Effects of the JOBS Program on Mother-Child Relations During the Early Months of Program Participation

Martha J. Zaslow and M. Robin Dion, Child Trends
Donna Ruane Morrison, Georgetown University

April 3, 1997
Washington, D.C.

Child Trends
4301 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 100
Washington, DC 20008
www.childtrends.org

Paper Presented at the Meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development
As Part of Symposium on Mother-Child Relations
In the Context of Contrasting Programs for Welfare Families

Introduction

The New Chance Observational Study (that you have just heard two papers about; De Temple, 1997; Weinfield, Ogawa, Hennighausen and Egeland, 1997), and the JOBS Observational Study (that our paper will now focus on) were launched as parallel research efforts using similar procedures and measures. The two observational studies were launched in this manner in order to permit us to examine whether there might be *differing* implications for mother-child interaction of *contrasting programs* for welfare families. Accordingly, an appropriate starting point for this paper is the question of how the New Chance and JOBS Programs differed.

Key Differences Between the New Chance and JOBS Programs

New Chance and JOBS can be contrasted on multiple dimensions. As can be seen in **Table 1**, these dimensions include *population targeted*, *mandatory vs. voluntary* nature of program participation, *comprehensiveness and nature of program services*, *one vs. two generational focus of the program*, and *scope of implementation*.

As you have heard, New Chance targeted a particular subset of welfare families: those headed by young women who had had a first child as teenagers, and who had already dropped out of school. Mothers volunteered to participate in New Chance, and although mothers were expected to show commitment to the program and to participate in it, there were no sanctions for non-participation. New Chance provided a comprehensive set of services, aimed at enhancing the development of both the parent and child. Thus the program can be seen as two generational. New Chance was a demonstration project, that is, a project implemented with the aim of assessing the effectiveness of a particular service approach. New Chance was mounted and evaluated in 16 sites.

By contrast, JOBS, the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program, was not a demonstration project, but rather the programmatic implementation of national welfare legislation, the Family Support Act of 1988. Variants of the JOBS Program were implemented in all 50 states. While participation in New Chance was voluntary, JOBS was a mandatory program. Mothers who applied to receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), and whose youngest child was three years old or older (younger at state option), and who did not have a basis for exemption from the program, were required to participate in activities to enhance their employability or labor force participation. Those who did not participate as required faced economic sanctions in terms of reductions in their welfare benefits. Whereas New Chance targeted young welfare mothers with limited education, JOBS was addressed to the more heterogeneous population of welfare recipients. While New Chance was an extremely comprehensive program, JOBS provided a more limited and specific set of services. Program resources were directed primarily at enhancing recipients= employability through education, training and job placement activities. The JOBS Program provided Medicaid benefits and child care subsidies, both during the time the mother received AFDC and for a year following her transition off of welfare and into employment. JOBS also sought to tighten child support

enforcement. Yet with no components intended directly to enhance the development of children, like early childhood intervention or parenting classes, the JOBS Program must be seen primarily as a one generational rather than two generational program.

The JOBS Observational Study: A Study Embedded Within a Larger Evaluation

Just as the New Chance Observational Study was embedded within the full evaluation of the New Chance Demonstration, the JOBS Observational Study has been embedded within a larger study examining the impacts of the JOBS Program. In fact the JOBS Observational Study is embedded within several layers of the larger evaluation of the JOBS Program, as can be seen in **Figure 1.**

The JOBS Evaluation. The outer circle of this figure shows the JOBS Evaluation. This study, funded by the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Education, is being carried out by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC). For this study, a sample of 55,000 individuals who had applied for or were receiving AFDC were randomly assigned to be in a control group or one of two experimental groups: a human capital development group, (in which participants were guided into educational activities as part of a longer-term strategy to enhance employability), or a labor force attachment group (in which job search and placement activities guided participants quickly into employment). The sample of 55,000 families in 7 JOBS sites is being followed for a period of 5 years in a study of economic impacts for recipients, with surveys occurring 2 and 5 years after random assignment, and administrative data available for the sample as well.

The JOBS Child Outcomes Study. The second circle on this figure shows the JOBS Child Outcomes Study. The JOBS Child Outcomes Study is the first national study of welfare policy that seeks to assess impacts on children. This study, being carried out by Child Trends, Inc., under subcontract to MDRC, is also funded by the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Education, with further funding coming from the Foundation for Child Development, the William T. Grant Foundation, and an anonymous funder. This study involves 3,000 families from the full JOBS Evaluation in 3 sites: Fulton County, Georgia, Kent County, Michigan, and Riverside County, California. Each of the participating families had a youngest child of between 3 and 5 at the time of random assignment within the JOBS Evaluation. Because the Family Support Act of 1988, for the first time, required mothers of preschool-age (rather than school-age children) to participate in a mandatory program to enhance economic self-sufficiency, it was considered particularly important to follow the development of these young children. The JOBS Child Outcomes Study, which is still ongoing, involves data collection at baseline (just prior to random assignment), and 2 and 5 year follow-up interviews. Data collection for the JOBS Child Outcomes study involves assessments of the children=s development, collection of interview data from mothers, and questionnaire data from teachers. The goal is not only to examine program impacts on children over time, but also to explore the ways in which any impacts come about. Thus, the interviews address such issues as the mothers= psychological well-being, social support, household composition, father involvement, difficult life circumstances, child care participation, family economic circumstances and parenting

behavior. Data from the 2 year follow-up for the Child Outcomes Study are now being analyzed. The 5 year follow-up is currently in the field. We note that having a complete record of impacts for children of both the JOBS human capital development and labor force attachment approaches will provide a critical benchmark for understanding impacts of new welfare policies for children.

