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To assess whether the three study groups are similar at baseline, we examine them with respect to baseline measures of several key variables listed in the Aims document. We used several hypothesis tests that we will outline here. The Pearson's $\chi^{2}$ test of independence is used to test the null hypothesis that there is no association between two categorical variables. In cases where the contingency tables had low cell counts, we sometimes use Fisher's exact test, which tests the same null hypothesis as the $\chi^{2}$ test of independence, but uses the exact distribution to calculate $p$-values. For variables that are ordinal, we used the proportional odds likelihood ratio test, which has more power to detect trends than the $\chi^{2}$ test because it makes use of the ordering in the ordinal variable. The Kruskal-Wallis test tests the null hypothesis that, for a continuous variable, the central tendency is the same in different groups. It is the nonparametric counterpart to the familiar one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), meaning that it does not require that the continuous variable be normally distributed.

We did not perform tests on awbq12, the number of jobs the mother held, because there was so little variation, that is, almost everyone had job, that the three treatment groups are automatically similar with respect to this variable. There was an exceptionally low response for awbq16a, awbq16b, and awbq16c, that was in some cases due to skip patterns, that any test results would be unreliable. For the public assistance variables, we did not test the variables with very low variability. Information about these variables can be found in Tables 1 and 2.

The Pearson's $\chi^{2}$ test statistic for the variable awbq06, which is current marital status, is undefined because some of the cell counts are zero. The $p$-value for the Fisher's exact test is 0.26 . The variable called "marital" is a collapsed version of awbq06 that appears after awbq06 in Table 4.

The table of frequencies for race and study group had small expected counts, so that the $\chi^{2}$ test of independence may not be appropriate (although this is debated in the literature). For this reason, we present the Fisher's exact test, which had a $p$-value of 0.425 .

All of the tests we conducted did not reject the null hypothesis at the 0.05 level, with the exception of income, whose $p$-value was 0.027 . This low $p$-value could only be due to the large number of tests. (For a type-I error rate of 0.05 , one would expect about one in every twenty tests to reject the null hypothesis when it is really true.) The income differences among the three groups was mainly due to the No Book group having fewer people in the lowest income category and more people in the highest income category than the VU Book group. Since this difference does not favor the experimental book group, one can be confident in attributing potential outcome differences to the experimental treatment. Overall, the three groups are similar with respect to the variables we tested. One purpose of randomization is to achieve group balance for all confounding variables, even those that are unknown to influence the outcomes.

Table 1: Employment and Income Variables

4 Variables 198 Observations

```
~
    n
11 job (87, 94%), 2 2 jobs (6, 6%)
awbq16a : Do anything else 4 pay (babysittg etc.)?
    n
O No (21, 81%), 1 Yes (5, 19%)
awbq16b : Hours of alt. work (16a) in past 7 days
    n missing 
0(2, 40%), 5.5 (1, 20%), 27.5 (1, 20%), 36 (1, 20%)
awbq16c : Hrly rate: alt. work (16a)- past 7 days
    n missing 
0(2, 40%), 2.35999989509583 (1, 20%), 6 (1, 20%), 10(1, 20%)
```

Table 2: Public Assistance Variables

4 Variables 198 Observations

0 No (195, 99\%), 1 Yes (2, 1\%)
awbq18d : Do you receive Veteran benefits?
$\begin{array}{rrr}\text { n } & \text { missing } & \text { unique } \\ 197 & & \end{array}$
0 No (195, 99\%), 1 Yes (2, 1\%)
awbq18f : Do you receive Disability Income (SDI)?
197 missing ${ }_{1}$ unique
0 No (196, 99\%), 1 Yes (1, 1\%)

```
awbq18gs : Do you receive Other; response specified
    n
```

AmeriChoice (4, 14\%), TennCare (21, 72\%), TennCare-AmeriChoice (1, 3\%)
unemployment (2, $7 \%$ ), unemployment, TennCare (1, 3\%)

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics by Study group (experimental con-
dition)

