

## Summary of study

- $9^{\text {th }}$ grade in 1994-95; 6 yrs HS experience
- Factors:
- Individual demographics
- Neighborhood characteristics
- High school characteristics
- Probability for 1 of 4 outcomes:
- Dropped and pregnant
- Not dropped and pregnant
- Dropped and not pregnant
- Not dropped and not pregnant


## Summary findings

- Initially, Hispanics appear to have higher risk of becoming DP or NDP than Blacks, but contextual factors eliminate the difference
- Border effects are large and important (possible cultural effects?)--even more than family income
- Immigrants are less likely to be dropped out and/or pregnant than those born in the US
- Including attrition in the dropout measure generally increases the probability of dropout and/or pregnancy outcomes
- Age is ethnic- and outcome-specific: older Hispanics are much likelier to be dropped/pregnant or not dropped/pregnant than are Blacks.
- Younger girls are more likely to be dropped and/or pregnant as campus size increases
- Older girls receiving special education or English-language services are less likely to become dropped out and/or pregnant.
- Not having a standardized math score is a strong risk signal.
- Attending all-Black HS seem to reduce the probability of dropping out and/or pregnancy

All results are estimated relative to Whites.
DP: Dropped out and pregnant (negative outcome)
NDP: Not dropped out and pregnant (negative outcome)

## Order of Presentation

Magnitude of the issue

## Prior research

Identifying, defining, measuring and describing
Findings
Interpretations and plausible explanations

Policy considerations
The path forward

## Magnitude of the issue

- Dropouts
- 30+\% high school dropout rates
- 40\% for Hispanics
- 1999: Texas $3^{r d}$ highest level of dropouts in US
- Pregnancies/births
- Pregnancy in 1995 (US): 1 in 3 sexually active Black or Hispanic vs 1 in 6 White
- In 1996: Texas ranked $1^{\text {st }}$ in teenage pregnancy in US
- In 2001, 1 of 27 girls 16 years old in Texas gets pregnant
- Bexar county: Hispanic birth rate is 2X Black rate, 5X White rate


## Fertility and Dropping Out <br> Academic Literature

- Human capital investment \& endowments (Rosenzweig \& Wolpin, 1995)
- "problem syndrome," control and differential association theories (Little \& Rankin, 2001)
- Prevention Strategies (Christopher, 1995), including Social Learning Theory (Kirby et al., 1994)
- Economic development: old age security (Robinson, 1985; Cain, 1981; Kao, McHugh \& Travis, 2007)
- Dropout/ pregnancy as a process (Entwisel \& Hayduk, 1988; Rumberger \& Larson, 1998; Afable-Munsuz \& Brindis, 2006)
- Retention (Jimerson, Anderson \& Whipple 2002)

Ethnicity/Culture/Religiosity (Manlove et al. 2000; Jonsson, Hrafn \& Rendall 2004; Fernandez \& Fogli 2005; Afable-Munsuz \& Brindis 2006; Brewster et al., 1988; Regnerus 2007; Smith \& Denton 2006)

- Neighborhood context /epidemic theory (Crane, 1991)
- Peer effects (Evans, Oates \& Schwab, 1992)
- Family context (Rumberger 2001; Portes 1998; Afable-Munsuz \& Brindis 2006)

Note: These references are not intended to be exhaustive.

## Contributions

1. Methodological advancement (di Tomasso and Weeks, 2000)

- Single joint model, dropout \& pregnancy coded together into the dependent variable

2. Conservative and more inclusive estimates for dropouts and pregnancies
3. Comprehensive individual data

- Distinct age group models

4. Neighborhood \& HS contextual measures

## Data

## Texas Schools Project (TSP):

- 6 yrs. crossectional data (1994-1995 to 1999-2000) to capture high school experience
- Individual characteristics: ethnicity, age, economic status, language needs, gifted, immigrant status, geographic location, math score
- High school composition: ethnicity, economically disadvantaged and immigrants; campus size
- File types: attendance, enrollment, demography, course completion, dropout/leaver, Career Technology, TAAS (standardized test scores) spanning 1990-91 through 1999-2000
U.S. Census: neighborhood-level (tract) measures: ethnicity, income, immigrants, Spanish speakers, mobility and grandparents in home


## Ethnicity/age distributions in the data

Table 5.7 Ethnic distributions within age groups

| Among: | White | Hispanic | Black | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age status |  |  |  |  |
| Below normal age | 51.0 | 29.2 | 19.7 | 100 |
| Normal age | 55.2 | 31.1 | 13.7 | 100 |
| Above normal age | 29.7 | $50.4$ | 19.9 | 100 |
| No. of observations | 68,221 | 54,017 | 22,937 | 145,175 |

Table 5.8 Age distributions within ethnicity

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | Among: |  |  |
| Age status | $\underline{\text { Hispanic }}$ | $\underline{\text { Black }}$ |  |
| Below normal age | 2.8 | 2.0 | 3.2 |
| Normal age | 77.2 | 55.0 | 56.8 |
| Above normal age | $\underline{20.1}$ | $\boxed{43.0}$ | $\underline{40.0}$ |
| Totals | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Distributions: other individual demographics

Table 5.13 Percent economically disadvantaged, immigrant, needing language services or living at the border by ethnicity (as percents)

|  | All | White | Hispanic | Black |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Economically <br> disadvantaged | 57.7 | 29.3 |  | 84.8 |
| Language needs | 12.8 | 0.3 | 33.9 | $\mathbf{7 8 . 4}$ |
| Immigrant | 6.3 | 0.5 | $\mathbf{1 6 . 0}$ | 0.5 |
| Border | 14.4 | 3.1 | $\mathbf{3 4 . 4}$ | 0.9 |

Dependent variable:
Definition \& measurement

## Conservative

## Dropout

- TSP's TEA official dropout and dropout reason files
Preanancy
- Campuses serving pregnant girls
- Career \& Technology program
- Coursework for pregnant/ parenting
- Dropout reasons


## Measurement: dependent variable

Table 5.4 Dropout and Pregnancy (Conservative msr) by ethnicity and age (in percent)

|  | Dependent variable (joint distribution of Pregnant and Dropped outcomes) |  |  |  | Marginal distributions |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Among: | Dropped \& Pregnant | Not Dropped \& Pregnant | Dropped \& Not Pregnant | Not Dropped \& Not Pregnant | $\begin{gathered} \text { Preg- } \\ \text { nant } \end{gathered}$ | Dropped |
| normal-age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All | 0.08 | 0.6 | 4.9 | 94.5 | 0.7 | 5.0 |
| White | 0.03 | 0.2 | 3.0 | 96.8 | 0.2 | 3.0 |
| Hispanic | 0.18 | 1.4 | 7.6 | 90.9 | 1.5 | 7.8 |
| Black | 0.04 | 0.5 | 6.2 | 93.2 | 0.6 | 6.3 |
| Older |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All | 1.1 | 2.4 | 18.5 | 78.1 | 3.5 | 19.6 |
| White | 0.6 | 1.4 | 14.6 | 83.4 | 2.0 | 15.2 |
| Hispanic | 1.5 | 2.9 | 19.4 | 76.2 | 4.4 | 20.9 |
| Black | 1.0 | 2.4 | 21.8 | 74.9 | 3.4 | 22.8 |

## Measurement: dependent variable by family economic status and age

Table 5.12 Dropout and pregnancy outcomes among Hispanics by family income and age (as percent)

| Among: |  | Dependent variable (joint distribution of Pregnant and Dropped outcomes) |  |  |  | Marginal distributions |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Dropped \& Pregnant | Not Dropped \& Pregnant | Dropped \& Not Pregnant | Not Dropped \& Not Pregnant | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Preg- } \\ \text { nant } \end{array}$ | Dropped |
| Non-poor Hispanic NATIVES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Normal age | 0.02 | 0.7 | 2.5 | 96.8 | 0.7 | 2.6 |
| (2) | Above normal age | 0.8 | 2.1 | 16.3 | 80.8 | 2.9 | 17.1 |
| Non-poor Hispanic immigrants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Normal age | 0.00 | 1.0 | 16.5 | 82.5 | 1.0 | 16.5 |
|  | Above normal age | 0.00 | 0.4 | 18.7 | 80.9 | 0.4 | 18.7 |
| Poor Hispanic NATIVES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Normal age | 0.3 | 1.7 | 8.6 | 89.5 | 1.9 | 8.8 |
| (1) | Above normal age | 1.8 | 3.5 | 20.7 | 74.1 | 5.3 | 22.4 |
| Poor Hispanic immigrants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Normal age | 0.03 | 0.8 | 9.8 | 89.4 | 0.8 | 9.8 |
| (3) | Above normal age | 0.5 | 1.4 | 16.3 | 81.8 | 1.9 | 16.8 |

## Method

Exhaustive, mutually-exclusive probabilistic jointly determined choice set (DP, NDP, DNP, NDNP);
Cumulative logistic function (multinomial logit)

$$
\ln \Omega_{i j}=\beta_{0, j}+X_{i j l} \beta_{j l}+\varepsilon_{i j}
$$

Estimation of marginal effects
$\frac{\partial y_{i j}}{\partial X_{i j l}}$

## Variations in models

Left hand side: probability of each of the 4 choice outcomes
as a function of .....

