Center for Promise
AMERICA'S PROMISE ALLIANCE®

Technical Report to accompany

Don't Quit on Me: What Young People Who Left School Say About the Power of Relationships

This resource provides a more detailed description of our survey measures, and quantitative analyses. Summary tables that include means and crosstabs the compare scores across the continuous-enrollment and interrupted-enrollment groups are included in the Appendix. In-depth regression tables and results from a latent class analysis are presented here.

Download the full report at GradNation.org/DontQuit

About the Center for Promise

The Center for Promise, the research institute for America's Promise Alliance, is housed at Boston University's School of Education and dedicated to understanding what young people need to thrive and how to create the conditions of success for all young people.

Questions? Feedback? Please contact the Center for Promise research team at cfp@americaspromise.org.

Suggested Citation:

Center for Promise. (2015). *Technical report to accompany Don't quit on me: What young people who left school say about the power of relationships*. America's Promise Alliance: Washington, DC.

Contents

Description of Measures 5
Table 1. Cronbach's Alphas for scales and subscales measuring support. 5
Descriptive Statistics 8
Table 2. Pearson correlations among participants' internal strengths, social supports received, and risk factor index 8
Table 3. Pearson correlations among participants' internal strengths, social supports received, and risk factor index 9
Table 4. Pearson correlations among participants' internal strengths, social supports received, and risk factor index 9
Analyses 10
Table 5. Logistic regression showing the different sources of support and risk index predicting dropout. 10
Table 6. Logistic regression showing the different risks predicting dropout. 11
Table 7. Logistic regression showing the types of support from adults in school predicting dropout. 12
Table 8. Logistic regression showing the types of support from adults outside of school predicting dropout. 13
Table 9. Logistic regression showing the types of support from parents predicting dropout... 14
Table 10. Logistic regression showing the types of support from friends predicting dropout. 15
Table 11. Logistic regression showing the interactions of support. 16
Table 12. Logistic regression showing the interactions of support. 17
Table 13. Logistic regression showing the interactions of life history predicting dropout status. 18
Table 14. Logistic regression showing the interactions of supportive adults outside of school and persistence. 19
Table 15. Logistic regression showing the interactions of supportive parents and persistence. 20
Table 16. Logistic regression showing the two-way interactions of supportive friends and persistence. 21
Table 17. Logistic regression showing the two-way interactions of supportive adults in school and persistence 22
Table 18. Logistic regression showing the interactions of sources of support and self-control. 23

Table 19. Logistic regression showing the interactions of supportive adults outside of school and self-control. 24

Table 20. Logistic regression showing the interactions of supportive adults in school and self-control. 25

Table 21. Logistic regression showing the interactions of parents support and self-control.... 26

Table 22. Logistic regression showing the interactions of friends support and self-control. ... 27

Table 23. Logistic regression showing the risk and adults out of school instrumental support. 28

Table 24. Logistic regression showing the interaction of gang involvement by supportive adults in school. 29

Table 25. Logistic regression showing the interaction of not feeling prepared for school and parent support..... 30

Table 26. Logistic regression showing the interaction of being homeless and support from adults in school. 31

Table 27. Logistic regression showing the interactions of having friends who get in fights and friend support. 32

Table 28. Logistic regression showing the interaction of supportive adults outside of school and risk index. 33

Table 29. Logistic regression with interaction of risk index and emotional support from adults outside of school. 34

Table 30. Logistic regression showing the interaction of risk index and informational support from adults outside of school. 35

Table 31. Logistic regression showing the interaction of gang involvement and supportive parents. 36

Table 32. Logistic regression showing the interaction of supportive adults outside of school and moving..... 37

Table 33. Logistic regression showing the interaction of supportive friends and moving. 38

Table 34. Logistic regression showing the interaction of supportive friends and friends get into fights. 39

Latent Class Analysis: Analytic Plan and Results 40

Table 35. Means and Standard Deviations for the high and low groups. 41

Table 36. Fit statistics for 5-, 6-, and 7-class solutions for Latent Class Analysis of Social Support..... 42

Table 37. Class counts and proportions for the 6-class solution..... 43

Table 38. Predicted likelihood (and standard errors) of social support measures for the 6-class solution..... 44

Table 39. Logistic regressions showing one source of support predicting dropout status. 45

Table 40. Logistic regression showing the interaction between support class and risk index.. 46

References..... 47

Description of Measures

Social Support was measured using the Child & Adolescent Social Support Scale – Level 2 (CASSS; Malecki & Demaray, 2002). The Level 2 version was designed for use with sixth through twelfth graders. The measure was adapted to be in past tense. We asked participants to indicate the degree to which they felt supported in their social relationships when they were between the ages of 14 and 18. These relationships included parents, adults outside of school, adults in school, and friends. Items included, "When you were between the ages of 14 and 18, how often did you feel like your parents: Gave me good advice," and were rated on a 6-point Likert scale (1= *Never* 6= *Always*). For each source of support (e.g., parents), participants were asked 12 items which indicated four subscales of types of support including emotional, informational, appraisal, and instrumental support. However, for the scale indicated friend support, one item was omitted from the survey. Cronbach's alphas for each scale and subscale are reported in Table 1.

Table 1. Cronbach's Alphas for scales and subscales measuring support.

Scale	Subscale	Subscale Cronbach's Alpha	Scale Cronbach's Alpha
Parents	Emotional	$\alpha = .92$	$\alpha = .97$
	Informational	$\alpha = .92$	
	Appraisal	$\alpha = .90$	
	Instrumental	$\alpha = .88$	
Adults Outside of School	Emotional	$\alpha = .91$	$\alpha = .97$
	Informational	$\alpha = .91$	
	Appraisal	$\alpha = .89$	
	Instrumental	$\alpha = .90$	
Adults in School	Emotional	$\alpha = .89$	$\alpha = .97$
	Informational	$\alpha = .91$	
	Appraisal	$\alpha = .90$	
	Instrumental	$\alpha = .90$	
Friends	Emotional	$\alpha = .90$	$\alpha = .97$
	Informational	$\alpha = .90$	
	Appraisal	$\alpha = .91$	
	Instrumental	$r = 74$ ($p<.001$)	

Self-control was measured using a revised version of the self-control subscale of the Chernyshenko Conscientiousness Scales (CCS; Roberts, Chernyshenko, Stark, & Goldberg, 2005; Hill & Roberts, 2011). Participants answered 9 items on a 6-point Likert scale (1= *Strongly Disagree*, 6= *Strongly Agree*). Items included, "I often rush into action without thinking about potential consequences" (reverse coded) and "I do not take unnecessary risks." Preliminary analyses indicated that the removal of one item, "I dislike being around impulsive people," would improve reliability ($\alpha = .79$). The self-control scale was worded in present tense, assessing participants' present status while filling out the survey.

Persistence was measured using revised version of the Measurement Instrument for Primary and Secondary Control Strategies (Wrosch, Heckhausen, & Lachman, 2000). Participants responded to four items on a 6-point Likert scale (1= *Strongly Disagree*, 6= *Strongly Agree*). Items included, "When I encounter problems, I don't give up until I solve them" ($\alpha = .89$). The persistence scale was worded in present tense, assessing participants' present status while filling out the survey.

Life History was measured through 19 items. Participants were asked to respond "*Yes*" or "No" to whether had experienced a variety of life events between the ages of 14 and 18. Items included, "I was physically abused (hit, kicked, punched) or emotionally abused (yelled at) by a parent or caregiver" and "Most of my friends used drugs in high school." We also calculated a risk index by summing all life history events.

Grades in school. Participants were asked, "In general, what kind of grades did you get in High School?" Responses were ranked 1= Mostly A's through 5= Mostly F's. Participants were also able to indicate that they did not attend high school.

Age was reported. Participants who selected under 18 or older than 26 or who refused the question were unable to complete the survey. Average age for the non-dropout group is 22.13 ($SD = 2.23$) and for the dropout group is 22.09 ($SD = 2.22$). There is no statistical difference between these two groups in terms of their average age.

Gender was reported (0= female, 1= male). More females than males filled out the survey for both the non-dropout group and the dropout group. For the non-dropout group, a total number of 1137 females (69.3%) answered the survey; and for the dropout group, a total number of 826 (69.8%) answered the survey. There is no statistical difference between these two groups on gender distribution, $\chi^2 = .08$, $p > .05$.

Race was reported. Participants were allowed to choose all that applied or fill in Other. In the non-dropout group, a majority of the sample were white (64.70%), 12.01% African American, 7.07% Hispanic/Latino, 6.71% Asian, 0.49% Native, and 9.02% other/mixed ethnicity. In the dropout group, the race distribution was similar, with 63.91% white, 11.13%

African American, 9.19% Hispanic/Latino, 3.88% Asian, 1.01% native, and 10.88% other/mixed ethnicity. The race distributions between these two groups were statistically different, $\chi^2 = .19.46$, $p < .01$.

Parent level of education was reported for mother and father. Choices included 1st grade through post-graduate school.

Number of times moved homes and schools.

In two separate questions, we asked participants how many times they moved homes and moved schools when they were between the ages of 14 and 18.

