Improving Introductory Economics Course Content and Delivery Improves Outcomes for Women[*]

Mallory Avery[†]   Jane Caldwell[‡]
Christian Schunn[§]   Katherine Wolfe[¶]

January 26, 2023

Abstract

The presentation of economics in introductory courses has been highlighted as potentially exacerbating the underrepresentation of women in economics. We study the impact of a gender-neutral change in content and instruction in introductory economics courses intended to increase student engagement. By implementing meaningful applied problems and structured group work, our intervention focuses on the students' perceptions of "what" economics is and "how" economics is used. Using institutional data of 8,727 students over 9 semesters we find that the intervention improved women's grades relative to men's in both Introductory Microeconomics and Macroeconomics and eliminated underperformance by women in Introductory Macroeconomics relative to men at baseline. These effects are evidence that the course content and delivery impacts the experiences and outcomes of female students in economics education.

JEL Codes: A22, I21, I29, J16
Keywords: Economics Instruction, Undergraduate Education, Gender, Inclusion, Pipeline

[†]Corresponding Author, Monash University, Department of Economics, Email: mallory.avery@monash.edu
[‡]University of Pittsburgh, Department of Economics
[§]University of Pittsburgh, Learning Research & Development Center
[¶]University of Pittsburgh, Department of Economics

1 Introduction

Economics education has a problem – students, instructors, and society are all pointing out how inaccessible and irrelevant introductory economics education has become relative to what is interesting to students and needed in the real world (Inman, 2014; Pühringer and Bäuerle, 2018; Reisz, 2018; Wolfers, 2019; Thornton, 2020; Oudija, 2022). This problem is not new; for decades people have been pointing out the limitations of how introductory economics is taught (Heyne, 1995, e.g.), and while some gains have been made, even in 2020 the main methods of teaching introductory economics are "chalk-and-talk" lectures that do not address topics of interest to students (Asarta et al., 2021). There have been wide-spread calls for moving away from pure lecture approaches in university instruction, moving instead to problem-based learning (Hmelo-Silver, 2004) or collaborative learning (Chi and Wylie, 2014). While many individual instructors and departments have made efforts to increase the interactivity and relevance of introductory economics education to their students, large time and cost barriers, as well as uncertainty about the benefit of such changes, has prevented more widespread adoption of these improved teaching techniques (Henderson and Dancy, 2007).

However, there may be an additional benefit to adopting these more interactive and relevant teaching methods – improving gender diversity throughout the economics pipeline. [1] Economics suffers from a gender representation problem – the further one goes along the academic pathways from introductory courses to full professorships, the proportion of women at each step decreases (Avilova and Goldin, 2018; Buckles, 2019). [2] The traditional way in which economics

---

[1] The economics profession also has large racial gaps in terms of outcomes and progression. While we can identify those gaps in our pre-intervention sample and we find evidence to support the closing of some of those gaps due to our intervention, the population of the University of Pittsburgh is such that we do not have a large enough sample of underrepresented minority students to have the power to detect such changes. While it was a goal of this project to also consider racial gaps in economics education outcomes, the structural pedagogical changes due to the Covid-19 pandemic and its associated shift to remote instruction has effectively cut off the clean post-intervention sample and has made it impossible to do that additional analysis in the future.

[2] For example, in high school, 55% of all Advanced Placement (AP) tests in the US are taken by women, but only 45% of all AP Micro test takers and 42% of all AP Macro test takers are women (College Board, 2020). Similarly, although women have consistently made up about 56% of US undergraduates from the 1990s to 2019 (US Department of Education, 2020), only about 42% of US students in introductory economics courses were women (Avilova and Goldin, 2018). Subsequently, only 31% of US undergraduate economics degrees were granted to women and this proportion has declined from the 1990s to more recent years (Avilova and Goldin, 2018; Bayer and Wilcox, 2019), and this pattern is replicated in other countries (Arnold, 2020). Furthermore, 44% of incoming Masters students and 34% of incoming PhD students in Economics in the US are women, and only 35% of economics PhDs are granted to women (Siegfried, 2010, 2020). In faculty careers, representation issues are even worse: 30% of assistant professors in economics are women, 26% of tenured faculty are women, and only 15% of full professors are women (Lundberg, 2017). At our own institution, while 55% of undergraduate students are women, just 41% of students in the introductory economics

is taught likely has both a causal and exacerbating effect on this underrepresentation (Bayer et al., 2020). For example, biased and narrow content matter focusing on theory, ignoring topics of greater interest to women, and diminishing the contributions of women to economics theory and practice negatively influences perceptions of relevance of economics to female students (Ferber, 1995; Jensen and Owen, 2001). Non-inclusive teaching techniques, i.e. the heavy use of lecture, individual learning through reading and homework, few high stakes exams, that differentially diminish a sense of self-efficacy in female students (Jensen and Owen, 2001) are also common in current introductory economics pedagogy.[3] Furthermore, while women typically receive higher grades than men in high school and university as an overall GPA (Conger, 2015; O'Dea et al., 2018) and as grades within many STEM courses (Matz et al., 2017; O'Dea et al., 2018), they have tended to receive lower grades than men in introductory economics courses (Anderson et al., 1994; Borg and Stranahan, 2002). Given that performance in the introductory economics courses is a strong determinant of course persistence and degree selection (Ahlstrom and Asarta, 2019; Arnold, 2020), the combination of having higher grades in other courses and lower grades in economics courses could be a particularly strong signal to major in other areas, particularly in combination with other signals of not belonging that women already face (Wang et al., 2013; Kugler et al., 2021).

In this paper, we provide evidence that the combination of 1) changing course content to be more focused on real-world applications and 2) changing pedagogical methods to be more interactive learning together improves the performance of women students in introductory economics courses to better match their overall stronger performance in most university courses, which could then increase rates of further study of economics at the undergraduate level. The University of Pittsburgh Economics department implemented an intervention in the recitations of multi-sectioned large introductory microeconomics and macroeconomics courses in which students engaged in more group learning, with a greater focus on contributing ideas rather than

---

courses are women, and only 28% of undergraduate economics degrees are granted to women.

[3]These non-inclusive teaching techniques generally diminish students' self-efficacy because students do not have opportunities to see whether their struggles with content are shared broadly by other students and can false attribute their own struggles as due to their own inadequacies rather than challenging concepts and/or poor pedagogy. Female students may be differentially impacted by this issue due to negative experiences in high school, because of which women are more likely to begin the undergraduate introductory courses with lower self-efficacy in economics, which then changes engagement, response to challenging coursework, and grade outcomes (Ballard and Johnson, 2005; Jakobsson, 2012).

just correct answers and in engaging with real-world data and examples. While these changes to recitations were primarily designed to generally increase all students' engagement in recitations and to help all students understand the broader implications of the material learned in class (Josephson et al., 2019), we find that women's overall course grades in these economic courses increased, relative to men, after the intervention is put into place. Women's grades increase by about 0.2 (on a 4.0 scale) after the intervention, with no change in men's grades. This is nearly the equivalent of moving from a minus to a whole grade or from a whole grade to a plus.[4]

This paper adds to the nascent literature understanding how course content and delivery impacts diversity in economics. There are very few papers addressing this specific topic. Owen and Hagstrom (2021) evaluate the impact of changing the undergraduate curriculum in economics to include classes focused on empirical economics and economic inequality and find that women receive higher grades under the revised curriculum. Espey (2018) finds that men and women perform differently in introductory microeconomics courses including team-based learning, a specific form of interactive learning, with women benefiting from teams that are more cooperative. While both of these interventions are productive, they both require substantial changes, i.e. adding courses to the curriculum and changing the way lectures are taught and graded, that may be prohibitively difficult for many departments. We provide evidence on a less invasive intervention that could be conducted within the existing structure of the curricula and only changed the way recitations were conducted and graded. We show that this relatively less intense change has positive benefits for women's outcomes in these introductory economics courses.