Right hand side:

- Start with: race/ethnicity
- Add: age
- Add: other individual demographics/characteristics
- Add: neighborhood characteristics
- Add: high school characteristics


## Dependent variable abbreviations

DP - Dropped out AND Pregnant

NDP - Not Dropped out AND Pregnant

DNP - Dropped out AND Not Pregnant


## Results: measurement

- 4 probabilistic outcomes ("marginal effects")
- Scaled in percentage points
- All findings are relative to a White female


## Results - Ethnicity

Marginal effects for below- and normal-age females, and unconditional probabilities

|  | Conservative |  |  | Moderate |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DP | NDP | DNP | DP | NDP | DNP |
| Basic Models (C1) | .08\% | 0.59\% | 4.81\% | 0.27\% | 0.40\% | 25.76\% |
| 1 Hispanic | . $1388 * *$ | 0.832*** | 4.619*** | $0.487 * *$ | 1.181*** | 6.827*** |
| 2 Black | 0.002 | 0.206*** | 3.129*** | 0.114*** | $0.318^{* * *}$ | 5.025*** |
| Full Models (C5) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 Hispanic | 0.0001 | 0.097*** | 0.173 | 0.024 | 0.071*** | (5.891) |
| 4 Black | (0.0002) | 0.150*** | (0.880)*** | 0.018 | 0.100*** | (10.804) |

Marginal effects for above age females, and unconditional probabilities

|  | ic Models | 1.11\% | 2.36\% | 18.46\% | 2.71\% | 0.76\% | 64.94\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | Hispanic | 0.843*** | 1.548*** | 4.821*** | $1.987^{* * *}$ | $0.405^{* * *}$ | 4.700*** |
| 6 | Black | 0.407*** | 0.983*** | 7.156*** | $1.182^{* * *}$ | 0.207* | 6.259*** |
| Full Models (M5) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Hispanic | 0.264*** | 0.853*** | 1.307** | 0.796*** | 0.289*** | $(4.506)^{* * *}$ |
| 8 | Black | 0.327*** | 0.897*** | 0.097 | 0.813*** | 0.384*** | $(9.698){ }^{* * *}$ |

Results for below- and normal-age females using moderate measures


## Findings specific to DP

- Using ethnicity only, Hispanics are $171 \%$ likelier than Whites (conservatively msd) and $180 \%$ likelier (moderately msd).
- Initially, Hispanics start have a higher risk of becoming DP than Blacks, but contextual factors greatly reduce the ethnic effects and virtually eliminate the difference.
- Border effects are large and important (possible cultural effects?)--even moreso than family income; the difference between race/ethnicity and immigrant status possibly hints at generational effects.
- A poor female is 5.33 times likelier to become DP than even a Hispanic
- Living near the border contributed most to DP, increasing the unconditional probability by $178 \%$

All results are estimated relative to Whites.
DP: Dropped out and pregnant (negative outcome)
NDP: Not dropped out and pregnant (negative outcome)

## Findings specific to DP

- Including attrition in the dropout measure generally increases the probability of negative outcomes.
- Going from the conservative to the moderate model, the border effect increased by a factor of 208.
- Gifted students or having a higher math score reduces the probability of being DP.
- Its marginal effect is greater than those of all other individual characteristics
- It reduces the probability of DP for a female with otherwise average characteristics by 53\%
- Not having a standardized math score is a strong risk signal.


## Findings specific to DP

- Incorporating high school characteristics reduces all marginal effects, EXCEPT for being near the border
- Unexpectedly, being exposed to an increased percentage of Hispanic or Black students in HS reduces the probability of DP (though the effect is small).
- Being at an all-Black HS seems to reduce the probability of harmful outcomes.
- But higher percentages of Hispanic or Blacks in the neighborhoods increases the probability of DP
- The more immigrants in the neighborhood, the grater the probability of DP.
- After including all HS \& neighborhood characteristics, living near the border contributes more to the probability of DP than any other variable.


## Summary findings for NDP and DNP outcomes

## NDP OUTCOME

- Probability for Hispanics is 0.41 pctg. pts. higher than for Whites
- For Blacks, it is 0.20 pctg. pts. higher


## DNP Outcome

- For Blacks, probability is 6.26 pctg. pts. higher than for Whites
- For Hispanics, it is 4.7 pctg. pts. higher


## Overall summary findings

- Initially, Hispanics appear to have higher risk of becoming DP or NDP than Blacks, but contextual factors generally eliminate the difference
- Border effects are large and important (possible cultural effects?)--even more than family income
- Immigrants are less likely to be dropped out and/or pregnant than those born in the US
- Including attrition in the dropout measure generally increases the probability of dropout and/or pregnancy outcomes
- Age is ethnic- and outcome-specific: older Hispanics are much likelier to be dropped/pregnant or not dropped/pregnant than are Blacks.
- Younger girls are more likely to be dropped and/or pregnant as campus size increases
- Older girls receiving special education or English-language services are less likely to become dropped out and/or pregnant.
- Not having a standardized math score is a strong risk signal.
- Attending all-Black HS seem to reduce the probability of dropping out and/or pregnancy


## Interpretation / plausible explanations



Interpretation / plausible explanations


## Policy Considerations

- Academic assistance / retention reduction can improve educational outcomes
- Cultural sensitivity in pedagogy, institutional processes and organization, and attitudes and behavior of school staff are cited as conducive to improved educational outcomes
- School-community-family connectivity can improve educational outcomes
- Mother-daughter connections are important to reducing pregnancy
- High school-to-work initiatives targeted to high risk schools might improve students' expectations for better work opportunities, thus keeping them in school and reducing pregnancies


# Path Ahead <br> Continuing Research 

## Existing data

- Geographic-cultural phenomena
- Regional


## New data

- Birth data \& Mom's SS
- Location of health clinics
- Generational effects
- Acculturation / assimilation measures
- Detailed family information
- Single/two-parent; family size; job classifications
- Preferences
- Sexual activity, birth control, having children


## La quinceañera



Hispanic high school parent


Photo by Leonard Ortiz 2007

## Liset Landeros and daughter




Hispanic high school graduate




## Thank you.

## Models

$$
P\left(Y_{i}=j\right)=\frac{1}{1+e^{-Z_{i j}}}, \quad P_{j}\left(X_{i}\right)=\frac{\exp \left(X_{i i} \beta_{j}\right)}{\exp \left(X_{i} \beta_{j}\right)+\ldots}+\exp \left(X_{i m} \beta_{j}\right),
$$

$\mathrm{Z}_{i j}$ is the linear indexes of $\alpha_{j}+\sum_{s=1}^{S} \phi_{s j} C_{s i}+\sum_{1=l}^{L} \beta_{l j} X_{i l}$
$Y_{i}=$ outcomes in $\{1,2,3,4\}$ ( $j$ indexes outcomes, $i$ individuals)
$\alpha_{j}=$ constant in outcome $j$ 's logistic probability equation
$\beta_{i j}$ are the coefficients for $X_{i l}$, indexed by $/$ in $\{1, \ldots, L\}$
$X_{i l}$ is individual $i^{\prime} s$ value of the $t^{\text {th }}$ regressor
$\phi_{s f}$ is the coefficient for Campus s in equation-j
$\epsilon_{\text {st }}$ are campus dummies

J-Outcomes
$j=1$ Dropped \& Pregnant (DP)
$j=2$ Not dropped \& Pregnant (NDP)
$j=3$ Dropped \& Not pregnant (DNP)
$j=4$ Not dropped \& Not pregnant (NDNP)
$X$-vector
individual demographics high school characteristics
neighborhood characteristics

## Results: moderately measured

Individual models (M2)

|  | DP | NDP | DNP |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hispanic |  |  |  |
| Below/normal | 0.035 | $0.145^{* * *}$ | $(5.960)^{* * *}$ |
| Older | $1.190^{* * *}$ | $0.464^{* * *}$ | $(3.970)^{* * *}$ |
| Black |  |  |  |
| Below/normal | $(0.002)$ | $0.118^{* * *}$ | $(9.073)^{* * *}$ |
| Older | 0.136 | $0.208^{* * *}$ | $(6.627)^{* * *}$ |
| P<.10, ${ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.05,{ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.01$ |  |  |  |

