

Orphelia Ellogne
Marina Kaminsky
Shubba Srimoyee Shanmugam

Economics 312 Final Project

Introduction

In this project, we chose to examine the effects of various demographic and academic variables on Reed students' choice of major. Based on general skill sets and incentive structures, we decided to categorize majors into three discrete categories, namely "Mathematics and Natural Science majors," "Economics majors," and "Other." Given that our dependent variable takes three discrete values, we chose to approach the problem using a multinomial logit model. As such, the interpretation of our results is largely in the form of probability at the margin of choosing one major group or another.

Data

We adapted our dataset from the datasets Reed.dta and Reed FY GPA.dta, both of which were provided to us by Jeffrey Parker. Our only major changes to these datasets were in dropping observations for individuals who did not graduate and creating dummy variables out of string variables (ie: for *ethnic*, *major*, and *gender*). We also recoded the *citz* variable (which originally had five categories: OR citizen, Other U.S citizen, Permanent Resident, Foreign National, and Unkown) to only have three categories: U.S citizens, Foreigners (Permanent Residents and Foreign Nationals), and Unkown. We chose to recode *citz* in this way because we are mainly interested in whether or not major choices differ between U.S citizens and foreigners.

Our final dataset, reededit7.dta, contains 4662 observations; however, most of our regressions only included approximately half that number due to missing data, especially in the *fygpa* and *fygpa_hum* variables.

Our variables are as follows:

Variable	Values if indicator variables	Label
major2 (Dependent Variable)	1	Non-mathematics, non-science, non-economics majors
	2	Mathematics or natural Science majors
	3	Economics majors
Rdr		Reader Rating
Finaid	0	No Financial Aid received
	1	Financial Aid received
Satv		SAT verbal score
Satm		SAT mathematics score
Citz	0	US citizen
	1	non-US citizen
	2	Unknown
ethnic2	0	Caucasian
	1	Asian
	2	Black
	3	Hispanic
	4	Native American
	5	Other
	6	Unknown
gender2	0	Male
	1	Female
Fygpa		Freshman year gpa
fygpa_hum		Freshman year humanitites grade
fygpa_hours		Units completed freshman year
year3	0 through 21	Calendar year graduated – 1985. Specifically, we have 21 years of data with a dummy for each year, in ascending order of years.

Variables Summary

```
. summarize finaid satv satm citz year3 fygpa fygpa_hum fygpahours gender2 ethnic
> major2 rdr, detail
```

Financial Aid Dummy

Percentiles	Smallest		
1%	0		
5%	0		
10%	0	Obs	4662
25%	0	Sum of Wgt.	4662
50%	1	Mean	.535607
		Largest	Std. Dev.
75%	1		.498784
90%	1	Variance	.2487855
95%	1	Skewness	-.1427907
99%	1	Kurtosis	1.020389

SATV

Percentiles	Smallest		
1%	480		
5%	560		
10%	590	Obs	4441
25%	640	Sum of Wgt.	4441
50%	680	Mean	681.742
		Largest	Std. Dev.
75%	730		71.78249
90%	780	Variance	5152.725
95%	800	Skewness	-.500899
99%	800	Kurtosis	3.471864

SATM

Percentiles	Smallest		
1%	460		
5%	520		
10%	550	Obs	4441
25%	600	Sum of Wgt.	4441
50%	650	Mean	642.4868
		Largest	Std. Dev.
75%	690		74.61262
90%	740	Variance	5567.043
95%	770	Skewness	-.1762929
99%	800	Kurtosis	2.94689

CITZ

Percentiles	Smallest		
1%	0		
5%	0		
10%	0	Obs	4604
25%	0	Sum of Wgt.	4604
50%	0	Mean	.0582103
		Largest	Std. Dev.
75%	0		.236933
90%	0	Variance	.0561372
95%	1	Skewness	3.919963
99%	1	Kurtosis	17.15678

year3

Percentiles		Smallest		
1%	4	0		
5%	4	0		
10%	5	1	Obs	4662
25%	8	2	Sum of Wgt.	4662
50%	12		Mean	12.30802
		Largest	Std. Dev.	5.025523
75%	17	21		
90%	19	21	Variance	25.25588
95%	20	21	Skewness	-.0494604
99%	21	21	Kurtosis	1.778037

fygpa

Percentiles		Smallest		
1%	1.85	1		
5%	2.225	1.142857		
10%	2.4	1.442857	Obs	2371
25%	2.714286	1.444444	Sum of Wgt.	2371
50%	3.085714		Mean	3.047156
		Largest	Std. Dev.	.4811967
75%	3.4125	4		
90%	3.655556	4	Variance	.2315503
95%	3.788889	4	Skewness	-.3837586
99%	3.9625	4	Kurtosis	2.919246

fygpa_hum

Percentiles		Smallest		
1%	1.65	.5000001		
5%	2	.9999999		
10%	2.25	1	Obs	2356
25%	2.65	1.22	Sum of Wgt.	2356
50%	3.025		Mean	3.000654
		Largest	Std. Dev.	.5541215
75%	3.408333	4		
90%	3.72	4	Variance	.3070507
95%	3.85	4	Skewness	-.3996171
99%	4	4	Kurtosis	2.887218

fygpahours

Percentiles		Smallest		
1%	4.5	1		
5%	6.5	1		
10%	7	1.5	Obs	2371
25%	7	2	Sum of Wgt.	2371
50%	8		Mean	7.591733
		Largest	Std. Dev.	.9044657
75%	8	10		
90%	9	10	Variance	.8180582
95%	9	10	Skewness	-1.244156
99%	9	10	Kurtosis	9.154116

major2

Percentiles	Smallest		
1%	1	1	
5%	1	1	
10%	1	1	Obs 4662
25%	1	1	Sum of Wgt. 4662
50%	1		Mean 1.358859
		Largest	Std. Dev. .5446447
75%	2	3	
90%	2	3	Variance .2966379
95%	2	3	Skewness 1.194013
99%	3	3	Kurtosis 3.430869

RDR

Percentiles	Smallest		
1%	1.35	1	
5%	1.75	1	
10%	2	1	Obs 4622
25%	2.25	1	Sum of Wgt. 4622
50%	2.75		Mean 2.67863
		Largest	Std. Dev. .5836287
75%	3	5	
90%	3.5	5	Variance .3406224
95%	3.5	5	Skewness .0110221
99%	4	5	Kurtosis 3.008464

gender2

Percentiles	Smallest		
1%	0	0	
5%	0	0	
10%	0	0	Obs 4662
25%	0	0	Sum of Wgt. 4662
50%	1		Mean .5066495
		Largest	Std. Dev. .5000094
75%	1	1	
90%	1	1	Variance .2500094
95%	1	1	Skewness -.0266004
99%	1	1	Kurtosis 1.000708

ethnic2

Percentiles	Smallest		
1%	0	0	
5%	0	0	
10%	0	0	Obs 4655
25%	0	0	Sum of Wgt. 4655
50%	0		Mean 1.099678
		Largest	Std. Dev. 2.126316
75%	1	6	
90%	6	6	Variance 4.521218
95%	6	6	Skewness 1.668817
99%	6	6	Kurtosis 4.020763

Our Initial model

The variables we chose to include in our initial regression are as follows: *rdr*, *fnaid*, *satv*, *satm*, *ethnic2*, *citz*, *gender2*, *fygpa*, *year3*. Below we give a brief overview of the theory and assumptions behind our choice to include each of these variables.

- *rdr*: We include *rdr* because we believe that it is a decent measure of students' future academic performances which in turn determine the choice of majors. As such, we think that it would be interesting to know the correlation between *rdr* and Reed students' choice of major. Initially assumed that low (better) reader ratings would be correlated with choosing to become a Math or Science Major. This hypothesis comes from a bias towards believing that Math and Science are more "difficult" majors and that students who excelled in these fields in highschool would also likely excel in "softer" areas of study.
- *fnaid*: We include financial aid status in our regression as a proxy for socioeconomic status, to test whether socioeconomic status has any effect on choice of major. Our hypothesis is that students enjoying high socioeconomic backgrounds feel less pressure to major in "practical" fields that will make them competitive in job markets. We therefore expect students who did not receive financial aid to have a higher probability of majoring in our "other" category.
- *satv* and *satm*: Our expectation is that students receiving relatively higher scores on the mathematics portion of the SAT exam are more likely to major in fields that demand quantitative skills, namely: Mathematics, the Natural Sciences and Economics. We are unsure if the inverse is true for students receiving relatively high verbal scores (do these students have a tendency to major in the "Other" category?).
- *ethnic2*: The conventional belief in the USA is that there is a disproportional prevalence of people of Asian descent in Mathematics and Natural Science fields, as well as in Economics. We want to test this hypothesis empirically and also wonder if individuals from any other ethnic backgrounds have a tendency to major in one area

over the other two categories we include in our dataset. Therefore we include ethnicity as a (dummy) regressor to test this empirically.

