An MDRC Working Paper

New Hope's Effects on Children's Future Orientation and Employment Experiences

Vonnie C. McLoyd
Rachel Kaplan
Kelly M. Purtell

July 2008

MDRC is evaluating the New Hope program under a contract with the New Hope Project, Inc., supported by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the Helen Bader Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the State of Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development, the William T. Grant Foundation, the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Priscilla Pond Flawn Endowment, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The eight-year evaluation was funded by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development award to the University of Texas at Austin (HD36038-08), and core support by the R24 center grant from NICHD to the Population Research Center, University of Texas at Austin.

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 Ambrose Monell Foundation, Bristol-Myers Squibb Foundation, The Kresge Foundation, and The Starr Foundation. MDRC's dissemination of its education-related work is supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York, and Citi 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, The Sandler Family Supporting Foundation, and The Stupski Family Fund, as well as other individual contributors.

The findings and conclusions presented 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 Web site: www.mdrc.org.

Introduction

This report focuses on New Hope's impacts on children's future orientation (i.e., attitudes and expectancies about work, involvement in employment and career preparation activities) and employment experiences (e.g., duration and intensity of employment) eight years after random assignment. Interest in these outcomes is partly an outgrowth of New Hope's earlier effects on child functioning. Two and five years after random assignment years, when children were ages 3–13, and ages 6–16, respectively, New Hope had positive effects on children's academic achievement, motivation, social behavior, and occupational and educational expectations and aspirations, primarily for boys.[1] Evidence about whether children set on a favorable trajectory in earlier life as a result of New Hope continued that trajectory during adolescence in terms of their future orientation and attachment to the labor market affords a broader perspective within which to consider the policy implications of New Hope.

Prior non-experimental research indicates that among low-income youth, a more optimistic future orientation and greater labor market attachment forecast greater educational attainment and better employment outcomes during adulthood.[2] Hence, evidence that New Hope had positive impacts on adolescents' future orientation and employment experiences may signal the program's potential for breaking the cycle of poverty and facilitating intergenerational mobility through employment. Employment and benefits linked to employment (e.g., Earned Income Tax Credits) are important, though not guaranteed, routes out of poverty.[3]

A second reason for assessing New Hope's impact on children's future orientation and employment experiences is that these outcomes are highly relevant to competencies many scholars and youth development leaders regard as necessary for positive development. The past decade witnessed burgeoning interest in positive youth development as a framework for understanding how both low-income and affluent adolescents develop in healthy ways and for delineating the kinds of supports and opportunities adolescents need to successfully transition to healthy and productive adulthood.

Guided by the notion that "problem-free is not fully prepared,"[4] this perspective moves beyond the focus on reduction and prevention of risk and expands the concept of adolescent health to include the "skills, prosocial behaviors, and competencies needed to succeed in employment, education, and civic life."[5] Major goals of successful adolescent development, then, include preparation for a lifetime of meaningful work and the development of specific compe-

[1]Huston et al., 2001; Huston et al., 2005.
[2]Clausen, 1991; Diemer and Blustein, 2007.
[3]McLoyd, Aikens, and Burton, 2006.
[4]Pittman, Irby, and Ferber, 2001.
[5]Benson, Mannes, Pittman, and Ferber, 2004.

tencies that signify this preparation (e.g., understanding and awareness of life options; knowledge of steps needed to make educational and occupational choices; preparation for work and family life; understanding the value and purpose of work and family).[6] In sum, the positive youth development perspective underscores the importance of assessing New Hope's effectiveness in promoting work-related attitudes and behaviors that constitute developmental strengths, not simply its effectiveness in preventing or curtailing problematic functioning.

Following a synopsis of the key findings, we present a description of the New Hope program and a brief summary of prior program effects relevant to our focus on children's future orientation and employment experiences. We continue with a discussion of why future orientation and work experiences are important for low-income youth and the bases on which we expected New Hope to influence these outcomes. Detailed descriptions of impacts are then presented. Impacts on attitudes and expectancies about work are examined for the full sample of children ages 9–19, whereas impacts on employment and involvement in employment and career preparation activities are examined for adolescents ages 12–19. We also assess whether impacts differed as a function of gender and ethnicity (African-American, Hispanic, and non-Hispanic white). Impacts for subgroups based on adolescents' age and parents' initial barriers to employment are also reported. The report ends with a discussion of the developmental significance of the findings and the possible processes that led to the impacts.

Key Findings

- Children in program-group families expressed less cynical attitudes about work and were more involved in employment and career preparation activities than youth in control-group families.

- New Hope's impacts on children's expectancies about employment and financial difficulties during adulthood differed by gender. Boys in New Hope families were less pessimistic about future prospects and were more involved in employment and career preparation activities than boys in control-group families. There were not corresponding program effects for girls.

- Adolescents in program-group families were employed for longer periods of time during the school year than adolescents in control-group families. On average, program-group adolescents worked less than three months during the school year.

- Program impacts on the duration and intensity of employment were larger for adolescents whose parents had no barriers to employment at random assign-

[6]Roth, Murray, Brooks-Gunn, and Foster, 1999.

ment than for adolescents whose parents had two or more barriers. New Hope adolescents in the no-barrier group worked for longer periods of time during both the school year and the summer, and for more hours during the school year than control-group adolescents in the no-barrier group. On average, program-group adolescents in the no-barrier group worked less than three months during the school year and during the summer, and about 6–10 hours per week during the school year. No program effects existed for adolescents in the two or more barriers group.

- New Hope's impact on adolescents' earnings during the school year differed across barrier groups. Program-group adolescents in the no-barrier group earned more money during the school year than control-group adolescents in the no-barrier group. There were no impacts on earnings for adolescents in the other barrier groups.

- Program impacts on whether adolescents deposited earnings in their own bank account differed across barrier groups. Adolescents in the no-barrier group were more likely to deposit earnings if they were in program-group families than if they were in control-group families. There was no comparable pattern for adolescents in the other barrier groups.

The New Hope Program and Evaluation

The New Hope Program offered an innovative and comprehensive approach to reduce poverty, reform welfare, and address the economic self-sufficiency of poor people who can work. Developed and implemented by a community-based nonprofit organization in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, New Hope was designed as a demonstration for a combination of work supports that could be replicated as permanent government policy. Two core principles guided development of the program: (1) that people who are willing to work full time should have the opportunity to do so and (2) that those who work full time should not be poor. The program operated in Milwaukee, Wisconsin from 1994 to 1998 and was available to individuals ages 18 and over who lived in one of two targeted low-income neighborhoods, had a household income at or below 150 percent of the federally defined poverty level, and were able to work at least 30 hours per week. New Hope provided participants four benefits:

- **Job access**. Participants who were unemployed or who wanted to change jobs received individualized job search assistance. If participants could not find work in the regular job market after an eight-week job search, they could apply for a community service job (CSJ) in a nonprofit organization. These opportunities were also offered to participants who were between jobs or

who were employed but not working the 30-hour minimum. The CSJs paid minimum wage and might be either full-time or part-time.

- **Earnings supplements**. New Hope offered monthly earnings supplements to participants who worked at least 30 hours per week, but whose earnings left their household below 200% of the poverty line. CSJ wages and employment were counted toward the 30-hour requirement and they also qualified a participant for the federal and Wisconsin Earned Income Tax Credits (EITCs). Combined with the EITC, New Hope's earnings supplements raised most participants' annual household income above the federal poverty level.

- **Health insurance**. New Hope offered a health insurance plan to program participants who worked at least 30 hours per week but were not covered by employer health insurance or Medicaid. Participants were asked to contribute toward the health insurance premium on a sliding scale that took into account their income and household size; New Hope subsidized the remainder.

- **Child care assistance**. New Hope offered financial assistance to cover child care expenses for participants who had children under age 13 and who worked at least 30 hours per week. Participants were asked to pay a portion of the cost based on their income and household size; New Hope covered the remainder. Child care had to be provided in state-licensed or county-certified homes or child care centers in order to qualify for New Hope subsidies.

Each participant was assigned a staff representative who provided the participant information about New Hope benefits, as well as support, encouragement, and assistance in meeting a variety of needs (e.g., finding child care, securing employment). The program's model emphasized respect and helpfulness in staff interactions with participants.

Participants in New Hope could use any number or combination of program benefits, depending on their needs. The earnings supplements, health insurance, and child care assistance were structured to create an incentive to work more hours and earn higher wages. The ultimate goal of New Hope was to help participants stabilize their employment and increase their income over time to a level where they no longer needed program assistance, although the designers of the program acknowledged that some participants would continue to need assistance because of various structural barriers (e.g., low wages, too few jobs, seasonal economies, lack of affordable child care). Eligibility for earnings supplements, health insurance, and child care assistance extended for three years after enrollment in the program, i.e., the date of random assignment. However, participants could work in CSJs for a total of only 12 months over

the three-year period. The time limits were due to funding constraints and were not integral to the program's design.[7]

New Hope Evaluation

The New Hope program used random assignment to achieve an experimental design. Applicants were assigned to either the program group or control group through a lottery process. Both groups were eligible for federal and state public assistance but only the program-group members had access to the additional New Hope benefits. Although New Hope was conceived as an alternative to the existing public welfare system, many New Hope participants continued to use public assistance or Medicaid in addition to or instead of New Hope benefits. Consequently, the evaluation of New Hope provides insight into what would happen if we added the supports available in New Hope on top of existing policies and programs, not what would happen if the existing welfare system was replaced with a work-based set of supports like those that New Hope provided.[8]

A total of 1357 adults were randomly assigned to either the program group (n=679) or the control group (n=678). A special sample, labeled the Child and Family Study (CFS) sample, was identified for the purpose of examining New Hope's effects on families and children. The CFS sample consists of all participants who had at least one child between the ages of 1 and 10 years old (program group, n=379; control group, n=366). If a family had multiple children in the age range, two focal children were chosen to participate in the surveys. Focal children were chosen randomly, except that preference was given to opposite-sex siblings. There were a total of 913 focal children (program group, n=447; control group, n=466). All of the findings reported in this paper are based on the CFS sample.

Impacts at the Two-Year and Five-Year Follow-Ups

Two years after random assignment, New Hope had positive effects on 9–12 year old boys' expectations to attend and complete college and on 6–12 year old boys' occupational aspirations and expectations. In addition, boys in New Hope families scored significantly higher than boys in control families on teacher reports of academic achievement, positive classroom behavior, and positive social behavior, and significantly lower on teacher reports of externalizing behavior, hyperactivity, and behavior that resulted in disciplinary actions. There were no corresponding program effects for girls. Changes in children's environments suggest possible pathways by which New Hope influenced children's behavior. Children in New Hope families spent more time in formal child care programs and other structured activities away from home than did children in control families. In addition, New Hope parents were employed more, had

[7]Bos et al., 1999.
[8]Bos et al., 1999.

higher income, reported more social support, and reported less stress and more optimism about achieving their goals than did parents in the control group.[9]

Five years after random assignment (and two years after New Hope benefits ended), New Hope had positive effects on children's motivation, school achievement, and social behavior, primarily for boys, across the age range 6–16. In comparison to impacts measured two years after random assignment, effects on achievement were robust, whereas effects on social behavior were reduced. At the five-year follow-up, children in the program and control group no longer differed in their occupational aspirations or expectations, but boys ages 11–16 in the program group were more likely than those in the control group to expect that they would complete college. Children in the program group performed better on the Broad Reading score of the Woodcock-Johnson test of achievement than did children in the control group. Boys in New Hope families scored significantly higher than boys in control families on teacher reports of academic skills, positive classroom behavior, and positive social behavior, whereas teachers rated girls in New Hope families lower on classroom skills and higher on internalizing problems than control girls.

