AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS
OF
ABSTINENCE–ONLY SEX EDUCATION
IN ALABAMA

by

SONDRA RENAÉ COLLINS

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Economics, Finance, and Legal Studies
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2011

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this dissertation is to assess the demand for, effectiveness of, and economic impact of Alabama's Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs. The specific outcomes to be examined in this study are gonorrhea, Chlamydia, birth, and abortion rates among Alabama teens. The particular programs assessed in this study were created by Title V Section 510 of the Social Security Act and authorized under the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The funding for Title V abstinence-only sex education programs became available from the federal government in 1998. The focus of this study is to determine what characteristics lead Alabama counties to adopt this particular type of sex education, the extent to which the decline in negative teen outcomes observed from 1998-2007 can be attributed to Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs and the amount of public funds that were saved as a result of adopting these programs.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my grandmother, Fannie L. Collins, who always wanted to have a doctor in the family.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

ADHR	Alabama Department of Human Resources
ADPH	Alabama Department of Public Health
AMA	Alabama Medicaid Agency
ASHA	American Social Health Association
CDC	Centers for Disease Control
FE	Fixed Effects
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HPV	Human Papillomavirus
IV	Instrumental Variable
OLS	Ordinary Least Square
PSM	Propensity Score Matching
RE	Random Effects
STD	Sexually Transmitted Disease
SNAP	Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program
TE	Treatment Effect

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It's hard to believe that this chapter in my life has come to an end. The completion of this doctoral degree has been an amazing journey and it would not have been possible without the help of so many people. I want take a moment to give thanks to everyone that gave their love, support, and encouragement during this process. There were innumerous times when your support kept me on the right path.

When it comes to overall support, I couldn't ask for more supportive family. My family believes in me even during those periods when I don't believe in myself. Knowing that I have their support in everything I do, gives me the strength to strive for excellence. I would like to begin by thank my mother, Dorothy Ann Collins McCaskill. She has encouraged me in every chapter of my life (and she really likes to see her name in print). My mother always believed I could achieve my goals, even when I changed those goals every week. I'd also like to thank my sisters and brothers (listed by age) Oswald Garrison, LaVera Gwynne, Stephen Xavier, Robert Earl, Gloria Nicole, Veranda Karan, Jasmine D'Altha, and Vandria Kierra for all of their love and support. The best thing about being a part of a large family is always having a sibling to lean on. Whether I need someone to comfort me, encourage me, make me laugh, cry with me, or just listen, there is always a sibling I can call. My aunt Leaner and uncle Morris have also been an amazing source of strength. They always have my best interest at heart. My list of thanks could not be complete if I didn't thank my uncle Irvin. He made sure my mom wasn't too hard on me when I was a kid and has encouraged me continuously as an adult. My family is absolutely amazing and I've only named a small portion of my family members. If I listed every family member, the list would be longer than the dissertation, so I'll just stop here and say thanks to my entire family. I couldn't have done it without you.

In addition to my amazing family, I have been blessed with some amazing friends. I have friends that I can call for anything even if we haven't spoken in years. It's amazing to have that kind of support and know that no matter what I have on my plate, my friends will help me make sense of it – especially Donald Green, Regina McCray, and Sedrick Stewart. I've known these guys forever and they have always been there when I need them.

I never would have considered pursuing a PhD in Economics had it not been for continued encouragement from Arthur King, Olasope Oyelaran, Charles Becker, and Cedric Jackson during my undergraduate career at WSSU. The first year of the PhD program was especially tough and I would never have survived it without Patrick Cooper, Ezekiel Nichols, Will Walsh and Mehmet Yaya. They encouraged, supported, and challenged me throughout the process. Over the course of the program, my support system continued to grow and I know those frienships will last a lifetime. I'd especially like to thank Miesha Williams, Michaela Patton, Patrick Washington, Karl Boulware, Ejindu Ume and Derek Gibbs for their support.

Finally I'd like to give special thanks to those who helped with the dissertation process. I am especially thankful to the members of my dissertation committee. This chapter could not have been completed if they had not shared their knowledge and expertise. To my committee chair, Gary Hoover, committee members, James Cover, Billy Helms, Junsoo Lee, Mehmet Yaya and my unofficial committee member Chapman Greer, thanks so much for keeping me motivated and sharing your knowledge of the research process. Your advice has been invaluable and I will continue to follow your words of wisdom as I move forward in my career. I'd also like to thank Ms. Sandy Powell of the Alabama Department of Public Health for opening her office to me. Without the information that I received from her office, this dissertation would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Sexually active teens are at risk for sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) and pregnancies. These events can have serious consequences for the teens involved as well as society. Taxpayers in the United States pay billions of dollars for teen STD and pregnancy related issues. The American Social Health Association (ASHA) estimates annual direct costs of all STDs to the health care system at $8.4 billion in the United States in 1996 and $132.1 million in Alabama alone (Alexander et al., 1998). According to the Alabama Department of Public Health (ADPH), about 30 percent of those treated for STDs are under the age of nineteen (ADPH statistics), implying that a significant amount of health care costs are geared toward treating STDs in people under the age of nineteen. The ASHA estimates only include direct medical costs of illnesses and doctors' visits caused by pre-diagnosed STDs and complications from STDs. The estimates do not include the cost of STD prevention, STD screening, loss of wages and productivity due to STD-related illness, or any out-of-pocket costs. Only total cost paid via the healthcare system, by either private insurance or public assistance, is included.

The National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy estimates the net public cost of teen childbearing in a 2006 report. According to the report, the United States incurs $9.1 billion in net public costs for teen childbearing in 2004; Alabama taxpayers pay a net public cost of approximately $178 million dollars for teen childbearing. These net public cost estimates include increases in public health care costs, child welfare costs, state prison system costs, and lost tax revenue incurred by those who become parents before age twenty. These are net costs because some costs would have been incurred even if the teens had waited until age twenty to

become parents (Hoffman, 2006). Unlike the STD estimates, the pregnancy estimates do not include all costs to the health care system, only public costs and only costs for those who become parents before age twenty.

Besides the monetary costs of teen pregnancy and STDs, there are several non-monetary costs of sexual involvement, born by all sexually active teens. Sabia (2007) finds that sexually activity by teens increases school suspensions and absences from school, decreases affinity for school, and decreases aspirations for college. Rector and Noyes (2003) find that teens that have sex are more likely to be depressed and to attempt suicide than those who abstain, regardless of whether they become teen parents or experience STDs.

There are additional non-monetary costs for those teens who acquire a STDs. Complications of bacterial STDs like Chlamydia and gonorrhea can lead to pelvic inflammatory disease (PID), chronic pain, infertility and tubal pregnancies, which can affect a woman's health and productivity throughout her lifetime (Alexander et al., 1998). Furthermore, people who have bacterial STDs are three to five times more likely to contract a viral STD like human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) than other people. Viral STDs like human papillomavirus (HPV) and HIV may require treatment over a period of years, which causes a loss in both productivity and wages. HPV infections may cause precancerous cervical lesions and possibly cervical cancer. HIV generally requires several medications with numerous adverse side effects (Kaiser, 1998). In addition, virtually every STD can be passed from a pregnant woman to her child. Because infants' immune systems are still developing, infections that are serious for an adult can be life threatening to a newborn. Common STD-related problems for infants include low birth weight, premature birth, conjunctivitis, pneumonia, neurologic problems, and congenital

abnormalities (Alexander et al., 1998). For infants who survive, these complications can have life-long effects, which can influence the level of human capital they acquire.

Aside from direct expenditure by the public sector, there are additional costs of teen parenting to the teens and society. Card and Wise (1978) find that both teen mothers and teen fathers obtain less education than those who postpone parenthood until their twenties. This yields lower human capital for society and lower wages for those who become teen parents. Fletcher and Wolfe (2009) find that teen mothers have a lower probability of graduating high school and are more likely to have lower income in their twenties. Examining women at age twenty-seven, Hofferth and Moore (1979) find that the indirect effects of early parenting, such as increased family size and lower earning spouses, lead to greater incidences of poverty for teen mothers compared to those who postpone childbearing to age twenty or older. Research by Geronimus and Korenman (1992) and Ribar (1994) concludes that teenage childbearing is not necessarily a cause of poor socioeconomic outcomes and may be just another symptom. These authors suggest that programs that help teens improve their socioeconomic status will do more to decrease teen pregnancy than programs that focus solely on sexual behaviors.

Research also suggests that teenage parenting not only has negative effects on the parents, but their children as well. Dahinten et al. (2007) find that ten to fifteen year-old children born to a young teen mother (age 13-17) had significantly lower math competency scores, even after controlling for several socioeconomic and individual factors about the mother. Haveman et al. (1997) find that if mothers who had children when they were younger than fifteen years old were to delay their childbearing until they were at least twenty years old, it would increase the probability that their children would finish high school by approximately eleven percent. They also find that if other young mothers (age 16-19) were to delay their childbearing until they were

at least twenty years old, it would increase the probability that their children would finish high school by approximately eight percent. Moore et al. (1997) find that children born to adolescent mothers aged seventeen and younger have lower scores in mathematics, reading recognition, and reading comprehension than children born to parents ages twenty or twenty-one. These lower scores increase the probability that the children of teen parents will obtain less education than their counterparts. George and Bong (1997) find that children of adolescent parents are more likely to be abused or neglected and are more likely to enter foster care than children born to parents twenty years old. Grogger (1997) finds that delaying childbearing reduces the likelihood of a young mother's son being incarcerated as an adult.

By educating teens on the dangers of risky behavior that leads to unwanted pregnancies and STDs, sex education aims to decrease the massive costs of teen childbearing and STDs. Although all sex education programs have the same basic goal, the information that they offer to adolescents varies. Sex education has been divided into two basic types: abstinence-only sex education and comprehensive sex education. Abstinence-only sex education teaches young people that the only way to be free of STDs and unplanned pregnancies is to abstain from having sex, usually until marriage. While most comprehensive sex education programs teach young people that abstaining from sex is the only absolute way to avoid STDs and unplanned pregnancies, they also discuss contraceptives and abortions (Keckner, 2008).

The federal government has been funding sex education and other types of STD and teen pregnancy prevention programs for decades. In the 1996 Title V Section 510 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA), Congress authorizes five years of funding for an abstinence-only sex education program. Each state is allocated a portion of the total $50 million annual budget based on the proportion of low-income children in their

state (NCFY Factsheet). States that accept abstinence-only sex education funds are required to provide $3 for every $4 they received in federal funds. The matching funds are allowed to come from a variety of sources including, but not limited to, private donors, community organizations, volunteer work, in-kind donations, etc. States are required to follow what is commonly referred to as the A through H (A-H) rules. The A-H rules are as follows:

A. Have as its exclusive purpose teaching the social, psychological, and health gains to be realized by abstaining from sexual activity

B. Teach abstinence from sexual activity outside marriage as the expected standard for all school-age children

C. Teach that abstinence from sexual activity is the only certain way to avoid out-of-wedlock pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases, and other associated health problems

D. Teach that a mutually faithful, monogamous relationship in the context of marriage is the expected standard of sexual activity

E. Teach that sexual activity outside the context of marriage is likely to have harmful psychological and physical effects

F. Teach that bearing children out-of-wedlock is likely to have harmful consequences for the child, the child's parents, and society

G. Teach young people how to reject sexual advances and how alcohol and drug use increases vulnerability to sexual advances

H. Teach the importance of attaining self-sufficiency before engaging in sexual activity (SSA, 2009)

The federal government's funding of abstinence-only sex education based on government mandated guidelines has led researchers and politicians to intensify the debate on the type of sex education that is most beneficial to young people.

This dissertation adds to the literature by assessing the community characteristics, effectiveness, and public cost impact attributed to Alabama's Title V abstinence-only sex education programs for the 1998-2007 period. Funding for Title V abstinence-only sex education programs has been available from the federal government since 1998. Between 1998 and 2007, the state of Alabama witnesses large decreases in birth, abortion, and gonorrhea rates

and modest increases in Chlamydia rates among 10-19 year olds. The focus of this study is to examine the characteristics of Alabama counties that choose to adopt Title V abstinence-only sex education programs between 1998 and 2007, determine how much of the decline in birth, abortion, Chlamydia and gonorrhea rates over the period can be attributed to Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs, and estimate the public cost saving created by Title V programs for the state of Alabama.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Previous research contributes greatly to our understanding of the benefits of abstinence-only sex education. Studies like those by Sather and Zinn (2002), Borawski et al. (2005), and Denny et al. (2002) evaluate a single program by surveying students before the intervention begins and again shortly after the program ends. Sather and Zinn (2002) evaluate an abstinence-only sex education program in Nebraska. The authors find that the abstinence-only program has no impact on students' attitudes toward abstinence. Borawski et al. (2005) find results that favor abstinence-only sex education when evaluating knowledge of risk associated with sexual involvement, attitudes toward abstinence, and intentions to abstain. However, the authors are unable to find any differences between the abstinence-only group and control group, when measuring actual behavior such as having sex within the previous five months and condom use at last intercourse. The authors do find that students who report being sexually active before the program begins and then receive abstinence-only sex education report fewer episodes of sexual intercourse and fewer sexual partners during the previous five month period than sexually active teens in the control group. This offers evidence that the program curbs casual sex among young teens. Interestingly, students in this study who receive abstinence-only sex education are significantly more likely to report that they plan not to use a condom if they have sex. The authors state this result needs more research.

Denny et al. (2002) evaluate the *Sex Can Wait* program in fifteen different school districts, where participants of the program are divided into age groups and assessed before the program begins and again when it ends. In all age groups, there is a control group and a

treatment group. The study finds favorable results on attitudes towards remaining abstinent and intended sexual behavior on both upper elementary students and high school students. The attitudes toward abstinence and intentions regarding sexual behavior that students report remain unchanged for middle school students when the program ends.

Critics often point out that evaluating students at the beginning and end of a program is not enough to get a true assessment of the program's impact. Denny and Young (2006), St. Pierre et al. (1995), Trenholm et al. (2008), Doniger et al. (2001), and Jemmott et al. (2010) answer this criticism by surveying program participants long after the program ends and evaluating the long-term impacts of the programs. For Denny and Young (2006), long-term is eighteen months and, like Denny, et al. (2002), they evaluate the *Sex Can Wait* program. Denny and Young (2006) find results that favored abstinence-only sex education in all three age groups. The results from the initial middle school students are the most impressive. Middle schools students, who have unchanged attitudes immediately following the program, according to Denny, et al. (2002), are significantly less likely to have sexual intercourse than those in the control group.

For twenty-seven months after the program ends, St. Pierre et al. (1995) evaluate the impact of *Stay SMART*, an abstinence-only sex education program. They perform follow-up surveys at 3, 15, and 27 months. The *Stay SMART* program is implemented at fourteen different Boys and Girls Clubs, with five of the participating clubs incorporating the *Stay SMART* program, five clubs incorporating the *Stay SMART plus Booster* (this program had follow-up sessions for the entire length of the study), and four clubs serving as the control group. Neither *Stay SMART* nor *Stay SMART plus Booster* students who are virgins at pretest show significant changes in attitudes towards abstinence. However, *Stay SMART* students who are not virgins at

pretest show changes in their attitudes about abstinence as well as their sexual behavior at the fifteen and twenty-seven month follow-ups. Considering the success of the *Stay SMART* program for non-virgins, the authors are surprised that the *Stay SMART plus Booster* students who are non-virgins are not significantly different from the control group non-virgins in neither their attitudes about abstinence nor their actual sexual behaviors.