- *citiz*: Relatedly, conventional wisdom and our anecdotal experience at Reed has led us to believe that non-American citizens have a disproportional tendency to major in Mathematics, Natural Sciences, and Economics, hence the dummy variable for citizenship is included in our initial regression.
- *gender2*: We expect to find that female students are less likely to major in Math, the Natural Sciences, and Economics, as these fields are widely considered to be dominated by males.
- *fygpa*: We include Freshman year GPA in our regression because we are curious as to whether those receiving higher grades freshman year have a tendency to major in Math or the Natural Sciences. We chose to use Freshman Year GPA rather than Reed GPA to minimise problems of endogeneity between major choice and grade as classes in different majors at Reed have different grade distributions. In later regressions, we include the variable *fygpa_hum*, predicting that those who enjoyed (and did better in) Humanities 110 would be more likely to major in the “Other” category. We also include *fygpahours* in a few of our later regressions to see if course overloads and underloads effected students’ major choice.
- *year3*: We include a year variable to test whether any specific years were correlated with a higher probability of students entering into one major category over the other two. We suspected that changes in the probabilities for major choice according to year would be due to economic, social, and political events occuring in the nation.

Our regression output is shown on the next page.

. mlogit major2 rdr i.finaid satv satm i.citz i.ethnic2 i.gender2 ib11.year3 fygpa

Iteration 0: log likelihood = -1671.78
 Iteration 1: log likelihood = -1468.6475
 Iteration 2: log likelihood = -1455.6097
 Iteration 3: log likelihood = -1455.2831
 Iteration 4: log likelihood = -1455.2073
 Iteration 5: log likelihood = -1455.1917
 Iteration 6: log likelihood = -1455.1885
 Iteration 7: log likelihood = -1455.1877
 Iteration 8: log likelihood = -1455.1875
 Iteration 9: log likelihood = -1455.1875
 Iteration 10: log likelihood = -1455.1875

Multinomial logistic regression

Number of obs = 2254
 LR chi2(56) = 433.19
 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
 Pseudo R2 = 0.1296

Log likelihood = -1455.1875

major2	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
rdr	-.5235844	.1222429	-4.28	0.000	-.7631761	-.2839927
1.finaid	.2497639	.1069201	2.34	0.019	.0402044	.4593235
satv	-.0063947	.0008443	-7.57	0.000	-.0080496	-.0047398
satm	.0107093	.0008906	12.03	0.000	.0089638	.0124548
citz						
1	.3910415	.2215801	1.76	0.078	-.0432476	.8253306
2	-13.59995	3983.544	-0.00	0.997	-7821.204	7794.004
ethnic2						
1	.7786423	.1916372	4.06	0.000	.4030403	1.154244
2	.4875157	.504816	0.97	0.334	-.5019056	1.476937
3	.3878365	.2857206	1.36	0.175	-.1721656	.9478386
4	.0116248	.5740278	0.02	0.984	-1.113449	1.136699
5	.2549191	.4332862	0.59	0.556	-.5943063	1.104144
6	-.2133201	.2045718	-1.04	0.297	-.6142734	.1876332
1.gender2	-.3903462	.1071051	-3.64	0.000	-.6002682	-.1804241
year3						
5	-13.37149	3983.544	-0.00	0.997	-7820.975	7794.232
6	1.000236	.6560735	1.52	0.127	-.2856448	2.286116
7	.1143087	.2607716	0.44	0.661	-.3967942	.6254116
8	.2885235	.2325223	1.24	0.215	-.1672119	.7442589
9	-.1622794	.2511475	-0.65	0.518	-.6545195	.3299607
10	.4147645	.2225845	1.86	0.062	-.0214931	.851022
12	.5437881	.2234061	2.43	0.015	.1059203	.9816559
13	.163376	.2278557	0.72	0.473	-.2832131	.609965
14	.0261431	.2249553	0.12	0.907	-.4147612	.4670475
15	.1119192	.2245981	0.50	0.618	-.3282851	.5521234
16	-.2887486	.2324373	-1.24	0.214	-.7443172	.1668201
17	.1902502	.3105623	0.61	0.540	-.4184408	.7989411
18	-.3620671	.6002147	-0.60	0.546	-1.538466	.8143321
19	-15.31135	3983.544	-0.00	0.997	-7822.915	7792.292
fygpa	.0585793	.1180151	0.50	0.620	-.1727261	.2898847
_cons	-2.329709	1.001732	-2.33	0.020	-4.293067	-.3663502

3						
rdr	.1063913	.3117416	0.34	0.733	-.5046111	.7173936
1.finaid	.5288299	.284067	1.86	0.063	-.0279311	1.085591
satv	-.0057953	.0020035	-2.89	0.004	-.0097221	-.0018686
satm	.0087392	.0021833	4.00	0.000	.0044601	.0130182
citz						
1	.9176727	.4344089	2.11	0.035	.066247	1.769098
2	-13.03198	13000.96	-0.00	0.999	-25494.44	25468.38
ethnic2						
1	1.15707	.3955484	2.93	0.003	.381809	1.93233
2	-14.83129	2079.693	-0.01	0.994	-4090.955	4061.292
3	.393202	.6555726	0.60	0.549	-.8916966	1.678101
4	-14.77008	2622.713	-0.01	0.996	-5155.193	5125.653
5	.9196497	.8022516	1.15	0.252	-.6527345	2.492034
6	-.6206355	.6197287	-1.00	0.317	-1.835281	.5940103
1.gender2	-.8894907	.2951641	-3.01	0.003	-1.468002	-.3109798
year3						
5	-13.40363	13000.96	-0.00	0.999	-25494.81	25468.01
6	1.295687	1.172867	1.10	0.269	-1.00309	3.594464
7	-.0587478	.6503263	-0.09	0.928	-1.333364	1.215868
8	-.1080179	.6001155	-0.18	0.857	-1.284223	1.068187
9	.0557045	.5530229	0.10	0.920	-1.0282	1.13961
10	.079948	.5478286	0.15	0.884	-.9937763	1.153672
12	-.5162635	.6395067	-0.81	0.420	-1.769674	.7371467
13	-.0920301	.5489252	-0.17	0.867	-1.167904	.9838435
14	-.5207009	.5974099	-0.87	0.383	-1.691603	.650201
15	.0905404	.5321564	0.17	0.865	-.952467	1.133548
16	-.13179	.5545937	-0.24	0.812	-1.218774	.9551937
17	.5111339	.7197012	0.71	0.478	-.8994545	1.921722
18	-15.19987	2235.828	-0.01	0.995	-4397.343	4366.943
19	-15.23525	13000.96	-0.00	0.999	-25496.64	25466.17
fygpa	-.1989759	.2926804	-0.68	0.497	-.772619	.3746672
_cons	-4.555838	2.475732	-1.84	0.066	-9.408183	.2965079

Testing for multicollinearity

In order to test for multicollinearity, we ran a meaningless regression with a white noise variable, “case”, and then did an estat command. All of our year variables were highly correlated with each other, which is neither surprising nor worrying, considering that these are consecutive years at the same college with a relatively unchanging incoming class, and considering also that collinearity between years does not substantially affect

the validity of our comparisons between other variables. There is negligible collinearity between other variables in the regression, except *fygpa_hum* and *fygpa* (the VIF score is still below 10 for these variables). When we include both *fygpa* and *fygpa_hum* in a later model, we use robust standard errors to correct for the collinearity between these variables.

```
. estat vif
```

Variable	VIF	1/VIF
rdr	1.60	0.625803
1.finaid	1.13	0.883320
satv	1.37	0.730079
satm	1.52	0.658384
citz		
1	1.17	0.855753
2	1.01	0.988877
year3		
6	15.18	0.065859
7	135.52	0.007379
8	191.08	0.005233
9	161.44	0.006194
10	209.13	0.004782
11	206.79	0.004836
12	202.81	0.004931
13	202.06	0.004949
14	210.92	0.004741
15	227.39	0.004398
16	209.93	0.004764
17	83.91	0.011917
18	20.11	0.049737
19	2.03	0.493267
fygpa	6.93	0.144339
fygpa_hum	6.79	0.147341
fygpahours	1.13	0.884262
1.gender2	1.18	0.850079
ethnic2		
1	1.16	0.859702
2	1.04	0.961417
3	1.06	0.947354
4	1.02	0.983358
5	1.02	0.978392
6	1.10	0.907861
Mean VIF	70.28	

For the “Other” major category, none of the marginal effects of our independent variables at the means of the other variables proved statistically significant except for *cit2*, *year5*, *year14*, and *year19*. We can ignore the “significance” of the *cit2* variable because not only is this meaningless as the “unknown” category of citizenship, but there are also only three observations in it, and therefore it is almost definitely skewed and unreliable. Similarly, we can ignore the “significance” of years 5 (1990) and 19 (2004) because they have only 2 observations and 1 observation respectively for Freshman year GPA, resulting in a negligible number of observations for these years included in the regression. Therefore the only statistically significant finding at the 10% level at the means is for the year 14 (1999), which, looking at the coefficients, does not show a very different probability of switching to an “other” major (at the means of the other variables). On the whole, the marginal effects of the independent variables at the means on the probability of becoming an “other” major are largely uninformative. This may be due to uneven distributions of observations between major categories such that the means are not the tipping points as they would be in a normal distribution.