The JOBS Descriptive Study. The third circle on the figure shows the JOBS Descriptive Study, a study carried out in a single site with the aim of describing the young children=s development and their families= circumstances close to the time of the mothers= enrollment in the JOBS Evaluation and Child Outcomes Study. In this study, we asked questions about such issues as the extent to which the mothers were at risk of depression close to the start of the evaluation, the children=s history of child care participation up to and then after random assignment, and the presence of protective as well as risk factors in the families, and the associations of these risk and protective factors with measures of the children=s development. For the Descriptive Study, in-home interviews were carried out with 790 families from the Fulton County site of the JOBS Evaluation on average 3 months after random assignment within the Evaluation. All of these families had a focal child of between 3 and 5 years of age at random assignment. The report of the Descriptive Study, *How Well Are They Faring? AFDC Families With Preschool Children at the Outset of the JOBS Program*, was published in 1995 (Moore, Zaslow, Coiro, Miller and Magenheim, 1995).

The JOBS Observational Study. The JOBS Observational Study is the bull=s-eye in the figure. This study is funded by the Foundation for Child Development, the William T. Grant Foundation, the George Gund Foundation, and an anonymous funder, with some of the pretest work funded by the Department of Health and Human Services, and some of the methodological analyses focusing on measures of the mother-child relationship funded through a grant from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. This study is being carried out by the same interdisciplinary team as has conducted the New Chance Observational Study. For a particular subset of 370 families participating in the JOBS Child Outcomes study, the JOBS Observational study augments the data collection efforts with sensitive and detailed measures of the mother-child relationship derived from direct observation of mother-child interaction as well as from interviews.

Methodology of the JOBS Observational Study

Sample

The subset of families from the JOBS Child Outcomes Study who participated in the observational study met a number of selection criteria. First, so that we would be able to relate the data from the observational study to the rich information from the Descriptive Study, the observational study sample was restricted to families in the Fulton County evaluation site who had participated in the Descriptive Study. The sample was further narrowed to families in either the control group or one of the two experimental groups of the JOBS Evaluation, the human capital development group. The sample also included only those families in which the focal child was 3 or 4 years old, the age range for which the observational study procedures were

appropriate. Data collection for control group families in the JOBS Descriptive Study was funded through the JOBS Observational Study, and started several months after data collection was initiated for the experimental groups. To eliminate the possibility of cohort effects, the Observational Study sample also included only those families from the human capital development group for whom data collection occurred during the same time period as did data collection for control group families.

The study sought a sample size of about 350 families, with about 200 from the experimental group and 150 from the control group. Power analyses indicated this sample size to be sufficient for the measures of the study to detect group differences in parenting behavior both overall and for baseline subgroups (for example, mothers who had and had not completed high school at baseline; mothers who had only one child or who had more than one at baseline). The larger sample for the experimental group would permit further within-group analyses.

Families in the Fulton County Site who met the selection criteria noted above were invited to participate in the observational study. Eighty-three percent of the families invited to participate agreed to do so. The final sample involved 370 families, 206 from the experimental group and 164 from the control group, slightly exceeding our sampling goal. Checks on the internal and external validity of the sample revealed no significant differences beyond what might occur by chance between those in the experimental and control group in terms of baseline characteristics; and further, no systematic differences between those families who participated in the observational study and families in the Fulton County site who were eligible to participate but did not participate in the observational study.

Table 2 shows characteristics at baseline of the 370 families in the JOBS Observational Study. As can be seen, the large majority (96.5%) of families in the sample were African-American. Most of the mothers in the sample had never been married (71.6%), most had received public assistance for two or more years (80.5%), and most were living in public or subsidized housing (70.5%). Yet it is noteworthy that a majority of the mothers in the sample had a high school diploma or GED (66.2%), that the mean age at first birth was beyond the teenage years (21.6 years), and that only a little more than a third of the mothers in the sample (35.2%) had been in families that had received welfare when they were children.

Waves of Data Collection

Whereas the New Chance Observational Study involved a single data collection point, about 21 months after random assignment within the New Chance Demonstration, the JOBS Observational Study involves two waves of data collection. The first wave of data collection occurred about 4-6 months after random assignment. During an extra home visit, mothers were given a brief interview, and mothers and children were videotaped engaging in a series of structured interaction tasks. The second wave of the JOBS Observational Study, which is now in the field, is being completed about 4 2 years after random assignment, when the children are between 7 and 9 years of age. We are again interviewing the mothers and videotaping mother-child interaction.

The decision to carry out two waves of data collection for the JOBS Observational Study reflected our concern that initial and later family adaptations to the JOBS Program might be substantially different. We hypothesized that the early months of program adaptation might involve stress, as mothers undertook new program activities, and children adjusted to new schedules and care situations. Such stress might be manifested in more negative patterns of mother-child interaction in the experimental group during the first months after random assignment. However we distinguished between two important subsequent pathways of family adaptation: such initial stress might endure, or might give way to positive family adaptations, particularly if JOBS participation eventually resulted in significant improvements in family economic status. Previous research on welfare-to-work programs indicates that it may take a period of years before economic impacts of such programs are realized by participants. Thus, the second wave of the JOBS Observational Study was timed to examine program impacts on parent-child relations after a period of years.

