Impact Of Welfare Spending As A Percent Of GDP On The Schooling Progress of Children Within United States of America

Andrew Palmer

Abstract: This paper analyzes the schooling progress of White, Black, Asian, and Hispanic students currently attending grades 1-12. I explore how changes in welfare spending as a percentage of GDP affects the schooling progress of the above racial groups and students as a whole. Using the 2013 ACS 5 Year Sample data, I find that increases in welfare spending as a percentage of GDP significantly decreases the likelihood that a child is behind in their schooling for the White, Black, and Hispanic races. For Asian students I find a slight positive relationship that can be explained through the percentage breakdown of welfare recipients by race.

Andrew Palmer
Econ 190 Research Paper
April 24, 2015

Impact Of Welfare Spending As A Percent Of GDP On The Schooling Progress of Children Within United States of America

I. Introduction

Welfare policy around the world has long been a subject of political debate. Specifically, people are likely to jump to one of two polarizing conclusions: welfare perpetuates a cycle of poor families relying on the government for sustenance with little personal effort, or welfare is the only solution to provide a base level of sustenance for the poor. This paper seeks to explore if there is an influential link between welfare spending as a percent of GDP and educational progress of children between the ages of 5-20 (possible age range of 1st to 12th graders in the US). For the purpose of analysis, we subtract out total spending on social security, as this does not have a direct or immediate effect on the schooling of children. Our measure of welfare explicitly includes relief or income security payments, rental housing subsidies, unemployment benefits, and government healthcare spending for the poor (including Medicaid).

Education has been established as the leading predictor of higher wages and long-term employment. (Blinder 1973) Thus, it follows that our analysis should focus on child education as a metric to see if welfare spending has a positive impact on families. Scholarly interest in educational characteristics has been explored more frequently in recent years (Thomas 2009; Harris, Jamison, and Trujillo 2008; Hirschman 2001; Kao 2004). In particular, studies often look at performance in school and standardized tests, educational attainments, and wages across all racial groups. Understanding how changes in welfare spending may affect child education is useful in terms of shaping political policy. It is hypothesized that there exists a positive correlation between welfare spending and schooling progress, as a stable home with parental influence is influential on child success. (Thomas 2009, Chen and Kaplan 2001) Looking at schooling progress in the US (whether a child is delayed or on track) across multiple years with varying levels of welfare spending as a percentage of GDP will improve our understanding of the possible link between government aid and life success.

I use staying on track in school as the primary dependent variable because it is more encompassing and indicative of schooling *progress*, and not simply performance. (Cook et. al 2002, Regnerus and Elder Jr. 2003) This variable implies that the child is successfully completing a set of standards such as adequate GPA, timely assignments, positive interaction with faculty and students, avoiding disciplinary action, as well as passing standardized tests. Thus, it seems logical that a student who is making progress through school is at least completing these criteria to a

satisfactory level. Papers that look simply at test scores may fail to encompass students overall performance. For example, a naturally intelligent student may score exceptionally well on standardized exams, however, they may act out in class and refuse to do homework, which would result in the failing of a grade. Moreover, children who fall behind in schooling are more likely to complete less overall years of education. Hence, our analysis will narrow focus to the concept of schooling progress. I must acknowledge, however, that our results will have some bias towards more children being "on track" given the use of social promotion in the United States. Social promotion is the practice of promoting a child to the next grade regardless of academic performance in an effort to keep children with their peers. This practice is banned in some cities but is still in practice around the US.

