

Choosing Between Undergraduate Engineering and Engineering Technology Academic Programs for Student Veterans

Bradley J. Sottile and Robert J. Rabb

DOI: 10.18260/jet.42.2.1

Abstract

Student veterans have a unique opportunity to pursue higher education post-discharge via successive offerings of the G.I. Bill program. Academic program preferences for veteran students have important implications across an organizational field where attention has sharpened on student matriculation, persistence, and retention. Some student veterans may pursue an engineering degree while others may earn a two- or four-year engineering technology degree. Student veterans should be aware of the differences in these degrees and the career opportunities in each. Some may put their technical military experience to use in higher education, while others may pursue a radically different educational path. There are numerous activities and processes employed both before student veterans arrive and during their time on campus to ensure they are part of the campus community and to ensure they graduate with an engineering or engineering technology degree within their timeline. These efforts can create a culture of open communication with student veterans and increase engagement of these students with faculty, engineering professionals, and peers to matriculate them into the campus engineering community.

1. Introduction

Through the lens of organizational theory, this work examines undergraduate engineering and engineering technology opportunities at The Pennsylvania State University (Penn State), a large, public, research-intensive, state university, in the northeast United States, with respect to program selection and retention, ultimately using mixed methods surveys (future work). This paper will inform a more detailed study to gain insight for advising and policymaker efforts to better serve this unique student population. The demand for engineering and engineering technology degrees is expected to increase, and large numbers of student veterans will continue to enroll in higher education institutions, necessitating the

need for increased attention on this student subgroup. The U.S. has a national interest in increasing and maintaining the number of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) professionals in the workforce (Wilkinson 2023), and this group will be part of the STEM professions.

Penn State is a land-grant, state institution with multiple campuses geographically dispersed throughout the state. Some campuses offer traditional four-year engineering degrees, while many of the smaller campuses offer a myriad of engineering technology degrees. The availability of engineering offerings is tremendous. However, approximately 25% of the student veteran population attends the main or flagship campus to earn a four-year engineering degree while 75% of the student veteran population attends one of the much smaller campuses, often earning an engineering technology degree.

This paper explores considerations for student veterans in choosing a two-year engineering program versus a traditional four-year engineering program. Two-year technical degrees are typically offered at junior or technical colleges, while the four-year engineering programs are offered at many traditional universities and colleges. This paper will focus on the differences between the two types of institutions and the veterans' backgrounds, priorities, and means to higher education. The student population in this paper refers to student veterans and reservists (and not to their family members).

Higher education and the national drive to support military-connected students is often limited by an insufficient understanding of this diverse student population. Nearly all the veteran education benefits have time limits, financial limits, and proof of satisfactory academic progress for accountability and oversight of limited resources. Many state university campuses may have a Veterans Affairs and Services Office, but they offer many services in addition to information and guidance on education benefits. Some employees may be tasked to organize military appreciation events, provide general campus information, and sometimes even childcare, etc. Additionally, the

concentration of this knowledge and the services in one building may be inconvenient to some students, especially on large campuses. Some large campuses offer military ally training (e.g., Green Zone Training), short courses aimed at instructors to promote awareness of military and veteran students' challenges and differences from traditional students. However, specific knowledge of the rules and policies of education benefits is often centralized among the staff at the campus advising or Veteran Affairs and Services Office, or to a few service-connected individuals in the academic units. Professional advising staff often focus on traditional students and the set curricula. Moreover, professional advising staff experience frequent turnover.

2. Background

Post-World War II, the higher education landscape evolved in several ways. The growth and importance of higher education were already felt before the war, and there was resistance from elite universities and presidents who believed higher education was a rite of passage for the elite who were gifted and had merit. Higher education became an important priority to improve the quality of life and expand opportunities for the middle class, hence the growth of state colleges and universities, along with community or junior colleges. When students were less academically prepared for a traditional baccalaureate degree, students used junior colleges as preparation venues (Brint 1989). Elite colleges were sometimes supportive of the junior colleges to meet demand for higher education while simultaneously limiting growth at their elite institutions (B. Clark 1960).