|  | N | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \text { VUBook } \\ N=62 \end{gathered}$ | 2 CommercialBook $N=66$ | 3 NoBookGiven $N=70$ | Test Statistic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| college : At least some college | 198 | 50\% (31) | 42\% (28) | 41\% (29) | $\chi_{2}^{2}=1.14, P=0.565{ }^{1}$ |
| No college |  | 50\% (31) | 58\% (38) | 59\% (41) |  |
| awbq04ord : 1 Some high school | 198 | 24\% (15) | 33\% (22) | 21\% (15) | $\chi_{2}^{2}=1.99, P=0.369^{2}$ |
| 2 Completed high school or GED |  | 26\% (16) | 24\% (16) | 37\% (26) |  |
| 3 Some college, but no degree |  | 37\% (23) | 32\% (21) | 19\% (13) |  |
| 4 Associate degree |  | 6\% (4) | 8\% (5) | $7 \%$ (5) |  |
| 5 Bachelor's degree |  | 5\% (3) | 2\% (1) | 4\% (3) |  |
| 6 Some graduate school |  | 0\% (0) | 0\% (0) | 1\% (1) |  |
| 7 Graduate degree |  | 2\% (1) | 2\% (1) | 10\% (7) |  |
| Mom's age at this ivw | 198 | 19.50021 .70024 .750 | 19.32520 .55023 .475 | 20.10022 .10024 .775 | $F_{2,195}=1.9, P=0.152^{3}$ |
| race: Asian | 198 | 0\% (0) | 2\% (1) | 1\% (1) | $\chi_{10}^{2}=8.86, P=0.545^{1}$ |
| black |  | 66\% (41) | 64\% (42) | 51\% (36) |  |
| Latino |  | $2 \% ~(1)$ | 5\% (3) | 3\% (2) |  |
| multiracial |  | 6\% (4) | $2 \% ~(1)$ | 7\% (5) |  |
| other |  | $2 \%$ (1) | 2\% (1) | 0\% (0) |  |
| white |  | 24\% (15) | 27\% (18) | 37\% (26) |  |
| White : non-white | 198 | $74 \%$ (46) | 68\% (45) | 60\% (42) | $\chi_{2}^{2}=3.05, P=0.218^{1}$ |
| white |  | 26\% (16) | 32\% (21) | 40\% (28) |  |
| income : 1 Less than \$8,000 | 120 | 29\% (13) | 29\% (10) | 15\% (6) | $\chi_{2}^{2}=7.2, P=0.027^{2}$ |
| 2 \$8,000-\$12,000 |  | 22\% (10) | 15\% (5) | 20\% (8) |  |
| 3 \$12,001-\$16,000 |  | 11\% (5) | 18\% (6) | 2\% (1) |  |
| 4 \$16,001-\$21,000 |  | 4\% (2) | 15\% (5) | 12\% (5) |  |
| 5 \$21,001-\$26,000 |  | $13 \%$ (6) | $6 \% ~(2)$ | 12\% (5) |  |
| 6 \$26,001-\$30,000 |  | 4\% (2) | 3\% (1) | 5\% (2) |  |
| 7 \$30,001-\$40,000 |  | 4\% (2) | 9\% (3) | 10\% (4) |  |
| 8 \$40,001-\$50,000 |  | $7 \%$ (3) | 0\% (0) | 7\% (3) |  |
| over \$50,000 |  | 4\% (2) | $6 \%$ ( 2) | 17\% (7) |  |

$a_{a} b$ represent the lower quartile $a$, the median $b$, and the upper
quartile $c$ for continuous variables.
$N$ is the number of non-missing values.
Numbers after percents are frequencies.
Tests used: ${ }^{1}$ Pearson test; ${ }^{2}$ Proportional odds likelihood ratio test;
${ }^{3}$ Kruskal-Wallis test

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics by Study group (experimental condition)

|  | N |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \mathrm{VUB} \\ & \mathrm{~N}=6 \end{aligned}$ |  | $2 \mathrm{Com}$ | nmer $N=$ | cialBook <br> 66 | 3 NoBookGiven$N=70$ |  | Test Statistic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| marital : Single | 197 |  | 79\% |  |  | 86\% |  | 70\% | (48) | $\chi_{4}^{2}=6.38, P=0.173^{1}$ |
| Married |  |  | 18\% |  |  | 9\% |  | 23\% | (16) |  |
| Other |  |  | 3\% |  |  | 5\% |  | 7\% |  |  |
| employment : Not working | 197 |  | 54\% |  |  | 47\% |  | 46\% |  | $\chi_{2}^{2}=1.47, P=0.48^{2}$ |
| Part time |  |  | 18\% |  |  | 23\% |  | 16\% |  |  |
| Full time |  |  | 28\% |  |  | 30\% |  | 39\% |  |  |
| Main job: wks worked for pay in last mo | 170 |  | 02 |  |  | 03 |  | 024 |  | $F_{2,167}=0.03, P=0.972^{3}$ |
| Main job: mos worked for pay in last 12 | 187 | 5.0000 | 7.000 | 11.0625 | 4.3750 | 8.000 | 12.0000 | 4.500010 .0000 | 0012.0000 | $F_{2,184}=0.98, P=0.379^{3}$ |
| Hours worked in past 7 days | 93 |  | 5.030 .0 | 040.0 |  | 520.0 | 40.0 | 8.030 .0 | 40.0 | $F_{2,90}=0.08, P=0.925^{3}$ |
| Hourly rate of pay in past 7 days | 88 |  | 7.500 | 10.000 | 7.525 | 9.00 | 10.185 | 7.5509 .000 | 12.750 | $F_{2,85}=0.62, P=0.543^{3}$ |
| WP total score; range [0,55] | 194 |  | 0014.00 | 020.25 | 9.00 | 11.50 | 18.50 | 12.0015 .50 | 1800 | $F_{2,191}=2.01, P=0.137^{3}$ |

