

The Community Guide - Health Equity, Housing Programs and Policies

Summary Evidence Tables

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Household income spent on housing not greater than 30%					
Abt Associates Inc. (1981) Least, Fair	Housing voucher/certificate	Reduction in percent of households paying more than 25% of income for rent & utilities (299)	6 months	36%	39% (not reported)
Kennedy (1980) Greatest, Fair	Direct cash housing subsidy	Favorable difference in percent of study participants spending over 25% of income on rent and utilities (1660)	2 years	21%	34% (not reported)
Kennedy & Finkel (1994) Least, Fair	Housing voucher/certificate	Reduction in percent of income spent on rent: New York City (384)	0 – 10 months (mean = not reported)	17%	26% (not reported)
		32 sites across the country (New York not included) (1090)		21%	38% (not reported)
Leger & Kennedy (1990) Least, Good	Housing voucher/certificate	Reduction in percent of income spent on rent: Voucher	1 year	33%	49% (not reported)
		2,239 Certificate 2,076		35%	53% (not reported)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Family relocation to neighborhoods of higher socioeconomic status					
Abt Associates Inc. (1981) Least, Fair	Housing voucher/certificate	Reduction in percent of households that are minority in neighborhoods resided in by minority study participants (253) Reduction in percent of households with incomes below the federal poverty line in neighborhoods resided in by study participants (498)	6 months	7% 1%	13% (.01 level) 9% (.01 level)
Atkinson, Hamilton & Myers (1980) Greatest, Fair	Direct cash housing subsidy	Reduction in percent of households with annual incomes below \$5,000 in neighborhoods resided in by study participants: Pittsburgh (1236) Phoenix (997) Reduction in percent of population that is black in neighborhoods resided in by black study participants: Pittsburgh (274) Phoenix (79) Reduction in percent of population that is Spanish American in neighborhoods resided in by Spanish American study participants (276)	2 years	0% -1% 7% 6% -1%	-18% (n.s.) 254% (n.s.) 184% (n.s.) -17% (n.s.)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Katz, Kling & Liebman (2000) ^b Greatest, Good MTO Study: Boston	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Favorable difference in neighborhood poverty rate: Experimental vs. Control (411)	1 - 3.5 years (mean = 2.2 years)	12%	34% (.05 level)
		Section 8 vs. Control (290)		10%	28% (.05 level)
		Percent of neighborhood population that is white: Experimental vs. Control (411)		15%	38% (.05 level)
		Section 8 vs. Control (290)		6%	16% (n.s.)
		Favorable difference in percent of families in neighborhood that are female-headed: Experimental vs. Control (411)		17%	27% (.05 level)
		Section 8 vs. Control (290)		11%	18% (.05 level)
		Favorable difference in neighborhood rate of public assistance receipt: Experimental vs. Control (411)		10%	33% (.05 level)
		Section 8 vs. Control (290)		7%	22% (.05 level)
		Favorable difference in neighborhood unemployment rate: Experimental vs. Control (411)		2%	21% (.05 level)
		Section 8 vs. Control (290)		1%	13% (.05 level)
		Proportion of managerial & professional workers in neighborhood: Experimental vs. Control (411)		3%	14% (.05 level)
		Section 8 vs. Control (290)		2%	11% (.05 level)
		Percent of neighborhood population 25 years and older with at least some college: Experimental vs. Control (411)		6%	22% (.05 level)
		Section 8 vs. Control (290)		7%	23%

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn (2000) Greatest, Fair MTO Study: New York	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Favorable difference in neighborhood poverty rate: Experimental vs. Control (203) Section 8 vs. Control (181) Favorable difference in neighborhood unemployment rate: Experimental vs. Control (203) Section 8 vs. Control (181) Favorable difference in percent of neighborhood population that is African American: Experimental vs. Control (203) Section 8 vs. Control (181) Favorable difference in percent of neighborhood population that is Latino: Experimental vs. Control (203) Section 8 vs. Control (181)	3 years	11% 4% 1% 2% 4% 4% -8% -4%	23% (.001 level) 9% (n.s.) 6% (.001 level) 11% (n.s.) 8% (n.s.) 8% (n.s.) -19% (.001 level) -9% (n.s.)