

Opportunity NYC–Work Rewards

**Building Self-Sufficiency for Housing Voucher
Recipients**

**Interim Findings from the Work Rewards
Demonstration in New York City**

Appendixes F and G: Supplementary Tables

**Stephen Nuñez
Nandita Verma
Edith Yang**



June 2015

Funders of the Opportunity NYC–Work Rewards Demonstration

Bloomberg Philanthropies
The Rockefeller Foundation
The Starr Foundation
Open Society Foundations
Robin Hood Foundation
American International Group (AIG)
Tiger Foundation
The Annie E. Casey Foundation
The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
New York Community Trust

Dissemination of MDRC publications is supported by the following funders that help finance MDRC’s public policy outreach and expanding efforts to communicate the results and implications of our work to policymakers, practitioners, and others: The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Charles and Lynn Schusterman Family Foundation, The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, Ford Foundation, The George Gund Foundation, Daniel and Corinne Goldman, The Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Foundation, Inc., The JBP Foundation, The Joyce Foundation, The Kresge Foundation, Laura and John Arnold Foundation, Sandler Foundation, and The Starr Foundation.

In addition, earnings from the MDRC Endowment help sustain our dissemination efforts. Contributors to the MDRC Endowment include Alcoa Foundation, The Ambrose Monell Foundation, Anheuser-Busch Foundation, Bristol-Myers Squibb Foundation, Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, Ford Foundation, The George Gund Foundation, The Grable Foundation, The Lizabeth and Frank Newman Charitable Foundation, The New York Times Company Foundation, Jan Nicholson, Paul H. O’Neill Charitable Foundation, John S. Reed, Sandler Foundation, and The Stupski Family Fund, as well as other individual contributors.

The findings and conclusions in this report do not necessarily represent the official positions or policies of the funders.

For information about MDRC and copies of our publications, see our website: www.mdrc.org.

Copyright © 2015 by MDRC®. All rights reserved.

Contents

List of Tables	v	
Introduction	vii	
Appendix		
F	Supplementary Tables for the Family Self-Sufficiency Study	1
G	Supplementary Tables for the Incentives-Only Study	31

List of Tables

Table

F.1	Participation in the FSS Program, by Program Group, First 48 Months, Full Sample	3
F.2	FSS Escrow Account, by Program Group, Full Sample	4
F.3	Reward Payments Participation, FSS+Incentives Program, Years 1 Through 3, Full Sample	5
F.4	Job Characteristics and Occupations of Respondents Who Were Employed at the Time of the 42-Month Survey, FSS Study, Core Sample	6
F.5	Impacts on Jobs Held by Respondents, FSS Study, Core Sample	7
F.6	Impacts on Employment and Earnings, by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment, FSS Study, Core Sample	8
F.7	Four-Year Impacts on Benefits Receipt, by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment, FSS Study, Core Sample	10
F.8	Impacts on Section 8 Housing and Section 8 Reported Income, by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment, FSS Study, Core Sample	13
F.9	Four-Year Impacts on Employment and Earnings, FSS Study, Full Sample	16
F.10	Impacts on Benefits Receipt, FSS Study, Full Sample	19
F.11	Impacts on Section 8 Housing and Section 8 Reported Income, FSS Study, Full Sample	21
F.12	Impacts on Financial Services, Savings, and Debt, by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment, FSS Study, Core Sample	23
F.13	Impacts on Income and Poverty, by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment, FSS Study, Core Sample	25
F.14	Four-Year Impacts on Household Income, by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment, FSS Study, Core Sample	27
F.15	Impacts on Sources of Debt, FSS Study, Core Sample	29

Table

G.1	Four-Year Impacts on Employment and Earnings, by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment, Incentives-Only Study, Core Sample	33
G.2	Impacts on Benefits Receipt, by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment, Incentives-Only Study, Core Sample	35
G.3	Impacts on Household Income, by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment, Incentives-Only Study, Core Sample	37
G.4	Impacts on Section 8 Housing, by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment, Incentives-Only Study, Core Sample	39
G.5	Rewards Receipt, Incentives-Only Study, Full Sample	41
G.6	Four-Year Impacts on Employment and Earnings, Incentives-Only Study, Full Sample	42
G.7	Impacts on Benefits Receipt, Incentives-Only Study, Full Sample	44
G.8	Impacts on Section 8 Housing, Incentives-Only Study, Full Sample	46

Introduction

This document contains Appendixes F and G for MDRC’s report on interim findings from the Opportunity NYC–Work Rewards demonstration, covering the first four years of follow-up.¹ (Complete details on the implementation of the Work Rewards demonstration and early findings are available in a previous MDRC report.)² Work Rewards is the first random assignment study of the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) program to date. FSS is the main federal program for increasing employment and earnings and reducing reliance on government subsidies among housing voucher recipients. Work Rewards, which focuses on the program in New York City, tested the FSS program alone (“FSS-only”) and an enhanced version of the program that combined FSS with special cash incentives (“FSS+incentives”) to encourage sustained, full-time employment; these two tests together are referred to throughout the full report and in these supplementary appendixes as the *FSS study*. The demonstration also tested a program that offered those same special incentives without FSS, referred to in the full report and here as the *incentives-only study*.

¹Stephen Nuñez, Nandita Verma, and Edith Yang, *Building Self-Sufficiency for Housing Voucher Recipients: Interim Findings from the Work Rewards Demonstration in New York City* (New York: MDRC, 2015).

²Nandita Verma, Betsy Tessler, Cynthia Miller, James Riccio, Zawadi Rucks, Edith Yang, *Working Toward Self-Sufficiency: Early Findings from a Program for Housing Voucher Recipients in New York City* (New York: MDRC, 2012).

Appendix F

**Supplementary Tables for the
Family Self-Sufficiency Study**

The Opportunity New York City Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table F.1

Participation in the FSS Program, by Program Group, First 48 Months, Full Sample

Outcome	FSS- Only	FSS+ Incentives	Difference (Impact)		P-Value
Any service received or milestone achieved (%)	55.5	71.3	15.7	***	0.000
<u>Services received</u> (%)					
Needs assessment	52.4	67.9	15.5	***	0.000
Case management and follow-up services	38.2	55.1	16.9	***	0.000
<u>Financial and support milestones achieved</u> (%)					
Attend financial literacy class or other asset-building service	12.0	11.7	-0.3		0.880
Linked to benefits or work supports	8.6	13.4	4.8	***	0.004
Credit improved	2.9	4.6	1.7	*	0.081
Linked to family-based support services	10.9	15.5	4.6	**	0.012
<u>Employment milestones achieved</u> (%)					
Began education/job training program	12.1	17.3	5.2	***	0.007
Started employment	12.7	16.6	3.9	**	0.041
Continuous employment - 30 days	13.5	22.2	8.7	***	0.000
Continuous employment - 90 days	10.1	16.1	6.0	***	0.001
Continuous employment - 180 days	6.3	10.3	3.9	***	0.007
Wage gain/promotion	2.4	5.7	3.3	***	0.001
Education upgrade	6.5	9.1	2.6	*	0.075
Average number of services received or milestones achieved	2.6	3.5	0.9	***	0.000
0 (%)	44.5	28.7	-15.7	***	0.000
1 (%)	17.3	13.6	-3.7	*	0.061
2 or more (%)	38.2	57.7	19.5	***	0.000
Sample size (total = 1,378)	698	680			

SOURCE: MDRC calculations from Seedco's Work Rewards program data.

NOTES: The full sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for sample members' pre-random assignment characteristics. A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between FSS-only and FSS+incentives outcomes. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference arose by chance.

Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

The Opportunity New York City Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table F.2

FSS Escrow Account, by Program Group, Full Sample

Outcome	Average Outcome Levels	
	FSS- Only	FSS+ Incentives
Had FSS escrow balance in Year 4 (%)	45.2	41.9
FSS escrow balance in Year 4 ^a (\$)	1,741	1,762
<u>Among those with an FSS escrow balance in Year 4</u>		
<i>FSS escrow balance in Year 4 (\$)</i>	<i>3,871</i>	<i>4,246</i>
<i>FSS escrow balance in Year 4 (%)</i>		
<i>\$1 - \$500</i>	<i>16.6</i>	<i>14.1</i>
<i>\$501 - \$1,000</i>	<i>8.9</i>	<i>12.4</i>
<i>\$1,001 - \$2,000</i>	<i>16.9</i>	<i>14.9</i>
<i>\$2,001 - \$5,000</i>	<i>29.2</i>	<i>29.6</i>
<i>Greater than \$5,000</i>	<i>28.4</i>	<i>29.1</i>
<i>Number of months until first FSS credit</i>	<i>19.7</i>	<i>18.9</i>
Sample size (total = 1,248)	629	619

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using administrative records data from the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD).

