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ABSTRACT
This study examined gender differences in influential antecedent learning factors that are associated with math achievement. Using the dataset extracted from the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002, structural equation modeling yields three major findings: (a) social economic status (SES), educational aspiration for attaining an educational degree, total AP/IB math courses, and the degree of advanced math course taking are significantly related with math self-efficacy (p<.001); (b) female students have better preparation in math through taking advanced math courses (p<.001) and have higher educational aspiration in obtaining advanced degrees (p<.001), while having significantly lower math self-efficacy than male students (p<.001); and (c) given the finding that female students have lower math achievement than male students (p<.001), math self-efficacy is the most critical antecedent learning factor for female students affecting math achievement. These results suggest that for female students, how to enhance math self-efficacy is a critical matter to improve math achievement.

INTRODUCTION
While a sufficient supply of knowledgeable and skilled science technology, engineering, and math (STEM) workers contributes to U.S. economic growth (U.S. Department of Labor, 2007), the number of knowledgeable and skilled STEM workers who have postsecondary degrees in STEM fields has decreased over the past decade (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). One of the dire facts related to the shortage of STEM workforce is the minority status of female students in STEM fields. The NSF (2007) from the Bureau of Labor Statistics revealed that while the percentage of women in the labor force was 46.4, female engineers represented only 11.1 percent of all engineers. Also, the percentage of female mathematical and computer scientists decreased from 31.0 in 1983 to 25.6 in 2007, although the overall ratio of women in the workforce increased from 43.7 % in 1983 to 46.4% in 2007 (NSF, 2007). Thus, how to encourage female students to choose STEM college majors and careers is a prime matter for educators and policy makers. A wealth of literature indicates that math achievement is a significant factor for students to choose STEM major choice in college (Astin & Astin, 1992; Besterfield-Sacre, Arman, & Sgynabm 1997; French, Immeokus, & Oakes, 2005; Levin & Wyekoff, 1998; Nicholls, Wolfe, Besterfield-Sacre, & Larpiattaworn, 2007; Veenstra, C.P., Dey, E.L., & Herrin, G.D., 2008). Also, it is well documented that math self-efficacy is another critical factor associated with STEM major choices in postsecondary settings (Betz & Hackett, 1983; Hackett & Bets, 1981; Hackett & Betz, 1983; Hackett & Campbell, 1987; Hyde, Fennema, & Ryan, 1990; Lent, Lopez, Bieschke, 1991; O’Brien, Martinez-Pons, & Kopala, 1999). In general, self-efficacy is considered a predictor of students’ academic achievement across academic areas and levels (Pajares & Urdan, 2006) as well as students’ college major choice and career choices (Brown & Lent, 2006), which is well applied to the social cognitive career theory (SCCT). Conceptually framing the SCCT, several studies discovered the association of math achievement, math self-efficacy, and STEM major and career choices, paying particular attention to gender differences. However, few studies focus on how the antecedent learning factors, other than math self-efficacy, are associated with math achievement based on a large scale.
To address these issues, this study will respond to the following research questions: a) What are the learning factors affecting math achievement? b) To what extent is gender associated with the learning factors? The national profile provides recommendations to educators, policy makers, parents, and female students themselves regarding how learning environments and processes can improve the math achievement of female students, which causes more female students to choose STEM majors in college.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
The hypotheses of this study are (a) math self-efficacy will affect the math achievement of female students; (b) a variety of academic and psychosocial factors such as the degree of taking advanced math courses and the educational aspiration of getting advanced educational degrees will influence the math self-efficacy of female students; and (c) students’ background factors (i.e., gender, social economic status (SES)) are associated with the academic and psychosocial factors. These hypotheses are established based on the social cognitive career theory (SCCT). SCCT (Lent, Brown, and Hackett, 1994) indicates that personal input (e.g., gender, racial/ethnicity background, disability status, etc) and environmental factors (e.g., social economic status, teacher support, etc) are associated with learning processes, impacting on learners’ self-efficacy, academic performance, and career
choices or goals. Through structural equation modeling (SEM), this study will examine how well SCCT fits into the proposed model (Figure 1).