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Ludwig, Duncan & Pinkston (2000) Greatest, Fair MTO Study: Baltimore	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	<p>Percent study participants residing in neighborhoods with poverty rates below 20 percent: Experimental vs. Control (450) Section 8 vs. Control (386)</p> <p>Percent of neighborhood population that is white: Experimental vs. Control (450) Section 8 vs. Control (386)</p> <p>Percent of adults in neighborhood with a college degree: Experimental vs. Control (450) Section 8 vs. Control (386)</p> <p>Favorable difference in percent of households in neighborhood headed by a female: Experimental vs. Control (450) Section 8 vs. Control (386)</p>	2 – 4 years (mean = 2.5 years)	39% 22% 21% 14% 8% 3% 22% 17%	325% (not reported) 179% (not reported) 146% (not reported) 99% (not reported) 104% (not reported) 39% (not reported) 33% (not reported) 25% (not reported)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Peroff, Davis, Jones, Curtin & Marans (1979) Moderate, Fair Gautreaux Study	Housing voucher/certificate & relocation services. Treatment: those moved to predominately white, suburban neighborhoods. Comparison: those moved to urban neighborhoods	Favorable difference in percent of neighborhood population that is black (363)	0 - 2.5 years (mean = not reported)	18%	95% (not reported)
		Percent of high school graduates in neighborhood (363)		17%	33% (not reported)
		Favorable difference in neighborhood unemployment rate (363)		1%	30% (not reported)
		Mean income in neighborhood (363)		\$2,199	Insufficient data to compute effect (not reported)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Pettit, McLanahan & Hanratty (2000) Greatest, Fair MTO Study: Los Angeles	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Favorable difference in neighborhood poverty rate: Experimental vs. Control (225) Section 8 vs. Control (128) Neighborhood employment rate: Experimental vs. Control (225) Section 8 vs. Control (128) Neighborhood college graduation rate: Experimental vs. Control (225) Section 8 vs. Control (128) Favorable difference in percent of households in neighborhood that are female-headed: Experimental vs. Control (225) Section 8 vs. Control (128)	1 year	25% 20% 17% 15% 12% 3% 21% 19%	50% (.05 level) 40% (.05 level) 37% (n.s.) 33% (.05 level) 383% (.05 level) 103% (.05 level) 36% (n.s.) 32% (.05 level)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Rosenbaum & Harris (2000) ^a Least, Fair MTO Study: Chicago	Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services	Percent of neighborhood population that is white (67) Favorable difference in neighborhood poverty rate (67) Favorable difference in neighborhood rate of public assistance receipt (67) Favorable difference in percent of families in neighborhood that are female-headed (67) Favorable difference in percent of adolescents aged 16-19 years in neighborhood neither enrolled in, nor graduated from, high school (67) Percent of adults aged 25 years and older in neighborhood with a college degree (67) Percent of neighborhood population aged 16 and older in the civilian labor force (67)	13 months	34% 64% 48% 48% 8% 15% 30%	309% (not reported) 86% (not reported) 83% (not reported) 56% (not reported) 44% (not reported) 185% (not reported) 78% (not reported)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Rusin-White (1993) Moderate, Fair Gautreaux Study	Housing voucher/certificate & relocation services. Treatment: those moved to predominately white, suburban neighborhoods. Comparison: those moved to urban neighborhoods	Percent of study participants in neighborhoods with mostly white racial composition (95)	7 – 13 years (mean = 9 years)	71%	879% (not reported)
Solomon & Fenton (1973) Least, Fair	Direct cash housing subsidy	Percent of black study participants residing in neighborhoods with population under 25% black (143)	3 months	15%	525% (not reported)
Level and quality of public services, access to private goods and services, and access to jobs					
Kaufman (1991) Moderate, Fair Gautreaux Study	Housing voucher/certificate & relocation services. Treatment: those moved to predominately white, suburban neighborhoods. Comparison: those moved to urban neighborhoods	Percent youth who attended high schools with ACT score averages of 20 or better (97)	7.5 – 13 years (mean = 9 years)	83%	1,456% (not reported)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn (2000) Greatest, Fair MTO Study: New York	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Percent commuting less than 15 minutes to work (measure of access to jobs within the neighborhood): Experimental vs. Control (203) Section 8 vs. Control (181) Satisfaction with neighborhood: Experimental vs. Control (203) Section 8 vs. Control (181)	3 years	15% -1% .53 .27	165% (.1 level) -10% (n.s.) .38 (.05 level) .19 (n.s.)
