**TABLE A0.1**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Age Group** | **Variable** | **Control Mean** | **Exp. Mean** | **Section 8 Mean** |
| Teens | Tract % Unemployment | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.16 |
| Teens | Tract % on AFDC | 0.18 | 0.14 | 0.14 |
| Teens | Tract % Female-headed | 0.53 | 0.48 | 0.47 |
| Teens | Tract % Minority Race | 0.88 | 0.84 | 0.88 |
| Teens | Tract Poverty Rate | 0.4 | 0.33 | 0.34 |
| Teens | Tract % with College Degrees | 0.15 | 0.19 | 0.17 |
| Teens | Graduated HS | 0.56 | 0.51 | 0.56 |
| Teens | Attended College | 0.41 | 0.36 | 0.35 |
| Teens | Work full-time | 0.60 | 0.61 | 0.54 |
| Teens | Is a Parent | 0.64 | 0.70 | 0.68 |
| Teens | Has Been in Jail/Prison | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.23 |
| Children | Tract % Unemployment | 0.19 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| Children | Tract % on AFDC | 0.18 | 0.13 | 0.14 |
| Children | Tract % Female-headed | 0.54 | 0.46 | 0.48 |
| Children | Tract % Minority Race | 0.88 | 0.82 | 0.86 |
| Children | Tract Poverty Rate | 0.4 | 0.31 | 0.32 |
| Children | Tract % with College Degrees | 0.16 | 0.2 | 0.18 |
| Children | Graduated HS | 0.66 | 0.68 | 0.68 |
| Children | Attended College | 0.43 | 0.44 | 0.43 |
| Children | Work full-time | 0.51 | 0.58 | 0.53 |
| Children | Is a Parent | 0.20 | 0.18 | 0.20 |
| Children | Has Been in Jail/Prison | 0.20 | 0.2 | 0.18 |

The data presented in the table show that the groups receiving welfare vouchers have a lower poverty rate and unemployment rate compared to the control group. Moreover, the former presents a higher percentage of graduates, suggesting a more developed socio-cultural environment. Regarding the remaining variables discussed, it is found that the percentage of graduates among children is higher, while for adolescents the percentage is lower. After the treatment, a lower incarceration rate is observed for children; adolescents belonging to the Section 8 group are more inclined to commit unlawful acts.

TABLE A.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| AGE\_GROUP | MATCHED |
| ADULT | 0.120 |
| TEENS | 0.176 |
| CHILDREN | 0.184 |

The variable **MATCHED** is an indicator that verifies whether there is a correspondence between the participants in the experiment and their registration in the voter roll. The match is real and active if the value is equal to one; on the other hand, if the individual is not matched, the value is equal to 0.

From the table it emerges that such a match occurred successfully for adults in 12% of cases, for adolescents in 17.6%, and finally for children in 18.4%.

TABLE A.2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AGE GROUP | MEN MATCH RATE | WOMEN MATCH RATE | NA |
| ADULT | 0.318 | 0.116 | 0.185 |
| TEENS | 0.252 | 0.0906 | 0.166 |
| CHILDREN | 0.263 | 0.0961 | 0.170 |

Unlike the previous table, the present one also introduces the variable of gender, which illustrates interesting differences. About the male category, the matching rates are considerably higher: 31.8% for adults, 25% for adolescents, and 26% for children. Conversely, the female sample shows a lower matching rate across the different age groups: 11% for adult women, 9% for adolescent girls, and 10% for young girls. This difference is probably explained by the change of surname following marriage.

TABLE A.3

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AGE GROUP | MEN MATCH RATE (MEAN POSTERIOR) | WOMEN MATCH RATE  (MEAN POSTERIOR) | NA |
| ADULT | 0.956 | 0.973 | 0.961 |
| TEENS | 0.938 | 0.977 | 0.952 |
| CHILDREN | 0.938 | 0.980 | 0.943 |

The table shows greater reliability of matches concerning the female cohort compared to the male one.

