



Plots of predicted dropout probability




Note: A probit regression model was used to predict the probability of dropout from sample membership and Bartlett factor scores (FS) for math self-efficacy. Following a two-stage path analysis (2S-PA) approach, FS were computed using the approximate invariance model determined via alignment optimization (AO) in the first stage to correct for measurement noninvariance. The scores were further corrected for unreliability in the second stage. The dotted lines indicate 95% confidence intervals.

Predicted Dropout Probability vs. Math Self-Efficacy (MIM-2S-PA)




Note: A probit regression model was used to predict the probability of dropout from sample membership and Bartlett factor scores (FS) for math self-efficacy. Following a two-stage path analysis (2S-PA) approach, FS were computed using the partial invariance model determined via measurement invariance modeling (MIM) in the first stage to correct for measurement noninvariance. The scores were further corrected for unreliability in the second stage. The dotted lines indicate 95% confidence intervals.

Predicted Dropout Probability vs. Math Self-Efficacy (AO)




Note: A probit regression model was used to predict the probability of dropout from sample membership and Bartlett factor scores (FS) for math self-efficacy. FS were computed using the approximate invariance model determined via alignment optimization (AO). The scores were not corrected for unreliability. The dotted lines indicate 95% confidence intervals.

Predicted Dropout Probability vs. Math Self-Efficacy (MIM)



Note: A probit regression model was used to predict the probability of dropout from sample membership and Bartlett factor scores (FS) for math self-efficacy. FS were computed using the partial invariance model determined via measurement invariance modeling (MIM). The scores were not corrected for unreliability. The dotted lines indicate 95% confidence intervals.

Predicted Dropout Probability vs. Math Self-Efficacy (MIM)




Note:

A probit regression model was used to predict the probability of dropout from sample membership and composite mean scores (CMS) of the math self-efficacy test items. The scores were not corrected for measurement error or unreliability. The dotted lines indicate 95% confidence intervals.


Comparing 2S-PA vs. PA approaches

The plots below illustrate predicted dropout probabilities computed using Bartlett factor scores corrected for measurement bias and unreliability following a two-stage path analysis (2S-PA) approach after AO or MIM or Bartlett factor scores corrected only for measurement bias after AO or MIM (PA) in the ELS and HSLS samples. The dotted lines indicate 95% confidence intervals.


Predicted Dropout Probability vs. Math Self-Efficacy in ELS



Predicted Dropout Probability vs. Math Self-Efficacy in HSLS



Predicted Dropout Probability vs. Math Self-Efficacy in ELS



Predicted Dropout Probability vs. Math Self-Efficacy in HSLS

