock, Claudia Coulton, Andrew London, Denise Polit, Lashawn Richburg-Hayes, Ellen Scott, Nandita Verma.

Comparing Outcomes for Los Angeles County's HUD-Assisted and Unassisted CalWORKs Leavers. 2003. Nandita Verma, Richard Hendra.

Monitoring Outcomes for Los Angeles County's Pre- and Post-CalWORKs Leavers: How Are They Faring? 2003. Nandita Verma, Richard Hendra.

Wisconsin Works

This study examines how Wisconsin's welfare-to-work program, one of the first to end welfare as an entitlement, is administered in Milwaukee.

Complaint Resolution in the Context of Welfare Reform: How W-2 Settles Disputes. 2001. Suzanne Lynn.

Exceptions to the Rule: The Implementation of 24-Month Time-Limit Extensions in W-2. 2001. Susan Gooden, Fred Doolittle.

Matching Applicants with Services: Initial Assessments in the Milwaukee County W-2 Program. 2001. Susan Gooden, Fred Doolittle, Ben Glispie.

Employment Retention and Advancement Project

Conceived and funded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), this demonstration project is aimed at testing various ways to help low-income people find, keep, and advance in jobs.

New Strategies to Promote Stable Employment and Career Progression: An Introduction to the Employment Retention and Advancement Project (HHS). 2002. Dan Bloom, Jacquelyn Anderson, Melissa Wavelet, Karen Gardiner, Michael Fishman.

Time Limits

Welfare Time Limits: State Policies, Implementation, and Effects on Families. 2002. Dan Bloom, Mary Farrell, Barbara Fink.

Leavers, Stayers, and Cyclers: An Analysis of the Welfare Caseload. 2002. Cynthia Miller.

Florida's Family Transition Program

An evaluation of Florida's initial time-limited welfare program, which includes services, requirements, and financial work incentives intended to reduce long-term welfare receipt and help welfare recipients find and keep jobs.

The Family Transition Program: Implementation and Three-Year Impacts of Florida's Initial Time-Limited Welfare Program. 1999. Dan Bloom, Mary Farrell, James Kemple, Nandita Verma.

The Family Transition Program: Final Report on Florida's Initial Time-Limited Welfare Program. 2000. Dan Bloom, James Kemple, Pamela Morris, Susan Scrivener, Nandita Verma, Richard Hendra.

Cross-State Study of Time-Limited Welfare

An examination of the implementation of some of the first state-initiated time-limited welfare programs.

Welfare Time Limits: An Interim Report Card. 1999. Dan Bloom.

Connecticut's Jobs First Program

An evaluation of Connecticut's statewide time-limited welfare program, which includes financial work incentives and requirements to participate in employment-related services aimed at rapid job placement. This study provides some of the earliest information on the effects of time limits in major urban areas.

Connecticut Post-Time Limit Tracking Study: Six-Month Survey Results. 1999. Jo Anna Hunter-Manns, Dan Bloom.

Jobs First: Implementation and Early Impacts of Connecticut's Welfare Reform Initiative. 2000. Dan Bloom, Laura Melton, Charles Michalopoulos, Susan Scrivener, Johanna Walter.

Connecticut's Jobs First Program: An Analysis of Welfare Leavers. 2000. Laura Melton, Dan Bloom.

Final Report on Connecticut's Welfare Reform Initiative. 2002. Dan Bloom, Susan Scrivener, Charles Michalopoulos, Pamela Morris, Richard Hendra, Diana Adams-Ciardullo, Johanna Walter.

Vermont's Welfare Restructuring Project

An evaluation of Vermont's statewide welfare reform program, which includes a work requirement after a certain period of welfare receipt, and financial work incentives.

Forty-Two-Month Impacts of Vermont's Welfare Restructuring Project. 1999. Richard Hendra, Charles Michalopoulos.

WRP: Key Findings from the Forty-Two-Month Client Survey. 2000. Dan Bloom, Richard Hendra, Charles Michalopoulos.

