

Cornell University ILR School

Cornell University ILR School DigitalCommons@ILR

Working Papers

ILR Collection

2010

Who Succeeds in STEM Studies? An Analysis of Binghamton University Undergraduate Students

Edward C. Kokkelenberg Cornell University

Eshna Sinha National Academy of Sciences

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/workingpapers Thank you for downloading an article from DigitalCommons@ILR. Support this valuable resource today!

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the ILR Collection at DigitalCommons@ILR. It has been accepted for inclusion in Working Papers by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@ILR. For more information, please contact catherwood-dig@cornell.edu.

If you have a disability and are having trouble accessing information on this website or need materials in an alternate format, contact web-accessibility@cornell.edu for assistance.

Who Succeeds in STEM Studies? An Analysis of Binghamton University Undergraduate Students

Abstract

Using student level data, the characteristics of STEM and Non-STEM students are examined for attributes associated with academic success. We use fixed effects models to analyze the variables' role in attaining graduation and college GPA and find preparation and ability, as evidenced by Advanced Placement course work, mathematical ability, gender, ethnicity, high school GPA and college experience are all statistically significant indicators of success.

These attributes may confer a comparative advantage to STEM students. The engineers have statistically significant differing response elasticities than the non-engineers, and show evidence of persistence that may arise from learning-by-doing. A successful engineering STEM major at Binghamton has good mathematics preparation, and disproportionately is of Asian ethnicity. Women are few in numbers as engineers. Other STEM fields see less emphasis on mathematics preparation, but more emphasis on the presence of AP course work. Women have the same presence in these other STEM fields as in the whole university.

Keywords

science, technology, engineering, math, STEM, Binghamton University, gender, race

Comments

Suggested Citation

Kokkelenberg, E.C. & Sinha, E. (2010). *Who succeeds in STEM studies? An analysis of Binghamton University undergraduate students* [Electronic version]. Retrieved [insert date], from Cornell University, School of Industrial and Labor Relations site: http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/workingpapers/120/

Required Publisher Statement

Published by the Cornell Higher Education Research Institute, Cornell University.

Who succeeds in STEM studies? An analysis of Binghamton University undergraduate students

Edward C. Kokkelenberg^{a,*}, Esha Sinha^{b,1}

^a Department of Economics, SUNY at Binghamton, and School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, 14850, USA

^b Committee on National Statistics, National Academy of Science, Washington, DC, 20001, USA

ARTICLE INFO

2

3

4

6

1		_
8	Article history:	
9	Received 28 June 2010	
10	Accepted 29 June 2010	
11		
12	JEL classification:	
13	C23	
14	120	
15	123	
16	Keywords:	
17	STEM preparation	
18	Fixed effect models	
19	Women in STEM <mark>fields</mark>	
20	Comparative advantage	
21	Learning-by-doing	

ABSTRACT

Using student level data, the characteristics of STEM and Non-STEM students are examined for attributes associated with academic success. We use fixed effects models to analyze the variables' role in attaining graduation and college GPA and find preparation and ability, as evidenced by Advanced Placement course work, mathematical ability, gender, ethnicity, high school GPA and college experience are all statistically significant indicators of success. These attributes may confer a comparative advantage to STEM students. The engineers have statistically significant differing response elasticities than the non-engineers, and show evidence of persistence that may arise from learning-by-doing. A successful engineering STEM major at Binghamton has good mathematics preparation, and disproportionately is of Asian ethnicity. Women are few in numbers as engineers. Other STEM fields see less work. Women have the same presence in these other STEM fields as in the whole university.

© 2010 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

1. Introduction

The question of academic success is important for Amer-23 ican society and the apparent paucity of STEM students is 24 of national concern. As an example, the number of under-25 graduate students earning a degree in engineering and 26 engineering technologies has fallen about 16 percent over a 27 twenty-year period (1985–86 to 2005–06). The first fifteen 28 of these years saw a decline of 25%. But, the last five saw 29 the number of degrees conferred in engineering and engi-30 neering technologies increase 12%, though the numbers did 31 not reach the level of 1985–86. The decline was uneven 32 when specific fields are considered. For example, Chemical 33 and Civil Engineering had positive growth from 1985-86 to 34

¹ Tel.: +1 202 334 3946.

0272-7757/\$ – see front matter s 2010 Published by Elsevier Ltd. doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2010.06.016

1995–96. But from 1996–97 to 2001–02 all the engineering fields declined (National Academies, 2006; Snyder & Dillow, 2010; US Department of Education, 2009).

If one looks at the history of people who are successful in the arts such as music or dance, or one considers people who are successful in highly technical fields such as astrophysics, we find these individuals often had an interest in their area since early childhood or at the least, since middle school. So it should be no surprise that the successful students in STEM courses probably had an interest in STEM fields for many years before college. Is this early interest evidence of a comparative advantage? Or does this early experience provide learning-by-doing?

Following that line of thought, researchers have considered STEM precursors in K-12 schools. For example, various international surveys on high school students' science and mathematics performance are conducted (Baldi, Jin, Skemer, Green, & Herget, 2007; Gonzales et al., 2008).

However, less attention has been focused on the problem in higher education and the observed high drop-out

^{*} Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 607 273 0882.

E-mail addresses: kokkele@binghamton.edu (E.C. Kokkelenberg), esha.sinha@gmail.com (E. Sinha).

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

rates from science and mathematics majors. Women 55 and/or non-white students opt out of STEM majors at dis-56 proportionate rates. And US universities have not kept pace 57 with rest of the world in the production of STEM graduates. 58 Even though a young student's interest in a STEM career 59 may start before she enters college or a university, it's the 60 postsecondary education that creates the career path and 61 prepares the student for work in a STEM occupation. Hence, 62 it is important to analyze the university/college experience 63 with STEM courses and the reasons for the high attrition 64 rates from STEM majors. 65

Our paper examines the characteristics of STEM stu-66 dents at Binghamton University (State University of New 67 York at Binghamton) and explores the differences between 68 STEM students and Non-STEM students in an attempt to 69 shed light on the question of academic success. We also 70 test the validity of some of the hypotheses that have been 71 offered to explain the gap between intended and completed 72 STEM field majors. We must caution the reader that we 73 have not found a clear answer to these questions, but we 74 have found some things that are important including the 75 differential of the correlates of a student's academic success 76 in various STEM and Non-STEM fields. 77

In the following sections, we first consider some def initional issues, and next discuss STEM research. This is
 followed by a description of our model for subsequent
 econometric analysis. The fifth section is a description of
 Binghamton data and the sixth section gives the results of
 the econometric analysis. Finally, we discuss and conclude.