NOTES: The full sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009.

Italic type indicates comparisons that are nonexperimental. Statistical tests were not performed; therefore, there are no impacts or p-values to report.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

^aDollar averages include zero values for sample members who did not have an FSS escrow balance.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table F.3

**Reward Payments Participation, FSS+Incentives Program,
Years 1 Through 3, Full Sample**

Outcome	FSS+Incentives, Years 1-3
Ever submitted a coupon (%)	36.6
Ever earned a reward (%)	31.5
Number of months earned rewards ^a	4.6
Average total amount earned ^a (\$)	1,942
Ever submitted a coupon for full-time work (%)	34.0
Ever earned a reward for full-time work (%)	28.5
Average total amount earned for full-time work rewards ^a (\$)	1,978
Ever submitted a coupon for education and training (%)	14.4
Ever earned a reward for education and training (%)	5.4
Average total amount earned for education and training rewards ^a (\$)	859
Was ever paid (%)	31.3
Was ever paid among those with earnings (%)	99.5
Average total amount received ^b (\$)	1,993
Sample size	680

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

NOTES: The full sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009.

Sample size refers to the number of adults in the program group.

^aCalculations are based on individuals who earned at least one reward in the category.

^bCalculations are based on individuals who were paid at least once.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table F.4

Job Characteristics and Occupations of Respondents Who Were Employed at the Time of the 42-Month Survey, FSS Study, Core Sample

Outcome	Survey Data Only (Non-UI)	UI and Survey Data
<u>Characteristics of current job^a</u>		
Average hourly wage (\$)	10.98	12.07
Average weekly earnings (\$)	272	375
Worked at least 30 hours per week (%)	61.0	69.9
Regular daytime shift (%)	68.9	69.7
Self-employed (%)	52.5	5.4
Employer-provided benefits ^b (%)	26.0	73.1
Paid sick days	14.6	49.4
Paid vacation days	19.5	56.1
Paid holidays, including Christmas and New Year's Day	21.1	59.0
Dental benefits	8.1	35.4
A retirement plan	9.0	39.2
A health or medical insurance plan	10.7	45.5
<u>Occupation (%)</u>		
Service workers	54.5	57.6
Child care	31.7	2.0
Health care support	6.5	31.1
Clerical workers	9.8	10.7
Maintenance workers	8.9	8.2
Sales-related workers	5.7	7.7
Teaching assistants and school aides	2.4	5.4
Transportation workers	6.5	5.4
Other	12.2	5.0
Sample size (total = 564)	123	441

SOURCES: MDRC calculations using data from the Work Rewards 42-Month Survey and administrative records data from New York State unemployment insurance (UI) wage records.

NOTES: The core sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009, and excludes elderly and disabled individuals.

Estimates include only the sample members who reported that they were employed at the time of the survey interview.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Sample sizes may vary because of missing values.

^aIf a respondent currently works multiple jobs, then only the primary job is reported. (The job at which the respondent works the most hours is considered primary.)

^bThis includes benefits that are or eventually will be offered, regardless of whether the respondent receives them.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards
Appendix Table F.5
Impacts on Jobs Held by Respondents, FSS Study, Core Sample

Outcome	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control		FSS+Incentives vs. Control		FSS+Incentives vs. FSS-Only	
	FSS-Only	FSS+Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Occupation (%)									
Service workers	25.5	33.2	25.4	0.1	0.971	7.8 **	0.012	7.6 **	0.013
Child care	4.9	5.1	2.6	2.3	0.107	2.6 *	0.078	0.2	0.879
Health care support	10.3	14.5	13.2	-2.9	0.215	1.3	0.592	4.2 *	0.075
Clerical workers	4.2	6.4	4.9	-0.7	0.673	1.6	0.332	2.2	0.162
Maintenance workers	5.0	4.5	2.8	2.3	0.104	1.8	0.213	-0.5	0.704
Sales-related workers	4.7	3.1	3.0	1.7	0.206	0.1	0.949	-1.6	0.228
Teaching assistants and school aides	1.0	3.7	2.4	-1.3	0.219	1.3	0.222	2.7 **	0.014
Transportation workers	3.7	2.3	2.4	1.2	0.293	-0.2	0.900	-1.4	0.237
Other	4.3	1.9	3.5	0.8	0.528	-1.6	0.204	-2.4 *	0.056
Sample size (total = 1,145)	384	384	377						

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Work Rewards 42-Month Survey.

NOTES: The core sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009, and excludes elderly and disabled individuals.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of families or sample members. A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the research groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Sample sizes may vary across measures because of missing values.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table F.6

Impacts on Employment and Earnings, by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment, FSS Study, Core Sample

Outcome	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control			FSS+Incentives vs. Control			FSS+Incentives vs. FSS-Only		
	FSS-Only	FSS+ Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
<u>Receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>												
Quarterly employment rate (%)												
Year 1	43.5	43.5	39.1	4.5 *	0.059		4.5 *	0.059		0.0	0.997	
Year 2	42.1	41.7	38.4	3.6	0.184		3.2	0.250		-0.4	0.885	
Year 3	41.1	41.6	37.9	3.2	0.262		3.7	0.213		0.5	0.867	
Year 4	39.7	42.5	37.4	2.3	0.425		5.1 *	0.087		2.8	0.352	
Full period	41.6	42.3	38.2	3.4	0.122		4.1 *	0.070		0.7	0.754	
Total earnings (\$)												
Year 1	5,818	5,777	5,388	430	0.284		389	0.350		-41	0.921	
Year 2	6,353	6,283	5,591	762	0.141		692	0.213		-70	0.902	
Year 3	6,877	6,411	5,863	1,014 *	0.081		548	0.369		-466	0.465	
Year 4	6,684	7,438	6,130	554	0.384		1,308 *	0.054		754	0.285	
Full period	25,731	25,908	22,971	2,760	0.124		2,937	0.128		177	0.928	
Sample size (total = 1,101)	369	369	363									

(continued)

Appendix Table F.6 (continued)

Outcome	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control			FSS+Incentives vs. Control			FSS+Incentives vs. FSS-Only		
	FSS-Only	FSS+ Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
<u>Not receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>												
Quarterly employment rate (%)												
Year 1	54.7	54.3	52.9	1.9	0.557		1.5	0.651		-0.4	0.895	
Year 2	52.4	56.9	53.9	-1.5	0.679		3.0	0.446		4.5	0.268	
Year 3	50.6	56.2	53.4	-2.8	0.507		2.8	0.549		5.6	0.235	
Year 4	51.1	51.9	51.9	-0.8	0.850		0.0	0.999		0.8	0.862	
Full period	52.2	54.8	53.0	-0.8	0.798		1.8	0.589		2.6	0.434	
Total earnings (\$)												
Year 1	9,694	9,941	10,079	-385	0.617		-138	0.868		246	0.713	
Year 2	10,278	10,611	10,966	-688	0.496		-355	0.747		333	0.716	
Year 3	10,460	10,661	11,001	-541	0.681		-339	0.806		202	0.863	
Year 4	10,789	10,713	11,028	-239	0.863		-315	0.826		-76	0.953	
Full period	41,221	41,926	43,074	-1,853	0.639		-1,148	0.784		705	0.840	
Sample size (total = 502)	177	154	171									

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

NOTES: The core sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009, and excludes elderly and disabled individuals.

The UI outcome data cover employment and earnings through June 30, 2013, and for 4 years after study entry for each sample member.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for sample members' pre-random assignment characteristics. A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the research groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference 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 for differences in impacts across subgroups (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences. Dollar averages include zero values for nonworking sample members.

This table includes only employment and earnings in jobs covered by the New York State UI program. It does not include employment outside New York State or in jobs not covered by the UI system (for example, "off the books" jobs and federal government jobs).