**Figure 1. Math Achievement Model of Female Students**

**METHOD**

In the dataset of the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS 2002/06), a sample of 8,147 female and 8,050 male students who were in 10th grade in 2002 was collected to examine gender differences in academic and psychosocial factors affecting math achievement. The gender and SES of a student are the exogenous variables in the proposed model (See Figure 1). A variety of academic and psychosocial factors are regarded as mediator variables. As shown in Figure 1, educational aspiration in attaining educational degrees, the degree of taking advanced math courses, total number of AP/IB math courses, and educational levels of math teachers are associated with math self-efficacy level, which has an effect on the math achievement level. Math self-efficacy is a latent variable that has been constructed by explanatory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The observed variables that explain the math self-efficacy latent variable were collected in 2002 and 2004, and thus, in this proposed model, there are two sequential math self-efficacy latent variables (i.e., math self-efficacy in 2002 and 2004). The outcome variable is a math standard score accessed in 2004. SEM is an appropriate statistical method because (a) this study examines relationships among academic and psychosocial factors which have an effect on math achievement; (b) this study tests whether the SCCT fits into the proposed model; and (c) the proposed model includes latent variables (i.e., math self-efficacy).
RESULTS
Based on the goodness of fit (i.e., $\text{CFI} = 0.95$, $\text{RMSEA} = 0.065$, $\text{SRMR} = 0.031$) of the proposed model, SEM reveals that (a) academic factors (i.e., educational aspiration in attaining educational degrees, the degree of taking advanced math courses, total number of AP/IB math courses, and educational levels of math teachers) have a significant direct effect on math achievement level, regardless of gender ($p < .001$); (b) two sequential math self-efficacy latent variables are positively associated with math achievement ($p < .001$); (c) there are positive relationships among the academic factors and the math self-efficacy in 2002 ($p < .001$); (d) compared to male students, female students have significantly lower self-efficacy levels in both years, 2002 and 2004 ($p < .001$), which is most likely to affect lower math achievement ($p < .001$); (e) compared to male students, female students are more likely taking advanced math courses and aspiring to attain higher educational degrees ($p < .001$). Table 1 shows the detailed model results including standard errors and factor loadings of the variables. The Table 2 represents the total and indirect effects for the math achievement.

Table 1. Maximum Likelihood Robust Estimates Direct Effects of Math Achievement Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Est./SE</th>
<th>Std</th>
<th>StdYX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEASUREMENT MODEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEFFI_11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE_112</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE_123</td>
<td>1.022**</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>146.674</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE_134</td>
<td>1.102**</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>129.192</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>0.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE_145</td>
<td>1.077**</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>127.238</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE_156</td>
<td>1.075**</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>121.681</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE_112</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE_218</td>
<td>1.022**</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>117.570</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE_2310</td>
<td>1.045**</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>115.003</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE_2411</td>
<td>0.942**</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>119.626</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE_2512</td>
<td>1.041**</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>122.660</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRUCTURAL MODEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEFFI_2 ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEFFI_1</td>
<td>0.462**</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>55.618</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEFFI_1 ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>-0.211**</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-17.493</td>
<td>-0.281</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>0.044**</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>8.079</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Teacher Education Level</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>2.010</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>0.128**</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>29.342</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Math Self-Efficacy in 2002
2. Can do excellent job on math tests
3. Can understand difficult math texts
4. Can understand difficult math classes
5. Can do excellent job on math assignment
6. Can master math class skills
7. Math Self-Efficacy in 2004 follow-up
8. Can do excellent job on math tests
9. Can understand difficult math texts
10. Can understand difficult math classes
11. Can do excellent job on math assignment
12. Can master math class skills
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSEFFI_2 ON</th>
<th></th>
<th>MSEFFI_1 ON</th>
<th></th>
<th>MSEFFI_2 ON</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.058**</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-5.318</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>0.013*</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>2.757</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Teacher</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1.269</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>0.022**</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>5.448</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Standard Score</td>
<td>2.463**</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>25.617</td>
<td>1.778</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEFFI_2</td>
<td>0.370**</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>3.977</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEFFI_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Taking Pipeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEFFI_2</td>
<td>0.186**</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>9.523</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEFFI_1</td>
<td>0.389**</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>20.431</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total AP/IB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Courses ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEFFI_2</td>
<td>0.034**</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>6.387</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEFFI_1</td>
<td>0.084**</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>16.068</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Standard Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEFFI_2</td>
<td>2.366**</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>51.362</td>
<td>2.366</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEFFI_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Taking Pipeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEFFI_2</td>
<td>3.591**</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>24.260</td>
<td>3.591</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEFFI_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>0.315**</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>6.942</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>1.422**</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>27.395</td>
<td>1.422</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-1.292**</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>-11.767</td>
<td>-1.292</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Taking Pipeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEFFI_2</td>
<td>0.349**</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>40.872</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEFFI_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.117**</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>5.266</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>0.339**</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>33.180</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>0.063**</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>5.845</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total AP/IB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Courses ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEFFI_2</td>
<td>0.031**</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>16.260</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEFFI_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>6.509</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aspiration ON
Female 0.404 0.021 18.926 0.404 0.141
SES 0.369 0.009 39.068 0.369 0.292