TABLE 1

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| TREATMENT GROUP | MATCHED | EVERVOTE | VOTERATE | VOTEPOSTREG |
| CONTROL | 0.163 | 0.120 | 0.0381 | 0.343 |
| EXPERIMENTAL | 0.170 | 0.122 | 0.0381 | 0.331 |
| SECTION 8 | 0.158 | 0.113 | 0.0332 | 0.315 |

In this table, the treatment group is compared with four variables that are defined in relation to political participation in a broad sense.  
The first variable, already discussed previously, shows a lower matching percentage in the Section 8 group.  
The variable *evervote* refers to the expression of at least one vote over the course of the participants’ lifetime. Once again, the lowest percentage is found in the Section 8 group, at 11%.  
The voting rate appears with the same percentage in the experimental group as in the control group.  
Finally, the last variable describes voter turnout following registration on the electoral rolls. The highest percentage is found in the control group, at 34%.

**TABLE A3.1**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: Matched to Voter File | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Experimental group | 0.0067 | 0.0096 | -0.0478 | -0.0315 | 0.018 | 0.0279 |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0128* | *0.0122* | *0.0213* | *0.0233* | *0.0137* | *0.0134* |
| Section 8 Group | -0.0072 | -0.0079 | -0.0336 | -0.0222 | 0.0083 | 0.0075 |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0126* | *0.0135* | *0.0244* | *0.0276* | *0.0134* | *0.0138* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *400* | *400* | *235* | *235* | *754* | *754* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The table describes the effect of the Moving to Opportunity program on voter registration. The number of observations used to verify the match between participants and their registration in the electoral rolls amounts to 400 for adults, 235 for adolescents, and 754 for children. The first and third rows show the differences between the percentage of matches in the experimental/Section 8 groups and the control group. For the experimental group, adults show an almost imperceptible percentage; meanwhile, adults in the Section 8 group present a very small negative value, which is almost negligible.  
Adolescents in both groups show more marked negative values compared to adults, which means that the probability of future registration on the electoral rolls appears lower. Finally, children show more pronounced positive values compared to the other age groups, but despite this, they are not high enough to clearly indicate a real and concrete probability of future registration.

**TABLE A3.2**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: Average Turnout Post-Treatment | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Experimental group | -0.0016 | -0.0009 | -0.0188 | -0.017 | 0.0032 | 0.0072 |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0049* | *0.0047* | *0.0062* | *0.0068* | *0.0039* | *0.0038* |
| Section 8 Group | -0.0048 | -0.0045 | -0.0108 | -0.0061 | -0.0006 | 0.0003 |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0048* | *0.0051* | *0.007* | *0.0081* | *0.0038* | *0.0039* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *400* | *400* | *235* | *235* | *754* | *754* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The table assesses the influence of the Moving to Opportunity program on the percentage of people who voted after the experiment. Here as well, the values are very small, making it difficult to clearly determine the extent to which the program may have affected individuals’ future voting behavior. Adults show very small negative values, which do not clearly illustrate the program’s impact. For adolescents, the figures are also negative, but again negligible given how close they are to zero. For children, the values are positive, but still too small to draw any conclusion indicating a clear correlation between the program and voter turnout.

**TABLE A3.3**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: Ever Voted Post-Treatment | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Experimental group | 0.0013 | 0.0033 | -0.0507 | -0.0448 | 0.013 | 0.0214 |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0116* | *0.0112* | *0.0184* | *0.0206* | *0.0107* | *0.0106* |
| Section 8 Group | -0.006 | -0.0076 | -0.0371 | -0.0267 | 0.0099 | 0.0085 |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0118* | *0.0131* | *0.0201* | *0.0238* | *0.0108* | *0.0108* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *400* | *400* | *235* | *235* | *754* | *754* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The table evaluates the influence of the Moving to Opportunity program on the probability of having voted at least once.  
For adults and children, the values are negligible given their proximity to zero, making it difficult to assess the strength of the program’s impact on the probability of having voted. By contrast, for adolescents, the negative values are more pronounced, presumably indicating a negative effect of the program on the likelihood of ever having voted, both in the experimental group and in the Section 8 group.

**TABLE 21**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome girls: Matching to voter file/registration | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Experimental group | 0.0052 |  | -0.0543 |  | -0.002 |  |
| *Standard Error*  *Observations* | *0.0126*  *380* |  | *0.0233*  *95* |  | *0.0121* | *340* |

Within this table, it is possible to examine the voter registration match rate for the experimental group, but the analysis focuses exclusively on females. Adults show a very small positive value, which is even exceeded by the standard error, providing no clear evidence of an impact on the registration of adult women. For adolescents, however, the effect is negative, suggesting that relocation reduced the likelihood that girls will register to vote in the future. Finally, young girls show a value very close to zero, with the standard error being larger, making it impossible to deduce a clear impact of the program on this age group.