It is important to note that the findings that you have heard from the New Chance Observational Study are from procedures carried out on average 21 months after random assignment, while those that you will hear about from wave 1 of the JOBS Observational Study are from data collected in the first months after random assignment. In both studies, children were preschoolers, the age for which the observational study procedures were developed. However the findings for the first wave of the JOBS Observational Study are from a much earlier period of adjustment to the program. Thus, the contrasting findings for the two studies must be interpreted not only in light of program and sample characteristics, but also in light of the difference in timing of data collection.

Procedures and Measures

We focus here on the procedures and measures of parenting available from wave 1 of the JOBS Observational Study. The observational procedures used in wave 1 of the JOBS Observational Study are the same as those used in the New Chance Observational study, with only minor modifications. Thus, mothers and children were videotaped reading and discussing the book *The Very Hungry Caterpillar;* using blocks of different sizes to match a model; tracing a maze on an Etch-A-Sketch board; playing a word game involving getting the child to name as many objects as possible with wheels; sorting shapes on a sorting board; and presenting the child with a small gift. The slight differences in procedures between the two studies involved an easier version of the sorting task for the younger children in the New Chance Observational Study.

As for the New Chance Observational Study, the videotapes of mother-child interaction have been coded in two independent research laboratories. At the University of Minnesota, a team lead by Byron Egeland, Nancy Weinfield and John Ogawa rated the tapes from the point of view of the affective quality of interaction. At Harvard University, a team led by Catherine Snow, Jeanne De Temple and Patton Tabors coded the literacy related aspects of mother-child interaction.

Interview-based measures of parenting are available for participants in wave 1 of the JOBS Observational Study both from the Descriptive Study interview, completed on average 3 months after random assignment, and from the brief interview carried out at the time of the observational session, completed between 4 and 6 months after random assignment. Analyses to date have focused on the interview measures of parenting from the Descriptive Study interview. Accordingly, our description of measures will focus on the parenting variables available from the Descriptive Study interview.

As part of the Descriptive Study interview, the short form of the Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment, or HOME Inventory (early childhood version), was completed. The short form of the HOME is an adaptation for survey administration of Caldwell and Bradley=s (1984) measure of the home environment which relies on a combination of maternal report and interviewer rating items to describe stimulation and support available to the child in the home environment. Responses to each item are scored in a binary, yes/no format, indicating the presence or absence of risk for the child=s development in particular aspects of the home environment. The short form of the HOME for early childhood yields a Total Score and subscales for Emotional Support and Cognitive Stimulation. Use of the Short Form of the HOME Inventory permits us to relate our findings to those of a national survey, the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement, for children in the same age range.

While it is extremely helpful to be using a measure that can relate findings for our sample to those of a national survey, it must also be noted that the Short Form of the HOME has been criticized on several grounds. A first concern is that the binary coding needed for the risk summary score loses information that is actually available in the original response categories. Particularly in a study of program impacts, it may be important to describe differences between groups that are more subtle than the number of items reflecting environmental risk. A second concern is that many of the items, particularly those for the Cognitive Stimulation Subscale, require material possessions such as books and toys. It may be important, particularly in a low income sample, to measure cognitive stimulation provided in forms that do not rely on possessions. A third concern is that the two global subscales do not address clear and discrete constructs. The Emotional Support Subscale, in particular, combines items on such a range of issues as discipline, father participation in the child=s life, and TV viewing. Perhaps due to the range of content covered, the internal consistency reliability of these two subscales, and particularly the Emotional Support Subscale, as used in the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child Supplement, is fairly low. We note that while the Short Form of the HOME provides these two over-arching subscales, the full HOME Inventory, with approximately twice the number of items, provides multiple subscales with much greater clarity as to underlying construct.

To address these concerns about the Short Form of the HOME, and as one component of a broader attempt to improve survey measures of parenting[1], the JOBS Descriptive Study also

[1] The methodological work reported on here has been carried out as part of a larger project focusing on survey measures of parenting, funded by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (5R01 HD31056-03)

included new scales that modified, adapted and extended the HOME subscales. We will refer to these scales as the Aexploratory@ parenting scales. These scales include some items from the Short Form of the HOME, as well as new items that we hoped would be particularly appropriate for a low income sample. We note that the exploratory scales do not involve risk summary scores, but rather tap the full response range for each item. Accordingly, where items from the HOME Short Form have been included in the new scales, they are not scored in the same way.

Four exploratory parenting scales were developed for the JOBS Descriptive Study. The *Exploratory Cognitive Stimulation Scale* increases the relative number of items that tap forms of stimulation that do not require possessions, such as telling stories together. This scale relies on both maternal report and interviewer ratings. Two scales sought to distill out particular aspects of the broad domain of emotional support. The *Exploratory Warmth Scale* includes items measuring mothers= perceptions of the emotional tone of her relationship with the child, as well as interviewer ratings of interactions observed during the course of the interview. The *Exploratory Discipline Scale* includes maternal report and interviewer ratings of the use of different disciplinary approaches (e.g., spanking, yelling, reasoning), of consistency in discipline practices, and expectations of self control in the child. An *Exploratory Measure of Aggravation in Parenting* relies entirely on maternal report, and asks for the mother=s subjective sense of difficulty in the parenting role. This measure draws on items from the Parenting Stress Index (Abidin, 1990), adapting the wording as needed for low income samples, and includes new items as well.

