Demographics and Experiences Impact on a Person's Opinion of Abortion Legality

Mary Kate Richards, Jackson Stokes, and Marko Suchy

April 17th, 2024

(i) Introduction

Legal abortions have been a heated topic of debate since before Roe v. Wade was first established by the Supreme Court in 1973. The controversy over legal abortions and the question of if women should have the right to them (and the circumstances around when they might be appropriate) remains highly prevalent today. Through our research, we hope to target a more narrow classification of who is supporting legal abortions for any circumstance and who is not, and to see if certain demographics or experiences people undergo have an impact on their beliefs of a woman's right to an abortion. Understanding more generally what impacts a persons' belief of the right to a legal abortion can inform policy makers, political leaders, and activists who to target when discussing policies, whether that be to imprint upon them the necessity of allowing legal abortions or to convince people against legal abortions. We are asking: how does a person's education level, marital status, sex, age, geographical region, religion, and urbanity affect their opinion on if women should be able to obtain a legal abortion for any reason?

(ii) Theory/Conceptual Framework

We work from the fundamental assumption that a person's life experiences have an important impact on their view of ethics, including their stance on abortions. We hope education level, marital status, sex, religion, age, urbanity, and geographical region adequately capture the life experience of respondents which lead to political leanings.

We believe a person's response to the GSS question, "Please tell me whether or not you think it should be possible for a pregnant woman to obtain a legal abortion if a woman wants for any reason" (referred to as *abany* from this point forward), will be a function of experiences associated with our exogenous variables. This relationship can be modeled in a general equation, as follows:

$$Abortion\ Attitude\ =\ f(Education,\ Marital\ Status,\ Sex,\ Age,\ Region,\ Religion,\ Urbanity)$$

Note that, for our model, positive effects make someone more likely to answer "yes" to *abany*, and negative effects make someone more likely to answer "no." We theorize that each of our variables will have the following effects:

Education level - We believe that there will be a strong positive effect from higher academic degrees, as such an effect has been previously well documented.

Marital Status - We believe that marriage is likely to make an individual more beholden to traditional worldviews, and thus marriage will have a negative effect.

Sex - We theorize that a sense of solidarity amongst women will lead to a positive effect for women, as well as the fact that abortions occur within womens bodies.

Age - We expect that age will have a small negative effect, as older populations are seen as more conservative and upholding of traditional values than younger generations.

Region - We believe southern regions will carry a negative effect, as there is more hesitancy around abortion in predominantly conservative states, which are disproportionately in the south. However, we suspect our effect may be small and statistically insignificant, as our

region variable does not capture urbanity or ruralness of our subject, which may be a stronger indicator than general region.

Religion - Generally, we believe no religion will have a positive effect, as most religious texts speak negatively of abortion. Among religious people, we are unsure which religion might have the strongest negative effect.

Urbanity - We theorize that urban places of living will carry a positive effect, due to the fact that urban places of living typically have a larger liberal populace.

(iii) Literature Review

It is important to identify the information that previous authors have already established surrounding our research question. Below, we discuss relevant authors who have helped begin to answer the prominent questions surrounding abortion belief, and how we will incorporate their findings into our model. However, we also discuss the limitations of this previous research, and discuss how our literature takes a new approach on the subject.

Emerson (1996) acknowledges how religion seems to be an obvious indicator of abortion attitudes. However, upon further investigation, Emerson (1996) found that it was not directly religion that influenced abortion beliefs, but rather the indirect influence of religion on one's worldview. In their words directly, "the degree to which beliefs and decisions are focused on transcendent authority is religion's central factor in shaping abortion attitudes" (Emerson 1996). However, Emerson (1996) notes that a more "promising line of future study" would be understanding the ways in which individuals morally reason with themselves. Utilizing Emerson's (1996) suggestions, we account for many individual religions instead of having solely a "religious: yes or no" category, in order to better reflect one's worldview view. By interpreting

each religion on its own level, we believe that our project will capture more specifically the type of religion with the strongest impacts on abortion belief. Further, we believe that including the effects of marital status, sex, urbanity, geographical location, and education level in our model will again grasp more broadly one's worldview, expanding Emerson's (1996) work as suggested.

