Published in final edited form as:

Am Educ Res J. 2012 December 1; 49(6): . doi:10.3102/0002831211435229.

The More Things Change, the More They Stay the Same? Examining Gender Equality in Prior Achievement and Entry into STEM College Majors over Time

Catherine Rieggle-Crumb,
The University of Texas at Austin

Barbara King,
The University of Texas at Austin

Eric Grodsky, and
The University of Minnesota

Chandra Muller
The University of Texas

Abstract

This article investigates the empirical basis for often-repeated arguments that gender differences in entrance into STEM majors are largely explained by disparities in prior achievement. Analyses use data from three national cohorts of college matriculates across three decades to consider differences across several indicators of high school math and science achievement at the mean and also at the top of the test distribution. Analyses also examine the different comparative advantages men and women enjoy in math/science vs. English/reading. Regardless of how prior achievement is measured, very little of the strong and persistent gender gap in physical science and engineering majors over time is explained. Findings highlight the limitations of theories focusing on gender differences in skills and suggest directions for future research.

Keywords

Achievement; gender; math; postsecondary; science

Introduction

The fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) enjoy a preeminent status in modern society due to their vital role in promoting and sustaining economic prosperity. The past decade has witnessed a re-invigorated national emphasis on education in these fields, driven in large part by concerns that there will be a shortage of individuals qualified to meet the projected growth of STEM occupations (National Academy of Sciences, 2007). Current conversations about lack of gender equality in STEM fields, as evidenced by the relatively low share of scientists who are women, often center on the need to increase the number of females entering postsecondary programs in STEM as a crucial solution to address the future workforce needs of the nation, while at the same time recognizing that continued stratification is an issue of social justice (Fox, Sonnert, & Nikiforova, 2011).ⁱ

Correspondence to: Catherine Rieggle-Crumb.

Although an interest in promoting women's participation in STEM fields is far from new and a large body of literature exists on the topic, there are nevertheless issues that require further investigation if we are to move towards a better understanding of these gendered patterns. In this article we critically examine a common explanation for women's underrepresentation in STEM fields of study (and subsequently related occupations), namely that inequality is mostly a consequence of gaps in achievement at earlier points in the life course. This supposition is often offered by researchers studying inequality at earlier ages and put forth as common knowledge (Fryer & Levitt, 2009; Lubinski & Benbow, 1992; Penner & Paret, 2008; Wai, Cacchio, Putallaz, & Makel, 2010; Wilson & Boldizar, 1990). Yet there are few empirical studies that actually test this assertion with nationally representative data, and those that do find little in the way of supporting evidence (Riegle-Crumb & King, 2010; Williams & Ceci, 2007; Xie & Shauman, 2003). If arguments about female under-achievement as a principal cause of gender inequality in STEM postsecondary fields are indeed not well-founded, then it is problematic for studies to continue invoking them. By doing so we risk placing too little focus on the development of new research and policies that might effectively redress inequality in STEM fields, while at the same time exaggerating or at least mis-specifying the consequences of small gender differences on certain measures of achievement during primary and secondary school, and perhaps inadvertently perpetuating gender stereotypes in the process.

Consequently, our study aims to provide a critical and thorough examination of the extent to which prior achievement can explain inequitable levels of gender representation in STEM fields of study. We move beyond a consideration of average gender differences in achievement in math and science as a key mechanism for subsequent inequality (Riegle-Crumb & King, 2010; Xie & Shauman, 2003), to explore two alternative conceptualizations of achievement that are less studied but potentially more informative. First, we examine the possibility that the relationship between academic background and the decision to major in a STEM field is nonlinear, such that gender differences at the top of the test score distribution matter most for understanding subsequent gender inequality in fields of study (Robinson & Lubinski, 2011). To the extent that students at the upper tail possess the strongest ability and relevant skills, gender differences among this group could have implications for the gender distribution of STEM college majors. Additionally, we test the idea that it is not *absolute* levels of math and science achievement that are important to explaining gendered postsecondary patterns, but rather individuals' *relative* strengths in math/science vs. non-math/science fields, or what we refer to as comparative advantage (Barone, 2011). This perspective emphasizes the potential relevance of within-person comparisons in contrast to most prior research on STEM that privileges only between-group comparisons (Eccles, 2007). Finally, we examine patterns over the past several decades, a time period when women have made substantial progress in postsecondary attendance to the point of now outpacing men (Buchmann & Diprete, 2006). This comparative perspective will provide new empirical information about the degree to which under-achievement arguments have (or have not) been useful for understanding gender patterns in STEM representation across time.

We utilize survey and transcript data from three nationally representative cohorts of college matriculates in the 1980's, 1990's and early 2000's (from the High School and Beyond Study (HS&B), the National Education Longitudinal Study (NELS) and the Educational Longitudinal Study (ELS) respectively). We concentrate on students' declaration of physical science and engineering majors (including math and computer science), as these fields exhibit strong gender disparities in enrollment, in contrast to the generally equitable patterns

ⁱ It is important to note that recent research finds that women do not leave STEM majors at higher rates than men; contingent on entering a STEM major, women and men have the same attrition rates (Xie & Shauman, 2003). Therefore the crucial threshold for examining gender disparities is the entrance into the major, which is what we model here.

observed in the biological sciences (NSB 2008). Our results indicate that regardless of how we measure achievement in high school, accounting for the relatively small disparities between males and females found across all three cohorts does very little to explain gender disparities in choice of a physical science/engineering (PS/E) major, a difference that remains strong and robust over time. We conclude by considering the limited utility of theories focusing on gender differences in skills and abilities and suggest how theories of gender as a social structure, which call attention to how inequality is produced at the individual, interactional, and institutional levels, may be more useful in motivating future research that effectively explains gender disparities in STEM postsecondary fields (Risman, 2004).

Background

In an influential early report entitled “Who Will Do Science,” Berryman (1983) likened the long path to an occupation in STEM fields to a pipeline that begins early in students’ educational careers and progresses through high school, into and out of college, and eventually ends in the labor force. While some recent studies have rightly critiqued this notion of the pipeline as too singular and simplistic (Xie & Shauman, 2003), there is clearly a connection between academic performance at earlier stages and performance and persistence at later stages of educational trajectories such that math and science achievement in middle and high school strongly predict pursuit of a STEM degree.ⁱⁱ Drawing on this link, Berryman (1983) reviewed research from the 1960’s and early 1970’s and surmised that opportunities for girls to enter STEM majors in college were curtailed because of their relatively weak math preparation in high school, as manifest in their lower math test scores in 12th grade, which were in turn the result of girls taking fewer advanced math classes than boys. Berryman’s argument that inequitable representation in STEM college fields was the result of female under-achievement at earlier points in the pipeline was supported with earlier empirical work (Dunteman, Wisenbaker, & Taylor, 1979; Goldman & Hewitt, 1976).

The theoretical perspective that underlies this argument is rooted in rational actor and human capital theories of gender differences in fields of study. Through this lens, college major is a choice made by individuals who seek to maximize the returns to their skills and efforts (Jonsson, 1999; Paglin & Rudfio, 1990). If females have lower average levels of math and science achievement or aptitude, then their success in STEM fields is less likely, or at the very least more difficult to achieve. Another perspective supporting this argument is the theory that scientific disciplines are defined by norms of universalism, such that entry and success are open to anyone who demonstrates skills and talent based on impersonal, objective, and measurable criteria (Merton, 1973). According to this perspective, entrance into and success in STEM majors is conditional solely on successfully completing certain courses and demonstrating merit through test scores and grades; gatekeepers presumably find additional social and background characteristics irrelevant (Long & Fox, 1995). Such ideas provide an explanation for gender inequality during the later stages of the STEM pipeline that appears meritocratic and just, and perhaps more clear and concrete when compared to more abstract theories of gender as a social construct or structure (a topic to which we will turn in the Conclusion).