For Trenholm et al., (2008) the follow-up period is two to five years and the results are not favorable towards the abstinence-only programs. The authors evaluate four different programs and find that none of the four programs has a significant effect on whether a teen remains abstinent or on the number of sexual partners each teen has. When asked about pregnancies and STDs, the teens in the treatment groups are equally likely to report being affected as those in the control groups.

Doniger et al. (2001) evaluate a program in Monroe County, New York, for a period of five years. They find that the teen pregnancy rate in Monroe County declined at a much faster rate than teen pregnancy rates in two similar counties and New York State as a whole during the years that "Not Me, Not Now" is being implemented.

Jemmott et al. (2010) create a "theory-based" abstinence-only program. The focus of this abstinence-only sex education program is "abstaining from vaginal, anal, and oral intercourse until a time later in life when the adolescent is more prepared to handle the consequences of sex." Marriage and other moral reasons for abstaining are not mentioned. Sixth and seventh grade African American students are recruited from four public schools that serve low-income communities. Students are randomly assigned to one of four groups – abstinence-only sex education, safe-sex only sex education, comprehensive sex education, or health-promotion control group. They have follow-up sessions at 3, 6, 12, 18, and 24 months that

correspond with their group assignment. The abstinence-only group is less likely to have initiated sex at the twenty-four month follow-up than the other groups. The abstinence-only intervention group reports significantly less sexual intercourse in the last three months than other groups at the twenty-four month follow-up, but show no statistically significant difference when asked about having multiple partners and condom use.

Hernandez (2009) uses trend analysis instead of survey data to examine the outcomes of sex education policies in Florida over the previous eighteen years. The author begins by dividing the data into two periods. In the first period, 1990-1999, Florida had a comprehensive sexuality education policy while in the second period, 2000-2007, Florida has federal support for an abstinence-only sex education program. Next, the author examines the differences in the trends of teen birth rates and STD rates such as gonorrhea, Chlamydia, and syphilis for each period. The author finds that gonorrhea rates decrease more during the abstinence sex education policy – rates decreased three times faster during the abstinence period than the comprehensive period for Hispanic females, less so for other groups, but still by a statically significant amount. Syphilis rates and birth rates decrease more during the comprehensive period than during the abstinence period. Chlamydia rates increase during both periods and show no response to either policy.

Since most abstinence-only sex education programs are small and self-evaluated, researchers like Kirby (2008) and Silva (2002) bring some of those small works together and attempt to draw conclusions about the success of abstinence-only sex education programs in general. Both authors concede that the research is just too varied in methodology and types of surveys to draw accurate conclusions about abstinence-only sex education.

This study adds to the literature by examining data on Title V abstinence-only sex education program participation and outcomes at the county level over a ten year period.

Because this study does not include survey data, it is easy for other researchers to replicate. Also by examining the program over a ten year period, we get a clear picture of the efficacy of Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs. We proceed by discussing the sources of our data, comparing the characteristics of counties that have Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs and those who do not, presenting an empirical model for examining the demand for and effectiveness of Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs, and finally examining the cost savings to the state for implementation of Title V funded programs.

CHAPTER 3

DATA

The state of Alabama submits an annual report to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The report contains information regarding all Alabama programs funded by Section 510 of Title V of the Social Security Act, which includes Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs. Using annual reports from 1998-2007, we are able to find all Title V grantees in the state and locate the counties that those grantees serve. Some grantees serve one county, while others serve several counties. Of the sixty-seven counties in Alabama, forty-nine counties receive Title V funding for least two years, while two additional counties receive Title V funding only during the 1998 fiscal year and do not serve any students. The remaining sixteen counties never receive any Title V funding. Of the fifty-one counties that receive Title V funding, fourteen counties receive funding for the full ten years of the study. On average counties that receive funding continue to adopt the program for approximately six years.

Next, we collect information from the Annual County Health Profiles, which Alabama Department of Public Health (ADPH) provides to the public. The county health profiles provide information on birth, abortion, marriage, and divorce rates as well as the percentage of teen mothers not married, and the percentage of teen mothers who use Medicaid to pay for the birth of their child. The birth rate is defined as the number of births per 1,000 women. We collect this information for three age groups – ages 10-14, ages 15-17, and ages 18-19 for the years 1998-2007. Abortion rates are calculated in the same manner as birth rates; however there is only one age group, ages 10-19. Marriage and divorce rates are calculated per 1,000 individuals residing

in a county. Data on whether the mother is unmarried or uses Medicaid is recorded at the time of the child's birth.

Next, we collect data on STD rates. The number of cases of Chlamydia and gonorrhea in each county for our age groups (ages 10-14, 15-17, and 18-19) is provided by the ADPH for each year from 1994-2007. We collect population variables from the U.S. Census Bureau, including county population by age. For the years, 1990-1999, the U.S. Census Bureau provides county populations for each age. For these years, we aggregate the data on individual ages into the three age groups. However for 2000-2007, the Census Bureau provides county populations in age groups. We collect data for two Census age groups, 10-14 year-olds and 15-19 year-olds. The 15-19 year-old age group has to be split into two smaller groups, 15-17 and 18-19. To create the two groups, we calculate the percentage of 18-19 year-olds in the larger 15-19 year-old population for each year in the 1997-1999 period. Next, we compute a three year average ratio of 18-19 year olds to the larger 15-19 year-old age group. We use the three year average and the large 15-19 year-old population data to compute the number of 18-19 year olds for the 2000-2007 period. Finally, we use the number of cases of Chlamydia and gonorrhea, along with the population in the corresponding age group, to compute Chlamydia and gonorrhea rates in the same manner that the County Health Profiles compute birth rates.

The number of students graduating from high school in each school system is provided by the Alabama Department of Education. We aggregate this data to the county level. Data on the number of students in each grade level in each school is collected from the U.S. Department of Education, which is also aggregated to the county level. We also use information from these sources to calculate graduation rates.

Graduation rates are calculated by taking the number of students who receive either a regular, advanced, or career-tech high school diploma in a given year and dividing by the number of students in the corresponding ninth grade class. The ninth grade class is calculated by taking the ninth grade class and averaging the number of students in the ninth grade class with the number of students in the previous year's eighth grade class and the next year's tenth grade class. For example, we compute the graduation rate for the year 2000 as such: we find the average number of students in the ninth grade class of 1997, the eighth grade class of 1996, and the tenth grade class of 1998. This average is considered the 1997 ninth grade class. We divide the number of students who received a regular, advanced, or career-tech diploma in 2000 by the 1997 ninth grade class. This calculation is known as the "average freshman graduation rate" and is the standard used in accountability reports by Alabama school systems (VOICES). The 'No Child Left Behind Act' has changed those standards for reporting beginning the 2010-2011 academic year, however the data required for the new accountability standard is not available for entire period of this study.

Data on the number of students who receive free lunch, the number of full time teachers, and the total number of students in each school is collected from the U.S. Department of Education. The U.S. Department of Education calculates the number of full time teachers, by counting all full time teachers as well as the portion of part time teachers' week actually spent teaching. For example if a teacher spent 30 hours per week teaching and 10 hours per week doing some other task, this counts as .75 of one full time teacher. After aggregating all variables to the county level, we use the number of full time teachers along with the number of students in each county to calculate a county level ratio of students to teachers. We then use the number of

students receiving free lunch and the total number of students to calculate the percentage of students in each county who receive free lunch during a given school year.

The financial data we collect from the U.S. Department of Education includes total expenditure, total revenue, federal revenue, state revenue, local revenue, and local property taxes each school system receives over the period. We calculate financial data on a per-student basis by dividing those variables by the number of students in the county, after aggregating school system data to the county level.

Population variables are collected from the U.S. Census Bureau including total county population, population by race, and population by gender. We use this data to calculate the percent of the population that is female, as well as the percent of the population that is nonwhite. Also collected from the U.S. Census Bureau are median household income and percentage of population under the age of eighteen living in poverty.

Voting data is collected from the Alabama Secretary of State (Chapman). Voting data consists of the percent of voters in each county that voted Republican in the previous election of the state's U.S. Representative. These results are the same for two consecutive years because elections for U.S. Representatives are held once every two years. The percentages are calculated based on the total number of individuals who vote in a given election, not the number of individuals residing in a county.

We collect a variable indicating whether or not a county is dry, meaning no alcohol can be sold in that county, from the Alabama Alcoholic Beverage Control Board. Finally, we collect information on which counties are included in Alabama's Black Belt from the Center for Economic and Business Research at the University of Alabama (CEBR). Alabama's Black Belt

counties are some of the poorest counties in the United States. This variable serves as a proxy for poverty.

In the next chapter, we examine the differences and similarities in the characteristics of counties that adopt Title V abstinence-only sex education programs and those who do not. We also examine how this characteristics change over the period. It is especially interesting to note the change in outcome variables in the two county groups over the period.

CHAPTER 4

COUNTY CHARACTERISTICS

A: Characteristics of Title V and non-Title V counties

One main aspect of this dissertation is to explore the characteristics of counties that demand Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs. In this section we discuss characteristics of Title V and non-Title V counties in 1998 and 2007. We have three basic variables that tell us about the poverty level in the county – the percentage of children (under age 18) living in poverty, the percentage of teen mothers (ages 10-19) using Medicaid to pay for the birth of their child, and the percentage of students receiving free lunch. In 1998, Title V counties have a higher percentage of children living in poverty and a higher percent of students receiving free lunch than non-Title V counties, indicating a higher level of poverty for Title V counties. However, the percent of teen mothers using Medicaid to pay for the birth of their child is lower in Title V counties in the same year. By 2007, Title V counties have a lower percent of population under eighteen living in poverty, a lower percent of teen mothers using Medicaid, and a lower percent of the students receiving free lunch, indicating a lower incidence of poverty in Title V counties (Table 4.1).

Next we explore the following education variables – the percentage of students who graduate from high school in four years, the student-teacher ratio for the county, and the total expenditure per student. In 1998, Title V counties have lower graduation rates, suggesting a lower value of education. However, Title V counties also have a lower student teacher ratio, and a higher total expenditure per student than non-Title V counties, which suggests a higher value of education. In 2007, Title V counties have a higher graduation rate, a lower student teacher ratio,

and a higher total expenditure per student, all of which suggest a higher community value on education (Table 4.2).

Title V and non-Title V Poverty Variables			
percent of population under 18 living in poverty			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
All Counties	25.85	27.41	6.03
Title V Counties	27.00	27.01	0.04
non Title V Counties	24.98	27.91	11.73
percent teens mothers using Medicaid			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
All Counties	82.35	83.81	1.77
Title V Counties	81.61	82.90	1.58
non Title V Counties	82.92	84.92	2.41
percent of students receiving free lunch			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
All Counties	44.40	49.10	10.59
Title V Counties	49.45	47.76	-3.42
non Title V Counties	40.47	50.77	25.45

Table 4.1 Compares poverty variables in Title V and non-Title V counties for 1998 and 2007. Also shows the percentage change in those variables over the period.

There are four basic cultural variables – the percentage of the population voting for a Republican candidate for US House of Representatives, whether the county is dry, the percentage of teen mothers not married when they give birth, and the county's divorce rate. In 1998, Title V counties have a lower divorce rate, a lower percentage of the population voting for a Republican candidate, a lower percentage of counties prohibiting the sale of alcohol, and a higher percentage of teen mothers not married. In 2007, Title V counties have a higher divorce rate, a higher percentage of the population voting for a Republican candidate, a lower percentage of unmarried teens giving birth, and a lower percentage of counties prohibiting the sale of alcohol (Table 4.3).

We explore three demographic variables – the percentage of the population that is nonwhite, the percentage of the population that is female, and the percentage of the population that is between the ages of ten and nineteen (teen population). In 1998, Title V counties have a larger nonwhite population than non-Title V counties, while the other two demographic variables are approximately the same in both the Title V and non-Title V groups. In 2007, Title V counties have a smaller nonwhite population than non-Title V counties, while the other two demographic groups remain about the same (Table 4.4).

Title V and non-Title V Education Variables

graduation rates

	1998	2007	Percentage Change
All Counties	64.36	64.68	0.50
Title V Counties	63.92	65.46	2.41
non Title V Counties	64.70	63.72	-1.51

student teacher ratio

	1998	2007	Percentage Change
All Counties	17.23	15.98	-7.25
Title V Counties	17.14	15.83	-7.64
non Title V Counties	17.29	16.16	-6.54

total expenditure per student

	1998	2007	Percentage Change
All Counties	5629.55	9252.84	64.36
Title V Counties	5657.05	9330.79	64.94
non Title V Counties	5608.56	9156.70	63.26

Table 4.2 Compares education variables in Title V and non-Title V counties for 1998 and 2007. Also shows the percentage change in those variables over the period.

Along with discussing the demand for Title V abstinence-only sex education programs, we also discuss the effectiveness of the programs in Alabama. Chlamydia rates, gonorrhea rates, birth rates, and abortion rates are used in this study to access the efficacy of Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs. In 1998, the year Title V is implemented, the gonorrhea rates for Alabama teens are 0.84, 10.07, and 17.88 per 1,000 teens in the following

age groups 10-14, 15-17 and 18-19, respectively (Table 4.5). By 2007, the gonorrhea rates for Alabama teens have declined at least twenty-five percent for all age groups. Between 1998 and 2007, there is a statewide increase in Chlamydia rates for all age groups ranging from a thirty-five percent increase for 10-14 years to a 102 percent increase for 18-19 year olds. Over the same period, birth rates in Alabama decline by approximately thirty percent statewide for 10-19 year olds. Abortion rates decline thirty-seven percent from 8.6 per 1,000 in 1998 to 5.4 per 1,000 in 2007 for 10-19 year olds (Table 4.5). This dissertation examines how much of the decline in gonorrhea, birth, and abortion rates during this period can be attributed to Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs and whether those programs have helped curb the increase in Chlamydia rates.

Title V and non-Title V Culture Variables

percent voting republican

	1998	2007	Percentage Change
All Counties	51.63	51.96	0.64
Title V Counties	44.98	53.85	19.72
non Title V Counties	56.70	49.65	-12.43

dry county

	1998	2007	Percentage Change
All Counties	38.81	38.81	2.15
Title V Counties	24.13	32.43	-20.35
non Title V Counties	50.00	46.67	30.13

percent teens mothers not married

	1998	2007	Percentage Change
All Counties	67.10	74.34	10.79
Title V Counties	73.20	72.58	-0.85
non Title V Counties	62.44	76.52	22.55

divorce rate

	1998	2007	Percentage Change
All Counties	5.51	4.48	-18.69
Title V Counties	5.32	4.51	-15.23
non Title V Counties	5.66	4.44	-21.55

Table 4.3 Compares culture variables for Title V and non-Title V counties for 1998 and 2007. Also shows the percentage change in those variables over the period.

Title V and non-Title V Demographic Variables			
percent nonwhite population			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
All Counties	29.78	30.41	2.12
Title V Counties	38.69	23.76	-38.59
non Title V Counties	23.76	31.57	32.87
percent female population			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
All Counties	51.91	51.47	-0.85
Title V Counties	52.19	51.73	-0.86
non Title V Counties	51.73	51.44	-0.56
percent teen population (ages 10-19)			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
All Counties	14.93	13.73	-8.04
Title V Counties	15.38	14.63	-4.88
non Title V Counties	14.63	13.84	-5.40

Table 4.4 Compares demographic variables in Title V and non-Title V counties for 1998 and 2007. Also shows the percentage change in those variables over the period.

Before discussing the data, we take a moment to caution the reader about one difference in the method we use to calculate the STD rates for Title V and non-Title county groups and the method we use to calculate birth and abortion rates for these two groups. The STD rates for each county are calculated so that we compute an actual STD rate for county groups in the same manner that we compute individual county rates. For example, we sum the STD cases from all Title V counties for each age group and sum the population living in those counties for the corresponding age groups and then divide the number of cases by the corresponding population and multiply by 1,000. However, birth and abortion rates are calculated by the ADPH. In this case, we do not have the actually number of cases. Instead of calculating a birth and abortion rate for Title V counties and non-Title V counties, we simply find the average birth and abortion rates for each county group.

