Examining the Effects of a Peer-Learning Research Community on the Development of Students’ Researcher Identity, Confidence, and STEM Interest and Engagement

Bon W. Koo1*, Shruti Bathia2*, Linda Morell2, Perman Gochyyev2, Michelle Phillips3, Mark Wilson2, and Rebecca Smith4

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

1Science Education for Public Understanding Program, Lawrence Hall of Science, UC Berkeley, Berkeley, CA; 2Berkeley Evaluation and Assessment Research Center, Graduate School of Education, UC Berkeley, Berkeley, CA; 3Phillips and Associates, San Francisco, CA; and 4Science and Health Education Partnership, UC San Francisco, San Francisco, CA

Keywords: STEM development, peer communities, researcher identity, identity, public health, Youth Participatory Action Research, research experience, high school

Publication Date: July 9, 2021
DOI: https://doi.org/10.15695/jstem/v4i1.05

ABSTRACT: While the impact of authentic research experiences in STEM on student engagement and interest in science has been documented, less is known about the role of peer communities in fostering this interest and engagement. This research explores the idea that a strong peer community can catalyze deep learning and engagement in scientific research among high school students. The program engaged 20 high school students in a year-long community-based participatory research project in public health each year. The study used a mixed methods approach, combining data from focus group discussions, observations, and surveys to describe the program’s impact on participants. Analysis across three years reveals that (a) the program was associated with a statistically significant shift in students’ identity as researchers, with a medium growth effect size (Cohen’s d) for the second and third years, which moderated by the end of the program, and (b) the peer community played a central role in the participants’ engagement in the program, on their identity as researchers, and strengthened their interest in STEM. These findings convey the importance of designing STEM experiences that build strong peer communities around science practices and how such communities can have profound impacts on students’ identities in STEM.

INTRODUCTION

Learning through Community. Lave and Wenger (1991) describe learning as a quintessentially social process and acknowledge that learning frequently takes place in the context of a community. Learning communities may be made up of groups with a wide variety of interests, such as in a school environment, or may consist of groups with a common interest in a subject or topic and who collaborate over an extended period of time. Lave and Wenger defined the latter as a community of practice, and these are known to play an important role in students’ career and identity development (Aschbacher et al., 2010). Communities of practice provide opportunities for both formal and informal apprenticeships in which students learn the shared language of a field, participate in its rituals, and learn the stories and histories valued within a given community. Students’ experiences are informed by the social interactions within the community that may occur between students and their peers, with teachers and/or with mentors who are themselves members of the community; and these interactions both with members of the community as well as those outside of it, including students’ parents, help shape students’ perception of a field and their place within it (Eccles et al., 1983).

In the context of science learning, classroom science is the most common community of practice in which students participate. While nearly every student will experience science in a school setting, the quality of these experiences varies greatly. In their longitudinal study, Aschbacher et al. (2010) found that 45% of students who reported a very strong
interest in a STEM major or career in 10th grade had lost that interest by 12th grade. Notably, the majority of the students who lost interest in STEM were from schools serving low-income student populations. For these students, schools, teachers, and counselors failed to encourage their science interests. According to Aschbacher et al. (2010), the students reported that science learning was not a priority, instruction was poor, and they were subjected to a boring curriculum with few hands-on opportunities. Students’ interest in STEM was further eroded by dual pressures – that of counselors serving as gatekeepers to advanced STEM courses and the students’ own faltering confidence in their STEM abilities as courses became more difficult (Aschbacher et al., 2010).

Many fewer students, particularly among those from backgrounds underrepresented in science, have access to out-of-classroom science enrichment experiences such as an internship in a research laboratory (Aschbacher et al., 2010). These kinds of opportunities immerse students in a professional community of practice in the form of an apprenticeship in which the students work directly with practicing scientists. Through this experience, students gain direct experience with the tools and practices of science, develop relationships with science role models from different backgrounds and at different stages across the educational and career continuum, and begin to learn the language and cultural practices of the field of science. These enrichment opportunities are powerful, and numerous papers have reported on the benefit of these types of experiences on students’ interest in science and their resultant further pursuit of STEM degrees and careers (Salto et al., 2014; Rohrbaugh and Corces, 2011; Kabacoff et al., 2017; Witzel et al., 2020).

While these immersive research experiences can play an important role in shaping students’ identities and interest in STEM, their structure is one that promotes assimilation into the culture of science, which is centered in dominant western cultural narratives and perspectives. This can be problematic for students from non-dominant communities whose cultural histories and perspectives are often not represented in STEM. The cultural bias of traditional STEM and sociopolitical history results in many youth from these backgrounds feeling as though they don’t belong in STEM careers (Aikenhead, 2001; Lee, 2011). It is therefore critical that students have STEM experiences that leverage their lived experiences and existing funds of knowledge and connect their participation in science with their identity in their home communities (Brickhouse and Potter, 2001). Thus, we were interested in understanding how engaging students in a different type of research experience, one that focused on building a strong student community and that explicitly recognizes and celebrates students’ knowledge of their communities and cultures, might contribute to students’ development of a researcher identity.

