

## **INDEX**

Abeles, Ronald P., 220 Abt Associates, 173, 190, 230, 231, Acton, J. P., 151-4, 229 administration of housing programs, 204 of a social experiment, 43 see also individual experiments; Colorado Experiment Administrative Agency Experiment (ME), 190-202 administration, 195-9 costs, 199-202 evaluation of, 201-4 findings, 199-201 objectives, 190 sample design, 191-5 treatment variables, 190-1 administrative costs, 10, 58, 182, 200administrative functions, 180-2, 195, 200 enrollment, 181-2 error control in payments, 181-2 housing certification, 181-2 housing evaluation, 181-2 outreach function, 181-2, 195, 200 service to enrollees, 181-2 Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), 37, 48, 51-2, 99, 123 costs 52

Aigner, D. J., 228, 229 Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, 165 allocation formula, Demand Experiment, 169 Allocation Model, 149-51 design points of, 149-50 alternative electricity rate structures, 157 see also electricity rates Alum Rock Union Elementary School District, 16-17 American Health Profiles, 135 analysis of variance models (ANOVA), 149, 154, 211 Archibald, R. W., 227 Arizona Experiment, 158-9 see also Time-of-day pricing experiments Ashenfelter, Orley, 14, 226 assistance payments, 175 Atkinson, R., 230 Atkinson, Scott E., 159, 229 attrition bias, 34, 36-7, 138 Avrih, Marcy, 225

Ball, Joseph, 226 Barnett, C. L., 231 Battalio, Raymond C., 228 Barbar, Bernard, 220 Bawden, D. L., 223, 224 Benedick, Marc, Jr., 232



Index 244

biases, 35-7 Hawthorne effect, 35 Boggis, James G., 228, 229 Boruch, R. F., 5, 211, 218 Brook, Robert H., 227 Brown County, Wisconsin, 165, 178-Budding, David W., 232 Burbank, H. Donald, 229 Burchnell, G. H., 229 Burstein, Paul, 226 Cain, Glen G., 14, 218 Calhoun County, Iowa, 85 Calumet Research Associates, 89 capacity utilization, 152 effect of peak rates on, 152 Carey, Alex, 217 Carlson, David B., 201, 232 Carman, James M., 217 cash allowances, 174 see also Housing allowances Census, U.S. Bureau of the, see U.S. Bureau of the Census Census of Population and Housing (1980), 215Charleston County, North Carolina, 135, 227 Charleston preenrollment group, 129, Cicchetti, C. J., 228 Cogan, John F., 63, 222 coinsurance, 127, 129, 139 Colorado Department of Social Services, 97 Colorado Experiment 97, 210, 212, 225 Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), 103, 108 Conlisk, John, 221, 223 Conlisk-Watts model, 32, 52-4, 63-6, 83, 86, 134, 221, 227, 229 evaluation of, 75-7, 211 Connecticut Peak-Load Pricing Experiment, 148, 154, 156-8, 162 electricity consumption in, 163 participation in, 163 response effects of, 162-3 sample design of, 156 Connell, Terrence L., 218 consequentialists, 40

contracting agencies, 192-4 Contractors, 135 subcontractors, 135, 180, 185, 190 control variables, 15, 74-5 costs, 160, 182, 185, 190, 200, 207, 231 administrative, 58, 182, 200-3 alternative national plans, 207 cash housing allowance program, 190 - 1evaluation, metering, 160 housing repairs, 185 intake, 200-1 maintenance, 200-1 Council for Grants to Families, 54 covariance model, 131 cross-price elasticity, 132, 147 data collection, 198-9, 212 see also individual experiments data quality, 34-5 data reliability, 203, 213 Dayton, Ohio, 135, 227, 228 Deaton, Angus, 228 declining-block rates, 143-5, 151, 158 tariffs, 151-4 see also electricity rates declining tax program, 68, 80-2 deductibles, 226-7 Demand Experiment, 126, 209 see also Health Insurance Study; Housing Allowance Demand Experiment demonstration projects, 1, 10, 16-19, 18, 98, 160, 216 alternative to social experiments, 16 Denver County, Colorado, 97 Denver-Seattle Income Maintenance Experiment, 8, 40, 74-5, 79-83, 86, 92–4, 210, 212, 219, 222 administration, 89-90 allocation, 87-8 design of, 83-8 evaluation of, 95-7, 206-7 fertility, 93 health effects, 93 income effect, 94 life style of participants, 93 marital dissolution, 94 sample selection, 88 school performance, 94