To conduct such analysis, I adopt a widely used analytical method: a logistic regression model. The logistic regression is run on the dummy variable that takes the value of 1 if a child is behind or 0 if they are on track. Standard controls will be included with specific attention to language proficiency as the US has large immigrant populations, many with first-generation American citizen students. This study focuses on the four major racial groups within the United States: Non Hispanic Black, Non Hispanic White, Hispanic, and Non Hispanic Asian. Using the 2012 American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Sample, I impute values for welfare spending as a percentage of GDP for the given census year. Thus, we have welfare spending data included in our sample that ranges for census years 2008 to 2012. I consider past analysis of schooling progress on children of specific race groups in the US (Regnerus and Elder Jr. 2003, Thomas 2009, Palmer 2014). I proceed with their definition of being "on track" in school: *age – grade > USA cutoff*. (Actual construction of the binary variable will be explained in detail in Section III)

This study differs from most in that I attempt to look at a direct link between welfare and schooling progress in the context of the US's welfare-spending spectrum. Adopting logistic regression furthers the research in the field to more accurately look at the distribution of children affected by the welfare system in the US. The implications of this paper can affect American's view on welfare spending and tax policy in a way that may favor a different view of government aid.

Thomas (2009) found that children of immigrant black parents were more likely to stay on track (metric mentioned above and in section III) in school compared to their native born black-parented counterparts. Moreover, Regnerus and Elder Jr. (2003) found that religious influence and church attendance had a greater effect on schooling progress of youth in high-risk areas when compared to low risk areas (high risk = impoverished neighborhoods with median income close to poverty line; low risk = neighborhoods with median household income above national averages). Given that the definition of high and low risk is dependent on the socioeconomic status of neighborhoods, financial means certainly can affect educational outcomes. Both Regnerus and Elder Jr. (2003) and Thomas (2009) indicate that racial and financial factors influence the ability for a child to progress through their education. Welfare affects primarily high-risk areas that are often highly concentrated with racial minorities. (Cook et al 2002) Hence, there exists an intuitive link between

welfare spending as a percentage of GDP and its direct or indirect effect on the schooling progress of children within the US.

Section II explains the relevant data I used to conduct the research in greater detail. Section III overviews the econometric methods and modes of interpretation used to look at the results. Section IV examines all major findings while section V concludes the paper.

II. Data

For analysis on schooling progress I use the 2012 American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Sample provided by IPUMS USA. It covers the period of ACS data from 2008-2012. This data set was selected based on its comprehensive and detailed nature of schooling. The ACS data codes for what grade a student is currently attending, including observations for preschool and kindergarten. Moreover, it combines 5 years of consecutive ACS data so I can readily compare how differing levels of spending on welfare from year to year affect schooling. We can examine this comparison by regression over the 5 year combined data set because the amount of welfare spending as a percentage of GDP varies for each observation depending on what year that observation was recorded.

Sample size can often affect the robustness of a study's results. Fortunately, the 2012 ACS 5-Year comes with over twenty four million observations. When reduced down to our study ages, I am still left with nearly three million student observations. Thus, our sample is thought to be widely representative of the student population of the United States. For a detailed breakdown of observations and characteristics by race, please refer to Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6 in the Appendix.

III. Methods

A. Data Preparation and Variables

To limit the scope of analysis, I drop all observations that are outside the age range of 5-20. This follows as a possible age range for students currently enrolled in the first through twelfth grades. If I limited the range at 18 there would be no evidence of schooling delay in the twelfth grade given that 18 is the correct age for seniors in high school. I further eliminate any child who is not currently attending a grade. This specifically affects the upper deciles of observations because the federally mandated age required to stay in school is 16. This is, however, an evolving law as eighteen states have recently adopted a law stating the new minimum age is 18. This does not mandate that a certain grade be completed, however. The ACS codes for what grade a current student is attending. A variable that numerically corresponds to the grade a child is in can be constructed so that it takes the value of 1 for first grade, 2 for second and so forth. United States national standards state

that the age of entry for first grade is either 6 or 7 depending on birth month. If the student enters at age 7, it is assumed they do not turn 8 during the year of schooling unless they have experienced delay in their progress. The age of 6 is also used in many papers' (Nanda 2010; Cowen and Haberfeld 1991; Korenan and Neumark 1990; Ono 1998; Steinberger and Antecol 2011 etc…) construction of potential work experience. They define possible years in the labor force as *age – schooling* – 6 suggesting that the socially accepted and agreed upon age of entry into first grade is around six years of age. Hence, I create an indicator dummy variable that is assigned to every observation and signals if they are on track in school. This study's schooling indicator is similar to previous studies that have examined such a statistic (Fields and Smith 1998; Oreopolous, Page, and Stevens 2006; Roderick 1994; Thomas 2009)