2. STEM students and academic success

The National Center for Education Statistics of the US 85 Department of Education (2006) developed a definition of 86 a STEM degree listing degree programs that include sci-87 ence, technology, engineering, or mathematics degrees. 88 The National Science Foundation defines STEM fields more 89 broadly and includes not only the common categories of 90 mathematics, natural sciences, engineering, and computer 91 and information sciences, but also social/behavioral sci-92 ences as psychology, economics, sociology, and political 93 science. This classification issue is discussed in Chen and 94 Weko (2009). We applied the first definition, eliminating 95 the social sciences from our study. Using the Bingham-96 ton list of majors, we found 18 engineering majors and 34 97 other non-engineering STEM fields in which degrees were 98 offered. 99

The definition of success is more difficult; grades, gradu-100 ation rates, persistence, completion time, or time to degree 101 are often used. Measures such as Grade Point Average 102 (GPA)² and time to degree are relatively easy to measure, 103 but persistence is not. A student may 'persist' in their quest 104 for education and a degree at many campuses and schools 105 over the course of many years. This may mitigate the 106 perceived high drop-out rates. And the scientific and engi-107 neering communities have need for substantial numbers of 108 support personnel such as lab assistants and technical writ-109 ers. These may be provided from the ranks of those who 110

formally drop out of STEM studies but are better trained individuals for their academic experience. We are not able to follow such a student or drop-out with our data and thus this issue is not addressed.

A further criticism of graduation or grades as a measure of a successful outcome is that they do not reflect the quality of the education of the student. The time students spend in exploring different majors and taking elective courses may better prepare them to be life-long learners and better citizens. From this perspective, measures of the educational output are the intelligence, the existence of a breadth of knowledge, understanding, their ability to adapt and learn on the job and thus become more productive, and personal satisfaction of the citizenry as well as their contribution to the commonweal.

We use both Grade Point Average and graduation rates as measures of success in this paper. We do note there are limitations to both; Bretz (1989), using Meta analysis, found success in a field is weakly related to GPA for some fields (e.g. teaching) but not related to success in most fields. Further, graduation rates are partially controlled by institutional characteristics, particularly funding. A good introduction to modern research on this issue together with a good bibliography is given in Calcagno, Bailey, Jenkins, Keens, and Leinbach (2008). Also see DesJardins, Kim, and Rzonca (2002–2003) and Braxton and Hirschy (2004, 2005). Many of the issues are identified in Habley and McClanahan (2004). Adelman (1999) is also useful.

Neither the use of grades nor that of graduation, considers variations in the length of a degree program. The idea of a traditional four-year degree program is not universal and this is relevant to STEM studies as many engineering and architectural programs are five years in length. Some other programs, such as three-two programs, where the student spends time in industry or some other field of study such as business, often require five years of study also. Finally, certification in some sub-field, employment, earnings subsequent to graduation, marriage, citizenship, and literacy are some further possible measures of success. There is some evidence that certification or its equivalent is useful in the STEM field of computers or information technology (Chen & Weko, 2009).

3. STEM research

Much of the literature of these metrics is descriptive and/or discusses the relationship among various student and institutional characteristics and the outcome. Baseline studies by Tinto (1975, 1982), Bean (1980), Pascarella **Q1** and Terenzini (1991) and Astin and Astin (1992) omit the role of resources, other than student financial assistance (see Archibald & Feldman, 2008). Others like Kuh (2003) who conducted research into student engagement found most, if not all, of the educational engagement factors studied have significant financial implications for the institution. And work by Kokkelenberg, Blose, and Porter (2006) found that institutional expenditures, adjusted for types of majors, to be most important in helping students achieve timely graduation.

Very few studies analyzing university/college education of STEM use longitudinal data, but two recent, notable 153

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

studies are by Xie and Shauman (2003) and Ohland et al. 170 (2008).³ Xie and Shauman addressed the low participation 171 of women in science fields by considering at the entire 172 science career trajectory starting from high school and 173 ending in doctoral degrees. They analyzed seventeen large 174 datasets to assess the performance of high school students 175 in science and mathematics considering the mean gender 176 difference in mathematics and science achievement scores. 177 They found the mean gender differences in scores to be 178 small in magnitude, and there was no significant difference 170 in mathematics and science scores of females compared 180 to males. Continuing in STEM major or early entry (within 181 first two years of baccalaureate education) into STEM major 182 from a Non-STEM major was found to be the most impor-183 tant factor contributing to achieving baccalaureate degree 184 in science. Late entry into a STEM major or re-entry into a 185 STEM major (students who switched from a STEM major 186 to a Non-STEM major and back to a STEM major) does not 187 necessarily lead to a science degree. The rates of persis-188 tence of men and women in engineering majors were found 189 to be similar and no significant differences existed among 190 racial/ethnic groups even though the gender distribution 191 of engineering majors is skewed more towards males. 192

Ohland et al. (2008) looked at engagement in an engi-193 neering major by analyzing the eight engagement metrics 194 and six outcome scales from National Survey of Student 195 Engagement (2006). Engineering majors were found to be 196 no different from other major groups in terms of involve-197 ment in working on campus and time spent on various 198 leisure activities. Substantial positive differences existed 199 in terms of internships, experience, and involvement in 200 research projects with faculty; and negative differences 201 exist for those taking foreign language classes and partici-202 pating in study abroad programs. They found that students 203 who persisted in engineering majors disengaged from both 204 liberal arts courses and other fields of engineering. 205

The question of persistence, engagement and migration 206 (both in and out) in baccalaureate engineering programs 207 is also addressed by Ohland et al. They proposed that 208 engagement is a precursor to persistence. The focus of the 209 paper was only on engineering programs and comparisons 210 were made against students in other academic programs 211 (which included STM programs) in terms of persistence 212 in the major they matriculated in and staying on in the 213 same university where they enrolled for the first time. The 214 difference in the rates of persistence between the engi-215 neering major and the other academic majors was found 216 to be small except that in-migration of students into engi-217 neering majors from other majors is very low compared to 218 other majors who attract students away from engineering 219 majors. Hence students who graduate in engineering are 220 the ones who moved into it quite early on in their academic 221 career, a result that was also found by Xie and Shauman and 222 that we found as shown below. 223

Most research on factors determining persistence and graduation in engineering degrees point out that having an interest in engineering, science or mathematics is crucial to pursue a degree in engineering. Among those we note McCormack (2000–2009), Zhang, Anderson, Ohland, Carter, and Thorndyke (2004), Fleming, Engerman, and Griffin (2005), Eris et al. (2007), McCain, Fleming, Williams, and Engerman (2007), Alting and Walser (2007), and Kilgore, Atman, Yasuhara, Barker, and Morozov (2007). All appear to find that a long interest is a common trait of successful students.

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261 262

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

Along with interest in STEM subjects, the kind of college experience an engineering student faces in the first two years of college was found to be very important as attrition rates among engineering students is high during the first two years. For example, see Brainard and Carlin (1997) who studied six hundred women students in six cohorts at the University of Washington. They found that perceived job outlook influenced persistence during the freshman year. It seems that the first two years in college play a significant role in helping a student focus more on engineering majors or to make a move away from such a major toward pursuing something else. The question of how students initially choose their major is addressed by Maple and Stage (1991), by Montmarquette, Cannings, and Mahseredjian (2002), and by Malgwi, Howe, and Burnaby (2005).

In summary, the vast research literature sheds much light on the nuances and identifies interesting and useful details. One of these is that early interest and continued experience in STEM work is advantageous. We test some of these findings, and extend some of this work, using Binghamton University longitudinal data.