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table F.7

Four-Year Impacts on Benefits Receipt, by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment, FSS Study, Core Sample

Outcome	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control			FSS+Incentives vs. Control		
	FSS-Only	FSS+Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
<u>Receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>									
Received TANF/SNA, Years 1-4 (%)	63.7	59.8	65.7	-2.0	0.523		-5.9 *	0.056	
Average quarterly TANF/SNA receipt (%)									
Year 1	41.6	39.9	42.8	-1.3	0.606		-2.9	0.233	
Year 2	34.6	34.6	40.5	-5.9 **	0.035	†	-5.9 **	0.035	††
Year 3	31.6	30.7	33.3	-1.8	0.534		-2.6	0.353	
Year 4	30.0	30.1	32.2	-2.2	0.457		-2.1	0.465	
Full period	34.4	33.8	37.2	-2.8	0.228		-3.4	0.140	
Last quarter	30.1	27.5	33.8	-3.7	0.265		-6.3 *	0.055	
Total amount of TANF/SNA received (\$)									
Year 1	1,963	2,015	2,063	-100	0.488		-48	0.735	
Year 2	1,915	1,805	2,134	-218	0.244		-328 *	0.078	††
Year 3	1,635	1,599	1,775	-140	0.453		-176	0.342	
Year 4	1,567	1,620	1,760	-194	0.328		-141	0.475	
Full period	7,080	7,039	7,732	-652	0.272		-694	0.240	
Last quarter	385	383	443	-58	0.285		-59	0.269	
Received food stamps, Years 1-4 (%)	99.8	99.5	99.6	0.2	0.714		-0.1	0.883	
Average quarterly food stamp receipt (%)									
Year 1	96.4	95.1	93.7	2.7 **	0.036		1.4	0.278	
Year 2	91.0	90.8	91.6	-0.7	0.738		-0.8	0.681	
Year 3	88.4	87.4	90.2	-1.9	0.400		-2.8	0.195	
Year 4	84.3	82.4	89.1	-4.8 *	0.054		-6.8 ***	0.007	
Full period	90.0	88.9	91.2	-1.2	0.482		-2.3	0.171	
Last quarter	83.0	80.9	87.7	-4.7 *	0.097		-6.8 **	0.016	

(continued)

Appendix Table F.7 (continued)

Outcome	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control			FSS+Incentives vs. Control		
	FSS-Only	FSS+ Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Total amount of food stamps received (\$)									
Year 1	3,990	3,881	3,901	89	0.397		-20	0.847	
Year 2	4,224	4,136	4,254	-30	0.829		-118	0.395	
Year 3	4,019	3,868	4,054	-36	0.822		-186	0.237	
Year 4	3,714	3,531	3,925	-211	0.216		-394 **	0.020	
Full period	15,947	15,415	16,134	-187	0.703		-718	0.141	
Last quarter	907	867	950	-44	0.350		-83 *	0.072	
Sample size (total = 1,015)	333	344	338						
<u>Not receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>									
Received TANF/SNA, Years 1-4 (%)	27.4	28.1	31.8	-4.5	0.376		-3.8	0.481	
Average quarterly TANF/SNA receipt (%)									
Year 1	7.2	6.5	8.0	-0.8	0.713		-1.5	0.520	
Year 2	8.5	10.2	6.9	1.6	0.560	†	3.3	0.233	††
Year 3	9.9	8.3	11.2	-1.3	0.669		-2.9	0.361	
Year 4	9.8	7.5	13.3	-3.6	0.248		-5.9 *	0.071	
Full period	8.8	8.1	9.9	-1.0	0.628		-1.7	0.439	
Last quarter	12.2	6.8	13.2	-1.1	0.773		-6.4 *	0.095	
Amount of TANF/SNA received (\$)									
Year 1	277	299	308	-31	0.776		-9	0.935	
Year 2	342	439	300	42	0.763		139	0.348	††
Year 3	440	367	493	-53	0.736		-126	0.447	
Year 4	491	413	509	-18	0.915		-96	0.583	
Full period	1,551	1,517	1,609	-59	0.897		-92	0.848	
Last quarter	156	85	141	15	0.762		-56	0.282	

(continued)

二

Appendix Table F.7 (continued)

Outcome	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control			FSS+Incentives vs. Control		
	FSS-Only	FSS+ Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Received food stamps, Years 1-4 (%)	67.2	60.2	67.5	-0.3	0.960		-7.3	0.211	
Average quarterly food stamp receipt (%)									
Year 1	30.7	31.8	29.4	1.3	0.781		2.5	0.610	
Year 2	46.4	40.2	45.2	1.1	0.831		-5.0	0.375	
Year 3	49.7	47.7	45.2	4.5	0.405		2.5	0.664	
Year 4	50.9	44.5	49.3	1.6	0.769		-4.8	0.409	
Full period	44.4	41.1	42.3	2.1	0.634		-1.2	0.798	
Last quarter	52.9	42.2	51.1	1.8	0.758		-8.9	0.152	
Total amount of food stamps received (\$)									
Year 1	893	957	956	-63	0.724		1	0.995	
Year 2	1,629	1,491	1,615	15	0.950		-123	0.615	
Year 3	1,914	1,690	1,682	232	0.363		8	0.975	
Year 4	1,909	1,458	1,813	96	0.712		-355	0.198	
Full period	6,344	5,597	6,065	279	0.724		-468	0.574	
Last quarter	515	377	472	42	0.560		-95	0.210	
Sample size (total = 440)	159	132	149						

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using administrative records data from the New York City Human Resources Administration (HRA).

NOTES: The core sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009, and excludes elderly and disabled individuals.

The HRA outcome data cover TANF/SNA and food stamp receipt through June 30, 2013, and for 4 years after study entry for each sample member.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for sample members' pre-random assignment characteristics. 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 arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent. Statistical significance levels for differences in impacts across subgroups (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

TANF/SNA and food stamp outcomes and impacts are averages among core sample households.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who did not receive TANF/SNA or food stamps.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table F.8

Impacts on Section 8 Housing and Section 8 Reported Income, by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment, FSS Study, Core Sample

Outcome	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control			FSS+Incentives vs. Control			FSS+Incentives vs. FSS-Only		
	FSS-Only	FSS+Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
<u>Receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>												
Received Section 8 housing subsidy (%)												
Year 1	99.2	98.6	98.6	0.6	0.473		0.0	0.982		-0.6	0.488	
Year 2	95.8	95.9	96.3	-0.5	0.747		-0.4	0.800	††	0.1	0.945	
Year 3	92.9	93.6	94.9	-1.9	0.300		-1.2	0.505		0.7	0.713	
Year 4	91.4	91.9	92.7	-1.3	0.551		-0.8	0.708		0.5	0.824	
Full period	99.1	98.9	98.7	0.5	0.552		0.3	0.747		-0.2	0.786	
Number of months received Section 8 housing subsidy												
Year 1	11.7	11.7	11.7	0.0	0.787		0.0	0.856	††	-0.1	0.652	
Year 2	11.3	11.4	11.5	-0.2	0.356		-0.1	0.551		0.1	0.744	
Year 3	11.0	11.1	11.3	-0.2	0.295		-0.1	0.621		0.1	0.581	
Year 4	10.8	10.8	10.9	-0.1	0.606		-0.1	0.649		0.0	0.952	
Full period	44.9	45.0	45.4	-0.5	0.485		-0.4	0.618		0.2	0.842	
Total Section 8 housing subsidy ^a (\$)												
Year 1	10,075	10,211	9,953	121	0.627		257	0.303	†	136	0.586	††
Year 2	10,258	10,228	10,014	244	0.410		215	0.470		-30	0.920	††
Year 3	10,384	10,349	10,088	296	0.390		261	0.450		-36	0.918	††
Year 4	10,647	10,296	10,400	247	0.522		-104	0.788		-351	0.365	
Full period	41,365	41,084	40,456	909	0.434		629	0.588		-280	0.810	†
Sample size (total = 1,001)	330	337	334									

(continued)

Appendix Table F.8 (continued)

Outcome	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control			FSS+Incentives vs. Control			FSS+Incentives vs. FSS-Only		
	FSS-Only	FSS+Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
<u>Not receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>												
Received Section 8 housing subsidy (%)												
Year 1	97.9	97.0	97.8	0.1	0.953		-0.8	0.693		-0.9	0.643	
Year 2	93.5	89.0	97.9	-4.5	0.115		-8.9 ***	0.003	††	-4.4	0.127	
Year 3	90.9	88.7	91.8	-1.0	0.773		-3.1	0.380		-2.1	0.536	
Year 4	88.3	85.0	86.2	2.2	0.578		-1.2	0.773		-3.4	0.399	
Full period	97.9	97.0	97.8	0.1	0.953		-0.8	0.693		-0.9	0.643	
Number of months received Section 8 housing subsidy												
Year 1	11.5	11.0	11.7	-0.2	0.447		-0.7 **	0.013	††	-0.5 *	0.071	
Year 2	11.0	10.7	11.4	-0.4	0.258		-0.7 *	0.071		-0.3	0.456	
Year 3	10.7	10.4	10.7	-0.1	0.839		-0.4	0.402		-0.3	0.508	
Year 4	10.4	10.1	10.3	0.1	0.819		-0.2	0.683		-0.3	0.519	
Full period	43.5	42.1	44.1	-0.6	0.671		-2.0	0.180		-1.4	0.335	
Total Section 8 housing subsidy ^a (\$)												
Year 1	9,913	9,034	9,637	276	0.495		-603	0.155	†	-879 **	0.033	††
Year 2	10,057	8,750	9,358	699	0.157		-608	0.241		-1,307 ***	0.010	††
Year 3	10,146	8,777	9,236	910	0.106		-459	0.435		-1,369 **	0.017	††
Year 4	10,088	9,064	9,393	696	0.239		-328	0.596		-1,024 *	0.090	
Full period	40,204	35,625	37,624	2,580	0.173		-1,998	0.314		-4,579 **	0.018	†
Sample size (total = 454)	162	139	153									

(continued)

Appendix Table F.8 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) Section 8 housing records.