**Researcher Identity.** Existing social, cultural, and historical biases about what science is, who can do science, who science is for, and who can be a scientist may limit students’ willingness to consider a science identity for themselves. For example, in a large study exploring the determinants of science identity in a middle school population, Hill et al. (2018) found that equal proportions of students, regardless of gender or race/ethnicity, had a “discovery orientation” – meaning they enjoyed taking things apart to see how they work and were curious about nature. However, when survey items in the study specifically included the word “science” there were significant disparities in responses among students of different genders and race/ethnicities. Thus, to avoid this negative effect, we decided not to focus on “science identity” in our study.

Students’ perceptions of science are largely defined by their experiences in science in school and from the media – thus while students recognize a physicist or a laboratory setting as being related to science, they are less likely to realize that there are careers in science that involve analyzing large data sets on a computer, or that there are careers for people interested in working to improve the health of their community that use tools such as survey-based research prevalent in public health. Thus, we hypothesized that probing students’ “researcher identity” might minimize the possibility that students would draw on a preexisting stereotype that did not include images within their identity schema and would allow for a broader range of potential roles to be consistent with this identity. We developed an instrument to measure students’ researcher identity using the BEAR Assessment System and conducted investigations to establish its validity and reliability. This instrument is described in more detail in the methodology section below.

**San Francisco Health Investigators.** The San Francisco Health Investigators (SFHI) program was developed by the Science and Health Education Partnership (SEP) at the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) in partnership with the Berkeley Evaluation and Assessment Research (BEAR) Center at the University of California, Berkeley. Core to the SFHI program is a youth participatory action research (YPAR) model, a variation of community-based participatory research (CBPR) that centers youth as co-researchers. Each year, the program engaged a cohort of up to 20 high school students from diverse backgrounds, the majority of whom were considered underrepresented in the biomedical sciences, based on the NIH’s definition, to conduct research into health issues of relevance to their communities. The health topic varied each year and focused on current and emerging public health issues such as infectious disease and immunity (with a Zika focus in year one), antibiotic resistance (in parallel with the World Health Organization’s World Antibiotic Resistance Awareness Week in year two),
and the health disparities surrounding cancer diagnosis and prevention in year three. Students utilized data they gathered from surveys they conducted in their communities and combined this information with their cultural knowledge gained from lived experiences to develop targeted health messaging campaigns designed to increase awareness and impact behavior change in their communities. Students subsequently evaluated the efficacy and impact of their health messages and shared their findings with community members, scientists, and health professionals in a culminating symposium.

SFHI was led by a team of Academic Coordinators from the UCSF SEP. All three of the Coordinators had completed doctoral degrees in the sciences and had extensive experience working in schools or informal learning environments with a focus on working in and with programs that promote access to careers in science for students from backgrounds underrepresented in the sciences. One of the Coordinators had experiences as a multi-racial first-generation college student, and another experienced the American educational system from the perspective of an immigrant and English Learner. All three came from low-income backgrounds. Each summer, the Coordinator team included a diverse group of UCSF scientists and health professionals in the program so that students could interact with a wide array of role models, learning not only from their work in science and health, but also from their stories and about their path to their careers. Students also worked closely with our graphic designer team as they crafted their health messages. The design team leader also serves as an Adjunct Professor of Cultural Studies and Social Justice at San Francisco State University, and her work with the students interwove expertise in design and critical cultural theory to encourage and promote student voices and cultural expertise in the design of the program’s health messages. In year three, the design team included an intern, a first-generation college student from a low-income family, who played a key role in intentional community building with the group and served as a near peer mentor to students. Through SFHI, students worked closely with an independent college counselor, a Latina, first generation college graduate. Her sessions served to demystify the college and financial aid application process and helped students to develop their college lists, while also authentically addressing the concerns of immigrant parents. Finally, the program actively encouraged students to take on the role of co-designers within the program. In each program year, students engaged in articulating the community norms, daily reflections informed the next day’s activities, and they worked collectively to develop surveys and translate them into their native languages, identify locations at which to survey community members, and were responsible for developing the creative strategy for their health message campaigns, leveraging their own voices and placing explicit value on students’ cultural expertise.

In any given year, the program began with a four-week Summer Intensive where students met daily to learn the science behind the health topic of focus, and to receive training to conduct human subjects research, design and conduct survey/interview research in their communities, and analyze their results to understand health awareness and behaviors. The Summer Intensive culminated with the development of health messaging campaign ideas that students pitched to the cohort and other health professionals and researchers, ultimately reaching a group consensus on a single campaign direction.

