

Dynamics of Engineering Labor Markets: Petroleum Engineering Demand and Responsive Supply

Leonard Lynn
Case Western Reserve University

Hal Salzman
Rutgers University
E.J. Bloustein School of Planning & Public Policy
J.J. Heldrich Center for Workforce Development

Daniel Kuehn
The Urban Institute

The National Bureau of Economic Research
Cambridge, MA

Forthcoming: Lynn, L. Salzman, H. and Kuehn, D. (2016) “Dynamics of Engineering Labor Markets: Petroleum Engineering and Responsive Supply” in Freeman, R. and H. Salzman (eds.) *Engineering in a Global Economy* (forthcoming, 2015) NBER and University of Chicago Press.

The research was supported through grants from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (with Lindsay Lowell) and the National Science Foundation (Human and Social Dynamics Program, #SES-0527584; Social Dimensions of Engineering, Science, and Technology #0431755). Research assistance was provided by Purba Ruda. Parts of this paper are drawn from: Lynn, Leonard and Salzman, Hal “The Globalization of Technology Development: Implications for U.S. Skills Policy,” in LERA Research Volume, 2010; and Salzman and Lynn, “Engineering and Engineering Skills: What’s Really Needed for Global Competitiveness,” paper presented at the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management Annual Meeting, November 4, 2010, Boston, MA. Professor Thomas K. Holley, Director of the Petroleum

Engineering Program at the University of Houston was also kind enough to read a draft of this chapter and make suggestions and comments. The authors, of course, take full responsibility for the chapter's conclusions and any factual errors that might remain in it.

Introduction

The dynamics of engineering labor markets are controversial. Some believe they are similar to other labor markets, in which the supply of workers is responsive to demand as reflected in salaries. As the demand for engineers increases, salaries increase, motivating more students to major in engineering and more incumbents to stay in engineering. Others assert that the specialized knowledge and arduous education and training required of engineers inherently limit the size of the labor pool. According to this view, the U.S. education system does not produce a sufficient number of qualified engineers to meet national needs. One problem is said to be a lack of interest in the profession of engineering by American young people, especially women and some minorities. Another is a supposed weakness in the U.S. K-12 education system which, it is claimed, does not produce a sufficient number of high school graduates qualified to enter university engineering programs.

Petroleum engineering provides an illustrative case study for assessing the dynamics of engineering labor markets more generally. Petroleum engineering is a field where concerns about shortages of talent have been strongly voiced by industry leaders for a number of years, first prompted by observations over the past decade of labor force demographics indicating a need for increased hiring. The anticipated wave of retirements in the industry, in a workforce where half of all geophysicists and engineers are expected to retire by 2018, is characterized by people in the oil and gas industry as “the great crew change.” In recent years the demand for replacement hiring was further compounded by increased exploration that requires hiring additional petroleum engineers. The history of petroleum engineering demand reflects the cyclical demand for engineers in response to changes in the industry.

The building of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline and increased oil exploration in other regions had led to rapidly increasing demand for petroleum engineers in the 1970s. But once the pipeline was built and new domestic oil exploration slowed, demand for new petroleum engineering graduates fell off. However, by the late 1990s many of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline generation engineers were approaching retirement age and, most recently, more of the workforce passed retirement age just as spikes in oil prices were leading to an anticipated increase in need for petroleum engineers as firms were motivated to explore more aggressively for new oil fields.

In this chapter we first examine the recent history of claims that the market for skilled labor is dysfunctional. We then investigate the adjustment of the supply of engineering graduates to meet sharp increases in demand for petroleum engineers, and the implications for other areas of engineering and for the supply and demand of science and engineering (S&E) personnel. This investigation begins with a description of the field of petroleum engineering. In the next section of this chapter we describe the supply responses to the market signals of the late 1990s and early 2000s. We then discuss the mechanisms that signaled an upcoming demand spike to universities and other institutions, and the responses that allowed those institutions to meet the demand. Finally, we conclude with the implications of this case for the shortage and mismatch claims made about the S&E workforce.

Shortage and Mismatch Claims

Following the Great Recession of 2008, a group of technology company CEOs and others on the President's Council on Jobs and Competitiveness called for special measures by government, business, and universities to increase the number of U.S. engineering graduates by 10,000 a year. The Institute for Electrical and Electronics Engineering President Ron Jensen supported this call, asserting that more engineering graduates are needed because engineers drive innovation and create jobs. Companies cited a shortage of engineers as the reason they have "had" to move work offshore. CBS News featured Andrew Liveris, president of Dow Chemical, lamenting the scarcity of qualified engineers in the United States, saying this had caused his company to open research and development labs in Brazil, China, India, and Eastern Europe instead of the United States. And famously in 2011, Steve Jobs told President Obama that the reason he located 700,000 manufacturing jobs in China instead of the United States was his inability to find enough industrial engineers in the United States (Issacson 2011). These calls for government to increase the number of engineering graduates follow a decade-long series of reports and policy statements decrying shortages of science and engineering graduates (e.g., see Teitelbaum 2014 for history of shortage claims; Salzman 2013).

