

# **EXPERIMENTAL ANALYSIS OF NEIGHBORHOOD EFFECTS**

Jeffrey R. Kling, Jeffrey B. Liebman, and Lawrence F. Katz

June 2006

*Econometrica*, forthcoming

## WEB APPENDIX

This web appendix contains the following sections:

- B. Summary indices and mean effect sizes
- C. Calculation of adjusted p-values
- D. Comparison of outcomes to the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth
- E. Additional discussion of internal validity
- F. Additional results for adults
- G. Additional results for youth

## B. Summary indices and mean effect sizes

This paper reports results for outcomes that are summary indices, aggregating information across related outcomes. This aggregation improves statistical power to detect effects that are consistent across specific outcomes when these specific outcomes also have idiosyncratic variation. Focusing our interpretation on the indices helps us to form conclusions about the overall impact of the study and to reduce the number of statistical tests performed so as to reduce the chance of false positives. Specific outcomes are normalized to in standardized units to study mean effect sizes of the indices relative to the standard deviation of the control group.

To illustrate the creation of a summary index, the 15 specific outcomes for adults are shown in Table B1. Column 1 (labeled “raw”) shows the mean of each outcome for the control group. In this paper, we focus on normalized transformations of each outcome (labeled “norm”), where we subtract the mean of the control group and divide by the standard deviation of the control group. Let  $Y_k$  be the  $k$ th of  $K$  outcomes,  $\mu_k$  be the control group mean, and  $\sigma_k$  be the control group standard deviation. The normalized outcome is  $Y_k^* = (Y_k - \mu_k) / \sigma_k$ . The summary index is  $Y^* = \sum_k Y_k^* / K$ . We use the control group standard deviation to compare the treatment groups to their counterfactual, because this metric does not depend on which treatment (experimental or Section 8) is being analyzed.

In calculating the normed measure, we reverse the sign for adverse outcomes (welfare, government income, distress, depression, anxiety, poor general health, physical limitations, asthma, obesity, hypertension), so that a higher value of the normalized measure represents a more “beneficial” outcome. For earnings in 2001, the control group mean was 8829 and the experimental-control (E-C) difference was 246 -- a difference of .02 standard deviations, relative to the control group standard deviation. For asthma attack in the past year, the fraction having an attack was .21 in the control group, with an E-C difference of -.01. This is also a difference of .02 standard deviations, relative to the control group. This illustrates how we use this normalization in order to translate the magnitudes of different measures into standardized units.

The bottom row of Table B1 shows our summary index, which is the equally weighted average of the normalized transformations for each of the 15 outcomes. For twelve of the fifteen, the experimental group shows more beneficial outcomes than the control group, and the E-C difference for our summary index is .05 standard deviations. These results are based on

unadjusted mean differences for simplicity of illustration, and slightly larger in magnitude (with slightly smaller p-values) than our preferred regression-adjusted specification discussed in the text. For Table B1 and for the analyses in Table II, weights are calculated based assuming that if an individual was subsampled for any one outcome in the index then they were subsampled for all outcomes in the index.<sup>1</sup>

We interpret this summary index as aggregating information about related constructs, but do not intend to suggest that the measures within a domain are merely proxies for a single latent factor. For the fifteen key outcomes in our analysis of adults, there are three principal components with eigenvalues greater than one. Promax rotated factors do correspond to the a priori designation of the fifteen variables into the three domains pre-specified: economic self-sufficiency, physical health, and mental health. There is considerable variation that is not explained by the first principal component within each domain: 39% in economic self-sufficiency, 54% in mental health, and 64% in physical health. Relatedly, instead of equal weights of .2 on each variable, a principal components approach would have weights that ranged from .17-.24 in economic self-sufficiency, .12-.25 in mental health, and .13-.26 in physical health -- with lower weights on sleep, obesity, and hypertension. However, we do not believe that hypertension is less important than, say, asthma simply because it has lower correlation with self-reported overall health and with physical limitations (and consequently, with the first principal component of physical health); therefore, we do not adopt the principal component approach.

An alternative approach to estimating ITT effects on these summary constructs is to first estimate treatment effect for each outcome, standardized them, and then average them. This approach is very similar to that used for global significance testing in biostatistics (O'Brien 1984) and for effect sizes in educational meta-analysis (Hedges and Olkin 1985). Let  $\sigma_k^2$  equal the variance of  $Y_k$  for the control group. Equation (A1) defines the mean effect size,  $\tau$ , for a set of K outcomes based on the treatment effect estimates and the control group standard deviations.

---

<sup>1</sup> As discussed by Orr et al. (2003), subsampling was not conducted at the household level, but separately for youth surveys, testing, parental surveys, and blood pressure measurement depending upon what data had been collected at the time of subsampling. The assumption used in creating weights for indices is that an individual subsampled for any outcome (e.g., from the youth survey, testing, or parental report of high school completion) was subsampled for all outcomes in the index. This simplification drops data for a few individuals with partially complete information, but introduces no bias.

$$(A1) \quad \tau = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\pi_{2k}}{\sigma_k}$$

To calculate the sample variance of  $\tau$ , we need to account for the covariance of the estimates  $\pi_{2k}$ . We obtain this covariance matrix using the seemingly unrelated regression system shown in equation (A2). Point estimates for each outcome are identical to those obtained using equation (1) for a specific outcome. Let  $I_K$  be a K by K identity matrix and let  $Z$  and  $X$  be defined as in (1).

$$(A2) \quad Y = (I_K \otimes (Z \quad X))\theta + \nu \quad Y = (Y_1', \dots, Y_K)'$$

We calculate a point estimate, standard error, and p-value for  $\tau$  based on the parameters,  $\pi_{2k}$ , jointly estimated as elements of  $\theta$  in (A2). These estimates treat  $\sigma_k$  as known. Kling and Liebman (2004) show that delta method and bootstrap approaches yield very similar inferences using these statistical methods in a study of MTO youth.

If there were no missing data on survey items and  $X$  contained only a constant, then the mean effect size in equation (A1) would be identical to estimation using the summary index in equation (1). Equation (A2) is a more direct summary of the treatment effects on each specific outcome and it incorporates regression adjustment for each outcome. The summary index approach is simpler to compute and can be represented graphically which is why we use it in the paper.

A comparison of results from the two approaches is given in Table B2. As a practical matter, our results are not very sensitive to the specification for regression adjustment or to item nonresponse. Therefore, results from the two approaches are very similar.

*Additional reference:*

Hedges, Larry V. and Olkin, Ingram, 1985. *Statistical Methods for Meta-Analysis*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Table B1. Components of Summary Indices for Adults

	CM		E-C		S-C	
	Raw 1	Norm 2	Raw 3	Norm 4	Raw 5	Norm 6
<i>A. Economic Self-sufficiency</i>						
Employed	.52	0	.02	.05	.02	.04
Earnings in 2001	8829	0	262	.02	-5	-.00
Employed & not on welfare	.45	0	.03	.06	.02	.04
Receiving welfare	.30	0	-.04*	.08*	-.05*	.11*
Government income in 2001	250	0	54	-.01	-158	.04
<i>B. Physical health</i>						
Overall health fair or poor	.33	0	.01	-.03	.02	-.03
Trouble carrying/climbing	.44	0	-.02	.04	-.02	.04
Asthma attack in past year	.21	0	-.01	.02	-.01	.02
Obese	.47	0	-.05*	.10*	-.05*	.09*
Hypertension	.30	0	.02	-.05	.03	-.06
<i>C. Mental health</i>						
Distress z-score	.05	0	-.09*	.09*	-.04	.04
Depression in past 12 months	.16	0	-.03*	.08*	-.02	.05
Worrying	.39	0	-.02	.05	-.01	.01
Calm and peaceful	.46	0	.07*	.13*	.02	.04
Sleep 7-8 hours nightly	.45	0	.04	.07	.02	.03
<i>D. Adult overall index</i>						
		0		.05*		.03

*Notes.* Raw = unadjusted value. Norm = (unadjusted value - control mean)/(control standard deviation); sign reversed for risky behavior, mental health, and physical health. CM = Control mean. E-C = Experimental - Control. S-C = Section 8 - Control. Differences based on unadjusted means, with no covariates. Summary index is the mean of normalized values of component items. Sample sizes are 859 and 3484 for male youth and all adults, respectively. \* = p-value <.05.

Table B2. Summary Index and Mean Effect Size Results for Adults

	Summary Index		Mean Effect Size	
	E-C	S-C	E-C	S-C
	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)
Self-sufficiency [5 measures]	.017 (.031)	.037 (.033)	.016 (.031)	.034 (.034)
Mental health [5 measures]	.079* (.030)	.029 (.033)	.084* (.030)	.030 (.034)
Physical health [5 measures]	.012 (.024)	.019 (.026)	.016 (.024)	.017 (.027)
Overall [15 measures]	.036 (.020)	.028 (.022)	.039 (.020)	.027 (.022)

*Notes.* E-C: Experimental - Control. S-C: Section 8 - Control. Estimates are the mean of the standardized intent-to-treat effects, from equation (A1). Standard errors are derived from equation (A2), adjusted for correlation within individuals.

### C. Calculation of adjusted p-values

This appendix describes our algorithm for calculating familywise adjusted p-values. It is based on the Westfall-Young (1993, algorithm 2.8) free step-down resampling method, modified to utilize per-comparison p-values based on bootstrap estimates instead of asymptotic approximations.