This paper also contributes to the extensive literature studying other classroom interventions geared at improving diversity in economics. In 2015, the Undergraduate Women in Economics Challenge (UWE) provided funds for a randomized control trial of interventions to improve the gender gap in economics in undergraduate institutions in the US, including disseminating information about the major and related career fields, providing female role models and mentoring, and explicitly encouraging women to major in economics (Avilova and Goldin, 2018). [5] However, the results of such interventions are mixed: Li (2018) found that information about

---

[4]At the University of Pittsburgh, plus and minus grades are increments of 0.25. So, while a B grade is 3.0 on a 4 point scale, a B+ is 3.25 and a B- is a 2.75.

[5]The UWE Challenge suggested interventions include changing instructional content and presentation style, but so far none of the participating schools have reported on such an intervention.

academic and professional career paths, along with information about relative academic standing and a "nudge" from a professor or advisor to encourage women to continue in economics increased the number of women who chose to take economics classes beyond the introductory courses, while Pugatch and Schroeder (2021) found that such nudges had no effect on women while increasing the likelihood that men would continue in economics. Porter and Serra (2020) found that a short exposure to female alumnae role models in the introductory classes increased the likelihood that women would major in economics while men's likelihood was not affected.[6] Most of these interventions might best be considered small non-pedagogical changes focused on encouraging women specifically to continue study in economics and choose economics-related careers. We provide evidence on an alternative tack for improving women's representation in economics that acts not on "who" economists are but "what" economics is.

We build off of the broader literature in research into pedagogical advancements that increase diversity in non-diverse fields. In STEM disciplines with similar or worse gender gaps, such as physics, computer science, and many areas of engineering, a variety of interventions have been tried to improve gender gaps by implementing changes in undergraduate courses. Many of these interventions have focused on showing women that they belong in that discipline, such as mentoring and same-gender instructors (Bettinger and Long, 2005; Carrell et al., 2010; Griffith, 2010), while others have focused on changing the pedagogical methods to emphasize interactive learning and collaboration in introductory physics courses (Lorenzo et al., 2006). While there is evidence that these techniques have been effective in reducing gender gaps in STEM disciplines, there is limited evidence as to their efficacy in economics.

The rest of the paper proceeds as follows: Part 2 presents a more thorough description of the intervention; Part 3 summarizes the data we collected; Part 4 analyzes the results of the intervention; and Part 5 presents our conclusions.

---

[6]We do consider the impact of instructor gender and TA gender on gaps in male and female outcomes but do not find any compelling evidence that instructor or TA gender matters. However, this may be due to the demographics of the instructors for the introductory microeconomics and macroeconomics courses, with most of the introductory microeconomics instructors being female and almost all of the introductory macroeconomics instructors being male. Results available upon request.

2 Intervention

As part of a university-wide effort to improve large lecture classes, in the fall of 2018, we implemented an intervention which changed the pedagogical methods and content in our introductory microeconomics and macroeconomics classes with the goal of increasing student engagement and having students utilize more higher-level thinking skills. Studies have shown that active learning, a learning process in which students are participating in ways other than simply listening or taking notes, increases examination scores and reduces failure rates in STEM disciplines (Freeman et al., 2014). In particular, collaborative learning strategies are especially effective (Springer et al., 1999; Chi and Wylie, 2014). In addition, there is ample evidence in the STEM pedagogy literature that learning is improved by the use of real-world problems (for a review, see Hmelo-Silver (2004)). Research also shows that these practices increase the retention of women in these disciplines (Lewis, 2011; Rodriguez et al., 2016; Di Tommaso et al., 2020). We wanted to exploit both of these potential pedagogical improvements (i.e., collaborative active learning and real world problems).

We decided to focus on the recitation sections as the locus of these changes because research from the STEM disciplines shows that interactive learning is logistically challenging in large classes and tends to be more effective in smaller class settings (Walker and Warfa, 2017). Our transformation of the recitations had two main components: (1) new lesson plans and materials for all of the weekly recitations in both Micro and Macro that incorporated interactive and collaborative learning and utilized real world examples and data; and (2) enhanced teacher training for the graduate student teaching assistants who lead the recitations, to train them in teaching using techniques that support interactive and collaborative learning.

2.1 Recitation Plans

Before the intervention, the content and format of the recitations had varied somewhat by faculty instructor and graduate teaching assistant. However, most commonly, the teaching assistant answered questions, and demonstrated solutions for the assigned homework problems or additional practice problems that were similar to the homework problems. Sometimes they gave a review lecture. Students received 5-10% of their course grade for attending recitation.

The learning was generally not active or interactive. Students listened, took notes, or worked individually on assigned problems.

In order to maximize the benefit of the new recitation plans, we collaborated with instructional design experts at the University's Center for Teaching and Learning to design plans that included active learning, applying economics to rich real-world problems, and analysis that required higher level thinking. We specifically planned activities which included using mathematical economic models for problem-solving, applying these models to analyze economic situations in the real world, analyzing economic data, and practicing the application of economic concepts and skills in novel situations. Instructors across the department each worked on creating one or more specific recitations using the design plan. The design plan forced each instructor to think carefully about how each recitation activity fits into the learning objective and how to effectively scaffold each step of these activities. Completed recitation plans served as a detailed guide for the recitation Teaching Assistants: 1) clear and specific learning objectives for the class which tie specifically to each included activity; and 2) a clear guide for leading the class including preparation before the recitation, an outline with guidelines for time to be spent on each task, and notes about possible pitfalls. In most cases, group work paused intermittently for larger group discussion and specific notes were included about how to lead this larger group discussion. Each lesson included some work to be handed in at the end of the session. This helped to guarantee participation from all students.

Activities included analyzing current events found in newspaper articles and videos, analyzing real economic data, participating in economic simulations and experiments, discussing readings, and analyzing case studies (see Appendix B for an example recitation plan). These included classroom simulations and experiments in which everyone could participate and problems about news stories or issues that would be familiar and relevant to most students, such as the price of concessions in sports stadiums and the impact of ride-sharing services. The goal was to increase engagement and develop higher-order thinking skills, while changing the focus of course material away from the usual hypothetical economics examples and towards more real-world topics with a broader interest range and greater applicability to current social issues, business, and other topics of students' current interests.

In each recitation session, we gave students the opportunity to work with their peers in pairs

or small groups. Groupwork pragmatically reduces the number of independent learners the TA needs to support, and a group will be less likely to get stuck than individuals working alone. Further, group work has generally been found to allow students to learn more and higher-level content through interactive discussion (Chi and Wylie, 2014) and master more complex skills (Kirschner et al., 2009). The group work also allowed students to build connections with their peers and with the teaching assistant, which could potentially improve sense-of-belonging and present economics as a discipline that involved working with others—two factors that have been identified as relevant to attracting women to economics (Werner et al., 2005).

Each recitation had a learning product that could be assessed at the end of the session. Students received 5-10% of their course grade for this product, rather than just for attendance. This was particularly important for assessing the higher-level skills in the course as the large lecture size made it difficult to include such non-standardized material on the exam assessments.

2.2 Teaching Assistant (TA) Training

Because the intervention was delivered in the recitation sections by TAs and it involved a kind of pedagogical approach that was unfamiliar to many of the TAs, the training of the TAs was a very important component in the success of the intervention. The Economics Department had an existing course for graduate students on teaching economics, which was required for all graduate students. The course used an apprenticeship model focused on discussion, observation of practice lessons and feedback, but did not include instruction on pedagogical theory and techniques. We modified this course with the help of the Center for Teaching and Learning to focus on active learning teaching techniques with sessions on presentation skills, facilitating group work, and teaching case studies.

Faculty instructors then worked closely with the TAs on preparing to teach each lesson. They met weekly with their TAs to preview that week's recitation plan—explaining the teaching methods that were to be used and answering questions about the learning objectives, methods, and materials for that recitation. In these meetings, faculty also collected TA feedback on the previous week's recitations, encouraging the TAs to reflect on the extent to which the recitation had met the learning objectives of the plan and soliciting their suggestions on how to improve

7

the lesson. The primary goal of these meetings was to facilitate high quality implementation of the new lesson plans and ensure that student engagement and learning goals were being met.

