Online Appendix for "Does Reducing Early School Tracking Affect Health Behaviors?"

Serena Canaan

November 20, 2023

Figure A1: Test of manipulation of running variable

Notes: This figure shows the distribution of the running variable for the main sample. I use local polynomial density estimator and $t-$statistic as described in Cattaneo, Jansson and Ma (2020) to test for the hypothesis of no discontinuity at the cutoff in the density of the running variable. The corresponding t-statistic is 0.6793 and p-value is 0.4969.

Table A1: Summary statistics for health behaviors

	All	Men	Women
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Smokes daily	0.271	0.291	0.254
	(0.445)	(0.455)	(0.436)
N	954	450	504
Drinks alcohol daily	0.0959	0.142	0.0546
	(0.295)	(0.350)	(0.227)
N	970	457	513
Is obese	0.150	0.153	0.146
	(0.357)	(0.361)	(0.353)
N	963	463	500
Does not eat fruits and vegetables daily	0.581	0.646	0.523
	(0.494)	(0.479)	(0.500)
N	967	460	507
Does not exercise	0.491	0.509	0.475
	(0.500)	(0.500)	(0.500)
N	943	448	495

Note: This table reports means, standard deviations (in parentheses) and number of observations (N) for key outcomes. Column (1) includes all individuals who are born within 20 months on either side of the January 1, 1966 cutoff. Columns (2) and (3) restrict the sample to men and women, respectively.

Table A2: Balanced covariates test

	Is female	Father, less than high school degree	Mother, less than high school degree	Predicted screening index
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
RD estimate	-0.076	0.039	0.040	-0.006
	(0.073)	(0.069)	(0.066)	(0.025)
N	984	984	984	984

Notes: Each cell reports the reduced form estimate of the impact of the reform on baseline covariates. Estimates are taken from separate local linear RD regressions which use a bandwidth of 20 months and a triangular kernel. Column 4 shows the predicted preventive screening index taken after regressing the preventive screening index (as defined in Section IV of the paper) on all baseline covariates. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. (*** p < 0.01 ** p <0.05 * p <0.1).

Table A3: Effect of the reform on individual health behaviors and OBGYN screening

	All	Men	Women
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Smokes daily	-0.055	-0.125	-0.005
	(0.064)	(0.102)	(0.079)
N	954	450	504
Drinks alcohol daily	-0.080*	-0.118	-0.0344
	(0.041)	(0.075)	(0.039)
N	970	457	513
Is obese	0.105	0.084	-0.042
	(0.054)	(0.075)	(0.079)
N	963	463	500
Does not eat daily fruits and vegetables	0.061	0.071	0.045
	(0.057)	(0.093)	(0.099)
N	967	460	507
Does not exercise	0.046	0.090	0.036
	(0.073)	(0.106)	(0.103)
N	943	448	495
Had a pap smear	–	–	0.018
	–	–	(0.079)
N	–	–	510
Had a mammogram	–	–	0.036
	–	–	(0.104)
N	–	–	512

Notes: Each cell reports the reduced form estimate of the impact of the reform on the corresponding outcome. Estimates are taken from separate local linear RD regressions using a triangular kernel. Regressions include month of birth fixed effects, dummy variables for whether the individual's father and mother have less than a high school degree and a dummy variable for whether the individual is female (except columns 2 and 3). Column 1 includes all individuals born within 20 months on either side of the January 1, 1966 cutoff. Columns 2 and 3 respectively restrict the sample to men and women. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

Table A4: Effects of the reform on health behavior and preventive screening, no controls

	All	Men	Women
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Health behaviors index	-0.067	-0.138	-0.015
	(0.077)	(0.115)	(0.104)
N	984	467	517
Had cholesterol screening	0.138***	0.182**	0.105
	(0.052)	(0.079)	(0.069)
N	962	455	507
Had glycemic index test	0.109*	0.111	0.119
	(0.056)	(0.086)	(0.074)
N	964	458	506
Had blood pressure test	0.013	0.047	-0.004
	(0.058)	(0.091)	(0.073)
N	966	456	510
Preventive screening index	0.214**	0.283*	0.179
	(0.109)	(0.166)	(0.144)
N	984	467	517
Preventive screening index	–	–	0.102
with OBGYN	–	–	(0.123)
N	–	–	517

Notes: Each cell reports the reduced form estimate of the impact of the reform on the corresponding outcome. Estimates are taken from separate local linear RD regressions using a triangular kernel. Column 1 includes all individuals born within 20 months on either side of the January 1, 1966 cutoff. Columns 2 and 3 respectively restrict the sample to men and women. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. (*** p < 0.01 ** p <0.05 * p <0.1).

Table A5: RD Estimates for main outcomes using different bandwidths

	BW=11	BW=14	BW=17	BW=23	BW=26	BW=29
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Health behavior index	-0.094	-0.091	-0.062	-0.014	-0.012	-0.017
	(0.104)	(0.093)	(0.083)	(0.070)	(0.066)	(0.062)
Preventive screening index	0.231	0.375***	0.297**	0.233**	0.220**	0.223**
	(0.149)	(0.131)	(0.119)	(0.101)	(0.963)	(0.921)
N	522	658	820	1,102	1,269	1,420

Notes: Each cell reports the reduced form estimate of the impact of the reform on main outcomes. Estimates are taken from separate local linear RD regressions which use a triangular kernel with controls. Each column uses the listed bandwidth (BW), and samples consist of all individuals born within those different bandwidths. Controls include month of birth fixed effects—except for the bandwidth 11 months—and dummy variables for whether the individual is female and whether their father and mother have less than a high school degree. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. (*** p < 0.01 ** p <0.05 * p <0.1).

Table A6: Effects of the reform on health behavior and preventive screening using placebo birth cutoff

	All
	(1)
Health behaviors index	0.115
	(0.076)
N	974
Had cholesterol screening	0.038
	(0.051)
N	958
Had glycemic index test	0.022
	(0.058)
N	958
Had blood pressure test	0.011
	(0.062)
N	964
Preventive screening index	0.072
	(0.121)
N	974

Notes: Each cell reports the reduced form estimate of the impact being born on either side of January 1, 1964 (the placebo cutoff) on the corresponding outcome. Estimates are taken from separate local linear RD regressions using a bandwidth of 20 months and a triangular kernel. Regressions include month of birth fixed effects, dummy variables for whether the individual's father and mother have less than a high school degree and a dummy variable for whether the individual is female. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. (*** p < 0.01 ** p <0.05 * p <0.1).

References

Cattaneo Matias D, Michael Jansson, and Xinwei Ma. 2020. Simple local polynomial density estimators. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 115(531): 1449-1455