Children from program-group families spent significantly more months in center-based care and before- and after-school programs, significantly fewer months in home-based care, and among 11–16 year olds, significantly fewer months in unsupervised care than did children from control-group families. During the entire follow-up period, the program group had higher income than the control group. Even though there were no differences in the amount of employment by the five-year follow-up, New Hope parents had more stable jobs paying higher wages than control-group parents.[10]

Expected Effects at the Eight-Year Follow-Up

We expected New Hope to have positive effects on adolescents' future orientation (i.e., decrease cynical attitudes about work, reduce pessimism about future employment prospects, increase involvement in employment and career preparation activities) and labor market attachment at the eight-year follow-up (five years after program benefits ended). Below, we discuss why these aspects of functioning are important for low-income youth and the bases on which we expected New Hope to influence them.

Future Orientation

Adolescents' attitudes and expectancies about work and their involvement in employment/career preparation activities are markers of future orientation. Typically, future orientation

[9]Huston et al., 2001.
[10]Huston et al., 2005.

is conceptualized as attitudes and behaviors that lead individuals to form expectations for the future, set goals and aspirations, and give personal meaning to future events.[11] Children growing up in poor and near-poor families are at increased risk for many negative outcomes including psychological distress, substance abuse, delinquency, and teen pregnancy as well as academic problems and truncated educational attainment.[12] A strong and positive future orientation appears to lower the risk of these negative outcomes, an assumption that undergirds efforts within prevention and intervention programs to help urban youth identify career goals and plans for reaching those goals.[13] For example, among lower SES adolescents, planning for the future predicts upward social mobility in adulthood.[14] In a similar vein, maintaining "vocational hope" is pivotal in advancing career development among urban, at-risk youth.[15]

More positive future orientation and expectations are associated with a host of positive social and psychological indicators among adolescents, including selection of nondeviant mates, more positive socioemotional adjustment at school, fewer conduct problems, less substance use, more positive self-esteem, and greater feelings of efficacy and responsibility for one's life and decisions.[16] Many of these findings are based on European-American middle-class youth, but it is highly plausible that they hold for less economically advantaged youth as well.

Children and youth from low-socioeconomic status backgrounds report lower occupational aspirations and expectations, have a larger gap between occupational aspirations and occupational expectations, and perceive more barriers to occupational success compared to those from more economically advantaged backgrounds. There is also evidence that the gap between occupational aspirations and expectations increases at a faster rate among low-income children as compared to economically advantaged children and that low-income status lowers occupational expectations though its influence on educational expectations.[17] Qualitative research indicates that some low-SES youth express high levels of cynicism about work, the opportunity structure, and the extent to which the social mobility system rewards effort and talent.[18] Perceptions of limited economic opportunities and skepticism about one's ability to attain labor market success can encourage disengagement from school and work.[19]

---

[11]Nurmi, 1991; Trommsdorff, 1986.

[12]Gutman and Midgley, 2000; McLoyd, 1990.

[13]Wyman et al., 1992; Murray, 1996.

[14]Clausen, 1991.

[15]Diemer and Blustein, 2007.

[16]Dorham, 2006; Kerpelman and Mosher, 2004; Nurmi, 1991; Quinton, Pickles, Maughan, and Rutter, 1993; Robbins and Bryan, 2004; Seginer, 2003; Wyman, Cowen, Work, and Kerley, 1993.

[17]Bigler, Averhart, and Liben, 2003; Cook et al., 1996.

[18]MacLeod, 1987.

[19]Holzer, in press; Wilson, 1996.

We expected that New Hope would temper cynical attitudes about work, lessen pessimism about future employment prospects, and increase involvement in employment and career preparation activities. The reasons for these expectations are two-fold. First, as discussed previously, New Hope had positive effects at earlier follow-ups on children's educational and occupational aspirations and expectations, especially among boys, that might carry forward into middle childhood and later adolescence. New Hope had no impact on boys' occupational aspirations or expectations at the five-year follow-up, but its positive impact on boys' educational expectations at this follow-up might translate into a more positive future orientation, given evidence that educational expectations predict occupational expectations and mediate the link between socioeconomic status and occupational expectations.[20]

Second, it is highly plausible that New Hope would positively affect children's future orientation indirectly through its beneficial effects on parents' employment, earnings, access to employment networks, and social capital. At the five-year follow-up, New Hope participants had more stable employment, lower rates of poverty, and higher wages than control-group parents. These positive impacts may have enhanced parents' status or salience as positive role models of employment. They also may have encouraged parents to focus more attention on, and rendered them more optimistic about, their children's employment and financial future (e.g., discussing job opportunities and career plans with adolescents). Children might respond to these parental behaviors and attitudes with lower levels of cynicism about work and increased optimism about their economic future, which likely would encourage greater involvement in employment and career preparation activities.

Prior research lends support to aspects of this hypothesized process and underscores the importance of parental behavior and modeling in shaping children's future orientation. More economically advantaged parents and parents who report less perceived financial strain, compared to parents who are less economically advantaged and report greater financial strain, are more optimistic about their children's economic future. Likewise, adolescents who perceive their families as experiencing less financial strain are more optimistic about their own economic future.[21] Changes in parental outlook and behavior appear to be partly responsible for negative changes in children's aspirations and expectations when parents experience job and income loss.[22] In addition, there is evidence that African-American adolescents living in households in which parents are employed and not receiving welfare, compared to their counterparts residing in mother-only households dependent on welfare, have higher expectations of being successful

[20]Cook et al., 1996
[21]Flanagan, 1990; Larson, 1984; McLoyd and Jozefowicz, 1996.
[22]Galambos and Silbereisen, 1987.

in obtaining well-paying jobs when they become adults.[23] More favorable parental work experiences also are linked to greater optimism among adolescents about future careers.[24]

Regardless of teenage childbearing status, African-American female youth (ages 15–23) from families with some history of welfare receipt have higher expectancies of future economic self-sufficiency, and are more likely to have definite and reasonably well-informed plans for educational and occupational attainment if they received more frequent messages from parents about the value of work, experienced greater tangible support of their work efforts from family members, and had multiple examples of extended family members with strong work attachments. There is also evidence that adolescents whose parents provide more instrumental support for career development (e.g., attending programs about employment opportunities for adolescents, discussing job opportunities with adolescent) subsequently attach greater importance to finding steady work — an effect that holds after taking account of relational parental support (e.g., joint adolescent-parent activities, discussion of problems with parent). Relational parental support, maternal involvement, and kinship support predict a more positive future orientation among adolescents generally, as well as higher adolescent expectancies of being successful in their future line of work.[25]

We expected New Hope's impact on children's future orientation to be larger for boys than girls because in prior follow-ups, New Hope positively affected boys', but not girls' educational and occupational aspirations and expectations. In addition, despite evidence in some studies that boys and girls are similar in their levels of future orientation, boys' future orientation appears to be less stable and more susceptible to influence than girls' future orientation. For example, identity exploration and other psychological characteristics are much stronger correlates of boys' future orientation than girls' future orientation. In addition, parental gender moderates the relation between parenting practices and future orientation among boys, but not girls.[26]

Labor Market Attachment

The research literature on the developmental significance of adolescent employment reflects two prominent perspectives. One perspective contends that employment during adolescence derails positive development by prematurely exposing youth to adult roles, behaviors, and responsibilities for which they are not prepared. It is thought to encourage autonomous decision-making, reduce time spent with the family, interfere with parental monitoring, and lessen school engagement — factors that can undermine school achievement and promote delinquent

[23]Quane and Rankin, 1998.
[24]Neblett and Cortina, 2006.
[25]Diemer, 2007; McCabe and Barnett, 2000b.
[26]Kerpelman and Mosher, 2004; Seginer and Lilach, 2004; Seginer, Vermulst, and Shoyer, 2004

behavior.[27] The alternative perspective suggests that employment during adolescence provides a growth-enhancing and protective experience — cultivating skills, habits, and psychological characteristics that help youth integrate into the adult work (e.g., time management, learning what society expects from them as adults, establishing a path to financial independence, facilitating identity formation).

Empirical support exists for both of these perspectives. Studies have linked adolescent employment to problematic functioning (e.g., truncated schooling, lower school performance, less positive mental health, higher levels of problem behavior, delinquency, substance use),[28] as well as positive adjustment (e.g., higher levels of self-reported punctuality, dependability, and personal responsibility; better school performance, lower school dropout rates, higher rates of employment during adulthood, better job performance during adulthood).[29] This pattern of conflicting findings is due, in part, to the fact that the influence of adolescent employment is conditional on myriad factors. Research indicates that the relation between adolescent employment and adjustment depends on the number of hours worked (i.e., work intensity), type of job (typical teenage jobs vs. adult jobs), and the adolescent's previous level of academic achievement, age, gender, and social class, among other factors.[30]

We believe extant research justify viewing adolescent employment among low-income youth as a developmental asset, rather than a risk factor, especially if it is moderate in intensity (i.e., less than 20 hours/week). Employment that is limited to less than 20 hours per week is less likely to interfere with school engagement and school achievement.[31] The few existing studies of employment among poor and low-income adolescents, and among ethnic minority adolescents, generally point to beneficial effects or few negative effects.[32] For example, lower SES males with poor school performance appear to benefit from work experience by improving their prospects for future employment. Studies also report that low-income African-American youth who enter the workforce earlier are more likely to complete high school than their peers.[33] In line with findings from survey data, ethnographic work suggests that employment provides poor

[27]Bauermeister, Zimmerman, Barnett, and Caldwell, 2007; Mortimer, 2003; Shanahan, Elder, Burchinal, and Conger, 1996.

[28]Greenberger and Steinberg; 1986; Marsh, 1991; Mortimer, Finch, Dennehy, Lee, and Beebe, 1994; Ploeger, 1997; Steinberg and Dornbusch, 1991; Steinberg, Fegley and Dornbusch 1993; Wright, Cullen, and Williams, 1997.

[29]D'Amico and Baker, 1984; Greenberger and Steinberg, 1986.

[30]Ekstrom, Goertz, Pollack and Rock, 1986; Hauser and Sweeney, 1997; Hill and Sandfort, 1995; Holzer, 1996; Iceland, 1997; Leventhal, Graber, and Brooks-Gunn, 2001.

[31]Mortimer, Finch, Ryu, Shanahan and Call, 1996

[32]Bauermeister et al., 2007; Johnson, 2004.

[33]Entwisle, Alexander and Olson, 2000; Leventhal, Graber, and Brooks-Gunn, 2001.

youth structured supports that foster continued education and buttress motivation to attain higher levels of schooling.[34] Working during adolescence also predicts higher earnings later in life.[35] This outcome is especially important for impoverished youth because they are less likely to go to college and more likely to face a difficult job market once they leave school.

It is likely that both the consequences and antecedents of adolescent employment are different for low-income youth than economically advantaged youth, given class-linked inequalities in opportunities for work and the nature of available work and class-linked differences in the meaning and function of adolescent employment.[36] Due to several factors, including a paucity of jobs and a large labor supply in economically disadvantaged neighborhoods, economically disadvantaged adolescents encounter far more difficulty than their economically advantaged counterparts securing and maintaining employment.[37] However, when they do find employment, economically disadvantaged youth often work more hours than their economically advantaged counterparts.[38] For economically advantaged adolescents, employment during high school typically is a source of pocket money for leisure spending and has little bearing on their post-high school employment outcomes or college attendance.[39] In contrast, for poor or near poor students — most of whom lack the means to go to college — employment during high school may not only help meet family needs, but may also forecast more favorable post-high school employment outcomes as a result of the practical skills and expanded social networks it affords.

