Conditional Cash Transfers in New York City

The Continuing Story of the
Opportunity NYC−Family Rewards Demonstration

Supplementary Appendixes

James Riccio
Nadine Dechausay
Cynthia Miller
Stephen Nuñez
Nandita Verma
Edith Yang

mdrc
BUILDING KNOWLEDGE
TO IMPROVE SOCIAL POLICY

September 2013

Funders of the Opportunity NYC–Family Rewards Demonstration

Contents

About MDRC

List of Exhibits

Table

Table

Table

Table

Figure

Box

Introduction

This document contains Supplementary Appendixes F through J for MDRC's report on interim findings from the Opportunity NYC−Family Rewards Demonstration, a conditional cash transfer program to help families break the cycle of intergenerational poverty. Launched in 2007 on a pilot basis, and the first of its kind in the United States, Family Rewards ties cash rewards for very low-income families to a variety of activities and outcomes related to children's educational efforts and achievement, family preventive health care practices, and parents' employment. As planned, the program offered participants a three-year intervention, which concluded, on schedule, in late 2010. A comprehensive evaluation, using a randomized control trial, is assessing the program's effects on family poverty and well-being over at least five years after families entered the study, including two years after families exited the program. Complete details on the interim findings from the Family Rewards demonstration are available in the full report, which covers the three program years and, for some measures, up to one year after the program ended.[1]

---

[1]James Riccio, Nadine Dechausay, Cynthia Miller, Stephen Nuñez, Nandita Verma, and Edith Yang, *Conditional Cash Transfers in New York City: The Continuing Story of the Opportunity NYC−Family Rewards Demonstration* (New York: MDRC, 2013).

Appendix F

Supplementary Exhibits for Chapter 3

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table F.1

**Impacts on Income, Poverty, and Material Hardship,
by Respondent's Family Status at the Time of Random Assignment**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Two-parent household at baseline (%)					
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments)[a,b,c]	47.7	64.6	-16.9 ***	0.001	
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards)[a,d]	57.3	64.6	-7.3	0.143	
Insufficient food[e]	11.3	21.8	-10.5 ***	0.008	
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months[f]	26.7	48.8	-22.1 ***	0.000	†††
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month	24.9	40.9	-16.0 ***	0.002	††
Average savings more than $500 [g]	22.5	12.1	10.4 **	0.014	†
Sample size (total = 376)	210	166			
Single-parent household at baseline (%)					
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments)[a,b,c]	57.9	69.3	-11.4 ***	0.000	
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards)[a,d]	68.1	69.3	-1.1	0.613	
Insufficient food[e]	16.2	20.7	-4.5 **	0.019	
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months[f]	42.9	43.6	-0.7	0.789	†††
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month	37.7	41.4	-3.7	0.129	††
Average savings more than $500 [g]	10.2	8.3	1.9	0.194	†
Sample size (total = 1,605)	814	791			

(continued)

3

Appendix Table F.1 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,982) of the survey respondents.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

[a]Monthly household income amounts equal to or greater than $10,000 were excluded from this calculation. About 7.2 percent of the sample is excluded from the income measures because respondents did not know or refused to provide the information. An additional 0.6 percent of the sample was excluded because the income provided was over $10,000.

[b]Family Rewards payments are based on Seedco's Family Rewards data from program Year 3, which include activities completed in September 2009 through August 2010. The monthly Family Rewards payment amount is calculated by dividing the annual reward amount by 12. The payment data do not include bonus payments that some families received for opening new bank accounts.

[c]Annual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 the respondent's income in the month prior to the survey interview. For program group members, it includes Family Rewards payments earned during program Year 3; see the preceding note. The federal poverty level was calculated based on annual income (monthly income multiplied by 12) and the household size at the time of the survey. The poverty threshold was measured according to the 2010 or 2011 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

[d]Annual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 the respondent's income in the month prior to the survey interview. This calculation excludes the Family Rewards payments earned during program Year 3. The federal poverty level was calculated based on annual income (monthly income multiplied by 12) and the household size at the time of the survey. The poverty threshold was measured according to the 2010 or 2011 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

[e]Insufficient food is defined as "sometimes" or "often times" not having enough food to eat.

[f]Only about 4 percent of the survey sample (N = 130) owned an apartment or a house at the time of the survey.

[g]About 6 percent of the sample is excluded from this analysis because of missing data.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table F.2

**Impacts on Income, Poverty, and Material Hardship,
by Respondent's Immigration Status at the Time of Random Assignment**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Foreign-born (%)					
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments) [a,b,c]	54.1	72.2	-18.1 ***	0.000	†
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards) [a,d]	67.7	72.2	-4.5	0.176	
Insufficient food [e]	21.6	28.8	-7.2 *	0.052	
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months [f]	36.3	44.8	-8.5 **	0.040	
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month	43.1	49.3	-6.1	0.146	
Average savings more than $500 [g]	14.4	8.5	5.9 **	0.031	
Sample size (total = 577)	301	276			
U.S.-born (%)					
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments) [a,b,c]	56.9	66.6	-9.7 ***	0.000	†
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards) [a,d]	65.5	66.6	-1.1	0.676	
Insufficient food [e]	12.6	17.7	-5.1 ***	0.008	
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months [f]	41.4	44.0	-2.6	0.333	
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month	32.2	37.6	-5.3 **	0.034	
Average savings more than $500 [g]	11.9	9.2	2.7	0.109	
Sample size (total = 1,405)	723	682			

(continued)

Appendix Table F.2 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,982) of the survey respondents.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

[a]Monthly household income amounts equal to or greater than $10,000 were excluded from this calculation. About 7.2 percent of the sample is excluded from the income measures because respondents did not know or refused to provide the information. An additional 0.6 percent of the sample was excluded because the income provided was over $10,000.

[b]Family Rewards payments are based on Seedco's Family Rewards data from program Year 3, which include activities completed in September 2009 through August 2010. The monthly Family Rewards payment amount is calculated by dividing the annual reward amount by 12. The payment data do not include bonus payments that some families received for opening new bank accounts.

[c]Annual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 the respondent's income in the month prior to the survey interview. For program group members, it includes Family Rewards payments earned during program Year 3; see the preceding note. The federal poverty level was calculated based on annual income (monthly income multiplied by 12) and the household size at the time of the survey. The poverty threshold was measured according to the 2010 or 2011 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

[d]Annual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 the respondent's income in the month prior to the survey interview. This calculation excludes the Family Rewards payments earned during program Year 3. The federal poverty level was calculated based on annual income (monthly income multiplied by 12) and the household size at the time of the survey. The poverty threshold was measured according to the 2010 or 2011 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

[e]Insufficient food is defined as "sometimes" or "often times" not having enough food to eat.

[f]Only about 4 percent of the survey sample (N = 130) owned an apartment or a house at the time of the survey.

[g]About 6 percent of the sample is excluded from this analysis because of missing data.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table F.3

**Impacts on Income, Poverty, and Material Hardship,
by Respondent's Depression Status at the Time of Random Assignment**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Not at risk of depression at baseline (%)				
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments) [a,b,c]	54.2	66.4	-12.2 ***	0.000
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards)[a,d]	64.1	66.4	-2.3	0.326
Insufficient food[e]	14.4	18.5	-4.0 **	0.029
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months [f]	38.8	43.2	-4.4 *	0.072
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month	32.6	39.0	-6.4 ***	0.007
Average savings more than $500 [g]	13.1	10.0	3.1 *	0.058
Sample size (total = 1,619)	835	784		
At risk of depression at baseline (%)				
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments) [a,b,c]	66.3	78.7	-12.3 **	0.034
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards)[a,d]	77.6	78.7	-1.0	0.907
Insufficient food[e]	21.5	30.8	-9.3	0.122
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months [f]	48.7	52.2	-3.6	0.604
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month	51.5	53.4	-1.8	0.789
Average savings more than $500 [g]	11.3	4.8	6.6 *	0.073
Sample size (total = 251)	129	122		

(continued)

Appendix Table F.3 (continued)

SOURCES: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,982) of the survey respondents.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. No statistically significant differences between subgroup impacts were observed.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

[a]Monthly household income amounts equal to or greater than $10,000 were excluded from this calculation. About 7.2 percent of the sample is excluded from the income measures because respondents did not know or refused to provide the information. An additional 0.6 percent of the sample was excluded because the income provided was over $10,000.

[b]Family Rewards payments are based on Seedco's Family Rewards data from program Year 3, which include activities completed in September 2009 through August 2010. The monthly Family Rewards payment amount is calculated by dividing the annual reward amount by 12. The payment data do not include bonus payments that some families received for opening new bank accounts.

[c]Annual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 the respondent's income in the month prior to the survey interview. For program group members, it includes Family Rewards payments earned during program Year 3; see the preceding note. The federal poverty level was calculated based on annual income (monthly income multiplied by 12) and the household size at the time of the survey. The poverty threshold was measured according to the 2010 or 2011 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

[d]Annual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 the respondent's income in the month prior to the survey interview. This calculation excludes the Family Rewards payments earned during program Year 3. The federal poverty level was calculated based on annual income (monthly income multiplied by 12) and the household size at the time of the survey. The poverty threshold was measured according to the 2010 or 2011 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

[e]Insufficient food is defined as "sometimes" or "often times" not having enough food to eat.

[f]Only about 4 percent of the survey sample (N = 130) owned an apartment or a house at the time of the survey.

[g]About 6 percent of the sample is excluded from this analysis because of missing data.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table F.4

Impacts on Income, Poverty, and Material Hardship,
by Respondent's Food Stamp Receipt at the Time of Random Assignment

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Not receiving food stamps at baseline (%)				
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments) [a,b,c]	36.5	50.4	-13.9 ***	0.000
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards)[a,d]	47.3	50.4	-3.0	0.351
Insufficient food[e]	12.7	20.0	-7.3 ***	0.006
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months [f]	35.1	42.7	-7.6 **	0.032
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month	29.7	35.0	-5.4	0.112
Average savings more than $500 [g]	17.6	15.4	2.2	0.444
Sample size (total = 789)	385	404		
Receiving food stamps at baseline (%)				
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments) [a,b,c]	68.2	81.1	-12.9 ***	0.000
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards)[a,d]	77.9	81.1	-3.3	0.182
Insufficient food[e]	16.7	21.5	-4.8 **	0.037
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months [f]	42.5	45.7	-3.2	0.275
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month	39.1	45.3	-6.3 **	0.03
Average savings more than $500 [g]	9.4	5.0	4.4 ***	0.005
Sample size (total = 1,170)	622	548		

(continued)

9

Appendix Table F.4 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,982) of the survey respondents.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. No statistically significant differences between subgroup impacts were observed.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

[a]Monthly household income amounts equal to or greater than $10,000 were excluded from this calculation. About 7.2 percent of the sample is excluded from the income measures because respondents did not know or refused to provide the information. An additional 0.6 percent of the sample was excluded because the income provided was over $10,000.

[b]Family Rewards payments are based on Seedco's Family Rewards data from program Year 3, which include activities completed in September 2009 through August 2010. The monthly Family Rewards payment amount is calculated by dividing the annual reward amount by 12. The payment data do not include bonus payments that some families received for opening new bank accounts.

[c]Annual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 the respondent's income in the month prior to the survey interview. For program group members, it includes Family Rewards payments earned during program Year 3; see the preceding note. The federal poverty level was calculated based on annual income (monthly income multiplied by 12) and the household size at the time of the survey. The poverty threshold was measured according to the 2010 or 2011 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

[d]Annual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 the respondent's income in the month prior to the survey interview. This calculation excludes the Family Rewards payments earned during program Year 3. The federal poverty level was calculated based on annual income (monthly income multiplied by 12) and the household size at the time of the survey. The poverty threshold was measured according to the 2010 or 2011 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

[e]Insufficient food is defined as "sometimes" or "often times" not having enough food to eat.

[f]Only about 4 percent of the survey sample (N = 130) owned an apartment or a house at the time of the survey.

[g]About 6 percent of the sample is excluded from this analysis because of missing data.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table F.5

Impacts on Income, Poverty, and Material Hardship, by
Respondent's TANF or SNA Receipt at the Time of Random Assignment

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Not receiving TANF/SNA at baseline (%)					
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments) [a,b,c]	49.2	62.9	-13.7 ***	0.000	
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards)[a,d]	60.1	62.9	-2.8	0.237	
Insufficient food[e]	14.6	19.6	-5.1 **	0.011	
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months [f]	38.5	45.5	-7.0 ***	0.007	††
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month	34.1	38.3	-4.3 *	0.089	
Average savings more than $500 [g]	13.7	10.5	3.2 *	0.067	
Sample size (total = 1,472)	758	714			
Receiving TANF/SNA at baseline (%)					
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments) [a,b,c]	75.5	84.6	-9.1 **	0.017	
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards)[a,d]	84.0	84.6	-0.6	0.845	
Insufficient food[e]	17.1	23.3	-6.2	0.104	
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months [f]	45.9	40.0	5.9	0.210	††
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month	39.7	49.3	-9.6 **	0.038	
Average savings more than $500 [g]	7.6	5.5	2.1	0.369	
Sample size (total = 460)	239	221			

(continued)

Appendix Table F.5 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: TANF = Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. SNA = Safety Net Assistance.

The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,982) of the survey respondents.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

[a]Monthly household income amounts equal to or greater than $10,000 were excluded from this calculation. About 7.2 percent of the sample is excluded from the income measures because respondents did not know or refused to provide the information. An additional 0.6 percent of the sample was excluded because the income provided was over $10,000.

[b]Family Rewards payments are based on Seedco's Family Rewards data from program Year 3, which include activities completed in September 2009 through August 2010. The monthly Family Rewards payment amount is calculated by dividing the annual reward amount by 12. The payment data do not include bonus payments that some families received for opening new bank accounts.

[c]Annual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 the respondent's income in the month prior to the survey interview. For program group members, it includes Family Rewards payments earned during program Year 3; see the preceding note. The federal poverty level was calculated based on annual income (monthly income multiplied by 12) and the household size at the time of the survey. The poverty threshold was measured according to the 2010 or 2011 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

[d]Annual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 the respondent's income in the month prior to the survey interview. This calculation excludes the Family Rewards payments earned during program Year 3. The federal poverty level was calculated based on annual income (monthly income multiplied by 12) and the household size at the time of the survey. The poverty threshold was measured according to the 2010 or 2011 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

[e]Insufficient food is defined as "sometimes" or "often times" not having enough food to eat.

[f]Only about 4 percent of the survey sample (N = 130) owned an apartment or a house at the time of the survey.

[g]About 6 percent of the sample is excluded from this analysis because of missing data.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table F.6

**Impacts on Income, Poverty, and Material Hardship,
by Respondent's Housing Status at the Time of Random Assignment**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)		P-Value	Sig.
Lived in public housing at baseline (%)						
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments) [a,b,c]	61.8	66.8	-5.0		0.180	†
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards)[a,d]	72.1	66.8	5.3		0.147	†
Insufficient food[e]	16.2	22.3	-6.2	**	0.047	
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months [f]	39.3	40.2	-0.8		0.828	
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month	36.7	38.9	-2.1		0.577	
Average savings more than $500 [g]	8.4	8.5	-0.1		0.975	†
Moved since random assignment [h]	13.3	14.1	-0.8		0.718	
Sample size (total = 652)	347	305				
Lived in Section 8 housing at baseline (%)						
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments) [a,b,c]	60.9	76.6	-15.6	***	0.000	†
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards)[a,d]	71.1	76.6	-5.4		0.152	†
Insufficient food[e]	15.8	19.8	-4.0		0.283	
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months [f]	42.2	45.6	-3.4		0.468	
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month	34.6	43.2	-8.7	*	0.064	
Average savings more than $500 [g]	10.1	8.1	2.0		0.473	†
Moved since random assignment [h]	23.0	23.2	-0.2		0.959	
Sample size (total = 461)	214	247				
Other housing status at baseline (%)						
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments) [a,b,c]	49.3	63.3	-14.0	***	0.000	†
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards)[a,d]	59.1	63.3	-4.2		0.210	†
Insufficient food[e]	14.4	20.5	-6.1	**	0.022	
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months [f]	38.6	45.9	-7.3	**	0.035	

(continued)

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month	34.4	40.9	-6.5 *	0.052	
Average savings more than $500 [g]	17.7	10.0	7.7 ***	0.002	†
Moved since random assignment [h]	27.2	25.7	1.5	0.540	
Sample size (total = 828)	443	385			

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,982) of the survey respondents.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

[a]Monthly household income amounts equal to or greater than $10,000 were excluded from this calculation. About 7.2 percent of the sample is excluded from the income measures because respondents did not know or refused to provide the information. An additional 0.6 percent of the sample was excluded because the income provided was over $10,000.

[b]Family Rewards payments are based on Seedco's Family Rewards data from program Year 3, which include activities completed in September 2009 through August 2010. The monthly Family Rewards payment amount is calculated by dividing the annual reward amount by 12. The payment data do not include bonus payments that some families received for opening new bank accounts.

[c]Annual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 the respondent's income in the month prior to the survey interview. For program group members, it includes Family Rewards payments earned during program Year 3; see the preceding note. The federal poverty level was calculated based on annual income (monthly income multiplied by 12) and the household size at the time of the survey. The poverty threshold was measured according to the 2010 or 2011 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

[d]Annual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 the respondent's income in the month prior to the survey interview. This calculation excludes the Family Rewards payments earned during program Year 3. The federal poverty level was calculated based on annual income (monthly income multiplied by 12) and the household size at the time of the survey. The poverty threshold was measured according to the 2010 or 2011 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

[e]Insufficient food is defined as "sometimes" or "often times" not having enough food to eat.

[f]Only about 4 percent of the survey sample (N = 130) owned an apartment or a house at the time of the survey.

[g]About 6 percent of the sample is excluded from this analysis because of missing data.

[h]The sample size for this measure is larger than that of the other measures displayed in this table because it was administered to all survey respondents.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table F.7

**Impacts on Income, Poverty, and Material Hardship,
by Respondent's Education Level at the Time of Random Assignment**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
High school diploma/GED certificate **or higher at baseline**				
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments) [a,b,c] (%)	46.1	58.9	-12.8 ***	0.000
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards) [a,d] (%)	57.2	58.9	-1.7	0.585
Average total household income in month prior to interview (including rewards) [a,b,c] ($)	2,205	1,871	334 ***	0.000
Insufficient food [e] (%)	13.4	19.4	-6.0 ***	0.006
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months [f] (%)	42.1	46.2	-4.1	0.162
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month (%)	32.6	38.5	-5.9 **	0.033
Average savings more than $500 [g] (%)	15.3	11.6	3.8 *	0.067
Sample size (total = 1,175)	597	578		
No high school diploma/GED certificate **at baseline**				
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments) [a,b,c] (%)	71.2	81.5	-10.3 ***	0.001
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards) [a,d] (%)	80.0	81.5	-1.5	0.541
Average total household income in month prior to interview (including rewards) [a,b,c] ($)	1,605	1,260	345 ***	0.000
Insufficient food [e] (%)	18.3	22.4	-4.1	0.167
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months [f] (%)	37.6	42.9	-5.3	0.141
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month (%)	38.9	44.5	-5.6	0.118
Average savings more than $500 [g] (%)	8.3	5.9	2.4	0.214
Sample size (total = 759)	403	356		

Appendix Table F.7 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,982) of the survey respondents.

   Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

   A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

   Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. No statistically significant differences between subgroup impacts were observed.

   Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

   Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

   GED = General Educational Development.

   [a]Monthly household income amounts equal to or greater than $10,000 were excluded from this calculation. About 7.2 percent of the sample is excluded from the income measures because respondents did not know or refused to provide the information. An additional 0.6 percent of the sample was excluded because the income provided was over $10,000.

   [b]Family Rewards payments are based on Seedco's Family Rewards data from program Year 3, which include activities completed in September 2009 through August 2010. The monthly Family Rewards payment amount is calculated by dividing the annual reward amount by 12. The payment data do not include bonus payments that some families received for opening new bank accounts.

   [c]Annual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 the respondent's income in the month prior to the survey interview. For program group members, it includes Family Rewards payments earned during program Year 3; see the preceding note. The federal poverty level was calculated based on annual income (monthly income multiplied by 12) and the household size at the time of the survey. The poverty threshold was measured according to the 2010 or 2011 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

   [d]Annual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 the respondent's income in the month prior to the survey interview. This calculation excludes the Family Rewards payments earned during program Year 3. The federal poverty level was calculated based on annual income (monthly income multiplied by 12) and the household size at the time of the survey. The poverty threshold was measured according to the 2010 or 2011 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

   [e]Insufficient food is defined as "sometimes" or "often times" not having enough food to eat.

   [f]Only about 4 percent of the survey sample (N = 130) owned an apartment or a house at the time of the survey.

   [g]About 6 percent of the sample is excluded from this analysis because of missing data.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table F.8

**Impacts on Income, Poverty, and Material Hardship,
by Respondent's Employment Status at the Time of Random Assignment**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Employed at baseline				
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments) [a,b,c] (%)	43.8	57.4	-13.6 ***	0.000
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards) [a,d] (%)	55.3	57.4	-2.1	0.460
Average total household income in month prior to interview (including rewards) [a,b,c] ($)	2,317	1,907	410 ***	0.000
Insufficient food [e] (%)	14.7	18.5	-3.9 *	0.099
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months [f] (%)	40.7	45.2	-4.5	0.147
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month (%)	30.2	34.7	-4.6	0.117
Average savings more than $500 [g] (%)	14.6	12.4	2.2	0.314
Sample size (total = 1,031)	534	497		
Not employed at baseline				
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments) [a,b,c] (%)	69.6	80.3	-10.8 ***	0.000
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards) [a,d] (%)	78.2	80.3	-2.1	0.418
Average total household income in month prior to interview (including rewards) [a,b,c] ($)	1,600	1,307	293 ***	0.000
Insufficient food [e] (%)	16.1	23.3	-7.2 ***	0.007
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months [f] (%)	39.6	42.5	-2.9	0.367
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month (%)	41.8	47.1	-5.2	0.107
Average savings more than $500 [g] (%)	10.3	5.7	4.6 **	0.013
Sample size (total = 927)	476	451		

(continued)

Appendix Table F.8 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,982) of the survey respondents.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. No statistically significant differences between subgroup impacts were observed.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

[a]Monthly household income amounts equal to or greater than $10,000 were excluded from this calculation. About 7.2 percent of the sample is excluded from the income measures because respondents did not know or refused to provide the information. An additional 0.6 percent of the sample was excluded because the income provided was over $10,000.

[b]Family Rewards payments are based on Seedco's Family Rewards data from program Year 3, which include activities completed in September 2009 through August 2010. The monthly Family Rewards payment amount is calculated by dividing the annual reward amount by 12. The payment data do not include bonus payments that some families received for opening new bank accounts.

[c]Annual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 the respondent's income in the month prior to the survey interview. For program group members, it includes Family Rewards payments earned during program Year 3; see the preceding note. The federal poverty level was calculated based on annual income (monthly income multiplied by 12) and the household size at the time of the survey. The poverty threshold was measured according to the 2010 or 2011 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

[d]Annual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 the respondent's income in the month prior to the survey interview. This calculation excludes the Family Rewards payments earned during program Year 3. The federal poverty level was calculated based on annual income (monthly income multiplied by 12) and the household size at the time of the survey. The poverty threshold was measured according to the 2010 or 2011 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

[e]Insufficient food is defined as "sometimes" or "often times" not having enough food to eat.

[f]Only about 4 percent of the survey sample (N = 130) owned an apartment or a house at the time of the survey.

[g]About 6 percent of the sample is excluded from this analysis because of missing data.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table F.9

**Impacts on Income, Poverty, and Material Hardship, by Number of Months
of Respondent's Rewards Eligibility in the 12 Months Before the Survey Interview**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)		P-Value	Sig.
7 months or more of rewards eligibility in past year						
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments, Year 3) [a,b,c] (%)	52.1	68.5	-16.4	***	0.000	†††
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards, early post-program) [a,d] (%)	63.5	68.5	-5.0	**	0.040	††
Rewards earned, Years 1-3 ($)	9,380	--	--		--	--
Average total household income in month prior to interview (including rewards) [a,b,c] ($)	2,034	1,633	401	***	0.000	††
Insufficient food [e] (%)	14.7	20.0	-5.3	**	0.012	
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months [f] (%)	38.9	43.4	-4.6	*	0.098	
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month (%)	36.2	40.9	-4.6	*	0.085	
Sometimes have enough money to buy something or go somewhere for fun (%)	30.9	26.4	4.5	*	0.078	†
Average savings more than $500 [g] (%)	12.1	8.6	3.5	**	0.044	
Average savings $1 - $250 [g] (%)	6.7	4.9	1.9		0.176	†
Ever borrow money from family or friends (%)	46.2	51.8	-5.6	**	0.044	
Sample size (total = 1,305)	748	557				
6 months or fewer of rewards eligibility in past year						
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (including Family Rewards payments, Year 3) [a,b,c] (%)	66.7	68.2	-1.5		0.677	†††
Household income at or below the federal poverty level (excluding rewards, early post-program) [a,d] (%)	73.4	68.2	5.2		0.129	††
Rewards earned, Years 1-3 ($)	8,332	--	--		--	--
Average total household income in month prior to interview (including rewards) [a,b,c] ($)	1,795	1,608	188	**	0.027	††
Insufficient food [e] (%)	17.2	21.5	-4.3		0.174	
Did not pay full rent or mortgage in past 12 months [f] (%)	42.6	45.4	-2.8		0.477	

(continued)

Appendix Table F.9 (continued)

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Usually not enough money to make ends meet at end of month (%)	33.3	41.0	-7.7 **	0.045	
Sometimes have enough money to buy something or go somewhere for fun (%)	27.5	31.0	-3.5	0.341	†
Average savings more than $500 [g] (%)	13.3	10.2	3.1	0.230	
Average savings $1 - $250 [g] (%)	7.4	1.8	5.6 ***	0.001	†
Ever borrow money from family or friends (%)	50.7	53.2	-2.5	0.535	
Sample size (total = 677)	276	401			

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,982) of the survey respondents.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

A double dash (--) indicates "not applicable."

[a]Monthly household income amounts equal to or greater than $10,000 were excluded from this calculation. About 7.2 percent of the sample is excluded from the income measures because respondents did not know or refused to provide the information. An additional 0.6 percent of the sample was excluded because the income provided was over $10,000.

[b]Family Rewards payments are based on Seedco's Family Rewards data from program Year 3, which include activities completed in September 2009 through August 2010. The monthly Family Rewards payment amount is calculated by dividing the annual reward amount by 12. The payment data do not include bonus payments that some families received for opening new bank accounts.

[c]Annual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 the respondent's income in the month prior to the survey interview. For program group members, it includes Family Rewards payments earned during program Year 3; see the preceding note. The federal poverty level was calculated based on annual income (monthly income multiplied by 12) and the household size at the time of the survey. The poverty threshold was measured according to the 2010 or 2011 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

[d]Annual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 the respondent's income in the month prior to the survey interview. This calculation excludes the Family Rewards payments earned during program Year 3. The federal poverty level was calculated based on annual income (monthly income multiplied by 12) and the household size at the time of the survey. The poverty threshold was measured according to the 2010 or 2011 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

[e]Insufficient food is defined as "sometimes" or "often times" not having enough food to eat.

[f]Only about 4 percent of the survey sample (N = 130) owned an apartment or a house at the time of the survey.

[g]About 6 percent of the sample is excluded from this analysis because of missing data.

Appendix G

Supplementary Exhibits for Chapter 4

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table G.1

**Impacts on Enrollment, Attendance, and Test Scores,
for Elementary School Students at the Time of Random Assignment**

Grade Level and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Enrollment status (%)				
On grade, Year 2	93.2	93.7	-0.5	0.578
On grade, Year 3	88.4	89.2	-0.8	0.498
On grade, Year 4	82.8	82.1	0.8	0.581
Enrolled in any grade in Year 4	91.9	91.5	0.4	0.691
Attendance rate 95% or higher (%)				
Year 1	43.7	41.1	2.7	0.143
Year 2	42.6	39.4	3.2 *	0.078
Year 3	41.0	39.4	1.7	0.368
Year 4	39.6	37.7	1.9	0.286
Average attendance rate (%)				
Year 1	91.5	91.0	0.5	0.175
Year 2	88.9	88.7	0.2	0.801
Year 3	85.9	86.6	-0.7	0.439
Year 4	83.4	83.0	0.5	0.668
Scored at proficient level or higher on ELA[a] (%)				
Year 1	49.5	49.9	-0.4	0.809
Year 2	63.1	61.9	1.2	0.466
Year 3	29.1	29.0	0.1	0.971
Year 4	26.3	27.3	-0.9	0.540
Scored at proficient level or higher on math[a] (%)				
Year 1	72.9	71.3	1.7	0.278
Year 2	79.0	76.2	2.8 **	0.041
Year 3	40.8	43.1	-2.3	0.166
Year 4	44.6	44.4	0.2	0.901
Sample size (total = 3,692)	1,889	1,803		

Appendix Table G.1 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Department of Education administrative records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 cover the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 school years, respectively.

"Elementary school students" refers to grades K-5.

Year 1 proficiency level is shown for third- through fifth-graders at random assignment. Year 2 proficiency level is shown for second- through fifth-graders at random assignment. Year 3 proficiency level is shown for first- through fifth-graders. Year 4 proficiency level is shown for kindergarteners through fifth-graders.

[a]In New York State, students who score at a level of 3 or higher on a 4-point scale are deemed "proficient."

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table G.2

Impacts on Enrollment, Attendance, Test Scores, Credits, and Regents Exams, for Middle School Students at the Time of Random Assignment

Grade Level and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Enrollment status (%)				
On grade, Year 2	95.4	96.9	-1.5 *	0.058
On grade, Year 3	86.9	88.3	-1.4	0.296
On grade, Year 4	71.2	73.8	-2.6	0.144
Enrolled in any grade in Year 4	90.6	90.8	-0.2	0.867
Attendance rate 95% or higher (%)				
Year 1	42.0	39.8	2.2	0.271
Year 2	36.0	32.4	3.6 *	0.054
Year 3	35.0	31.1	3.8 **	0.043
Year 4	26.2	24.0	2.2	0.208
Average attendance rate (%)				
Year 1	90.8	90.1	0.7	0.120
Year 2	86.0	86.2	-0.3	0.749
Year 3	80.1	79.9	0.2	0.849
Year 4	73.4	73.3	0.1	0.933
Scored at proficient level or higher on ELA[a] (%)				
Year 1	44.6	43.9	0.7	0.668
Year 2	50.4	48.9	1.6	0.388
Scored at proficient level or higher on math[a] (%)				
Year 1	58.8	56.8	2.0	0.223
Year 2	64.3	65.4	-1.1	0.531
Attempted 11+ credits (%)				
Year 3	78.5	78.3	0.1	0.942
Year 4	75.8	75.2	0.6	0.728
Earned 11+ credits (%)				
Year 3	50.0	48.9	1.2	0.586
Year 4	48.0	47.2	0.8	0.677
Number of Regents exams taken				
Year 3	1.3	1.3	0.1 *	0.099
Year 4	1.8	1.8	0.0	0.612
Number of Regents exams passed				
Year 3	0.8	0.7	0.1	0.125
Year 4	1.0	0.9	0.1 **	0.019
Sample size (total = 2,580)	1,264	1,316		

(continued)

Appendix Table G.2 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Department of Education administrative records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary becasue of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 cover the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 school years, respectively.

The Regents measures in this table include the following Regents exams: English, Math A, Math B, Geometry, Integrated Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, U.S. History and Government, Global History and Geography, Living Environment, Chemistry, Physics, and Earth Science.

"Middle school students" refers to grades 6-8.

Year 3 credits and Regents exams are shown for seventh- through eighth-graders at random assignment.

[a]In New York State, students who score at a level of 3 or higher on a 4-point scale are deemed "proficient."

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table G.3

Impacts on Enrollment, Graduation, Attendance, Credits, and Regents Exams,
for High School Students at the Time of Random Assignment

Grade Level and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Enrollment and graduation (%)				
On grade, Year 2	65.2	64.4	0.8	0.620
On grade, Year 3	45.1	45.2	-0.1	0.936
On grade, Year 4	34.1	33.0	1.1	0.423
Enrolled in any grade in Year 4	57.5	56.6	0.9	0.497
Graduated within 4 years[a]	56.4	55.6	0.8	0.629
Attendance rate 95% or higher (%)				
Year 1	31.4	27.9	3.4 **	0.037
Year 2	23.7	21.0	2.7 *	0.072
Year 3	18.5	17.3	1.3	0.351
Year 4	11.5	10.5	1.1	0.342
Average attendance rate (%)				
Year 1	81.3	80.8	0.5	0.549
Year 2	68.6	67.8	0.8	0.457
Year 3	56.0	55.7	0.2	0.837
Year 4	42.3	41.5	0.8	0.512
Attempted 11+ credits (%)				
Year 1	84.5	81.6	2.9 **	0.017
Year 2	70.1	67.4	2.6 *	0.070
Year 3	53.5	52.4	1.1	0.458
Year 4	30.5	31.5	-1.0	0.514
Earned 11+ credits (%)				
Year 1	49.9	49.4	0.5	0.780
Year 2	41.3	42.0	-0.7	0.682
Year 3	32.3	30.9	1.4	0.347
Year 4	20.9	20.9	0.1	0.972
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	27.8	27.6	0.3	0.834
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	28.1	27.7	0.4	0.518
Regents exams, Years 1 to 4				
Number taken	5.1	4.9	0.2	0.108
Number passed	2.6	2.5	0.1	0.178
Passed at least 5 exams (%)	27.3	27.8	-0.5	0.710
Sample size (total = 3,076)	1,538	1,538		

(continued)

Appendix Table G.3 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Department of Education administrative records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

    A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

    Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

    Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

    Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 cover the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 school years, respectively.

    The Regents measures in this table include the following Regents exams: English, Math A, Math B, Geometry, Integrated Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, U.S. History and Government, Global History and Geography, Living Environment, Chemistry, Physics, and Earth Science.

    "High school students" refers to grades 9-12. To preserve the experimental comparison, outcomes for all years are calculated over all entering high school students. For example, attendance in Year 3 is calculated over all students, even though most eleventh- and twelfth-graders should have left school by that year. The results were very similar when outcomes were calculated only over students who should still be in school in a given year.

    [a]Refers to 4 years since enrollment in the study.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table G.4

School Progress During the Four-Year Study Period, Control Group

Student's Grade Level at Baseline	Follow-up Year			
	Year 1	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**
Grade 4				
Projected grade	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7
Enrolled on grade (%)	100.0	94.7	92.0	85.5
Average attendance rate, if enrolled (%)	92.3	92.4	92.3	91.0
Proficient on math test [a] (%)	71.2	78.6	41.7	43.1
Score on math test (in 10s)	66.9	67.3	66.7	66.5
Grade 7				
Projected grade	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10
Enrolled on grade (%)	100.0	96.4	89.9	74.1
Average attendance rate, if enrolled (%)	91.2	89.6	86.2	81.5
Proficient on math test [a] (%)	59.6	63.5	--	--
On grade for credits earned (%)	--	--	50.7	45.7
Grade 9				
Projected grade	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12
Enrolled on grade (%)	100.0	70.6	53.0	51.2
Average attendance rate, if enrolled (%)	85.5	81.2	77.2	75.7
On grade for credits earned (%)	50.0	44.4	40.9	40.5
Graduated (%)	--	--	--	48.2

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Department of Education administrative records.

NOTES: A double dash (--) indicates "not applicable."

Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 cover the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011 school years, respectively.

[a]In New York State, students who score at a level of 3 or higher on a 4-point scale are deemed "proficient."

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table G.5

Education Rewards Earned, by School Level

School Level and Outcome	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Elementary school students			
Earned any education reward (%)	96.5	92.3	73.8
Total amount earned [a] ($)	494	544	267
Earned at least 1 attendance reward (%)	86.1	76.5	--
Earned an attendance reward in more than 4 periods (%)	46.5	36.4	--
Earned reward for English language arts (ELA) test [b] (%)	50.3	65.6	34.2
Earned reward for math test [b] (%)	68.2	78.5	40.4
Earned reward for obtaining a library card (%)	64.9	8.3	--
Parent earned a reward for attending parent-teacher conference (%)	67.3	64.3	60.2
Sample size	1,889	1,661	766
Middle school students			
Earned any education reward (%)	96.8	91.4	69.5
Total amount earned [a] ($)	614	620	339
Earned at least 1 attendance reward (%)	84.3	74.0	0.2
Earned an attendance reward in more than 4 periods (%)	47.7	35.1	--
Earned reward for ELA test [b] (%)	45.5	52.5	24.7
Earned reward for math test [b] (%)	60.6	65.1	37.1
Earned reward for obtaining a library card (%)	63.8	7.9	--
Parent earned a reward for attending parent-teacher conference (%)	60.7	58.8	50.2
Sample size	1,264	1,285	1,254

(continued)

Appendix Table G.5 (continued)

School Level and Outcome	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
High school students			
Earned any education reward (%)	87.8	76.3	82.8
Total amount earned [a] ($)	1,167	1,234	1,277
Earned at least 1 attendance reward (%)	67.5	52.9	61.8
Earned an attendance reward in more than 4 periods (%)	42.9	34.9	35.8
Earned rewards for a Regents exam (%)	40.6	47.7	52.7
Regents exam - Math A	22.6	20.7	20.5
Regents exam - Global History and Geography	7.1	20.1	10.6
Regents exam - U.S. History and Government	9.6	7.7	17.8
Regents exam - Comprehensive English	8.1	12.8	19.3
Regents exam - Science	24.5	16.7	20.3
Earned reward for earning at least 11 credits (%)	51.0	45.9	51.9
Earned reward for obtaining a library card (%)	57.6	6.6	--
Earned reward for taking the PSAT (%)	15.3	12.0	10.0
Parent earned a reward for attending parent-teacher conference (%)	48.4	40.5	39.6
Sample size	1,538	1,631	2,056

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using Seedco's Family Rewards program data.