Some claim that persistent high rates of unemployment in the wake of the economic crisis that started in 2008 were caused by a mismatch between the skills of the unemployed and the skill needs of the new economy. Rapidly advancing technology implies that the skill needs of the "new" economy are primarily in the area of S&E human resources. These claims are compounded by the fear that the United States is losing (or will soon be losing) a technological race with other countries. This fear is supported by reports that China and India are producing hundreds of thousands of engineers. Furthermore, numerous reports argue that the United States is losing technological competitiveness because of weaknesses in our K-12 math and science education system. One alleged consequence of this weakness is a shortage of Americans well enough educated to succeed in university engineering programs.¹

These concerns have motivated proposals for heavy investments to remedy the weaknesses in the United States' K-12 math and science education system, make engineering as a career seem more attractive to young people (especially women and minorities who are underrepresented in engineering), offer more scholarships to engineering students, and expand university engineering programs. These primary and secondary educational reforms are typically complemented by proposals to bring in larger numbers of talented foreign engineers while retaining more of those who are already here at our universities and in our high-tech workforce.

The purported need to increase the number of engineering graduates available in the United States for employers is based on a number of assumptions. It is assumed that there is indeed a shortage of engineers that cannot be met by the normal functioning of labor markets. Furthermore it is assumed that the size of the stock of engineers in a country is proportional to the country's economic and military security, or even that to be secure a country must have more engineers than its rivals. Still another assumption is that increasing the supply of engineers, regardless of the demand expressed in the market place, will increase innovation and in turn drive economic growth. Still more assumptions underlie the proposals to fix the supposed shortage problem, such as the notion that part of the claimed shortage of engineering graduates is caused by the failure of American schools to train K-12 students so that they are qualified to enter university engineering departments and this failure is exacerbated by a failure to convince students about the excitement of engineering as a profession. The contention, then, is that there

¹ Probably the most prominent publications making these claims are National Research Council 2007, 2010.

are “market failures” leading to shortages in the supply of engineers in the United States. U.S. universities and students, according to this logic, are not responding to the national need for larger numbers of well-educated engineers. Further, those concerned about the supposed engineering shortage argue that the United States’ stock of engineers should be further increased by bringing in larger numbers of talented foreign professionals and by retaining those who are here at our universities (see Lynn and Salzman, 2010, for a review and discussion of these points).

Many social scientists have been skeptical of these claims, arguing that much of the push to train (or import) more engineers is actually motivated by the labor cost interests of employers rather than actual labor market dysfunctions. If there is a surplus of engineering graduates companies can pay new graduates less, thus lowering their labor costs. The costs to society of creating an oversupply of engineers, however, are high. These include the wasted time and efforts of bright young people being trained for jobs that don’t exist and the wasted resources of government and universities creating the capacity to train more engineers than are needed.² Moreover, an extreme oversupply might dampen the interest of new generations of Americans in pursuing high-tech education leading to real shortages in the future (note the arguments reviewed in Teitelbaum 2014, 118-154). And of course, there are the personal costs and frustrations borne by those who do not find careers in engineering despite their academic qualifications.

How responsive generally are labor markets to rapid changes in demand? Several studies have considered the labor market response to a large demand shock following the discovery of natural resources. This work typically finds evidence that labor markets are very responsive, although the response lags sharp initial wage increases. Indeed, recent natural resource booms such as the building of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline (Carrington 1996) have been associated with higher labor supply elasticity than older cases such as the California Gold Rush (Margo 2000). The impact of these shocks on local labor markets has been of particular interest. There is also a literature that provides critical insights into the general equilibrium response to a natural resource shock (e.g., Marchand 2012; Clay and Jones 2008; Aragon and Rud 2013; Black, McKinnish, and Sanders 2005), although all consider the broader labor market and none deal directly with engineering labor markets.

So far, evaluations of arguments about alleged market failures in engineering job markets have generally relied on research showing the numbers of graduates each year who are hired into engineering jobs, university enrollments, salary trends, and other statistical indicators for engineers in the aggregate. Dynamic changes in a specific labor market are more difficult to study, yet such studies are needed to give us a better sense of what influences the supply of engineers. How quickly does the education system, for example, respond to changes in market demand? Do shortages of qualified engineering students or institutional rigidities in universities cause failures in supply to meet the demand for engineers? Let us now turn to the case of the market response to sudden changes in the demand for petroleum engineers.

Petroleum engineering: What do petroleum engineers do?

² Some of the reports and papers arguing that for action to increase the number of engineering graduates in the United States are Council on Competitiveness (2004), Farrell and Grant (2005), National Academy of Sciences (2007, 2010) and National Association of Manufacturers (2005). We have addressed these arguments in Lindsay and Salzman (2007), Lynn and Salzman (2010), Salzman (2013) and elsewhere.

Petroleum engineers are engaged in a wide span of activities related to the development and exploitation of crude oil and natural gas fields. Their activities span the life cycle of the fields: finding reservoirs, deciding how to get the best yield from them, designing equipment for drilling and pumping, ensuring regulatory compliance, getting additional yield from older fields, and shutting down depleted fields. Major areas of specialization within petroleum engineering include drilling engineering, production engineering, reservoir engineering, and petrophysical engineering (designing tools and techniques to determine rock and fluid characteristics). Engineers from mechanical, civil, electrical, geological, and chemical engineering have contributed to these fields. *Princeton Review* says the work "... can mean travel, long stays in unusual (and sometimes inhospitable) locations, and uncertain working conditions." The *Review* cites a petroleum engineer as saying, "If you're into engineering and gambling, petroleum engineering is for you." Because of the sometimes harsh working conditions and sometimes quickly fluctuating employment prospects starting salaries have tended to be high compared to other fields of engineering. While a bachelor's degree in petroleum engineering is preferable for petroleum engineers, some hold degrees in mechanical or chemical engineering (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2014).