A simple look at the data provides some clues as to the success of Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs. Between 1998 and 2007, there is a statewide decline in gonorrhea rates. For 10-14 year olds, Title V counties have a larger decline in gonorrhea rates than non-Title V counties. Even more impressive is that 15-17 year olds and 18-19 year olds in Title V counties experience large declines in gonorrhea rates, while gonorrhea rates increase for those same age groups in the non-Title V counties. Chlamydia rates increase for teens throughout the state of Alabama; however Title V counties have a smaller increase in Chlamydia rates than non-Title V counties for all three age groups (Table 4.6). In 1998 the average birth rate for 10-14 year olds in Title V counties is 3.18 per 1,000 which then declines to 1.06 per 1,000 for 2007 Title V counties. This is a sixty-seven percent decline in Title V counties, which is much larger than the twenty-nine percent decline in non-Title V counties. Statewide abortion rates also decline over this period. For this outcome we only have one age group, ages 10-19, for which the decline in abortion rates for the Title V counties is larger than the decline for the non-Title V counties (Table 4.6). This examination of the data suggests that Title V abstinence-only sex education programs are effective at reducing teen STD, birth, and abortion rates.

Alabama Teen Outcomes			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
Gonorrhea ages 10-14	0.84	0.43	-48.81
Gonorrhea ages 15-17	10.07	6.42	-36.25
Gonorrhea ages 18-19	17.88	13.11	-26.68
Chlamydia ages 10-14	0.86	1.16	34.88
Chlamydia ages 15-17	11.27	19.59	73.82
Chlamydia ages 18-19	18.72	37.79	101.87
Birth rates ages 10-14	1.70	0.90	-51.93
Birth rates ages 15-17	43.20	28.9	-29.79
Birth rates ages 18-19	113.40	91.00	-19.75
Abortion rates ages 10-19	8.60	5.40	-37.21

Table 4.5 Shows gonorrhea, Chlamydia, birth and abortion rates per 1,000 for the state of Alabama for 1998 and 2007. Also shows the percentage change in those variables over the period.

Outcomes for Title V and non-Title V Counties			
Chlamydia ages 10-14			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
Title V Counties	1.11	1.14	2.70
non-Title V Counties	0.47	1.20	155.32
Chlamydia ages 15-17			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
Title V Counties	14.08	19.83	40.84
non-Title V Counties	6.98	19.08	173.35
Chlamydia ages 18-19			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
Title V Counties	21.00	36.65	74.52
non Title V Counties	14.35	40.26	180.56
gonorrhea ages 10-14			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
Title V Counties	0.99	0.46	-53.54
non Title V Counties	0.61	0.36	-40.98
gonorrhea ages 15-17			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
Title V Counties	13.04	6.56	-49.69
non Title V Counties	5.52	6.12	10.87
gonorrhea ages 18-19			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
Title V Counties	20.37	12.77	-37.31
non Title V Counties	12.87	13.93	8.24
birth rates ages 10-14			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
Title V Counties	3.18	1.06	-66.67
non Title V Counties	1.68	1.20	-28.57
birth rates ages 15-17			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
Title V Counties	45.97	29.91	-34.94
non Title V Counties	44.65	34.03	-23.78
birth rates ages 18-19			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
Title V Counties	113.09	101.39	-10.35
non Title V Counties	111.48	97.84	-12.24
abortion rates			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
Title V Counties	9.20	4.62	-49.78
non Title V Counties	6.11	3.63	-40.59

Table 4.6 Compares gonorrhea, Chlamydia, birth, and abortion rates for Title V and non-Title V counties. Also compares the percentage change in those variables over the period.

B: Characteristics of 10-year Title V counties and 10-year non-Title V counties

Deciding to adopt Title V funded abstinence only sex education programs is not necessarily a long term commitment. Counties are free to opt in and out of this program, which means the 1998 Title V counties and the 2007 Title V counties are not the same counties. Therefore our simple look at the characteristics of 1998 Title V counties and the characteristics of 2007 Title V counties may be misleading. To give the reader a more complete comparison, we compare characteristics of counties that remain in the program for all ten years (10-year Title V counties) and counties that do not enter the program during the entire ten years period (10-year non-Title V counties). There are fourteen 10-year Title V counties and sixteen 10-year non-Title V counties.

10-year Title V and 10-year non-Title V Poverty Variables			
percent of population under age 18 living in poverty			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	27.41	28.86	5.29
10-year non-Title V Counties	26.12	27.84	6.58
percent teens mothers using Medicaid			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	79.66	83.04	4.24
10-year non-Title V Counties	82.43	85.70	3.97
percent of students receiving free lunch			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	50.79	53.29	4.92
10-year non-Title V Counties	42.00	48.50	15.48

Table 4.7 Compares poverty variables of 10-year Title V and 10-year non-Title V counties in 1998 and 2007. Also compares the percentage change in those variables over the period.

We revisit our three basic poverty level variables – the percentage of population under age eighteen living in poverty, the percentage teen mothers using Medicaid to pay for the birth of their child, and the percentage of students receiving free lunches. Counties that remain an adopter of Title V programs have a higher percent of the population under age eighteen living in

poverty and a higher percent of students receiving free lunch in 1998 and 2007 than 10-year non-Title V counties. They also have a lower percent of teen moms using Medicaid in 1998 and 2007 (Table 4.7). Comparing the 10-year Title V counties with 10-year non-Title V counties shows much smaller differences in the percentage change in the poverty variables, especially the percentage of the population under eighteen living in poverty and the percentage of students receiving free lunch. This implies that most of the differences seen in Table 4.1 could be due to poorer counties adopting the program and/or wealthier counties opting out of the program.

10-year Title V and 10-year non-Title V Education Variables

graduation rates

	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	63.94	64.64	1.09
10-year non-Title V Counties	65.73	65.25	-0.73

student teacher ratio

	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	17.02	15.69	-7.81
10-year non-Title V Counties	17.33	16.20	-6.52

total expenditure per student

	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	5664.97	9500.16	67.70
10-year non-Title V Counties	5491.48	8798.38	60.22

Table 4.8 Compares education variables in 10-year Title V and 10-year non-Title V counties for 1998 and 2007. Also shows the percentage change in those variables over the period.

Next, we revisit the education variables – graduation rate, student-teacher ratio, and total expenditure per student. In 1998 and 2007, 10-year Title V counties have lower student-teacher ratios (Table 4.8). This is parallel to what we see in Table 4.2. Total expenditure per student is higher in 10-year Title V counties than 10-year non-Title V counties. This is also parallel to what we see in Table 4.2, which suggests a higher value of education in those counties. In both years, 10-year Title V counties have lower graduation rates than 10-year non-Title V counties (Table 4.8). Although having lower graduation rates suggest that the community values

education less, the 10-year Title V counties do improve their graduation rates over the period, while the 10-year non-Title V counties do not.

10-year Title V and 10-year non-Title V Culture Variables			
percent voting republican			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	45.34	52.43	15.64
10-year non-Title V Counties	55.12	51.69	-6.22
dry counties			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	14.29	14.29	0.00
10-year non-Title V Counties	62.50	62.50	0.00
percent teens mothers not married			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	75.60	76.26	0.87
10-year non-Title V Counties	61.64	73.48	19.21
divorce rate			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	5.02	3.99	-20.52
10-year non-Title V Counties	5.76	4.51	-21.70

Table 4.9 Compares culture variables in 10-year Title V and 10-year non-Title V counties in 1998 and 2007. Also shows the percentage change in those variables over the period.

Next is a brief discussion of our four basic culture variables – dry county, divorce rate, the percentage of teen mothers not married, and the percentage of population voting for a Republican candidate. Ten-year Title V counties have a lower percentage of voters choosing a Republican candidate in 1998 and a higher percentage choosing a Republican candidate in 2007 compared to 10-year non-Title V counties. For both years, 10-year Title V counties have lower divorce rates and lower percentage of dry counties (Table 4.9). Although 10-year Title V counties also have a higher percent of unmarried teen mothers in 1998 and 2007 than 10-year non-Title V counties, the increase in the percentage of unmarried teen mothers is much smaller for 10-year Title V counties.

Title V and non-Title V Demographic Variables			
percent nonwhite population			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	37.70	38.76	2.81
10-year non-Title V	25.07	25.23	0.64
percent female population			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	52.09	51.98	-0.21
10-year non Title V	51.84	51.46	-0.73
percent teen population (ages 10-19)			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	15.29	14.29	-6.54
10-year non Title V	15.16	13.65	-9.96

Table 4.10 Compares demographic variables in Title V and non-Title V counties for 1998 and 2007. Also shows the percentage change in those variables over the period.

Now that we have discussed characteristics of 10-year Title V and 10-year non-Title V counties, we discuss outcome variables of those county groups. The counties that remain in the program all ten years have a much smaller increase in Chlamydia rates for all three age groups than the counties that never enter the program (Table 4.11). Gonorrhea rates for the oldest two age groups decrease more in the 10-year Title V counties than in the 10-year non-Title V counties. However, for the youngest age group, the decline was larger in the non-Title V counties. Birth rates decrease more in 10-year Title V counties for the 10-14 and 15-17 year-old age groups, but not for the 18-19 year-old age group. The decline in abortion rates for the 10-year Title V counties is larger than for the 10-year non-Title V counties. Although, the differences between the 10-year Title V counties and the 10-year non-Title V counties (Table 4.11) is not as striking as those between the Title V counties and non-Title V counties (Table 4.6), they still suggest that Title V abstinence-only sex education programs may be effective in reducing teen STD, birth, and abortion rates.

Outcomes for 10-year Title V and 10-year non-Title V counties			
Chlamydia ages 10-14			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	0.95	1.18	24.21
10-year non-Title V Counties	0.46	1.37	197.83
Chlamydia ages 15-17			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	11.16	19.77	77.15
10-year non-Title V Counties	6.80	14.20	108.82
Chlamydia ages 18-19			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	16.24	30.27	86.39
10-year non-Title V Counties	13.08	32.32	147.09
gonorrhea ages 10-14			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	0.91	0.63	-30.77
10-year non-Title V Counties	0.46	0.25	-45.65
gonorrhea ages 15-17			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	11.89	6.07	-48.95
10-year non-Title V Counties	5.73	2.99	-47.82
gonorrhea ages 18-19			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	17.57	11.26	-35.91
10-year non-Title V Counties	11.99	8.67	-27.69
birth rates ages 10-14			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	4.91	1.19	-75.76
10-year non-Title V Counties	2.12	0.95	-55.19
birth rates ages 15-17			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	45.36	27.62	-39.11
10-year non-Title V Counties	45.43	34.25	-24.61
birth rates ages 18-19			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	107.43	89.91	-16.31
10-year non-Title V Counties	125.80	103.93	-17.38
abortion rates			
	1998	2007	Percentage Change
10-year Title V Counties	9.23	5.09	-44.85
10-year non-Title V Counties	5.75	3.32	-42.26

Table 4.11 Compares gonorrhea, Chlamydia, birth, and abortion rates for 10-year Title V and 10-year non-Title V counties. Also compares the percentage change in those variables over the period.

CHAPTER 5

MODELS

A: Empirical study of demand for abstinence-only sex education

We begin by examining the demand for Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs. We discuss several papers in the literature review that detail the effectiveness of abstinence-only sex education, but are unable to find anything in the literature concerning the demand for abstinence-only sex education. We assume that a county adopts a Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program when the expected benefit of the program exceeds the expected costs. Although we cannot observe the expected benefit or expected costs before the program begins, we can observe whether the program is adopted. We assume that the expected net benefit is positive if the program is adopted and negative otherwise. Therefore we use a probit model, which is designed to capture the effect of having an underlying normally distributed variable (net benefit) when only a dichotomous variable can be observed (adoption of the program). Because we use time-invariant variables as well as variables that vary little within counties across years, a random effects probit model is used instead of a fixed effects probit model. This method has been used previously to access the demand for certain policies (Gallet et al., 2006).

The following random effects probit model is estimated:

$$(\mathit{titlevprog})_{it} = \alpha_{it} + \beta_1(\mathit{pernein})_{it} + \beta_2(\mathit{pervoter})_{it} + \beta_3(\mathit{lbirrat15\_17})_{it} + \beta_4(\mathit{riskv})_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

In this model, *titlevprog* is a binary variable that indicates participation in a Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program.

Pernein is the percentage of adjacent neighboring counties that adopt a Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program during a given year and is included as a proxy for shared values. We expect it to be positively related to a county's adoption of a Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program because members of neighboring counties are likely to have similar values and perceive the net benefit of this program in a similar manner.

We use the percentage of voters who choose a Republican candidate in the election for US Representative (*pervoter*) to control for the effect that political party affiliation may have on the adoption of such a program. This variable can either increase or decrease demand for Title V funded abstinence-only sex programs. It may increase demand if this is a program more likely to be favored by conservative individuals and conservative individuals are more likely to vote for a Republican candidate.

The one-year lagged birth rate for 15-17 year olds (*lbirrat15_17*) is expected to be positively related to demand for Title V funded abstinence-only sex education because counties may have been more inclined to request funding if teen pregnancy is perceived as a problem in the community. Birth rates are chosen over the various STD rates, because teen birth rates are more visible in the community and are generally more openly discussed. The 15-17 year old age group is chosen over other age groups because Alabama's annual reports on the Title V abstinence-only sex education programs lists 15-17 year olds as the primary target for birth and STD rate reduction.

Riskv is a set of variables that directly affect risky behavior in teens and may indirectly affect the adoption of Title V funded program. We discuss how these variables may affect teen behavior in the next section, but in this section we simply list the *riskv* variables and give some general expectations. The *riskv* variables are the percentage of population under age18 and

living in poverty, the percentage of students receiving free lunch, the percent of teen mothers who are not married when they give birth, the percentage of the population between the ages of 10 and 19, the percentage of the population that is female, the percentage of the population that is nonwhite, the total education expenditure per student, whether the county is dry, the divorce rate, the graduation rate, and the student teacher ratio. We expect factors that have a positive effect on outcome variables to also have a positive effect on demand, if any effect at all. We reason that if a county has a larger birth, abortion, and/or STD rate, they may be more willing to try a new sex education program, particularly if that program is partially financed by the federal government. Conversely, if variables have a negative effect on outcomes, those variables may also have a negative effect on the county's demand for Title V funded abstinence-only sex education. If a county has relatively low birth, abortion and/or STD rates, the county may be more likely to assume the current sex education curriculum is working and less likely to adopt a federally funded program.

B: Empirical study of effectiveness of abstinence-only sex education

After we examine the factors that influence the demand for Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs, we examine how effectively those programs decrease risky sexual behavior among teens. Our measures for the presence of risky behaviors are birth, abortion, Chlamydia, and gonorrhea rates. If having a Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program significantly lowers the rates of these outcome variables, we assume that the presence of this program decreases risky behavior in the counties that adopt the program. Because each of these outcome variables has unique characteristics, we create a slightly different model for each. First, we will discuss the independent variables that are included in all models. Then we will discuss how the models for abortion, birth, Chlamydia, and gonorrhea are different.

Our models include the poverty, culture, education, and demographic variables that we discuss in the descriptive statistics section. First, we discuss our poverty variables included in these models – the percentage of students receiving free lunch (*freelunch*), and the percentage of children living in poverty (*perun18inpov*). Living in poverty is generally a good predictor of risky teen sexual behavior (Moore et al., 1994). We expect both poverty variables to have a positive relationship to risky sexual behavior among teens and therefore have a positive relationship to teen Chlamydia, gonorrhea, and birth rates. We expect poverty variables to be negatively related to abortion rates since the cost of an abortion may make them unattainable for teens in poor families. We refrain from including both of these highly correlated variables in the model at the same time to avoid multicollinearity issues.