Alphas for the HOME Short Form and Exploratory measures of parenting based on the larger Descriptive Study sample are presented in **Table 3**. While internal consistency reliability for the Exploratory measures is generally better than for the HOME subscales, it is not uniformly high, ranging from .58 (for the Exploratory Warmth Scale) to .80 (for the Exploratory Measure of Aggravation in Parenting). Recent analyses examining the predictive validity of the HOME Short Form Subscales and the Exploratory parenting measures within the JOBS Descriptive Study sample show that in a number of instances, the exploratory measures have better predictive validity for specific child outcomes (Zaslow, Oldham and Mariner, forthcoming).

The Observational Studies Team, having just completed the monograph reporting on the New Chance Observational Study, has only recently embarked on its analyses of the JOBS Observational Study data. Our analyses to date are restricted to an examination of the interview-based measures of parenting completed for the observational study sample as part of the Descriptive Study. Accordingly, I will be reporting on findings for the seven parenting measures from the Descriptive Study interview noted above: The HOME Short Form Total Score, Emotional Support Subscale and Cognitive Stimulation Subscale, and our Exploratory Measures of Warmth, Discipline, Cognitive Stimulation, and Aggravation. Future reports will focus on the observational measures.

Results

Our analyses address a series of questions. We ask first whether there were overall program impacts on the seven parenting measures we are focusing on, and if so how large the effects are. We then turn to the question of whether program impacts occur for all baseline subgroups, or rather whether they occur only for subgroups with certain characteristics. Next we look at individual interview items in order to ascertain whether group differences occur for maternal report items only, or also occur on ratings made by interviewers. Finally we ask whether our findings of group differences are attributable mainly to those who have already started to participate in some form of JOBS Program activity.

Are there group differences on the interview-based measures of parenting collected several months after random assignment? Table 4 presents adjusted means and standard deviations for the seven interview-based measures of parenting collected for our sample as part of the Descriptive Study interview, on average three months after random assignment. These analyses controlled for child age and gender, number of children in the family, family race/ethnicity, and maternal literacy, as had the New Chance Observational Study analyses examining program impacts.

Differences that were significant or that approached significance were found for three of the seven measures. Mothers in the experimental group had significantly lower scores than those in the control group for the HOME Total Score and HOME Cognitive Stimulation Subscale, as well as for the Exploratory Warmth measure.

What is the magnitude of these effects? Effect sizes were .40 for the Warmth Scale, .25 for the HOME Total Score, and .20 for the HOME Cognitive Stimulation Subscale. These effect sizes fall in the range defined by Cohen (1988**)** as small. Thus, while we see negative effects of for the human capital development group during the early months of JOBS Program, the effects are not large in magnitude.

Do the effects occur across baseline subgroups, or are the effects more delimited; found only for baseline subgroups with particular characteristics? A next important question is that of whether experimental-control group differences were widely significant across all baseline subgroups, or were found only for baseline subgroups with particular characteristics. For example, do findings hold whether or not the mother had completed a high school degree or obtained a GED at the time of enrollment; whether or not she had received welfare as a child; irrespective of how long she had been receiving welfare; whether she had only one child or more than one child at baseline? One hypothesis would be that these negative effects would hold particularly for those at greater economic and/or socioemotional disadvantage at baseline, for example, those mothers who had less education and lower literacy; who had higher depression scores and less social support.

Table 5(a-c) presents means for the experimental and control groups in light of baseline subgroups. We limit our attention here to the three parenting variables on which we found significant or marginally significant overall group differences, examining whether experimental-control group differences are significant *within* specific baseline subgroups (e.g., looking at

experimental-control group differences within the subgroup of mothers who had completed high school or received a GED at baseline; then within the subgroup of mothers who had not attained this level of education at baseline).

We do not see a pattern that would support the hypothesis that differences are concentrated among those at greatest disadvantage at baseline. It is noteworthy, for example, that the negative impacts are found for mothers at lower rather than higher depression, and for those who had obtained a high school diploma or GED. We see a pattern of impacts occurring for those subgroups of mothers who:

- *Were doing relatively well on measures of psychological well-being at baseline* (group differences on the parenting variables were significant within subgroups of mothers with lower depression scores, more social support, a more internal locus of control, and who had not moved a lot in the past two years);

- *Did not seem to be Amobilized@ to be working or attending school* at baseline (group differences occurred in the subgroups in which mothers reported no earnings at baseline, indicated that they had never worked full time for 6 months or more, and had been on welfare for a longer period of time. Differences occurred for those mothers with the least positive orientation to school).

- *At the same time, seemed in other ways to be appropriate candidates for a work or study program* (group differences occurred in the subgroups in which the mother *did* have a high school degree or GED at baseline, who had not received welfare during their own childhoods, who had the fewest barriers to working, and who had medium or negative attitudes about welfare).