World War II veterans were like their civilian peers on campuses in their career goals. Student veterans wanted new courses in business, economics, and engineering, and sought changes to humanities courses so they could be more relevant to real life in an industrialized, post-World War II America (D. Clark 1998). Due to the demand of over 2 million veterans seeking bachelor's degrees (Serow 2004), physical expansion was necessary, resulting in large lecture halls and temporary living quarters on or near campuses (D. Clark 1998). This expansion changed the perception of the country's population, who now saw that college was not only for the elite, but it was also available and for the average citizen (D. Clark 1998; Serow 2004; Thelin 2004).

With the return of 2 million service personnel back to mainstream America at the close of World War II, the United States government established the original GI Bill, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. The Act initiated a wide-ranging series of benefits and programs to help ease veterans back into

American society without burdening the American workplace. The most prominent benefit of the GI Bill was the educational component, but the Servicemen's Readjustment Act included unemployment benefits, business loans, home loans, and training opportunities, allowing the veterans to go to college. After World War II, student veterans used the GI Bill to pursue higher education goals and contributed to the diversity of university and college populations. Since 1944, there have been six iterations of GI Bill educational programs. The most recent one is known as the Post-9/11 GI Bill, which was implemented in the fall of 2009 (Vacchi 2014). Since 2009, the Post-9/11 GI Bill has been a significant investment to support higher education for more than 1.4 million service members, veterans, and their families (Molina and Morse 2015).

3. Current Education Funding

This section highlights two of the most common ways student veterans receive federal funding to pursue their degrees. There is a myriad of programs to assist with disabilities and other special situations, but most student veterans use the following sources. For clarity, tuition assistance is what veterans may use while still in the military, whereas the GI Bill is the tool they use once they have exited the military.

3.1. Tuition Assistance

The Tuition Assistance (TA) program provides funding for voluntary civilian education programs in support of a service member's professional and personal self-development goals. Such work is done during off-duty times. Courses and degree programs may be academic or technical and can be taken from a variety of sources and modalities, including two- or four-year institutions, on-site, off-site, or distance learning. The U.S. Department of Education must recognize the higher education institution. In the TA program, the service branch pays tuition directly to the school, not the service member. TA may be used for:

- Vocational/technical programs
- Undergraduate programs
- Graduate programs
- Independent study
- Distance-learning programs

All service branches and the U.S. Coast Guard offer the TA program to support the users' personal and professional goals. The program is open to officers, warrant officers, and enlisted active-duty service personnel. In addition, members of the National Guard and Reserve Components may be eligible for

TA based on their service eligibility (have enough remaining time on their service contract to complete the course). Some TA recipients may be required to fulfill a short service obligation that can run parallel to their current service obligation. TA only covers tuition and not logistics such as books and course materials, special training fees, retaking the course, or continuing education units (CEUs) (Military One Source 2013).

3.2. Post-9/11 GI Bill

The GI Bill allows current and former service members to pay for college, trade school, technical school, licensing, certification programs, on-the-job training, online schooling, and more. The Post-9/11 GI Bill provides benefits for those who served on active duty or in the Selected Reserve for 90 or more days after 10 September 2001. The GI Bill allows four academic years (36 months) of educational tuition benefits for an approved program up to the cost of the most expensive in-state undergraduate public tuition in the state where the veteran enrolls. Additional tuition at more expensive private schools under the “Yellow Ribbon” program allows participating institutions to share the cost (usually, one-to-one) with the federal government up to 100% of the expense. Other benefits include:

- A monthly living allowance based on housing costs of the location of the learning institution. Student veterans attending schools online or through correspondence will receive a partial benefit if their entire enrollment is in distance or online learning. The student veteran will receive a living allowance if at least one course is classified as “in-residence.”
- International education programs outside the United States are eligible.
- An annual stipend up to \$1,000 to cover other education costs (e.g., books, supplies, and fees).
- Up to \$2,000 towards one-time licensing or certification testing (U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs 2024a).