**TABLE 22**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: voting rate posttreatment, girls | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Experimental group | -0.0006 |  | -0.0244 |  | -0.0017 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.005* |  | *0.0069* |  | *0.003* |  |
| Section 8 Group | -0.0038 |  | -0.0149 |  | -0.0015 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0048* |  | *0.0078* |  | *0.0034* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *380* |  | *95* |  | *340* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This table shows the impact of the Moving to Opportunity program on the voting rate of girls after the treatment. Both the experimental group and the Section 8 group are considered here. For the adult age group, the value is negative but extremely small, both for the experimental group and the Section 8 group. This indicates that the program did not have a significant impact on the voting rate of adult women. As for adolescents, the values are also negative but larger compared to adult women, suggesting that the program may have had a negative effect on their voting rate. For young girls, the value is very small, close to zero, and therefore no clear impact of the program can be identified for this age group. It should be noted that the number of observations on which this evaluation is based amounts to 380 for adults, 95 for adolescents, and 340 for young girls.

**TABLE 23**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: predict ever voted posttreatment, girls | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Experimental group | 0.0037 |  | -0.0609 |  | -0.0034 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0116* |  | *0.022* |  | *0.01* |  |
| Section 8 Group | -0.0029 |  | -0.051 |  | 0.0057 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0118* |  | *0.0229* |  | *0.0111* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *380* |  | *95* |  | *340* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

In this table, it is possible to examine the impact of the Moving to Opportunity program on the probability that girls voted after the treatment. For adult women in the experimental group, the value is particularly low but positive. For adult women in the Section 8 group, instead, the impact is very low but negative. However, since the standard errors in both groups are higher than the program’s direct values, it is not possible to clearly determine the extent to which the treatment may have influenced voting.

For adolescents, in both cases the value is negative and larger in magnitude, which suggests that the program had a negative effect on girls with respect to voting after the treatment.

For young girls, we see that in the experimental group the value is very low but negative. Yet, since it is so close to zero, it is not possible to state that the program had a clear impact on voting. The same applies to the Section 8 group, where the value is positive, but still so close to zero that it is impossible to define the program’s impact on voting among young girls.

**TABLE 25**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: matching voter file/registration, Boys | | | |
| Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  |
| Experimental group | -0.0597 |  | 0.0353 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0293* |  | *0.0195* |  |
| Section 8 Group | -0.0315 |  | 0.0126 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0311* |  | *0.0181* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *110* |  | *384* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

With regard to the following table, it is possible to observe how the MTO program affected the match rate between participants and voter registration, this time focusing on boys. In this table, only two age groups are presented: adolescents and children. The number of observations amounts to 110 for adolescents and 384 for children.

For adolescents, both the experimental group and the Section 8 group show negative values. This suggests that the program likely had a negative impact on the probability of voter registration. In contrast, for children, the values are mostly positive, indicating that the program had a positive effect on voter registration for this age group.

**TABLE 26**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: voting rate posttreatment, Boys | | | |
| Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  |
| Experimental group | -0.019 |  | 0.0072 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0096* |  | *0.0062* |  |
| Section 8 Group | -0.0146 |  | -0.0025 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0103* |  | *0.0059* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *110* |  | *384* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

The following table shows the probability that the Moving to Opportunity program affected the voting rate after the treatment. The groups compared are the experimental group and the Section 8 group, and the age groups considered are adolescents and children.

For adolescents, we see that the impact is once again negative, both for the experimental group and for the Section 8 group. For children, the experimental group shows a value very close to zero, which does not suggest a strong impact, and the same is true for the Section 8 group. Although the value is negative, it is particularly close to zero, so the impact is not clearly defined — meaning it cannot be stated with certainty that there was an effect.

**TABLE 27**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: predict ever voted posttreatment, Boys | | | |
| Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  |
| Experimental group | -0.0575 |  | 0.0003 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0277* |  | *0.016* |  |
| Section 8 Group | -0.0369 |  | 0.0096 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0298* |  | *0.0163* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *110* |  | *384* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Finally, this table shows the extent to which the MTO program influenced the probability that boys have ever voted following the treatment. For adolescents, we see that the impact is negative in both the experimental group and the Section 8 group. For children, however, the values for both the experimental and Section 8 groups are positive but very close to zero, making it difficult to assume that the impact for this age group was significant.