For each parameter of interest,  $\tau_j$ , define  $\hat{\tau}_j$  as the estimated value from the actual data and  $p_j^c$  as the asymptotic per-comparison p-value on the test of the null hypothesis that  $\tau_j$  equals zero. Define N as the number of bootstrap replications. The per-comparison bootstrap p-value for  $\tau_j$  is  $p_j^b$ , and the Westfall-Young familywise adjusted p-value for  $\tau_j$  is  $p_j^a$ .

```
/* Calculate bootstrap p-values ( $p_j^b$ ) */
For j = 1 to J {
     $p_j^a = p_j^b = 0$ 
}
For i = 1 to N {
    Draw a sample of households with replacement.
    For j = 1 to J {
        Calculate  $\tau_{ij}^*$ , the estimated value of  $\tau_j^*$  for this bootstrap replication.
        Calculate the p-value  $r_{ij}$  for the test that  $\tau_{ij}^* = \hat{\tau}_j$ .
        If  $r_{ij} < p_j^c$ , then  $p_j^b = p_j^b + 1/N$ 
    }
}
```

/\* Calculate p-values for each replication under null hypothesis ( $s_{ij}$ ), ordering by  $r_{ij}$   
and imposing uniform p-value distribution across replications  
for each of J parameters \*/

Define  $r_j$  as a vector of length N with elements  $r_{ij}$

For  $j = 1$  to J {

Sort elements of  $r_j$  so  $r_{kj}$  is smallest value of  $r_j$  when k is 1

For  $k = 1$  to N {

$$s_{kj} = (k-.5)/N$$

}

}

/\* Calculate adjusted p-value ( $p_j^a$ ) \*/

For the J parameters in the family of tests, sort  $p_j^b$  such that j indexes family members in  
descending order of significance, so  $p_1^b$  is the smallest bootstrap p-value.

For  $k = 1$  to N {

$$q_{J+1} = 1$$

For  $j = J$  to 1 {

$$q_j = \min(s_{kj}, q_{j+1})$$

If  $q_j < p_j^b$ , then  $p_j^a = p_j^b + 1/N$

}

}

/\* Enforce monotonicity so that the order of outcomes according to bootstrap  
per-comparison p-values is weakly preserved according to adjusted p-values \*/

$$p_0^a = 0$$

For  $j = 1$  to J {

$$p_j^a = \max(p_{j-1}^a, p_j^a)$$

}

## D. Comparison of outcomes to the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth

Table D1. Risky behavior outcome means

	MTO			NLSY97	
	Exp (1)	Sec8 (2)	Control (3)	adjusted (4)	unadjusted (5)
A. Females					
Used marijuana in past 30 days	.07	.08	.13	.10	.16
Smoked in past 30 days	.14	.14	.19	.25	.33
Had alcohol in past 30 days	.14	.14	.21	.26	.44
Been or gotten someone pregnant	.25	.33	.27	.29	.14
B. Females -- gifted dropped					
Used marijuana in past 30 days	.07	.08	.14	.10	.15
Smoked in past 30 days	.14	.11	.20	.27	.33
Had alcohol in past 30 days	.13	.12	.23	.26	.43
Been or gotten someone pregnant	.26	.32	.27	.29	.14
C. Males					
Used marijuana in past 30 days	.19	.21	.12	.23	.18
Smoked in past 30 days	.24	.29	.13	.33	.33
Had alcohol in past 30 days	.21	.24	.14	.32	.46
Been or gotten someone pregnant	.16	.19	.12	.19	.07
D. Males -- gifted dropped					
Used marijuana in past 30 days	.18	.23	.13	.23	.18
Smoked in past 30 days	.22	.30	.12	.36	.33
Had alcohol in past 30 days	.19	.22	.13	.33	.45
Been or gotten someone pregnant	.17	.17	.12	.19	.07

Notes. Exp: Experimental. Sec8: Section 8. Con: Control. Columns 1-3 are unadjusted means using MTO survey weights. Column 5 is the unadjusted sample mean of NLSY97 Round 3 outcomes for ages 15-20 using NLSY97 survey weights. Using the same NLSY97 data, column 4 contains the predicted values from regressions of outcomes on covariates, based on MTO covariate means. Covariates were census tract poverty rate, sixth order polynomial in age, race white, race other non-black, adult head age 19-29, adult head age 30-39, adult head age 40-49, household size 2, household size 3, household size 4, adult head has car, adult head employed, adult head never married, adult head GED or high school graduate, adult head receiving welfare, missing parental interview, youth gifted classes, youth remedial classes, youth disabled, youth special medical needs. MTO covariates are from the MTO baseline survey. NLSY97 age and census tract poverty rate are as of Round 3 interview; other NLSY covariates are from Round 1, recoded to match MTO baseline covariates. Regressions were estimated separately for females and males and evaluated at the gender-specific means of the MTO baseline covariates (except missing parental interview indicator evaluated at NLSY97 mean). Panels B and D drop observations where youth had earlier been in gifted classes to illustrate the lack of sensitivity to the covariate Imbalance shown in Table A2.

## **E. Additional discussion of internal validity**

Regarding the internal validity of these results, two key concerns include the use of self-reports and the possibility of attrition bias. Most of the outcomes used in this paper were self-reported, and neither the participants nor the interviewers were blinded to the intervention. Thus, it is possible that the estimated impacts are due to some sort of reporting bias. However, the consistency between survey and administrative self-sufficiency estimates discussed in the main text and the negligible estimates of treatment effects for many outcomes help rule out the most obvious types of reporting bias. Given that the name of the demonstration is “Moving to Opportunity” and that it was promoted by HUD as a pathway to better jobs, one might expect employment and earnings to be the most likely outcomes to be exaggerated by the treatment groups, but this did not turn out to be the case. Also, in related MTO research studying youth arrests (Kling, Ludwig, and Katz 2005), self-reported and administrative data have generated similar results.

Additional supporting evidence finds strong beneficial effects on the mental health of female youth. Female adults and youth may have experienced similar outcomes from living in the same neighborhood, and the youth tend to have less awareness that their household had been randomly assigned to a group in the MTO demonstration five years ago and seem even less likely to provide biased reports.

Because some participants and interviewers were aware of treatment status, it is possible that some survey responses reflected what the participants thought the investigators wanted to hear rather than the truth or that interviewers themselves (though not told whether a respondent was a member of the intervention group) might surmise which group the respondent was in from where the person lives and somehow administer the questions or record the answers differently. If respondents were giving positive responses because they “won the lottery,” then we would have expected the Section 8 group (which received the most desirable lottery outcome, an unrestricted voucher) to report more positive responses than the Experimental group (which received a geographically restricted voucher) – but this did not occur for any outcome. For social desirability bias to be consistent with the results for youth, it would have to be very complex – positive bias for female substance use and mental health, negligible for female physical health, and negative for males – and the available evidence is not consistent with a broad, systematic effect of this sort. On measures where one might expect a strong social

desirability bias, such as obesity, poor health, dropping out of high school, or being idle (not working or in school), there are not significant treatment effects for youth. Moreover, using the same type of demographic adjustments as in Table A1, we find that the MTO treatment groups are within a couple of percentage points of similar youth in the NLSY97 on these measures (see Table D1), whereas social desirability bias might predict that they would report significantly more desirable behavior. A lack of systematic social desirability bias between the treatment and control groups is consistent with a low level of awareness among youth about treatment status from a housing voucher lottery that their parents participated in when they were ages 8-16 and how it affected their residential location 4-7 years later when they were 15-20 years old. To the extent that outcomes like risky behavior are under-reported by a constant factor (say, two-thirds of the time) in all groups, the lower prevalence in self-reported data does reduce the statistical power to detect treatment effects, but does not bias their direction or result in the appearance of treatment effects when the true effects are zero.

In terms of potential attrition bias, our effective survey response rate was 90 percent and it is possible that the characteristics of those who were not interviewed differed systematically across the three groups. However, response rates were similar across the randomly-assigned groups, and our estimation models control for baseline characteristics in order to reduce the sensitivity of our results to differential attrition. Of course, it is also possible that the individuals who were not interviewed in the three groups differed in their unobservable characteristics. Kling and Liebman (2004) conduct extensive bounds calculations for youth outcomes from the MTO interim evaluation. They show that worse case assumptions about missing data can change the results a great deal, but that the sign of summary measure estimates do not change under less extreme assumptions about missing data.

We have used the administrative data on employment, earnings, and welfare to compare estimates for full sample and for the sample with which we completed surveys and did not find significant differences. This analysis was based on the four states with individual-level UI data, and the five states with individual-level welfare data. For example, the experimental group ITT estimate of the five years after RA was .024 for employment and -.017 for welfare in the full sample, and .038 for employment and -.022 for welfare in the sample with completed surveys (using survey weights), with p-values on the differences of .25 for employment and .62 for welfare. The point estimates of the employment rates for the survey sample were consistently

higher than for the full administrative sample, and the p-values on this contrast for the six employment and earnings measures in Table IV ranged from .40 to .12. Further comparisons of the full sample to everyone we attempted to interview regardless of completion status (and therefore involving no attrition) found differences just as large or larger. Thus even these modest and statistically insignificant differences seem more likely to be the result of sampling variation from our subsampling of nonrespondents than of attrition bias.