$a b c$ represent the lower quartile $a$, the median $b$, and the upper
quartile $c$ for continuous variables.
$N$ is the number of non-missing values.
Numbers after percents are frequencies.
Tests used: ${ }^{1}$ Pearson test; ${ }^{2}$ Proportional odds likelihood ratio test;
${ }^{3}$ Kruskal-Wallis test

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics by Study group (experimental con-
dition)

|  | N | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \text { VUBook } \\ N=62 \end{gathered}$ |  | 2 CommercialBook$N=66$ |  | 3 NoBookGiven$N=70$ |  | Test Statistic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Do you receive WIC? : 0 No | 197 | 32\% | (20) | 41\% | (27) | 48\% | (33) | $\chi_{2}^{2}=3.29, P=0.193$ |
| 1 Yes |  | 68\% | (42) | $59 \%$ | (39) | $52 \%$ | (36) |  |
| Do you receive Food stamps? : 0 No | 197 | 52\% | (32) | $56 \%$ | (37) | 67\% | (46) | $\chi_{2}^{2}=3.26, P=0.195$ |
| 1 Yes |  | 48\% | (30) | 44\% | (29) | 33\% |  |  |
| Do you receive Family First? : 0 No | 197 | 89\% | (55) | 89\% | (59) | 91\% |  | $\chi_{2}^{2}=0.26, P=0.877$ |
| 1 Yes |  | 11\% | (7) | 11\% |  | 9\% | ( 6) |  |
| Do you receive Other? : 0 No | 197 | 87\% | (54) | 86\% | (57) | 83\% | (57) | $\chi_{2}^{2}=0.62, P=0.735$ |
| 1 Yes |  | 13\% | (8) | 14\% | (9) | 17\% | (12) |  |

$N$ is the number of non-missing values.
Numbers after percents are frequencies.
Test used: Pearson test

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics by Study group (experimental con-
dition)

|  | N | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \text { VUBook } \\ N=62 \end{gathered}$ | 2 CommercialBook $N=66$ | 3 NoBookGiven $N=70$ | Test Statistic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| O1B total \# correct | 198 | 10.2512 .0014 .00 | 10.0012 .0014 .75 | 11.0013 .0015 .00 | $F_{2,195}=1.51, P=0.223^{1}$ |
| O1B \% correct, based on \# answered | 198 | 33.867540 .045045 .1600 | 32.260038 .710047 .5825 | 35.777541 .940048 .3900 | $F_{2,195}=1.45, P=0.238^{1}$ |
| RSP summary score | 193 | 141516 | 131516 | 131516 | $F_{2,190}=0.81, P=0.446^{1}$ |
| PRP total score | 198 | 80.0087 .0092 .00 | 83.2588 .0092 .00 | 84.0090 .0092 .00 | $F_{2,195}=1.27, P=0.283^{1}$ |
| PRP Teaching Efficacy Subscore | 198 | 28.0029 .0031 .00 | 28.2530 .0031 .00 | 29.0030 .0031 .00 | $F_{2,195}=1.84, P=0.162^{1}$ |
| PRP positive Affect Subscore | 196 | 16.7518 .0019 .00 | 17.0018 .0019 .00 | 17.0018 .0019 .00 | $F_{2,193}=0.23, P=0.794^{1}$ |
| PRP Verbal Participation Subscore | 196 | 19.7522 .0024 .00 | 20.0022 .5024 .00 | 21.0022 .0024 .00 | $F_{2,193}=0.25, P=0.783^{1}$ |
| PRP Reading Instruction Subscore | 198 | 668 | 668 | 678 | $F_{2,195}=0.77, P=0.463^{1}$ |
| PRP Resource Subscore | 197 | 131516 | 141616 | 151616 | $F_{2,194}=1.96, P=0.143^{1}$ |
| PES Uplift Frequency | 198 | 91010 | 91010 | 81010 | $F_{2,195}=0.15, P=0.863^{1}$ |
| PES Hassle Frequency | 198 | 6.007 .008 .75 | 6.008 .009 .00 | 5.257 .009 .00 | $F_{2,195}=0.71, P=0.495^{1}$ |
| CES summary score: [0-30] | 198 | 6.259 .0012 .00 | 7.0011 .0012 .00 | 6.009 .0012 .00 | $F_{2,195}=0.85, P=0.429^{1}$ |
| Do you plan on breastfeeding your baby? : 1 Yes | 198 | $74 \%$ (46) | 64\% (42) | 76\% (53) | $\chi_{4}^{2}=5.49, P=0.241^{2}$ |
| 2 No |  | 15\% (9) | 29\% (19) | 19\% (13) |  |
| 3 Haven't decided yet |  | $11 \%$ (7) | $8 \%$ (5) | $6 \% ~(4)$ |  |
| Total \# correct, AWBI05-10 | 198 | 556 | 456 | 556 | $F_{2,195}=0.5, P=0.609^{1}$ |

$a b c$ represent the lower quartile $a$, the median $b$, and the upper
quartile $c$ for continuous variables.
$N$ is the number of non-missing values.
Numbers after percents are frequencies.
Tests used: ${ }^{1}$ Kruskal-Wallis test; ${ }^{2}$ Pearson test