Hans and Kimberly (2014) add to the topic by addressing the idea that abortion beliefs can be very situational. While it may seem very polarized in the media and as if one political party always leans a certain direction, these authors argue that adding contextualization to the problem of abortion can very dramatically shift one's belief on if it should be allowed or not (Hans and Kimberly, 2014). Therefore, these authors suggest accounting for the stipulations of certain contextualized problems in future research in order to gain a more accurate picture of what people truly believe (Hans and Kimberly, 2014). While our research includes a direct "yes" or "no" answer to the question, the specific wording of "under any circumstance" ensures that the respondents are aware that the type of abortion they are voting "yes" or "no" for could truly be for *any* reason. Hence, we are fairly certain by using this language that respondents who answer "yes" believe that abortion should always be allowed, avoiding any misleading responses.

Peterson and Smith (2020) find that, contrary to folk wisdom, political attitudes are generally stable over time. However, it is more likely that people will become conservative as they age than become liberal (Peterson and Smith 2020). Using this theory, we want to know if the somewhat conservative nature of aging will affect abortion beliefs, or if the other variables associated with political affiliation are more important predictors of abortion belief than age. For example, religion, geographical location, and urbanity are all correlated with political affiliation, so we are curious if those factors are stronger determinants of one's view on abortion than age.

González et al. (2018) addresses how access to legal abortion can lead to productive societal outcomes. They state: "we find evidence that the legalization of abortion in Spain in 1985 led to… women [being] more likely to graduate from high school, less likely to marry young, less likely to divorce in the long-term, and [reporting] higher life satisfaction as adults" (González et al. 2018). Our expansion to this discussion could inform policy makers, political leaders, and activists of a more narrow idea of who is more likely to be against legal abortions, and then the informants could use González et al. as an example of some of the positive impacts of legal abortion, if they desired.

Overall, these authors have begun digging into the topic of legal abortions, and we hope to expand their works in the ways described above. By including all religions and analyzing their independent effects, we take into consideration Emerson's (1996) suggestion of gaining a more holistic worldview. Using a question with the language, "for any reason," ensures that responders to the survey are very understanding of what their response entails– which is supporting a woman's right to a legal abortion for *any* reason imaginable. While Hans and Kimberly (2014) note that changing the question could change our regression results, we believe that understanding this question of, "for any reason," is an important question to investigate. Understanding whether the impacts of age are stronger than other politically motivated areas will provide powerful insight into who political leaders or activists should target when addressing abortion beliefs. Lastly, González et al. (2018) demonstrate that answering this question could potentially lead to positive societal outcomes, showing that it is a crucial topic for policy makers to investigate. Our model is not perfect; however, we do believe that the question we ask will reveal a more refined picture of supporters or adversaries to legal abortions, favorably adding to the existing literature on the topic.

(iv) Data and Descriptive Analysis

This study uses data provided by the General Social Survey (GSS), which is collected regularly by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) during in-person interviews throughout the United States. Table A and Table B include relevant information about the exogenous and endogenous variables of our study, respectively:

Table A: Exogenous Variables*

Variable Name	Definition	Unit of Measure	Limits of Measure
Education Level	Broken into dummy variables: "LessThanHS," "HS," "Assoc," "Bach," and "Grad." The survey question asked was, "Respondent's degree." The possible answers were: less than HS, HS grad, Associated degree, Bachelor's degree, and Graduate degree.	Degree type	Does not take into account partially finished degrees
Marital Status	Broken into dummy variables "Married," "Widowed," "Divorced," "Separated," and "NeverMarried." The survey question asked was, "Are you currently — married, widowed, divorced, separated, or have you ever been married?" The "Separated" response indicates that the respondent is not legally divorced but is living apart from their spouse and have not yet legally finalized their divorce.	—	Does not consider the quality of current relationship status (e.g. satisfaction in marriage, messiness of divorce, etc.)
Sex	Broken into dummy variables "Male" and "Female." The survey question asked was, "Code respondent's sex."	—	—
Age	The respondent answered the question, "respondent's age." It is measured by year, starting at 18 and ending at 89 or older. The survey question asked was, "Respondent's Age"	Years (integer)	—
Region**	Region is a dummy variable with "NewEngland," "MiddleAtlantic," "EastNorthCentral," "WestNorthCentral," "SouthAtlantic,"	—	Does not capture urbanity or ruralness