Did differences occur only on the individual interview items that were based on maternal report, or did the items that relied on interviewer ratings also show differences? In the New Chance Observational Study, an important finding is that group differences occurred across measures that relied on different informants. Are the present findings of group differences attributable entirely to interview items that rely on maternal report? If so, perhaps the findings reflect an attitudinal or reporting tendency among mothers who have recently been required to fulfill the JOBS mandate. To examine this issue, we can disaggregate the parenting scales, and ask whether significant differences occur on items relying on maternal report, on items that rely on interviewer ratings, or both.

Table 6 notes the individual items within the Exploratory Warmth Scale and the HOME Cognitive Stimulation subscale for which there were significant differences. As can be seen, differences were found *both* for maternal report items and interviewer ratings. Thus, we cannot conclude that the findings are restricted to one informant or reflect response tendencies of mothers who have recently started the JOBS Program.

How do the findings on parenting behavior relate to mothers= program participation? Elsewhere we have presented evidence that already in the first several months

after random assignment within the JOBS Evaluation, there are significant group differences in maternal program participation as well as in use of child care arrangements (Moore, Zaslow, Coiro, Miller and Magenheim, 1995). Within the observational study sample, 58.5% of the mothers in the experimental (human capital development) group, but 18.3% of those in the control group were involved in an educational activity, job training, or employment activity when they were interviewed as part of the Descriptive Study.

In nonexperimental analyses (looking at group differences for subgroups that were formed *after* random assignment), we examined the pattern of group differences separately for those mothers who *were* and *were not* participating in some form of school, job training, or employment activity at the time of the Descriptive Study. Again we restricted our focus to the three parenting measures for which we had found significant or marginally significant overall group differences. Findings are summarized in **Table 7**.

Examination of the mean scores in Table 7 reveals that mothers in the experimental group, those who were engaging in some form of activity to enhance economic self-sufficiency as well as those who were not, showed numerically lower scores than their counterparts in the control group. However the lowest scores are those of experimental group mothers who had *not yet engaged in some form of work, school or training*. Indeed mean scores for the experimental and control groups differ significantly or approach significance within the subgroup of mothers *not* yet participating for all three of the parenting variables considered. By contrast, there is a marginally significant difference for only one of the parenting variables within the subgroup of mothers engaged in school training or work. We note, however, that for each of the parenting variables, the interaction of group and participation did not reach statistical significance.

Summary and Discussion

To summarize, we see evidence that in the first months after random assignment within the JOBS Evaluation, mothers in the human capital development group of the observational study sample show less warmth and less cognitive stimulation with their young children, according to interview-based measures of parenting. Differences, while significant, were small in magnitude. These differences occurred on interview items for which mothers as well as interviewers were the informants, indicating that response biases of the mothers do not account for the findings. Experimental-control group differences occurred within baseline subgroups of mother who may be described as appropriate candidates for a work or study program, and yet who did not seem to be mobilized to be working or attending a program at baseline. Finally, negative impacts on the parenting variables occurred most often among those mothers who had not yet started participating in some way in educational or employment activities. Thus, the findings appear to reflect on the sense of JOBS as a mandate, more than on family adjustments to new work, school or child care schedules.

Previous research would suggest that a pattern of initial *stress* during the early months of program participation might be manifested in an increased sense of aggravation in parenting, and perhaps also an increase in harshness of discipline. That is, stress would be associated with

increases in *negative* parenting behaviors and reactions to parenting. Yet our findings point to significant group differences on neither the Aggravation nor the Discipline Scales for the observational study sample. Rather, the pattern of significant differences that did occur suggests a withdrawal of *positive* energy from the parenting role. Perhaps mothers who felt subject to the JOBS mandate, particularly those who had not yet undertaken its requirements, were preoccupied and less available to their young children. An alternative interpretation concerns not response to the mandate, but rather self-selection: mothers who were not yet participating in JOBS activities despite the mandate may have been a group with initial characteristics that would predispose them to less warm and stimulating parenting behavior.

We are at a very early point in these analyses. These are findings that underscore the importance of following up, especially with analyses of the observational data. We do not know if the differences we have noted are temporary fluctuations in the mother-child relationship, or endure, even over the initial months of the JOBS Program. We have data both from interviews and from direct observations of mother-child interactions for the families in our sample from the observational session, which was carried out approximately 2 months after the Descriptive Study. With these data we will be able to ask if the group differences we have noted are a very brief Ablip@ on the screen, or continue, at least over the first half year of family response to the JOBS mandate.

The availability of observational data is particularly important. In the New Chance Observational Study, the broad pattern of findings was similar across observational and interview-based measures. Yet the observational measures detected group differences on behaviors that the interview measures could not measure (for example, in the *quality* of book reading, which interview-based measures cannot address). Further, confidence in the findings of group differences in the New Chance Observational Study increased when we saw that program impacts occurred for measures collected via direct observation of mother-child interaction, with raters who were Ablind@ as to group, as well as for measures collected via interview.

Even if we find group differences on observational measures from wave 1 of the JOBS Observational Study, we will still need to make the distinction between short and longer-term family adaptations. An initial period of difficulty in adapting to the JOBS mandate, even if it involves negative impacts on parenting behavior, could be the precursor to later positive family adaptations. Such positive adaptations within the family could occur, for example, if family economic circumstances eventually improve, or if mothers= psychological well-being is enhanced by schooling or employment. With data from the second wave of the JOBS Observational Study, we will be able to distinguish between early and later family adaptations to the JOBS Program.