4. Modeling college success

The basic model for tests of outcomes we employed is a fixed effects estimator. This model is specified as follows:

$$y_{itih}^* = \alpha + x_{itjh}^* \beta + \varepsilon_{itih}^* \tag{1}$$

where *i* denotes the individual student, *t* denotes the academic level of the student, *j* denotes the course, and *h* denotes the high school of the student. We define

$$y_{itih}^* \equiv y_{itjh} - \bar{y}_{h(i)}, \qquad 263$$

$$x_{itjh}^* \equiv x_{itjh} - \bar{x}_{h(i)}, \text{ and}$$
 264

$$\varepsilon_{itjh}^* \equiv \varepsilon_{itjh} - \bar{\varepsilon}_{h(i)}$$

Here $\bar{y}_{h(i)}, \bar{x}_{h(i)}$, and $\bar{\varepsilon}_{h(i)}$ are the average observations of the *i*-th individual student's high school, *h*, averaged over all observations for that high school in that year. Hence, y_{itjh}^* is the individual student's deviation from the mean of students from the relevant high school, etc. This is a fixed effects model that estimates intercepts for each high school. The dependent variable, *y*, denotes the undergraduate GPA at various stages of the college career, or the awarding of a degree. A vector of explanatory variables is denoted by *x*, and epsilon is an error vector.

This fixed effects method reduces heterogeneity that arises from such things as size and type of high school, area of the country, the social environment, the issue of varying academic and sports emphasis, and possibly, to some degree, the parental economic status. Importantly, it also attempts to address the role of differential high

³ A slightly older one is Brainard and Carlin (1997).

 Table 1

 Characteristics of Binghamton students 1997 through 2007 March 2, 2010.

	Number of degrees awarded	Average SATV	Average SATM	HS average	Number of AP hours credit	Percent female	Percent Black	Percent Hispanic	Percent Asian	Average final GPA
All	24251	571.1	614.1	91.69	4.48	54%	4%	5%	14%	3.22
Median		575.6	620.0	91.85	0.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	3.25
Engineers	604	563.2	638.4	91.75	2.68	13%	1%	3%	16%	3.07
Median		570.0	640.0	91.74	0.00	0%	0%	0%	0%	3.05
Non-Eng. STEM	1267	565.7	624.6	92.16	4.31	51%	5%	3%	18%	3.16
Median		570.0	630.0	92.10	0.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	3.18
Chemistry	82	546.0	626.0	92.09	3.80	49%	6%	1%	26%	3.18
Median		540.0	633.6	92.13	0.00	0%	0%	0%	0%	3.16
Economics	803	551.2	614.1	90.99	2.76	37%	2%	4%	26%	3.04
Median		550.0	620.0	91.10	0.00	0%	0%	0%	0%	3.05
English	1049	581.0	582.8	90.97	2.88	71%	5%	6%	9%	3.30
Median		590.0	580.0	91.18	0.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	3.31

school guidance counselors. Anecdotal evidence suggests 282 that K-12 schools and school districts or systems devote dif-283 ferent levels of resources to guidance activities with some 284 providing minimal mandated efforts and others meeting 285 prospective college students and their parents even as 286 much as monthly for their last three years of high school. 287 The fixed effects model should accommodate this sus-288 pected important variation in the intercept term. 289

A number of hypothesis concerning STEM majors prepa-290 ration and success can be tested with this model. We tested 291 the following hypothesis: 1. Correlates of successful out-292 comes as measured by GPA or degree awarded do not vary 293 between STEM and Non-STEM majors; 2. STEM majors and 294 Non-STEM majors do not differ in preparation, gender, or 295 ethnicity; 3. The Instructor's gender makes no difference; 296 and 4. STEM courses have higher grading standards and 297 this is discouraging to students. The above tests might 298 weakly reveal some insight into the hypothesis that by the 299 time students enroll as undergraduates, many have devel-300 oped some comparative advantage for a specific discipline 301 and the ancillary hypothesis that the opportunity costs of 302 changing majors post matriculation is high. 303

Several other hypotheses were also tested but we found 304 many of these tests to yield inconclusive results because 305 of the absence of sufficient observations. For example, we 306 looked at how the ethnicity of the faculty was related to 307 the drop-out rate but such data on faculty ethnicity are 308 only collected for recent years and the drop-out rates were 309 strongly related to grades making such tests inconclusive. 310 Several other hypotheses we attempted to test included: 311 students' interests are awakened by introductory courses; 312 a lack of preparation for STEM work; and AP courses may 313 build over-confidence. The tests we were able to devise 314 with the data we had in hand for these also were incon-315 clusive and we can neither sustain nor challenge these 316 hypothesis. 317

318 5. **Binghamton data**

The data for Binghamton University was provided by the Office of Institutional Research at Binghamton and was garnered from various administrative and student records. The Data consists of 926,759 observations at the studentcourse level for 176 variables, and covers 1997 Fall Term through 2007 Spring Term. There are over 44,000 individuals or subjects.

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

The summary characteristics of Binghamton students in this data set who were awarded a degree are given in Table 1. Data is provided for all Binghamton students, engineers, other STEM students, chemistry students (a STEM field), economics and English. These last three are for illustrative purposes with Economics being considered a hard grading Non-STEM Department and English an easy grading Non-STEM Department.⁴ Engineers have lower verbal SAT scores than the school average, higher mathematics SAT scores, comparable high school averages, and present fewer AP credits when they enroll. Engineers have a higher percentage of Asian students but lower percentages of Blacks and Hispanics and a far lower percentage of women (13 percent versus 54 percent) than the school as a whole. The average and the median values are quite close for nondemographic variables; the most notable exception is gender where women dominate the English discipline. We have found that about 50 percent of the incoming engineering majors switch out of engineering. There are virtually no Binghamton students who switch from some other field into engineering. This may be because the engineering programs precede lock step through a curriculum leaving little room for electives and the STEM courses build upon each other in the sequence and this observation is consistent with the literature cited above. In short, Binghamton STEM students exhibit characteristics common to those of many other schools.

In brief, Binghamton engineers present lower ability scores (except for math) than other STEM graduates, are more likely to be transfer students, and graduate fewer women and non-Asian minorities. Both engineers and non-engineers as graduates experience a considerable reduction in numbers from those initially intending to be a STEM student.