4. Where Veterans Choose to Go to College

Not every higher education institution has the same distribution of student veterans. One study (Radford 2009) showed that student veterans resemble nontraditional students when choosing college type and degree choices. The study found approximately 12% of student veterans attend private for-profit institutions and 64% attend public institutions - results which are quite different from traditional student enrollment patterns. Student veterans

also attend public community colleges at a rate of 43%, and they attend four-year institutions at a rate of 57%. However, 89% of student veterans pursue bachelor's or associate degrees, and slightly more student veterans pursue bachelor's degrees than associate degrees. This implies that a fair percentage of student veterans at community colleges continue to pursue further study at four-year colleges.

5. Why Two-Year vs. Four-Year Institutions

Education centers on military installations offer a variety of transition services to help potential student veterans decide where to attend college and what type of degree or campus. A two-year institution, such as a community college or a junior college, can offer some advantages to veterans, like cost-effectiveness, smaller class sizes, and more flexible scheduling. However, a four-year institution may provide a more comprehensive academic experience and a wider range of extracurricular activities (U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs 2016). Some key points and differences are elucidated in Table 1.

There are potential advantages for student veterans at two-year colleges. The lower cost of attendance can help maximize the GI Bill benefits, and the more flexible scheduling can accommodate work or family obligations. Additionally, many community colleges have dedicated veteran support programs (CalVet 2022).

Four-year universities may allow access to advanced research projects, equipment, and faculty expertise (U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs 2016; U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs 2024b; University of Bridgeport 2023), and campus life engagement is different as most universities have a multitude of diverse activities (Mount Wachusett 2023). Student veterans should always research individual institutions and their veteran support services before deciding (U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs 2016; Jordan 2019; CalVet 2022).

6. What Student Veterans Choose to Study

Student veterans pursuing a technical degree have many options when choosing between engineering technology programs and more traditional engineering programs. As noted in the literature (Florida Polytechnic University 2024), an engineering degree focuses on theory and advanced concepts, while an engineering technology degree focuses on practical applications and hands-on work. Kuehn, in studies of engineering technology workforce trends, specified that students earning 2-year engineering technology degrees are termed “technicians,” and those earning 4-year engineering technology degrees “technologists” (2015). The 2017 National Academy of Engineer-

Table 1. Two-year and four-year institution comparison.

	Two-Year	Four-Year
Cost (U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs 2024b; Going Merry 2024; University of Bridgeport 2023)	Significantly lower tuition fees compared to a four-year university, making it a cost-effective option for veterans utilizing GI Bill benefits	Higher tuition costs, though some may offer veteran-specific scholarships or reduced tuition rates
Academic Focus (U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs 2016; U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs 2024b; University of Bridgeport 2023)	Offers foundational courses and associate degrees, providing a good base for subsequently transferring to a four-year program	More specialized majors and more advanced coursework, often with greater research opportunities
Class Size (Going Merry 2024; University of Bridgeport 2023; Jordan 2019)	Smaller class sizes, potentially allowing for more personalized attention from instructors	Larger class sizes, especially in introductory courses, may be less intimate
Flexibility (Going Merry 2024; Jordan 2019; Travis County 2025)	Often offers flexible scheduling with evening and weekend classes, accommodating veterans with work or family commitments	May have more rigid class schedules, though some flexibility may exist depending on the institution
Campus Life (Going Merry 2024; University of Bridgeport 2023; Mount Wachusett 2023)	Typically, a less vibrant campus life with fewer extracurricular activities and student organizations	More robust campus culture, with a wider array of clubs, sports, and social events
Transferability (U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs 2016; U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs 2024b; University of Bridgeport 2023)	Student veterans must carefully research transfer agreements between community and junior colleges and four-year institutions to ensure their credits will transfer smoothly	

ing report (Frase, Latanision, and Pearson 2016) on engineering technology education adopted a similar nomenclature, though concurrently shared the observation that “many of those with 4-year [engineering technology] degrees do not identify themselves as technologists” and instead “they may call themselves engineers or managers.”