References

Abidin, R. R. (1990). Parenting Stress Index-Short Form. University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

Caldwell, B.M. and Bradley, R.H. (1984). Home observation for measurement of the environment. Little Rock: AR: University of Arkansas at Little Rock Press.

Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

De Temple, J. (April 1997). Mothers= book reading with young children: An observational study within the New Chance Demonstration Project. Paper presented as part of symposium AMother-child relations in the context of contrasting programs for welfare families@ at the meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, Washington, D.C.

Moore, K.A., Zaslow, M. J., Coiro, M.J., Miller, S.M. and Magenheim, E.B. (1995). How well are they faring? AFDC families with preschool-age children in Atlanta at the outset of the JOBS Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.

Weinfield, N.S., Ogawa, J.R., Hennighausen, K. H., and Egeland, B. (April 1997). Helping mothers, helping children? Predicting child outcomes from mother-child interaction in the New Chance Demonstration. Paper presented as part of symposium AMother-child relations in the context of contrasting programs for welfare families@ at the meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, Washington, D.C.

Zaslow, M.J., Oldham, E., and Mariner, C. (forthcoming). Predictive validity of the HOME-Short Form subscales and exploratory measures of parenting in a low-income sample. Working Paper Series on Methods and Measures, Child Trends, Inc., Washington, D.C.

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF SELECTED FEATURES OF JOBS AND NEW CHANCE PROGRAMS

JOBS	NEW CHANCE
Population Targeted: Broad coverage of large segment of the welfare caseload	***Population Coverage***: Limited to young mothers who had given birth as teenagers and who had dropped out of school
Participation Mandate: Mandatory	***Participation Mandate***: Voluntary
Comprehensiveness and Nature of Program Services: Education, skills training, work experience, job search assistance	***Comprehensiveness and Nature of Program Services***: Education, skills training, work experience, employment preparation, career exploration/counseling, life skills instruction, family planning and health education, parenting education, personal and group counseling, pediatric and maternal health care
Parent/Child Focus: Primarily one generational	***Parent/Child Focus:*** Two generational
Scope of Implementation: All 50 states Programmatic implementation of national welfare legislation	***Scope of Implementation***: 16 sites in 10 states Demonstration project

TABLE 2

BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS OF JOBS OBSERVATIONAL STUDY SAMPLE

CHARACTERISTICS	PERCENT
African-American	96.5
Never Married	71.6
Has high school diploma or GED	66.2
Received AFDC 2 years or more	80.5
Received welfare as a child	35.2
Gave birth to > 1 child	73.8
Lives in public/subsidized housing	70.5
Functional literacy	48.2
Mean age at random assignment (years)	29.3
Mean age at first birth (years)	21.6
Mean age of focal child at random assignment	4.1
Depression score (CESD)	15.2
Number of life stresses previous year	3.3

SOURCE: JOBS Baseline data from Standard Client Characteristics and Private Opinion Survey forms. Sample size = 370.

TABLE 3

INTERNAL CONSISTENCY OF HOME-SF SUBSCALES AND EXPLORATORY MEASURE OF PARENTING

Measure	Coefficient Alpha	Number of Items
Total HOME	.56	26
HOME Cognitive Stimulation	.55	14
HOME Emotional Support Subscale	.32	12
Exploratory Cognitive Stimulation Scale	.65	12
Exploratory Warmth Scale	.58	6
Exploratory Discipline Scale	.69	12
Exploratory Measure of Aggravation in Parenting	.80	10

SOURCE: JOBS Descriptive Study Sample, N=790

TABLE 4

IMPACTS ON INTERVIEW-BASED PARENTING MEASURES

		Means		
	Standard Deviation	**Experimental**	**Control**	**p-level**
HOME-SF Total	2.67	16.72	17.36	.02*
HOME-SF Cognitive Stimulation Subscale	1.95	10.29	10.66	.07+
HOME-SF Socioemotional Support Subscale	1.44	6.47	6.69	.16
Exploratory Measure of Cognitive Stimulation	.46	-.04	.02	.18
Exploratory Warmth Scale	.52	-.03	.18	.000***
Exploratory Discipline Scale	.47	.04	.10	.19
Exploratory Measure of Aggravation in Parenting	.58	-.01	.07	.18

SOURCE: JOBS Observational Study Sample, N=370

NOTES:

All means have been adjusted for 5 covariates: child age, gender, number of children in family, race/ethnicity, and maternal literacy.

Means for Exploratory measures may be positive or negative because the individual items within each exploratory measure were first standardized to a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 before averaging.

HOME-SF means reflect the average number of items scored in the positive range, with maximums of 24.0 for the HOME Total, 14.0 for the HOME Cognitive Stimulation and 11.0 for the HOME Emotional Support subscales.