High school models (M2)

|  | DP | NDP | DNP |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hispanic |  |  |  |
| Below/normal | 0.023 NS | $0.077^{* * *}$ | $(5.856)^{* * *}$ |
| Older | $0.864^{* * *}$ | $0.303^{* * *}$ | $(4.464)^{* * *}$ |
| Black |  |  |  |
| Below/normal | 0.026 NS | $0.131^{* * *}$ | $(10.673)^{* * *}$ |
| Older | $0.844^{* * *}$ | $0.402^{* * *}$ | $(9.625)^{* * *}$ |
| P<.10, ${ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.05,^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.01$ |  |  |  |

Full models (M2)

|  | DP | DP | NDP |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hispanic |  |  |  |
| Below/normal | 0.024 NS | $0.071^{* * *}$ | $(5.891)^{* * *}$ |
| Older | $0.796^{* * *}$ | $0.298^{* * *}$ | $(4.506)^{* * *}$ |
| Black |  |  |  |
| Below/normal | 0.018 NS | $0.100^{* * *}$ | $(10.804)^{* * *}$ |
| Older | $0.793^{* * *}$ | $0.384^{* * *}$ | $(9.698)^{* * *}$ |
| P<.10, ${ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.05,,^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.01$ |  |  |  |

## Results by dependent variable for individual, HS and full models



| NDP |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Econ disadvantaged | 0.242** | 0.291** | 0.139** | 0.276** | 0.128*** | 0.280** |
| Math | (0.004) | 0.153 | (0.001) | 0.155 | (0.008) | 0.148 |
| Nomath | (0.106) ${ }^{\text {** }}$ | (0.670) ${ }^{\text {-* }}$ | (0.067) ${ }^{\text {-** }}$ | (0.588) ${ }^{\text {c. }}$ | (0.060)** | (0.575) ${ }^{\text {c* }}$ |
| Language needs | (0.039)* | (0.516) ${ }^{\text {c* }}$ | (0.019) | (0.399) ${ }^{\text {c* }}$ | (0.039)** | (0.394) ${ }^{\text {c* }}$ |
| Gifted | (0.001) | 0.043 | 0.021 | 0.252 | 0.034 | 0.190 |
| speced | (0.011) | 0.319** | 0.000 | $0.241^{* *}$ | 0.001 | $0.242^{* *}$ |
| Immigrant | (0.123)*** | (0.166) | ${ }^{(0.016)}$ | 0.033 | (0.002) | 0.028 |
| Border | 0.821** | $0.484^{*}$ | 1.022*** | 0.513** | $0.740^{* *}$ | 0.547** |
| Relative to a White female w/avg. characteristics and holding constant all other RHS-variables |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DNP |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Econ | 12.865*** | 10.259*** | 13.105*** | $9.600^{* *}$ | 13197*** | 9.682*** |
| Math | (7.337)** | (12.445) ${ }^{*}$ | (7.314)** | (12.483) ${ }^{\text {c* }}$ | (7.336)** | (12.478) ${ }^{\text {c* }}$ |
| Nomath | 23.621** | $36.759^{* *}$ | 23.121*** | $36.640^{* *}$ | 27.072*** | $36.583^{* *}$ |
| Language needs | (0.092) | (3.675) ${ }^{\text {c* }}$ | (0.419) | (4.179) ${ }^{\text {c* }}$ | (0.654) | (4.093) ${ }^{\text {c* }}$ |
| Gifted | (9.465) ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | (18.869) ${ }^{\text {c* }}$ | (9.620)** | (20.914) ${ }^{\text {c* }}$ | (9.632)** | (20.553) ${ }^{\text {c- }}$ |
| Speced | (6.041) ${ }^{* *}$ | (31.575) $\cdots$ | (5.551)** | (31.353) $\cdots$ | (5.617)** | (31.370) $\cdots$ |
| Immigrant | $1.581^{\circ *}$ | (5.176) ${ }^{\text {-** }}$ | 1.728** | (6.023) ${ }^{\text {-** }}$ | $2.044^{* *}$ | (5.793)** |
| Border | (5.397) ${ }^{\text {** }}$ | (4.926) ${ }^{\text {c* }}$ | $(4.358)^{* *}$ | (5.715) ${ }^{\text {c* }}$ | (1.889) ${ }^{\text {** }}$ | (3.273) ${ }^{\text {c* }}$ |
| Reiative to a White female w/avg. characteristics and holding constant all other RHS-variables |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 6.2. Marginal effects on the probability of being Dropped out and Pregnant, conservatively measured (unconditional probability is $\mathbf{0 . 0 8 \%}$ ) for the primary models of interest using the below- and normal-age sample of 99,076 females

${ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<.10^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.05^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.01$
Note: Appendix C, Table C. 1 provides the values of variables for computing marginal effects. Campus size is the $\log$ of total campus population at campuses attended by females in the cohort.

Table 6.3. Marginal effects on the probability of being Dropped out and Pregnant, moderately measured (unconditional probability is $0.27 \%$ ) for the primary models of interest using the below- and normal-age sample of 95,365 females

${ }^{*}$ p $<.10^{* *}$ p $<.05^{* * *}$ p $<.01$
Note: Appendix C, Table C1 provides the values of variables for computing marginal effects. Neighborhood variables are measured as percent. Campus size is the $\log$ of total campus population at campuses attended by females in the cohort.

Table 6.4. Marginal effects on the probability of being Dropped out and Pregnant, conservatively measured (unconditional probability is $1.11 \%$ ) for the primary models of interest using the above-normal age sample of 46,099 females

${ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<.10^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.05^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.01$
Note: Appendix C, Table C. 1 provides the values of variables for computing marginal effects.
Neighborhood variables are measured as percent. Campus size is the $\log$ of total campus population at campuses attended by females in the cohort.

Table 6.5. Marginal effects on the probability of being Dropped out and Pregnant, moderately measured (unconditional probability is $2.71 \%$ ) for the primary models of interest using the above-normal age sample of 46,099 females

${ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<.10^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.05^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.01$
Note: Appendix C, Table C. 1 provides the values of variables for computing marginal effects.
Neighborhood variables are measured as percent. Campus size is the $\log$ of total campus population at campuses attended by females in the cohort.

Table 6.6. Marginal effects on the probability of being Not Dropped out and Pregnant, conservatively measured (unconditional probability is $\mathbf{0 . 5 9 \%}$ ) for the primary models of interest using the below- and normal-age sample of 99,076 females

${ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<.10^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.05^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.01$
Note: Appendix C, Table C. 1 provides the values of variables for computing marginal effects.
Neighborhood variables are measured as percent. Campus size is the $\log$ of total campus population at campuses attended by females in the cohort.

Table 6.7. Marginal effects on the probability of being Not Dropped out and Pregnant, moderately measured (unconditional probability is $\mathbf{0 . 4 0 \%}$ ) for the primary models of interest using the below- and normal-age sample of 99,076 females

${ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<.10^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.05^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.01$
Note: Appendix C, Table C. 1 provides the values of variables for computing marginal effects.
Neighborhood variables are measured as percent. Campus size is the $\log$ of total campus population at campuses attended by females in the cohort.

Table 6.8. Marginal effects on the probability of being Not Dropped out and Pregnant, conservatively measured (unconditional probability is $2.36 \%$ ) for the primary models of interest using the above-normal age sample of 46,099 females

${ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<.10^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.05{ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.01$
Note: Appendix C, Table C. 1 provides the values of variables for computing marginal effects.
Neighborhood variables are measured as percent. Campus size is the $\log$ of total campus population at campuses attended by females in the cohort.

Table 6.9. Marginal effects on the probability of being Not Dropped out and Pregnant, moderately measured (unconditional probability is $0.76 \%$ ) for the primary models of interest using the above-normal age sample of 46,099 females


[^0]Note: Appendix C, Table C. 1 provides the values of variables for computing marginal effects. Neighborhood variables are measured as percent. Campus size is the $\log$ of total campus population at campuses attended by females in the cohort.

Table 6.10. Marginal effects on the probability of being Dropped out and Not Pregnant, conservatively measured (unconditional probability is $4.81 \%$ ) for the primary models of interest using the below- and normal-age sample of 99,076 females

${ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<.10^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.05^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.01$
Note: Appendix C, Table C. 1 provides the values of variables for computing marginal effects.
Neighborhood variables are measured as percent. Campus size is the $\log$ of total campus population at campuses attended by females in the cohort.