2.3 Intervention Summary

See Table 1 for a summary of how the intervention did and did not change the students' experience in the course. The result for students was a course with greater expectations for student engagement during recitations, with more active and collaborative learning. For recitation instructors, the recitation followed a carefully crafted plan that they reviewed with the instructor prior to the recitation.

Table 1: Intervention Summary

Class Element	Before Intervention	After Intervention
Lecture pedagogy and student behavior	Large lecture (200-260 students) with limited student interaction (i.e., predominantly listening and note-taking)	
Lecture content	Standard introductory economic theory	
Homework	Multiple choice and problem solving (numerical answer)	
Exams	Multiple choice and problem solving (numerical answer)	
Recitation % of final grade	5-10% of course grade (set by instructor)	
Recitation grade basis	Attendance	Completion of group work
Recitation instructor (TA) behaviors	Homework review, lecture review, and demonstration of practice problems	Posing questions, facilitation of group work, coaching problem solving
Recitation student behavior	Listening and note taking, asking clarifying questions, or individual problem solving	Active learning and group work
Recitation content	Theory and abstract hypothetical examples	Theory and detailed real-world cases (e.g., news articles or real economic data)
Recitation instructor (TA) training	Focused on organizing a coherent lecture and designing a syllabus	Focused on supporting active and collaborative learning

Notes - This table describes how students' experiences in the introductory economics courses changed and did not change with the intervention.

3 Data Summary

This intervention was implemented in the economics department on the main campus of the University of Pittsburgh, a large, public, urban, residential R1 university in the northeastern United States with over 19,000 undergraduates enrolled each semester. Students at this university are representative of the typical residential public university student: 95% are full-time, 66% are in-state students, and 83% of students are age 18-21. As of Fall 2019, the undergraduate student body was 55% female, 68% white, 5% African American, 11% Asian American, 4% Hispanic or Latino/a, and 5% international students of various origins.

The economics department is housed in the School of Arts and Sciences. While the School of Arts and Sciences is the largest school (58% by undergraduate enrollment in Fall 2019), the university hosts various other schools, the largest of which are the School of Engineering (15%) and the College of Business Administration (10%). Students are admitted into a school and must choose majors from within that school unless they switch schools. However, students can take classes across schools, and students from all schools can take introductory microeconomics and macroeconomics.

Depending on major and school, introductory microeconomics and macroeconomics may be required or may count towards general graduation requirements. Both introductory economics courses are required for Economics majors and minors and may be taken in either order. Undergraduates in the College of Business Administration are required to take both introductory courses and must start with microeconomics. In addition, either introductory course can be counted towards the general education requirement for students in the School of Arts and Sciences or the School of Engineering. Our study population consists of all full-time students at the main campus who were registered in any class in a Fall or Spring semester from Fall 2015 through Fall 2019.[7] These 9 semesters comprise 6 pre-intervention semesters (Fall 2015-Spring 2018) and 3 post-intervention semesters (Fall 2018-Fall 2019).

---

[7]We exclude Summer classes as they are substantially different from main-term classes. Specifically they tend to be smaller and taught by graduate student instructors rather than full-time instructors. None of the Summer classes in the post-intervention period were subject to the intervention.

3.1 Demographics of the university vs. the introductory economic class population

In this section, we compare the demographics of students who take either introductory economics class to those who never take such an economics class. In order to analyze the impact of our intervention on students' decisions to take later economics courses, we only include in our sample full-time students at the main campus who have taken any class from Fall 2015 to Fall 2019.

Panel A of Table 2 compares the demographics of students in our sample who have ever taken an introductory economics class to those who have not. Students who take introductory economics classes are less likely to be female, more likely to be white, less likely to belong to an under-represented minority group, more likely to be Asian American, and more likely to be an international student compared to the general student body.[8] They are also less likely to be first generation students. These differences raise the issue of recruiting both female students and under-represented minority students into the introductory economics classes which will be necessary to close the gender gap at this step in the pipeline. Aside from possible enhanced reputational effects, which we expect will be minimal given the proportion of first-time freshman in the introductory economics courses, addressing this issue is beyond the scope of our intervention.

Students who take introductory economics classes seem to be marginally better prepared academically than their peers. While they do not have substantially different high school GPAs, students who take introductory economics courses have higher SAT verbal and math scores.[9] On the other hand, when looking at Advanced Placement tests, students who take either introductory economics course tend have lower scores conditional on taking the exam. This is because students who do well in these exams place out of the introductory classes. However, it is relevant to note that taking the AP Micro and Macro tests is relatively uncommon in both our school sample and our economics sub-sample, with only about 7% of students having taken these exams.

---

[8]Under-represented minorities include those that identify as African American, Hispanic, American Indian, and Pacific Islander. Asian American includes both those that primarily identify as Asian and who identify as both Asian and White. First generation students are defined as having no parents who attended college.

[9]For students that took the ACT rather than SAT, scores were converted to their SAT equivalent using the 2018 College Board SAT/ACT concordance tables found here: https://collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/pdf/guide-2018-act-sat-concordance.pdf .

Table 2: Summary Statistics

Variables	Panel A: School Sample			Panel B: Economics Sample		
	No Intro Econ	Intro Econ	Difference	Pre-Incubator	Post-Incubator	Difference
Female	0.48 (0.00)	0.38 (0.01)	0.09 (0.01)***	0.38 (0.01)	0.39 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
White	0.66 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	-0.06 (0.01)***	0.72 (0.01)	0.70 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.01)**
URM	0.11 (0.00)	0.10 (0.00)	0.01 (0.00)***	0.10 (0.00)	0.11 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
Asian American	0.08 (0.00)	0.10 (0.00)	-0.02 (0.00) ***	0.10 (0.00)	0.11 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
International	0.03 (.00)	0.06 (0.00)	-0.03 (0.00)***	0.06 (0.00)	0.07 (0.00)	0.01 (0.01)
HS GPA	3.87 (0.01)	3.89 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.01)**	3.87 (0.01)	3.94 (0.01)	0.07 (0.01)***
SAT Verbal/100	6.42 (0.00)	6.53 (0.01)	-0.11 (0.01)***	6.52 (0.01)	6.55 (0.01)	0.03 (0.01)**
SAT Math/100	6.47 (0.01)	6.68 (0.01)	-0.21 (0.01)***	6.66 (0.01)	6.73 (0.01)	0.07 (0.02)***
First Generation	0.46 (0.00)	0.37 (0.01)	0.08 (0.01)***	0.38 (0.01)	0.36 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.01)*
Took AP Micro	0.06 (0.00)	0.06 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.06 (0.00)	0.06 (0.00)	0.00 (0.01)
AP Micro Score	3.85 (0.03)	3.30 (0.05)	0.55 (0.05)***	3.33 (0.06)	3.23 (0.08)	-0.10 (0.10)
Took AP Macro	0.06 (0.00)	0.07 (0.00)	-0.01 (0.00)***	0.07 (0.00)	0.08 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
AP Macro Score	3.81 (0.03)	3.26 (0.05)	0.55 (0.05)***	3.25 (0.06)	3.28 (0.08)	0.03 (0.10)
Arts & Sciences	0.54 (0.00)	0.69 (0.00)	-0.14 (0.01)***	0.69 (0.01)	0.67 (0.01)	-0.03 (0.01)**
Engineering	0.13 (0.00)	0.13 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.14 (0.00)	0.11 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.01)***
Business	0.06 (0.00)	0.17 (0.00)	-0.11 (0.00)***	0.15 (0.00)	0.20 (0.01)	0.05 (0.01)***
First Time Freshman				0.58 (0.01)	0.66 (0.01)	0.08 (0.01) ***
First Micro Grade				2.79 (0.02)	2.94 (0.02)	0.15 (0.03)***
First Micro DFW				0.17 (0.00)	0.13 (0.01)	-0.05 (0.01)***
First Macro Grade				2.88 (0.02)	3.07 (0.03)	0.19 (0.03)***
First Macro DFW				0.15 (0.00)	0.08 (0.01)	-0.07 (0.01)***
N	29052	8727	37779	5860	2867	8727

Notes - Means and standard errors in parentheses for different variables. The school sample includes all students who were registered in any classes between Fall 2015 and Fall 2019. The no intro econ sample includes those students who never take an introductory economics course in that time-frame. The intro econ sample includes all students who take an introductory economics course in that time-frame. Difference is the no intro econ group mean minus the intro econ group mean as well as the significance of the t-test comparing those two means. The economics sample includes all students who registered for their first introductory economics course between Fall 2015 and Fall 2019. Pre-intervention is all students who took their first introductory economics course before the intervention started in Fall 2018. Post-incubator is all students who took their first introductory economics course after the intervention started in Fall 2018. Difference is the post-intervention mean minus the pre-intervention mean as well as the significance of the t-test comparing those two means. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Students from the School of Arts and Sciences and the College of Business Administration are well represented in the introductory economics courses. The representation of engineering students does not vary across the two groups.