Next, we discuss the cultural variables – divorce rate (*divorcerate*), the percentage of teen mothers who are unmarried when they give birth (*perm10-19nmr*), and whether or not the county prohibits the sale of alcohol (*drycounty*). Research suggests that children of divorced parents are more likely to participate in risky behavior (Miller et al., 1994). We expect the divorce rate to be positively related to Chlamydia, gonorrhea, birth, and abortion rates based on that previous research. The percent of unmarried teen mothers already residing in a county is expected to have a positive effect on risky sexual behavior. Our reasoning is that more unmarried teenage parents there are within a community, the more likely it is that this behavior will become an acceptable norm in that community. This norm can lower the perceived costs of risky sexual behavior thus causing higher occurrences of STDs and pregnancies for teens. Living in a dry county is expected to lower risky sexual behavior (or have a negative effect). Alcohol lowers inhibitions and is often associated with risky sexual behavior (Chesson et al., 2000). If a county prohibits the sale of alcohol, this presents an additional hurdle for teens who would like to purchase

alcohol. If this hurdle is enough of a deterrent for teens in dry counties to decrease alcohol consumption as well as risky sexual behaviors, then we should expect to see less risky sexual behavior among teens in dry counties.

The education variables in our analysis are graduation rate (*gradrates*), student-teacher ratio (*stuteach*), and total expenditure per student (*texperh*). The graduation rate is expected to be negatively related to Chlamydia, gonorrhea, birth, and abortion rates, because students who are focused on graduating from high school are less likely to participate in risky behavior (Sabia, 2007). The student-teacher ratio is expected to be positively related to risky sexual behaviors among teens. The higher the student-teacher ratio, the less likely each student is to receive the attention that he or she needs to be successful in school and the more likely the teen is to participate in risky behavior. Total expenditure per student is used to proxy for how much a community values education and is expected to have a negative effect on risky sexual behavior. If the community values education more, those values should be adopted by teens and teens who value education are less likely to participate in risky sexual behaviors.

Finally, we have a few demographic variables - percent of nonwhites in the county population (*pernonwhpop*), percent of females in the county population (*perfemalepop*), and percent of the population between the ages of ten and nineteen (*perage10_19*). The percent of nonwhites in the population is used to control for the fact that nonwhites are more likely than whites to experience an STD and/or teen pregnancy. According to CDC Wonder, the database that houses public health data for the Center for Disease Control (CDC), gonorrhea rates are fifteen times higher for blacks in the 15-19 age groups than whites in the same age group in the state of Alabama over the 1998-2007 period. Over the same period, Alabama's Chlamydia rates for blacks age 15-19 are seven times higher than rates for whites in the same age group.

According to the Alabama County Health Profiles, black teens are approximately seventy percent more likely than white teens to become parents during the 1998-2007 period. Therefore we expect the percent of the population that is nonwhite to be positively related to Chlamydia, gonorrhea, birth, and abortion rates. The percent of females in the population controls for the fact that, over the same period, females are twice as likely as males to be treated for an STD (CDC Wonder). Therefore we expect the percent of the population that is female to be positively related to Chlamydia and gonorrhea rates. We have no a priori expectations about how the female population may be related to birth and abortion rates. The population between the ages of 10 - 19 is included to make a more fair comparison among counties since the percentage of the teenage population varies among counties. We have no a priori expectations for how the percent of the teen population may affect birth, abortion, Chlamydia, or gonorrhea rates.

The first model is a simple pooled ordinary least squares (OLS) model. In a pooled OLS model, each observation is treated as a random draw (Wooldridge, 2003). In this study, this may be an unreasonable assumption since we are surveying the same Alabama counties every year; however since OLS is the most efficient model when all assumptions are met, we will use this model as a benchmark. For example our pooled OLS model for abortion rates is as follows:

$$(abtrat)_i = \alpha_i + \beta_1(freelunch)_i + \beta_2(perm10\text{-}19nmr)_i + \beta_3(divorcerate)_i + \beta_4(drycounty)_i + \beta_5(stuteach)_i + \beta_6(gradrates)_i + \beta_7(texperh)_i + \beta_8(pernonwhpop)_i + \beta_9(perfemalepop)_i + \beta_{10}(perage10\_19)_i + \varphi(titlevprog)_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (2)$$

The reader should recall that in some specifications, *perun18inpov* is used instead of *freelunch*. The pooled OLS model for birth rates is very similar to that of abortion rates except the dependent variable in the birth rate model is next period's birth rate. This is because risky behaviors that transpire in one period will not appear in the birth rate data until the next period.

The models for Chlamydia and gonorrhea rates are also very similar to the abortion rate model except they include a one year lagged dependent variable in addition to the variables discussed above. Since these diseases are communicable, it seems plausible that the lagged rate influences the current rate. We expect the lagged dependent variable to be positively related to the current STD rate.

In addition to the pooled OLS model, we estimate a treatment effect model. The purpose of the treatment model is to avoid bias that could occur due to self-selection (Wooldridge, 2002). In this study Alabama's sixty-seven counties may adopt a Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program or construct their own sex education program. The possible selection issue is that those counties who choose to adopt a Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program and abide by the federal guidelines may be different from those counties who choose to construct their own sex education program using their own guidelines and funds. Using the treatment effects model, we can account for the fact that selection into the Title V program is not random and then determine the true effect of Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs on Chlamydia, gonorrhea, birth, and abortion rates. A requirement of the treatment effect model is the use of instrumental variables (IVs). For this model we have two IVs. The first IV is the percentage of neighbors that have Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs (*pernein*). Having a neighbor with a Title V funded program may encourage a county to adopt the program as well; however having a neighbor with a Title V funded program should in no way influence the outcome variables in this study – birth, Chlamydia, gonorrhea, and abortion rates. The second IV is the percentage of voters who chose a Republican candidate in the previous election for US House of Representatives (*pervoter*). Voting choices may influence whether or

not a county adopts a Title V funded program, but should not influence outcomes. The following is our treatment model for abortion rates:

$$(abtrat)_i = \alpha_i + \beta_1(freelunch)_i + \beta_2(perm10\text{-}19nmr)_i + \beta_3(divorcerate)_i + \beta_4(drycounty)_i + \beta_6(stuteach)_i + \beta_6(gradrates)_i + \beta_6(texperh)_i + \beta_5(pernonwhpop)_i + \beta_6(perfemalepop)_i + \beta_6(perage10\_19)_i + \varphi(titlevprog)_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (3)$$

$$(titlevprog)^*_i = \alpha i + \delta_1(penein)_i + \delta_2(pervoter)_i + \mu_i \quad (4)$$

Equation (3) is exactly the same as the pooled OLS model and equation (4) includes all variables in equation (3) plus the two IVs listed in (4). Once the treatment model is estimated we use those estimates to calculate the expected value of the outcome variable conditional on the adoption of the Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program minus the expected value of the outcome variable conditional on the absence of the program [E(outcome | titlevprog = 1) – E(outcome | titlevprog = 0)]. This estimate provides the effectiveness of Title V funded abstinence-only sex education. Again, we adjust the model so that the dependent variable in the birth rate models are next period's birth rate and the STD models include lagged STD rates.

One problem with using the treatment effects model is the possibility that our IVs are weak. We performed a total of three tests to check for weak IVs (Baum et al., 2007). The first test is the Sargan-Hansen test of over-identifying restrictions. The null hypothesis of this test is that the instruments are valid instruments and are correctly excluded from the first stage equation. Failure to reject the null implies that instruments are probably valid (Green, 2003). The next test is a Lagrange multiplier (LM) version of the Anderson canonical correlations test (Anderson, 1951). The null hypothesis of this test is that the equation is under-identified or not of full rank. The purpose is to test whether the excluded instruments are correlated with the

endogenous variables. A rejection of the null indicates that the matrix is full column rank and that the equation is identified, suggesting that the instruments are valid. The final test is an F version of the Cragg-Donald Wald statistic and it tests for weak identification (Cragg and Donald, 1993). The null hypothesis is that the instrumental variables are only weakly correlated with the endogenous variable. Stock and Yogo (2005) have compiled critical values for the Cragg-Donald F statistic for several different estimators. We use those critical values to determine whether we can reject the null hypothesis. If we reject the null, the instrumental variables are not weak and are therefore valid instruments for our study.

Although our instruments do not appear to be weak, we use the propensity score matching (PSM) model as a robustness check. One advantage of this model is the fact that instrumental variables are not needed. The PSM model begins by matching observations on the probability that a particular county will participate in the program, given a set of observable county characteristics (i.e. $PS(County_i) = Prob(titlevprog_i = 1| CountyCharacteristics_i)$). By matching counties who receive Title V funding (treated) to those who do not receive funding (control) but have the same probability of program participation based on county characteristics, we are able to estimate the average treatment effect (Khandker et al., 2010). This estimate simulates a randomized experiment so we do not have to be concerned with unobserved heterogeneity among counties. Matching should ensure that there are no systematic differences between counties who adopt Title V funded programs and those that do not.

One shortfall of the PSM method is that by the nature of the matching technique no conclusions can be drawn about any variables other than program participation. Panel data methods, however allow us to control for unobserved heterogeneity as well as estimate coefficients for other independent variables of interest (Wooldridge, 2002). In order to employ

the panel data method, we first test for evidence of unobserved heterogeneity using the Breusch and Pagan (1979) Lagrange multiplier test. The null hypothesis is that cross-sectional variance components are zero. Failure to reject the null implies that there is no need for a panel model. However, a rejection of the null suggests that a panel model provides a better estimation than the pooled OLS model. Since we find evidence of unobserved heterogeneity for all ten cases (abortion rates, birth rates for all three age groups, Chlamydia rates for all three age groups, and gonorrhea rates for all three age groups), we use a panel model to find the average treatment effect that the Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs have on outcome variables. In fixed effects panel data models (FE), no other assumptions are needed, however in random effects panel data models (RE), we also assume that the unobserved heterogeneity is uncorrelated with each of our independent variables. RE is the more efficient estimator and we prefer to use this estimator when it is appropriate. However the additional assumption can sometimes be too strong. We use the Hausman test to decide between RE and FE (Wooldridge, 2002). The Hausman test chooses FE as the best model therefore we report the results of the FE model in the next chapter.

Overall, we use a total of four different methods to estimate the efficiency of Title V abstinence-only sex education programs in reducing birth, abortion, Chlamydia, and gonorrhea rates. Each method has a slightly different purpose and we examine the results of each method in the next chapter.

C. Economic Impact Analysis

To determine the benefit of the program, we use the estimated benefit in the effectiveness section (i.e. the estimated decrease in birth, Chlamydia, and gonorrhea rates), the average benefits package paid to a single mother of one in Alabama, the cost to the state of treating

STDs, and the probability that those births and STDs that are deterred as a result of this program would be funded with public funds had they occurred.

A new mother who meets all income restrictions could qualify for approximately $360 per month in food assistance via Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). This estimate is obtained using the SNAP Eligibility Screening Tool, by entering information for an 18 year old, new mother with no income, no rental payments (assuming teen parents live with adult), and no assets. A young mother also qualifies for $186.35 per month in Temporary Assistance to Needy Families and $249 per month for child care according to the Alabama Department of Human Resources (ADHR) 2007 Annual Report. Young mothers also qualify for approximately $169.38 per month in assistance from the Alabama Department of Public Health's Women Infant and Children (WIC) program according to the WIC annual report for fiscal year 2007. Children age 0-5 years, also use on average about $1,255 per year in Medicaid according to the Alabama Medicaid Agency (AMA) Annual Report for fiscal year 2006. This is an estimated benefit package of $10,968.26 per year to an eligible young mother. This estimate is likely to be biased since the estimates are based on information for only one fiscal year. Requests for previous annual reports remain answered by ADPH, ADHR and AMA.

Chlamydia treatment costs the state approximately $242.14 per treatment for those who qualify for state assistance according to a report by the Center for Disease Control. This does not include any long term care that may result from Chlamydia related illnesses. Unable to find an estimate of direct cost of treating gonorrhea, we assume that direct cost of a gonorrhea treatment is the same as the direct cost of a Chlamydia.

CHAPTER 6

RESULTS

A. Demand Results

We report results from four different model specifications. The first model (1) includes the percentage of the children living in poverty (*perun18inpov*) as the poverty variable and has no time dummy variables, model (2) is the same as model (1) with the addition of time dummy variables. Model (3) is similar to model (1); however the percentage of students receiving free lunch (*freelunch*) is used as the poverty variable. Model (4) is the same as model (3) plus time dummy variables (Table 6.1).

The estimated coefficient for the percentage of adjacent neighboring counties who adopted a Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program (*pernein*) is positive and significant as expected in all model specifications. This implies that having neighbors that adopt the program is positively related to a county's decision to adopt the program. The percentage of voters who vote for a Republican candidate in the previous election for US Representative (*pervoter*) is negative in all specifications, but is also insignificant in all specifications.

The only variable in our *riskv* matrix that significantly effects demand, regardless of the model specification, is whether the county is dry (*drycounty*). Being a dry county is negatively related with a county's adoption of a Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program. One possible reason for this significant result is that living in a dry county could be a better proxy for conservative values than voting Republican. If individuals with conservative values dislike large amounts of federal spending and numerous social programs, then they would be less likely to support the adoptions of a Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program. This

could explain the negative relationship between being a dry county and adopting the program.

The only other *riskv* variable that is significant in some model specifications is the total revenue

Table 6.1: Demand for Title V Funded Abstinence-Only Sex Education

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
pernein	0.019***	0.015***	0.019***	0.015***
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
pervoter	-0.000	-0.001	-0.000	-0.001
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
pernonwhpop	0.006	0.006	0.002	0.004
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
perfemalepop	-0.018	-0.022	-0.029	-0.029
	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.04)
divorcerate	0.015	0.015	0.018	0.015
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
gradrates	0.007	0.008	0.009	0.009
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
texperh	0.012**	0.010	0.012**	0.010
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
stuteach	-0.012	0.028	-0.009	0.030
	(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.06)	(0.08)
perm10_19nmr	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.002
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
perun18inpov	-0.005	-0.005		
	(0.01)	(0.01)		
perage10_19	-0.070	-0.048	-0.059	-0.043
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)
drycounty	-0.623***	-0.635***	-0.655***	-0.651***
	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)
freelunch			0.004	0.000
			(0.01)	(0.01)
_cons	-0.330	-0.682	-0.295	-0.681
	(2.37)	(2.59)	(2.39)	(2.61)
N	737	670	737	670
time dummies	No	Yes	No	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

per student spent in the school system (*texperh*). The estimated coefficient on this variable is positive meaning it is positively related to the demand for the program; however this result is only significant when time dummy variables are excluded.

B. Effectiveness Results

We report results from four different types of models to test the effectiveness of Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs – the pooled Ordinary Least Squares (OLS), treatment effect (TE), Propensity Score Matching (PSM), and Fixed Effects (FE) models. Each model has at least two specifications, one that includes the percentage of children living in poverty (*perun18inpov*) as the poverty variable and one that includes the percentage students receiving free lunch (*freelunch*) as the poverty variable. The pooled OLS model has two additional specifications which are each of the above models with time dummy variables. Also note that in the treatment effect model, we discuss the second stage results for all dependent variables except the Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs (*titlevprog*). For Title V programs, we discuss [E(outcome | titlevprog = 1) – E(outcome | titlevprog = 0)], where the outcomes are birth, abortion, Chlamydia and gonorrhea rates as explained in chapter 5. PSM does not yield coefficients for other independent variables by nature of the matching method. Therefore when we discuss additional factors that influence outcomes, we will only discuss the pooled OLS, treatment effects, and FE models.