Math Teacher Educational Level ON
Female -0.006 0.016 -0.375 -0.006 -0.003
SES 0.053** 0.007 7.464 0.053 0.059

Selected goodness-of-fit indices
\( \chi^2 (df=92) = 6463.713, p<.000; \) CFI = 0.950; TLI = 0.926; RMSEA = 0.065; SRMR = 0.031

Table 2. Standardized Total and Indirect Effects for the Math Achievement Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects from MSEFFI_2 to Math standard score</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Est./S.E.</th>
<th>Std</th>
<th>StdYX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total **</td>
<td>3.026**</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>26.627</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total indirect **</td>
<td>0.562**</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>9.655</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific indirect
Math standard score
Math course taking pipeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSEFFI_2</th>
<th>0.440**</th>
<th>0.047</th>
<th>9.393</th>
<th>0.034</th>
<th>0.034</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Math standard score
Total AP/IB Math Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSEFFI_2</th>
<th>0.123**</th>
<th>0.020</th>
<th>6.240</th>
<th>0.010</th>
<th>0.010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Direct
Math standard score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSEFFI_2</th>
<th>2.463**</th>
<th>0.096</th>
<th>25.617</th>
<th>0.192</th>
<th>0.192</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Effects from Math teacher educational level to MSEFFI_2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0.012*</th>
<th>0.006</th>
<th>2.079</th>
<th>0.017</th>
<th>0.017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total indirect</td>
<td>0.005*</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>2.009</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific indirect
MSEFFI_2

MSEFFI_1

Math Teacher Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0.005*</th>
<th>0.003</th>
<th>2.009</th>
<th>0.008</th>
<th>0.008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Direct
MSEFFI_2

Math Teacher Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0.007</th>
<th>0.005</th>
<th>1.269</th>
<th>0.009</th>
<th>0.009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Effects from SES to MSEFFI_1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0.092**</th>
<th>0.005</th>
<th>17.244</th>
<th>0.122</th>
<th>0.139</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total indirect</td>
<td>0.048**</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>23.831</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific indirect
MSEFFI_1

Educational aspiration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES</th>
<th>0.047**</th>
<th>0.002</th>
<th>23.775</th>
<th>0.063</th>
<th>0.072</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

MSEFFI_1

Math Teacher Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES</th>
<th>0.001</th>
<th>0.000</th>
<th>1.935</th>
<th>0.001</th>
<th>0.001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Direct
MSEFFI_1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES</th>
<th>0.044**</th>
<th>0.005</th>
<th>8.079</th>
<th>0.058</th>
<th>0.066</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Effects from Female to MSEFFI_1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>-0.159**</th>
<th>0.012</th>
<th>-13.017</th>
<th>-0.212</th>
<th>-0.106</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Indirect</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>15.709</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

The results show that, for female students, among the antecedent learning factors, math self-efficacy has most significant effect on the math standard score. Interestingly, although female students have better math educational preparation in terms of taking advanced math courses and have higher educational aspiration than male students, they have lower math achievement than male students. Importantly, unlike the other learning factors, female students have significantly lower math self-efficacy than male students. It is most likely that the major learning factor impacting on lower math achievement of female students is the math self-efficacy of the female students. In fact, regardless of gender, SES, GPA, taking advanced math courses and higher educational aspiration significantly impact on math standard scores. These findings suggest that how to increase math self-efficacy is a critical matter for female students to improve math standard scores.

Considering the importance of math self-efficacy for female students, teachers, counselors, and parents should be aware of how educational environments and learning processes can increase the math self-efficacy of female students. Future studies should investigate the sources of math self-efficacy, gender differences in the sources, and the extent to which the sources impact on math self-efficacy and math achievement levels, conceptually framing the hypothesized sources of self-efficacy (i.e., experienced mastery, vicarious experience, verbal and social persuasions, and emotional and physical states) by Bandura (1986, 1997).
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