Table 6.11. Marginal effects on the probability of being Dropped out and Not Pregnant, moderately measured (unconditional probability is $25.76 \%$ ) for the primary models of interest using the below- and normal-age sample of 99,076 females

${ }^{*}$ p $<.10^{* *}$ p $<.05^{* * *}$ p $<.01$
Note: Appendix C, Table C. 1 provides the values of variables for computing marginal effects.
Neighborhood variables are measured as percent. Campus size is the $\log$ of total campus population at campuses attended by females in the cohort.

Table 6.12. Marginal effects on the probability of being Dropped out and Not Pregnant, conservatively measured (unconditional probability is $18.46 \%$ ) for the primary models of interest using the above-normal age sample of 46,099 females

${ }^{*}$ p $<.10^{* *}$ p $<.05^{* * *}$ p $<.01$
Note: Appendix C, Table C. 1 provides the values of variables for computing marginal effects.
Neighborhood variables are measured as percent. Campus size is the $\log$ of total campus population at campuses attended by females in the cohort.

Table 6.13. Marginal effects on the probability of being Dropped out and Not Pregnant, moderately measured (unconditional probability is $\mathbf{6 4 . 9 4 \%}$ ) for the primary models of interest using the above-normal age sample of 46,099 females

${ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<.10^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.05^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.01$
Note: Appendix C, Table C. 1 provides the values of variables for computing marginal effects.
Neighborhood variables are measured as percent. Campus size is the $\log$ of total campus population at campuses attended by females in the cohort.

Table 6.14. Marginal effects on the probability of being Not Dropped out and Not Pregnant, conservatively measured (unconditional probability is $94.52 \%$ ) for the primary models of interest using the below- and normal-age sample of 99,076 females

|  Basic: <br> ethnicity and <br> age <br> Variables Cl | Basic plus all individual demographics <br> C2 | Basic with all individual demographics plus HS characteristics Models C3 | Basic with all individual demographics plus neighborhood characteristics | Full Model: all individual, neighborhood and high school characteristics C5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hispanic (5.938) ${ }^{* * *}$ | $(0.677)^{* * *}$ | (0.279) ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | $(0.425){ }^{\text {*** }}$ | (0.270) |
| Black (3.449) ${ }^{\text {*** }}$ | 0.339 ** | 0.681 *** | 0.550 *** | 0.730 *** |
| Economically disadvantaged | (3.877) *** | (3.592) ${ }^{\text {*** }}$ | (3.818) ${ }^{\text {*** }}$ | (3.574) *** |
| Math | 1.198 *** | 1.174 *** | $1.194^{* * *}$ | 1.182 *** |
| Nomath | $(3.270)$ *** | (3.170) *** | $(3.146) * * *$ | (3.149) ${ }^{* * *}$ |
| Language needs | (0.025) | 0.035 | 0.073 | 0.117 |
| Gifted | 2.040 *** | 2.071 *** | 2.072 *** | 2.059 *** |
| Speced | 0.452 ** | 0.320 * | 0.364 * | 0.316 * |
| Immigrant | 0.039 | (0.017) | 0.018 | (0.077) |
| Border | (0.303) ${ }^{*}$ | $(0.373) *$ | 0.196 | (0.193) |
| Pct Hispanic in neighborhood |  |  | (0.068) | 0.003 |
| Pct Black in neighborhood |  |  | $(0.013) * *$ | 0.002 |
| Family income in neighborhood |  |  | 0.051 | (0.070) |
| Pct immigrant in neighborhood |  |  | (0.319) ${ }^{\text {** }}$ | (0.378) ${ }^{* *}$ |
| Pct Spanish speakers in neighborhood |  |  | 0.006 | 0.001 |
| Pct mobility in neighborhood |  |  | $(0.028){ }^{\text {*** }}$ | (0.027) ${ }^{* *}$ |
| Pct grandparents in neighborhood |  |  | 0.010 | 0.013 |
| Missing census |  |  | (0.775) | (2.225) |
| Pct Hispanic at HS |  | (0.002) |  | (0.008) |
| Pct Black at HS |  | (0.009) |  | (0.012) |
| Pct economically disadvantaged at HS |  | $(0.069) * * *$ |  | $(0.043){ }^{* *}$ |
| Pct immigrant at HS |  | (0.008) |  | (0.001) |
| Campus Size |  | $(0.436) * * *$ |  | $(0.249){ }^{* * *}$ |

${ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<.10^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.05^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.01$
Note: Appendix C, Table C. 1 provides the values of variables for computing marginal effects.
Neighborhood variables are measured as percent. Campus size is the $\log$ of total campus population at campuses attended by females in the cohort.

Table 6.15. Marginal effects on the probability of being Not Dropped out and Not Pregnant, moderately measured (unconditional probability is $73.57 \%$ ) for the primary models of interest using the below- and normal-age sample of 99,076 females

| Basic: ethnicity and age | Basic plus all individual demographics | Basic with all individual demographics plus HS characteristics Models | Basic with all individual demographics plus neighborhood characteristics | Full Model: all individual, neighborhood and high school characteristics |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variables M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 |
| Hispanic $\quad(8.146){ }^{\text {*** }}$ | $5.780^{* * *}$ | 5.756 *** | 5.947 *** | $5.796^{* * *}$ |
| Black (5.344) ${ }^{\text {** }}$ | 8.957 *** | 10.517 *** | 10.031 *** | 10.686 *** |
| Economically disadvantaged | $(13.271){ }^{\text {*** }}$ | (13.352) ${ }^{* * *}$ | (13.822) ${ }^{\text {*** }}$ | (13.429) ${ }^{\text {*** }}$ |
| Math | 7.381 *** | 7.345 *** | 7.431 *** | 7.374 *** |
| Nomath | (23.640) ${ }^{\text {*** }}$ | (23.154) ${ }^{* * *}$ | $(23.211){ }^{\text {*** }}$ | (23.104) ${ }^{\text {*** }}$ |
| Language needs | 0.158 | 0.445 | 0.621 | 0.713 |
| Gifted | 9.564 *** | 9.663 *** | 9.648 *** | 9.657 *** |
| Speced | 6.060 *** | 5.557 *** | 5.845 *** | 5.619 *** |
| Immigrant | (1.359) ${ }^{*}$ | (1.671) ${ }^{* *}$ | (1.761) ${ }^{* *}$ | (2.009) *** |
| Border | 4.096 *** | $2.686^{* * *}$ | $1.602^{* * *}$ | 0.569 |
| Pct Hispanic in neighborhood |  |  | (0.314) *** | $(0.296) ~ * * * ~$ |
| Pct Black in neighborhood |  |  | (0.058) *** | 0.004 |
| Family income in neighborhood |  |  | (2.558) *** | (3.301) *** |
| Pct immigrant in neighborhood |  |  | (0.489) *** | (0.517) *** |
| Pct Spanish speakers in neighborhood |  |  | 0.122 *** | 0.139 *** |
| Pct mobility in neighborhood |  |  | (0.120) ${ }^{\text {*** }}$ | $(0.117){ }^{\text {*** }}$ |
| Pct grandparents in neighborhood |  |  | (0.149) | (0.090) |
| Missing census |  |  | (41.592) ${ }^{\text {*** }}$ | $(48.676){ }^{\text {*** }}$ |
| Pct Hispanic at HS |  | 0.046 *** |  | 0.062 *** |
| Pct Black at HS |  | (0.027) * |  | (0.027) |
| Pct economically disadvantaged at HS |  | $(0.087){ }^{* * *}$ |  | (0.122) *** |
| Pct immigrant at HS |  | (0.007) |  | 0.010 |
| Campus Size |  | $(2.312){ }^{* * *}$ |  | $(1.393){ }^{\text {*** }}$ |

Note: Appendix C, Table C. 1 provides the values of variables for computing marginal effects.
Neighborhood variables are measured as percent. Campus size is the $\log$ of total campus population at campuses attended by females in the cohort.

Table 6.16. Marginal effects on the probability of being Not Dropped out and Not Pregnant, conservatively measured (unconditional probability is $78.07 \%$ ) for the primary models of interest using the above-normal age sample of 46,099 females


Note: Appendix C, Table C. 1 provides the values of variables for computing marginal effects.
Neighborhood variables are measured as percent. Campus size is the log of total campus population at campuses attended by females in the cohort.