* p < .05
** p < . 01
*** p <. .001
+ p < .10

TABLE 5a
IMPACTS ON HOME-SF TOTAL BY BASELINE SUBGROUPS

Subgroup at Random Assignment	Experimentals	Controls	p for within group difference	p for between group difference
Full Sample				
Mean (SD = 2.67)	16.72	17.36		.02*
High school completion				.38
No Degree	16.64	16.95	.51	
GED/HS diploma/college	16.77	17.59	.02*	
AFDC during childhood				.11
No	16.75	17.69	.01**	
Yes	16.72	16.66	.90	
Welfare Duration				.92
Less than 2 years	17.43	17.92	.45	
2 years but less than 5 years	16.75	17.47	.13	
5 or more years	16.31	17.11	.06	
Current Housing				.86
Public Housing	16.58	17.05	.28	
Subsidized Housing	16.58	17.38	.13	
None of the above	16.98	17.71	.17	
Residential Stability				.43
No moves in past 2 years	16.79	17.23	.30	
One move in past 2 years	16.55	17.67	.02*	
2 or more moves in past 2 years	16.90	17.15	.70	
Earnings				.89
None	16.57	17.30	.02*	
Under $1,000	16.95	17.55	.50	
$1,000 or more	17.44	17.73	.75	
Work History				.81
Never worked full-time 6 mos or more	16.59	17.08	.31	
Has worked full-time 6 mos or more	16.82	17.46	.06	
Currently Working				.35
No	16.64	17.32	.02*	
Yes	17.81	17.51	.77	
Depression Index				.67
Rarely/Some/A little depressed	16.60	17.34	.02*	
Moderate amount/most/all days	17.25	17.67	.54	
Locus of Control				.81
Most internal third	16.68	17.52	.07	
Middle third	17.03	17.48	.36	
Most external third	16.37	17.24	.11	
Family Barriers to Work				.60
Lowest barriers	17.01	17.96	.05*	
Medium third	16.68	17.57	.10	
Highest barriers	16.57	16.89	.50	
Social Support				.18
Lowest support	16.28	16.98	.18	

Subgroup at Random Assignment	Experimentals	Controls	p for within group difference	p for between group difference
Medium third	17.10	17.25	.74	
Highest support	16.59	18.04	.01**	
Welfare Attitudes				.25
Most positive attitudes	16.41	16.77	.46	
Medium third	16.51	18.08	.01**	
Most negative attitudes	17.14	17.59	.32	
Positive Orientation to School				.80
Lowest orientation	16.58	17.17	.32	
Medium third	16.53	17.46	.05*	
Highest orientation	17.09	17.60	.32	

SOURCE: JOBS Observational Study Sample, N=370

NOTE: Means have been adjusted for 5 covariates: child age, gender, number of children in family, race/ethnicity, and maternal literacy

HOME-SF means reflect the average number of items scored in the positive range, with maximums of 24.0 for the HOME Total, 14.0 for the HOME Cognitive Stimulation and 11.0 for the HOME Emotional Support subscales.

TABLE 5b
IMPACTS ON HOME-SF COGNITIVE STIMULATION SUBSCALE, BY BASELINE SUBGROUPS

Subgroup at Random Assignment	Experimentals	Controls	p for within group difference	p for between group difference
Full Sample				
Mean	10.29	10.66		.07+
High school completion				.20
No Degree	10.20	10.22	.95	
GED/HS diploma/college	10.34	10.91	.03*	
AFDC during childhood				.14
No	10.30	10.85	.04*	
Yes	10.32	10.19	.72	
Welfare Duration				.75
Less than 2 years	10.77	11.38	.20	
2 years but less than 5 years	10.27	10.47	.56	
5 or more years	10.05	10.52	.13	
Current Housing				.95
Public Housing	10.14	10.45	.34	
Subsidized Housing	10.28	10.66	.32	
None of the above	10.46	10.92	.24	
Residential Stability				.08
No moves in past 2 years	10.59	10.44	.64	
One move in past 2 years	9.99	10.86	.01**	
2 or more moves in past 2 years	10.17	10.79	.17	
Earnings				.94
None	10.19	10.61	.07	
Under $1,000	10.50	10.66	.80	
$1,000 or more	10.66	11.03	.56	
Work History				.96
Never worked full-time 6 mos or more	10.11	10.44	.36	
Has worked full-time 6 mos or more	10.41	10.73	.21	
Currently Working				.84
No	10.26	10.59	.13	
Yes	10.47	10.96	.50	
Depression Index				.32
Rarely/Some/A little depressed	10.17	10.72	.02*	
Moderate amount/most/all days	10.64	10.65	.99	
Locus of Control				.90
Most internal third	10.08	10.64	.10	
Middle third	10.41	10.76	.34	
Most external third	10.39	10.78	.32	
Family Barriers to Work				.29
Lowest barriers	10.25	11.12	.02	
Medium third	10.24	10.67	.28	
Highest barriers	10.34	10.41	.83	
Social Support				.04*
Lowest support	10.04	10.31	.49	
Medium third	10.69	10.53	.64	
Highest support	10.04	11.29	.00***	

Subgroup at Random Assignment	Experimentals	Controls	p for within group difference	p for between group difference
Welfare Attitudes				.36
Most positive attitudes	10.15	10.38	.52	
Medium third	10.19	11.19	.03*	
Most negative attitudes	10.38	10.67	.39	
Positive Orientation to School				.88
Lowest orientation	10.23	10.50	.55	
Medium third	10.31	10.86	.11	
Highest orientation	10.19	10.68	.19	

SOURCE: JOBS Observational Study Sample, N=370

NOTE: Means have been adjusted for 5 covariates: child age, gender, number of children in family, race/ethnicity, and maternal literacy

HOME-SF means reflect the average number of items scored in the positive range, with maximums of 24.0 for the HOME Total, 14.0 for the HOME Cognitive Stimulation and 11.0 for the HOME Emotional Support subscales.