NOTES: This table presents rewards earned by the level students were enrolled in during the given program year.

    The first program year covers September 2007 through August 2008; the second program year covers September 2008 through August 2009; and the third program year covers September 2009 through August 2010.

   A double dash (--) indicates "not applicable."

  [a]This is calculated only for students who earned any education rewards.

  [b]Receipt of elementary and middle school test score rewards in a given year is calculated only for students who are in grades that take the tests (grades 3 to 5 among elementary school students and grades 6 to 8 among middle school students).

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table G.6

**Impacts on School Outcomes for Students in Grade 9 at the
Time of Random Assignment, by Family Status**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Two-parent household at baseline				
Graduated within 4 years (%)	57.1	58.1	-1.0	0.846
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	83.0	82.8	0.2	0.930
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	68.1	65.4	2.7	0.454
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	52.6	52.3	0.3	0.952
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	37.6	36.0	1.6	0.409
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	45.8	47.2	-1.4	0.777
Sample size (total = 370)	188	182		
Single-parent household at baseline				
Graduated within 4 years (%)	47.5	45.8	1.6	0.486
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	77.5	76.5	1.0	0.371
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	59.1	58.3	0.8	0.642
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	38.8	37.9	0.9	0.698
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	31.6	30.9	0.7	0.427
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	34.5	33.2	1.3	0.524
Sample size (total = 1,608)	800	808		

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Department of Education administrative records.

NOTES: Samples sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. No statistically significant differences between subgroup impacts were observed.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

The Regents measures in this table include the following Regents exams: English, Math A, Math B, Geometry, Integrated Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, U.S. History and Government, Global History and Geography, Living Environment, Chemistry, Physics, and Earth Science.

Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 cover the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 school years, respectively.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table G.7

**Impacts on School Outcomes for Students in Grade 9 at the
Time of Random Assignment, by Parents' Immigration Status**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Foreign-born				
Graduated within 4 years (%)	61.0	58.9	2.1	0.578
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	84.3	83.3	1.1	0.480
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	66.3	68.1	-1.9	0.481
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	52.0	55.6	-3.7	0.320
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	37.3	37.3	0.0	0.996
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	48.6	49.2	-0.6	0.853
Sample size (total = 624)	303	321		
U.S.-born				
Graduated within 4 years (%)	43.7	43.3	0.5	0.850
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	75.9	75.1	0.8	0.543
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	58.3	55.6	2.7	0.176
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	36.7	33.4	3.2	0.192
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	30.7	29.3	1.4	0.159
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	31.5	29.2	2.3	0.311
Sample size (total = 1,354)	685	669		

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Department of Education administrative records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. No statistically significant differences between subgroup impacts were observed.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

The Regents measures in this table include the following Regents exams: English, Math A, Math B, Geometry, Integrated Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, U.S. History and Government, Global History and Geography, Living Environment, Chemistry, Physics, and Earth Science.

Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 cover the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 school years, respectively.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table G.8

**Impacts on School Outcomes for Students in Grade 9 at the
Time of Random Assignment, by Parents' Depression Status**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Not at risk of depression at baseline					
Graduated within 4 years (%)	50.0	49.4	0.7	0.775	
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	79.3	78.1	1.2	0.264	
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	62.6	60.1	2.5	0.156	
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	43.0	41.0	2.0	0.403	
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	33.5	32.1	1.4	0.115	
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	38.3	35.8	2.5	0.240	††
Sample size (total = 1,580)	764	816			
At risk of depression at baseline					
Graduated within 4 years (%)	48.3	42.0	6.3	0.319	
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	74.8	74.8	0.0	0.994	
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	55.0	56.8	-1.8	0.712	
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	36.7	36.9	-0.2	0.980	
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	30.8	29.8	1.0	0.674	
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	28.8	37.5	-8.7 *	0.097	††
Sample size (total = 269)	159	110			

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Department of Education administrative records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

   A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

   Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

   Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

   Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

   The Regents measures in this table include the following Regents exams: English, Math A, Math B, Geometry, Integrated Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, U.S. History and Government, Global History and Geography, Living Environment, Chemistry, Physics, and Earth Science.

   Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 cover the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 school years, respectively.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table G.9

**Impacts on School Outcomes for Students in Grade 9 at the
Time of Random Assignment, by Parents' Food Stamp Receipt**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Not receiving food stamps at baseline					
Graduated within 4 years (%)	59.8	53.7	6.1 *	0.061	††
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	83.5	80.8	2.8 *	0.062	†
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	66.9	65.9	1.0	0.689	
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	50.2	47.0	3.2	0.323	
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	36.7	34.1	2.6 **	0.039	†
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	44.8	42.0	2.8	0.354	
Sample size (total = 820)	386	434			
Receiving food stamps at baseline					
Graduated within 4 years (%)	41.5	44.0	-2.5	0.382	††
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	74.8	75.4	-0.6	0.661	†
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	56.2	55.0	1.2	0.570	
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	34.9	35.4	-0.5	0.844	
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	29.7	30.1	-0.4	0.719	†
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	30.8	30.7	0.1	0.982	
Sample size (total = 1,131)	586	545			

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Department of Education administrative records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

The Regents measures in this table include the following Regents exams: English, Math A, Math B, Geometry, Integrated Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, U.S. History and Government, Global History and Geography, Living Environment, Chemistry, Physics, and Earth Science.

Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 cover the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 school years, respectively.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table G.10

**Impacts on School Outcomes for Students in Grade 9
at the Time of Random Assignment, by Parents' TANF or SNA Receipt**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Not receiving TANF/SNA at baseline				
Graduated within 4 years (%)	51.7	51.1	0.6	0.823
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	80.5	79.0	1.5	0.174
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	63.4	62.9	0.5	0.767
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	44.0	43.1	0.9	0.697
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	34.1	33.1	1.0	0.300
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	39.4	37.9	1.5	0.496
Sample size (total = 1,448)	707	741		
Receiving TANF/SNA at baseline				
Graduated within 4 years (%)	39.8	39.5	0.3	0.950
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	72.1	73.7	-1.7	0.451
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	52.6	50.7	1.9	0.592
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	32.7	35.3	-2.6	0.555
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	28.5	28.7	-0.3	0.874
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	28.2	29.5	-1.3	0.737
Sample size (total = 469)	248	221		

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Department of Education administrative records.

NOTES: TANF = Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. SNA = Safety Net Assistance.
 Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.
 A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.
 Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. No statistically significant differences between subgroup impacts were observed.
 Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.
 Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.
 The Regents measures in this table include the following Regents exams: English, Math A, Math B, Geometry, Integrated Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, U.S. History and Government, Global History and Geography, Living Environment, Chemistry, Physics, and Earth Science.
 Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 cover the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 school years, respectively.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table G.11

**Impacts on School Outcomes for Students in Grade 9 at the
Time of Random Assignment, by Housing Status**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Lived in public housing at baseline				
Graduated within 4 years (%)	45.2	44.9	0.2	0.956
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	77.5	77.0	0.5	0.788
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	58.4	57.0	1.4	0.638
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	37.1	36.1	1.0	0.808
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	31.1	30.2	0.9	0.550
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	28.8	28.8	-0.1	0.989
Sample size (total = 566)	279	287		
Lived in Section 8 housing at baseline				
Graduated within 4 years (%)	49.6	46.2	3.4	0.434
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	78.3	76.6	1.7	0.388
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	63.9	59.1	4.9	0.118
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	42.1	38.1	3.9	0.351
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	33.1	31.4	1.7	0.295
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	37.1	34.4	2.7	0.488
Sample size (total = 488)	228	260		
Other housing status at baseline				
Graduated within 4 years (%)	52.6	51.1	1.6	0.631
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	79.8	78.2	1.6	0.303
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	61.9	61.3	0.6	0.809
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	46.0	44.3	1.7	0.588
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	34.1	32.9	1.2	0.361
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	42.1	40.6	1.5	0.614
Sample size (total = 875)	452	423		

(continued)

Appendix Table G.11 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Department of Education administrative records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. No statistically significant differences between subgroup impacts were observed.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

The Regents measures in this table include the following Regents exams: English, Math A, Math B, Geometry, Integrated Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, U.S. History and Government, Global History and Geography, Living Environment, Chemistry, Physics, and Earth Science.

Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 cover the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 school years, respectively.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table G.12

**Impacts on School Outcomes for Students in Grade 9 at the
Time of Random Assignment, by Parents' Employment Status**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Employed at baseline				
Graduated within 4 years (%)	54.0	55.3	-1.3	0.662
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	81.7	80.4	1.2	0.349
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	65.4	63.8	1.6	0.459
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	45.0	46.4	-1.4	0.631
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	34.7	33.9	0.8	0.477
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	42.9	40.9	2.1	0.432
Sample size (total = 1,068)	514	554		
Unemployed at baseline				
Graduated within 4 years (%)	43.7	39.0	4.7	0.141
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	75.0	74.1	1.0	0.524
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	55.5	54.5	1.0	0.690
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	37.5	33.1	4.4	0.155
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	30.5	29.2	1.3	0.286
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	29.7	29.6	0.1	0.964
Sample size (total = 877)	451	426		

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Department of Education administrative records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. No statistically significant differences between subgroup impacts were observed.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

The Regents measures in this table include the following Regents exams: English, Math A, Math B, Geometry, Integrated Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, U.S. History and Government, Global History and Geography, Living Environment, Chemistry, Physics, and Earth Science.

Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 cover the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 school years, respectively.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table G.13

**Impacts on School Outcomes for Students in Grade 9 at the
Time of Random Assignment, by Gender**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Male child					
Graduated within 4 years (%)	42.7	43.0	-0.3	0.914	
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	76.1	77.2	-1.1	0.469	†
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	57.7	58.6	-0.9	0.697	
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	33.8	37.7	-3.9	0.183	††
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	29.0	29.6	-0.6	0.614	†
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	30.0	30.7	-0.7	0.779	
Sample size (total = 966)	490	476			
Female child					
Graduated within 4 years (%)	55.8	52.8	2.9	0.312	
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	80.9	78.3	2.7 **	0.040	†
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	63.8	60.7	3.1	0.146	
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	49.3	43.3	6.0 **	0.040	††
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	36.5	34.1	2.4 **	0.028	†
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	43.5	40.4	3.1	0.251	
Sample size (total = 1,006)	494	512			

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Department of Education administrative records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

   A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

   Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

   Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample member. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

   Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

   The Regents measures in this table include the following Regents exams: English, Math A, Math B, Geometry, Integrated Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, U.S. History and Government, Global History and Geography, Living Environment, Chemistry, Physics, and Earth Science.

   Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 cover the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 school years, respectively.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table G.14

**Impacts on School Outcomes for Students in Grade 9 at the
Time of Random Assignment, by Family Poverty Level**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Income at or above 50% of FPL at baseline					
Graduated within 4 years (%)	50.1	49.4	0.7	0.798	
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	79.4	77.3	2.2 *	0.091	†
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	62.4	60.0	2.4	0.242	
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	41.9	41.6	0.3	0.925	
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	33.5	32.0	1.4	0.170	
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	38.7	36.6	2.1	0.391	
Sample size (total = 1,221)	618	603			
Income less than 50% of FPL at baseline					
Graduated within 4 years (%)	48.0	46.1	1.8	0.601	
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	77.1	78.4	-1.3	0.430	†
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	58.2	58.9	-0.7	0.781	
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	41.2	38.4	2.9	0.410	
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	31.6	31.5	0.1	0.909	
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	33.7	33.9	-0.2	0.961	
Sample size (total = 757)	370	387			

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Department of Education administrative records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.
     A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.
     Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.
     Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.
     Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.
     The Regents measures in this table include the following Regents exams: English, Math A, Math B, Geometry, Integrated Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, U.S. History and Government, Global History and Geography, Living Environment, Chemistry, Physics, and Earth Science.
     Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 cover the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 school years, respectively.
     FPL = federal poverty level.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table G.15

**Impacts on School Outcomes for Students in Grade 9 at the
Time of Random Assignment, by Enrollment in "Small Schools of Choice"**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Students in small schools of choice at baseline					
Graduated within 4 years (%)	53.3	58.6	-5.3	0.266	
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	81.7	82.3	-0.6	0.770	
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	63.8	64.2	-0.4	0.916	
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	50.1	52.9	-2.8	0.551	
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	36.9	38.6	-1.7	0.335	†
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	40.7	41.8	-1.1	0.802	
Sample size (total = 417)	197	220			
Students in other schools at baseline					
Graduated within 4 years (%)	48.1	45.3	2.8	0.242	
Attendance rate, Years 1 to 3 (%)	77.7	76.5	1.2	0.297	
Attendance rate, Year 4 (%)	60.0	58.3	1.7	0.346	
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	39.2	37.2	2.0	0.378	
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	31.6	30.0	1.6 *	0.070	†
Passed at least 5 Regents exams, Years 1 to 4 (%)	35.6	34.1	1.6	0.446	
Sample size (total = 1,561)	791	770			

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Department of Education administrative records.

NOTES: "Small schools of choice" are high schools that were opened in New York City in the early 2000s in response to the closing of many large, failing high schools. In an ongoing evaluation by MDRC, these small schools have been found to lead to large improvements in school progress and graduation rates (Bloom, Thompson, and Unterman, 2010; Bloom and Unterman, 2012).

　　Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

　　A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

　　Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

　　Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

　　Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

　　The Regents measures in this table include the following Regents exams: English, Math A, Math B, Geometry, Integrated Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, U.S. History and Government, Global History and Geography, Living Environment, Chemistry, Physics, and Earth Science.

　　Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 cover the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 school years, respectively.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Table G.16

Impacts on Enrollment, Graduation, Attendance, Credits, and Regents Exams, for Students in Grade 9 at the Time of Random Assignment, Proficient on the ELA Test in the Prior Year (Grade 8), by Gender

	Male Child			Female Child		
Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)
Enrollment and graduation (%)						
Enrolled in grade 12, Year 4	74.3	65.1	9.1	80.7	70.0	10.7 **
Enrolled in any grade in Year 4	89.6	89.5	0.1	90.9	89.2	1.7
Graduated within 4 years	69.9	64.0	5.9	78.6	67.5	11.1 **
Attendance rate 95% or higher (%)						
Year 1	54.7	47.4	7.3	56.1	39.1	16.9 ***
Year 2	48.9	38.8	10.1	47.4	30.3	17.0 ***
Year 3	40.7	39.5	1.1	40.3	26.4	14.0 ***
Year 4	26.3	27.6	-1.3	29.2	20.7	8.6 *
Average attendance rate (%)						
Year 1	91.7	88.1	3.6	91.9	86.9	5.1 ***
Year 2	88.1	81.0	7.1 *	87.1	81.8	5.3 **
Year 3	83.6	79.1	4.5	83.9	76.4	7.5 ***
Year 4	76.4	73.0	3.4	76.7	71.3	5.4
Attempted 11+ credits (%)						
Year 1	95.5	92.4	3.1	96.1	91.5	4.7 *
Year 2	93.3	84.5	8.8 *	92.5	87.6	4.9
Year 3	88.3	84.2	4.1	86.1	79.3	6.8
Year 4	56.9	63.0	-6.1	49.7	57.8	-8.0
Earned 11+ credits (%)						
Year 1	75.5	62.7	12.7 *	77.3	68.2	9.2 *
Year 2	65.4	58.6	6.8	74.5	59.2	15.4 ***
Year 3	58.1	53.9	4.2	68.9	53.8	15.1 ***
Year 4	45.7	43.3	2.5	40.4	44.9	-4.6

Table G.16 (continued)

| | **Male Child** | | | | **Female Child** | | |
Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)		Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)
Earned at least 44 credits, Years 1 to 4 (%)	62.9	59.0	3.9		68.8	55.1	13.7 **
Average number of credits earned, Years 1 to 4	42.7	39.4	3.3		45.1	40.5	4.7 ***
Regents exams, Years 1 to 4							
Number taken	7.1	6.6	0.5		7.3	6.5	0.8 **
Number passed	4.9	4.4	0.5		5.1	4.7	0.4
Passed at least 5 exams (%)	73.7	60.1	13.6 **		72.8	64.6	8.3
Sample size (total = 525)	93	89			176	167	

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Department of Education administrative records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groupS arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. No statistically significant differences between subgroup impacts were observed.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

The Regents measures in this table include the following Regents exams: English, Math A, Math B, Geometry, Integrated Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, U.S. History and Government, Global History and Geography, Living Environment, Chemistry, Physics, and Earth Science.

Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 cover the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 school years, respectively.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table G.17

**Impacts on Parental Engagement and on Focal Child's Educational Outcomes
and Activities, for Students in Grade 4 at the Time of Random Assignment**

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Effect Size
Parental engagement					
Respondent attended parent-teacher conference (%)	96.7	95.0	1.8	0.192	
Respondent has done the following (1 = never; 4 = several times per week)					
Talked with child about school	3.8	3.9	0.0	0.245	-0.079
Helped child with homework	3.4	3.3	0.0	0.525	0.042
Checked to see child's homework was complete	3.8	3.9	0.0	0.448	-0.051
Helped child prepare for test	3.0	2.9	0.1	0.389	0.058
School status					
Child currently attends school (%)	100	100	0.0	--	
How child performed in school (1 = not well at all; 5 = very well)	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.960	0.003
Activities since September 2009 (%)					
Child participated in any extracurricular activity	94.1	91.7	2.4	0.161	
Before- or after-school program	58.5	60.2	-1.7	0.590	
Program to help with schoolwork or homework	49.8	46.5	3.3	0.340	
School clubs or organizations	22.6	23.2	-0.6	0.842	
Sports	64.4	61.4	3.0	0.347	
Band, choir, orchestra, or chorus	28.6	29.9	-1.3	0.680	
Lessons such as dance, music, or arts and crafts[a]	56.6	54.2	2.4	0.480	
Club or youth group	36.5	34.1	2.4	0.459	
Recreation or community center activities	30.6	36.9	-6.3 **	0.048	
Worked inside or outside home for pay	10.3	13.7	-3.5	0.106	
Internet/cell phone/library use (%)					
Child has access to Internet from home	90.4	86.0	4.4 **	0.043	
Child has public library card	96.9	92.2	4.6 ***	0.002	
Child visited library in past 6 months	87.4	82.7	4.7 *	0.053	
Child has working cell phone	56.2	54.9	1.2	0.704	
Sample size (total = 898)	466	432			

(continued)

Appendix Table G.17 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: This table presents outcomes only for focal children who were living in the household at the time of the survey interview.

    Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

    A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

    Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

    Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

    The effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes expressed as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcome for both groups combined.

    No p-value is provided where estimates are equal to 100 percent for both samples.