In addition to the research and campaign development, the Summer Intensive also played a critical role in developing and strengthening relationships within the cohort of student researchers and included a series of daily activities to facilitate community building. In the first year of the program, community building activities were limited to the first two days of the Summer Intensive and included an icebreaker activity that integrated learning about infectious disease transmission, small group discussions, and the cooperative board game Pandemic, followed by one-time weekly group lunch activities, which were co-designed with students. Feedback from students and staff observations both indicated that this was insufficient and in subsequent years, the first thirty-minutes of each day was dedicated to community building activities. These activities were explicitly designed to build connection across differences, develop trust among cohort members, and to create and sustain an inclusive environment that valued the voice of all members. In year three, we brought in program alumni to serve as Peer Leaders, and one of their roles was to design and lead community building activities with the group. In years two and three we also integrated a resiliency curriculum into the Summer Intensive to help students articulate their strengths and values, recognize the support networks extant in their lives, and learn to leverage their strengths, values, and support to achieve their goals.

Following the Summer Intensive, students met monthly on weekends to continue to develop their campaigns in preparation for a launch at a large public science event that draws over 30,000 people as part of the Bay Area Science Festival. Figure 1 shows example health messages that the cohorts created in each of the program years described in this paper. After the launch, students continued to disseminate their health messaging campaigns both in person and through digital platforms, and also gathered efficacy data on their campaign messages. The program ended in May with an end-of-program symposium where students presented their research findings and health messaging campaigns to members of their families, peers, teachers, health professionals and research scientists.

The program’s goals included increasing students’ 1) knowledge of science content, 2) knowledge of ethical and methodologically-sound research processes and practices, 3)
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We developed a programmatic model that positioned students as researchers and immersed them in a community of practice focused on public health and science, where peer-to-peer interaction and learning were central features. We set out to understand the impact of such a model on the development of students’ researcher identity and their confidence and engagement in STEM.

This paper focuses on the research outcomes of this project. Specifically, we wanted to understand how the SFHI program impacted students in the following four ways:

1. Self-identification as a researcher
2. Sense of belonging to a community
3. Confidence and self-efficacy in science and research
4. Engagement and interest in science and research

METHODS

Participants. Our research sample included 56 participants across three program years. Two students from the program cohorts were not included in the Researcher Identity Scale data analysis because we were unable to match their pre-post surveys. Retention in the program was very high, with 97% (58/60) of students who enrolled in the program completing all program activities and requirements. All of the participants were high school students aged 16 to 18 who began our program during the summer between their sophomore and junior year of high school. The students were selected through a competitive application process that called on teachers in a large urban school district in California to nominate students to apply for positions in the program. We have found that this diversifies our applicant pool as teachers “tap” students who may not initially see themselves as viable candidates, encouraging them to apply. Not only does this process identify students who may not pursue a science research experience on their own, it gives students who have faced obstacles in the past an opportunity to move beyond those challenges. Moreover, the nomination itself has the potential to impact STEM self-efficacy and spark new interest in science research, as students are recognized by their teachers for their potential in STEM. Students submitted written applications and participated in in-person interviews to be selected for the program. While selection criteria required students express an interest in and curiosity about science, program recruitment materials explicitly stated that partici-
The hypothesis of the Researcher Identity construct map starts at the lowest level (Level 0) with the student being unaware of what research entails and no consideration for their own role in research. At Level 1, the student is a newcomer to the concept of research. At Level 2, the student explores the different aspects of research. At Level 3, the student begins to feel comfortable with their identity as a researcher. At Level 4, the student identifies as a researcher and integrates this into their larger self.

After several iterations based on the pilot data, think aloud (cognitive interviews) and exit interviews with students, teachers and subject matter experts, the final instrument consisted of 45 items and six Likert-type response categories (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Slightly Disagree, Slightly Agree, Agree, and Strongly Agree). In the survey, a researcher is defined for the students as: “someone who conducts an organized and systematic investigation on a topic or question related to a scientific field.” This definition was provided to all students at the beginning of the survey instrument. The researcher identity construct is considered one unified idea made up of four strands: Agency, Community, Fit and Aspiration, and Self (Table 2). The Agency strand relates to the extent of ownership an individual feels about conducting research. The Community strand measures the student’s sense of belonging to the research community. The Fit and Aspiration strand measures the extent to which the researcher description aligns with the student’s interests and future career goals. The Self strand measures the extent to which the student identifies himself/herself as a researcher.

The RIS was administered to each cohort of students at three time points - the first time before they began the program (pretest), the second after completion of the Summer Intensive (posttest 1) and the third time after successful completion of the full program year (posttest 2).
**Program Evaluation and Revision.** Through an external
critical evaluation, we monitored program quality, progress
and participant experiences using a combination of observa-
tions, written surveys and focus group interviews. Evalu-
data used in this study were collected from three cohorts
of the program. For each cohort, these data were gathered at
three timepoints, through written surveys and focus group
interviews at the beginning of the program, after the Sum-
mer Intensive, and again at the end of the program year.