see also utilitarians



Index 245

stratification process, 87 supply response, 66-7 support levels, 79-82, 87 tax rates, 79-82, 86 training subsidies, 86 treatment variables, 79-83 deontological school of thought, 41 Dickson, Donald E., 220 Dickson, William, 217, 232 Dikeman, Neil J., 230 Dong, Fred, 224 dowry effect, 35-6 Drug Abuse, National Institute on, see National Institute on Drug Abuse Duplin County, North Carolina, 85 Durham, North Carolina, 194, 198 earmarking, 167-71, 176, 178 econometric models, 1, 10, 13-16, 30economic behavior and social experiments, 205-10 elasticity, 14 cross-price elasticity, 132 price elasticities, 162, 228-9 substitution elasticity, 14 total-income elasticity, 14 Electric Power Research Institute, 228, 229 electricity, 142 consumer expenditures for, 146 consumption of, 147-8, 152, 160, demand equations for, 159 demand for, 142-4 rates, 143-6 supply aspects, 142 Electricity Council of London, 154 Electricity Council of United Kingdom, electricity peak-load pricing experiments, 142-63, 209, 212, 228 administration, 157 analytical problems, 144-7 Arizona Experiment, 158-9 Connecticut Peak-Load Pricing Experiment, 148 design of, 148-57 evaluation of, 160-3 findings, 157-60

load management alternatives, 143 Los Angeles Peak-Load Pricing Experiment, 148 objectives, 142-3 sample participation, 157, 161 sample selection, 209 time horizons, 209 treatment variables, 143-5 electricity rates, 143-6 declining-block rates, 143-5 flat rates, 143-5 inverted rates, 143-5 "life-line" rates, 143-5 off-peak rates, 146 peak-load rates, 146-50 three-part rates, 143-45 time-of-use/life-line rates, 143-45 time-of-use rates, 143-45 eligibility, 26, 33-4, 50, 56, 59-60, 64, 79–88, 99, 105, 113, 134, 152, 155-6, 161-3, 170-1, 173-81, 191-8, 209, 212, 220, 231 Elmore, Richard F., 220 Employment and Training Administration, see U.S. **Employment and Training** Administration Energy, U.S. Department of, see U.S. Department of Energy entitlement, see Youth Entitlement Program environmental changes, 24 governmental, 24 societal, 24 ethical issues, 37-43 ethics in research, 40-1, 220 European residential experience, electricity consumption, 159 Experimental Housing Allowance Program, 18, 21-2, 164-204, 209 design elements, 170 integrated analysis of, 165 participation, 200, 208 requirements, 200 supportive services, 198, 200 see also individual housing allowance experiments

Fair, Jerilyn, 219, 220, 221, 222 family type, 83 Farkas, George, 226



Index 246

Federal Energy Agency, 160-1 fee-for-service system (FFS), 125-6, 129, 135, 226 Ferber, Robert, 217, 219 finite selection model, 134, 150-2, 227 Fitchburg, Massachusetts, 135, 227 Foel, W. K., 228 Ford Foundation, 99 Franklin County, Massachusetts, 135, Friedman, Joseph, 230 Gary Negative Income Tax Experiment, 79, 82–4, 89–94, 219–20 administration, 89-90 attrition rate, 84 design of, 83-86 eligibility requirements, 79 evaluation of, 95-97