We expected New Hope to increase the probability, duration, and intensity of adolescent employment directly through its earlier and salutary effects on boys' academic achievement, achievement motivation, classroom behavior skills, social behavior, and occupational aspirations and expectations, combined with its reduction in problem behavior.[40] This expectation is based on evidence that both higher school achievement and fewer problem behaviors enhance the prospect of employment among low-income youth.[41] New Hope might also increase employment among adolescents indirectly through its beneficial effects on parents' employment, earnings, access to employment networks, and social capital. If New Hope's positive impacts on parents' employment and earnings made parents more attentive and optimistic about their children's employment prospects and financial future and enhanced parents' status or salience as positive role models of employment, adolescents in turn, might seek employment more vigorously and work more intensely over longer periods of time. Moreover, because New Hope par-

[34]Newman, 1996.
[35]Ruhm, 1997.
[36]Furnham, 1994.
[37]Newman, 1999.
[38]D'Amico, 1984; Entwisle, Alexander, and Olson, 2000; Keithly and Deseran, 1995; Steinberg and Dornbusch, 1991.
[39]Entwisle, Alexander, and Olson, 2000; Newman, 1999; Ruhm, 1997.
[40]Huston et al., 2001; Huston et al, 2005.
[41]Ekstrom et al., 1986; Hauser and Sweeney, 1997; Hill and Sandfort, 1995; Holzer, 1996; Iceland, 1997.

ents had more stable employment at the five-year follow-up than control-group parents, their employment networks and social capital may have been more expansive, putting them in a stronger position to help their adolescent children secure employment.

Several studies linking parenting factors (e.g., role modeling, direct socialization) to youth employment support these predictions. Low-income adolescents are more likely to be employed if their mothers or fathers are employed (rather than not-employed).[42] Labor force attachment is greater among adolescent and young adult mothers if prior to becoming new mothers, they held less negative attitudes about working wives and held higher work aspirations and if, at age 14, their mother worked in a blue-collar or unskilled service job (as opposed to having a mother who did not work).[43] In a similar vein, research indicates that regardless of teenage childbearing status, African-American female youth (ages 15–23) from families with some history of welfare receipt have higher rates of employment and stronger attachment to the labor force if they had multiple examples of extended family members with strong work attachments, received more frequent messages from parents about the value of work, and experienced greater tangible support of their work efforts from family members.[44]

Research examining parents' involvement in organized institutions and its association to youth behavior is also congruent with the notion that New Hope could indirectly influence adolescents' employment experiences through parental socialization processes. This work indicates that parents' involvement in organized institutions and activities strongly predicts adolescent involvement in similar types of activities. Such participation increases families' social networks, which adolescents can then draw on for assistance in finding a job and gaining access to social and educational resources.[45]

New Hope's impact on adolescents' labor market attachment might be larger for African-American adolescents than their Hispanic and white counterparts because, in general, African-American adolescents are comparatively more disadvantaged in the labor market to begin with. White youth are more likely to work during adolescence than Hispanic and African-American youth.[46] In 2002, 32% of European-American youth (16–19 year olds) were working and enrolled in school, compared to 17% of Hispanic youth and 15% of African-American youth. In 2003, white youth were the most likely to be employed in any given month (38.8%), followed by Hispanic youth (21.5%) and African-American youth (16.3%).[47]

[42]Gardecki, 2001; Johnson and Lino, 2000.
[43]Greenwell, Leibowitz, and Klerman, 1998.
[44]Iversen and Farber, 1996.
[45]Furstenberg, Cook, Eccles, Elder, and Sameroff, 1999.
[46]Gardecki, 2001.
[47]Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004.

Ethnic differences in the unemployment rate of adolescents mirror those for employment. In 2003, for example, the unemployment rate for white youth was 15%, compared to 30% for African-American youth.[48] In addition, both African-American and Hispanic youth earn less than white youth. Patterns of spatial isolation, discrimination, and labor market bifurcation between high and low skilled jobs can affect disadvantaged minorities' access to jobs and wages. Adolescents tend to work close to home, so those living in poor areas with fewer potential employers have less opportunity for employment. To add to this disadvantage, employers are also less likely to hire minority adolescents than white adolescents.[49]

Both Hispanic and European-American youth are more likely than African-American youth to have employee-only jobs (i.e., jobs in which the youth has an ongoing relationship with a particular employer, such as working in a supermarket), whereas African-American youth are more likely than both Hispanic and European-American youth to have freelance-only jobs (i.e., jobs that involve doing one or a few tasks without a specific "boss," like babysitting). During the years 1995–2002, for example, 73% of European-American 18-year-olds and 77% of Hispanic 18-year-olds held employee-only jobs, as compared to 66% of African-American 18-year-olds. Comparable figures for freelance-only jobs were 2.6%, 2.6%, and 4.5%, respectively.[50] If the positive impact of New Hope on parents' employment served to connect adolescents to more traditional employment opportunities (i.e., employee-only jobs), and to the extent that employee-only jobs tend to be more stable and offer more hours of employment than freelance jobs, New Hope might have a stronger impact on the employment experiences of African-American adolescents than Hispanic and European-American adolescents.[51]

Earnings

We expected that New Hope adolescents would earn more than control-group adolescents. As a consequence of more stable employment, New Hope parents may have garnered more social and informational capital with which to help their adolescent children not only secure employment, but get higher-paying jobs. We also assessed the impact of New Hope on how adolescents used their earnings. Non-leisure "spending" (e.g., saving earnings for later needs; depositing earnings into bank account; giving earnings to parents to help meet family needs; paying for necessities such as school fees, clothes, shoes), in contrast to leisure spending (e.g., purchase of non-essential items for personal consumption), is thought to signify greater maturity and the assumption of more adult responsibilities (e.g., sense of independence, concern for others).

---

[48]Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004.

[49]O'Regan and Quigley, 1996; Portes and Rumbaut, 2001; Perreira, Harris, and Lee, 2007.

[50]Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health and Human Services, 2003.

[51]Gardecki, 2001.

Among rural families, adolescent non-leisure spending is associated with spending more time with the family, less parental monitoring, an increase in the extent to which adolescents and parents seek advice from each other, and an increase in the affective quality of the adolescent-parent relationship. These correlates may be even stronger if adolescents use their earnings to help parents achieve important family goals.[52] Parents' future orientation and discussion of financial matters with children have been found to positively predict more responsible economic behavior among children during adulthood (e.g., greater bank savings).[53] In addition, the amount of money children and adolescents receive (from part-time jobs, gifts, pocket money/allowance) is a robust predictor of regularity of saving and the proportion of money saved.[54]

For several reasons, New Hope adolescents might be more likely than control-group adolescents to use their earnings for non-leisure "spending." Program group parents' improved economic circumstances may have fostered higher levels of optimism about the adolescent's future, which might prompt more discussions with the adolescent about the future, the importance of saving and money management, and family financial matters. In turn, New Hope adolescents, compared to control-group adolescents, might be more inclined to save and, more generally, to use their earnings for non-leisure "spending," especially if they were earning more than control-group adolescents.

Sample

The analyses presented in this report are based on data from 1042 African-American (56%; *n*=578), Hispanic (29%; *n*=304), and white (15%; *n*=160) youth ages 9 to 19, with a mean age of 14.3 (standard deviation of 3.02). 48% of the adolescents were female. Measures assessing attitudes and expectancies about work were administered to the full sample, but questions pertaining to involvement in employment and career preparation activities and to employment experiences were asked of only adolescents ages 12 and older (*n*=751; mean age=15.7 years; standard deviation of 2.39). The demographic characteristics of this older adolescent subsample are comparable to those of the younger children. The 1042 adolescents in the current analyses were the children of 656 parents (92% female) in the CFS sample. Data were collected in the family's home, with adolescents providing information about themselves via interviews and self-administered questionnaires.

[52]Elder, 1974; Shanahan, Elder, Burchinal, and Conger, 1996.
[53]Webley and Nyhus, 2006.
[54]Furnham, 1999.

Treatment of Missing Data

Missing data is a problem when attrition is not random such that those who drop out of the study are systematically different from those with complete data. Differential attrition does not necessarily affect the impact coefficients, but reduces the ability to generalize to the original population. In an experimental study, if the pattern of missingness differs systematically between the program and control group, the validity of experimental findings is called into question because the impacts may be over-estimated or under-estimated.

We analyzed all data with two generally accepted ways to correct for the potential biases resulting from missing data as well as analyzing the original data. One method was to weight observations by baseline characteristics. The other was to use multiple imputation procedures to estimate missing observations.[55] Weighting uses only the information in the baseline variables and does not correct for bias associated with variables not observed at baseline. Multiple imputation estimates missing values using all available data, and by creating multiple data sets, it allows some correction of random error in those estimates in the final analyses performed. In this report, we present findings based on multiple imputation because this procedure uses more information to estimate missing observations and because the baseline variables are not strong predictors of the child variables. The results for the imputed analyses are very similar to those found in the original unweighted and unimputed data.

Analyses

Because New Hope was a random-assignment experiment, the method of evaluating impacts is comparison of program and control groups. We estimated program impacts for the full sample by regressing (using ordinary least squares) each of the dependent measures on a dummy variable representing the family's experimental status in the program, plus the following baseline parent variables: having a high school diploma or general equivalency diploma; gender of the parent reporting; parental age; ethnicity; having a child under the age of two years; having more than three children; receipt of welfare in the prior year; receiving AFDC in family of origin; having a car; having ever been employed full time; neighborhood (north side or south side); current employment status; and earnings in the year prior to random assignment. If the impacts were not estimated separately by gender or age, we controlled for the gender and age of the child as well. Although random assignment in a large sample should ensure that the two groups do not differ significantly on background characteristics, these baseline covariates were included in our regressions to increase the precision of the experimental-control contrasts.

All of the analyses compared the entire group of children in the CFS sample of New Hope families with children in control-group families. For each outcome, differences in impacts

[55]See Appendix B of Huston et al., 2008 for a detailed description of these procedures.

were examined for boys and girls, for two age groups, and for African-American, Hispanic, and white youth. Because prior reports indicated that some of the economic impacts differed for families with different barriers to employment at baseline,[56] we also examined differences in child impacts for subgroups based on parents' initial barriers to employment. These barriers were: low level of education, responsibility for young children, an arrest record, lack of recent job experience, and having been fired from one's last job. Differences in program impact were tested for statistical significant.[57]

Future Orientation

Measures

Children ages 9–19 completed scales assessing cynicism about work and pessimism about employment during adulthood (self-administered questionnaire). Questions about involvement in employment and career preparation activities were asked of only youth ages 12–19.

- **Cynicism about work**. This six-item scale assesses children's cynicism about work and the value they attach to work. The items are statements and the child indicates on a four-point scale (1= "strongly disagree," 4= "strongly agree") how much he or she agrees with each one. Sample items include: "If I had the chance, I would go through life without ever working," "Workers are entitled to call in sick when they don't feel like working," "There is no such thing as a company that cares about its employees," "Most people today are stuck in dead-end, go-nowhere jobs."[58] The mean score of responses was calculated, with higher scores indicating more cynical attitudes toward work (α=.57).

- **Pessimism about future employment**. Children reported on their expectations of employment and financial difficulties during adulthood, using a six-point scale ranging from 1 ("very unlikely") to 6 ("very likely"). They indicated how likely they were to experience difficulty finding a good job as an adult, lose a job, experience difficulty supporting a family financially, and have a good job as an adult (reverse coded).[59] Responses to these items were

[56]Huston et al., 2003.

[57]The test statistic is the weighted sum of squares of the effect size estimates for the subgroups about the weighted mean effect. If the effects are identical, this statistic has a χ^2 distribution. Thus, a χ^2 test was used to determine whether estimated effects for different subgroups were statistically significantly different from one another; Greenberg, Meyer, and Wiseman, 1993, p. 20.

[58]Stern, Stone, Hopkins, and McMillion, 1990.

[59]McLoyd and Jozefowicz,1996.

averaged to create a measure of pessimism about future employment, with higher scores indicating greater pessimism (α= .67).