NOTES: The core sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009, and excludes elderly and disabled individuals.

The data cover housing records through June 30, 2013, and for 4 years after study entry for each sample member.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for sample members' pre-random assignment characteristics. A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the research groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent. Statistical significance levels for differences in impacts across subgroups (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Housing subsidy outcomes and impacts are averages among core sample households.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who did not receive housing subsidies.

^aThe measure reflects the housing subsidy paid by the housing agency to landlords. This amount excludes utility allowance payments made directly to tenants. A separate analysis of HPD data showed that in 98 percent of cases, the subsidy paid to the landlord and total subsidy for a voucher household were exactly the same.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table F.9

Four-Year Impacts on Employment and Earnings, FSS Study, Full Sample

Outcome	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control		FSS+Incentives vs. Control		FSS+Incentives vs. FSS-Only	
	FSS-Only	FSS+Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
	Ever employed (%)								
Quarter of random assignment	37.8	36.9	36.1	1.7	0.259	0.8	0.585	-0.9	0.580
Quarter 2	39.5	38.7	36.3	3.2 *	0.064	2.4	0.198	-0.8	0.671
Quarter 3	39.7	38.8	36.3	3.4 *	0.067	2.5	0.196	-1.0	0.620
Quarter 4	38.8	39.2	35.9	2.9	0.143	3.3 *	0.098	0.4	0.864
Quarter 5	36.3	38.7	35.9	0.4	0.837	2.9	0.144	2.4	0.227
Quarter 6	37.0	39.0	35.7	1.3	0.499	3.3	0.104	2.0	0.354
Quarter 7	37.6	38.1	35.7	1.9	0.338	2.5	0.223	0.6	0.781
Quarter 8	37.6	38.3	35.0	2.6	0.210	3.3	0.124	0.7	0.736
Quarter 9	37.7	37.5	35.9	1.8	0.378	1.7	0.442	-0.2	0.945
Quarter 10	37.4	38.4	35.4	2.0	0.339	3.0	0.174	1.0	0.663
Quarter 11	36.9	38.0	36.0	0.9	0.680	2.0	0.387	1.1	0.640
Quarter 12	37.1	37.0	34.0	3.1	0.138	3.0	0.177	-0.1	0.967
Quarter 13	36.2	38.5	34.7	1.6	0.452	3.8 *	0.084	2.2	0.321
Quarter 14	36.4	37.7	34.8	1.6	0.460	2.9	0.184	1.3	0.545
Quarter 15	36.2	38.6	35.0	1.2	0.580	3.6	0.111	2.4	0.289
Quarter 16	37.3	36.8	34.4	2.8	0.190	2.3	0.292	-0.5	0.813
Quarter 17	36.5	37.4	34.8	1.8	0.429	2.6	0.249	0.8	0.710
Year 1	49.0	49.3	46.3	2.8	0.150	3.0	0.131	0.2	0.911
Year 2	46.4	47.1	44.9	1.5	0.465	2.2	0.309	0.7	0.751
Year 3	45.9	48.1	45.3	0.6	0.778	2.8	0.231	2.2	0.348
Year 4	45.5	46.5	43.1	2.4	0.285	3.4	0.143	1.0	0.665
Full period	62.1	63.2	59.6	2.5	0.226	3.6 *	0.090	1.0	0.617
Average quarterly employment (%)	37.4	38.2	35.4	2.0	0.156	2.8 *	0.063	0.8	0.609

(continued)

Appendix Table F.9 (continued)

Outcome	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control		FSS+Incentives vs. Control		FSS+Incentives vs. FSS-Only	
	FSS-Only	FSS+ Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
	Total earnings (\$)								
Quarter of random assignment	1,347	1,261	1,243	105 *	0.060	19	0.761	-86	0.144
Quarter 2	1,417	1,342	1,320	96	0.189	21	0.790	-75	0.329
Quarter 3	1,434	1,438	1,409	25	0.767	30	0.751	4	0.961
Quarter 4	1,369	1,451	1,431	-62	0.481	20	0.837	82	0.348
Quarter 5	1,390	1,494	1,415	-25	0.788	80	0.410	104	0.252
Quarter 6	1,515	1,566	1,497	19	0.846	69	0.499	50	0.610
Quarter 7	1,494	1,504	1,463	31	0.758	41	0.718	9	0.928
Quarter 8	1,542	1,540	1,396	146	0.170	143	0.218	-2	0.985
Quarter 9	1,575	1,545	1,495	79	0.481	50	0.663	-30	0.791
Quarter 10	1,662	1,538	1,559	103	0.402	-21	0.864	-123	0.303
Quarter 11	1,620	1,569	1,496	125	0.314	73	0.604	-51	0.694
Quarter 12	1,646	1,578	1,381	265 **	0.027	197	0.116	-67	0.578
Quarter 13	1,651	1,539	1,459	193	0.136	80	0.516	-112	0.363
Quarter 14	1,630	1,656	1,458	171	0.177	197	0.115	26	0.838
Quarter 15	1,651	1,665	1,509	142	0.278	156	0.228	14	0.914
Quarter 16	1,662	1,733	1,550	112	0.404	182	0.189	70	0.604
Quarter 17	1,619	1,721	1,573	46	0.738	148	0.299	102	0.457
Year 1	5,610	5,725	5,575	35	0.902	150	0.619	115	0.679
Year 2	6,126	6,154	5,851	275	0.462	303	0.445	28	0.941
Year 3	6,579	6,225	5,894	685	0.130	331	0.472	-354	0.428
Year 4	6,562	6,774	6,091	472	0.342	683	0.170	212	0.667
Full period	24,877	24,878	23,411	1,466	0.290	1,467	0.307	1	0.999
Sample size (total = 2,072)	698	694	680						

(continued)

Appendix Table F.9 (continued)

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

NOTES: The full sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009.

The UI outcome data cover employment and earnings through June 30, 2013, and for 4 years after study entry for each sample member.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for sample members' pre-random assignment characteristics. A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the research groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference arose by chance.

Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for nonworking sample members.

This table includes only employment and earnings in jobs covered by the New York State UI program. It does not include employment outside New York State or in jobs not covered by the UI system (for example, "off the books" jobs and federal government jobs).