## F. Additional results for adults

Table F1. List of Tables for Adult Results

---

Table	Title
F2	Effects on Selected Mediating Factors
F3	Effects on Economic Self-Sufficiency
F4	Effects on Earnings and Welfare Receipt — Administrative Data
F5	Effects on Mental Health and Physical Health
F6	Effects on Economic Self-Sufficiency and Health by Age at Randomization
F7	Effects on Employment by Age at Randomization, Administrative Data
F8	Effects on Earnings by Age at Randomization, Administrative Data
F9	Effects on Voucher Use, Housing and Neighborhood Quality, and Safety
F10	Effects on Social Networks
F11	Effects on Education, Training, Health Behaviors and Health Care Access
F12	Effects on Mobility and Housing Assistance, Access to Transportation, and Relative Income
F13	Baseline Characteristics of Adult Survey Respondents and the Full Adult Sample
F14	Effects on Change in Employment within Zip Code Between 1994 and 2001

---

Table F2. Effects on Selected Mediating Factors

	Experimental versus Control					Section 8 versus Control			
	CM	ITT	TOT	CCM	N	ITT	TOT	CCM	N
	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)	(vi)	(vii)	(viii)	(ix)
Average census tract poverty rate [ADDR]	.448	-.119*	-.256*	.449	2533	-.097*	-.160*	.463	2073
		(.007)	(.012)			(.006)	(.010)		
Average census tract poverty rate below 30% [ADDR]	.132	.345*	.739*	.131	2533	.242*	.401*	.130	2073
		(.018)	(.031)			(.020)	(.031)		
Average census tract share on public assistance [ADDR]	.228	-.063*	-.136*	.227	2533	-.055*	-.091*	.239	2073
		(.004)	(.008)			(.004)	(.006)		
Average census tract share of adults employed [ADDR]	.384	.074*	.159*	.386	2532	.056*	.093*	.379	2072
		(.004)	(.008)			(.004)	(.006)		
Average census tract share workers in professional and managerial occupations [ADDR]	.215	.041*	.087*	.207	2530	.016*	.027*	.210	2071
		(.004)	(.008)			(.004)	(.007)		
Respondent saw illicit drugs being sold or used in neighborhood during past 30 days [SR]	.457	-.118*	-.253*	.432	2481	-.104*	-.171*	.451	2023
		(.022)	(.046)			(.024)	(.039)		
Average census tract share minority [ADDR]	.898	-.074*	-.159*	.886	2533	-.025*	-.042*	.896	2073
		(.007)	(.014)			(.007)	(.012)		
Average census tract share minority below 50% [ADDR]	.058	.065*	.140*	.064	2533	.006	.010	.062	2073
		(.011)	(.024)			(.010)	(.017)		
Moved at least 10 miles from baseline address [ADDR]	.106	.054*	.116*	.154	2424	.028	.046	.111	2005
		(.016)	(.034)			(.018)	(.030)		
Housing has problem with mice, rats or cockroaches [SR]	.541	-.049*	-.104*	.479	2511	-.014	-.024	.500	2058
		(.022)	(.046)			(.023)	(.039)		
Has a friend who graduated college or who earns more than \$30,000 a year [SR]	.518	.053*	.113*	.513	2334	.032	.054	.511	1917
		(.022)	(.047)			(.025)	(.042)		
Attends church or religious service at least once a month [SR]	.426	-.031	-.066	.464	2521	.008	.014	.438	2064
		(.021)	(.046)			(.024)	(.039)		

*Notes.* ADDR = address history from tracking file linked to Census data. Census tract characteristics are the average for an individual's addresses from randomization through 2001 weighted by duration. Except for "managerial and professional occupations" (for which only 2000 Census data was used due to differences in the occupation classification used for the 1990 Census and 2000 Census), values for inter-census years are interpolated. SR = self-report. CM = control mean. Intent-to-treat (ITT) from equation (1), using covariates in Table A1 and weights described in the text. TOT = Treatment-on-treated from equation (2) estimated by two stage least squares with treatment group assignment indicator variables as the instruments for the treatment take-up indicator variables. CCM = control complier mean, as defined in the text. \* = statistically significant at the 5 percent level. Standard errors, adjusted for heteroscedasticity, are in parentheses.

Table F3. Effects on Economic Self-Sufficiency

	Experimental versus Control					Section 8 versus Control			
	CM (i)	ITT (ii)	TOT (iii)	CCM (iv)	N (v)	ITT (vi)	TOT (vii)	CCM (viii)	N (ix)
Adult employed and not on TANF [SR]	.453	.019 (.020)	.040 (.044)	.453	2521	.015 (.023)	.025 (.038)	.449	2066
Employed [SR]	.520	.015 (.021)	.033 (.044)	.533	2525	.024 (.023)	.040 (.038)	.522	2068
Earnings in 2001 [SR]	8839	125 (449)	268 (960)	9108	2386	-5 (486)	-9 (811)	9305	1950
Receiving TANF [SR]	.295	-.021 (.019)	-.046 (.040)	.325	2519	-.031 (.021)	-.051 (.034)	.320	2063
Income received from government sources during 2001 [SR]	2484	194 (184)	419 (398)	2248	2381	-110 (205)	-181 (336)	2297	1946

*Notes.* TANF = Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. SR = self-report. CM = control mean. Intent-to-treat (ITT) from equation (1), using covariates in Table A1 and weights described in the text. TOT = Treatment-on-treated from equation (2) estimated by two stage least squares with treatment group assignment indicator variables as the instruments for the treatment take-up indicator variables. CCM = control complier mean, as defined in the text. \* = statistically significant at the 5 percent level. Standard errors, adjusted for heteroscedasticity, are in parentheses.

Table F4. Effects on Earnings and Welfare Receipt — Administrative Data

	Experimental versus Control					Section 8 versus Control			
	CM (i)	ITT (ii)	TOT (iii)	CCM (iv)	N (v)	ITT (vi)	TOT (vii)	CCM (viii)	N (ix)
<b>A. Employment</b>									
Fraction of quarters employed in 2001 [ADMIN]	.508	-.017 (.017)	-.036 (.035)	.550	2910	.014 (.017)	.022 (.028)	.546	2411
Fraction of quarters employed in years 1 through 5 after RA [ADMIN]	.422	-.006 (.013)	-.012 (.028)	.468	2455	.001 (.014)	.001 (.023)	.447	2039
Fraction of quarters employed in year 5 after RA [ADMIN]	.499	.002 (.018)	.005 (.039)	.532	2455	.008 (.020)	.013 (.032)	.531	2039
<b>B. Earnings</b>									
Earnings in 2001 [ADMIN]	8490	-287 (400)	-612 (853)	9062	2910	41 (441)	67 (714)	8899	2411
Annualized earnings in years 1 through 5 after RA [ADMIN]	5948	-6 (295)	-13 (630)	5622	2455	90 (345)	143 (546)	5481	2039
Earnings in year 5 after RA [ADMIN]	7924	128 (417)	273 (890)	7475	2455	370 (471)	587 (744)	7313	2039
<b>C. TANF receipt</b>									
Fraction of quarters received TANF in 2001 [ADMIN]	.263	-.001 (.015)	-.001 (.031)	.281	2912	.005 (.016)	.008 (.026)	.265	2407
Fraction of quarters received TANF in year 5 after RA [ADMIN]	.276	-.011 (.018)	-.024 (.040)	.293	2041	.018 (.021)	.029 (.033)	.264	1569
<b>D. TANF amount</b>									
Amount of TANF received in 2001 [ADMIN]	1406	-44 (88)	-92 (187)	1653	2912	-92 (94)	-150 (153)	1493	2407
Amount of TANF payments received in year 5 after RA [ADMIN]	1316	-116 (96)	-263 (219)	1500	2041	7 (110)	11 (176)	1242	1569

*Notes.* ADMIN = administrative data. RA = random assignment. TANF = Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. CM = control mean. Intent-to-treat (ITT) from equation (1), using covariates in Table A1 and weights described in the text. TOT = Treatment-on-treated from equation (2) estimated by two stage least squares with treatment group assignment indicator variables as the instruments for the treatment take-up indicator variables. CCM = control complier mean, as defined in the text. Administrative data on employment and earnings are from state unemployment insurance (UI) records and data on TANF receipt are from state and county welfare agencies. Data were obtained for California (LA county only for TANF), Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts and New York. TANF data were analyzed at the individual level. UI estimates are based on cell data as described in the text, controlling for site and mean randomization quarter, baseline education, and baseline work status. \* = statistically significant at the 5 percent level. Standard errors, adjusted for heteroscedasticity, are in parentheses.

Table F5. Effects on Mental Health and Physical Health

	Experimental versus Control					Section 8 versus Control			
	CM (i)	ITT (ii)	TOT (iii)	CCM (iv)	N (v)	ITT (vi)	TOT (vii)	CCM (viii)	N (ix)
<b>A. Mental health</b>									
Psychological distress, K6 z-score [SR]	.050	-.092* (.046)	-.196* (.099)	.150	2531	-.033 (.051)	-.054 (.085)	.028	2069
Probability of major depressive episode [SR]	.164	-.027 (.014)	-.059 (.031)	.196	2529	-.013 (.016)	-.022 (.027)	.165	2070
Worried, tense, or anxious [SR]	.393	-.029 (.022)	-.061 (.047)	.456	2496	-.008 (.024)	-.013 (.040)	.411	2037
Calm and peaceful [SR]	.466	.061* (.022)	.131* (.047)	.443	2530	.014 (.024)	.024 (.040)	.487	2069
Sleeps at least 7 and <9 hours per night [SR]	.450	.033 (.022)	.070 (.048)	.447	2503	.016 (.025)	.026 (.041)	.443	2046
<b>B. Physical health</b>									
Has fair or poor health [SR]	.330	.017 (.019)	.036 (.041)	.295	2530	.011 (.021)	.019 (.036)	.310	2073
Has trouble carrying groceries or climbing stairs [SR]	.436	-.018 (.021)	-.039 (.045)	.423	2526	-.020 (.023)	-.034 (.038)	.418	2070
Had an asthma or wheezing attack during past year [SR]	.212	-.013 (.018)	-.027 (.038)	.206	2529	-.010 (.019)	-.017 (.032)	.208	2071
Obese, BMI $\geq$ 30 [SR]	.468	-.048* (.022)	-.103* (.047)	.502	2450	-.046 (.025)	-.077 (.041)	.491	1999
Has hypertension, [M] SBP $\geq$ 140 or DBP $\geq$ 90	.297	.022 (.020)	.048 (.045)	.241	2315	.022 (.023)	.037 (.039)	.267	1900

*Notes.* M = direct measurement. SR = self-report. CM = control mean. SBP = systolic blood pressure. DBP = diastolic blood pressure. Intent-to-treat (ITT) from equation (1), using covariates in Table A1 and weights described in the text. TOT = Treatment-on-treated from equation (2) estimated by two stage least squares with treatment group assignment indicator variables as the instruments for the treatment take-up indicator variables. CCM = control complier mean, as defined in the text. \* = statistically significant at the 5 percent level. Standard errors, adjusted for heteroscedasticity, are in parentheses.