	"EastSouthCentral," "WestSouthCentral," "Mountain," and "Pacific." The survey question asked was, "Region of interview"		
Religion	Broken into dummy variables "Protestant," "Catholic," "Jewish," "None," "Other," "Buddhism," "Hinduism," "MuslimOrIslam," "OrthodoxChristian," "Christian." The survey question asked was, "What is your religious preference? Is it Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, some other religion, or no religion?" Additional responses were written in manually by respondents.	—	Does not consider level of devotion to the faith
Urbanity	Broken into dummy variables "Country_Nonfarm," "Farm," "Town_Lt_FiftyK," "FiftyK_to_TwoFiftyK," "City_Gt_TwoFiftyK," "Big_City_Suburb." The survey question asked was, "Which of the categories on this card comes closest to the type of place you were living in when you were 16 years old?" "FiftyK" and "TwoFiftyK" denote a population of fifty thousand people and two hundred and fifty thousand people, respectively. "Lt" and "Gt" mean "Less than" and "Greater than," respectively.	Population of municipality lived in at age 16	Does consider current residency

*All exogenous variable data collected by GSS interviewers
** "Region" is defined as the region in which the interview took place, not necessarily the region in which the respondent lived at the time they answered the survey.

Table B: Endogenous Variable*

Variable Name	Definition	Unit of Measure	Limits of Measure
Opinion on abortion for any reason (*abany*)	Binary "yes" or "no" answer to the question, "Please tell me whether or not you think it should be possible for a pregnant woman to obtain a legal abortion if a woman wants for any reason"	"Yes" or "no"	Opinions on abortion under specific circumstances are not considered in this variable

*All endogenous variable data collected by GSS interviewers

(v) Estimation Strategy

We will explore the relationship between individuals' demographic variables and their opinions on the legality of abortion by running a regression with several dummy variables. We

analyze correlations between our endogenous variable, which is a survey respondent's answer to the question, "Please tell me whether or not you think it should be possible for a pregnant woman to obtain a legal abortion if a woman wants for any reason" (*abany*) and our exogenous dummy variables, which include the education level, marital status, gender, and religion, and urbanity of respondents. Because our response variable encodes a "yes" or "no" response, we utilize a probit regression. We do not have a particular focal variable because we explore several demographic and experience-driving variables, which may contribute to a person's worldview and quite possibly, their views on abortion legality. This helps us correct for a problem pointed out by Emerson (1996): many facets of a person's life impact their views on abortion. Our estimation strategy helps us paint a detailed picture of how broad life experiences impact abortion views.

To run our probit regression, we drop all rows in our dataset which are missing data to any response. Notably, after filtering for those who did not respond to the question *abany*, most missing values come from respondents refusing to answer the question on their religion. A few responses were excluded for their lack of data on marital status. Thus our sample may be self-selecting for those who are proud of their religious views, and marital status. We also drop all data with age greater than 89, as the GSS data used does not record ages over 89 years numerically. See Appendices A and B for Stata scripts which carried out the estimation strategy.

(vi) Results

Table C: Probit Results with Average Marginal Effects

Average marginal effects — Number of obs = **1,510**
Model VCE: **OIM**

Expression: **Pr(abYes), predict()**
dy/dx wrt: **age HS Assoc Bach Grad Male Protestant Catholic Jewish Other Buddhism Hinduism MuslimOrIslam OrthodoxChristian Christian MiddleAtlantic EastNorthCentral WestNorthCentral SouthAtlantic EastSouthCentral WestSouthCentral Mountain Pacific Married Widowed Divorced Separated Country_Nonfarm Farm Town_Lt_FiftyK FiftyK_to_TwoFiftyK Big_City_Suburb**