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table F.10

Impacts on Benefits Receipt, FSS Study, Full Sample

Outcome	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control		FSS+Incentives vs. Control		FSS+Incentives vs. FSS-Only	
	FSS-Only	FSS+Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
TANF/SNA receipt									
Received TANF/SNA (%)									
Full period	48.3	46.5	51.0	-2.6	0.262	-4.5 *	0.055	-1.9	0.424
Average quarterly receipt (%)									
Year 1	27.0	25.8	29.0	-2.0	0.206	-3.3 **	0.042	-1.2	0.442
Year 2	23.6	23.6	26.8	-3.2 *	0.065	-3.2 *	0.068	0.0	0.985
Year 3	22.1	20.8	23.6	-1.5	0.389	-2.8	0.115	-1.3	0.475
Year 4	21.0	20.2	22.9	-1.9	0.288	-2.7	0.138	-0.8	0.670
Full period	23.4	22.6	25.6	-2.2	0.132	-3.0 **	0.039	-0.8	0.574
Received in last quarter	21.3	18.5	23.4	-2.1	0.311	-5.0 **	0.016	-2.9	0.166
Amount received (\$)									
Year 1	1,248	1,281	1,349	-102	0.239	-69	0.427	33	0.703
Year 2	1,241	1,210	1,358	-117	0.299	-148	0.190	-31	0.784
Year 3	1,090	1,071	1,220	-130	0.247	-148	0.188	-18	0.871
Year 4	1,044	1,094	1,178	-134	0.253	-85	0.473	50	0.672
Full period	4,622	4,656	5,105	-483	0.171	-449	0.204	34	0.924
Last quarter	261	254	295	-35	0.282	-41	0.204	-6	0.843
Food stamp receipt									
Received food stamps (%)									
Full period	90.2	89.5	90.6	-0.5	0.777	-1.1	0.489	-0.7	0.682

(continued)

Appendix Table F.10 (continued)

Outcome	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control		FSS+Incentives vs. Control		FSS+Incentives vs. FSS-Only	
	FSS- Only	FSS+ Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Average quarterly receipt (%)									
Year 1	77.5	78.9	76.9	0.6	0.730	2.0	0.271	1.4	0.450
Year 2	78.6	79.1	79.4	-0.9	0.656	-0.3	0.879	0.6	0.770
Year 3	78.5	78.4	78.7	-0.2	0.929	-0.3	0.869	-0.2	0.940
Year 4	76.1	74.4	78.4	-2.3	0.286	-4.0 *	0.065	-1.7	0.434
Full period	77.7	77.7	78.3	-0.7	0.690	-0.7	0.703	0.0	0.987
Last quarter	75.8	73.0	78.0	-2.3	0.329	-5.1 **	0.030	-2.8	0.230
Amount received (\$)									
Year 1	2,806	2,798	2,789	17	0.823	9	0.907	-8	0.916
Year 2	3,216	3,189	3,228	-12	0.901	-38	0.696	-26	0.790
Year 3	3,182	3,057	3,128	54	0.622	-71	0.514	-125	0.253
Year 4	2,959	2,794	3,065	-107	0.359	-271 **	0.020	-164	0.159
Full period	12,162	11,839	12,210	-48	0.889	-372	0.279	-324	0.346
Last quarter	733	691	753	-20	0.534	-62 *	0.052	-42	0.187
Sample size (total = 1,883)	629	619	635						

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using administrative records data from the New York City Human Resources Administration (HRA).

NOTES: The full sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009.

The HRA outcome data cover TANF/SNA and food stamp receipt through June 30, 2013, and for 4 years after study entry for each sample member.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for sample members' pre-random assignment characteristics. A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the research groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference arose by chance.

Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

TANF/SNA and food stamp outcomes and impacts are averages among full sample households.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who did not receive TANF/SNA or food stamps.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table F.11

Impacts on Section 8 Housing and Section 8 Reported Income, FSS Study, Full Sample

Outcome	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control		FSS+Incentives vs. Control		FSS+Incentives vs. FSS-Only	
	FSS-Only	FSS+Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Received Section 8 housing subsidy (%)									
Year 1	99.1	98.5	98.6	0.5	0.416	0.0	0.954	-0.6	0.386
Year 2	95.4	94.2	96.6	-1.2	0.305	-2.4 **	0.042	-1.2	0.315
Year 3	92.4	92.2	94.0	-1.6	0.265	-1.8	0.204	-0.2	0.873
Year 4	90.3	89.9	90.9	-0.6	0.722	-1.0	0.530	-0.5	0.785
Full period	99.1	98.7	98.6	0.5	0.438	0.1	0.858	-0.4	0.553
Number of months received Section 8 housing subsidy									
Year 1	11.7	11.5	11.7	0.0	0.920	-0.2 *	0.095	-0.2 *	0.077
Year 2	11.3	11.2	11.4	-0.2	0.226	-0.2	0.134	0.0	0.770
Year 3	10.9	10.9	11.1	-0.2	0.318	-0.2	0.319	0.0	0.999
Year 4	10.7	10.6	10.7	0.0	0.813	-0.1	0.552	-0.1	0.720
Full period	44.5	44.2	44.9	-0.4	0.491	-0.7	0.230	-0.3	0.609
Total Section 8 housing subsidy ^a (\$)									
Year 1	9,714	9,450	9,524	190	0.287	-74	0.677	-264	0.140
Year 2	9,856	9,434	9,587	269	0.208	-153	0.474	-422 **	0.049
Year 3	9,900	9,494	9,689	211	0.393	-195	0.431	-406	0.102
Year 4	10,053	9,486	9,918	135	0.619	-432	0.113	-567 **	0.038
Full period	39,523	37,863	38,718	805	0.335	-855	0.307	-1,660 **	0.048
Sample size (total = 1,883)	629	619	635						

(continued)

Appendix Table F.11 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) Section 8 housing records.

NOTES: The full sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009.

The data cover housing records through June 30, 2013, and for 4 years after study entry for each sample member.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for sample members' pre-random assignment characteristics. A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between outcomes for the research groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference arose by chance.

Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Housing subsidy outcomes and impacts are averages among full sample households.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who did not receive housing subsidies.

^aThe measure reflects the housing subsidy paid by the housing agency to landlords. This amount excludes utility allowance payments made directly to tenants. A separate analysis of HPD data showed that in 98 percent of cases, the subsidy paid to the landlord and total subsidy for a voucher household were exactly the same.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table F.12

Impacts on Financial Services, Savings, and Debt, by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment, FSS Study, Core Sample

Outcome	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control			FSS+Incentives vs. Control		
	FSS-Only	FSS+ Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
<u>Receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>									
Currently has bank account (%)	46.8	53.4	37.9	8.9 **	0.032		15.5 ***	0.000	
Cash check or pay bill at check cashier at least once a month (%)	54.8	52.8	61.7	-6.9	0.115		-8.9 **	0.038	
Average savings (\$)	96	133	33	62	0.143	††	99 **	0.018	
Any savings (%)	15.2	15.9	7.6	7.6 ***	0.010	†	8.3 ***	0.004	
Average debt (\$)	5,929	6,066	6,735	-807	0.450		-669	0.525	
Sample size (total = 819)	262	280	277						
<u>Not receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>									
Currently has bank account (%)	61.1	62.8	57.4	3.8	0.574		5.4	0.436	
Cash check or pay bill at check cashier at least once a month (%)	43.5	50.1	52.8	-9.3	0.180		-2.6	0.715	
Average savings (\$)	155	404	542	-387 *	0.071	††	-138	0.535	
Any savings (%)	18.1	28.0	22.1	-4.0	0.494	†	5.9	0.324	
Average debt (\$)	7,071	5,449	7,517	-446	0.807		-2,069	0.276	
Sample size (total = 333)	123	106	104						

(continued)

Appendix Table F.12 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Work Rewards 42-Month Survey.

NOTES: The core sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009, and excludes elderly and disabled individuals.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of families or sample members. 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 arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent. Statistical significance levels for differences in impacts across subgroups (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Sample sizes may vary across measures because of missing values.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table F.13

Impacts on Income and Poverty, by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment,
FSS Study, Core Sample

Outcome	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control			FSS+Incentives vs. Control		
	FSS-Only	FSS+ Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
<u>Receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>									
Average total household income in month prior to interview ^a (\$)	1,065	1,175	1,019	46	0.518		156 **	0.026	††
Percentage of families with household income at or below the federal poverty level ^b (%)	79.5	76.1	81.4	-2.0	0.589		-5.3	0.138	
Total household income in prior year as a percentage of the federal poverty level ^b (%)									
Less than 50%	36.4	36.6	38.2	-1.8	0.667		-1.6	0.700	
50% - 100%	43.1	39.5	43.2	-0.1	0.979		-3.7	0.402	
101% -129%	10.8	12.0	13.0	-2.2	0.451		-0.9	0.744	
130% or more	9.8	11.8	5.6	4.2	0.102	††	6.2 **	0.013	†
Sample size (total = 819)	262	280	277						

(continued)

Appendix Table F.13 (continued)

Outcome	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control			FSS+Incentives vs. Control		
	FSS-Only	FSS+ Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
<u>Not receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>									
Average total household income in month prior to interview ^a (\$)	1,318	1,127	1,265	54	0.650		-137	0.267	††
Percentage of families with household income at or below the federal poverty level ^b (%)	73.1	68.6	63.6	9.5	0.147		5.0	0.462	
Total household income in prior year as a percentage of the federal poverty level ^b (%)									
Less than 50%	22.0	28.6	23.5	-1.5	0.817		5.2	0.430	
50% - 100%	51.1	40.0	40.1	11.0	0.129		-0.1	0.986	
101% -129%	16.3	15.3	16.3	0.1	0.987		-1.0	0.863	
130% or more	10.5	16.1	20.2	-9.6 *	0.061	††	-4.1	0.446	†
Sample size (total = 333)	123	106	104						

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Work Rewards 42-Month Survey.