Table F6. Effects on Economic Self-sufficiency and Health by Age at Randomization

	Age < 33 at RA			Age ≥ 33 at RA			Diff. by Age	
	CM	E-C ITT	S-C ITT	CM	E-C ITT	S-C ITT	E-C ITT	S-C ITT
	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)	(vi)	(vii)	(viii)
<b>A. Economic self-sufficiency</b>								
Adult employed and not on TANF [SR]	.467	.050 (.030)	.021 (.033)	.439	-.013 (.028)	.010 (.031)	-.063 (.040)	-.011 (.045)
Employed [SR]	.555	.032 (.030)	.032 (.033)	.484	-.001 (.028)	.015 (.031)	-.033 (.041)	-.017 (.045)
Earnings in 2001 [SR]	9643	589 (659)	-508 (691)	7980	-362 (609)	486 (689)	-951 (896)	994 (980)
Receiving TANF [SR]	.334	-.036 (.027)	-.042 (.030)	.254	-.006 (.026)	-.020 (.028)	.030 (.037)	.022 (.040)
Income received from government sources during 2001 [SR]	2420	-84 (252)	-382 (277)	2552	479 (269)	179 (295)	563 (370)	561 (400)
<b>B. Mental health</b>								
Psychological distress, K6 z-score [SR]	-.021	-.090 (.064)	-.051 (.069)	.125	-.095 (.067)	-.012 (.075)	-.005 (.092)	.039 (.102)
Probability of major depressive episode [SR]	.153	-.021 (.020)	-.013 (.021)	.177	-.035 (.021)	-.014 (.024)	-.014 (.029)	-.001 (.032)
Worried, tense, or anxious [SR]	.360	-.015 (.030)	.026 (.033)	.429	-.043 (.031)	-.043 (.034)	-.028 (.043)	-.069 (.047)
Calm and peaceful [SR]	.474	.051 (.031)	.025 (.033)	.457	.073* (.031)	.003 (.035)	.022 (.044)	-.023 (.048)
Sleeps at least 7 and <9 hours per night [SR]	.479	.045 (.031)	.027 (.034)	.420	.020 (.032)	.005 (.035)	-.026 (.045)	-.021 (.049)
<b>C. Physical health</b>								
Has fair or poor health [SR]	.248	-.012 (.026)	-.030 (.028)	.416	.046 (.029)	.054 (.033)	.057 (.039)	.084* (.043)
Has trouble carrying groceries or climbing stairs [SR]	.332	-.038 (.029)	-.043 (.031)	.545	.001 (.030)	.002 (.033)	.039 (.042)	.045 (.045)
Had an asthma or wheezing attack during past year [SR]	.205	-.028 (.025)	-.031 (.026)	.221	.003 (.025)	.011 (.028)	.031 (.035)	.042 (.038)
Obese, BMI ≥ 30 [SR]	.452	-.056 (.031)	-.069* (.034)	.484	-.040 (.032)	-.023 (.035)	.015 (.044)	.047 (.049)
Has hypertension, [M] SBP ≥ 140 or DBP ≥ 90	.227	-.030 (.027)	-.010 (.030)	.369	.075* (.031)	.055 (.035)	.104* (.041)	.064 (.046)

Notes. SR = self-report. M = direct measurement. SBP = systolic blood pressure. DBP = diastolic blood pressure. RA = random assignment. CM = control mean. E-C: Experimental - Control. S-C: Section 8 - Control. Intent-to-treat (ITT) from equation (2), using covariates in Table A1 and weights described in the text, where  $X$  also contains an indicator for age < 33 and  $Z$  contains interactions of age < 33 and age ≥ 33 with the treatment indicator. The total number of completed surveys was 1793 for adults under age 33 and 1733 for those 33 and older. \* = statistically significant at the 5 percent level. Standard errors, adjusted for heteroscedasticity, are in parentheses.

Table F7. Effects on Employment by Age at Randomization — Administrative Data

	Age < 33 at RA			Age ≥ 33 at RA			Diff. by Age	
	CM	E-C ITT	S-C ITT	CM	E-C ITT	S-C ITT	E-C ITT	S-C ITT
	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)	(vi)	(vii)	(viii)
<u>A. Fraction of quarters employed by calendar year, 4 states</u>								
1998 [ADMIN]	.473	-.015 (.024)	-.003 (.027)	.378	-.022 (.024)	.030 (.027)	-.008 (.034)	.034 (.038)
1999 [ADMIN]	.520	.010 (.024)	-.011 (.028)	.394	-.006 (.024)	.050 (.028)	-.017 (.034)	.061 (.039)
2000 [ADMIN]	.537	.055* (.025)	.011 (.028)	.440	-.009 (.026)	.026 (.028)	-.063 (.036)	.014 (.040)
2001 [ADMIN]	.549	.029 (.026)	.030 (.029)	.456	-.017 (.026)	-.002 (.029)	-.046 (.036)	-.031 (.041)
<u>B. Fraction of quarters employed by year since RA, 4 states</u>								
Year 1 After RA [ADMIN]	.363	-.036 (.022)	-.057* (.024)	.285	-.007 (.022)	.016 (.024)	.029 (.031)	.072* (.034)
Year 2 After RA [ADMIN]	.433	-.025 (.025)	-.055 (.029)	.324	.005 (.025)	.033 (.027)	.030 (.035)	.088* (.039)
Year 3 After RA [ADMIN]	.462	.024 (.026)	-.019 (.030)	.375	-.000 (.026)	.032 (.028)	-.024 (.037)	.051 (.041)
Year 4 After RA [ADMIN]	.490	.055* (.027)	.029 (.030)	.407	.002 (.026)	.055 (.030)	-.052 (.038)	.026 (.042)
Year 5 After RA [ADMIN]	.544	.055* (.027)	-.005 (.031)	.439	-.013 (.027)	.023 (.030)	-.068 (.038)	.028 (.043)
<u>C. Employment in 2001 from administrative versus survey data</u>								
Any positive earnings in 2001, 4 states [ADMIN]	.670	.017 (.028)	.055 (.031)	.549	-.017 (.028)	-.020 (.031)	-.035 (.039)	-.075 (.044)
Any positive earnings in 2001, 4 states [SR]	.690	.007 (.033)	.006 (.039)	.570	-.006 (.034)	.006 (.038)	-.013 (.047)	.001 (.055)
Any positive earnings in 2001, 5 states [SR]	.701	.013 (.028)	.014 (.034)	.578	-.027 (.029)	-.007 (.033)	-.040 (.041)	-.021 (.047)

Notes. ADMIN = administrative data. SR = self-report. RA = random assignment. CM = control mean. Intent-to-treat (ITT) from equation (1), using covariates in Table A1 and weights described in the text, where X also contains an indicator for age <33 and Z contains interactions of age<33 and age≥33 with the treatment indicator. \* = statistically significant at the 5 percent level. Standard errors, adjusted for heteroscedasticity, are in parentheses. Administrative data on individual earnings and employment are from California, Illinois, Maryland, and New York unemployment insurance records. Records were obtained for 1615 adults less than 33 years old and 1560 adults 33 and older.

Table F8. Effects on Earnings by Age at Randomization — Administrative Data

	Age < 33 at RA			Age ≥ 33 at RA			Diff. by Age	
	CM	E-C ITT	S-C ITT	CM	E-C ITT	S-C ITT	E-C ITT	S-C ITT
	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)	(vi)	(vii)	(viii)
<u>A. Annual earnings by calendar year, 4 states</u>								
1998 [ADMIN]	5377	68 (399)	-220 (439)	5140	8 (454)	588 (496)	-60 (605)	808 (659)
1999 [ADMIN]	6596	490 (486)	-302 (512)	6000	244 (539)	958 (594)	-246 (728)	1260 (781)
2000 [ADMIN]	7630	1117* (540)	-247 (574)	6956	-171 (547)	253 (594)	-1288 (768)	501 (822)
2001 [ADMIN]	8870	480 (608)	-441 (662)	7252	-348 (555)	344 (630)	-828 (820)	785 (909)
<u>B. Annual earnings by year since RA, 4 states</u>								
Year 1 After RA [ADMIN]	3885	-489 (350)	-857* (360)	3571	34 (376)	330 (413)	523 (514)	1187* (543)
Year 2 After RA [ADMIN]	4995	-377 (436)	-950* (439)	4581	441 (494)	430 (495)	818 (665)	1380* (661)
Year 3 After RA [ADMIN]	5692	544 (490)	-438 (509)	5314	381 (518)	850 (558)	-163 (718)	1288 (757)
Year 4 After RA [ADMIN]	6595	1011 (560)	256 (585)	6199	-68 (555)	1049 (624)	-1078 (791)	793 (851)
Year 5 After RA [ADMIN]	7727	1748* (610)	300 (644)	7276	-538 (594)	444 (684)	-2285* (857)	144 (929)
<u>C. Earnings in 2001 from administrative versus survey data</u>								
Earnings in 2001, 4 states [ADMIN]	8870	480 (608)	-441 (662)	7252	-348 (555)	344 (630)	-828 (820)	785 (909)
Earnings in 2001, 4 states [SR]	8869	864 (718)	-765 (746)	7550	4 (675)	515 (778)	-861 (982)	1280 (1087)
Earnings in 2001, 5 states [SR]	9643	589 (659)	-508 (691)	7980	-362 (609)	486 (689)	-951 (896)	994 (980)

Notes. ADMIN = administrative data. SR = self-report. RA = random assignment. CM = control mean. E-C: Experimental - Control. S-C: Section 8 - Control. Intent-to-treat (ITT) from equation (1), using covariates in Table A1 and weights described in the text, where  $X$  also contains an indicator for age <33 and  $Z$  contains interactions of age <33 and age ≥33 with the treatment indicator. \* = statistically significant at the 5 percent level. Standard errors, adjusted for heteroscedasticity, are in parentheses. Administrative data on individual earnings and employment are from California, Illinois, Maryland, and New York unemployment insurance records. Records were obtained for 1615 adults less than 33 years old and 1560 adults 33 and older.