Table 6.17. Marginal effects on the probability of being Not Dropped out and Not Pregnant, moderately measured (unconditional probability is $31.59 \%$ ) for the primary models of interest using the abovenormal age sample of 46,099 females

|  Basic: <br> ethnicity and <br> age <br> Variables M1 | Basic plus all individual demographics <br> M2 | Basic with all individual demographics plus HS characteristics Models M3 | Basic with all individual demographics plus neighborhood characteristics <br> M4 | Full Model: all individual, neighbor-hood and high school characteristics |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hispanic (7.091) ${ }^{\text {*** }}$ | $2.316^{* * *}$ | $3.297^{* * *}$ | $3.117^{* * *}$ | 3.422 *** |
| Black (7.649) *** | 6.283 *** | 8.378 *** | 6.861 *** | 8.520 *** |
| Economically disadvantaged | (12.254) *** | (11.272) *** | $(12.031)^{* * *}$ | $(11.361)^{* * *}$ |
| Math | $12.532^{\text {*** }}$ | $12.536^{\text {*** }}$ | $12.499^{\text {*** }}$ | $12.536^{\text {*** }}$ |
| Nomath | (39.094) *** | (38.822) ${ }^{\text {*** }}$ | (38.936) ${ }^{\text {*** }}$ | $(38.709) * * *$ |
| Language needs | 5.519 *** | 5.547 *** | $5.375^{* * *}$ | $5.413^{* * *}$ |
| Gifted | 19.607 *** | 20.933 *** | $19.737^{\text {*** }}$ | 20.627 *** |
| Speced | 32.467 *** | 32.276 *** | 32.381 *** | 32.262 *** |
| Immigrant | 6.684 *** | 6.865 *** | 6.372 *** | 6.630 *** |
| Border | 3.493 *** | 4.102 *** | 2.005 ** | 1.007 |
| Pct Hispanic in neighborhood |  |  | $(0.288){ }^{\text {*** }}$ | (0.219) ${ }^{* * *}$ |
| Pct Black in neighborhood |  |  | 0.006 | 0.122 *** |
| Family income in neighborhood |  |  | 0.792 | (1.139) |
| Pet immigrant in neighborhood |  |  | $(0.091)^{* * *}$ | (0.104) ${ }^{* * *}$ |
| Pct Spanish speakers in neighborhood |  |  | 0.382 *** | 0.466 *** |
| Pet mobility in neighborhood |  |  | (0.007) | (0.045) ** |
| Pet grandparents in neighborhood |  |  | $(0.124){ }^{\text {*** }}$ | (0.314) ${ }^{* * *}$ |
| Missing census |  |  | 0.612 | $(16.422){ }^{\text {*** }}$ |
| Pet Hispanic at HS |  | (0.032) |  | (0.011) |
| Pet Black at HS |  | $(0.062){ }^{\text {*** }}$ |  | (0.113) ${ }^{* *}$ |
| Pet economically disadvantaged at HS |  | (0.032) |  | (0.038) |
| Pct immigrant at HS |  | (0.025) |  | (0.042) |
| Campus Size |  | 1.228 *** |  | $1.416^{* * *}$ |

${ }^{*} \mathbf{p}<.10^{* *} \mathbf{p}<.05^{* * *} \mathbf{p}<.01$
Note: Appendix C, Table C. 1 provides the values of variables for computing marginal effects.
Neighborhood variables are measured as percent. Campus size is the log of total campus population at campuses attended by females in the cohort.


Texas Colonias


Table 4.1 Correlations between neighborhood (level percent) and high school variables (level percent) for the full cohort

|  | Pct Hispanic in neighborhood | Pct Black in neighborhood | Family income in neighborhood |  | Pct Spanish speakers in neigh borhood | Pct mobility in neighborhood | Pct grandparents in neighborhood | Pct <br> Hispanic at HS | Pct <br> Black <br> at HS | Pct <br> economically disad vantage d at HS | Pct immigrant at HS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pct Hispanic in neighborhood | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pct Black in neighborhood | -0.226 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family income in neighborhood | 0.153 | 0.072 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pct immigrant in neighborhood | 0.714 | -0.082 | 0.180 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pct Spanish speakers in neighborhood | 0.985 | -0.199 | 0.145 | 0.776 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pct mobility in neighborhood | -0.010 | 0.101 | 0.662 | 0.205 | -0.002 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pct grandparents in neighborhood | 0.380 | 0.446 | 0.342 | 0.397 | 0.396 | 0.153 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |
| Pct Hispanic at HS | 0.883 | -0.026 | -0.405 | 0.558 | 0.865 | -0.143 | 0.199 | 1.000 |  |  |  |
| Pct Black at HS | -0.271 | 0.838 | -0.082 | -0.072 | -0.243 | 0.004 | 0.316 | -0.332 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Pct economically disadvantaged at HS | 0.683 | 0.150 | -0.115 | 0.458 | 0.685 | -0.179 | 0.414 | 0.751 | 0.198 | 1.000 |  |
| Pct immigrant at HS | 0.552 | -0.150 | -0.027 | 0.537 | 0.602 | -0.052 | 0.185 | 0.649 | -0.167 | 0.570 | 1.000 |

## Histogram of campus sizes



## Histogram of log of campus sizes



## Histogram of median household income



## Histogram of the log of median household income



Dropout reasons by pregnancy, marriage, and other

|  |  | All | PregA | PregF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bik |  | 23,012 |  |  |
| Hsp |  | 54,213 |  |  |
| Wht |  | 68,579 |  |  |
| Summed Total |  | 145,804 | 2,266 | 8,527 |
| Reported Total |  | 145,804 | 2,266 | 8,527 |
| Droppre |  |  |  |  |
| g |  |  | 5.52 |  |
| B1k | 14.40 | 0.08 | 4.69 | 0.86 |
| Hsp | 64.00 | 0.15 | 5.37 | 1.87 |
| Wht | 21.60 | 0.04 | 6.91 | 1.25 |
| Blk 14.40 |  |  |  |  |
| Hsp 64.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Wht $\quad \underline{21.60}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Dropmar |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{\square}$ |  |  |  | 1.40 |
| Blk | 1.68 | 0.01 |  | 0.10 |
| Hsp | 78.15 | 0.17 |  | 2.18 |
| Wht | 20.17 | 0.03 |  | 1.11 |
| Bik 1.68 |  |  |  |  |
| Hsp $\quad 78.15$ |  |  |  |  |
| Wht $\quad 20.17$ |  |  |  |  |
| 100 |  |  |  |  |
| Dropothr |  |  |  | 15.82 |
| Blk | 25.57 | 1.50 |  | 16.44 |
| Hsp | 55.74 | 1.39 |  | 17.61 |
| Wht | 18.68 | 0.37 |  | 11.68 |

Percentage of the total cohort enrolled in each year


Texas teen pregnancy rates, 2000


Table of basic models for ethnicity

Results for above normal-age females using moderate measures

|  | DP 2.71\% <br> (Table 6.5) | NDP 0.76\% <br> (Table 6.9) | DNP <br> 64.94\% <br> (Table 6.13) | NDNP <br> $31.59 \%$ <br> (Table 6.17) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Basic Models |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | $1.987^{* * *}$ | $0.405^{* * *}$ | $4.700^{* * *}$ | $-7.091^{* * *}$ |
| Black | $1.182^{* * *}$ | $0.204^{*}$ | $6.259^{* * *}$ | $-7.649^{* * *}$ |
| Full Models |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | $0.796^{* * *}$ | $0.289^{* * *}$ | $0.289^{* * *}$ | $-4.506^{* * *}$ |
| Black | $0.793^{* * *}$ | $0.384^{* * *}$ | $0.384^{* * *}$ | $-6.698^{* * *}$ |

Table 4.2 Overview of empirical models for investigating joint decisions about dropping

| Variables | Models |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Hispanic | X | X | X | X | X |
| Black | X | X | X | X | X |
| Economically disadvantaged |  | X | X | X | X |
| Math |  | X | X | X | X |
| Nomath |  | X | X | X | X |
| Language needs |  | X | X | X | X |
| Gifted |  | X | X | X | X |
| Speced |  | X | X | X | X |
| Immigrant |  | X | X | X | X |
| Border |  | X | X | X | X |
| Pct Hispanic in neighborhood |  |  |  | X | X |
| Pct Black in neighborhood |  |  |  | X | X |
| Family income in neighborhood |  |  |  | X | X |
| Pct immigrant in neighborhood |  |  |  | X | X |
| Pct Spanish speakers in neighborhood |  |  |  | X | X |
| Pct mobility in neighborhood |  |  |  | X | X |
| Pct grandparents in neighborhood |  |  |  | X | X |
| Missing census |  |  |  | X | X |
| Pct Hispanic at HS |  |  | X |  | X |
| Pct Black at HS |  |  | X |  | X |
| Pct economically disadvantaged at HS |  |  | X |  | X |
| Pct immigrant at HS |  |  | X |  | X |
| Campus size |  |  | X |  | X |

