

SIISP: Self-Efficacy Intervention to Improve STEM Performance

Dr. Stephanie Sedberry-Carrino, Prof. William J. Gerace, Prof. Ian D. Beatty, Prof. Michael J. Kane, Dr. Jason Strickhouser, Maha Elobeid, Stephanie Hudson & Christine Bottini Physics Education Research Group, University of North Carolina Greensboro (USA) an ongoing collaboration between the Dept. of Physics & Astronomy & Dept. of Psychology



OBJECTIVES:

- Develop, test, document, and disseminate a practical, scalable intervention to increase self-efficacy in university STEM students.
- Develop and validate an efficient **instrument for** measuring university STEM self-efficacy, growth mindset, and perceived academic control in university STEM

- **Self-efficacy** (beliefs about one's ability to perform tasks successfully) is a psycho-social construct that **strongly correlates** with academic success. It is a stronger predictor of student performance than purely cognitive traits.
- Social/psychological interventions are **particularly effective for** women and underrepresented minorities because they mitigate stereotype threats.

students.

 Improve our understanding of the dynamics of selfefficacy – the factors that lead to growth, especially for traditionally under-represented, at-risk demographic groups.

THE INSTRUMENT:

- 34 Likert scale items gauging three psychosocial traits, plus demographic questions:
 - \rightarrow 20 items targeting **self-efficacy** (in 3 sub-groups);
 - → 7 items targeting **perceived academic control**; and
 - → 7 items targeting **growth mindset**.
- **Iteratively improved** through three revisions.
- Validated via exploratory factor analysis, Rasch analysis, and multitrait multi-method comparison to coded interviews (in progress).
- **Rasch modeling** produces a reliable estimate for each student's trait scores, with uncertainties (±).
- Efficient and portable: can be administered online or via scannable paper form; requires ~10 minutes to complete.

- No practical, replicable interventions exist to increase university-level STEM students' self-efficacy. Extant interventions are resource-intensive, hard to replicate, and domain-specific.
- **Growth mindset** is a key ingredient for maintaining and strengthening self-efficacy in the face of challenges.

The "persistence cycle": how a growth mindset encourages persistence and the embrace of struggle, leading to success and increased self-efficacy.



THE INTERVENTION:

- **One 30-minute main session** in a lecture, recitation, or lab section, led by a project team member.

THE PROTOCOL:

WHAT'S NEXT?

- Week 1: Solicit informed consent, collect demographics, & pre-test with survey ("the instrument") for baseline.
- Week 4 (or shortly after first course exam): Main intervention in lab meetings; collect workbooks w/written responses (qualitative data) and subset of questionnaire.
- Week 7: Follow-up intervention in class or online; worksheet provides more qualitative data.
- Week 11: **Post-test with survey** for impact of intervention.
- Subsequent academic term: **Delayed post-test** with same survey (third time) for longevity of impact.
- **Timeline is adaptable** to each course schedule.
- Students are quasi-randomly assigned by lab section to either treatment or control groups.
- The **control group** receives an alternate intervention about "cultural competency," designed to be relevant and engaging but unlikely to influence instrument responses.

• One 10-minute followup ~3 weeks later, in-class or online.

- Main session involves interspersed **presentation** (oral PowerPoint), narrated video, open discussion, and written reactions in a workbook.
- Focuses on the science of growth mindset, its link to academic success, and its application to taking a hard STEM course.
- Suggests concrete strategies and actions students can try to manifest growth mindset in their behavior (thus encouraging a sense of **academic control**).
- Followup session worksheet asks students to recall key ideas and reflect on whether/how they've adjusted their behaviors.
- Intervention design elements are based on successful extant **interventions** for success/failure attributional retraining and growth/fixed intelligence mindset.

RESULTS & FINDINGS SO FAR:

- Data drawn from calculus- and algebra-based physics at **three** North Carolina public universities with different demographics.
- Linear modeling was used to test the impact of treatment vs. control on pre-test to post-test score changes for self-efficacy (SE), growth mindset (GM), and perceived academic control (PAC) including interactions with institution, course, and demographics.
- **Replicate the Spring 2018 results** in Fall 2018, including a third site and much larger population.
- Validate the survey instrument against interview data.
- Polish and package for distribution the intervention and survey instrument.
- **Seek partners** for implementation and scaling-up research.



See http://physics.uncg.edu/siisp for more information, or contact Dr. Stephanie Sedberry-Carrino (sscarrin@uncg.edu).

This material is based upon work supported by the US National Science Foundation under Grant No. DUE-1612053. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

- Spring 2017: No statistically significant effects of treatment vs. control, prompting revisions of instrument & intervention.
- Fall 2017: Greater increase in GM for treatment than control (p=0.02). Effect depends on institution (p=0.1).
- **Spring 2018**: Due to treatment, **significant increase in GM** (p < 0.001), marginally significant increase in SE (p = 0.062), **significant increase in PAC** for calculus-based courses (p=0.01).
- We've also learned much about the details of delivering an effective self-efficacy intervention, including mechanisms for increasing engagement, and contextual characteristics of the course and university that mediate success.