It is constructed as follows:

$$schooldelay = 1 \; if \; age - grade > 6 \quad (1)$$
$$schooldelay = 0 \; if \; age - grade < 7 \quad (2)$$

Age and grade variables can only take integer values. Hence, the inequality holds for all observations. A possible bias mentioned above that can affect the credibility of this statistic is the practice of "red shirting" children to gain size and intellectual advantages. Parents who do this decide to enroll their child in another year of kindergarten prior to first grade. Fortunately, ACS contains education statistics on children enrolled in pre-school and kindergarten. Of the 190,546 kindergarteners in the sample, only 4564 (2.40%) were older than the "standard" age. Assuming a representative sample and random selection, only 2.40% (plus or minus) of our analysis on the rest of all students should be affected by the red shirt effect. There have been anecdotal cases of deliberately redshirting children in grades above kindergarten; however, I believe this to have little impact on the results.

I further create control variables for later use in the logistic regression analysis. I limit my focus to variables that can easily affect school progress. I create region bins, state dummies, language proficiency bins, labor force participation status, age, age squared, and sex controls. These necessary controls allow us to see the true effect welfare spending as a percent of GDP has on educational progress. Variable breakdown can be seen in the table below and comments.

Table 1. Summary Statistics For Children Currently Attending Grades 1-12, Observations: 2,342,383

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Median	Min	Max
Personal Characteristics					
Age	12.1	3.550	12	5	20
Male	51.5%	0.500	1	0	1
LFP	6.6%	0.248	0	0	1
No English	0.1%	0.033	0	0	1
Yes English (Well)	98.8%	0.108	1	0	1
Yes English (Poorly)	1.1%	0.103	0	0	1
School Characteristics					
Grade Level Attending	6.607	3.439	7	1	12
Schooling Delay	6.3%	0.243	0	0	1
Country Characteristics					
Welfare Spending as % of GDP	3.720	0.606	3.69	2.76	4.55
Northeast	17.4%	0.379	0	0	1
Midwest	22.2%	0.416	0	0	1
South	36.5%	0.481	0	0	1
West	24.0%	0.427	0	0	1

- *Age* is a variable that records the child's age at the time of the given years by ACS
- *Male* is a dummy variable that takes on the value of 1 if the child is male and 0 if the child is female. In this sample, there are slightly more men than women.
- *LFP* (labor force participation) represents the percent of children in the labor force who are also still attending school. The national minimum age to work is 16, so we see an increase from 6.6% to 29.3% when we restrict the age to 16 and above.
- *No English* is a dummy variable that takes 1 if the child does not speak any English and 0 alternatively. Because these language controls rely on each other, one must be dropped in our regressions.
- *Yes English (well)* takes the value of 1 if the child speaks fluent English and 0 if otherwise.
- *Yes English (poorly)* takes the value of 1 if the child indicates some understanding of the English language but cannot speak well. It takes the value of 0 otherwise.

- *Grade Level Attending* takes the numerical value of the current grade a student is attending (1-12).
- *Schooling Delay* is a dummy variable that takes the value of 1 if the child is behind in school and 0 if they are on track. The construction of this variable is described in the above data section.
- *Welfare Spending as % of GDP* takes the percent value of welfare spending on GDP less social security payments. Each year within the 5-Year Survey is assigned its corresponding value. All values are from the US Census Bureau, The Presidential Budget, and the US Bureau of Economic Analysis.
- *Northeast* is a dummy variable that takes the value of 1 if the child lives in the ACS defined Northeast region and 0 otherwise.
- *Midwest* is a dummy variable that takes the value of 1 if the child lives in the ACS defined Midwest region and 0 otherwise.
- *South* is a dummy variable that takes the value of 1 if the child lives in the ACS defined South region and 0 otherwise.
- *West* is a dummy variable that takes the value of 1 if the child lives in the ACS defined West region and 0 otherwise.