TABLE 5c
IMPACTS ON EXPLORATORY WARMTH SCALE, BY BASELINE SUBGROUPS

Subgroup at Random Assignment	Experimentals	Controls	p for within group difference	p for between group difference
Full Sample				
Mean (SD = .52)	-.03	.18		.00 ***
High school completion				.19
No Degree	.01	.31	.00***	
GED/HS diploma/college	-.05	.10	.03*	
AFDC during childhood				.85
No	-.01	.19	.01**	
Yes	-.05	.12	.10	
Welfare Duration				.99
Less than 2 years	-.00	.21	.09	
2 years but less than 5 years	.03	.24	.03*	
5 or more years	-.10	.12	.01**	
Current Housing				.38
Public Housing	-.03	.20	.01**	
Subsidized Housing	-.02	.08	.33	
None of the above	-.04	.27	.01**	
Residential Stability				.14
No moves in past 2 years	-.07	.15	.01**	
One move in past 2 years	-.03	.27	.00***	
2 or more moves in past 2 years	.08	.07	.95	
Earnings				.63
None	-.06	.17	.00***	
Under $1,000	.08	.13	.79	
$1,000 or more	.13	.30	.33	
Work History				.03*
Never worked full-time 6 mos or more	-.20	.17	.00***	
Has worked full-time 6 mos or more	.08	.19	.12	
Currently Working				.63
No	-.04	.17	.00***	
Yes	.12	.23	.61	
Depression Index				.17
Rarely/Some/A little depressed	-.04	.20	.00***	
Moderate amount/most/all days	-.00	.04	.78	
Locus of Control				.56
Most internal third	-.06	.22	.00***	
Middle third	.04	.18	.16	
Most external third	-.08	.08	.13	
Family Barriers to Work				.44
Lowest barriers	.09	.29	.03*	
Medium third	-.10	.19	.01**	
Highest barriers	-.05	.06	.23	
Social Support				.07

Subgroup at Random Assignment	Experimentals	Controls	p for within group difference	p for between group difference
Lowest support	.07	.08	.90	
Medium third	-.14	.18	.00***	
Highest support	.03	.29	.01**	
Welfare Attitudes				.97
Most positive attitudes	-.00	.17	.08	
Medium third	-.07	.13	.11	
Most negative attitudes	-.02	.18	.03*	
Positive Orientation to School				.52
Lowest orientation	-.07	.24	.01**	
Medium third	-.01	.16	.06	
Highest orientation	.03	.18	.14	

SOURCE: JOBS Observational Study Sample, N=370

NOTE: Means have been adjusted for 5 covariates: child age, gender, number of children in family, race/ethnicity, and maternal literacy

Means for the Exploratory Wamth measure may be positive or negative because the individual items comprising the scale were first standardized to a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 before averaging.

TABLE 6

IMPACTS ON SELECTED INDIVIDUAL ITEMS OF WARMTH AND HOME COGNITIVE STIMULATION SUBSCALES

	Experimentals	Controls	p-level
WARMTH			
Even when I=m in a bad mood I show lots of love (Maternal Report, range 0-10)	7.59	8.33	.02 *
Never too busy to joke and play (Maternal Report, range 0-10)	6.89	7.63	.04 *
Mother=s voice conveyed positive feeling about child (Interviewer Assesment, range 0-1)	.91	.97	.02 *
Mother caressed, kissed, or hugged child at least once (Interviewer Assessment, range 0-1)	.38	.47	.05 *
Mother spontaneously praised child for his/her behavior, looks or other positive qualities (Interviewer Assessment, range 1-3)	1.55	1.75	.02 *
HOME-SF COGNITIVE STIMULATION			
Someone has helped or is helping (CHILD) learn shapes and sizes (Maternal report, range 0-1)	.87	.93	.07+

SOURCE: JOBS Observational Study Sample, N=370

NOTE: Means have been adjusted for 5 covariates: child age, gender, number of children in family, race/ethnicity, and maternal literacy.

Means for individual items reflect scores prior to standardization.

TABLE 7

IMPACTS ON SELECTED PARENTING MEASURES, BY PARTICIPATION STATUS

	Experimentals	Controls	p for within subgroup difference	p for between groups difference
Warmth				.45
In School, Training, or Work	.04	.24	.07+	
Not in School, Training, or Work	-.13	.17	.000***	
HOME-SF Total				.76
In School, Training, or Work	16.97	17.68	.20	
Not in School, Training, or Work	16.39	17.30	.01**	
HOME-SF Cognitive Stimulation Subscale				.90
In School, Training, or Work	10.43	10.88	.28	
Not in School, Training, or Work	10.11	10.62	.06+	

SOURCE: JOBS Observational Study Sample, N=370.

NOTES: Means for Exploratory measures may be positive or negative because the individual items within each exploratory measure were first standardized to a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 before averaging.

HOME-SF means reflect the average number of items scored in the positive range, with maximums of 24.0 for the HOME Total, 14.0 for the HOME Cognitive Stimulation and 11.0 for the HOME Emotional Support subscales.

*** $p < .001$
** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$
+ $p < .10$

Figure 1

STUDY DESIGN