

# Research on Teen Parent Programs:

---



Program Impacts on Repeat Pregnancies and Births

Rebecca A. Maynard  
University Trustee Professor  
University of Pennsylvania  
March 6, 1998

# Experimental Field Tests

*Voluntary*

→ **Job Start** (\$6,000)

Emp & Training

Mixed Target Groups

★ ↑ **GED**

→ **New Chance** (\$9,000)

Teen Parents Only

Comprehensive Services

Family Planning & Health

★ ↑ **GED, HS, Emp**

*Mandatory*

→ **Ohio's LEAP** (\$1000)

Teen Parents only

Sanctions & Lim. Services

★ ↑ **HS, GED, & Emp**

→ **Teen Parent Demo**

(\$2,000 per year)

Sanctions & Services

Family Planning

★ ↑ **HS, GED, & Emp**

*Welfare Based*

# Family Planning: Variable Input and Output

## *Voluntary*

### → Job Start

Not program goal

No systematic services

### → New Chance

Core goal

Core Service

1 - 4 sessions per month

Case manager counseling

Referral to local clinics

## *Mandatory*

### → Ohio LEAP

Not program goal

No systematic services

### → Teen Parent Demo

Core goal

On-site workshops (2 - 100 hours)

Case manager follow-up

Referral to clinics

(sometimes co-located)

# Few Programs Help Postpone Future Births

## Measured Impacts (% Gains/Losses)

	<u>Pregnancies</u>	<u>Births</u>
<b>Job Start</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>New Chance</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>8%</b>
**San Jose	-12.4	—
<b>Ohio LEAP</b>	—	<b>4%</b>
<b>Teen Parent Demo</b>	<b>&lt;1%</b>	<b>7%</b>
**Camden	-8%	-5%
<b>★Elmira Home Visit</b>	<b>-43%</b>	—

# Common Features in More Effective Programs:



**Clear, unambiguous message**

**Build on teen's goals**

**Real family planning services**

**No celebration of births**

**Modest size case loads**

**Consequences for noncompliance with program guidelines**

# Health-Based Programs Show Strongest Outcomes



- Not tested in universal program setting
- More costly than welfare-based programs