WRP: Final Report on Vermont's Welfare Restructuring Project. 2002. Susan Scrivener, Richard Hendra, Cindy Redcross, Dan Bloom, Charles Michalopoulos, Johanna Walter.

Financial Incentives

Encouraging Work, Reducing Poverty: The Impact of Work Incentive Programs. 2000. Gordon Berlin.

Minnesota Family Investment Program

An evaluation of Minnesota's pilot welfare reform initiative, which aims to encourage work, alleviate poverty, and reduce welfare dependence.

Reforming Welfare and Rewarding Work: Final Report on the Minnesota Family Investment Program. 2000:

Volume 1: Effects on Adults. Cynthia Miller, Virginia Knox, Lisa Gennetian, Martey Dodoo, Jo Anna Hunter, Cindy Redcross.

Volume 2: Effects on Children. Lisa Gennetian, Cynthia Miller.

Reforming Welfare and Rewarding Work: A Summary of the Final Report on the Minnesota Family Investment Program. 2000. Virginia Knox, Cynthia Miller, Lisa Gennetian.

Final Report on the Implementation and Impacts of the Minnesota Family Investment Program in Ramsey County. 2000. Patricia Auspos, Cynthia Miller, Jo Anna Hunter.

New Hope Project

A test of a community-based, work-focused antipoverty program and welfare alternative operating in Milwaukee.

New Hope for People with Low Incomes: Two-Year Results of a Program to Reduce Poverty and Reform Welfare. 1999. Johannes Bos, Aletha Huston, Robert Granger, Greg Duncan, Thomas Brock, Vonnice McLoyd.

Canada's Self-Sufficiency Project

A test of the effectiveness of a temporary earnings supplement on the employment and welfare receipt of public assistance recipients. Reports on the Self-Sufficiency Project are available from: Social Research and Demonstration Corporation (SRDC), 275 Slater St., Suite 900, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5H9, Canada. Tel.: 613-237-4311; Fax: 613-237-5045. In the United States, the reports are also available from MDRC.

Does SSP Plus Increase Employment? The Effect of Adding Services to the Self-Sufficiency Project's Financial Incentives (SRDC). 1999. Gail Quets, Philip Robins, Elsie Pan, Charles Michalopoulos, David Card.

When Financial Work Incentives Pay for Themselves: Early Findings from the Self-Sufficiency Project's Applicant Study (SRDC). 1999. Charles Michalopoulos, Philip Robins, David Card.

The Self-Sufficiency Project at 36 Months: Effects of a Financial Work Incentive on Employment and Income (SRDC). 2000. Charles Michalopoulos, David Card, Lisa Gennetian, Kristen Harknett, Philip K. Robins.

The Self-Sufficiency Project at 36 Months: Effects on Children of a Program That Increased Parental Employment and Income (SRDC). 2000. Pamela Morris, Charles Michalopoulos.

When Financial Incentives Pay for Themselves: Interim Findings from the Self-Sufficiency Project's Applicant Study (SRDC). 2001. Charles Michalopoulos, Tracey Hoy.

SSP Plus at 36 Months: Effects of Adding Employment Services to Financial Work Incentives (SRDC). 2001. Ying Lei, Charles Michalopoulos.

Making Work Pay: Final Report on the Self-Sufficiency Project for Long-Term Welfare Recipients (SRDC). 2002. Charles Michalopoulos, Doug Tattrie, Cynthia Miller, Philip Robins, Pamela Morris, David Gyarmati, Cindy Redcross, Kelly Foley, Reuben Ford.

Mandatory Welfare Employment Programs

National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies

Conceived and sponsored by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), with support from the U.S. Department of Education (ED), this is the largest-scale evaluation ever conducted of different strategies for moving people from welfare to employment.

Do Mandatory Welfare-to-Work Programs Affect the Well-Being of Children? A Synthesis of Child Research Conducted as Part of the National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies (HHS/ED). 2000. Gayle Hamilton.