Peroff, Davis, Jones, Curtin & Marans (1979) Moderate, Fair Gautreaux Study	Housing voucher/certificate & relocation services. Treatment: those moved to predominately white, suburban neighborhoods. Comparison: those moved to urban neighborhoods	Percent reporting "very satisfied" with neighborhood (296) Percent rating public services as "very good" (271) Percent rating public schools as "very good" (270) Percent rating police protection as "very good" (262) Percent rating recreational facilities as "very good" (268)	0 - 2.5 years (mean = not reported)	3% -19% 39% 14% 20%	7% (not reported) -58% (not reported) 113% (not reported) 37% (not reported) 96% (not reported)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Rosenbaum & Harris (2000) ^b Least, Fair MTO Study: Chicago	Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services	Report of proximity to services: -Takes 15 minutes or less to get to nearest bus or train stop -Takes 15 minutes or less to get to grocery store used most of the time -Takes 15 minutes or less to get to nearest park or playground -Takes 15 minutes or less to get to church or place of worship -Takes 15 minutes or less to get to doctor, health clinic, or hospital used most of the time (54)	13 months	6% 30% 23% 28% 9%	7% (n.s.) 85% (.001 level) 36% (.01 level) 115% (.01 level) 46% (n.s.)
Rosenbaum, Kulieke & Rubinowitz (1987) Moderate, Limited Gautreaux Study	Housing voucher/certificate & relocation services. Treatment: those moved to predominately white, suburban neighborhoods. Comparison: those moved to urban neighborhoods	Parental satisfaction with help child received from teachers at child's school (162) Parental approval of child's treatment by teachers at child's school (162)	Not reported	29% 10%	97% (not reported) 12% (not reported)
Rosenbaum & Popkin (1990) Moderate, Fair Gautreaux Study	Housing voucher/certificate & relocation services. Treatment: those moved to predominately white, suburban neighborhoods. Comparison: those moved to urban neighborhoods	Parents happier with children's school (342)	2 - 8 years (mean = 5.6 years)	.64	.92 (.001 level)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Rusin-White (1993) Moderate, Fair Gautreaux Study	Housing voucher/certificate & relocation services. Treatment: those moved to predominately white, suburban neighborhoods. Comparison: those moved to urban neighborhoods	Satisfaction with services: -Police -Medical care -Transportation -Schools (342)	0 to 15 years (mean = 5 years)	.28 -.26 -1.22 .57	.30 (.05 level) -.26 (.05 level) -1.04 (.001 level) .64 (.001 level)
Neighborhood safety and physical disorder (e.g., crime, violence, exposure to toxins or unsafe conditions)					
Atkinson, Hamilton & Myers (1980) Greatest, Fair	Direct cash housing subsidy	Favorable percent change in rate of crimes against persons: Pittsburgh (320) Phoenix (433) Favorable percent change in rate of crimes against property: Pittsburgh (320) Phoenix (433)	2 years	2% -11% 5% -11%	23% -153% (n.s.) 489% (n.s.) -136% (.05 level)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Katz, Kling & Liebman (2000)a Greatest, Good MTO Study: Boston	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	<p>Favorable difference in percent reporting streets near home are "unsafe" or "very unsafe" during day: Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=509)</p> <p>Favorable difference in household head or children having seen people using or selling drugs in neighborhood once a week or more: Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=507)</p> <p>Favorable difference in household head or children having seen or heard gunfire in neighborhood once a month or more: Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=513)</p> <p>Favorable difference in child having seen someone with a weapon in the past 3 months: Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=558)</p>	1 - 3.5 years (mean = 2.2 years)	14% 6% 20% 13% 12% 10% 7% 3%	37% (.05 level) 16% (n.s.) 55% (.05 level) 35% (.05 level) 60% (.05 level) 48% (.05 level) 70% (.05 level) 33% (n.s.)
Katz, Kling & Liebman (2000)b Greatest, Good MTO Study: Boston	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Favorable difference in experience of any criminal victimization in previous 6 months: Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=519)	1 - 3.5 years (mean = 2.2 years)	12% 12%	46% (.05 level) 45% (.05 level)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn (2000) Greatest, Fair MTO Study: New York	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Favorable difference in scale measure of physical and social disorder (trash, graffiti, public drinking, public drug use, and abandoned buildings) are reported as a problem in neighborhood: Experimental vs. Control (203) Section 8 vs. Control (181) Favorable difference in scale measure of exposure to violence (mugged, threatened with gun or knife, beaten or assaulted, and stabbed/shot) in past six months: Experimental vs. Control (203) Section 8 vs. Control (181)	3 years	2.18 1.43 .13 .01	.93 (.001 level) .61 (.01 level) .18 (n.s.) .01 (n.s.)