Table. Percentages of participants reported moved homes and schools.

Zip Code

Employment status (1= Full Time, 2= Part Time, 3= not employed and not in school, 4= not employed, in school).

Country of Origin participants used a drop down menu to select country of origin. Participants who were not born in the United States were asked to report their **age of immigration**.

Level of education was reported by the participants. Options included 1st grade through post-graduate school. Individuals who reported they received a high school diploma or GED were asked to report the **age at which they completed their degree**.

Drop out status. Participants were asked, "Regardless of your education level, at any time did you ever drop out or stop attending high school for at least one semester (about four months)?" Participants who indicated "*Yes*" were coded as interrupted enrollment. Participants who indicated "*No*" were coded as continuous enrollment. Participants with reported interrupted enrollment were asked whether they had **ever returned to an educational center** and if they were **currently enrolled in school** (0= "*No*", 1= "*Yes*"). If participants indicated they had returned to school, they were asked to report the **age at which they returned** and to select **reasons for their return**. Choices included "Someone encouraged me to return" and "I needed more education to get a good job." Participants were also asked to rank first, second, and third, the **people in their lives who helped them return to school**.

Participants were asked to rank, first, second, and third, the social relationships they turned to between the ages of 14 and 18. These items included "When you were 14-18 years old, when you had trouble with school, who did you go to for help?" and "Was anyone in your life

that encouraged you to drop out of high school?" Twelve types of relationships were provided, including "Mother," "No One," "Friend," and the opportunity to write in "Other."

Participants were asked, "Not counting your parents, when you were between 14-18 years old, how many adults in your school, neighborhood, or community knew you well, and you could rely on to help you if you had a problem?" (Zero=0, One=1, Two=2, and Three or more =3)

Descriptive Statistics

Means, standard deviations, and Pearson correlations among all participants' internal strengths, social supports received, and risk factor index, are presented in Table 2. Descriptive statistics for the continuous-enrollment group are presented in Table 3. Descriptive statistics for the interrupted-enrollment group are presented in Table 4. Results are weighted to create an equal distribution of males and females.

Table 2. Pearson correlations among participants' internal strengths, social supports received, and risk factor index.

	Persistence	Self-control	Supporting Adults in School	Supporting Adults Outside School	Supporting Parents	Supporting Friends	Risk Index
Self-control	.19**	---					
Supporting Adults in School	.32**	.02	---				
Supporting Adults Outside School	.26**	-.11**	.64**	---			
Supporting Parents	.29**	.05*	.53**	.62**	---		
Supporting Friends	.34**	-.03	.55**	.58**	.46**	---	
Risk Index	-.04*	-.21**	-.24**	-.15**	-.26**	-.07**	---
Mean	4.64	4.10	4.08	3.60	4.27	4.17	3.77
SD	1.05	.93	1.26	1.36	1.37	1.24	3.58

Table 3. Pearson correlations among participants' internal strengths, social supports received, and risk factor index [non-dropout, $N = 1572$].

	Persistence	Self-control	Supporting Adults in School	Supporting Adults Outside School	Supporting Parents	Supporting Friends	Risk Index
Self-control	.21**	---					
Supporting Adults in School	.34**	.05	---				
Supporting Adults Outside School	.26**	-.11**	.59**	---			
Supporting Parents	.29**	.07**	.53**	.63**	---		
Supporting Friends	.34**	-.05	.55**	.57**	.46**	---	
Risk Index	-.07**	-.21**	-.21**	-.11**	-.26**	-.07**	---
Mean	4.72	4.21	4.32	3.78	4.47	4.28	2.72
SD	.97	.90	1.13	1.27	1.27	1.15	2.90

Table 4. Pearson correlations among participants' internal strengths, social supports received, and risk factor index [dropout, $N = 1158$].

	Persistence	Self-control	Supporting Adults in School	Supporting Adults Outside School	Supporting Parents	Supporting Friends	Risk Index
Self-control	.15**	---					
Supporting Adults in School	.29**	-.09**	---				
Supporting Adults Outside School	.24**	-.15**	.67**	---			
Supporting Parents	.27**	-.04	.49**	.60**	---		
Supporting Friends	.32**	-.04	.53**	.57**	.44**	---	
Risk Index	.04	-.14**	-.14**	-.10**	-.19**	.00	---
Mean	4.53	3.93	3.73	3.35	4.00	4.02	5.22
SD	1.15	.96	1.35	1.44	1.45	1.34	3.92

Analyses

Table 5. Logistic regression showing the different sources of support and risk index predicting dropout.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
Constant	.59(.45)	.40*(.47)	.17**(.49)
Female	.91(.09)	.98(.09)	1.00(.09)
White [a]			
Black/African American	1.23(.13)	1.32*(.14)	1.37*(.14)
Hispanic/Latino	1.02(.16)	.97(.17)	1.08(.17)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.10(.15)	1.04(.15)	1.07(.16)
Asian	.58**(.20)	.61*(.20)	.71(.21)
Native	1.02(.66)	.86(.66)	.68(.67)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	.36**(.15)	.36**(.15)	.40**(.16)
ME GED	.74(.22)	.68(.23)	.68(.23)
ME Associates/Technical	.60**(.18)	.59**(.19)	.64*(.19)
ME Some college 2/4 year	.49**(.16)	.49**(.16)	.56**(.16)
ME College Graduate and up	.40**(.16)	.42**(.16)	.52**(.17)
Age	1.04*(.02)	1.06**(.02)	1.06**(.02)
Persistence	.88**(.04)	1.02(.05)	.96(.05)
Self-Control	.76**(.05)	.73**(.05)	.83**(.05)
SASH		.69**(.05)	.75**(.05)
SAO		.96(.05)	.94(.05)
SP		.93(.04)	1.01(.05)
SF		1.09(.05)	1.05(.05)
Risk Index			1.19**(.01)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SASH= Supporting Adults in School; SAO= Supporting Adults outside of School; SP= Parental Support; SF= Friend Support. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 6. Logistic regression showing the different risks predicting dropout.

