

Education	Examples of Indicators Used	Outcome and Strength of Linkage
Neighbourhood affluence / level of education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neighbourhood affluence; home ownership rates; residential stability/instability; achievement scores; literacy of parents; median family income; availability of books in household.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some studies have found positive educational outcomes for students and children related to neighbourhood affluence and level of neighbourhood education. (<i>Beauvais &amp; Jenson 2003; Buck, 2001; Edwards, 2005; Ellen &amp; Turner, 1997; Erebus, 2005; Jencks &amp; Mayer, 1990; Kohen &amp; Hertzman, 1999 and with Brooks-Gunn 1998; Manski, 1993; Pebley &amp; Sastry, 2003; Tremblay et al. 2001</i>)</li> <li>• Noted as having a significant positive effect on drop-out rates of female students. (<i>Kling &amp; Liebman, 2004; Popkin, Leventhal &amp; Weismann, 2006</i>)</li> <li>• Other studies point to little or no effect of neighbourhood affluence. (<i>Currie &amp; Yelowitz, 1999; Jacob, 2003; Phibbs &amp; Young, 2005; Sanbonmatsu et al., 2004; U.S. HUD, 2003</i>)</li> <li>• Overall, findings are somewhat inconclusive: many authors stress that individual and family characteristics cannot be completely discounted, while others highlight incomplete knowledge of these linkages.</li> </ul>
Family income / level of educational attainment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motor and social development; neighbourhood affluence/poverty; family income; parent(s) education level; neighbourhood family structure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some studies have pointed to higher family educational attainment and income as associated with educational outcomes. (<i>Edwards, 2005; Kohen &amp; Hertzman, 1999; Peck, 2001</i>)</li> </ul>
Stability and Transience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Family income; number of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved educational outcomes arise from housing stability.</li> </ul>

	family moves; number of times children changed schools; tenure type; condition of housing.	( <i>Braconi, 2001; Kohen, Hertzman &amp; Brooks-Gunn, 1998; Cooper, 2001</i> ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of moves can affect likelihood of graduation and/or educational performance (<i>Braconi, 2001</i>)</li> </ul>
Tenure (owning versus renting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Success at school; family income; labour force participation; tenure; condition of home; civic engagement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive association with children’s educational attainment and home ownership in several studies. (<i>Braconi, 2001; Bridge et al., 2007; Crawford &amp; Londerville, 2004; Curtis &amp; Phipps, 2000; Mullins &amp; Western, 2001a; Rossi &amp; Webber, 1996; Steele &amp; Sarker, 2005</i>)</li> <li>• Some studies point to negative aspects, or lack of understanding of home ownership impacts for low-income households. (<i>Blunden, 2005; Mendelson, 2006; Peck, 2001; Rohe, Van Zandt &amp; McCarthy, 2001</i>)</li> </ul>
Housing Conditions (physical characteristics: overcrowding, density, physical condition of dwelling, noise levels, etc).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Child education performance; condition of housing; tenure; family income; educational services;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong evidence showing negative educational impacts from aspects such as homelessness, noisy homes, overcrowded dwellings, and living in poor housing conditions. (<i>Braconi, 2001; Cooper, 2001, Mullins, Western &amp; Broadbent, 2001; Mullins &amp; Western, 2001a; Phibbs &amp; Young, 2005</i>)</li> <li>• Evidence that good housing conditions are important for children’s educational outcomes, and can have repercussive effects (positive or negative) in other areas such as health and employment. (<i>Evans, Wells &amp; Moch, 2003</i>)</li> </ul>
<b>Employment and Skills Development</b>		<b>Outcome and Strength of Linkage</b>
Tenure (owning versus renting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on literature reviews.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of evidence and research showing clear relationship between employment/skills development and tenure.</li> <li>• Tenure is more indicative of SES and employment status than it is causative. (<i>Blunden, 2005</i>)</li> </ul>
Income structures and rent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education level; skills level; employment earnings;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research has found a relationship between income-related rent structures and disincentives to work. Referred to as a “poverty trap” by some, can penalize tenants for working, especially in lower-paying jobs. (<i>Hulse &amp; Randolph, 2004; Phibbs &amp; Young, 2005; Riccio, 2007</i>)</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of Jobs-Plus program in the United States highlighted positive outcomes for participants. Especially strong outcomes for women who participated in such endeavours. (<i>Bloom, Riccio &amp; Verma, 2005; Johnson &amp; Ruddock, 2000; Kramer, 2000</i>)</li> </ul>
Spatial Inequalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welfare receipt; neighbourhood poverty rates; job accessibility as jobs per job-seeker;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing location can have exclusionary effects on employment: areas of low-employment usually mean high-affordability, and areas of high-employment often have low-affordability. (<i>Allard &amp; Danziger, 2003; Dodson, 2005; DTZ Consulting, 2006; Hulse &amp; Randolph, 2004</i>)</li> <li>• Studies have highlighted that people are more apt to work if situated closer to work opportunities. (<i>Allard &amp; Danziger, 2003; Blunden, 2005; Ihlafeldt &amp; Sjoquist, 1998</i>)</li> <li>• A locational factor exists between housing and employment, but authors stress that other factors should also be studied in future work, such as transportation accessibility and concentration of poverty.</li> </ul>
Neighbourhood affluence / level of education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender of household lead; level of education; parental earnings; sibling income comparisons over time; labour market engagement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies have found few effects, either positive or negative, of high-poverty or low-poverty neighbourhood on labour or employment. (<i>Buck, 2001; DTZ Consulting, 2006; Engeland &amp; Lewis, 200; Erebus, 2005; Levy &amp; Woolley, 2007; Oreopoulos, 2003; Mullins &amp; Western, 2001a; Phibbs &amp; Young, 2001; U.S. HUD, 2003</i>).</li> </ul>
Stability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rental type (private or public); current employment status; living arrangement; education level; difficulty in paying rent; factors affecting decisions about employment; difficulties in finding employment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies have found positive effects of stable housing in unemployed tenants, inferring better chances or outcomes in finding employment. (<i>Hulse &amp; Randolph, 2004; Phibbs &amp; Young, 2001</i>)</li> <li>• Some evidence points to stability having positive effects for women, facilitating support networks and aiding in accessing the workforce.</li> <li>• (<i>Johnson &amp; Ruddock, 2000</i>)</li> <li>• Too little research on this issue at the moment to conclusively relate stability and employment.</li> </ul>