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## What is needed to increase recruitment in STEM field?



PROFICIENCY IN SOLVING NON-ROUTINE PROBLEMS


TEAMWORK

## STEM is needed everywhere...



SHORTAGE OF NURSES, DOCTORS, ENGINEERS, MATHEMATICIANS
STATISTICIANS
DATA SCIENTISTS

- Future
- Environmental
- Health
- Economics
- Behavior
- Accountability
- International

Community

## Resources?

Grants for STEM

- Advancing Informal STEM Learning (AISL) National Science Foundation.
- Science Education Partnership Award (SEPA) National Institutes of Health. ...
- Bay Watershed Education and Training Program (B-WET) ...
- Innovative Technology Experiences for Students and Teachers (ITEST) ...
- Laboratory Equipment Donation Program (LEDP)
- Universities and Colleges



## STEM

－Scisence


－風気気解



－居是


## STEM





## Survey data and analyze

## Hypotheses <br> Data from built in questionnaire Algorithms and measure results

## Motivation

H1: students generally understand the value of STEM, but do not include Math in STEM. In fact, do they associate Math to STEM?
H 2 : there are questions involving the liking of Math and its use. The students do have confidence in using STE but do not have confidence in using Math.


The survey was administered at the school level and targeted high schools and both 2 -year and 4 -year institutions of higher education in the Hampton Road area of Virginia.

## Questionnaire

## Q6: I like using science

Q8: I plan to use science in my future career.
Q12: Generally speaking, I like doing Math.
Q14: I plan to use Math in my future career.
Q15: If I do well in Math classes, it will help me in my future career.
Q19: Generally speaking, I like activities involving technology.
Q26: Generally speaking, I like activities involving engineering.
Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

## Generalized Linear Analysis (GLM)

## Quantile Analysis (QA)

## Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

| Q2 | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative | Cumulative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender |  |  | Frequency | Percent |
| Female | 208 | 66.88 | 208 | 66.88 |
| Male | 103 | 33.12 | 311 | 100 |
|  |  | Frequency Missing =2 |  |  |


| Q4 | Cumulative | Cumulative |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schooling <br> methods | Frequency | Percent | Frequency | Percent |
| Community <br> college | 65 | 20.97 | 65 | 20.97 |
| High School <br> Public <br> university | 47 | 15.16 | 112 | 36.13 |
| Frequency Missing =3 |  |  |  |  |


| Q3 |  |  | Cumulative | Cumulative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Race |  | Percent | Frequency | Percent |
| Black | 100 | 31.95 | 100 | 31.95 |
| Other | 59 | 18.85 | 159 | 50.8 |
| White | 154 | 49.2 | 313 | 100 |


| Variable | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q-6 | 0 | 2.56 | 4.79 | 18.21 | 33.87 | 40.58 |
| Like science |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q 8 | 1.92 | 4.79 | 3.19 | 17.89 | 25.56 | 46.65 |
| Use of science |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q 12 | 11.84 | - 7.57 | 9.21 | 25 | 28.29 | 18.09 |
| Liking Math |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q 14 | 4.28 | - 5.26 | - 8.22 | 22.37 | 29.28 | 30.59 |
| use of Math in the future |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q 15 | 0.34 | 3.03 | 5.39 | 21.55 | 31.65 | 38.05 |
| Perception of Math in Science |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q 19 | 0.68 | 2.74 | 5.48 | 24.66 | 33.22 | 33.22 |
| Like Technology |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q 26 | 6.64 | 18.18 | 15.38 | 25.87 | 18.18 | 15.73 |
| Liking Engineering |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## EFA

Fifty-seven percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed to the question "I believe that teaching is a valued profession in our country," but only 21 percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed to "I can see myself as a middle or high school STEM teacher in the future."
Agreement plot of mathematics usefulness in career and interest in teaching.
Agreement between science usefulness in career and interest in teaching.



Agreement plot of interest in science and perceived usefulness of science in future career
Agreement plot between interest in mathematics and perceived usefulness of mathematics in future career.