Evaluating Alternative Welfare-to-Work Approaches: Two-Year Impacts for Eleven Programs (HHS/ED). 2000. Stephen Freedman, Daniel Friedlander, Gayle Hamilton, JoAnn Rock, Marisa Mitchell, Jodi Nudelman, Amanda Schweder, Laura Storto.

Impacts on Young Children and Their Families Two Years After Enrollment: Findings from the Child Outcomes Study (HHS/ED). 2000. Sharon McGroder, Martha Zaslow, Kristin Moore, Suzanne LeMenestrel.

What Works Best for Whom: Impacts of 20 Welfare-to-Work Programs by Subgroup (HHS/ED). 2000. Charles Michalopoulos, Christine Schwartz.

Evaluating Two Approaches to Case Management: Implementation, Participation Patterns, Costs, and Three-Year Impacts of the Columbus Welfare-to-Work Program (HHS/ED). 2001. Susan Scrivener, Johanna Walter.

How Effective Are Different Welfare-to-Work Approaches? Five-Year Adult and Child Impacts for Eleven Programs – Executive Summary (HHS/ED). 2001. Gayle Hamilton, Stephen Freedman, Lisa Gennetian, Charles Michalopoulos, Johanna Walter, Diana Adams-Ciardullo, Anna Gassman-Pines, Sharon McGroder, Martha Zaslow, Surjeet Ahluwalia, Jennifer Brooks.

Moving People from Welfare to Work: Lessons from the National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies (HHS/ED). 2002. Gayle Hamilton.

Los Angeles's Jobs-First GAIN Program

An evaluation of Los Angeles's refocused GAIN (welfare-to-work) program, which emphasizes rapid employment. This is the first in-depth study of a full-scale "work first" program in one of the nation's largest urban areas.

The Los Angeles Jobs-First GAIN Evaluation: First-Year Findings on Participation Patterns and Impacts. 1999. Stephen Freedman, Marisa Mitchell, David Navarro.

The Los Angeles Jobs-First GAIN Evaluation: Final Report on a Work First Program in a Major Urban Center. 2000. Stephen Freedman, Jean Knab, Lisa Gennetian, David Navarro.

Teen Parents on Welfare

Teenage Parent Programs: A Synthesis of the Long-Term Effects of the New Chance Demonstration, Ohio's Learning, Earning, and Parenting (LEAP) Program, and the Teenage Parent Demonstration (TPD). 1998. Robert Granger, Rachel Cytron.

Ohio's LEAP Program

An evaluation of Ohio's Learning, Earning, and Parenting (LEAP) Program, which uses financial incentives to encourage teenage parents on welfare to stay in or return to school.

LEAP: Final Report on Ohio's Welfare Initiative to Improve School Attendance Among Teenage Parents. 1997. Johannes Bos, Veronica Fellerath.

New Chance Demonstration

A test of a comprehensive program of services that seeks to improve the economic status and general well-being of a group of highly disadvantaged young women and their children.

New Chance: Final Report on a Comprehensive Program for Young Mothers in Poverty and Their Children. 1997. Janet Quint, Johannes Bos, Denise Polit.

Parenting Behavior in a Sample of Young Mothers in Poverty: Results of the New Chance Observational Study. 1998. Martha Zaslow, Carolyn Eldred, editors.

Center for Employment Training Replication

This study is testing whether the successful results for youth of a training program developed in San Jose can be replicated in 12 other sites around the country.

Evaluation of the Center for Employment Training Replication Sites: Interim Report (Berkeley Policy Associates). 2000. Stephen Walsh, Deana Goldsmith, Yasuyo Abe, Andrea Cann.

Focusing on Fathers

Parents' Fair Share Demonstration

A demonstration for unemployed noncustodial parents (usually fathers) of children on welfare. PFS aims to improve the men's employment and earnings, reduce child poverty by increasing child support payments, and assist the fathers in playing a broader constructive role in their children's lives.