Within the vast literature on gender inequality in STEM fields published in the last several decades, there are conflicting accounts of the continued validity of female underachievement arguments as a primary cause of gaps in college and beyond. On the one hand, a host of

ⁱⁱ For example, early work by Ware, Steckler and Leserman (1985), Oakes (1990) and Maple and Stage (1991) found that math SAT score, and math and science grades and high school course-taking were among the strongest predictors of choice of a STEM major. More recent analyses by Xie and Shauman (2003) and Crisp et al (2009) concur with these findings.

studies repeatedly invokes this argument as the rationale for a continued focus on gender differences in the elementary and secondary years (Fryer & Levitt, 2009; Hedges & Nowell, 1995; Good, Aronson, & Harder, 2007; Leahey & Guo, 2001; Lubinski & Benbow 1992; Muller, Stage, & Kinzie, 2001; Oakes, 1990; Penner & Paret, 2008; Wai et al., 2010; Wilson & Boldizar, 1990). Indeed, according to Xie and Shauman (2003), female underachievement in primary and secondary school is “*the most frequently cited justification for continuing to study math and science gender gap*” (p.3), and is prevalent among studies in education, sociology, psychology and economics. For example, researchers studying the effect of stereotype threat contend that gender gaps in test scores are important because they lay the foundation for women’s under-representation in science at the postsecondary level (Good et al., 2007). Sociologists offer the same explanation for investigating gender differences in high school math test scores (Hedges & Nowell, 1995; Leahey & Guo, 2001). This argument is also prevalent in studies of students as young as elementary school (Fryer & Levitt, 2009; Penner & Paret, 2008). It is interesting to note that these studies offer widely divergent theories as to the cause of the slight gender gap in primary and secondary achievement that they observe; yet they converge by endorsing the idea that these differences have important consequences for female underrepresentation in STEM college fields.ⁱⁱⁱ

Yet in contrast to the assertions of the research described above, other studies explicitly call attention to the fact that while some gender differences in STEM achievement persist, they are generally quite small in magnitude and not likely to be consequential.^{iv} For example, Hyde and her colleagues (2008) found that in recent years, the average gender gap on state math assessments has diminished to only one tenth of a standard deviation in magnitude. Likewise the gender gap in advanced course-taking implicated in Berryman’s (1983) study has virtually disappeared in recent decades (Dalton, Ingels, Downing, Bozick, & Owings, 2007). Grades are another important dimension of prior preparation, and one where girls generally outscore boys even in the subjects of math and science (AAUW, 2008; Ewert, 2010). Indeed two recent studies which focused on empirically investigating the extent to which prior disparities explain gender inequality in college STEM fields concluded that the evidence does not support this notion. Using data from HS&B, Xie and Shauman (2003) found that while prior academic preparation in math and science is strongly related to entrance into a STEM major, the small gender differences favoring males in this cohort were inadequate to explain the gap in field of study at the postsecondary level. Analyses using data from a more recent national cohort found similar results (Riegler-Crumb & King, 2010).

These prior studies cast doubt on the feasibility of prior achievement as an explanation of gender differences in entrance into STEM fields. Yet they cannot be considered exhaustive in their ability to refute underachievement arguments. In this study, we therefore seek to offer a critical, rigorous, and comprehensive examination of the validity of such arguments with the intent of helping to resolve this inconsistency in the literature. To do so we retain the focus on individual skills that underlies previous work but move beyond a focus on differences at the mean to further consider conceptualizations of academic performance that might provide a more powerful account of gendered postsecondary paths. Additionally, we consider patterns across cohorts of high school students from the last several decades to discern whether underachievement arguments may be more or less relevant at different periods.

ⁱⁱⁱThe disagreement about the source of females’ lower achievement is the result of a continued debate about the extent to which innate and biological differences in ability are the culprit, or whether socio-cultural forces work to produce differences. See Blickenstaff (2005) or Halpern et al (2007) for a review of the related arguments and supporting evidence.

^{iv} Indeed the two studies discussed above acknowledge the small magnitude of the gender gap they examine. Fryer and Levitt (2009), for example, find a difference of about .2 standard deviations at the end of fifth grade, while Robinson and Lubinski (2010) note a gap of .12 standard deviations at the end of 8th grade.

Further Considerations of Gender Inequality

With regard to test scores, differences between male and female students are generally observed to be larger in size toward the upper end of the distribution, where males are disproportionately represented (Benbow & Stanley, 1983; Feingold, 1992; Hedges & Nowell, 1995). Seen through the lens of individual skills-based explanations of choice of field of study, this asymmetry at the upper end of the test score distribution may be consequential for later gender patterns, as the highest achievers may have the best chances for successfully meeting the demands of postsecondary STEM majors as well as signaling and attracting the notice of STEM gatekeepers such as faculty, counselors, and recruiters (Xie & Shauman, 2003).^v Two recent articles (Penner & Paret, 2008; Robinson & Lubinski, 2011) invoked this rationale for studying gender disparities at the top five and ten percent of the test score distribution among elementary school students; but as with most research on test score gaps, the authors focus on attempting to explain the source of the gap and not on examining its consequences. In this paper we therefore investigate the proposition that gender differences in the concentration of students in the upper tail drives subsequent inequality by employing an empirical model that allows the relationship between test scores and STEM participation to vary across the achievement distribution.

Additionally we consider the possibility that relative rather than absolute levels of prior academic achievement may be more useful for understanding subsequent postsecondary gender patterns in fields of study. Barone (2011) notes that while average gender differences in math and science achievement have decreased, girls continue to outperform boys in the humanities, and he suggests that such differentials might play an important role in entrance into STEM fields. This notion of comparative advantage is consistent with theories on the social-psychological aspects of performance, including confidence and self-efficacy, as put forth by Eccles (1994; 2007). She argues that within-person comparisons are much more relevant to understanding individuals' trajectories than between-group mean-level comparisons. Yet like other arguments about the centrality of gender differences in skills, this idea is also consistent with rational actor theories, such that students are attuned to their relative strengths and use them to assess the probability of success and the amount of effort required when comparing different options for their futures (Correll, 2001; Jonsson, 1999). From this perspective, to the extent that males are likely to have stronger math and science skills compared to their skills in reading and English, and females generally have skills weighted in the opposite direction, both genders select a major consistent with their achievement profile. Despite the plausibility of comparative advantage as a key mechanism in individuals' choice of field, it has been rarely empirically examined (Jonsson, 1999). We therefore contribute to the literature on STEM inequality by examining whether the comparative advantage that males and females possess in different subjects offers a more effective explanation of gender disparities at the postsecondary level.

Finally, this study will also examine trends over time to explore whether accounting for prior achievement contributes differentially to explaining the gender gap of major for different cohorts. A simple extension of under-achievement arguments would anticipate that if gaps in prior preparation are larger among earlier cohorts, then a larger share of gender disparities in choice of major will be explained. Yet a consideration of changes in the higher education landscape offers a more complex picture. Rates of college attendance and attainment have increased steadily for both genders over the last several decades, but historical gender patterns have reversed such that women have gained the advantage (Buchmann & Diprete, 2006). Neo-institutionalist theories of social change would argue that

^v Based on this assumption, several studies have chosen to limit their exploration of gender equality in STEM fields to students with high levels of achievement. See for example Boli, Allen and Paynel (1985) as well as Seymour and Hewitt (1997) who limited their study to students scoring highly on the math SAT.

in addition to the decrease in obstacles to women's presence in higher education and the labor force (Long & Fox, 1995; Ramirez & Wotipka, 2001), we should also see a move towards gender desegregation as a consequence of increasing egalitarianism and the delegitimation of ascribed inequalities, including gender (Barone, 2011; Charles & Bradley, 2002). Although the female share of intended as well as attained bachelor's degrees in physical science and engineering fields has remained relatively flat since the early 1980's (England & Li, 2006), it is nevertheless plausible that such fields have become more universalistic over time, such that differences in prior achievement would explain a larger share of gender inequality in college majors among more recent cohorts, with less of a net effect of gender on entry into these fields. While it is beyond the scope of this paper to test theories about large scale social change or stratification, by focusing on inequality across the last several decades we contribute new and important empirical information to such discussions.

Data and Results

We utilize data from three longitudinal studies conducted by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES): the High School and Beyond: Sophomore Cohort (HS&B), the National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS), and the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS). We use data from student and parent surveys conducted during the students' sophomore year of high school, which was in 1980, 1990, and 2002 respectively, and from follow-up student surveys conducted during their senior year, as well as two years after on-time high school graduation. We also utilize information from students' high school transcripts collected by all three studies to construct measures of course-taking and grades, as discussed below. We restrict our analyses to all students who enrolled in a four-year degree-granting institution and reported having declared a major field of study on the student survey administered two years post high school (corresponding to 1984 for HS&B students, 1994 for NELS students, and 2006 for ELS students). Missing data are imputed via single imputation.

Our multivariate models include self-reported measures for students' gender and race/ethnicity. Family background indicators include a series of dummy variables to capture the highest level of education obtained by either parent (with high school graduation as the contrast category). To measure family income we recoded the original ordinal indicator in each dataset by taking the mid-point of each income category. For the open ended final category we extrapolate from the next-to-last category using a modified Pareto formula suggested by Hout (2004). Next we converted the dollar values from HS&B and NELS into equivalent dollars for students in the ELS cohort based on the consumer price index (CPI-U) and then divided all values by 10,000 to facilitate presentation. We also include a dichotomous measure of whether the student enrolled in college the fall subsequent to high school graduation (coded 0) or was delayed in enrollment (coded 1). See the appendix for a detailed description of each of these background variables. Below we discuss our key variables of interest.

