

1 **Title**

2 Medical student residency preferences and motivational factors: a longitudinal, single-institution
3 perspective

4

5 **Authors**

6 Feria A. Ladha^{1*}, Anthony M. Pettinato^{1*}, Adam E. Perrin^{2,3}

7

8 **Affiliations**

9 ¹M.D./Ph.D. Program, University of Connecticut School of Medicine, Farmington, CT

10 ²Department of Family Medicine, University of Connecticut School of Medicine, Farmington, CT

11 ³Family Medicine Center at Asylum Hill, Hartford, CT

12 *These authors contributed equally

13 Correspondence: ladha@uchc.edu or pettinato@uchc.edu

14

15 **Keywords**

16 medical education, residency selection, career choice, motivation, primary care, surgery

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** A high proportion of medical school graduates pursue specialties different from
3 those declared at matriculation. While these choices influence the career paths, satisfaction, and
4 potential regret students will experience, they also impact the supply and demand ratio of the
5 shorthanded physician workforce across many specialties. In this study, we investigate how the
6 choice of medical specialty and the factors motivating those choices change between the
7 beginning and end of medical school training.

8
9 **Methods:** A questionnaire was administered annually from 2017 to 2020 to a cohort of medical
10 students at the University of Connecticut to determine longitudinal preferences regarding
11 residency choice, motivational factors influencing residency choice, future career path, and
12 demographic information.

13
14 **Results:** The questionnaire respondent totals were as follows: n=76 (Year 1), n=54 (Year 2),
15 n=31 (Year 3), and n=65 (Year 4). Amongst newly matriculated students, 25.0% were interested
16 in primary care, which increased ~1.4-fold to 35.4% in the final year of medical school. In
17 contrast, 38.2% of matriculated students expressed interest in surgical specialties, which
18 decreased ~2.5-fold to 15.4% in the final year. Specialty choices in the final year that exhibited
19 the largest absolute change from matriculation were orthopedic surgery (-9.9%), family medicine
20 (+8.1%), radiology (+7.9%), general surgery (-7.2%), and anesthesiology (+6.2%). Newly
21 matriculated students interested in primary care demonstrated no differences in their ranking of
22 motivational factors compared to students interested in surgery, but many of these factors
23 significantly deviated between the two career paths in the final year. Specifically, students
24 interested in surgical specialties were more motivated by the rewards of salary and prestige
25 compared to primary care students, who more highly ranked match confidence and
26 family/location factors.

1
2 **Conclusions:** We identified how residency choices change from the beginning to the end of
3 medical school, how certain motivational factors change with time, how these results diverge
4 between primary care and surgery specialty choice, and propose a new theory based on risk-
5 reward balance regarding residency choice. Our study promotes awareness of student
6 preferences and may help guide school curricula in developing more student-tailored training
7 approaches. This could foster positive long-term changes regarding career satisfaction and the
8 physician workforce.
9

1 **Background**

2 For medical students, deciding on a residency specialty that will guide careers and impact
3 personal lives is a complicated and multifactorial process, made even more difficult by the
4 complex and stressful nature of attempting to switch residency specialties post hoc (1). These
5 decisions have broad implications regarding healthcare and biomedical research across the
6 globe, namely an imbalance between physician supply and demand in primary care (2–4),
7 surgery (5–7), research (8–10), and clinical subspecialties (11–13), a disparity that dates back
8 over a century and will continue to worsen for the foreseeable future (14–16). These disparities
9 can have a significant impact on healthcare outcomes. For example, a greater supply of primary
10 care physicians per capita is associated with improved cardiovascular health, lower mortality,
11 increased lifespan, and a reduction in low birth-weight rates (17–19). While the physician
12 workforce landscape is shaped by numerous variables that can differ in importance and
13 oversight across municipalities, states/provinces, and countries, principal persistent factors that
14 contribute are the personal desires and interests of the physician trainees themselves, which
15 may or may not align with the needs of the healthcare system (20).

16 Investigating which specialties medical students prefer and why has been of long-
17 standing interest to medical schools and healthcare administrations, as a better understanding of
18 these preferences could provide insights that enable improvements to education curricula that
19 better foster the wants and needs of future physicians and the healthcare system. Previous
20 studies have demonstrated that the residency preferences of matriculating medical students
21 change by the time a final residency choice is made at the end of medical school (21,22).
22 Notably, students have demonstrated a persistent tendency to categorically switch preference
23 between primary care and surgical specialties (23–26). While informative studies have observed
24 specific predictive factors influencing residency choice, such as demographics, interest, lifestyle,
25 finances, and prestige, the single time point nature of these studies limits our understanding of
26 how these factors may change over time (23–25,27–30), and results can be further confounded

1 due to recall bias from methods that require retrospective assessment by respondents.
2 Moreover, alterations to the medical curriculum itself have been shown to impact residency
3 choice (31–34), making it imperative to obtain accurate and current data regarding student
4 preferences that can be used to facilitate optimal curriculum changes.