Fathers' Fair Share: Helping Poor Men Manage Child Support and Fatherhood (Russell Sage Foundation). 1999. Earl Johnson, Ann Levine, Fred Doolittle.

Parenting and Providing: The Impact of Parents' Fair Share on Paternal Involvement. 2000. Virginia Knox, Cindy Redcross.

Working and Earning: The Impact of Parents' Fair Share on Low-Income Fathers' Employment. 2000. John M. Martinez, Cynthia Miller.

The Responsible Fatherhood Curriculum. 2000. Eileen Hayes, with Kay Sherwood.

The Challenge of Helping Low-Income Fathers Support Their Children: Final Lessons from Parents' Fair Share. 2001. Cynthia Miller, Virginia Knox.

Career Advancement and Wage Progression

Opening Doors to Earning Credentials

An exploration of strategies for increasing low-wage workers' access to and completion of community college programs.

Opening Doors: Expanding Educational Opportunities for Low-Income Workers. 2001. Susan Golonka, Lisa Matus-Grossman.

Welfare Reform and Community Colleges: A Policy and Research Context. 2002. Thomas Brock, Lisa Matus-Grossman, Gayle Hamilton.

Opening Doors: Students' Perspectives on Juggling Work, Family, and College. 2002. Lisa Matus-Grossman, Susan Gooden.

Opening Doors: Supporting CalWORKs Students at California Community Colleges: An Exploratory Focus Group Study. 2002. Laura Nelson, Rogéair Purnell.

Education Reform

Career Academies

The largest and most comprehensive evaluation of a school-to-work initiative, this study examines a promising approach to high school restructuring and the school-to-work transition.

Career Academies: Building Career Awareness and Work-Based Learning Activities Through Employer Partnerships. 1999. James Kemple, Susan Poglinco, Jason Snipes.

Career Academies: Impacts on Students' Engagement and Performance in High School. 2000. James Kemple, Jason Snipes.

Career Academies: Impacts on Students' Initial Transitions to Post-Secondary Education and Employment. 2001. James Kemple.

First Things First

This demonstration and research project looks at First Things First, a whole-school reform that combines a variety of best practices aimed at raising achievement and graduation rates in both urban and rural settings.

Scaling Up First Things First: Site Selection and the Planning Year. 2002. Janet Quint.

Closing Achievement Gaps

Conducted for the Council of the Great City Schools, this study identifies districtwide approaches to urban school reform that appear to raise overall student performance while reducing achievement gaps among racial groups.

Foundations for Success: Case Studies of How Urban School Systems Improve Student Achievement. 2002. Jason Snipes, Fred Doolittle, Corinne Herlihy.

Project GRAD

This evaluation examines Project GRAD, an education initiative targeted at urban schools and combining a number of proven or promising reforms.

Building the Foundation for Improved Student Performance: The Pre-Curricular Phase of Project GRAD Newark. 2000. Sandra Ham, Fred Doolittle, Glee Ivory Holton.

Accelerated Schools

This study examines the implementation and impacts on achievement of the Accelerated Schools model, a whole-school reform targeted at at-risk students.

Evaluating the Accelerated Schools Approach: A Look at Early Implementation and Impacts on Student Achievement in Eight Elementary Schools. 2001. Howard Bloom, Sandra Ham, Laura Melton, Julienne O'Brien.

Extended-Service Schools Initiative

Conducted in partnership with Public/Private Ventures (P/PV), this evaluation of after-school programs operated as part of the Extended-Service Schools Initiative examines the programs' implementation, quality, cost, and effects on students.

Multiple Choices After School: Findings from the Extended-Service Schools Initiative (P/PV). 2002. Jean Baldwin Grossman, Marilyn Price, Veronica Fellerath, Linda Jucovy, Lauren Kotloff, Rebecca Raley, Karen Walker.

School-to-Work Project

A study of innovative programs that help students make the transition from school to work or careers.

