

Attribution Bias in Major Decisions: Evidence from the United States Military Academy

Kareem Haggag, Richard W. Patterson, Nolan G. Pope, and Aaron Feudo*

June 10, 2019

Abstract

Using administrative data, we study the role of attribution bias in a high-stakes, consequential decision: the choice of a college major. Specifically, we examine the influence of fatigue experienced during exposure to a general education course on whether students choose the major corresponding to that course. To do so, we exploit the conditional random assignment of student course schedules at the United States Military Academy. We find that students who are assigned to an early morning (7:30 AM) section of a general education course are roughly 10% less likely to major in that subject, relative to students assigned to a later time slot for the course. We find similar effects for fatigue generated by having one or more back-to-back courses immediately prior to a general education course that starts later in the day. Finally, we demonstrate that the pattern of results is consistent with attribution bias and difficult to reconcile with competing explanations.

*Haggag: Social and Decision Sciences, Carnegie Mellon University, kareem.haggag@cmu.edu. 208-H Porter Hall, Pittsburgh, PA 15213. Patterson: Department of Social Sciences, United States Military Academy, richard.patterson@usma.edu. B117 Lincoln Hall, West Point, NY 10996. Pope: Department of Economics, University of Maryland, pope@econ.umd.edu. 3115H Tydings Hall, 7343 Preinkert Dr., College Park, MD 20742. Feudo: Department of Social Sciences, United States Military Academy, aaron.feudo@usma.edu. B103E Lincoln Hall, West Point, NY 10996. We thank Linda Babcock, Susan Carter, Jeffrey Denning, Tatiana Homonoff, Lars Lefgren, Jordan Matsudaira, Tobin McKearin, Devin Pope, Joseph Price, Nathan Wozny, and seminar audiences at Brown University, Carnegie Mellon University, the United States Military Academy, and Wesleyan University for helpful comments. The opinions expressed herein reflect the personal views of the authors and not those of the United States Military Academy, U.S. Army, or Department of Defense.

1 Introduction

When making consequential decisions, such as choosing a partner or career, people are likely to reflect on their prior experiences to inform which choice will provide them with the highest well-being. The standard economic model predicts that people will recognize the role that temporary physical and emotional states, such as inclement weather or fatigue, played in their prior experiences and will not be overly influenced by those states when making their choices.

However, theory and evidence from psychology and behavioral economics suggest that individuals may make systematic mistakes when responding to changes in physical and emotional states. In particular, a growing body of literature has found evidence of prospective mistakes in the form of projection bias (Loewenstein et al., 2003): instances in which individuals act *as if* their current temporary state will persist into the future.¹ More recently, Haggag et al. (2018) proposed a model and demonstrated evidence of retrospective mistakes in the form of attribution bias: instances in which individuals misattribute the influence of a prior temporary state to a fixed property of their utility over a good or activity. For example, they find that random variation in thirst experienced while sampling a new drink has a significant influence on people’s later stated willingness to drink it again in the future. In this paper, we test for attribution bias in an important decision with long-run consequences: the choice of a college major. If students are subject to such attribution bias, prior incidental emotional and physical states during initial exposure to academic subjects may have undue influence on their college major choice.

Specifically, we test whether student fatigue generated by plausibly random variation in course schedules (i.e. “incidental fatigue”) influences students’ graduating major at the United States Military Academy (USMA). Our study design is motivated by evidence that students exhibit diminished performance in early morning courses (Carrell et al., 2011; Ed-

¹e.g. (Conlin et al., 2007; Busse et al., 2015)

wards, 2012; Dills and Hernandez-Julian, 2008) and in courses that are scheduled immediately after one or more back-to-back course (Pope, 2016; Williams and Shapiro, 2018), presumably due to heightened levels of fatigue. We hypothesize that the level of incidental fatigue students experience in a course may extend beyond their coincident performance; influencing their judgment of the overall corresponding subject and thus their resultant college major.

Our study employs two unique approaches to identify the effects of incidental fatigue on major choice. For both of these approaches we take advantage of the fact that students schedules are randomly assigned conditional on their registered courses and whether they are a Division I athlete. First, we test if being assigned to a first period (7:30 AM) section of a required course (e.g. Economics 101) influences the choice to major in a corresponding subject (e.g. Economics).² Second, we test whether variation in the number of back-to-back courses students are assigned immediately before (on the same day of) a required course influences major choice.³ This second approach allows us to compare students with different levels of fatigue from the exact same classroom, thus enabling us to rule out potential classroom-level effects of fatigue on major choice such as instructor quality or peer effects. To employ these tests, we use administrative records from USMA containing the course schedules and college major choices of 18,753 students from 2001 to 2017.

We find that students are significantly less likely to major (using graduating major) in a course’s subject area when conditionally randomly assigned to an early morning course. Our estimates suggest that students assigned to an early morning section of a course are approximately 10% less likely to major in a subject related to that morning course, relative to students assigned to a later time slot for the course.⁴ We also find that each additional

²Students at USMA declare a major online during a 4-5 week window during the first semester of their sophomore year. This window opens between August 27 and September 11 and closes between September 29 and October 11.

³Courses at USMA are all 55 minutes long and only start at one of six times: 7:30 AM, 8:40 AM, 9:50 AM, 11:00 AM, 1:55 PM and 3:05 PM. A course is defined as having a “back-to-back course” immediately before it if there is no break between courses in the schedule prior to it. For example, if a student has one class at 8:40 AM and another at 11:00AM, the 11:00 AM class will be treated as having 0 immediately preceding courses. If the student instead has an additional class at 9:50 AM, then the 11:00 AM class will be treated as having 2 immediately preceding courses and the 9:50 AM class will be treated as having 1 immediately preceding course. Finally, the counts are reset at 1:55 PM, as all classes prior to this period will have had a lunch break in the schedule.

⁴This estimate corresponds to a 0.20 percentage point reduction relative to the mean of 1.9 percent. This baseline mean is relatively small due to the nature of the decision problem. Our approach relies on matching each of the 18 general education

course immediately preceding a class reduces the probability that students major in a related subject by approximately 12%. Our main specifications isolate variation between students with the same set of registered courses in a semester (i.e. the same “course roster”), but who are conditionally randomly assigned to different timings for those courses (i.e. a different “course schedule”). We show that these results are robust to a number of modifications including the addition of faculty fixed effects and using a broader mapping of courses to majors. Moreover, we provide a simple falsification test against the concern that students may select (on unobservables) into preferable schedules for courses in their intended majors. We show that the same identification strategy does not predict college major when looking at the semester after students have made their college major choice (the fourth semester).

Furthermore, we find a number of patterns that are inconsistent with the neoclassical model of rational choice and better fit a model of attribution bias. Specifically, we address the hypothesis that students avoid majors sampled under fatigue because they rationally anticipate being less prepared for success in those majors. First, we find evidence that the effects of fatigue on performance are not persistent. In a subsample of courses that have more than one required course in the sequence (chemistry, English, math, and physics), fatigue does reduce students grades in the initial course, but has no negative effect on the subsequent required course in the sequence (in the following semesters). Second, our results across different sources of fatigue generate patterns that cannot be explained by a stable response to reduced performance. We find that while having an early morning class or a preceding class reduces the likelihood of majoring in the corresponding major by nearly the same amount of roughly 10 percent, having an early morning class or a preceding class have significantly different effects on course performance: reducing a student’s GPA by 0.053 and 0.015 standard deviations, respectively. Moreover, simple linear extrapolations of our estimates suggest that, if performance differences fully explained the results, then fairly

courses to a corresponding major (producing 14 course-to-major mappings – see Table A.1 for a breakdown). Since roughly 71.31% of students enroll in majors that do not have a clear corresponding general education course (31.18% engineering, 8.06% foreign language, and 32.07% other noncorresponding majors), the dependent variable is capturing the remaining 28.69% of majors split over the 14 course-to-major mappings.

small grade differences (0.12-0.50 standard deviations) would be enough to eliminate all majors in a subject. Finally, we find similar negative effects of fatigue on major choice in specifications that conservatively control for coincident performance.⁵

Our results have several implications. First, we provide field evidence of attribution bias in a highly consequential decision environment. Our estimates of attribution bias are both statistically significant and large in magnitude, suggesting that increasing the stakes of a decision do not eliminate the effects of attribution bias.⁶ Second, college major choice significantly impacts earnings (Arcidiacono, 2004) and well being (Wiswall and Zafar, 2014). Understanding the factors that influence this choice can help inform students, professors, and college administrators. Finally, our results yield simple, low-cost policy prescriptions to institutions that want to increase or decrease the probability that students select a certain major. By modifying what early morning courses are offered or manipulating the breaks before certain courses, universities can nudge students toward or away from certain majors.

This paper contributes to three distinct literatures. First, this paper expands the behavioral literature on state-dependent preferences. Recent work has found evidence of projection bias (Loewenstein et al., 2003) – behavior resulting from individuals underestimating the degree to which their current tastes will match their future tastes in other states – in a variety of settings. For example, evidence of projection bias has been documented in catalog orders (Conlin et al., 2007), automobile purchases (Busse et al., 2015), gym attendance (Acland and Levy, 2015), and – most closely related to our study – college enrollment decisions (Simonsohn, 2009). In contrast, evidence of attribution bias (Haggag et al., 2018) – behavior resulting from misattributing the influence of a temporary state to a fixed attribute of a good or activity – is much more limited. With the exception of Haggag et al. (2018), who provide evidence of misattribution of thirst in evaluating a drink and weather in evaluating a vacation destination, there is little rigorous evidence of attribution bias in economics.

⁵This last result, however, is subject to the strong caveats associated with controlling for a post-treatment outcome.

⁶In section 4.3, we benchmark our estimates against other determinants of college major. For example, we find that the effect of a 7:30 AM section is similar to that of being assigned to an instructor who received a 1 standard deviation lower evaluation in past semesters of the course.

Additionally, this paper builds on a literature examining the effects of fatigue on individual judgment and performance. Recent research suggests that both the time of day and prior exertion can have a significant effect on outcomes and decisions in both work and academic environments. Workers are less productive, prone to make mistakes, and more likely to be injured during night shifts (Folkard and Tucker, 2003; Smith et al., 1994) and students perform worse when they take early morning courses (Carrell et al., 2011; Edwards, 2012; Dills and Hernandez-Julian, 2008). Prior exertion also appears to have a significant influence on judgment and performance: judges become less likely to make the difficult decision to parole inmates as the number of cases they have seen in a row increases (Danziger et al., 2011), medical residents make significantly more mistakes the longer they have been on their shifts (Landrigan et al., 2004; Barger et al., 2006), and students perform worse in classes if they have attended multiple prior courses (Pope, 2016; Williams and Shapiro, 2018). While each of these studies show that fatigue affects contemporaneous judgment and performance, we are unaware of any prior studies that examine how fatigue affects future decision making.

Lastly, this paper contributes to the broad literature on college major choice. Prior research has identified a number of standard factors that influence college major choice including differential tuition and student aid (Denning and Turley, 2017; Sjoquist and Winters, 2015; Stange, 2015), expected earnings (Berger, 1988; Beffy et al., 2012; Arcidiacono et al., 2012), instructor characteristics (Bettinger and Long, 2005; Carrell et al., 2010), ability (Arcidiacono et al., 2012; Stinebrickner and Stinebrickner, 2013), and tastes and preferences (Arcidiacono, 2004; Zafar, 2013). Our paper also fits within a smaller literature on the role of behavioral influences in college major, job, and career choice, including the roles of overconfidence (Reuben et al., 2017), psychological debt aversion (Field, 2009), and social information (Coffman et al., 2017).

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section II describes a conceptual framework of college major choice that accounts for attribution bias. Section III describes our study environment and data. Section IV reports our empirical strategy and primary

results. Section V presents robustness tests of our results and explores the rational and psychological explanations for our findings. Section VI concludes.

2 Conceptual Framework

In this section, we discuss a simple framework for how attribution bias may affect a student’s selection of a college major. The framework applies the model of attribution bias outlined by Haggag et al. (2018) to college choice. In the Haggag et al. (2018) model of consumer choice, an agent attempts to predict her instantaneous utility of consuming c while in state s_t , having previously consumed the item in an alternative state s_{t-1} . The agent is said to demonstrate attribution bias if her predicted utility falls between her true utility in her current (or future) state and her realized utility in the prior different state, i.e. $\tilde{u}(c, s_t) = (1 - \gamma)u(c, s_t) + \gamma u(c, s_{t-1})$ for some $\gamma \in [0, 1]$. In this context, s is understood as the fatigue generated by either time of day or prior courses taken in the day.⁷

The college major choice studied in this paper departs from the stylized consumer choice model and the experiments discussed in the earlier work in a few ways. First, the “consumption” episode (i.e. each class meeting) is repeated numerous times before the retrospective decision period (i.e. the college major choice); however, the setting is almost ideal because the state is kept relatively constant across these several repeated consumption episodes.⁸ Second, we narrowly define the consumption episodes as the class meeting times; however, students are likely to engage with the subject in other time periods during the semester (e.g. doing homework in the evening), a fact that works against us finding evidence of attribution bias. Third, in making a college major choice, the student is not only forecasting utility across similar consumption episodes (e.g. class meetings which may be spread across the

⁷While we model the prediction of utility as occurring in the state of time t (and thus characterized as attribution bias), it is possible that students are making their mental *decision* in the state of time $t-1$ (i.e. while sitting in the classroom). We believe this is justified since students are typically making the *choice* (i.e. declaring their major) at a time period outside the class (see footnote 2). However, the alternative case could be characterized as an initial projection bias made at time $t-1$ that remains sticky through to the point of the choice at time t .