5 In this longitudinal study, we track the residency specialty preferences and motivational
6 factors for a cohort of U.S. medical students throughout their training at the University of
7 Connecticut School of Medicine. The aim of this study is to identify if and how the residency
8 preferences of newly matriculated medical students change compared to the residency
9 specialties chosen in their last year of medical school. Concurrently, this study also aims to
10 investigate the factors influencing residency choice, with a focus on how these factors may or
11 may not change with time and between specialty categories, such as between primary care and
12 surgical specialties. The results from this study will add to the growing understanding of medical
13 student career preferences. This may help to inform decisions regarding medical education,
14 such as more personalized training plans that foster career satisfaction and guidance towards in-
15 demand specialties.

16

1 **Methods**

2 **Subjects and Questionnaire**

3 This study was reviewed by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at UConn Health and qualified
4 for exempt status (IRB number 18-062-3). A voluntary, self-administered questionnaire (**Table 1**)
5 was developed to longitudinally assess medical students' residency specialty preferences, as
6 well as the factors motivating those preferences, throughout their medical school training
7 towards conferral of their medical degree (M.D.). A survey was chosen as the data collection
8 instrument in order to measure attitudes/beliefs, as these qualities are personal/internal and thus
9 not directly observable. The questionnaire was administered annually from 2017 to 2020 to the
10 same student cohort from the University of Connecticut School of Medicine (UConn SOM Class
11 of 2021), a 4-year M.D.-granting medical school in the U.S., starting upon matriculation (Year 1;
12 n=102 matriculants) and concluding during submission of residency applications using the
13 Electronic Residency Application Service (ERAS) (Year 4; n=100 matches). The anonymous
14 questionnaire consisted of respondents self-reporting their preferred (Years 1-3) or chosen (Year
15 4) residency specialty, their likely career path following residency (e.g. subspecialty training,
16 research, etc.), and ranking the various motivational factors (e.g. specialty lifestyle, prestige,
17 etc.) on these stated choices, in addition to demographics information (e.g. age, marital status,
18 etc.). To meet recent guidelines for survey-based research, this questionnaire format (**Table 1**) is
19 similar to what has been utilized in previous studies (22,23,36), was reviewed by two faculty
20 members unaffiliated with the study, and a survey trial with interview-based feedback was
21 performed using a small number of respondents outside the cohort of interest to ensure content,
22 face, and response process validity as well as interrater reliability (35,37).

23

24 **Procedure**

25 For Years 1-3, the questionnaire was administered in-person at curriculum sessions in which a
26 majority of students would be present, such as at the end of lecture (Years 1-2) or prior to an

1 orientation session (Year 3) and students were given 20 minutes to complete the survey. The
2 surveyors (F.A.L. and A.M.P.) announced the goals and voluntary/anonymous nature of the
3 study to the students present, distributed paper copies of the questionnaire, and collected the
4 completed questionnaires with respect to respondent anonymity. Due to the COVID-19
5 pandemic, the Year 4 questionnaire was distributed using the class email listserv and voluntary,
6 anonymous responses were submitted electronically. No incentive was offered for completing
7 the survey.

9 **Data Analysis**

10 The data obtained in this study, including the internally distributed results from the National
11 Resident Matching Program (NRMP) for the UConn SOM (n=100), were electronically cataloged
12 and analyzed. Data in this study excluded oral and maxillofacial surgery and preliminary surgery
13 Match outcomes, as well as longitudinal results from students in dual degree programs (e.g.
14 M.D./Ph.D., M.D./M.B.A, etc), as these represent atypical training timelines and/or career paths.
15 For the “primary care” specialty categorization, this encompassed internal medicine, pediatrics,
16 and family medicine, as defined by the American Academy of Family Physicians (AAFP). For the
17 “surgery” specialty categorization, this encompassed general surgery, orthopedic surgery,
18 neurological surgery, vascular surgery, plastic surgery, otolaryngology, and urology, as defined
19 by the American College of Surgeons (ACS). Obstetrics and gynecology (OB/GYN) was
20 excluded from either classification due to its hybrid nature and evolving landscape (38–41).

21 With the potential for small sample sizes due to specific residency choice, incomplete
22 questionnaires, and/or survey distribution logistics (i.e. cohort availability), a 90 percent
23 confidence level ($\alpha = 0.1$) was chosen (42,43). For analysis, the percentage of students who
24 chose each residency specialty were calculated relative to the total respondents for each year
25 the questionnaire was completed. To assess correlation between Year 4 survey results and
26 Match outcomes, a Pearson correlation coefficient (r) and its associated P -value were calculated

1 using GraphPad Prism. The importance of the six factors motivating the chosen specialties,
2 which were numerically recorded on an ordinal scale from least important (1) to most important
3 (6), were compiled by both medical school year and specialty choice. The median scale values
4 and interquartile ranges were calculated and plotted in GraphPad Prism. Statistical comparisons
5 were performed using nonparametric Mann-Whitney U tests in GraphPad Prism, and the
6 resulting *P*-values were considered statistically significant if $P \leq 0.1$.

