

STEM PhD Students' Career Preference and Sense of Belonging: Demographic Similarities and Differences Lauren Ortosky, Suyi Leong, & David K. Sherman University of California Santa Barbara, Department of Psychological & Brain Sciences

INTRODUCTION

- According to the National Academies of Sciences¹, there is a huge disproportionate ratio, by race and ethnicity, on the number of doctoral degrees awarded in STEM fields.
 - The number of doctoral degrees awarded to White is more than three times higher compared to other racial groups
 - There is an increasing number of White doctorate degree holders, while it remains largely unchanged across all other racial groups
- The purpose of this study is to explore potential barriers to diversifying the professorate through:
 - Identifying differences and similarities in career goals for different groups of graduate students.
- Identifying the discrepancies between graduate students' and their advisors' expectations of their career choices.
- Examining graduate students' sense of belonging in the program by the targeted demographic characteristics.
- Through comparing 4 demographic groups (underrepresented minority (URM), gender, first-generation status and advancement status), we hypothesized that:
- Graduate students across these four demographic groups will show interest in diverse career options (e.g., research, teaching, and non-academic roles) but will perceive greater advisor support for research than for careers in teaching or non-academic roles.
- Graduate students who perceived discordance in career preferences will perceive a lower sense of belonging in their programs, and the lack of belonging will be more pronounced among students who are underrepresented female, first-generation college students, (e.g., underrepresented ethnic minorities).

Measures	Items	Alpha	Example Iter
Career Preference Ranking (1 = Most desirable; 3 = Least Desirable)	3	NA	Please rank the fol career options (I Academic- vs. Tea vs. Research-Foc Positions) in the o your personal pref
Belongingness Scale	11	.86	People in my depa like me

STUDY PROCEDURE

David Sherman <u>sherman@ucsb.edu</u> Lauren Ortosky lortosky@ucsb.edu



- lowing Nonachingcused order of ference
- artment

References

Research supported by NSF grant: Collaborative Research: The AGEP California Hispanic Serving Institutions (HIS) Alliance to 1. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). Graduate STEM Education for the 21st Century. Washington, I Increase Underrepresented Minority Faculty in STEM. Award #1820886. The National Academies Press. Thanks to fellow PIs Marty Hegarty, Carlos Nash, Carol Genetti, and Christopher Kello for assistance in executing this research.

♦ PhD students, regardless of their demographic characteristics, showed similar patterns in their career preferences, such that they preferred pursuing a nonacademic position the most, followed by research-, and lastly, teaching-focused position.

 \diamond However, PhD students across groups had a general perception that faculty overwhelmingly prefer them to pursue research careers. ♦ URM (vs. Non-URM), first-generation college students(vs. continuing-generation college students) and females (vs. males) reported a lower sense of belonging in their program, but there was no difference in PhD students' advancement status.

STUDY 2: The next study focused on faculty perceptions of graduate students' career goals, compared to their own goals for them, as well as general career preferences for an ideal student to pursue. We examined whether the descriptive norms of what faculty actually prefer for their students are consistent with the perceived norms that students have about faculty. Correcting these discordant perceptions could lead to improved openness in communication between graduate students and their advisors, which may ultimately increase sense of belonging and facilitate attainment of PhD students' academic career goals.

Acknowledgements



nd Advisors' Career Preferences							
emic	Teaching	Research	Total				
			Iotai				
	%	%	n	χ2			
	20	34.3	70	$\chi 2 (2) = .003, p = .99$			
	20.3	34.1	123				
	10.5	78.9	57	$\chi 2(2) = 2, p = .368$			
	5.5	78.9	109				
	13.3	37.8	90	$\chi^2(4) = 6.44, p = .168$			
	27.5	30.4	102				
	5.2	81.8	77	$\chi 2(4) = 6.3, p = .177$			
	8	77	87				
	26.2	33.8	65	x(2)(2) = 2.517 m = -284			
	17.1	34.1	129	$\chi_{2}(2) = 2.317, p = .264$			
	12.7	74.5	55	$\chi 2 (2) = 3.714, p = .156$			
	4.5	81.1	111				
	21	35.8	81	$\chi^2(4) = 2.624, p = .623$			
	20.5	33	112				
	7	78.9	71	$\chi 2 (4) = .280, p = .991$			
	7.4	78.7	94				