3.2 Demographics of introductory economics students before and after the intervention

The intervention was implemented in Fall 2018. The pre-intervention data includes students who took their first introductory economics class from Fall 2015 through Spring 2018, and the post-intervention data includes students who took their first introductory economics class from Fall 2018 through Fall 2019. Panel B of Table 2 demonstrates the demographics of the pre-intervention and post-intervention samples. The primary demographic of concern in this paper, gender, does not change across this sample in this time frame. This allays any concerns about concurrent efforts to recruit more women into the economics major or substantial changes in recruitment by gender at the university. However, other demographics do vary across this time-period, specifically the population taking introductory economics classes becomes less white. Given that almost three quarters of students in our economics sample are white, we will restrict our final sample to white students. We make this restriction because we anticipate that intersectionality may be important in understanding the outcomes for women due to this intervention, but given the small sample of non-white students we do not have the power to investigate this intersectionality properly. Instead of assuming that women of all races have the same reaction to this intervention, we instead make the decision to restrict our sample to white students while acknowledging that this limits the scope of our results and recognizing the importance of studying the outcomes for non-white students, both overall and interacted with gender. We do include a basic analysis in Figure A.1, but this analysis is underpowered and should be interpreted with caution.

Academic preparedness seems to improve in this time-period as well. Students who take introductory economics courses have higher high school GPAs and math SAT scores in the post-intervention period compared to the pre-intervention period. However, the likelihood of having taken an Advanced Placement economics exam or the average score conditional on having taken

the exam did not change in this period. These are factors that we will control for in our main analysis.

Students who take these courses are more likely to be from the College of Business Administration and less likely to be from the School of Arts and Sciences or the School of Engineering in the post-intervention period compared to the pre-intervention period. This may represent a greater shift within the school towards being in the College of Business Administration. We choose to restrict our sample to students in the School of Arts and Sciences for multiple reasons. First, we believe students in the School of Arts and Sciences are more likely to be voluntarily taking these economics courses out of interest or to consider economics as a major, whereas students from the College of Business Administration and the School of Engineering take these courses either as required classes or to satisfy general education requirements. Second, we believe that the students who are in the School of Arts and Sciences are the most relevant population to discuss in terms of the representation problem in economics, as they are the ones who would potentially progress on in economics conditional on their experiences in their introductory courses. Additionally, students who take introductory economics after the intervention are more likely to be first time freshmen. As such, we will control for this in our main analyses.

Given the substantial changes in demographics and preparedness that occur across these two samples, we will include these controls in main analyses. However, we are primarily concerned with whether these controls change with the intervention differentially by gender. Figure 1 shows the pre- and post-intervention means for the academic preparation variables separately by gender.[10] Due to some small differences found in some of the coefficients, primarily in having taken the AP Macro exam, we believe controlling for these incoming variables will be most important. We add those controls separately to evaluate the relative importance of adding those controls on our regression results.

4 Results

In this section, we will discuss the impact of the pedagogical intervention on student outcomes, both overall and split by gender.

---

[10]This is done only for our final sample, which is white students in the school of Arts and Sciences.

Figure 1: Pre- to post-intervention differences by student gender

Change in Predictors and Outcome Variables from Pre to Post Intervention

■ Male students
■ Female students

Notes - Pre- to post-intervention differences by student gender on key inputs (academic resources and other demographic variables) and key outputs (course performance). Includes only final sample of white students in the School of Arts and Sciences.

4.1 Outcomes of introductory economics students before and after the intervention

Before discussing our main results, we will discuss how the outcomes of students who take introductory economics courses before and after the intervention vary. This analysis is cursory means-level comparisons and is only to get a sense of the general population effects of the intervention.

Panel B of Table 2 presents the means of various outcomes in the pre- and post-intervention groups. In general, it seems like outcomes in introductory courses are better after the intervention compared to before the intervention. Post-intervention students get 0.15 better grades in introductory microeconomics and 0.19 better grades in introductory macroeconomics on their first try, and are 5 (7) percentage points less likely to get a D or F or to withdraw intro micro

(macro).[11] These results indicate that the intervention seems to have positively benefited the population of introductory economics students both in terms of getting better grades and in being less likely to have bad grade outcomes.

4.2 The Intervention Effects on Course Grades

We now turn our attention to the primary concern of our analysis: the impact of the intervention by gender, with an eye towards understanding how outcomes of women differentially respond to the intervention. We begin by analyzing the mean grade changes from pre- to post-intervention by gender and race in the full sample of students who took an introductory economics course between Fall 2015 and Fall 2019. As we can see in Figure 2, there was minimal changes in grades among white male students, while all other demographic groups including white women showed improvements in mean grade, particularly for intro macro.[12] This is encouraging, as it indicates that while white men were not necessarily benefited, they were not harmed, nor were any other group who is not considered in the remainder of the analyses. The lower panel of Figure 1 also reflects these outcomes in the final sample focusing on white students in the School of Arts and Sciences, showing that women's grades in both courses differentially improve after the intervention. Additionally, Figure 3 presents these results for white students in the School of Arts and Sciences by year, and shows that for both the introductory courses the structural break is after the intervention, providing evidence that the intervention is likely the cause of this change. However, due to the differential change in incoming characteristics by gender that we found in Figure 1, we rely on regression results to fully evaluate this outcome.

We run regressions in which we can control for potentially varying student characteristics in order to evaluate the impact of the intervention on student grades in line with the following equation:

---

[11]Grades are out of a 4 point scale, where grades are accorded given the following letters: A or A+ =4.0, A- = 3.75, B+ = 3.25, B = 3.0, B- = 2.75, C+ = 2.25, C =2.0, C- = 1.75, D+ = 1.25, D = 1.0, D- = 0.75, F=0. The measure of DFW, or getting a D or F or having to withdraw, is an important indicator for very bad course outcomes and generally means the student will not get credit for the course, will have to retake the course, or will have substantial penalties to their GPA.

[12]Figure A.1 shows the complete intersectionality of male/female within all four racial groups. The number of students in each category becomes very small and thus the means are poorly estimated, but the trends are suggestive of all groups except white males showing benefits of the intervention in at least one of the two courses. The remaining analyses presented below focus on the gender effect within white students because there are clear signs of gender x race/ethnicity intersectionality in the effects of the intervention but there is only enough power to estimate the gender effect among White students.

Figure 2: Grades by Gender and Ethnicity, Pre- and Post-Intervention

Notes - Mean grades pre- and post-intervention by ethnicity (and by gender for white students) for Introductory Microeconomics (left) and Introductory Macroeconomics (right). Full sample of students who took an introductory economics course between Fall 2015 and Fall 2019.

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * Female_i + \beta_2 * Intervention_i + \beta_3 * Female_i * Intervention_i + \xi X_i + \epsilon_i \quad (1)$$

in which y_i presents individual student's outcome variable of either their course grade or getting a D, F, or withdraw in either their first attempt at an introductory Microeconomics or Macroeconomics course. The "first" in these outcome variables indicates that it is the first attempt at these courses and does not include retakes. $Female_i$ is an indicator variable that is equal to 1 when the student is female and 0 when the student is male.[13] $Intervention_i$ is an indicator variable that is equal to 1 when the student took their first attempt at that particular course, either introductory Microeconomics or Macroeconomics in line with the course referenced in y_i, during the intervention period, i.e. Fall 2018 or later, and 0 otherwise. X_i is a vector of controls. In the first model, we consider only structural controls for the student's academic year when they first took that economics course, either freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior and beyond. The second model adds on prior academic experience controls such as their high school GPA, their math and verbal SAT scores, and whether they took AP Micro and AP Macro. This model also includes controls

---

[13]Given the reporting in our data, very few students report any gender identity other than male or female, and so we restrict our sample to these two groups.