The average marginal effects of *rdr*, *satv*, and *satm* are all significant at the 5% significance level, as are *finaid*, *citiz1*, *gender2*, and Asian ethnicity. The years that were significant at the 10% level (ignoring years 5 and 19) are years 10 and 12. Below, we interpret these effects:

- The coefficient for *rdr* is 0.0873833, which tells us that with a one unit increase in reader rating, there is an approximately 8.7% increase in the probability that a student will become a non-Mathematics, non-Science, non-Economics major on average. This is an interesting result that we will discuss at greater length later.
- The coefficient for *satv* is 0.0011809, which indicates that a 10 point increase in verbal SAT score is correlated, on average, with a 1% greater probability of being an “other” major. The *satm* coefficient is -0.0019622, indicating that a 10 point increase in SAT math scores is correlated with an approximately 2% lower probability of being an “other” major. This is in accordance with our initial hypotheses as those who are more mathematically oriented are more likely to become Math, Science or Economics majors as these are the majors that involve more quantitative skills.
- Financial aid status has a coefficient of -0.0509423, telling us that on average, students on financial aid are 5% less likely to be non-Mathematics, non-Science, non-Economics majors at Reed college, which is also in accordance with our initial expectations that more privileged socioeconomic backgrounds often produce students who are less driven by “practical” or “economic” motivation when choosing their majors.
- The *citiz1* coefficient (-0.0872404) indicates that, on average, foreigners are nearly 9% less likely to major in the social sciences or the arts, confirming our initial expectation that foreigners tend to major in Math, Science, or Economics.
- Similarly, students of Asian descent are about 16% less likely to major in the “other” category on average (the marginal effect is -0.1640517).
- Being female increases the probability of majoring in the “other” category by about 8% (the coefficient is 0.0818755) on average.

- Where reader rating was positively correlated with the probability of becoming an “Other” major, it is negatively correlated with the probability of becoming a Mathematics or Natural Science major; it has a coefficient of -0.0964132, telling us that when reader rating increases by one unit, the probability of becoming a Math or Science major falls by approximately 10% on average. This seems to indicate that the skill sets that it takes to impress readers are those required in more quantitative majors.
- Similarly, the coefficient for verbal SAT scores here is slightly negative (-0.001095) where that for “Other” category of major is positive, indicating, again, a declining probability of becoming a Math or Science major as demonstrated verbal skills increase (approximately 1% less probable with a 10 point increase in verbal SAT score). The coefficient for Math SAT scores is positive (0.0018451) – although higher demonstrated verbal skills make a student less likely to become a Math or Science major, higher demonstrated Math skills make them more likely to become a Math or Science major.
- The coefficient for Financial Aid here is positive (0.0394004), unlike that for non-quantitative majors; students with Financial Aid are 4% more likely to become Mathematics or Science majors than students without Financial Aid, supporting our theory that less privileged backgrounds make students more likely to pursue “practical” options.
- Ethnicity 1 has a coefficient of 0.1333236, indicating that people of Asian descent are 13% more likely to be Math or Science majors than Caucasians, a finding consistent with the fact that Asians are less likely than Caucasians to pick a major in category 1. This is the only statistically significant result for ethnicity, which suggests that either there are no strong trends among people of non-Asian ethnic groups, or that there are insufficient observations to give us a representative indication of the trends among Hispanic people, Black people, and Native Americans.
- Once again, gender is highly significant, and it is negative for Math and Science majors, with a coefficient of -0.0623926, indicating that women are 6% less likely than men to major in Math or a Science.

- As with the “Other” category, years 10 and 12 are statistically significant from year 11, here with positive coefficients of 0.0762003 and 0.1079914 respectively, telling us that people were substantially more likely to become Math and Science majors in 1995 and 1997 than they were in 1996. Again, we are unsure of the reasons for this.

The only statistically significant coefficients here other than those for variables already established as having negligible observations are the coefficients for *satm*, which is tiny (0.0001171), ethnicity 2 – Black, for which there are 2 observations, and ethnicity 4 – Native American, for which there are 0 observations. Therefore we can safely ignore the marginal effects for Economics majors.

Alternative Regressions

Model 1: taking out citizenship

major2	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
rdr	-.5341202	.1220979	-4.37	0.000	-.7734277	-.2948126
1.finaid	.2506965	.1067709	2.35	0.019	.0414293	.4599636
satv	-.0066543	.000834	-7.98	0.000	-.0082889	-.0050197
satm	.0108244	.0008894	12.17	0.000	.0090811	.0125676
ethnic2						
1	.8701901	.1836712	4.74	0.000	.5102012	1.230179
2	.5642375	.5010153	1.13	0.260	-.4177345	1.54621
3	.4609749	.2817679	1.64	0.102	-.0912799	1.01323
4	.0078663	.5751599	0.01	0.989	-1.119426	1.135159
5	.2948338	.4280316	0.69	0.491	-.5440928	1.13376
6	-.1909942	.2038078	-0.94	0.349	-.5904502	.2084618
1.gender2	-.3934212	.1069527	-3.68	0.000	-.6030448	-.1837977
year3						
5	-11.27179	1383.752	-0.01	0.994	-2723.376	2700.832
6	.9743315	.6570466	1.48	0.138	-.3134563	2.262119
7	.0828691	.2585001	0.32	0.749	-.4237818	.5895201
8	.271727	.2315365	1.17	0.241	-.1820762	.7255303
9	-.1649203	.2508857	-0.66	0.511	-.6566473	.3268068
10	.4115134	.2223371	1.85	0.064	-.0242594	.8472861
12	.5308372	.22318	2.38	0.017	.0934124	.968262
13	.1480708	.2274747	0.65	0.515	-.2977713	.5939129
14	.003205	.2243923	0.01	0.989	-.4365958	.4430057
15	.1020614	.2243531	0.45	0.649	-.3376626	.5417853
16	-.3213228	.2318429	-1.39	0.166	-.7757265	.1330809
17	.1669677	.3103101	0.54	0.591	-.4412289	.7751642
18	-.40955	.6032101	-0.68	0.497	-1.59182	.7727202
19	-13.16858	1383.752	-0.01	0.992	-2725.273	2698.935
fygpa	.0732769	.1173204	0.62	0.532	-.156667	.3032207
_cons	-2.221246	.9986164	-2.22	0.026	-4.178498	-.2639942

3							
	rdr	.1166277	.3064361	0.38	0.704	-.483976	.7172314
	1.finaid	.535355	.2782486	1.92	0.054	-.0100023	1.080712
	satv	-.0066058	.0019448	-3.40	0.001	-.0104177	-.002794
	satm	.0088623	.0021405	4.14	0.000	.0046671	.0130576
	ethnic2						
	1	1.4117	.3573996	3.95	0.000	.7112101	2.112191
	2	-12.65296	774.9669	-0.02	0.987	-1531.56	1506.254
	3	.4666827	.6505973	0.72	0.473	-.8084646	1.74183
	4	-12.59357	888.9566	-0.01	0.989	-1754.917	1729.729
	5	1.457703	.6726755	2.17	0.030	.1392834	2.776123
	6	-.5491515	.6171855	-0.89	0.374	-1.758813	.6605098
	1.gender2	-.9552876	.2919888	-3.27	0.001	-1.527575	-.3830001
	year3						
	5	-11.2816	4455.518	-0.00	0.998	-8743.937	8721.374
	6	1.174267	1.170929	1.00	0.316	-1.120712	3.469246
	7	.0925349	.606642	0.15	0.879	-1.096462	1.281531
	8	-.0395632	.5683625	-0.07	0.945	-1.153533	1.074407
	9	.0670224	.549927	0.12	0.903	-1.010815	1.14486
	10	.0357937	.5453623	0.07	0.948	-1.033097	1.104684
	12	-.5815961	.6371232	-0.91	0.361	-1.830335	.6671424
	13	-.161787	.5465397	-0.30	0.767	-1.232985	.9094111
	14	-.617498	.5935154	-1.04	0.298	-1.780767	.5457708
	15	.0583036	.5285324	0.11	0.912	-.9776009	1.094208
	16	-.2347565	.5481312	-0.43	0.668	-1.309074	.8395609
	17	.4247435	.7175995	0.59	0.554	-.9817257	1.831213
	18	-13.13356	729.3444	-0.02	0.986	-1442.622	1416.355
	19	-12.76327	4455.518	-0.00	0.998	-8745.419	8719.892
	fygpa	-.0710573	.2886356	-0.25	0.806	-.6367728	.4946581
	_cons	-4.406735	2.432932	-1.81	0.070	-9.175195	.361724

