HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI KASVATUSTIETEELLINEN TIEDEKUNTA PEDAGOGISKA FAKULTETEN FACULTY OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES



## **RISK OF LOSING STEM MOTIVATION**

Kezia Olive\*, Xin Tang, Anni Loukomies,

### FOR GIRLS BUT NOT BOYS? ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS' GENDERED MOTIVATION PROFILES, ACHIEVEMENT, AND STEM ASPIRATION

# INTRODUCTION

Supporting efforts to narrow the gender gap, we analyzed the relationship between:

students' **gender**, **motivational beliefs** in different subjects, their school **achievement** and **STEM aspiration** at the end of elementary school.



## Figure 2. Four motivational profiles in grade 6 for Science, Math and Finnish



### Kalle Juuti, Katariina Salmela-Aro

\*kezia.olive@helsinki.fi

# RESULTS

We found **four motivational profiles** (Figure 2):

- more **girls** are characterized by **low math motivation**;
- more **boys** transitioned to **high math motivation** (Table 1)

### In relation to achievement & aspiration:

- Higher math motivation associated with higher math achievement and vice versa (Table 2);
- Within-profile **higher achievement** of **girls** in Science and Finnish (Figure 3);
- Low overall motivation is associated with lower



Figure 1. Our study framework based on *Expectancy Value Theory/EVT* (Eccles and Wigfield, 2020) and *Dimensional Comparison Theory* (Moller & Marsh, 2013)

We set forth to answer:

- **RQ1:** what kind of **motivation pattern** and **transition** can we identify in elementary school students in grade 5 and 6? Are there **gender differences** in these pattern and transition?
- **RQ2:** how do these motivational beliefs influence their achievement and STEM aspiration?

# METHODS

**Data**: Students at the end of elementary school (**Grade 5** and **6**, N = 360, 55% girls, Mean at grade 5 = 11.14 years old).

### Figure 3. Achievement difference of boys and girls within the four motivational profiles

Gender, Profile Membership and Score difference at Year 6



#### Table 1. Transition Odds of Girls and Boys

6th grade profiles								
(Girls)								
5th grade	High all	High math	Low math	Low all				
High all	0.746	0.090	0.130	0.033				
High math	0.000	0.999	0.000	0.001				
Low math	0.026	0.001	0.753	0.220				
Low all	0.140	0.047	0.271	0.542				
(Boys)								
High all	0.709	0.268	0.024	0.000				
High math	0.003	0.790	0.002	0.205				
Low math	0.000	0.380	0.620	0.000				
Low all	0.159	0.041	0.103	0.696				

**STEM aspiration**; math specific motivation is *not related* to STEM aspiration

# CONCLUSION

At the end of elementary school, we found evidence of: - a significant amount of girls have shown low motivation in math, more likely to stay in low math and have lower math achievement -- **potential vicious cycle** 

-association between domain-specific motivation with achievement, but not as clearly associated with STEM aspiration

#### **IMPLICATIONS**

-Specific attention needed to girls with low math motivation, as they mostly will only continue declining in math motivation and achievement

- there is not yet strong coupling between STEM specific motivation and STEM aspiration — potential point of intervention to improve their STEM aspiration

### Variables:

- Measures of **Task value** and **Self-concept** based on EVT in Science, Math, Finnish
- Students' dream job, coded as STEM aspiration
  Students' grades in Science, Math, Finnish

With *Latent Profile* and *Transition Analysis*, we derived:

motivational belief profiles and profile transition probabilities within the two years
Regression with achievement and STEM aspiration with the influence of gender

#### Table 2. Outcome difference between profile

Profile	High All	High Math	Low Math	Low All	Significant difference
Science	9.016	8.653	8.265	7.784	P1 > P2 > P3 >
	[8.819;9.214]	[8.496; 8.811]	[8.035; 8.495]	[7.474; 8.094]	P4
Math	9.039	8.828	7.378	7.613	(P1 = P2) >
	[8.854; 9.225]	[8.697; 8.960]	[7.062; 7.693]	[7.120; 8.106]	(P3 = P4)
Finnish	8.929	8.571	8.309	7.673	P1 > (P2 = P3)
	[8.752; 9.105]	[8.373; 8.769]	[8.052; 8.567]	[7.253; 8.092]	> P4
STEM	0.406	0.379	0.254	0.083	P1 = P2 = P3 >
Aspiration	[0.288; 0.523]	[0.271; 0.487]	[0.123; 0.384]	[0.029; 0.136]	P4

## REFERENCES

Eccles, J.S., and Wigfield, A. (2020). From expectancy-value theory to situated expectancy-value theory: A developmental, social cognitive, and sociocultural perspective on motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology 61. doi: 10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101859*.
Moller, J., & Marsh, H. W. (2013). Dimensional comparison theory. *Psychol Rev, 120(3), 544-560. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032459*

Scan for pdf version of the poster, further details of the study, and contact details





This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 953326.