	dy/dx	Delta-method std. err.	z	P>|z|	[95% conf.	interval]
age	-.0007319	.0008614	-0.85	0.395	-.0024203	.0009564
HS	.1179638	.0414403	2.85	0.004	.0367423	.1991853
Assoc	.1116181	.0562409	1.98	0.047	.001388	.2218482
Bach	.2512448	.0459164	5.47	0.000	.1612503	.3412393
Grad	.3200555	.0528555	6.06	0.000	.2164605	.4236504
Male	-.0188414	.024361	-0.77	0.439	-.066588	.0289052
Protestant	-.2373499	.029559	-8.03	0.000	-.2952845	-.1794154
Catholic	-.2164199	.0355815	-6.08	0.000	-.2861583	-.1466815
Jewish	-.0503357	.1071309	-0.47	0.638	-.2603084	.1596371
Other	.0419886	.1044082	0.40	0.688	-.1626477	.246625
Buddhism	-.065856	.1371154	-0.48	0.631	-.3345973	.2028853
Hinduism	-.2118549	.2164709	-0.98	0.328	-.6361301	.2124203
MuslimOrIslam	-.4001039	.1558312	-2.57	0.010	-.7055275	-.0946803
OrthodoxChristian	-.3746356	.1882092	-1.99	0.047	-.7435188	-.0057524
Christian	-.1852649	.1035288	-1.79	0.074	-.3881775	.0176478
MiddleAtlantic	.089038	.0651588	1.37	0.172	-.0386709	.2167469
EastNorthCentral	.0146401	.0583872	0.25	0.802	-.0997966	.1290769
WestNorthCentral	-.1186051	.0726432	-1.63	0.103	-.2609832	.023773
SouthAtlantic	-.0251728	.0569101	-0.44	0.658	-.1367146	.0863689
EastSouthCentral	-.2015352	.0706225	-2.85	0.004	-.3399528	-.0631176
WestSouthCentral	-.1065939	.0615477	-1.73	0.083	-.2272251	.0140374
Mountain	.0559865	.0661974	0.85	0.398	-.073758	.1857311
Pacific	.036006	.0596467	0.60	0.546	-.0808993	.1529114
Married	-.0926616	.0322771	-2.87	0.004	-.1559237	-.0293996
Widowed	-.0750587	.0573183	-1.31	0.190	-.1874005	.0372831
Divorced	-.0325334	.0410415	-0.79	0.428	-.1129732	.0479065
Separated	.0014009	.0673029	0.02	0.983	-.1305103	.1333121
Country_Nonfarm	-.1328924	.0458528	-2.90	0.004	-.2227622	-.0430226
Farm	-.0766613	.0575039	-1.33	0.182	-.1893669	.0360443
Town_Lt_FiftyK	-.1103005	.03487	-3.16	0.002	-.1786445	-.0419565
FiftyK_to_TwoFiftyK	-.0207531	.0396066	-0.52	0.600	-.0983806	.0568744
Big_City_Suburb	.0357818	.0437232	0.82	0.413	-.0499141	.1214777

Table C features several interesting results from our probit regression. Note that these results show probabilistic coefficients (average marginal effects.) At a threshold of 0.5, our regression is able to predict respondents' answer to *abany* correctly 66% of the time, indicating a decent model fit. The scripts used to prepare data and run this regression can be seen in appendices A and B.

First, we see that being Muslim has the greatest impact on abortion views, followed closely by being Orthodox Christian. On average, being Muslim makes one 40.0% less likely to favor abortion under any circumstance, and being Orthodox Christian makesone 37.5% less likely to favor abortion under any circumstance. Both of these effects are statistically significant at the 0.05 level. They are also both quite intuitive. Note that for religion, the response ‘not religious’ was left out to avoid the dummy variable trap. This ‘not religious’ baseline did not specify if respondents were atheist or agnostic, thus our regression does not account for active disbelief in god versus passive uncertainty. Catholic and Protestant were the only other religious groups which generated statistically significant coefficients, with average marginal effects of -21.6% and -23.7% respectively. These results bolster the findings of Emerson (1996), by showing that, when controlling for other life experiences which contribute to one's worldview, religion still may have an important effect. Being Jewish, Hindu, Buddhist, simply defining yourself as Christian (not Protestant, Catholic, or Orthodox), or being of an ‘other’ religion, does not have a statistically significant effect on a person’s support of abortion for any reason.