Alternative Model 2: Taking out citizenship and replacing fygpa with fygpahours

major2	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
rdr	-.543042	.1159444	-4.68	0.000	-.770289	-.3157951
satv	-.006614	.00083	-7.97	0.000	-.0082407	-.0049873
satm	.010745	.0008919	12.05	0.000	.0089969	.0124932
ethnic2						
1	.86576	.1838642	4.71	0.000	.5053927	1.226127
2	.5394135	.4989233	1.08	0.280	-.4384583	1.517285
3	.4522925	.2816984	1.61	0.108	-.0998263	1.004411
4	-.0194738	.5734168	-0.03	0.973	-1.14335	1.104402
5	.283225	.4270353	0.66	0.507	-.5537489	1.120199
6	-.1859932	.2040545	-0.91	0.362	-.5859326	.2139463
1.finaid	.2517539	.1068032	2.36	0.018	.0424235	.4610842
1.gender2	-.3980134	.1070152	-3.72	0.000	-.6077594	-.1882675
fygpahours	.0803454	.0581071	1.38	0.167	-.0335424	.1942332
year3						
5	-10.9984	1383.752	-0.01	0.994	-2723.102	2701.106
6	.9570674	.653812	1.46	0.143	-.3243805	2.238515
7	.0684093	.2584143	0.26	0.791	-.4380734	.574892
8	.2832063	.2316753	1.22	0.222	-.1708689	.7372816
9	-.1537167	.250877	-0.61	0.540	-.6454265	.3379932
10	.4155431	.2222252	1.87	0.061	-.0200103	.8510966
12	.5292856	.223165	2.37	0.018	.0918902	.966681
13	.1375802	.2274614	0.60	0.545	-.3082359	.5833962
14	-.0108338	.2244324	-0.05	0.961	-.4507131	.4290455
15	.0888543	.224297	0.40	0.692	-.3507597	.5284683
16	-.3271241	.2316984	-1.41	0.158	-.7812447	.1269964
17	.1811302	.3103393	0.58	0.559	-.4271236	.789384
18	-.4083325	.6044447	-0.68	0.499	-1.593022	.7763572
19	-13.2035	1383.752	-0.01	0.992	-2725.307	2698.9
_cons	-2.555041	1.0108	-2.53	0.011	-4.536172	-.5739092

3							
	rdr	.1280937	.294621	0.43	0.664	-.4493528	.7055402
	satv	-.0066163	.0019409	-3.41	0.001	-.0104205	-.0028121
	satm	.0089421	.0021404	4.18	0.000	.0047469	.0131373
	ethnic2						
	1	1.420356	.3581565	3.97	0.000	.7183825	2.12233
	2	-12.62887	775.5374	-0.02	0.987	-1532.654	1507.397
	3	.4958315	.6491089	0.76	0.445	-.7763985	1.768062
	4	-12.58824	886.7003	-0.01	0.989	-1750.489	1725.312
	5	1.473288	.6732815	2.19	0.029	.15368	2.792895
	6	-.556183	.6175335	-0.90	0.368	-1.766526	.6541605
	1.finaid	.5400167	.2782558	1.94	0.052	-.0053547	1.085388
	1.gender2	-.9541191	.2915667	-3.27	0.001	-1.525579	-.3826588
	fygpahours	-.0735276	.137916	-0.53	0.594	-.3438381	.1967828
	year3						
	5	-11.5118	4455.518	-0.00	0.998	-8744.167	8721.144
	6	1.174446	1.172683	1.00	0.317	-1.123972	3.472863
	7	.1238304	.6069099	0.20	0.838	-1.065691	1.313352
	8	-.0471456	.5687804	-0.08	0.934	-1.161935	1.067644
	9	.0672184	.5486249	0.12	0.902	-1.008067	1.142503
	10	.0369298	.5449599	0.07	0.946	-1.031172	1.105032
	12	-.5749667	.6370751	-0.90	0.367	-1.823611	.6736775
	13	-.156186	.5471805	-0.29	0.775	-1.22864	.9162681
	14	-.5929632	.5936886	-1.00	0.318	-1.756571	.570645
	15	.0763238	.5285042	0.14	0.885	-.9595254	1.112173
	16	-.2178478	.54775	-0.40	0.691	-1.291418	.8557225
	17	.422057	.7173089	0.59	0.556	-.9838426	1.827957
	18	-13.15754	721.4025	-0.02	0.985	-1427.08	1400.765
	19	-12.71323	4455.518	-0.00	0.998	-8745.369	8719.942
	_cons	-4.157613	2.426009	-1.71	0.087	-8.912504	.5972782

Marginal Effects

There is no noteworthy difference between the significant coefficients here and those in the regression with `fygpa` rather than `fygpahours`.

Marginal Effects at Means for “Other” Major

```
. margins, dydx(rdr fygpa hours satv satm fina id gender2 ethnic2 year3) predict(outcome(1)) atmeans
```

Conditional marginal effects
Model VCE : OIM

Number of obs = 2266

	Delta-method				[95% Conf. Interval]	
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z		
rdr	.1061291	.0808899	1.31	0.190	-.0524122	.2646704
1.finaid	-.056266	.0624823	-0.90	0.368	-.1787291	.0661971
satv	.0013942	.0006234	2.24	0.025	.0001724	.002616
satm	-.0022425	.000852	-2.63	0.008	-.0039123	-.0005727
ethnic2						
1	-.2150698	.1139934	-1.89	0.059	-.4384928	.0083532
2	-.1041586	.1609514	-0.65	0.518	-.4196176	.2113004
3	-.1015628	.0727461	-1.40	0.163	-.2441426	.0410169
4	.0186359	.1514478	0.12	0.902	-.2781963	.3154681
5	-.0961687	.2464293	-0.39	0.696	-.5791612	.3868239
6	.0407926	.0533966	0.76	0.445	-.0638627	.145448
1.gender2	.0910249	.1114787	0.82	0.414	-.1274692	.3095191
year3						
5	.2858012	.1688009	1.69	0.090	-.0450424	.6166449
6	-.2293467	.1765109	-1.30	0.194	-.5753016	.1166082
7	-.01513	.0540606	-0.28	0.780	-.1210869	.0908269
8	-.0559239	.0577391	-0.97	0.333	-.1690904	.0572426
9	.0265437	.0538058	0.49	0.622	-.0789138	.1320012
10	-.085631	.0573558	-1.49	0.135	-.1980463	.0267843
12	-.1054574	.1091051	-0.97	0.334	-.3192996	.1083848
13	-.0244307	.0570813	-0.43	0.669	-.136308	.0874465
14	.0095141	.0841512	0.11	0.910	-.1554192	.1744473
15	-.0182638	.0454177	-0.40	0.688	-.1072809	.0707532
16	.0602704	.0435055	1.39	0.166	-.0249989	.1455396
17	-.0431374	.0864086	-0.50	0.618	-.2124951	.1262204
18	.0893039	.1919943	0.47	0.642	-.2869979	.4656058
19	.2858069	.1685851	1.70	0.090	-.0446139	.6162277
fygpahours	-.0150244	.0222713	-0.67	0.500	-.0586754	.0286267

Average Marginal Effects for "Other" Major

. margins, dydx(rdr fypgahours satv satm finaaid gender2 ethnic2 year3) predict(outcome(1))

Average marginal effects
Model VCE : OIM

Number of obs = 2266

	Delta-method					[95% Conf. Interval]	
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z			
rdr	.0899366	.0207295	4.34	0.000	.0493074	.1305657	
1.finaid	-.0515694	.019262	-2.68	0.007	-.0893222	-.0138165	
satv	.0012307	.0001428	8.62	0.000	.0009509	.0015106	
satm	-.0019695	.0001423	-13.84	0.000	-.0022484	-.0016906	
ethnic2							
1	-.1867634	.0369224	-5.06	0.000	-.2591299	-.1143968	
2	-.0871231	.1004771	-0.87	0.386	-.2840546	.1098085	
3	-.0889143	.055312	-1.61	0.108	-.1973238	.0194952	
4	.019931	.1025211	0.19	0.846	-.1810067	.2208687	
5	-.0899756	.0812808	-1.11	0.268	-.2492831	.0693319	
6	.038187	.0347723	1.10	0.272	-.0299655	.1063396	
1.gender2	.0844717	.0198233	4.26	0.000	.0456187	.1233247	
year3							
5	.3236059	.0324639	9.97	0.000	.2599779	.3872339	
6	-.1951335	.1292003	-1.51	0.131	-.4483615	.0580945	
7	-.0137071	.0463033	-0.30	0.767	-.1044599	.0770457	
8	-.0474858	.042263	-1.12	0.261	-.1303198	.0353482	
9	.0228803	.0430506	0.53	0.595	-.0614974	.1072579	
10	-.0726208	.0409445	-1.77	0.076	-.1528706	.0076289	
12	-.087171	.0416162	-2.09	0.036	-.1687372	-.0056048	
13	-.0203269	.0408031	-0.50	0.618	-.1002995	.0596458	
14	.0107281	.0395314	0.27	0.786	-.066752	.0882082	
15	-.0161369	.0400632	-0.40	0.687	-.0946594	.0623855	
16	.0548121	.0389423	1.41	0.159	-.0215134	.1311375	
17	-.0392359	.056465	-0.69	0.487	-.1499052	.0714335	
18	.0878288	.0933415	0.94	0.347	-.0951171	.2707747	
19	.323616	.028721	11.27	0.000	.2673238	.3799081	
fypgahours	-.0124033	.0104641	-1.19	0.236	-.0329125	.0081059	