Terminology aside, a recent study (Wilson 2024) investigated the top reasons students select an engineering technology major. The study reinforces the idea that students in general select engineering technology programs due to hands-on learning, multiple lab experiences, and math requirements. Students have expressed concerns when choosing STEM vs. non-STEM studies, specifically, some have anxiety in knowing math (theoretical) and doing math (applied). Mathematicians, engineers, and natural scientists depend more heavily on the theoretical application of math, while social scientists and technologists depend more heavily on its practical application. Technologists also need more mathematical literacy than non-STEM professionals (Wilkinson 2023). Table 2 offers a side-

by-side examination of the differences between engineering and engineering technology.

7. Future Work

This preliminary study will shape future work and will involve student veterans and campus staff, and administrators. Although this university is a complex system of a main campus with nearly two dozen smaller campuses, the investigators hope to generalize the factors that student veterans consider pursuing a two-year engineering technical degree versus a traditional four-year engineering degree. Because of the unique characteristics of the subject institution's campus system and the state's rurality, the investigators welcome partnering with other institutions to deepen and broaden their understanding of student veterans' higher education goals.

8. Conclusion

Given the imbalance of student veterans attending this institution's distributed campuses versus the flagship main campus, the authors would like to better

Table 2. Engineering vs. Engineering Technology.

	Engineering	Engineering Technology
Theoretical Versus Practical (Excelsior 2024; Polk 2025)	Involves an in-depth study of advanced mathematics and scientific theories to create new ideas and solutions.	Focuses on applying existing methods to problems and on using technology, applied science, and mathematics to solve problems
Hands-On Versus Theoretical (New Hampshire 2022)	Tends to be more theoretical and analytical	Tends to be more hands-on and applications-oriented
Specialization (Polk 2025; Grand Canyon 2016)	One can focus on a specific area of engineering, such as aerospace engineering or mechanical engineering	One can focus on a specific area of engineering technology, such as advanced manufacturing or mechanical design and fabrication
Career Paths (Excelsior 2023; New Hampshire 2022; Grand Canyon 2016)	Engineers can work in design, research, and other theoretical roles	Engineering technologists can work as liaisons between engineering and manufacturing teams, or as design and testing partners to engineers

understand student veterans' decision-making and the factors involved.

Student veterans are non-traditional students, and reviews of the extant research literature suggest there is more exploration needed to better understand their engineering degree and school choices, including introspection of their positionality as non-traditional students. That said, student veterans have been on college campuses for decades and are not a 'new generation.' The gaps in understanding this population are great compared to the literature on traditional college student populations. Prior research on student veterans points others in the direction to continue investigations and towards a better understanding of student veterans.

References

- Brint, Steven and Jerome Karabel. 1989. *The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985*. Oxford University Press.
- CalVet. 2022. "Education Benefits." Accessed 15 January 2025. <https://www.calvet.ca.gov/veteran-services-benefits/education>.
- Clark, Burton. 1960. The "Cooling-out" Function in Higher Education. *American Journal of Sociology*, 65: 569-576.
- Clark, Daniel A. 1998. "The Two Joes Meet—Joe College, Joe Veteran: The GI Bill, college education, and postwar American culture." *History of Education Quarterly* 38(2): 165-190.
- Excelsior University. 2023. "Engineering vs. Engineering Technology." Accessed 15 January 2025. <https://www.excelsior.edu/article/engineering-vs-engineering-technology/>.
- Florida Polytechnic University. 2024. "Bachelors of Engineering Compared to Engineering Technology." Accessed 15 January 2025. <https://floridapoly.edu/admissions-and-aid/difference-engineering-technology-degree-bachelor-science-engineering.php>.
- Frase, Katharine G., Latanision, Ronald M., and Pearson, Greg, eds. 2016. *Engineering Technology Education in the United States*, Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press: 19. <https://doi.org/10.17226/23402>.
- Going Merry. 2024. "Community College vs. a Four-Year University: 8 Key Differences." Accessed 15 January 2025. <https://goingmerry.com/blog/community-college-or-a-4-year-university/>.
- Grand Canyon University. 2016. "Earning a Degree in Mechanical Engineering vs. Mechanical Engineering Technology." Accessed 15 January 2025. <https://www.gcu.edu/blog/engineering-technology/earning-degree-mechanical-engineering-vs-mechanical-engineering>.
- Jordan, Alexander T. 2019. "Soldier to Student: Understanding the Transition Experiences of Veterans From the Military to Community College." PhD diss. University of South Carolina. Accessed 15 January 2025. <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=6382&context=etd>.