Home-Grown Lessons: Innovative Programs Linking School and Work (Jossey-Bass Publishers). 1995. Edward Pauly, Hilary Kopp, Joshua Haimson.

Home-Grown Progress: The Evolution of Innovative School-to-Work Programs. 1997. Rachel Pedraza, Edward Pauly, Hilary Kopp.

Project Transition

A demonstration program that tested a combination of school-based strategies to facilitate students' transition from middle school to high school.

Project Transition: Testing an Intervention to Help High School Freshmen Succeed. 1999. Janet Quint, Cynthia Miller, Jennifer Pastor, Rachel Cytron.

Equity 2000

Equity 2000 is a nationwide initiative sponsored by the College Board to improve low-income students' access to college. The MDRC paper examines the implementation of Equity 2000 in Milwaukee Public Schools.

Getting to the Right Algebra: The Equity 2000 Initiative in Milwaukee Public Schools. 1999. Sandra Ham, Erica Walker.

Employment and Community Initiatives

Jobs-Plus Initiative

A multisite effort to greatly increase employment among public housing residents.

Mobilizing Public Housing Communities for Work: Origins and Early Accomplishments of the Jobs-Plus Demonstration. 1999. James Riccio.

Building a Convincing Test of a Public Housing Employment Program Using Non-Experimental Methods: Planning for the Jobs-Plus Demonstration. 1999. Howard Bloom.

Jobs-Plus Site-by-Site: An Early Look at Program Implementation. 2000. Edited by Susan Philipson Bloom with Susan Blank.

Building New Partnerships for Employment: Collaboration Among Agencies and Public Housing Residents in the Jobs-Plus Demonstration. 2001. Linda Kato, James Riccio.

Making Work Pay for Public Housing Residents: Financial-Incentive Designs at Six Jobs-Plus Demonstration Sites. 2002. Cynthia Miller, James Riccio.

The Special Challenges of Offering Employment Programs in Culturally Diverse Communities: The Jobs-Plus Experience in Public Housing Developments. 2002. Linda Kato.

The Employment Experiences of Public Housing Residents: Findings from the Jobs-Plus Baseline Survey. 2002. John Martinez.

Children in Public Housing Developments: An Examination of the Children at the Beginning of the Jobs-Plus Demonstration. 2002. Pamela Morris, Stephanie Jones.

Jobs-Plus Site-by-Site: Key Features of Mature Employment Programs in Seven Public Housing Communities. 2003. Linda Kato.

Staying or Leaving: Lessons from Jobs-Plus About the Mobility of Public Housing Residents and Implications for Place-Based Initiatives. 2003. Nandita Verma.

Neighborhood Jobs Initiative

An initiative to increase employment in a number of low-income communities.

The Neighborhood Jobs Initiative: An Early Report on the Vision and Challenges of Bringing an Employment Focus to a Community-Building Initiative. 2001. Frieda Molina, Laura Nelson.

Structures of Opportunity: Developing the Neighborhood Jobs Initiative in Fort Worth, Texas. 2002. Tony Proscio.

Final Report on the Neighborhood Jobs Initiative: Lessons and Implications for Future Community Employment Initiatives. 2003. Frieda Molina, Craig Howard.

Connections to Work Project

A study of local efforts to increase competition in the choice of providers of employment services for welfare recipients and other low-income populations. The project also provides assistance to cutting-edge local initiatives aimed at helping such people access and secure jobs.

Designing and Administering a Wage-Paying Community Service Employment Program Under TANF: Some Considerations and Choices. 1999. Kay Sherwood.

San Francisco Works: Toward an Employer-Led Approach to Welfare Reform and Workforce Development. 2000. Steven Bliss.

Canada's Earnings Supplement Project

A test of an innovative financial incentive intended to expedite the reemployment of displaced workers and encourage full-year work by seasonal or part-year workers, thereby also reducing receipt of unemployment insurance.