But non-engineering STEM graduates have profiles quite close to that of the Non-STEM student in all of the

⁴ As would be expected, English majors excel in verbal SAT scores, and women account for 71 percent of the English majors, almost 1.5 times higher than in the whole school and over 5 times more than in engineering. The final GPA is of interest with the English majors having a much higher final GPA than various STEM groups or Economics.

dimensions presented except attrition from major. Con-362 sider the fields of biology, chemistry, and physics. We use 363 data for the freshman cohorts, 1997 to 2003 and map 364 how these students proceeded through their college career 365 (Appendix). The first result is that while 16,380 students 366 took a course in one of these fields, only 1803 declared 367 one of these three fields to be their major. Thus, Bingham-368 ton appears to have few STEM majors, but many STEM 369 courses that are taken by Non-STEM students to fulfill 370 distribution requirements. This is compounded as the engi-371 neering school also requires course work in mathematics, 372 chemistry and physics, again increasing the distributional 373 loading in these STEM departments.⁵ 374

The second point is that only 46–60 percent of these 375 who declared one of these majors graduated in that field. 376 One conclusion is that Binghamton students have a high 377 rate of attrition from non-engineering STEM courses. A 378 second observation is that many of these STEM courses 379 are probably fulfilling educational distributional require-380 ments in the main; only 873 students over eight years 381 of entrants or five point six percent of the students who 382 initially declared one of these three fields as their major, 383 graduated in that major 384

But the third and most important point is that AP work is consistent with graduation in a STEM field. A higher percentage of those who graduate in any of these three majors had AP work in that field when compared to the percentage of graduates from the group with no AP work. This is possibly an indication of comparative advantage or learning-by-doing for these graduates.

6. Econometric results

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

403

404

Our paper tests if STEM majors have different correlates of graduation rates (a binary variable, 1 for graduation and 0 for non-graduation within six years of entering the university) and correlates of GPA (a continuous variable in the range 0–4), compared to the correlates for the Non-STEM majors. It does so with respect to the following explanatory variables: SAT yerbal Score, SAT mathematics score, high school GPA, advanced placement grades, fulltime or part-time status, gender, and ethnicity.

402 6.1. Fixed effects models

We first investigated the issue of success by denoting GPA as the dependent variable for all Binghamton stu-

dents (n = 44,045). Using a fixed effects model in SAS (we repeated much of our work in STATA where we obtained the same results), we tested a version of Eq. (1). There are two models presented in Table 2 differing in the number of explanatory variables. Model 1 includes the issuance of a bachelor's degree, "Rec'vd Degree", and is the better model in terms of fit.⁸ The inclusion of the degree variable is justified on both an econometric basis and a statistical basis: it adds a way to partition the sample into successful students (attained a degree) and those who have as yet to achieve success and it is a statistically significant dimension. All of the estimators are statistically significant by a t-test statistic. We found women do better than men (coefficient is the second largest in value at 0.139), entering as a freshman is advantageous as is prior ability indicated by SAT and AP scores. Blacks, Hispanics and Asians are at a disadvantage, and STEM students have lower GPAs. The basic difference between the results of Model 1 and Model 2 are that allowing for the issuance of a degree reverses the negative sign on the correlation between GPA and STEM majors (engineers and non-engineering STEM). We interpret this to mean that of all students, STEM students do better (Model 2) but when allowing for the attainment of a degree, STEM students have a lower GPA than Non-STEM graduating undergraduate students.

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

Similar results to those reported above and below were obtained over a variety of model specifications, some of which included high school grades, full versus part-time students, and parental income as explanatory variables, and some of which explored non-linear models. The results were not substantially enhanced and the conclusions are the same.

We next ran parallel fixed effects analysis for STEM students and a breakdown of these into non-engineering and engineering STEM students. These results are given in Table 3. In these cases, the degree variable was insignificant so the runs shown did not include that explanatory variable. In all of these STEM results, the relative size of the estimators is about the same. However, the correlation between women and GPA weakens and becomes statistically insignificant as we look at more detail. In other words, the advantage women hold as shown in Table 2 disappears when we partition the data into different major STEM groups. The negative correlation between GPA and the ethnic groups is weakened as the estimators become less significant in the partitioning between engineers and other STEM. Prior ability as denoted by the SAT and AP variables continues to be strongly correlated with success in non-

⁵ The Watson School of Engineering at Binghamton University requires four specific mathematical courses, two specified Physics courses and one specified <u>chemistry course</u>.

⁶ The Marpur College Bulletin states; "Harpur students must complete additional requirements designed by Harpur College of Arts and Sciences to compliment and extend the general education requirements and further their liberal arts education. These requirements include: two courses in the Division of Humanities, two courses in the Division of Science and Mathematics, two courses in the Division of Sciences, and an additional four liberal arts courses chosen from each of the two divisions outside the division of the student's major department."Harpur College is the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Binghamton University and it is the largest college by far at that University.

⁷ Initially, we tried to analyze many issues using a Tobit procedure. We then looked at grades using ordered Logit, but were not certain the data met the proportionality assumption and indeed, there is evidence that the data probably violated this assumption (see Kokkelenberg, Dillon, & Christy, 2008). Thus, we used a fixed effects model.

⁸ While the differing number of observations makes a strict comparison via log likelihood Chi squared test uncertain, as the sample size approaches infinity, the likelihood ratio approaches Chi squared and this forms the basis for an approximate statistical test. In our case, the differences in the sample size are 0.63%, 44,324 versus 44,045 observations. The less restricted model is better by a Chi squared test; the calculated value is 12,535 whereas the critical value is about 8 for one degree of freedom at the 99.5% confidence level.

 Table 2

 Fixed effects model for all Binghamton students 1997 through 2007 dependent variable is last observed cumulative GPA fixed effect is high school.

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	F value of test	of fixed		F value of test	of fixed	
	Estimate	T-statistic	Effects	Estimate	T-statistic	Effects
Intercept	2.301	107.09		2.577	114.09	
Freshman	0.012	2.68	7.2	0.008	1.67	2.8
SAT <mark>verbal</mark>	0.0004	16.11	259.5	0.0003	10.49	110.1
SAT math	0.0004	13.08	171.1	0.0003	10.1	102.1
AP credits	0.015	44.00	1935.7	0.016	44.73	2000.8
Female	0.139	32.89	1081.5	0.165	36.78	1353.0
Non-engineering STEM degree	-0.056	-4.37	19.1	0.101	7.67	58.8
Engineering degree	-0.086	-4.72	22.3	0.082	4.32	18.7
Black 🔨	-0.192	-19.03	362.0	-0.208	-19.34	374.0
Hispanic	0 .129	-13.65	186.4	-0.158	-15.70	246.5
Asian	^ 0.071	-11.47	131.5	-0.058	-8.83	77.9
Receivd degree	0.337	79.72	6354.6			
Ν	44045			44324		
Log likelihood	50996.7			57264		

engineering STEM courses, though SAT, both Mathematics and Verbal, become statistically insignificant for engineering students, while AP work continues to be important.

The results of a further parallel fixed effects analysis for all Non-STEM students were explored and we found that all the estimators with the exception of that for freshman in Model 2 are significant, and the results are basically the same as above; ability is important, women do better, and ethnic groups are negatively correlated with GPA (See Table 4).

One of the chief conclusions from this analysis is that
 after allowing for the student's background as proxied by
 the high school (the fixed effect), ability, as proxied by SAT
 scores and AP credits, is important regardless of discipline
 in terms of final GPA. Any advantage that women have is
 confined to the Non-STEM fields, and Blacks, Hispanics, and
 Asians do not do as well as other ethnic groups.