Table 4.3 Models by sub-group populations to investigate effects on joint decisions about dropping out

| Parameters | Models |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hispanics | Blacks | Those at/near the border |
| Hispanic |  |  | X |
| Black |  |  | X |
| Below normal age | x | x |  |
| Above normal age | x | X |  |
| Economic disadvantage | x | X | X |
| Math | X | X | X |
| Nomath | x | x | X |
| Language needs | x | X | X |
| Gifted | X | X | X |
| Speced | x | x | x |
| Immigrant | X | X | X |
| Border | x | x |  |
| Pct Hispanic in neighborhood | X | X | X |
| Pct Black in neighborhood | X | X | X |
| Family income in neighborhood | x | x | x |
| Pct immigrant in neighborhood | x | x | x |
| Pct Spanish speakers in neighborhood | X | X | X |
| Pct mobility in neighborhood | X | X | X |
| Pct grandparents in neighborhood | X | X | X |
| Missing Census | X | X | X |
| Pct Hispanic at HS | X | X | X |
| Pct Black at HS | X | X | X |
| Pct econ. disadv. at HS | x | X | X |
| Pct immigrant at HS | x | X | X |
| Campus size | X | X | X |

Table 4.4 Hypotheses of effects for the outcome Dropped out and Pregnant


The " + " sign corresponds with a hypothesized marginal effect greater than zero.

|  | Models |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variables | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Hispanic | + | + | + | + | + |
| Black | + | + | + | + | + |
| Economically disadvantaged |  | + | + | + | + |
| Math |  | + | + | + | + |
| Nomath |  | - | - | - | - |
| Language needs |  | - | - | - | - |
| Gifted |  | + | + | + | + |
| Speced |  | - | - | - | - |
| Immigrant |  | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Border |  | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Pct Hispanic in neighborhood |  |  |  | ? | $?$ |
| Pct Black in neighborhood |  |  |  | ? | ? |
| Family income in neighborhood |  |  |  | + | + |
| Pct immigrant in neighborhood |  |  |  | ? | ? |
| Pct Spanish speakers in neighborhood |  |  |  | ? | ? |
| Pct mobility in neighborhood |  |  |  | - | - |
| Pct grandparents in neighborhood |  |  |  | ? | ? |
| Missing census |  |  |  | ? | ? |
| Pct Hispanic at HS |  |  | ? |  | ? |
| Pct Black at HS |  |  | ? |  | ? |
| Pct economically disadvantaged at HS |  |  | - |  | - |
| Pct immigrant at HS |  |  | ? |  | ? |
| Campus Size |  |  | ? |  | ? |

The " + " sign corresponds with a hypothesized marginal effect greater than zero.
The "-" sign corresponds with a hypothesized marginal effect less than zero.
A "?" indicates that the effect cannot be a priori hypothesized.

Table 4.6 Theoretically-dervied hypotheses of effects for the outcome Dropped out and Not Pregnant

| Models |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variables | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Hispanic | + | + | + | + | + |
| Black | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Economically disadvantaged |  | + | + | + | + |
| Math |  | - | - | - | - |
| Nomath |  | + | + | + | + |
| Language needs |  | - | - | - | - |
| Gifted |  | - | - | - | - |
| Speced |  | - | - | - | - |
| Immigrant |  | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Border |  | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Pct Hispanic in neighborhood |  |  |  | ? | ? |
| Pct Black in neighborhood |  |  |  | ? | ? |
| Family income in neighborhood |  |  |  | - | - |
| Pct immigrant in neighborhood |  |  |  | ? | ? |
| Pct Spanish speakers in neighborhood |  |  |  | ? | ? |
| Pct mobility in neighborhood |  |  |  | + | + |
| Pct grandparents in neighborhood |  |  |  | ? | ? |
| Missing census |  |  |  | ? | ? |
| Pct Hispanic at HS |  |  | ? |  | ? |
| Pct Black at HS |  |  | ? |  | ? |
| Pct economically disadvantaged at HS |  |  | + |  | + |
| Pct immigrant at HS |  |  | ? |  | ? |
| Campus Size |  |  | ? |  | ? |

The " + " sign corresponds with a hypothesized marginal effect greater than zero.

Table 5.4. Dropout and pregnancy by ethnicity and age (in percent)

|  | Conservative |  |  |  |  |  | Inclusive |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dependent variable (joint distribution of Pregnant and Dropped outcomes) |  |  |  | Marginal distributions |  | Dependent variable (joint distribution of Pregnant and Dropped outcomes) |  |  |  | Marginal distributions |  |
| Among: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dropped } \\ & \& \\ & \text { Pregnant } \end{aligned}$ | Not Dropped \& Pregnant | Dropped \& Not Pregnant | Not <br> Dropped \& Not Pregnant | Pregnant | Dropped | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dropped } \\ \& \\ \text { Pregnant } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Not Dropped \& Pregnant | Dropped \& Not Pregnant | Not <br> Dropped \& Not <br> Pregnant | Pregnant | Dropped |
| $\underset{(\mathrm{N}=145,175)}{\text { All }}$ | 0.41 | 1.2 | 9.1 | 89.3 | 1.6 | 9.6 | 4.3 | 1.5 | 34.9 | 59.2 | 5.9 | 39.3 |
| All Whites ( $\mathrm{N}=68,221$ ) | 0.15 | 0.4 | 5.3 | 94.2 | 0.6 | 5.4 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 28.7 | 68.1 | 3.2 | 31.0 |
| All Hispanics (N=54,017) | 0.72 | 2.0 | 12.7 | 84.6 | 2.8 | 13.4 | 5.8 | 2.1 | 41.4 | 50.7 | 7.9 | 47.2 |
| All Blacks $(\mathrm{N}=22,937)$ | 0.43 | 1.3 | 12.4 | 86.0 | 1.7 | 12.8 | 7.0 | 2.2 | 38.0 | 52.4 | 9.2 | 45.0 |
| normal-age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All | 0.08 | 0.6 | 4.9 | 94.5 | 0.7 | 5.0 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 24.5 | 72.7 | 2.7 | 26.1 |
| White | 0.03 | 0.2 | 3.0 | 96.8 | 0.2 | 3.0 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 22.1 | 76.4 | 1.5 | 23.0 |
| Hispanic | 0.18 | 1.4 | 7.6 | 90.9 | 1.5 | 7.8 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 28.1 | 67.6 | 4.3 | 30.4 |
| Black older | 0.04 | 0.5 | 6.2 | 93.2 | 0.6 | 6.3 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 26.0 | 69.9 | 4.1 | 28.5 |

Table 5.9. Dropout and pregnancy outcomes by family income and their marginal distributions (as percent)

|  | Conservative |  |  |  |  |  | Inclusive |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dependent variable (joint distribution of Pregnant and Dropped outcomes) |  |  |  | Marginal distributions |  | Dependent variable (joint distribution of Pregnant and Dropped outcomes) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Among: | Dropped \& Pregnant | Not <br>  <br> Pregnant | Dropped \& Not Pregnant | Not <br> Dropped \& Not Pregnant | Preg nant | Drop <br> ped | Dropped \& Pregnant | Not <br>  <br> Pregnant |  <br> Not <br> Pregnant | Not <br> Dropped \& Not Pregnant | Preg nant | Drop ped |
| All non-poor | 0.1 | 0.3 | 3.7 | 95.9 | 0.4 | 3.8 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 23.7 | 73.9 | 2.6 | 25.4 |
| Normal age, nonpoor | 0.02 | 0.2 | 2.0 | 97.9 | 0.2 | 2.0 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 17.9 | 81.1 | 1.2 | 18.5 |
| Above normal age, non-poor | 0.3 | 1.0 | 12.3 | 86.3 | 1.4 | 12.7 | 7.2 | 2.3 | 51.5 | 39.3 | 9.5 | 58.7 |
| All poor | 0.7 | 1.1 | 7.9 | 90.9 | 1.7 | 8.6 | 0.7 | 1.8 | 13.3 | 84.3 | 2.5 | 14.0 |
| Normal age, poor | 0.2 | 1.1 | 8.0 | 90.9 | 1.3 | 8.2 | 2.6 | 2.0 | 31.6 | 64.0 | 4.6 | 34.2 |
| Above normal age, $\qquad$ poor | 1.3 | 2.7 | 20.2 | 75.7 | 4.1 | 21.5 | 11.4 | 2.4 | 58.9 | 27.5 | 13.8 | 70.3 |