Figure 3: Grades Over Time by Gender

Notes - Mean grades (with SE bars) by year for Micro (left) and Macro (right). Vertical red line indicates pre- versus post-intervention. Final sample of white students from the School of Arts and Sciences who took an introductory economics course between Fall 2015 and Fall 2019.

for whether they took either introductory course at a satellite campus prior to taking the course at the main campus. The third model adds on prior economics coursework controls for whether they took introductory microeconomics or macroeconomics first. The final model adds on family characteristics controls such as whether their family reports having a low income, whether they are a first generation college student, and whether their parents have 3 or more children family including themselves. β_1, β_2, and β_3 present our coefficients of interest, while β_0 indicates the constant, ζ represents the vector of coefficients for the vector of controls X_i and ϵ_i indicates the error term. Our primary analysis is OLS regressions, but we include Logit regressions for the binary outcomes of getting D, F, or W in either course in the appendix; we find substantially similar results using this alternative framework.

In Table 3, Models 1a-4a present the primary coefficients of interest for regressions evaluating the impact of the intervention on introductory microeconomics grades, and Models 1b-4b present the same for introductory macroeconomics grades. The different columns indicate different sets of controls, starting with a model with only structural controls to the last column including all of the controls. The controls of concern, those of high school GPA and Math SAT scores, are incorporated in Models 1b and 2b for introductory micro grade and introductory macro grade

regressions, respectively.[14] Using these regressions, we first find evidence of gender disparities in grades in introductory macroeconomics, but not introductory microeconomics.[15] We also find no evidence of an impact of the intervention on the grades of male students. However, we find that the intervention raises grades for women by 0.15 to 0.22 points (out of a 4.0 scale), and though this is marginally insignificant in some of the macroeconomics regressions. To put this change in context, a 0.2 point change could bring someone from a minus grade to a full grade, or from a full grade to a plus grade. Additionally, it more than closes any pre-existing gender gaps in grades and results in a reversal of such gaps, with women performing better than men in the classes.

We can also evaluate the impact of the intervention on the distribution of course grades. The top panel of Figure 4 presents the changes in the percent of students in each grade category that occurred with the intervention, split by course and the gender of the student. Both courses saw an increase at the top of the grade distribution and a decrease at the bottom of the grade distribution for both genders. For Micro, the growth was in As and Bs and is larger for female students. For Macro, the growth was specifically in As, and especially large for female students. We may also be concerned where these students are moving from. In particular, we would want these increases at the top end of the distribution to be coming from decreases in the bottom end of the distribution, in particular the Ds, Fs, and Ws (sometimes collected as DFW). We see that there is some decrease in the DFW rate, particularly for women, but much of the decrease is happening in the C grade range. This suggests that while some of the worst outcomes are being averted, particularly for women, most of the change in grades is coming from a hollowing out of the middle outcomes towards the better outcomes.

Turning specifically to these most negative outcomes, the DFW rate, we can evaluate if the intervention had any specific impact on these outcomes, and if so if it differentially impacted men and women. Considering the temporal trends, the lower panel of Figure 4 suggests that

---

[14]See Tables A.1 and A.2 for the full set of estimated coefficients from each model.

[15]While not our primary model of interest, we also evaluate the gender gaps in grade anomalies for these courses, defined as the gender gaps in grades conditional on the students' semester GPA excluding these classes. We find evidence of a gender gap in grade anomalies, with women performing significantly worse in both courses when controlling for their same-semester GPA from their other classes. This is true if we control for the entire same-semester GPA or only their Arts and Sciences GPA, their GPA in other social sciences class, or, for macroeconomics grade, their GPA in their sciences classes. These gaps are substantial, ranging from about a 0.2 gap in the microeconomics course grades to a 0.3 gap in the macroeconomics course grades. Results available upon request.

Table 3: Grades and DFW Rates

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Overall grades				
Micro	Model 1a	Model 2a	Model 3a	Model 4a
Female	-0.02	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03
	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Intervention	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.02
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Female x Intervention	0.22**	0.15*	0.15*	0.15*
	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
Macro	Model 1b	Model 2b	Model 3b	Model 4b
Female	-0.08	-0.11**	-0.10**	-0.10*
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Intervention	0.03	-0.01	0.01	0.01
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)
Female x Intervention	0.22**	0.18*	0.15*	0.15
	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.09)
DFW				
Micro	Model 1c	Model 2c	Model 3c	Model 4c
Female	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Intervention	-0.02	-0.01	-0.03*	-0.03
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Female x Intervention	-0.07**	-0.05**	-0.05**	-0.05**
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Macro	Model 1d	Model 2d	Model 3d	Model 4d
Female	-0.01	-0.01	-0.00	-0.00
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Intervention	-0.05***	-0.04***	-0.03**	-0.03**
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Female x Intervention	-0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)

Notes - Separately for Micro and Macro as well separately for overall grades and DFW rates, estimated regression beta coefficients (and standard errors) for the main effect of gender, main effect of intervention pre vs. post, and interaction of intervention by gender across models which included (1) only structural controls, (2) the addition of prior academic experience controls, (3) the addition of prior economics coursework controls, and (4) the addition of family characteristic controls. Final sample of white students from the School of Arts and Sciences who took an introductory economics course between Fall 2015 and Fall 2019. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Figure 4: Grade Distributions and DFW Evolution by Gender

Notes - Micro (left) and Macro (right) grade distributions (top) and DFW rates (bottom) by year for male and female students. Vertical red line indicates pre versus post intervention. Final sample of white students from the School of Arts and Sciences who took an introductory economics course between Fall 2015 and Fall 2019.

the intervention may differentially inhibited the overall decline in DFW rates for men but not for women in introductory microeconomics, while there were no differences for introductory macroeconomics. Columns 1c-4c and 1d-4d of Table 3 present regressions of the interaction between the intervention and gender for the DFW rate in introductory microeconomics (1c-4c) and macroeconomics (1d-4d) with the associated controls.[16] We can see here that there does not seem to be a differential DFW rate by gender prior to the intervention. In microeconomics, there seems to be no change in the DFW rate for men and a 5 to 7 percentage point decrease for women. However, this does indicate the generation of a gender gap in the DFW rate for

---

[16]Full regression outputs are presented in Tables A.3 and A.4. Logit regressions are presented in Tables A.5 and A.6. They present similar results.

introductory microeconomics with women having lower DFW rates than men. In introductory macroeconomics, there again seems to be an overall decrease in the DFW rate for both men and women, though this is likely due to ongoing trends. Unlike for introductory microeconomics, there is no gender gap in DFW rates generated with the intervention.

5   Discussion and Conclusion

Gender gaps in economics are pervasive and persistent and they start as early as the first economics course a student takes in their undergraduate studies. While there have been many interventions attempted at this level to change in students' minds the image of who an economist is (i.e. that economists are women) (Carrell et al., 2010; Griffith, 2010; Li, 2018; Porter and Serra, 2020), there have not been interventions that manipulate the presentation of what economics is (i.e. something that is interesting to women), through either course content or content delivery.

In this paper, we evaluate an intervention that changed both course content and the way that content was presented and evaluated in the recitations of introductory microeconomics and macroeconomics courses. This intervention made recitations more focused on group work that involved solving real-world problems using the economic models learned in class. Not only did this better integrate marginalized students, such as women, into the class discussion, but also provided a broader range of examples of how economics can be used. While the intervention was not designed to close gender or any other demographic gaps, we thought such changes may be possible given how the content of the course was broadened by the intervention.