For each of the three years included in this study, student
participants participated in focus groups prior to the start of
the program (pre) and following the final activity at the end
of the program (post). Every student participated in a focus
group of no more than five students and at times (due to
scheduling) as few as two participants. Focus groups were
audio recorded and transcribed and the interviewer also took
notes. The questions for the post focus group interviews
included open-ended (qualitative) and ratings scale (quan-
titative) questions. In addition to addressing health science
content, the questions probed students’ sense of themselves
as researchers and agents of change, as well as their sense of
community within SFHI. For example, questions included:
“How, if at all, has your definition of a researcher changed
through this program?”, “How, if at all, do you feel you have
grown as a researcher through SFHI?,” and “On a scale from
1-5, with 1 meaning ‘Not At All’ and 5 meaning ‘A Great
Deal’ (low to high), to what extent would you agree with
the following statements: ‘I feel a responsibility to make
change in my community,’ and ‘I feel that I have the skills
to make change in my community’?” Each participant was
expected to contribute and the conversation was intention-
ally facilitated to ensure that every student had an opportu-
nity to respond to a question or prompt. The vast majority
of students’ feedback on the program was positive, with oc-
casional practical suggestions for the college counseling
or resilience components—and not related to students’ sense
of community or sense of researcher identity.

Evaluation surveys used a combination of Likert-style
and free-response items. The evaluation was designed to
provide program staff immediate and actionable feedback
that could be used to improve the program year-over-year.
Likert items used a four point scale (Not at all, To a very lit-
tle extent, To some extent, To a very great extent) and probed
students’ perceptions of (1) the quality of the program (e.g., I
felt the Summer Intensive was well-planned and organized),
(2) the program experience (e.g., I feel like I am a member
of a research community), (3) their learning from the pro-
gram (e.g., I have learned a lot about conducting research),
and (4) ways they have benefitted from the program (e.g., I
have made friendships with other students in the program).
Open-ended questions asked what students valued about the
experience, what went well, and what could be improved.
Focus group interviews with small groups of students, fol-
lowing the survey administration, allowed our evaluator to
probe student responses on the survey more deeply, ultimate-
ly resulting in a more complete description of the students’
experiences in the program and their perceptions of what
they gained from their participation. Our external evalua-
tor worked directly with participants and staff to gather data
and shared anonymized findings with project staff both in a
summary form for immediate, actionable feedback, as well
as in annual reports. The annual reports included both quan-
titative and qualitative data that gave insights on participant
and staff experiences, and student quotations from these data
sources provided additional explanation and depth to shifts
in student responses on quantitative surveys. Revisions and
refinements were made to the program each year based on
the evidence provided in the evaluation reports along with
the program staff’s own careful observations and reflections.

We initially used Miles and Huberman’s (1994) and Miles
et al.’s (2013) cluster coding techniques for analysis of the
qualitative focus group data (in the form of transcriptions)
and responses to open-ended survey items. The initial pro-
cess of open coding served to conceptualize and categorize
participants’ responses. Coding prompted the team to revisit
all aspects of the data, including themes that may not have
seemed to be priorities during data collection but emerged
as salient through coding (Saldana, 2015). Revisiting the
data repeatedly over the years allowed us to employ an axial
coding strategy for developing an understanding of how the
emphasis on strengthening community influenced student
participants’ confidence, interest, and engagement in STEM.

The project’s research team was able to triangulate
between the RIS survey responses and the anonymized
mixed-methods evaluation data to build a deeper under-
standing of the outcomes of the San Francisco Health Inves-
tigators project. Supplementary Materials 1 presents a table
that shows the relationship between the project’s research
questions, RIS items, and evaluation items that were used as
a part of this study.

**Longitudinal Follow-up.** In addition to the evaluation sur-
veys, students were asked to complete a longitudinal fol-
low-up survey one-year post program, in late May of their
senior year of high school. The May date is strategic as it
is after the “commit” date for college enrollment, so stu-
dents are likely to know their plans for the fall, but criti-
cally, they are still enrolled in their local schools, so school
district issued email addresses are still active. This allows
staff to reach students before they no longer have access to
the primary email address we have on file, and update stu-
dents’ contact information so we can continue to connect
with them in the future. The longitudinal follow-up survey
asks a series of questions about students’ plans post high-
school graduation and, using Likert-style questions (5-point
scale, Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree), asks students to
reflect on the impact of SFHI with respect to their self-efficacy, preparation for college, awareness of careers, and their future college and career goals. Finally, a series of open-response questions provides additional information that help program staff to understand students’ response to the Likert questions. Response rates on the longitudinal follow-up survey were 79% (students from year one), 90% (year two), and 58% (year three). Note that the year three survey was administered in May of 2020, as students were disconnected from school and missing the rituals of senior year due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Program staff followed-up individually through text messages and emails with any member of the year three cohort who did not complete the survey, so while survey data is incomplete with regards to Likert and open-ended responses, we were able to learn about college plans and career goals for 100% of students from this cohort. Data from the National Student Clearinghouse is used to provide additional evidence of student matriculation and continued enrollment in college.