**TABLE 41/45/49/53/57**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: matching voter file/registration, Baltimore | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Experimental group | 0.0183 |  | -0.1314 |  | 0.0346 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0377* |  | *0.0548* |  | *0.0423* |  |
| Section 8 Group | 0.0008 |  | -0.0193 |  | 0.0333 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0345* |  | *0.0968* |  | *0.0336* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *55* |  | *27* |  | *102* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Now, through these tables, it is possible to conduct an analysis related to the variables we have already discussed, this time introducing a new variable: the city. Specifically, this table focuses on the city of Baltimore. The total number of observations is 184, with 55 adults, 27 adolescents, and 102 children.

For adults, this first table shows how the results of the MTO program analysis affected the probability of being on the voter registry in Baltimore. For adults, both the experimental group and the Section 8 group show positive values, but they are both very close to zero, making it unclear whether there was a significant impact.

For adolescents in the experimental group, the value is negative and more pronounced compared to previous ones, suggesting that the program may have had a negative impact on voter registration in Baltimore. In the Section 8 group, on the other hand, the value is positive, though less pronounced than in the experimental group.

For children, the values are positive but rather small, making it difficult to determine whether the impact was strong enough to indicate a direct correlation between the treatment and voter registration.

**TABLE 42/46/50/54/58**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: voting rate posttreatment, Baltimore | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Experimental group | -0.0171 |  | -0.0397 |  | 0.0086 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0138* |  | *0.0186* |  | *0.0118* |  |
| Section 8 Group | -0.013 |  | -0.0044 |  | 0.0157 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0154* |  | *0.0345* |  | *0.0118* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *55* |  | *27* |  | *102* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The table shows the impact of the Moving to Opportunity program on the voting rate of participants in Baltimore following the treatment. For the adult age group, both the experimental group and the Section 8 group display negative values, which are quite close to zero, making it difficult to determine the extent of the program’s effect on this category.

For adolescents, the experimental group shows a negative value that is clearly larger in magnitude compared to adults. The Section 8 group, however, shows a value very close to zero, so in this case we cannot speak of a strong negative impact of the program on the voting rate of participants in Baltimore.

For children, we again find positive values, but since these values are very close to zero, the treatment does not provide sufficient evidence to indicate a clear correlation between the use of vouchers and relocation to lower-poverty areas and the voting rate.

**TABLE 43/47/51/55/59**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: predict ever voted posttreatment, Baltimore | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Experimental group | -0.0132 |  | -0.1254 |  | 0.0415 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0335* |  | *0.0515* |  | *0.0335* |  |
| Section 8 Group | -0.0147 |  | -0.072 |  | 0.0434 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0261* |  | *0.0831* |  | *0.0298* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *55* |  | *27* |  | *102* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This table, instead, shows the impact of the Moving to Opportunity program on the probability of ever having voted after the treatment. For adults, both in the experimental group and in the Section 8 group, we see negative values, but they are not high enough to indicate a strong impact, either positive or negative.

For adolescents, however, the values are higher in magnitude and negative, suggesting that the MTO program likely had a negative impact — in other words, it may have discouraged participants living in the city of Baltimore from voting after the treatment.

For children, the values are positive but very small, meaning that the program’s impact appears negligible.

**TABLE 41/45/49/53/57**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: matching voter file/registration, Boston | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Experimental group | 0.0015 |  | -0.0586 |  | 0.0227 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0341* |  | *0.0563* |  | *0.0275* |  |
| Section 8 Group | -0.0132 |  | -0.0994 |  | -0.0017 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0316* |  | *0.0561* |  | *0.0252* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *83* |  | *40* |  | *148* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Continuing with this table, we see that this one evaluates the match rate between participants in the experiment and their registration in the electoral rolls, considering the three age groups and the treatment groups, but this time in the city of Boston.

For adults, both the experimental group and the Section 8 group show particularly low values. For adolescents, the values are slightly higher but both negative, suggesting that the program likely had a negative impact on voter registration among adolescents.