Marginal Effects at Means for “Math and Science” Major

. margins, dydx(rdr fygpahours satv satm finaaid gender2 ethnic2 year3) predict(outcome(2)) atmeans

Conditional marginal effects
Model VCE : OIM

Number of obs = 2266

	Delta-method					
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
rdr	-.1111136	.0480267	-2.31	0.021	-.2052441	-.016983
1.finaaid	.0482248	.0473416	1.02	0.308	-.044563	.1410127
satv	-.001312	.0007696	-1.70	0.088	-.0028203	.0001964
satm	.0021405	.001157	1.85	0.064	-.0001271	.0044082
ethnic2						
1	.1766541	.1562794	1.13	0.258	-.1296479	.482956
2	.1245161	.1298359	0.96	0.338	-.1299575	.3789897
3	.0932693	.0780846	1.19	0.232	-.0597738	.2463123
4	.0017216	.1192625	0.01	0.988	-.2320285	.2354717
5	.0397067	.1547417	0.26	0.797	-.2635815	.342995
6	-.0327775	.0433004	-0.76	0.449	-.1176448	.0520898
1.gender2	-.075882	.0792705	-0.96	0.338	-.2312494	.0794854
year3						
5	-.2627414	.0689727	-3.81	0.000	-.3979254	-.1275573
6	.2017421	.2339275	0.86	0.388	-.2567474	.6602316
7	.0126431	.051332	0.25	0.805	-.0879658	.113252
8	.0587084	.0475701	1.23	0.217	-.0345272	.151944
9	-.0290637	.0460444	-0.63	0.528	-.1193091	.0611817
10	.0876324	.0480732	1.82	0.068	-.0065893	.1818541
12	.1174572	.0509748	2.30	0.021	.0175484	.217366
13	.02844	.0453554	0.63	0.531	-.060455	.117335
14	.0006313	.0507433	0.01	0.990	-.0988237	.1000862
15	.0170714	.0444321	0.38	0.701	-.0700139	.1041566
16	-.0573214	.0453883	-1.26	0.207	-.1462809	.0316381
17	.0331528	.0730645	0.45	0.650	-.1100509	.1763565
18	-.0662438	.1145651	-0.58	0.563	-.2907873	.1582996
19	-.2627469	.0684514	-3.84	0.000	-.3969091	-.1285846
fygpahours	.0167157	.0134642	1.24	0.214	-.0096736	.0431051

Marginal Effects at Means for "Economics" Major

. margins, dydx(rdr fygpahours satv satm finaaid gender2 ethnic2 year3) predict(outcome(3)) atmeans

Conditional marginal effects
Model VCE : OIM

Number of obs = 2266

	Delta-method					[95% Conf. Interval]	
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z			
rdr	.0049842	.0589372	0.08	0.933	-.1105306	.1204991	
1.finaid	.0080412	.0948817	0.08	0.932	-.1779236	.1940059	
satv	-.0000822	.0009696	-0.08	0.932	-.0019826	.0018182	
satm	.0001019	.0012029	0.08	0.932	-.0022557	.0024596	
ethnic2							
1	.0384157	.2470566	0.16	0.876	-.4458064	.5226378	
2	-.0203575	.1386859	-0.15	0.883	-.2921768	.2514618	
3	.0082935	.0576788	0.14	0.886	-.1047549	.121342	
4	-.0203575	.1386858	-0.15	0.883	-.2921766	.2514616	
5	.0564619	.3573443	0.16	0.874	-.6439201	.7568439	
6	-.0080151	.0544879	-0.15	0.883	-.1148095	.0987792	
1.gender2	-.0151429	.17794	-0.09	0.932	-.3638988	.333613	
year3							
5	-.0230599	.2265098	-0.10	0.919	-.467011	.4208912	
6	.0276046	.2620178	0.11	0.916	-.4859408	.5411501	
7	.002487	.0277703	0.09	0.929	-.0519418	.0569157	
8	-.0027845	.0292619	-0.10	0.924	-.0601367	.0545677	
9	.00252	.0273261	0.09	0.927	-.0510382	.0560782	
10	-.0020014	.0224389	-0.09	0.929	-.0459809	.0419781	
12	-.0119998	.1168821	-0.10	0.918	-.2410844	.2170849	
13	-.0040093	.0401506	-0.10	0.920	-.082703	.0746844	
14	-.0101453	.0987902	-0.10	0.918	-.2037705	.1834799	
15	.0011925	.0165889	0.07	0.943	-.0313211	.0337061	
16	-.002949	.0305607	-0.10	0.923	-.0628468	.0569488	
17	.0099846	.096983	0.10	0.918	-.1800986	.2000677	
18	-.0230601	.226508	-0.10	0.919	-.4670076	.4208874	
19	-.0230601	.2265079	-0.10	0.919	-.4670075	.4208873	
fygpahours	-.0016912	.0200646	-0.08	0.933	-.0410171	.0376347	

Model 3: Taking out rdr

major2	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
1.finaid	.3643691	.1032127	3.53	0.000	.1620759	.5666624
satv	-.0054992	.0008144	-6.75	0.000	-.0070955	-.0039029
satm	.0115984	.000863	13.44	0.000	.0099069	.0132899
citz						
1	.4614859	.2168103	2.13	0.033	.0365455	.8864264
2	-13.90977	3983.045	-0.00	0.997	-7820.534	7792.715
ethnic2						
1	.7852417	.1900962	4.13	0.000	.4126601	1.157823
2	.5692176	.5004142	1.14	0.255	-.4115761	1.550011
3	.4012061	.2858877	1.40	0.161	-.1591234	.9615356
4	.0221278	.5696039	0.04	0.969	-1.094275	1.138531
5	.3062481	.4270011	0.72	0.473	-.5306587	1.143155
6	-.1989292	.2001537	-0.99	0.320	-.5912232	.1933647
1.gender2	-.3344461	.104971	-3.19	0.001	-.5401855	-.1287066
year3						
5	-13.37414	3983.045	-0.00	0.997	-7819.998	7793.25
6	.9013651	.6534106	1.38	0.168	-.3792962	2.182026
7	.2623698	.2562254	1.02	0.306	-.2398229	.7645624
8	.3402625	.2301344	1.48	0.139	-.1107926	.7913176
9	-.0862735	.2485213	-0.35	0.728	-.5733662	.4008192
10	.407443	.2210019	1.84	0.065	-.0257128	.8405988
12	.5398905	.2205801	2.45	0.014	.1075615	.9722195
13	.1495911	.2250131	0.66	0.506	-.2914265	.5906088
14	.0505331	.2234911	0.23	0.821	-.3875015	.4885676
15	.1239158	.2221079	0.56	0.577	-.3114077	.5592393
16	-.24891	.230661	-1.08	0.281	-.7009972	.2031773
17	.2314737	.3096372	0.75	0.455	-.3754041	.8383515
18	-.3417724	.5950156	-0.57	0.566	-1.507981	.8244367
19	-14.62713	3983.045	-0.00	0.997	-7821.251	7791.997
fygpa	.2346248	.1111531	2.11	0.035	.0167687	.452481
_cons	-5.588602	.6735182	-8.30	0.000	-6.908674	-4.268531

3							
	1.finaid	.4945521	.2723243	1.82	0.069	-.0391938	1.028298
	satv	-.0058262	.0019583	-2.98	0.003	-.0096644	-.001988
	satm	.0086631	.0021265	4.07	0.000	.0044953	.0128309
	citiz						
	1	.9124752	.4322894	2.11	0.035	.0652036	1.759747
	2	-12.97371	13045.47	-0.00	0.999	-25581.63	25555.68
	ethnic2						
	1	1.163119	.3931339	2.96	0.003	.3925907	1.933647
	2	-14.85369	2110.278	-0.01	0.994	-4150.924	4121.216
	3	.4349963	.6535406	0.67	0.506	-.8459197	1.715912
	4	-14.7457	2547.579	-0.01	0.995	-5007.909	4978.418
	5	.9236282	.8004672	1.15	0.249	-.6452587	2.492515
	6	-.6182392	.6190166	-1.00	0.318	-1.83149	.5950111
	1.gender2	-.9044832	.2921211	-3.10	0.002	-1.47703	-.3319364
	year3						
	5	-13.39704	13045.47	-0.00	0.999	-25582.05	25555.26
	6	1.305251	1.173686	1.11	0.266	-.9951301	3.605633
	7	-.0921217	.6440624	-0.14	0.886	-1.354461	1.170217
	8	-.1055219	.5994875	-0.18	0.860	-1.280496	1.069452
	9	.0496389	.5509992	0.09	0.928	-1.0303	1.129577
	10	.0788187	.5472392	0.14	0.885	-.9937505	1.151388
	12	-.5098369	.6390632	-0.80	0.425	-1.762378	.742704
	13	-.1162905	.5491637	-0.21	0.832	-1.192632	.9600507
	14	-.5288814	.5965811	-0.89	0.375	-1.698159	.6403962
	15	.0602355	.5311965	0.11	0.910	-.9808905	1.101361
	16	-.1492022	.5528294	-0.27	0.787	-1.232728	.9343235
	17	.5021839	.7179858	0.70	0.484	-.9050423	1.90941
	18	-15.19313	2245.787	-0.01	0.995	-4416.855	4386.468
	19	-15.36997	13045.47	-0.00	0.999	-25584.03	25553.29
	fygpa	-.2226544	.2783516	-0.80	0.424	-.7682134	.3229047
	_cons	-4.093138	1.700072	-2.41	0.016	-7.425217	-.7610588