RESULTS

Self-identification as a Researcher. We compared overall student outcomes on the RIS prior to the start of the program (pretest) with outcomes both at the end of the Summer Intensive (posttest 1) and at the conclusion of the year-long program (eleven months following the pretest, posttest 2) across a span of three years using the latent regression model (Mislevy, 1987; Verhelst and Eggen, 1989; Zwanderman, 1991). This analysis is derived from a Rasch-based analysis (Rasch, 1960). The Rasch model is in the Item Response Theory (IRT) family of psychometric models. To ensure a comparability of gains across cohorts, we used a Delta Dimensional Alignment (DDA; Schwartz, et al., 2017) technique, which allowed results from all three cohorts to be reported on a common metric, rather than a more traditional “common-item anchoring” approach due to the differences (across three years) in item scales of the items that have the same stem. Technical details are provided in Supplementary Materials 2.

Table 3 provides evidence that on average the growth of students’ researcher identity was statistically significant, with a medium effect size for the years two and three cohorts. Note that a one logit increase is associated with an increase of: (1) 8% or 6 points (out of 70) for the year one cohort; (2) 11% or 14 points (out of 133) for the year two cohort; and (3) 8% or 13 points (out of 174) for the year three cohort. Effect size of growth was estimated using Cohen’s d (Cohen, 1988). Notably this increase was present both at the completion of the Summer Intensive and persisted, though it moderated somewhat, through the end of the SFHI experience eleven months later. It is worth noting here that program organizers recognized after year one that additional work needed to be done in the project to build community among the participants and substantial effort was dedicated in subsequent years towards building a more inclusive research community.

Many researchers have found that an important component of identity development is recognition by others (including friends, parents, teachers, and mentors) (Carlone and Johnson, 2007; Aschbacher et. al 2010) and having peers with whom to share science interests can help solidify students’ visions of themselves as scientists in the future (Stake and Nikens, 2005). Thus, it is striking to note that as a result of their participation in SFHI, students felt more accepted as researchers by their friends. This is indicated by responses to the Likert item “My friends see me as someone who is interested in research.” We observed a positive change (average change of +3 students) in students responding “agree” or “strongly agree” to this statement (see Supplementary Materials 3 for full frequency table). A look at the change by year shows maximum positive change in year three (+7 students). The numbers reported here and below for RIS items are the computed frequency of responses to each category (strongly agree to strongly disagree) in the pretest and posttest 2 for all three years. For example, for this item, we looked at the incremental change in the number of students who responded either strongly agree or agree from pretest to posttest for all the three years. Open-ended responses on the longitudinal follow-up survey provides more depth to this result. When asked “What aspects of SFHI were most valuable to you?”, 70% of respondents included a statement about the value of the friendships they made in the program.

In addition to the data from the RIS, we identified one item on our end-of-program evaluation survey that addresses students’ identity as researchers. Specifically, 72% of all participants (across the three years) agreed “to a great extent” with the statement “I feel like a researcher as a result of the SFHI program” (Table 4). However, consistent with the RIS findings, there are differences in the student responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohorts</th>
<th>Pretest to Posttest 1</th>
<th>Pretest to Posttest 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Growth (logits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.12*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05
Figure 2. Frequency of Cohort Three Student Responses to Subset of RIS Likert Items. Items included in these graphs represent a subset of the RIS Likert items that highlight the role of students’ relationships and the peer community. Each panel includes the Likert items for one of the four RIS strands: A. Agency; B. Community; C. Fit and Aspiration; and D. Self.
to this item in the first year when compared to students in the second and third years of the program. Specifically, while only 61% of students in the first year agreed “to a great extent” with this statement, 80% and 75% respectively of students in years two and three agreed “to a great extent” with this statement.

Exit focus group interviews conducted as part of the external evaluation provide descriptive evidence of how students’ perceptions of who researchers are, what types of problems they study, and how researchers approach these problems have changed as a result of the program (see quotes, below). Critically, these data also present evidence for how this change in perception helped change students’ perceptions of themselves as researchers.

“I used to think that researchers were more independent and they did their own independent work - I didn’t realize that also you can be a researcher by communicating with your community and working with others. I never really had, um, those kinds of skills at first. And I feel like this internship helped me develop it or make my communication skills.”