1. Birth Rate Results

For 10-14 year olds, the pooled OLS model suggests that adopting a Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program has a negative effect on (decreases) a county's birth rates. The decline is approximately 0.2 per 1,000 teen girls when year dummy variables are included to account for a possible trend (Table 6.2). The treatment model supports the results

Table 6.2 – Birth Rates Ages 10-14 Results for Pooled OLS Models

	OLS1	OLS2	OLS3	OLS4
titlevprog	-0.335**	-0.210**	-0.357**	-0.226**
	(0.14)	(0.10)	(0.15)	(0.11)
pernonwhpop	0.024***	0.025***	0.037***	0.032***
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
perfemalepop	-0.190***	-0.214***	-0.131*	-0.166**
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.07)
divorcerate	0.096***	0.080***	0.092***	0.081***
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
stuteach	0.063	-0.125*	0.068	-0.139*
	(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.06)	(0.08)
gradrates	0.008	0.004	0.005	0.002
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
texperh	-0.017*	-0.008	-0.019**	-0.012
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
perm10_19nmr	0.005	0.008	-0.001	0.003
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
perun18inpov	0.064***	0.065***		
	(0.02)	(0.02)		
perage10_19	-0.033	-0.125	-0.081	-0.153*
	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.09)
drycounty	-0.116	-0.042	0.018	0.063
	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.12)
freelunch			0.010	0.017**
			(0.01)	(0.01)
_cons	8.488**	14.299***	7.506**	13.967***
	(3.61)	(3.45)	(3.82)	(3.56)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2	0.127	0.156	0.113	0.146
time dummies	No	Yes	No	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.3 – Birth Rates Ages 10-14 Results for TE and PSM Models

	TE1	TE2	PSM1	PSM2
titlevprog	-0.309***	-0.326***	-0.566**	-0.372
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.26)	(0.24)
N	737	737	737	737
poverty variable	perun18inpov	freelunch	perun18inpov	freelunch

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

for the pooled OLS model and suggests that Title V abstinence-only sex education programs had a larger effect on birth rates for this age group after accounting for endogeneity (Table 6.3). The PSM model suggests a significant decline in teen births in this age group when the percentage of the children living in poverty (*perun18inpov*) is the poverty variable, but the decline is not significant at traditional levels when the percentage of students receiving free lunch (*freelunch*) is the poverty variable (Table 6.3). The fixed effects model shows no significant change in birth rates for this age group (Table 6.4). Overall, the results for this age group suggest that counties that adopt Title V funded programs experience more of a decline in birth rates than counties that do not adopt Title V funded programs.

Next, we examine the results for 15-17 year olds. Using the simple pooled OLS model, we find that Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs decrease birth rates for this age group as well. However, this result is only significant when year dummies are not included (Table 6.5). Once endogeneity is minimized using the treatment effect model, Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs once again have a negative and significant effect on birth rates (Table 6.6). The PSM model yields results similar to the pooled OLS and treatment models in sign and significance (Table 6.6), but only when the percentage of children living in poverty (*perun18inpov*) is used as the poverty variable. The fixed effect model also shows a negative and significant effect on birth rates for this age group, but only when the percentage of students receiving free lunch (*freelunch*) is the poverty variable (Table 6.7). Overall, the

Table 6.4 – Birth Rates Ages 10-14 Results for TE and FE Models

	TE1	TE2	FE1	FE2
pernonwhpop	0.025***	0.038***	-0.005	0.002
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.07)	(0.07)
perfemalepop	-0.193***	-0.136*	-0.395**	-0.389**
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.18)	(0.18)
divorcerate	0.096***	0.092***	0.285***	0.266***
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.10)	(0.10)
gradrates	0.008	0.006	0.021	0.025
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)
texperh	-0.016**	-0.018**	-0.007	-0.006
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
stuteach	0.057	0.062	0.149	0.224**
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.10)	(0.10)
perm10_19nmr	0.005	-0.001	0.010	0.006
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
perun18inpov	0.063***		0.143***	
	(0.02)		(0.03)	
perage10_19	-0.041	-0.090	0.436***	0.372**
	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.14)	(0.15)
drycounty	-0.141	-0.014		
	(0.12)	(0.11)		
titlevprog	-0.499	-0.551*	-0.639***	-0.747***
	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.20)	(0.21)
freelunch		0.009		0.033
		(0.01)		(0.02)
_cons	8.789**	7.868**	6.918	8.256
	(3.45)	(3.63)	(9.06)	(9.18)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2			0.086	0.065
adj. R^2			-0.020	-0.042

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.5 – Birth Rates Ages 15-17 Results for Pooled OLS Models

	OLS1	OLS2	OLS3	OLS4
titlevprog	-2.222**	-1.055	-2.435***	-1.108
	(0.87)	(0.83)	(0.88)	(0.83)
pernonwhpop	0.047	0.036	0.054	-0.044
	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.07)
perfemalepop	-0.876*	-1.261***	-0.484	-1.007**
	(0.51)	(0.48)	(0.51)	(0.47)
divorcerate	0.785***	0.437**	0.812***	0.501**
	(0.24)	(0.21)	(0.24)	(0.21)
stuteach	2.163***	0.764	2.329***	0.699
	(0.45)	(0.48)	(0.45)	(0.47)
gradrates	-0.190**	-0.193***	-0.171**	-0.157**
	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.07)
texperh	-0.202***	-0.039	-0.222***	-0.065
	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.04)
perm10_19nmr	0.011	0.084*	-0.026	0.060
	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
perun18inpov	0.651***	0.726***		
	(0.11)	(0.10)		
perage10_19	-0.432	-1.742***	-0.696	-1.937***
	(0.54)	(0.50)	(0.56)	(0.49)
drycounty	1.259	2.144**	1.996**	2.645***
	(1.01)	(0.91)	(1.00)	(0.89)
freelunch			0.258***	0.392***
			(0.05)	(0.05)
_cons	56.444**	109.906***	44.459	106.147***
	(26.77)	(25.88)	(27.53)	(26.47)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2	0.247	0.380	0.228	0.388
time dummies	No	Yes	No	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.6 – Birth Rates Ages 15-17 Results for TE and PSM Models

	TE1	TE2	PSM1	PSM2
titlevprog	-1.376***	-1.582***	-3.243**	-1.513
	(0.31)	(0.30)	(1.28)	(1.55)
N	737	737	737	737
poverty variable	perun18inpov	freelunch	perun18inpov	freelunch

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

results for this age group suggest that the decline in birth rates in Title V counties is more than the decline in other counties.

The final age group to be discussed is 18-19 year olds. The pooled OLS model suggests that adopting a Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program has a negative effect on birth rates, but only when the time dummy variables are not included (Table 6.8). The treatment effect model yields a negative coefficient for Title V programs; however this coefficient is only significant when the percentage of students receiving free lunch (*freelunch*) is the poverty variable (Table 6.9). The PSM model suggests that birth rates decline more in counties that receive Title V funding than in counties that do not receive Title V funding when the percentage of the children living in poverty (*perun18inpov*) is the poverty variable (Table 6.9). The fixed effect model suggests that the Title V funded programs has no significant effect on birth rates for this age group (Table 6.10). The results vary; making it difficult to draw conclusions about the effect of Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs on birth rates for 18-19 year olds.

Now, we discuss factors other than the existence of a Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program that affect county level birth rates. These results are presented in Tables 6.2 and 6.4 for 10-14 year olds, Tables 6.5 and 6.7 for 15-17 year olds and Tables 6.8 and 6.10 for 18-19 year olds. We examine these additional factors by category beginning with the poverty

Table 6.7 – Birth Rates Ages 15-17 Results for TE and FE Models

	TE1	TE2	FE1	FE2
pernonwhpop	0.079	0.079	-0.678**	-0.571*
	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.32)	(0.33)
perfemalepop	-0.969**	-0.601	-2.628***	-2.546***
	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.84)	(0.85)
divorcerate	0.796***	0.825***	1.299***	1.162***
	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.44)	(0.45)
gradrates	-0.170**	-0.150*	-0.062	-0.048
	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
texperh	-0.167***	-0.187***	-0.078*	-0.070
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
stuteach	2.037***	2.202***	2.617***	2.789***
	(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.45)	(0.46)
perm10_19nmr	0.010	-0.025	-0.110**	-0.120**
	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.05)
perun18inpov	0.626***		0.537***	
	(0.11)		(0.16)	
perage10_19	-0.661	-0.903*	4.407***	3.962***
	(0.53)	(0.54)	(0.66)	(0.67)
drycounty	0.426	1.115		
	(1.07)	(1.05)		
titlevprog	-7.536***	-7.679***	-1.407	-1.654*
	(1.71)	(1.64)	(0.93)	(0.95)
freelunch		0.255***		0.007
		(0.05)		(0.10)
_cons	64.744**	53.073**	82.893**	92.539**
	(25.93)	(26.52)	(41.92)	(42.35)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2			0.245	0.232
adj. R^2			0.158	0.143

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.8 – Birth Rates Ages 18-19 Results for Pooled OLS Models

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
titlevprog	-2.983*	-1.638	-3.622**	-1.748
	(1.80)	(1.81)	(1.82)	(1.79)
pernonwhpop	-0.037	-0.044	-0.178	-0.321**
	(0.14)	(0.13)	(0.14)	(0.13)
perfemalepop	-2.265***	-2.738***	-1.306	-2.100**
	(0.86)	(0.85)	(0.86)	(0.83)
divorcerate	3.431***	2.986***	3.607***	3.185***
	(0.53)	(0.53)	(0.55)	(0.53)
stuteach	3.261***	1.112	3.917***	0.958
	(0.99)	(1.16)	(1.01)	(1.16)
gradrates	-0.467***	-0.494***	-0.348**	-0.371**
	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)
texperh	-0.337***	-0.178*	-0.405***	-0.250**
	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.11)
perm10_19nmr	-0.223**	-0.134	-0.314***	-0.192**
	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.09)
perun18inpov	2.025***	2.067***		
	(0.22)	(0.23)		
perage10_19	-3.990***	-5.533***	-4.534***	-6.051***
	(1.13)	(1.10)	(1.14)	(1.08)
drycounty	2.652	3.785*	4.162**	5.003**
	(2.07)	(2.05)	(2.05)	(1.98)
freelunch			1.002***	1.178***
			(0.10)	(0.10)
_cons	227.915***	305.675***	188.208***	294.958***
	(43.57)	(46.67)	(44.04)	(45.93)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2	0.296	0.347	0.289	0.372
time dummies	No	Yes	No	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.9– Birth Rates Ages 18-19 Results for TE and PSM Models

	TE1	TE2	PSM1	PSM2
titlevprog	-0.573	-1.614**	-4.902*	-1.846
	(.077)	(0.75)	(2.81)	(2.83)
N	737	737	737	737
poverty variable	perun18inpov	freelunch	perun18inpov	freelunch

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

variables. Poverty seems to have a positive and significant effect on birth rates for all age groups when the percentage of the children living in poverty (*perun18inpov*) is the poverty variable. However, when the percentage of students receiving free lunch (*freelunch*) is the poverty variable, poverty appears to have a smaller effect on birth rates and the result is not always significant.

Next, we examine the cultural variables that affect the county's birth rate. The county's divorce rate (*divorcerate*) positively and significantly influences birth rates for the all three age groups according to most models. This positive relationship provides support for the hypothesis that teens of divorced parents are more likely to participate in risky behavior, although micro-level data is needed to further test this hypothesis. Another cultural variable, the percentage of mothers not married when they give birth (*perm10_19nmr*) is positive and significant in the FE models for all three age groups as expected. However, this variable is negative and significant for 18-19 year olds in both the pooled OLS and treatment models. Our final significant cultural variable is *drycounty*. Living in a county that prohibits the sale of alcohol has a positive effect on birth rates in some of the pooled models, which is the opposite of what we expect. We expect teens living in dry counties to have an additional hurdle to alcohol consumption that decreases their use of alcohol and as a consequence, decreases other risky behavior including those behaviors that may lead to unplanned pregnancies. In the treatment models, living in a dry

Table 6.10 – Birth Rates Ages 18-19 Results for TE and FE Models

	TE1	TE2	FE1	FE2
pernonwhpop	0.061	-0.116	-1.771***	-1.701**
	(0.15)	(0.14)	(0.67)	(0.69)
perfemalepop	-2.559***	-1.602*	-2.996*	-2.937
	(0.87)	(0.85)	(1.79)	(1.80)
divorcerate	3.469***	3.643***	1.438	1.285
	(0.57)	(0.57)	(0.94)	(0.95)
gradrates	-0.403**	-0.294*	-0.001	0.034
	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)
texperh	-0.227*	-0.317***	-0.063	-0.051
	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.10)
stuteach	2.893***	3.615***	4.150***	4.711***
	(1.06)	(1.05)	(0.95)	(0.97)
perm10_19nmr	-0.228**	-0.312***	-0.388***	-0.422***
	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.11)	(0.11)
perun18inpov	1.944***		1.104***	
	(0.23)		(0.34)	
perage10_19	-4.698***	-5.045***	4.263***	3.730***
	(1.19)	(1.16)	(1.40)	(1.43)
drycounty	0.036	1.947		
	(2.52)	(2.37)		
titlevprog	-19.665**	-16.794**	1.739	0.931
	(8.50)	(6.77)	(1.98)	(2.01)
freelunch		0.996***		0.238
		(0.11)		(0.22)
_cons	253.302***	209.433***	177.895**	189.009**
	(45.48)	(43.98)	(88.80)	(89.61)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2			0.123	0.110
adj. R^2			0.021	0.008

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

county has no significant effect on birth rates. The dry county variable is not included in the fixed effects model because it is time invariant.

Now, we examine the effect education variables have on birth rates. The percentage of students who finish high school in four years (*gradrate*) significantly influences birth rates for the two oldest age groups in the pooled OLS and treatment effects models, but not in the fixed effects models. When significant, graduation rates are negatively related to birth rates as expected. This supports the hypothesis that teens who are more focused on education are less likely to participate in risky behavior. For the older two age groups, the student teacher ratio (*stuteach*) has a positive effect on birth rates as expected. This is true for all models except the pooled OLS models with time dummy variables. Spending per student (*texperh*) appears to have a negative effect on birth rates, however this variables is not significant at traditional levels in all model specifications.