⁸More precisely, the treatment variable, class time, is held constant. The manipulated state, fatigue, may acclimate to class time as the semester progresses, but this should weaken our effects.

day in future semesters), but also across episodes that may substantially differ (e.g. working in careers associated with that major).

As with prior work, we do not identify the specific mechanisms underlying the complementarity between the state and the consumption item. For example, one may experience higher utility of consuming a food when hungry due to hunger affecting the sensitivity of taste/smell receptors or through heightened attention to the taste itself (e.g. at the expense of attending to other attributes such as nutrition or texture). Likewise, in the context of this paper, incidental fatigue could lower one’s utility from taking a class by diminishing goal-oriented attention broadly (e.g. see Boksem et al. (2005)) or through how any particular attribute is evaluated (e.g. by increasing irritability with an instructor’s speaking style or tone that might otherwise be ignored). Beyond those attentional or mood channels, students may make misattributions over how difficult the subject is, their own subject-specific ability, or how “interesting” the subject is. Although a variety of factors such as future job characteristics, future pay, faculty, and program reputation are likely to influence a student’s choice of major, a number of studies suggest that the most important factors are a student’s subject-specific abilities and whether she enjoys or is interested in the subject (e.g. Beggs et al., 2008; Malgwi et al., 2005; Zafar, 2013) – thus misattributions over these factors may be particularly important. In Section 5.2, we begin the process of disentangling these channels using revealed preference and student course evaluation data. Ultimately, future work with more detailed and mixed data sources may be able to better parse the underlying channels of misattribution.

3 Data and Empirical Strategy

3.1 Data

Data for this study come from administrative records at the United States Military Academy (USMA) at West Point, NY and includes 233,452 student-course observations from 18,753

freshman and sophomore USMA students between the years of 2001 and 2017. The main unit of analysis in the data is a student-course observation. USMA is a 4-year undergraduate institution with an approximate enrollment of 4,400 students. In total, USMA offers 38 majors within basic science, engineering, humanities, and social science. USMA also provides all students with the equivalent of a “full-ride” scholarship, but also requires students to attend all assigned classes, graduate within four years, and complete a 5 year service commitment in the United States Army. In spite of these unique attributes, the admissions rate, student-to-faculty ratio, class size, racial composition, and standardized test performance are similar to selective liberal arts colleges such as Williams College, Davidson College, and Washington and Lee University (Carter et al., 2017). USMA admits 10% of all applicants, has a student to faculty ratio of 7:1,⁹ and limits class sizes to 18 students. The racial composition of our sample, shown in Table 1, is 72.1% white, 8.7% Hispanic, 8.5% black, and 7.2% Asian. Also, the standardized test performance in our sample reflects the selectivity of USMA, with average SAT math and verbal scores of 652/800 and 639/800 respectively.¹⁰ While in many ways the student population is similar to other selective liberal arts colleges, there are characteristics that are unique. Only 16.5% of students in our sample are female, 16.3% have prior military service, 22.1% have prior college experience, 16.3% previously attended a military preparatory academy, 33.2% are Division I athletes, and students come from across the country with students from every state.¹¹

In comparison to other colleges, students’ time and schedules are highly structured at USMA. In the first three semesters, student schedules consist of 15 required courses in basic science, humanities, and social science.¹² These 15 courses are only taught to students in

⁹Source: <https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?q=united+states+military+academy&s=all&id=197036>. Accessed 9/14/2017.

¹⁰National averages during this time were approximately 516/800 and 501/800 for math and verbal scores, respectively. Source: <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=171> accessed 4/17/2018.

¹¹This diversity is driven by a rule that places a limit on the number of students that can come from each congressional district.

¹²During the first three semesters at USMA, student schedules consist nearly entirely of the required courses listed in Table A.1. Specifically, students typically take 14/18 of the courses listed in Appendix Table A.1. during their first three semesters at USMA. All students who do not test out of the following courses will take Chemistry 1, Chemistry 2, English Composition, Literature, Calculus 1, Calculus 2, Psychology, Computer Science, and Physics (9 total courses). Students also select 2/3 history courses available (US History, Western Civilization, World History), and additionally, students will be assigned two of

particular semesters and can be seen in Appendix Figure A.1. Students do not have control over the order of these courses. Students are required to take each of these courses unless they test out. When courses are offered is also highly structured: courses at USMA are all 55 minutes long and only start at one of six times: 7:30 AM, 8:40 AM, 9:50 AM, 11:00 AM, 1:55 PM and 3:05 PM.¹³ All classes are assigned a fixed time, but not a fixed day of the week: courses rotate weekly between a Monday/Wednesday/Friday schedule and a Tuesday/Thursday schedule so all course are seen on each day of the week throughout the semester.¹⁴ Particularly important to our approach is that instead of students choosing their own schedules, USMA's registrar's office assigns the time, day, and instructor for each course. This plausibly random assignment to course scheduling is a key component of our identification strategy. In addition, on a typical day students are required to participate in breakfast formation at 6:55 AM and breakfast from 7:05 to 7:20 AM. Depending on students schedules, some students start their first classes as soon as 7:30 AM and classes, studying, and rest occur from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM with a break for lunch.¹⁵ The evening consists of intramural and varsity athletics, dinner, and an evening study period. The scheduled study period ends at 11:30 PM and students are instructed to turn their overhead lights off at 12:00 AM.¹⁶ Also important to our analysis is the structured process of selecting a major. Within the years of our sample, students declare a major during the first semester of their sophomore year during a 4-5 week window.¹⁷ Students then begin coursework in their selected major

Geography, American Politics, Economics, and Philosophy in the first semester of their sophomore year. Finally, depending on math preparation, students either take a math sequence of Math Modeling, Calculus 1, and Calculus 2, or a sequence of Calculus 1, Calculus 2, and Probability and Statistics. Once a student's course roster for the semester is set, the registrar's office uses a computer algorithm to assign a student to specific time and instructor for each course. This algorithm does account for scheduling constraints, such as Division I sport practices in scheduling, but does not consider student demographic characteristics when determining the assigned time of day for a course.

¹³These listed start times are for years 2007-2017. From 2001 to 2006, classes at USMA started at 7:35 AM, 8:40 AM, 9:45 AM, 10:50 AM, 1:50 PM, and 2:55 PM. Given the similarity of these start times to those from 2007-2017, we treat these courses as if they started at 7:30 AM, 8:40 AM, 9:50 AM, 11:00 AM, 1:55 PM and 3:05 PM, respectively.

¹⁴Classes that begin this rotation on the first day of the semester are called Day 1 courses and classes that begin on the second day of the semester are called Day 2 courses. In total there are six Day 1 slots and six Day 2 slots.

¹⁵All students are required to attend breakfast formation and breakfast. However, many students without a 7:30 AM class take a nap after breakfast.

¹⁶Students may continue studying with a desk lamp after 12:00 AM.

¹⁷USMA tradition is to refer to freshman, sophomores, juniors, and seniors as Plebes, Yearlings, Cows, and Firsties, respectively. We use the more common terminology for clarity. This window to choose majors opens between August 27 and September 11 and closes between September 29 and October 11. Beginning with the graduating class of 2019, students declared a major in between their first and second year, but could easily change majors prior to their junior year. We include these students in our sample, but our results are robust to excluding the class of 2019 and 2020 and only including observations from

the first semester of their junior year. It should be noted that 83% of students graduate with the major they choose in the first semester of their sophomore year. In addition, our analysis focuses on the 29% of students who enroll in majors that correspond to a general education course in the first three semesters, as many majors at USMA do not have such a course.

The structured nature of the first two years for students at USMA has several characteristics that make this setting ideal for testing the relationship between course scheduling and major choice. Because all students are either required to take or test out of a set list of courses, students have nearly identical schedules. This allows us to compare outcomes among students who take the exact same roster of courses in a semester. Also, because students all select their majors at the same time during their third semester, we are able cleanly identify which courses could plausibly influence a student’s major choice. Additionally, because students do not have control of when they take classes during the day, it is plausible that students are conditionally randomly assigned to class hours.¹⁸ Finally, because students face strict consequences for missing courses, we do not have to be concerned with differential attendance driving our results.¹⁹

The key assumption in our identification strategy is that students are conditionally randomly assigned to instructors and course schedules. The unique environment at USMA, where students have little control over which courses they take and do not choose their instructors or course hours, makes self-selection into courses at certain times with certain instructors unlikely. However, we examine the randomization to course schedules in Tables 2 and 3. In Table 2 we compare observable characteristics between students assigned to first period courses and courses at other periods during the day, where each observation is at the student-course level. In column 1 of Table 2 we simply regress the individual characteris-

the first year.

¹⁸While there are certain factors that influence when a student takes a class (e.g. certain courses are not offered at all hours and student athletes practices that conflict with certain periods), they are observable to the researcher and assignment to classes at a certain hour are plausibly randomly assigned conditional on these factors.

¹⁹The typical penalty for students who have an unexcused absence is to spend 10 hours during the weekend walking along a line in a formal uniform.

tics onto assignment to a first period course, controlling for year fixed effects. With 3/11 characteristics differing at the 1% level and a joint F-test p-value of 0.00, the observable characteristics are not unconditionally balanced across first and other period courses. This, however, is unsurprising. Because not all courses are offered in every period, assignment to a first hour course is partially a function of a student's course roster. Students with different course rosters are also likely to be different on other dimensions, so controlling for students course composition is an important precursor for conditionally random assignment to courses. Additionally, Division I athletes have practice schedules that often keep them from taking early morning courses. Therefore, in column 2 of Table 2 we control for both course roster fixed effects and an indicator for Division I athlete status. The student characteristics appear to be balanced once these controls are added, with no characteristics varying between first and other hour courses at the 5% level, a joint F-test p-value of 0.19, and only age of students varying at the 10% level.²⁰ Adding course fixed effects in column 3 does little to change the coefficient or joint test values. Column 4 adds a more flexible control for athlete schedules, including a sport-by-semester fixed effect instead of a general indicator. This control does make age differ across course times at the 5% level, but improves the overall balance: increasing the f-stat p-value from 0.22 to 0.63. Furthermore, an age difference of -0.001 years is likely to be economically insignificant. Adding faculty fixed effects in column 5 makes little difference for the individual or joint balance across characteristics. Altogether, columns 2-5 of Table 2 suggest that assignment to first hour courses is random after controlling for course composition and Division I athlete status.

In Table 3, we also examine whether the variation in the number of preceding courses a student has before a course appears to be conditionally random. In column 1 we do not control for student course roster fixed effects and find some differences in characteristics among students with different numbers of preceding courses. Specifically, 1/12 variables differ at the 1% level in column 1 and the Joint F-statistic p-value is 0.03. However, including

²⁰Conditional on the other covariates, a Division I athlete is 1.99% less likely to be enrolled in an early morning class than a non-athlete (p-value = 0.000).

course roster fixed effects and controls for Division I athlete status eliminates the imbalance across characteristics. In columns 2-4 – which add course roster fixed effects, course fixed effects, and sport-by-semester fixed effects, respectively – no variables significantly differ and all generate F-statistic P-values greater than 0.95. Adding unique course fixed effects (i.e. the interaction between instructor, semester, section, and course) in column 5 does lead the sex of students to vary at the 5% level. However, no other variables differ at any significance level and the joint F-statistic has a p-value of 0.39. Similar to our findings in Table 2, Table 3 suggests that variation in the number of preceding courses is conditionally random after controlling for course roster fixed effects.

4 Methods and Results

4.1 Methods

We start by examining the relationship between assignment to a 7:30 AM course and whether a student selects a corresponding major. This approach is similar to that taken by Carrell et al. (2011) to study the effects of school start time on performance at the United States Air Force Academy (USAFA).²¹ To identify the causal effects of being assigned an early morning class on college major choice, we estimate the following equation:

$$Y_{icjts} = \beta F_{icts} + \delta_1 X_i + \delta_2 \frac{\sum_{k \neq i} X_{kcts}}{n_{cts} - 1} + \delta_3 R_{it} + \gamma_c + \phi_j + \lambda_t + \epsilon_{cjts} \quad (1)$$

where Y_{icjts} is an indicator for whether individual i in course c with professor j during time-slot s in year t chooses to major in a corresponding subject area.²² F_{icts} is an indicator

²¹A more exact extension of their approach would be to estimate the effects of being assigned an early morning course on whether students select the corresponding major(s) of any of their classes throughout that day (rather than just for the first course of the day). However Carrell et al. (2011) only find performance effects throughout the day when the first course started at 7:00 AM. When courses started at USAFA at 7:30 AM (as at USMA) Carrell et al. find students perform poorly in the 7:30 AM course but there are no residual effects of an early morning courses on the performance of students later in the day. We reproduce this finding in our context: assignment to a 7:30 AM course reduces performance in the course, but does not affect performance in subsequent courses. For this reason we focus our analysis only on the first hour courses.