“I initially thought of a researcher as more someone who sits in a lab and I don’t know, dissects something, or it looks at things and then writes down their findings. And over the summer that idea was kind of broadened because I learned that researchers also survey people and collect data on the public and help the public as well.”

“As a researcher, I’ve grown in a lot of ways. I found out through the program you need others to help you know if your data is accurate. You need more people to do more trials. There might be trends you can’t have seen if you are only doing your own trials.”

**Sense of Belonging to a Community.** Both the program evaluation data and items from the RIS provided evidence that students in SFHI developed a sense of belonging to a community. One Likert-type question that was present on the end-of-program survey across all three cohorts specifically addressed this area – “I felt like a part of a strong community of student researchers in the SFHI program.” In aggregate, across the three program years, 70% of respondents agreed “to a great extent” with this statement (Table 4). However, there is a significant variation in responses to this item when comparing year one to years two and three -after more intentional community building activities were put in place. Only 38% of respondents in year one agreed “to a great extent” with this item whereas in years two and three, 75% and 95% respectively agreed “to a great extent” with this statement. In addition, students’ responses to open-ended prompts on the evaluation survey provide additional insights into the students’ sense of belonging to a program community. When asked about the most memorable part of the program, many respondents in the first year referred to the community, including “working with other people from different backgrounds and ethnicities,” “working together as a team to achieve a common goal,” “the people that I met,” and “getting to know new people who like science just like me.”

Conversely, when prompted about areas for improvement, many year-one respondents alluded to the need to “build a safe and strong community,” for “better communication between students” and “more team building exercises and activities to get to know your cohort.” In contrast, year two students expressed unanimous enthusiasm for the community building activities and conveyed the importance of these features to the project, as can be seen in the quotes below:

“I think the community building was extremely important in getting to know everyone. It really helped for us to work well together and make this project a success”

“I really enjoyed the team building activities and small group activities because it helped me bond with people in a comfortable way that was easy and included in the program”

The comments of year three respondents echo the sentiments of students in year two and highlight the impacts of the community building activities on the group. It was particularly notable how frequently students mentioned community across multiple open-ended prompts and how highly they regarded this feature of the program. For example, one open-ended question asked students to comment on what they enjoyed most about the Summer Intensive. Seventeen of the 19 students (89%) who responded to this question mentioned the people and/or the community specifically:

“I think the program did a great job in welcoming everybody. The daily group activities were an effective way to bond with each other, and we grew to be

---

**Table 4. Frequency Table of Student Responses to Evaluation Survey Items.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Year 1 (n=18)</th>
<th>Year 2 (n=20)</th>
<th>Year 3 (n=19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel like a researcher as a result of the SFHI program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt like a part of a strong community of student researchers in the SFHI program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoyed the San Francisco Health Investigators program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My voice was respected by fellow students</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student responses on a longitudinal follow-up survey completed in late May of the students’ senior year of high school (two years after the start of the program and one-year post program completion) provide further evidence of the strength of the SFHI community. Ninety percent of the respondents completed in late May of the students’ senior year of high school (two years after the start of the program and one-year post program completion) provide further evidence of the strength of the SFHI community. Ninety percent of the respondents stated that “My voice was respected by fellow students” for which 100% of respondents agreed “to a good” or “to a great extent.”

On the exit focus group interviews conducted as part of the external program evaluation, students’ reflections provide further evidence on their sense of belonging to a community of researchers through SFHI:

“To be able to get the final results that we got, we needed our team... you know, we actually had to rely on each other... everybody had to do their part. If we had been alone, we wouldn’t have gotten the results we did.”

“I believe that the title of researcher is something you earn through experience working on projects in a community. It’s like stripes you have to earn. When I consider myself a researcher, it’s what I’ve learned from other researchers, so it touches back on the community and teamwork.”

“I am surrounded by researchers—researchers that I like and who like science... people who look at things scientifically and break it down. So we all help and support each other during labs and analyzing data, and things like that.”

Evidence for the impact of the program on students’ confidence and self-efficacy can be found in student responses on the RIS, as well as in qualitative data from the end-of-program evaluation survey, and both Likert-style and open-ended items on the longitudinal follow-up survey. From the RIS, changes in students’ responses pre to posttest 1 on the following three items indicate change in confidence and self-efficacy: “I can discuss research ideas with my peers;” “I can do research that helps people;” and “I can research issues independently.”

We observed a positive change in students responding “agree” or “strongly agree” to all three statements for each year of the study with the exception of the second statement (“I can do research that helps people”) for year one, which remained high from the time of the pretest to posttest 1. Especially notable was the year two cohort. Eighteen students either agreed or strongly agreed at the time of the pretest, and 18 students agreed (either agreed or strongly agreed) with the statement about discussing research ideas with their peers at the time of the posttest administration (I can discuss research ideas with my peers).