	Model 1		Model 2	
	Exp(B)	(S.E.)	Exp(B)	(S.E.)
Constant	.80	(.46)	.23**	(.52)
Female	1.02	(.09)	1.09	(.10)
White [a]				
Black/African American	1.19	(.14)	1.27	(.15)
Hispanic/Latino	1.16	(.17)	1.33	(.19)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.30	(.14)	1.31	(.16)
Asian	.64*	(.20)	.87	(.22)
Native	1.60	(.56)	1.12	(.62)
ME Below high school [a]				
ME High School Diploma	.34**	(.15)	.40**	(.16)
ME GED	.79	(.22)	.87	(.24)
ME Associates/Technical	.54**	(.18)	.69	(.20)
ME Some college 2/4 year	.44**	(.16)	.59**	(.17)
ME College Graduate and up	.35**	(.16)	.53**	(.17)
Age	1.02	(.02)	1.03	(.02)
Gang involvement			.65	(.31)
Drug use			1.18	(.14)
Jail			1.10	(.24)
Lost parent			.99	(.17)
Caregiver			.91	(.12)
Foster care			1.16	(.27)
Expelled/suspended			2.26**	(.14)
Not prepared			1.76**	(.12)
Abused by parent			1.13	(.14)
Abused by non-parent			.81	(.15)
Homeless			1.45*	(.18)
Moved homes			1.29*	(.12)
Changed schools			1.22	(.12)
Friends drop out			2.15**	(.16)
Friends do drugs			.86	(.14)
Friends start fights			.87	(.14)
Birth/fathered a child			2.22**	(.19)
Mental health			1.93**	(.11)
Bullied			.99	(.11)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 7. Logistic regression showing the types of support from adults in school predicting dropout.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
Constant	.84(.46)	.66(.46)	.51(.48)
Female	1.02(.09)	.92(.09)	.96(.09)
White [a]			
Black/African American	1.27(.13)	1.27(.14)	1.35*(.14)
Hispanic/Latino	1.10(.16)	1.07(.16)	1.05(.17)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.20(.15)	1.14(.15)	1.10(.16)
Asian	.65*(.20)	.60*(.20)	.66*(.21)
Native	1.02(.65)	1.05(.66)	.98(.67)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	.34**(.15)	.34**(.15)	.34**(.16)
ME GED	.67(.23)	.66(.23)	.59*(.23)
ME Associates/Technical	.55**(.18)	.59**(.19)	.58**(.19)
ME Some college 2/4 year	.45**(.16)	.46**(.16)	.45**(.16)
ME College Graduate and up	.34**(.16)	.37**(.16)	.38**(.17)
Age	1.02(.02)	1.04(.02)	1.05*(.02)
Persistence		.87**(.04)	1.00(.05)
Self-Control		.74**(.05)	.71**(.05)
SA_EMO			.80**(.08)
SA_INFO			.94(.09)
SA_APP			1.11(.08)
SA_INST			.81**(.08)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SA= Supporting Adults in School; EMO= Emotional; INFO= Informational; APP= Appraisal; INST= Instrumental.* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 8. Logistic regression showing the types of support from adults outside of school predicting dropout.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
Constant	.77(.46)	.63(.46)	.41(.48)
Female	1.00(.09)	.91(.09)	.97(.09)
White [a]			
Black/African American	1.23(.13)	1.23(.13)	1.32*(.14)
Hispanic/Latino	1.10(.16)	1.08(.16)	1.05(.17)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.17(.15)	1.12(.15)	1.11(.15)
Asian	.66*(.2)	.62*(.21)	.64*(.21)
Native	.99(.65)	1.02(.66)	.88(.67)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	.35**(.15)	.36**(.15)	.38**(.15)
ME GED	.73(.22)	.73(.22)	.76(.23)
ME Associates/Technical	.55**(.19)	.59**(.19)	.60**(.19)
ME Some college 2/4 year	.46**(.16)	.47**(.16)	.51**(.16)
ME College Graduate and up	.36**(.16)	.39**(.16)	.43**(.17)
Age	1.03(.02)	1.04(.02)	1.05**(.02)
Persistence		.89**(.04)	.96(.05)
Self-Control		.76**(.05)	.70**(.05)
SAO_EMO			.88(.08)
SAO_INFO			1.10(.08)
SAO_APP			.98(.08)
SAO_INST			.83*(.08)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SAO= Supporting Adults outside of School; EMO= Emotional; INFO= Informational; APP= Appraisal; INST= Instrumental.* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 9. Logistic regression showing the types of support from parents predicting dropout.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
Constant	.72(.45)	.61(.46)	.48(.47)
Female	1.01(.09)	.91(.09)	.97(.09)
White [a]			
Black/African American	1.28(.13)	1.28(.13)	1.24(.14)
Hispanic/Latino	1.10(.16)	1.07(.16)	1.04(.16)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.15(.15)	1.11(.15)	1.08(.15)
Asian	.65*(.20)	.61*(.20)	.61*(.20)
Native	1.01(.65)	1.04(.66)	.83(.67)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	.35**(.15)	.36**(.15)	.38**(.15)
ME GED	.73(.22)	.73(.22)	.74(.22)
ME Associates/Technical	.55**(.18)	.59**(.18)	.63*(.19)
ME Some college 2/4 year	.45**(.15)	.46**(.16)	.49**(.16)
ME College Graduate and up	.35**(.16)	.38**(.16)	.43**(.16)
Age	1.03(.02)	1.04*(.02)	1.05*(.02)
Persistence		.89**(.04)	.97(.05)
Self-Control		.76**(.05)	.75**(.05)
SP_EMO			.83*(.08)
SP_INFO			1.08(.08)
SP_APP			1.13(.08)
SP_INST			.79**(.09)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SP= Supporting Parents; EMO= Emotional; INFO= Informational; APP= Appraisal; INST= Instrumental.* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 10. Logistic regression showing the types of support from friends predicting dropout.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
Constant	.90(.45)	.73(.46)	.70(.46)
Female	.98(.09)	.89(.09)	.89(.09)
White [a]			
Black/African American	1.23(.13)	1.23(.14)	1.25(.14)
Hispanic/Latino	1.01(.16)	.99(.17)	1.00(.17)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.18(.15)	1.12(.15)	1.12(.15)
Asian	.63*(.20)	.60*(.20)	.61*(.20)
Native	.99(.65)	1.03(.66)	.99(.67)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	.37**(.15)	.38**(.15)	.38**(.15)
ME GED	.71(.22)	.70(.22)	.68(.23)
ME Associates/Technical	.57**(.18)	.61**(.18)	.61**(.18)
ME Some college 2/4 year	.48**(.15)	.50**(.16)	.50**(.16)
ME College Graduate and up	.37**(.16)	.40**(.16)	.41**(.16)
Age	1.02(.02)	1.03(.02)	1.03(.02)
Persistence		.87**(.04)	.93(.05)
Self-Control		.76**(.05)	.74**(.05)
SF_EMO			1.08(.08)
SF_INFO			.76**(.08)
SF_INST			1.01(.09)
SF_APP			1.02(.07)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SF= Supporting Friends; EMO= Emotional; INFO= Informational; APP= Appraisal; INST= Instrumental.* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 11. Logistic regression showing the interactions of support.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
White [a]			
Black/African American	1.22 (.13)	1.21 (.13)	1.20 (.13)
Hispanic/Latino	1.14 (.16)	1.17 (.16)	1.18 (.16)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.16 (.14)	1.16 (.14)	1.14 (.14)
Asian	.58 (.20)*	.58 (.20)*	.58 (.20)*
Native	1.97 (.52)	1.86 (.53)	1.90 (.53)
Female	1.11 (.08)	1.12 (.09)	1.12 (.09)
Age	1.05 (.02)*	1.04 (.02)*	1.04 (.02)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	.36 (.14)**	.36 (.14)**	.35 (.14)**
ME GED	.66 (.21)*	.67 (.21)	.66 (.21)*
ME Associates/Technical	.58 (.18)**	.59 (.18)**	.59 (.18)**
ME Some college 2/4 year	.46 (.15)**	.46 (.15)**	.45 (.15)**
ME College Graduate and up	.39 (.15)**	.39 (.15)**	.39 (.15)**
SASH	.68 (.05)**	.70 (.05)**	.66 (.05)**
SAO	1.01 (.05)	1.03 (.05)	1.01 (.05)
SP	.90 (.04)*	.86 (.04)**	.82 (.05)**
SF	1.11 (.04)*	1.11 (.05)*	1.12 (.05)*
SAO by SASH		1.19 (.04)**	1.18 (.04)**
SASH by SP		.90 (.03)**	.95 (.04)
SASH by SF		.99 (.03)	.98 (.03)
SAO by SASH by SP			1.06 (.02)**
SAO by SASH by SF			.99 (.02)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SASH= Supporting Adults in School; SAO= Supporting Adults outside of School; SP= Parental Support; SF= Friend Support. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 12. Logistic regression showing the interactions of support.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
White [a]			
Black/African American	1.22 (.13)	1.20 (.13)	1.18 (.13)
Hispanic/Latino	1.14 (.16)	1.14 (.16)	1.15 (.16)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.16 (.14)	1.16 (.14)	1.13 (.14)
Asian	.58 (.20)*	.59 (.20)*	.58 (.20)*
Native	1.97 (.52)	2.15 (.52)	2.31 (.53)
Female	1.11 (.08)	1.12 (.09)	1.12 (.09)
Age	1.05 (.02)*	1.04 (.02)*	1.05 (.02)*
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	.36 (.14)**	.35 (.14)**	.35 (.14)**
ME GED	.66 (.21)*	.65 (.21)*	.63 (.21)*
ME Associates/Technical	.58 (.18)**	.57 (.18)**	.57 (.18)**
ME Some college 2/4 year	.46 (.15)**	.46 (.15)**	.45 (.15)**
ME College Graduate and up	.39 (.15)**	.38 (.15)**	.38 (.15)**
SASH	.68 (.05)**	.68 (.05)**	.68 (.05)**
SAO	1.01 (.05)	1.00 (.05)	.98 (.05)
SP	.90 (.04)*	.89 (.04)*	.86 (.05)**
SF	1.11 (.04)*	1.14 (.05)*	1.09 (.05)*
SAO by SP		1.01 (.03)	1.00 (.03)
SAO by SF		1.10 (.03)	1.09 (.03)*
SF by SP		.95 (.03)	1.00 (.04)
SASH by SP by SF			.99 (.02)
SAO by SF by SP			1.06 (.02)*