1 Results

2 The total number of cohort respondents by year were n=76 for Year 1, n=54 for Year 2, n=31 for
3 Year 3, and n=64 for Year 4, as summarized in **Table 2**. Due to the lower response rate in Years
4 2 and 3, we directed our focus and analyses on Years 1 and 4. The age range for Year 1
5 respondents was 21-33 years-old and 25-34 years-old for Year 4 respondents. This was
6 accompanied by an increase in the percentage of married respondents (6.6% in Year 1 and
7 15.6% in Year 4) and respondents with children (0.0% in Year 1 and 3.1% in Year 4).

8 With regard to residency specialty choices (**Table 3**), the top six choices for the entering
9 students in Year 1 were internal medicine (14.5%), emergency medicine (14.5%), orthopedic
10 surgery (14.5%), general surgery (11.8%), pediatrics (7.9%), and OB/GYN (7.9%). For Year 4,
11 the top six residency specialty choices were internal medicine (15.4%), emergency medicine
12 (12.3%), family medicine (10.8%), pediatrics (9.2%), OB/GYN (9.2%), and radiology (9.2%). Of
13 note, the specialty choices that exhibited the greatest absolute change from Year 1 to Year 4
14 were orthopedic surgery (-9.9%), family medicine (+8.1%), radiology (+7.9%), general surgery (-
15 7.2%), and anesthesiology (+6.2%). This correlated well with the final NRMP Match outcomes
16 for this cohort of UConn SOM students ($r = 0.91$, $P < 0.001$), as the greatest absolute changes
17 from Year 1 to the Match were orthopedic surgery (-12.5%), anesthesiology (+8.0%), general
18 surgery (-7.8%), radiology (+6.7%), and family medicine (+5.4%; tied with psychiatry). Of note,
19 the least popular specialties—those that garnered no interest in Year 1 and no Match
20 outcomes—were child neurology, combined internal medicine and pediatrics (med-peds),
21 pathology, and physical medicine and rehabilitation. Finally, the majority of students reported a
22 desire to pursue fellowship/subspecialty training after residency in both Year 1 (51.3%) and Year
23 4 (66.2%), whereas 0% of Year 1 students were interested in research compared to 13.8% of
24 students in Year 4 (**Table 4**). Industry was the least likely post-residency path for respondents,
25 with only 2.6% of Year 1 students and 4.6% of Year 4 students expressing interest.

26 To determine which factors may motivate a student's preferred/chosen residency

1 specialty, we asked respondents to rank six factors—family/location, field interest, prestige,
2 lifestyle, financial incentive, and match confidence—from least important to most important in
3 motivating their reported residency specialty choice. Using a linear scale (1=least important to
4 6=most important) to numerically compare these responses, we identified no significant leading
5 motivational factor in Year 1, as the median ranking was relatively similar across the six
6 assessed factors (**Figure 1**). However, when compared to Year 4, significant changes were
7 observed. Interest in the field itself (e.g. underlying science, day-to-day duties, target patient
8 population, subsequent training opportunities, etc.) and field lifestyle (e.g. hours) significantly
9 increased in importance in Year 4, whereas field prestige, financial incentive (e.g. salary), and
10 match confidence significantly decreased in importance. The importance of family and/or
11 location requirements did not significantly change from Year 1 to Year 4.

12 As we observed disparities and changes between specialty choices within and between
13 Years 1 and 4, we next set out to compare interest amongst broad specialty categorizations,
14 specifically primary care versus surgery, as change between these specialty categories during
15 medical school has been shown to occur across studies from multiple decades (23–25,33,34). In
16 Year 1, 25.0% of students were interested in primary care specialties (internal medicine,
17 pediatrics, or family medicine), which increased ~1.4-fold to 35.4% in Year 4 and ~1.3-fold to
18 32.0% in the final Match outcome (**Figure 2A**). In contrast, 38.2% of Year 1 students expressed
19 interest in surgical specialties (orthopedic surgery, general surgery, neurological surgery,
20 vascular surgery, plastic surgery, otolaryngology, and urology), which decreased ~2.5-fold to
21 15.4% in Year 4 and ~2.7-fold to 14.0% in the final Match outcome (**Figure 2B**).

22 With the knowledge that considerable changes occurred between the proportion of
23 students interested in primary care versus surgery in Year 1 compared to Year 4 and the Match,
24 we next wanted to assess if and how our panel of motivational factors may have changed within
25 primary care and surgery from Year 1 to Year 4. For primary care, interest in the field itself
26 significantly increased as a factor motivating students' choice of a career in a primary care

1 specialty from Year 1 to Year 4, whereas prestige and financial incentives associated with
2 primary care specialties decreased (**Figure 3A**). Specialty lifestyle, match confidence, and
3 family/location factors did not significantly change. For surgery, interest in the field itself
4 significantly increased from Year 1 to Year 4, while the influence of prestige decreased (**Figure**
5 **3B**). Factors pertaining to specialty lifestyle, financial incentive, match confidence, and
6 family/location did not significantly change amongst those interested in surgery between Years 1
7 and 4.