Table 5.11. Hispanic Dropout and Pregnancy outcomes by immigrant versus non-immigrant status (as percent)


Table 5.12. Dropout and pregnancy outcomes among Hispanics by family income and age (as percent)
Dependent variable (joint distribution of
Pregnant and Dropped outcomes) $\quad$ Marginal distributions

## Not



## Non-poor

Non-poor Hispanic natives

| All ages | 0.2 | 1.0 | 6.1 | 92.7 | 1.3 | 6.3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Normal age | 0.02 | 0.7 | 2.5 | 96.8 | 0.7 | 2.6 |
| Above normal <br> age | 0.8 | 2.1 | 16.3 | 80.8 | 2.9 | 17.1 |
| Non-poor Hispanic immigrants |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All ages | 0.00 | 0.8 | 17.8 | 81.4 | 0.8 | 17.8 |
| Normal age | 0.00 | 1.0 | 16.5 | 82.5 | 1.0 | 16.5 |
| Above normal <br> age | 0.00 | 0.4 | 18.7 | 80.9 | 0.4 | 18.7 |
| Poor Hispanic natives |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All ages | 0.9 | 2.5 | 13.9 | 82.7 | 3.4 | 14.8 |
| Normal age | 0.3 | 1.7 | 8.6 | 89.5 | 1.9 | 8.8 |
| Above normal <br> age | 1.8 | 3.5 | 20.7 | 74.1 | 5.3 | 22.4 |
| Poor Hispanic immigrants |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All ages | 0.3 | 1.1 | 13.2 | 85.4 | 1.4 | 13.5 |
| Normal age | 0.03 | 0.8 | 9.8 | 89.4 | 0.8 | 9.8 |
| Above normal <br> age | 0.5 | 1.4 | 16.3 | 81.8 | 1.9 | 16.8 |

Figure 5.2 Histogram of the1990-91 statewide 5th grade normalized and standardized TAAS math scores (both sexes).


## Tests of hypotheses

Test of hypothesis for multiple coefficients across three models for each of three outcomes using conservative measurements for above-normal age females

|  | DP |  |  | NDP |  |  | DNP |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | C3 | C4 | C5 | C3 | C4 | C5 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| Neighborhood | --- | $\begin{gathered} 0.955 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.107 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | --- | $\begin{gathered} 0.109 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.207 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | --- | $\begin{gathered} 0.198 \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.046 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ |
| High School | $\begin{gathered} 0.000 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | --- | $\begin{gathered} 0.000 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.000 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | --- | $\begin{gathered} 0.000 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.000 \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | --- | 0.001 5 |

## Major Hypotheses (Relative to the average White female)

|  |  <br> Pregnant | Not Dropped <br> and Pregnant | Dropped and <br> Not Pregnant |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hispanic | + | + | + |
| Econ.Disadvantage | + | + | + |
| Immigrant | $?$ | $?$ | $?$ |
| Border | $?$ | $?$ | $?$ |
| Black | + | $?$ | $?$ |
| Special education | - | - | + |
| Age: older | + | + | + |

## Pregnancy Outcome Rates for Texas by

## Smoothed Counties, 1995-1999

Fertility; 15-17 years; All Races; All Ethnicities


The rate for Texas is 46.64.
National statistics ${ }^{\ddagger}$ The rate for the nation is $\mathbf{3 2 . 0 1}$.
The upper 10th percentle rates for this demograpilic group are 48.77 and above.
The lower 10th percentlie rates for this demographic group are 15.63 and below.

Source: 1-CDC, National Center for Health Statistics, Division of Vital Statistics, National Vital Statistics System.
2-U.S. Bureau of the Census, United States population estimates, by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin: 1995-1999. Washington: U.S. Department of Commerce.
Map classification method: Equal Interval

## Magnitude of the issue: dropouts



## Magnitude of the issue: pregnancy/births

"TEENAGE PREGNANCY RATES ... DECLINED CONSIDERABLY IN THE 1990'S ... DOWN 15 PERCENT" (FEMALES 15-19 YRS)
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, Jan. 2000, Series 21 No.

In the United States, teen pregnancy rates have dropped in the last decade, but the decline is the smallest for
Latinas...WPTV - West Palm Beach,FL, Sept. 14, 2007.
However, in 1995, "about 1 out of 3 sexually active black and Hispanic teenagers became pregnant compared with about 1 out of 6 sexually active non-Hispanic white teenagers.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, Jan. 2000, Series 21 No. 56

In 2002, Hispanics had the highest birth rate: 83.4 births per 1000 females (Martin eta. 2005)

Magnitude of the issue: pregnancy/births US and TEXAS

Teen Pregnancy Rate for Girls Aged 15-19 by Race/Ethnicity, 2000 (Rate per 1,000)

| Statistic | Texas | United States |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Non-Hispanic Whites | 65 | 55 |
| African Americans | 120 | 153 |
| Hispanics | 142 | 138 |

Source: The National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy (2007) compiled from a report by The Alan Guttmacher Institute (2004).

## Magnitude of the issue: pregnancy/births TEXAS

## 1996: Texas $1^{\text {st }}$ in number of teenage pregnancies ${ }_{\text {(oc } 2000)}$

A consequence: by 2007, Webb county in Texas
had the highest proportionof children under 5-yrs old.

Age $\quad$| Number of |
| :--- |
| individuals |$\quad$ Percent within cohort

| Below normal age* <br> 14 | 3,711 | 2.6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Normal age* |  |  |
| 14 | 44,809 | 30.9 |
| 15 | 50,556 | 34.8 |
|  |  |  |
| Above normal age* |  |  |
| 15 | 17,616 | 12.1 |
| 16 | 20,743 | 14.3 |
| 17 | 5,922 | 4.1 |
| 18 | 1,403 | 1.0 |
| 19 | NA |  |
| 20 | NA |  |
|  |  | 99.7 |
|  |  |  |
| Total(ex cluding 19 and |  |  |
| 20 yearolds): |  |  |

*Anindividual was classified as normal-age if her birth date satisfied state guidelines matchingages with grade levels.
**NA indicates counts that cannot be revealed a srequired by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). The cohort sample size is 145,175 . Thus, the $415(=145,175-144,760)$ ex cluded girls in the cohort, who were ages 19 and 20 , represent less than 0.3 percent of the cohort sample size.

Table 5.14. Means and standard deviations of individual characteristics and their neighborhood characteristics averaged over individuals (as percents or a 0-to-1 binary

|  | variable) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\underline{\text { Meandard }}$ |
| Variables | 0.37 | 0 | 1 | $\underline{\text { Deviation }}$ |
| Hispanic | 0.16 | 0 | 1 | 0.48 |
| Black | 0.03 | 0 | 1 | 0.37 |
| Below normal age | 0.32 | 0 | 1 | 0.47 |
| Above normal age | 0.16 | 0 | 1 | 0.37 |
| Hispanic-above normal age | 0.06 | 0 | 1 | 0.24 |
| Black-above normal age interaction | 0.58 | 0 | 1 | 0.49 |
| Economically disadvantaged | -0.02 | -4.01 | 1.64 | 0.86 |
| Math | 0.23 | 0 | 1 | 0.42 |
| Nomath | 0.13 | 0 | 1 | 0.33 |
| Language needs | 0.09 | 0 | 1 | 0.28 |
| Gifted | 0.07 | 0 | 1 | 0.26 |
| Speced | 0.06 | 0 | 1 | 0.24 |
| Immigrant | 0.14 | 0 | 1 | 0.35 |
| Border | 0.34 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.31 |
| Pct Hispanic in neighborhood | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.95 | 0.19 |
| Pct Black in neighborhood | 37,886 | 0.00 | 134,081 | 19,181 |
| Family income in neighborhood | 0.13 | 0.00 | 61.55 | 0.12 |
| Pct immigrant in neighborhood | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.91 | 0.25 |
| Pct Spanish speakers in neighborhood | 0.46 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.15 |
| Pct mobility in neighborhood | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.03 |
| Pct grandparents in neighborhood | 0.00 | 0 | 1 | 0.03 |
| Missing census | 0.37 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.32 |
| Pct Hispanic at HS | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.98 | 0.21 |
| Pct Black at HS | 0.51 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.25 |
| Pct economically disadvantaged at HS | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.96 | 0.10 |
| Pct immigrant at HS | 0.24 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.36 |
| Hispanic-Pct Hispanic at HS | 0.35 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.32 |
| Pct Hispanic females at HS | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 0.21 |
| Pct Black females at HS | 0.51 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.25 |
| Pct econ. disadvantaged females at | 0.06 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.09 |
| Pct immigrant females at HS | 0.23 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.36 |
| Hispanic-Pct Hispanic at HS | 1472 | 6 | 880 | 3795 |
| Campus Size |  |  | 1 |  |


${ }^{1}$ Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS)
"C" indicates source files that were used to identify individuals in the cohort (dataset construction).
"ch" indicates sources used for checking duplicate observations and other low-frequency but potentially serious identifications problems originating from the construction of the data.
"V" indicates source files used to construct new variables (variables construction).
"DV" (for Dependent Variable) indicates source files used in contructing both conservative and inclusive measures of the dependent variable defined by pregnancy and dropout outcomes.
" + " indicates source files used to add or match demographic characteristics in the cohort.