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SASH= Supporting Adults in School; SAO= Supporting Adults outside of School; SP= Parental Support; SF= Friend Support. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 13. Logistic regression showing the interactions of life history predicting dropout status.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)
Female	1.02 (.09)	1.09 (.10)
White [a]		
Black/African American	1.19 (.14)	1.27 (.15)
Hispanic/Latino	1.16 (.17)	1.33 (.19)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.30 (.14)	1.31 (.16)
Asian	.64 (.20)*	.87 (.22)
Native	1.60 (.56)	1.12 (.62)
ME Below high school [a]		
ME High School Diploma	.34 (.15)**	.40 (.16)**
ME GED	.79 (.22)	.87 (.24)
ME Associates/Technical	.54 (.18)**	.69 (.20)
ME Some college 2/4 year	.44 (.16)**	.59 (.17)**
ME College Graduate and up	.35 (.16)**	.53 (.17)**
Age	1.02 (.02)	1.03 (.02)
Gang		.65 (.31)
Drugs		1.18 (.14)
Jail		1.10 (.24)
Lost a Parent		.99 (.17)
Caregiver		.91 (.12)
Foster Care		1.16 (.27)
Suspended/Expelled		2.26 (.14)**
Not Prepared		1.76 (.12)**
Abused by Parent		1.13 (.14)
Abused by Non-Parent		.81 (.15)
Homeless		1.45 (.18)*
Moved Homes		1.29 (.12)*
Changed Schools		1.22 (.12)
Friends Dropped out		2.15 (.16)**
Friends do Drugs		.86 (.14)
Friends got in Fights		.87 (.14)
Birthed/Fathered a Child		2.22 (.19)**
Mental Health		1.93 (.11)**
Bullied		.99 (.11)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education.
* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Table 14. Logistic regression showing the interactions of supportive adults outside of school and persistence.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
White [a]			
Black/African American	1.23 (.14)	1.30 (.14)	1.30 (.14)
Hispanic/Latino	1.07 (.17)	1.03 (.17)	1.03 (.17)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.12 (.15)	1.06 (.16)	1.06 (.16)
Asian	.63 (.21)*	.66 (.21)*	.66 (.21)*
Native	1.02 (.66)	.87 (.66)	.87 (.67)
Female	.91 (.09)	.98 (.09)	.98 (.09)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	.36 (.15)**	.36 (.15)**	.36 (.16)**
ME GED	.74 (.22)	.68 (.23)	.68 (.23)
ME Associates/Technical	.60 (.19)*	.58 (.19)**	.58 (.19)**
ME Some college 2/4 year	.48 (.16)**	.48 (.16)**	.48 (.16)**
ME College Graduate and up	.40 (.16)**	.42 (.17)**	.42 (.17)**
Age	1.04 (.02)	1.05 (.02)*	1.05 (.02)*
Persistence	.89 (.02)*	1.03 (.05)	1.04 (.02)
Self-control	.76 (.05)**	.73 (.05)**	.73 (.05)**
SASH		.68 (.05)**	.68 (.05)**
SF		1.08 (.05)	1.08 (.05)
SP		.92 (.04)*	.92 (.04)*
Persistence by SAO EMO			1.00 (.08)
Persistence by SAO INFO			1.05 (.09)
Persistence by SAO APP			.94 (.08)
Persistence by SAO INST			1.04 (.07)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SASH= Supporting Adults in School; SAO= Supporting Adults outside of School; SP= Parental Support; SF= Friend Support; EMO= Emotional; INFO= Informational; APP= Appraisal; INST= Instrumental. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 15. Logistic regression showing the interactions of supportive parents and persistence.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
White [a]			
Black/African American	1.29 (.13)*	1.40 (.14)*	1.39 (.14)*
Hispanic/Latino	1.08 (.16)	1.03 (.17)	1.03 (.17)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.12(.15)	1.06 (.15)	1.06 (.15)
Asian	.62 (.20)*	.66 (.21)*	.66 (.21)*
Native	1.03 (.66)	.91 (.66)	.92 (.67)
Female	.91 (.09)	.97 (.09)	.96 (.09)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	.35 (.15)**	.35 (.15)**	.35 (.15)**
ME GED	.73 (.22)	.68 (.23)	.68 (.23)
ME Associates/Technical	.60 (.18)*	.58 (.19)**	.58 (.19)**
ME Some college 2/4 year	.46 (.16)**	.45 (.16)**	.46 (.16)**
ME College Graduate and up	.38 (.16)**	.40 (.16)**	.40 (.16)**
Age	1.04 (.02)*	1.06 (.02)*	1.06 (.02)*
Persistence	.89 (.04)**	1.02 (.05)	1.03 (.05)
Self-control	.77 (.05)**	.73 (.05)**	.73 (.05)**
SAO		.92 (.05)	.92 (.05)
SASH		.68 (.05)**	.68 (.05)**
SF		1.09 (.05)	1.09 (.05)
Persistence by SP EMO			.99 (.08)
Persistence by SP INFO			1.05 (.08)
Persistence by SP APP			.97 (.08)
Persistence by SP INST			1.02 (.08)