Meaden (1993) Moderate, Fair Gautreaux Study	Housing voucher/certificate & relocation services. Treatment: those moved to predominately white, suburban neighborhoods. Comparison: those moved to urban neighborhoods	Never been hurt at school (98)	7.5 – 13 years (mean = not reported)	1%	(n.s.)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Peroff, Davis, Jones, Curtin & Marans (1979) Moderate, Fair Gautreaux Study	Housing voucher/certificate & relocation services. Treatment: those moved to predominately white, suburban neighborhoods. Comparison: those moved to urban neighborhoods	Neighborhood social and physical disorder reported as "not a problem": -Vandalism -Rundown houses -Juvenile delinquency -Trash and litter -Drug addiction -Neighborhood crime (294)	0 - 2.5 years (mean = not reported)	12% 22% 17% 7% 18% 14%	28% (not reported) 35% (not reported) 30% (not reported) 12% (not reported) 29% (not reported) 22% (not reported)
Pettit, McLanahan & Hanratty (2000) Greatest, Fair MTO Study: Los Angeles	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Favorable percent change in neighborhood murder rate: Experimental vs. Control (225) Section 8 vs. Control (128)	1 year	60% 44%	Insufficient data to compute effect Insufficient data to compute effect

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Rosenbaum & Harris (2000)a Least, Fair MTO Study: Chicago	Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services	Favorable difference in degree to which 5 categories of physical and social disorder are reported as a problem in neighborhood: -Trash or litter on streets or sidewalks -Graffiti or writing on walls -People drinking in public -Drug dealers or users -Abandoned buildings (60)	13 months	67% 89% 85% 77% 83%	70% (.001 level) 90% (.001 level) 89% (.001 level) 78% (.001 level) 92% (.001 level)
Rosenbaum & Harris (2000)b Least, Fair MTO Study: Chicago	Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services	Parking lots or streets near neighborhood school rated as "safe" or "very safe" (55) Being home alone at night rated as "safe" or "very safe" (55) Streets near home at night rated as "safe" or "very safe" (55) Favorable difference in report of anyone in household experiencing criminal victimization (reference period is previous 6 months at baseline and previous 3 months at posttest): -Having purse, wallet, or jewelry snatched -Being threatened with a knife or gun -Being beaten or assaulted -Being stabbed or shot -Someone trying to break into home (55)	13 months	78% 56% 79% 26% 15% 22% 9% 27%	423% (.001 level) 144% (.001 level) 853% (.001 level) 88% (.001 level) 73% (.01 level) 92% (.001 level) 100% (.1 level) 93% (.001 level)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Rusin-White (1993) Moderate, Fair Gautreaux Study	Housing voucher/certificate & relocation services. Treatment: those moved to predominately white, suburban neighborhoods. Comparison: those moved to urban neighborhoods	Perception of neighborhood safety (149)	0 – 6 years (mean = 2 years)	.80	.17 (.01 level)
Socioeconomically heterogeneous social networks and social support					
Katz, Kling & Liebman (2000) ^a Greatest, Good MTO Study: Boston	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	At least one close friend in neighborhood (boys): Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=272) At least one close friend in neighborhood (girls): Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=302) Visited with friend or relative at own home at least once a week in past month: Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=509)	1 - 3.5 years (mean = 2.2 years)	1% 2% -15% -19% -6% -6%	1% (n.s.) 3% (n.s.) -18% (.05 level) -23% (.05 level) -12% (n.s.) -12% (n.s.)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Rosenbaum & Popkin (1990) Moderate, Fair Gautreaux Study	Housing voucher/certificate & relocation services. Treatment: those moved to predominately white, suburban neighborhoods. Comparison: those moved to urban neighborhoods	Have some friends in neighborhood (342)	2 - 8 years (mean = 5.6 years)	7%	11% (not reported)
Rosenbaum, Popkin, Kaufman & Rusin (1991) Moderate, Fair Gautreaux Study	Housing voucher/certificate & relocation services. Treatment: those moved to predominately white, suburban neighborhoods. Comparison: those moved to urban neighborhoods	Percent of black study participants' friends that are white (342) Interaction scale measuring level of positive interaction/social support in regard to neighbors (342)	2 - 8 years (mean = 5.6 years)	22% .03	94% (not reported) .04 (n.s.)