Defining High School Achievement

We consider several distinct conceptualizations of math and science achievement in high school. First, we discuss relatively standard measures of high school academic preparation (math and science course-taking, math and science grades, and math achievement tests) and then we discuss measures of high-end achievement as well as our comparative advantage indicator. To construct measures of course-taking we rely on the students' high school transcripts. Based on the thresholds established by prior research as best capturing students' level of coursework (Adelman, 1999), we distinguish among students whose highest level math course was calculus, pre-calculus or other advanced math (which includes

trigonometry and statistics), or algebra 2 or below (the reference category). Likewise, we distinguish among four levels of science course-taking : physics, biology 2 or chemistry 2 (referred to in tables as advanced science), or chemistry 1 or below (the reference category). We obtained grades from students' high school transcripts and averaged across all math and science courses taken in high school on the traditional four point scale. Students' math test scores are available from both 10th and 12th grade. Because we are interested in comparability across the three time points, we standardize each test score (10th and 12th grade test) within cohorts and then take the mean of available standardized scores for each student.^{vi}

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics for each of these achievement measures separately for males and females by cohort. Most gender differences are quite consistent over these three cohorts. Beginning with rates of advanced course-taking, we see that both genders have increased their representation in the highest courses over time. While the female advantage at the penultimate level has grown over times in both subjects, males have a significant advantage in both calculus and physics course-taking at all three time points (although women have shrunk the physics course-taking gap over time). It is important to point out, however, that these differences are in large part a consequence of sample selection. If we expand the sample to look at the population of high school seniors (rather than those seniors who entered college within two years of completing high school), males and females are equally likely to take calculus, and while boys remain more likely to take physics among the larger sample (by 7 percentage points), this difference is smaller than observed for our analytic sample of four-year college matriculates (a difference of 12 percentage points). Therefore, boys who attend college are increasingly selected on high school academic achievement relative to girls, a pattern most pronounced in the ELS cohort.^{vii}

Returning to Table 1, across cohorts, women hold an advantage in math/science GPA. This advantage fluctuates slightly between one and two tenths of a standard deviation. For math test scores (in a standardized version as described above), men hold a consistent advantage across cohorts. The magnitude of difference is about four tenths of a standard deviation in the earliest cohort and three tenths of a standard deviation in the latest cohort.

As we are interested in examining whether achievement at the upper end of the test score distribution is consequential for gender disparities in choice of major, we turn to focus on male and female students' math test score distribution. Across cohorts, we see that men's representation toward the top of the test score distribution is several percentage points higher than women's. For example, in the HS&B cohort, approximately 7% of men ranked in the 90-95th percentile of math test takes, compared to approximately 5% of women. The corresponding numbers for ELS are approximately 7% and 3% respectively. Thus women are indeed under-represented toward the elite end of the test score distribution and this does not appear to have diminished over time, at least among students attending college.

Our final consideration of how achievement might pertain to men and women's choice of a STEM major centers on the idea of comparative advantage. Here we compare students' performance in math and science to performance in reading/English by creating measures of the differences for both grades and test scores. To measure comparative advantage for GPA, we simply subtract students' cumulative GPA in English classes taken during high school

^{vi} Standardizing test scores within cohorts discards information about absolute levels of knowledge that may increase or decline across cohorts. Models using the original IRT metrics and those using SAT math scores in lieu of NCES standardized scores produced substantively identical results to those presented here, as are models that include science test scores available only for the HS&B and NELS cohorts.

^{vii} Results are available upon request from the authors. This pattern appears to be consistent with findings by Buchmann and Diprete (2006), as well as Ewert (2010), who find gender differences in the selection into college as a function of students' background.

from their GPA in their math and science courses. For test score differences, we follow the operationalization utilized by Xie and Achen (2009). We rely on the reading tests administered in tandem with the math tests in all three studies, and calculate the difference between the students' math test percentile and their reading test percentile. In all of our difference measures, a value greater than 0 indicates a comparative advantage in math/science, while a value less than 0 indicates an advantage in reading/English.^{viii} We also include variables to capture the number of honors English courses taken during high school as a control variable (see Appendix for full description).

Turning again to Table 1, we see that both male and female college matriculates from the HS& B cohort had a higher math/science GPA than English GPA in high school (as indicated by the positive values on the GPA difference measure). For the NELS and ELS cohorts, students of both genders averaged higher grades in English than in math/science, but this comparative advantage was more pronounced for females than for males. For example in the ELS cohort, boys' English grades were higher than their math/science grades by about one tenth of a grade point, while girls' English grades were approximately one fifth of a grade point higher than their math/science grades. Comparing test scores across subjects, males are on average more proficient in math than reading comprehension across all three cohorts (by 3-5 percentage points). Females are about 2 percentage points more proficient on math than reading comprehension in the NELS cohort, but in both the HS&B and ELS cohorts they scored on average several percentage points higher on the reading than the math test (by approximately 1.5 and 4.5 percentage points respectively).

Defining College Major

Our outcome of interest is student's declared major. Because different fields within the broad category of STEM are known to have different histories of gender segregation, we distinguish among students who declared a major in PS/E fields (which includes physical sciences, engineering, math and computer science), those who declared a major in the biological sciences, and those who declared a major in a non-STEM field.

Figure 1 displays the breakdown of male and female students into these two different categories of STEM majors across the three different national cohorts of college matriculates, as well as trend lines that show the percentages of male and female high school graduates that attend four-year colleges for each cohort. As noted elsewhere (Ewert, 2006), both genders have increased their rates of college attendance over the time period, yet women have eclipsed men during recent decades. The share of students declaring a major in the field of the biological sciences is generally equitable across all three time points. Approximately ten percent of men and women declared a biological science major in both NELS and ELS, with closer to five percent of both genders doing so in HS&B. In contrast, female college students are underrepresented in physical science and engineering fields for all three cohorts. In these fields, there is a male advantage ranging from 15 to 20 percentage points that remains constant despite the fact that there is an overall decrease in the percentage of students majoring in PS/E from the HS&B cohort to the NELS cohort.^{ix} Given the similar gender patterns in the biological sciences, we subsequently restrict the analyses shown here to those that model the likelihood of students majoring in PS/E fields versus non-STEM fields.

^{viii} We also created ratio versions of students' comparative advantage in GPA and test scores; results of analyses were substantively identical to those presented here.

^{ix} Data from the National Science Foundation (NSF) show a similar pattern of decline for the same time period in PS/E degree attainment among both males and females (NSB, 2008).

Predicting Choice of Major

We now turn to the results of multivariate analyses. Our goal is to examine the extent to which gender disparities in representation in PS/E fields at the postsecondary level appear to be related to achievement gaps in high school, as well as whether and how such patterns have changed over time. In order to facilitate comparisons across nested models as well as cross-cohort comparisons we present average marginal effects. Unlike odds ratios, average marginal effects are insensitive to differences in unobserved heteroskedasticity across groups or over time (Hoetker, 2007; Mood, 2010). They are also more intuitive, corresponding to the expected change in the probability of the outcome associated with a one unit change in the predictor, averaged across all observations in the analytic sample.^x

Results are displayed in Table 2. We begin with a baseline model that includes gender, social class background and an indicator of delayed college entry. For the HS&B cohort, on average the probability that a male student declares a PS/E major is 21 percentage points greater than that of a female student; the corresponding effect observed for the ELS cohort is approximately 20 percentage points. In the next model we include measures of course-taking, grades, and test scores that are similar to those from some recent research (Riegle-Crumb & King, 2010; Xie & Shauman, 2003); this will provide a basis of comparison for our subsequent analyses modeling achievement at the top of the test distribution as well as comparative advantage.

We see that across the cohorts there is a strong link between high school math and science achievement and the declaration of a PS/E major. Both math/science GPA and physics course-taking significantly predict choice of PS/E major in all three cohorts. For example, in HS&B students who take physics have a 14.6 percentage point higher probability of declaring a PS/E major than those whose highest science course is chemistry or below. The average marginal effect of taking physics decreases across the three datasets to approximately 4 percentage points in ELS. As for math course-taking, calculus is a significant predictor of declaring a PS/E major for both the NELS and ELS cohorts. In ELS, students who take calculus have a 12.9 percentage point higher probability of declaring a PS/E major than students who complete algebra 2 or less, while in NELS students in calculus have a 9.4 percentage point advantage. For math test score, its predictive power (measured linearly) decreases in both size and statistical significance from HS&B to ELS.

