Introduction
Sex education in the United States has been hotly debated for decades now. There are three main models of sex education:

- Abstinence-only: strong emphasis & fear tactics to dissuade students from engaging in sexual activity
- Abstinence-plus: emphasis on abstinence with conversation about contraception and healthy sexual practices
- Comprehensive: according to the Guttmacher Institute’s definition it will include information regarding gender/sexuality diversity, STD/STIs, healthy relationships, violence, sexual rights, sexual pleasure, and racial/cultural diversity.

Findings
In this study, I find that sociocultural factors contribute much more often to high school students’ health and behavioral outcomes than the components of their sexuality education. The outcomes were more often affected by the religiosity, political ideology, and education level of the state than by the comprehensiveness score or presence of abstinence education.

- Teenage pregnancy decreased with higher levels of education and a higher white and female percent of the population. It increased with higher percentages of sexually active high school females and religiosity.
- STD/STI rates (rates of chlamydia and gonorrhea among high school students) increased with rates of religiosity and decreased with higher white percentages.
- Gender-based violence rates (percent of high school students forced to have sex; percent of high school students who have experienced physical dating violence) increased with religiosity, usually. These outcomes also tended to decrease with the percent of the population that is white. Physical dating violence outcomes for male high school students also appeared to increase as a result of current sexuality education mandates.

Literature
This study expands on existing literature in the following ways:

- Most research on comprehensive sexuality education focuses on only teenage pregnancy, STD/STI rates, and other similar health outcomes. This study adds gender-based violence to its dependent variables, as statistics show that up to one in every four women on a college campus will experience a sexual assault before her college graduation.
- This study also focuses on high school aged students.
- There is a wealth of literature on CSE from other countries, particularly the Nordic countries.
- Much of the research debating models of sexuality education was last updated in the late 1990’s and early 2000’s.

Methodology
Using data from the Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) State Profiles, I compare states by the comprehensiveness of their mandated sexuality education and three dependent variables:

- Teenage pregnancy
- STD/STIs
- Gender-based violence

Each state receives a score 1-7 for comprehensiveness of their sexuality education mandate, according to the Guttmacher definition. This data, as well as the data for the dependent variables was found in the SIECUS State Profiles (2018).

I also controlled for the following sociocultural characteristics of the state: percent white, percent female, percent with a high school diploma, percent of sexually active female high school students, religiosity, and percent liberal. This data was found in the 2010 Census and on Pew Research Center.

Implications
More research is required to determine the effectiveness of comprehensive sexuality education in terms of all three dependent variables. This study shows us that current sexuality education in the United States is not effective in achieving desired health and behavioral outcomes and likely requires reform. I suggest further research focused on municipalities and school districts instead of a sweeping 50 state analysis in the future, due to variation within the state that was not accounted for here. Implementing a curriculum using the Guttmacher Institute and manually controlling for sociocultural factors is another possible next step in this evaluation process.
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