Table F9. Effects on Voucher Use, Housing and Neighborhood Quality, and Safety

	CM (i)	Experimental - Control		Section 8 - Control	
		ITT (ii)	N (iii)	ITT (iv)	N (v)
<u>A. Used MTO Voucher</u>					
Moved using MTO voucher [ADDR]	.000	.467* (.015)	2533	.602* (.017)	2073
<u>B. Census tract characteristics</u>					
Average census tract poverty rate [ADDR]	.448	-.119* (.007)	2533	-.097* (.006)	2073
Average census tract share on public assistance [ADDR]	.228	-.063* (.004)	2533	-.055* (.004)	2073
Average census tract share of adults employed [ADDR]	.384	.074* (.004)	2532	.056* (.004)	2072
Average census tract share workers in professional and managerial occupations [ADDR]	.215	.041* (.004)	2530	.016* (.004)	2071
<u>C. Neighborhood quality</u>					
Very or somewhat satisfied with neighborhood [SR]	.476	.136* (.022)	2510	.106* (.024)	2056
Neighborhood problems index [SR]	.539	-.126* (.017)	2510	-.093* (.019)	2056
Negative exterior conditions of buildings and neighborhood [OBS]	.201	-.038* (.011)	2359	-.029* (.012)	1921
<u>D. Safety</u>					
Streets are safe or very safe during the day [SR]	.758	.090* (.018)	2501	.090* (.018)	2049
Streets are safe or very safe at night [SR]	.554	.141* (.022)	2480	.091* (.024)	2031
Member of household victimized by crime during past 6 months [SR]	.213	-.042* (.017)	2530	-.055* (.018)	2071
Saw drugs sold or used during past 30 days [SR]	.457	-.118* (.022)	2481	-.104* (.024)	2023
Police not coming when called is a problem in the neighborhood [SR]	.342	-.128* (.020)	2338	-.096* (.023)	1913
<u>E. Housing quality</u>					
Unit is in poor or fair condition [SR]	.473	-.096* (.022)	2504	-.067* (.024)	2051
Home problems index [SR]	.340	-.050* (.013)	2512	-.027 (.014)	2059
Interior of the home negative conditions index [OBS]	.190	-.013 (.010)	2397	-.016 (.011)	1950
Exterior of the home negative conditions index [OBS]	.170	-.034* (.011)	2415	-.028* (.012)	1969

*Notes.* ADDR = address history from tracking file linked to Census data on tract characteristics. Census tract characteristics are averaged across individual addresses since RA, weighted by duration. Except for “managerial and professional occupations” (for which only 2000 Census data was used due to differences in 1990 and 2000 occupation classifications), the characteristics of an address are a linear interpolation from the 1990 Census and 2000 Census. SR = self-report. OBS = interviewer observations. CM = control mean. Intent-to-treat (ITT) from equation (1), using covariates in Table A1 and weights described in the text. \* = statistically significant at the 5 percent level. Standard errors, adjusted for heteroscedasticity, are in parentheses.

Table F10. Effects on Social Networks

	CM (i)	Experimental - Control		Section 8 - Control	
		ITT (ii)	N (iii)	ITT (iv)	N (v)
Has three or more close friends [SR]	.351	.017 (.021)	2525	.006 (.023)	2071
Visits friends or relatives in their home at least once a week [SR]	.426	-.023 (.022)	2525	-.021 (.024)	2064
Visits friends or relatives in own home at least once a week [SR]	.428	-.023 (.022)	2525	.006 (.024)	2061
Has diffuse network of friends in which only a few friends know each other [SR]	.276	-.016 (.019)	2520	.025 (.022)	2062
Found current job through a friend, relative or acquaintance living in neighborhood [SR]	.075	.002 (.012)	2490	.018 (.013)	2041
Has no friends who live in the neighborhood [SR]	.588	.022 (.022)	2527	.048* (.024)	2067
Chats with neighbor at least once a week [SR]	.492	.020 (.022)	2523	.015 (.024)	2064
Has a friend who graduated college or earns more than \$30,000 a year [SR]	.518	.053* (.022)	2334	.032 (.025)	1917
Attends church or religious service at least once a month [SR]	.426	-.031 (.021)	2521	.008 (.024)	2064
Believes people can be trusted [SR]	.097	.011 (.014)	2505	.006 (.015)	2056
Experienced discrimination in a shop, restaurant, the neighborhood, child's school, or by police during the past 6 months [SR]	.244	-.038* (.018)	2532	-.045* (.019)	2072

*Notes.* SR = self-report. CM = control mean. Intent-to-treat (ITT) from equation (1), using covariates in Table A1 and weights described in the text. \* = statistically significant at the 5 percent level. Standard errors, adjusted for heteroscedasticity, are in parentheses.

Table F11. Effects on Education, Training, Health Behaviors and Health Care Access

	CM (i)	Experimental versus Control		Section 8 versus Control	
		ITT (ii)	N (iii)	ITT (iv)	N (v)
<u>A. Education and training</u>					
Years of education completed [SR]	11.047	.020 (.096)	2516	-.104 (.107)	2057
Has high school diploma or GED [SR]	.586	-.006 (.017)	2524	.020 (.020)	2063
Participated in job training since September 2000 [SR]	.181	-.018 (.016)	2523	.017 (.019)	2064
<u>B. Exercise and nutrition</u>					
Moderate physical exercise, fraction of week engaged in [SR]	.471	.025 (.018)	2516	.049* (.020)	2064
Diet, fraction of week ate green vegetables or fruit [SR]	.670	.030* (.014)	2511	.019 (.015)	2059
<u>C. Smoking and drinking</u>					
Smoking [SR]	.293	.010 (.020)	2512	.005 (.022)	2059
Binge drinking during past year [SR]	.073	.003 (.012)	2483	.006 (.013)	2035
<u>D. Health care access</u>					
Has health insurance [SR]	.849	.018 (.017)	2528	.006 (.018)	2067
Has a usual place to go when sick [SR]	.945	-.008 (.011)	2530	.011 (.011)	2072

Notes. SR = self-report. CM = control mean. Intent-to-treat (ITT) from equation (1), using covariates in Table A1 and weights described in the text. \* = statistically significant at the 5 percent level. Standard errors, adjusted for heteroscedasticity, are in parentheses.

Table F12. Effects on Mobility and Housing Assistance, Access to Transportation, & Relative Income

	CM (i)	Experimental versus Control		Section 8 versus Control	
		ITT (ii)	N (iii)	ITT (iv)	N (v)
<b>A. Mobility and housing assistance</b>					
Moved more than 10 miles from baseline address [ADDR]	.106	.054* (.016)	2424	.028 (.018)	2005
Currently receiving Section 8 [SR]	.255	.294* (.021)	2317	.345* (.023)	1907
Lives in baseline neighborhood or still has friends there [SR]	.746	-.050* (.020)	2526	-.086* (.021)	2065
Lives in baseline neighborhood or has friends from there who come to visit at least a couple of times a year [SR]	.613	-.083* (.022)	2525	-.080* (.023)	2064
Lives in baseline neighborhood or goes back to visit at least a couple of times a year [SR]	.664	-.071* (.021)	2522	-.084* (.022)	2062
<b>B. Access to transportation</b>					
Takes less than 15 minutes to get to nearest bus or train stop [SR]	.921	.015 (.012)	2493	-.003 (.015)	2042
Someone in household has a car, van or truck that runs [SR]	.381	.011 (.020)	2529	.026 (.022)	2070
Has a valid driver's license [SR]	.454	.016 (.020)	2532	-.002 (.023)	2072
<b>C. Relative income</b>					
Household income as fraction of median household income for the tract [SR]	.811	-.177* (.033)	2220	-.174* (.034)	1817

Notes. ADDR = address history from tracking file and linked to Census data. SR = self-report. CM = control mean. Intent-to-treat (ITT) from equation (1), using covariates in Table A1 and weights described in the text. Relative income is household income from 2001 divided by the median household income for the Census tract for the year 1999 in 2001 dollars. \* = statistically significant at the 5 percent level. Standard errors, adjusted for heteroscedasticity, are in parentheses.