Marginal Effects:

Marginal Effects at Means for "Other" Major

	Delta-method					[95% Conf. Interval]	
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z			
year3							
5	.2777459	.5629437	0.49	0.622	-.8256035	1.381095	
6	-.2182024	.4028137	-0.54	0.588	-1.007703	.5712978	
7	-.0503374	.1176508	-0.43	0.669	-.2809286	.1802538	
8	-.0666249	.1378665	-0.48	0.629	-.3368383	.2035884	
9	.0147873	.0657345	0.22	0.822	-.11405	.1436246	
10	-.0834158	.1018507	-0.82	0.413	-.2830395	.116208	
12	-.1073839	.2750217	-0.39	0.696	-.6464165	.4316487	
13	-.0270706	.0954997	-0.28	0.777	-.2142467	.1601054	
14	-.0031428	.1963245	-0.02	0.987	-.3879318	.3816461	
15	-.0245096	.0482111	-0.51	0.611	-.1190016	.0699824	
16	.0456354	.0585458	0.78	0.436	-.0691122	.160383	
17	-.0540164	.2024385	-0.27	0.790	-.4507884	.3427557	
18	.0765266	.4709868	0.16	0.871	-.8465906	.9996437	
19	.2777463	.5629409	0.49	0.622	-.8255975	1.38109	
ethnic2							
1	-.1906427	.2502155	-0.76	0.446	-.6810561	.2997708	
2	-.112081	2.479254	-0.05	0.964	-4.971329	4.747167	
3	-.0897018	.118667	-0.76	0.450	-.3222849	.1428812	
4	.0101463	.3384987	0.03	0.976	-.653299	.6735916	
5	-.0803398	.3271474	-0.25	0.806	-.7215369	.5608573	
6	.0438358	.1370331	0.32	0.749	-.2247441	.3124157	
1.gender2	.0772261	.2964033	0.26	0.794	-.5037136	.6581658	
1.finaid	-.0776095	.1413528	-0.55	0.583	-.3546559	.1994368	
satv	.0011632	.0016777	0.69	0.488	-.0021251	.0044515	
satm	-.002412	.0029363	-0.82	0.411	-.0081671	.0033431	
citz							
1	-.1114378	.3110816	-0.36	0.720	-.7211465	.4982709	
2	.2972133	.629773	0.47	0.637	-.9371191	1.531546	
fygpa	-.0442557	.1603344	-0.28	0.783	-.3585054	.2699939	

As in the original model, none of the coefficients for our variables are significant here.

Average Marginal Effects for “Other” Major

	Delta-method				[95% Conf. Interval]	
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z		
year3						
5	.315451	.0287244	10.98	0.000	.2591521	.3717498
6	-.1893662	.130324	-1.45	0.146	-.4447965	.0660642
7	-.0432059	.0471002	-0.92	0.359	-.1355205	.0491087
8	-.0570282	.0422819	-1.35	0.177	-.1398993	.0258428
9	.012803	.0430001	0.30	0.766	-.0714756	.0970817
10	-.0719412	.0407926	-1.76	0.078	-.1518933	.008011
12	-.0902441	.0412438	-2.19	0.029	-.1710805	-.0094077
13	-.0230835	.0404184	-0.57	0.568	-.1023021	.0561351
14	-.0006208	.0396371	-0.02	0.988	-.0783082	.0770666
15	-.0216828	.0397934	-0.54	0.586	-.0996764	.0563109
16	.0416938	.0390994	1.07	0.286	-.0349396	.1183273
17	-.0494712	.0567515	-0.87	0.383	-.160702	.0617597
18	.0765918	.0934123	0.82	0.412	-.106493	.2596765
19	.3154517	.0284695	11.08	0.000	.2596525	.371251
ethnic2						
1	-.1662649	.0385697	-4.31	0.000	-.2418602	-.0906697
2	-.0945523	.1022179	-0.93	0.355	-.2948957	.1057911
3	-.0791485	.0562005	-1.41	0.159	-.1892994	.0310025
4	.0122905	.1043585	0.12	0.906	-.1922485	.2168294
5	-.0733701	.0828323	-0.89	0.376	-.2357184	.0889783
6	.041282	.034395	1.20	0.230	-.026131	.108695
1.gender2	.0727142	.0196397	3.70	0.000	.0342211	.1112074
1.finaid	-.0702811	.0186694	-3.76	0.000	-.1068724	-.0336898
satv	.0010366	.0001437	7.21	0.000	.000755	.0013183
satm	-.0021292	.0001346	-15.82	0.000	-.002393	-.0018653
citz						
1	-.1001464	.0433143	-2.31	0.021	-.1850409	-.0152519
2	.3348432	.0099198	33.75	0.000	.3154007	.3542856
fygpa	-.0367966	.020226	-1.82	0.069	-.0764388	.0028455

Freshman year GPA becomes significant at the 10% level here with a coefficient of -0.0367966. As Freshman year GPA increases by 1 point, the probability that someone will become an “Other” major decreases by 3.7%.

Marginal Effects at Means for “Math and science” Major

	Delta-method				
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
year3					
5	-.2560721	.3730164	-0.69	0.492	-.9871708 .4750265
6	.1840827	.5860449	0.31	0.753	-.9645441 1.33271
7	.0536224	.0662323	0.81	0.418	-.0761905 .1834354
8	.0705946	.07017	1.01	0.314	-.0669362 .2081253
9	-.0163567	.0479513	-0.34	0.733	-.1103395 .0776262
10	.0843468	.0870553	0.97	0.333	-.0862784 .254972
12	.117976	.0985123	1.20	0.231	-.0751045 .3110565
13	.0301732	.0506777	0.60	0.552	-.0691533 .1294998
14	.0121006	.0766406	0.16	0.875	-.1381122 .1623134
15	.0239451	.0512536	0.47	0.640	-.0765102 .1244004
16	-.0438109	.0698594	-0.63	0.531	-.1807329 .0931111
17	.0425563	.1457844	0.29	0.770	-.2431759 .3282885
18	-.0548528	1.227934	-0.04	0.964	-2.461558 2.351853
19	-.2560725	.373011	-0.69	0.492	-.9871607 .4750157
ethnic2					
1	.1636082	.3669078	0.45	0.656	-.5555178 .8827342
2	.1322753	.2149935	0.62	0.538	-.2891042 .5536548
3	.0826476	.1465376	0.56	0.573	-.2045608 .369856
4	.010048	.167899	0.06	0.952	-.3190279 .3391239
5	.0554446	.2345535	0.24	0.813	-.4042718 .5151609
6	-.0351975	.0883455	-0.40	0.690	-.2083516 .1379566
1.gender2	-.063844	.1997072	-0.32	0.749	-.4552629 .3275749
1.finaid	.0714463	.142856	0.50	0.617	-.2085463 .3514388
satv	-.0010953	.0019735	-0.55	0.579	-.0049632 .0027727
satm	.0023269	.0037849	0.61	0.539	-.0050913 .0097452
citz					
1	.0942877	.2990481	0.32	0.753	-.4918358 .6804111
2	-.2815593	.5263254	-0.53	0.593	-1.313138 .7500194
fygpa	.0489299	.0703128	0.70	0.486	-.0888807 .1867406

Again, none of the coefficients for our variables are significant at the means for this major category.