## EFA

Score1= Likes Science (Q6)+Likes Math (Q12)+Likes Tech (Q19)+Likes Eng. (Q26), that describes liking of STEM.

```
Score2= Q7_new+Q13_new+Q20_new+Q27_new,
```

    that describes understanding of STEM.
    Score3= Q8_new+Q14_new+Q21_new+Q28_new,
that describes career of STEM.
Score4= Q8_new+ Q21_new+Q28_new,
that describes using of STE.

Focused investigation about why students' responses about Math and their perceptions of the usefulness of Math varied so starkly when compared to the other STEM disciplines

H1: students generally understand the value of STEM, but do not include Math in STEM. In fact, do they associate Math to STEM? H 2 : There are questions involving the liking of Math and its use. So, the second aspect is the hypothesis that in their training, students do have confidence in using STE but do not have confidence in using Math. The students do not even seem to acknowledge the Math influence in STEM careers. Math is in its own bubble. They do not connect Math with STEM.


## Generalized Linear Analysis (GLM)

## Analysis

The Score 3 values show that gender difference (male and female only) could be removed from the model statement, as the marginal lines based on gender cross, although the lines are positive with the liking of engineering, with then $\hat{\sigma}^{2}=6.25$. In later models, we include additional predictors and attempt to account for some of the variability in Score 3.

The analysis shows that the likings of science, Math and technology are highly significant in predicting Score 4. However, when the liking of engineering and race are added in the model, the liking of Math and gender become non-significant in predicting Score 4. This shows that "doing Math" is not so well acknowledged in Score 4 in the use of STEM. This confirms the second hypothesis. In other words, the second hypothesis is not rejected.
Also, the correlation between Score 3 and Score 4 is quite strong and is not ignorable. That explains similar results with all the variables, except for the liking of Math. In Score 4, the liking of Math is not significant. There is a strong correlation between liking of STEM and use of STE.
We interpret the gender as micro-unit naturally occurring when the unit groups (Q6, Q12, Q19 and Q26) are not revealed/included.
The achievements in Score 3 and Score 4 are differentiated by the liking of Math.

Assumptions of independence and normality of responses and homogeneity of variances are not sustained.

The KMO- measure of sampling adequacy turned out to be 0.781 , indicating that the data is suitable to perform quantile factor analysis (Cerny \& Kaiser, 1977; Xuexia, 2011).

## Quantile Analysis (QA)

The quantile regression with least absolute shrinkage and selection operator procedure will compare and differentiate the students with higher Score 3 vs those with lower Score 3, by considering the sparse model at $0.05,0.1,0.5$, and 0.9 quantiles. $30 \%$ of the data was reserved as validation, which avoid overfitting. The output for the quantiles at $0.10,0.50$ and 0.90 are presented in Figure 3. One interesting characteristic is that the AIC has a negative parabola shape. The values of the AIC increase from 0.05 to 0.5 quantiles and then decrease from 0.5 to 0.9 quantiles. This shows that the career in STEM is mostly of better fit at the high and low quantiles of the students that are surveyed.


Q14: use of Math in the future
Q8: use of Science
Q6: like Science
Q15: Perception of Math in Science

## Conclusion

So, both hypotheses are sustained.

## Students generally understand the value of STEM but ignore the Math component of STEM.

## They also like and have confidence in using STE (mostly female) but lack confidence in using Math.

The results are full of insights as it will help suggest guidance and training bridges. Indeed, education is a service field, a must/need for any sustainable development, with great rewards. So those that are leading the training should have acquaintance that the concepts our students have about Math can be described as a function of the understanding that Math components play in the curriculum. Connecting the training with the issues will help students gain confidence in their abilities to become STEM teachers and influence students in the Math areas.

H1: students generally understand the value of STEM, but do not include Math in STEM. In fact, do they associate Math to STEM?
H 2 : there are questions involving the liking of Math and its use. So, the second aspect is the hypothesis that in their training, students do have confidence in using STE but do not have confidence in using Math. The students do not even seem to acknowledge the Math influence in STEM careers. Math is in its own bubble. They do not connect Math with STEM.

## Science really rocks. Data Science and Statistics will be present in almost all research efforts <br> Thank you <br> We sratefully acknowledge the research team at ODU and collaborators as well as the many scientists who are part of the education programs in the Souheast. Funding was provided by NSF's NOYCE Capacity Building Grant award number 1852813.

## Thank SDSS

## Questions?

Comments?