- **Involvement in employment and career preparation activities**. Adolescents ages 12–19 indicated on a four-point scale (1= "never," 2= "once or twice," 3= "three to five times," 4= "more than five times") how often during the past year they had done the following to help them prepare for future employment and careers: taken a school field trip to learn about a business or industry; heard someone from a business or industry give a talk at school; talked about what they will do after high school with a teacher or other adult at school; got instruction or counseling on how to find a job; studied about different kinds of jobs and requirements for the jobs in class; and had discussions with adults outside of school about careers and work.[60] Responses to these six items were averaged, with higher scores indicating more employment and career preparation (α= .81).

Results

Table 1 shows the means for the full sample on the three indicators of future orientation. Children in program-group families held significantly less cynical attitudes about work than their control-group counterparts. For example, 40% of them strongly disagreed with the statement, "There is no such thing as a company that cares about its employees," as compared to 36% of control group children. Likewise, 44% of program-group children disagreed with the statement, "Work is nothing more than making a living," as compared to 39% of the control-group children. Children in program-group families also were more involved in employment and career preparation activities than control-group children. New Hope had no overall impact on children's pessimism about their prospects for employment and financial security during adulthood.

- **Gender differences**. Table 2 presents the impacts on future orientation separately for boys and girls. The test indicated a significant difference by gender in New Hope's impact on pessimism and involvement in employment and career preparation activities. Boys in New Hope families were less pessimistic and were more involved in employment and career preparation activities than boys in control-group families, but there were not corresponding program effects for girls.

[60]Kemple, Poglinco, and Snipes, 1999.

- **Ethnic differences**. In Table 3, we present the impacts on future orientation separately by ethnicity. The impacts for African-American, Hispanic, and white children did not differ significantly.

- **Age differences**. Table 4 shows the impacts on future orientation separately for younger adolescents (ages 12–13) and older adolescents (ages 14–19). The impacts on cynicism, pessimism, and involvement in employment and career preparation activities were similar across age groups, but more pronounced for older adolescents than younger adolescents.

- **Differences by parents' initial barriers to employment**. Differential impacts on future orientation by parents' initial barriers to employment were examined. Impacts did not differ significantly across barrier groups, indicating similar patterns for the no-barrier, one-barrier, and two or more barriers subgroups (Table 5).

Labor Market Attachment

Measures

Adolescents ages 12 and older were interviewed about their employment experiences during the previous school year (September 2002–May 2003) and the previous summer (June, July, and August, 2003). Employment during the school year was distinguished from employment during the summer because previous research indicates that there are different correlates of each.[61] For each of these periods, adolescents indicated how many months they worked for pay for someone other than their parents (for summer, 1= one month or less, 2= one to two months; 3= two to three months; for the school year, 1= one month or less; 2= one to three months, 3= three to six months, 4= six to nine months) and how many hours they worked a week for pay for someone other than their parents during those times; responses ranged from 1–9 (1= one to five hours, 5= 21–25 hours, 9= over 40 hours). Higher scores indicated longer duration of employment and greater intensity of employment, respectively. These measures were adapted from measures in the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/codebooks).

Results

The summer employment rate for program-group adolescents was 43%, as compared to 41% for control-group adolescents. The employment rate during the school year was 35% for program-group adolescents and 32% for control-group adolescents. These differences were not

[61] Marsh, 1991.

statistically significant. Because New Hope did not impact whether or not adolescents worked and because there were no gender, ethnicity, age, or barrier group differences in New Hope's impact on adolescents' employment status, results for adolescents' employment status are not presented in this report.

To maintain the integrity of random assignment, analyses of New Hope's impacts on duration and intensity of employment were based on the full sample of adolescents ages 12 and older — both employed and nonemployed. In these analyses, adolescents who were not employed received scores of 0. Appendix A displays impacts on duration and intensity of employment for only those adolescents who were employed.

Program impacts on duration and intensity of employment are displayed in Table 1. Only one of the program effects was statistically significant. Adolescents in program-group families worked for longer periods of time during the school year than adolescents in control-group families. On average, program-group adolescents worked less than three months during the school year. The two groups worked for similar periods of time during the summer months and at similar levels of intensity during the summer and school year.

- **Gender differences**. Table 2 shows the impacts on duration and intensity of employment separately for boys and girls. The impacts for boys and girls did not differ significantly, indicating similar patterns across gender.

- **Ethnic differences**. Table 3 presents the impacts on employment separately by ethnicity. The impacts on duration and intensity of employment were similar across ethnic groups, although they tended to be more pronounced for African-American adolescents than Hispanic and white adolescents. A comparison of means indicates that New Hope brought the level of employment among African-American adolescents in program-group families closer to the levels typical of white adolescents in control-group families. The duration and intensity of employment among program-group African-American adolescents were consistently below that experienced by program group white adolescents.

- **Age differences**. Impacts on duration and intensity of employment for younger and older adolescents did not differ significantly, although in general they were more pronounced for older adolescents than younger adolescents (Table 4).

- **Differences by parents' initial barriers to employment**. Impacts on duration and intensity of employment differed significantly across barrier groups, with the impacts being strongest among adolescents whose parents had no

barriers to employment. Program-group adolescents in the no-barrier group worked significantly longer periods of time during the school year and the summer, and significantly more hours during the school year than control-group adolescents in the no-barrier group. On average, program-group adolescents in the no-barrier group worked less than three months during the school year and during the summer, and about 6–10 hours per week during the school year. No corresponding effects existed for adolescents in the one-barrier group or the two or more barriers group. All of the differences in impacts for the no-barrier group versus the two or more barrier group were statistically significant. Impacts on hours of employment during the summer did not differ significantly across barrier groups (Table 5).

Earnings

Measures

Adolescents ages 12 and older who had worked during the previous school year and/or during the previous summer reported the amount of money they earned per week from their employment, using a six-point scale ranging from 1 ($1–$20) to 6 (over $100). Higher scores indicate greater earnings. Adolescents who had not worked during these periods received a score of 0.

Adolescents who had worked also reported how they used their earnings. We were particularly interested in non-leisure spending as markers of maturity, responsibility, and future orientation. The four categories of non-leisure spending were: saving earnings for later needs; depositing earnings into their own bank account; giving earnings to parents to help meet family needs; and paying for necessities like groceries, utilities, or rent.[62] For each category, the adolescent answered "yes" (1) or "no" (0). Each category of non-leisure spending was analyzed separately.

Results

New Hope had no overall impact on the amount of money adolescents earned during the school year or the summer (Table 1). Impacts on earnings did not differ by adolescent gender (Table 2), ethnicity (Table 3), or age (Table 4). However, program impacts on adolescents' earnings during the school year differed across barrier groups (Table 5). New Hope's impact on earnings during the school year was strongest among adolescents whose parents had no barriers to employment. Program-group adolescents in the no-barrier group earned more money during

[62]Shanahan, Elder, Burchinal, and Conger, 1996.

the school year than control-group adolescents in the no-barrier group. There were no impacts on earnings for adolescents in the other barrier groups.

New Hope had no overall impact on any of the four categories of non-leisure spending. In addition, impacts did not differ by gender, ethnicity, or age. However, program impacts on whether adolescents deposited earnings in their own bank account differed across barrier groups. Adolescents in the no-barrier group were more likely to deposit earnings in their bank account if they were in program-group families than if they were in control-group families (40% versus 23%, respectively). There was no comparable pattern for adolescents in the other barrier groups (results not shown).

Conclusions

The impacts of New Hope on adolescents' attitudes about work and involvement in employment and career preparation activities are important indicators of a more positive developmental trajectory. During adolescence, youth ponder their future and begin to make important decisions that have consequences for their psychological well-being and economic success.[63] New Hope adolescents, relative to control-group adolescents, reported some behavioral as well as attitudinal advantages that may ease their transition to adulthood. Their higher level of involvement in employment and career preparation activities is suggestive of a more planful approach to the future. In addition, New Hope adolescents' lower level of cynicism about work and tendency to attach more intrinsic value to work may forecast stronger and more stable labor market attachment, help prevent disengagement from the labor market, and discourage youth "idleness"(a category of behavior linked to later struggles in the labor market during adulthood).[64] These positive effects on attitudes and behavior likely take on added significance in contexts distinguished by too few jobs and a paucity of jobs that pay above-poverty wages and provide good fringe benefits.

Although the overall impact of New Hope on the length of time adolescents worked during the school year is small, it is impressive nonetheless. For youth growing up in impoverished families, particularly in urban areas, obtaining employment is a difficult task. Labor markets in urban areas are often depressed and transportation to areas with more employment opportunities may not be available. Multiple ethnographies indicate that one of the reasons inner-city youth struggle to stay in the labor market is because they are competing with workers who are older and more experienced than they are.[65] Because of the lack of higher paying jobs, adults

[63]Nurmi, 2005.
[64]Edelman, Holzer, and Offner, 2006.
[65]Burton, Allison, and Obeidallah, 1995; Newman, 1999.

in inner-cities are often forced to enter the service sector of employment and hold jobs that are typically reserved for youth work in more affluent areas.

There is little to suggest that New Hope's impact on adolescent employment put youth at developmental risk. New Hope increased the duration of employment, but had no impact on work intensity in the full sample of adolescents. It is high levels of work intensity, not longer duration of employment, that has been most consistently linked to negative outcomes (e.g., delinquent behavior).[66] Even in the subgroup in which New Hope significantly increased work intensity (i.e., no-barrier group), the typical program group adolescent worked well below 20 hours per week. Moreover, there is little evidence in the data that adolescents' involvement in work dampened school engagement or truncated educational aspirations and expectations. A cursory examination revealed that duration and intensity of employment during the summer and school year, for the most part, were unrelated to achievement test scores, teacher reports of academic progress, and adolescents' expectations of completing high school, going to college, or completing college, as measured at the eight-year follow-up.

Although further follow-ups would be required to gauge the developmental advantages that New Hope's impact on the duration of employment might confer, prior research provides some basis for viewing New Hope's impact on adolescent employment in positive terms. The few existing longitudinal studies of employment among poor and low-income adolescents generally find that adolescent employment predicts higher, rather than lower, educational attainment, earnings, and psychological adjustment in later life.[67] Although we do not have information on the quality of the jobs that adolescents held, it is likely that adolescents gained or cultivated basic, but important skills and habits necessary for career success (e.g., punctuality, dependability, learning how to interact with authority figures).

The findings revealed a consistent pattern of stronger effects on the employment experiences of adolescents whose parents had no barriers to employment, relative to adolescents in the other barrier groups. Within the no-barrier group, New Hope adolescents, as compared to control-group adolescents, worked for longer periods of time during the school year and the summer, worked more hours during the school year, earned more money during the school year, and were more likely to deposit earnings in their own bank account. Parents in the no-barrier group were the most ready to engage in full-time employment at random assignment. Hence, in addition to having more human capital at baseline, they also likely accrued employment-relevant social capital at a faster pace because of stronger and more stable attachments to the labor market, relative to parents who had more initial barriers to employment. As a consequence of more human and social capital, parents in the no-barrier group likely were better positioned to help their adolescent children find and maintain employment and better-paying jobs. In the

[66]Mortimer et al., 1996.

[67]Entwisle, Alexander, and Olson, 2000; Leventhal, Graber, and Brooks-Gunn, 2001; Ruhm, 1997.

youth labor market, interpersonal connections to potential employers are salient pathways through which jobs are obtained.[68]

As a consequence of their greater involvement in work activities away from home and in after-school programs three years prior, program-group children whose parents had no barriers to employment may have had more social capital of their own that proved helpful in securing and maintaining employment and better-paying jobs. Parallel with our findings at the eight-year follow-up, at the five-year follow-up, program-group children whose parents had no barriers to employment reported spending more time working for pay during the summer than control-group children. This impact was not found for children in the other barrier groups. In addition, at the five-year follow-up, the impact of New Hope on the use of formal care during the school year (including after-school programs) was concentrated in the group of parents who had no initial barriers to employment.[69]

Overall, the findings suggest that low-income children benefit from a parent-focused, work-based, antipoverty program that increases parental employment and family income in the form of more positive future orientations and stronger attachments to the labor market, both of which are likely to have economic, educational, and psychological payoffs in later life.