findings, 92-95, 206-7 Hawthorne effect in, 84 labor supply response, 85 sample allocation, 83, 84 sample design, 83-4 treatment variables, 79-83 General Accounting Office, U.S., see U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) Georgetown County, South Carolina, 135, 227 Gerould, David M., 226 graduated stress, 209 Graham, Nancy L., 225 Granger, C. W. J., 228, 229 Green Bay, Wisconsin, 180 see also Brown County, Wisconsin Groeneveld, Lyle P., 225 Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound (GHC), 129, 135-6 control groups, 130 demographic characteristics, 131-2 health expenditures, 132 objectives, 130-1 guaranteed minimum income program, 12 - 16

effect on labor supply, 13

experiments

see also income maintenance

perceived duration by workers, 12-13

Hall, Arden, 224 Halsey, Harlan I., 219 Hamilton, William L., 231, 232 Hannan, Michael T., 225 Harrar, W. S., 223, 224 Hausman, Jerry A., 219, 228, 232 Hawthorne effect, 6, 35, 84, 130 Head Start, 20 health definitions of, 132-3, 227 health care demand models, 132-3 Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), U.S. Department of, see U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 78, 97 Health Insurance Study, 3, 21-2, 35, 125-41, 206, 212 administration, 135-8 attrition bias, 36-7, 138 community effects, 36 Conlisk-Watts Model, 134 cost, 136 cost function for, 134 description of plans, 128-9 design, 133-5 dowry effect in, 35-6 evaluation of, 139-41, 212-13 findings, 138-9 finite selection model, 134 response rates, 136-8 sample number, 133-4 site selection, 134 time horizon effects, 36 treatment variables, 127-33 Heckman, James, 14 Heinberg, John D., 232 Hershey, Alan M., 225 Hester, J., 228 Hieronymous, William H., 229 Holden, Constance, 220 Holshouser, William L., Jr., 231, 232 homothetic separability, 146 Horner, David, 222 Hotchkiss, Charles M., 231 households, 171 definition of, 171 elderly, 197 minority, 197-8 see also eligibility housing, 164-204



Index 247

allowance payments, 176, 178	185, 207–9
certification, 181–2	participation rate, 208
demand for, 165-77, 185, 203	see also cash allowances
discrimination, 182	Housing and Urban Development, U.S.
expenditures, 175-6, 182	Department of, see U.S.
price elasticities for, 176	Department of Housing and Urban
rents, 166-8, 170-2, 175-6, 183-6	Development
repair costs, 185, 189	housing-gap formula, 167-9
representative sites, 177–8	of the Demand Experiment, 178
saturation, 177	Huettner, David A., 230
standards, 175, 185, 197-9, 208	Hughes, William R., 229
supply of, 165, 203-4	
vacancy rates, 178-80, 190, 192-4	Illness episode, 132
Housing Allowance Demand	Income, 90, 96, 171
Experiment, 165, 167–76, 178,	break-even level, 91
191, 202–4, 209	data errors, 219
administration, 169–74	definition of, 90, 171
earmarking constraint, 168-70	farm income, 90
findings, 174–7	monthly reporting system, 97
housing gap, 172	reporting of, 91
minimum standards of, 168, 178	self-employment income, 90
percentage of rent in, 172	see also income effect, income
sample design, 170	maintenance experiments, income
sample selection, 169–73	maintenance program
treatment cells, 168-9, 172	income effect, 12, 36
treatment variables, 168-9	contamination of treatment process,
Housing allowance Office (HAO), 180-	37
81	spillover effects, 37
Housing Allowance Supply	income maintenance experiments, see
Experiment, 21, 46, 165, 170,	individual experiments; income
17790	maintenance program; negative
administration, 180-2	income tax experiments
design of, 178-9	income maintenance program, 29, 36,
direct effect of, 187-8	90, 218
effect on housing, 183	informed consent, 42
effect on participants, 183	Institute for Research on Poverty,
enrollment in, 180-1	University of Wisconsin, 49, 54,
findings, 183–90	58, 110
housing conditions in, 178–9	integrated analysis of housing allowance
income transfers, 183	experiments, 166-7, 202-3
market intermediaries, 177, 183, 186	interdisciplinary approach, 30
objectives, 177	• • •
participation rate, 202	Jacksonville, Florida, 190-1, 193, 196,
populations in, 178–9	200
racial integration in, 178–9	judgmental elements, 211
rent increases, 183-4	
residential mobility, 177, 183, 186-7	Kant, Immanuel, 41
site selection, 178–9	Kasulis, Jack J., 230
supply response, 177, 183-6	Keeley, Michael C., 222, 223, 225
housing allowances, 164-7, 176, 178,	Kehrer, Kenneth C., 84-5, 223, 224