For children, the experimental group shows a positive value — not too low but not very high either — making it unclear whether we can speak of a truly significant impact of the program on this age group. For the Section 8 group, however, the value for children is negative but very close to zero, meaning the impact is almost negligible.

It should also be noted that the total number of observations here is 271, with 83 for adults, 40 for adolescents, and 148 for children.

**TABLE 42/46/50/54/58**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: voting rate posttreatment, Boston | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Experimental group | 0.0062 |  | -0.022 |  | -0.0046 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0125* |  | *0.0166* |  | *0.0077* |  |
| Section 8 Group | -0.0055 |  | -0.0274 |  | -0.0035 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0087* |  | *0.0156* |  | *0.0076* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *83* |  | *40* |  | *148* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The table shows the extent to which the MTO program in Boston affected voter participation. For adults, the values are very close to zero. For adolescents, the numbers also show a negative effect — not strongly negative, but definitely greater than for the adult group. For children, the effects are very close to zero for both groups, indicating that the program did not have a clear impact on future voter participation.

**TABLE 43/47/51/55/59**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: predict ever voted posttreatment, Boston | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Experimental group | 0.0173 |  | -0.0506 |  | 0.0039 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0306* |  | *0.0396* |  | *0.0211* |  |
| Section 8 Group | 0.0006 |  | -0.0832 |  | 0.0125 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0287* |  | *0.0405* |  | *0.0216* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *83* |  | *40* |  | *148* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The table aims to show the impact of the MTO program on the probability of voting at least once after the treatment. For adults, the values are very close to zero, indicating that the impact was not particularly strong. For adolescents, the values are negative, meaning that the effect was negative and suggesting that the treatment may have discouraged adolescents from voting. For children, the values are positive but also very close to zero, making the impact negligible.

**TABLE 41/45/49/53/57**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: matching voter file/registration, Chicago | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Experimental group | -0.0109 |  | -0.0566 |  | 0.005 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0299* |  | *0.0501* |  | *0.032* |  |
| Section 8 Group | -0.0091 |  | -0.0563 |  | 0.0201 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0338* |  | *0.0602* |  | *0.0353* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *78* |  | *48* |  | *165* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

In this table, we once again examine the three variables for the three age groups and for the treatment groups, but this time within the city of Chicago, in order to assess whether there is any variation compared to the cities previously analyzed and those that will be examined later. The total number of observations here is 291, with 78 for adults, 48 for adolescents, and 165 for children.

For adults, both the experimental group and the Section 8 group show values that are very close to zero, indicating that the program did not have a clear impact on adult registration. For adolescents, both the experimental group and the Section 8 group show negative values, indicating a decrease in the probability of voter registration for adolescents following relocation.

For children, both the experimental group and the Section 8 group show positive values. For the Section 8 group, the positive value is more evident, though it is still unclear whether the program had a truly significant positive impact, as the values are not particularly large.

**TABLE 42/46/50/54/58**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: voting rate posttreatment, Chicago | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Experimental group | -0.0065 |  | -0.0262 |  | 0.0121 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0141* |  | *0.0163* |  | *0.0089* |  |
| Section 8 Group | -0.0098 |  | -0.0222 |  | 0.0067 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0146* |  | *0.0175* |  | *0.0098* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *78* |  | *48* |  | *165* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Here, the impact of the MTO program on the voting rate in Chicago is analyzed. For adults, both the experimental group and the Section 8 group show negative values that are very close to zero, indicating a minimal effect on adult voting rates. For adolescents, both groups show a negative impact — not as pronounced as observed in other cities, but still suggesting a decrease in voter participation. For children, the effects, although small, are positive, indicating a slight tendency toward increased future voter participation.

**TABLE 43/47/51/55/59**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: predict ever voted posttreatment, Chicago | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Experimental group | -0.0179 |  | -0.0547 |  | 0.0071 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0292* |  | *0.0539* |  | *0.0257* |  |
| Section 8 Group | -0.0017 |  | -0.0514 |  | 0.0159 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0367* |  | *0.058* |  | *0.0282* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *78* |  | *48* |  | *165* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Finally, for the last table concerning the city of Chicago, the impact of the program on the probability of ever having voted is analyzed. For adults, the values are negative but very close to zero, indicating that the program’s impact was minimal. For adolescents, the negative values are larger, suggesting that the program had a negative effect on the probability of ever having voted, meaning that relocation reduced the likelihood that adolescents would have ever voted. For children, the values are positive but very close to zero, indicating the absence of a significant impact.