Note: [a] = reference group. All coefficients are Exp(B). ME =Maternal Education; SASH= Supporting Adults in School; SAO= Supporting Adults outside of School; SP= Parental Support; SF= Friend Support; EMO= Emotional; INFO= Informational; APP= Appraisal; INST= Instrumental. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 16. Logistic regression showing the two-way interactions of supportive friends and persistence.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
White [a]			
Black/African American	1.23 (.14)	1.32 (.14)*	1.31 (.14)*
Hispanic/Latino	1.00 (.17)	.97 (.17)	.97 (.17)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.12 (.15)	1.07 (.15)	1.07 (.15)
Asian	.60 (.20)*	.65 (.21)*	.65 (.21)*
Native	1.02 (.66)	.88 (.67)	.89 (.67)
Female	.89 (.09)	.95 (.09)	.95 (.09)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	.37 (.15)**	.37 (.15)**	.37 (.15)**
ME GED	.70 (.22)	.65 (.23)	.65 (.23)
ME Associates/Technical	.61 (.18)*	.60 (.19)*	.60 (.19)*
ME Some college 2/4 year	.49 (.16)**	.50 (.16)**	.50 (.16)**
ME College Graduate and up	.40 (.16)**	.43 (.17)**	.43 (.17)**
Age	1.03 (.02)	1.05 (.02)*	1.05 (.02)*
Persistence	.87 (.04)**	1.03 (.05)	1.04 (.05)
Self-control	.76 (.05)**	.73 (.05)**	.73 (.05)**
SP		.94 (.04)	.94 (.04)
SAO		.98 (.05)	.97 (.05)
SASH		.71 (.05)**	.71 (.05)**
Persistence by SF EMO			1.01 (.08)
Persistence by SF INFO			1.10 (.09)
Persistence by SF INST			.99 (.09)
Persistence by SF APP			.95 (.08)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SASH= Supporting Adults in School; SAO= Supporting Adults outside of School; SP= Parental Support; SF= Friend Support; EMO= Emotional; INFO= Informational; APP= Appraisal; INST= Instrumental. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 17. Logistic regression showing the two-way interactions of supportive adults in school and persistence.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
White [a]			
Black/African American	1.25 (.14)	1.31 (.14)*	1.31 (.14)*
Hispanic/Latino	1.05 (.17)	1.00 (.17)	1.00 (.17)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.15 (.15)	1.12 (.15)	1.13 (.16)
Asian	.60 (.20)*	.60 (.21)*	.60 (.21)*
Native	1.04 (.66)	.88 (.67)	.87 (.67)
Female	.91 (.09)	.97 (.09)	.98 (.09)
ME < high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	.34 (.15)**	.36 (.15)**	.36 (.15)**
ME GED	.65 (.23)	.67 (.23)	.65 (.23)
ME Associates/Technical	.60 (.19)*	.61 (.19)*	.61 (.19)*
ME Some college 2/4 year	.46 (.16)**	.49 (.16)**	.49 (.16)**
ME College Graduate and up	.37 (.16)**	.41 (.17)**	.40 (.17)**
Age	1.03 (.02)	1.05 (.02)*	1.04 (.02)*
Persistence	.86 (.04)**	.95 (.05)	.96 (.05)
Self-control	.75 (.05)**	.71 (.05)**	.71 (.05)**
SF		1.02 (.04)	1.02 (.04)
SP		.90 (.04)*	.90 (.04)
SAO		.82 (.05)**	.82 (.05)**
Persistence by SASH EMO			.85 (.08)*
Persistence by SASH INFO			1.10 (.09)
Persistence by SASH APP			1.10 (.08)
Persistence by SASH INST			.99 (.08)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SASH= Supporting Adults in School; SAO= Supporting Adults outside of School; SP= Parental Support; SF= Friend Support; EMO= Emotional; INFO= Informational; APP= Appraisal; INST= Instrumental. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 18. Logistic regression showing the interactions of sources of support and self-control.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
Constant	.59(.45)	.40*(.47)	.41(.47)
White [a]			
Black/African American	1.23(.13)	1.32*(.14)	1.30(.14)
Hispanic/Latino	1.04(.16)	1.00(.17)	1.00(.17)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.11(.15)	1.05(.15)	1.04(.15)
Asian	.58**(.20)	.61*(.20)	.61*(.20)
Native	1.03(.66)	.86(.66)	.78(.67)
Female	.92(.09)	.99(.09)	.98(.09)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	.36**(.15)	.36**(.15)	.37**(.15)
ME GED	.73(.22)	.67(.23)	.69(.23)
ME Associates/Technical	.60**(.18)	.58**(.19)	.59**(.19)
ME Some college 2/4 year	.49**(.16)	.49**(.16)	.50**(.16)
ME College Graduate and up	.40**(.16)	.42**(.16)	.43**(.16)
Age	1.04*(.02)	1.06**(.02)	1.05**(.02)
Persistence	.88**(.04)	1.02(.05)	1.02(.05)
Self-Control	.76**(.05)	.73**(.05)	.72**(.05)
SASH		.69**(.05)	.69**(.05)
SAO		.96(.05)	.95(.05)
SP		.92(.04)	.93(.04)
SF		1.09(.05)	1.08(.05)
Self-Control by SASH			.87**(.05)
Self-Control by SAO			1.00(.05)
Self-Control by SP			.96(.04)
Self-Control by SF			1.09(.05)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SASH= Supporting Adults in School; SAO= Supporting Adults outside of School; SP= Parental Support; SF= Friend Support. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 19. Logistic regression showing the interactions of supportive adults outside of school and self-control.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
White [a]			
Black/African American	1.24 (.14)	1.31 (.14) *	1.30 (.14)
Hispanic/Latino	1.04 (.17)	1.01 (.17)	1.02 (.17)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.10 (.15)	1.04 (.16)	1.04 (.16)
Asian	.62 (.21) *	.65 (.21)*	.65 (.21) *
Native	1.00 (.66)	.86 (.66)	.83 (.67)
Female	.91 (.09)	.97 (.09)	.96 (.09)
ME < high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	.36 (.15)**	.35 (.16)*	.36 (.16)**
ME GED	.71 (.22)	.65 (.23)	.66 (.23)
ME Associates/Technical	.60 (.19)*	.58 (.19)**	.57 (.19)**
ME Some college 2/4 year	.48 (.16)**	.48 (.16)**	.48 (.16)**
ME College Graduate and up	.40 (.16)**	.42 (.17)**	.42 (.17)**
Age	1.04 (.02)	1.05 (.02)*	1.05 (.02)*
Persistence	.88 (.04)*	1.03 (.05)	1.02 (.05)
Self-control	.76 (.05)**	.73 (.05)**	.73 (.05)**
SASH		.68 (.05)**	.68 (.05)**
SF		1.08 (.04)	1.09 (.04)
SP		.92 (.04)*	.92 (.04)*
Self-Control by SAO EMO			.99 (.09)
Self-Control by SAO INFO			.88 (.10)
Self-Control by SAO APP			1.01 (.09)
Self-Control by SAO INST			1.08 (.09)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SASH= Supporting Adults in School; SAO= Supporting Adults outside of School; SP= Parental Support; SF= Friend Support; EMO= Emotional; INFO= Informational; APP= Appraisal; INST= Instrumental. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 20. Logistic regression showing the interactions of supportive adults in school and self-control.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
Constant	.69(.46)	.45(.47)	.47(.48)
White [a]			
Black/African American	1.27(.14)	1.33*(.14)	1.32*(.14)
Hispanic/Latino	1.07(.17)	1.03(.17)	1.04(.17)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.15(.15)	1.12(.15)	1.13(.15)
Asian	.60*(.20)	.60*(.21)	.58**(.21)
Native	1.05(.66)	.88(.67)	.86(.67)
Female	.92(.09)	.98(.09)	.98(.09)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	.34**(.15)	.36**(.15)	.36**(.15)
ME GED	.65(.23)	.67(.23)	.67(.23)
ME Associates/Technical	.6**(.19)	.62*(.19)	.61**(.19)
ME Some college 2/4 year	.46**(.16)	.48**(.16)	.48**(.16)
ME College Graduate and up	.37**(.16)	.41**(.17)	.41**(.17)
Age	1.03(.02)	1.05*(.02)	1.05*(.02)
Persistence	.86**(.04)	.95(.05)	.95(.05)
Self-Control	.75**(.05)	.71**(.05)	.70**(.05)
SAO		.83**(.05)	.83**(.05)
SP		.90*(.04)	.90*(.04)
SF		1.01(.05)	1.01(.05)
SA_EMO by Self-Control			1.00(.09)
SA_INFO by Self-Control			.81*(.10)
SA_APP by Self-Control			1.14(.08)
SA_INST by Self-Control			.95(.09)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SAO= Supporting Adults outside of School; SP= Parental Support; SF= Friend Support; EMO= Emotional; INFO= Informational; APP= Appraisal; INST= Instrumental. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 21. Logistic regression showing the interactions of parents support and self-control.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
Constant	.62(.46)	.43(.48)	.44(.48)
White [a]			
Black/African American	1.28(.14)	1.39*(.14)	1.4*(.14)
Hispanic/Latino	1.05(.17)	1.00(.17)	1.02(.17)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.1(.15)	1.05(.15)	1.03(.15)
Asian	.60*(.20)	.64*(.21)	.64*(.21)
Native	1.02(.66)	.9(.66)	.86(.67)
Female	.90(.09)	.95(.09)	.94(.09)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	.35**(.15)	.35**(.15)	.35**(.15)
ME GED	.70(.22)	.65(.23)	.64(.23)
ME Associates/Technical	.60**(.19)	.58**(.19)	.57**(.19)
ME Some college 2/4 year	.46**(.16)	.46**(.16)	.46**(.16)
ME College Graduate and up	.38**(.16)	.4**(.16)	.40**(.17)
Age	1.04*(.02)	1.06**(.02)	1.05**(.02)
Persistence	.88**(.04)	1.01(.05)	1.01(.05)
Self-Control	.77**(.05)	.73**(.05)	.73**(.05)
SAO		.92(.05)	.91(.05)
SASH		.68**(.05)	.68**(.05)
SF_APP		1.09(.04)	1.09(.05)
Self-control by SP_EMO			1.05(.08)
Self-control by SP_INFO			1.15(.09)
Self-control by SP_APP			.87(.08)
Self-control by SP_INST			.87(.1)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SASH= Supporting Adults in School; SAO= Supporting Adults outside of School; SP= Parental Support; SF= Friend Support; EMO= Emotional; INFO= Informational; APP= Appraisal; INST= Instrumental. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 22. Logistic regression showing the interactions of friends support and self-control.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
Constant	.69(.46)	.47(.48)	.48(.48)
White [a]			
Black/African American	1.23(.14)	1.32*(.14)	1.32*(.14)
Hispanic/Latino	1.00(.17)	.97(.17)	.97(.17)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.12(.15)	1.07(.15)	1.07(.15)
Asian	.60*(.2)	.65*(.21)	.65*(.21)
Native	1.02(.66)	.88(.67)	.89(.67)
Female	.89(.09)	.95(.09)	.96(.09)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	.37**(.15)	.37**(.15)	.37**(.15)
ME GED	.70(.22)	.65(.23)	.65(.23)
ME Associates/Technical	.61**(.18)	.60**(.19)	.60**(.19)
ME Some college 2/4 year	.49**(.16)	.50**(.16)	.49**(.16)
ME College Graduate and up	.40**(.16)	.43**(.17)	.43**(.17)
Age	1.03(.02)	1.05*(.02)	1.05*(.02)
Persistence	.87**(.04)	1.03(.05)	1.03(.05)
Self-Control	.76**(.05)	.73**(.05)	.73**(.05)
SAO		.98(.05)	.98(.05)
SP		.94(.04)	.94(.04)
SASH		.71**(.05)	.71**(.05)
Self-Control by SF_EMO			.99(.08)
Self-Control by SF_INFO			1.09(.09)
Self-Control by SF_INST			.98(.09)
Self-Control by SF_APP			.94(.08)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SASH= Supporting Adults in School; SAO= Supporting Adults outside of School; SP= Parental Support; SF= Friend Support; EMO= Emotional; INFO= Informational; APP= Appraisal; INST= Instrumental. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 23. Logistic regression showing the risk and adults out of school instrumental support.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 4 Exp(B) (S.E.)
AGE	1.04(.02)	1.05*(.02)	1.06**(.02)	1.06**(.02)
Female	1.00(.08)	.97(.09)	.93(.09)	.92(.09)
White [a]				
Black/African American	.42(.50)	.68(.53)	.69(.54)	.71(.55)
Hispanic/Latino	.47(.51)	.80(.54)	.85(.55)	.88(.56)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	.47(.52)	.84(.55)	.84(.56)	.89(.56)
Asian	.52(.52)	.83(.55)	.83(.55)	.86(.56)
Native	.26*(.53)	.50(.57)	.51(.57)	.53(.58)
ME Below high school [a]				
ME High School Diploma	2.8**(.15)	2.01**(.16)	1.96**(.16)	1.95**(.16)
ME GED	1.01(.12)	.86(.13)	.84(.13)	.83(.13)
ME Associates/Technical	2.07**(.20)	1.5(.21)	1.47(.21)	1.48(.21)
ME Some college 2/4 year	1.64**(.16)	1.4*(.17)	1.36(.17)	1.37(.17)
ME College Graduate and up	1.33*(.13)	1.15(.14)	1.13(.14)	1.13(.14)
Risk Index		1.22**(.01)	1.21**(.01)	1.22**(.01)
SAO			.85**(.03)	.95(.05)
SAO by Risk Index				.97**(.01)
Constant	.58(.65)	.15**(.69)	.13**(.70)	.11**(.71)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SAO= Supporting Adults outside of School. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 24. Logistic regression showing the interaction of gang involvement by supportive adults in school.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 4 Exp(B) (S.E.)
AGE	1.03(.02)	1.02(.02)	1.04*(.02)	1.04*(.02)
Female	.99(.08)	1.04(.08)	.98(.09)	.99(.09)
White [a]				
Black/African American	.67(.56)	.74(.56)	1.01(.58)	1.06(.59)
Hispanic/Latino	.77(.56)	.81(.57)	1.19(.59)	1.25(.60)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	.75(.57)	.83(.58)	1.11(.60)	1.17(.61)
Asian	.79(.57)	.86(.57)	1.13(.60)	1.2(.60)
Native	.39(.58)	.40(.59)	.58(.61)	.62(.62)
ME Below high school [a]				
ME High School Diploma	2.74**(.15)	2.69**(.15)	2.69**(.15)	2.68**(.15)
ME GED	1.00(.12)	1.01(.12)	.96(.12)	.95(.12)
ME Associates/Technical	2.08**(.19)	2.03**(.19)	1.79**(.20)	1.74**(.20)
ME Some college 2/4 year	1.57**(.16)	1.57**(.16)	1.51*(.16)	1.47*(.16)
ME College Graduate and up	1.27(.13)	1.25(.13)	1.18(.13)	1.16(.13)
LHGANG.		3.07**(.21)	3.18**(.22)	3.04**(.21)
SASH			.68**(.03)	.66**(.04)
SASH by LHGANG.				1.7**(.17)
Constant	.42(.69)	.39(.70)	.22*(.72)	.21*(.73)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SASH= Supporting Adults in School; LHGANG = Life History-Gang Involvement. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 25. Logistic regression showing the interaction of not feeling prepared for school and parent support.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 4 Exp(B) (S.E.)
AGE	1.03(.02)	1.03(.02)	1.04*(.02)	1.04*(.02)
Female	.99(.08)	.99(.08)	.94(.09)	.95(.09)
White [a]				
Black/African American	.43(.51)	.47(.52)	.50(.53)	.53(.53)
Hispanic/Latino	.49(.52)	.54(.53)	.58(.54)	.60(.54)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	.46(.53)	.51(.54)	.55(.55)	.57(.55)
Asian	.53(.52)	.57(.53)	.59(.54)	.62(.54)
Native	.27*(.54)	.29*(.55)	.30*(.56)	.31*(.56)
ME Below high school [a]				
ME High School Diploma	2.71**(.15)	2.35**(.15)	2.15**(.15)	2.13**(.15)
ME GED	1.00(.12)	.88(.12)	.84(.12)	.84(.12)
ME Associates/Technical	2.06**(.19)	1.82**(.20)	1.68**(.20)	1.67*(.20)
ME Some college 2/4 year	1.47*(.16)	1.4*(.16)	1.34(.16)	1.33(.16)
ME College Graduate and up	1.25(.13)	1.15(.13)	1.10(.13)	1.08(.13)
LHNPRE.		2.84**(.10)	2.63**(.10)	2.71**(.10)
SP			.82**(.03)	.78**(.04)
SP by LHNPRE.				1.17*(.07)
Constant	.65(.65)	.46(.67)	.38(.68)	.37(.68)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SP= Parental Support; LHNPRE = Life History – Not Prepared for School. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 26. Logistic regression showing the interaction of being homeless and support from adults in school.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 4 Exp(B) (S.E.)
AGE	1.03(.02)	1.03(.02)	1.05*(.02)	1.05*(.02)
Female	.97(.08)	.98(.08)	.93(.09)	.92(.09)
White [a]				
Black/African American	.53(.53)	.59(.54)	.73(.57)	.71(.56)
Hispanic/Latino	.59(.54)	.60(.55)	.81(.58)	.79(.57)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	.61(.54)	.70(.56)	.85(.58)	.84(.58)
Asian	.62(.54)	.67(.56)	.81(.58)	.80(.57)
Native	.30*(.56)	.36(.57)	.47(.60)	.45(.59)
ME Below high school [a]				
ME High School Diploma	2.74**(.15)	2.49**(.15)	2.51**(.15)	2.49**(.16)
ME GED	1.01(.12)	.95(.12)	.91(.12)	.91(.12)
ME Associates/Technical	2.12**(.19)	1.88**(.20)	1.69**(.20)	1.66*(.20)
ME Some college 2/4 year	1.53**(.16)	1.46*(.16)	1.41*(.16)	1.40*(.16)
ME College Graduate and up	1.29*(.13)	1.27(.13)	1.22(.13)	1.21(.13)
LHHOML.		3.29**(.14)	2.99**(.14)	3.17**(.14)
SASH			.69**(.03)	.67**(.04)
SASH by LHHOML.				1.32**(.11)
Constant	.53(.67)	.42(.68)	.26(.71)	.27(.70)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SASH= Supporting Adults in School; LHHOML = Life History - Homeless. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 27. Logistic regression showing the interactions of having friends who get in fights and friend support.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 4 Exp(B) (S.E.)
AGE	1.03(.02)	1.03(.02)	1.03(.02)	1.03(.02)
Female	.97(.08)	1.04(.08)	1.04(.08)	1.04(.08)
White [a]				
Black/African American	.63(.54)	.71(.56)	.71(.57)	.67(.57)
Hispanic/Latino	.76(.55)	.82(.57)	.83(.58)	.80(.58)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	.70(.56)	.79(.58)	.79(.59)	.74(.58)
Asian	.74(.56)	.85(.57)	.86(.58)	.80(.58)
Native	.35(.57)	.41(.59)	.42(.60)	.39(.60)
ME Below high school [a]				
ME High School Diploma	2.73**(.15)	2.45**(.15)	2.42**(.15)	2.43**(.15)
ME GED	1.01(.12)	.95(.12)	.93(.12)	.95(.12)
ME Associates/Technical	2.13**(.20)	2.02**(.20)	1.97**(.20)	2.00**(.20)
ME Some college 2/4 year	1.60**(.16)	1.54**(.16)	1.54**(.16)	1.54**(.16)
ME College Graduate and up	1.29*(.13)	1.24(.13)	1.22(.13)	1.21(.13)
LHFRFIT.		2.13**(.10)	2.13**(.10)	2.12**(.10)
SF			.86**(.03)	.82**(.04)
SF by LHFRFIT.				1.28**(.08)
Constant	.43(.68)	.33(.70)	.32(.71)	.33(.71)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SF= Friend Support; LHFRFIT = Life History-Friends Involved in Fights. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 28. Logistic regression showing the interaction of supportive adults outside of school and risk index.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 4 Exp(B) (S.E.)
AGE	1.03(.02)	1.04*(.02)	1.05*(.02)	1.05*(.02)
Female	.98(.08)	.96(.09)	.92(.09)	.91(.09)
White [a]				
Black/African American	.42(.50)	.69(.53)	.70(.54)	.72(.54)
Hispanic/Latino	.47(.51)	.80(.54)	.86(.55)	.89(.55)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	.48(.52)	.87(.55)	.87(.56)	.90(.56)
Asian	.51(.51)	.81(.55)	.81(.55)	.83(.56)
Native	.24**(.53)	.48(.56)	.49(.57)	.50(.57)
ME Below high school [a]				
ME High School Diploma	2.68**(.15)	1.94**(.16)	1.9**(.16)	1.89**(.16)
ME GED	1.00(.12)	.86(.12)	.84(.12)	.84(.12)
ME Associates/Technical	1.99**(.19)	1.43(.21)	1.41(.21)	1.42(.21)
ME Some college 2/4 year	1.54**(.16)	1.31(.16)	1.28(.16)	1.28(.16)
ME College Graduate and up	1.26(.13)	1.09(.13)	1.07(.13)	1.08(.13)
Risk Index		1.23**(.01)	1.22**(.01)	1.22**(.01)
SAO			.84**(.03)	.92(.05)
SAO by Risk Index				.98*(.01)
Constant	.72(.64)	.18*(.69)	.15**(.69)	.14**(.70)