B. Logistic Regression Model

To examine the effect of welfare spending as a percentage of GDP on the likelihood that an observation is behind in their schooling, we adopt a logistic regression model. In the logit model, the log odds of the outcome are modeled as a linear combination of the predictor variables. The inverse of the logistic function yields the beta coefficient on each explanatory dummy variable that is included in each logit.

$$g(x) = \ln \frac{F(x)}{1 - F(x)} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x, \tag{3}$$

β_0 and β_1 can be expanded to β_n for *n* number of explanatory variables that are included in the analysis. With the logit model, I add dummy variables to control for age, ages squared, sex, region of the country (additional regressions control for individual state), labor force participation (lfp) of the student, ability to speak English, and welfare spending as a percent of GDP. The logit is run conditionally on *school delay* while controlling for the aforementioned variables. We pay specific attention to the coefficient on the welfare-spending variable. This will indicate if increases in welfare spending as a percentage of GDP leads to a significant effect on schooling progress.

IV. Results

A distribution of characteristics of all children within the sample broken down by race can be found in Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6. The mean age among sample groups are all very close (within .5 yrs) and average to around 12.1. The percent of students that are behind vary significantly by race. For the population as a whole, we see that 6.3% of students are behind in their schooling. However, when examining the four major identifying races, Black and Hispanic fall above the average at 10.6% and 7.6% respectively. White and Asian students fall below the average at 5.6% and 4.3% respectively. These group characteristics follow the findings of Thomas 2009 and Palmer 2014 in terms of which race has a higher percentage of students delayed in their schooling progress. Looking at the geographical breakdown by race, we see that only white students have a relatively even distribution in their residence across the country. All other races are highly concentrated in a single region. Given that the other races are racial minorities and often part of the immigrant population, they tend to live in ethnic enclaves. For example, almost half of both the Asian and Hispanic children live in the Western region while 60% of Black students live in the south. The racial differences point to the reason why examining the effects of welfare spending as a percentage of GDP on a race specific basis is necessary. However, given the large variation by state, I will also include a logistic regression that controls for all 50 states instead of region to verify if region controls are enough to control for state-by-state variation in government aid.

Logistic Regression Results:

The marginal effects in our adjusted logistic regression analysis as well as the standard errors and p-value are examined in greater detail in Tables 7 and 9. We focus our attention on the value and magnitude of the marginal effects (denoted: dy/dx) on the welfare spending as a percentage of GDP. Thus, if the marginal effect is negative, an increase in welfare spending makes an individual less likely to fall behind. The opposite is true for a positive number.

Three of the four racial categories showed statistically significant results with a negative coefficient on the welfare spending variable, indicating a negative relationship between welfare spending and schooling delay. For Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics the marginal effect was negative and significant at the 1% level. However, the negative effect was not uniform for all races. For White students, the marginal effect of welfare spending on schooling progress was -8.4% with a P-value of .000. This implies that for a one percent increase in welfare spending as a percentage of GDP there is a corresponding decrease in the proportion of students who are behind by roughly eight percent. The marginal effect for Black students was twice as large at -19.4% with a P-value of .000 while the marginal effect on Hispanic students was the smallest at -7.4%. The same conclusions can be drawn with the values for Blacks and Hispanics. The larger the negative marginal effect on schooling delay, the more welfare spending effects this particular group. These results are consistent with the grouped logistic regression including all races where we also see a negative

coefficient on the welfare spending regressor.