With regard to explaining gender disparities, once we condition on these measures of achievement, the average marginal effect of gender decreases from about 21 percentage points to 16 percentage points for students in the HS&B cohort. The parallel decrease in both NELS and ELS is even smaller; for these later cohorts the decrease is about 2 percentage points. Thus as anticipated, accounting for average test scores and GPA as well as advanced course-taking does very little to explain the gender disparity in entrance into PS/E majors.^{xi}

The results of models focusing on the upper end of the math test score distribution are shown in model 3 for each cohort in Table 2. The linear measure used in model 2 does not allow for different slopes across the achievement distribution, and as discussed earlier, it could be that achievement at the high end plays a bigger role in explaining gender disparities in choice of major. While previous research has suggested that the very elite segment of the test score distribution, i.e. the top 5 or 10 percent, is perhaps the most consequential (Penner & Paret, 2008; Robinson & Lubienski, 2011; Xie & Shauman, 2003), these cut-offs seem

^x Models with odds ratios provide substantively similar results with regard to gender patterns. Results available upon request.

^{xi} We tested for but did not find any evidence of significant interactions between gender and any of our achievement indicators across models and cohorts.

quite restrictive as well as somewhat arbitrary. We explore the underlying relationship between test scores and choice of major by graphing the share of men and women declaring a PS/E major for each percentile of the test score distribution (see the Appendix for the plots). The plots suggest that the probability of declaring a PS/E major is random with respect to test scores for students below about the third quartile of the test score distribution, at least for the latter two cohorts, but linear with respect to test scores above the third quartile. Based on these graphs, we operationalize test score as a linear spline with a single knot at the 75th percentile.^{xii}

Turning our attention back to model 3 in Table 2, for HS&B it appears that both splines are roughly equivalent conditional on other attributes, while for the two later cohorts only the spline capturing the top 25% is greater than zero and statistically significant. Thus for NELS and ELS test score is only predictive of choice of PS/E major among the top 25% of students. As observed in Table 1, women in all cohorts are under-represented in this top quartile. Yet when examining the average marginal effect of gender, modeling test score in this manner leaves the effect virtually unaltered from model 2. As such, it seems that gender differences in choice of PS/E major are constant across the test score distribution, and therefore adding measures that more explicitly model the high end do not help to further explain the gap.

Finally, we consider whether comparative advantage indicators might shed more light on gender disparities in choice of PS/E major than previous models utilizing absolute indicators of achievement. In model 4 of Table 2 we add measures of the difference between students' GPA, and test scores in math/science vs. English/reading (note that we retain the measurement of test score in splines as it is the preferred operationalization). Students who earn better grades in math/science than in English are significantly more likely to declare a PS/E major at all three time points. For example, on average students in NELS who have a 3.5 math/science GPA and a 2.5 English GPA have a 6.9 percentage point higher probability of declaring a physical science/engineering major compared to students who have a 3.5 GPA in all subjects.

In examining how the inclusion of these measures of comparative advantage changes the average marginal effect of gender, we note that there is a small reduction of about two percentage points for all three cohorts. For example, the average marginal effect in HS&B decreases from almost 16 percentage points to about 14 percentage points, while for ELS it decreases from 18 to slightly less than 16 points. Interestingly, supplementary analyses including each comparative advantage indicator separately reveal that it is the inclusion of the GPA measure that is primarily responsible for this modest reduction. It is not boys' comparative advantage in math test scores over reading test scores that works to chip away a little at the gender gap in choice of major, but rather girls' comparative advantage in English grades relative to math/science grades. The coefficient for comparative advantage in test scores is very small in magnitude and statistically significant only for the ELS cohort.^{xiii}

^{xii} To ensure that we specified the best model we also experimented with placing additional knots at the 85th and 95th percentiles. However, BIC statistics favored the model with only one knot, where test score is captured by two different terms, one measuring the relationship between test score and choice of major for those who are lower than the 75th percentile for test scores, and one for those higher than the 75th percentile. This model was also a better fit than the single linear term used in model 2 (particularly for the ELS cohort). We also examined the best functional form for the relationship between GPA and choice of major (although we note that focusing on the higher ends of the GPA distribution would not better explain gender disparities in choice of major since female students trump /male students on that measure). Looking first at scatterplots parallel to those created for test scores, we observed that the relationship appeared to be quite linear; subsequent spline models placing knots at various points in the GPA distribution did nothing to improve model fit. Therefore we retain a simple linear measure of GPA.

^{xiii} In results not shown (available upon request) we examined the possibility that it is students at the top end of the test score distribution that respond most to their comparative advantage, by including interaction terms between those in the top 25% of test scorers and each of the comparative advantage indicators. None were significant and neither did their inclusion improve model fit.

To help summarize the results of our analyses and more easily focus on comparing patterns across the decades, in Figure 2 we show results of a counterfactual analyses showing the gap in PS/E majors that we would expect to see if women had men's high school achievement. The dark solid line on the bottom shows the average predicted proportion of women in PS/E majors over time (net of controls for social background) and the top dashed line shows the same for men. We then include three additional lines that show the counterfactual of how women would look if they had men's distribution on achievement, with one line corresponding to each of the models 2–4 in Table 2. As can be seen in Figure 2, the line representing the counterfactual of the proportion of women in PS/E we would expect to see if they had men's scores on the comparative advantage variables slightly improves upon the other models, such that it explains a little more of the gender gap in PS/E majors. However, it is clear that accounting for achievement, however measured, does very little to help explain gender gap in PS/E major over time.

Finally, turning back to Table 2, there are a few effects of other variables on choice of PS/E major that we find worth noting. Across all three cohorts, black students have a higher probability of declaring a PS/E major than white students conditional on academic achievement. A similar pattern applies to Hispanic youth in HS&B only; in the later two cohorts there is not a statistically significant difference in the likelihood of declaring a PS/E major between white and Hispanic students. Students from homes characterized by higher levels of parental education do not differ from their peers from less educated homes in terms of declaring a PS/E major. We find a significant effect for income, but it goes in a direction opposite to what might be expected: each additional \$10,000 in real family income is associated with a slight decrease (between 0.2 and 0.5 percentage points depending on the cohort) in the probability of declaring a physical science/engineering major.

Conclusion

This paper investigated the empirical basis for often-repeated arguments that gender differences in entrance into STEM postsecondary majors are largely explained by disparities in prior academic achievement. We contributed to the relatively small body of empirical work on this topic using national level data by considering several different conceptualizations of high school achievement that might be relevant for gender inequalities at the college level. Our results indicate that whether focusing on the high end of the test distribution or focusing more broadly on average differences across several indicators including course-taking, conditioning on achievement does extremely little to diminish the gender gap in PS/E majors across time. While models that include measures of comparative advantage in math/science (vs. English/reading) appear to account for more of the gender gap in field of study than the other models considered, overall the evidence we present strongly undermines the assertion that women's underrepresentation in PS/E fields is due to deficits in prior achievement.

These results are important given the prevalence of this assertion in the literature on gender inequality in STEM areas, particularly among those offering a rationale for why we should be concerned about the test score gap observed at earlier stages of the life course (Fryer & Levitt, 2009; Good et al., 2007; Muller et al., 2001; Penner & Paret, 2008; Wai et al., 2010). As noted earlier, gender gaps do remain on many national standardized tests. We are not suggesting that such disparities are unimportant; however we argue that researchers studying them need to provide another reason why they are important. Continuing to suggest such gaps are an important cause of women's underrepresentation in some STEM fields is not only inaccurate but potentially harmful in its consequences if it contributes to the perpetuations of gender stereotypes.

Our analyses also revealed that among our analytic sample of college matriculates, students whose race and social class background is typically associated with educational disadvantages (including black and lower SES youth) were not under-represented in PS/E majors at any time point. This offers some evidence consistent with the assertion that STEM fields are universalistic, such that social background characteristics per se are irrelevant for entry (Merton, 1973; Xie & Achen, 2009). Yet these patterns also serve to place the gender trends observed here in even starker relief. Why is gender the indicator of ascribed identity that continues to strongly differentiate entrance into PS/E fields of study net of achievement differences?