²²We observe both the major students initially select and the major students finally choose (i.e. graduating major). Our analyses use the graduating major as the outcome of interest. However, our results do not change in magnitude or significance if we use initial major choice as our outcome instead.

of whether the course is an early morning course (7:30 AM). X_i is a vector of student characteristics including: age, sex, race/ethnicity, SAT math and SAT verbal test scores, and leadership scores. $\frac{\sum_{k \neq i} X_{kcts}}{n_{cts}-1}$ is a vector of the average characteristics of a student's peers within a course. Particularly important to our analysis is our course roster fixed effect (R_{it}), which is a fixed effect for the particular combination of courses a student takes in a given semester.²³ Due to the rigid structure of when students take courses, the course roster fixed effect additionally subsumes a semester fixed effect. By comparing outcomes only among students who share the exact same combination of courses, we are able to isolate the effect of scheduling differences on course outcomes. Additionally, γ_c is a course fixed effect (e.g. Calculus I or World History),²⁴ ϕ_j is an instructor fixed effect, and λ_t is a year fixed effect. Our controls also include fixed effects for the number of courses a student has assigned on that same day and for the number of courses immediately preceding each course. These variables are intended to isolate the fatigue generated by early morning assignment from other sources of fatigue such as exertion.²⁵ In the above equation, our parameter of interest is β which measures the effect of being assigned an early morning course on the probability of a student selecting a major in that early morning course's subject area. We estimate this equation with ordinary least squares, two-way clustering our standard errors by both individual and course section.

In our second empirical strategy, we estimate whether the number courses of immediately preceding a required course affects major choice. This design draws motivation from studies such as Pope (2016) and Williams and Shapiro (2018), which find that students perform

²³All students are required to complete or test out of all assigned first and second year courses. Additionally, several courses have honors sections that students are admitted into by either (a) having high academic qualifications or (b) expressing strong interest in majoring in the subject area. To avoid selection into testing out of certain courses or taking honors sections biasing our results, we include a fixed effect for each combination of courses students take. One caveat is that we treat all language courses as being the same course, as language courses are the courses over which students can exert the greatest amount of choice, and including all combinations of languages and core courses would begin to closely approximate an individual fixed effect.

²⁴Honors and non-honors sections are treated as different courses.

²⁵By controlling for the number of courses and immediately preceding courses, our equation estimates the difference in major choice from those with similar workloads (e.g. both have a break before class and have the same number of courses they have prepared for), but one is assigned 7:30 AM section and another is assigned a later section. Our estimates are robust to excluding these controls, as can be seen in appendix Table A.2.

worse as they spend more time in school on a given day. Additionally, this approach relates to a broader literature that links sustained effort to a drop in performance across a number of domains (e.g. Folkard and Tucker, 2003; Landrigan et al., 2004; Danziger et al., 2011). To identify the effects of the number of preceding courses on college major choice, we estimate:

$$Y_{icjts} = \beta_1 \textit{Preceding}_{icjts} + \delta_1 X_i + \delta_2 \frac{\sum_{k \neq i} X_{kcts}}{n_{cts} - 1} + \delta_3 R_{it} + \gamma_{ctjs} + \lambda_t + \mu_i + \epsilon_{cjs} \quad (2)$$

where $\textit{Preceding}_{icjts}$ is a count of immediately preceding courses and γ_{ctjs} is an instructor-semester-section-course (i.e. “unique class”) fixed effect. Our controls also include fixed effects for the period of the course to isolate the fatigue generated by preceding courses. All other variables are identical to those specified in Equation 1. More specifically our regressor of interest, $\textit{Preceding}_{icjts}$, is defined as the streak of courses (i.e. with no break in between) before the course of interest. For example, if a student has one class at 8:40 AM and another at 11:00AM, the 11:00 AM class will be treated as having 0 immediately preceding courses. If the student instead has an additional class at 9:50 AM, then the 11:00 AM class will be treated as having 2 immediately preceding courses and the 9:50 AM class will be treated as having 1 immediately preceding courses. Finally, the counts are reset at 1:55 PM, as all classes prior to this period will have had a lunch break in the schedule. The variation in the preceding course measure is shown in Appendix Table A.11.

In addition to providing another source of variation in fatigue, this second approach allows us to exploit variation in fatigue within specific classrooms. Using this within-course variation in our estimates is attractive because it allows us to rule out potential classroom level effects of fatigue on major choice, such as the fatigue of the instructor or peer effects.

4.2 Results

We present our estimates of equations (1) and (2) in Panel A and B of Table 4 respectively. Columns 1-3 of Panel A report the estimates of the effects of early morning classes outlined in equation (1).²⁶ In each specification in Panel A our estimate of β is negative and statistically significant, indicating that assignment to a 7:30 AM course decreases the probability that a student will select a corresponding major. Column 1 of Table 3, which does not control for faculty, demographic, or peer demographic controls, suggests that assignment to an early morning course decreases the probability that a student majors in a corresponding major by 9.99%, or 0.19 percentage points (significant at the 5% level). Controlling for instructor fixed effects, demographic controls, and classmate demographics in columns 2 and 3 has no effect on our estimates: each of these specifications indicate that assignment to an early morning course reduces the probability that a student chooses a corresponding major by 10.34% and 10.53% respectively, or 0.20 percentage points (all significant at the 5% level).²⁷

In Panel B of Table 4 we estimate whether prior exertion also influences what major a student selects. Specifically, we examine whether the number immediately preceding courses a student is assigned—a different source of incidental fatigue—affects whether students choose a corresponding major. Our results corroborate our findings in Panel A and further suggest that fatigue reduces the probability that a student selects the corresponding major. In column 1 of Panel B we estimate Equation 2 with course subject fixed effects instead of unique course fixed effects.²⁸ In this estimate we find that each immediately preceding course decreases the probability that a student selects a corresponding major by 7.94% or 0.15 percentage points (significant at the 5% level). In each column 2-3 of Panel B we control for unique course fixed effects, additionally including demographic controls in column 3. These

²⁶Estimates that replace the dependent variable with a broader mappings of courses to majors and estimates that exclude athletes can be found in Appendix Tables A.5 and A.6. Our results are robust to these alternate specifications. Mappings of courses to broad and narrow majors can be found in Appendix Table A.1.

²⁷While we use a series of controls and fixed effects in our main specifications to ensure conditional randomization, we see similar results in simplified versions of our primary models. Tables A.2 and A.3 show estimates of simplified versions of our models alongside estimates of our primary models.

²⁸This specification is nearly identical to the specifications outlined in Equation 1 and estimated in Table 3, except with a treatment of number of preceding courses in place of a treatment of 7:30 AM course.

specifications control for any classroom-specific variation such as the level of preparation and fatigue of the instructor, the light, smell, and temperature in the room, and the behavior of the students within the class. Both of these specifications provide consistent evidence that increasing the number of back-to-back courses before a class reduces the probability of majoring in a related subject. In column 2 we find that each immediately preceding course decreases the probability that a student chooses a narrowly defined corresponding major by 12.11% or 0.23 percentage points (significant at the 1% level). Adding demographic controls in column 3 does not change our estimates or precision.

4.3 Effect Magnitudes

To provide context for our results, in Table 5 we estimate four benchmark comparisons for our results. The first two estimates exploit similarly (conditionally) randomly assigned influences (instructor characteristics), while the latter two use potentially endogenous regressors. The first benchmark is motivated by Carrell et al. (2010), who find that female students are more likely to select STEM majors if the instructors in their general education STEM courses are female as well. In column 1 of Table 5, we examine the effect of having a female instructor in a general education STEM course on the likelihood that a female student enrolls in the corresponding major. We find that women are about 0.64 percentage points more likely to choose a corresponding major when their instructor is female, a point estimate that is about four times larger in absolute magnitude than our estimated effects of early morning course assignment and each immediately preceding course.²⁹

The second benchmark is the effect of being randomly assigned to an instructor with better prior course evaluations for that same course. In column 2 of Table 5, we find that assignment to an instructor with a 1 standard deviation higher prior aggregate course-evaluation average increases the probability that a student majors in a corresponding course by 0.19 percentage

²⁹We find that assignment of female students to either male or female instructors in STEM courses is uncorrelated with student characteristics, which allows us to estimate a causal relationship between instructor assignment and major choice.

points.³⁰ This estimate is nearly identical in absolute magnitude to our effects of early morning courses and immediately preceding courses on major choice.

In column 3 of Table 5 we estimate the correlation between a student’s course evaluation and major choice. While this relationship is not causal, we find that a student who gives a course a 1 standard deviation higher rating is 0.70 percentage points more likely to choose a corresponding major. This suggests that our effects of fatigue are comparable with approximately a 0.27 standard deviation drop in instructor evaluations. In column 4 we similarly examine the correlation between student performance and major choice and find that a 1 standard deviation improvement in grades corresponds to a 1.38 percentage point increase in the probability that a students select a corresponding major. Therefore, our estimates are comparable with approximately a 0.14 standard deviation drop in performance.

While the magnitude of the effects of fatigue on major are large in percent terms (with both 7:30 courses and each preceding course decreasing the probability that students major in a related subject by approximately 10%), our estimates are small in percentage point terms due to the low probability that students eventually choose majors that correspond to required courses at USMA. A reasonable question is whether our estimates would grow in percentage-points if the baseline probability of choosing a major increased. In Appendix Table A.10, we estimate our results separately by low- and high-popularity majors.³¹ Although these estimates lack the precision of our primary specifications, we find that the percentage point effect size scales reasonably with the baseline popularity. In panel A of Appendix Table A.10, we find that assignment to a 7:30 AM section of a course reduces the probability that students choose a corresponding major by 0.11 percentage points (or 12.86%) in low-popularity majors and by 0.35 percentage points in high-popularity majors (or 8.47%), with neither estimate being statistically significant. In panel B of Appendix Table A.10 we find that that each

³⁰We construct our measure of prior course evaluations by averaging all of an instructors prior evaluations within a course and then creating a z-score measure within a course. Similar to our findings in column 1, we find that student observable characteristics are uncorrelated with prior course characteristics.

³¹Low-popularity majors include Chemistry, English, Math, Philosophy, Physics, US History, and Western Civilization. High-popularity majors include American Politics, Economics, Geography, International History, IT/Computer Science, and Psychology.

preceding course reduces the probability that students choose a corresponding major by a statistically insignificant 0.03 percentage points (or 4.11%) in low-popularity majors and by 0.50 percentage points (or 12.10%) in high-popularity majors, which is significant at the 5% level.

5 Mechanisms

5.1 Fatigue and Attribution Bias

Our analysis is motivated by the assumptions that early or back-to-back courses increase student fatigue, and that the resultant fatigue in a class reduces a student’s overall enjoyment of it (i.e. that the class experience is state-dependent with respect to fatigue). An ideal dataset would allow us to measure the effect of the course schedule assignment on fatigue (i.e. a “manipulation check”) and that a student’s experience in a course is worse when fatigued (i.e. a “first stage” test of state-dependence). In the absence of these measures, we provide some suggestive evidence using the available large-scale administrative data. First, as a partial attempt at a manipulation check, we test whether students’ grades in a class are affected in the expected direction by course schedules. Second, to shed light on state-dependence, we combine the class schedule data with course evaluations (over the subset of years for which there is coverage: 2008 to 2017). While there is no overall assessment of the class, and many of the questions ask students to evaluate the instructor, the pattern may shed light on students’ enjoyment of the course. For both sets of analyses, we repeat our primary specifications but change the outcome variables to student performance or course evaluation rather than college major choice.

In column 1 of Panel A of Table 6 we find that assignment to an early morning course reduces performance by 0.047 standard deviations (significant at the 1% level).^{32,33} Including

³²Normalized grades are calculated by taking the distance in standard deviations from the course code-by-semester mean grade. This is very similar to the approach taken by Carrell et al. (2011). The effect size in our context is between 38%-62% of the estimates found for the effects of a 7:30 AM class time in that paper (Columns 4-6 of Table 5 in Carrell et al. (2011)). Our specification most closely follows column 5, which is the estimate that is most similar to our own effect size.

³³The degree to which grades reflect true learning differences hinges on the grading structure of courses. At one extreme, if

instructor fixed effects, student demographics, and peer demographics in columns 2 and 3 slightly increases the magnitude of these estimates to 0.051 and 0.053 standard deviations, respectively. Panel B of Table 6 similarly shows that each additional immediately preceding course reduces performance by between 0.014 and 0.017 standard deviations. Altogether our results in Table 6 are consistent with early morning courses and preceding courses increasing student fatigue and reducing student performance.

The data underlying the student evaluation exercise come from anonymous, voluntary, end-of-the-semester, online evaluations by USMA students starting in 2008. Despite these evaluations being optional, we maintain a 62% response rate among the courses in our sample. Each course evaluation includes 10 questions that were determined at the institutional level.³⁴ Students who start an evaluation are required to answer all questions to submit the evaluation, so we have even coverage of all 10 questions. We verify that evaluation response rates are not significantly predicted by assignment to a 7:30 AM course nor by the number of immediately preceding courses. Table 7 reports the analysis of the student evaluations. Columns 1-3 report the effect of having an early morning course on evaluations for different specifications and columns 4-6 report the effect of having immediately preceding courses. The first row shows the effect on an aggregate evaluation that puts equal weight on each of the 10 standardized questions regarding the instructor (5), course (2), schedule (2), and peers (1). Regardless of the specification, having an early morning course decreases a student's aggregate evaluation of the course by between 0.13 and 0.15 standard deviations. Although the effect size varies some for each specific question, the effect of an early morning course is highly statistically significant for each student evaluation question and ranges from 0.07 to 0.15 standard deviations. By contrast, we do not find significant effects of the number of immediately preceding courses.

every professor aimed to assign the exact same grade distribution, then average grades would be identical across all courses. While we cannot fully rule out some within-class curving, the USMA strongly discourages it. The official grading policy is as follows: "To the extent consistent with subject matter, instructors will provide cadets with a statement of the objectives for each course. Cadets will be evaluated against these objectives. Departments will avoid evaluation and grading practices that encourage reliance on curving." [Source: USMA Academic Program (Redbook), AY 2013-2013]

³⁴Departments and course directors can (and do) add additional questions. However we focus our analysis on the 10 questions asked to all students in our sample.