Index 248

Kelling, G. L., 218 Kennedy, Stephen, 230 Kershaw, David, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223 Kurz, M., 223 labor force experiments, 98 see also income maintenance program labor force participation, 9, 31 in the New Jersey Experiment, 61-3 in other negative income tax experiments, 91-7 in the Supported Work Program, 111 labor supply response, 15, 52-3, 58-61, 92-5, 206-7, 209-10 base for analyses, 66 by ehtnic groups, 61, 64, 72-74, 94 estimation of, 68-9, 75 see also individual negative income tax experiments Law Assistance Administration (U.S.). Lawrence, Anthony, 229, 230 Leveson, L., 228 load alternatives, 143 load factor, 158 load management, 143 load response, 148 longitudinal operation, 210-11 headaches of, 33-4 Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, 157 employee training, 157 Los Angeles Peak-Load Pricing Experiment for Electricity, 148-55, 158 - 60allocation model, 149-51 design of, 148-9 electricity consumption in, 152 load response, 148 objective, 148 peak/off-peak rates, 149-50 sample selection, 152 Lowry, Ira S., 231 Lyall, Katherine C., 219, 221

McDonald, John F., 220, 224 McFadden, Daniel, 230 Macmillan, Jean, 231 Mahoney, B. S., 218

Mahoney, W. M., 218 Maloy, Charles M., 232 Mamer, John, 218 Mandel, Sheila, 226 Manning, Willard G., Jr., 159, 229 Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC), 99, 101-3, 109, 115, 121 Mararka, Burma, 223 Maricopa County, Arizona, 165 marital dissolution, 94-5, 207 Marner, John, 218 Mathematica, Inc., 54-5, 58, 65, 135 Mathematica Policy Research, 97, 110 Mayo, Stephen K., 230 medical expenditures, 132, 138-9 variance of, 138 Medicare, 227 Metcalf, Charles E., 220 metering costs, 160 Mitchell, Bridger M., 229 model cities, 83 model housing, 164 model housing codes, 181 Moffitt, Robert A., 220, 224 Morris, Carl, 152, 227, 229 see also finite selection model moving behavior, 94, 176, 187, 225, 230

Muellbauer, John, 228 multidisciplinary approach, 30 National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects, 41 national health insurance plan, 139-40 cost of, 139 National Institute on Drug Abuse, 225 National Opinion Research Center (NORC), 135, 173 National Urban League, 174 negative income tax (NIT) 7, 48-51, 65, 209-16 labor supply response to, 209-10 see also individual experiments negative income tax experiments, 10, 21, 30, 46, 78, 92–3, 206–7 eligible household participation, 206, 210, 214, 216 see also individual experiments New Jersey Negative Income Tax