We find that, prior to the intervention, women get similar grades to men in their introductory economics courses. When the intervention was implemented, we found women's grades in their introductory economics courses exceeded those of men with similar characteristics and educational background. This is an important step in ensuring that women proceed along the economics pipeline, as prior literature has shown that women are particularly sensitive to grades when deciding whether or not to remain in economics. Furthermore, since women typically get better grades in non-economics courses, the increase in grades women receive here will potentially put their economics grades more in line with the rest of the grades they are receiving, giving them less of an indication that they should specialize outside of economics.

This intervention highlights the importance of considering course content and content delivery when trying to understand why gender gaps emerge and persist in economics. The traditional framing in economics courses superficially focusing on business may be less interesting to women than other framings, such as those aimed at policy and welfare. However, this intervention also attends to pedagogy as a component of gender gaps.

Another area of future research would be to evaluate how this intervention impacted other demographic gaps, such as racial gaps, in economics course outcomes and progression. While we are able to show evidence that suggests that racial gaps in course performance in Micro also improved given the intervention (Miller-Cotto and Schunn, 2020), we do not have the power to evaluate whether this was consistently the case across both courses or for progression into later courses. Further, it is unlikely that we will be able to further evaluate this program in the near run due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

In evaluating interventions, dimensions other than effect sizes should be considered, such as cost and sustainability. From a cost perspective, this intervention was expensive to develop (e.g., summer support for many faculty) but then inexpensive to sustain. The high development cost could have been distributed over more time by having a smaller team gradually change the contents of recitations. However, this might have produced an incoherent experience for students across the transition years. Further, training TAs on a new approach is important and hard to justify along the way when only a small proportion of recitation contents are changed. From a sustainability perspective, there were benefits of the adapted implementation strategy of involving all relevant faculty in the development of the revision materials and then in the teaching using the revised materials: it created an institutional commitment that is important for sustain the revisions across the gradual replacement of faculty and introduction of new policy changes. The research literature on the process of changing teaching across a department suggests that curriculum/pedagogy-focused efforts can be more successful than other kinds of changes because faculty see the value of working collectively and sufficient data can be collected to robustly test the effects (Henderson et al., 2010). It is an open question, however, whether the faculty involved then also changed other aspects of their teaching (e.g., how they teach upper level undergraduate courses).

Several strategic elements were vital to the successful implementation of this large project.

With the support of a grant from our provost, we were able to get active cooperation and collaborative design during a summer term from all the faculty who teach introductory micro or macro. This collective approach, in addition to enabling robust quantitative modeling of effects of the intervention on student outcomes, allowed us to implement the new training for all of the teaching assistants, which simplified scheduling and also allowed us take advantage of economies of scale. Faculty shared the workload of developing the new recitation plans and specialized in particular topics. It also allowed faculty to design plans collaboratively which fostered innovation and an iterative revision process that we believe served to improve our results. The exchange of ideas through regular meetings and hallway conversations throughout the summer term was invaluable to faculty. Similarly, teaching assistants benefitted from being in a teaching class with their peers and using the same lesson plans as their peers. They were able to assist each other, since they were working on the same lessons at the same time. Finally, the collective approach will likely support sustainability of the revision since so many faculty are invested and personally connected to the revision.

References

Ahlstrom, Laura J, and Carlos J Asarta (2019) 'The gender gap in undergraduate economics course persistence and degree selection.' In 'AEA Papers and Proceedings,' vol. 109 pp. 255–60

Anderson, Gordon, Dwayne Benjamin, and Melvyn A Fuss (1994) 'The determinants of success in university introductory economics courses.' *The Journal of Economic Education* 25(2), 99–119

Arnold, Ivo JM (2020) 'Gender and major choice within economics: Evidence from europe.' *International Review of Economics Education* 35, 100191

Asarta, Carlos J, Rebecca G Chambers, and Cynthia Harter (2021) 'Teaching methods in undergraduate introductory economics courses: Results from a sixth national quinquennial survey.' *The American Economist* 66(1), 18–28

Avilova, Tatyana, and Claudia Goldin (2018) 'What can uwe do for economics?' In 'AEA papers and proceedings,' vol. 108 pp. 186–90

Ballard, Charles, and Marianne Johnson (2005) 'Gender, expectations, and grades in introductory microeconomics at a us university.' *Feminist Economics* 11(1), 95–122

Bayer, Amanda, and David W Wilcox (2019) 'The unequal distribution of economic education: A report on the race, ethnicity, and gender of economics majors at us colleges and universities.' *The Journal of Economic Education* 50(3), 299–320

Bayer, Amanda, Syon P Bhanot, Erin T Bronchetti, and Stephen A O'Connell (2020) 'Diagnosing the learning environment for diverse students in introductory economics: An analysis of relevance, belonging, and growth mindsets.' In 'AEA Papers and Proceedings,' vol. 110 pp. 294–98

Bettinger, Eric P, and Bridget Terry Long (2005) 'Do faculty serve as role models? the impact of instructor gender on female students.' *American Economic Review* 95(2), 152–157

Borg, Mary O'Malley, and Harriet Stranahan (2002) 'The effect of gender and race on student performance in principles of economics: the importance of personality type.' *Applied Economics* 34(5), 589–598

Buckles, Kasey (2019) 'Fixing the leaky pipeline: Strategies for making economics work for women at every stage.' *Journal of economic perspectives* 33(1), 43–60

Carrell, Scott E, Marianne E Page, and James E West (2010) 'Sex and science: How professor gender perpetuates the gender gap.' *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 125(3), 1101–1144

Chi, Michelene TH, and Ruth Wylie (2014) 'The icap framework: Linking cognitive engagement to active learning outcomes.' *Educational psychologist* 49(4), 219–243

College Board, . (2020) '2020 program summary report'

Conger, Dylan (2015) 'High school grades, admissions policies, and the gender gap in college enrollment.' *Economics of Education Review* 46, 144–147

Di Tommaso, Maria Laura, Dalit Contini, Dalila De Rosa, Francesca Ferrara, Daniela Piazzalunga, and Ornella Robutti (2020) *Tackling the gender gap in math with active learning teaching practices* (Università degli studi di Torino, Department of Economics and Statistics . . .)

Espey, Molly (2018) 'Diversity, effort, and cooperation in team-based learning.' *The Journal of Economic Education* 49(1), 8–21

Ferber, Marianne A (1995) 'The study of economics: A feminist critique.' *The American Economic Review* 85(2), 357–361

Freeman, Scott, Sarah L Eddy, Miles McDonough, Michelle K Smith, Nnadozie Okoroafor, Hannah Jordt, and Mary Pat Wenderoth (2014) 'Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics.' *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* 111(23), 8410–8415

Griffith, Amanda L (2010) 'Persistence of women and minorities in stem field majors: Is it the school that matters?' *Economics of Education Review* 29(6), 911–922

Henderson, Charles, and Melissa H Dancy (2007) 'Barriers to the use of research-based instructional strategies: The influence of both individual and situational characteristics.' *Physical Review Special Topics-Physics Education Research* 3(2), 020102

Henderson, Charles, Noah Finkelstein, and Andrea Beach (2010) 'Beyond dissemination in college science teaching: An introduction to four core change strategies.' *Journal of College Science Teaching* 39(5), 18–25

Heyne, Paul (1995) 'Teaching introductory economics.' *Agenda* 2(2), 149–158

Hmelo-Silver, Cindy E (2004) 'Problem-based learning: What and how do students learn?' *Educational psychology review* 16(3), 235–266

Inman, Phillip (2014) 'Economics students call for shakeup of the way their subject is taught.' *The Guardian*

Jakobsson, Niklas (2012) 'Gender and confidence: are women underconfident?' *Applied Economics Letters* 19(11), 1057–1059

Jensen, Elizabeth J, and Ann L Owen (2001) 'Pedagogy, gender, and interest in economics.' *The Journal of Economic Education* 32(4), 323–343

Josephson, Anna, Larry DeBoer, Dave Nelson, and Angelika Zissimopoulos (2019) 'Learning to do: Facilitating practice in a large introductory macroeconomics class.' *The Journal of Economic Education* 50(2), 142–156