Rusin-White (1993) Moderate, Fair Gautreaux Study	Housing voucher/certificate & relocation services. Treatment: those moved to predominately white, suburban neighborhoods. Comparison: those moved to urban neighborhoods	Percent of study participants (who were youths at initiation of intervention) whose co-workers are mostly white (75) Percent of study participants (who were adults at initiation of intervention) with at least 1 white friend (95) Percent of study participants (who were youths at initiation of intervention) with at least 1 white friend (95)	7 - 13 years (mean = 9 years)	31% 44% 48%	156% (not reported) 554% (not reported) 141% (not reported)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Civic engagement and community cohesion					
Katz, Kling & Liebman (2000) ^a Greatest, Good MTO Study: Boston	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Went to church or place of worship at least once in the past month: Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=510)	1 - 3.5 years (mean = 2.2 years)	0% -5%	-8% (n.s.)
Katz, Kling & Liebman (2000) ^b Greatest, Good MTO Study: Boston	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Participation in extra-curricular activities (boys): Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=274) Participation in extra-curricular activities (girls): Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=290)	1 - 3.5 years (mean = 2.2 years)	-5% -9% -14% -3%	-12% (n.s.) -21% (n.s.) -29% (.1 level) -7% (n.s.)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn (2000) Greatest, Fair MTO Study: New York	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Youth participation in school activity in past year: -Orchestra, band, theater, drama, dance or choir: Experimental vs. Control (236) Section 8 vs. Control (267) -Organized sports teams or athletics: Experimental vs. Control (236) Section 8 vs. Control (267) -Student government or council: Experimental vs. Control (236) Section 8 vs. Control (267) -Academic clubs: Experimental vs. Control (236) Section 8 vs. Control (267) Parental school engagement in past year: -Volunteered at child's school or on school committee: Experimental vs. Control (272) Section 8 vs. Control (267) -Attended school function (meetings, back-to-school night): Experimental vs. Control (272) Section 8 vs. Control (267) -Attended school or class event (play, sporting event, science fair):	3 years	-6% -7% -6% -7% 15% -18% 4% -2% -13% 5% -7% 5% -1%	-9% (n.s.) -10% (n.s.) -9% (n.s.) -10% (n.s.) 32% (.1 level) -40% (.05 level) 11% (n.s.) -6% (n.s.) -32% (.1 level) 13% (n.s.) -8% (n.s.) 6% (n.s.) -2% (n.s.)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Pettit, McLanahan & Hanratty (2000) Greatest, Fair MTO Study: Los Angeles	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Percent of parents who talk with parents of children's school friends: Experimental vs. Control (225) Section 8 vs. Control (128)	1 year	-4% -7%	-5% (n.s.) -9% (n.s.)
		Percent of parents who attend functions/programs at their children's schools: Experimental vs. Control (225) Section 8 vs. Control (128)		5% -2%	9% (n.s.) -4% (n.s.)
		Percent of parents belonging to a church: Experimental vs. Control (225) Section 8 vs. Control (128)		-11% -19%	-16% (n.s.) -30% (.05 level)
		Children participate in an after-school activity: Experimental vs. Control (225) Section 8 vs. Control (128)		0% 7%	9% (n.s.)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Social and Health Risks: Employment and Income Outcomes					
Katz, Kling & Liebman (2000) ^b Greatest, Good MTO Study: Boston	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Employed: Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=520) Average hourly wages of those employed: Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=186)	1 - 3.5 years (mean = 2.2 years)	-7% 0% \$.49 \$.15	-16% (n.s.) Insufficient data to compute effect (n.s.) Insufficient data to compute effect (n.s.)