8 Additional analyses were performed to assess if and how these motivational factors differ
9 between primary care and surgery within Year 1 and Year 4. For Year 1, none of the surveyed
10 factors demonstrated a significant difference between students who were interested in primary
11 care versus surgery (**Figure 4A**); however, significant changes were observed in Year 4 (**Figure**
12 **4B**). The influence of family and/or location factors was significantly lower in students who had
13 chosen a surgical specialty in Year 4 compared to primary care, as was the importance of
14 confidently matching into the specialty of choice. Furthermore, specialty prestige and financial
15 incentive were more influential amongst students who were pursuing a surgical specialty. Field
16 interest and lifestyle were not significantly different between the two groups in Year 4.

1 Discussion

2 While students enter medical school with specific specialties they intend to pursue, which may
3 be predictive of career choice in some studies (44,45), up to 70-80% of medical school
4 graduates have been shown to ultimately pursue specialties different from those declared at
5 matriculation, a figure that has persisted for many decades (26,46). Importantly, the worsening
6 mismatch between physician supply and demand in key specialties hinges, in part, on the career
7 decisions made by medical students. Thus, understanding these decisions can provide
8 invaluable information that could be harnessed to shape training goals for both students and
9 healthcare as a whole. As such, the overall aim of this study was to track how final residency
10 choices differ from those at matriculation, and what factors may play a role in these differences.

11 In the cohort surveyed in this study, a considerable decrease was observed regarding the
12 proportion of students choosing surgical specialties in their final year compared to matriculation.
13 The top residency choices at matriculation were internal medicine (14.5%), emergency medicine
14 (14.5%), orthopedic surgery (14.5%), general surgery (11.8%), pediatrics (7.9%), and OB/GYN
15 (7.9%). In contrast, the top choices for this cohort in their final year were internal medicine
16 (15.4%), emergency medicine (12.3%), family medicine (10.8%), pediatrics (9.2%), OB/GYN
17 (9.2%), and radiology (9.2%). Notably, 25.0% of students at matriculation were interested in
18 primary care, while 38.2% were interested in surgical specialties. In the final year, these results
19 shifted to 35.4% and 15.4%, respectively. The specialty choices that exhibited the greatest
20 absolute change were orthopedic surgery (-9.9%), family medicine (+8.1%), radiology (+7.9%),
21 general surgery (-7.2%), and anesthesiology (+6.2%). The final year survey results were similar
22 to the final NRMP Match results for this cohort.

23 These results are in accord with previous studies, which have demonstrated that ~30% of
24 medical graduates now pursue primary care, a globally applicable percentage that has been in
25 decline across multiple countries (22,28,47,48). Similarly, a decline in graduating medical
26 students choosing surgical specialties has been observed over the years, such that ~15% of

1 medical graduates now pursue surgery (6,7,49,50), in line with the percentage observed in our
2 study. The other ~55% of graduates mostly pursue emergency medicine, OB/GYN, radiology,
3 anesthesiology, and psychiatry, in varying proportions. Moreover, the declining entry rates of
4 students into primary care and surgery are generally inconsistent with student preferences upon
5 matriculation, as it has been previously reported that students choose residencies different than
6 the ones they claim to be interested in upon matriculation (21–25,46). Within this context, our
7 study further supports this by providing the most current investigation of these multi-decade
8 patterns that continue to afflict physician supply.

9 Importantly, our study additionally aimed to examine the underlying motivational factors
10 that influence residency choice, with particular focus on how these factors change with time and
11 specialty choice. Compared to matriculation, influence of specialty interest and lifestyle were
12 significantly more important when students made their final residency choice, whereas field
13 prestige, financial incentive, and match confidence were significantly less important. Similar
14 temporal trends existed when results were stratified by residency choice amongst primary care
15 and surgical specialties. As the influence of certain factors differed with time and coincided with
16 an increase and decrease in the proportion of students choosing primary care and surgery,
17 respectively, we wanted to test if factor differences existed between these specialty categories
18 over time, as a frequently proposed theory regarding primary care being a less attractive career
19 choice is due to the salary inequality compared to other specialities (51,52), as well as the lower
20 perceived prestige (22,53). At matriculation in our cohort, no significant differences were
21 detected amongst the factor rankings between students interested in primary care versus
22 surgery; however, in the final year, students choosing surgery ranked prestige and financial
23 incentive significantly higher than primary care. In contrast, final year students interested in
24 primary care rated match confidence and family/location factors higher than students in surgery.
25 These results support another previously proposed theory that lifestyle, hours, and training
26 commitment are a common reason that students may shy away from surgical specialties (53–

1 56). Finally, both groups expressed a similarly high importance of interest in their chosen field as
2 well.