Following religion closely, we see that education, particularly attainment of a bachelor or graduate degree, is the second most influential factor in abortion views. Compared to an education without completion of a high school diploma (LessThanHS was the dropped dummy) we see that completing a bachelor's degree makes one 25.2% more likely on average to support

abortion for any reason, and completing a graduate level degree makes one 32.0% more likely on average to support abortion for any reason. These average marginal effects have the highest magnitudes aside from being Orthodox Christian or Muslim. We also see that completion of an Associate's degree and completion of high school make one more likely to support abortion for any reason, with respective average marginal effects of 11.2% and 11.8%. All coefficients on education are significant at the 0.05 level. Clearly, any level of education is quite an important experiential factor in determining views on abortion for any reason.

Some results contradict common beliefs or stereotypes around the subject of abortion. Firstly, gender has no statistically significant effect on abortion belief. Although the sign was negative, which we theorized due to a sense of solidarity amongst women, as well as the fact that abortions occur within womens bodies, it was not statistically significant. With such a high p value (0.44), we cannot conclude that gander has an effect distinguishable from 0. Furthermore, age is also not statistically significant. This result is consistent with Peterson and Smith's (2020) finding that political attitudes are generally stable over time, contrary to folk wisdom that older populations are more conservative and therefore less likely to support legal abortion rights.

The variable for marriage reveals that there is a statistically significant effect for non-married respondents to be more supportive of legal abortions for any reason than married couples. We theorized that marriage is likely to make an individual more beholden to traditional worldviews, and thus marriage will have a negative effect, which could explain this result. Another plausible explanation for this result is that married couples are more likely to want to have kids and many believe it is socially acceptable for married couples to have kids, whereas if you are unmarried, it is less socially acceptable.

We find that region and urbanity both have limited levels of statistical significance in their effects. For urbanity, we find that (when the respondent was 16 years old) living in towns with a population of less that 50,000, and living in the country, both have statistically significant effects, with average marginal effects of -11.0% and -13.3% respectively, as compared to living in a city with population greater than 250,000. Living on a farm does not carry a statistically significant coefficient. For region of the interview, we find that only EastSouthCentral has a statistically significant coefficient. This is likely because the EastSouthCentral region includes the states KY, TN, MS, and AL, which during 2018 were all republican dominated states, where other regions all include a mix of republican and democratic states.

(vii) Conclusion

We show that the factors included in our theoretical model do a fairly good job at predicting an individual's views on abortions. Our probit model correctly estimates 66% of responses based on those factors. Our model's predictions are quite a bit better than a random guess at random, or one informed by folk wisdom.

Our probit regression analysis also reveals that the two most impactful factors on a person's view of the legality of abortion for any reason are education and religion. In these areas, we saw the most statistical significance, and largest coefficient magnitudes. These findings could be useful in many ways, but are especially useful for organizations or individuals looking to advertise their own abortion views among groups with particular viewpoints. For instance, our results suggest that a politician who is highly pro-life should advertise their abortion stance in Muslim and Orthodox Christian communities for maximal coalition gains. On the contrary, an abortion rights activist group may find most success in advertising pro-choice events among

non-religious academic communities, with high proportions of graduate and bachelor degrees. Our regression suggests that targeted ad campaigns with higher specificity should also include consideration of Married people, those living in the country or small towns, or those living in the EastSouthCentral region. Additionally, our regression reveals that, when accounting for all the variables listed, age and gender need not be a focal area to target when campaigning for or against abortion.

Our probit regression analysis does not consider factors describing wealth, income, or race. These factors are likely important in painting a broader picture of one's worldview, and thus they may be useful in further study of demographic effects on abortion views. Inclusion of these factors may result in better predictive power of our model.