Kaufman (1991) Moderate, Fair Gautreaux Study	Housing voucher/certificate & relocation services. Treatment: those moved to predominately white, suburban neighborhoods. Comparison: those moved to urban neighborhoods	Youth employed (93) Wages of youth > \$6.50 per hour (73)	7.5 – 13 years (mean = 9 years)	34% 16%	81% (.005 level) 320% (not reported)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn (2000) Greatest, Fair MTO Study: New York	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Maternal weekly earnings from primary job: Experimental vs. Control (203) Section 8 vs. Control (181) Hours mother works per week at primary job: Experimental vs. Control (203) Section 8 vs. Control (181) Increase in maternal employment: Experimental vs. Control (203) Section 8 vs. Control (181)	3 years	\$54 \$38 2.24 5.45 6% 9%	.39 (n.s.) .28 (n.s.) .23 (n.s.) .57 (.1 level) 43% (n.s.) 65% (n.s.)
Ludwig, Duncan & Pinkston (2000) Greatest, Fair MTO Study: Baltimore	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Employment: Experimental vs. Control (450) Section 8 vs. Control (386) Earnings: Experimental vs. Control (450) Section 8 vs. Control (386)	2.4 – 4.4 years (mean = 3.8 years)	-1% -2% -\$10.42 \$4.54	-2% (n.s.) -5% (n.s.) Insufficient data to compute effect (n.s.) Insufficient data to compute effect (n.s.)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Popkin, Rosenbaum & Meaden (1993) Moderate, Fair Gautreaux Study	Housing voucher/certificate & relocation services. Treatment: those moved to predominately white, suburban neighborhoods. Comparison: those moved to urban neighborhoods	Employment (332) Reported better job post move (332) Mean hourly wage of those employed (198) Mean hours worked per week among those employed (198)	0 - 12 years (mean = 5.5 years)	13% .52 -\$.20 1.47	25% (.05 level) .99 (.001 level) Insufficient data to compute effect (not reported) Insufficient data to compute effect (not reported)
Rosenbaum & Harris (2000) ^a Least, Fair MTO Study: Chicago	Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services	Employed (53)	13 months	22%	89% (.01 level)
Solomon & Fenton (1973) Least, Fair Fair	Direct cash housing subsidy	Employed full- or part-time (134)	15 months	3%	7% (not reported)
Social and Health Risks: Educational Outcomes					

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Kaufman (1991) Moderate, Fair Gautreaux Study	Housing voucher/certificate & relocation services. Treatment: those moved to predominately white, suburban neighborhoods. Comparison: those moved to urban neighborhoods	Favorable difference in failure to graduate from high school (among those over 18 who were youths at initiation of intervention) (66) College attendance (among those over 18 who were youths at initiation of intervention) (55)	7.5 – 13 years (mean = 9 years)	11% 33%	34% (not reported) 157% (.025 level)
Social and Health Risks: Housing Hazard Outcomes					
Rosenbaum & Harris (2000)a Least, Fair MTO Study: Chicago	Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services	Favorable difference in: -Walls with peeling paint or broken plaster -Plumbing that doesn't work -Rat or mice infestation -Broken locks or no locks on the door to unit (64)	13 months	53% 28% 34% 42%	76% (.001 level) 59% (.001 level) 66% (.001 level) 98% (.001 level)
Social and Health Risks: Youth Risk Behaviors					
Katz, Kling & Liebman (2000)a Greatest, Good MTO Study: Boston	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Favorable difference in fraction of 7 problem behaviors in school and home (boys): Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=274) Favorable difference in fraction of 7 problem behaviors in school and home (girls): Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=300)	1 - 3.5 years (mean = 2.2 years)	9% 11% 2% 5%	28% (.05 level) 35% (.05 level) 12% (n.s.) 26% (n.s.)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn (2000) Greatest, Fair MTO Study: New York	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Favorable difference in percent of youth reporting having smoked cigarettes in past month: Experimental vs. Control (96)	3 years	9%	39% (n.s.)
		Section 8 vs. Control (103)		-2%	-10% (n.s.)
		Favorable difference in percent of youth reporting having consumed alcohol in past month: Experimental vs. Control (96)		-1%	-23% (n.s.)
		Section 8 vs. Control (103)		-3%	-66% (n.s.)
		Favorable difference in number of delinquent acts (trespassed, graffiti, stolen, secretly carried a weapon, hit someone, and destroyed property) engaged in by youth during past month: Experimental vs. Control (96)		.09	.07 (n.s.)
		Section 8 vs. Control (103)		.26	.20 (n.s.)
		Favorable difference in self report among youth of experiencing behavior problems sometimes or often in past 6 months: -Disobey parents: Experimental vs. Control (236)		9%	27% (n.s.)