Finally, we examine the demographic variables that have an effect on birth rates. The percentage of the population that is nonwhite (*pernonwhpop*) is positively and significantly related to birth rates for 10-14 year olds in both the pooled OLS and treatment effects models as expected. However in the older two age groups, the percentage of the population that is nonwhite is negatively and significantly related to birth rates in the fixed effects models and generally insignificant in the pooled OLS and treatment models. A larger female population seems to have a negative effect on birth rates that is significant in most models for all age groups. The percentage of the population between the ages of 10 and 19 (*perage10_19*) significantly affects birth rates differently depending on the model specification age. For 10-14 year olds, *perage10_19* is positively related and only significant in the FE models. For the older two age groups, *perage10_19* is positively and significantly related to teen birth rates in the FE

Table 6.11 – Chlamydia Rates Ages 10-14 Results for Pooled OLS Models

	OLS1	OLS2	OLS3	OLS4
titlevprog	0.045	0.018	0.047	0.016
	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.08)
lr10_14chl	0.261***	0.253***	0.259***	0.249***
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)
pernonwhpop	0.025***	0.023***	0.028***	0.028***
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
perfemalepop	-0.043	-0.044	-0.043	-0.040
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
divorcerate	0.029	0.028	0.027	0.027
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
gradrates	0.001	0.002	-0.000	-0.000
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
texperh	0.001	-0.005	0.001	-0.006
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
stuteach	0.027	0.021	0.022	0.020
	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.06)
perm10_19nmr	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.006
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
perun18inpov	-0.008	-0.004		
	(0.01)	(0.01)		
perage10_19	-0.138***	-0.124**	-0.141***	-0.126**
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
drycounty	0.086	0.050	0.093	0.063
	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.08)
freelunch			-0.007	-0.007
			(0.01)	(0.01)
_cons	3.231*	3.287*	3.433*	3.325*
	(1.90)	(1.98)	(1.93)	(1.98)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2	0.250	0.281	0.252	0.284
time dummies	No	Yes	No	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.12 – Chlamydia Rates Ages 10-14 Results for TE and PSM Models

	TE1	TE2	PSM1	PSM2
titlevprog	0.006	0.010	0.052	0.012
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.14)	(0.15)
N	737	737	737	737
poverty variable	perun18inpov	freelunch	perun18inpov	freelunch

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

model specification, but negatively and significantly related to teen birth rates in pooled OLS and treatment effect model specification.

2. Chlamydia Rate Results

Results from all models suggest that the Title V abstinence-only sex education program has no significant effect on Chlamydia rates for 10-14 year olds (Tables 6.11-6.13). For the older two age groups, the FE model suggests positive and significant effects on Chlamydia rates, although the estimates from other models are insignificant for these age groups as well. The positive coefficient that we observe in the FE model suggests that counties who adopt a Title V program subsequently have higher Chlamydia rates than counties that do not adopt a Title V program.

Now we discuss other factors that influence Chlamydia rates. Beginning with the poverty variables, we see that neither of the poverty variables is significant for the youngest two age groups. For 18-19 year olds, the percentage of children living in poverty is positively related to Chlamydia rates and significant at the 10% level, but not at the traditional 5% level. This suggests that poverty may not be an indicator for teen Chlamydia rates.

Examining our cultural variables, we find that the county's lagged Chlamydia rate and divorce rate significantly affect the county's birth rate. The lagged Chlamydia rate positively affects the current Chlamydia rate for all three age groups. We expect the lagged Chlamydia rate to have a positive effect on the current Chlamydia rate because Chlamydia is a communicable

Table 6.13 – Chlamydia Rates Ages 10-14 Results for TE and FE Models

	TE1	TE2	FE1	FE2
lr10_14chl	0.258***	0.256***	0.040	0.050
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.05)
pernonwhpop	0.023***	0.027***	0.018	0.023
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.03)
perfemalepop	-0.040	-0.038	-0.004	0.001
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.09)	(0.09)
divorcerate	0.029	0.027	-0.021	-0.023
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.05)	(0.05)
gradrates	0.000	-0.001	0.002	0.001
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
texperh	-0.001	-0.000	0.011**	0.011**
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
stuteach	0.032	0.027	0.031	0.007
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.05)
perm10_19nmr	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.008
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)
perun18inpov	-0.007		-0.027	
	(0.01)		(0.02)	
perage10_19	-0.129***	-0.133***	-0.119*	-0.125*
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.07)	(0.07)
drycounty	0.122	0.130		
	(0.08)	(0.08)		
titlevprog	0.275*	0.265*	0.094	0.129
	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.10)	(0.10)
freelunch		-0.007		-0.017
		(0.01)		(0.01)
_cons	2.895	3.102	1.048	1.152
	(1.93)	(1.95)	(4.36)	(4.37)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2			0.043	0.043
adj. R^2			-0.069	-0.069

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.14 – Chlamydia Rates Ages 15-17 Results for Pooled OLS Models

	OLS1	OLS2	OLS3	OLS4
titlevprog	0.745	0.227	0.729	0.197
	(0.47)	(0.45)	(0.47)	(0.45)
lr15_17chl	0.562***	0.551***	0.561***	0.546***
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
pernonwhpop	0.141***	0.131***	0.165***	0.161***
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
perfemalepop	0.014	0.028	0.076	0.100
	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)
divorcerate	0.246*	0.188	0.236*	0.182
	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.12)
gradrates	-0.002	0.003	-0.009	-0.008
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
texperh	0.012	-0.045	0.012	-0.049*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
stuteach	-0.362	-0.098	-0.370	-0.123
	(0.27)	(0.33)	(0.27)	(0.33)
perm10_19nmr	0.032	0.039	0.026	0.032
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)
perun18inpov	0.044	0.041		
	(0.06)	(0.06)		
perage10_19	-0.692**	-0.472	-0.751**	-0.511*
	(0.33)	(0.30)	(0.31)	(0.29)
drycounty	-0.350	-0.644	-0.191	-0.476
	(0.53)	(0.51)	(0.49)	(0.48)
freelunch			-0.010	-0.020
			(0.03)	(0.03)
_cons	11.627	4.888	11.211	4.742
	(10.54)	(11.10)	(10.73)	(11.13)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2	0.618	0.673	0.618	0.673
time dummies	No	Yes	No	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.15 – Chlamydia Rates Ages 15-17 Results for TE and PSM Models

	TE1	TE2	PSM1	PSM2
titlevprog	0.210	0.212	1.455	0.310
	(0.39)	(0.39)	(0.97)	(1.00)
N	737	737	737	737
poverty variable	perun18inpov	freelunch	perun18inpov	freelunch

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

disease. The divorce rate does not appear to have an effect on Chlamydia rates for 10-14 year olds regardless of the model specification. For 15-17 year olds, some models suggest that the divorce rate may have a positive effect on Chlamydia rates, although only at the 10% significance level and not the traditional 5% significance level. For 18-19 year olds, the divorce rate has a positive and significant effect on Chlamydia rates in all models except the FE models.

All three education variables appear insignificant in all models except the FE model. According to the FE model, expenditure per student is positively related to Chlamydia rates for all three age groups, while the student teacher ratio is negatively related to Chlamydia rates for the oldest two age groups.

Demographic variables that seem to affect the Chlamydia rates for all three age groups are the percentage of the population that is nonwhite (*pernonwhpop*), and the percentage of the population between the ages of 10 and 19 (*perage10_19*). Having a larger nonwhite population has a positive effect on the Chlamydia rate as is expected. Having a larger teen population has a negative effect on the Chlamydia rate, which is what we observe in the birth rate models although we have no a priori reasoning for this result.

3. Gonorrhea Rate Results

Results from the pooled OLS, FE, and PSM models suggest that the Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs have no significant effect on gonorrhea rates for 10-14 year olds. However, the results from the treatment models suggest that adopting a Title V

Table 6.16 – Chlamydia Rates Ages 15-17 Results for TE and FE Models

	TE1	TE2	FE1	FE2
lr15_17chl	0.553***	0.551***	0.328***	0.327***
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.04)
pernonwhpop	0.124***	0.152***	0.531**	0.580***
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.21)	(0.21)
perfemalepop	0.073	0.148	0.258	0.292
	(0.22)	(0.21)	(0.55)	(0.55)
divorcerate	0.241*	0.229*	0.223	0.180
	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.29)	(0.29)
gradrates	-0.015	-0.023	-0.036	-0.038
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.05)
texperh	-0.010	-0.010	0.056*	0.058*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
stuteach	-0.291	-0.303	-0.493*	-0.568*
	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.29)	(0.30)
perm10_19nmr	0.034	0.026	0.002	0.007
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
perun18inpov	0.060		-0.011	
	(0.07)		(0.11)	
perage10_19	-0.562*	-0.641**	-1.981***	-2.106***
	(0.33)	(0.32)	(0.44)	(0.45)
drycounty	0.186	0.354		
	(0.60)	(0.58)		
titlevprog	4.170***	3.980**	1.303**	1.412**
	(1.58)	(1.59)	(0.61)	(0.61)
freelunch		-0.009		-0.077
		(0.03)		(0.07)
_cons	6.761	6.374	12.789	15.736
	(11.25)	(11.43)	(27.69)	(27.66)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2			0.275	0.277
adj. R^2			0.191	0.192

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.17 – Chlamydia Rates Ages 18-19 Results for Pooled OLS Models

	OLS1	OLS2	OLS3	OLS4
titlevprog	0.496	-0.600	0.437	-0.615
	(0.81)	(0.79)	(0.81)	(0.79)
lr18_19chl	0.543***	0.505***	0.539***	0.504***
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
pernonwhpop	0.305***	0.328***	0.323***	0.333***
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)
perfemalepop	0.181	0.322	0.308	0.364
	(0.41)	(0.37)	(0.40)	(0.37)
divorcerate	0.573***	0.504**	0.574***	0.506**
	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.21)	(0.20)
gradrates	0.059	0.041	0.059	0.039
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)
texperh	0.063	-0.081	0.058	-0.084*
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
stuteach	-0.495	-0.247	-0.468	-0.260
	(0.42)	(0.47)	(0.43)	(0.47)
perm10_19nmr	0.044	0.045	0.033	0.041
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
perun18inpov	0.172*	0.063		
	(0.10)	(0.10)		
perage10_19	-2.226***	-1.806***	-2.339***	-1.834***
	(0.61)	(0.54)	(0.59)	(0.53)
drycounty	-0.166	-0.480	0.108	-0.388
	(0.87)	(0.82)	(0.85)	(0.78)
freelunch			0.050	0.020
			(0.05)	(0.05)
_cons	14.659	6.610	11.919	6.299
	(22.33)	(20.83)	(22.52)	(20.89)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2	0.642	0.708	0.641	0.708
time dummies	No	Yes	No	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.18 – Chlamydia Rates Ages 18-19 Results for TE and FE Models

	TE1	TE2	FE1	FE2
lr18_19chl	0.543***	0.539***	0.304***	0.292***
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
pernonwhpop	0.291***	0.313***	0.497	0.595*
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.35)	(0.36)
perfemalepop	0.222	0.360	0.173	0.209
	(0.41)	(0.41)	(0.93)	(0.94)
divorcerate	0.567***	0.567***	-0.515	-0.635
	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.49)	(0.49)
gradrates	0.050	0.050	-0.045	-0.039
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.08)
texperh	0.047	0.043	0.148***	0.156***
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
stuteach	-0.442	-0.417	-0.902*	-0.861*
	(0.43)	(0.43)	(0.50)	(0.51)
perm10_19nmr	0.045	0.032	-0.047	-0.050
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.06)
perun18inpov	0.184*		0.306*	
	(0.10)		(0.18)	
perage10_19	-2.123***	-2.250***	-3.622***	-4.018***
	(0.60)	(0.59)	(0.77)	(0.77)
drycounty	0.206	0.493		
	(0.92)	(0.90)		
titlevprog	2.875*	2.727	2.699***	2.637**
	(1.69)	(1.67)	(1.03)	(1.04)
freelunch		0.051		-0.039
		(0.05)		(0.11)
_cons	11.010	8.253	48.327	58.294
	(22.64)	(22.71)	(47.08)	(47.14)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2			0.332	0.329
adj. R^2			0.254	0.251

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.19 – Chlamydia Rates Ages 18-19 Results for TE and PSM Models

	TE1	TE2	PSM1	PSM2
titlevprog	0.110	0.060	0.689	1.728
	(0.70)	(0.70)	(2.02)	(1.67)
N	737	737	737	737
poverty variable	perun18inpov	freelunch	perun18inpov	freelunch

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

program has a positive effect on gonorrhea rates for 10-14 year olds (Tables 6.20-6.22). According to results from all pooled OLS, treatment effects and FE models, adopting a Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program has a positive effect on gonorrhea rates for 15-17 year olds. These results are highly significant. The PSM model yields positive coefficients for 15-17 year olds, although they are not significant at the 5% level (Tables 6.20-6.22). Results from all model specifications suggest that the Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs have no significant effects on gonorrhea rates for 18-19 year olds (Tables 6.26-6.28). Overall, these results suggest that counties that adopt a Title V program may subsequently have higher teen gonorrhea rates than counties that do not adopt the program.

We examine additional factors that influence gonorrhea rates by category beginning with the poverty variables. For the youngest two age groups the percentage of students participating in the federal free lunch program (*freelunch)* is negatively related to gonorrhea rates and significant in all model specifications, while the percentage of children living in poverty (*perun18inpov*) is negatively related to gonorrhea rates, but not significant. For 18-19 year olds, the opposite is true; the percentage of children living in poverty (*perun18inpov*) is significant in all model specifications, while the percentage of students receiving free lunch (*freelunch*) is not.

Cultural factors that significantly affect the gonorrhea rate for all age groups are the lagged gonorrhea rate and divorce rate. The lagged gonorrhea rate has a positive effect on the

Table 6.20 – Gonorrhea Rates Ages 10-14 Results for Pooled OLS Models

	OLS1	OLS2	OLS3	OLS4
titlevprog	0.029	0.046	0.031	0.044
	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.05)
lr10_14gono	0.093*	0.079	0.081	0.074
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
pernonwhpop	0.010**	0.009**	0.014***	0.013***
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
perfemalepop	0.011	0.003	0.014	0.006
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
divorcerate	0.014	0.008	0.011	0.007
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
gradrates	-0.000	-0.001	-0.002	-0.002
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
texperh	-0.003	-0.000	-0.003	-0.000
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
stuteach	0.086**	0.037	0.081**	0.037
	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.05)
perm10_19nmr	0.002	0.004*	0.002	0.004*
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
perun18inpov	-0.008	-0.006		
	(0.01)	(0.01)		
perage10_19	-0.031	-0.059	-0.036	-0.060*
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.04)
drycounty	-0.009	0.005	0.003	0.012
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
freelunch			-0.009***	-0.006**
			(0.00)	(0.00)
_cons	-1.233	0.236	-1.026	0.267
	(1.31)	(1.23)	(1.33)	(1.23)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2	0.137	0.180	0.147	0.185
time dummies	No	Yes	No	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.21 – Gonorrhea Rates Ages 10-14 Results for TE and FE Models

	TE1	TE2	FE1	FE2
lr10_14gono	0.092*	0.081	-0.145***	-0.146***
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.04)
pernonwhpop	0.010**	0.015***	-0.058***	-0.053***
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.02)	(0.02)
perfemalepop	0.010	0.012	0.088*	0.092*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.05)
divorcerate	0.014	0.011	-0.013	-0.017
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.03)
gradrates	-0.000	-0.002	0.001	0.000
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
texperh	-0.003	-0.002	0.002	0.002
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
stuteach	0.085**	0.079**	0.122***	0.111***
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)
perm10_19nmr	0.002	0.002	0.004	0.005
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
perun18inpov	-0.008		-0.006	
	(0.01)		(0.01)	
perage10_19	-0.033	-0.039	0.084**	0.072*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.04)
drycounty	-0.018	-0.009		
	(0.05)	(0.05)		
titlevprog	-0.024	-0.039	-0.005	0.011
	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.06)	(0.06)
freelunch		-0.009***		-0.010*
		(0.00)		(0.01)
_cons	-1.160	-0.923	-5.772**	-5.492**
	(1.32)	(1.35)	(2.47)	(2.48)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2			0.087	0.090
adj. R^2			-0.019	-0.016

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.22 – Gonorrhea Rates Ages 10-14 Results for TE and PSM Models

	TE1	TE2	PSM1	PSM2
titlevprog	0.037***	0.042***	0.051	-0.032
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.07)	(0.07)
N	737	737	737	737
poverty variable	perun18inpov	freelunch	perun18inpov	freelunch

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

current gonorrhea rate as expected because gonorrhea is a communicable disease. The divorce rate is positively related to gonorrhea rates and significant for 18-19 year olds in all pooled OLS and treatment effect model specifications. Being an unmarried teen mother has a positive and significant coefficient for all age groups in the pooled OLS models that include time dummy variables; however these coefficients are only significant in the treatment model for 18-19 year olds and are not significant in the FE model for any age group.