    [a]This measure includes all lessons except those that involve sports.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table G.18

Impacts on Parental Engagement and on Focal Child's Educational Outcomes and Activities, for Students in Grade 7 at the Time of Random Assignment

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Effect Size
Parental engagement					
Respondent attended parent-teacher conference (%)	90.0	89.4	0.6	0.772	
Respondent has done the following (1 = never; 4 = several times per week)					
Talked with child about school	3.8	3.8	0.1 *	0.059	0.131
Helped child with homework	2.7	2.6	0.1	0.318	0.070
Checked to see child's homework was complete	3.5	3.4	0.1 *	0.076	0.124
Helped child prepare for test	2.4	2.4	0.1	0.392	0.060
School status					
Child currently attends school (%)	98.2	98.8	-0.7	0.430	
How child performed in school (1 = not well at all; 5 = very well)	3.7	3.7	0.1	0.514	0.044
Activities since September 2009 (%)					
Child participated in any extracurricular activity	89.8	89.6	0.2	0.911	
Before- or after-school program	50.7	48.5	2.1	0.525	
Program to help with schoolwork or homework	47.9	44.6	3.3	0.340	
School clubs or organizations	25.4	25.8	-0.4	0.891	
Sports	57.5	60.5	-3.0	0.383	
Band, choir, orchestra, or chorus	19.8	20.7	-0.9	0.746	
Lessons such as dance, music, or arts and crafts[a]	38.7	38.9	-0.2	0.949	
Club or youth group	36.8	35.6	1.2	0.718	
Recreation or community center activities	29.4	29.9	-0.5	0.870	
Worked inside or outside home for pay	24.4	18.6	5.9 **	0.042	
Internet/cell phone/library use (%)					
Child has access to Internet from home	85.6	87.5	-2.0	0.408	
Child has public library card	96.6	89.6	7.0 ***	0.000	
Child visited library in past 6 months	79.0	73.4	5.6 *	0.061	
Child has working cell phone (%)	67.4	65.5	2.0	0.540	
Sample size (total = 855)	451	404			

(continued)

Appendix Table G.18 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: This table presents outcomes only for focal children who were living in the household at the time of the survey interview.

    Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

    A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

    Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

    Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

    The effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes expressed as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcome for both groups combined.

    [a]This measure includes all lessons except those that involve sports.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table G.19

Impacts on Parental Engagement and on Focal Child's Educational Outcomes and Activities, for Students in Grade 9 at the Time of Random Assignment

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Effect Size
Parental engagement					
Respondent attended parent-teacher conference (%)	87.7	84.3	3.4	0.178	
Respondent has done the following (1 = never; 4 = several times per week)					
Talked with child about school	3.7	3.6	0.1 *	0.085	0.125
Helped child with homework	2.2	2.1	0.0	0.647	0.033
Checked to see child's homework was complete	3.2	3.0	0.2 **	0.042	0.148
Helped child prepare for test	2.1	2.0	0.1	0.383	0.063
School status					
Child currently attends school (%)	94.6	91.8	2.8	0.110	
How child performed in school (1 = not well at all; 5 = very well)	3.8	3.7	0.1	0.345	0.065
Activities since September 2009 (%)					
Child participated in any extracurricular activity	91.8	84.2	7.7 ***	0.001	
Before- or after-school program	51.6	49.6	2.1	0.545	
Program to help with schoolwork or homework	51.2	45.2	6.0 *	0.093	
School clubs or organizations	32.3	29.2	3.2	0.331	
Sports	54.8	46.6	8.2 **	0.020	
Band, choir, orchestra, or chorus	17.3	14.4	2.9	0.278	
Lessons such as dance, music, or arts and crafts[a]	38.2	33.6	4.5	0.190	
Club or youth group	31.2	31.9	-0.7	0.826	
Recreation or community center activities	31.0	26.1	4.9	0.127	
Worked inside or outside home for pay	30.6	28.6	2.0	0.561	
Internet/cell phone/library use (%)					
Child has access to Internet from home	88.9	85.8	3.0	0.205	
Child has public library card	95.4	92.0	3.4 *	0.056	
Child visited library in past 6 months	79.1	74.1	5.1	0.112	
Child has working cell phone	79.3	73.6	5.7 *	0.055	
Sample size (total = 789)	414	375			

(continued)

49

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: This table presents outcomes only for focal children who were living in the household at the time of the survey interview.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

The effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes expressed as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups.

[a]This measure includes all lessons except those that involve sports.

Appendix H

Supplementary Exhibits for Chapter 5

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table H.1

**Impacts on Parents' Receipt of Health Care Services and Health Outcomes,
by Respondent's Family Status at the Time of Random Assignment**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)		P-Value	Sig.
Two-parent household at baseline (%)						
Had a health checkup in past 12 months	92.2	89.9	2.4		0.446	
Had 1 or more dental checkups in past 12 months	86.2	73.2	13.0	***	0.002	
Had 2 or more dental checkups	51.5	34.3	17.2	***	0.001	
Excellent or very good self-rated health	30.7	36.3	-5.6		0.246	††
Has any medical condition[a]	56.6	54.7	1.9		0.704	
Asthma	15.4	13.4	2.0		0.595	
High blood pressure/hypertension	30.1	30.0	0.1		0.988	
High cholesterol/high LDL	10.7	11.3	-0.6		0.855	
Diabetes	11.7	10.1	1.6		0.612	
Obese according to Body Mass Index (BMI)[b]	48.1	48.1	0.0		0.997	
Sample size (total = 368)	200	168				
Single-parent household at baseline (%)						
Had a health checkup in past 12 months	89.5	88.7	0.9		0.580	
Had 1 or more dental checkups in past 12 months	80.2	70.9	9.4	***	0.000	
Had 2 or more dental checkups	43.8	33.1	10.7	***	0.000	
Excellent or very good self-rated health	37.2	32.2	5.1	**	0.024	††
Has any medical condition[a]	55.1	53.6	1.5		0.518	
Asthma	17.8	16.9	0.9		0.648	
High blood pressure/hypertension	26.8	25.9	0.9		0.664	
High cholesterol/high LDL	9.8	11.6	-1.8		0.236	
Diabetes	11.2	11.5	-0.3		0.860	
Obese according to Body Mass Index (BMI)[b]	45.6	46.0	-0.4		0.878	
Sample size (total = 1,593)	822	771				

(continued)

53

Appendix Table H.1 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,961) of the survey respondents.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

[a]The 4 most commonly reported conditions are listed.

[b]Weight categories are from the National Institutes of Health. Obesity is defined as having a BMI of at least 30. About 6 percent of the sample is excluded from this analysis because of missing data.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table H.2

Impacts on Parents' Receipt of Health Care Services and Health Outcomes, by Respondent's Immigration Status at the Time of Random Assignment

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Foreign-born (%)				
Had a health checkup in past 12 months	92.9	90.0	2.9	0.213
Had 1 or more dental checkups in past 12 months	87.2	75.6	11.7 ***	0.001
Had 2 or more dental checkups	53.5	39.5	13.9 ***	0.001
Excellent or very good self-rated health	28.9	27.4	1.6	0.659
Has any medical condition[a]	49.4	47.5	1.9	0.620
Asthma	8.1	9.6	-1.6	0.511
High blood pressure/hypertension	26.4	22.3	4.2	0.221
High cholesterol/high LDL	15.7	13.7	1.9	0.514
Diabetes	9.5	10.6	-1.1	0.664
Obese according to Body Mass Index (BMI)[b]	34.8	38.8	-3.9	0.349
Sample size (total = 580)	295	285		
U.S.-born (%)				
Had a health checkup in past 12 months	88.9	88.4	0.4	0.808
Had 1 or more dental checkups in past 12 months	78.9	69.8	9.1 ***	0.000
Had 2 or more dental checkups	42.0	30.9	11.1 ***	0.000
Excellent or very good self-rated health	39.0	35.1	3.9	0.115
Has any medical condition[a]	57.9	56.6	1.3	0.606
Asthma	21.1	19.1	2.0	0.343
High blood pressure/hypertension	28.0	28.4	-0.4	0.846
High cholesterol/high LDL	7.8	10.4	-2.6 *	0.079
Diabetes	12.3	11.2	1.1	0.494
Obese according to Body Mass Index (BMI)[b]	50.7	49.5	1.2	0.656
Sample size (total = 1,381)	727	654		

(continued)

Appendix Table H.2 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,961) of the survey respondents.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. No statistically significant differences between subgroup impacts were observed.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

[a]The 4 most commonly reported conditions are listed.

[b]Weight categories are from the National Institutes of Health. Obesity is defined as having a BMI of at least 30. About 6 percent of the sample is excluded from this analysis because of missing data.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table H.3

**Impacts on Parents' Receipt of Health Care Services and Health Outcomes,
by Respondent's Depression Status at the Time of Random Assignment**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Not at risk of depression at baseline					
Had a health checkup in past 12 months	90.6	89.4	1.2	0.436	
Had 1 or more dental checkups in past 12 months	82.6	72.7	9.9 ***	0.000	
Had 2 or more dental checkups	45.7	33.7	12.0 ***	0.000	
Excellent or very good self-rated health	38.1	36.3	1.8	0.433	
Has any medical condition[a]	52.6	50.2	2.4	0.302	
Asthma	16.7	13.6	3.1 *	0.081	††
High blood pressure/hypertension	25.4	25.0	0.5	0.812	
High cholesterol/high LDL	8.8	9.6	-0.8	0.552	
Diabetes	11.0	10.3	0.7	0.662	
Obese according to Body Mass Index (BMI)[b]	45.5	46.0	-0.5	0.859	
Sample size (total = 1,590)	832	758			
At risk of depression at baseline					
Had a health checkup in past 12 months	89.1	86.7	2.4	0.582	
Had 1 or more dental checkups in past 12 months	76.1	67.4	8.7	0.146	
Had 2 or more dental checkups	41.7	32.7	9.1	0.152	
Excellent or very good self-rated health	23.2	16.8	6.4	0.217	
Has any medical condition[a]	68.5	70.1	-1.6	0.775	
Asthma	23.6	33.0	-9.4	0.101	††
High blood pressure/hypertension	34.8	31.2	3.6	0.522	
High cholesterol/high LDL	19.5	16.9	2.6	0.593	
Diabetes	12.9	12.0	0.9	0.832	
Obese according to Body Mass Index (BMI)[b]	43.7	47.1	-3.4	0.606	
Sample size (total = 258)	136	122			

(continued)

Appendix Table H.3 (continued)

NOTES: The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,961) of the survey respondents.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

[a]The 4 most commonly reported conditions are listed.

[b]Weight categories are from the National Institutes of Health. Obesity is defined as having a BMI of at least 30. About 6 percent of the sample is excluded from this analysis because of missing data.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table H.4

Impacts on Parents' Receipt of Health Care Services and Health Outcomes, by Respondent's Food Stamp Receipt at the Time of Random Assignment

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Not receiving food stamps at baseline (%)				
Had a health checkup in past 12 months	91.0	88.5	2.5	0.265
Had 1 or more dental checkups in past 12 months	83.1	69.9	13.2 ***	0.000
Had 2 or more dental checkups	45.5	34.8	10.8 ***	0.002
Excellent or very good self-rated health	40.0	39.5	0.5	0.887
Has any medical condition[a]	49.7	47.8	1.9	0.570
Asthma	13.8	13.4	0.4	0.869
High blood pressure/hypertension	25.4	23.6	1.9	0.519
High cholesterol/high LDL	9.1	11.9	-2.8	0.195
Diabetes	10.5	8.5	2.0	0.341
Obese according to Body Mass Index (BMI)[b]	45.6	44.7	0.9	0.815
Sample size (total = 775)	394	381		
Receiving food stamps at baseline (%)				
Had a health checkup in past 12 months	89.5	88.9	0.6	0.748
Had 1 or more dental checkups in past 12 months	80.1	72.6	7.4 ***	0.003
Had 2 or more dental checkups	44.8	32.8	12.0 ***	0.000
Excellent or very good self-rated health	33.1	28.4	4.7 *	0.072
Has any medical condition[a]	59.1	57.9	1.2	0.651
Asthma	19.6	18.4	1.2	0.602
High blood pressure/hypertension	28.6	28.6	0.0	0.988
High cholesterol/high LDL	10.5	10.8	-0.3	0.853
Diabetes	11.9	13.0	-1.1	0.563
Obese according to Body Mass Index (BMI)[b]	46.1	47.6	-1.5	0.623
Sample size (total = 1,160)	611	549		

Appendix Table H.4 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,961) of the survey respondents.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. No statistically significant differences between subgroup impacts were observed.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

[a]The 4 most commonly reported conditions are listed.

[b]Weight categories are from the National Institutes of Health. Obesity is defined as having a BMI of at least 30. About 6 percent of the sample is excluded from this analysis because of missing data.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table H.5

Impacts on Parents' Receipt of Health Care Services and Health Outcomes, by Respondent's TANF or SNA Receipt at the Time of Random Assignment

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)		P-Value	Sig.
Not receiving TANF/SNA at baseline (%)						
Had a health checkup in past 12 months	90.6	88.3	2.3		0.164	
Had 1 or more dental checkups in past 12 months	82.8	69.9	12.8	***	0.000	††
Had 2 or more dental checkups	45.3	31.1	14.2	***	0.000	†
Excellent or very good self-rated health	37.5	34.7	2.8		0.244	
Has any medical condition[a]	53.6	51.3	2.3		0.340	
Asthma	16.3	16.1	0.2		0.917	
High blood pressure/hypertension	26.6	25.9	0.7		0.738	
High cholesterol/high LDL	9.6	10.7	-1.2		0.451	
Diabetes	11.2	10.5	0.7		0.667	
Obese according to Body Mass Index (BMI)[b]	46.9	46.0	0.9		0.727	
Sample size (total = 1,441)	742	699				
Receiving TANF/SNA at baseline (%)						
Had a health checkup in past 12 months	88.9	91.1	-2.2		0.456	
Had 1 or more dental checkups in past 12 months	77.6	76.3	1.3		0.757	††
Had 2 or more dental checkups	44.5	40.0	4.5		0.355	†
Excellent or very good self-rated health	33.3	28.5	4.8		0.260	
Has any medical condition[a]	61.5	60.4	1.1		0.794	
Asthma	21.2	16.3	5.0		0.187	
High blood pressure/hypertension	28.6	29.1	-0.5		0.909	
High cholesterol/high LDL	12.2	13.4	-1.2		0.703	
Diabetes	11.8	13.9	-2.1		0.513	
Obese according to Body Mass Index (BMI)[b]	42.8	46.4	-3.6		0.460	
Sample size (total = 455)	245	210				

(continued)

Appendix Table H.5 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: TANF = Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. SNA = Safety Net Assistance.

The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,961) of the survey respondents.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

[a]The 4 most commonly reported conditions are listed.

[b]Weight categories are from the National Institutes of Health. Obesity is defined as having a BMI of at least 30. About 6 percent of the sample is excluded from this analysis because of missing data.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table H.6

Impacts on Parents' Receipt of Health Care Services and Health Outcomes, by Respondent's Housing Status at the Time of Random Assignment

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Lived in public housing at baseline (%)				
Had a health checkup in past 12 months	88.9	89.0	0.0	0.999
Had 1 or more dental checkups in past 12 months	81.9	67.7	14.2 ***	0.000
Had 2 or more dental checkups	42.6	28.6	14.0 ***	0.000
Excellent or very good self-rated health	31.5	29.2	2.3	0.515
Has any medical condition[a]	58.5	58.6	-0.1	0.987
Asthma	19.7	19.6	0.1	0.969
High blood pressure/hypertension	29.8	30.5	-0.7	0.846
High cholesterol/high LDL	11.6	13.8	-2.2	0.390
Diabetes	15.1	11.8	3.4	0.214
Obese according to Body Mass Index (BMI)[b]	48.1	51.0	-2.9	0.492
Sample size (total = 604)	309	295		
Lived in Section 8 housing at baseline (%)				
Had a health checkup in past 12 months	92.5	88.0	4.4	0.129
Had 1 or more dental checkups in past 12 months	82.9	71.1	11.8 ***	0.004
Had 2 or more dental checkups	44.8	34.9	9.9 **	0.039
Excellent or very good self-rated health	38.7	30.9	7.8 *	0.071
Has any medical condition[a]	60.1	55.2	4.9	0.260
Asthma	21.2	15.4	5.9	0.110
High blood pressure/hypertension	29.0	27.9	1.1	0.780
High cholesterol/high LDL	9.0	9.7	-0.7	0.787
Diabetes	12.9	11.9	0.9	0.766
Obese according to Body Mass Index (BMI)[b]	46.1	50.3	-4.2	0.389
Sample size (total = 461)	228	233		

(continued)

Appendix Table H.6 (continued)

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Other housing status at baseline (%)				
Had a health checkup in past 12 months	89.6	89.2	0.4	0.855
Had 1 or more dental checkups in past 12 months	80.4	74.0	6.4 **	0.026
Had 2 or more dental checkups	47.0	35.9	11.2 ***	0.001
Excellent or very good self-rated health	36.7	36.8	-0.1	0.974
Has any medical condition[a]	52.0	49.5	2.4	0.451
Asthma	14.6	14.4	0.2	0.936
High blood pressure/hypertension	25.3	23.0	2.3	0.422
High cholesterol/high LDL	9.4	11.2	-1.8	0.377
Diabetes	8.1	10.0	-1.9	0.318
Obese according to Body Mass Index (BMI)[b]	43.6	40.6	2.9	0.403
Sample size (total = 855)	462	393		

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,961) of the survey respondents.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. No statistically significant differences between subgroup impacts were observed.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

[a]The 4 most commonly reported conditions are listed.

[b]Weight categories are from the National Institutes of Health. Obesity is defined as having a BMI of at least 30. About 6 percent of the sample is excluded from this analysis because of missing data.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table H.7

Impacts on Children's Medicaid Coverage

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Children's Medicaid coverage				
Ever covered (%)				
Years 1-3	82.5	81.9	0.6	0.453
Year 1	76.9	76.0	0.8	0.346
Year 2	74.1	73.4	0.7	0.510
Year 3	70.6	69.4	1.1	0.310
Always covered (%)				
Years 1-3	36.2	35.4	0.7	0.558
Year 1	56.4	55.2	1.2	0.336
Year 2	55.2	52.8	2.4 *	0.064
Year 3	50.3	48.9	1.4	0.283
Average number of covered quarters				
Years 1-3	7.8	7.7	0.1	0.175
Year 1	2.7	2.7	0.0	0.167
Year 2	2.6	2.6	0.0	0.320
Year 3	2.5	2.4	0.0	0.259
Sample size (total = 11,329)	5,680	5,649		

SOURCE: MDRC calculations from Human Resources Administration (HRA) Medicaid coverage data.