We think that considering inequality in STEM through the lens of sociological theories that recognize gender as a social structure are more likely to help answer this question than those that focus on differences in individual skills as tested here. Critical gender theorists posit that gender is a multi-tiered system with connections between three levels: the larger macro level of politics, economics, and culture; the more micro contexts of personal interactions and exchanges; and lastly, the individual with internalized beliefs and values (Eisenhart & Finkel, 1998; England, 2010; Risman, 2004). This implies that we should think further about how STEM fields fit within the broader structure of gender inequality rather than focusing on such fields in exclusion. Consistent with this view, Charles and Bradley (2002) argue that the U.S. culture (as well as those of many western nations) still strongly endorses the idea that the genders are innately and fundamentally ‘equal but different,’ and therefore continues to encourage the enactment of distinct affinities, distinguishing between those that are appropriately feminine or masculine. England (2010) also argues that our cultural and institutional logics include the maintenance of gender essentialist beliefs, noting that a large part of women’s progress in the educational and occupational sectors is in domains that do not violate traditional gender roles; and even when they do enter male-typical domains, women are more likely to choose those subfields within them that seem “consistent with their (tacitly gendered) notions of their interests and their ‘true selves’ (p. 161).” From this perspective, girls may improve their math and science achievement in secondary school, take more advanced courses, and excel in those courses, because such measures of performance are generally important for college matriculation, independent of field of study (Adelman, 1999). Yet because of the societal pervasiveness of gender essentialist beliefs and the accompanying socialization and micro-level interactions that support them, gendered patterns in choice of major will not shift accordingly.

Several gender theorists point to the level of interactions and exchanges as perhaps the least studied and most potentially informative area of research on gender inequality (Deutsch, 2007; Ridgeway, 1997; Risman, 2004). Such a lens also prompts us to move beyond a treatment of individual characteristics as fixed or exogenous; rather, we should think of gender as a role or identity that is likely more salient in certain social interactions or contexts than in others, with resultant implications for the activation of stereotypes and social scripts (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). For example, future research might examine whether gender appears to be less relevant in social interactions among students, or between students and their teachers, in high school biology classes as compared to physics classes. Given the early formation of career and subject interests, additional insights might be provided by focusing on interactions within math and science classrooms at the elementary or middle school level from a similar perspective. Comparing these different micro-level contexts might provide more information about when, where, and how particular scientific identities are cultivated or dampened and subsequently why females might remain less likely to enter some postsecondary STEM fields of study *despite* comparable levels of achievement to their male peers.

Finally, consistent with research by Eccles (1994) on how individual preferences are shaped by both interests and feelings of efficacy, future research should focus more on thinking about the choices women make as a choice *for* something rather than simply a choice *against* PS/E fields (Stinebrickner & Stinebrickner, 2011; Zafar, 2011). What do many qualified females find more attractive in these other fields of study, and more importantly why? In answering such questions we should think more critically about the social structures that shape and scaffold the development of preferences, and the dynamic rather than static nature of such preferences. We must also consider variation both within and across genders, for example, by examining why and how some females resist cultural expectations and pursue degrees in engineering. By doing so we recognize the importance of human agency and the potential for gender to be ‘undone’, or perhaps reconstructed using alternative definitions of both the nature of STEM disciplines as well as gender as a social category (Deutsch, 2007; Eisenhart & Finkel, 1998).

The primary aim of this paper was to test the applicability of an old explanation for inequality that continues to resonate. We have offered powerful evidence that long-standing under-achievement arguments fail to provide the answer to the question of gender inequality in representation in STEM postsecondary fields. We are unable to test or prove the validity of alternative answers with existing national surveys. A combination of future surveys and qualitative studies designed specifically to address some of the macro-level sociological processes discussed here as well as the more micro-level social-psychological ones are likely necessary to more effectively answer this elusive question.

Acknowledgments

Funding Sources: This research was supported by grant (5 R24 HD042849, *Population Research Center*) awarded to the Population Research Center at The University of Texas at Austin by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Health and Child Development, and also by a grant from the National Science Foundation (DUE-0757018), Chandra Muller, PI, Catherine Riegler-Crumb, Co-PI, and R. Kelly Raley, Co-PI. Opinions reflect those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the granting agencies.

Works Cited

- AAUW. Where the girls are: The facts about gender equity in Education. Washington, D.C: 2008.
- Adelman, C. Postsecondary attainment, attendance, curriculum, and performance: Selected results from the NELS:88/2000 Postsecondary Education Transcript Study (PETS), 2000. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, NCES; 1999. p. 2003-394.
- Benbow CP, Stanley JC. Consequences in high school and college of sex differences in mathematical reasoning ability: A longitudinal perspective. *American Educational Research Journal*. 1982; 19(4): 598–622.
- Barone C. Some things never change: Gender segregation in higher education across eight nations and three decades. *Sociology of Education*. 2011; 84(2):157–176.
- Berryman, SE. Who will do science? Trends, and their cause in minority and female representation among holders of advanced degrees in science and mathematics. Rockefeller Foundation; 1983.
- Boli J, Allen ML, Payne A. High-ability women and men in undergraduate mathematics and chemistry courses. *American Educational Research Journal*. 1985; 22:605–626.
- Buchmann C, DiPrete TA. The growing female advantage in college completion: The role of family background and academic achievement. *American Sociological Review*. 2006; 71(4):515–541.
- Charles M, Bradley K. Equal but separate? A cross-national study of sex segregation in higher education. *American Sociological Review*. 2002; 67(4):573–599.
- Correll SJ. Gender and the career choice process: The role of biased self-assessments. *The American Journal of Sociology*. 2001; 106(6):1691–1730.

- Crisp G, Nora A, Taggart A. Student characteristics, pre-college, college, and environmental factors as predictors of majoring in and earning a STEM degree: An analysis of students attending a Hispanic serving institution. *American Educational Research Journal*. 2009; 46(4):924–942.
- Dalton, B.; Ingels, S.J.; Downing, J.; Bozick, R.; Owings, J. Advanced mathematics and science course-taking in the spring high school senior classes of 1982, 1992, and 2004. U.S. Department of Education, National Center of Education Statistics: NCES; 2007. p. 2007-312.
- Deutsch FM. Undoing gender. *Gender and Society*. 2007; 21(1):106–127.
- Duntzman, G.H.; Wisenbaker, J.; Taylor, M.E. National Science Foundation Report. 1979. Race and sex differences in college science program participation.
- Eccles JS. Understanding women's education and occupational choices: Applying the Eccles et al. model of achievement-choices. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 1994; 18(4):585–609.
- Eccles, J.S. Where are all the women? Gender differences in participation in physical science and engineering. In: Ceci, S.J.; Williams, W.M., editors. *Why Aren't More Women in Science? Top Researchers Debate the Evidence*. Washington D.C: American Psychological Association; 2007. p. 199-210.
- Eisenhart, M.A.; Finkel, E. *Women's science: Learning and succeeding from the margins*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press; 1998.
- England P. The gender revolution: Uneven and stalled. *Gender and Society*. 2010; 24:149–165.
- England P, Li S. Desegregation stalled: The changing gender composition of college majors, 1971–2002. *Gender and Society*. 2006; 20(5):657–677.
- Ewert S. Male and female pathways through four-year colleges: Disruption and sex stratification in higher education. *American Educational Research Journal*. 2010; 47(4):744–773.
- Feingold A. Sex differences in variability in intellectual abilities. *Review of Educational Research*. 1992; 62:61–84.
- Fox M, Sonnert G, Nikiforova I. Programs for undergraduate women in science and engineering: Issues, problems, and solutions. *Gender and Society*. 2011; 25(5):589–615.
- Fryer RG, Levitt SD. An empirical analyses of the gender gap in mathematics. NBER Working Paper, No 15430. 2009
- Goldman RG, Hewitt BN. The scholastic aptitude test 'explains' why college men major in science more often than college women. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 1976; 23(1):50–54.
- Good C, Aronson J, Harder JA. Problems in the pipeline: stereotype threat and women's achievement in high-level math courses. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*. 2007; 29:17–28.
- Hedges LV, Nowell A. Sex differences in mental test scores, variability, and numbers of high scoring individuals. *Science*. 1995; 269:41–45. [PubMed: 7604277]
- Hoetker G. The use of logit and probit models in strategic management research: Critical issues. *Strategic Management Journal*. 2007; 28:331–343.
- Hout, M. Getting the most out of the GSS income measures. GSS Methodological Report 101. 2004. Retrieved on June 5, 2011 at http://publicdata.norc.umd.edu/gss/DOCUMENTS/REPORTS/Methodological_Reports/MR101.pdf
- Hyde J, Lindberg S, Linn M, Ellis A, Williams C. Gender similarities characterize math performance. *Science Magazine*, July. 2008; 25:494–495.
- Jonsson J. Explaining sex differences in educational choice: An empirical assessment of a rational choice model. *European Sociological Review*. 1999; 15(4):391–404.
- Leahey E, Guo G. Gender differences in mathematical trajectories. *Social Forces*. 2001; 80(2):713–732.
- Long JS, Fox MF. Scientific careers: Universalism and particularism. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 1995; 21:45–71.
- Lubinski D, Benbow CP. Gender differences in abilities and preferences among the gifted: implications for the math-science pipeline. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. 1992; 1(2):61–66.
- Merton, R.K. *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press; 1973.