Experiment, 7, 24-5, 32, 37, 46,



Index

249

48-79, 89, 91-3, 95, 210, 219, Phoenix, 230 see also Maricopa County, Arizona 222, 223 administration, 54-8, 89 Phoenix Experiment, 173-6 Phoenix Urban League, 173 cost, 58 economic conditions, 65 physician capacity utilization survey, ethnic composition, 60 evaluation of, 7, 63-6, 78, 210, 213 Pittsburgh, 173-6, 230 findings, 61-6, 206-7 see also Allegheny County, labor force participation, 62–6 Pennsylvania Pittsburgh Urban League, 173 labor supply response by ethnic Pocahontas County, Iowa, 85 groups. 61-2, 64, 66, 75 management problems of, 46-7, 54-Poirier, D. J., 228 Policy Development and Research, Office of, see U.S. Department of representativeness, 7, 64, 217-18 response results, 58-60 Housing and Urban Development sample design, 7, 51, 217-18 policy formation, 2 sample selection, 58-60 see also individual U.S. departments; Pollak, Robert A., 228 sample size, 65-6 support level, 50-4, 56, 62-3, 69-74 poverty level, 83, 221 tax rate, 50-4, 56, 62-3, 69-74 prepaid group practice, 125-6 treatment variables, 50-4, 62-3, 69price effects, 147–8, 162 price elasticities, 162 New York Times, 40, 220 see also elasticity public housing, 164 Newhouse, J. P., 133, 219, 227, 228 Nixon, Richard M., 24 Public Utilities Commission, 156 Northeast Utilities, 156 Northwest Council for Families (NCF), Rand Corporation, 135-7, 157, 179-81, 227, 229, 230, 231 Rasmussen, Roger L., 218 Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), rate schedules, 158 17, 49, 78, 135 alternative rate structures, 157 Orcutt, Alice G., 221 declining-block, 158 time-of-day, 158-9, 163 Orcutt, Guy H., 221 recruitment, 33, 58-60, 85-8, 105-8, out-of-pocket expenses, 129, 133, 139 114-18, 133-7, 152, 156-7, 171-5, 180-1, 191-5, 208, 212-13 Palmer, John L., 223, 224 Patterson-Passaic, 58-60, 221 Rees, Albert, 10-11, 218, 220, 221, see also New Jersey Experiment 222, 223 rent, 167-72, 183-85 payments system, 55 peak consumption, 146 repair costs of housing, 185, 189 peak-load pricing, 142-50 residential mobility, 94, 177, 183, 186definition of, 142 demand curves of, 149 response behavior, theoretical model of, design of, 149 10-13, 66-77 household response to, 158-63 response effects, 29-31 rates, 146-50, 152 estimation of, 66-77 Pechman, Joseph A., 218, 221, 223, response variables, 211 responsive services, 198-99 peer support, 209 Riecken, Henry W., 217, 218 Peoria, Illinois, 190-3, 200 Rivlin, Alice, 20-1, 218 Phipps, A., 230 Robins, Philip K., 219, 223, 224



Index 250

Ross, Heather, 221 Rossi, Peter H., 219, 221 Rural Experiment, 78-9, 82, 86, 90-7, administration, 90-1 accounting system, 96 evaluation of, 95, 213-14 guarantee levels, 96, 214 labor supply response, 96, 213 publicity, 214-15 reliability of data, 95, 214 reporting arrangement for, 90-1 response rates, 86-7 sample design, 86-7 treatment variables, 79-81 Salem, Oregon, 192, 195, 200 sample allocation, 31-3, 53, 211, 223, 230 San Bernadino, California, 190-1, 193 saturation sampling, 21 Scranton, Pennsylvania, 58-60 seasonal rate experiment, 150 Seattle, Washington, 135, 227 see also Denver-Seattle Experiment self-selection mechanism, 65 Shanley, Michael G., 231 simulation models, 1, 19 Slutsky condition of symmetry, 146 Slutsky-type demand function, 67 socialized medicine, 125 Solnick, Loren, 226 South Bend, Indiana, 184-7 Spiegelman, Robert G., 218, 223 spline series, 69 Springfield, Massachusetts, 192, 198 Stephenson, Stanley P., 224 stock-adjustment model, 176 Stokes, Houston F., 220 Stucker, James P., 184 Struyck, Raymond J., 232 substitution effects, 12, 127, 147 substitution elasticity, 14 substitution response, 159 price-induced, 159