The profession of petroleum engineering got its formal start early in the 20th century when it became clear that the harvesting of surface oil and the use of water well drilling techniques were not sufficient to meet the burgeoning demand for oil and gasoline. The first oil fields were in Pennsylvania, and the University of Pittsburgh introduced courses in oil and gas industry practices in 1910. The first degree in petroleum engineering was granted in 1915. The University of California at Berkeley introduced courses in petroleum engineering around the same time, and established a four-year petroleum engineering program in 1915. Around twenty universities now offer petroleum engineering education programs, the largest programs (in number of bachelor of science degrees awarded in recent years) are Texas A&M University, Pennsylvania State University, Colorado School of Mines, University of Texas at Austin and Texas Tech University). A number of programs at other universities have not awarded degrees in recent years **and some programs have capped enrollments** Some companies offer in-house training programs in petrochemical engineering.

At first the focus of petroleum engineers was on finding ways to address drilling problems. In the 1920s it shifted to improving well design and production methods. A decade later a major concern was finding ways to maximize outputs from entire fields. After World War II petroleum engineers improved the techniques of reservoir analysis and petrophysics. New technology also was needed to support the new offshore oil industry. More recently additional challenges have been posed by the need to find oil and natural gas in the arctic, very deep water, and desert conditions. These have required additional technical inputs from thermohydraulics, geomechanics, and intelligent systems. Still another development has been the increased use of hydraulic fracking techniques for the extraction of hydrocarbons.

This chapter draws on two data sources to assess the size of the petroleum engineering workforce; the American Community Survey (ACS), produced by the Census Bureau, and the Occupational Employment Statistics (OES) produced by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In 2010 there were about 35,000 petroleum engineers in the United States (37,340 according to the ACS and 34,910 according to the OES; given the small relative size of this workforce, we expect some variation in these estimates). The ACS estimates show a 58 percent increase from the 23,604 petroleum engineers in the workforce in 2010. Employers include major oil companies and oil industry suppliers such as Exxon-Mobil, Chevron, Haliburton, and Schlumberger, as well as

large numbers of smaller independent oil, services, and production companies. In 2013 the mean salary for petroleum engineers in the United States was estimated to be \$128,000 according to the ACS and \$149,000 according to the OES datasets. Median salaries were somewhat lower in both datasets at \$100,000 and \$132,000, respectively.

In number of bachelor's degrees awarded, petroleum engineering is one of the smaller engineering fields. In 2012-2013 only 1,130 of 87,812 bachelor's degree awards in engineering in the United States were petroleum engineers. Nearly half the bachelor's degrees awarded in engineering went to students in just three fields: mechanical (25 percent), civil (18 percent), and electrical (21 percent). In 2012-2013, some 14 percent of new petroleum engineers were women, slightly less than the 19 percent of women in engineering overall. The number of bachelor's degrees awarded in petroleum engineering more than quadrupled between 2003 and 2013, from 252 to 1,130. Petroleum engineering has the largest rate of increase of any engineering field, though the even smaller workforces in mining engineering and nuclear engineering also had large rates of increase³.

Market Signals and Market Responses

In the 1970s, the building of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline and increased oil exploration in other regions led to rapidly increasing demand for petroleum engineers. By 2002 however, *Occupational Outlook* forecast an employment decline “because most of the petroleum-producing areas in the United States already have been explored” (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2004), and this continued to be the forecast through the 2008 edition of *Occupational Outlook*. In the most recent edition, 2014-2015 however, the Bureau of Labor Statistics forecast changed to a projected employment increase of 26 percent over the coming decade because “petroleum engineers increasingly will be needed to develop new resources, as well as new methods of extracting more from existing sources.” The shift to greater exploration followed the 2008 oil price spike, which also increased the returns to investments in types of oil extraction that were previously cost prohibitive (e.g., horizontally-drilled and hydraulically fractured shale), thus increasing the demand for petroleum engineers, especially those with new skill sets.

The number of job openings began to exceed the number of graduates around 2002, even though there still had been no overall workforce growth⁴. This was because of retirements and because there had been little hiring since the earlier oil boom and hiring expansion of the 1970s and 1980s. In some interviews with managers in oil companies in the mid-2000s, we found high levels of concern because the large cohort of engineers hired in the 1970s and 1980s was retiring just as the firms were launching large development and maintenance projects. This underlying demand was then exacerbated by the oil price spike, which intensified exploration efforts, as higher oil prices made previously unprofitable exploration (which in many cases posed greater engineering challenges) now profitable.

The response to this confluence of events—little hiring for many years, a current workforce that was aging and retiring, and a sudden increase in oil exploration—led to an observable demand for new petroleum engineers that exceeded the number of graduates each year. The earlier demand pressure from retirements had already led to increases in starting

³ Although no other field quadrupled, mining engineering went from 85 to 231, and nuclear engineering went from 202 to 614 from 2004 to 2013 (Yoder, 2013).