3 Interestingly, we believe that these results provide preliminary evidence that students
4 may exhibit different risk-reward profiles based on the type of residency specialty they choose to
5 pursue. Specifically, students interested in surgery may risk successfully matching into these
6 more competitive residencies for the reward of the salary and perceived prestige that
7 accompany many surgical specialties, whereas students pursuing primary care place greater
8 emphasis on family/location requirements that may also relate to match confidence. Vice versa,
9 students interested in surgery may have more competitive application characteristics, giving
10 them greater confidence and having less concern about matching. While these implications
11 would need to be more closely examined amongst larger student cohorts in order to establish
12 more definitive correlation, the associations observed in our study are not without precedent. It
13 has previously been reported, albeit in separate studies, that students pursuing primary care are
14 more motivated by medical lifestyle/work-life balance (23,27,30), ease of residency entry (23),
15 and family status (24). In contrast, students pursuing surgery or other non-primary care fields
16 were more motivated by economics (23,24,28,29), prestige (22,24), and having more
17 competitive application characteristics (23,57). Our study adds to these previous findings by
18 comprehensively assessing the relative influence of many of these factors, not only on the basis
19 of specialty choice, but also, uniquely, in association with different training stages.

20 However, while students state having high interest in the fields they pursue and
21 contemplate additional key factors supporting that pursuit, many residents and physicians regret
22 or are unsatisfied with their career choice (1,58,59), undermining the health of a long-depleted
23 workforce (14–16). One reason, amongst many, that may explain this is that students may not
24 fully understand the specialties they choose and how they align with their personal/career
25 values. Additionally, the formal, informal, and hidden curricula students are exposed to through
26 their interpersonal, organizational, and cultural interactions in medical school can have

1 significant impact on students' career perceptions (60,61). As our study shows, newly
2 matriculated students interested in primary care versus surgery exhibit no differences in their
3 ranking of motivational factors, but many of these factors significantly deviate between the two
4 career paths in the final year, as we have described. This demonstrates, in part, the impact of
5 the medical curriculum. While exposure to the informal and hidden curricula will vary from
6 student-to-student and school-to-school, making it difficult to exactly measure and control,
7 interventions regarding the formal curriculum have been well-established. Particularly, outside of
8 the typical required clinical clerkships, longitudinal and auxiliary experiences have been shown
9 to foster student interest and impact residency choice (24,27,28,31–33). The long-term effects
10 regarding career choice regret and satisfaction have yet to be explored, but these experiential
11 curricular additions offer an opportunity for medical schools to provide more personalized
12 scholastic exposures that cultivate student interests, which could be performed in conjunction
13 with consideration of student values upon matriculation and throughout major training stages.

14

15 **Study Limitations**

16 This study has important limitations to consider. First, analysis was performed on a single U.S.
17 medical student cohort from the University of Connecticut, a public research university with
18 longitudinal curriculum experiences that provide significant exposure to primary care, making
19 external extrapolation challenging, though multi-institutional studies have shown consistent
20 residency choice outcomes between schools (22,30). Second, cohort sizes at this institution are
21 roughly ~100 students per year, and when considering factors that can dampen response rate
22 for a voluntary survey (student availability, willingness, survey completion, etc.), our sample size
23 was limited, and particularly low for Years 2 and 3, hindering our ability to confidently assess
24 these stages due to non-response bias. This small class size failed to demonstrate interest (at
25 matriculation or in the Match) in child neurology, combined internal medicine and pediatrics,
26 pathology, and physical medicine and rehabilitation, likely owing to the roughly $\leq 1\%$ national

1 Match outcomes for these specialties (62). While the Year 4 survey results correlated well with
2 our cohort's Match outcomes, our limited response rate also failed to identify the high proportion
3 of students who matched into psychiatry, illustrating potential confounding from non-response
4 bias. Finally, while inspired by previous studies, our questionnaire format and delivery method
5 can be improved upon. The anonymous nature of our survey prevented us from tracking the
6 same students throughout the study, limiting more refined longitudinal analysis. Methods for
7 anonymity through electronic questionnaire distribution could address this and also expand the
8 cohort scope and sample size in future studies. Additionally, the ordinal scale of our ranking
9 system limits weighted analysis of the motivational factors examined in this study. Allowing
10 respondents to attribute influence weight to these ranked factors, as well as expanding the
11 specificity and range of factors surveyed in the questionnaire, such as assessing students'
12 perceptions of specialty-specific physician burnout and reasons behind factors such as match
13 confidence, could provide more accurate and nuanced results.

14

15 **Conclusion**

16 In summary, this study examined the longitudinal residency choices and motivational factors for
17 a cohort of U.S. medical students, with the aim of generating insight that could aid the training of
18 the next generation of physicians. We identified how residency choices change between the
19 beginning and end of medical school, how the influence of certain factors change over this
20 period, and stratify our results by specialty choice between primary care and surgery. Our study
21 promotes awareness of student preferences, provides a blueprint for future studies to examine
22 these factors on a larger scale, proposes a new theory based on risk-reward balance regarding
23 residency choice, and may help guide medical school curricula in developing more student-
24 tailored approaches to education and training. Eventually, we hope this work can help play a part
25 in addressing the supply and dissatisfaction issues plaguing the physician workforce, which will
26 ultimately improve healthcare outcomes for patients.