- Files not available in those years; they either did not exist (e.g. Leaver) or were replaced (e.g. Drop, Drop Reason).
** TSP files either did not exist or were not available for use.

| Data file types | $\begin{gathered} 1990- \\ \underline{1991} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1991- \\ 1992 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1992- \\ 1993 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1993- \\ 1994 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1994- \\ & 1995 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1995- \\ 1996 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1996- \\ 1997 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1997- \\ & 1998 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1998- \\ 1999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1999- \\ & 2000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | uses of data sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Attendance |  |  | V, DV | V, DV | V, DV | V, DV | V, DV | V, DV | V, DV | V, DV | campuses devoted to serving pregnant girls (conservative \& inclusive) |
| Drop | ** | ** |  |  | DV | DV | DV | DV | DV | - |  |
| Drop Reason <br> Leaver | ** | ** | ** | - | DV | DV | DV | DV | DV | DV | dropout and pregnancy outcomes (conservative \& inclusive) |
| Graduation |  |  |  |  | DV | DV | DV | DV | DV | DV | dropout information (inclusive only) |
| TAAS, all grades | V, + | V, + | V, + | V, + | V, + | V, + | V, + | V, + | V, + | V, + | standardized math scores |

${ }^{1}$ Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS)
"C" indicates source files that were used to identify individuals in the cohort (dataset construction).
"ch" indicates sources used for checking duplicate observations and other low-frequency but potentially serious identifications problems originating from the construction of the data.
"V" indicates source files used to construct new variables (variables construction).
"DV" (for Dependent Variable) indicates source files used in contructing both conservative and inclusive measures of the dependent variable defined by pregnancy and dropout outcomes.
" + " indicates source files used to add or match demographic characteristics in the cohort.

- Files not available in those years; they either did not exist (e.g. Leaver) or were replaced (e.g. Drop, Drop Reason).
** TSP files either did not exist or were not available for use.


## Results - high school exposure

Marginal effects for below- and normal age girls, moderately measured

| Percent | DP | NDP | DNP |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hispanic | $(0.001)^{* * *}$ | $(0.001)^{* * *}$ | $(0.045)^{* * *}$ |
| Black | $(0.000)^{* * *}$ | $(0.000)^{* * *}$ | NS |
| Economically disadvantaged | $0.022^{* *}$ | 0.041 | NS |
| Immigrant | NS | NS | NS |
| Campus Size | $0.064^{* * *}$ | $0.224^{* * *}$ | $2.023^{* * *}$ |

For a unit change of $0 \%$ to $100 \%$ for percents; from min. to max. for campus size * p <.10, ** p <.05, *** p <. 01

## Interpretation / Plausible Explanations <br> Dropping Out

- Hopelessness of poverty
- Educational future
- Employment future
- Dysfunctional family
- Abuse
- Parenting
- Cultural identity
- Membership attachment
- Gender role
- Health policy
- Education policy
- Abstinence only vs sex education in schools
- Poor academic performance
- Attachment to school
- Economic disadvantage
- Abuse as child
- Attachment to school
- Poor academic performance
- Culture
- Hispanic vs. Black
- Catholicism vs. Protestantism
- Mexican-heritage vs. American heritage
- Acculturation/assimilation
- Color line
- Transitions and adjustments


## Measurement: dependent variable

Table 5.4. Dropout and pregnancy by ethnicity and age (in percent)

| - | Conservative |  |  |  |  |  | Inclusive |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dependent variable (joint distribution of Pregnant and Dropped outcomes) |  |  |  | Marginal distributions |  | Dependent variable (joint distribution of Pregnant and Dropped outcomes) |  |  |  | Marginal distributions |  |
|  | Dropped \& Pregnant | Not <br> Dropped <br> $\&$ <br> Pregnant | Dropped <br> \& Not <br> Pregnant | Not <br> Dropped <br> \& Not <br> Pregnant |  |  | Dropped <br>  <br> Pregnant | Not <br>  <br> Pregnant | Dropped \& Not Pregnant | Not <br> Dropped <br> \& Not <br> Pregnant |  |  |
| Among: |  |  |  |  | Pregnant | Dropped |  |  |  |  | Pregnant | Dropped |
| All ( $\mathrm{N}=145,175$ ) | 0.41 | 1.2 | 9.1 | 89.3 | 1.6 | 9.6 | 4.3 | 1.5 | 34.9 | 59.2 | 5.9 | 39.3 |
| All Whites ( $\mathrm{N}=68,221$ ) | 0.15 | 0.4 | 5.3 | 94.2 | 0.6 | 5.4 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 28.7 | 68.1 | 3.2 | 31.0 |
| All Hispanics ( $\mathrm{N}=54,017$ ) | 0.72 | 2.0 | 12.7 | 84.6 | 2.8 | 13.4 | 5.8 | 2.1 | 41.4 | 50.7 | 7.9 | 47.2 |
| All Blacks ( $\mathrm{N}=22,937$ ) | 0.43 | 1.3 | 12.4 | 86.0 | 1.7 | 12.8 | 7.0 | 2.2 | 38.0 | 52.4 | 9.2 | 45.0 |
| normal-age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All | 0.08 | 0.6 | 4.9 | 94.5 | 0.7 | 5.0 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 24.5 | 72.7 | 2.7 | 26.1 |
| White | 0.03 | 0.2 | 3.0 | 96.8 | 0.2 | 3.0 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 22.1 | 76.4 | 1.5 | 23.0 |
| Hispanic | 0.18 | 1.4 | 7.6 | 90.9 | 1.5 | 7.8 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 28.1 | 67.6 | 4.3 | 30.4 |
| Black | 0.04 | 0.5 | 6.2 | 93.2 | 0.6 | 6.3 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 26.0 | 69.9 | 4.1 | 28.5 |
| older |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All | 1.1 | 2.4 | 18.5 | 78.1 | 3.5 | 19.6 | 10.4 | 2.3 | 57.2 | 30.1 | 12.7 | 67.7 |
| White | 0.6 | 1.4 | 14.6 | 83.4 | 2.0 | 15.2 | 7.8 | 2.1 | 55.0 | 35.1 | 9.9 | 62.8 |
| Hispanic | 1.5 | 2.9 | 19.4 | 76.2 | 4.4 | 20.9 | 10.6 | 2.1 | 58.9 | 28.4 | 12.8 | 69.5 |
| Black | 1.0 | 2.4 | 21.8 | 74.9 | 3.4 | 22.8 | 13.9 | 3.0 | 56.3 | 26.8 | 16.9 | 70.3 |

## Measurement: published Texas birth rates by age/ethnicity/year

Table 5.5. Birth rates per 1000 females aged 15-19 in Texas, by ethnicity for years 1995-2000

| Year | $\frac{3}{\text { Black }}$ |  | Hispanic | $\frac{\text { White }}{}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1995 | 97 | 119 | 44 |  |
| 1996 | 94 | 117 | 42 |  |
| 1997 | 94 | 117 | 41 |  |
| 1998 | 90 | 119 | 40 |  |
| 1999 | 86 | 123 | 39 |  |
| 2000 | 80 | 104 | 42 |  |

Sources: Birth statistics were calculated by author using data available from the Texas Department of State Health Services, Texas Health Data. These data were accessed using the customizable statistical reports, http://soupfin.tdh.state.tx.us/birthdoc.htm and http://soupfin.tdh.state.tx.us/people.htm. Population statistics for 1995 through 1999 were estimates. The 2000 population was calculated by author using the 2000 U.S. Census factfinder table selection for White non-Hispanic, Black-alone and Hispanic, http://factfinder:census.gov/.

Summary of the dependent variable

## Conservative

- Official HS dropout rates
\&
- Conservative pregnancy measures


## Moderate

- Inclusive HS dropout rates
\&
- Conservative pregnancy measures


[^0]:    *p <. 10 ** $\mathrm{p}<.05^{* * *}$ p $<.01$