Several issues complicate the interpretation of the student evaluation data. First, it could be the case that students treat course evaluations as a recommendation to future students, and thus attempt to adjust for the influence of fatigue on their enjoyment before answering. Under that interpretation, the analysis of course evaluations would itself be a test of attribution bias rather than the “first-stage” verification of state-dependence. Second, we do not have an overall assessment of the course or course content, but rather a set of questions heavily representing instructor performance. It is perhaps then unsurprising that we find negative effects for the 7:30 AM empirical strategy which may reflect instructor fatigue, but do not find it in immediately preceding courses results, where instructor and peer fatigue are held constant.³⁵ Ultimately, while columns 1-3 are suggestive of some scope for state-dependence, the evaluation data are limited in what they can say.

5.2 Rational Response

While our results in Table 6 strongly suggest that students in early morning courses and with immediately preceding courses are fatigued, they also open the possibility that the decrease in the probability that students select a corresponding major is not driven by attribution bias, but a rational response to reduced performance. Specifically, students who were fatigued in certain courses because of random variation in their course schedules may be aware that they would have performed better in a later course or after a break *and* are aware of the influence of course schedule variation on other aspects of the college major choice, such as enjoyment of the subject materials. In spite of this understanding, students may still decide not to pursue a corresponding major because their schedule caused them to believe that they are less prepared to succeed in that subject.

One reason to doubt that this rational channel could fully explain our primary results is

³⁵Under this interpretation of the evaluation data, part of the treatment effect observed for the 7:30 AM identification strategy may reflect the worse performance of the instructors. Such a channel is a bit different than the model described in our conceptual framework. Rather than making an *intrapersonal* misattribution (i.e. failing to adjust for their own states), students may be making an *interpersonal* misattribution (i.e. failing to adjust for instructors’ states). Ultimately, our data do not allow us to disentangle these two subtly different mechanisms for the early morning results.

the difference in magnitude of the estimates between Panel A and B in Table 6. In Tables 4, our estimates of the effects of early morning courses and preceding courses on major selection are nearly identical. If both of these effects were driven entirely through differential preparation, we would also expect the effects of early morning courses and preceding courses on performance to be similar. However, our estimates of the effects of early morning courses on performance in columns 1-3 of Panel A in Table 6 are approximately four times the magnitude of the effects of preceding courses on performance reported in columns 1-3 of Panel B.

Another reason to question whether a rational response to reduced preparation could be driving our results is the implied magnitude of the effect of reduced preparation on college major choice. Our estimates of equation (1) in Tables 4 and 6 suggest that first hour courses reduce the probability that students select a corresponding major by 10.53% and course performance by 0.053 standard deviations. If the negative effect on major selection is completely driven by a rational response to lesser preparation, then linearly extrapolating our estimates suggests that on average a 0.52 standard deviation reduction in preparation, or roughly the difference between a B and B-, could be enough to eliminate all majors in core subjects.³⁶ Our estimates of equation (2) in Tables 4 and 6, which indicate that each preceding course reduces the probability that a student majors in a related course by 12.11% and reduces performance by 0.015 standard deviations, suggest an even smaller effect of preparation on major choice. Linearly extrapolating these estimates suggests that if our results are driven by a lack of preparation, then an average reduction of preparation of 0.12 standard deviations could be enough to eliminate all majors from core courses. With the caveat that these estimates are extrapolated far beyond our existing estimates, we find it unlikely that a decline in preparation in the range of 0.12-0.50 standard deviation would lead

³⁶We calculate this value by first identifying that in our preferred specification, first period assignment reduces the probability that a student majors in a subject by 10.53%. To determine the drop in grade that would eliminate all majors, we divide the effect of first hour course on grade (0.053 standard deviations) by 10.53% or 0.1053. The standard deviation of performance in our sample is 0.73 grade points, so a 0.50 standard deviation reduction in performance is equivalent to a 0.37 grade point drop. The difference between a B and a B- is 0.33 grade points.

all students in core courses to select different majors at USMA. Alternatively, we could use the estimated correlation from Table 5 that a 1 standard deviation improvement in grades corresponds to a 1.38 percentage point increase in the probability that a student selects a corresponding major. This correlation likely overestimates the causal effect of performance on major selection, as unobserved ability potentially drives both. Nevertheless, even using this estimate along with the treatment effects on performance (0.053 or 0.015 standard deviations) would suggest that only 36% of the effect of first hour assignment and 9% of the effect of preceding courses on major choice could be explained through the performance channel.

To further investigate whether it is plausible that students avoid majors due to persistent disadvantages caused by assignment to a 7:30 AM course or multiple courses in a row, we examine performance in required classes that are part of a sequence within the core curriculum (chemistry, English, math, and physics). In Tables 8 and 9, we test whether students assigned to those conditions in the first course of a sequence (e.g. Chemistry 1) perform worse in the next required class in the same subject area (e.g. Chemistry 2). Our findings in Table 8 are somewhat surprising: our estimates in columns 1-3 of Panel A indicate that assignment to a 7:30 section has a positive effect on performance in the next required subject area course of between 0.010 and 0.023 standard deviations. One potential concern is that students in courses identified in Panel A of Table 8 do not experience the same effects of 7:30 AM courses as identified in Table 6. Specifically, if there were little to no immediate effect of 7:30 AM courses on performance in the courses identified in Table 8, then we would be uncomfortable generalizing these results to the classes that are not followed by a required course. However, our results in columns 1-3 of Panel B of Table 8 indicate that the immediate effects of assignment to a 7:30 AM course on performance in these initial subject area courses (-0.053 to -0.067 standard deviations) is similar to the overall effects of 7:30 AM course assignment on performance reported in Table 6 (-0.047 to -0.053 standard deviations). Together the patterns in Panel A and B of Table 8 suggest that persistent negative effects of

early morning course assignments on performance are unlikely to be large and that students may actually slightly benefit in the long-run from an early morning class assignment.

In Table 9 we explore whether being assigned preceding courses before a class affects performance in future classes in the same subject area. Our results in Table 9 are consistent with our findings in Table 8. In column 1 in Panel A of Table 9 we find a small, but statistically insignificant, negative effect of preceding courses on future performance. However, including unique course fixed effects and demographic controls in columns 2-3 generate positive, but statistically insignificant, estimates of the effects of preceding courses on future performance. One caveat to our results in Table 9 is that our estimates of preceding courses on current performance are imprecise and smaller in magnitude than our estimates in Table 6, so these estimates should be interpreted more cautiously than those presented in in Table 8. Nevertheless, neither our results in Tables 8 nor 9 indicate that fatigue has persistent negative effects on performance. These results help rule out the possibility that our primary results are generated by a rational response to reduced performance.

Given that our findings are unlikely to be driven by a rational response to increased fatigue, we finally turn to exploring our primary posited mechanism of attribution bias. In our conceptual framework, we identified that student's states in early morning courses could generate attribution bias through two primary channels. First, students may misattribute the negative effects of fatigue on performance to their subject-specific ability. Second, students may misattribute the unpleasantness of taking a course when fatigued to a lack of enjoyment of the subject. One way to explore whether our effects are coming through performance or some other channel, such as tastes, is by including course performance as a covariate in our estimates. In Table 10 we include controls for course performance in the specifications outlined in equations (1) and (2) to examine whether the effects of fatigue operate through the channel of performance or some other channel.³⁷ There are two important caveats to this approach. First, because course performance is endogenous, the estimates in these are no

³⁷ Angrist et al. (2016) use the same approach to disentangle the crowd-in and crowd-out effects of a large grant program on other forms of student aid.

longer unbiased and should be interpreted cautiously. Second, even if the response to early morning courses is completely loading on performance this does not rule out other channels. For example, poor performance may be a result of a reduction of interest in the subject area. Nevertheless, we find that the results in Table 10 are suggestive that channels that rely on a response to performance are unlikely to fully explain our results. In columns 1-3 of Panel A we find that controlling for course performance reduces the absolute magnitude of our estimates of the effect of 7:30 AM courses on major choice by between 32% and 37% and makes our estimates statistically insignificant. In Panel B of Table 10 we find more compelling evidence that the effects of fatigue are not acting through a channel of reduced performance. After controlling for performance, we find in columns 1-3 of Table 10 that each additional preceding course reduces the probability that students major in a related course by between 6.84% and 11.05% (or between 0.13 and 0.21 percentage points), which is nearly identical to the range of effects found in our primary estimates shown in Table 4.

5.3 Alternate Mechanisms and Robustness Checks

An alternative explanation of our results is that poor performance in a required course could mechanically reduce the probability that students enroll in a corresponding major. While there are no formal performance standards to be admitted into a major at USMA, departments do have to approve an application to a major and have the discretion to reject an application. If departments have implicit grade standards in subject-area courses, then poor performance in a corresponding course might mechanically reduce the probability that students select a major. To address this potential concern we separate majors by the fraction of students who receive worse than a 3.0 grade point (i.e. B average) in corresponding required courses and enroll in the major. Majors with low fractions of below 3.0 grade point students we designate as “selective” majors. If our effects are driven by “selective” majors, we may be concerned about a mechanical relationship between variation in course schedules and college major choice. However, in Appendix Table A.4 we show that there is

no evidence that our results are driven by selective majors but find suggestive evidence that both the effects of early morning courses and number of preceding courses on major choice are primarily driven by courses with less selective admission patterns. These results suggest that the effects are not driven by grade cut-offs.

Another potential concern is that, in spite of balance across observable characteristics observed in Tables 2 and 3, unobserved selection into course schedules could be contributing to our results. This potential unobserved selection could bias the results in either direction. Specifically, it is possible that students who have unobservable preferences for certain majors are able to arrange their schedules to have courses related to those majors at preferred times (i.e. times other than 7:30 AM and after breaks) causing an upward bias. Alternatively, if students could completely avoid early morning classes such that only “morning people” take early morning classes then our estimates may be biased downward. To test for this type of selection, we take advantage of the fact that students take required courses in both semesters during their Sophomore year, but are required to declare a major during the first semester of their Sophomore year. Instead of using graduation major as the outcome variable as done with all of the previous results, we instead use the initial major choice students make during the first semester of their Sophomore year.³⁸ We perform a falsification test that tests whether fatigue experienced during a course taken in the second semester of the sophomore year predicts the initial major choice made in the prior semester. If there is selection on unobservables, then the results of this falsification test should be similar to our main results. The results of this test are reported in Table 11. We find no evidence that having either an early morning class (Panel A) or preceding courses (Panel B) in the semester after a student’s college major decision affects a student’s major choice. The effects for early morning are in fact in the opposite direction of the main effects, although statistically insignificant. The effects for preceding courses are in the same direction of the main effects, however much smaller and statistically insignificant, suggesting a limited scope for selection

³⁸Note that 83% of students graduate with the major they choose in the first semester of their sophomore year.

on unobservables to explain the results.³⁹

We additionally examine the extent to which our results change as we expand the course-to-major mapping. We start in Appendix Table A.5 with a broader definition of the corresponding major, primarily as a robustness check. For example, while our main results examine how fatigue in a course (e.g. Chemistry 101) affects the likelihood of pursuing the most directly comparable major (e.g. Chemistry), in Column 2 we allow for a slightly expanded set of majors (e.g. Chemistry or Chemical Engineering).⁴⁰ The results across Panels A and B of Column 2 suggest that fatigue has a similar effect on the selection of narrowly- and broadly-defined corresponding majors. As we move across the table to Columns 3 and 4, we follow the same approach of expanding the outcome variable, but with the goal of examining substitution more broadly (rather than as a robustness test). In particular, in Column 3 we examine whether experiencing fatigue in a course (e.g. Chemistry 101) affects the likelihood that a student chooses a major within the corresponding *field* (e.g. Science, which includes 10 majors in total).⁴¹ Finding a null effect in Column 3, for example, would suggest that the effects found in Columns 1 and 2 were entirely produced by substitutions within a field (e.g. switching from a counterfactual major of Chemistry to Biology). The estimates in the third column of Table A.5 are imprecisely estimated, but larger in absolute magnitude than those in the first and second column, suggesting that the effects of fatigue are not entirely driven by substitutions within a field. Finally, in Column 4 we expand the

³⁹Because of a much smaller sample size (56,327 vs. 233,452), our estimates in Table 11 are significantly less precise than our primary estimates. Nevertheless, we believe that this falsification test is informative because the results in Panel A of Table 11 are opposite signed of the primary estimates in Panel A of Table 4 and the results in Panel B of Table 11 are less than half the magnitude of the primary estimates in Panel B of Table 4.