- Mood C. Logistic regression: Why we cannot do what we think we can do, and what we can do about it. *European Sociological Review*. 2009;1–13.
- Muller PA, Stage FK, Kinzie J. Science achievement growth trajectories: Understanding factors related to gender and racial-ethnic differences in precollege science achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*. 2001; 38(4):981–1012.
- National Academy of the Sciences. *Rising above the gathering storm: Energizing and employing America for a brighter economic future*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2007.
- National Science Board. *Science and engineering indicators 2008*. Vol. 1. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation; 2008. NSB 08-01; volume 2, NSB 08-01A
- Oakes J. Opportunities, achievement, and choice: Women and minority students in science and mathematics. *Review of Research in Education*. 1990; 16:153–222.
- Paglin M, Rufolo. Heterogeneous human capital, occupational choice, and male-female earnings differences. *Journal of Labor Economics*. 1990; 8(1):123–144.
- Penner A, Paret M. Gender differences in mathematics achievement: Exploring the early grades and the extremes. *Social Science Research*. 2008; 37:239–253.
- Ramirez FO, Wotipka CM. Slowly but surely? The global expansion of women's participation in science and engineering fields of study, 1972–92. *Sociology of Education*. 2001; 74(3):231–251.
- Ridgeway C. Interaction and the conservation of gender inequality: Considering employment. *American Sociological Review*. 1997; 62(2):218–35.
- Ridgeway CL, Correll SJ. Unpacking the gender system. *Gender & Society*. 2004; 18:510–531.
- Riegler-Crumb C, King B. Questioning a white male advantage in STEM: Examining disparities in college major. *Educational Researcher*. 2010; 39:656–664.
- Risman B. Gender as a social structure: Theory wrestling with activism. *Gender and Society*. 2004; 18(4):429–450.
- Robinson JP, Lubienski ST. The development of gender gaps in mathematics and reading during elementary and middle school: Examining direct cognitive assessments and teacher ratings. *American Educational Research Journal*. 2011; 48(2):268–302.
- Seymour, E.; Hewitt, NM. *Talking about leaving: Why undergraduates leave the sciences*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press; 1997.
- Stinebrickner T, Stinebrickner R. Math or science? Using longitudinal expectations data to examine the process of choosing a college major. NBER Working Paper, No 16869. 2011
- Wai J, Cacchio M, Putallaz M, Makel MC. Sex differences in the right tail of cognitive abilities: A 30 year examination. *Intelligence*. 2010; 38:412–423.
- Williams, WW.; Ceci, SJ. Setting the stage: Striving for perspective in the debate on women in science. In: Ceci, SJ.; Williams, WM., editors. *Why Aren't More Women in Science? Top Researchers Debate the Evidence*. Washington D.C: American Psychological Association; 2007. p. 1–24.
- Wilson KL, Boldizar JP. Gender segregation in higher education: effects of aspirations, mathematics achievement, and income. *Sociology of Education*. 1990; 63(1):62–74.
- Xie, Y.; Achen, A. *Science on the decline? Educational outcomes of three cohorts of young Americans*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan; 2009.
- Xie, Y.; Shauman, KA. *Women in science career processes and outcomes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 2003.
- Zafar B. How do college students form expectations? *Journal of Labor Economics*. 2011; 29(2):301–348.

Biographies

Catherine Riegler-Crumb is an Assistant Professor of Science and Math Education at the University of Texas at Austin, Department of Curriculum and Instruction. She can be reached at Main 2312, 1 University Station G1800, Austin, TX 78712-0374; email: riegle@austin.utexas.edu. Her research focuses on gender and racial/ethnic inequality in educational experiences and achievement, particularly in STEM fields.

Barbara King is a Ph.D. candidate in Math Education at the University of Texas at Austin, Department of Curriculum and Instruction. She can be reached at Main 2304, 1 University Station G1800, Austin, TX 78712-0374; bking@mail.utexas.edu. Her dissertation examines persistence and attrition in STEM postsecondary fields.

Eric Grodsky is an Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of Minnesota. He can be reached at 267 19th Ave S, Minneapolis, MN 55455; email: egrodsky@umn.edu. Much of his research addresses social inequality in participation in higher education and degree attainment.

Chandra Muller is a Professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of Texas at Austin. She can be reached at Main 2320, 1 University Station G1800, Austin, TX 78712-0374; email: cmuller@soc.utexas.edu. Her research focuses on the diversity of pathways into and through higher education and on the linkages between education and STEM labor force participation.

Appendix

I. Analytic Sample

HS&B

The analytic sample was restricted to students who attended a four-year institution and declared a major field of study at the first institution attended, as indicated by SY18A and SY18H from the 1984 Second Follow-Up data, and had a valid weight on PANEL5WT.

NELS

The analytic sample was restricted to students who attended a four-year institution by 1994 (PSEFIRTY, PSELONTY, PSELASTY) and declared a major field of study at the first institution attended (PSEFIRMJ) indicated from the 1994 Third Follow-Up data, and had a valid weight on F3F1PNWT.

ELS

The analytic sample was restricted to students who attended a four-year institution prior to or during 2006 (the year the Second Follow-Up data was collected), declared a major field of study in 2006, as indicated by F2EDLEVL and F2MAJOR4 from the ELS Second Follow-Up data, and had a valid weight on F2BYWT.

II. Description of Variables

Dependent Variable: Choice of Major

F2MAJOR4 is the ELS variable indicating respondents' self-declared field of major in 2006. The 193 possible categories for field of study were divided into three mutually exclusive categories for the analyses in this study. Similar variables in HS&B (SY18H) and NELS (PSEFIRMJ) exist with slightly different coding schemes. Here we list the 33 categories used in ELS to describe a students' major as in physical science or engineering. These categories are more detailed than those used for the HS&B or NELS cohort, but are otherwise similar to the categories used in the HS&B and NELS surveys. PS/E fields of study include: computer/information technology administration and management, computer programming, computer science, computer software and media applications, computer systems analysis, computer systems networking and telecommunications, data entry/microcomputer applications, computer systems analysis, computer systems networking and telecommunications, data entry/microcomputer applications, data processing, information

science/studies, computer and information science and support services, biomedical/medical engineering, chemical engineering, civil engineering, computer engineering, electrical engineering, engineering technologies, environmental engineering, mechanical engineering, other engineering, mathematics, statistics, other mathematics and statistics, systems science and theory, astronomy and astrophysics, atmospheric sciences and meteorology, chemistry, geological and earth sciences, physics, biological and physical science, systems science and theory, other physical sciences, nuclear and industrial radiologic technicians, and physical science technologies.

Gender

HS&B, NELs, ELS—A dichotomous variable was created for students who self-identify as female. The contrast category in all analyses is males. Source variable is SEXCOMP, F3QSEX, and F1SEX in HS&B, NELs, and ELS, respectively.

Race/Ethnicity

HS&B—Separate dichotomous variables were created for students who self-identify as non-Hispanic white (contrast category), Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic. Students who identified as Native American or other race/ethnicity were excluded from the analyses due to small sample sizes. Source variable is RACE2 in the HS&B Third Follow-Up data.

NELs—Separate dichotomous variables were created for students who self-identify as non-Hispanic white (contrast category), Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic. Students who identified as Native American or other race/ethnicity were excluded from the analyses due to small sample sizes. Source variable is F3QRACE in the Third Follow-Up data.

ELS—Separate dichotomous variables were created for students who self-identify as non-Hispanic white (contrast category), Black, Asian/Native Hawaii/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic. Students who identified as multi-race black are coded as black in these analyses. Students who identified as Native American/Alaska Native or other race/ethnicity were excluded from the analyses due to small sample sizes. Source variable for race/ethnicity is F1RACE2 in the ELS First Follow-Up (F1) data.

Parent Education Level

HS&B—The highest level of education received by either of the students' parents was originally coded as follows: 1 (some high school), 2 (high school graduate), 3 (attended 2-year school; no degree), 4 (2-years or more at 2-year school), 5 (attended 4-year school; no degree), 6 (4-year degree), 7 (master's degree). This variable was re-coded into a series of dichotomous variables as follows: 1 (some high school), 2 (high school graduate), 3 (attended college, but no bachelor's degree earned), 4 (earned a bachelor's degree), 5 (earned an advanced degree). Source variable is PAREDUC in the HS&B Third Follow-Up data. The contrast category for analyses is high school graduate.