Two of the education variables, student-teacher ratio and total expenditure per student have a significant effect on gonorrhea rates. The student teacher ratio has a positive and significant effect on gonorrhea rates for all age groups in all model specifications except the pooled OLS model without time dummy variables. Total expenditure per student is negative for all age groups, but generally not significant at the 5% level.

Having a larger nonwhite population has a positive effect on gonorrhea rates in all pooled and treatment models, however in the FE models the effect is either negative or is not significant. The percentage of the population between the ages of 10 and 19 (*perage10_19*) has a negative relationship with gonorrhea rates in all pooled OLS and treatment models, although the effect is only significant for 18-19 year olds. In the FE models, the effect becomes positive for the youngest two age groups, although this positive effect is only significant for the youngest age group.

Table 6.23 – Gonorrhea Rates Ages 15-17 Results for Pooled OLS Models

	OLS1	OLS2	OLS3	OLS4
titlevprog	0.751***	0.650**	0.770***	0.645**
	(0.27)	(0.26)	(0.27)	(0.26)
lr15_17gono	0.421***	0.413***	0.401***	0.400***
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
pernonwhpop	0.072***	0.071***	0.108***	0.100***
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
perfemalepop	0.136	0.103	0.175	0.131
	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)
divorcerate	0.101	0.059	0.086	0.050
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)
gradrates	-0.020	-0.028	-0.035	-0.040
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)
texperh	-0.024	-0.021	-0.022	-0.021
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)
stuteach	0.408***	0.154	0.376**	0.145
	(0.15)	(0.20)	(0.15)	(0.20)
perm10_19nmr	0.017	0.025*	0.015	0.023*
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
perun18inpov	-0.033	-0.040		
	(0.03)	(0.03)		
perage10_19	-0.179	-0.246	-0.223	-0.254
	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.17)	(0.17)
drycounty	-0.548*	-0.508*	-0.439	-0.449
	(0.30)	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.28)
freelunch			-0.056***	-0.051**
			(0.02)	(0.02)
_cons	-7.719	-0.919	-6.838	-0.766
	(8.73)	(9.30)	(8.63)	(9.27)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2	0.537	0.558	0.544	0.564
time dummies	No	Yes	No	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.24 – Gonorrhea Rates Ages 15-17 Results for TE and FE Models

	TE1	TE2	FE1	FE2
lr15_17gono	0.412***	0.393***	0.102***	0.098**
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.04)
pernonwhpop	0.068***	0.106***	-0.027	0.021
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.11)	(0.11)
perfemalepop	0.156	0.195	-0.045	-0.010
	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.29)	(0.29)
divorcerate	0.102	0.086	0.195	0.153
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.15)	(0.15)
gradrates	-0.024	-0.038	-0.023	-0.026
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
texperh	-0.030*	-0.028*	-0.015	-0.013
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
stuteach	0.436***	0.400***	0.712***	0.643***
	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)
perm10_19nmr	0.018	0.015	-0.002	0.003
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)
perun18inpov	-0.030		-0.002	
	(0.03)		(0.05)	
perage10_19	-0.137	-0.191	0.167	0.040
	(0.18)	(0.17)	(0.22)	(0.23)
drycounty	-0.404	-0.311		
	(0.32)	(0.32)		
titlevprog	1.724**	1.576*	0.937***	1.042***
	(0.82)	(0.81)	(0.32)	(0.32)
freelunch		-0.056***		-0.076**
		(0.02)		(0.03)
_cons	-9.413	-8.310	-4.080	-1.019
	(8.92)	(8.76)	(14.22)	(14.20)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2			0.088	0.094
adj. R^2			-0.019	-0.012

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.25 – Gonorrhea Rates Ages 15-17 Results for TE and PSM Models

	TE1	TE2	PSM1	PSM2
titlevprog	0.593***	0.635***	1.030*	0.503
	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.54)	(0.50)
N	737	737	737	737
poverty variable	perun18inpov	freelunch	perun18inpov	freelunch

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

4. Abortion Rate Results

There is only one age group for abortion rates. Adopting a Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program is positively related to abortion rates according to all pooled OLS and treatment model specifications; however, the FE models show no significant effect. Although abortion rates decline statewide over the period, results suggest that counties that adopt a Title V program have higher abortion rates over the period than those that do not adopt a Title V program. This increase is between 0.7 and 1.2 cases per 1,000 young women. Both poverty variables, the percentage of the children living in poverty (*perun18inpov*) and the percentage of students receiving free lunch (*freelunch*) are negatively related to abortion rates and significant. The magnitudes are approximately the same regardless of which poverty variable is used in the model. This is an expected result because the cost of an abortion is prohibitive for many of those living in poverty.

Cultural variables influencing abortion rates are the percentage of teen mothers who are not married when they give birth (*perm10_19nmr*) and the divorce rate (*divorcerate*). The estimated coefficients for *perm10_19nmr* are negative and significant as expected. This provides support for the hypothesis that more unmarried teen mothers living in a community makes teen parenting more acceptable in that community. The divorce rate is positive and significant in all the treatment effects and FE models and most pooled OLS specifications.

Table 6.26 – Gonorrhea Rates Ages 18-19 Results for Pooled OLS Models

	OLS1	OLS2	OLS3	OLS4
titlevprog	-0.151	-0.248	-0.122	-0.220
	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.49)
lr18_19gono	0.483***	0.475***	0.486***	0.478***
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
pernonwhpop	0.184***	0.184***	0.179***	0.167***
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
perfemalepop	0.269	0.242	0.213	0.166
	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.29)
divorcerate	0.422***	0.378***	0.418***	0.377***
	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)
gradrates	0.017	0.001	0.015	0.007
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
texperh	-0.048*	-0.059**	-0.046*	-0.053*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
stuteach	0.658*	0.252	0.638*	0.276
	(0.35)	(0.44)	(0.35)	(0.43)
perm10_19nmr	0.041*	0.051**	0.046*	0.059**
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
perun18inpov	-0.084*	-0.089*		
	(0.05)	(0.05)		
perage10_19	-0.977***	-1.095***	-0.933***	-1.046***
	(0.29)	(0.31)	(0.30)	(0.31)
drycounty	-0.206	-0.170	-0.313	-0.339
	(0.55)	(0.55)	(0.55)	(0.54)
freelunch			-0.029	-0.015
			(0.03)	(0.03)
_cons	-9.998	1.127	-8.546	1.516
	(16.37)	(17.20)	(16.35)	(17.26)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2	0.584	0.603	0.584	0.602
adj. R^2	0.578	0.591	0.577	0.590
time dummies	No	Yes	No	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.27 – Gonorrhea Rates Ages 18-19 Results for TE and FE Models

	TE1	TE2	FE1	FE2
lr18_19gono	0.484***	0.487***	0.113***	0.122***
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.04)
pernonwhpop	0.180***	0.176***	-0.197	-0.224
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.19)	(0.19)
perfemalepop	0.280	0.229	0.970*	0.946*
	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.50)	(0.50)
divorcerate	0.420***	0.416***	0.339	0.382
	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.26)	(0.26)
gradrates	0.014	0.012	0.021	0.015
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
texperh	-0.053*	-0.050*	-0.045*	-0.047*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
stuteach	0.670*	0.652*	0.736***	0.661**
	(0.35)	(0.35)	(0.27)	(0.27)
perm10_19nmr	0.041*	0.046**	-0.004	0.000
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)
perun18inpov	-0.080		-0.202**	
	(0.05)		(0.10)	
perage10_19	-0.949***	-0.906***	-0.355	-0.210
	(0.29)	(0.30)	(0.39)	(0.40)
drycounty	-0.104	-0.195		
	(0.56)	(0.56)		
titlevprog	0.498	0.570	0.457	0.559
	(1.06)	(1.06)	(0.55)	(0.56)
freelunch		-0.029		-0.013
		(0.03)		(0.06)
_cons	-10.951	-9.620	-35.015	-38.561
	(16.20)	(16.16)	(24.87)	(24.99)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2			0.080	0.074
adj. R^2			-0.027	-0.034

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.28 – Gonorrhea Rates Ages 18-19 Results for TE and PSM Models

	TE1	TE2	PSM1	PSM2
titlevprog	-0.253	-0.233	-0.067	0.028
	(0.35)	(0.35)	(1.05)	(0.95)
N	737	737	737	737
poverty variable	perun18inpov	freelunch	perun18inpov	freelunch

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

All three education variables significantly affect the abortion rate. Graduation rates are negatively related and significant in the most pooled OLS and treatment effects models. This result could also support our previous hypothesis that teens who focus their attention on academics are less likely to participate in risky behaviors. The total expenditure per student is negatively related to abortion rates and significant in all treatment effects and FE models, while the student teacher ratio is positively related and significant in all treatment and FE models.

The only demographic variable significantly influencing abortion rates is the percentage of the population that is nonwhite (*pernonwhpop*) and it is positively related and significant in all pooled OLS and treatment models, but insignificant in the FE model.

C. Economic Impact Results

We use several models to determine the effectiveness of Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs. We will only use two models to estimate the economic impact – the treatment model and the PSM model when the percent of children in poverty is used as the poverty variable. In general, we find that the Title V abstinence-only sex education program decreases birth rates, but increases STD rates for some age groups. First, we discuss the direct economic impact of the decrease in birth rates for each age group. Then we discuss the direct economic impact of the increase in STD rates for each age group. The decrease in birth rates for 10-14 year olds is an estimated 0.309 births per 1,000 using the treatment effects model and 0.566 per 1,000 using the PSM model. The average number of females age 10-14 in the state

Table 6.29 – Abortion Rates Ages 10-19 Results for Pooled OLS Models

	OLS1	OLS2	OLS3	OLS4
titlevprog	0.920***	1.185***	0.970***	1.182***
	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.19)
pernonwhpop	0.114***	0.116***	0.168***	0.154***
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)
perfemalepop	0.254**	0.189*	0.237**	0.162
	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.10)
divorcerate	0.171***	0.107*	0.132**	0.085
	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)
stuteach	0.326***	0.104	0.233**	0.108
	(0.12)	(0.15)	(0.11)	(0.14)
gradrates	-0.021	-0.023	-0.047***	-0.040**
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
texperh	-0.043***	-0.007	-0.036***	-0.002
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
perm10_19nmr	-0.041***	-0.027**	-0.039***	-0.025**
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
perun18inpov	-0.177***	-0.171***		
	(0.02)	(0.02)		
perage10_19	0.103	-0.177	0.079	-0.145
	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.12)
drycounty	-0.549**	-0.317	-0.480**	-0.354*
	(0.24)	(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.21)
freelunch			-0.139***	-0.116***
			(0.01)	(0.01)
_cons	-6.288	3.259	-2.201	4.150
	(5.51)	(5.74)	(5.49)	(5.77)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2	0.332	0.415	0.396	0.449
time dummies	No	Yes	No	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.30 - Abortion Rates Ages 10-19 Results for TE and FE Models

	TE1	TE2	FE1	FE2
pernonwhpop	0.108***	0.163***	-0.026	0.023
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.07)	(0.08)
perfemalepop	0.274**	0.255**	-0.030	0.006
	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.20)	(0.20)
divorcerate	0.169**	0.131**	0.511***	0.464***
	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.10)	(0.10)
gradrates	-0.025	-0.050***	-0.003	-0.003
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
texperh	-0.050***	-0.042***	-0.057***	-0.055***
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
stuteach	0.355***	0.260**	0.341***	0.304***
	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.10)	(0.11)
perm10_19nmr	-0.040***	-0.039***	-0.031**	-0.028**
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
perun18inpov	-0.171***		0.053	
	(0.03)		(0.04)	
perage10_19	0.152	0.119	0.327**	0.184
	(0.13)	(0.11)	(0.15)	(0.16)
drycounty	-0.374	-0.334		
	(0.27)	(0.26)		
titlevprog	2.039**	1.884**	-0.070	-0.017
	(0.88)	(0.87)	(0.22)	(0.22)
freelunch		-0.137***		-0.057**
		(0.01)		(0.02)
_cons	-8.112	-3.811	1.018	4.228
	(5.55)	(5.59)	(9.75)	(9.75)
N	737	737	737	737
R^2			0.220	0.224
adj. R^2			0.130	0.134

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table 6.31 - Abortion Rates Ages 10-19 Results for TE and PSM Models

	TE1	TE2	PSM1	PSM2
titlevprog	0.740***	0.820***	0.727*	1.053***
	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.37)	(0.35)
N	737	737	737	737
poverty variable	perun18inpov	freelunch	perun18inpov	freelunch

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

of Alabama is 152,785 for the ten year period. This implies that 47-86 teens aged 10-14 may have become mothers without the adoption of Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program. According to the County Health profiles, an average of 82.1% of all young mothers ages 10-19 use Medicaid to pay for the birth of their child during this period. We assume that all young mothers who would use Medicaid to pay for the birth of their child would qualify for other public assistance as well. The public assistance package is $10,968.26 per year as discussed in Chapter 5. This is a direct savings of $423,232 – $774,425 per year for the state of Alabama before adding the savings from the older age groups. Next, we consider only the 15-17 year-olds. We estimate that Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs reduce teen births among this age group by approximately 1.376 births per 1,000 using the treatment effects model or 3.243 per 1,000 using the PSM model. The average number of females between the ages of 15-17 over the ten year period is 94,426. This yields an estimated 130-306 young women that would become teen mothers in the absence of Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs. This is a savings of $1,170,642 - $2,755,512 for each year the child would receive public assistance. For the oldest age group, age18-19, only the PSM model suggests a significant decline in birth rates. The PSM model estimates a decline in birth rates of 4.902 girls per 1,000. Using the average number of females in that age group over the period, we estimate that approximately 309 young women would have become teen mothers in the absence of Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs. This is a savings of $0 - $2,782,527 for each

year that the child would have received public assistance. The sum of birth rate savings for all age groups implies that the state of Alabama had a direct savings of $1,593,874 - $6,312,464 per year using Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs.

Now that we have examined the cost savings for birth rates, we will examine the cost savings for STD rates. Using the treatment effect and PSM models, our estimates suggest that Title V abstinence-only sex education programs has no effect on Chlamydia rates for any age group although coefficients are consistently positive. Gonorrhea rates, however, are significantly increased for the youngest two age groups using those models. For 10-14 year olds, the estimated coefficient in the PSM model is insignificant, but the TE model estimates 12 teens contracted gonorrhea that would not have contracted the disease in the absence of Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs. Direct cost of treatment is $242.14 as discussed in Chapter 5. We assume 82.1% of all teens who contract gonorrhea use public assistance to pay for treatment; this is a direct additional cost to the state of $0 - $2386 for teens aged 10-14. The estimated coefficients for both the PSM and TE models are positive and significant when examining the effect of the program on gonorrhea rates for 15-17 year olds. These coefficients suggest that 114-197 additional teens contracted gonorrhea, an addition cost to the state of $22,663 - $39,163. This is a total additional cost to the state of $22,663 - $41,549 for STD treatments of teens in all age groups.