**TABLE 41/45/49/53/57**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: matching voter file/registration, Los Angeles | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Experimental group | 0.0426 |  | -0.0384 |  | 0.0059 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0239* |  | *0.0376* |  | *0.0293* |  |
| Section 8 Group | -0.0037 |  | -0.008 |  | -0.0102 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0218* |  | *0.039* |  | *0.0269* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *90* |  | *61* |  | *175* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This table shows the effects of the Moving to Opportunity program for the city of Los Angeles. Specifically, these data illustrate the impact of the MTO program on voter registration.

For adults, the experimental group shows a positive but rather weak effect, suggesting a probable increase in registration, while for the Section 8 group, the effect is negligible and slightly negative. For adolescents, both groups show negative values that are very close to zero, indicating that, unlike in other cities, the program’s impact is not particularly pronounced.

For children, the experimental group shows a positive value, though very close to zero, while the Section 8 group shows a slightly negative value, making it difficult to draw a clear conclusion about the strength of the impact. Compared to previous cities, Los Angeles shows, at least for this variable, a less significant effect.

The total number of observations for Los Angeles is 326, with 90 for adults, 61 for adolescents, and 175 for children.

**TABLE 42/46/50/54/58**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: voting rate posttreatment, Los Angeles | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Experimental group | 0.0093 |  | -0.019 |  | -0.0024 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.008* |  | *0.0098* |  | *0.0081* |  |
| Section 8 Group | -0.0053 |  | -0.0042 |  | -0.0119 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0069* |  | *0.0102* |  | *0.0068* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *90* |  | *61* |  | *175* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The following table shows the impact of the Moving to Opportunity program on the voting rate in Los Angeles. For adults, the experimental group shows a positive but very low value, while for the Section 8 group, the value is slightly negative. The coefficients are very small, suggesting that the program did not have a clear impact on adult voting rates.

For adolescents, both the experimental group and the Section 8 group show negative values. The negative effect is more pronounced in the experimental group, indicating a slight negative impact and suggesting a decrease in voter participation for this group. In the Section 8 group, the value is very low, so the impact can be considered negligible.

For children, the effects are also very close to zero, indicating that the program did not have a clear impact on future voter participation. It is noteworthy, however, that in this case the values are negative, unlike in the other cities.

**TABLE 43/47/51/55/59**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: predict ever voted posttreatment, Los Angeles | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Experimental group | 0.0288 |  | -0.0598 |  | 0.004 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0205* |  | *0.0303* |  | *0.022* |  |
| Section 8 Group | -0.01 |  | -0.0136 |  | -0.0101 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0192* |  | *0.0322* |  | *0.0209* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *90* |  | *61* |  | *175* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This table examines the impact of the Moving to Opportunity program on the probability of ever having voted after the treatment. For adults in the experimental group, the value is positive, while for the Section 8 group it is negative. Since the values are not very large, it cannot be said that the program had a strong effect.

For adolescents, especially in the experimental group, the value is notably negative, suggesting that the MTO program may have had a negative impact on the likelihood of voting. This implies that relocation decreased the probability that adolescents would ever vote.

For children, the experimental group shows a positive value, but it is very close to zero. For the Section 8 group, the value is also very close to zero, but negative, making it difficult to draw a clear conclusion about the impact of the MTO program.

**TABLE 41/45/49/53/57**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: matching voter file/registration, New York | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Experimental group | -0.015 |  | -0.0031 |  | 0.0297 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0218* |  | *0.0453* |  | *0.0262* |  |
| Section 8 Group | -0.0084 |  | -0.0089 |  | 0.0068 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0234* |  | *0.0464* |  | *0.0285* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *94* |  | *59* |  | *164* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This is the last city to be analyzed in the tables. Here, we examine the impact of the MTO program on the voting rate for all three age groups in New York City. The total number of observations is 317, with 94 for adults, 59 for adolescents, and 164 for children.

For adults, both the experimental group and the Section 8 group show negative values, but these are very close to zero. For adolescents, the values are also negative, yet again very close to zero, making their impact negligible. Finally, for children, the values are positive, with the highest being in the experimental group, but these values are still not sufficient to draw a definitive conclusion regarding the impact on their future voter registration.