Table F13. Baseline Characteristics of Adult Survey Respondents and the Full Adult Sample

Variable	Controls		Experimental		Section 8	
	Respon- dents (i)	Full Sample (ii)	Respon- dents (iii)	Full Sample (iv)	Respon- dents (v)	Full Sample (vi)
<u>Demographics</u>						
Age in years (as of December 2001)	39.6	39.6	39.7	39.9	40.1	40.0
Male	.02	.02	.01	.02*	.02	.02
Baltimore site	.15	.15	.15	.15	.15	.15
Boston site	.21	.23	.22	.23	.22	.23
Chicago site	.22	.21	.23	.21*	.23	.21*
Los Angeles site	.16	.16	.16	.16	.15	.16
New York site	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25
African-American	.66	.66	.67	.64*	.66	.64*
Other race	.27	.27	.26	.28*	.26	.27
Hispanic ethnicity, any race	.29	.30	.29	.30*	.30	.31
Never married	.62	.63	.62	.62	.62	.62
Teen parent	.24	.25	.25	.25	.26	.26
<u>Economic and education</u>						
Working	.25	.25	.29	.27	.25	.25
On AFDC	.75	.74	.74	.74	.75	.75
In school	.16	.16	.16	.16	.16	.17
High school diploma	.38	.38	.41	.42	.41	.40
General equivalency diploma	.21	.22	.18	.18	.19	.20
<u>Household</u>						
Had car	.15	.15	.17	.18	.16	.17
Household member with a disability	.16	.16	.16	.16	.17	.15
Household member victimized by crime during past 6 months	.41	.41	.42	.43	.43	.42
No teen children	.62	.63	.59	.60	.61	.61
Household of size 2	.20	.20	.23	.22	.21	.21
Household of size 3	.32	.32	.30	.30	.31	.30
Household of size 4	.22	.22	.23	.23	.23	.23
<u>Neighborhood and housing</u>						
Lived in neighborhood 5+ years	.62	.61	.61	.60*	.63	.62
Moved > 3 times in past 5 years	.11	.11	.08	.09	.09	.09
Very dissatisfied with neighborhood	.46	.47	.46	.47	.47	.47
Streets very unsafe at night	.49	.50	.48	.49	.49	.50
Chats with neighbors 1+ / week	.55	.54	.52	.52	.50	.50
Very likely to tell neighbor if saw their child getting into trouble	.56	.57	.53	.55*	.55	.54
No family living in neighborhood	.65	.65	.65	.65	.62	.63
No friends living in neighborhood	.41	.41	.40	.41	.38	.39
Very sure would find an apartment in another part of city	.45	.45	.45	.46	.48	.49
To get away from gangs or drugs was primary or secondary reason for moving	.78	.78	.77	.77	.75	.76
Better schools was primary or secondary reason for moving	.48	.47	.47	.47	.52	.51
Had applied for S8 voucher before	.45	.44	.41	.42	.39	.39
N	1080	1310	1453	1729	993	1209

Notes: S8 = Section 8. Table consists of the covariates included in the regression models; age is included in the model as a sixth order Legendre polynomial rather than in years. \* = p-value < .05 on difference between respondents and full sample.

Table F14. Effects on Change in Employment within Zip Code Between 1994 and 2001

	CM (i)	Experimental versus Control		Section 8 versus Control	
		ITT (ii)	N (iii)	ITT (iv)	N (v)
<u>Residence 1 year after RA</u>					
Change from 1994 to 1995 in log of employment [ADDR]	-0.008	.010* (.003)	2462	.013* (.003)	2028
Change from 1994 to 1996 in log of employment [ADDR]	-.023	.005 (.005)	2462	-.000 (.006)	2028
Change from 1994 to 1997 in log of employment [ADDR]	-.028	.015* (.007)	2462	-.002 (.007)	2028
Change from 1994 to 1998 in log of employment [ADDR]	-.011	.007 (.007)	2462	-.006 (.008)	2028
Change from 1994 to 1999 in log of employment [ADDR]	.015	.005 (.008)	2462	-.012 (.009)	2028
Change from 1994 to 2000 in log of employment [ADDR]	.056	.001 (.009)	2462	-.029* (.010)	2028
Change from 1994 to 2001 in log of employment [ADDR]	.065	.001 (.009)	2462	-.032* (.010)	2028
<u>Residence in 2002</u>					
Change from 1994 to 1995 in log of employment [ADDR]	.005	.004 (.003)	2453	.012* (.005)	2021
Change from 1994 to 1996 in log of employment [ADDR]	-.009	-.006 (.007)	2453	.005 (.007)	2021
Change from 1994 to 1997 in log of employment [ADDR]	-.014	.004 (.008)	2453	.005 (.009)	2021
Change from 1994 to 1998 in log of employment [ADDR]	.001	.003 (.009)	2453	.001 (.009)	2021
Change from 1994 to 1999 in log of employment [ADDR]	.024	.002 (.010)	2453	-.003 (.010)	2021
Change from 1994 to 2000 in log of employment [ADDR]	.050	.002 (.010)	2453	-.007 (.011)	2021
Change from 1994 to 2001 in log of employment [ADDR]	.050	-.001 (.011)	2453	-.006 (.011)	2021

*Notes.* RA = randomization. ADDR = address history from tracking file linked to zip code-level employment data. Employment data is from the U.S. Census Bureau's Zip Code Business Patterns for 1994 through 2001. Total employment represents the sum of full- and part-time employees on the payroll of establishments in the zip code. For zip codes with suppressed employment data, employment was imputed as the midpoint of the relevant range indicated by the data suppression flag. Change in employment is defined as the log of employment in the later year minus the log of employment in 1994. CM = control mean. Intent-to-treat (ITT) from equation (1), using covariates in Table A1 and weights described in the text. \* = statistically significant at the 5 percent level. Standard errors, adjusted for heteroscedasticity, are in parentheses.

## G. Additional results for youth

Table G1. List of Tables for Youth Results

Table	Title
G2	Effects for Youth Outcomes
G3	Effects for Neighborhood and Victimization Mediators
G4	Effects for Housing, Parenting, and School Mediators
G5	Effects for Peer and Adult Role Model Mediators
G6	Effects for Educational Mediators
G7	Effects for Health Mediators
G8	Effects for Residential Mobility

Table G2. Intent-To-Treat Effects for Youth Outcomes

Outcome	Female			Male			Male - Female	
	CM (1)	E-C (2)	S-C (3)	CM (4)	E-C (5)	S-C (6)	E-C (7)	S-C (8)
<b>A. Physical health</b>								
Overall health fair/poor [SR]	.101	.008 (.029)	-.017 (.029)	.045	.033 (.019)	.027 (.025)	.025 (.035)	.044 (.038)
Asthma attack in past year [SR]	.201	.002 (.037)	-.048 (.038)	.122	.016 (.032)	.039 (.039)	.014 (.049)	.088 (.056)
Non-sport injury in past year [SR]	.115	-.015 (.025)	-.028 (.026)	.062	.087* (.026)	.080* (.028)	.102* (.036)	.108* (.039)
Body Mass Index > 95th percentile [SR]	.173	-.009 (.034)	-.042 (.037)	.161	.026 (.037)	-.012 (.041)	.036 (.049)	.030 (.055)
<b>B. Mental health</b>								
Psychological distress -- K6 scale z-score [SR]	.268	-.289* (.094)	-.145 (.106)	-.162	.095 (.085)	.005 (.100)	.385* (.125)	.150 (.143)
Ever had serious depression symptoms [SR]	.137	-.055 (.030)	-.061 (.032)	.031	.013 (.022)	-.005 (.024)	.068 (.037)	.056 (.040)
Ever had generalized anxiety symptoms [SR]	.121	-.069* (.027)	-.075* (.029)	.055	-.015 (.024)	-.049* (.024)	.054 (.036)	.026 (.038)
<b>C. Education</b>								
Graduated HS or still in school [PRY]	.772	.064 (.036)	.049 (.037)	.759	-.044 (.037)	-.040 (.041)	-.108* (.051)	-.090 (.055)
In school or working [SR]	.771	.040 (.035)	-.019 (.037)	.758	.018 (.035)	-.007 (.040)	-.022 (.050)	.012 (.054)
WJ-R reading z-score [WJR]	.059	.093 (.084)	.046 (.092)	-.110	-.087 (.096)	.048 (.111)	-.180 (.125)	.002 (.142)
WJ-R math z-score [WJR]	.005	.119 (.095)	.071 (.099)	-.042	-.095 (.097)	.019 (.107)	-.214 (.132)	-.052 (.145)
<b>D. Risky behavior</b>								
Used marijuana in past 30 days [SR]	.131	-.065* (.029)	-.072* (.032)	.118	.051 (.030)	.055 (.035)	.115* (.041)	.127* (.047)
Smoked cigarettes in past 30 days [SR]	.191	-.054 (.033)	-.055 (.036)	.125	.103* (.032)	.151* (.037)	.157* (.046)	.206* (.052)
Had alcohol in past 30 days [SR]	.206	-.060 (.037)	-.091* (.038)	.140	.063 (.033)	.061 (.037)	.122* (.049)	.151* (.052)
Ever pregnant or gotten someone pregnant [SR]	.267	-.011 (.040)	.036 (.040)	.119	.028 (.031)	.032 (.035)	.039 (.051)	-.004 (.052)

Notes. CM: Control mean. E-C: experimental - control difference. S-C: Section 8 - control difference. SR: Self-report. PRY: Parental report about youth. WJR: Woodcock Johnson Revised Assessment. Differences regression-adjusted, with standard errors clustered by household. \* indicates p-value <.05. Surveys were completed in experimental, Section 8, and control groups with 749, 510, and 548 respondents respectively ages 15-20 on 12/31/2001.