Qualitative data from evaluation surveys administered at the end of the program year, provide additional evidence for an increase in students’ confidence and self-efficacy in science and research among students in years two and three:

“The most important take-away for me was that I...”
went completely out of my comfort zone through the help of this program. I have learned a lot more about myself and my capabilities. I have also gained a lot of confidence in my research skills. I feel a lot more connected to my community and I know that I made a positive impact on people’s lives which is my greatest achievement so far.”

“This program is what has made me more confident in myself. I have confidence in my own skills and I can work well with others. It is one of the reasons I am going into the health field and one of the reasons that I can do well in any challenges I face.”

“I think the most important takeaway for me in this program is that we are not too young to make a difference in our communities. I remember when I was accepted into the program, I did have some doubts and insecurities whether I was smart enough or good enough to do this, but I’ve learned that I can. With the help of others, students can make a difference.”

Longitudinal survey data also provides striking evidence for the impact of SFHI on students’ confidence and self-efficacy in science and research. One year after completing the program, 91% of program alumni agreed or strongly agreed that as a result of participation in SFHI their self-confidence increased. Two other Likert-items in the longitudinal survey shed additional light on specific dimensions in which students perceived their confidence to have increased as a result of their participation in the program: 96% of SFHI alumni agreed or strongly agreed that as a result of their participation in SFHI they became more comfortable communicating in classes or groups and 91% agreed/strongly agreed that they became more comfortable communicating with adults. Finally, 79% reported that participation in the program increased their expectations for what they could achieve in life. In response to open-ended questions, students shared some of the ways SFHI had helped them to build their confidence and affected their expectations for the future:

“The program helped me communicate with people better all thanks to the survey taking we conducted. It also helped me improve my public speaking skills by the mini presentations we did in the program.”

“SFHI made me believe that college is possible. Having a large group of supportive friends from SFHI has taught me that college and hardships would be easier with a network to hold on to.”

Engagement and Interest in Science and Research. The recruitment of students into the program was unbiased with respect to student’s inclination to pursue a career in science and research, i.e., to be selected as a participant in our pro-
gram, demonstrating interest in science and research was not mandatory, rather we sought students interested in exploring science and research in a new context. Irrespective of students’ prior interest in science, an overwhelming majority of students reported that they enjoyed being a part of the program. Specifically, each year, students were asked on the program evaluation exit surveys to what extent they enjoyed being a part of SFHI, on a scale from one to four, (one = not at all and four = a great deal). In year one, 78% of students responded with the maximum rating of four and the remaining 22% responded with the second-highest rating of three. After program leaders placed a greater emphasis on community-building among students in cohorts two and three, these ratings increased; 100% of students in years two and three responded with the highest rating of four. Moreover, evidence from the RIS, the end-of-program evaluation surveys, and longitudinal surveys provides evidence that students’ interest in pursuing careers in science and research increased after the SFHI experience and that this interest persisted at least one-year post-program.

Two items from the “Fit and Aspiration” strand of the RIS provide quantitative evidence for change in students’ interest in research. While the overall outcome was consistent across three years, we noticed a larger change from pretest to posttest in the year three than other years. Because of the SFHI intervention, (a) student aspirations to pursue a research-related degree in college increased as indicated by response to the item “I plan to get a research-related degree in college.” We observed a positive change (average change of +2.33 students) in the frequency of students responding to “agree” or “strongly agree” to this statement. A look at the change by year shows maximum change in year three (+5 students). (b) Students’ inclination to follow their own research interests also increased as indicated by response to the item “I plan to follow my own research interests in the future” We observed a positive change (average change of +4 students) in students responding to “agree” or “strongly agree” to this statement. Maximum change was recorded in year three (+7 students).

Comments from students in years two and three on the end-of-program evaluation survey provide descriptive evidence for the influence of the SFHI community on their interest in pursuing a career in science or health.

“Being a part of this program influenced me to lean towards working in the public health field, because I like helping people.”

“Before I started this program, the only career ideas I had were either gaming or graphic design. But this program showed me how the medical field works and that it isn’t as scary as I thought it would be. Now I’m looking into Sports Medicine because I really love sports and health. It’s the best of both worlds.”
On the longitudinal follow-up survey, seventy-eight percent of program alumni agreed or strongly agreed that participation in the program increased their interest in science. For example, one respondent remarked, “[SFHI] made me more interested in science and helped me figure out what I want to study.” Eighty-four percent of SFHI alumni stated that as a result of SFHI their motivation to work hard in school increased. Notably, 40% of program alumni responded that they changed their course-taking in their senior year to include more rigorous science and math classes as a result of SFHI. As one student stated: “It made me want to learn about data, so I took AP Statistics.” It is worth noting that 74% of the students who did not report taking additional science and math classes stated that they were unable to do so because either 1) their school did not offer advanced courses in these fields or 2) their schedule had already been determined prior to the summer experience and they were not able to change it in the fall. In addition, 100% of SFHI alumni state that as a result of their participation in SFHI, they better understand the work of researchers. In their open-ended responses, students reflected on the role that SFHI played in exposing them to new fields of study and helping them to identify their major in college and future career path in science and research.