⁴ The BLS's Occupation Outlook Handbook notes that for 2012 the number of job openings was 38,500 with projected growth of 26% 2012-2022 (much faster than average).

salaries, but with the oil price spike petroleum engineering starting salaries rose even further, becoming the highest of all fields of engineering for new bachelor's degree graduates (National Association of Colleges and Employers 2010). Starting salaries (in 2014 dollars) jumped from an already high \$64,201 in 1997 (\$43,674 in actual, 1997 dollars) to \$71,568 in 1999 (\$50,400 in 1999 dollars). Starting salaries in the early 2000s rose (in 2014 dollars) to \$72,532 and \$75,290 in 2003 and 2005, respectively, and then falling to \$72,804 in 2008 (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2004, 2006; National Association of Colleges and Employers, 2009). The recent substantial increase in demand for petroleum engineering graduates began in 2009, when starting salary offers jumped to \$90,754 in 2014 dollars, and steadily increased afterwards, reaching \$98,257 in 2013 (National Association of Colleges and Employers 2010, 2014). In all these years, petroleum engineering salaries were higher than other engineering salaries but, until the spike in demand, the petroleum engineering starting salary premium was relatively small. For example, the 1997 \$43,674 starting salary for petroleum engineers was only slightly greater than that for the second highest paid engineering field, chemical engineers, who received an average starting salary of \$42,817. In 2010, however, the starting salary of \$86,220 for petroleum engineers was much higher than that of the second highest field, still chemical engineering, which was only \$65,142 (National Association of Colleges and Employers 2010). Petroleum engineer starting salary figures from NACE are reported in Figure 1, along with mean salary trends for all petroleum engineers estimated using the American Community Survey (ACS) and the Occupational Employment Statistics (OES) database (all in 2014 dollars). Starting salary data from NACE should be interpreted with some caution as they are not comprehensive but are based on a survey of only NACE member employers and a small sample of petroleum engineers. However, the trends in starting salaries track trends in the salaries of all petroleum engineers, increasing impressively over the last decade. From 2003 to 2013, petroleum engineer starting salaries reported by NACE and petroleum engineer salaries reported in the OES both grew by over 35 percent. The ACS reports somewhat slower salary growth of 25 percent.

INSERT FIGURE 1

Employment growth between 2003 and 2013 was even more substantial than earnings growth. Figure 2 presents petroleum engineer employment from the ACS and the OES, as well as the number of foreign petroleum engineers working in the United States from the ACS. The ACS reports petroleum engineer employment growth of 58 percent over this decade, and even this impressive growth figure is far lower than the OES estimate of 200 percent growth. (Divergences in these estimates are due to the fact that relatively small samples are used to estimate national employment levels.)⁵ Nevertheless, the data sources consistently show substantial growth from a workforce of around 20,000 to one of around 35,000 (recent surveys from ACS and OES show similar estimates of work force sizes in 2013; the large differences in the two surveys mentioned above are for earlier years). The increase in the number of foreign (i.e., non-citizen) petroleum engineers in the ACS was somewhat slower than the growth in number of all petroleum engineers (48 percent growth compared to 58 percent). In 2013, estimates from the ACS suggest that 7,877, or 21 percent of all petroleum engineers working in the United States were not citizens).

⁵ In the ACS, only several hundred survey respondents report working as petroleum engineers each year.

Rapid growth in the employment of petroleum engineers generally came by hiring younger workers. Figure 3 shows the change in the age distribution of the workforce in 2003 and the age distribution in 2013. While the modal age of petroleum engineers in 2003 was just under 50, by 2013 it was under 30. Although some of these new employees could have been pulled in from other sectors of the economy, many are new graduates of petroleum engineering programs and other engineering programs such as chemical engineering, which exhibited considerable growth over this period.⁶

The changes in earnings and employment between 2003 and 2013 suggests a tremendous responsiveness of employment to wages (an estimated elasticity of 2.4 from the ACS and 5.7 from the OES data⁷). Although petroleum engineering is a relatively small occupational group, the data strongly suggest that the petroleum engineering labor market is highly responsive to price signals.

INSERT FIGURES 2 & 3

In response to increasing median salaries, starting salaries, and other market signals the number of new petroleum engineering bachelor's degrees awarded by U.S. universities more than quadrupled between 2003 and 2013. Most of the growth was concentrated between 2008 and 2011, at the same time that the strongest starting salary growth was occurring. During this period petroleum engineering bachelor's awards grew from 521 to 1,030. Texas A&M and Colorado School of Mines more than tripled their output of new graduates from 42 to 128 and 32 to 100, respectively. As shown in Figure 4, the dramatic increase in petroleum engineering bachelor's degrees awarded followed the rise in starting salaries, which in turn reflected an increase in industry demand. This would seem to be a clear textbook case of efficient and responsive market functioning. It seems to show that normal market mechanisms, namely wage increases, can dramatically and quickly increase supply.

INSERT FIGURE 4

Dependencies on Domestic or Foreign Student Supply

A key claim about the U.S. S&E workforce is that it is dependent on foreign students and workers because it is not possible to find sufficient numbers of U.S. S&E workers. However, when we examine the dramatic increase in petroleum engineering graduates we find, interestingly, that although a significant source of supply for petroleum engineers historically has been foreign students, the new demand accompanied by sharp increases in salaries resulted in

⁶ A degree in mechanical or chemical engineering may also suffice for employment as petroleum engineer according to the *Occupational Outlook Handbook*. BLS Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2014-2015.