- Kuehn, Daniel Peter, Melvin L. Roberts, Walter W. Buchanan, and Greg Pearson. 2015. "The Engineering Technician and Technologist Workforce." In *2015 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition*, Seattle, WA. 10.18260/p.24868.
- Military One Source. 2013. "How to Use the Military Tuition Assistance Program." Accessed 15 January 2025. Washington, DC: Department of Defense. <https://www.militaryonesource.mil/education-employment/for-service-members/how-to-use-the-military-tuition-assistance-program/>.
- Molina, Dani, and Andrew Morse. 2015. "Military-connected Undergraduates: Exploring Differences between National Guard, Reserve, Active Duty, and Veterans in Higher Education." Washington, DC: American Council on Education and NASPA – Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education.
- Mount Wachusett Community College. 2023. "Community College vs. University: Pros and Cons." Accessed 15 January 2025. <https://mwcc.edu/blog/community-college-vs-university/>.
- New Hampshire Technical Institute. 2022. "Engineering vs Engineering Technology. What You Need to Know." Accessed 15 January 2025. <https://www.nhti.edu/engineering-vs-engineering-technology-what-you-need-to-know/>.
- Polk State College. 2025. "Engineering Technology." Accessed 15 January 2025. <https://www.polk.edu/engineering-technology/engineering-technology-vs-engineering/>.
- Radford, Alexandria Walton. 2009. *Military Service Members and Veterans in Higher Education: What the New GI Bill May Mean for Postsecondary Institutions*. American Council on Education.
- Serow, Robert C. 2004. "Policy as symbol: Title II of the 1944 GI Bill." *The Review of Higher Education* 27(4): 481-499.
- Thelin, John R. 2019. *A History of American Higher Education*. JHU Press.
- Travis County TX. 2025. "8 Tips for Student Veterans Using the Post 9/11 GI Bill." Accessed 15 January 2025. <https://www.traviscountytexas.gov/veterans-services/tips-students>.
- University of Bridgeport. 2023. "What's the Difference Between a University and a Community College?." Accessed 15 January 2025. <https://www.bridgeport.edu/news/difference-between-university-and-community-college/>.
- U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. 2016. "Factors to Consider When Choosing a School." 5th Edition, October 2016. Accessed 15 January 2025. https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao_blog/inline/Choosing_a_School.pdf.
- U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. 2024a. "Veteran Readiness and Employment (Chapter 31)." Accessed 15 January 2025. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. <https://www.va.gov/careers-employment/vocational-rehabilitation/>.
- U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. 2024b. "Building Your Future With The GI Bill." Accessed 15 January 2025. <https://benefits.va.gov/gibill/docs/gibguideseries/chooseyoureducation-pathway.pdf>.
- University of Bridgeport. 2023. "What's the Difference Between a University and a Community College?." Accessed 15 January 2025. <https://www.bridgeport.edu/news/difference-between-university-and-community-college/>.
- Vacchi, David T. and Joseph B. Berger. 2013. "Student Veterans in Higher Education." In *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*. 29: 93-151. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.
- Wilkinson, Elizabeth C. 2023. "Holistic Review: Math Anxiety and the STEM Profession." *Journal of Engineering Technology*. 40(2): 20-42.
- Wilson, Dru M., and Brian P. DeJong. 2024. "Why Students Select Engineering Technology Majors." *Journal of Engineering Technology*. 41(2): 42-53.

Bradley J. Sottile

Brad Sottile is an Associate Teaching Professor in The Pennsylvania State University's College of Engineering, School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science. He received his D.Eng. from The Pennsylvania State University focusing on engineering education. His research interests include astronautical engineering, computational science, and engineering and higher education.

Robert J. Rabb

Robert Rabb is the Associate Dean of Education and a Teaching Professor in The Pennsylvania State University's College of Engineering. He earned his B.S. from USMA and his M.S. and PhD from the University of Texas at Austin. His research interests are in mechatronics, regenerative energy, and engineering education.