Another interesting avenue for further research would be to stratify regression based on subgroups, especially religious subgroups, educational subgroups, or regional subgroups. This approach would allow us to distinguish between differences in average marginal effects among different religious, education, or regional subgroups. Furthermore, this would allow for further specification in targeted marketing approaches, with alterations made based on subgroup differences.

(viii) References

Emerson, Michael O. "Through tinted glasses: Religion, worldviews, and abortion attitudes." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* (1996): 41-55. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1386394

Hans, Jason D., and Claire Kimberly. "Abortion attitudes in context: A multidimensional vignette approach." *Social Science Research* 48 (2014): 145-156. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0049089X14001252

Luna, Libertad Gonzalez, et al. *The Effect of Abortion Legalization on Fertility, Marriage and Long-Term Outcomes for Women*. 2018. *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=eoh&AN=1711489&site=ehost-live.

Peterson, Johnathan C., Kevin B. Smith, and John R. Hibbing. "Do people really become more conservative as they age?." The Journal of Politics 82.2 (2020): 600-611. https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1086/706889

Saad, L. (2022, May 12). *Education trumps gender in predicting support for abortion*. Gallup.com. https://news.gallup.com/poll/127559/education-trumps-gender-predicting-support-abortion.aspx

(ix) Appendices

Appendix A - PrepareData.do

```
/***************************
Mary Kate Richards, Jackson Stokes, Marko Suchy
Empirical project

Data wrangling script
***************************/
capture log close
clear all

cd
        "C:\Users\suchym24\Box\Econometrics\DATASETS_FOR_EMPIRICAL_GROUP_PRO
        JECT_export\General Social Survey 2018 (US)"

//initilize log
log using "log.log", replace

//get data
use "GSS2018_only2018vars.dta"

//response variables: question abany
//summarize abany

//Explanatory Variables: Education Level, Marital Status, Gender, Religion, Age, Rural/Urban
/*
summarize degree if abany == 1 | abany == 2 //education! This will need to be turned into a
        dummy var but its fine for now.
summarize marital if abany == 1 | abany == 2 //will need to be coded as dummy
summarize sex if abany == 1 | abany == 2
summarize relig if abany == 1 | abany == 2
summarize age if abany == 1 | abany == 2 //numerical. nice.
summarize region if abany == 1 | abany == 2
*/


//Now make a new dataset that only looks at relevants columns, and breaks them out into
        dummys if needed
keep abany degree marital sex relig age region res16
keep if abany == 1 | abany == 2


tabulate abany, generate(abany_dummy_)
tabulate degree, generate(degree_dummy_)
```

```
tabulate sex, generate(sex_dummy_)
tabulate relig, generate(relig_dummy_)
tabulate region, generate(region_dummy_)
tabulate marital, generate(marital_dummy_)
tabulate res16, generate(res16_dummy_)

//get rid of non-dummys
keep age abany_dummy_1 abany_dummy_2 degree_dummy_1 degree_dummy_2
        degree_dummy_3 degree_dummy_4 degree_dummy_5 sex_dummy_1 sex_dummy_2
        relig_dummy_1 relig_dummy_2 relig_dummy_3 relig_dummy_4 relig_dummy_5
        relig_dummy_6 relig_dummy_7 relig_dummy_8 relig_dummy_9 relig_dummy_10
        region_dummy_1 region_dummy_2 region_dummy_3 region_dummy_4
        region_dummy_5 region_dummy_6 region_dummy_7 region_dummy_8
        region_dummy_9 marital_dummy_1 marital_dummy_2 marital_dummy_3
        marital_dummy_4 marital_dummy_5 res16_dummy_1 res16_dummy_2 res16_dummy_3
        res16_dummy_4 res16_dummy_5 res16_dummy_6

//rename dummys
rename abany_dummy_1 abYes
rename abany_dummy_2 abNo

rename degree_dummy_1 LessThanHS
rename degree_dummy_2 HS
rename degree_dummy_3 Assoc
rename degree_dummy_4 Bach
rename degree_dummy_5 Grad
rename sex_dummy_1 Male
rename sex_dummy_2 Female
rename relig_dummy_1 Protestant
rename relig_dummy_2 Catholic
rename relig_dummy_3 Jewish
rename relig_dummy_4 None
rename relig_dummy_5 Other
rename relig_dummy_6 Buddhism
rename relig_dummy_7 Hinduism
rename relig_dummy_8 MuslimOrIslam
rename relig_dummy_9 OrthodoxChristian
rename relig_dummy_10 Christian
rename region_dummy_1 NewEngland
rename region_dummy_2 MiddleAtlantic
rename region_dummy_3 EastNorthCentral
rename region_dummy_4 WestNorthCentral
rename region_dummy_5 SouthAtlantic
rename region_dummy_6 EastSouthCentral
rename region_dummy_7 WestSouthCentral
rename region_dummy_8 Mountain
```

```
rename region_dummy_9 Pacific
rename marital_dummy_1 Married
rename marital_dummy_2 Widowed
rename marital_dummy_3 Divorced
rename marital_dummy_4 Separated
rename marital_dummy_5 NeverMarried
rename res16_dummy_1 Country_Nonfarm
rename res16_dummy_2 Farm
rename res16_dummy_3 Town_Lt_FiftyK
rename res16_dummy_4 FiftyK_to_TwoFiftyK
rename res16_dummy_5 Big_City_Suburb
rename res16_dummy_6 City_Gt_TwoFiftyK

//summarize stuff
summarize abYes
summarize abNo
sum LessThanHS
sum HS
sum Assoc
sum Bach
sum Grad
sum Male
sum Female
sum Protestant
sum Catholic
sum Jewish
sum None
sum Other
sum Buddhism
sum Hinduism
sum MuslimOrIslam
sum OrthodoxChristian
sum Christian
sum NewEngland
sum MiddleAtlantic
sum EastNorthCentral
sum WestNorthCentral
sum SouthAtlantic
sum EastSouthCentral
sum WestSouthCentral
sum Mountain
sum Pacific
sum age
sum Married
sum Widowed
sum Divorced
```

```
sum Separated
sum NeverMarried
sum Country_Nonfarm
sum Farm
sum Town_Lt_FiftyK
sum FiftyK_to_TwoFiftyK
sum Big_City_Suburb
sum City_Gt_TwoFiftyK


//save the data!
save "regression_data.dta", replace

log close
```