[68]Newman, 1999.
[69]Huston et al., 2003.

Report Tables

The New Hope Project

Table 1

Impacts on Adolescent Work-Related Attitudes and Employment Experiences

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]
Future orientation						
Cynicism about work (9 and up)	1=strongly disagree 4=strongly agree	2.49	2.56	-0.07 *	0.07	-0.13
Pessimism about future employment (9 and up)	1=very unlikely 6=very likely	1.98	2.07	-0.09	0.16	-0.10
Employment and career preparation (12 and up)	1=never 4=more than 5 times	2.35	2.26	0.09 *	0.07	0.16
Duration of employment						
Months during summer (12 and up)	0 none 3=2-3	1.52	1.42	0.10	0.14	0.14
Months during school year (12 and up)	0=none 4=6-9	1.59	1.44	0.15 **	0.04	0.17
Intensity of employment						
Hours during summer (12 and up)	0 = none 9 = over 40	1.98	1.87	0.11	0.48	0.06
Hours during school year (12 and up)	0 = none 9 = over 40	1.76	1.61	0.15	0.21	0.10
Employment earnings						
Summer (12 and up)	0 = $0 6 = $100	2.11	2.02	0.09	0.49	0.05
School year (12 and up)	0 = $0 6 = $100	1.94	1.75	0.19	0.11	0.13

(continued)

Table 1 (continued)

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

Analyses concerning attitudes about work were based on the full CFS youth sample who were 9 years old and older (N = 1042). Analyses concerning employment and career preparation, duration of emplyment, intensity of employment, and employment earnings were based on the CFS youth sample who were 12 years old and older (N = 751).

[a]The effect size is the difference between program-and control-group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the control group. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

The New Hope Project

Table 2

Impacts on Adolescent Work Related Attitudes and Employment Experiences, by Gender

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]	Boys vs. Girls[b]
Boys							
Future orientation							
Cynicism about work (9 and up)	1=strongly disagree 4=strongly agree	2.50	2.62	-0.12 **	0.02	-0.22	0.20
Pessimism about future employment (9 and up)	1=very unlikely 6=very likely	1.94	2.12	-0.18 **	0.04	-0.19	0.03 ††
Employment and career preparation (12 and up)	1=never 4=more than 5 times	2.41	2.24	0.17 **	0.02	0.20	0.07 †
Duration of employment							
Months during summer (12 and up)	0=none 3=2–3	1.52	1.42	0.10	0.21	0.14	0.86
Months during school year (12 and up)	0=none 4=6-9	1.64	1.42	0.22 **	0.03	0.25	0.35
Intensity of employment							
Hours during summer (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	1.96	1.81	0.15	0.45	0.08	0.65
Hours during school year (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	1.81	1.59	0.22	0.21	0.15	0.78
Employment earnings							
Summer (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	2.14	2.08	0.06	0.74	0.04	0.94
School year (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	1.94	1.84	0.10	0.54	0.07	0.95

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]
Girls						
Future orientation						
Cynicism about work (9 and up)	1=strongly disagree 4=strongly agree	2.47	2.50	-0.03	0.51	-0.06
Pessimism about future employment (9 and up)	1=very unlikely 6=very likely	2.03	2.00	0.03	0.72	0.03
Employment and career preparation (12 and up)	1=never 4=more than 5 times	2.28	2.27	0.01	0.92	0.02
Duration of employment						
Months during summer (12 and up)	0=none 3=2–3	1.51	1.43	0.08	0.41	0.11
Months during school year (12 and up)	0=none 4=6-9	1.54	1.45	0.09	0.39	0.10
Intensity of employment						
Hours during summer (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	1.96	1.94	0.02	0.91	0.01
Hours during school year (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	1.72	1.61	0.11	0.50	0.07
Employment earnings						
Summer (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	2.06	1.98	0.08	0.68	0.05
School year (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	1.92	1.68	0.24	0.13	0.16

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

Analyses concerning attitudes about work were based on the full CFS youth sample who were 9 years old and older (N = 1042). Analyses concerning employment and career preparation, duration of emplyment, intensity of employment, and employment earnings were based on the CFS youth sample who were 12 years old and older (N = 751).

[a]The effect size is the difference between program-and control-group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the control group. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

[b]A statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts presented for different groups in this table were significantly different from one another. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across different panels of the table is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as: ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Table 3

Impacts on Adolescent Work Related Attitudes and Employment Experiences by Race/Ethnicity

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]	African Amer. vs. Hisp.[b]	African Amer. vs. Whites[b]	Hisp. vs. Whites[b]
African Americans									
Future orientation									
Cynicism about work (9 and up)	1=strongly disagree 4=strongly agree	2.48	2.57	-0.09 *	0.09	-0.17	0.37	0.92	0.58
Pessimism about future employment (9 and up)	1=very unlikely 6=very likely	2.00	2.07	-0.07	0.44	-0.07	0.62	0.21	0.12
Employment and career preparation (12 and up)	1=never 4 = more than 5 times	2.47	2.31	0.16 *	0.02	0.28	0.48	0.56	0.88
Duration of employment									
Months during summer (12 and up)	0=none 3=2-3	1.51	1.39	0.12	0.17	0.16	0.77	0.69	0.57
Months during school year (12 and up)	0=none 4=6-9	1.54	1.38	0.16 *	0.10	0.18	0.96	0.97	0.94
Intensity of employment									
Hours during summer (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	1.93	1.66	0.27	0.12	0.15	0.67	0.40	0.63
Hours during school year (12 and up)	0=none 9 over 40	1.68	1.42	0.27 *	0.07	0.18	0.45	0.90	0.75
Employment earnings									
Summer (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	2.13	1.94	0.19	0.25	0.11	0.73	0.53	0.75
School year (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	1.95	1.66	0.29 *	0.08	0.19	0.63	0.41	0.67

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]
Hispanics						
Future orientation						
Cynicism about work (9 and up)	1=strongly disagree 4=strongly agree	2.53	2.55	-0.02	0.73	-0.04
Pessimism about future employment (9 and up)	1=very unlikely 6=very likely	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.97	0.00
Employment and career preparation (12 and up)	1=never 4=more than 5 times	2.35	2.25	0.10 **	0.03	0.17
Duration of employment						
Months during summer (12 and up)	0=none 3=2–3	1.54	1.37	0.16	0.17	0.22
Months during school year (12 and up)	0=none 4=6-9	1.64	1.47	0.17	0.32	0.19
Intensity of employment						
Hours during summer (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	1.97	1.84	0.13	0.64	0.07
Hours during school year (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	1.76	1.71	0.05	0.86	0.03
Employment earnings						
Summer (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	2.01	1.93	0.08	0.76	0.05
School year (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	1.92	1.77	0.15	0.55	0.10

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]
Whites						
Future orientation						
Cynicism about work (9 and up)	1=strongly disagree 4=strongly agree	2.43	2.51	-0.08	0.39	-0.15
Pessimism about future employment (9 and up)	1=very unlikely 6=very likely	1.84	2.13	-0.29 *	0.06	-0.31
Employment and career preparation (12 and up)	1=never 4=more than 5 times	2.19	2.11	0.08	0.48	0.14
Duration of eEmployment						
Months during summer (12 and up)	0=none 3=2-3	1.60	1.56	0.04	0.84	0.05
Months during school year (12 and up)	0=none 4=6-9	1.67	1.52	0.15	0.50	0.17
Intensity of employment						
Hours during summer (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	2.34	2.45	-0.11	0.80	-0.06
Hours during school year (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	2.16	1.95	0.21	0.63	0.14
Employment earnings						
Summer (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	2.29	2.36	-0.07	0.85	-0.04
School year (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	1.94	1.97	-0.03	0.95	-0.02

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

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

Analyses concerning attitudes about work were based on the full CFS youth sample who were 9 years old and older (N = 1042). Analyses concerning employment and career preparation, duration of emplyment, intensity of employment, and employment earnings were based on the CFS youth sample who were 12 years old and older (N = 751).

[a]The effect size is the difference between program-and control-group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the control group. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

[b]A statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts presented for different groups in this table were significantly different from one another. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across different panels of the table is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as: ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Table 4

Impacts on Adolescent Work-Related Attitudes and Employment Experience by Age Group

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]	12 to 13 Year Olds vs. 14 to 19 Year Olds[b]
12 to 13 year olds							
Future orientation							
Cynicism about work (9 and up)	1=strongly disagree 4=strongly agree	2.53	2.65	-0.12	0.14	-0.24	0.91
Pessimism about future employment (9 and up)	1=very unlikely 6=very likely	2.05	2.05	0.001	0.99	0.001	0.28
Employment and career preparation (12 and up)	1=never 4=more than 5 times	2.25	2.16	0.09	0.34	0.16	0.85
Duration of employment							
Months during summer (12 and up)	0=none 3=2–3	1.20	1.19	0.01	0.93	0.01	0.27
Months during school year (12 and up)	0=none 4=6–9	1.28	1.14	0.14	0.15	0.16	0.82
Intensity of employment							
Hours during summer (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	1.18	1.24	-0.06	0.58	-0.03	0.38
Hours during school year (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	1.15	1.16	-0.01	0.96	-0.01	0.22
Employment earnings							
Summer (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	1.46	1.23	0.23	0.13	0.14	0.34
School year (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	1.27	1.21	0.06	0.65	0.04	0.39

(continued)

Table 4 (continued)

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]
14 to 19 year olds						
Future orientation						
Cynicism about work (9 and up)	1=strongly disagree 4=strongly agree	2.40	2.51	-0.11 **	0.04	-0.22
Pessimism about future employment (9 and up)	1=very unlikely 6=very likely	1.86	2.02	-0.16 **	0.04	-0.18
Employment and career preparation (12 and up)	1=never 4=more than 5 times	2.40	2.29	0.11 **	0.05	0.19
Duration of employment						
Months during summer (12 and up)	0=none 3=2–3	1.64	1.51	0.13	0.12	0.18
Months during school year (12 and up)	0=none 4=6–9	1.71	1.54	0.17 *	0.10	0.19
Intensity of employment						
Hours during summer (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	2.28	2.13	0.15	0.45	0.08
Hours during school year (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	2.00	1.79	0.21	0.21	0.14
Employment earnings						
Summer (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	2.36	2.34	0.02	0.89	0.01
School year (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	2.20	1.97	0.23	0.15	0.15

(continued)

Table 4 (continued)

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

Analyses concerning attitudes about work were based on the full CFS youth sample who were 9 years old and older (N = 1042). Analyses concerning employment and career preparation, duration of emplyment, intensity of employment, and employment earnings were based on the CFS youth sample who were 12 years old and older (N = 751).