1 **Declarations**

2 **Abbreviations**

3 **IRB:** Institutional Review Board

4 **UConn SOM:** University of Connecticut School of Medicine

5 **ERAS:** Electronic Residency Application Service

6 **NRMP:** National Resident Matching Program

7 **AAFP:** American Academy of Family Physicians

8 **ACS:** American College of Surgeons

9 **OB/GYN:** Obstetrics and gynecology

10

11 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

12 This study was reviewed and approved by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB)
13 at UConn Health (IRB number 18-062-3) and all participants were consented for the study. All
14 methods were carried out in accordance with the institutional guidelines and regulations. All the
15 participants provided informed consent to participate in the study.

16

17 **Consent for publication**

18 Not applicable.

19

20 **Availability of data and material**

21 The acquired dataset used and analyzed during the current study are not publicly available due
22 to participant anonymity but are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

23

1 **Competing Interests**

2 The authors declare no competing interests.

3

4 **Funding**

5 No funding was received.

6

7 **Author Contributions**

8 F.A.L. and A.M.P.: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation,

9 Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original

10 draft, and Writing – review & editing. A.E.P.: Conceptualization, Methodology, Project

11 administration, Supervision, and Writing – review & editing.

12

13 **Acknowledgements**

14 We would like to thank the UConn School of Medicine students who volunteered to participate in

15 this study, professors Raymond J. Foley, D.O. (UConn) and Jason W. Ryan, M.D., M.P.H.

16 (UConn) for helping the authors coordinate appropriate times to distribute the questionnaires

17 used in this study, and professor James J. Grady, Dr.P.H. (UConn) for consultation regarding

18 statistical analyses. The authors were supported, in part, by fellowship training grants from the

19 American Heart Association (PRE35110005 to F.A.L. and PRE34381021 to A.M.P.) and

20 institutional funds from the UConn School of Medicine, Graduate School, and M.D./Ph.D.

21 Program.

1 References

- 2 1. Dyrbye LN, Burke SE, Hardeman RR, Herrin J, Wittlin NM, Yeazel M, et al. Association of
3 Clinical Specialty With Symptoms of Burnout and Career Choice Regret Among US
4 Resident Physicians. *JAMA*. 2018 Sep 18;320(11):1114.
- 5 2. Bodenheimer T. Primary care--will it survive? *N Engl J Med*. 2006 Aug 31;355(9):861–4.
- 6 3. Chen C, Petterson S, Phillips RL, Mullan F, Bazemore A, O'Donnell SD. Toward graduate
7 medical education (GME) accountability: measuring the outcomes of GME institutions.
8 *Acad Med*. 2013 Sep;88(9):1267–80.
- 9 4. Bucur PA, Bhatnagar V, Diaz SR. A “U-shaped” Curve: Appreciating How Primary Care
10 Residency Intention Relates to the Cost of Board Preparation and Examination. *Cureus*.
11 2019 Sep 10;11(9):e5613.
- 12 5. Grigg M, Arora M, Diwan AD. Australian medical students and their choice of surgery as a
13 career: a review. *ANZ J Surg*. 2014 Sep;84(9):653–5.
- 14 6. Scott IM, Matejcek AN, Gowans MC, Wright BJ, Brenneis FR. Choosing a career in
15 surgery: factors that influence Canadian medical students' interest in pursuing a surgical
16 career. *Can J Surg*. 2008 Oct;51(5):371–7.
- 17 7. Ellison EC, Pawlik TM, Way DP, Satiani B, Williams TE. Ten-year reassessment of the
18 shortage of general surgeons: Increases in graduation numbers of general surgery
19 residents are insufficient to meet the future demand for general surgeons. *Surgery*. 2018
20 Oct;164(4):726–32.
- 21 8. Archer SL. The making of a physician-scientist--the process has a pattern: lessons from the
22 lives of Nobel laureates in medicine and physiology. *Eur Heart J*. 2007 Feb;28(4):510–4.
- 23 9. Salata RA, Geraci MW, Rockey DC, Blanchard M, Brown NJ, Cardinal LJ, et al. U.S.
24 Physician-Scientist Workforce in the 21st Century: Recommendations to Attract and
25 Sustain the Pipeline. *Acad Med*. 2018 Apr;93(4):565–73.
- 26 10. Ishikawa M. Distribution and retention trends of physician-scientists in Japan: a longitudinal
27 study. *BMC Med Educ*. 2019 Dec;19(1):394.
- 28 11. Rallis KS, Wozniak AM, Hui S, Nicolaides M, Shah N, Subba B, et al. Inspiring the future
29 generation of oncologists: a UK-wide study of medical students' views towards oncology.
30 *BMC Med Educ*. 2021 Dec;21(1):82.
- 31 12. Narang A, Sinha SS, Rajagopalan B, Ijioma NN, Jayaram N, Kithcart AP, et al. The Supply
32 and Demand of the Cardiovascular Workforce. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2016 Oct
33 11;68(15):1680–9.
- 34 13. Ross H, Higginson L, Ferguson A, O'Neill B, Kells C, Cox J, et al. Too many patients, too
35 few cardiologists to care? *Can J Cardiol*. 2006 Sep;22(11):901–2.
- 36 14. Shortage of Physicians. *The Boston Medical and Surgical Journal*. 1920 May
37 27;182(22):563–8.
- 38 15. Zhang X, Lin D, Pforsich H, Lin VW. Physician workforce in the United States of America:
39 forecasting nationwide shortages. *Hum Resour Health*. 2020 Dec;18(1):8.
- 40 16. AAMC. The Complexities of Physician Supply and Demand: Projections From 2018 to 2033
41 [Internet]. Association of American Medical Colleges; 2020 p. 92. Available from:
42 <https://www.aamc.org/media/45976/download>
- 43 17. Shi L. The relationship between primary care and life chances. *J Health Care Poor*
44 *Underserved*. 1992;3(2):321–35.
- 45 18. Shi L. Primary care, specialty care, and life chances. *Int J Health Serv*. 1994;24(3):431–58.
- 46 19. Pilkerton CS, Singh SS, Bias TK, Frisbee SJ. Healthcare resource availability and
47 cardiovascular health in the USA. *BMJ Open*. 2017 Dec 14;7(12):e016758.
- 48 20. Blake A, Carroll BT. Game theory and strategy in medical training. *Medical Education*.
49 2016;50(11):1094–106.
- 50 21. Kaur B, Carberry A, Hogan N, Robertson D, Beilby J. The medical schools outcomes