470 6.2. Declaration of major

471 Most STEM tracks at Binghamton require a fairly lock-472 step series of courses be taken. At any level of the student's career, he or she must take certain specified courses to prepare them for the next level of study, and enrollment in certain upper division level courses is restricted to those with the prerequisites and frequently to department majors. Hence it is important that a student follow the proscribed path of study and declare their major early in their career. Yet the evidence is that Non-STEM students often wait until their junior year to declare, the exception being Economics Majors who must be a declared major to register for many courses. We thus looked at the initial declaration of major to test how important this is by running comparative fixed effects models to investigate the factors that correlate with getting an engineering degree and a nonengineering STEM degree. These results are discussed next, and are shown in Tables 5 and 6.

In Table 5, we report the correlation of the initial declaration of a major with the receipt of an engineering degree as the dependent variable. While the explanatory variables are for the most part the same as those reported above, here we include the student's choice of first and second major as added explanatory varibles. Using the log likelihood value, we see the regression with the inclusion of first major

Table 3

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

Fixed effects model for all Binghamton STEM students non-engineering STEM students engineering STEM students 1997 through 2007 dependent variable is last observed cumulative GPA fixed effect is high school (FE) Model 2.

Effect	All STEM			Non-enginee	ering STEM		Engineering	Engineering STEM ————————————————————————————————————			
	Test of FE F v	/alue		Test of FE F v	alue		Test of FE F				
	Estimate	T-statistic	Туре 3	Estimate	T-statistic	Туре 3	Estimate	T-statistic	Туре З		
Intercept	2.556	24.89		2.429	19.74		2.775	15.08			
Freshman	0.032	1.47	2.15	0.093	3.41	11.66	-0.083	-2.31	5.36		
SAT verbal	0.0003	3.00	9.02	0.0005	3.27	10.68	^ 0.0001	0.44	0.19		
SAT math	0.0005	3.59	12.87	0.0006	3.56	12.65	0.0004	1.68	2.81		
AP credits	0.013	111	60.37	0.011	5.82	33.88	0.015	4.06	16.5		
Female	0.060	3.11	9.67	0.027	1.20	1.45	0.066	1.29	1.67		
Black	-0.109	-2.16	4.68	-0.093	-1.77	3.12	-0.302	-2.07	4.29		
Hispanic	△ 0.101	-1.89	3.57	-0.103	-1.66	2.74	-0.094	-0.93	0.87		
Asian	-0.060	-2.39	5.72	-0.070	-2.35	5.54	-0.035	-0.76	0.57		
Number of FE	581			481			295				
Ν	1871			1267			604				
Log likelihood	1917.3			1262.1			683.9				

Table 4 Fixed effects model for all Binghamton Non-STEM students 1997 through 2007 dependent variable is last observed cumulative GPA fixed effect is high school.

Variable	Model 1			Model 2	Model 2				
	F value of test of	f fixed		<i>F</i> value of test of fixed					
	Estimate	T-statistic	Effects	Estimate	T-statistic	Effects			
Intercept	2.300	104.85		2.581	111.57	2.36			
Freshman	0.012	2.53	6.4	0.008	1.54	101.72			
SAT verbal	0.0004	15.87	251.8	0.0003	10.09	92.47			
SAT Math	0.0004	12.63	159.4	0.0003	9.62	1939.40			
AP Credits	0.015	43.3	1874.6	0.016	44.04	1363.20			
Female	0.142	33.05	1092.3	0.169	36.92	368.20			
Black	-0.195	-18.89	357.0	-0.212	-19.19	242.90			
Hispanic	^ 0.130	-13.48	181.8	-0.160	-15.58	71.00			
Asian	<u>^0.072</u>	-11.19	125.1	-0.058	-8.44	52.35			
Receivd degree	0.337	79.37	6299.5						
Ν	42,250			42,453					
Log likelihood	49,175			55,298					

Table 5

Fixed effects model for all Binghamton engineering STEM students 1997 through 2007 dependent variable is awarding of degree fixed effect is high school correlation of initial declaration of major with engineering degree receipt.

Variable	F-statistic	P value	F-statistic	P value	F-statistic	P value	F-statistic	P value
Freshman	3.95	0.0470	11.27	0.0008	4.51	0.0336	7.07	0.0078
SAT verbal	6.44	0.0112	73.56	< 0.0001	6.18	0.0129	82.7	< 0.0001
SAT math	21.76	< 0.0001	87.73	< 0.0001	23.51	<.0001	111.55	< 0.0001
AP credits	7.48	0.0062	38.1	< 0.0001	9.27	0.0023	66.19	< 0.0001
Female	97.68	< 0.0001	850.98	< 0.0001	97.72	<.0001	886.98	< 0.0001
Black	1.87	0.1720	9.39	0.0022	1.63	0.2018	7.16	0.0075
Hispanic	0.97	0.3241	3.38	0.0661	0.91	0.3408	3.21	0.0730
Asian	11.35	0.0008	13.61	0.0002	12.57	0.0004	25.57	< 0.0001
First <mark>major</mark> ENG	40048.30	< 0.0001			39896.60	< 0.0001		
Second major ENG			3571.03	< 0.0001			3550.90	< 0.0001
Second major Non-ENG STEM					25.45	< 0.0001		
First major Non-ENG STEM							404.67	< 0.0001
Ν	24,251		24,251		24,251		24,251	
Log likelihood	^ 20394.7		-83.9		-20411.4		-476.3	

495 496 497

498

499

choice as engineering is the best explanatory model. Thus, students who graduate as engineers, start their academic career by majoring in engineering. Students who graduated in non-engineering STEM fields have a weaker correlation with declaring engineering as their first or second major. In other words, the non-engineering STEM students do not, on average, seem to be engineering students who switched majors to some other STEM field. Similar tests and results for non-engineering STEM students are reported in Table 6; the initial declaration of a non-engineering STEM major

Table 6

Fixed effects model for all Binghamton non-engineering STEM students 1997 through 2007 dependent variable is awarding of degree fixed effect is high school.

Effect	F	$\Pr > F$	F	$\Pr > F$	F	$\Pr > F$		$\Pr > F$
Freshman	58.88	<.0001	64.12	<.0001	63.68	<.0001	59.67	<.0001
SAT <mark>verbal</mark>	3.59	0.0581	5.57	0.0183	3.15	0.0758	12.22	0.0005
SAT math	23.71	<.0001	70.87	<.0001	26.78	<.0001	94.60	<.0001
AP credits	153.26	<.0001	298.46	<.0001	154.24	<.0001	327.24	<.0001
Female	7.59	0.0059	0.70	0.4038	3.93	0.0474	23.65	<.0001
Black	1.05	0.3063	0.70	0.4039	1.03	0.3099	0.30	0.586
Hispanic	1.64	0.1999	0.78	0.3774	1.93	0.1645	1.37	0.241
Asian	11.39	0.0007	78.82	<.0001	11.39	0.0007	84.07	<.0001
First Maj Non-STEM	36365.10	<.0001			36328.80	<.0001		
Second Maj Non-STEM			3739.29	<.0001			3673.35	<.0001
Second Maj ENG					66.19	<.0001		
First Maj ENG							371.42	<.0001
Ν		24,251		24,251		24,251		24,251
Number of FE		1788		1788		1788		1788
Log likelihood		-5910.9		12823.8		-5969.7		12463.1

 Table 7

 Elasticities of response cumulative GPA Response to a one percent increase in explanatory variable.