Table G3. Intent-To-Treat Effects for Neighborhood and Victimization Mediators

Outcome	Female			Male			Male - Female	
	CM (1)	E-C (2)	S-C (3)	CM (4)	E-C (5)	S-C (6)	E-C (7)	S-C (8)
<b>A. General Neighborhood</b>								
Youth lives in baseline neighborhood [SR]	.455	-.143* (.043)	-.148* (.046)	.485	-.101* (.045)	-.120* (.048)	.042 (.059)	.028 (.064)
Poverty rate in current neighborhood [ADDRESS]	.402	-.086* (.017)	-.071* (.016)	.396	-.088* (.019)	-.064* (.018)	-.002 (.025)	.008 (.024)
Pct minority in neighborhood [ADDRESS]	.877	-.033 (.020)	.017 (.017)	.869	-.035 (.021)	-.041 (.022)	-.001 (.028)	-.058* (.027)
Pct youth in neighborhood not in school or work [ADDRESS]	.120	-.014 (.008)	-.014 (.008)	.126	-.016 (.010)	-.015 (.011)	-.003 (.012)	-.001 (.013)
Pct adults in pro/mgmt occupations [ADDRESS]	.206	.042* (.010)	.016 (.009)	.224	.020 (.011)	.002 (.010)	-.022 (.014)	-.014 (.013)
Not satisfied with neighborhood [PR]	.555	-.177* (.051)	-.203* (.054)	.511	-.100 (.051)	-.059 (.054)	.078 (.073)	.143 (.078)
Feels unsafe in neighborhood at night [PR]	.437	-.170* (.047)	-.086 (.054)	.509	-.178* (.049)	-.155* (.052)	-.008 (.070)	-.069 (.076)
Fraction of 4 types of discrimination in 'hood [SR]	.107	-.018 (.019)	-.006 (.019)	.134	-.024 (.019)	.005 (.025)	-.006 (.027)	.011 (.030)
Fraction of 6 problems with neighborhood [PR]	.565	-.164* (.037)	-.128* (.041)	.509	-.102* (.039)	-.064 (.037)	.062 (.054)	.064 (.056)
Saw drugs in neighborhood 1+/week in past 30 days [SR]	.437	-.104* (.047)	-.122* (.051)	.441	-.042 (.047)	-.026 (.056)	.062 (.066)	.095 (.075)
Heard gunshots in 'hood 1+/week in past 30 days [SR]	.118	-.040 (.031)	-.053 (.028)	.155	-.034 (.031)	-.075* (.032)	.006 (.043)	-.022 (.043)
<b>B. Victimization</b>								
Household member was crime victim past 6 mths [PR]	.275	-.082 (.044)	-.096* (.043)	.247	-.014 (.044)	-.058 (.046)	.068 (.062)	.038 (.063)
Saw someone shot or stabbed in past 12 mths [SR]	.150	-.043 (.036)	-.047 (.034)	.209	-.016 (.039)	-.030 (.046)	.027 (.053)	.017 (.057)
Was "jumped" in past 12 months [SR]	.085	-.006 (.029)	.005 (.028)	.181	.010 (.038)	-.003 (.041)	.015 (.047)	-.008 (.049)

Notes. CM: Control mean. E-C: experimental - control difference. S-C: Section 8 - control difference. ADDRESS: Address history from tracking file, linked to Census. SR: Self-report. PRY: Parental report about youth. PR: Parental report about household. Differences regression-adjusted, with standard errors clustered by household. \* indicates p-value <.05. For PR measures, analysis was conducted at household level using household average right-hand side variables. Surveys were completed in experimental, Section 8, and control groups with 749, 510, and 548 respondents respectively ages 15-20 on 12/31/2001. Types of discrimination were: at school or work, neighborhood recreation program, shopping or restaurant, with police. Problems with neighborhood were: litter, graffiti, public drinking, abandoned buildings, people hanging out, police not coming. Types of criminal victimization were: purse or wallet snatched, threatened with weapon, beaten or assaulted, break-in to home, stabbed or shot.

Table G4. Intent-To-Treat Effects for Housing, Parenting, and School Mediators

Outcome	Female			Male			Male - Female	
	CM (1)	E-C (2)	S-C (3)	CM (4)	E-C (5)	S-C (6)	E-C (7)	S-C (8)
<b>A. Housing</b>								
Overall housing condition is fair/poor [PR]	.477	-.071 (.049)	-.020 (.054)	.507	-.055 (.050)	-.098 (.053)	.016 (.071)	-.078 (.076)
Fraction of 7 problems with home [PR]	.334	-.048 (.025)	-.035 (.029)	.333	-.052 (.028)	-.038 (.029)	-.004 (.038)	-.003 (.042)
Fraction of 7 problems with home interior [OBS]	.216	-.055* (.022)	-.013 (.026)	.222	-.022 (.025)	-.030 (.030)	.033 (.035)	-.017 (.040)
Fraction of 7 problems with home exterior [OBS]	.218	-.062* (.024)	-.039 (.029)	.227	-.037 (.026)	-.034 (.029)	.024 (.037)	.006 (.039)
<b>B. Parenting Practices</b>								
Mother /primary caregiver is very supportive [SR]	.670	.035 (.045)	.024 (.049)	.842	-.056 (.034)	-.054 (.039)	-.091 (.056)	-.078 (.063)
Parent knows all about friends & whereabouts [SR]	.258	.012 (.039)	-.050 (.041)	.173	-.044 (.036)	-.034 (.041)	-.056 (.054)	.016 (.059)
No adult present after school [SR]	.242	.046 (.050)	-.010 (.055)	.301	.068 (.051)	.061 (.059)	.022 (.070)	.071 (.079)
Fraction days/week family eats together [PR]	.571	.042 (.039)	.034 (.040)	.596	-.021 (.040)	.016 (.042)	-.063 (.058)	-.019 (.059)
Fraction of 4 types of parental contact w/schl [PR]	.370	.022 (.031)	.023 (.033)	.418	-.034 (.033)	-.010 (.033)	-.056 (.046)	-.033 (.047)
<b>C. School Environment</b>								
% free lunch [ADMIN]	.516	-.053* (.022)	.000 (.022)	.524	-.079* (.024)	-.033 (.026)	-.026 (.032)	-.033 (.033)
% limited English proficient [ADMIN]	.155	-.030* (.014)	-.004 (.016)	.163	-.033* (.014)	-.032* (.015)	-.003 (.019)	-.028 (.021)
% white [ADMIN]	.114	.061* (.020)	.012 (.020)	.112	.065* (.021)	.067* (.026)	.004 (.029)	.055 (.033)
Pupil-teacher ratio [ADMIN]	18.6	.533 (.358)	-.252 (.459)	17.4	1.402* (.414)	.607 (.441)	.868 (.544)	.859 (.633)
Percentile rank on state exam [ADMIN]	.240	.040 (.024)	-.013 (.024)	.188	.063* (.026)	.037 (.027)	.023 (.034)	.050 (.035)
Fraction of 5 positive school climate items [SR]	.621	-.001 (.033)	.039 (.034)	.599	.028 (.031)	-.008 (.037)	.029 (.045)	-.047 (.049)

Notes. CM: Control mean. E-C: experimental - control difference. S-C: Section 8 - control difference. ADMIN: State data on schools. OBS: interviewer observation of housing unit. SR: Self-report. PRY: Parental report about youth. PR: Parental report about household. Differences regression-adjusted, with standard errors clustered by household. \* indicates p-value <.05. For PR measures, analysis was conducted at household level using household average right-hand side variables. Surveys were completed in experimental, Section 8, and control groups with 749, 510, and 548 respondents respectively ages 15-20 on 12/31/2001. Problems with home were: peeling paint, plumbing, rats or mice, cockroaches, broken locks, broken windows, heat. Interviewer observations of problems with home interior were: cracks in walls, peeling paint, mold, cigarette smoke, noisy inside, noisy outside, cluttered. Interviewer observations of problems with home exterior were: condition of unit, condition of other units on block, metal bars on unit, metal bars on other units, condition of block, broken windows, junk on block. Items parental knows everything about were: who friends are, who with when not home.

Table G5. Intent-To-Treat Effects for Peer and Adult Role Model Mediators

Outcome	Female			Male			Male - Female	
	CM (1)	E-C (2)	S-C (3)	CM (4)	E-C (5)	S-C (6)	E-C (7)	S-C (8)
<b>A. Peers</b>								
Has at least one close friend [PRY]	.890	.036 (.025)	-.013 (.034)	.917	.008 (.027)	.051 (.029)	-.028 (.036)	.064 (.044)
Has 5 or more friends [SR]	.382	.050 (.044)	-.004 (.046)	.530	.024 (.047)	.067 (.051)	-.026 (.064)	.071 (.070)
Friends involved in school activities [SR]	.615	.071 (.045)	.050 (.048)	.710	-.013 (.042)	.010 (.049)	-.083 (.062)	-.040 (.071)
Has friends who use drugs [SR]	.295	.002 (.043)	-.001 (.044)	.327	.127* (.046)	.161* (.051)	.125* (.062)	.161* (.067)
Has friends who carry weapons [SR]	.098	.009 (.026)	.031 (.030)	.157	.037 (.039)	-.033 (.036)	.028 (.045)	-.064 (.046)
Has relatives or friends who belong to a gang [SR]	.154	.005 (.035)	-.029 (.031)	.187	-.063 (.032)	-.055 (.037)	-.068 (.046)	-.027 (.047)
Friends from baseline visit new neighborhood [SR]	.178	-.018 (.036)	-.007 (.041)	.164	-.022 (.035)	-.047 (.036)	-.004 (.050)	-.040 (.055)
Visits baseline 'hood but doesn't live there [SR]	.234	-.026 (.037)	-.012 (.043)	.205	.034 (.040)	.022 (.044)	.061 (.054)	.034 (.061)
<b>B. Adult Role Models</b>								
Likely neighbors intervene vs. graffiti [PR]	.497	.166* (.049)	.105 (.057)	.575	.052 (.050)	-.026 (.056)	-.114 (.071)	-.131 (.080)
Likely neighbors intervene if kids skipping school [PR]	.343	.099 (.053)	.038 (.058)	.370	.086 (.050)	.067 (.056)	-.013 (.075)	.029 (.083)
Structured activity after school [SR]	.275	.050 (.043)	.004 (.042)	.248	.064 (.041)	.051 (.047)	.015 (.060)	.047 (.064)
Attended 1+ church youth activities per month [SR]	.380	.006 (.048)	-.050 (.048)	.313	-.020 (.041)	.012 (.045)	-.025 (.062)	.062 (.065)
Saw father at least once a week in past 12 months [SR]	.253	.068 (.040)	.078 (.046)	.365	-.043 (.044)	-.017 (.047)	-.111 (.057)	-.095 (.065)
Father has been very supportive [SR]	.235	.026 (.039)	-.000 (.043)	.271	.033 (.041)	-.006 (.043)	.007 (.055)	-.006 (.060)
Comfortable talking about problems w/3+ adults [SR]	.305	.133* (.042)	.061 (.048)	.397	-.005 (.046)	-.009 (.051)	-.138* (.062)	-.069 (.070)
Has 4+ adults who care and will help if trouble [SR]	.448	.070 (.047)	.028 (.047)	.498	.003 (.046)	-.042 (.053)	-.067 (.066)	-.070 (.072)

Notes. CM: Control mean. E-C: experimental - control difference. S-C: Section 8 - control difference. SR: Self-report. PRY: Parental report about youth. PR: Parental report about household. Differences regression-adjusted, with standard errors clustered by household. \* indicates p-value <.05. For PR measures, analysis was conducted at household level using household average right-hand side variables. Surveys were completed in experimental, Section 8, and control groups with 749, 510, and 548 respondents respectively ages 15-20 on 12/31/2001. No adult present was: no adult at either 3:45, 5:30, or 7:30 on selected day of week. Parental contact with school (for any child in household) was: went to general school meeting, went to a school event, volunteered at school, volunteered for team or club.