- 1 database project: Australian medical student characteristics. *BMC Med Educ*. 2014 Aug
- 2 29;14:180.
- 3 22. Compton MT, Frank E, Elon L, Carrera J. Changes in U.S. Medical Students' Specialty
- 4 Interests over the Course of Medical School. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2008 Jul;23(7):1095–100.
- 5 23. Scott I, Gowans MC, Wright B, Brenneis F. Why medical students switch careers. *Can Fam*
- 6 *Physician*. 2007 Jan;53(1):94–5.
- 7 24. Bland CJ, Meurer LN, Maldonado G. Determinants of primary care specialty choice: a non-
- 8 statistical meta-analysis of the literature. *Acad Med*. 1995 Jul;70(7):620–41.
- 9 25. Markert RJ. Why medical students change to and from primary care as career choice. *Fam*
- 10 *Med*. 1991 Jul;23(5):347–50.
- 11 26. Fischer JP, Clinite K, Sullivan E, Jenkins TM, Bourne CL, Chou C, et al. Specialty and
- 12 Lifestyle Preference Changes during Medical School. *Med Sci Educ*. 2019 Dec;29(4):995–
- 13 1001.
- 14 27. Hauer KE, Durning SJ, Kernan WN, Fagan MJ, Mintz M, O'Sullivan PS, et al. Factors
- 15 associated with medical students' career choices regarding internal medicine. *JAMA*. 2008
- 16 Sep 10;300(10):1154–64.
- 17 28. Jeffe DB, Whelan AJ, Andriole DA. Primary care specialty choices of United States medical
- 18 graduates, 1997-2006. *Acad Med*. 2010 Jun;85(6):947–58.
- 19 29. Clinite KL, Reddy ST, Kazantsev SM, Kogan JR, Durning SJ, Blevins T, et al. Primary care,
- 20 the ROAD less traveled: what first-year medical students want in a specialty. *Acad Med*.
- 21 2013 Oct;88(10):1522–8.
- 22 30. Cleland J, Johnston PW, French FH, Needham G. Associations between medical school
- 23 and career preferences in Year 1 medical students in Scotland. *Medical Education*.
- 24 2012;46(5):473–84.
- 25 31. Ford CD, Patel PG, Sierpina VS, Wolffarth MW, Rowen JL. Longitudinal Continuity
- 26 Learning Experiences and Primary Care Career Interest: Outcomes from an Innovative
- 27 Medical School Curriculum. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2018 Oct;33(10):1817–21.
- 28 32. Stark E, Christensen JD, Schmalz NA, Uijtdehaage S. Evaluation of a Curricular Addition to
- 29 Assist Medical Students in Specialty Selection. *J Med Educ Curric Dev*. 2018
- 30 Dec;5:2382120518788867.
- 31 33. Sheu L, Goglin S, Collins S, Cornett P, Clemons S, O'Sullivan PS. How Do Clinical
- 32 Electives during the Clerkship Year Influence Career Exploration? A Qualitative Study.
- 33 *Teach Learn Med*. 2021 Apr 1;1–11.
- 34 34. Campwala I, Aranda-Michel E, Watson GA, Hamad GG, Losee JE, Kilic A, et al. Impact of a
- 35 Surgical Subspecialty Roundtable on Career Perception for Preclerkship Medical Students.
- 36 *J Surg Res*. 2021 Mar;259:493–9.
- 37 35. Artino AR, Durning SJ, Sklar DP. Guidelines for Reporting Survey-Based Research
- 38 Submitted to Academic Medicine. *Academic Medicine*. 2018 Mar;93(3):337–40.
- 39 36. Matthew Hughes JD, Azzi E, Rose GW, Ramnanan CJ, Khamisa K. A survey of senior
- 40 medical students' attitudes and awareness toward teaching and participation in a formal
- 41 clinical teaching elective: a Canadian perspective. *Med Educ Online*. 2017;22(1):1270022.
- 42 37. Bolarinwa OA. Principles and methods of validity and reliability testing of questionnaires
- 43 used in social and health science researches. *Niger Postgrad Med J*. 2015 Dec;22(4):195–
- 44 201.
- 45 38. Coleman VH, Laube DW, Hale RW, Williams SB, Power ML, Schulkin J. Obstetrician-
- 46 gynecologists and primary care: training during obstetrics-gynecology residency and
- 47 current practice patterns. *Acad Med*. 2007 Jun;82(6):602–7.
- 48 39. McAlister RP, Andriole DA, Brotherton SE, Jeffe DB. Are entering obstetrics/gynecology
- 49 residents more similar to the entering primary care or surgery resident workforce? *Am J*
- 50 *Obstet Gynecol*. 2007 Nov;197(5):536.e1-6.
- 51 40. Ogburn T, Espey E, Autry A, Leeman L, Bachofer S. Why obstetrics/gynecology, and what