Kirschner, Femke, Fred Paas, and Paul A Kirschner (2009) 'Individual and group-based learning from complex cognitive tasks: Effects on retention and transfer efficiency.' *Computers in Human Behavior* 25(2), 306–314

Kugler, Adriana D, Catherine H Tinsley, and Olga Ukhaneva (2021) 'Choice of majors: are women really different from men?' *Economics of Education Review* 81, 102079

Lewis, Scott E (2011) 'Retention and reform: An evaluation of peer-led team learning.' *Journal of Chemical Education* 88(6), 703–707

Li, Hsueh-Hsiang (2018) 'Do mentoring, information, and nudge reduce the gender gap in economics majors?' *Economics of Education Review* 64, 165–183

Lorenzo, Mercedes, Catherine H Crouch, and Eric Mazur (2006) 'Reducing the gender gap in the physics classroom.' *American Journal of Physics* 74(2), 118–122

Lundberg, Shelly (2017) 'Report: Committee on the status of women in the economics profession (cswep).' *American Economic Review* 107(5), 759–76

Matz, Rebecca L, Benjamin P Koester, Stefano Fiorini, Galina Grom, Linda Shepard, Charles G Stangor, Brad Weiner, and Timothy A McKay (2017) 'Patterns of gendered performance differences in large introductory courses at five research universities.' *Aera Open* 3(4), 2332858417743754

Miller-Cotto, Dana, and Christian Schunn (2020) 'Mind the gap: how a large-scale course redesign in economics reduced performance gaps.' *The Journal of Experimental Education* pp. 1–14

O'Dea, Rose E, Malgorzata Lagisz, Michael D Jennions, and Shinich Nakagawa (2018) 'Gender differences in individual variation in academic grades fail to fit expected patterns for stem.' *Nature communications* 9(1), 1–8

Oudija, Nouhaila (2022) 'Economics is failing us college students.' *Rethinking Economics*

Owen, Ann L, and Paul Hagstrom (2021) 'Broadening perceptions of economics in a new introductory economics sequence.' *The Journal of Economic Education* pp. 1–17

Porter, Catherine, and Danila Serra (2020) 'Gender differences in the choice of major: The importance of female role models.' *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 12(3), 226–54

Pugatch, Todd, and Elizabeth Schroeder (2021) 'Promoting female interest in economics: Limits to nudges.' In 'AEA Papers and Proceedings,' vol. 111 pp. 123–27

Pühringer, Stephan, and Lukas Bäuerle (2018) 'What economics education is missing: the real world.' *International Journal of Social Economics*

Reisz, Matthew (2018) 'Economics degrees still 'too narrow in focus'.' *Times Higher Education*

Rodriguez, Idaykis, Geoff Potvin, and Laird H Kramer (2016) 'How gender and reformed introductory physics impacts student success in advanced physics courses and continuation in the physics major.' *Physical Review Physics Education Research* 12(2), 020118

Siegfried, John J (2010) 'Trends in undergraduate economics degrees, 1991–2009.' *The Journal of Economic Education* 41(3), 326–330

— (2020) 'Trends in undergraduate economics degrees, 2001–2019.' *The Journal of Economic Education* 51(3-4), 359–363

Springer, Leonard, Mary Elizabeth Stanne, and Samuel S Donovan (1999) 'Effects of small-group learning on undergraduates in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology: A meta-analysis.' *Review of educational research* 69(1), 21–51

Thornton, Tim (2020) 'The problem with the way economists are educated.' *Global Development Policy Center Economics in Context Initiative*

US Department of Education, . (2020) 'Digest of education statistics 2019'

Walker, Lindsey, and Abdi-Rizak M Warfa (2017) 'Process oriented guided inquiry learning (pogil®) marginally effects student achievement measures but substantially increases the odds of passing a course.' *PLoS One* 12(10), e0186203

Wang, Ming-Te, Jacquelynne S Eccles, and Sarah Kenny (2013) 'Not lack of ability but more choice: Individual and gender differences in choice of careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.' *Psychological science* 24(5), 770–775

Werner, Linda, Brian Hanks, Charlie McDowell, Heather Bullock, and Julian Fernald (2005) 'Want to increase retention of your female students.' *Computing Research News* 17(2), 2

Wolfers, Justin (2019) 'Economics isn't dismal, it's useful.' *New York Times* 26, 2019

APPENDIX A

Appendix Figures

Figure A.1: Grades by Race, Gender, and Intervention

Notes - Mean grades pre and post intervention by ethnicity and gender for Micro (left) and Macro (right). Full economics student sample of all students who took an introductory economics course between Fall 2015 and Fall 2019.

Appendix Tables

Table A.1: Full Regression Results - Outcome: First Micro Grade

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Female	-0.02	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Intervention	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.02
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Intervention X Female	0.22**	0.15*	0.15*	0.15*
	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
Year = (Baseline = Freshman)				
Sophomore	-0.08*	-0.02	-0.00	-0.00
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Junior	-0.15**	-0.14**	-0.13**	-0.14**
	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.07)
Senior	-0.42***	-0.21**	-0.19**	-0.20**
	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)
HS GPA		0.70***	0.70***	0.70***
		(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Math SAT/100		0.31***	0.31***	0.31***
		(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Verbal SAT/100		0.10***	0.10***	0.10***
		(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Took AP Micro		0.24**	0.23*	0.23*
		(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)
Took AP Macro		0.20**	0.22**	0.22***
		(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
Took Micro at Satellite Campus		-0.32	-0.31	-0.29
		(1.00)	(1.00)	(1.00)
Took Macro at Satellite Campus		0.57	0.57	0.57
		(0.39)	(0.39)	(0.39)
Took Micro First			0.04	0.04
			(0.07)	(0.07)
Took Macro First			0.15*	0.14*
			(0.08)	(0.08)
Low Income				-0.04
				(0.05)
First Generation				0.08
				(0.06)
3 or More in Family				0.05
				(0.09)
Constant	2.79***	-2.61***	-2.67***	-2.75***
	(0.03)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.26)
Observations	2881	2813	2813	2813
R-squared	0.02	0.21	0.21	0.21

Notes - Full regression results with the outcome variable of first micro grade across models which included (1) only structural controls, (2) the addition of prior academic experience controls, (3) the addition of prior economics coursework controls, and (4) the addition of family characteristic controls. Final sample of white students from the School of Arts and Sciences who took an introductory economics course between Fall 2015 and Fall 2019. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Table A.2: Full Regression Results - Outcome: First Macro Grade

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Female	-0.08	-0.11**	-0.10**	-0.10*
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Intervention	0.03	-0.01	0.01	0.01
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)
Intervention X Female	0.22**	0.18*	0.15*	0.15
	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)
Year = (Baseline = Freshman)				
Sophomore	-0.12**	-0.03	0.00	-0.00
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Junior	-0.27***	-0.24***	-0.18**	-0.20***
	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
Senior	-0.43***	-0.40***	-0.31***	-0.34***
	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)
HS GPA		0.63***	0.64***	0.64***
		(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Math SAT/100		0.17***	0.16***	0.16***
		(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Verbal SAT/100		0.04	0.05	0.05
		(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Took AP Micro		0.14	0.20**	0.20**
		(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)
Took AP Macro		0.16	0.12	0.13
		(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)
Took Micro at Satellite Campus		-0.56	-0.53	-0.54
		(0.49)	(0.48)	(0.48)
Took Micro First			0.24***	0.23***
			(0.08)	(0.08)
Took Macro First			0.01	-0.00
			(0.07)	(0.07)
Low Income				0.08
				(0.06)
First Generation				-0.01
				(0.06)
3 or More in Family				0.26***
				(0.10)
Constant	2.95***	-0.83***	-0.96***	-1.25***
	(0.03)	(0.27)	(0.28)	(0.29)
Observations	2454	2403	2403	2403
R-squared	0.02	0.13	0.14	0.15