⁴⁰Broadly defined major definitions are outlined in Appendix Table A.1

⁴¹We define four fields: Engineering/Technology/Math (ETM), Science, Social Science, and Humanities. ETM majors (11) include all majors in the Civil & Mechanical Engineering, Electrical Engineering & Computer Science, Math, Systems Engineering, and Nuclear Engineering departments. Science majors (10) include all majors within the Chemistry & Life Science, Geography & Environmental Engineering, and Physics Departments. Social Science majors (8) include all majors within the Social Sciences and Behavioral Science & Leadership Department. Humanities majors (8) include all majors within Law, History, Foreign Language, English, Philosophy & Language, and Military Instruction departments. To construct the mapping, we additionally need to classify the introductory courses into their respective field classification, as follows. ETM courses include: Calculus I, Calculus II, Information Technology, Math Modeling, and Probability and Statistics. Humanities Courses include: Philosophy, all English courses, and all History courses. Science courses include: Chemistry I, Chemistry II, Physical Geography, and Physics. Social Science Courses include American Politics, Economics, and Psychology. We do not map majors to the Kinesiology Major in the the department of education but do classify this as a non-stem major.

outcome to a binary classification of STEM vs. Non-STEM majors.⁴² While Column 3 provides evidence consistent with switching between the four broad fields, the results of column 4 suggest that it is confined within the binary STEM classification.⁴³

Across Appendix Tables A.6, A.7, and A.8, we run additional robustness checks to test the sensitivity of our results to the composition of our sample and the way we define the treatments. In Appendix Table A.6 we exclude athletes from our primary specifications, and find this has little effect on our estimates. In Appendix Table A.7, we simultaneously estimate the effects of being assigned to 7:30 AM, 8:40 AM, 11:00 AM, 1:55 PM and 3:05 PM courses (omitting the most commonly assigned course period of 9:40AM) on selecting a corresponding major. We find that while assignment to 7:30 AM courses reduces the probability that students major in a related subject, assignment to 11:00 AM courses *increases* the probability that students major in a course. Finally, in Appendix Table A.8 we estimate equation (2), but replace our linear definition of preceding courses with an indicators for one, two, and three preceding courses. We find similar point estimates for one and two preceding courses on major selection (with the one period estimates being measured with more precision), but a much larger negative effect of three preceding courses. Our results, however, are not precise enough to rule out linear effects.

Finally, in Appendix Table A.9 we examine heterogeneity by student characteristics including sex, race, prior college experience, and academic aptitude. While we do not see consistent heterogeneous effects of fatigue across sex, race, or academic aptitude, we find that early morning courses and preceding courses have larger estimated effects on students without prior experience. While this result is consistent with the predictions of attribution bias, the differences between students with and without prior college experience are too imprecisely estimated to draw any certain conclusions.

⁴²The STEM classification simply groups the Science and ETM fields together and the non-stem classification groups Humanities and Social Science fields together along with the Kinesiology major.

⁴³In the fourth column of Panel A in Table A.5 we do not find evidence of assignment early morning courses affecting whether a student selects a major with the same STEM classification. In the fourth column of Panel B in Table A.5 our estimate of the effects of preceding courses on choosing a major with the same STEM classification is negative, but smaller in absolute magnitude than the other estimates of preceding courses imprecisely estimated.

6 Conclusion

This paper documents an attribution bias in the consequential domain of college major choice. We find that USMA students are less likely to enroll in a major if they are assigned to an early morning section of the corresponding introductory (general education) course. This result is consistent with students misattributing the negative effects of their temporary fatigue in the class to some fixed attribute of the overall subject. While the early morning course assignment does generate slightly diminished performance in the class itself, we show the overall effect is difficult to fully explain by a rational expectation of diminished performance in the corresponding major. Moreover, we show that this type of attribution bias also holds for a second, but related type of fatigue generated by course timings (back-to-back courses).

Our results have immediate policy implications, insofar as they generalize to other universities. For example, an institution that would like to increase the number of majors in a particular subject may be able to do so at little or no cost by ensuring that the corresponding introductory course is offered after a break and outside of the early morning time-slot. While it may seem that such policies are zero-sum in the sense that one department's gain in majors will be another department's loss, this may not be the case. Given that many students in the US are on the margin of dropping out of college, it is possible that institutions could increase retention by minimizing fatigue across all introductory classes while students form their first impressions of fields.⁴⁴ Beyond scheduling, institutions may wish to shift other resources to their introductory courses (e.g. higher quality instructors), as this initial experience may have a large influence on major choice.

The findings of this paper also have implications that go beyond education policy. In prior work, Haggag et al. (2018) find evidence of attribution bias generated by temporary states of thirst and weather in the decisions of whether to consume a drink and return to an

⁴⁴Source: <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=40> accessed 10/12/2017

amusement park, respectively. Our evidence of attribution bias is generated by a different temporary state (fatigue) in a decision with much higher stakes (college major choice). The consistency of our findings with those of Haggag et al. (2018), in spite of the significant differences in contexts, suggest that the influence of attribution bias on decision making could be widespread.

References

- Acland, Dan and Matthew R Levy**, “Naiveté, projection bias, and habit formation in gym attendance,” *Management Science*, 2015, *61* (1), 146–160.
- Angrist, Joshua, Sally Hudson, Amanda Pallais et al.**, “Evaluating Post-Secondary Aid: Enrollment, Persistence, and Projected Completion Effects,” Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2016.
- Arcidiacono, Peter**, “Ability sorting and the returns to college major,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 2004, *121* (1), 343–375.
- , **V Joseph Hotz, and Songman Kang**, “Modeling college major choices using elicited measures of expectations and counterfactuals,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 2012, *166* (1), 3–16.
- Barger, Laura K, Najib T Ayas, Brian E Cade, John W Cronin, Bernard Rosner, Frank E Speizer, and Charles A Czeisler**, “Impact of extended-duration shifts on medical errors, adverse events, and attentional failures,” *PLoS Med*, 2006, *3* (12), e487.
- Beffy, Magali, Denis Fougere, and Arnaud Maurel**, “Choosing the field of study in postsecondary education: Do expected earnings matter?,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2012, *94* (1), 334–347.
- Beggs, Jeri Mullins, John H Bantham, and Steven Taylor**, “Distinguishing the Factors Influencing College Students’ Choice of Major,” *College Student Journal*, 2008, *42* (2), 381.
- Berger, Mark C**, “Predicted future earnings and choice of college major,” *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 1988, pp. 418–429.
- Bettinger, Eric P and Bridget Terry Long**, “Do faculty serve as role models? The impact of instructor gender on female students,” *American Economic Review*, 2005, pp. 152–157.
- Boksem, Maarten AS, Theo F Meijman, and Monique M Lorist**, “Effects of mental fatigue on attention: an ERP study,” *Cognitive brain research*, 2005, *25* (1), 107–116.
- Busse, Meghan R, Devin G Pope, Jaren C Pope, and Jorge Silva-Risso**, “The psychological effect of weather on car purchases,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2015, *130* (1), 371–414.
- Carrell, Scott E, Marianne E Page, and James E West**, “Sex and Science: How Professor Gender Perpetuates the Gender Gap,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, August 2010, *125* (3), 1101–1144.
- , **Teny Maghakian, and James E West**, “A’s from Zzzz’s? The causal effect of school start time on the academic achievement of adolescents,” *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 2011, *3* (3), 62–81.
- Carter, Susan Payne, Kyle Greenberg, and Michael S Walker**, “The impact of computer usage on academic Performance: Evidence from a randomized trial at the United States military academy,” *Economics of Education Review*, 2017, *56*, 118–132.

- Coffman, Lucas C, Clayton R Featherstone, and Judd B Kessler**, “Can Social Information Affect What Job You Choose and Keep?,” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2017, 9 (1), 96–117.
- Conlin, Michael, Ted O’Donoghue, and Timothy J Vogelsang**, “Projection bias in catalog orders,” *The American Economic Review*, 2007, 97 (4), 1217–1249.
- Danziger, Shai, Jonathan Levav, and Liora Avnaim-Pesso**, “Extraneous factors in judicial decisions,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2011, 108 (17), 6889–6892.
- Denning, Jeffrey T and Patrick Turley**, “Was that SMART? Institutional financial incentives and field of study,” *Journal of Human Resources*, 2017, 52 (1), 152–186.
- Dills, Angela K and Rey Hernandez-Julian**, “Course scheduling and academic performance,” *Economics of Education Review*, 2008, 27 (6), 646–654.
- Edwards, Finley**, “Early to rise? The effect of daily start times on academic performance,” *Economics of Education Review*, 2012, 31 (6), 970–983.
- Field, Erica**, “Educational debt burden and career choice: evidence from a financial aid experiment at NYU law school,” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2009, 1 (1), 1–21.
- Folkard, Simon and Philip Tucker**, “Shift work, safety and productivity,” *Occupational medicine*, 2003, 53 (2), 95–101.
- Haggag, Kareem, Devin G Pope, Kinsey B Bryant-Lees, and Maarten W Bos**, “Attribution Bias in Consumer Choice,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 2018, (Forthcoming).
- Landrigan, Christopher P, Jeffrey M Rothschild, John W Cronin, Rainu Kaushal, Elisabeth Burdick, Joel T Katz, Craig M Lilly, Peter H Stone, Steven W Lockley, David W Bates et al.**, “Effect of reducing interns’ work hours on serious medical errors in intensive care units,” *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2004, 351 (18), 1838–1848.
- Loewenstein, George, Ted O’Donoghue, and Matthew Rabin**, “Projection bias in predicting future utility,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2003, 118 (4), 1209–1248.
- Malgwi, Charles A, Martha A Howe, and Priscilla A Burnaby**, “Influences on students’ choice of college major,” *Journal of Education for Business*, 2005, 80 (5), 275–282.
- Pope, Nolan G**, “How the time of day affects productivity: Evidence from school schedules,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2016, 98 (1), 1–11.
- Reuben, Ernesto, Matthew Wiswall, and Basit Zafar**, “Preferences and biases in educational choices and labour market expectations: Shrinking the black box of gender,” *The Economic Journal*, 2017, 127 (604), 2153–2186.
- Simonsohn, Uri**, “Weather to go to College,” *Economic Journal*, 2009, 120, 270–280.
- Sjoquist, David L and John V Winters**, “State merit aid programs and college major: A focus on STEM,” *Journal of Labor Economics*, 2015, 33 (4), 973–1006.

- Smith, Lesley, Simon Folkard, and CJM Poole**, “Increased injuries on night shift,” *The Lancet*, 1994, 344 (8930), 1137–1139.
- Stange, Kevin**, “Differential pricing in undergraduate education: Effects on degree production by field,” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 2015, 34 (1), 107–135.
- Stinebrickner, Ralph and Todd R Stinebrickner**, “A major in science? Initial beliefs and final outcomes for college major and dropout,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 2013, 81 (1), 426–472.
- Williams, Kevin M and Teny Maghakian Shapiro**, “Academic achievement across the day: Evidence from randomized class schedules,” *Economics of Education Review*, 2018, 67 (4), 158–170.
- Wiswall, Matthew and Basit Zafar**, “Determinants of college major choice: Identification using an information experiment,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 2014, 82 (2), 791–824.
- Zafar, Basit**, “College major choice and the gender gap,” *Journal of Human Resources*, 2013, 48 (3), 545–595.

Tables and Figures

Table 1: Summary Statistics for Cadets

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.	N
Female	0.165	0.371	0	1	18,753
Asian	0.072	0.258	0	1	18,753
Black	0.085	0.279	0	1	18,753
Hispanic	0.087	0.282	0	1	18,753
White	0.721	0.449	0	1	18,753
Prior Military Service	0.163	0.370	0	1	18,753
Prior College Attendance	0.220	0.414	0	1	18,753
USMA Preparatory Academy	0.149	0.356	0	1	18,753
Division I Athlete	0.332	0.471	0	1	18,753
Age	19.8	1.005	18	27	18,753
Average Number of Courses	5.14	0.269	2	6.5	18,753
SAT Verbal	639	73.4	300	800	18,753
SAT Math	652	68.4	390	800	18,753

Observations from students attending USMA between 2001 and 2017.