NOTES: The core sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009, and excludes elderly and disabled individuals.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of families or sample members. 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 arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent. Statistical significance levels for differences in impacts across subgroups (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Sample sizes may vary across measures because of missing values.

^aMonthly household income amounts equal to or greater than \$10,000 were excluded from this calculation. About 5.0 percent of the sample is excluded from the income measures because respondents refused to provide the information. An additional 0.4 percent of the sample was excluded because the income provided was over \$10,000.

^bAnnual household income is calculated by multiplying by 12 an average of the respondent's income in the month prior to the 12-month survey interview. For program group members, it includes average incentive payments earned during program Years 1 and 3. The federal poverty level was determined 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 2011 or 2012 Poverty Guidelines, depending on when a respondent was interviewed.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table F.14

**Four-Year Impacts on Household Income,
by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment, FSS Study, Core Sample**

Outcome (\$)	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control		FSS+Incentives vs. Control		Sig.	Sig.
	FSS- Only	FSS+ Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Difference (Impact)	P-Value		
<u>Receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>									
Total household income, excluding incentive payments									
Year 1	12,502	12,303	11,916	586	0.188	387	0.381		
Year 2	13,308	12,893	12,552	756	0.198	341	0.560		
Year 3	13,344	12,573	12,256	1,087	0.104	316	0.634		
Year 4	12,793	13,231	12,491	302	0.687	739	0.321		
Full period	51,946	50,999	49,215	2,731	0.190	1,784	0.389		
Total household income, including incentive payments									
Year 1	12,499	12,564	11,919	580	0.198	645	0.150		
Year 2	13,306	13,295	12,553	753	0.206	742	0.210		
Year 3	13,343	12,627	12,258	1,085	0.106	370	0.579		
Year 4	12,793	13,231	12,491	302	0.687	739	0.321		
Full period	51,941	51,717	49,221	2,720	0.195	2,496	0.231		
Sample size (total = 1,015)	333	344	338						
<u>Not receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>									
Total household income, excluding incentive payments									
Year 1	11,966	12,104	12,645	-679	0.422	-541	0.543		
Year 2	13,472	13,516	14,239	-767	0.487	-723	0.534		
Year 3	14,304	13,672	14,475	-172	0.901	-803	0.581		
Year 4	14,668	13,724	14,556	113	0.942	-831	0.613		
Full period	54,410	53,017	55,915	-1,505	0.725	-2,898	0.520		

(continued)

Appendix Table F.14 (continued)

Outcome (\$)	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control		Sig.	FSS+Incentives vs. Control		Sig.
	FSS-Only	FSS+ Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value		Difference (Impact)	P-Value	
Total household income, including incentive payments									
Year 1	11,982	12,446	12,629	-648	0.446		-184	0.837	
Year 2	13,497	14,294	14,235	-738	0.507		58	0.960	
Year 3	14,305	13,765	14,476	-171	0.902		-711	0.626	
Year 4	14,668	13,724	14,556	113	0.942		-831	0.613	
Full period	54,452	54,228	55,896	-1,444	0.736		-1,668	0.712	
Sample size (total = 440)	159	132	149						

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using administrative records data from New York State unemployment insurance (UI) wage records, the New York City Human Resources Administration (HRA), and Seedco's Work Rewards program data.

NOTES: The core sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009, and excludes elderly and disabled individuals.

The UI outcome data cover employment and earnings through June 30, 2013, and for 4 years after study entry for each sample member.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for sample members' pre-random assignment characteristics. 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 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 for differences in impacts across subgroups (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who did not receive any income.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table F.15

Impacts on Sources of Debt, FSS Study, Core Sample

Outcome	Average Outcome Levels			FSS-Only vs. Control		FSS+Incentives vs. Control		FSS+Incentives vs. FSS-Only	
	FSS-Only	FSS+Incentives	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Outstanding loans or payments (%)									
No debt sources	62.7	62.4	61.8	0.9	0.799	0.5	0.878	-0.4	0.919
Car loan	2.7	2.5	2.0	0.7	0.551	0.5	0.665	-0.2	0.871
Home loan or back rent	12.8	10.4	14.3	-1.6	0.517	-3.9	0.103	-2.4	0.326
Student loan	24.0	23.9	26.4	-2.4	0.442	-2.5	0.425	-0.1	0.976
Hospital or medical bill	15.8	17.4	19.0	-3.1	0.255	-1.5	0.583	1.6	0.555
Credit card or store bill	35.8	40.7	36.4	-0.6	0.859	4.3	0.203	4.9	0.146
Child support	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.0	0.943	0.2	0.787	0.2	0.732
Other	5.4	8.6	4.7	0.6	0.714	3.9 **	0.028	3.2 *	0.066
Currently repaying (%)									
Any loan	34.7	39.0	36.5	-1.8	0.596	2.6	0.454	4.4	0.201
Car loan	1.5	1.6	1.4	0.0	0.967	0.2	0.864	0.1	0.896
Home loan	0.2	0.5	0.0	0.2	0.582	0.5	0.183	0.3	0.434
Student loans	7.1	9.9	9.2	-2.1	0.301	0.7	0.736	2.8	0.170
Hospital or medical bill	3.4	4.5	3.7	-0.3	0.809	0.8	0.580	1.1	0.426
Credit card or store bill	21.0	25.4	21.2	-0.3	0.931	4.2	0.144	4.5	0.121
Other	11.0	11.1	12.2	-1.2	0.612	-1.2	0.623	0.0	0.988
Sample size (total = 1,152)	385	386	381						

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from the Work Rewards 42-Month Survey.

NOTES: The core sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009, and excludes elderly and disabled individuals.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of families or sample members. A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between outcomes for the research groups. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Sample sizes may vary across measures because of missing values.

Appendix G

Supplementary Tables for the Incentives-Only Study

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table G.1

**Four-Year Impacts on Employment and Earnings, by Food Stamp Receipt
at Random Assignment, Incentives-Only Study, Core Sample**

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
<u>Receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>					
Quarterly employment rate (%)					
Year 1	46.6	44.5	2.1	0.294	
Year 2	44.3	43.1	1.2	0.600	
Year 3	44.8	41.9	2.9	0.246	
Year 4	41.4	43.8	-2.4	0.368	
Full period	44.3	43.3	1.0	0.617	
Total earnings (\$)					
Year 1	6,151	5,500	651 *	0.055	
Year 2	6,655	5,975	681	0.157	
Year 3	7,024	6,302	722	0.200	
Year 4	7,188	6,485	703	0.248	
Full period	27,018	24,262	2,756	0.102	
Sample size (total = 966)	480	486			
<u>Not receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>					
Quarterly employment rate (%)					
Year 1	56.6	58.6	-1.9	0.545	
Year 2	51.7	54.1	-2.4	0.540	
Year 3	51.4	52.5	-1.1	0.779	
Year 4	52.5	52.0	0.5	0.907	
Full period	53.1	54.3	-1.3	0.690	
Total earnings (\$)					
Year 1	10,429	10,745	-317	0.665	
Year 2	10,298	10,332	-34	0.975	
Year 3	10,360	10,230	130	0.909	
Year 4	10,899	10,834	66	0.955	
Full period	41,986	42,141	-155	0.965	
Sample size (total = 352)	172	180			

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

NOTES: The core sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009, and excludes elderly individuals, disabled individuals, and individuals who likely belong to the Hasidic community. The UI outcome data cover employment and earnings through June 30, 2013, and for 4 years after study entry for each sample member.

Appendix Table G.1 (continued)

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for sample members' pre-random assignment characteristics. A two-tailed t-test was applied to the differences between program and control group outcomes. The p-value indicates the likelihood that the difference 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 for differences in impacts across subgroups (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who did not receive TANF/SNA or food stamps.

This table includes only employment and earnings in jobs covered by the New York State UI program. It does not include employment outside New York State or in jobs not covered by the UI system (for example, "off the books" jobs and federal government jobs).