Over the period, the federal government provides approximately $7,605,425 to the state of Alabama for Title V programs. Various localities provide matching funds of approximately $5,704,100, yielding a total cost of $13,309,493. To compare the direct cost to direct benefits, we assume that each mother receives public assistance for five years over the ten year period. That means the minimum costs-saving from the decline in birth rates becomes $7,969,370 and

the maximum $31,652,320. The minimum additional cost from the increase in STD rates is $22,663, while the maximum additional cost is $41,549. Considering the public funds that are saved as a result of the estimated decrease in teen births and the additional public costs undertaken as a result of the estimated increase in gonorrhea rates, the adoption of Title V abstinence-only sex education programs saves the state of Alabama $7,946,707 - $31,610,771 over the period. If we compare the midpoint of our cost saving estimate, $19,778,739, to the total costs of the programs, $13,309,493, we see that it is a strong possibility that Title V programs saved the state more over the period than it cost. This is very promising for abstinence-only sex education programs. However, if the programs could be enhanced to better prevent STDs, perhaps even more state funds could be saved.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

Our examination of what attracts certain counties to Title V programs reveals that counties are more likely to adopt a Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program if their neighbors adopt a Title V funded program or if the county prohibits the sale of alcohol. Past birth rates, political affiliations, and other factors have no significant effect on the county's decision to adopt a Title V program.

Generally, our results show that adopting a Title V funded abstinence-only sex education program leads to a decline in teen birth rates, but an increase in STD and abortion rates. The decline in birth rates is significant in most models for 10-14 year olds and 15-17 year olds, although the significance varies by model for 18-19 year olds. Overall, we estimate that the state of Alabama would have had between 174 and 698 additional teen pregnancies if counties had not adopted the Title V funded programs. We also estimate an increase in cases of gonorrhea of 114 -208 cases over the period. Most models show no significant increase in Chlamydia rates. For abortion rates, we estimate an increase of approximately 225-230 abortions by Alabama's teens.

When estimating the cost savings (or in the case of STDs, additional costs) of the program, we find that the state saves $7,969,370 - $31,652,320 by decreasing births rates, but spent an additional $22,663 - $41,549 treating STDs as a result of the adoptions of Title V funded abstinence-only sex education programs. This is strictly an estimate of cost incurred and/or saved over the period. There are other cost associated with teen births and STDs such as the adult outcomes of the children born to teens as well as illnesses that stem for STDs later in life such as pelvic inflammatory disease and infertility. While there are several costs associated with abortions, none of these are direct costs to the state and are not measured in this study,

although those costs are worth considering when determining what type of sex education curriculum to adopt.

While measuring effectiveness, we discover some interesting facts about risky teen sexual activity. Poverty is positively related to birth rates in most model specification and for all age groups, therefore programs that improve the poverty rates, should by default decrease teen birth rates.

In addition to poverty, several cultural variables influence risky behavior among teens. Divorce rates have a positive and significant relationship with birth rates for all age groups according to most model specifications. Divorce rates also have a positive and significant relationship with STD rates, but only for 18-19 year olds. Individual level data and more research are needed to uncover more details between divorced parents and risky behavior among teens.

Education appears to have a significant effect on birth rates, although not necessarily on STD and abortion rates. Both the student teacher ratio and the graduation rate have a significant effect on birth rates for the older two age groups. The student-teacher ratio has a positive effect which means a higher student teacher ratio leads to a higher birth rate. Graduation rates have a negative effect implying that a higher graduation rate – and perhaps a higher desire to succeed in school – lowers birth rates. Perhaps 10-14 is too young to detect the effect of graduation rates because most teens in this age group have not entered high school.

Moving to the final category, two of the three demographic variables had a significant effect on our outcomes. The first is the percentage of the population that is nonwhite. Having a larger nonwhite population has a positive effect on birth rates for 10-14 year olds; however for the oldest two age groups, an increase in the nonwhite population yields either a negative effect

or no effect on birth rates. This may imply that other socioeconomic factors are more important in determining teen birth rates than race. For both STD rates and abortion rates, nonwhite is positive and significant for all age groups in all pooled OLS and treatment models, however in the FE model this variables appears insignificant for most age groups. The second variable yielding significant results is the teen population variable. These results vary in sign and significance and because we had no a prior expectations for this variable, further investigation is needed to determine what information the teen population variable is relaying.

Overall, we notice that although the same risky behavior leads to births, abortions and/or STDs, not all factors that affect birth and abortion rates affect STD rates. This implies that more research needs to be done on exactly what changes teens are making to reduce birth rates after participating in a sex education program – particularly abstinence-only sex education program. Once we understand how the key elements of the program are being processed by the students, we can implement changes to help curb more risky behavior.

WORKS CITED

Alabama Department of Human Resources 2007 Annual Report. Retrieved from http://www.dhr.alabama.gov/large_docs/StatFY2008.pdf

Alabama High School Graduation Rates from 2000-2007. Voices for Alabama's Children. Retrieved from http://www.alavoices.org/files/Graduation_Rates.pdf cited (VOICES)

Alexander, Linda L.; Cates, Joan R.; Herndon, Nancy and Ratcliffe, Jennifer F. 1998. Sexually Transmitted Diseases in America: How Many Cases and at What Cost? Prepared for the Kaiser Family Foundation by: American Social Health Association. Retrieved from http://www.kff.org/womenshealth/1445-std_rep.cfm

Anderson, T. W. 1951. Estimating Linear Restrictions on Regression Coefficients for Multivariate Normal Distributions. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 22: 327-51

Baum, C. F.; Schaffer, M. E. and Stillman, S. 2007. ivreg2: Stata Module For Extended Instrumental Variables/2SLS, GMM and AC/HAC, LIML, and K-Class Regression. Boston College Department of Economics, Statistical Software Components S425401. Downloadable from http://ideas.repec.org/c/boc/bocode/s425401.html.

Berry, C. and Zhou, L. 2007. *Documentation for the NCES Common Core of Data School District Finance Survey (F-33), School Year 2003–04 (Fiscal Year 2004)* (NCES 2007-391). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Breusch, T.S. and Pagan, A.R. 1979. Simple Test for Heteroscedasticity and Random Coefficient Variation. *Econometrica* 47.5: 1287–1294

Card, Josefina J. and Wise, Lauress L. 1978. Teenage Mothers and Teenage Fathers: The Impact of Early Childbearing on the Parents' Personal and Professional Lives. *Family Planning Perspectives* 10.4:199-205

Chapman, Beth. Alabama Secretary of State. Elections Division Data Downloads. Retrieved from <http://www.sos.state.al.us/downloads/dl2.aspx?div1=Elections%20Division&Types=Data>

Chesson, Harrell; Harrison, Paul and Kassler, William J. 2000. Sex Under The Influence: The Effect of Alcohol Policy on Sexually Transmitted Disease Rates in The United States. *Journal of Law and Economics*. XLIII(1):215-238.

Cragg, J. G. and Donald, S. G. 1993. Testing Identfiability and Specification in Instrumental Variables Models. *Econometric Theory* 9: 222-240

Dahinten, V. Susan; Shapka, Jennifer D. and Willms, J. Douglas. 2007. Adolescent Children of Adolescent Mothers: The Impact of Family Functioning on Trajectories of Development. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 36.2:195–212

Denny, George and Young, Michael. 2006. An Evaluation of an Abstinence-Only Sex Education Curriculum: An 18-Month Follow-up**.** *Journal of School Health* 76.8:414-423

Denny, George; Young, Michael; Rausch, Susan and Spear, Caile. 2002**.** An Evaluation of An Abstinence Education Curriculum Series: Sex Can Wait. *American Journal of Health Behavior* 26.5:366-378

Doniger, Andrew S.; Adams, Edgar; Utter, Cheryl A. and Riley, John S. 2001. Impact Evaluation of the "Not Me, Not Now" Abstinence-Oriented, Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Communications Program, Monroe County, New York. *Journal of Health Communication*, 6.1:45-60.

Fact Sheet: State Abstinence Education Program. *National Clearinghouse on Families and Youth.* Retrieved from <http://ncfy.acf.hhs.gov/publications/stateabsstedfs.htm> cited (NCFY Factsheet)

Gallet, Craig; Hoover, Gary and Lee, Junsoo. 2006. Putting out Fires: An Examination of the Determinants of State Clean Indoor-Air Laws *Southern Economic Journal*, Vol. 73.1:112-124

Geronimus, Arline T. and Korenman, Sanders. 1992. The Socioeconomic Consequences of Teen Childbearing Reconsidered. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107.4:1187-1214.

Green, William H. 2003. Econometric Analysis. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Haveman, Robert; Wolfe, Barbara and Peterson, Elaine. 1997. Children of Early Childbearers as Young Adults. Kids Having Kids: Economic Costs and Social Consequences of Teen Pregnancy.

Hernandez, Leticia E. 2009. The Implications of Sexuality Education in Florida. Dissertation.

Hoffman, Saul. 2006. By the Numbers: The Public Costs of Teen Childbearing. Washington, DC: National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy

Jemmott, John B.; Jemmott, Loretta S. and Geoffrey T. Fong. 2010. Efficacy of a Theory-Based Abstinence-Only Intervention over 24 Months. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine 164.2:152-159.*

Keckner, Charles. 2008. Testimony before Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. U.S. House of Representatives. Wednesday, April 23, 2008 retrieved from <http://www.hhs.gov/asl/testify/2008/04/t20080423a.html>

Kirby, Douglas B. 2008. The Impact of Abstinence and Comprehensive Sex and STD/HIV Education Programs on Adolescent Sexual Behavior. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*. 5.3:18-27

Marsiglio, William and Mott, Frank L. 1986. The Impact of Sex Education on Sexual Activity, Contraceptive Use and Premarital Pregnancy Among American Teenagers. *Family Planning Perspectives* 18.4:151-162

Miller, Brent C.; Norton, Maria C.; Curtis, Thom; Hill, E. Jeffrey; Schvaneveldt, Paul and Young, Margaret H. 1997**.** The Timing of Sexual Intercourse among Adolescents: Family, Peer, and Other Antecedents. *Youth Society.* 29: 54-83

Moore, Kristin A.; Morrison, Donna Ruane and Glei, Dana A. 1995. Welfare and adolescent sex: The Effects of Family History, Benefit Levels, and Community Context. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues.* 16.2-3: 207-237

Moore, Kristin Anderson; Morrison, Donna Ruane and Greene, Angela Dungee. 1997. Effects on the Children Born to Adolescent Mothers. Kids Having Kids: Economic Costs and Social Consequences of Teen Pregnancy

Oettinger, Gerald S. 1999. *The Effects of Sex Education on Teen Sexual Activity* and *Teen Pregnancy. Journal of Political Economy* 107.3: 606-645

Rector, R. E.; Johnson, K. A. and Noyes L. R. 2003. Sexually Active Teenagers are More Likely to Be Depressed and to Attempt Suicide. *A Report of the Heritage Center for Data Analysis.*

Ribar, David. 1994. Teenage Fertility and High School Completion. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*. 76.3: 413-424

Sabia, Joseph J. 2007. Early Adolescent Sex and Diminished School Attachment: Selection or Spillovers? *Southern Economic Journal* 74.1: 239–268

Sather, Linda and Zinn, Kelly. 2002. Effects of Abstinence-Only Education on Adolescent Attitudes and Values Concerning Premarital Sexual Intercourse. *Family and Community Health*. 25.2: 1-15.

Seastrom, M.; Hoffman, L.; Chapman, C. and Stillwell, R. 2007. The Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate for Public High Schools From the Common Core of Data: School Years 2002–03 and 2003-04 (NCES 2006–606rev). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Sexually Transmitted Disease Statistics. *Alabama Department of Public Health*. Retrieved from < http://www.adph.org/STD/Default.asp?id=1080>

Silva, Mónica. 2002. The Effectiveness of School-Based Sex Education Programs In The Promotion Of Abstinent Behavior: A Meta-Analysis. Health Education Research 17.4: 471-481

Social Security Online. 2009. Separate Program for Abstinence Education. *Compilation of the Social Security Laws* retrieved from <http://www.ssa.gov/OP_Home/ssact/title05/0510.htm >cited (SSA)

Spanier, Graham B. 1976. Formal and Informal Sex Education as Determinants of Premarital Sexual Behavior. *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 5.1: 39-67

Thomas, J.M.; Sable, J.; Dalton, B. and Sietsema, J. 2007. *Documentation to the NCES Common Core of Data Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 2004–05* (NCES 2006-440rev). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education

Traditional Counties of the Alabama Black Belt. *Center for Economic and Business Research.* University of Alabama. Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/prc/pdf/AL-black-belt.pdf cited (CEBR)

Trenholm, Christopher; Devaney, Barbara; Fostson, Kenneth; Clark, Melissa; Quay, Lisa and Wheeler, Justin. 2008. Impacts of Abstinence Education on Teen Sexual Activity, Risk of Pregnancy and Risk of Sexually Transmitted Diseases. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. 27.2: 255-276.

United States House of Representatives Committee on Government Reform — Minority Staff Special Investigations Division. 2004. The Content of Federally Funded Abstinence-Only Education Programs

Weed, Stan E.; Ericksen, Irene H.; Birch, Paul J.; White, Joseph M.; Evans, Matthew T. and Anderson, Nicole E. 2007. "Abstinence" or "Comprehensive" Sex Education?— The *Mathematica* Study in Context. *The Institute for Research and Evaluation*

Wooldridge, Jeffrey M. 2002. Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data. Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Wooldridge, Jeffrey M. 2003. Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach. various cities: South-Western Publishing Company.

APPENDIX A

Variable Names and Meanings

divorcerate	Divorce rate (cases per 1000)
drycounty	Binary variable, 1 if county prohibits the sale of alcohol, 0 otherwise
freelunch	Percent of students in the county who qualify for free lunch
gradrates	Percent of students who graduate high school in 4 years
lr10_14chl	One period lagged Chlamydia rate for individuals aged 10-14
lr15_17chl	One period lagged Chlamydia rate for individuals aged 15-17
lr18_19chl	One period lagged Chlamydia rate for individuals aged 18-19
lr10_14gono	One period lagged gonorrhea rate for individuals aged 10-14
lr15_17gono	One period lagged gonorrhea rate for individuals aged 15-17
lr18_19gono	One period lagged gonorrhea rate for individuals aged 18-19
perage10_19	Percentage of the population ages 10-19
perfemalepop	Percentage of population that is female
perm10_19nmr	Percentage of those aged 10-19 who are not married when they give birth
pernein	Percentage of adjacent neighbors adopting a Title V funded program
pernonwhpop	Percentage of population that is nonwhite
pervoter	Percentage choosing a Republican candidate for U.S. Representative
perun18inpov	Percentage of population under age 18 living in poverty
stuteach	Student to teacher ratio
titlevprog	Binary variable, 1 if county participated in Title V program, 0 otherwise
texperh	Total expenditure by school systems per student in 2007 dollars

APPENDIX B

Data Sources

- United States
  - Census Bureau
    - Population characteristics – total population, women, racial make-up
    - Percent of the population under age 18 living in poverty
    - Median income
- State of Alabama
  - Annual Report to Health and Human Services
    - Counties that received Title V funding each year from 1998-2007
    - Aside: annual reports contained information on how much money each grantee received and how many students each grantee served. Because some grantees who served multiple counties were unable to determine how much money was spent in each of their counties, and how many students were served in each of their counties, these data are not included in the study.
  - Department of Public Health
    - Number of STD cases by age group – 3 groups – ages 10-14, 15-17 and 18-19
    - County Health Profiles
      - Birth and abortion rates
      - Marriage and divorce rates
      - Percent of teens using Medicaid to pay for the birth of their children
      - Percent of teen mothers who are unmarried when they give birth
  - Department of Education
    - Number of students receiving advanced/college prep, regular, and career tech high school diplomas
- Alabama Secretary of State
  - Number of individuals in a county who voted for a Republican, Democrat, or third party candidate for U.S. Representative
- Alabama Alcoholic Beverage Control Board
  - Whether or not a county is considered a dry county
- Alabama Center for Economic and Business Research
  - Counties that are commonly considered to be a part of the Alabama Black Belt