⁷ While these figures strongly indicate a responsive labor market, the exact point estimates should be interpreted with considerable caution. Changes in employment and earnings over the course of ten years suggest that these are relatively long-run elasticities, which are expected to be higher. They also pertain to a small workforce, for which rapid growth is easier to accommodate. Finally, the elasticity estimates are clearly imprecise and vary considerably across data sources.

markedly increase numbers of domestic students (U.S. citizens and permanent residents) responding to these market signals and graduating in petroleum engineering. In the initial stages of increased hiring and large salary increases, in the middle of the first decade of the 21st century, nearly the entire increase in graduates was composed of U.S. students (citizens and permanent residents), and the share of foreign students declined. Toward the end of the decade, the number and share of foreign students increased, but this was also a period when salary growth began to slow and even plateau. As will be discussed below, some petroleum engineering department chairs are now expressing concerns about an impending oversupply of new graduates.

In terms of understanding responsiveness of engineering labor markets, it is important to note that it is not just the overall supply of petroleum engineering graduates from colleges that appears to have been responsive to demand and wages, but it is the *domestic supply in particular* that supplies the increased pool of graduates. As wages increased and job demand in the United States increased, there has been a shift in the relative share of domestic students in the graduating pool. The percentage of foreign petroleum engineering graduates in the United States on student visas, the highest of any of the engineering fields at the bachelor's degree level, declined from a peak of 34 percent in 2005 to 24 percent in 2013 as the domestic supply increases (**Error! Reference source not found.**5 & 6). At the bachelor's degree level, the percent of total graduates who are on student visas dropped to the lowest proportion of total graduates in almost 20 years in 2007, at the beginning of the rapid increase in bachelor's awards. In the initial period of sharp salary and hiring increases, the share of graduates on student visas dropped from slightly more than half the proportion 13 years earlier, and the increased demand was largely satisfied by American students (foreign students accounted for 31 percent of the graduates in 1995 vs. 17 percent in 2008, as the increase came from U.S. students while the number of student visa graduates held steady).

INSERT FIGURES 5 & 6

When demand for engineers drops

As was noted above, one reason for the higher salaries received by petroleum engineers is the instability of job markets (The Princeton Review 2013). When oil prices drop it becomes uneconomical to explore and exploit fields where production costs are high (such as deep water offshore sites, or those requiring expensive new technologies).⁸ As oil prices sharply declined in 2014 and early 2015 there were increasing reports of job cuts, either those that had already occurred or those that were feared. In February 2015 Reuters stated that more than 100,000 layoffs worldwide had been reported in the oil industry. Halliburton had announced cuts of 8 percent of its global workforce and Schlumberger was planning to eliminate 7 percent of its workforce (Kemp 2015).

Bloomberg (Shauk 2015) reported concerns of new petroleum engineering graduates about their job prospects commenting, "Six months ago, a degree in petroleum engineering was a ticket to a job with a six-figure salary. Now it's looking like a path to the unemployment office." The director of undergraduate advising for Texas A&M's Petroleum Engineering Department indicated that student were expressing "definite concern" about the job market.

⁸ The relationship is not entirely linear, because petroleum projects differ in the time required for completion. Onshore projects such as exploration through first production can be relatively quick, while deep water offshore projects can take years before first production.

In March 2015 we sent survey questions to the Chairs of 13 leading U.S. petroleum engineering departments asking about their experiences in adjusting capacity to meet industry demands for new petroleum engineering graduates. Three of the four chairs who responded expressed concerns that U.S. universities had overbuilt their capacity, and needed to take stronger actions to control growth so as to avoid a glut of new graduates. The fourth chair was more sanguine, expressing confidence that the demand for petroleum engineers would continue growing so that the increased capacity would be needed.

Despite the recent downturn, industry spokesmen have also continued to argue that large numbers of petroleum engineers will be needed in the next few years. Not discussed, however, was how programs and students should respond in the short term if there are not immediate employment opportunities for current graduates.

Implications and Conclusions

The case presented here suggests that American universities and American students were remarkably responsive to market signals when it came to addressing the need for new graduates in petroleum engineering. But was the market responsive “enough”? Conceivably even bigger increases than the doubling and tripling that occurred would have been desirable. Or perhaps quality standards were dropped in an effort to meet the increased demand. While a systematic analysis of these issues goes beyond the scope of this paper, the following “Industry Alert” from the Society of Petroleum Engineers in 2010 is suggestive.

Environmental and remediation companies of all sizes have a real opportunity to take steps in 2010 to address that shortage of engineering talent expected in the next decade, especially in the United States and Europe.

Key factors that are creating this opportunity:

- *An increase in the number of graduates in petroleum engineering programs is creating the largest pool in 20 years of young engineers seeking entry into the oil and gas industry.

- *The global recession has caused experienced professionals to postpone retirement, offering a window of opportunity to transfer their knowledge to these new entrants.

- *These students can contribute very quickly, and companies that act now can begin developing new entrants into autonomous professionals with the complex decision-making and ability required to exploit advanced technology.

- *Scaling back on new graduate recruiting in 2010 could lead to a permanent loss of this talent from the industry, and chill the interest of future engineering students in pursuing careers in the oil and gas industry.