Table 7. Logistic Regression Results On Schooling Delay For White, Black, and Hispanic Children Attending Grades 1-12

	White			Black			Hispanic		
Variable	**dy/dx**	**Std. Err.**	**P>|Z|**	**dy/dx**	**Std. Err.**	**P>|Z|**	**dy/dx**	**Std. Err.**	**P>|Z|**
Age	-0.016	0.000	0.000	-0.022	0.000	0.000	-0.017	0.000	0.000
Age Squared	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000
LFP	-0.016	0.000	0.000	-0.019	0.000	0.000	-0.009	0.000	0.000
Male	0.016	0.000	0.000	0.028	0.000	0.000	0.014	0.000	0.000
No English	0.089	0.002	0.000	0.021	0.005	0.000	0.069	0.002	0.000
Speaks English (Poorly)	0.034	0.000	0.000	0.014	0.001	0.000	0.040	0.001	0.000
Northeast	0.000	0.000	0.183	0.049	0.001	0.000	0.033	0.000	0.000
Midwest	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.049	0.001	0.000	0.023	0.000	0.000
South	0.026	0.000	0.000	0.053	0.000	0.000	0.043	0.000	0.000
Welfare Spending as % of GDP	-0.084	0.005	0.000	-0.194	0.015	0.000	-0.074	0.011	0.000

The only race that did not follow the dominant trend was the Asian students. They experienced a positive marginal effect of 4.9% on schooling delay with a P-value of .003. This suggests that increasing welfare spending as a percentage of GDP actually leads to an increase in the number of Asian students who fall behind in their schooling. Of note is the associated P-value with the Asian finding. Though it still indicates significance at the 1% level, it is the only P-value that when rounded to the thousands takes a positive value. Hence, this finding does not hold as much weight as the aforementioned results. These results could stem from the welfare system itself. Of the four racial categories included, Asians receive the least amount of welfare on a percentage bases. Below is the racial breakdown of welfare recipients.

Table 8. Welfare Recipients By Race (2012 Gender and Generations Survey)

Percent of recipients who are white	38.80%	Percent of whites who have ever received welfare	15.00%
Percent of recipients who are black	39.80%	Percent of blacks who have ever received welfare	31.00%
Percent of recipients who are Hispanic	15.70%	Percent of Hispanics who have ever received welfare	22.00%
Percent of recipients who are Asian	2.40%	Percent of Asian who have ever received welfare	N/A
Percent of recipients who are Other	3.30%	Percent of other who have ever received welfare	18.00%

If welfare simply does not affect the Asian race to a significant extent, welfare's level of spending should not have an effect on Asian student's schooling progress unless through indirect effects of other races. Looking at the racial breakdown, it follows that the welfare spending should have the biggest effect on White and Black students. Our results confirm this, with the highest negative coefficients on welfare spending belonging to the White and Black races with Hispanic values close behind.

Table 9. Logistic Regression Results On Schooling Delay For Asian Children Attending Grades 1-12

Variable	dy/dx	Std. Err.	Z	P>|Z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]	x
Age	-0.022	0.000	-101.360	0.000	-0.022	-0.021	11.871
Age Squared	0.001	0.000	135.330	0.000	0.001	0.001	153.70
LFP	-0.002	0.000	-7.170	0.000	-0.003	-0.002	0.032
Male	0.007	0.000	34.900	0.000	0.007	0.007	0.505
No English	0.072	0.004	19.660	0.000	0.065	0.080	0.003
Speaks English (Poorly)	0.048	0.001	54.760	0.000	0.046	0.049	0.036
Northeast	0.010	0.000	31.890	0.000	0.010	0.011	0.202
Midwest	0.014	0.000	34.810	0.000	0.014	0.015	0.127
South	0.017	0.000	53.380	0.000	0.017	0.018	0.227
Welfare Spending as % of GDP	0.049	0.017	2.940	0.003	0.016	0.082	0.037