Testing a Re-Employment Incentive for Displaced Workers: The Earnings Supplement Project. 1999. Howard Bloom, Saul Schwartz, Susanna Lui-Gurr, Suk-Won Lee.

MDRC Working Papers on Research Methodology

A series of papers that explore alternative methods of examining the implementation and impacts of programs and policies.

Building a Convincing Test of a Public Housing Employment Program Using Non-Experimental Methods: Planning for the Jobs-Plus Demonstration. 1999. Howard Bloom.

Estimating Program Impacts on Student Achievement Using "Short" Interrupted Time Series. 1999. Howard Bloom.

Using Cluster Random Assignment to Measure Program Impacts: Statistical Implications for the Evaluation of Education Programs. 1999. Howard Bloom, Johannes Bos, Suk-Won Lee.

The Politics of Random Assignment: Implementing Studies and Impacting Policy. 2000. Judith Gueron.

Assessing the Impact of Welfare Reform on Urban Communities: The Urban Change Project and Methodological Considerations. 2000. Charles Michalopoulos, Joannes Bos, Robert Lalonde, Nandita Verma.

Measuring the Impacts of Whole School Reforms: Methodological Lessons from an Evaluation of Accelerated Schools. 2001. Howard Bloom.

A Meta-Analysis of Government Sponsored Training Programs. 2001. David Greenberg, Charles Michalopoulos, Philip Robins.

Modeling the Performance of Welfare-to-Work Programs: The Effects of Program Management and Services, Economic Environment, and Client Characteristics. 2001. Howard Bloom, Carolyn Hill, James Riccio.

A Regression-Based Strategy for Defining Subgroups in a Social Experiment. 2001. James Kemple, Jason Snipes.

Explaining Variation in the Effects of Welfare-to-Work Programs. 2001. David Greenberg, Robert Meyer, Charles Michalopoulos, Michael Wiseman.

Extending the Reach of Randomized Social Experiments: New Directions in Evaluations of American Welfare-to-Work and Employment Initiatives. 2001. James Riccio, Howard Bloom.

Can Nonexperimental Comparison Group Methods Match the Findings from a Random Assignment Evaluation of Mandatory Welfare-to-Work Programs? 2002. Howard Bloom, Charles Michalopoulos, Carolyn Hill, Ying Lei.

Using Instrumental Variables Analysis to Learn More from Social Policy Experiments. 2002. Lisa Gennetian, Johannes Bos, Pamela Morris.

Using Place-Based Random Assignment and Comparative Interrupted Time-Series Analysis to Evaluate the Jobs-Plus Employment Program for Public Housing Residents. 2002. Howard Bloom, James Riccio

Intensive Qualitative Research Challenges, Best Uses, and Opportunities. 2003. Alissa Gardenhire, Laura Nelson

About MDRC

MDRC is a nonprofit, nonpartisan social policy research organization. We are dedicated to learning what works to improve the well-being of low-income people. Through our research and the active communication of our findings, we seek to enhance the effectiveness of social policies and programs. MDRC was founded in 1974 and is located in New York City and Oakland, California.

MDRC's current projects focus on welfare and economic security, education, and employment and community initiatives. Complementing our evaluations of a wide range of welfare reforms are new studies of supports for the working poor and emerging analyses of how programs affect children's development and their families' well-being. In the field of education, we are testing reforms aimed at improving the performance of public schools, especially in urban areas. Finally, our community projects are using innovative approaches to increase employment in low-income neighborhoods.

Our projects are a mix of demonstrations — field tests of promising program models — and evaluations of government and community initiatives, and we employ a wide range of methods to determine a program's effects, including large-scale studies, surveys, case studies, and ethnographies of individuals and families. We share the findings and lessons from our work — including best practices for program operators — with a broad audience within the policy and practitioner community, as well as the general public and the media.

Over the past quarter century, MDRC has worked in almost every state, all of the nation's largest cities, and Canada. We conduct our projects in partnership with state and local governments, the federal government, public school systems, community organizations, and numerous private philanthropies.