Table 2: Assignment to First Period Classes: Conditional Randomization Checks

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Female	0.0023*	0.0017	0.0017	-0.0003	-0.0003
	(0.0013)	(0.0012)	(0.0012)	(0.0013)	(0.0011)
Age	-0.0005	-0.0013*	-0.0013*	-0.0014**	-0.0012**
	(0.0007)	(0.0007)	(0.0007)	(0.0007)	(0.0006)
Asian	-0.0014	-0.0006	-0.0006	-0.0010	0.0001
	(0.0020)	(0.0019)	(0.0020)	(0.0020)	(0.0018)
Black	-0.0053***	-0.0026	-0.0026	-0.0019	-0.0019
	(0.0020)	(0.0018)	(0.0018)	(0.0018)	(0.0016)
Hispanic	-0.0004	0.0018	0.0018	0.0015	0.0013
	(0.0016)	(0.0016)	(0.0016)	(0.0016)	(0.0014)
SAT Verbal	0.0032***	-0.0000	-0.0000	-0.0002	-0.0006
	(0.0012)	(0.0011)	(0.0011)	(0.0011)	(0.0010)
SAT Math	-0.0048***	-0.0003	-0.0003	-0.0003	-0.0003
	(0.0016)	(0.0014)	(0.0014)	(0.0014)	(0.0013)
Academic Composite	-0.0032	0.0000	0.0000	0.0001	0.0004
	(0.0022)	(0.0018)	(0.0018)	(0.0018)	(0.0016)
Prior Service	-0.0014	0.0015	0.0015	0.0015	0.0020
	(0.0030)	(0.0028)	(0.0028)	(0.0028)	(0.0025)
Prior College	0.0010	0.0017	0.0017	0.0015	0.0013
	(0.0020)	(0.0019)	(0.0019)	(0.0019)	(0.0017)
USMA Preparatory School	-0.0038	-0.0040	-0.0040	-0.0027	-0.0026
	(0.0031)	(0.0029)	(0.0028)	(0.0028)	(0.0026)
N	233,452	233,452	233,452	233,452	233,452
R^2	0.0031	0.0323	0.2059	0.2061	0.2592
F-Stat P-Value	0.0000	0.1948	0.2209	0.6257	0.6018
Division I Athlete	N	Y	Y	N	N
Course Roster FE	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Course FE	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Sport x Semester FE	N	N	N	Y	Y
Faculty FE	N	N	N	N	Y

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Each specification represents results for a regression where the dependent variable is an indicator for first period. The SAT verbal, SAT math, and academic composite variables were divided by 100 prior to estimation. All specifications include a year fixed effects and Columns 2 and 3 include an indicator for being a recruited Division I athlete. In both Columns 2 and 3, Division I athlete status is associated with an 0.58 percentage point increase in assignment to a 7:30 AM course (p-value=0.00). The course roster fixed effect is a fixed effect for the particular combination of courses a student takes in a given semester (e.g. Calculus I, Economics, US History, and Physics). Robust standard errors are two-way clustered at the individual and section-by-year levels (15,370 total clusters).

Table 3: Number of Preceding Classes: Conditional Randomization Checks

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Female	0.0003 (0.0030)	0.0004 (0.0030)	0.0004 (0.0030)	0.0012 (0.0032)	0.0063** (0.0028)
Age	0.0002 (0.0015)	-0.0004 (0.0015)	-0.0004 (0.0015)	-0.0003 (0.0015)	-0.0009 (0.0013)
Asian	0.0043 (0.0045)	0.0047 (0.0046)	0.0046 (0.0046)	0.0050 (0.0046)	0.0053 (0.0041)
Black	-0.0009 (0.0043)	-0.0028 (0.0042)	-0.0028 (0.0042)	-0.0006 (0.0042)	-0.0031 (0.0036)
Hispanic	-0.0033 (0.0039)	-0.0008 (0.0038)	-0.0008 (0.0038)	-0.0003 (0.0038)	-0.0007 (0.0034)
SAT Verbal	0.0012 (0.0022)	-0.0028 (0.0024)	-0.0028 (0.0024)	-0.0024 (0.0024)	-0.0016 (0.0021)
SAT Math	0.0085*** (0.0029)	0.0006 (0.0028)	0.0006 (0.0028)	0.0005 (0.0028)	-0.0000 (0.0025)
Academic Composite	-0.0012 (0.0037)	-0.0002 (0.0037)	-0.0002 (0.0036)	-0.0000 (0.0037)	0.0031 (0.0032)
Prior Service	-0.0066 (0.0054)	0.0011 (0.0054)	0.0011 (0.0053)	0.0006 (0.0054)	-0.0012 (0.0045)
Prior College	0.0070** (0.0035)	-0.0007 (0.0036)	-0.0007 (0.0036)	-0.0007 (0.0036)	0.0027 (0.0030)
USMA Preparatory School	0.0032 (0.0057)	0.0022 (0.0058)	0.0022 (0.0057)	0.0019 (0.0058)	0.0027 (0.0048)
N	233,452	233,452	233,452	233,452	233,452
R^2	0.0094	0.0863	0.1227	0.0867	0.5043
F-Stat P-Value	0.0275	0.9635	0.9621	0.9852	0.3901
Division I Athlete	N	Y	Y	N	N
Course Roster FE	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Course FE	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Sport x Semester FE	N	N	N	Y	Y
Unique Course FE	N	N	N	N	Y

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Each specification represents results for a regression where the dependent variable is the number of immediately preceding courses. The SAT verbal, SAT math, and academic composite variables were divided by 100 prior to estimation. All specifications include a year fixed effects and Columns 2 and 3 include an indicator for being a recruited Division I athlete. In both Columns 2 and 3, Division I athlete status is associated with 0.0087 additional preceding courses (p-value=0.00). The course roster fixed effect is a fixed effect for the particular combination of courses a student takes in a given semester (e.g. Calculus I, Economics, US History, and Physics). Unique courses are individual classroom observations (i.e. the interaction between instructor, semester, section, and course). Robust standard errors are two-way clustered at the individual and section-by-year levels (15,370 total clusters).

Table 4: Fatigue and Selection of Major in Subject Area

<i>Panel A: Time of Day</i>			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
7:30 AM Course	-0.0019** (0.0009)	-0.0020** (0.0009)	-0.0020** (0.0009)
N	233,452	233,452	233,452
R^2	0.0652	0.0770	0.0772
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0190	0.0190	0.0190
Faculty FE	N	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	N	N	Y
Peer Demographic Controls	N	N	Y
<i>Panel B: Number of Immediately Preceding Courses</i>			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Number of Preceding Courses	-0.0015** (0.0007)	-0.0023*** (0.0008)	-0.0023*** (0.0008)
N	233,452	233,452	233,452
R^2	0.0654	0.1361	0.1363
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0190	0.0190	0.0190
Unique Course FE	N	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	N	N	Y

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Robust standard errors are two-way clustered by unique course and student in parentheses (15,370 total clusters). All columns in Panel A and B include year fixed effects, course roster fixed effects, sport-by-semester fixed effects, and fixed effects for the number of courses in a day. All columns in Panel A include indicators for whether courses were immediately preceded by other courses. Column 1 of Panel B additionally includes course time fixed effects. Demographic variables include: indicators for sex, race/ethnicity, prior military service, prior college attendance, attendance at preparatory academy, and SAT verbal scores, SAT math scores, and overall pre-attendance student ranking. Unique courses are individual classroom observations (i.e. the interaction between instructor, semester, section, and course). Our reported sample size includes singleton observations that do not contribute to our identifying variation. If we omit these observations, our effective sample sizes are 231,458, 231,457, and 231,457 in columns 1-3 of Panel A and 231,413, 231,398, and 231,398 in columns 1-3 of Panel B.

Table 5: Benchmark Comparisons

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Female STEM Instructor for Female Student	0.0064* (0.0033)			
Prior Instructor Evaluation		0.0019*** (0.0007)		
Own Instructor Evaluation			0.0070*** (0.0005)	
Normalized Grade				0.0138*** (0.0004)
N	17,608	60,481	88,251	233,452
R^2	0.1558	0.1103	0.1058	0.0722
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0212	0.0200	0.0205	0.0190

$p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Robust standard errors clustered by unique course and student in parentheses. All columns include year fixed effects, course roster fixed effects, sport-by-semester fixed effects, and fixed effects for the number of courses in a day. Demographic variables include: indicators for sex, race/ethnicity, prior military service, prior college attendance, attendance at preparatory academy, and SAT verbal scores, SAT math scores, and overall pre-attendance student ranking. The dependent variable for each column is an indicator for whether the student chose the major corresponding to the relevant course. Column 1 only includes female observations in required STEM courses and reports the coefficient on having a female STEM instructor. STEM course subjects in our sample include: chemistry, computer science, math, physical geography, and physics. Column 2 includes all observations from students assigned to an instructor that has prior instructor evaluations and the reports the coefficient on the instructor's prior average evaluations. Column 3 includes all observations from students that fill out a course-specific evaluation and reports the coefficients on the student's own instructor evaluation. Column 4 includes all observations and reports the coefficients on the student's own normalized grade in the course.

Table 6: Fatigue and Normalized Academic Performance

<i>Panel A: Time of Day</i>			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
7:30 AM Course	-0.0472*** (0.0087)	-0.0511*** (0.0078)	-0.0525*** (0.0069)
N	233,443	233,443	233,443
R^2	0.2292	0.2691	0.3435
Faculty FE	N	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	N	N	Y
Peer Demographic Controls	N	N	Y
<i>Panel B: Number of Immediately Preceding Courses</i>			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Number of Preceding Courses	-0.0165*** (0.0045)	-0.0132*** (0.0043)	-0.0147*** (0.0041)
N	233,443	233,443	233,443
R^2	0.2294	0.3624	0.4239
Unique Course FE	N	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	N	N	Y

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Robust standard errors are two-way clustered by unique course and student in parentheses (15,365 total clusters). All columns in Panel A and B include year fixed effects, course roster fixed effects, sport-by-semester fixed effects, and fixed effects for the number of courses in a day. All columns in Panel A also include indicators for whether courses were immediately preceded by other courses. Column 1 of Panel B additionally includes course time fixed effects. Demographic variables include: indicators for sex, race/ethnicity, prior military service, prior college attendance, attendance at preparatory academy, SAT verbal scores, SAT math scores, and overall pre-attendance student ranking. Unique courses are individual classroom observations (i.e. the interaction between instructor, semester, section, and course). Normalized academic performance measures an individual's distance in standard deviations from the course-by-semester mean performance. Our reported sample size includes singleton observations that do not contribute to our identifying variation. If we omit these observations, our effective sample sizes are 231,449, 231,449, and 231,449 in columns 1-3 of Panel A and 231,404, 231,390, and 231,390 in columns 1-3 of Panel B.

Table 7: Fatigue and Student Evaluations

	7:30 AM Courses			Immediately Preceding Courses		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Aggregate Evaluations	-0.1392*** (0.0151)	-0.1482*** (0.0107)	-0.1474*** (0.0107)	-0.0046 (0.0078)	-0.0035 (0.0077)	-0.0033 (0.0077)
Instructor Encouraged Responsibility	-0.0809*** (0.0119)	-0.0854*** (0.0096)	-0.0842*** (0.0096)	-0.0070 (0.0068)	0.0015 (0.0074)	0.0016 (0.0074)
Instructor Effective	-0.1343*** (0.0161)	-0.1501*** (0.0110)	-0.1493*** (0.0110)	-0.0071 (0.0076)	-0.0032 (0.0072)	-0.0027 (0.0072)
Instructor Cares	-0.1030*** (0.0149)	-0.1125*** (0.0105)	-0.1116*** (0.0105)	-0.0034 (0.0073)	-0.0060 (0.0073)	-0.0057 (0.0073)
Instructor Respectful	-0.0740*** (0.0143)	-0.0826*** (0.0106)	-0.0822*** (0.0106)	-0.0009 (0.0073)	-0.0078 (0.0074)	-0.0076 (0.0074)
Instructor Stimulating	-0.1372*** (0.0148)	-0.1453*** (0.0108)	-0.1445*** (0.0107)	-0.0034 (0.0074)	-0.0008 (0.0074)	-0.0004 (0.0074)
Course Motivated Learning	-0.1206*** (0.0130)	-0.1335*** (0.0100)	-0.1328*** (0.0100)	-0.0003 (0.0072)	-0.0013 (0.0075)	-0.0009 (0.0075)
Course Increased Critical Thinking	-0.0937*** (0.0125)	-0.1046*** (0.0102)	-0.1043*** (0.0102)	0.0031 (0.0072)	-0.0021 (0.0076)	-0.0017 (0.0075)
Schedule Allows Reflection	-0.0742*** (0.0112)	-0.0788*** (0.0099)	-0.0791*** (0.0099)	-0.0081 (0.0072)	-0.0053 (0.0080)	-0.0052 (0.0079)
Schedule Enables Max Performance	-0.0765*** (0.0109)	-0.0804*** (0.0099)	-0.0806*** (0.0099)	-0.0093 (0.0072)	-0.0066 (0.0080)	-0.0065 (0.0080)
Peers Contribute to Learning	-0.0964*** (0.0103)	-0.1029*** (0.0097)	-0.1021*** (0.0097)	-0.0050 (0.0068)	-0.0039 (0.0075)	-0.0037 (0.0075)
N	88,254	88,254	88,254	88,254	88,254	88,254
Faculty FE	N	Y	Y	—	—	—
Demographic Controls	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Peer Demographic Controls	N	N	Y	—	—	—
Unique Course FE	—	—	—	N	Y	Y

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Robust standard errors are two-way clustered by unique course and student in parentheses (8,403 total clusters). Each row/column entry reports the coefficient from a unique regression. Aggregate evaluations are a normalized sum of all the 5 point scores among 10 variables listed. Ratings from each individual question are converted from 5 point agreement scale questions to z-scores at the subject-year level. Observations come from student responses collected between 2008 and 2017. Aggregate evaluations, Schedule allows reflection, and Schedule enables max performance variables are not reported in 2008. Sample sizes for the other variables range between 100,076-100,830.