[a]The effect size is the difference between program-and control-group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the control group. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

[b]A statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts presented for different groups in this table were significantly different from one another. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across different panels of the table is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as; ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Table 5

Impacts on Adolescent Work Related Attitudes and Employment Experiences by Barrier Group

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]	No Barr. vs. one barr.[b]	No Barr. vs. two+ barr.[b]	One Barr. vs. two+ barr.[b]
No barriers									
Future orientation									
Cynicism about work (9 and up)	1=strongly disagree 4=strongly agree	2.45	2.47	-0.02	0.75	-0.04	0.28	0.92	0.33
Pessimism about future employment (9 and up)	1=very unlikely 6=very likely	1.87	2.01	-0.14	0.27	-0.15	0.81	0.86	0.95
Employment and career preparation (12 and up)	1=never 4=more than 5 times	2.34	2.30	0.04	0.62	0.07	0.93	0.24	0.16
Duration of employment									
Months during summer (12 and up)	0=none 3=2–3	1.71	1.44	0.27 **	0.05	0.36	0.17	0.09 †	0.82
Months during school year (12 and up)	0=none 4=6–9	1.72	1.32	0.40 **	0.01	0.45	0.23	0.04 †	0.32
Intensity of employment									
Hours during summer (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	2.21	1.85	0.36	0.21	0.20	0.33	0.56	0.67
Hours during school year (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	1.93	1.41	0.52 **	0.04	0.35	0.38	0.04 †	0.25
Employment earnings									
Summer (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	2.44	2.02	0.42 *	0.10	0.25	0.15	0.27	0.67
School year (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	2.25	1.55	0.70 **	0.01	0.46	0.08 †	0.02 †	0.48

(continued)

Table 5 (continued)

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]
One barrier						
Future orientation						
Cynicism about work (9 and up)	1=strongly disagree 4=strongly agree	2.56	2.60	-0.04	0.59	-0.23
Pessimism about future employment (9 and up)	1=very unlikely 6=very likely	2.05	2.16	-0.11	0.35	-0.11
Employment and career preparation (12 and up)	1=never 4=more than 5 times	2.32	2.29	0.03	0.70	0.05
Duration of employment						
Months during summer (12 and up)	0=none 3=2–3	1.52	1.47	0.05	0.63	0.07
Months during school year (12 and up)	0=none 4=6–9	1.66	1.49	0.17	0.20	0.19
Intensity of employment						
Hours during summer (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	2.05	2.05	-0.01	0.98	-0.01
Hours during school year (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	1.93	1.70	0.23	0.31	0.15
Employment earnings						
Summer (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	2.11	2.17	-0.06	0.81	-0.04
School year (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	1.98	1.84	0.14	0.49	0.09

(continued)

Table 5 (continued)

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]
Two or more barriers						
Future orientation						
Cynicism about work (9 and up)	1=strongly disagree 4=strongly agree	2.55	2.59	-0.04	0.59	-0.06
Pessimism about future employment (9 and up)	1=very unlikely 6=very likely	2.05	2.16	-0.11	0.35	-0.12
Employment and career preparation (12 and up)	1=never 4=more than 5 times	2.39	2.20	0.19 *	0.04	0.33
Duration of Employment						
Months during summer (12 and up)	0=none 3=2–3	1.34	1.32	0.02	0.80	0.02
Months during school year (12 and up)	0=none 4=6–9	1.40	1.39	0.01	0.88	0.01
Intensity of Employment						
Hours during summer (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	1.73	1.59	0.14	0.58	0.08
Hours during school year (12 and up)	0=none 9=over 40	1.43	1.53	-0.10	0.60	-0.07
Employment Earnings						
Summer (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	1.86	1.79	0.07	0.76	0.04
School year (12 and up)	0=$0 6=$100	1.64	1.69	-0.05	0.82	-0.05

(continued)

Table 5 (continued)

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

Analyses concerning attitudes about work were based on the full CFS youth sample who were 9 years old and older (N = 1042). Analyses concerning employment and career preparation, duration of emplyment, intensity of employment, and employment earnings were based on the CFS youth sample who were 12 years old and older (N = 751).

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

[b]A statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts presented for different groups in this table were significantly different from one another. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across different panels of the table is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as: ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

Appendix A

Tables Displaying Impacts on Employment Experiences of Employed Adolescents

The New Hope Project

Table A.1

Impacts on Adolescent Employment Experiences for Employed Adolescents

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]
Duration of employment						
Months during summer (12 and up)	1=1–2 3=2–3	2.22	1.99	0.23 **	0.02	0.26
Months during school year (12 and up)	1=1–2 4=6–9	2.67	2.31	0.36 **	0.01	0.31
Intensity of employment						
Hours during summer (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	3.35	3.02	0.33	0.25	0.14
Hours during school year (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	3.18	2.81	0.37	0.18	0.17
Employment earnings						
Summer (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	3.65	3.41	0.24	0.27	0.13
School year (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	3.69	3.27	0.42 *	0.09	0.22

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

Analyses based on CFS youth sample who were 12 years old and older and employed during the summer (N = 314) and/or employed during the school year (N = 254).

[a]The effect size is the difference between program-and control-group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the control group. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

The New Hope Project

Table A.2

Impacts on Adolescent Employment Experiences for Employed Adolescents by Gender

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]	Boys vs. Girls[b]
Boys							
Duration of employment							
Months during summer (12 and up)	1=1–2 3=2–3	2.25	1.95	0.30 **	0.04	0.34	0.65
Months during school year (12 and up)	1=1–2 4=6–9	2.86	2.22	0.64 **	0.003	0.57	0.07 †
Intensity of employment							
Hours during summer (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	3.37	2.78	0.59	0.15	0.25	0.41
Hours during school year (12 and up)	1 =1–5 9=over 40	3.41	2.70	0.71 *	0.08	0.14	0.30
Employment earnings							
Summer (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	3.74	3.46	0.28	0.36	0.15	0.91
School year (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	3.81	3.43	0.38	0.26	0.13	0.88

(continued)

Table A.2 (continued)

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]
Girls						
Duration of employment						
Months during summer (12 and up)	1=1–2 3=2–3	2.23	2.20	0.21	0.14	0.24
Months during school year (12 and up)	1=1–2 4=6–9	2.49	2.38	0.11	0.59	0.10
Intensity of employment						
Hours during summer (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	3.35	3.02	0.33	0.25	0.05
Hours during school Year (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	2.99	2.89	0.10	0.82	0.04
Employment earnings						
Summer (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	3.65	3.41	0.24	0.27	0.12
School year (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	3.56	3.12	0.45	0.18	0.23

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

Analyses based on CFS youth sample who were 12 years old and older and employed during the summer (N = 314) and/or employed during the school year (N = 254).

[a]The effect size is the difference between program-and control-group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the control group. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

[b]A statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts presented for different groups in this table were significantly different from one another. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across different panels of the table is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as: ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Table A.3

Impacts on Adolescent Employment Experiences for Employed Adolescents by Race/Ethnicity

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]	African Amer. vs. Hisp.[b]	African Amer. vs. Whites[b]	Hisp. vs. Whites[b]
African Americans									
Duration of employment									
Months during summer (12 and up)	1=1–2 3=2–3	2.16	1.89	0.27 **	0.04	0.31	0.59	0.57	0.38
Months during school year (12 and up)	1=1–2 4=6–9	2.60	2.24	0.36 *	0.06	0.32	0.78	0.98	0.86
Intensity of employment									
Hours during summer (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	3.15	2.5	0.65 *	0.06	0.27	0.73	0.23	0.38
Hours during school Year (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	3.03	2.34	0.69 *	0.06	0.31	0.23	0.60	0.86
Employment earnings									
Summer (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	3.62	3.19	0.43	0.12	0.22	0.90	0.22	0.30
School year (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	3.81	3.15	0.66 **	0.04	0.34	0.54	0.20	0.40

(continued)

Table A.3 (continued)

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]
Hispanics						
Duration of employment						
Months during summer (12 and up)	1=1–2 3=2–3	2.45	2.05	0.40 **	0.05	0.45
Months during school year (12 and up)	1=1–2 4=6–9	2.91	2.43	0.48	0.18	0.42
Intensity of employment						
Hours during summer (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	3.69	3.27	0.42	0.47	0.18
Hours during school year (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	3.18	3.25	-0.07	0.89	-0.03
Employment earnings						
Summer (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	3.83	3.47	0.36	0.47	0.19
School year (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	3.72	3.41	0.31	0.54	0.15

(continued)

Table A.3 (continued)

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]
Whites						
Duration of employment						
Months during summer (12 and up)	1=1–2 3=2–3	2.23	2.14	0.09	0.76	0.10
Months during school year (12 and up)	1=1–2 4=6–9	2.60	2.23	0.37	0.45	0.33
Intensity of employment						
Hours during summer (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	3.58	4.06	-0.48	0.58	-0.20
Hours during school year (12 and up)	=1–5 9=over 40	3.58	3.45	0.13	0.89	0.06
Employment earnings						
Summer (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	3.36	3.97	-0.61	0.45	-0.32
School year (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	2.99	3.55	-0.56	0.53	-0.29

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

Analyses based on CFS youth sample who were 12 years old and older and employed during the summer (N = 314) and/or employed during the school year (N = 254).

[a]The effect size is the difference between program-and control-group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the control group. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

[b]A statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts presented for different groups in this table were significantly different from one another. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across different panels of the table is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as: ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Table A.4

Impacts on Adolescent Employment Experience for Employed Adolescents by Age Group

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]	12 to 13 Year Olds vs. 14 to 19 Year Olds[b]
12 to 13 year olds							
Duration of employment							
Months during summer (12 and up)	1=1–2 3=2–3	1.61	1.59	0.02	0.94	0.02	0.23
Months during school year (12 and up)	1=1–2 4=6–9	1.82	1.33	0.49 *	0.10	0.44	0.70
Intensity of employment							
Hours during summer (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	1.56	1.72	-0.16	0.69	-0.07	0.27
Hours during school year (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	1.44	1.39	0.05	0.88	0.02	0.36
Employment earnings							
Summer (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	2.30	1.75	0.55	0.23	0.29	0.43
School year (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	1.76	1.48	0.28	0.43	0.14	0.53

(continued)

Table A.4 (continued)

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]
14 to 19 year olds						
Duration of employment						
Months during summer (12 and up)	1=1–2 3=2–3	2.43	2.09	0.34 **[b]	0.003	0.39
Months during school year (12 and up)	1=1–2 4=6–9	2.43	2.07	0.36 **	0.03	0.32
Intensity of employment						
Hours during summer (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	3.84	3.41	0.43	0.25	0.18
Hours during school year (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	3.07	2.51	0.56 *	0.08	0.25
Employment earnings						
Summer (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	4.02	3.87	0.15	0.57	0.08
School year (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	3.35	2.79	0.56 **	0.04	0.29

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

Analyses based on CFS youth sample who were 12 years old and older and employed during the summer (N = 314) and/or employed during the school year (N = 254).

[a]The effect size is the difference between program-and control-group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the control group. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

[b]A statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts presented for different groups in this table were significantly different from one another. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across different panels of the table is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as: ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

The New Hope Project

Table A.5

Impacts on Adolescent Employment Experiences for Employed Adolescents, by Barrier Group

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]	No Barr. vs. One Barr.[b]	No Barr. vs. Two+ Barr.[b]	One Barr. vs. Two+ Barr.[b]
No barriers									
Duration of employment									
Months during summer (12 and up)	1=1–2 3=2–3	2.40	2.08	0.32 *	0.07	0.36	0.97	0.23	0.21
Months during school year (12 and up)	1=1–2 4=6–9	2.56	2.42	0.14	0.63	0.13	0.20	0.87	0.31
Intensity of employment									
Hours during summer (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	3.38	3.06	0.32	0.55	0.13	0.80	0.88	0.93
Hours during school year (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	3.00	2.76	0.24	0.67	0.11	0.42	0.70	0.20
Employment earnings									
Summer (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	3.82	3.52	0.30	0.49	0.16	0.81	0.62	0.44
School year (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	3.84	3.26	0.58	0.27	0.30	0.86	0.60	0.42

(continued)

Table A.5 (continued)

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]
One barrier						
Duration of employment						
Months during summer (12 and up)	1=1–2 3=2-3	2.30	1.99	0.31 **	0.05	0.35
Months during school year (12 and up)	1=1–2 4=6-9	2.93	2.32	0.61 ***	0.01	0.55
Intensity of employment						
Hours during summer (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	3.64	3.13	0.51	0.49	0.21
Hours during school year (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	3.74	2.92	0.82	0.92	0.37
Employment earnings						
Summer (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	3.80	3.37	0.43	0.97	0.22
School year (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	3.93	3.23	0.70	0.70	0.35

(continued)

Table A.5 (continued)

Outcome	Range	Program Group	Control Group	Difference	P-Value	Effect Size[a]
Two or more barriers						
Duration of employment						
Months during summer (12 and up)	1=1–2 3=2–3	1.91	1.93	-0.02	0.93	-0.02
Months during school year (12 and up)	1=1–2 4=6–9	2.41	2.20	0.21	0.53	0.19
Intensity of employment						
Hours during summer (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	3.04	2.60	0.44	0.49	0.18
Hours during school year (12 and up)	1=1–5 9=over 40	2.58	2.63	-0.05	0.92	-0.02
Employment earnings						
Summer (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	3.28	3.30	-0.02	0.97	0.18
School year (12 and up)	1=$1–$20 6=$100	3.31	3.11	0.20	0.70	0.10

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

Analyses based on CFS youth sample who were 12 years old and older and employed during the summer (N = 314) and/or employed during the school year (N = 254).