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; SAO= Supporting Adults outside of School. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 29. Logistic regression with interaction of risk index and emotional support from adults outside of school.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
Age	1.04 (.02)*	1.05 (.02)*	1.05 (.02)*
Female	1.00 (.09)	.96 (.09)	.95 (.09)
White [a]			
Black/African American	.67 (.53)	.69 (.54)	.71 (.54)
Hispanic/Latino	.82 (.54)	.88 (.55)	.92 (.55)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	.89 (.55)	.90 (.56)	.94 (.56)
Asian	.84 (.55)	.85 (.55)	.87 (.56)
Native	.50 (.57)	.51 (.57)	.53 (.58)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	1.91 (.16)**	1.85 (.16)**	1.85 (.16)**
ME GED	.84 (.13)	.83 (.13)	.83 (.13)
ME Associates/Technical	1.44 (.21)	1.41 (.21)	1.42 (.21)
ME Some college 2/4 year	1.36 (.17)	1.33 (.17)	1.33 (.17)
ME College Graduate and up	1.10 (.14)	1.07 (.14)	1.08 (.14)
Risk Index	1.23 (.01)**	1.21 (.01)**	1.22 (.01)**
SAO EMO		.85 (.03)**	.92 (.05)
SAO EMO by Risk Index			.98 (.01)*