Explanatory variable	All students	Non-STEM students	All STEM students	Non-engineering STEM	Engineers
Freshman	0.012	0.009	0.036	0.090	-0.066
SAT verbal	0.243	0.259	0.169	0.000	0.006
SAT math	0.210	0.179	0.467	0.001	^ 0.569
AP credits	0.066	0.062	0.094	0.012	0.090
Female	0.133	0.140	0.104	0.066	0.101
Black	-0.197	-0.201	-0.157	-0.163	-0.214
Hispanic	∆ 0.133	-0.139	-0.070	-0.087	-0.053
Asian	-0.068	-0.076	-0.030	-0.052	0.003
nengstem	-0.040				
eng	△ 0.095				

is strongly correlated with receiving a degree in a non engineering STEM field. These findings are consistent with,
 but not conclusive concerning the existence of dedication,
 persistence, and possibly of a comparative advantage for
 these STEM students.

510 6.3. Elasticities

Elasticities as response percentages of mean cumula-511 tive GPA based on these models and data are reported in 512 Table 7. The change in response of cumulative GPA for 513 all students. Non-STEM students. and STEM students are 514 shown. STEM students' grades were more responsive to the variable of having entered as freshman, more respon-516 sive to better mathematics scores and more responsive 517 to reported AP course hours, than were Non-STEM stu-518 dents. The difference between engineers and other STEM 519 students is also shown. A one percent change in mathemat-520 ics scores results in a 0.569 percent change in graduation 521 grades for engineers, but a very small, almost nonexistent, 522 result for non-engineering STEM students. Again, it appears 523 engineering STEM students need to concentrate on math-524 ematics skills and not verbal ones. 525

526 6.4. Gender <mark>issues</mark>

We were able to test the conclusion of "Mathemati-527 cal Self-Concept: How College Reinforces the Gender Gap," 528 Sax (1994) that found the prevalence of female students 529 on campus improves the mathematical confidence among 530 female students enrolled in mathematics courses. We 531 tested this for Biology and Mathematics courses using the 532 dichotomous variable of "received an A" or "did not receive 533 an A" as the dependent variable. A variable that was per-534

centage of female students enrolled in a specific course of interest was introduced across all course levels in a regression model and was found to be significant and positive for sophomore level mathematics courses, but negative for junior level courses. In other words the percentage females in a class was beneficial in terms of a grade of A for sophomore mathematics classes, but not for other levels. Similar results were found for the grades of A minus, B plus, B and B minus. 535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

An Interaction term of the percent female students variable together with a term denoting the gender of instructor was not found to be significant in all cases except in beginning Biology where the relationship was negative (see Table 8).

Therefore there is evidence of a gender peer effect; having more females in a class, improves a female student's individual performance in a class. We caution that the reason behind this peer effect could be that female students perform better than male students, as the gender of the student variable is often significant and positive in other studies (Polachek, 1978; Kokkelenberg et al., 2006, 2008). But, even though having female faculty, and though the female students generally having better grades, the joint effect of these two variables was not found to be statistically significant in our tests.

The reader should note that we only investigated grades which are but one of the products of college education and even if female instructors do not provide extra encouragement or better results for female students when it comes to grades, they may provide other forms of encouragement such as counseling and career advice that are not captured in our study.

Finally, having more female students in a specific class helps the grades of all the females in that class. Gender peer

Influence of percent female in class and gender of instructor in biology and mathematics courses all students earning grade of A.

^				^				
Variable	Estimate	Standard Error						
Course level	400		300		200		100	
Biology courses								
Number of observations	1065		2741		360		1966	
Instructor gender	-0.070	0.030	0.006	0.019	0.155	0.245	-0.051	0.023
Percent female	0.227	0.087	-0.041	0.066	0.300	0.171	0.217	0.123
Math courses								
^ Number of observations	715		2909		3342		1088	
Instructor gender	0.062	0.059	0.010	0.025	0.026	0.015	0.021	0.039
Percent female	0.038	0.117	-0.259	0.078	0.673	0.086	0.165	0.149

 Table 9

 Correlation of STEM and Non-STEM AP exams taken with receipt of engineering degree, non-engineering STEM degree, or any STEM degree.

	Engineers			Non-engi	neering STEN	И	Any STEM	I	
Variable	Estimate	T-statistic	F value of test of fixed effects	Estimate	T-statistic	<i>F</i> value of test of fixed Effects	Estimate	T-statistic	F value of test of fixed effects
Intercept	-0.006	-0.54		-0.098	-6.96		-0.099	-5.82	
Freshman	0.005	2.21	4.9	0.026	7.87	61.96	0.030	7.56	57.15
SAT verbal	0.000	-1.18	1.39	0.000	4.64	21.5	0.000	2.88	8.29
SAT math	0.000	4.06	16.45	0.000	4.71	22.19	0.000	6.5	42.25
STEM AP	0.009	6.26	39.14	0.023	11.94	142.55	0.033	14.19	201.4
Non-STEM AP	-0.006	-4.43	19.63	-0.003	-2.02	4.09	-0.009	-4.51	20.36
Female	-0.020	-9.59	91.94	0.007	2.34	5.46	-0.015	-4.46	19.88
Black	-0.007	-1.46	2.14	-0.009	-1.33	1.77	-0.017	-2.06	4.25
Hispanic	-0.004	-0.9	0.8	-0.008	-1.23	1.52	-0.013	-1.55	2.4
Asian	0.009	2.96	8.74	0.010	2.54	6.45	0.020	4.11	16.93
First major ENG	0.768	198	39203.8						
2nd major Non-ENG STEM	-0 026	-5.3	28.05						
1st major Non-ENG STEM				0.759	189.67	35,974			
2nd major ENG				$\Delta_{0.086}$	-8.54	73			
1st major STEM							0.738	177.49	31504
Ν	24,251			24,251			24,251		
Log likelihood	-20441.5			-5953			3198		

effect was found to be significant for Biology and Mathematics courses, i.e. having greater percentage of women in a class will raise the average performance of the class (except for 300 level mathematics courses). Again there are a complex possible set of causes generating this result which needs further study.

6.5. AP work, persistence and comparative advantage

The next model includes the number of AP credits as 576 one of the explanatory variables. Specifically, this is the 577 total number of credits reported by a student once he or 578 she declares the AP exams were taken and the respective 579 grades on them are known. A student can take AP exams 580 in STEM fields-physics, biology, mathematics, chemistry, 581 statistics, and computer science and also in Non-STEM 582 fields-Literature, history, music, psychology, art studio and 583 economics. The number of STEM AP exams and Non-STEM 584 AP exams reported may show past interest or disinterest in 585 STEM fields and evidence of prior training in a discipline. 586 To explore the correlation between the of number of STEM 587 and Non-STEM AP exams taken and the choice of major, the 588 regression modèl for major choice (attainment of a degree 589 is the dependent variable) is modified to include two new 590 explanatory variables in place of the AP credits variable. The 591 two new explanatory variables are STEM AP that equals 592 the number of STEM AP exams reported by the student, 593 and Non-STEM AP that equals the number of Non-STEM AP 594 exams reported by the student. These two variables were 595 significant in the degree choice models with opposite signs 596 (See Table 9). Taking a larger number of STEM AP exams is 597 associated with an increased chance of graduating with an 598 engineering or non-engineering STEM degree. The oppo-599 site results hold if a larger number of Non-STEM AP exams 600 are taken. We interpret this as an indication that interest 601 in STEM fields may start at the high school level which 602 inspires a student to take more STEM AP related courses 603 and eventually graduate with a STEM degree from college. 604 It also is consistent with a hypothesis that certain STEM-605

destined students have a comparative advantage in STEM work and this is exhibited by appropriate AP work. Such work is also consistent with the idea of learning-by-doing. Sadly, we cannot disentangle this further with our data.