Table 8: Assignment to an Early Morning Class and Future Academic Performance

<i>Panel A: Performance in Subsequent Subject Area Course</i>			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
7:30 AM Course	0.0210*	0.0230**	0.0097
	(0.0114)	(0.0106)	(0.0081)
N	84,387	84,387	84,387
R^2	0.2000	0.2234	0.3212
<i>Panel B: Performance in Current Subject Area Course</i>			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
7:30 AM Course	-0.0532***	-0.0599***	-0.0667***
	(0.0131)	(0.0116)	(0.0099)
N	84,387	84,387	84,387
R^2	0.2102	0.2633	0.3659
Faculty FE	N	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	N	N	Y
Peer Demographic Controls	N	N	Y

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Robust standard errors are two-way clustered by unique course and student in parentheses (5,754 total clusters). For chemistry, English, math, and physics multiple courses are required. Panel B reports the effect of having an early morning course in the current semester on current performance in the subject (i.e. same semester normalized GPA in the subject). Panel A reports the effect of having an early morning course in the current semester on performance in the next course (i.e. next semester normalized GPA in the subject). All columns include year fixed effects, course roster fixed effects, sport-by-semester fixed effects, fixed effects for the number of courses in a day, and indicators for whether courses were immediately preceded by other courses. Demographic variables include: indicators for sex, race/ethnicity, prior military service, prior college attendance, attendance at preparatory academy, and SAT verbal scores, SAT math scores, and overall pre-attendance student ranking. Normalized academic performance measures an individual's distance in standard deviations from the course-by-semester mean performance. Our reported sample size includes singleton observations that do not contribute to our identifying variation. If we omit these observations, our effective sample sizes are 82,632, 82,631, and 82,631 in columns 1-3 of Panel A and 82,629, 82,628 and 82,628 in columns 1-3 of Panel B.

Table 9: Number of Preceding Courses and Future Academic Performance

<i>Panel A: Performance in Subsequent Subject Area Course</i>			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Number of Preceding Courses	-0.0030 (0.0073)	0.0029 (0.0075)	-0.0001 (0.0072)
N	84,387	84,387	84,387
R^2	0.2000	0.3121	0.3789
<i>Panel B: Performance in Current Subject Area Course</i>			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Number of Preceding Courses	-0.0057 (0.0059)	-0.0016 (0.0050)	-0.0033 (0.0047)
N	84,387	84,387	84,387
R^2	0.2878	0.4531	0.5228
Unique Course FE	N	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	N	N	Y

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Robust standard errors are two-way clustered by unique course and student in parentheses (5,752 total clusters). For chemistry, English, math, and physics multiple courses are required. Panel B reports the effect of having a preceding course in the current semester on current performance in the subject (i.e. same semester normalized GPA in the subject). Panel A reports the effect of having a preceding course in the current semester on performance in the next course (i.e. next semester normalized GPA in the subject). All columns include year fixed effects, course roster fixed effects, sport-by-semester fixed effects, and fixed effects for the number of courses in a day. Column 1 additionally includes course time fixed effects. Demographic variables include: indicators for sex, race/ethnicity, prior military service, prior college attendance, attendance at preparatory academy, and SAT verbal scores, SAT math scores, and overall pre-attendance student ranking. Unique courses are individual classroom observations (i.e. the interaction between instructor, semester, section, and course). Normalized academic performance measures an individual's distance in standard deviations from the course-by-semester mean performance. Our reported sample size includes singleton observations that do not contribute to our identifying variation. If we omit these observations, our effective sample sizes are 82,603, 82,564, and 82,564 in columns 1-3 of Panel A and 82,603, 82,564 and 82,564 in columns 1-3 of Panel B.

Table 10: Fatigue and Selection of Major in Subject Area, Controlling for Performance

<i>Panel A: Time of Day</i>			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
7:30 AM Course	-0.0013 (0.0009)	-0.0013 (0.0009)	-0.0012 (0.0009)
Normalized Grade	0.0126*** (0.0004)	0.0127*** (0.0004)	0.0140*** (0.0004)
N	233,443	233,443	233,443
R^2	0.0713	0.0829	0.0836
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0190	0.0190	0.0190
Faculty FE	N	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	N	N	Y
Peer Demographic Controls	N	N	Y
<i>Panel B: Number of Immediately Preceding Courses</i>			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Number of Preceding Courses	-0.0013** (0.0007)	-0.0021*** (0.0008)	-0.0020*** (0.0008)
Normalized Grade	0.0126*** (0.0004)	0.0135*** (0.0004)	0.0148*** (0.0005)
N	233,443	233,443	233,443
R^2	0.0714	0.1419	0.1426
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0190	0.0190	0.0190
Unique Course FE	N	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	N	N	Y

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Robust standard errors are two-way clustered by unique course and student in parentheses (15,365 total clusters). All columns in Panel A and B include year fixed effects, course roster fixed effects, sport-by-semester fixed effects, and fixed effects for the number of courses in a day. All columns in Panel A also include indicators for whether courses were immediately preceded by other courses. Column 1 of Panel B additionally includes course time fixed effects. Demographic variables include: indicators for sex, race/ethnicity, prior military service, prior college attendance, attendance at preparatory academy, and SAT verbal scores, SAT math scores, and overall pre-attendance student ranking. Unique courses are individual classroom observations (i.e. the interaction between instructor, semester, section, and course). Normalized academic performance measures an individual's distance in standard deviations from the course-by-semester mean performance. Our reported sample size includes singleton observations that do not contribute to our identifying variation. If we omit these observations, our effective sample sizes are 231,449, 231,449, and 231,449 in columns 1-3 of Panel A and 231,404, 231,390, and 231,390 in columns 1-3 of Panel B.

Table 11: Falsification Test: Fatigue and Prior Major Choice

<i>Panel A: Time of Day</i>			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
7:30 AM Course	0.0010 (0.0017)	0.0018 (0.0017)	0.0019 (0.0017)
N	56,327	56,327	56,327
R^2	0.2021	0.2179	0.2186
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0167	0.0167	0.0167
Faculty FE	N	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	N	N	Y
Peer Demographic Controls	N	N	Y
<i>Panel B: Number of Immediately Preceding Courses</i>			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Number of Preceding Courses	-0.0005 (0.0011)	-0.0008 (0.0011)	-0.0008 (0.0011)
N	56,327	56,327	56,327
R^2	0.2021	0.2949	0.2952
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0167	0.0167	0.0167
Unique Course FE	N	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	N	N	Y

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Robust standard errors are two-way clustered by unique course and student in parentheses (3,708 total clusters). This table estimates the relationship between fourth semester variation in course schedules and third semester major choices. All columns in Panel A and B include year fixed effects, course roster fixed effects, sport-by-semester fixed effects, and fixed effects for the number of courses in a day. All columns in Panel A also include indicators for whether courses were immediately preceded by other courses. Column 1 of Panel B additionally includes course time fixed effects. Demographic variables include: indicators for sex, race/ethnicity, prior military service, prior college attendance, attendance at preparatory academy, and SAT verbal scores, SAT math scores, and overall pre-attendance student ranking. Unique courses are individual classroom observations (i.e. the interaction between instructor, semester, section, and course).

A Appendix

Table A.1: Mapping Between Required Courses and Majors

Course	Year	Majors (Narrow)	Fraction	Majors (Broad)	Fraction
Chemistry I	1	Chemistry	0.008	Chemistry; Chemical Engineering	0.019
Chemistry II	1	Chemistry	0.009	Chemistry; Chemical Engineering	0.020
English Composition	1	English	0.003	English; Art, Philosophy, and Literature	0.018
English Literature	1	English	0.003	English; Art, Philosophy, and Literature	0.020
US History	1	US History	0.017	US History; International History; Military History; European History	0.044
World History	1	International History	0.023	US History; International History; Military History; European History	0.052
Western Civilization	1	European History History	0.004	US History; International History; Military History; European History	0.053
Math Modeling	1	Mathematical Sciences	0.008	Mathematical Sciences	0.008
Calculus I	1	Mathematical Sciences	0.008	Mathematical Sciences	0.008
General Psychology	1	Psychology	0.024	Psychology; Engineering Psychology	0.042
Computing and Information Technology	1	Computer Science; Information Technology	0.041	Computer Science; Information Technology	0.041
Calculus II	2	Mathematical Sciences	0.008	Mathematical Sciences	0.008
Probability and Statistics	2	Mathematical Sciences	0.031	Mathematical Sciences	0.031
Physics	2	Physics	0.014	Physics; Physics Engineering; Interdisciplinary Physics	0.015
Economics	2	Economics	0.076	Economics	0.076
American Politics	2	Political Science	0.030	International Relations; Political Science	0.057
Philosophy and Ethics	2	Philosophy	0.002	Philosophy; Art, Philosophy, and Literature	0.021
Physical Geography	2	Geography	0.075	Geography	0.075

Because majors are selected during the third semester, only a subsample of students take the listed second year courses. History courses are not offered at 7:30 AM. As a result, history courses only contribute to the analysis variation in the preceding courses specifications. The Fraction column refers to the fraction of students in the course who eventually major in the corresponding major(s).

Table A.2: Early Morning Courses and Selection of Major in Subject Area

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
7:30 AM Course	-0.0018** (0.0008)	-0.0022** (0.0009)	-0.0019** (0.0009)	-0.0020** (0.0009)	-0.0020** (0.0009)	-0.0020** (0.0009)
N	233,452	233,452	233,452	233,452	233,452	233,452
R^2	0.0269	0.0269	0.0649	0.0766	0.0772	0.0772
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0190	0.0190	0.0190	0.0190	0.0190	0.0190
General Schedule FE	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Course Roster FE	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Faculty FE	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Peer Demographic Controls	N	N	N	N	N	Y

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Robust standard errors are two-way clustered by unique course and student in parentheses (15,372 total clusters).. All specifications include year and course fixed effects. General schedule fixed effects include an indicator for the number of courses a student has in a day and an indicator for the number of immediately preceding courses. The course roster fixed effect is a fixed effect for the particular combination of courses a student takes in a given semester (e.g. Calculus I, Economics, US History, and Physics). Demographic variables include: indicators for sex, race/ethnicity, prior military service, prior college attendance, attendance at preparatory academy, and SAT verbal scores, SAT math scores, athlete status, and overall pre-attendance student ranking. Our reported sample size includes singleton observations that do not contribute to our identifying variation. If we omit these observations, our effective sample sizes are 233,452, 233,452, 231,458, 231,457, 231,457, and 231,457 in columns 1-5, respectively.

Table A.3: Immediately Preceding Courses and Selection of Major in Subject Area

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Number of Preceding Courses	-0.0006 (0.0006)	-0.0019*** (0.0006)	-0.0015** (0.0007)	-0.0023*** (0.0008)	-0.0023*** (0.0008)
N	233,452	233,452	233,452	233,452	233,452
R^2	0.0269	0.0270	0.0650	0.1357	0.1363
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0190	0.0190	0.0190	0.0190	0.0190
General Schedule FE	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Course Roster FE	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Unique Course FE	N	N	N	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	N	N	N	N	Y

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Robust standard errors are two-way clustered by unique course and student in parentheses (15,372 total clusters). All specifications include year and course fixed effects. General schedule fixed effects include an indicator for the scheduled course time (e.g. 7:30 AM, 8:40 AM, 3:05 PM) and the number of courses a student has that day. The course roster fixed effect is a fixed effect for the particular combination of courses a student takes in a given semester (e.g. Calculus I, Economics, US History, and Physics). Demographic variables include: indicators for sex, race/ethnicity, prior military service, prior college attendance, attendance at preparatory academy, and SAT verbal scores, SAT math scores, athlete status, and overall pre-attendance student ranking. Unique courses are individual classroom observations (i.e. the interaction between instructor, semester, section, and course). Our reported sample size includes singleton observations that do not contribute to our identifying variation. If we omit these observations, our effective sample sizes are 233,452, 233,402, 231,413, 231,398, and 231,398 in columns 1-5, respectively.

Table A.4: Fatigue and Selection of Major in Subject Area, Selective vs. Non-Selective Majors

<i>Panel A: Time of Day</i>			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
7:30 AM Course	-0.0059** (0.0025)	-0.0045* (0.0024)	-0.0045* (0.0024)
7:30 AM*Selective Major	0.0049* (0.0026)	0.0032 (0.0025)	0.0032 (0.0025)
N	233,452	233,452	233,452
R^2	0.0653	0.0770	0.0773
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0190	0.0190	0.0190
Faculty FE	N	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	N	N	Y
Peer Demographic Controls	N	N	Y
<i>Panel B: Number of Immediately Preceding Courses</i>			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Number of Preceding Courses	-0.0023** (0.0011)	-0.0038*** (0.0014)	-0.0037*** (0.0014)
Preceding Courses*Selective Major	0.0013 (0.0013)	0.0024 (0.0016)	0.0024 (0.0016)
N	233,452	233,452	233,452
R^2	0.0654	0.1361	0.1363
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0190	0.0190	0.0190
Unique Course FE	N	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	N	N	Y

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Robust standard errors are two-way clustered by unique course and student in parentheses (15,370 total clusters). All columns in Panel A and B include year fixed effects, course roster fixed effects, sport-by-semester fixed effects, and fixed effects for the number of courses in a day. All columns in Panel A also include indicators for whether courses were immediately preceded by other courses. Column 1 of Panel B additionally includes course time fixed effects. Demographic variables include: indicators for sex, race/ethnicity, prior military service, prior college attendance, attendance at preparatory academy, and SAT verbal scores, SAT math scores, and overall pre-attendance student ranking. Unique courses are individual classroom observations (i.e. the interaction between instructor, semester, section, and course). Our reported sample size includes singleton observations that do not contribute to our identifying variation. If we omit these observations, our effective sample sizes are 231,458, 231,457, and 231,457 in columns 1-3 of Panel A and 231,413, 231,398, and 231,398 in columns 1-3 of Panel B.