Appendix B - Run_Regression.do

```
/***************************
Mary Kate Richards, Jackson Stokes, Marko Suchy
Empirical project

Regression Running Script
***************************/

capture log close
clear all

cd
        "C:\Users\suchym24\Box\Econometrics\DATASETS_FOR_EMPIRICAL_GROUP_PRO
        JECT_export\General Social Survey 2018 (US)"

//initialize log
log using "regress.log", replace

//get data
use "regression_data.dta"

//data manipulation
//this stuff needs to get filled in!
drop if missing(Catholic) //drops rows which don't have an answer for religion
gen age_str = string(age)
drop if age_str == "89 or older" //drops non-numeric age stuff
drop age_str

drop if missing(Married)
```

```
//run a probit regression
//Baseline dummys: LessThanHS, Female, None (religion), New England, Nevermarried,
        City_Gt_TwoFiftyK
probit abYes age HS Assoc Bach Grad Male Protestant Catholic Jewish Other Buddhism
        Hinduism MuslimOrIslam OrthodoxChristian Christian MiddleAtlantic EastNorthCentral
        WestNorthCentral SouthAtlantic EastSouthCentral WestSouthCentral Mountain Pacific
        Married Widowed Divorced Separated Country_Nonfarm Farm Town_Lt_FiftyK
        FiftyK_to_TwoFiftyK Big_City_Suburb

//look at predictive power
predict pred_probs, pr
gen pred_class = pred_probs >= 0.5
gen correct_pred = pred_class == abYes
sum correct_pred

//look at average marginal effects
margins, dydx(*) post


ssc install outreg2
outreg2 using probit_result.xls


log close
```