“SFHI was my first exposure to the science/health field and I found that I really enjoyed it through the program.”

“SFHI has helped show me that a career in public health can be fun and beneficial and have a super big impact on the communities. And I have always wanted to be someone that helps others and I always thought that was just through being a doctor or police or firefighter, but I realized that careers in public health also play a major role in helping the public.”

At least 92% of the SFHI alumni from across the three study years matriculated directly to college in the fall following high school graduation (Table 5). This number far exceeds the nationwide rate of college matriculation among students who would be first in their family to attend college (58%) as well as that of students whose parents hold a Bachelor’s degree (78%) (NCES, 2018). While SFHI students report that SFHI influenced their confidence in their ability to be successful in college, their choice of where to apply, and their competitiveness as a college applicant, it is beyond the scope of this study to ascribe causality to this outcome.

**DISCUSSION**

**Practical Use of the Researcher Identity Scale.** The RIS used in this study was developed using the BEAR Assessment System (BAS) (Wilson, 2005). While most frequently used for content assessments, the BAS is a useful framework for developing affective student assessments, such as the RIS. Assessments developed in this system provide leveled understanding of where an individual student falls with respect to the affective trait being assessed (i.e., Researcher Identity), and in combination with the Construct Map, provide actionable information that help inform program refinement to promote student growth. In this paper we describe how the RIS revealed how few students in the first year of the program felt a part of a strong community of researchers and ultimately students in this cohort showed limited growth in their Researcher Identity. In response to these findings, program staff in subsequent years dedicated significantly more effort to community building. This investment of time resulted in substantial growth in students’ agreement to this item and a corresponding increase in students’ overall Researcher Identity. Thus, this study provides a concrete example of how the BAS, and the system’s tenets of aligning the Construct, assessment items, and curriculum can provide formative feedback to improve a program, while also helping to understand a program’s summative outcomes. While sustainability of programs is always a challenge after funding sunsets, we believe that the RIS is a tool that may be of broad use in other science education programs and indeed, at this writing, at least six informal science programs have expressed interest in using the RIS.

**Importance of Community on Students’ Researcher Identity, Engagement, and Belonging.** Improving the state of science education in the United States has become a national priority, with the goal of increasing diversity in STEM fields as well as meeting demands for the STEM workforce. One response to this problem has been the implementation of STEM enrichment programs designed to increase the number of students that complete STEM majors, enter graduate programs in science, and enter STEM careers. Current research indicates enrichment programs can have positive effects for student performance, degree completion, interest in science and graduate enrollment (Salto et al., 2014; Rohr-

Table 5. College Matriculation of SFHI Alumni.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>TOTAL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year Public</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year Private</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Services</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Student is matriculating to a 4-year university in Fall 2021.*
The research findings presented in this paper indicate that for the SF Health Investigators program, a continued emphasis on peer relationships and community development coupled with an experience that elevates students’ cultural knowledge and expertise has had a statistically significant effect size, and also an impact on engagement in the program and their sense of belonging in the program community and ultimately the research community as a whole. Our analysis suggests that observed increases in engagement and sense of belonging to the community between the first-year cohort and subsequent cohorts improved with the increased emphasis on community building. Furthermore, we observed that students’ sense of belonging in the community and their interest in STEM, their self-efficacy, and their identities as researchers grew during the SFHI program.

There may be concern that programs like SFHI, that leverage and explicitly value students’ many identities rather than encouraging assimilation into a “traditional” scientific environment might result in an idealized view of STEM environments and thus not adequately prepare students to succeed in more traditional STEM settings. However, we have found this not to be the case as our longitudinal survey results suggest that the impact of this experience can be long-lasting and broad in scope. Despite the fact that participants leave the unique STEM learning community of SFHI to enter other more traditional STEM spaces in school, as high school seniors, and subsequently as college students, they are able to view themselves and those spaces in a new light. Specifically, alumni one-year post-program completion report increased expectations for what they can achieve in their lives, increased motivation to pursue more rigorous study and science coursework and a strong sense of belonging to a life-long network of peers with whom they share a STEM and research identity. Moreover, program alumni view the SFHI community as an important and valuable network and resource for persisting through hardships and challenges they will face in the future. This is an exciting and encouraging outcome given the need to address the well-documented disparities for degree completion rates among minoritized undergraduates and their persistence in STEM majors and careers. These findings have significant implications for designing STEM experiences for youth, both in terms of STEM learning and in terms of cultivating long-term interest and engagement in STEM careers.
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