Table A.5: Fatigue and Selection of Major in Narrow Subject, Broad Subject, Field, and STEM Match

<i>Panel A: Time of Day</i>				
	Narrow	Broad	Field	STEM
7:30 AM Course	-0.0020** (0.0009)	-0.0024** (0.0010)	-0.0026 (0.0031)	0.0004 (0.0029)
N	233,452	233,452	233,452	233,452
R^2	0.0772	0.0665	0.0709	0.0541
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0190	0.0306	0.2586	0.5025
<i>Panel B: Number of Immediately Preceding Courses</i>				
	Narrow	Broad	Field	STEM
Number of Preceding Courses	-0.0023*** (0.0008)	-0.0020** (0.0009)	-0.0034 (0.0023)	-0.0017 (0.0027)
N	233,452	233,452	233,452	233,452
R^2	0.1363	0.1288	0.1376	0.1221
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0190	0.0306	0.2586	0.5025

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Robust standard errors are two-way clustered by unique course and student in parentheses (15,370 total clusters). Narrow and broad majors definitions are outlined in Appendix Table A.1. Fields include Engineering/Technology/Math (ETM), Humanities, Science, and Social Science. ETM majors include all majors within Civil & Mechanical Engineering, Electrical Engineering & Computer Science, Math, Systems engineering, and Nuclear Engineering departments. Humanities majors include all majors within Law, History, Foreign Language, English, Philosophy & Language, and Military Instruction departments. Science majors include all majors within the Chemistry & Life Science, Geography & Environmental Engineering, and Physics Departments. Social Science Majors include all majors within the Social Sciences and Behavioral Science & Leadership Departments. ETM courses include: Calculus I, Calculus II, Information Technology, Math Modeling, and Probability and Statistics. Humanities Courses include: Philosophy, all English courses, and all History courses. Science courses include: Chemistry I, Chemistry II, Physical Geography, and Physics. Social Science Courses include American Politics, Economics, and Psychology. STEM classification groups Science and ETM Fields and non-stem classification groups Humanities and Social Science Fields along with a Kinesiology major. All columns in Panel A and B include year fixed effects, course roster fixed effects, sport-by-semester fixed effects, fixed effects for the number of courses in a day, and demographic controls. All columns in Panel A also include indicators for whether courses were immediately preceded by other courses, faculty fixed effects, and peer demographic controls. All columns in Panel B include unique course fixed effects. Demographic variables include: indicators for sex, race/ethnicity, prior military service, prior college attendance, attendance at preparatory academy, and SAT verbal scores, SAT math scores, and overall pre-attendance student ranking. Unique courses are individual classroom observations (i.e. the interaction between instructor, semester, section, and course). Our reported sample size includes singleton observations that do not contribute to our identifying variation. If we omit these observations, our effective sample size is 231,457 in columns 1-4 of Panel A and 231,398 in columns 1-4 of Panel B.

Table A.6: Fatigue and Selection of Major in Subject Area, Excluding Athletes

<i>Panel A: Time of Day</i>			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
7:30 AM Course	-0.0017 (0.0011)	-0.0020** (0.0010)	-0.0020* (0.0011)
N	155,035	155,035	155,035
R^2	0.0719	0.0873	0.0875
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0201	0.0201	0.0201
Faculty FE	N	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	N	N	Y
Peer Demographic Controls	N	N	Y
<i>Panel B: Number of Immediately Preceding Courses</i>			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Number of Preceding Courses	-0.0008 (0.0008)	-0.0017* (0.0010)	-0.0017* (0.0010)
N	155,035	155,035	155,035
R^2	0.0721	0.1711	0.1713
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0201	0.0201	0.0201
Unique Course FE	N	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	N	N	Y

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Robust standard errors are two-way clustered by unique course and student in parentheses (12,529 total clusters). All columns in Panel A and B include year fixed effects, course roster fixed effects, sport-by-semester fixed effects, and fixed effects for the number of courses in a day. All columns in Panel A also include indicators for whether courses were immediately preceded by other courses. Column 1 of Panel B additionally includes course time fixed effects. Demographic variables include: indicators for sex, race/ethnicity, prior military service, prior college attendance, attendance at preparatory academy, and SAT verbal scores, SAT math scores, and overall pre-attendance student ranking. Unique courses are individual classroom observations (i.e. the interaction between instructor, semester, section, and course). Our reported sample size includes singleton observations that do not contribute to our identifying variation. If we omit these observations, our effective sample sizes are 153,533, 153,528, and 153,528 in columns 1-3 of Panel A and 153,501, 153,410, and 153,410 in columns 1-3 of Panel B.

Table A.7: Assignment to Early Morning Classes and Selection of Major in Subject Area

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
7:30 AM Course	-0.0029** (0.0012)	-0.0023** (0.0011)	-0.0023** (0.0011)	-0.0022** (0.0011)
8:40 AM Course	-0.0011 (0.0014)	-0.0004 (0.0014)	-0.0004 (0.0014)	-0.0005 (0.0014)
11:00 AM Course	0.0023 (0.0015)	0.0024* (0.0014)	0.0024* (0.0014)	0.0024* (0.0014)
1:55 PM Course	-0.0001 (0.0020)	0.0003 (0.0020)	0.0002 (0.0020)	0.0004 (0.0020)
3:05 PM Course	0.0040* (0.0021)	0.0046** (0.0021)	0.0045** (0.0021)	0.0031 (0.0022)
N	233,452	233,452	233,452	233,452
R^2	0.0535	0.0657	0.0665	0.0665
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0190	0.0190	0.0190	0.0190
Faculty FE	N	Y	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	N	N	Y	Y
Peer Demographic Controls	N	N	N	Y

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Robust standard errors are two-way clustered by unique course and student in parentheses (15,370 total clusters). Omitted hour is 9:50 AM. All columns include year fixed effects, course roster fixed effects, sport-by-semester fixed effects, fixed effects for the number of courses in a day, and indicators for whether courses were immediately preceded by other courses. Demographic variables include: indicators for sex, race/ethnicity, prior military service, prior college attendance, attendance at preparatory academy, and SAT verbal scores, SAT math scores, and overall pre-attendance student ranking.

Table A.8: Number of Preceding Courses and Selection of Major in Subject Area

	(1)	(2)	(3)
One Preceding Course	-0.0014 (0.0009)	-0.0026** (0.0011)	-0.0026** (0.0011)
Two Preceding Courses	-0.0025 (0.0017)	-0.0031 (0.0019)	-0.0031 (0.0019)
Three Preceding Courses	-0.0083* (0.0049)	-0.0116** (0.0058)	-0.0115** (0.0058)
N	233,452	233,452	233,452
R^2	0.0654	0.1361	0.1363
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0190	0.0190	0.0190
Unique Course FE	N	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	N	N	Y

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Robust standard errors are two-way clustered by unique course and student in parentheses (15,364 total clusters). Each column includes year fixed effects, course roster fixed effects, sport-by-semester fixed effects, and fixed effects for the number of courses in a day. Additionally, column 1 includes course time fixed effects. Demographic variables include: indicators for sex, race/ethnicity, prior military service, prior college attendance, attendance at preparatory academy, and SAT verbal scores, SAT math scores, and overall pre-attendance student ranking. Unique courses are individual classroom observations (i.e. the interaction between instructor, semester, section, and course).

Table A.9: Heterogeneous Effects of Fatigue on Student Major

<i>Panel A: Time of Day</i>					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
7:30 AM Course	-0.0023*** (0.0008)	-0.0011 (0.0009)	-0.0020** (0.0009)	-0.0019* (0.0010)	-0.0035 (0.0022)
7:30 AM*Female	0.0037* (0.0022)	—	—	—	—
7:30 AM*Minority	—	-0.0021 (0.0016)	—	—	—
7:30 AM*Prior College	—	—	0.0015 (0.0018)	—	—
7:30 AM*High SAT	—	—	—	0.0005 (0.0015)	—
7:30 AM*STEM	—	—	—	—	0.0021 (0.0024)
R^2	0.039	0.039	0.039	0.039	0.039
N	233,452	233,452	233,452	233,452	233,452
<i>Panel B: Number of Immediately Preceding Courses</i>					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Preceding Courses	-0.0021*** (0.0008)	-0.0022** (0.0009)	-0.0026*** (0.0008)	-0.0014 (0.0009)	-0.0014 (0.0011)
Preceding*Female	-0.0012 (0.0015)	—	—	—	—
Preceding*Minority	—	-0.0003 (0.0012)	—	—	—
Preceding*Prior College	—	—	0.0014 (0.0013)	—	—
Preceding*High SAT	—	—	—	-0.0017 (0.0012)	—
Preceding*STEM	—	—	—	—	-0.0014 (0.0015)
R^2	0.041	0.041	0.041	0.041	0.041
observations	233,452	233,452	233,452	233,452	233,452

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Robust standard errors are two-way clustered by unique course and student in parentheses (15,505 total clusters). All columns in Panel A and B include schedule fixed effects, Division I athlete controls, and sport-by-semester fixed effects, and controls for number of courses in a day. All columns in Panel A additionally include year fixed effects and indicators for whether courses were immediately preceded by other courses. Column 1 of Panel B includes course time fixed effects and year fixed effects. Unique courses are individual classroom observations (i.e. the interaction between: instructor x year x semester x section x course). Our reported sample size includes singleton observations that do not contribute to our identifying variation. If we omit these observations, our effective sample sizes are 231,450 in columns 1-5 of Panel A and 231,394 in columns 1-5 of Panel B.

Table A.10: Fatigue and Selection of Major in Subject Area, by Major Popularity

<i>Panel A: Time of Day</i>		
	Low Popularity Majors	High Popularity Majors
7:30 AM Course	-0.0011 (0.0007)	-0.0035 (0.0026)
N	157,042	76,410
R^2	0.0827	0.0950
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0082	0.0413
Faculty FE	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	Y	Y
Peer Demographic Controls	Y	Y
<i>Panel B: Number of Preceding Courses</i>		
	Low Popularity Majors	High Popularity Majors
Number of Immediately Preceding Courses	-0.0003 (0.0006)	-0.0050** (0.0024)
N	157,042	76,410
R^2	0.1450	0.1520
Dependent Variable Mean	0.0082	0.0413
Unique Course FE	Y	Y
Demographic Controls	Y	Y

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Robust standard errors clustered by unique course and student in parentheses. All columns in Panel A and B include year fixed effects course roster fixed effects, sport-by-semester fixed effects, and fixed effects for the number of courses in a day. All columns in Panel A also include indicators for whether courses were immediately preceded by other courses. Column 1 of Panel B additionally includes course time fixed effects. Demographic variables include: indicators for sex, race/ethnicity, prior military service, prior college attendance, attendance at preparatory academy, and SAT verbal scores, SAT math scores, and overall pre-attendance student ranking. Unique courses are individual classroom observations (i.e. the interaction between instructor, semester, section, and course).

Table A.11: Patterns in Course Schedules, Core Courses

Period	Time	Number of Preceding Courses				total
		0	1	2	3	
1	7:30-8:25 AM	43,653	–	–	–	43,653
2	8:40-9:35 AM	18,861	11,510	–	–	30,371
3	9:50-10:45 AM	36,423	9,306	6,352	–	52,081
4	11:00-11:15 AM	20,197	15,268	3,173	1,177	35,630
5	1:55-2:50 PM	35,630	–	–	–	35,630
6	3:05-4:00 PM	24,863	6,989	–	–	31,852
Totals		179,677	43,073	9,525	1,177	233,452

Observations at the student-course level. Observations are from students in first and second year core courses. First year core courses include: mathematical modeling and introduction to calculus, calculus 1, introduction to computing, psychology, history of the United States, western civilization, world history, composition, literature, and a student success course. Second year core courses include: calculus 2, probability and statistics, economics, physics 1 and 2, philosophy, geography, and American politics

Figure A.1: Typical USMA Schedule in First Two Years

TYPICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM

FRESHMAN YEAR		SOPHOMORE YEAR	
Term 1	Term 2	Term 1	Term 2
MA 103 - 4.0 Math Modeling/Intro to Calculus	MA104 - 4.5 Calculus I	MA205 - 4.5 Calculus II	MA206 - 3.0 Prob & Stats
CH101 - 3.5 Chemistry I	CH102 - 3.5 Chemistry II	PH201 - 3.5 Physics I	PH202 - 3.5 Physics II
EN101 - 3.0 English Composition	EN102 - 3.0 Literature	Lx203 - 3.5 Foreign Language	Lx204 - 3.5 Foreign Language
HI10_ - 3.0 History	HI10_ - 3.0 History	SS201 - 3.5 Economics	SS202 - 3.5 Political Science
PL100 - 3.0 General Psychology	IT105 - 3.0 Intro to Computing and Information Technology	PY201 - 3.0 Philosophy	EV203 - 3.0 Physical Geography

Courses highlighted in yellow may be assigned to students in either first or second semester of the respective year. Students must complete or test out of all courses listed.