		Section 8 vs. Control (267)		13%	41% (.1 level)
		-Disobey in school: Experimental vs. Control (236)		8%	28% (n.s.)
		Section 8 vs. Control (267)		2%	6% (n.s.)
		-Difficulty getting along with others: Experimental vs. Control (236)		6%	17% (n.s.)
		Section 8 vs. Control (267)		-8%	-26% (n.s.)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Ludwig, Duncan & Hirschfield (2000) Greatest, Fair MTO Study: Baltimore	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Favorable difference in percent of teens arrested for violent crime per quarter: Experimental vs. Control (244) Section 8 vs. Control (188) Favorable difference in percent of teens arrested for property crime per quarter: Experimental vs. Control (244) Section 8 vs. Control (188)	3 – 5 years (mean = 3.7 years)	1% 1% -1% 0%	48% (.1 level) 44% (n.s.) -50% (n.s.)
Social and Health Risks: Mental Health Status					
Katz, Kling & Liebman (2000) ^a Greatest, Good MTO Study: Boston	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Self report of feeling calm and peaceful a good bit of the time or more often during the past 4 weeks: Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=508) Self report of being happy a good bit of the time or more often during the past four weeks: Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=506) Favorable difference in predictive probability of having had a major depressive episode: Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=511)	1 - 3.5 years (mean = 2.2 years)	11% 14% 7% 5% 5% 6%	23% (.05 level) 30% (.05 level) 12% (n.s.) 9% (n.s.) 19% (n.s.) 24% (n.s.)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn (2000) Greatest, Fair MTO Study: New York	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Favorable difference in self report of experiencing depressive behaviors some, most or all of the time in past month: -Feeling unhappy, sad or depressed: Experimental vs. Control (203) Section 8 vs. Control (181) -Feeling hopeless about the future: Experimental vs. Control (203) Section 8 vs. Control (181) -Feeling nervous or tense: Experimental vs. Control (203) Section 8 vs. Control (181) -Worrying too much about things: Experimental vs. Control (203) Section 8 vs. Control (181) Favorable difference in self report of experiencing anxious behaviors some, most or all of the time in past month: -Nervous or shakiness: Experimental vs. Control (203) Section 8 vs. Control (181) -Trembling: Experimental vs. Control (203) Section 8 vs. Control (181) -Suddenly scared for no reason: Experimental vs. Control	3 years	18% 4% 6% -4% 14% 3% 17% 3% 22% 14% 13% 4% 5% 0%	35% (.01 level) 9% (n.s.) 20% (n.s.) -13% (n.s.) 35% (.05 level) 6% (n.s.) 27% (.01 level) 5% (n.s.) 59% (.001 level) 37% (.05 level) 75% (.001 level) 21% (n.s.) 29% (n.s.)

Study, Design Suitability, Execution Quality	Intervention	Measure Used (Sample Size)	Measurement time from intervention	Absolute Difference	Effect size* (p value)
Social and Health Risks: Physical Health Status					
Katz, Kling & Liebman (2000) ^a Greatest, Good MTO Study: Boston	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	If child been to doctor for regular check-up or immunization during previous 6 months: Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=566)	1 - 3.5 years (mean = 2.2 years)	-4%	-5% (n.s.)
				-7%	-8% (n.s.)
		Favorable difference in child experiencing an injury or accident requiring medical attention in past 6 months: Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=569)		6%	56% (.05 level)
				4%	35% (n.s.)
		Favorable difference in child experiencing an asthma attack requiring medical attention in past 6 months: Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=570)		5%	52% (.1 level)
		Self report that overall health is good or better: Experimental vs. Control Section 8 vs. Control (all groups=511)		12%	20% (.05 level)
				16%	28% (.05 level)
Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn (2000) Greatest, Fair MTO Study: New York	Experimental: Housing voucher / certificate (restricted for use in low-poverty areas) & relocation services Section 8: Housing voucher/certificate	Self report that overall health is good or excellent: Experimental vs. Control (203) Section 8 vs. Control (181)	3 years	11%	32% (.1 level)
				7%	20% (n.s.)
		Self report of youth that overall health is good or excellent: Experimental vs. Control (236) Section 8 vs. Control (267)		11%	19% (.1 level)
				5%	8% (n.s.)

* Standard Effect Size: (Mean I – Mean C) / Standard Deviation C
Percent Difference: (Percent I – Percent C) / Percent C