NELs—This is the highest level of education received by either of the students' parents, coded as follows: 1 (some high school), 2 (high school graduate or GED), 3 (attended 2-year school), 4 (4-year degree), 5 (master's degree), 6 (advanced degree such as MD or PhD). Categories 5 and 6 were re-coded into a single measure representing earning an advanced degree. Source variable is F1PARED in the NELs First Follow-Up (F1) data. The contrast category for analyses is high school graduate.

ELS—This is the highest level of education received by either of the students' parents, coded as follows: 1 (some high school), 2 (high school graduate or GED), 3 (attended 2-year

school; no degree), 4 (2-year degree), 5 (attended 4-year school; no degree), 6 (4-year degree), 7 (master's degree), 8 (advanced degree such as MD or PhD). This variable was recoded into a series of dichotomous variables as follows: 1 (some high school), 2 (high school graduate), 3 (attended college, but no bachelor's degree earned), 4 (earned a bachelor's degree), 5 (earned an advanced degree). Source variable is F1PARED in the ELS First Follow-Up (F1) data. The contrast category for analyses is high school graduate.

Family Income

HS&B—The original total family income variable was coded as follows: 1 (Less than \$8,000), 2 (\$8,000 -- \$14,999), 3 (\$15,000--\$19,999), 4 (\$20,000--\$24,999), 5 (\$25,000--\$29,999), 6 (\$30,000--\$39,999), 7 (\$40,000--\$49,999), 8 (\$50,000 & more). We recoded the variable so that the new values represent the midpoint of each category. For the open ended final category we extrapolate from the next-to-last category using a modified Pareto formula suggested by Hout (2004). Next we converted the values from 1980 dollars into 2002 dollars using an income inflation calculator. Finally, we divided all values by 10,000 to aid in the interpretation of the coefficients associated with income. Source variable is FAMINC in the HS&B Base Year (BY) data, which is based on student reports of family income.

NELS—The original total family income variable was coded as follows: 1 (None), 2 (\$1,000 or less), 3 (\$1,000--\$2,999), 4 (\$3,000--\$4,999), 5 (\$5,000--\$7,499), 6 (\$7,500--\$9,999), 7 (\$10,000--\$14,999), 8 (\$15,000--\$19,999), 9 (\$20,000--\$24,999), 10 (\$25,000--\$34,999), 11 (\$35,000--\$49,999), 12 (\$50,000--\$74,999), 13 (\$75,000 --\$99,999), 14 (\$100,000 -- \$199,999), 15 (\$200,000 or more). Due to small cell sizes, we collapsed categories 1-6 into one category for those making \$10,000 or less. We recoded the variable so that the new values represent the midpoint of each category and used the method described above to estimate the midpoint of the final category. For the open ended final category we extrapolate from the next-to-last category using a modified Pareto formula suggested by Hout (2004). Next we converted the values from 1990 dollars into 2002 dollars using an income inflation calculator. Finally, we divided all values by 10,000 to aid in the interpretation of the coefficients associated with income. Source variable is BYFAMINC in the NELS Base Year (BY) data, which is based on parent reports of family income.

ELS—The original total family income from all sources 2001 had the following categories: 1 (None), 2 (\$1,000 or less), 3 (\$1,001--\$5,000), 4 (\$5,001--\$10,000), 5 (\$10,001--\$15,000), 6 (\$15,001--\$20,000), 7 (\$20,001--\$25,000), 8 (\$25,001--\$35,000), 9 (\$35,001--\$50,000), 10 (\$50,001--\$75,000), 11 (\$75,001--\$100,000), 12 (\$100,001--\$200,000), 13 (\$200,001 or more). Due to small cell sizes, we collapsed categories 1-4 into one category for those making \$10,000 or less. We then re-coded the variable so that values represented the midpoint of each category and used the method described above to estimate the midpoint of the final category. Finally, we divided all values by 10,000 to aid in the interpretation of the coefficients associated with income. Source variable is BYINCOME in the ELS Base Year (BY) data, which is based on parent reports of family income.

Delayed Start of College

HS&B, NELS, and ELS—This indicates whether the student enrolled in a post-secondary institution in the semester following high school graduation or delayed enrollment after graduation. Source variable is SY18CY in the HS&B Second Follow-Up data, PSEFIRD in the NELS Third Follow-Up data, and F2RTYPE in the ELS Second Follow-Up (F2) data.

Math Test Score

HS&B, NELS, and ELS—Students' math IRT scores from sophomore and senior year were standardized and then averaged to create a single standardized math test score. Source variables are IRT80M and IRT82M from the HS&B Base-Year and First Follow-Up data, F12XMIRR and F22XMIRR from the NELS First Follow-Up and Second Follow-Up data, and BYTXMIRR and F1TXM1IR from the ELS Base-Year and First Follow-Up data.

Highest Math Course

HS&B, NELS, and ELS—As part of each survey students' high school transcripts were collected. Consistent with prior transcript studies conducted by NCES, each course that appeared on students' transcripts was assigned a CSSC code (which refers to the Classification of Secondary School Courses taxonomy). The CSSC identifying different math courses appearing on students' transcripts were collapsed into the following 9 categories: Basic/Remedial Math, General/Applied Math, Pre-algebra, Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II, Advanced Math (Algebra III, Finite Math, Statistics), Pre-calculus (includes Trigonometry), and Calculus. These categories were then recoded into three dichotomous variables representing students whose highest math course is algebra 2 or below, those whose highest course is pre-calculus or advanced math, and those whose highest course is calculus. For more detailed information on CSSC codes in math and other subjects, see Appendix D of the ELS Data File Documentation (NCES 2006-344).

Highest Science

Course HS&B, NELS, and ELS—This highest science course variable was constructed similarly to the highest math course variable. CSSC codes identifying different science courses appearing on students' transcripts were collapsed into the following 6 categories: basic or remedial science, earth science, biology, chemistry, advanced science (including biology 2 and chemistry 2), and physics. Dichotomous variables were created grouping students into three categories, those whose highest science course was chemistry or below, those whose highest course was advanced science, and those whose highest course was physics.

English Course Taking

HS&B, NELS, and ELS—Based on CSSC codes attached to students' English courses on their transcript, three dichotomous variables were constructed to represent 1) students who took no honors or AP/IB English courses, 2) students who took between one semester and two years of honors or AP/IB English courses, and 3) students who took more than two honors or AP/IB English courses.

Math GPA

HS&B, NELS, and ELS—This measures students' grade point average in math classes and science classes during their 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grade years. Math and science classes were identified in students' transcripts through CSSC codes, then the standardized course grade attached to each class (and which includes pluses and minuses), values were recoded so that a value of 12 was assigned for A+, 11 for an A, 10 for an A-, 9 for a B+, etc. Grades of F were assigned a value of 0. Students' math and science grades for each year were then averaged and recoded into a more conventional four-point scale by dividing the twelve point scale by three.

III. Scatter Plots

To explore the functional form between math test score and choice of PS/E major, we constructed the following three scatter plots, which represent the proportionate share of students entering PS/E majors across each percentile on math test score for the HS&B, NELS, and ELS cohorts.