NOTES: A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

   Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

   Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table H.8

Impacts on Parents' Receipt of Health Care Services and Health Outcomes, by Respondent's Education Level at the Time of Random Assignment

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
High school diploma/GED certificate or higher at baseline (%)					
Had a health checkup in past 12 months	89.6	88.3	1.3	0.502	
Had 1 or more dental checkups in past 12 months	82.9	72.2	10.7 ***	0.000	
Had 2 or more dental checkups	44.2	32.9	11.3 ***	0.000	
Excellent or very good self-rated health	42.0	37.9	4.1	0.132	
Has any medical condition[a]	51.2	51.1	0.1	0.965	
Asthma	15.8	13.6	2.2	0.284	
High blood pressure/hypertension	25.2	25.0	0.2	0.930	
High cholesterol/high LDL	7.8	10.9	-3.1 *	0.060	††
Diabetes	9.5	10.8	-1.3	0.444	†
Treated for any medical condition[a]	46.2	45.7	0.6	0.828	
Asthma	13.1	12.4	0.7	0.723	
High blood pressure/hypertension	23.5	23.7	-0.2	0.933	
High cholesterol/high LDL	6.9	9.0	-2.2	0.157	††
Diabetes	9.5	10.3	-0.8	0.639	†
Obese according to Body Mass Index (BMI)[b]	48.4	44.3	4.1	0.171	
Sample size (total = 1,169)	603	566			
No high school diploma/GED certificate at baseline (%)					
Had a health checkup in past 12 months	90.5	90.2	0.3	0.889	
Had 1 or more dental checkups in past 12 months	79.5	69.4	10.1 ***	0.002	
Had 2 or more dental checkups	46.8	33.3	13.5 ***	0.000	
Excellent or very good self-rated health	26.2	26.1	0.1	0.968	
Has any medical condition[a]	62.1	57.8	4.3	0.210	
Asthma	19.9	20.0	-0.1	0.961	
High blood pressure/hypertension	29.8	28.8	1.0	0.747	
High cholesterol/high LDL	14.1	11.2	2.8	0.242	††
Diabetes	15.2	11.1	4.1 *	0.084	†

(continued)

66

Appendix Table H.8 (continued)

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Treated for any medical condition[a]	57.2	50.5	6.6 *	0.059	
Asthma	18.5	18.2	0.4	0.898	
High blood pressure/hypertension	28.3	25.9	2.4	0.441	
High cholesterol/high LDL	12.5	9.0	3.6	0.113	††
Diabetes	14.4	10.2	4.2 *	0.070	†
Obese according to Body Mass Index (BMI)[b]	44.4	48.1	-3.7	0.324	
Sample size (total = 750)	395	355			

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,961) of the survey respondents.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

[a]The 4 most commonly reported conditions are listed.

[b]Weight categories are from the National Institutes of Health. Obesity is defined as having a BMI of at least 30. About 6 percent of the sample is excluded from this analysis because of missing data.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table H.9

**Impacts on Parents' Receipt of Health Care Services and Health Outcomes,
by Respondent's Employment Status at the Time of Random Assignment**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)		P-Value	Sig.
Employed at baseline (%)						
Had a health checkup in past 12 months	90.4	88.4	2.0		0.316	
Had 1 or more dental checkups in past 12 months	82.7	73.3	9.3	***	0.000	
Had 2 or more dental checkups	46.1	34.4	11.7	***	0.000	
Excellent or very good self-rated health	45.2	41.4	3.8		0.203	
Has any medical condition[a]	45.8	42.6	3.2		0.283	
Asthma	13.0	11.7	1.3		0.537	
High blood pressure/hypertension	21.8	21.3	0.5		0.831	
High cholesterol/high LDL	7.6	9.2	-1.6		0.337	
Diabetes	7.8	6.7	1.1		0.511	
Treated for any medical condition[a]	40.3	36.6	3.7		0.196	
Asthma	10.9	10.1	0.8		0.677	
High blood pressure/hypertension	19.4	19.0	0.4		0.879	
High cholesterol/high LDL	6.3	6.9	-0.6		0.704	
Diabetes	7.6	6.3	1.3		0.399	
Obese according to Body Mass Index (BMI)[b]	45.5	40.5	5.0		0.117	††
Sample size (total = 1,022)	524	498				
Not employed at baseline (%)						
Had a health checkup in past 12 months	89.6	89.6	0.0		0.995	
Had 1 or more dental checkups in past 12 months	79.9	69.8	10.1	***	0.000	
Had 2 or more dental checkups	44.7	31.9	12.8	***	0.000	
Excellent or very good self-rated health	26.5	23.7	2.8		0.310	
Has any medical condition[a]	65.8	66.0	-0.2		0.954	
Asthma	21.8	20.8	0.9		0.737	
High blood pressure/hypertension	33.5	32.1	1.4		0.637	
High cholesterol/high LDL	12.3	14.1	-1.8		0.420	
Diabetes	15.8	15.6	0.1		0.955	

(continued)

Appendix Table H.9 (continued)

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Treated for any medical condition[a]	60.8	60.2	0.6	0.845	
Asthma	19.5	19.7	-0.2	0.929	
High blood pressure/hypertension	32.4	30.7	1.6	0.575	
High cholesterol/high LDL	11.6	12.3	-0.7	0.735	
Diabetes	15.3	14.7	0.7	0.773	
Obese according to Body Mass Index (BMI)[b]	46.6	53.1	-6.5 *	0.057	††
Sample size (total = 910)	484	426			

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,961) of the survey respondents.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

[a]The 4 most commonly reported conditions are listed.

[b]Weight categories are from the National Institutes of Health. Obesity is defined as having a BMI of at least 30. About 6 percent of the sample is excluded from this analysis because of missing data.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Figure H.1

Family Rewards Child Non-Emergency Medical Checkup Form

Appendix I

Supplementary Exhibits for Chapter 6

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table I.1

**Impacts on Employment, Earnings, and Credentials,
by Family Status at the Time of Random Assignment**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Two-parent household at baseline				
Full sample, UI records				
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	62.9	63.8	-0.9	0.654
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	49.4	50.2	-0.8	0.618
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	42,804	44,584	-1,780	0.320
Sample size (total = 1,151)	601	550		
Survey sample (%)				
Currently working	64.0	52.7	11.3 ***	0.003
Has any trade license or training certification	56.3	54.2	2.1	0.625
Has bachelor's degree or higher	12.1	10.8	1.3	0.631
Sample size (total = 548)	305	243		
Single-parent household at baseline				
Full sample, UI records				
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	63.5	65.1	-1.6	0.165
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	47.2	48.1	-0.9	0.292
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	35,147	35,403	-255	0.751
Sample size (total = 3,842)	1,912	1,930		
Survey sample (%)				
Currently working	54.3	48.7	5.6 ***	0.001
Has any trade license or training certification	53.9	49.4	4.5 **	0.025
Has bachelor's degree or higher	9.3	7.9	1.3	0.227
Sample size (total = 2,417)	1,238	1,179		

(continued)

Appendix Table I.1 (continued)

SOURCES: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey and New York State unemployment insurance (UI) wage records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. No statistically significant differences between subgroup impacts were observed.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who were not employed.

UI records include only employment and earnings in jobs covered by the New York State UI program. They do not include employment outside of New York State, nor in jobs not covered by the UI system (for example, "off-the-books" jobs and federal government jobs).

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table I.2

**Impacts on Employment, Earnings, and Credentials,
by Immigration Status at the Time of Random Assignment**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Foreign-born				
Full sample, UI records				
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	67.4	67.8	-0.4	0.796
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	54.0	54.8	-0.8	0.574
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	38,203	38,554	-351	0.773
Sample size (total = 1,683)	841	842		
Survey sample (%)				
Currently working	68.6	64.4	4.2	0.126
Has any trade license or training certification	59.3	58.6	0.7	0.837
Has bachelor's degree or higher	12.3	10.0	2.3	0.260
Sample size (total = 877)	457	420		
U.S.-born				
Full sample, UI records				
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	61.3	63.3	-2.1 *	0.096
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	44.6	45.4	-0.7	0.442
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	36,371	36,856	-486	0.605
Sample size (total = 3,310)	1,672	1,638		
Survey sample (%)				
Currently working	50.7	43.5	7.3 ***	0.000
Has any trade license or training certification	52.3	46.9	5.4 **	0.013
Has bachelor's degree or higher	8.8	7.8	1.1	0.367
Sample size (total = 2,089)	1,086	1,003		

Appendix Table I.2 (continued)

SOURCES: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey and New York State unemployment insurance (UI) wage records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. No statistically significant differences between subgroup impacts were observed.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who were not employed.

UI records include only employment and earnings in jobs covered by the New York State UI program. They do not include employment outside of New York State, nor in jobs not covered by the UI system (for example, "off-the-books" jobs and federal government jobs).

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table I.3

Impacts on Employment, Earnings, and Credentials, by Depression Status at the Time of Random Assignment

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Not at risk of depression at baseline					
Full sample, UI records					
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	66.3	67.3	-1.0	0.363	†
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	50.7	51.1	-0.5	0.583	†
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	39,823	40,177	-354	0.680	
Sample size (total = 4,067)	2,040	2,027			
Survey sample (%)					
Currently working	58.5	52.6	5.9 ***	0.001	
Has any trade license or training certification	55.3	51.3	4.1 **	0.043	
Has bachelor's degree or higher	10.2	8.9	1.3	0.247	
Sample size (total = 2,422)	1,265	1,157			
At risk of depression at baseline					
Full sample, UI records					
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	47.5	54.3	-6.8 **	0.029	†
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	32.9	37.3	-4.4 **	0.044	†
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	20,696	23,747	-3,051 *	0.062	
Sample size (total = 637)	340	297			
Survey sample (%)					
Currently working	42.3	37.0	5.3	0.211	
Has any trade license or training certification	51.0	46.2	4.8	0.363	
Has bachelor's degree or higher	8.2	4.8	3.4	0.182	
Sample size (total = 386)	201	185			

(continued)

Appendix Table I.3 (continued)

SOURCES: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey and New York State unemployment insurance (UI) wage records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who were not employed.

UI records include only employment and earnings in jobs covered by the New York State UI program. They do not include employment outside of New York State, nor in jobs not covered by the UI system (for example, "off-the-books" jobs and federal government jobs).

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table I.4

**Impacts on Employment, Earnings, and Credentials,
by Food Stamp Receipt at the Time of Random Assignment**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)		P-Value	Sig.
Not receiving food stamps at baseline						
Full sample, UI records						
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	74.4	75.6	-1.3		0.302	
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	63.3	62.5	0.8		0.465	††
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	61,703	61,485	217		0.879	
Sample size (total = 2,048)	1,002	1,046				
Survey sample (%)						
Currently working	69.9	63.3	6.6	***	0.004	
Has any trade license or training certification	56.4	50.1	6.4	**	0.029	
Has bachelor's degree or higher	14.1	13.6	0.5		0.819	
Sample size (total = 1,173)	596	577				
Receiving food stamps at baseline						
Full sample, UI records						
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	55.3	57.6	-2.4		0.106	
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	36.5	39.2	-2.7	**	0.014	††
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	19,430	20,614	-1,184		0.128	
Sample size (total = 2,884)	1,474	1,410				
Survey sample (%)						
Currently working	46.8	40.5	6.3	***	0.002	
Has any trade license or training certification	53.5	50.2	3.3		0.162	
Has bachelor's degree or higher	7.0	5.2	1.9	*	0.099	
Sample size (total = 1,756)	921	835				

(continued)

Appendix Table I.4 (continued)

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who were not employed.

UI records include only employment and earnings in jobs covered by the New York State UI program. They do not include employment outside of New York State, nor in jobs not covered by the UI system (for example, "off-the-books" jobs and federal government jobs).

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table I.5

Impacts on Employment, Earnings, and Credentials, by TANF or SNA Receipt at the Time of Random Assignment

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Not receiving TANF/SNA at baseline				
Full sample, UI records				
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	67.6	69.3	-1.8 *	0.097
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	53.8	54.6	-0.8	0.378
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	44,194	44,965	-772	0.402
Sample size (total = 3,714)	1,846	1,868		
Survey sample (%)				
Currently working	61.4	56.2	5.1 ***	0.003
Has any trade license or training certification	54.8	51.6	3.3	0.122
Has bachelor's degree or higher	11.3	10.2	1.1	0.370
Sample size (total = 2,204)	1,139	1,065		
Receiving TANF/SNA at baseline				
Full sample, UI records				
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	49.6	51.4	-1.8	0.481
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	27.9	30.3	-2.4	0.167
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	13,550	14,295	-745	0.517
Sample size (total = 1,128)	583	545		
Survey sample (%)				
Currently working	40.3	29.9	10.4 ***	0.002
Has any trade license or training certification	53.4	47.6	5.8	0.129
Has bachelor's degree or higher	4.6	4.1	0.5	0.763
Sample size (total = 673)	355	318		

(continued)

Appendix Table I.5 (continued)

SOURCES: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey and New York State unemployment insurance (UI) wage records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. No statistically significant differences between subgroup impacts were observed.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who were not employed.

UI records include only employment and earnings in jobs covered by the New York State UI program. They do not include employment outside of New York State, nor in jobs not covered by the UI system (for example, "off-the-books" jobs and federal government jobs).

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table I.6

**Impacts on Employment, Earnings, and Credentials,
by Housing Status at the Time of Random Assignment**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Lived in public housing at baseline				
Full sample, UI records				
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	60.7	60.7	0.0	0.985
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	44.0	43.7	0.2	0.869
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	29,918	30,631	-713	0.560
Sample size (total = 1,451)	732	719		
Survey sample (%)				
Currently working	48.6	43.5	5.1 *	0.056
Has any trade license or training certification	51.2	47.2	4.0	0.220
Has bachelor's degree or higher	5.9	4.3	1.6	0.267
Sample size (total = 937)	485	452		
Lived in Section 8 housing at baseline				
Full sample, UI records				
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	61.7	64.8	-3.1	0.152
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	45.1	45.8	-0.7	0.675
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	28,093	28,160	-67	0.959
Sample size (total = 1,105)	527	578		
Survey sample (%)				
Currently working	55.8	47.2	8.6 **	0.010
Has any trade license or training certification	58.0	54.3	3.6	0.338
Has bachelor's degree or higher	8.8	5.9	2.9	0.139
Sample size (total = 702)	337	365		

Appendix Table I.6 (continued)

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Other housing status at baseline				
Full sample, UI records				
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	65.5	67.6	-2.1	0.144
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	51.2	53.1	-1.9 *	0.093
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	45,672	46,724	-1,052	0.400
Sample size (total = 2,312)	1,185	1,127		
Survey sample				
Currently working (%)	61.4	56.4	5.0 **	0.030
Has any trade license or training certification	55.2	50.1	5.0 *	0.071
Has bachelor's degree or higher	13.2	12.8	0.4	0.825
Sample size (total = 1,272)	693	579		

SOURCES: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey and New York State unemployment insurance (UI) wage records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. No statistically significant differences between subgroup impacts were observed.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who were not employed.

UI records include only employment and earnings in jobs covered by the New York State UI program. They do not include employment outside of New York State, nor in jobs not covered by the UI system (for example, "off-the-books" jobs and federal government jobs).

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table I.7

**Impacts on Employment, Earnings, and Credentials,
by Employment Status at the Time of Random Assignment**

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Full-time employment at baseline					
Full sample, UI records					
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	87.8	88.7	-0.9	0.387	
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	75.9	75.8	0.1	0.928	
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	67,140	68,496	-1,356	0.369	
Sample size (total = 1,882)	967	915			
Survey sample (%)					
Currently working	82.4	77.9	4.5 *	0.057	
Has any trade license or training certification	58.1	57.0	1.2	0.692	†
Has bachelor's degree or higher	12.8	11.1	1.7	0.383	
Sample size (total = 1,101)	580	521			
Part-time employment at baseline					
Full sample, UI records					
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	85.5	85.3	0.2	0.947	
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	69.2	70.5	-1.3	0.622	
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	38,600	40,172	-1,572	0.484	
Sample size (total = 444)	206	238			
Survey sample (%)					
Currently working	82.1	70.5	11.6 **	0.032	
Has any trade license or training certification	56.6	61.2	-4.6	0.458	†
Has bachelor's degree or higher	12.2	8.8	3.4	0.374	
Sample size (total = 277)	142	135			

Appendix Table I.7 (continued)

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Not employed at baseline					
Full sample, UI records					
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	37.4	39.8	-2.4	0.192	
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	18.2	20.7	-2.5 **	0.033	
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	9,368	10,007	-640	0.447	
Sample size (total = 2,282)	1,147	1,135			
Survey sample (%)					
Currently working	27.5	23.1	4.4 *	0.054	
Has any trade license or training certification	50.8	43.2	7.7 ***	0.004	†
Has bachelor's degree or higher	7.2	4.8	2.4 *	0.055	
Sample size (total = 1,395)	721	674			

SOURCES: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey and New York State unemployment insurance (UI) wage records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

   A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

   Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

   Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

   Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

   Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who were not employed.

   UI records include only employment and earnings in jobs covered by the New York State UI program. They do not include employment outside of New York State, nor in jobs not covered by the UI system (for example, "off-the-books" jobs and federal government jobs).

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table I.8

Impacts on Employment, Earnings, and Credentials,
by Self-Rated Health at the Time of Random Assignment

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Self-rated health is excellent or very good at baseline					
Full sample, UI records					
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	72.0	75.5	-3.5 **	0.017	
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	56.4	57.9	-1.6	0.197	
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	46,794	46,909	-115	0.927	
Sample size (total = 2,136)	1,072	1,064			
Survey sample (%)					
Currently working	64.3	59.9	4.4 *	0.064	
Has any trade license or training certification	55.0	53.5	1.4	0.599	
Has bachelor's degree or higher	9.9	12.0	-2.0	0.220	††
Sample size (total = 1,305)	671	634			
Self-rated health is good at baseline					
Full sample, UI records					
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	65.6	65.6	0.0	0.983	
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	49.5	49.1	0.4	0.772	
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	36,108	36,705	-597	0.622	
Sample size (total = 1,835)	928	907			
Survey sample (%)					
Currently working	57.6	48.7	9.0 ***	0.001	
Has any trade license or training certification	53.9	51.8	2.1	0.508	
Has bachelor's degree or higher	9.8	5.2	4.6 ***	0.004	††
Sample size (total = 1,033)	541	492			

(continued)

Appendix Table I.8 (continued)

Subgroup and Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Self-rated health is fair or poor at baseline					
Full sample, UI records					
Ever employed, Years 1-3 (%)	41.4	41.2	0.3	0.904	
Average quarterly employment, Years 1-3 (%)	26.4	28.5	-2.1	0.178	
Total earnings, Years 1-3 ($)	17,680	19,710	-2,029	0.121	
Sample size (total = 988)	499	489			
Survey sample (%)					
Currently working	35.0	30.7	4.3	0.165	
Has any trade license or training certification	53.2	42.6	10.6 ***	0.008	
Has bachelor's degree or higher	9.5	6.7	2.7	0.199	††
Sample size (total = 605)	320	285			

SOURCES: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey and New York State unemployment insurance (UI) wage records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Differences across subgroup impacts were tested for statistical significance. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members. Standard errors were adjusted to account for multiple observations per family.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who were not employed.

UI records include only employment and earnings in jobs covered by the New York State UI program. They do not include employment outside of New York State, nor in jobs not covered by the UI system (for example, "off-the-books" jobs and federal government jobs).