Table G6. Intent-To-Treat Effects for Educational Mediators

Outcome	Female			Male			Male - Female	
	CM (1)	E-C (2)	S-C (3)	CM (4)	E-C (5)	S-C (6)	E-C (7)	S-C (8)
<b>A. School Engagement</b>								
Always pays attention in class [SR]	.490	.118* (.056)	-.002 (.062)	.484	-.013 (.056)	.066 (.062)	-.131 (.078)	.068 (.087)
Works hard in school [SR]	.508	.058 (.058)	.028 (.061)	.449	-.101 (.056)	-.013 (.068)	-.158* (.079)	-.040 (.091)
B grades or higher last year [SR]	.415	-.008 (.047)	-.018 (.050)	.293	-.055 (.042)	-.105* (.044)	-.047 (.062)	-.088 (.067)
Always finishes homework [SR]	.505	.027 (.060)	-.003 (.066)	.406	-.029 (.055)	-.078 (.062)	-.057 (.082)	-.074 (.091)
At least 5 hours/week of homework [SR]	.488	.052 (.057)	.045 (.063)	.354	.056 (.053)	.110 (.061)	.005 (.078)	.065 (.087)
At least 5 hours/week of reading [SR]	.377	-.006 (.045)	-.026 (.051)	.250	.023 (.042)	.028 (.049)	.030 (.060)	.054 (.068)
<b>B. Educational Track</b>								
Ever took SAT, ACT, or AP exams [SR]	.426	-.047 (.046)	.037 (.052)	.358	-.037 (.048)	.045 (.053)	.010 (.067)	.009 (.074)
Ever took algebra or higher math [SR]	.833	.012 (.033)	-.005 (.039)	.827	-.085* (.037)	-.055 (.035)	-.097 (.050)	-.050 (.053)
Gifted class in past 2 years [PRY]	.068	.057 (.031)	.010 (.034)	.147	-.040 (.039)	-.039 (.037)	-.097 (.050)	-.049 (.051)
Special education in past 2 years [PRY]	.154	.037 (.038)	-.002 (.038)	.324	.014 (.050)	-.038 (.052)	-.023 (.063)	-.035 (.065)
<b>C. Educational Problems</b>								
Ever repeated a grade [PRY]	.200	.096* (.036)	.009 (.037)	.326	-.028 (.041)	-.049 (.042)	-.124* (.054)	-.058 (.056)
Late for school once a month or more [SR]	.679	-.020 (.042)	.033 (.048)	.616	.030 (.046)	.060 (.051)	.050 (.061)	.027 (.070)
Absent from school 5% or more of the school year [SR]	.426	-.076 (.047)	-.040 (.052)	.389	-.002 (.045)	.005 (.052)	.074 (.065)	.045 (.073)
School requested meet about prob past 2 yrs [PRY]	.184	-.034 (.039)	-.012 (.046)	.337	.044 (.050)	.061 (.058)	.078 (.064)	.072 (.073)
Was suspended/expelled from school past 2 yrs [PRY]	.117	.011 (.035)	.042 (.042)	.301	-.033 (.050)	-.080 (.056)	-.044 (.060)	-.122 (.070)
<b>D. Future Expectations</b>								
Believes chances high will complete college [SR]	.543	.073 (.046)	.034 (.049)	.449	-.044 (.044)	-.053 (.048)	-.117 (.064)	-.088 (.069)
Believes chances high will find good job as adult [SR]	.742	.055 (.037)	.007 (.044)	.652	-.003 (.043)	.039 (.047)	-.059 (.056)	.032 (.065)

Notes. CM: Control mean. E-C: experimental - control difference. S-C: Section 8 - control difference. SR: Self-report. PRY: Parental report about youth. Differences regression-adjusted, with standard errors clustered by household. \* indicates p-value <.05. Surveys were completed in experimental, Section 8, and control groups with 749, 510, and 548 respondents respectively ages 15-20 on 12/31/2001. Some items not asked for youth ages 19-20, resulting in smaller sample sizes: no adult present after school, fraction of school climate items, pays attention, works hard, finishes homework, 5+ hours homework, gifted class, special education, school requested meeting, suspended/expelled. School climate was: teachers interested in students, students disruptive, cheating on tests, discipline fair, felt safe. Structured activity was: at school, church or community center -- participating in a sport, club, tutoring, or other organized activity.

Table G7. Intent-To-Treat Effects for Health Mediators

Outcome	Female			Male			Male - Female	
	CM (1)	E-C (2)	S-C (3)	CM (4)	E-C (5)	S-C (6)	E-C (7)	S-C (8)
<b>A. Healthy environment</b>								
Fraction of past 7 days did aerobic exercise [SR]	.353	.055 (.032)	.022 (.040)	.555	.029 (.033)	.020 (.036)	-.027 (.045)	-.003 (.053)
Fraction of past week moderate activity [SR]	.412	.045 (.033)	-.023 (.040)	.476	.067 (.034)	.045 (.037)	.023 (.047)	.068 (.054)
Participates in sport after school [SR]	.032	.061* (.022)	.006 (.017)	.138	.014 (.030)	.033 (.038)	-.047 (.037)	.027 (.042)
Fraction of past 7 days some fruits/vegetables [SR]	.574	.028 (.032)	-.036 (.035)	.568	.010 (.030)	.036 (.032)	-.019 (.044)	.072 (.048)
Fraction of 6 asthma triggers [PR]	.187	.011 (.023)	.021 (.024)	.212	.003 (.021)	.014 (.023)	-.007 (.029)	-.007 (.032)
<b>B. Access to care</b>								
Youth has health insurance [PRY]	.873	-.011 (.029)	.003 (.034)	.809	.081* (.034)	.047 (.039)	.092* (.044)	.044 (.049)
Talked to a doctor about health in past 6 mths [PRY]	.736	.052 (.046)	-.035 (.059)	.728	-.058 (.056)	-.142* (.067)	-.110 (.073)	-.108 (.089)
<b>C. Adult mental health</b>								
Adult distress K6 z-score [PR]	.170	-.275* (.112)	-.193 (.124)	-.058	.160 (.103)	.096 (.110)	.436* (.152)	.289 (.169)
Adult probability of depression [PR]	.187	-.039 (.034)	-.066 (.036)	.138	.003 (.030)	.038 (.037)	.043 (.047)	.104* (.052)
Adult fraction worried, tense or anxious [PR]	.424	-.071 (.050)	-.073 (.055)	.453	-.053 (.051)	-.024 (.056)	.018 (.073)	.049 (.079)
Adult fraction calm and peaceful [PR]	.375	.140* (.049)	.142* (.053)	.508	-.062 (.050)	-.113 (.058)	-.202* (.071)	-.256* (.079)
Adult fraction sleeping 7-8 hours/night [PR]	.362	.118* (.052)	.078 (.056)	.409	.089 (.049)	.058 (.057)	-.028 (.074)	-.020 (.081)

Notes. CM: Control mean. E-C: experimental - control difference. S-C: Section 8 - control difference. SR: Self-report. PRY: Parental report about youth. PR: Parental report about household. Differences regression-adjusted, with standard errors clustered by household. \* indicates p-value <.05. For PR measures, analysis was conducted at household level using household average right-hand side variables. Surveys were completed in experimental, Section 8, and control groups with 749, 510, and 548 respondents respectively ages 15-20 on 12/31/2001. Asthma triggers were: rats or mice, cockroaches, wall-to-wall carpet, pets with fur, cigarette smoke, mold.

Table G8. Intent-To-Treat Effects for Residential Mobility

Outcome	Female			Male			Male - Female	
	CM (1)	E-C (2)	S-C (3)	CM (4)	E-C (5)	S-C (6)	E-C (7)	S-C (8)
Program move [ADDRESS]	.000	.471* (.034)	.556* (.039)	.000	.415* (.034)	.568* (.039)	-.056 (.047)	.012 (.056)
One or more moves [ADDRESS]	.643	.143* (.043)	.203* (.039)	.687	.084* (.036)	.092* (.038)	-.059 (.055)	-.112* (.052)
One or more moves [PR]	.623	.075 (.045)	.093* (.046)	.654	.012 (.047)	-.009 (.046)	-.063 (.066)	-.103 (.065)
Two or more moves [ADDRESS]	.298	.125* (.043)	.141* (.047)	.301	.079 (.042)	.159* (.049)	-.046 (.058)	.017 (.066)
Two or more moves [PR]	.266	.035 (.045)	.094 (.050)	.301	-.023 (.043)	.063 (.049)	-.059 (.065)	-.031 (.072)
Number of moves [ADDRESS]	1.04	.374* (.091)	.442* (.094)	1.14	.208* (.089)	.375* (.105)	-.166 (.124)	-.067 (.138)
Number of moves [PR]	1.11	.057 (.114)	.213 (.123)	1.25	-.101 (.120)	-.022 (.127)	-.158 (.175)	-.234 (.173)

Notes. CM: Control mean. E-C: experimental - control difference. S-C: Section 8 - control difference. PR: parental report about household. ADDRESS: Address history from tracking file, linked to Census. ADMIN: Administrative data from school reported to attend or last attended. Differences regression-adjusted, using equation (1) with standard errors clustered by household. \* indicates p-value <.05. For PR measures, analysis was conducted at household level using household average right-hand side variables. Sample is ages 15-20 as of 12/31/01.