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

A further result from this analysis shown in Table 9 is that the successful STEM majors, whether engineering or non-engineering STEM, initially declare their major to be in the field in which they finally receive their degree.

We next looked at all students who declared engineering as their first major choice and who then received a bachelor's degree. We further separated this group into those who graduated with an engineering degree and those who received a degree in some other field, STEM or Non-STEM. We decided that a regression using cumulative GPA as a dependent variable was not useful as it is well known that engineering grades harder than most other disciplines. Hence, we looked at the characteristics of these two groups and these results are presented in Table 10. There we show the mean of the ability variables together with a Satterthwaite test of the significance for the difference between the two means.⁹

The relative ability variables are all higher for those who received an engineering degree in terms of the means, and the means are statistically significantly different from each other with the only exception of the verbal SAT scores. This is consistent with a comparative advantage or with learning-by-doing, but may also be the result of some other cause.¹⁰ Hence those who persist in engineering declare it as their first major and have better ability credentials compared to those who switch out of engineering.

⁹ This test requires that the samples are assumed to be independent, but may not have the same variance and is thus the Satterthwaite approximation of the degrees of freedom of the *t*-test.

¹⁰ This may be also interpreted as evidence of persistence but that term begs the question of why persistence may exist whereas comparative advantage and learning-by-doing may be the ultimate cause of persistence.

 Table 10
 Satterthwaite test of equality of means of ability of all graduates who declare engineering as first major.

Ability metric	Degree awarded in	Degree awarded in	Satterthwaite	test statistic
	engineering mean	non-engineering mean	t-Test	$\Pr > t $
Math SAT	647	635	-2.73	0.0070
Undergrad cumulative GPA	3.14	3.04	4.37	< 0.0001
No. of AP credits	5.80	4.52	<u>∧</u> _{3.36}	0.0008
No. of STEM AP credits	0.81	0.63	-3.01	0.0027
Verbal SAT	563	568	0.95	0.3440

636 6.6. Other results

Finally, we looked at the possibility that STEM fields 637 grade harder and this discourages continuation in these 638 fields. It has been suggested that academics in STEM fields 639 see their role, in part, to weed out the less motivated and the 640 incompetents and do so more strongly than academics of 641 other fields. Teachers of STEM courses do not see a societal 642 good in inept designers of vehicles, bridges, and manufacto-643 ries. Hence, they challenge applicants to be motivated and 644 competent. This would result in higher grading standards 645 and practices in STEM fields, which is a testable hypothesis 646 and indeed we found evidence of this differential grading. 647 But we cannot link this statistically as causal of exces-648 sive drop-outs. So the answer is yes, the average grades 649 are lower for STEM courses but this is difficult to relate 650 to the encouragement or discouragement of students. It 651 is well known that Economics Departments grade harder 652 than English Departments, yet there are majors in both 653 fields, and the drop-out rates are not as severe as those 654 of STEM fields but we have no measure of encouragement 655 in this case either. 656

657 7. **Discussion and conclusion**

The attributes of a successful STEM major at Bingham-658 ton can be summarized briefly. Engineers who have good 659 mathematics preparation, who declare and enter engineer-660 ing as freshmen, or transfer in with prior STEM work, 661 and are of Asian ethnicity have better chances of success. 662 Women are few in numbers as engineers. All other STEM 663 fields see less emphasis on mathematics preparation, but 664 far more on the presence of any advanced placement course 665 work, and are not as rigorous in a lock-step program neces-666 sitating freshman entry. Women also seem to have the 667 same presence in these other STEM fields as they do in the 668 whole university. 669

670 After reviewing the rates at which students change majors, it is evident that these rates are varied. If we par-671 tition students into two groups, STEM and Non-STEM, we 672 find differential rates of changing from either to the other 673 with very few students embracing a STEM major after start-674 ing out as a Non-STEM student (similar to engineers). But 675 the rate of switching out of a STEM field is high, over 50% 676 in some of our data. This may be a rough measure of the 677 opportunity costs of switching majors; high to switch into 678 a STEM field and low to switch out of STEM work. Measures 679 of this are beyond the scope of this paper. 680

Hence, we postulate that success in a STEM field, success
 here defined as declaring STEM as a major and graduat-

ing from a STEM field, accrues to those who have been interested and studying and working in STEM fields from high school or even possibly earlier. Both the existence of a long-term interest in STEM fields and prior middle and high school experience with STEM work are consistent with the development of a student's comparative advantage and/or with learning-by-doing in STEM work. Our data only allows us to test this very weakly using the presence of high school AP credits as evidence of early commitment to studying a STEM field. Again, we caution that this does not allow us to conclude with any certainty that either a comparative advantage exists nor that there exists considerable learning-by-doing.

There are several issues that remain untested, issues that may be important. These include the early life experiences of a student, the effect of peers, and the career outlook. Inspiration for STEM interest can come from various scientific toys, such as chemistry sets and Legos, from middle school science fairs,¹¹ and from family and neighbor role models. Peer effects can come from various levels of school and include dorm mates, Greek Houses, clubs, athletics, summer school, siblings and other relatives, and work. The perceived job outlook for most pre-college and for many undergraduates is based on anecdotal evidence until they see a placement officer at their college. Such things as expected income, working conditions, geographic location, and opportunities are only slowly developed but they may influence the choice of major. Our models also may mis-measure several complex variables such as drop outs as students switch colleges, do not measure idealism, and are functionally specified as log-linear in variables.

Future work to answer the question of why there is such a large drop-out rate from STEM majors nationally probably should consider survey methods to elucidate the answers from a large sample of students, faculty, and K-12 teachers and counselors; econometrics alone may be less useful given the data limitations we now have about the motivations to enter STEM, the possible existence of comparative advantage, the issue of learning-by-doing, and the many possible reasons for success.

Indeed, we think the question to address about STEM students is better phrased as "Why do students select and excel in STEM studies?" rather than "Why do the other students drop out?"

Appendix A.

727

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

726

¹¹ Economist, Technology Quarterly, June 12–18, 2010. p25.