Note: [a] = reference group. SAO EMO= Emotional support from adults outside of school; ME =Maternal Education.
* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 30. Logistic regression showing the interaction of risk index and informational support from adults outside of school.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
Age	1.04 (.02)	1.05 (.02)*	1.05 (.02)*
Female	.96 (.09)	.93 (.09)	.93 (.09)
White [a]			
Black/African American	.75 (.55)	.79 (.56)	.82 (.56)
Hispanic/Latino	.91 (.56)	1.01 (.57)	1.06 (.58)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	.96 (.57)	.98 (.58)	1.03 (.58)
Asian	.91 (.56)	.94 (.57)	.97 (.58)
Native	.55 (.58)	.58 (.59)	.60 (.60)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	2.01 (.16)**	1.97 (.16)**	1.96 (.16)**
ME GED	.85 (.13)	.83 (.13)	.83 (.13)
ME Associates/Technical	1.47 (.21)	1.46 (.21)	1.46 (.21)
ME Some college 2/4 year	1.36 (.17)	1.32 (.17)	1.32 (.17)
ME College Graduate and up	1.12 (.14)	1.10 (.14)	1.10 (.14)
Risk Index	1.22 (.01)**	1.21 (.01)**	1.22 (.01)**
SAO INFO		.85 (.03)**	.91 (.05)
SAO INFO by Risk Index			.98 (.01)*

Note: [a] = reference group. SAO INFO= Informational support from adults outside of school; ME =Maternal Education.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 31. Logistic regression showing the interaction of gang involvement and supportive parents.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
Age	1.02 (.02)	1.03 (.02)	1.03 (.02)
Female	1.03 (.08)	.97 (.08)	.97 (.08)
White [a]			
Black/African American	.74 (.56)	.87 (.58)	.89 (.58)
Hispanic/Latino	.81 (.57)	.95 (.59)	.97 (.59)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	.83 (.58)	.97 (.59)	.98 (.60)
Asian	.88 (.57)	.99 (.59)	.99 (.59)
Native	.41 (.59)	.46 (.61)	.48 (.61)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	2.70 (.15)**	2.40 (.15)**	2.40 (.15)**
ME GED	1.01 (.12)	.95 (.12)	.95 (.12)
ME Associates/Technical	2.02 (.19)**	1.82 (.20)**	1.82 (.20)**
ME Some college 2/4 year	1.55 (.16)**	1.45 (.16)*	1.44 (.16)*
ME College Graduate and up	1.24 (.13)	1.15 (.13)	1.14 (.13)
Gang	3.05 (.21)**	3.16 (.22)**	3.00 (.21)**
SP		.79 (.03)**	.78 (.03)**
SP by Gang			1.37 (.14)*

Note: [a] = reference group. SP= Supportive Parents; Gang= Gang involvement; ME =Maternal Education.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 32. Logistic regression showing the interaction of supportive adults outside of school and moving.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
Age	1.03 (.02)	1.04 (.02)*	1.04 (.02)*
Female	1.00 (.08)	.94 (.08)	.94 (.08)
White [a]			
Black/African American	.64 (.53)	.71 (.54)	.72 (.54)
Hispanic/Latino	.73 (.54)	.86 (.55)	.86 (.55)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	.76 (.55)	.81 (.56)	.81 (.56)
Asian	.79 (.55)	.86 (.55)	.85 (.55)
Native	.41 (.56)	.46 (.57)	.46 (.57)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	2.54 (.15)**	2.41 (.15)**	2.44 (.15)**
ME GED	.99 (.12)	.95 (.12)	.96 (.12)
ME Associates/Technical	1.85 (.20)**	1.77 (.20)**	1.77 (.20)**
ME Some college 2/4 year	1.53 (.16)*	1.47 (.16)*	1.50 (.16)*
ME College Graduate and up	1.28 (.13)	1.24 (.13)	1.24 (.13)
Moving	2.05 (.09)**	2.06 (.09)**	2.07 (.09)**
SAO		.80 (.03)**	.76 (.04)**
SAO by Moving			1.13 (.06)*

Note: [a] = reference group. SAO= Supportive Adults Outside of School; ME =Maternal Education.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 33. Logistic regression showing the interaction of supportive friends and moving.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
Age	1.03 (.02)	1.03 (.02)	1.03 (.02)
Female	.99 (.08)	.99 (.08)	1.00 (.08)
White [a]			
Black/African American	.65 (.53)	.64 (.54)	.66 (.54)
Hispanic/Latino	.74 (.54)	.75 (.55)	.77 (.55)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	.74 (.55)	.73 (.56)	.75 (.55)
Asian	.77 (.55)	.78 (.55)	.80 (.55)
Native	.39 (.56)	.40 (.57)	.41 (.57)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	2.57 (.15)**	2.52 (.15)**	2.53 (.15)**
ME GED	1.01 (.12)	.99 (.12)	.99 (.12)
ME Associates/Technical	1.91 (.20)**	1.84 (.20)**	1.82 (.20)**
ME Some college 2/4 year	1.58 (.16)**	1.57 (.16)**	1.59 (.16)**
ME College Graduate and up	1.32 (.13)*	1.29 (.13)*	1.28 (.13)
Moving	2.04 (.09)**	2.09 (.09)**	2.08 (.09)**
SF		.85 (.03) **	.79 (.04)**
SF by Moving			1.23 (.07)**

Note: [a] = reference group. SF= Supportive Friends; ME =Maternal Education.
* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 34. Logistic regression showing the interaction of supportive friends and friends get into fights.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
Age	1.03 (.02)	1.03 (.02)	1.03 (.02)
Female	1.04 (.08)	1.04 (.08)	1.04 (.08)
White [a]			
Black/African American	.71 (.56)	.71 (.57)	.67 (.57)
Hispanic/Latino	.82 (.57)	.83 (.58)	.80 (.58)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	.79 (.58)	.79 (.59)	.74 (.58)
Asian	.85 (.57)	.86 (.58)	.80 (.58)
Native	.41 (.59)	.42 (.60)	.39 (.60)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	2.45 (.15)**	2.42 (.15)**	2.43 (.15)**
ME GED	.95 (.12)	.93 (.12)	.95 (.12)
ME Associates/Technical	2.02 (.20)**	1.97 (.20)**	2.00 (.20)**
ME Some college 2/4 year	1.54 (.16)*	1.54 (.16)*	1.54 (.16)*
ME College Graduate and up	1.24 (.13)	1.22 (.13)	1.21 (.13)
Fights	2.13 (.10)**	2.13 (.10)**	2.12 (.10)**
SF		.86 (.03)**	.82 (.04)**
SF by Fights			1.28 (.08)**

Note: [a] = reference group. SF= Supportive Friends; Fights= Friends get into fights; ME =Maternal Education.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Latent Class Analysis: Analytic Plan and Results

Latent Class Analysis (LCA) examines categorical answers (e.g., Yes or No) to examine the probability that an individual will be in a certain class of individuals. We used LCA to identify classes of social support using the variables for emotional, informational, appraisal, and instrumental support among adults in school, adults out of school, parents, and friends (McCutcheon, 1987). We split each of these variables (originally measured on a 6-point Likert scale) into high and low categories based on mean for each variable (see Table 35 for the means and standard deviations for each variable in the high and low groups).

We tested models with 1-8 classes and selected the final model based on parsimony and fit statistics (Jung & Wickrama, 2007). For fit indices, we examined information criteria, a likelihood ratio test, and entropy. For the information criteria (AIC and BIC), lower values indicated better model fit (Akaike, 1974; Schwarz, 1978). The Lo-Mendell-Rubin test (LMRT; Lo, Mendell, & Rubin, 2001) compares the model fit between solutions with k and k – 1 class groups (for example, comparing a 3-class model to a 2-class model). The test provides an overall value (which is not informative on its own), and an associated p-value. A p-value less than .05 indicates that the current class solution, k, (for example, 3) is significantly better than the class solution, k – 1 (for example, 2). Entropy indicates the level of accuracy in classifying neighborhoods into profiles (Celeux & Soromenho, 1996); it ranges from 0 to 1, with values closer to 1 indicating higher overall classification accuracy. Finally, we evaluated models with different numbers of classes for parsimony and interpretability and examined plots of class means to assess practical differentiation among typologies. Variables were not correlated within latent classes. Missing data were estimated using full information maximum likelihood estimation with robust standard errors in Mplus 7.0 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2010).

We saved the most likely class membership for each individual and used the class membership as a variable in our subsequent analyses. Using this variable, we assessed class predicting dropout status and the interaction of class and risk index scores predicting dropout status.

Table 36 shows fit indices for models with 5, 6, and 7 classes. BIC and AIC values decreased with each successive number of profiles. The LMRT p-value (.72 for a 7-class model) suggested that a 6-class model provided the best fit. Entropy values were similar across all three models. These fit indices indicated the use of a 6-class solution. Table 36 presents the counts and percent proportion of individuals in each class.

Table 38 reports the predicted likelihood of being in the high group on the measures of interest for each of the six classes. The numbers reported indicate the likelihood that individuals in that class were in the high group for each respective variable. For example, numbers closer to 1 indicate a higher likelihood that the individual in that class was in the high group on that variable. Based on inspection of the pattern of means within each group, we named these six classes as follows: High Support; Parents and Adults Outside of School; Parents Only; School Adults, Adults Outside of School, and Friends; Low Support; and Friends Only.

Table 35. Means and Standard Deviations for the high and low groups.