Average Marginal Effects for “Math and science” Major

	Delta-method					[95% Conf. Interval]
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z		
year3						
5	-.2816819	.0281092	-10.02	0.000	-.336775	-.2265887
6	.147618	.1319148	1.12	0.263	-.1109302	.4061663
7	.0491354	.0464371	1.06	0.290	-.0418797	.1401506
8	.0642283	.041959	1.53	0.126	-.0180099	.1464665
9	-.0155604	.042152	-0.37	0.712	-.0981768	.067056
10	.0749799	.0403519	1.86	0.063	-.0041083	.1540682
12	.1076199	.0408474	2.63	0.008	.0275605	.1876793
13	.0283299	.039815	0.71	0.477	-.049706	.1063658
14	.0143837	.0390343	0.37	0.713	-.0621222	.0908896
15	.0213969	.0390955	0.55	0.584	-.0552289	.0980227
16	-.0400281	.038167	-1.05	0.294	-.1148341	.0347778
17	.0340368	.0566723	0.60	0.548	-.0770389	.1451125
18	-.0428225	.0934414	-0.46	0.647	-.2259644	.1403193
19	-.2816825	.027877	-10.10	0.000	-.3363204	-.2270447
ethnic2						
1	.1358259	.0384599	3.53	0.000	.0604459	.2112058
2	.1214802	.1022012	1.19	0.235	-.0788304	.3217908
3	.0714238	.0560471	1.27	0.203	-.0384265	.181274
4	.0146374	.1195798	0.12	0.903	-.2197347	.2490095
5	.0433926	.0811246	0.53	0.593	-.1156087	.202394
6	-.0302784	.034088	-0.89	0.374	-.0970897	.036533
1.gender2	-.0524099	.0193607	-2.71	0.007	-.0903561	-.0144637
1.finaid	.0610537	.0184607	3.31	0.001	.0248713	.0972361
satv	-.0009409	.0001419	-6.63	0.000	-.001219	-.0006629
satm	.002027	.0001348	15.04	0.000	.0017629	.0022911
citz						
1	.0747134	.0423183	1.77	0.077	-.0082288	.1576557
2	-.3079019	.0096596	-31.88	0.000	-.3268343	-.2889695
fygpa	.0456707	.0200425	2.28	0.023	.0063881	.0849533

Citizenship becomes significant at the 10% level. The coefficient for financial aid increases from 0.0394 in the original regression to 0.0610537 in the regression without reader rating. This suggests that reader rating is somewhat collinear with the financial aid variable – a “better” reader rating was probably correlated to some degree with being on Financial Aid, and therefore being on Financial Aid is correlated to some degree with

being a more demonstrably capable student, serving as another explanation for why students on Financial Aid are more likely to become Math or Science majors.

Marginal Effects at Means for "Economics" Major

	Delta-method					[95% Conf. Interval]
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z		
year3						
5	-.0216738	.6217354	-0.03	0.972	-1.240253	1.196905
6	.0341197	.9250571	0.04	0.971	-1.778959	1.847198
7	-.003285	.0932427	-0.04	0.972	-.1860375	.1794674
8	-.0039696	.1123572	-0.04	0.972	-.2241857	.2162465
9	.0015693	.0455386	0.03	0.973	-.0876847	.0908234
10	-.000931	.0285544	-0.03	0.974	-.0568965	.0550345
12	-.010592	.3005071	-0.04	0.972	-.5995751	.578391
13	-.0031026	.0879442	-0.04	0.972	-.17547	.1692648
14	-.0089578	.253788	-0.04	0.972	-.5063732	.4884576
15	.0005645	.0194474	0.03	0.977	-.0375517	.0386807
16	-.0018245	.0525033	-0.03	0.972	-.1047291	.1010801
17	.01146	.3183145	0.04	0.971	-.6124249	.635345
18	-.0216738	.6217362	-0.03	0.972	-1.240254	1.196907
19	-.0216738	.6217362	-0.03	0.972	-1.240254	1.196907
ethnic2						
1	.0270345	.560524	0.05	0.962	-1.071572	1.125641
2	-.0201943	.4385871	-0.05	0.963	-.8798092	.8394206
3	.0070542	.1503137	0.05	0.963	-.2875551	.3016636
4	-.0201943	.4385871	-0.05	0.963	-.8798091	.8394206
5	.0248953	.5172325	0.05	0.962	-.9888618	1.038652
6	-.0086383	.185598	-0.05	0.963	-.3724036	.355127
1.gender2	-.0133821	.468671	-0.03	0.977	-.9319605	.9051962
1.finaid	.0061633	.2166114	0.03	0.977	-.4183873	.4307139
satv	-.000068	.0023884	-0.03	0.977	-.0047491	.0046132
satm	.0000851	.0029924	0.03	0.977	-.0057799	.0059501
citz						
1	.0171501	.5852177	0.03	0.977	-1.129856	1.164156
2	-.015654	.5522469	-0.03	0.977	-1.098038	1.06673
fygpa	-.0046737	.164133	-0.03	0.977	-.3263685	.3170211

Average Marginal Effects for "Economics" Major

	Delta-method					[95% Conf. Interval]
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z		
year3						
5	-.0337691	.0118745	-2.84	0.004	-.0570427	-.0104955
6	.0417482	.0718412	0.58	0.561	-.0990579	.1825543
7	-.0059295	.0179804	-0.33	0.742	-.0411704	.0293114
8	-.0072	.0165979	-0.43	0.664	-.0397313	.0253312
9	.0027574	.0179011	0.15	0.878	-.0323281	.0378429
10	-.0030388	.0163641	-0.19	0.853	-.0351118	.0290342
12	-.0173758	.0143242	-1.21	0.225	-.0454508	.0106992
13	-.0052464	.0158773	-0.33	0.741	-.0363654	.0258726
14	-.0137629	.0147111	-0.94	0.350	-.0425962	.0150703
15	.0002859	.016664	0.02	0.986	-.032375	.0329467
16	-.0016657	.0168565	-0.10	0.921	-.0347038	.0313724
17	.0154344	.0296839	0.52	0.603	-.042745	.0736137
18	-.0337692	.011769	-2.87	0.004	-.0568361	-.0107023
19	-.0337692	.0117711	-2.87	0.004	-.0568401	-.0106983
ethnic2						
1	.0304391	.0185329	1.64	0.101	-.0058848	.0667629
2	-.0269279	.0040257	-6.69	0.000	-.0348181	-.0190376
3	.0077247	.020807	0.37	0.710	-.0330562	.0485057
4	-.0269279	.0040258	-6.69	0.000	-.0348182	-.0190375
5	.0299774	.0397654	0.75	0.451	-.0479613	.1079162
6	-.0110037	.0100935	-1.09	0.276	-.0307866	.0087792
1.gender2	-.0203043	.0074351	-2.73	0.006	-.0348768	-.0057319
1.finaid	.0092274	.0071338	1.29	0.196	-.0047546	.0232095
satv	-.0000957	.0000526	-1.82	0.069	-.0001988	7.37e-06
satm	.0001022	.0000537	1.90	0.057	-3.11e-06	.0002075
citz						
1	.025433	.0191868	1.33	0.185	-.0121725	.0630384
2	-.0269413	.0040011	-6.73	0.000	-.0347833	-.0190993
fygpa	-.0088739	.0075854	-1.17	0.242	-.0237411	.0059933

SAT math scores lose significance slightly in this regression, and SAT verbal scores gain significance. There are no other prominent differences from the original regression evidenced in these marginal effects.

Model 4: including *fygpa_hum* and *fygpahours*

For this regression, we decided to use robust standard errors to account for the collinearity between *fygpa* and *fygpa_hum*, which was hinted at in our original VIF table. To do this we used the command `vce(bootstrap)` as an “option” following our `mlogit` command.

major2	Observed Coef.	Bootstrap Std. Err.	z	P> z	Normal-based [95% Conf. Interval]	
1	(base outcome)					
2						
rdr	-.5247282	.1271449	-4.13	0.000	-.7739276	-.2755287
1.finaid	.2331162	.089711	2.60	0.009	.0572859	.4089466
satv	-.0058107	.0006393	-9.09	0.000	-.0070637	-.0045578
satm	.0101324	.0008322	12.18	0.000	.0085014	.0117634
citz						
1	.3915803	.1417388	2.76	0.006	.1137774	.6693832
2	-11.55938	.6514465	-17.74	0.000	-12.83619	-10.28257
ethnic2						
1	.7582795	.2066398	3.67	0.000	.3532729	1.163286
2	.5114421	.5973611	0.86	0.392	-.6593641	1.682248
3	.41668	.3637851	1.15	0.252	-.2963258	1.129686
4	.0504892	.5985871	0.08	0.933	-1.12272	1.223698
5	.1949926	.4946863	0.39	0.693	-.7745746	1.16456
6	-.2138605	.2047515	-1.04	0.296	-.615166	.187445
1.gender2	-.3704436	.0729455	-5.08	0.000	-.5134141	-.2274731
year3						
5	-10.88652	.8658306	-12.57	0.000	-12.58352	-9.189527
6	.932737	.9129908	1.02	0.307	-.8566921	2.722166
7	.0101204	.1984813	0.05	0.959	-.3788957	.3991366
8	.2623536	.3030198	0.87	0.387	-.3315543	.8562616
9	-.190866	.2721976	-0.70	0.483	-.7243635	.3426314
10	.3953301	.3054917	1.29	0.196	-.2034226	.9940829
12	.4932188	.2319467	2.13	0.033	.0386116	.9478259
13	.1111594	.2170832	0.51	0.609	-.314316	.5366347
14	.010276	.1691373	0.06	0.952	-.3212269	.341779
15	.0907895	.2628097	0.35	0.730	-.4243079	.605887
16	-.3406571	.2442217	-1.39	0.163	-.8193228	.1380086
17	.1490164	.2110884	0.71	0.480	-.2647092	.562742
18	-.3475359	3.910158	-0.09	0.929	-8.011305	7.316233
19	-13.45299	.7272354	-18.50	0.000	-14.87834	-12.02763
fygpa	-1.03486	.2600692	-3.98	0.000	-1.544586	-.5251334
fygpa_hum	1.002396	.2494722	4.02	0.000	.5134397	1.491353
fygpahours	.0367814	.084151	0.44	0.662	-.1281515	.2017143
_cons	-2.272171	1.039036	-2.19	0.029	-4.308643	-.2356984