**TABLE 42/46/50/54/58**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: voting rate posttreatment, New York | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Experimental group | -0.0058 |  | -0.0005 |  | 0.0042 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0076* |  | *0.0119* |  | *0.0083* |  |
| Section 8 Group | 0.0052 |  | -0.0013 |  | -0.0047 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0095* |  | *0.0108* |  | *0.0072* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *94* |  | *59* |  | *164* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This table shows the impact of the MTO program on the voting rate across all age groups. For adults, the experimental group shows a negative value, although it is very close to zero. The Section 8 group shows a positive value, but it is also very low, providing no clear indication of the program’s impact.

The same applies to adolescents, where both groups show negative values that are very close to zero, making it impossible to conclude that the MTO program had a significant effect.

For children, the experimental group shows a positive value, while the Section 8 group shows a negative value. However, both values are too small to determine whether the MTO program had any meaningful impact on voting.

**TABLE 43/47/51/55/59**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outcome: predict ever voted posttreatment, New York | | | | | |
| Adults | | Age 13-19 at baseline | | Age 0-12 | at baseline |
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| Experimental group | -0.0144 |  | -0.004 |  | 0.0191 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0195* |  | *0.0359* |  | *0.0208* |  |
| Section 8 Group | -0.006 |  | -0.0063 |  | 0.0001 |  |
| *Standard Error* | *0.0208* |  | *0.0327* |  | *0.0215* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Observations* | *94* |  | *59* |  | *164* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Finally, for the last table concerning New York City, the impact of the MTO program on the probability that participants have ever voted following the treatment is measured. For adults, both groups show negative values, with the higher group displaying a slightly larger negative value, indicating that relocation did not significantly increase the likelihood that adults would ever vote.

For adolescents, the coefficients are also negative but very close to zero, meaning that the impact of the MTO program on this group cannot be considered significant.

For children, the values are positive, but so low that no increase in voter turnout can be attributed to the MTO program.

**APPENDIX 3**

**Matching voter file 🡪 Local poverty post-treatment**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Adults | Adolescents | Young Children |
| Local Poverty Post-Treatment | -0.0433 | 0.5706 | -0.1721 |
| *Standard Error* | 0.1394 | 0.2681 | 0.1374 |
| Observations | 400 | 235 | 754 |

In this table, the focus is on age groups and how the match rate between MTO participants and voter registrations may be influenced by local poverty post-treatment. For adults, a one-percentage-point increase in poverty is associated with a very small decrease of about 4.33 percentage points.

For adolescents, the relationship is strong and positive, meaning that a one-percentage-point increase in poverty is associated with a substantial increase in the probability of being registered. For this group, higher levels of poverty did not reduce civic participation.

For young children, however, a one-percentage-point increase in poverty is associated with a decrease of about 17.21 percentage points in the probability of being registered.

**Voting rate posttreatment** 🡪 **Local poverty post-treatment**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Adults | Adolescents | Young Children |
| Local Poverty Post-Treatment | 0.0273 | 0.2162 | -0.0235 |
| *Standard Error* | 0.0530 | 0.0803 | 0.0394 |
| Observations | 400 | 235 | 754 |

Here, the focus is on the relationship between age groups, local poverty post-treatment, and the voting rate. For adults, the impact is very small, indicating that local poverty did not have a significant effect on the voting rate.

For adolescents, the effect is positive, meaning that higher local poverty is associated with an increase in the voting rate.

For young children, the impact is negative, at around 2%, which is particularly negligible.

**Predict ever voted posttreatment** 🡪 **Local poverty post-treatment**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Adults | Adolescents | Young Children |
| Local Poverty Post-Treatment | 0.0036 | 0.6095 | -0.1370 |
| *Standard Error* | 0.1267 | 0.2370 | 0.1076 |
| Observations | 400 | 235 | 754 |

This table shows the influence of the neighborhood poverty where participants relocated and how it affected the probability of having voted at least once after the program. For adults, the impact is very small, indicating that local poverty had no measurable effect on their likelihood of having voted.

For adolescents, the effect is very large, around 60%, meaning that higher local poverty is associated with a substantial increase in the probability of having voted.

For children, the effect is negative, approximately 14%.