		High Group *Mean* (*SD*)	Low Group *Mean* (*SD*)
Adults in School	EMO	5.22 (.58)	3.00 (.88)
	INFO	4.97 (.72)	2.73 (.80)
	APP	4.95 (.70)	2.71 (.81)
	INST	4.97 (.71)	2.59 (.83)
Adults Outside of School	EMO	4.92 (.71)	2.34 (.80)
	INFO	4.96 (.69)	2.44 (.79)
	APP	4.93 (.70)	2.36 (.79)
	INST	4.56 (.88)	2.12 (.73)
Supportive Friends	EMO	5.23 (.58)	3.02 (.91)
	INFO	4.95 (.70)	2.80 (.80)
	APP	4.95 (.74)	2.70 (.81)
	INST	5.23 (.58)	3.10 (.87)
Supportive Parents	EMO	5.36 (.57)	2.79 (.96)
	INFO	5.59 (.39)	3.14 (1.00)
	APP	5.27 (.60)	2.85 (.94)
	INST	5.32 (.60)	2.91 (.92)

Note: EMO=Emotional Support; INFO= Informational Support; APP= Appraisal Support; INST= Instrumental Support.

Table 36. Fit statistics for 5-, 6-, and 7-class solutions for Latent Class Analysis of Social Support

Fit index	5-class	6-class	7-class
AIC	38395.04	37532.73	36886.20
BIC	38894.01	38132.69	37587.15
LMRT (*p* value)	1026.50 (.00)	889.71 (.00)	675.53 (.72)
Entropy	.90	.90	.90

Note: AIC = Akaike Information Criterion; BIC = Bayesian Information Criterion; LMRT = Lo-Mendell-Rubin Adjusted Likelihood Ratio Test.

Table 37. Class counts and proportions for the 6-class solution.

Class	Count	Proportion
High Support	821	29.24%
Parents and Adults out of School	326	11.62%
Parents Only	416	14.80%
School Adults, Adults Outside of School, and Friends	349	12.42%
Low Support	608	21.66%
Friends Only	288	10.25%

Table 38. Predicted likelihood (and standard errors) of social support measures for the 6-class solution.

		High Support	Parents and Adults Outside of School	Parents Only	School Adults, Adults Outside of School, and Friends	Low Support	Friends Only
Adults in School	EMO	.93 (.01)***	.48 (.05)***	.36 (.04)***	.60 (.04)***	.11 (.02)***	0.33 (.05)***
	INFO	.98 (.01)***	.67 (.04)***	.50(.04)***	.77 (.03)***	.19 (.03)***	0.52 (.06)***
	APP	.98 (.01)***	.63 (.04)***	.39 (.04)***	.75 (.03)***	.15 (.02)***	0.44 (.05)***
	INST	.98 (.01)***	.58 (.05)***	.37 (.04)***	.72 (.03)***	.13 (.02)***	0.38 (.06)***
Adults Outside of School	EMO	.96 (.02)***	.92 (.03)***	.05 (.02)**	.79 (.04)***	.03 (.01)**	0.03 (.02)+
	INFO	.96 (.01)***	.96 (.02)***	.09 (.02)***	.88 (.04)***	.05 (.01)***	0.03 (.01)*
	APP	.93 (.02)***	.89 (.03)***	.06 (.02)**	.81 (.04)***	.03 (.01)**	0.03 (.02)
	INST	.94 (.01)***	.91 (.03)***	.09 (.02)***	.90 (.03)***	.10 (.02)***	0.10 (.03)***
Supportive Friends	EMO	.96 (.01)***	.39 (.05)***	.38 (.04)***	.52 (.04)***	.02 (.01)*	0.76 (.05)***
	INFO	.99 (.01)***	.55 (.05)***	.45 (.04)***	.70 (.04)***	.08 (.02)***	0.84 (.03)***
	APP	.98 (.01)***	.59 (.04)***	.48 (.04)***	.77 (.03)***	.13 (.02)***	0.87 (.03)***
	INST	.97 (.01)***	.34 (.05)***	.39 (.04)***	.52 (.04)***	.02 (.01)*	0.76 (.05)***
Supportive Parents	EMO	.96 (.01)***	.95 (.02)***	.91 (.02)***	.19 (.03)***	.07 (.01)***	0.10 (.04)**
	INFO	.92 (.01)***	.89 (.03)***	.81 (.03)***	.05 (.02)**	.01 (.01)+	0.01 (.01)
	APP	.94 (.01)***	.87 (.03)***	.83 (.03)***	.19 (.03)***	.05 (.01)***	0.06 (.02)*
	INST	.97 (.01)***	.98 (.01)***	.91 (.02)***	.24 (.03)***	.06 (.01)***	0.12 (.03)***

+ $p < .10$, *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Note: EMO=Emotional Support; INFO= Informational Support; APP= Appraisal Support; INST= Instrumental Support.

Table 39. Logistic regressions showing one source of support predicting dropout status.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)
Age	1.00 (.02)	1.01 (.02)
Male	1.04 (.09)	1.08 (.09)
White [a]		
Black/African American	1.04 (.13)	1.09 (.13)
Hispanic/Latino	1.23 (.15)	1.20 (.15)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.27 (.13)	1.23 (.14)
Asian	.63 (.19)*	.63 (.20)*
Native	2.06 (.48)	2.17 (.48)
ME Below high school [a]		
ME High School Diploma	.39 (.13)**	.39 (.14)**
ME GED	.74 (.20)	.73 (.20)
ME Associates/Technical	.53 (.17)**	.54 (.17)**
ME Some college 2/4 year	.44 (.14)**	.43 (.15)**
ME College Graduate and up	.33 (.15)**	.35 (.15)**
One Source of Support		1.90 (.08)**

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education.
* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 40. Logistic regression showing the interaction between support class and risk index.

	Model 1 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 2 Exp(B) (S.E.)	Model 3 Exp(B) (S.E.)
Male	1.09 (.08)	1.09 (.09)	1.08 (.09)
White [a]			
Black/African American	1.17 (.13)	1.20 (.13)	1.22 (.13)
Hispanic/Latino	1.11 (.15)	1.23 (.16)	1.22 (.16)
Other/Mixed Ethnicity	1.14 (.14)	1.11 (.14)	1.12 (.15)
Asian	.57 (.20)**	.69 (.20)	.70 (.20)
Native	2.52 (.51)	1.58 (.54)	1.55 (.54)
ME Below high school [a]			
ME High School Diploma	.38 (.14)**	.44 (.14)**	.45 (.15)**
ME GED	.74 (.21)	.74 (.22)	.75 (.22)
ME Associates/Technical	.59 (.17)**	.67 (.18)*	.68 (.18)*
ME Some college 2/4 year	.47 (.15)**	.56 (.15)**	.55 (.16)**
ME College Graduate and up	.40 (.15)**	.52 (.16)**	.53 (.16)**
Age	1.04 (.02)*	1.05 (.02)*	1.04 (.02)*
Class 1 [a]			
Class 2	1.05 (.14)	1.08 (.15)	.95 (.22)
Class 3	1.59 (.13)**	1.44 (.14)*	.89 (.22)
Class 4	1.30 (.14)	1.08 (.15)	1.13 (.22)
Class 5	2.28 (.12)**	1.87 (.12)	1.98 (.18)**
Class 6	1.98 (.15)**	1.38 (.16)	.83 (.29)
Risk Index		1.21 (.01)**	1.18 (.02)**
Class 1 by Risk Index [a]			
Class 2 by Risk Index			1.04 (.05)
Class 3 by Risk Index			1.15 (.05)*
Class 4 by Risk Index			1.00 (.04)
Class 5 by Risk Index			.99 (.04)
Class 6 by Risk Index			1.12 (.05)*

Note: [a] = reference group. ME =Maternal Education; Class 1= High Support; Class 2= Parents and Adults out of School; Class 3= Parents Only; Class 4= School Adults, Adults Outside of School, and Friends; Class 5= Low Support; Class 6= Friends Only.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

References

Akaike, H. (1974). A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control 19*(6), 716-723. doi: 10.1109/TAC.1974.1100705

Celeux, G., & Soromenho, G. (1996). An entropy criterion for assessing the number of clusters in a mixture model. *Journal of Classification, 13*, 195-212.

Demaray, M. K., & Malecki, C. K. (2002). The relationship between perceived social support and maladjustment for students at risk. *Psychology in the Schools*, *39*(3), 305-316.

Hill, P. L., & Roberts, B. W. (2011). The role of adherence in the relationship between conscientiousness and perceived health. *Health Psychology*, *30*(6), 797.

Jung, T., & Wickrama, K. A. S. (2007). An introduction to latent class growth analysis and growth mixture modeling. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2/1*, 302-317.

Lo, Y., Mendell, N. R., & Rubin, D. B. (2001). Testing the number of components in a normal mixture. *Biometrika, 88*(3), 767-778.

McCutcheon, A. L. (1987). *Latent class analysis*: Sage.

Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (1998-2010). *Mplus User's Guide. Sixth Edition*. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.

Wrosch, C., Heckhausen, J., & Lachman, M.E. (2000). Primary and secondary control strategies for managing health and financial stress across adulthood. *Psychology and Aging*, *15*(3), 387-399. doi: 10.1037//0882-7974.15.3.387