Appendix J

Response Analysis for the 42-Month Survey

The Family Rewards 42-month survey provides information about Family Rewards sample members on topics such as participation in employment and education activities, health care, employment and job characteristics, household composition, and child outcomes. As the survey was administered to a subset of the Family Rewards sample, it is necessary to assess the reliability of impact results for the survey sample along two dimensions. First, the results for the survey sample may or may not generalize to (or be representative of) the full sample because (1) only a subset of the Family Rewards sample was selected to be interviewed, and (2) individuals who responded to the survey may be different from those who were selected for the survey but did not respond. Second, the failure of some families to respond to the survey may compromise the validity of the impact estimates, particularly if response rates differed by research group. This appendix presents a description of the survey fielding effort and assesses the survey in terms of its generalizability to the research sample and its validity for estimating program impacts. Overall, the results suggest that the survey sample provides valid estimates of the program's effects that can be generalized to the research sample.

Sample Selection and Survey Administration

The research sample includes 4,749 families, 3,739 of whom were selected to be interviewed for the survey (that is, to be in the fielded sample),[1] as described in Appendix Box J.1. The selection process proceeded in two steps. First, only families who entered the study by October 31, 2007, were eligible to be in the survey sample. Appendix Table J.1 shows baseline characteristics for the research sample (4,749 families) and the subsample of this group that was eligible for survey selection (4,092 families). Overall, the group that was randomly assigned by October 31 is very similar to the full sample. However, there are small differences, of a few percentage points, on two related characteristics: Hispanic origin and English as the primary language spoken at home.

From the sample that was randomly assigned by October 31, 2007, a subsample of 3,739 families was selected for interviewing (the fielded sample). In order to ensure adequate representation of families with children in each of the three target grades, families were chosen to be in the survey sample such that about one-third of the sample had a child in each target grade. That is, 1,247 of the fielded sample members were selected from among families with a child in grade 4; 1,248 were selected from among those with a child in grade 7; and 1,244 were

---

[1]The unit of selection for the fielded sample was families, and the interview was administered to one adult family member. As shown in Appendix Table J.1, only 5.7 percent of the research sample families had two adult participants. In those cases, the adult family member who completed the baseline information form first, usually the female, was contacted for the survey interview.

Appendix Box J.1

Sample Definitions

Research sample: All 4,749 families who were randomly assigned during the sample intake period, which extended from July 2007 through March 2008.

Fielded sample: Among the 4,092 families who were randomly assigned by October 31, 2007, 3,739 families were chosen for the survey. Families were divided into three groups, based on the grade of the target child, and then selected at random for the survey.

Respondent sample: Fielded sample members who completed the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

Nonrespondent sample: Fielded sample members who did not complete the Family Rewards 42-month survey for various reasons — for example, because they were not located or refused to be interviewed.[*]

_____
   *The nonrespondent sample includes 22 deceased sample members and one incarcerated sample member.

---

selected from among those with a child in grade 9.[2] As shown in Appendix Table J.1, however (in the third panel, "Target children's baseline measures," under "Grade"), the research sample and the sample that was randomly assigned by October 31 are both weighted somewhat more heavily toward families with ninth-graders (representing 36 percent of the sample). Thus, the sampling strategy for the survey involved somewhat undersampling families with ninth-graders and oversampling families with younger children. An additional selection criterion was that the primary adult in the family spoke English well or very well or spoke primarily English or Spanish in the home.

A comparison of the last two columns of the table shows that the fielded sample differs from the nonfielded sample in a few ways, some of which were expected. For example, there are differences between the two samples in the grade of the target children, with the fielded sample split evenly among the three grades. An unexpected difference, however, is for English as the primary language — about 80 percent of families in the fielded sample spoke English as

_____
   [2]Selection of the fielded sample was optimized by selected background characteristics. Samples that were equal in number to the target fielded sample size were drawn repeatedly, yielding several potential fielded samples. The potential samples were then evaluated based on how similar the program and control groups were to each other on a set of baseline characteristics in order to identify the actual sample. The sample in which the program and control group members were most similar was then used for the survey. Specifically, a distance measure was created — that is, a measure that summarized the standardized distance between the program and control groups on a set of background characteristics. The sample that had the smallest distance measure was chosen as the fielded sample.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table J.1

**Characteristics of the Fielded Survey Sample and Those Not Selected for the Survey at the
Time of Random Assignment**

Characteristic	Research Sample		Selected for Fielded Sample	Not Selected for Fielded Sample	Sig.
	All Sample Members	Those Assigned by October 31, 2007			
Family baseline measures					
Two-parent family [a] (%)	19.1	18.9	18.9	19.3	
Two parents enrolled in Family Rewards study [b] (%)	5.7	5.8	5.8	6.2	
Number of children in household (%)					
1 child	22.8	22.9	22.6	25.3	
2 children	34.2	33.9	34.1	32.4	
3 children	25.1	25.0	25.1	23.9	
4 children or more	17.8	18.2	18.2	18.5	
Primary language spoken at home is English (%)	76.9	78.8	79.8	68.3	***
Family living in public housing (%)	30.3	31.2	31.3	30.5	
Family receiving Section 8 rental assistance (%)	23.0	23.2	23.1	24.6	
Family receiving TANF or Safety Net Assistance [c] (%)	24.0	23.7	23.7	24.0	
Family receiving food stamps (%)	59.4	58.9	58.9	58.0	
Earnings above 130% of federal poverty level [d] (%)	14.9	15.1	15.1	15.2	
Community district (%)					
Bronx 5	15.9	13.7	13.6	14.4	
Bronx 6	17.8	16.1	16.0	17.3	
Brooklyn 5	19.3	20.7	20.9	19.3	
Brooklyn 16	15.6	16.6	16.7	14.7	
Manhattan 10	11.7	11.3	11.6	8.8	
Manhattan 11	19.7	21.6	21.2	25.5	

<div align="right">(continued)</div>

Appendix Table J.1 (continued)

Characteristic	Research Sample All Sample Members	Those Assigned by October 31, 2007	Selected for Fielded Sample	Not Selected for Fielded Sample	Sig.
Parents' baseline measures[e]					
Female (%)	94.3	94.2	94.5	91.2	**
Age (%)					
18-34	29.2	29.4	29.7	26.3	
34-44	45.2	44.9	44.9	44.5	
45-54	20.5	20.3	20.1	23.2	
55 or older	5.1	5.4	5.3	5.9	
Citizenship (%)					
U.S. citizen by birth	67.4	68.7	69.4	61.8	**
Naturalized U.S. citizen	15.7	15.1	14.8	18.4	**
Legal Permanent Resident	16.9	16.2	15.8	19.8	**
Race/ethnicity (%)					
Hispanic/Latino	46.7	44.4	44.0	48.0	**
Black, non-Hispanic/Latino	51.2	53.6	54.1	48.3	**
Other, non-Hispanic/Latino	2.1	2.1	1.9	3.7	**
Education (highest degree or diploma earned) (%)					
Less than high school diploma/GED certificate	40.2	40.0	40.0	40.1	
High school diploma/GED certificate	26.0	26.0	25.7	28.9	
More than high school diploma/GED certificate	33.8	34.0	34.3	31.0	
Currently working (%)	53.0	52.6	52.9	49.4	
Working full time [f] (%)	40.2	40.2	40.4	38.3	
Covered by public health insurance (%)	70.5	70.2	70.0	71.9	
Self-rated health is excellent, very good, or good (%)	79.9	79.9	79.9	80.3	
Has a physical or mental condition that limits work (%)	23.3	23.7	23.7	23.4	

(continued)

Appendix Table J.1 (continued)

| | Research Sample | | | | |
Characteristic	All Sample Members	Those Assigned by October 31, 2007	Selected for Fielded Sample	Not Selected for Fielded Sample	Sig.
Over the past 2 weeks					
Had little or no interest in doing things and					
had been feeling down, depressed, or hopeless (%)	13.8	13.6	13.7	13.2	
Target children's baseline measures					
Born in the United States (%)	92.8	93.1	93.4	90.0	**
Race/ethnicity (%)					
Hispanic/Latino	47.0	44.8	44.7	46.0	***
Black, non-Hispanic/Latino	50.6	52.7	53.1	49.1	***
Other, non-Hispanic/Latino	2.4	2.5	2.3	4.8	***
Attended public school in past year (%)	98.4	98.4	98.4	99.1	
Grade [g] (%)					
Grade 4	32.8	32.6	33.4	24.9	***
Grade 7	31.4	31.7	33.4	13.9	***
Grade 9	35.8	35.7	33.3	61.2	***
Covered by public health insurance (%)	79.1	78.7	78.5	80.9	
Has a physical, emotional or mental health problem that limits activities (%)	14.1	14.3	14.5	12.1	
Parent's rating of child's health is excellent, very good, or good (%)	96.6	96.7	96.7	96.3	

(continued)

Characteristic	Research Sample		Selected for Fielded sample	Not Selected for Fielded Sample	Sig.
	All Sample Members	Those Assigned by October 31, 2007			
Administrative data measures					
UI earnings in the year prior to random assignment ($)	10,812	10,836	10,902	10,137	
TANF payments in the year prior to random assignment ($)	2,332	2,322	2,332	2,216	
Food stamp payments in the year prior to random assignment ($)	2,335	2,320	2,330	2,207	
Medicaid coverage in the 3 quarters prior to random assignment (%)	66.5	65.5	65.4	66.9	
Target child proficient on ELA test, 2007 (%)	38.4	38.4	38.5	36.5	
Target child proficient on math test, 2007 (%)	55.3	55.3	56.3	44.1	***
Sample size	4,749	4,092	3,739	353	

SOURCES: MDRC calculations using Family Rewards Baseline Information Forms and administrative records from New York State.

NOTES: In order to assess differences in characteristics across research groups, chi-square tests were used for categorical variables, and t-tests were used for continuous variables. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

  Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

  Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums.

  [a]Families with parents who reported their marital status as single, single but living with a boyfriend or girlfriend, separated, divorced, or widowed are considered single-parent families; those with parents who reported their marital status as married or legal domestic partnership are considered two-parent families.

  [b]This measure refers to sample members who enrolled in the Family Rewards study with their spouse or legal domestic partner.

  [c]This measure includes families with child-only cases.

  [d]Income amounts from sources other than earnings were not available from the Baseline Information Form.

  [e]These measures exclude information for enrolled second parents in two-parent households (N = 247).

  [f]This measure refers to 30 hours a week or more.

  [g]Grades 4, 7, and 9 were "target grades" for the Family Rewards program. Therefore, all enrolled families had to have a child in grade 4, 7, or 9.

their primary language, compared with 68 percent of families in the sample that was not fielded. This difference, in turn, appears to be related to differences by race and citizenship status. The reason for these differences is not clear. However, because the nonfielded sample is a small percentage of the eligible sample, the fielded sample looks on average very similar to the eligible sample (that is, those assigned by October 31) and to all sample members.

The survey instrument consisted of 11 modules, some of which were designated as "core" and were administered to the entire fielded sample and some of which were designated as "noncore" and were administered to a randomly chosen subset of the fielded sample. This design strategy was chosen to preserve the breadth of the survey topics, while also being sensitive to the time burden placed on participants. Fielded sample members were randomly distributed into three mutually exclusive groups, and the members in each group completed a predefined set of the noncore survey modules. Some of the noncore modules were administered to more than one subsample. In addition, a survey module concerning program experiences and perceptions was administered to a subsample of program group respondents.

Fielding of the survey began in November 2010. Members of the fielded sample were initially contacted by a letter that introduced the survey and solicited their participation, and then were telephoned for the survey interviews. Individuals were offered $30 for completing the interview.[3] As fielding progressed, it became evident that individuals in the program group were responding at a higher rate than those in the control group and that response rates varied by community district. At that point, survey outreach efforts began to be targeted to address those imbalances. Survey interviews concluded in June 2011. Respondents were interviewed anywhere from 38 to 48 months after they were randomly assigned. Because of the initial imbalance in response rates by research group, control group members were interviewed on average nearly a couple of weeks later (relative to random assignment) than program group members, 41.9 months versus 41.3 months, respectively.

Characteristics of Respondents and Nonrespondents Within the Fielded Sample

Among the 3,739 families who were chosen to be surveyed, 2,966 completed a survey interview, for a response rate of 79 percent. The response rate was 82 percent for the program group and 76 percent for the control group.

Appendix Table J.2 presents selected baseline characteristics for survey respondents and nonrespondents. Some differences are to be expected, given that individuals who respond to

---

[3]Incentives increased from $30 to $60 in March 2011, and from $60 to $100 in May 2011. Approximately 76 percent of the respondent sample received a $30 incentive, 22 percent received a $60 incentive, and 2 percent received a $100 incentive.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards
Appendix Table J.2
Characteristics of the Fielded Survey Sample at the Time of Random Assignment,
by Response Status

Characteristic	Survey Respondents	Non-Respondents	Fielded Sample	Sig.
Assigned to program group (%)	52.0	42.4	50.0	***
Family baseline measures				
Two-parent family [a] (%)	18.5	20.3	18.9	
Two parents enrolled in Family Rewards study [b] (%)	5.7	6.1	5.8	
Number of children in household (%)				
1 child	23.2	20.5	22.6	
2 children	33.5	36.3	34.1	
3 children	24.8	26.4	25.1	
4 children or more	18.5	16.8	18.2	
Primary language spoken at home is English (%)	81.0	75.4	79.8	***
Family living in public housing (%)	32.2	27.6	31.3	**
Family receiving Section 8 rental assistance (%)	24.1	19.4	23.1	***
Family receiving TANF or Safety Net Assistance [c] (%)	23.4	24.6	23.7	
Family receiving food stamps (%)	60.0	55.0	58.9	**
Earnings above 130% of federal poverty level [d] (%)	14.6	17.0	15.1	
Community district (%)				
Bronx 5	13.5	14.4	13.6	
Bronx 6	15.8	16.9	16.0	
Brooklyn 5	20.9	20.8	20.9	
Brooklyn 16	17.0	15.7	16.7	
Manhattan 10	11.9	10.2	11.6	
Manhattan 11	21.0	22.0	21.2	
Parents' baseline measures[e]				
Female (%)	95.4	90.8	94.5	***
Age (%)				
18-34	29.3	31.3	29.7	
35-44	44.6	46.2	44.9	
45-54	20.9	17.1	20.1	
55 or older	5.3	5.4	5.3	
Citizenship (%)				
U.S. citizen by birth	70.4	65.3	69.4	***
Naturalized U.S. citizen	14.0	18.0	14.8	***
Legal Permanent Resident	15.6	16.7	15.8	***
Race/ethnicity (%)				
Hispanic/Latino	42.6	49.7	44.0	***
Black, non-Hispanic/Latino	55.6	48.0	54.1	***
Other, non-Hispanic/Latino	1.8	2.3	1.9	***

(continued)

Characteristic	Survey Respondents	Non-Respondents	Fielded Sample	Sig.
Education (%)				
Less than high school diploma/GED certificate	38.9	44.2	40.0	***
High school diploma/GED certificate	25.6	26.0	25.7	***
More than high school diploma/GED certificate	35.5	29.8	34.3	***
Currently working (%)	52.3	55.4	52.9	
Working full time [f] (%)	39.7	43.0	40.4	
Covered by public health insurance (%)	70.7	67.3	70.0	*
Self-rated health is excellent, very good, or good (%)	79.4	81.5	79.9	
Has a physical or mental condition that limits work (%)	24.2	21.9	23.7	
Over the past 2 weeks				
Had little or no interest in doing things and				
had been feeling down, depressed, or hopeless (%)	13.7	13.5	13.7	
Target children's baseline measures				
Born in the United States (%)	93.7	92.1	93.4	
Race/ethnicity (%)				
Hispanic/Latino	43.3	49.7	44.7	***
Black, non-Hispanic/Latino	54.4	47.8	53.1	***
Other, non-Hispanic/Latino	2.2	2.5	2.3	***
Attended public school in past year (%)	98.4	98.2	98.4	
Grade [g] (%)				
Grade 4	33.6	32.3	33.4	
Grade 7	33.6	32.5	33.4	
Grade 9	32.8	35.2	33.3	
Covered by public health insurance (%)	78.9	77.0	78.5	
Has a physical, emotional or mental health problem that limits activities (%)	14.7	13.8	14.5	
Parent's rating of child's health is excellent, very good, or good (%)	96.7	96.9	96.7	
Administrative data measures				
UI earnings in the year prior to random assignment ($)	10,737	11,532	10,902	
TANF payments in the year prior to random assignment ($)	2,306	2,434	2,332	
Food stamp payments in the year prior to random assignment ($)	2,337	2,306	2,330	
Medicaid coverage in the 3 quarters prior to random assignment (%)	65.9	63.1	65.4	
Target child proficient on ELA test, 2007 (%)	38.3	39.5	38.5	
Target child proficient on math test, 2007 (%)	56.5	55.7	56.3	

(continued)

Appendix Table J.2 (continued)

Characteristic	Survey Respondents	Non-Respondents	Fielded Sample	Sig.
Family earned at least one reward, Year 1-3 (%)				
Health reward	98.8	94.2	98.0	***
Education reward	98.9	94.8	98.2	***
Workforce reward	55.8	41.8	53.3	***
Average reward payment, Year 3 ($)	3,291	2,244	3,108	***
Sample size	2,966	773	3,739	

SOURCES: MDRC calculations using Family Rewards Baseline Information Forms and administrative records from New York State.

NOTES: In order to assess differences in characteristics across research groups, chi-square tests were used for categorical variables, and t-tests were used for continuous variables. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

  Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

  Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums.

  [a]Families with parents who reported their marital status as single, single but living with a boyfriend or girlfriend, separated, divorced, or widowed are considered single-parent families; those with parents who reported their marital status as married or legal domestic partnership are considered two-parent families.

  [b]This measure refers to sample members who enrolled in the Family Rewards study with their spouse or legal domestic partner.

  [c]This measure includes families with child-only cases.

  [d]Income amounts from sources other than earnings were not available from the Baseline Information Form.

  [e]These measures exclude information for enrolled second parents in two-parent households (N = 247).

  [f]This measure refers to 30 hours a week or more.

  [g]Grades 4, 7, and 9 were "target grades" for the Family Rewards program. Therefore, all enrolled families had to have a child in grade 4, 7, or 9.

surveys tend to be different, usually less disadvantaged, from those who do not. The table illustrates these types of differences. The respondent sample, for example, has a higher fraction of individuals for whom English is the primary language spoken at home. Similarly, U.S. citizens by birth were more likely to have responded to the survey than naturalized citizens and noncitizens.