This strongly suggests that even in a peak demand year there was no serious shortage in the availability of new petroleum engineering graduates and that, indeed, there was some concern of future generations being turned away from the field if companies did not proactively hire more new graduates than were immediately needed. The petroleum engineering department chairs responding to our survey seem to confirm this impression.

The potential downside of large increases in the supply of engineers is suggested in a guest editorial written by the current department chair and a former department chair of the Petroleum Engineering Department at Texas A&M University. These authors note:

Between fall 2011 and fall 2012, the number of freshmen in petroleum engineering programs in the United States grew from 1,388 to 2,153, a 55 percent increase in one year. The enrollment pressure we are experiencing at Texas A&M suggests that there will be another increase in freshman enrollment in 2013. We are rapidly heading toward having more than 2,000 bachelor of science degree petroleum engineering graduates per year in the United States. So far, essentially all of our graduates have been receiving job offers, but there is concern that the job market may not grow as fast as enrollment and graduation rates.

These authors note similarities with an earlier ramping up of the number of petroleum engineering students in the 1980s (though they say that if account is taken of the number of students transferring into petroleum engineering in their sophomore and junior years, the increases are even larger this time). They fear a potential collapse of the job market and suggest that more universities should manage “the unbounded growth in enrollment that is currently occurring.” They note that the two departments that have historically been the largest in the United States, Texas A&M University and University of Texas at Austin, have indeed controlled their growth, but complain that other departments have not, and have passed the two Texas schools in size of enrollments.

So might there still somehow be an impending crisis demanding special measures to increase the number of graduating engineers in petroleum engineering? Employers continue to voice alarm, but some suggest that in the past such warnings were overstated. Rigzone, a Website that posts job notices in the petroleum industry, for example, said in a 2011 article that the “great crew change” is indeed a problem, but comments, “Much like the old story about the boy who cried ‘wolf’ so many times that nobody would listen when the wolf finally was at the door, statistics confirm that the post-World War II ‘baby boom’ generation is at the retirement door” (Saunders 2011).

What then, does the case of petroleum engineers suggest about other fields of engineering? First, in petroleum engineering there seemed to be no serious difficulty in getting qualified students once students had the strong incentive of high salaries to enter this field of engineering. Was this because qualified students were drawn from other fields leaving them short of qualified students? While it is difficult to totally dismiss this possibility, we have seen no sign of it in the literature or in discussions with people in the field. The four chairs of leading petroleum engineering departments who responded to an e-mail survey sent out in March 2015 indicated that they have experienced no difficulty in recruiting students. While the department chairs complained of having some difficulties in recruiting as many qualified faculty as they might have liked (this need was met by hiring more practitioners with industry experience), they were able to meet the increases in demand for qualified students, with no lowering of standards. U.S. universities seem to have been remarkably flexible. Third, and perhaps most importantly, it is not clear that nonmarket signals such as projections of demand by experts (U.S. Department of Labor) or industry spokespeople (who may, after all, have a vested interest in talking up prospects for demand), have done any better in their predictions than the market.

In the case of petroleum engineering we saw no signs of problems caused by weaknesses in the U.S. K-12 education system or the motivation of young people to undertake careers in engineering. It seemed, as well, that the U.S. was reasonably able to meet its needs for S&E workers though domestic student supply. It is important to note that this analysis of the responsiveness of student supply to market signals does not address issues such as diversity and addressing the underrepresentation of groups such as women and some minorities. Research

suggests that, in the area of diversity, the market is not effective and thus a need may exist for programs that increase the interest of minorities and women in STEM careers, and their access to these STEM education. Nor do we advocate the exclusion of talented foreign STEM workers from the U.S. economy. The findings of this analysis, however, suggest that when it comes to providing an appropriate number of engineers in the U.S., there is not much evidence of a market failure.

References

- American Petroleum Institute. 1961. *History of Petroleum Engineering*. New York: American Petroleum Institute.
- Aragon, Fernando, and Juan Pablo Rud. 2013. "Natural Resources and Local Communities: Evidence from a Peruvian Gold Mine." *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 5(2): 1-25.
- Black, Dan, Terra McKinnish, and Seth Sanders. 2005. "The Economic Impact of the Coal Boom and Bust." *The Economic Journal* 115(503): 449-476.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1996. "Occupational Outlook Handbook, 1996-97." *UM-St. Louis Libraries Edition*, derived and modified by Raleigh Muns July 20, 1996. <http://stats.bls.gov/ocohome.htm>.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1998. "Occupational Outlook Handbook, 1998-99." *UM-St. Louis Libraries Edition*, derived and modified by Raleigh Muns April 14, 1998. <http://stats.bls.gov/ocohome.htm>.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2004. "Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2004-05 Edition." Accessed July 15, 2010. <http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos027.htm>.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2006. "Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2006-07 Edition." Accessed July 15, 2010. <http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos027.htm>.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2010. "Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2010-11 Edition: Engineers." Accessed July 15, 2010. <http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos027.htm>.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2014. "Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2014-2015 Edition." Accessed July 15, 2010. <http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos027.htm>.
- Carrington, William. 1996. "The Alaskan Labor Market During the Pipeline Era." *Journal of Political Economy* 104: 186-218.
- Clay, Karen, and Randall Jones. 2008. "Migrating to Riches? Evidence from the California Gold Rush." *Journal of Economic History* 68(4): 997-1027.

