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## Background

- STEM: Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics


Breiner et al., 2012; Heilbronner, 2013; LaForce et al., 2017

## Does it matter what counts as STEM?

## Situated Expectancy-value theory (SEVT)


(STEM) Career interest

- SEVT originally adapted to explain gender differences
- On average, (White) girls have lower levels of math expectancies of success, interest, and utility value


## Differences in predictors by definition: Gottlieb, 2018

- Math utility only predictive of STEM; Science utility only predictive of STEM +M
Odds of planning a STEM/STEM +M career in $9^{\text {th }}$ grade at the BA level, compared to White boys


## STEM STEM+M

## White girls <br> .79** <br> 2.57*** <br> Black girls .45** $2.92^{* * *}$

## Research Questions: Does it matter what counts as STEM?

- What predicts traditional-STEM career interest?
- What predicts STEM+M career interest?
- i.e., Are there different predictors by definition? Especially interested in motivation
- Based on Gottlieb (2018), we expect varying predictors by definition


## Does it matter what counts as STEM?

## Method

- Participants ( $\mathrm{n}=455$ ) are part of a longitudinal study looking at math achievement and STEM interest of students in the Southeastern US
- Current work is looking at primarily concurrent relations in $10^{\text {th }}$ grade
- Majority of students come from families with limited resources, attending schools in the Nashville metropolitan area
- 79\% of sample is Black, $9 \%$ non-White Hispanic


## Predictors

- Math achievement measured in 9th grade (Woodcock-Johnson quantitative concepts, KeyMath: numeration, algebra, geometry subtests)
- Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study measure of math and science motivation ( $10^{\text {th }}$ grade):
- Expectancies of success: "Math is not one of my strengths" (9 items)
- Utility value: "I would like a job that uses math" (6 items)
- Interest: "I enjoy learning math"
(5 items)
- 1 to 4 likert scale

Connolly, 2007; Martin et al., 2012; Mullis et al., 2021; Woodcock et al., 2001

Outcomes ( $10^{\text {th }}$ grade interview)

## STEM <br> STEM+M

## CHEMIST <br> ENGINEER

DOCTOR

Gender differences in STEM/STEM+M career interest
1


Does it matter what counts as STEM?

## Logistic regression results: Predictors

|  | Traditional STEM <br> interest | STEM+M interest |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Predictor | Exp(B) (SE) | $\operatorname{Exp}(\mathrm{B})(\mathrm{SE})$ |
| Math Expectancies of Success | 1.67 | 1.50 |
| Math Interest | .86 | .68 |
| Math Utility | 1.12 | 1.32 |
| Science Expectancies of Success | 1.22 | .90 |
| Science Interest | 1.31 | 1.34 |
| $9^{\text {th }}$ grade math achievement | 1.44 | 1.24 |

## Implications

- Found different gender differences in career interest by definition
- Surprising that only one motivation construct was related to STEM/STEM+M career interest given decades of past research (though past research is mostly with White, middle-class students)
- we found similar null relations when using 6 th grade math motivation predicting 10th grade career interest, from both variable-centered and person-centered approaches
- Also conducted focus groups with subset of students, and found mismatch between students' career interests and their perceived utility of math
- Interest in STEM drastically changed by definition-from 13\% to 42\%--and gender differences also flipped when expanding to include medical careers
- How can we get more students, especially girls and marginalized students, interested in traditional STEM careers?


## Implications

- Improving students' utility value for science seems like a particularly important target if one considers careers in medicine to be STEM careers
- Past utility-value interventions successful at increasing science utility, STEM career interest, course enrollments, and math and science ACT scores (Rozek et al., 2017; Shin et al., 2022)
- Need for more motivation research, and theory-building, with marginalized students
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## Full logistic regression results

|  | Traditional-STEM Interest |  |  | STEM+Medicine interest |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Predictor | Estimate | $S E$ | $\operatorname{Exp}(\mathrm{~B})$ | Estimate | $S E$ | $\operatorname{Exp}(\mathrm{~B})$ |
| Math Expectancies of Success | .515 | .332 | 1.67 | .408 | .22 | 1.50 |
| Math Interest | -.149 | .354 | .862 | -.389 | .24 | .68 |
| Math Utility | .115 | .396 | 1.12 | .274 | .25 | 1.32 |
| Science Expectancies of Success | .197 | .325 | 1.22 | -.107 | .22 | .90 |
| Science Interest | .268 | .312 | 1.31 | .290 | .21 | 1.34 |
| Science Utilitv | .267 | .270 | $\underline{1.31}$ | $.585 \% \% \%$ | .182 | 1.8 |
| 9th grade math achievement | .363 | .189 | 1.437 | .216 | .132 | 1.24 |