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table G.2

Impacts on Benefits Receipt, by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment, Incentives-Only Study, Core Sample

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
<u>Receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>					
Received TANF/SNA, Years 1-4 (%)	62.5	58.8	3.7	0.185	†
Average quarterly TANF/SNA receipt (%)					
Year 1	36.2	37.8	-1.6	0.446	††
Year 2	32.1	34.0	-1.9	0.405	
Year 3	29.7	31.1	-1.5	0.538	
Year 4	26.2	26.8	-0.6	0.815	
Full period	31.0	32.4	-1.4	0.458	
Last quarter	27.5	27.7	-0.2	0.943	†
Amount of TANF/SNA received (\$)					
Year 1	1,532	1,594	-62	0.574	††
Year 2	1,668	1,686	-18	0.908	
Year 3	1,396	1,637	-241	0.140	
Year 4	1,274	1,381	-107	0.532	
Full period	5,870	6,298	-428	0.367	
Last quarter	358	351	8	0.878	
Received food stamps, Years 1-4 (%)	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.000	
Average quarterly food stamp receipt (%)					
Year 1	95.3	96.1	-0.7	0.469	
Year 2	92.0	92.7	-0.7	0.665	
Year 3	88.6	91.3	-2.6	0.157	
Year 4	83.7	86.8	-3.0	0.175	
Full period	89.9	91.7	-1.8	0.190	
Last quarter	82.9	86.3	-3.4	0.162	
Amount of food stamps received (\$)					
Year 1	3,839	3,985	-146	0.128	
Year 2	4,356	4,433	-76	0.562	
Year 3	4,072	4,336	-264 *	0.057	
Year 4	3,771	3,929	-157	0.301	
Full period	16,039	16,683	-643	0.146	
Last quarter	910	959	-50	0.221	
Sample size (total = 851)	423	428			
<u>Not receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>					
Received TANF/SNA, Years 1-4 (%)	26.9	33.8	-6.9	0.168	†
Average quarterly TANF/SNA receipt (%)					
Year 1	12.2	6.0	6.2 **	0.024	††
Year 2	8.4	10.3	-1.9	0.502	
Year 3	8.7	11.6	-2.9	0.341	
Year 4	8.6	14.5	-5.9 *	0.069	

(continued)

Appendix Table G.2 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
Full period	9.5	10.6	-1.1	0.626	
Last quarter	8.2	16.2	-8.0 **	0.031	†
Amount of TANF/SNA received (\$)					
Year 1	481	218	263 **	0.033	††
Year 2	375	401	-26	0.877	
Year 3	385	443	-58	0.745	
Year 4	388	504	-117	0.409	
Full period	1,629	1,567	62	0.889	
Last quarter	86	131	-45	0.261	
Received food stamps, Years 1-4 (%)	70.8	67.8	3.0	0.571	
Average quarterly food stamp receipt (%)					
Year 1	31.4	33.6	-2.1	0.642	
Year 2	47.3	49.6	-2.2	0.680	
Year 3	53.3	54.3	-1.0	0.848	
Year 4	55.1	53.4	1.7	0.759	
Full period	46.8	47.7	-0.9	0.832	
Last quarter	54.6	51.7	2.9	0.619	
Amount of food stamps received (\$)					
Year 1	835	1,068	-234	0.167	
Year 2	1,650	1,834	-184	0.460	
Year 3	1,653	1,996	-342	0.151	
Year 4	1,824	1,745	79	0.739	
Full period	5,962	6,643	-681	0.373	
Last quarter	451	411	40	0.527	
Sample size (total = 309)	150	159			

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using administrative records data from the New York City Human Resources Administration (HRA).

NOTES: The core sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009, and excludes elderly individuals, disabled individuals, and individuals who likely belong to the Hasidic community.

The HRA outcome data cover TANF/SNA and food stamp receipt through June 30, 2013, and for 4 years after study entry for each sample member.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for sample members' pre-random assignment characteristics. 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 arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent. Statistical significance levels for differences in impacts across subgroups (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

TANF/SNA and food stamp outcomes and impacts are averages among core sample households.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who did not receive TANF/SNA or food stamps.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table G.3

**Impacts on Household Income, by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment,
Incentives-Only Study, Core Sample**

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
<u>Receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>					
Total household income, excluding incentive payments (\$)					
Year 1	12,435	11,875	560	0.147	
Year 2	13,647	12,992	656	0.232	
Year 3	13,536	13,176	360	0.573	
Year 4	13,281	12,741	540	0.440	
Full period	52,901	50,784	2,117	0.273	
Total household income, including incentive payments (\$)					
Year 1	12,870	11,870	1,000 **	0.012	
Year 2	14,219	12,987	1,232 **	0.028	
Year 3	13,618	13,176	442	0.489	
Year 4	13,281	12,741	540	0.440	
Full period	53,988	50,773	3,215 *	0.099	
Sample size (total = 851)	423	428			
<u>Not receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>					
Total household income, excluding incentive payments (\$)					
Year 1	13,231	13,556	-325	0.672	
Year 2	13,741	14,019	-278	0.797	
Year 3	13,656	14,357	-701	0.559	
Year 4	14,566	14,778	-212	0.870	
Full period	55,194	56,710	-1,516	0.681	
Total household income, including incentive payments (\$)					
Year 1	13,825	13,575	250	0.748	
Year 2	14,524	14,056	468	0.669	
Year 3	13,760	14,359	-599	0.618	
Year 4	14,566	14,778	-212	0.870	
Full period	56,676	56,768	-93	0.980	
Sample size (total = 309)	150	159			

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using administrative records data from New York State unemployment insurance (UI) wage records, the New York City Human Resources Administration (HRA), and Seedco's Work Rewards program data.

NOTES: The core sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009, and excludes elderly individuals, disabled individuals, and individuals who likely belong to the Hasidic community.

The HRA outcome data cover TANF/SNA and food stamp receipt through June 30, 2013, and for 4 years after study entry for each sample member.

(continued)

Appendix Table G.3 (continued)

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for sample members' pre-random assignment characteristics. 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 arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent. Statistical significance levels for differences in impacts across subgroups (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

TANF/SNA and food stamp outcomes and impacts are averages among core sample households.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who did not receive TANF/SNA or food stamps.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table G.4

Impacts on Section 8 Housing, by Food Stamp Receipt at Random Assignment, Incentives-Only Study, Core Sample

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	Sig.
<u>Receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>					
Received Section 8 housing subsidy (%)					
Year 1	97.7	97.1	0.6	0.581	
Year 2	94.7	94.5	0.3	0.846	
Year 3	91.4	91.0	0.4	0.831	
Full period	98.2	97.6	0.6	0.538	
Month 42	85.5	86.8	-1.3	0.583	
Number of months received Section 8 housing subsidy					
Year 1	11.4	11.4	0.0	0.967	
Year 2	11.1	11.0	0.2	0.447	
Year 3	10.7	10.6	0.1	0.710	
Full period	38.4	38.2	0.2	0.769	
Total Section 8 housing subsidy ^a (\$)					
Year 1	9,965	10,117	-153	0.333	
Year 2	9,977	10,062	-84	0.718	
Year 3	9,796	9,801	-5	0.985	
Full period	34,568	34,885	-317	0.650	
Month 42	801	819	-18	0.505	
Sample size (total = 851)	423	428			
<u>Not receiving food stamps at random assignment</u>					
Received Section 8 housing subsidy (%)					
Year 1	95.0	94.0	1.0	0.683	
Year 2	91.0	93.4	-2.4	0.401	
Year 3	85.8	87.7	-1.9	0.616	
Full period	95.8	95.2	0.6	0.770	
Month 42	81.8	81.3	0.5	0.909	
Number of months received Section 8 housing subsidy					
Year 1	10.9	11.1	-0.2	0.602	
Year 2	10.5	10.7	-0.2	0.547	
Year 3	10.1	10.1	0.0	0.917	
Full period	36.5	36.9	-0.4	0.741	
Total Section 8 housing subsidy ^a (\$)					
Year 1	7,912	7,844	68	0.806	
Year 2	7,958	7,965	-7	0.984	
Year 3	7,483	7,717	-234	0.599	
Full period	27,132	27,309	-178	0.872	
Month 42	635	631	4	0.923	
Sample size (total = 309)	150	159			

(continued)

Appendix Table G.4 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) Section 8 housing records.

NOTES: The core sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009, and excludes elderly individuals, disabled individuals, and individuals who likely belong to the Hasidic community.

The data cover housing records through June 30, 2012, and for 3.5 years after study entry for each sample member.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for sample members' pre-random assignment characteristics. 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 arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent. Statistical significance levels for differences in impacts across subgroups (Sig.) are indicated as follows: ††† = 1 percent; †† = 5 percent; † = 10 percent.