Other marginal effects worth analyzing are labor force participation, age, and the language regressors. The age and language regressors follow an intuitive pattern for all races. Not speaking English at all or speaking it poorly leads to a positive effect between 1% and 8% on schooling delay for White, Black, Asian, and Hispanic students. This implies that turning on the dummy variable that corresponds to the language proficiency categorization leads to an increase of one to eight percent of the student population that is behind in school. This follows naturally that if a child cannot communicate or understand the material, they are more susceptible to not meeting the necessary requirements to advance to the next grade. The negative marginal effect also follows an intuitive pattern. For all races there exists a -1% to -2% marginal effect for age. As a student increases in age, their likelihood of falling behind decreases. Statistically, the majority of retention cases happen in the early years of primary school (Thomas 2009). Labor force participation does not follow a clear intuitive pattern. For all races there exists a negative marginal effect between -.2% and -2%. Many cognitive theorists and child development experts agree that if a child must manage their time and are dedicated to certain activities, performance in school can actually increase. However, we must be careful and address possible selection bias. Because every student in the sample is currently attending school, those that also work may self select into the labor force because they know they are good students and can manage. Further tests need to be run to try and separate these effects.

As stated above, I also ran additional regressions controlling for all 50 states rather than aggregating into four regions. Given that state level spending varies significantly for welfare, controlling for each state will give us a more representative picture. Logit results were almost identical for all races. The largest change in the returns to welfare spending as a percentage of GDP was .5% as a result of the new controls for Whites. It made the effect of welfare slightly less impactful on schooling progress. This follows standard intuition that if we more accurately control for observables, the overall explanatory power of certain variables is slightly reduced. This does not, however, change our analysis in the slightest and we still see that for Blacks, Whites, and Hispanics welfare has a positive effect on schooling progress of children.

V. Conclusions

I analyze the schooling progress of White, Black, Asian, and Hispanic students currently attending grades 1-12. I explore how changes in welfare spending as a percentage of GDP effects the schooling progress of the above racial groups and students as a whole.

Using the 2012 ACS 5 Year Sample data, I find that increases in welfare spending as a percentage of GDP significantly decreases the likelihood that a child is behind in their schooling for the White, Black, and Hispanic races. For Asian students I find a slight positive relationship that can be explained through the percentage breakdown of welfare recipients by race.

Many prior studies find a positive relationship between schooling performance and socioeconomic background. The welfare program in the United States aims at providing at least a certain level of economic stability for families in need of assistance. If welfare can be effectively distributed to increase the socioeconomic status of some families we can expect to see some positive effects on the children of those families. Moreover, not only should we see effects in the children directly affected by the welfare system, we should see an aggregate improvement based on improved quality of students.

It is important to address how welfare affects students of varying races differently. The fact that increases in welfare spending as a percentage of GDP affects Black students twice as much as Whites suggests that the Black student experience is fundamentally different from Whites.

Overall, the study finds that for every racial group except Asians, there exists a significant link between increases in welfare spending and reductions in the amount of children behind in school. It is evident that the effect is not uniform across races and further analysis is needed to understand the true mechanisms behind the

welfare program and its effect on the schooling of children. These findings may be of use in the shaping of policy, however, further detailed study is needed to confirm the results. Future studies should consider using longitudinal panel data to better understand the welfare effects on specific individuals. Moreover, better controlling for state level spending on welfare will further the robustness of future work. Limiting analysis to only students who's families received welfare may also give better insight into the welfare system.

VI. Appendix

Table 3. Summary Statistics For White Children Currently Attending Grades 1-12, Observations: 1,690,623

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Personal Characteristics				
Age	12.2	3.529	5	20
Male	51.6%	0.500	0	1
LFP	7.1%	0.257	0	1
No English	0.1%	0.030	0	1
Yes English (Well)	99.0%	0.097	0	1
Yes English (Poorly)	0.9%	0.093	0	1
School Characteristics				
Grade Level Attending	6.6	3.435	1	12
Schooling Delay	5.6%	0.229	0	1
Country Characteristics				
Welfare Spending as % of GDP	3.7%	0.006	2.8%	4.5%
Northeast	18.1%	0.385	0	1
Midwest	25.2%	0.434	0	1
South	34.7%	0.476	0	1
West	22.0%	0.414	0	1

Table 4. Summary Statistics For Black Children Currently Attending Grades 1-12, Observations: 287,682