- College Board. 2006. "Table 2: Mean SAT Scores of College-Bound Seniors, 1967-2006." http://www.collegeboard.com/prod_downloads/about/news_info/cbsenior/yr2006/table2-mean-SAT-scores.pdf.
- Council on Competitiveness. 2005. *Innovate America: Thriving In a World of Challenge and Change*. Washington, D.C.: Council on Competitiveness.
- DuBois, Shelley. 2011. "Petroleum Engineers: Big Oil Wants You." *CNN Money*, July 20, 2011.
- Farrell, Diana, and Andrew Grant. 2005. "China's Looming Talent Shortage." *McKinsey Quarterly* 4: 72
- Flecker, J., and Meil, P. 2011. "Organisational Restructuring and Emerging Service Value Chains – Implications for Work and Employment." *Work, Employment & Society* 24(4): 680-698.
- Freeman, Richard B. 1976. "Cobweb Model of the Supply and Starting Salary of New Engineers." *Industrial & Labor Relations Review* 29(2): 236-248.
- Gereffi, G., Vivek Wadhwa, Ben A. Rissing, and Ryan Ong. 2008. "Getting the Numbers Right: International Engineering Education in the United States, China, and India." *Journal of Engineering Education* 97(1): 13-25.
- Gomory, Ralph E., and William J. Baumol. 2000. *Global Trade and Conflicting National Interests*. Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Hill, Daniel, and Stephen A. Holdritch. 2013. "Guest Editorial: Déjà Vu All Over Again," *Journal of Petroleum Technology* 65(6).
- Hill, Christopher T. 2007. "The Post-Scientific Society." *Issues in Science and Technology* 24(1).
- Hira, Ron. 2010. "Bridge to Immigration or Cheap Temporary Labor? The H-1B & L-1 Visa Programs Are a Source of Both." *Economic Policy Institute Briefing Paper #257*.
- Hira, R., and Anil Hira. 2005. *Outsourcing America*. New York: Amacom.
- Isaacson, Walter. 2011. *Steve Jobs*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kaiser, David. In Preparation. *American Physics and the Cold War Bubble*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kemp, John. 2015. "Mass layoffs complicate oil industry's long-term plans: Kemp," www.reutersreprints.com. February 16.

- Lowell, B. Lindsay, and Hal Salzman. 2007. "Into the Eye of the Storm: Assessing the Evidence on Science and Engineering Education, Quality, and Workforce Demand." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, Washington, D.C., November 8-10.
- Lowell, B. Lindsay, Hal Salzman, Hamutal Bernstein, and Everett Henderson. 2009. "Steady as She Goes? Three Generations of Students through the Science and Engineering Pipeline." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, Washington, D.C., November 5-7.
- Lowell, B. Lindsay, Hal Salzman, Hamutal Bernstein, and Renato Busquets. 2010. "Career Attrition Among Scientists And Engineers: Comparing Demographic Groups And Fields Of Education, 1993 And 2003." Working Paper.
- Lynn, L., and H. Salzman. 2002. "What Makes a Good Engineer? United States, German, and Japanese Perspectives." Proceedings of the European Applied Business Research Conference, Rothenburg, Germany, June.
- Lynn, L. and H. Salzman, 2004. "Third Generation Globalization: The New International Distribution of Knowledge Work." *The International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management* 4: 1511–1521, 2004. Also published in John Westover (2010). *Globalization, Labor, and the Transformation of Work*. Champlain, IL.: Common Ground Publishing.
- Lynn, L., and H. Salzman. 2006. "Collaborative advantage." *Issues in Science and Technology* Winter: 74-82.
- Lynn, L., and H. Salzman. 2007. "'Innovation Shift' to the Emerging Economies: Cases From IT and Heavy Industries." *Sloan Industry Studies* Occasional Paper WP-2007-22.
- Lynn, L., and H. Salzman. 2009. "The 'New' Globalization of Engineering: How the Offshoring of Advanced Engineering Affects Competitiveness and Development." *Economics, Management, and Financial Markets* 4(1).
- Lynn, L., and H. Salzman. 2010. "The Globalization of Technology Development: Implications for U.S. Skills Policy," In *Transforming the U.S. Workforce Development System: Lessons From Research and Practice*, edited by David Finegold, Mary Gatta, Harold Salzman, Susan J. Shurman, 57-86. New York: Labor and Employment Relations Association.
- Lynn, Leonard, Pamela Meil, and Hal Salzman. 2012. "Reshaping Global Technology Development: Innovation and Entrepreneurship in China and India." *Journal of Asia Business Studies* 6(2): 143-159.
- Marchand, Joseph. 2012. "Local labor market impacts of energy boom-bust in Western Canada." *Journal of Urban Economics* 71(1): 165-174.