	0			References
	Percent of those who took a course	53.4 9.4 1.6	12	Adelman, C. (1999). Answe dance patterns, and bach Department of Educatio Alting, A., & Walser, A. (200 uate engineering studen Proceedings of the Amer conference Honolulu, Ha Archibald, R. B., & Feldman
	Graduates in this major	237 51 11	299	higher education afforda nomics, College of Willi Astin, A. W., & Astin, H. S. impact of different colleg the sciences. Final repor Education Research Inst Baldi, S., Jin, Y., Skemer, M. from PISA 2006: Perform
Presented AP work	Took a course in this field	1251 542 690	2483	and mathematics literacy Washington, DC: Nation Education Sciences, U.S. Brainard, S. G., & Carlin, L. ate women in engineer <i>in education conference,</i> <i>learning in an era of chai</i> Braxton, J. M., & Hirschy, A.
	Percent of those who took a course	11.2 2.1 1.6	12	social integration in st (Eds.), Retention and su University Press. Braxton, J. M., & Hirschy, A lege student departure. Formula for student suc Press. Bretz, R. (1989). College grac A meta-analytic review.
ork	Graduates in I this major t	443 103 28	574	Management, 18. Calcagno, J. C., Bailey, T., J. Community college stu tics make a difference? I Chen, X., & Weko, T. (July 2 engineering and mathen Department of Educatio Cohn, E., Cohn, S., Balch, D. undergraduate GPAs: S
Presented no AP work	Took a course in this field	3947 4809 5141	####	rank. Economics of Educ DesJardins, S. L., Kim, DO., of factors affecting bac Student Retention, 4(4), (2010). Economist, Technolo, Eris, O., Chachra, D., Chen, (2007). A preliminary tence: Results from a lor
Declare as	third major	3 4 26	33	society for engineering e June 24–27, 2007. Fleming, L., Engerman, K., & education: Experiences versity. In Proceedings o annual conference Portla Gonzales, P., Williams, T., Jo
Declare as	second major	122 46 39	207	(2008). Highlights from ment of U. S. fourth- a context. Washington, L Institute of Education S Habley, W. R., & McClanal tion—all survey colleges. Kilgore, D., Atman, C. J., Yas Considering context: As
Declare as	first major	1336 209 17	1562	of Engineering Education Kokkelenberg, E. C., Blose, tional funding cuts on b education. In R. C. Ehre education? (pp. 71–82). Kokkelenberg, E. C., Dillon, size on student grades
Field		Biology Chemistry Physics	Totals	Review, 27(2), 221–233. Kuh, G. D. (2003). What we NSSE. Change, 35(2), 24- Malgwi, C. A., Howe, M. A., & choice of college major.

the tool box: Academic intensity, attendegree attainment. Washington, DC: U.S. etention and persistence of undergrad-Vhat Happens After The First Year?". In society for engineering education annual June 24–27, 2007. . (2008) How to think about changes in Working papers 76. Department of Econd Mary. 🔨). Undergraduate science education: The vironments on the educational pipeline in ifornia University, Los Angeles: Higher en, P. J., & Herget, D. (2007). Highlights of U. S. 15-year-old students in science n international context (NCES 2008-016). nter for Education Statistics, Institute of artment of Education. 7). A longitudinal study of undergradund science. In Proceedings of the frontiers on 27th annual conference. Teaching and ol. 01. IEEE Computer Society. 004). Reconceptualizing antecedents of departure. In M. Yorke, & B. Longden in higher education. Buckingham: Open 005). Theoretical developments in col-Seidman (Ed.), College student retention: pp. 61-87). Westport, CT: Greenwood nt average as a predictor of adult success: me additional evidence. Public Personnel s. D., Kienzl, G., & Leinbach, T. (2008). success: What institutional characterisnics of Education Review, 27(6), 632–645. Students who study science, technology, (STEM) in postsecondary education. U.S. ES 2009-161. Bradley, J., Jr. (2004). Determinants of ores, high-school GPA and high-school Review, 23(6), 577–586. nca, C. S. (2002-2003). A nested analysis s degree completion. Journal of College 135. arterly, (June 12–18). osca, C, Ludlow, L., Sheppard, S., et al. sis of correlates of engineering persisinal study. In Proceedings of the American ion annual conference Honolulu, Hawaii, in, A. (2005). Persistence in engineering year students at a historically black unimerican society for engineering education regon, June 12-15, 2005. L., Roey, S., Kastberg, D., & Brenwald, S. 2007: Mathematics and science achieveghth-grade students in 🏠 international ational Center for Education Statistics, es, U.S. Department of Education. . (2004). What works in student reten-City, Iowa: ACT, Inc. n, K., Barker, T. K. & Morozov, A. (2007). of first year engineering students. Journal !), 321–334. Porter, J. (2006). The effects of instituureate graduation rates in public higher (Ed.), What's happening to public higher nan & Littlefield Education. Christy, S. M. (2008). The effects of class ublic university. Economics of Education arning about student engagement from aby, P. A. (2005). Influences on students' al of Education for Business, 80, 275–282.

- Maple, S. A., & Stage, F. K. (1991). Influences on the choice of math/science
 major by gender and ethnicity. American Educational Research Journal,
 28(1), 37–60.
- McCain, J., Fleming, L., Williams, D., & Engerman, K. (2007). The role
 of doggedness in the completion of an undergraduate engineering
 degree. In *Proceedings of the American society for engineering education annual conference* Honolulu, Hawaii, June 24–27, 2007.
- McCormick, A. C. (2000–2009). National survey of student engagement (NSSE). Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research.
- Montmarquette, C., Cannings, K., & Mabseredjian, S. (2002). How do young
 people choose college majors? *Economics of Education Review*, 21(6),
 543–556.
- National Academies of Sciences. (2006). Rising above the gathering storm:
 Energizing and employing America for a brighter economic future.
 National Academy Press.
- Ohland, M. W., Sheppard, S. D., Lichtenstein, G., Eris, O., Chachra, D.,
 & Layton, R. A. (2008). Persistence, engagement, and migration in
 engineering programs. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 97(3), 259–278.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). How college affects students:
 Findings and insights from twenty years of research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Polachek, S. W. (1978). Sex-Differences in college major. Industrial & Labor Relations Review, 31(4), 498–508.

829

830

831

832

833

834

835

836

837

838

839

840

841

842

843

844

845

846

847

848

849

850

851

- Sax, L. J. (1994). Mathematical self-concept: How college reinforces the gender gap. *Research in Higher Education*, 35(2), 141–166.
- Snyder, T. D., & Dillow, S. A. (2010). Digest of education statistics 2009 (NCES 2010-013). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, 45, 89–125.
- Tinto, V. (1982). Limits of theory and practice in student attrition. *Journal* of Higher Education, 53(6), 687–700.
- U.S. Department of Education. (July, 2009). Students who study science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) in postsecondary education. Washington, DC.: U.S. Department of Education.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2006). http://www.ice.gov/doclib/sevis/pdf/nces_cip_codes_rule.pdf.
- Xie, Y., & Shauman, K. A. (2003). Women in science: Career processes and outcomes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Zhang, G., Anderson, T. J., Ohland, M. W., Carter, R., & Thorndyke, B. R. (2004). Identifying factors influencing engineering student graduation and retention: A longitudinal and cross-institutional study. In *Proceedings of the American society for engineering education annual conference* Montreal, Quebec, Canada, June 16–19, 2002,