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Personal Characteristics				
Age	12.4	3.617	5	20
Male	51.5%	0.500	0	1
LFP	5.9%	0.235	0	1
No English	0.0%	0.020	0	1
Yes English (Well)	99.4%	0.074	0	1
Yes English (Poorly)	0.5%	0.071	0	1
School Characteristics				
Grade Level Attending	6.8	3.437	1	12
Schooling Delay	10.6%	0.308	0	1
Country Characteristics				
Welfare Spending as % of GDP	3.7%	0.006	2.8%	4.5%
Northeast	15.7%	0.363	0	1
Midwest	16.7%	0.373	0	1
South	59.3%	0.491	0	1
West	8.3%	0.276	0	1

Table 5. Summary Statistics For Asian Children Currently Attending Grades 1-12, Observations: 104,840

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Personal Characteristics				
Age	11.9	3.570	5	20
Male	50.2%	0.500	0	1
LFP	3.3%	0.178	0	1
No English	0.3%	0.050	0	1
Yes English (Well)	96.0%	0.196	0	1
Yes English (Poorly)	3.7%	0.190	0	1
School Characteristics				
Grade Level Attending	6.5	3.469	1	12
Schooling Delay	4.3%	0.202	0	1
Country Characteristics				
Welfare Spending as % of GDP	3.7%	0.006	2.8%	4.5%
Northeast	19.7%	0.398	0	1
Midwest	10.7%	0.310	0	1
South	22.9%	0.420	0	1
West	46.7%	0.499	0	1

Table 6. Summary Statistics For Hispanic Children Currently Attending Grades 1-12, Observations: 451,942

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Personal Characteristics				
Age	11.9	3.592	5	20
Male	51.4%	0.500	0	1
LFP	4.8%	0.213	0	1
No English	0.4%	0.061	0	1
Yes English (Well)	96.7%	0.180	0	1
Yes English (Poorly)	3.0%	0.170	0	1
School Characteristics				
Grade Level Attending	6.4	3.448	1	12
Schooling Delay	7.6%	0.265	0	1
Country Characteristics				
Welfare Spending as % of GDP	3.7%	0.006	2.8%	4.5%
Northeast	11.7%	0.322	0	1
Midwest	9.0%	0.287	0	1
South	34.6%	0.476	0	1
West	44.6%	0.497	0	1

VII. References

Blinder A. "Wage Discrimination: Reduced Form and Structural Estimates" *The Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 8, No. 4 (Autumn, 1973), pp. 436-455

Chen Z. and Kaplan H. "Intergenerational Transmission of Constructive Parenting" *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 63, No. 1 (Feb., 2001), pp. 17-31

Cook, T. D., Herman, M. R., Phillips, M., & Settersten , R. A., Jr. (2002). Some ways in which neighborhoods, nuclear families, friendship groups, and schools jointly affect changes in early adolescent development. Child Development, 73(4), 1283-1309

DiNardo J., Fortin M. and Lemieux T. "Labor Market Institutions and the Distribution of Wages, 1973-1992: A Semiparametric Approach" *Econometrica*, Vol. 64, No. 5 (Sep., 1996), pp. 1001-1044

Harris A., Jamison K. and Trujillo M. "Disparities in the Educational Success of Immigrants: An Assessment of the Immigrant Effect for Asians and Latinos" *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 620, Exceptional Outcomes: Achievement in Education and Employment among Children of Immigrants (Nov., 2008), pp. 90-114

Hirschman C. "The Educational Enrollment of Immigrant Youth: A Test of the Segmented- Assimilation Hypothesis" *Demography*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (Aug., 2001), pp. 317-336

Kao G. "Parental Influences on the Educational Outcomes of Immigrant Youths" *International Migration Review* (2004) 38L 427-49

Thomas K. "Parental Characteristics and the Schooling Progress of the Children of Immigrant and U.S.-Born Blacks" *Demography*, Vol. 46, No. 3 (Aug., 2009), pp. 513-534

Regnerus, Mark D., and Glen H. Elder. "Staying on Track in School: Religious Influences in High- and Low-Risk Settings." *Journal for the Scientific Stud of Religion* 42.4 (2003): 633-49. Web