3							
	rdr	.108406	.3044922	0.36	0.722	-.4883878	.7051998
	1.finaid	.4773771	.2793515	1.71	0.087	-.0701417	1.024896
	satv	-.0050634	.0015396	-3.29	0.001	-.0080809	-.0020459
	satm	.0079808	.0032067	2.49	0.013	.0016958	.0142658
	citz						
	1	.939466	.4034806	2.33	0.020	.1486586	1.730273
	2	-11.08097	3.323522	-3.33	0.001	-17.59495	-4.566982
	ethnic2						
	1	1.187088	.3528274	3.36	0.001	.4955589	1.878617
	2	-12.64581	.8996539	-14.06	0.000	-14.4091	-10.88252
	3	.463143	4.855989	0.10	0.924	-9.05442	9.980706
	4	-12.57338	.92808	-13.55	0.000	-14.39238	-10.75438
	5	.8905892	.7610449	1.17	0.242	-.6010314	2.38221
	6	-.5769037	3.131305	-0.18	0.854	-6.714148	5.560341
	1.gender2	-.8444127	.3344959	-2.52	0.012	-1.500012	-.1888128
	year3						
	5	-10.98186	3.294688	-3.33	0.001	-17.43933	-4.52439
	6	1.402763	7.697698	0.18	0.855	-13.68445	16.48997
	7	.0002708	3.35184	0.00	1.000	-6.569215	6.569756
	8	.0134005	.507705	0.03	0.979	-.981683	1.008484
	9	.1879012	.4714607	0.40	0.690	-.7361448	1.111947
	10	.2189141	.7096103	0.31	0.758	-1.171896	1.609725
	12	-.4120585	.697191	-0.59	0.555	-1.778528	.9544108
	13	-.0012284	.8363457	-0.00	0.999	-1.640436	1.637979
	14	-.3872794	.6504553	-0.60	0.552	-1.662148	.8875896
	15	.2171771	.5572389	0.39	0.697	-.8749911	1.309345
	16	-.0299399	.5382624	-0.06	0.956	-1.084915	1.025035
	17	.5966909	3.489801	0.17	0.864	-6.243193	7.436575
	18	-12.96597	.6147128	-21.09	0.000	-14.17078	-11.76115
	19	-13.24809	.9506125	-13.94	0.000	-15.11125	-11.38492
	fygpa	-1.302152	.590952	-2.20	0.028	-2.460397	-.1439072
	fygpa_hum	1.03606	.5284332	1.96	0.050	.0003502	2.07177
	fygpahours	.0046081	.1162768	0.04	0.968	-.2232903	.2325065
	_cons	-4.463083	2.481805	-1.80	0.072	-9.327331	.4011649

model. All of these coefficients are basically the same as in the original model except that for *fygpa*, which is now .22144 where in the original model it is -0.0093445. The coefficient for *fygpa_hum* is of a similar magnitude but the opposite sign – its coefficient is -0.2117533. This tells us that as freshman year overall gpa increases by 1 unit, the probability that someone will become an “Other” major decreases by approximately 22%, but as their humanities grade increases by 1 unit, the probability that they will become an “Other” major decreases by approximately 21%. This is an intriguing finding, because freshman year humanities grade is a component of freshman year GPA, and so the natural expectation would be that a dependent variable would vary with both of them together. However, this also explains why when freshman year humanities grade is left out of the regression, freshman year GPA is not significant and has a much lower coefficient: it has two major components which offset each other. We will discuss this further in the conclusion.

Citizenship becomes significant in this model, where it was not significant in the original model, but the magnitude of the coefficient is approximately the same. As with the “Other” major category, *fygpa* becomes significant in this model where it was not in the original model, and *fygpa_hum* is also significant, with a coefficient of approximately the same magnitude and the opposite sign.

For Economics majors, at the means, Ethnicity 1 (Asian) becomes significant where it was not in the original regression, but the coefficient remains approximately the same. Both *satv* and *fygpa* become significant at the 10% level, but only *fygpa* has a substantial change in its coefficient, from -0.003505 to -0.0171653, telling us that as *fygpa* increases by one unit, the probability that the mean student will become an Economics major decreases by 1.7% - an unflattering but not devastating statistic for the Economics department.

Conclusion

What most strikes us about our multiple models is their fundamental similarities. Somewhat reassuringly, no one of the variables that we removed or changed out for a different variable overthrew our whole regression; rather, the most that we would see would be a slight change in another coefficient or an increase or decrease in the significance levels of other coefficients. The most major change was in Model 4, when we included both freshman year GPA and freshman year humanities grade, and the coefficients for freshman year GPA both increased greatly in magnitude and became significant, as did the coefficients for freshman year humanities grade. This relative constancy tells us that our model is somewhat reliable as an estimator for the general patterns in the Reed student population's selection of majors. Our initial assumptions that being male, being of Asian descent, being on financial aid, being an international student, and having a better reader rating would all increase the probability of becoming a Mathematics, Science, or Economics major, were all verified: on the whole, the probability of becoming a non-Math, non-Science, non-Economics major increased by approximately 9% with an increase in reader rating by 1 point, was approximately 5% lower in students on financial aid, was approximately 9% lower in international students, was approximately 8% higher in women, and approximately 16% lower in students of Asian descent.

As we expected, the Economics major category seems to share many of the characteristics of the Math and Science major category, but due to the small sample size, the coefficients were generally less statistically significant. As with Math and Sciences, international students, students of Asian descent, men, students on financial aid, and students with higher SAT math scores (and lower SAT verbal scores) tend to become Economics majors. However, interestingly, the deviation from this pattern of similarity between Economics and Math and Science majors is illuminated in Model 4; Economics follows the pattern of the "Other" major category in that students with higher freshman year GPAs are less likely to become Economics majors, and students with higher humanities grades are more likely to become Economics majors. It would be interesting

to see whether these patterns stayed with a larger sample size, and if so, to examine what this tells us about the ways in which Economics – and the students that it attracts – are similar to Math and Science majors, and the ways in which they are more similar to “Other” majors.

Despite the highly comparable nature of the models that we are examining, they are not fully comparable; due to limitations of the dataset, in which we had missing values in different variables for different cases, there are observations which are included in some regressions but not in others. Therefore it is slightly problematic to assume that all of these models are completely comparable. Another consequence of limited data is that there are some coefficients that are rendered utterly meaningless in the regression. For example, the small sample sizes of students of certain ethnicities, specifically Black and Native American students, rendered the statistically significant coefficients for these groups in certain regressions meaningless. Furthermore, our use of many indicator variables with this data means that we are comparing groups with very incomparable numbers – using ethnicity as an example again, the base case (Caucasian) has multiple times the observations that any other group has.

After analysis of each of our permutations of the original model, we settled upon Alternative Model 4, the one in which we include both *fygpa* and *fygpa_hum* as regressors as our favored model. Inclusion of both these variables illuminates the divergence between them despite the fact that *fygpa_hum* is a component of *fygpa*, eliminating – or at least reducing – the problem of one cancelling out the other’s effects when only *fygpa* is included. It makes intuitive sense that students with superior verbal skills would do better in humanities and be more inclined toward non-quantitative majors, while those whose strengths lie in more quantitative areas would be less likely to do well in humanities but more likely to do well in other subjects, such as introductory science courses, which most freshmen take. Therefore, intuitively, we would expect a general trend for people with higher GPAs to be Math and Science majors, and for people with higher Humanities grades to be “Other” majors, as is reflected in this model.

Based on our findings, it could be interesting to investigate how the proportions of Math, Science, and Economics majors at Reed might change due to increases in students coming from low-income backgrounds. Another question in this vein is how these proportions might shift if more foreigners enrolled at the college, or if the school recruited more Asian students. It could also be interesting to re-run these regressions after splitting up the “Other” major category (in this case we would have more options for our dependent variable. For example, we could have categories for social sciences, art, languages, etc.). Obviously any further work on these questions would be relevant specifically to Reed, and could not be generalized to all types of post-secondary education.

On the whole, we are relatively comfortable concluding that our initial assumptions were generally supported by the data, despite the minor limitations of the dataset.