Housing subsidy outcomes and impacts are averages among core sample households.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who did not receive housing subsidies

^aThe measure reflects the housing subsidy paid by the housing agency to landlords. This amount excludes utility allowance payments made directly to tenants. A separate analysis of NYCHA data showed that in 98 percent of cases, the subsidy paid to the landlord and total subsidy for a voucher household were exactly the same.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table G.5

Rewards Receipt, Incentives-Only Study, Full Sample

Outcome	Years 1-3
Ever submitted a coupon (%)	51.1
Ever earned a reward (%)	45.3
Number of months earned rewards ^a	5.6
Average total amount earned ^a (\$)	2,385
Ever submitted a coupon for full-time work (%)	48.9
Ever earned a reward for full-time work (%)	43.6
Average total amount earned for full-time work rewards ^a (\$)	2,378
Ever submitted a coupon for education and training (%)	17.7
Ever earned a reward for education and training (%)	4.1
Average total amount earned for education and training rewards ^a (\$)	1,080
Was ever paid (%)	44.3
Was ever paid among those with earnings (%)	97.8
Average total amount received ^b (\$)	2,342
Sample size	1,223

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

NOTES: The full sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009.

Sample size refers to the number of adults in the program group.

^aCalculations are based on individuals who earned at least one reward in the category.

^bCalculations are based on individuals who were paid at least once.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table G.6

Four-Year Impacts on Employment and Earnings, Incentives-Only Study, Full Sample

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Ever employed (%)				
Quarter of random assignment	42.9	42.5	0.5	0.677
Quarter 2	44.6	43.8	0.8	0.531
Quarter 3	45.3	44.9	0.4	0.764
Quarter 4	41.5	43.3	-1.9	0.217
Quarter 5	41.4	42.6	-1.2	0.417
Quarter 6	41.3	42.1	-0.7	0.636
Quarter 7	42.6	42.8	-0.3	0.873
Quarter 8	42.3	42.9	-0.6	0.718
Quarter 9	43.0	42.3	0.7	0.687
Quarter 10	43.7	44.5	-0.8	0.637
Quarter 11	44.6	44.7	-0.1	0.977
Quarter 12	43.2	44.2	-0.9	0.581
Quarter 13	44.3	44.3	0.0	0.992
Quarter 14	44.0	46.0	-2.0	0.249
Quarter 15	43.4	45.0	-1.6	0.375
Quarter 16	42.9	44.2	-1.3	0.467
Quarter 17	42.2	43.5	-1.3	0.471
Year 1	53.4	54.3	-0.9	0.513
Year 2	50.1	52.6	-2.5	0.112
Year 3	52.5	53.7	-1.2	0.479
Year 4	50.6	53.8	-3.3 *	0.065
Full period	66.8	68.6	-1.8	0.218
Average quarterly employment (%)	43.1	43.8	-0.7	0.565
Total earnings (\$)				
Quarter of random assignment	1,328	1,314	14	0.707
Quarter 2	1,435	1,334	101 **	0.043
Quarter 3	1,536	1,416	119 **	0.030
Quarter 4	1,399	1,404	-5	0.927
Quarter 5	1,418	1,391	27	0.672
Quarter 6	1,515	1,422	93	0.194
Quarter 7	1,554	1,478	76	0.302
Quarter 8	1,486	1,438	48	0.515
Quarter 9	1,589	1,479	110	0.188
Quarter 10	1,648	1,518	130	0.134

(continued)

Appendix Table G.6 (continued)

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Quarter 11	1,658	1,563	96	0.264
Quarter 12	1,624	1,508	116	0.215
Quarter 13	1,713	1,567	145	0.146
Quarter 14	1,735	1,546	189 **	0.046
Quarter 15	1,756	1,621	135	0.168
Quarter 16	1,669	1,544	125	0.195
Quarter 17	1,685	1,597	88	0.394
Year 1	5,788	5,546	242	0.191
Year 2	6,144	5,817	327	0.220
Year 3	6,644	6,156	487	0.141
Year 4	6,845	6,309	537	0.139
Full period	25,420	23,828	1,593	0.104
Sample size (total = 2,465)	1,223	1,242		

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

NOTES: The full sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009.

The UI outcome data cover employment and earnings through June 30, 2013, and for 4 years after study entry for each sample member.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for sample members' pre-random assignment characteristics. 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 arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for nonworking sample members.

This table includes only employment and earnings in jobs covered by the New York State UI program. It does not include employment outside New York State or in jobs not covered by the UI system (for example, "off the books" jobs and federal government jobs).

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards

Appendix Table G.7

Impacts on Benefits Receipt, Incentives-Only Study, Full Sample

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
<u>TANF/SNA receipt</u>				
Received TANF/SNA (%)				
Full period	49.3	47.2	2.1	0.275
Average quarterly receipt (%)				
Year 1	22.8	22.6	0.2	0.887
Year 2	21.8	22.7	-0.8	0.517
Year 3	21.5	21.5	-0.1	0.958
Year 4	18.2	19.7	-1.6	0.280
Full period	21.1	21.6	-0.6	0.583
Last quarter	17.7	20.7	-3.0 *	0.067
Amount received (\$)				
Year 1	962	963	-1	0.986
Year 2	1,076	1,093	-17	0.837
Year 3	1,000	1,074	-74	0.403
Year 4	872	947	-75	0.400
Full period	3,910	4,078	-167	0.503
Last quarter	223	239	-16	0.537
<u>Food stamp receipt</u>				
Received food stamps (%)				
Full period	94.2	94.1	0.1	0.924
Average quarterly receipt (%)				
Year 1	84.7	85.0	-0.4	0.775
Year 2	86.1	86.6	-0.4	0.749
Year 3	85.0	86.5	-1.5	0.290
Year 4	82.1	83.4	-1.3	0.390
Full period	84.5	85.4	-0.9	0.445
Last quarter	81.2	82.9	-1.7	0.308
Amount received (\$)				
Year 1	4,661	4,752	-91	0.153
Year 2	5,497	5,531	-33	0.718
Year 3	5,295	5,460	-165 *	0.099
Year 4	5,127	5,160	-34	0.766
Full period	20,580	20,903	-323	0.311
Last quarter	1,249	1,263	-13	0.657
Sample size (total = 1,935)	972	963		

(continued)

Appendix Table G.7 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using administrative records data from the New York City Human Resources Administration (HRA).

NOTES: The full sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009.

The HRA outcome data cover TANF/SNA and food stamp receipt through March 31, 2013, and for 4 years after study entry for each sample member.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for sample members' pre-random assignment characteristics. 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 arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

TANF/SNA and food stamp outcomes and impacts are averages among full sample households.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who did not receive TANF/SNA or food stamps.

The Opportunity NYC Demonstration: Work Rewards
Appendix Table G.8
Impacts on Section 8 Housing, Incentives-Only Study, Full Sample

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Received Section 8 housing subsidy (%)				
Year 1	97.6	97.5	0.1	0.859
Year 2	95.5	95.8	-0.3	0.729
Year 3	92.4	92.7	-0.3	0.827
Full period	98.0	98.1	-0.1	0.859
Month 42	80.8	84.2	-3.4 **	0.047
Number of months received Section 8 housing subsidy				
Year 1	11.5	11.5	-0.1	0.408
Year 2	11.3	11.2	0.1	0.609
Year 3	10.4	10.5	-0.1	0.522
Full period	38.0	38.3	-0.3	0.472
Total Section 8 housing subsidy ^a (\$)				
Year 1	10,602	10,670	-68	0.521
Year 2	10,828	10,806	22	0.879
Year 3	9,859	10,051	-192	0.301
Full period	35,878	36,320	-442	0.316
Month 42	761	800	-39 *	0.052
Sample size (total = 1,935)	972	963		

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using data from New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) Section 8 housing records.

NOTES: The full sample includes housing voucher recipients who were randomly assigned between January 1, 2008, and January 16, 2009.

The data cover housing records through June 30, 2012, and for 3.5 years after study entry for each sample member.

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for sample members' pre-random assignment characteristics. 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 arose by chance. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Housing subsidy outcomes and impacts are averages among full sample households.

Rounding may cause discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who did not receive housing subsidies.

^aThe measure reflects the housing subsidy paid by the housing agency to landlords. This amount excludes utility allowance payments made directly to tenants. A separate analysis of NYCHA data showed that in 98 percent of cases, the subsidy paid to the landlord and total subsidy for a voucher household were exactly the same.

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.