Figure 1.
Rates of College Entrance and Choice of STEM Major by Gender (for students attending four-year colleges within two years of high school completion)

Figure 2.
Predicted and Counterfactual Proportions for Declaring a Physical Science/Engineering Major

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for High School Academic Achievement (for students attending four-year colleges within two years of high school completion)

	High School Class of 1982 (HS&B)			High School Class of 1992 (NELS)			High School Class of 2004 (ELS)		
	Male Mean	Female Mean	Difference	Male Mean	Female Mean	Difference	Male Mean	Female Mean	Difference
Highest Math Course Taken									
Algebra two or below	0.41	0.52 ***	-0.11	0.28	0.32	-0.04	0.19	0.19	0.00
Pre-calculus or advanced math	0.44	0.36**	0.08	0.47	0.48	-0.01	0.51	0.58 ***	-0.07
Calculus	0.15	0.12*	0.03	0.25	0.21 *	0.04	0.30	0.23 ***	0.07
Highest Science Course Taken									
Chemistry or below	0.43	0.65***	-0.22	0.29	0.35 ***	-0.06	0.22	0.24	-0.02
Advanced science	0.12	0.13	-0.01	0.16	0.25 ***	-0.09	0.21	0.31 ***	-0.10
Physics	0.44	0.23***	0.21	0.55	0.40 ***	0.15	0.57	0.45 ***	0.12
Math/Science GPA	2.65 (0.74)	2.75 (0.76) **	-0.13	2.35 (0.80)	2.44 (0.73) **	-0.12	2.51 (0.71)	2.67 (0.68) ***	-0.23
Math Test Score	0.92 (0.79)	0.61 (0.82) ***	0.39	0.74 (0.82)	0.61 (0.77) ***	0.16	0.69 (0.82)	0.44 (0.78) ***	0.30
Math Test Score Percentiles									
Less than the 75th percentile	0.65	0.79***	-0.14	0.71	0.79 ***	-0.08	0.69	0.82 ***	-0.13
75th to 90th percentile	0.20	0.13***	0.07	0.18	0.14 **	0.04	0.17	0.13 ***	0.04
90th to 95th percentile	0.07	0.05*	0.02	0.05	0.04	0.01	0.07	0.03 ***	0.04
Above 95th percentile	0.09	0.03 ***	0.06	0.06	0.03 ***	0.03	0.07	0.02 ***	0.05
Comparative Advantage Measures									
Difference between math/science GPA and English GPA	0.26 (0.53)	0.06 (0.55) ***	0.38	-0.04 (0.50)	-0.36 (0.68) ***	0.48	-0.08 (0.43)	-0.19 (0.42) ***	0.27
Difference between math and reading test percentiles	2.98 (22.46)	-1.50 (21.31) ***	0.21	4.82 (23.42)	1.97 (22.80) ***	0.21	5.13 (24.18)	-4.62 (23.01) ***	0.41
Ns (weighted)	1588	1702		1735	2056		2149	2756	

Notes: Proportions and means are displayed for males and females, with standard deviations for continuous variables in parentheses.

An asterisk indicates that the male and female means are statistically different (* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001). Differences for proportions are calculated by subtracting the female proportion from the male proportion. Differences for continuous variables are calculated as the difference between the means divided by the pooled standard deviation.

Table 2

Average Marginal Effects on Probability of Declaring a PS/E Major

	High School Class of 1982 (HS&B) ^a				High School Class of 1992 (NELS)				High School Class of 2004 (ELS)			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Female	−0.215*** (0.019)	−0.159*** (0.017)	−0.157*** (0.017)	−0.137*** (0.018)	−0.170*** (0.016)	−0.146*** (0.015)	−0.143*** (0.014)	−0.123*** (0.015)	−0.196*** (0.014)	−0.181*** (0.013)	−0.174*** (0.013)	−0.155*** (0.013)
Highest Math Course (ref= Algebra 2 or below)												
Pre-calculus or advanced math		−0.013 (0.022)	−0.012 (0.022)	−0.009 (0.022)		0.013 (0.020)	0.021 (0.022)	0.026 (0.022)		0.030 (0.022)	0.041~ (0.022)	0.043* (0.022)
Calculus		0.041 (0.032)	0.036 (0.032)	0.045 (0.032)		0.094*** (0.026)	0.094*** (0.027)	0.099*** (0.027)		0.129*** (0.027)	0.124*** (0.026)	0.124*** (0.026)
Highest Science Course (ref= Chemistry or below)												
Advanced science		0.007 (0.030)	0.007 (0.030)	0.011 (0.031)		−0.007 (0.025)	−0.004 (0.025)	−0.002 (0.025)		−0.005 (0.020)	−0.004 (0.020)	−0.000 (0.020)
Physics		0.146*** (0.020)	0.144*** (0.020)	0.148*** (0.020)		0.062*** (0.017)	0.064*** (0.017)	0.067*** (0.017)		0.044** (0.017)	0.044** (0.016)	0.045** (0.016)
Math/Science GPA		0.068*** (0.014)	0.066*** (0.014)	0.047** (0.015)		0.033** (0.012)	0.029* (0.012)	0.008 (0.013)		0.044*** (0.012)	0.042*** (0.012)	0.029* (0.013)
Math test score		0.066*** (0.016)				0.048*** (0.014)				0.015 (0.011)		
Spline Models												
Math test score below 75th percentile			0.002** (0.001)	0.002** (0.001)			0.001 (0.000)	0.001 (0.000)		−0.000 (0.000)		−0.001 (0.000)
Math test score above 75th percentile			0.003* (0.001)	0.003* (0.001)			0.003** (0.001)	0.003** (0.001)		0.004*** (0.001)		0.004*** (0.001)
Comparative Advantage												
Difference between math/ science GPA and English GPA				0.059*** (0.017)				0.069*** (0.015)				0.058*** (0.018)
Difference between math and reading test percentiles				0.001 (0.000)				0.000 (0.000)				0.001*** (0.000)

Student Background

Racial/Ethnic Group (ref=non-Hispanic white)												
Black	−0.003 (0.032)	0.132*** (0.030)	0.124*** (0.029)	0.113*** (0.029)	0.054* (0.026)	0.122*** (0.024)	0.113*** (0.023)	0.109*** (0.024)	0.036~ (0.020)	0.107*** (0.021)	0.098*** (0.021)	0.087*** (0.020)
Hispanic	0.048 (0.037)	0.116** (0.038)	0.114** (0.038)	0.112** (0.037)	−0.002 (0.030)	0.027 (0.030)	0.028 (0.030)	0.026 (0.028)	0.000 (0.024)	0.026 (0.024)	0.024 (0.023)	0.027 (0.022)

	High School Class of 1982 (HS&B) ^a				High School Class of 1992 (NELS)				High School Class of 2004 (ELS)			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Asian	0.106 [*] (0.045)	0.039 (0.046)	0.039 (0.046)	0.035 (0.043)	0.039 (0.028)	0.004 (0.020)	0.002 (0.020)	0.002 (0.020)	0.060 ^{**} (0.018)	0.027 (0.018)	0.024 (0.018)	0.017 (0.018)
<i>Parent's Highest Level of Education (ref= high school grad)</i>												
No high school diploma	0.027 (0.047)	0.033 (0.042)	0.035 (0.042)	0.035 (0.042)	-0.022 (0.040)	0.033 (0.037)	0.026 (0.036)	0.017 (0.036)	-0.006 (0.045)	0.006 (0.047)	-0.004 (0.046)	-0.015 (0.045)
Attended some college, no bachelor's degree	-0.006 (0.043)	-0.010 (0.037)	-0.009 (0.037)	-0.010 (0.037)	-0.033 [*] (0.017)	-0.009 (0.016)	-0.008 (0.016)	-0.011 (0.016)	-0.020 (0.023)	-0.022 (0.022)	-0.022 (0.022)	-0.021 (0.022)
Bachelor's degree	0.002 (0.048)	-0.021 (0.042)	-0.019 (0.042)	-0.018 (0.042)	-0.024 (0.019)	-0.015 (0.017)	-0.016 (0.017)	-0.019 (0.017)	0.009 (0.023)	-0.020 (0.022)	-0.020 (0.022)	-0.013 (0.022)
Advanced degree	-0.027 (0.052)	-0.061 (0.046)	-0.062 (0.046)	-0.063 (0.046)	0.001 (0.034)	-0.010 (0.029)	-0.014 (0.029)	-0.013 (0.028)	0.023 (0.023)	-0.020 (0.023)	-0.023 (0.023)	-0.013 (0.023)
Family income	-0.004 (0.002)	-0.005 [*] (0.002)	-0.005 [*] (0.002)	-0.005 [*] (0.002)	-0.005 ^{**} (0.001)	-0.004 ^{***} (0.001)	-0.005 ^{***} (0.001)	-0.004 ^{***} (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.002 [*] (0.001)	-0.002 [*] (0.001)	-0.002 [*] (0.001)
Delayed start of college	0.071 (0.102)	0.244 ^{**} (0.087)	0.234 ^{**} (0.087)	0.222 [*] (0.088)	-0.162 ^{**} (0.057)	-0.001 (0.059)	-0.096 (0.058)	-0.097 (0.058)	-0.068 (0.041)	-0.000 (0.038)	-0.003 (0.038)	-0.016 (0.038)
<i>English Course Taking (ref=no honors, AP/IB)</i>												
One-half to two honors or AP/IB English courses				-0.049 (0.026)				-0.014 (0.016)				-0.011 (0.015)
More than two honors or AP/IB English courses				-0.043 (0.038)				-0.015 (0.017)				-0.020 (0.016)
N	3115				3435				4477			

Notes:

^aFor each of the three cohorts the sample is limited to those students who attend a four-year institution and declared a major within two years of high school graduation. Significance levels:

* p < .05;

** p < .01;

*** p < .001.