[a]The effect size is the difference between program-and control-group outcomes as a proportion of the standard deviation of the control group. This standard deviation is always obtained from the entire research sample, even if the table shows impacts for subgroups.

[b]A statistical test was conducted to measure whether impacts presented for different groups in this table were significantly different from one another. This p-value represents the probability that apparent variation in impacts across different panels of the table is simply the result of random chance. If this probability is less than 10 percent, the variation in impacts is considered statistically significant. Statistical significance levels are indicated as: ††† = 1 percent, †† = 5 percent, and † = 10 percent.

References

Alexander, K., D. Entwisle, and C. Horsey. 1997. "From First Grade Forward: Early Foundations of High-School Dropout." *Sociology of Education* 70 (2): 87–107.

Bachman, J., and J. Schulenberg. 1993. "How Part-Time Work Intensity Relates to Drug Use, Problem Behavior, Time Use, and Satisfaction among High School Seniors: Are These Consequences or Merely Correlates?" *Developmental Psychology* 29: 220–235.

Bauermeister, J., M. Zimmerman, T. Barnett, and C. Caldwell. 2007. "Working in High School and Adaptation in the Transition to Young Adulthood among African-American Youth." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 36: 877–890.

Benson, P., M. Mannes, K. Pittman, and T. Ferber. 2004. "Youth Development, Developmental Assets, and Public Policy." In R. Lerner and L. Steinberg (eds.), *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*. New York: John Wiley.

Bigler, R., C. Averhart, and L. Liben. 2003. "Race and the Work Force: Occupational Status, Aspirations, and Stereotyping among African-American Children." *Developmental Psychology* 39: 572–580.

Billis, D., L. Helms, and M. Ozcan. 1995. "The Impact of Student Employment on Teachers' Attitudes and Behaviors towards Working Students." *Youth and Society* 27 (2): 169–193.

Bos, J., A. Huston, R. Granger, G. Duncan, T. Brock, and V. McLoyd, with D. Crosby, C. Gibson, V. Fellerath, K. Magnuson, R. Mistry, S. Poglinco, J. Romich, and A. Ventura. 1999. *New Hope for People with Low Incomes: Two-Year Results of a Program to Reduce Poverty and Reform Welfare.* New York: MDRC.

Brown, C. 1997. "Sex Differences in the Career Development of Urban African-American Adolescents." *Journal of Career Development* 23: 295–304.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2004. *Employment and Unemployment among Youth: Summer 2004* (USDL 04-1590). Washington DC: Department of Labor.

Burton, L., K. Allison, and D. Obeidallah. 1995. "Social Context and Adolescence: Perspectives on Development among Inner-City African American Teens." In L. Crockett and A. Crouter. (eds.), *Pathways through Adolescence: Individual Development in Relation to Social Contexts.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cairns, R., B. Cairns, and H. Neckerman. 1989. "Early School Dropout: Configurations and Determinants." *Child Development* 60 (6): 1437–1452.

Carr, R., J. Wright, and C. Brody. 1996. "Effects of High School Work Experience a Decade Later: Evidence from the NLS." *Sociology of Education* 69 (1): 66–81.

Clausen, J. 1991. "Adolescent Competence and the Shaping of the Life Course." *American Journal of Sociology* 96: 805–842.

Coleman, J. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *American Journal of Sociology* 94: 95–120.

Conger, R., and G. Elder. 1994. *Families in Troubled Times: Adapting to Change in Rural America*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Cook, T. et al. 1996. "The Development of Occupational Aspirations and Expectations among Inner-City Boys." *Child Development* 67: 3368–3385.

D'Amico, R. 1984. "Does Employment during High School Impair Academic Progress?" *Sociology of Education* 57: 152–164.

D'Amico, R., and P. Baker. 1984. *Pathways to the Future* (Vol. 4). Columbus: Ohio State University, Center for Human Resource Research.

Diemer, M. 2007. "Parental and School Influences upon the Career Development of Poor Youth of Color." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 70: 502–524.

Diemer, M., and D. Blustein. 2007. "Vocational Hope and Vocational Identity: Adolescents Career Development." *Journal of Career Assessment* 15 (1): 98–118.

Dorham, C. 2006. "Future Orientation as a Protective Factor in the Relationship between Deviant Peer Association and Adolescent Adjustment." *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering* 66 (9-B): 5121.

Edelman, P., H. Holzer, and P. Offner. 2006. *Reconnecting Disadvantaged Young Men.* Washington D.C.: Urban Institute Press.

Ekstrom, R., M. Goertz, J. Pollack, and S. Rock. 1986. "Who Drops Out of High School and Why? Findings from a National Study." *Teachers College Record* 87: 356–373.

Elder, G. 1974. *Children of the Great Depression: Social Change in Life Experiences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Elder, G., and A. Caspi. 1990. "Studying Lives in a Changing Society: Sociological and Personological Explanations." In A. Rabin, R. Zucker, R. Emmons, and S. Franks (eds.), *Studying Persons and Lives*. New York: Springer.

Entwisle, D., K. Alexander, and L. Olson, L. 2000. "Early Work Histories of Urban Youth." *American Sociological Review* 65 (2): 279–297.

Entwisle, D., K. Alexander, and L. Olson. 2005. "Urban Teenagers Work and Dropout." *Youth and Society* 37 (1): 3–32.

Fend, H. 1994. "The Historical Context of Transition to Work and Youth Unemployment." In A. Petersen and J. Mortimer (eds.), *Youth Unemployment and Society*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Flanagan, C. 1990. "Families and Schools in Hard Times." In V. McLoyd and C. Flanagan. (eds.), *New Directions for Child Development, 46: Economic Stress: Effects on Family Life and Child Development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Furnham, A. 1994. "The Psychosocial Consequences of Youth Unemployment." In A. Petersen and J. Mortimer (eds.), *Youth Unemployment and Society*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Furnham, A. 1999. "The Saving and Spending Habits of Young People." *Journal of Economic Psychology* 20: 677–697.

Furstenberg, F., T. Cook, J. Eccles, G. Elder, and A. Sameroff. 1999. *Managing to Make it: Urban Families and Adolescent Success*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Galambos, N., and R. Silbereisen. 1987. "Income Change, Parental Life Outlook, and Adolescent Expectations for Job Success." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 49: 141–149.

Gardecki, R. August 2001. "Racial Differences in Youth Employment." *Monthly Labor Review*: 51–67.

Greenberg, D., R. Meyer, and M. Wiseman. 1993. *Prying the Lid from the Black Box: Plotting Evaluation Strategy for Welfare Employment and Training Programs*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, Institute for Research on Poverty.

Greenberger, E., and L. Steinberg. 1986. *When Teenagers Work: The Psychological and Social Costs of Adolescent Employment.* New York: Basic Books.

Greene, A., and S. Wheatley. 1992. "'I've got a lot to do, and I don't think I'll have the time': Gender Differences in Late Adolescents' Narratives of the Future." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 21: 667–686.

Greenwell, L., A. Liebowitz, and J. Klerman. 1998. "Welfare Background, Attitudes, and Employment among New Mothers." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60: 175–193.

Gutman, L., and C. Midgley. 2000. "The Role of Protective Factors in Supporting the Academic Achievement of Poor African-American Students during the Middle School Transition." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 20: 388–417.

Hauser, R., and M. Sweeney. 1997. "Does Poverty in Adolescence affect the Life Chances of High School Graduates?" In G. Duncan and J. Brooks-Gunn (eds.), *Consequences of Growing Up Poor*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation Press.

Hill, M., and J. Sandfort. 1995. "Effects of Childhood Poverty on Productivity Later in Life: Implications for Public Policy." *Children and Youth Service Review* 12: 91–126.

Holzer, H. 1996. *What Employers Want: Job Prospects for Less-Educated Workers*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Holzer, H. (in press). "The Labor Market and Young Black Men: Updating Moynihan's Perspective." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.*

Huston, A., G. Duncan, R. Granger, J. Bos, V. McLoyd, R. Mistry, D. Crosby, C. Gibson, K. Magnuson, J. Romich, and A. Ventura. 2001. "Work-based Antipoverty Programs for Parents can Enhance the School Performance and Social Behavior of Children." *Child Development* 72 (1): 318–336.

Huston, A., A. Gupta, A. Bentley, C. Dowsett, A. Ware, and S. Epps. 2008. "New Hope's Effects on Social Behavior, Parenting, and Activities at Eight Years." New York: MDRC.

Huston, A., C. Miller, L. Richburg-Hayes, G. Duncan, C. Eldred, T. Weisner, E. Lowe, V. McLoyd, D. Crosby, M. Ripke, and C. Redcross. 2003. *New Hope for Families and Children: Five-Year Results of a Program to Reduce Poverty and Reform Welfare*. New York: MDRC.

Huston, A., G. Duncan, V. McLoyd, D. Crosby, M. Ripke, T. Weisner, and C. Eldred. (2005). "Impacts on Children of a Policy to Promote Employment and Reduce Poverty for Low-Income Parents: New Hope After Five Years." *Developmental Psychology* 41: 902–918.

Iceland, J. 1997. "Urban Labor Markets and Individual Transitions out of Poverty." *Demography* 34: 429–441.

Iversen, R., and N. Farber. 1996. "Transmission of Family Values, Work, and Welfare among Poor Urban Black Women." *Work and Occupations* 23: 437–460.

Jambori, S. 1993. "Parenting Styles, Aims, Attitudes, and Future Orientation of Adolescents and Young Adults." *Review of Psychology* 10 (2): 131–140.

Johnson, D., and M. Lino. September 2000. "Teenagers: Employment and Contributions to Family Spending." *Monthly Labor Review*: 15–25.

Johnson, M. 2004. "Further Evidence on Adolescent Employment and Substance Use: Differences by Race and Ethnicity. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 45 (2): 187–197.

Keithly, D., and F. Deseran. 1995. "Households, Local Labor Markets, and Youth Labor Force Participation." *Youth and Society* 26: 463–492.

Kemple, J., S. Poglinco, and J. Snipes. 1999. *Career Academies: Building Career Awareness and Work-Based Learning Activities through Employer Partnerships.* New York: MDRC.

Kerpelman, J., and L. Mosher. 2004. "Rural African-American Adolescents' Future Orientation: The Importance of Self-Efficacy, Control, Responsibility, and Identity Development." *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research* 4 (2): 187–208.

Larson, J. 1984. "The Effect of Husband's Unemployment on Marital and Family Relations in Blue-Collar Families." *Family Relations* 33: 503–511.

Leventhal, T., J. Graber, and J. Brooks-Gunn. 2001. "Adolescent Transitions to Young Adulthood: Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences of Adolescent Employment." *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 11 (3): 297–323.

MacLeod, J. 1987. *Ain't No Makin' It: Leveled Aspirations in a Low-Income Neighborhood.* Boulder, Co. Westview Press.

Manning, W. 1990. "Parenting Employed Teenagers." *Youth and Society* 22: 184–200.

Marsh, H. 1991. "Employment during High School: Character Building or Subversion of Academic Goals?" *Sociology of Education* 64 (3): 172–189.