Notes - Full regression results with the outcome variable of first macro grade across models which included (1) only structural controls, (2) the addition of prior academic experience controls, (3) the addition of prior economics coursework controls, and (4) the addition of family characteristic controls. Final sample of white students from the School of Arts and Sciences who took an introductory economics course between Fall 2015 and Fall 2019. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A.3: Full Regression Results - Outcome: D, F, or W in First Micro

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Female	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Intervention	-0.02	-0.01	-0.03*	-0.03
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Intervention X Female	-0.07**	-0.05**	-0.05**	-0.05**
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Year = (Baseline = Freshman)				
Sophomore	-0.02	-0.04***	-0.04***	-0.04***
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Junior	-0.03	-0.03*	-0.03*	-0.03*
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Senior	0.01	-0.04*	-0.03	-0.03
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
HS GPA		-0.15***	-0.15***	-0.15***
		(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Math SAT/100		-0.05***	-0.05***	-0.05***
		(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Verbal SAT/100		-0.04***	-0.03***	-0.03***
		(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Took AP Micro		-0.10***	-0.02	-0.02
		(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Took AP Macro		-0.04	-0.08***	-0.08***
		(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Took Micro at Satellite Campus		-0.16	-0.07	-0.067
		(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.16)
Took Macro at Satellite Campus		0.13	0.05	0.05
		(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)
Took Micro First			0.00	0.00
			(0.02)	(0.02)
Took Macro First			-0.19***	-0.19***
			(0.03)	(0.03)
Low Income				0.00
				(0.02)
First Generation				-0.00
				(0.02)
3 or More in Family				-0.03
				(0.03)
Constant	0.20***	1.35***	1.43***	1.45***
	(0.01)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
Observations	4093	3992	3992	3992
R-squared	0.01	0.08	0.14	0.14

Notes - Full regression results with the outcome variable of getting a D, F, or W in the first micro class across models which included (1) only structural controls, (2) the addition of prior academic experience controls, (3) the addition of prior economics coursework controls, and (4) the addition of family characteristic controls. Final sample of white students from the School of Arts and Sciences who took an introductory economics course between Fall 2015 and Fall 2019. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Table A.4: Full Regression Results - Outcome: D, F, or W in First Macro

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Female	-0.01	-0.01	-0.00	-0.00
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Intervention	-0.05***	-0.04***	-0.03**	-0.03**
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Intervention X Female	-0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Year = (Baseline = Freshman)				
Sophomore	0.010	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Junior	0.01	0.00	-0.00	-0.00
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Senior	0.01	0.00	-0.021	-0.017
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
HS GPA		-0.12***	-0.12***	-0.12***
		(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Math SAT/100		-0.04***	-0.04***	-0.04***
		(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Verbal SAT/100		-0.00	-0.01	-0.01
		(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Took AP Micro		-0.02	-0.09***	-0.09***
		(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Took AP Macro		-0.06**	-0.014	-0.02
		(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Took Micro at Satellite Campus		0.41***	0.34**	0.34**
		(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)
Took Macro at Satellite Campus		-0.41***	-0.31**	-0.31**
		(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)
Took Micro First			-0.22***	-0.22***
			(0.02)	(0.02)
Took Macro First			-0.04	-0.04
			(0.02)	(0.02)
Low Income				-0.02
				(0.02)
First Generation				0.00
				(0.02)
3 or More in Family				-0.05*
				(0.0262)
Constant	0.16***	0.91***	1.04***	1.10***
	(0.01)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.08)
Observations	4093	3992	3992	3992
R-squared	0.01	0.05	0.12	0.12

Notes - Full regression results with the outcome variable of getting a D, F, or W in the first macro class across models which included (1) only structural controls, (2) the addition of prior academic experience controls, (3) the addition of prior economics coursework controls, and (4) the addition of family characteristic controls. Final sample of white students from the School of Arts and Sciences who took an introductory economics course between Fall 2015 and Fall 2019. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

.1

Table A.5: Full Logit Regression Results - Outcome: D, F, or W in First Micro

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Female	-0.05	0.04	0.05	0.05
	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.12)
Intervention	-0.11	-0.09	-0.22*	-0.22*
	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.13)
Intervention X Female	-0.59***	-0.56***	-0.55**	-0.55**
	(0.201)	(0.215)	(0.223)	(0.223)
Year = (Baseline = Freshman)				
Sophomore	-0.13	-0.31***	-0.35***	-0.35***
	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.11)
Junior	-0.20	-0.27*	-0.28*	-0.28*
	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.17)	(0.17)
Senior	0.03	-0.36*	-0.32	-0.32
	(0.17)	(0.19)	(0.20)	(0.21)
HS GPA		-1.16***	-1.29***	-1.29***
		(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.12)
Math SAT/100		-0.38***	-0.49***	-0.49***
		(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.09)
Verbal SAT/100		-0.29***	-0.22**	-0.23**
		(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)
Took AP Micro		-1.27***	-0.74*	-0.74*
		(0.39)	(0.41)	(0.41)
Took AP Macro		-0.32	-0.63**	-0.63**
		(0.26)	(0.27)	(0.27)
Took Micro at Satellite Campus		-1.08	-0.16	-0.15
		(1.17)	(1.23)	(1.23)
Took Macro at Satellite Campus		0.34	-0.46	-0.45
		(0.97)	(0.98)	(0.98)
Took Micro First			0.03	0.04
			(0.18)	(0.18)
Took Macro First			-1.89***	-1.89***
			(0.21)	(0.21)
Low Income				-0.00
				(0.14)
First Generation				-0.03
				(0.14)
3 or More in Family				-0.24
				(0.22)
Constant	-1.39***	7.37***	8.67***	8.92***
	(0.07)	(0.62)	(0.68)	(0.71)
Observations	4093	3992	3992	3992

Notes - Full logit regression results with the outcome variable of getting a D, F, or W in the first micro class across models which included (1) only structural controls, (2) the addition of prior academic experience controls, (3) the addition of prior economics coursework controls, and (4) the addition of family characteristic controls. Final sample of white students from the School of Arts and Sciences who took an introductory economics course between Fall 2015 and Fall 2019. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A.6: Full Logit Regression Results - Outcome: D, F, or W in First Macro

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Female	-0.05	-0.06	-0.01	-0.02
	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)
Intervention	-0.43***	-0.39***	-0.29**	-0.30**
	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.15)
Intervention X Female	-0.08	0.05	0.00	0.01
	(0.22)	(0.23)	(0.24)	(0.24)
Year = (Baseline = Freshman)				
Sophomore	0.05	-0.09	-0.18	-0.19
	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.12)
Junior	0.06	0.02	-0.05	-0.02
	(0.16)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)
Senior	0.06	-0.02	-0.21	-0.18
	(0.19)	(0.20)	(0.21)	(0.21)
HS GPA		-1.03***	-1.09***	-1.10***
		(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)
Math SAT/100		-0.40***	-0.36***	-0.37***
		(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)
Verbal SAT/100		-0.01	-0.07	-0.07
		(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.10)
Took AP Micro		-0.16	-0.76**	-0.75**
		(0.31)	(0.32)	(0.32)
Took AP Macro		-0.80***	-0.42	-0.44
		(0.31)	(0.32)	(0.32)
Micro at Satellite Campus		1.99*	1.29	1.34
		(1.21)	(1.21)	(1.23)
Took Micro First			-1.92***	-1.90***
			(0.18)	(0.18)
Took Macro First			-0.22	-0.21
			(0.17)	(0.17)
Low Income				-0.18
				(0.15)
First Generation				0.02
				(0.15)
3 or More in Family				-0.40*
				(0.22)
Constant	-1.70***	4.91***	6.26***	6.76***
	(0.08)	(0.64)	(0.70)	(0.74)
Observations	4093	3985	3985	3985

Notes - Full logit regression results with the outcome variable of getting a D, F, or W in the first macro class across models which included (1) only structural controls, (2) the addition of prior academic experience controls, (3) the addition of prior economics coursework controls, and (4) the addition of family characteristic controls. Final sample of white students from the School of Arts and Sciences who took an introductory economics course between Fall 2015 and Fall 2019. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

APPENDIX B: Example Recitation Plan and Student Worksheet

APPEND WORD DOC IN PDF FORM