These differences were also tested in a regression model, in which the probability of response was regressed on a range of baseline covariates. The results are shown in Appendix Table J.3. Some of the statistically significant differences shown in Appendix Table J.2 remain statistically significant. In addition, the full model is statistically significant. The differences between the two groups suggest some caution when generalizing the survey findings to the research sample. However, because the response rate was fairly high (nonrespondents represent about 21 percent of the fielded sample), the respondent sample still looks similar to the fielded sample.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table J.3

**Estimates from a Logistic Regression for the Probability of Being
a Respondent to the Family Rewards 42-Month Survey**

Variable	Fielded Sample	
	Parameter Estimate	P-Value
Family baseline measures		
Assigned to program group	0.402 ***	<.0001
Target child proficient on ELA test, 2007	-0.089	0.372
Target child proficient on math test, 2007	0.082	0.399
Community district Bronx 5	0.141	0.344
Community district Bronx 6	0.031	0.823
Community district Brooklyn 5	0.083	0.540
Community district Brooklyn 16	0.050	0.736
Community district Manhattan 10	0.125	0.437
Number of children in household	-0.008	0.818
Primary language spoken at home is English	0.141	0.297
Two-parent family	-0.004	0.967
High school diploma/GED certificate, or above	0.242 ***	0.007
Currently working	-0.099	0.296
Randomly assigned after September 2008	0.064	0.555
Black, non-Hispanic/Latino	0.304	0.287
Hispanic/Latino	0.101	0.725
U.S. citizen by birth	0.042	0.697
Age	0.011 **	0.034
Family living in public housing or receiving Section 8	0.363 ***	<.0001
Family receiving TANF or Safety Net Assistance	-0.158	0.141
Covered by public health insurance	0.207 **	0.044
Likelihood ratio	101.0 ***	<.0001
Wald statistic	97.6 ***	<.0001
Sample size		3,739

SOURCES: MDRC calculations using Family Rewards Baseline Information Forms and New York
City Department of Education administrative records.

NOTES: Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10
percent.
  ELA = English language arts.

Finally, the top row of Appendix Table J.2 shows that individuals in the program group were more likely to respond to the survey than those in the control group. Although there is always the possibility that program group respondents are different from control group respondents, even with similar response rates between the two groups, this issue becomes more of a concern with differential response rates. Differences in characteristics between the program and control groups, in turn, lead to the possibility that impact estimates may be biased, or invalid. Although the difference between respondents and nonrespondents who were assigned to the program group, shown in Appendix Table J.2, is not large (10 percentage points), this difference remains statistically significant in the logistic regression model (Appendix Table J.3).

Comparison Between the Research Groups in the Survey Respondent Sample

Selected baseline characteristics for program and control group survey respondents are shown in Appendix Table J.4. Although the two groups are similar across most dimensions, there are a few exceptions. For example, a higher fraction of program group respondents are in two-parent families, compared with control group respondents. The program group is also less likely to receive Section 8 rental assistance. Although most of these differences are small, a notable difference between the two groups is for earnings in the prior year, based on unemployment insurance (UI) records. Program group respondents earned about $1,750 more than control group respondents in the year before random assignment.

These differences are also estimated in a logistic regression framework, in which the likelihood of being in the program group is regressed on a range of baseline characteristics (Appendix Table J.5). Although most of the differences found in Appendix Table J.4 remain statistically significant in the full model, the model as a whole is not statistically significant. While these differences do suggest caution when interpreting survey impacts, all of the characteristics for which there are differences between the research groups are included in the impact regression models.

Consistency of Impacts

The previous sections suggested some caution in interpreting the results from the survey for two reasons. First, the results for the survey sample may not be generalizable to the full research sample, given the difference between the late cohort (not eligible for survey fielding) and the early cohort on English language use and related characteristics, and given the differences on these same characteristics between individuals who responded to the survey and those who did not. Second, although accounted for in the impact regression model, there were a few differences in characteristics between program and control group respondents.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table J.4

**Characteristics of the Survey Respondents at the Time of Random Assignment,
by Research Group**

Characteristic	Program Group Respondents	Control Group Respondents	Survey Respondents	Sig.
Family baseline measures				
Two-parent family [a] (%)	19.8	17.1	18.5	*
Two parents enrolled in Family Rewards study [b] (%)	6.8	4.5	5.7	***
Number of children in household (%)				
1 child	24.1	22.2	23.2	
2 children	32.5	34.7	33.5	
3 children	25.9	23.5	24.8	
4 children or more	17.5	19.6	18.5	
Primary language spoken at home is English (%)	80.6	81.4	81.0	
Family living in public housing (%)	32.0	32.4	32.2	
Family receiving Section 8 rental assistance (%)	22.2	26.1	24.1	**
Family receiving TANF or Safety Net Assistance [c] (%)	23.8	23.0	23.4	
Family receiving food stamps (%)	60.7	59.1	60.0	
Earnings above 130% of federal poverty level [d] (%)	15.7	13.4	14.6	
Community district (%)				
Bronx 5	13.3	13.6	13.5	
Bronx 6	15.9	15.7	15.8	
Brooklyn 5	20.8	20.9	20.9	
Brooklyn 16	17.2	16.8	17.0	
Manhattan 10	11.6	12.2	11.9	
Manhattan 11	21.2	20.7	21.0	
Parents' baseline measures[e]				
Female (%)	95.4	95.4	95.4	
Age (%)				
18-34	28.7	30.0	29.3	*
35-44	43.3	46.0	44.6	*
45-54	22.2	19.4	20.9	*
55 or older	5.8	4.6	5.3	*
Citizenship (%)				
U.S. citizen by birth	70.4	70.5	70.4	
Naturalized U.S. citizen	14.0	14.0	14.0	
Legal Permanent Resident	15.6	15.5	15.6	
Race/ethnicity (%)				
Hispanic/Latino	43.5	41.6	42.6	
Black, non-Hispanic/Latino	55.0	56.3	55.6	
Other, non-Hispanic/Latino	1.5	2.1	1.8	

Characteristic	Program Group Respondents	Control Group Respondents	Survey Respondents	Sig.
Education (%)				
Less than high school diploma/GED certificate	39.3	38.6	38.9	*
High school diploma/ GED certificate	23.8	27.6	25.6	*
More than high school diploma/GED certificate	36.9	33.9	35.5	*
Currently working (%)	52.6	52.0	52.3	
Working full time [f] (%)	40.2	39.2	39.7	
Covered by public health insurance (%)	69.9	71.6	70.7	
Self-rated health is good, very good, or excellent (%)	79.1	79.8	79.4	
Has a physical or mental condition that limits work (%)	24.7	23.6	24.2	
Over the past 2 weeks				
Had little or no interest in doing things and had been feeling down, depressed or hopeless (%)	13.7	13.8	13.7	
Target children's baseline measures				
Born in the United States (%)	94.0	93.5	93.7	
Race/ethnicity (%)				
Hispanic/Latino	44.1	42.5	43.3	
Black, non-Hispanic/Latino	53.8	55.1	54.4	
Other, non-Hispanic/Latino	2.2	2.3	2.2	
Attended public school in past year (%)	98.6	98.2	98.4	
Grade [g] (%)				
Grade 4	33.2	34.1	33.6	
Grade 7	33.6	33.6	33.6	
Grade 9	33.2	32.3	32.8	
Covered by public health insurance (%)	78.8	79.0	78.9	
Has a physical, emotional or mental health problem that limits activities (%)	13.6	15.9	14.7	*
Parent's rating of child's health is excellent, very good, or good (%)	97.3	96.0	96.7	**
Administrative data measures				
UI earnings in the year prior to random assignment ($)	11,578	9,828	10,737	***
TANF payments in the year prior to random assignment ($)	2,339	2,269	2,306	
Food stamp payments in the year prior to random assignment ($)	2,320	2,355	2,337	
Medicaid coverage in the three quarters prior to random assignment (%)	64.9	67.0	65.9	

Appendix Table J.4 (continued)

Characteristic	Program Group Respondents	Control Group Respondents	Survey Respondents	Sig.
Target child proficient on ELA test, 2007 (%)	39.7	36.7	38.3	
Target child proficient on math test, 2007 (%)	57.8	55.0	56.5	
Sample size	1,543	1,423	2,966	

SOURCES: MDRC calculations using Family Rewards Baseline Information Forms and administrative records from New York State.

NOTES: In order to assess differences in characteristics across research groups, chi-square tests were used for categorical variables, and t-tests were used for continuous variables. Statistical significance levels (Sig.) are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

    Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

    Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums.

    [a]Families with parents who reported their marital status as single, single but living with a boyfriend or girlfriend, separated, divorced, or widowed are considered single-parent families; those with parents who reported their marital status as married or legal domestic partnership are considered two-parent families.

    [b]This measure refers to sample members who enrolled in the Family Rewards study with their spouse or legal domestic partner.

    [c]This measure includes families with child-only cases.

    [d]Income amounts from sources other than earnings were not available from the Baseline Information Form.

    [e]These measures exclude information for enrolled second parents in two-parent households (N = 247).

    [f]This measure refers to 30 hours a week or more.

    [g]Grades 4, 7, and 9 were "target grades" for the Family Rewards program. Therefore, all enrolled families had to have a child in grade 4, 7, or 9.

This section helps to put the survey results in context, by comparing impacts estimated from administrative data for the research, fielded, and respondent samples. Impacts for the research sample represent the best estimate of the program's effects, given that they use the full program group and control group, and not a potentially nonrandom subset of survey respondents. Thus, finding similar impacts for the survey sample and the larger research sample would give more credibility to the survey analysis. Appendix Tables J.6 and J.7 present the results, showing impacts for employment outcomes using UI records data, and impacts for education outcomes using data from Department of Education (DOE) records.

The employment outcomes presented in Appendix Table J.6 are largely consistent across each of the three samples. Among outcomes where statistically significant impacts were found in the research sample, the direction of those impacts is maintained in the fielded and respondent samples, even where the significance level is not maintained. All other impacts that are shown in the table are nonsignificant across the samples. The results are generally similar, indicating few significant impacts on employment and earnings, across the three samples.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table J.5

**Estimates from a Logistic Regression for the Probability of Being
a Program Group Respondent to the Family Rewards 42-Month Survey**

Variable	Respondent Sample	
	Parameter Estimate	P-Value
Family baseline measures		
Target child proficient on ELA test, 2007	0.097	0.273
Target child proficient on math test, 2007	0.091	0.291
Community district Bronx 5	-0.068	0.616
Community district Bronx 6	-0.010	0.937
Community district Brooklyn 5	-0.052	0.674
Community district Brooklyn 16	0.023	0.863
Community district Manhattan 10	-0.096	0.491
Number of children in household	-0.019	0.521
Primary language spoken at home is English	-0.017	0.896
Two-parent family	0.159	0.114
High school diploma/GED certificate, or above	-0.061	0.453
Currently working	0.041	0.626
Randomly assigned after September 2008	0.000	0.996
Black, non-Hispanic/Latino	0.373	0.192
Hispanic/Latino	0.449	0.120
U.S. citizen by birth	0.098	0.327
Age	0.009 *	0.061
Family living in public housing or receiving Section 8	-0.165 ***	0.039
Family receiving TANF or Safety Net Assistance	0.120	0.215
Covered by public health insurance	-0.061	0.516
Likelihood ratio	24.2	0.719
Wald statistic	23.9	0.735
Sample size		2,966

SOURCES: MDRC calculations using Family Rewards Baseline Information Forms and New
York City Department of Education administrative records.

NOTE: Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; *
= 10 percent.
  ELA = English language arts.

Appendix Table J.6

**Impacts on UI-Covered Employment and Earnings for the
Research, Fielded, and Respondent Samples, Years 1 to 3**

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Year 1				
Ever employed (%)				
Research sample	56.4	58.7	-2.4 **	0.013
Fielded sample	57.2	59.4	-2.2 **	0.044
Respondent sample	57.0	59.0	-2.0 *	0.094
Average quarterly employment (%)				
Research sample	49.1	50.3	-1.2	0.130
Fielded sample	49.7	50.5	-0.8	0.387
Respondent sample	49.5	50.0	-0.5	0.659
Employed 4 consecutive quarters (%)				
Research sample	40.9	41.7	-0.8	0.367
Fielded sample	41.5	41.9	-0.4	0.694
Respondent sample	41.6	41.4	0.2	0.886
Total earnings ($)				
Research sample	12,018	12,177	-159	0.482
Fielded sample	12,234	12,137	97	0.705
Respondent sample	12,060	11,806	254	0.376
Year 2				
Ever employed (%)				
Research sample	55.3	56.3	-1.0	0.373
Fielded sample	55.4	56.5	-1.1	0.347
Respondent sample	56.0	56.1	-0.1	0.951
Average quarterly employment (%)				
Research sample	48.0	48.9	-0.9	0.360
Fielded sample	48.2	49.3	-1.2	0.275
Respondent sample	48.4	49.0	-0.6	0.604
Employed 4 consecutive quarters (%)				
Research sample	40.6	41.0	-0.4	0.719
Fielded sample	40.8	41.5	-0.7	0.570
Respondent sample	40.9	41.2	-0.3	0.832
Total earnings ($)				
Research sample	12,292	12,486	-194	0.504
Fielded sample	12,354	12,549	-196	0.554
Respondent sample	12,277	12,332	-55	0.879

(continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Year 3				
Ever employed (%)				
Research sample	52.6	53.5	-1.0	0.385
Fielded sample	52.6	53.9	-1.3	0.314
Respondent sample	53.2	53.5	-0.4	0.782
Average quarterly employment (%)				
Research sample	46.1	46.8	-0.7	0.475
Fielded sample	46.2	47.1	-0.9	0.453
Respondent sample	46.6	46.7	-0.1	0.923
Employed 4 consecutive quarters (%)				
Research sample	39.9	40.1	-0.2	0.869
Fielded sample	40.0	40.2	-0.2	0.902
Respondent sample	40.3	39.7	0.6	0.662
Total earnings ($)				
Research sample	12,330	12,406	-76	0.817
Fielded sample	12,500	12,453	46	0.899
Respondent sample	12,391	12,159	231	0.564

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York State unemployment insurance (UI) wage records.

NOTES: A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

    Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics for families or sample members.

    Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

    Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who were not employed.

    This table includes only employment and earnings in jobs covered by the New York State UI program. It does not inlcude employment outside of New York State, nor in jobs not covered by the UI system (for example, "off-the-books" jobs and federal government jobs).

    In two-parent families, only the first adult who enrolled in the study is included.

    The full sample includes 4,746 sample members; program, 2,374; control, 2,372. The fielded sample includes 3,737 sample members; program, 1,869; control, 1,868. The respondent sample includes 2,964 sample members; program,1,541; control,1,423.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table J.7

Impacts on Attendance, Test Scores, and Credits
for the Research, Fielded, and Respondent Samples

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Students in grade 4 at random assignment[a] (%)				
Attendance rate 95% or higher, Year 1				
Research sample	42.6	42.6	0.1	0.982
Fielded sample	41.0	43.0	-2.1	0.456
Respondent sample	42.1	43.5	-1.4	0.670
Attendance rate 95% or higher, Year 2				
Research sample	43.9	41.7	2.2	0.379
Fielded sample	42.2	40.6	1.5	0.586
Respondent sample	44.1	41.1	3.0	0.350
Attendance rate 95% or higher, Year 3				
Research sample	41.5	40.8	0.7	0.797
Fielded sample	40.5	40.3	0.2	0.943
Respondent sample	42.8	39.0	3.8	0.241
Attendance rate 95% or higher, Year 4				
Research sample	40.4	40.2	0.2	0.941
Fielded sample	40.1	39.8	0.3	0.916
Respondent sample	41.3	38.8	2.5	0.435
Scored at proficient level or higher on ELA, Year 1 [b]				
Research sample	51.5	52.2	-0.7	0.758
Fielded sample	51.9	52.1	-0.2	0.941
Respondent sample	52.2	52.5	-0.3	0.910
Scored at proficient level or higher on ELA, Year 2 [b]				
Research sample	68.7	69.1	-0.3	0.883
Fielded sample	69.1	69.1	0.0	0.999
Respondent sample	68.7	70.6	-1.9	0.507
Scored at proficient level or higher on ELA, Year 3 [b]				
Research sample	27.5	30.0	-2.5	0.281
Fielded sample	26.7	29.6	-2.9	0.253
Respondent sample	25.8	29.1	-3.3	0.243
Scored at proficient level or higher on ELA, Year 4 [b]				
Research sample	24.9	25.6	-0.7	0.759
Fielded sample	22.8	24.8	-2.0	0.415
Respondent sample	22.1	25.5	-3.4	0.219

(continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Scored at proficient level or higher on math, Year 1 [b]				
Research sample	75.2	72.8	2.3	0.232
Fielded sample	74.7	72.6	2.1	0.344
Respondent sample	73.9	74.8	-0.8	0.738
Scored at proficient level or higher on math, Year 2 [b]				
Research sample	80.5	80.2	0.3	0.888
Fielded sample	80.5	79.0	1.4	0.509
Respondent sample	79.7	79.9	-0.2	0.941
Scored at proficient level or higher on math, Year 3 [b]				
Research sample	41.3	42.4	-1.2	0.622
Fielded sample	41.6	41.0	0.7	0.797
Respondent sample	41.8	41.5	0.3	0.922
Scored at proficient level or higher on math, Year 4 [b]				
Research sample	44.8	44.0	0.8	0.745
Fielded sample	44.4	42.4	2.1	0.457
Respondent sample	44.1	42.3	1.8	0.565
Students in grade 7 at random assignment[c] (%)				
Attendance rate 95% or higher, Year 1				
Research sample	44.1	43.4	0.7	0.800
Fielded sample	44.2	43.9	0.3	0.911
Respondent sample	45.1	46.1	-1.0	0.769
Attendance rate 95% or higher, Year 2				
Research sample	36.6	36.6	0.0	0.996
Fielded sample	37.0	36.8	0.2	0.942
Respondent sample	38.4	39.2	-0.8	0.802
Attendance rate 95% or higher, Year 3				
Research sample	38.6	34.1	4.5 *	0.073
Fielded sample	38.0	33.8	4.2	0.123
Respondent sample	40.0	34.8	5.1	0.116
Attendance rate 95% or higher, Year 4				
Research sample	28.5	26.0	2.4	0.308
Fielded sample	28.4	26.7	1.6	0.528
Respondent sample	29.4	28.5	0.9	0.773

(continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Attempted 11+ credits, Year 1				
Research sample	90.4	86.2	4.2 ***	0.004
Fielded sample	91.6	84.7	6.9 ***	0.000
Respondent sample	92.2	86.7	5.5 ***	0.004
Attempted 11+ credits, Year 2				
Research sample	83.6	80.6	3.1 *	0.095
Fielded sample	83.1	80.9	2.2	0.303
Respondent sample	86.8	83.9	2.9	0.218
Attempted 11+ credits, Year 3				
Research sample	74.6	71.1	3.5	0.101
Fielded sample	75.6	71.9	3.7	0.137
Respondent sample	81.6	77.4	4.2	0.127
Attempted 11+ credits, Year 4				
Research sample	48.0	50.4	-2.4	0.339
Fielded sample	46.6	50.1	-3.5	0.238
Respondent sample	50.1	54.0	-3.8	0.282
Enrolled in any grade in Year 4				
Research sample	84.4	83.2	1.2	0.516
Fielded sample	84.9	84.7	0.3	0.907
Respondent sample	90.9	89.2	1.7	0.443
Graduated within 4 years				
Research sample	52.2	50.7	1.5	0.516
Fielded sample	52.1	51.4	0.8	0.781
Respondent sample	57.8	53.9	3.9	0.239

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Department of Education administrative records.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of family or sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 cover the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 school years, respectively.