McCabe, K., and D. Barnett, D. 2000a. "First Comes Work, Then Comes Marriage: Future Orientation among African-American Young Adolescents." *Family Relations* 49: 63–70.

McCabe, K., and D. Barnett. 2000b. "The Relation between Familial Factors and the Future Orientation of Urban, African-American Sixth Graders." *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 9 (4): 491–508.

McLoyd, V. 1993. "Employment among African-American Mothers in Dual-Earner Families: Antecedents and Consequences for Family Life and Child Development." In J. Frankel (ed.), *The Employed Mother and the Family Context*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

McLoyd, V. 1990. "The Impact of Economic Hardship on Black Families and Children: Psychological Distress, Parenting, and Socioemotional Development." *Child Development* 61: 311–346.

McLoyd, V., N. Aikens, and L. Burton. 2006. "Childhood Poverty, Policy, and Practice." In W. Damon (series ed.), and I. Sigel and K. Renninger (eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychology: Vol. 4. Child Psychology in Practice* (5th ed.) New York: Wiley.

McLoyd, V., and D. Jozefowicz. 1996. "Sizing Up the Future: Predictors of African-American Adolescent Females' Expectancies about Their Economic Fortunes and Family Life Course." In B. Leadbeater and N. Way (eds.), *Creating Identities, Resisting Stereotypes: Urban Adolescent Girls*. New York: University Press.

McMorris, B., and C. Uggen. 2000. "Alcohol and Employment in the Transition to Adulthood." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 41: 276–294.

McNeal, R. 1997. "Are Students Being Pulled Out of High School? The Effect of Adolescent Employment on Dropping Out." *Sociology of Education* 70 (3): 206–220.

Meyer, R., and D. Wise. 1982. "High-School Preparation and Early Labor Force Experience." In R. Freeman and D. Wise (eds.), *The Youth Labor Market Problem: Its Nature, Causes, and Consequences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mortimer, J. 2003. *Work and Growing up in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mortimer, J., and M. Finch. 1986. "The Effects of Part-Time Work on Adolescent Self-Concept and Achievement." In K. Borman and J. Reisman (eds.), *Becoming a Worker*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Mortimer, J., M. Finch, K. Dennehy, C. Lee, and T. Beebe. 1994. "Work Experience in Adolescence." *Journal of Vocational Education Research* 19: 39–70.

Mortimer, J., M. Finch, S. Ryu, M. Shanahan, and K. Call. 1996. "The Effect of Work Intensity on Adolescent Mental Health, Achievement, and Behavioral Adjustment: New Evidence from a Prospective Study." *Child Development* 67 (3): 1243–1261.

Mortimer, J., and M. Johnson. 1998. "New Perspectives on Adolescent Work and the Transition to Adulthood." In R. Jessor (ed.), *New Perspectives on Adolescent Risk Behavior*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Murray, B. 1996. "Program Helps Kids Map Realistic Goals." *American Psychological Association Monitor* 27: 40.

National Research Council. 1998. *Protecting Youth at Work*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Neblett, N., and K. Cortina. 2006. "Adolescents' Thoughts about Parents' Jobs and Their Importance for Adolescents' Future Orientation." *Journal of Adolescence* 29: 795–811.

Newman, K. 1996. "Working Poor: Low-Wage Employment in the Lives of Harlem Youth." In J. Graber et al. (eds.), *Transitions through Adolescence*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Newman, K. 1999. *No Shame in My Game: The Working Poor in the Inner City*. New York: Knopf and the Russell Sage Foundation.

Nurmi, J. 1991. "How Do Adolescents See Their Future? A Review of the Development of Future Orientation and Planning." *Developmental Review* 11: 1–59.

Nurmi, J. 2005. "Thinking About and Acting Upon the Future: Development of Future Orientation Across the Lifespan." In A. Strathman and J. Joireman (eds.), *Understanding Behavior in the Context of Time: Theory, Research, and Application.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Nurmi, J., M. Poole, and V. Kalakoski. 1994. "Age Differences in Adolescent Future-Oriented Goals, Concerns, and Related Temporal Extensions in Different Sociocultural Contexts." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 23: 471–488.

Nurmi, J., M. Poole, and R. Seginer. 1995. "Tracks and Transitions: A Comparison of Adolescent Future-Oriented Goals, Explorations, and Commitments in Australia, Israel, and Finland." *International Journal of Psychology* 30: 355–375.

Nurmi, J., and H. Pulliainen. 1991. "The Changing Parent-Child Relationship, Self-Esteem and Intelligence as Determinants of Orientation to the Future during Early Adolescence." *Journal of Adolescence* 14: 35–51.

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health and Human Services 2003. *Trends in the Well-Being of America's Children and Youth*. Washington, DC.

O'Regan, K., and J. Quigley. 1996. "Teenage Employment and the Spatial Isolation of Minority and Poverty Households." *Journal of Human Resources* 31: 692–702.

Paternoster, R., S. Bushway, R. Brame, and R. Apel. 2003. "The Effect of Teenage Employment on Delinquency and Problem Behavior." *Social Forces* 82 (1): 297–335.

Perreira, K., K. Harris, and D. Lee. 2007. "Immigrant Youth in the Labor Market." *Work and Occupations* 34: 5–34.

Pittman, K., M. Irby, and T. Ferber. 2001. "Unfinished Business: Further Reflections on a Decade of Promoting Youth Development." In P. Benson and K. Pittman (eds.), *Trends in Youth Development: Visions, Realities and Challenges*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Ploeger, M. 1997. "Youth Employment and Delinquency: Reconsidering a Problematic Relationship." *Criminology* 35: 659–675.

Pollard, J., D. Hawkins, and M. Arthur. 1999. "Risk and Protection: Are Both Necessary toUnderstand Diverse Behavioral Outcomes in Adolescence?" *Social Work Research* 23: 145–158.

Portes, A., and R. Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Quane, J., and B. Rankin. 1998. "Neighborhood Poverty, Family Characteristics, and Commitment to Mainstream Goals." *Journal of Family Issues* 19: 769–794.

Quinton, D., A. Pickles, B. Maughan, and M. Rutter. 1993. "Partners, Peers, and Pathways: Assortative Pairing and Continuities and Discontinuities in Conduct Disorder." *Developmental Psychology* 5: 763–783.

Reynolds, A. 2000. *Success in Early Intervention*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Robbins, R., and A. Bryan. 2004. "Relationships between Future Orientation, Impulsive Sensation Seeking, and Risk Behaviors among Adjudicated Adolescents." *Journal of Adolescent Research* 19 (4): 428–445.

Roderick, M. 1994. "Grade Retention and School Dropout: Investigating the Association." *American Education Research Journal* 31 (4): 729–759.

Roth, J., L. Murray, J. Brooks-Gunn, and W. Foster. 1999. "Youth Development Programs." In D. Besharov (ed.). *America's Disconnected Youth: Toward a Preventive Strategy*. Washington, D.C: Child Welfare League of America.

Ruhm, C. 1997. "Is High-School Employment Consumption or Investment?" *Journal of Labor Economics* 15: 735–776.

Schoenhals, M., M. Tienda, and B. Schneider. 1998. "The Educational and Personal Consequences of Adolescent Employment." *Social Forces* 77: 723–762.

Seginer, R. 2003. "Adolescent Future Orientation in Culture and Family Settings." In W. Friedlmeier, P. Chakarath, and B. Schwartz (eds.), *Culture and Human Development: The Importance of Cross-Cultural Research to the Social Sciences.* Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets and Zetlinger.

Seginer, R,. and H. Halabi-Kheir. 1998. "Adolescent Passage to Adulthood: Future Orientation in the Context of Culture, Age, and Sex." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 22: 309–328.

Seginer, R., and E. Lilach. 2004. "How Adolescents Construct Their Future: The Effect of Loneliness on Future Orientation." *Journal of Adolescence* 27: 625–643.

Seginer, R., A. Vermulst, and S. Shoyer. 2004. "The Indirect Link between Perceived Parenting and Adolescent Future Orientation: A Multiple Step Model." *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 28 (4): 365–378.

Shanahan, M., G. Elder, M. Burchinal, and R. Conger. 1996. "Adolescent Paid Labor and Relationships with Parents: Early Work-Family Linkages." *Child Development* 67: 2183–2200.

Shapiro, D. 1979. "Working Students." In M. Borus (ed.), *Pathways to the Future: Preliminary Report to Youth and the Labor Market*. Columbus, OH: Center for Human Resources.

Skorikov, V. 2007. "Continuity in Adolescent Career Preparation and its Effects on Adjustment." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 70: 8–24.

Steinberg, L., and E. Cauffman. 1995. "The Impact of Employment on Adolescent Development." In R. Vasta (ed.), *Annals of Child Development* (vol. 11). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Steinberg, L., and S. Dornbusch. 1991. "Negative Correlates of Part-Time Employment during Adolescence: Replication and Elaboration." *Development Psychology* 27 (2): 304–313.

Steinberg, L., S. Fegley, and S. Dornbusch. 1993. "Negative Impact of Part-Time Work on Adolescent Adjustment: Evidence from a Longitudinal Study." *Developmental Psychology* 29 (2): 171–180.

Stephenson, S. 1980. *In-School Work and Early Post-School Labor Market Dynamics* (Working paper, Department of Economics). University Park: Pennsylvania State University.

Stern, D., J. Stone, C. Hopkins, and M. McMillion. 1990. "Quality of Students' Work Experience and Orientation toward Work." *Youth and Society* 22: 263–282.

Temple, J., A. Reynolds, and W. Miedel. 2000. "Can Early Intervention Prevent High School Dropout? Evidence from the Chicago Child-Parent Centers." *Urban Education* 35 (1): 31–56.

Tienda, M., and A. Ahituv. 1996. "Ethnic Differences in School Departure: Does Youth Employment Promote or Undermine Educational Attainment?" In G. Mangum and S. Mangum (eds.), *Of Heart and Mind: Social Policy Essays in Honor of Sar A. Levitan*. Kalamazoo, MI: Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Tienda, M., and H. Stier. 1996. "Generating Labor Market Inequality: Employment Opportunities and the Accumulation of Disadvantage." *Social Problems* 43: 147–165.

Trommsdorff, G. 1983. "Future Orientation and Socialization." *International Journal of Psychology* 18: 381–406.

Trommsdorff, G. 1986. "Future Orientation and its Relevance for Development as Action." In R. Silbereisen, K. Eyferth, and G. Rudinger (eds.), *Development as Action in Context: Problem Behavior and Normal Youth Development.* Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Voydanoff, P., and B. Donnelly. 1990. *Adolescent Sexuality and Pregnancy*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Warren, J., P. LePore, and R. Mar. 2000. "Employment during High School: Consequences for Students' Grades in Academic Courses." *American Education Research Journal* 37: 943–969.

Webley, P., and E. Nyhus. 2006. "Parents' Influence on Children's Future Orientation and Saving." *Journal of Economic Psychology* 27: 140–164.

Weis, L., E. Farrar, and H. Petrie. 1989. *Dropouts from School*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Wilson, W. 1996. *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Knopf.

Wright, J., F. Cullen, and N. Williams. 1997. "Working While in School and Delinquent Involvement: Implications for Social Policy." *Crime and Delinquency* 43: 203–221.

Wyman, P., E. Cowen, W. Work, and J. Kerley. 1993. "The Role of Children's Future Expectations in Self-System Functioning and Adjustment to Life Stress: A Prospective Study of Urban At-Risk Children." *Development and Psychopathology* 5: 649–661.

Wyman, P., E. Cowen, W. Work, B. Raoof, P. Gribble, G. Parker, and M. Wannon. 1992. "Interviews with Children who Experienced Major Life Stress: Family and Child Attributes that Predict Resilient Outcomes." *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 31: 904–910.

About MDRC

MDRC is a nonprofit, nonpartisan social 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 Child Development
- Improving Public Education
- Promoting Successful Transitions to Adulthood
- 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.