Roethlisberger, Fritz J., 217

Rosen, Harvey J., 232

98-111, 114, 123, 208-9 AFDC women, 99-111 alcoholics, 99-111 cost-benefit analysis, 111-12 demographic characteristics, 105-8 design of, 100-3 effects of, 108-12 evaluation of, 111-12, 122-4, 208-9 ex-offenders, 99-111 findings of, 108-12 former drug addicts, 99-111 graduated stress, 100 labor force participation, 111 mentally ill, 99-111 out-of-school youth, 99-111 peer support, 100 recruitment sources, 114 response rates, 111 sites, 102-3, 122 special characteristics, 100 sponsoring agencies, 101-3 supervision, 100-1 target groups, 101-3 terms of participants, 101 Survey of Economic Opportunity (SEO), 13

target population, 20 tariffs, 151-4 declining-block, 151-4 flat-rate, 151-4 seasonal, 151-4 time-of-day, 151-4 tax rate, 48-9, 53, 68-9, 206-7 break-even point, 63, 92 effects of, 53, 62-3, 93, 222 Taylor, Lester D., 159, 229 Temple, Frederick T., 194 time horizons, 161, 209 time-of-day prices, 159, 163 response to, 159 time-of-day pricing experiments, 142administration, 157 analytical problems, 144-8 consumer expenditures, 146 customer preferences, 158 design of, 148-57 economic theory, use of, 146-7 evaluation of, 160-3, 209

Sudman, Seymour S., 219

support level, 48-9, 207

supply response in housing market, 165

Supported Work Program (SWP), 3,



Index 251

findings, 157-63 rate schedule, 158 response to, 144, 147, 150-1, 157-63 short-run/long-run effects of, 144 treatment variables, 143-4 Timpane, P. Michael, 218, 221 Tobin, James, 221 Tobit Model, 69 transfer program simulation model (TRIM), 202 transitory demand, 130 treatment combinations, 53 treatment variables, 28-9, 53 Trenton, New Jersey, 58, 221 see also New Jersey Experiment Tulsa, Arizona, 190-4, 200 see also Administrative Agency Experiment; Arizona Experiment Tuma, Nancy B., 225

United Kingdom Experiment, 159, 229 Urban Development Services, 90 Urban Institute, 167, 202-3, 232 urban renewal, 164 U.S. Bureau of the Census, 169, 221 U.S. Department of Energy, 143 U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), 78, 97, 221 U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 164, 171, 180, 190, 225, 230, 231 Office of Policy Development and Research, 171 U.S. Employment and Training Administration, 225 U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO), 40, 220 utilitarians, 40 see also consequentialists utility theory, 74

wage rates, 68, 206 Wales, Terence J., 228 Water and Power, Los Angeles Department of, see Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Watts, Harold W., 11, 14, 218, 220, 221, 222, 223, 227, 229 see also Conlisk-Watts model Weiler, Daniel, 218 Weiss, Yoram, 224 Welch, Finis, 224 West, Richard W., 218, 224 Westat, Inc., 161 Williams, K. N., 227 Williams, Robert G., 225 Williams, Walter, 220 Wisconsin Experiment, 158 Wise, David A., 219, 232 within-site variances, 134 Wolfe, Marian L., 232 Work Incentive Program, 108 work sponsor, 121 World Health Organization (WHO), 132

Vandenbrink, Donna C., 224 voucher system, 16

YMCA, 103
Youth Entitlement Demonstration, see
Youth Entitlement Program
Youth Entitlement Program, 98, 112–
24, 206
design of, 113–14
drop-out youths, 114–19
evaluation of, 119–24
follow-up interviews, 123
job creation, 118–19
nonentitlement sites, 119
recruitment, 114–18
site selection, 124
types of enrollees, 114–15
work time, 120