Only target children are included.

ELA = English language arts.

[a]For students in grade 4 at random assignment, the sample sizes are as follows: The full sample includes 1,444 sample members; program, 723; control, 721. The fielded sample includes 1,167 sample members; program, 584; control, 583. The respondent sample includes 896 sample members; program, 465; control, 431.

(continued)

[b]In New York State, students who score at a level of 3 or higher on a 4-point scale are deemed "proficient."

[c]For students in grade 7 at random assignment, the sample sizes are as follows: The full sample includes 1,365 sample members; program, 687; control, 678. The fielded sample includes 1,147 sample members; program, 580; control, 567. The respondent sample includes 852 sample members; program, 451; control, 401.

[d]For students in grade 9 at random assignment, the sample sizes are as follows: The full sample includes 1,549 sample members; program, 773; control, 776. The fielded sample includes 1,138 sample members; program, 567; control, 571. The respondent sample includes 789 sample members; program, 414; control, 375.

Impacts on educational outcomes are shown in Appendix Table J.7. In the fourth- and seventh-grade panels, the impacts across the samples are consistently small and, with one exception, nonsignificant. In the ninth-grade panel, the significance level of the impacts varies by sample for some outcomes, but in all cases the sign of the impact is the same and the magnitudes are similar. Taken together, Appendix Tables J.6 and J.7 do not suggest any major problems for the generalizability of the fielded and respondent samples.

Sensitivity Test: Weighting

The impacts for the survey sample using administrative records data are similar to impacts for the full sample. Nonetheless, given the differences between the respondent and other samples on factors such as race, citizenship status, and English language use, the sensitivity of the survey results was assessed by reweighting the survey sample to better match the full research sample. In particular, the probability of survey response for the research sample was regressed on a range of characteristics.[4] Survey weights were constructed as the inverse of the predicted probability of response.[5]

Weighted impacts for selected tables from the report are shown in Appendix Tables J.8 through J.12 (on pages 114 to 123). Overall, the impact estimates across the range of outcomes are not highly sensitive to weighting. The weighted results, for example, show similar effects on financial well-being and food security (Appendix Table J.8) and similar effects on employment at the time of the survey interview (Appendix Table J.12). Overall, a few impacts appear to be somewhat sensitive to weighting (for example, "currently pregnant" in Appendix Table J.11), suggesting differential effects of the program for groups that may have been underrepresented in

---

[4]The probability of being a respondent was regressed on age, sex, race/ethnicity, education level, community district, citizenship status, marital status, employment, earnings, health, receipt of public benefits, English language use, and time of random assignment.

[5]The earlier Family Rewards report (Riccio et al., 2010) presented weighted and unweighted impacts for the 18-month survey. Subsequently, it was discovered that the nonresponse weights had been calculated incorrectly. However, once the weights were corrected, the weighted and unweighted impacts were still similar.

the survey. Nonetheless, given the similarity of results across the wide range of outcomes presented in this report, weighting the data does not alter the general conclusions about the program's effects.

Conclusion

Overall, the variety of tests conducted and results presented suggest that the survey sample provides valid estimates of the program's effects and these effects are representative of those that would have been obtained for the full research sample. Although the survey sample differed from the full sample in terms of English language use and other related variables, the administrative records impacts for the survey sample were similar to those for the full research sample. In addition, reweighting the survey data to represent the research did not change the overall story.

Appendix Table J.8

Weighted Impacts on Material Hardship and Financial Strain

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Effect Size
Any housing/utilities material hardship in the past 12 months (%)	55.6	58.5	-3.0	0.175	
Did not pay full rent or mortgage [a]	40.0	44.1	-4.1 *	0.064	
Evicted from home for not paying rent or mortgage [a]	3.8	4.6	-0.7	0.433	
Did not pay full utility bill [b]	31.0	31.9	-1.0	0.646	
Utility was turned off [b]	5.6	8.0	-2.4 **	0.040	
Phone service was disconnected [c]	19.8	22.3	-2.5	0.167	
Financial well-being (4 = low; 16 = high) [d]	9.0	8.8	0.3 **	0.016	0.114
Strongly or somewhat agree with the following (%)					
Financial situation is better than last year	51.9	46.2	5.7 **	0.012	
Do not worry about having enough money in future	20.9	20.3	0.6	0.758	
Can generally afford to buy needed things	67.8	65.3	2.5	0.248	
Sometimes have enough money to buy something or go somewhere just for fun	30.1	28.5	1.7	0.415	
Family finances usually work out to have the following at end of month (%)					
Some money left over	14.8	12.7	2.1	0.186	
Just enough to make ends meet	49.9	46.2	3.8 *	0.094	
Not enough to make ends meet	35.3	41.1	-5.8 ***	0.007	
Ever borrow cash from family or friends (%)	47.1	52.6	-5.5 **	0.013	
Ever sell personal belongings at a pawnshop (%)	14.5	18.1	-3.7 **	0.029	
Children skipped meal in prior month (%)	3.5	6.8	-3.3 ***	0.001	
Food security (1 = low; 4 = high) [e]	3.4	3.3	0.1 ***	0.000	0.180
Insufficient food [f] (%)	14.8	21.3	-6.5 ***	0.000	
Did not get needed medical care because of cost in past 12 months [g] (%)	6.9	8.4	-1.5	0.236	
Did not fill prescription because of cost in past 12 months (%)	14.7	12.8	1.9	0.238	
Sample size (total = 1,982)	1,024	958			

(continued)

Appendix Table J.8 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,982) of the survey respondents.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by char Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignm characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

The effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes expressed as a propor the standard deviation of the outcome for both groups combined.

[a]Only about 4 percent of the survey sample (N = 130) owned an apartment or a house at the time of t survey.

[b]Utilities include gas, oil, and electricity.

[c]This includes cellular or land service.

[d]Components of the financial well-being scale have been coded such that a lower score implies being worse off and a higher score implies being better off. The scale is calculated by summing responses to th component questions. Thus, the financial well-being scale presented here ranges from 4 to 16 points.

[e]The food security question describes food eaten by the family in the prior month: 1= Often not enou eat; 2 = Sometimes not enough to eat; 3 = Enough to eat but not always the kinds of food desired; 4 = Enc to eat of the kinds of food desired.

[f]Insufficient food is defined as "sometimes" or "often times" not having enough food to eat.

[g]This excludes prescriptions.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table J.9

**Weighted Impacts on Parental Engagement and on Focal Child's Educational
Outcomes and Activities, for Students in Grade 4 at the Time of Random Assignment**

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Effect Size
Parental engagement					
Respondent attended parent-teacher conference (%)	96.6	95.1	1.5	0.273	
Respondent has done the following (1 = never; 4 = several times per week)					
Talked with child about school	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.576	-0.039
Helped child with homework	3.4	3.3	0.0	0.570	0.039
Checked to see child's homework was complete	3.8	3.9	-0.1	0.155	-0.101
Helped child prepare for test	3.0	2.9	0.1	0.463	0.051
School status					
Child currently attends school (%)	100.0	100.0	0.0	--	
How child performed in school (1 = not well at all; 5 = very well)	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.946	-0.005
Activities since September 2009 (%)					
Child participated in any extracurricular activity	94.2	91.4	2.8	0.126	
Before- or after-school program	58.8	59.5	-0.7	0.825	
Program to help with schoolwork or homework	50.3	45.7	4.6	0.175	
School clubs or organizations	22.8	23.1	-0.3	0.912	
Sports	64.4	61.1	3.4	0.290	
Band, choir, orchestra, or chorus	28.8	29.6	-0.8	0.802	
Lessons such as dance, music, or arts and crafts[a]	56.4	54.4	2.0	0.549	
Club or youth group	36.9	33.7	3.2	0.319	
Recreation or community center activities	31.2	36.3	-5.1	0.109	
Worked inside or outside home for pay	10.1	13.9	-3.7 *	0.071	
Internet/cell phone/library use (%)					
Child has access to Internet from home	89.8	86.6	3.2	0.146	
Child has public library card	97.0	92.1	4.9 ***	0.001	
Child visited library in past 6 months	87.5	82.3	5.2 **	0.035	
Child has working cell phone	56.1	55.0	1.1	0.733	
Sample size (total = 898)	466	432			

Appendix Table J.9 (continued)

NOTES: This table presents outcomes only for focal children who were living in the household at the time of the survey interview.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

The effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes expressed as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcome for both groups combined.

No p-value is provided where estimates are equal to 100 percent for both samples.

[a]This measure includes all lessons except those that involve sports.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table J.10

**Weighted Impacts on Families' Health Insurance Coverage
and Parents' Receipt of Health Care Services**

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Health insurance coverage in previous month (%)				
Respondent had health insurance	95.7	92.8	2.9 ***	0.001
Publicly funded	72.0	71.0	1.0	0.507
Privately funded	33.1	27.4	5.7 ***	0.000
Publicly and privately funded	9.4	5.5	3.9 ***	0.000
All dependent children had health insurance[a]	*95.0*	*92.6*	--	--
Public health insurance only[b]	*74.7*	*75.0*	--	--
Private health insurance only[b]	*17.5*	*16.0*	--	--
Health insurance coverage in past 12 months (%)				
Respondent had a period with no coverage	15.2	17.7	-2.5 *	0.064
Some or all of respondent's children had a period with no coverage[a]	*14.1*	*16.9*	--	--
Sample size (total = 2,966)	1,543	1,423		
Respondent's health care use (%)[c]				
Has a usual source of health care	94.7	93.3	1.3	0.228
Clinic or health center	59.1	53.1	6.0 ***	0.007
Doctor's office	21.9	24.6	-2.7	0.131
Hospital emergency room	3.0	4.0	-1.0	0.241
Hospital outpatient department	10.3	11.1	-0.8	0.537
Other	0.4	0.5	-0.1	0.769
Has seen health professional for any reason in past 12 months	94.5	94.5	0.0	0.973
Had a health checkup in past 12 months	90.2	88.7	1.5	0.286
Number of visits to dentist for any reason in past 12 months				
None	14.2	25.1	-10.9 ***	0.000
1	22.2	25.0	-2.9	0.137
2	38.9	28.0	11.0 ***	0.000
3 or more	24.7	21.9	2.8	0.141
Has seen a dentist for any reason in past 12 months	85.8	74.9	10.9 ***	0.000
Had 1 or more dental checkups in past 12 months	81.9	70.9	11.0 ***	0.000
Had 2 or more dental checkups	46.1	32.7	13.4 ***	0.000
Number of visits to emergency room in past 12 months				
None	56.3	53.5	2.8	0.211
1	17.3	19.4	-2.1	0.230
2	13.1	15.1	-2.0	0.208
3 or more	13.3	12.0	1.3	0.388
Number of overnight admissions to hospital in past 12 months				
None	86.0	87.3	-1.3	0.406
1	7.7	7.3	0.4	0.724
2 or more	6.3	5.5	0.9	0.418

(continued)

Outcome (%)	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Unmet health needs due to cost in past 12 months (%)[c]				
Did not get needed medical care[d]	6.9	8.4	-1.5	0.236
Did not fill prescription	14.7	12.8	1.9	0.238
Sample size (total = 1,961)	1,022	939		

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of families or sample members.

Italic type indicates comparisons that are nonexperimental. Statistical tests were not performed.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

[a]Child-related health insurance measures were calculated for sample members with at least 1 child at the time of the survey.

[b]The percentages of all children covered by public health insurance and all children covered by private health insurance do not add up to the percentage of all children covered by any insurance because some families reported having children covered by both types of insurance.

[c]The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,961) of the survey respondents.

[d]This excludes prescriptions.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table J.11

Weighted Impacts on Parents' Health Outcomes

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Effect Size
Health status					
Average self-rated health (1 = poor; 5 = excellent)	3.1	3.1	0.1	0.168	0.059
Excellent (%)	14.7	14.1	0.6	0.726	
Very good (%)	20.9	18.9	2.0	0.246	
Good (%)	33.7	33.9	-0.2	0.932	
Fair (%)	24.4	25.9	-1.5	0.423	
Poor (%)	6.3	7.2	-0.9	0.414	
Currently pregnant (%)	1.4	2.2	-0.8	0.195	
Health conditions and risks					
Smokes cigarettes (%)	22.3	24.5	-2.2	0.235	
Has any medical condition[a] (%)	56.2	52.8	3.3	0.110	
Asthma	17.5	15.8	1.6	0.323	
High blood pressure/hypertension	27.6	26.6	1.0	0.585	
High cholesterol/high LDL	10.4	11.2	-0.8	0.550	
Diabetes	11.3	11.2	0.1	0.915	
Treated for any medical condition[a] (%)	50.5	47.3	3.1	0.134	
Asthma	15.1	14.5	0.6	0.717	
High blood pressure/hypertension	25.6	24.9	0.7	0.681	
High cholesterol/high LDL	9.0	9.5	-0.4	0.728	
Diabetes	11.0	10.6	0.4	0.787	
Average Body Mass Index (BMI)[b]	30.5	30.6	-0.1	0.836	-0.010
Underweight (%)	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.214	
Normal weight (%)	20.2	21.9	-1.7	0.383	
Overweight (%)	32.8	31.4	1.4	0.519	
Obese (%)	45.9	46.2	-0.3	0.913	
Psychosocial well-being					
Average score on "State of Hope" scale (6 = low; 24 = high)[c]	17.9	17.5	0.3 ***	0.004	0.138
How life today compares to way it was a year ago (%)					
Much better today	32.1	31.8	0.3	0.907	
Somewhat better	27.0	27.5	-0.5	0.809	
About the same	28.3	27.2	1.1	0.597	
Somewhat worse	7.8	7.7	0.2	0.898	
Much worse	4.8	5.8	-1.0	0.325	
Sample size (total = 1,961)	1,022	939			

Appendix Table J.11 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of families or sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

The effect size is the difference between program and control group outcomes expressed as a proportion of the standard deviation of the outcomes for both groups combined.

The items in this section of the survey were administered to a random subsample (N = 1,961) of the survey respondents.

[a]The 4 most commonly reported conditions are listed.

[b]Weight categories are from the National Institutes of Health. Underweight is defined as having a BMI of less than 18.5. Normal weight is defined as having a BMI between 18.5 and 24.9. Overweight is defined as having a BMI between 25 and 29.9. Obesity is defined as having a BMI at least 30. About 6 percent of the sample is excluded from this analysis because of missing data.

[c]The "State of Hope" scale measures the level of ongoing goal-directed thinking. The response codes (1 to 4) of the 6 items for each person are summed, with lower values representing less goal-directed thinking and higher values representing more. The scale is taken from Snyder et al. (1996).

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Family Rewards

Appendix Table J.12

Weighted Impacts on Employment and Job Characteristics

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Employment status (%)				
Currently employed at the time of the survey	55.8	50.2	5.6 ***	0.000
Employed in past year	65.8	62.4	3.5 **	0.021
Characteristics of current job[a]				
Average hourly wage ($)	*13.83*	*13.94*	--	--
Less than $7.00 (%)	6.7	4.3	2.4 ***	0.005
$7.00 - $8.99 (%)	8.5	7.8	0.7	0.479
$9.00 or more (%)	34.9	30.2	4.7 ***	0.002
Not reported (%)	5.8	7.9	-2.2 **	0.018
Hours worked per week (%)				
1-19	3.5	3.1	0.4	0.564
20-29	6.7	6.4	0.3	0.755
30-34	6.1	6.1	0.0	0.988
35 or more	38.3	33.5	4.9 ***	0.001
Not reported	1.2	1.1	0.1	0.837
Worked at least 30 hours per week (%)	44.4	39.6	4.9 ***	0.002
Average weekly earnings ($)	258	225	32 ***	0.001
Usual work schedule (%)				
Regular daytime shift	40.5	37.9	2.6	0.106
Regular evening/night shift	6.9	5.5	1.4	0.114
Rotating or split shift	5.0	3.9	1.0	0.175
Irregular shift	2.9	2.1	0.8	0.158
Other	0.6	0.7	-0.2	0.585
Self-employed (%)	7.3	4.7	2.6 ***	0.003
Employer-provided benefits[b] (%)				
Paid sick days	33.7	30.3	3.4 **	0.018
Paid vacation days	35.1	33.6	1.5	0.311
Paid holidays, including Christmas and New Year's Day	35.7	32.8	2.9 **	0.045
Dental benefits	27.3	24.4	2.9 **	0.034
A retirement plan	28.2	25.0	3.2 **	0.020
A health or medical insurance plan	29.5	26.8	2.7 *	0.051
Enrolled in a work-related health or medical insurance plan	21.7	19.8	1.9	0.143

(continued)

Appendix Table J.12 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Employment search (%)				
Looked for work in previous 4 weeks	24.9	24.9	0.0	0.992
Sample size (total = 2,966)	1,543	1,423		

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Family Rewards 42-month survey.

NOTES: Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the program and control groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the differences between the program and control groups arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Italic type indicates comparisons that are nonexperimental. Statistical tests were not performed.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of families or sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

[a]If a respondent worked multiple jobs, then only the characteristics of the primary job are reported. (The job at which the respondent worked the most hours is considered primary.) Respondents who were not employed at the time of the survey are included in all the current job characteristics measures, except for average hourly wage. The average hourly wage measure includes only respondents who were employed at the time of the survey.

[b]This includes benefits that are or eventually will be offered, regardless of whether the respondent received them.

About MDRC

MDRC is a nonprofit, nonpartisan social and education policy research organization dedicated to learning what works to improve the well-being of low-income people. Through its research and the active communication of its findings, MDRC seeks to enhance the effectiveness of social and education policies and programs.

Founded in 1974 and located in New York City and Oakland, California, MDRC is best known for mounting rigorous, large-scale, real-world tests of new and existing policies and programs. Its projects are a mix of demonstrations (field tests of promising new program approaches) and evaluations of ongoing government and community initiatives. MDRC's staff bring an unusual combination of research and organizational experience to their work, providing expertise on the latest in qualitative and quantitative methods and on program design, development, implementation, and management. MDRC seeks to learn not just whether a program is effective but also how and why the program's effects occur. In addition, it tries to place each project's findings in the broader context of related research — in order to build knowledge about what works across the social and education policy fields. MDRC's findings, lessons, and best practices are proactively shared with a broad audience in the policy and practitioner community as well as with the general public and the media.

Over the years, MDRC has brought its unique approach to an ever-growing range of policy areas and target populations. Once known primarily for evaluations of state welfare-to-work programs, today MDRC is also studying public school reforms, employment programs for ex-offenders and people with disabilities, and programs to help low-income students succeed in college. MDRC's projects are organized into five areas:

- Promoting Family Well-Being and Children's Development
- Improving Public Education
- Raising Academic Achievement and Persistence in College
- Supporting Low-Wage Workers and Communities
- Overcoming Barriers to Employment

Working in almost every state, all of the nation's largest cities, and Canada and the United Kingdom, MDRC conducts its projects in partnership with national, state, and local governments, public school systems, community organizations, and numerous private philanthropies.