- Margo, Robert A. 2000. *Wages and Labor Markets in the United States, 1820-1860*. Chicago: The Chicago University Press and the National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Meiksins, P. and C. Smith. 1996. *Engineering Labor: Technical Workers in Comparative Perspective*. London: Verso.
- Meil, P. and H. Salzman. 2010. "Technology Entrepreneurs in India," Working paper: Rutgers University.
- National Research Council. 2007. *Rising Above the Gathering Storm: Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press.
- National Research Council. 2010. *Rising Above the Gathering Storm, Revisited: Rapidly Approaching Category 5*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press.
- National Association of Colleges and Employers. 2009. "Salary Survey." Bethlehem, PA. Volume 48, Issue 2.
- National Association of Colleges and Employers. 2010. "Salary Survey." Bethlehem, PA. Volume 49, Issue 3.
- National Association of Colleges and Employers. 2011. "Salary Survey." Bethlehem, PA. Volume 50, Issue 1.
- National Association of Colleges and Employers. 2014. "Salary Survey." Bethlehem, PA.
- National Association of Manufacturers. 2005. *The Looming Workforce Crisis: Preparing American Workers for 21st Century Competition*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Manufacturers.
- National Science Board. 2010a. *Science and Engineering Indicators 2010*. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation.
- National Science Board. 2010b. *Globalization of Science and Engineering Research: A Companion to Science and Engineering Indicators 2010*. Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2003. *Problem Solving for Tomorrow's World: First Measures of Cross-Curricular Competencies from PISA 2003*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2004. *Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2006. *PISA 2006: Science Competencies for Tomorrow's World Report*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Porter, M., H. Takeuchi, and M. Sakakibara. 2000. *Can Japan Compete?* New York: Perseus Press.

The Princeton Review. 2013. "Career: Petroleum Engineer." Accessed February 2013. <http://www.princetonreview.com/careers.aspx?cid=109>

Raymond, Martin S., and William L. Leffler. 2006. *Oil and Gas Production in Nontechnical Language*. Tulsa, OK: PennWell Corp.

Rothstein, Richard. 1998. *The Way We Were? The Myths and Realities of America's Student Achievement*. New York: Century Foundation Press.

Ruggles, Steven, J. Trent Alexander, Katie Genadek, Ronald Goeken, Matthew B. Schroeder, and Matthew Sobek. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 5.0 [Machine-readable database]. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2010.

Salzman, Harold. 2000. "The Information Technology Industries and Workforces: Work Organization and Human Resource Issues." Report for the National Academy of Sciences Committee on Workforce Needs in Information Technology.

Salzman, Hal. 2007. "Globalization of R&D and Innovation: Implications for U.S. STEM Workforce and Policy." Testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation. Statement submitted to the Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation of the Committee on Science and Technology, U.S. House of Representatives.


Salzman, Hal. 2013. "What Shortages? The Real Evidence About the STEM Workforce" *Issues in Science and Technology* (National Academy of Science policy magazine) Summer 2013

Salzman, Harold, and Radha Roy Biswas. 2000. "The Indian IT Industry and Workforce." Report for the National Academy of Sciences Committee on Workforce Needs in Information Technology.

Salzman, Hal, and Lindsay Lowell. 2008. "Making the Grade." *Nature* 453: 28-30.


- Salzman, Hal, and Leonard Lynn. 2010. "Engineering and Engineering Skills: What's really needed for global competitiveness" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, Boston, Massachusetts, November 4.
- Saunders, Barbara. 2011. "The Great Crew Change: 'Wolf Cries' or Reality?" Accessed August 12, 2011. http://www.rigzone.com/news/article.asp?a_id=110134.
- Schauk, Zain. 2015. "Is There Money to be Made in Oil? New Grads Don't Think So." Accessed January 28, 2015. <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-01-29/graduates-question-six-figure-oil-jobs-as-layoffs-swell>.
- Sheppard, Sheri D., Kelly Macatangay, Anne Colby, William M. Sullivan, and Lee S. Shulman. 2008. *Educating Engineers: Designing for the Future of the Field*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Teitelbaum, Michael S. 2014. *Falling Behind? Boom, Bust, and the Global Race for Scientific Talent*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Teitelbaum, Michael. 2008. "Structural Disequilibria in Biomedical Research" *Science* 321: 644-645.
- Walker, Joe. 2010. "Engineering Grads Earn the Most." Accessed March 12, 2010. http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703625304575116170339369354.html?mod=djemPJ_t.
- Wadhwa, Vivek. 2010. "The Global Innovation Migration." Accessed March 9, 2010. http://www.bloomberg.com/bw/technology/content/nov2009/tc2009119_331698.htm.
- Yoder, Brian L. 2013. "Engineers by the Numbers." https://www.asee.org/papers-and-publications/publications/14_11-47.pdf.

Figure 1. Mean real petroleum engineer salaries and starting salaries, 2003-2013




Source: Authors' calculations from annual NACE salary surveys, BLS Occupational Employment Statistics, and the American Community Survey. Starting salaries for 2004, 2006, 2007, and 2012 were not available and have been linearly interpolated.

Figure 2. Petroleum engineer employment, 2003-2013




Source: Authors' calculations from the BLS Occupational Employment Statistics, and the American Community Survey.

Figure 3. Petroleum engineer age distribution, 2003 and 2013




Source: Authors' calculations from the American Community Survey.

Figure 4. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Petroleum Engineering, 1995-2013




Source: Authors' calculations from the IPEDS

Figure 5. Temporary Visa Share of Degrees Awarded in Petroleum Engineering, 1995-2013



Source: Authors' calculations from the IPEDS

Figure 6. Petroleum Engineering Degree Awards by Temporary Visa Status, 1995-2013



Source: Authors' calculations from the IPEDS