- 1 if it were not an option? A survey of resident applicants. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2007
- 2 Nov;197(5):538.e1-4.
- 3 41. Morgan MA, Anderson BL, Lawrence H, Schulkin J. Well-woman care among obstetrician-
- 4 gynecologists: opportunity for preconception care. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med*. 2012
- 5 Jun;25(6):595–9.
- 6 42. Miller J, Ulrich R. The quest for an optimal alpha. Li Y, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2019 Jan
- 7 2;14(1):e0208631.
- 8 43. Kim JH, Choi I. Choosing the Level of Significance: A Decision-theoretic Approach.
- 9 *Abacus*. 2021;57(1):27–71.
- 10 44. Zeldow PB, Preston RC, Daugherty SR. The decision to enter a medical specialty: timing
- 11 and stability. *Med Educ*. 1992 Jul;26(4):327–32.
- 12 45. Scott I, Gowans M, Wright B, Brenneis F. Stability of medical student career interest: a
- 13 prospective study. *Acad Med*. 2012 Sep;87(9):1260–7.
- 14 46. Kassebaum DG, Szenas PL. Medical students' career indecision and specialty rejection:
- 15 roads not taken. *Acad Med*. 1995 Oct;70(10):937–43.
- 16 47. Pfarrwaller E, Sommer J, Chung C, Maisonneuve H, Nendaz M, Junod Perron N, et al.
- 17 Impact of Interventions to Increase the Proportion of Medical Students Choosing a Primary
- 18 Care Career: A Systematic Review. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2015 Sep;30(9):1349–58.
- 19 48. Svirko E, Goldacre MJ, Lambert T. Career choices of the United Kingdom medical
- 20 graduates of 2005, 2008 and 2009: questionnaire surveys. *Med Teach*. 2013
- 21 May;35(5):365–75.
- 22 49. Peel JK, Schlachta CM, Alkhamesi NA. A systematic review of the factors affecting choice
- 23 of surgery as a career. *Can J Surg*. 2018 Feb;61(1):58–67.
- 24 50. Brundage SI, Lucci A, Miller CC, Azizzadeh A, Spain DA, Kozar RA. Potential targets to
- 25 encourage a surgical career. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2005 Jun;200(6):946–53.
- 26 51. Bodenheimer T, Pham HH. Primary Care: Current Problems And Proposed Solutions.
- 27 *Health Affairs*. 2010 May;29(5):799–805.
- 28 52. McDonald C, Henderson A, Barlow P, Keith J. Assessing factors for choosing a primary
- 29 care specialty in medical students; A longitudinal study. *Med Educ Online*. 2021
- 30 Dec;26(1):1890901.
- 31 53. Yang Y, Li J, Wu X, Wang J, Li W, Zhu Y, et al. Factors influencing subspecialty choice
- 32 among medical students: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2019 Mar
- 33 7;9(3):e022097.
- 34 54. Newton DA, Grayson MS, Thompson LF. The variable influence of lifestyle and income on
- 35 medical students' career specialty choices: data from two U.S. medical schools, 1998-
- 36 2004. *Acad Med*. 2005 Sep;80(9):809–14.
- 37 55. Richardson JD. Workforce and lifestyle issues in general surgery training and practice. *Arch*
- 38 *Surg*. 2002 May;137(5):515–20.
- 39 56. Pulcrano M, Evans SRT, Sosin M. Quality of Life and Burnout Rates Across Surgical
- 40 Specialties: A Systematic Review. *JAMA Surg*. 2016 Oct 1;151(10):970–8.
- 41 57. Jones MD, Yamashita T, Ross RG, Gong J. Positive predictive value of medical student
- 42 specialty choices. *BMC Med Educ*. 2018 Mar 9;18(1):33.
- 43 58. Shanafelt TD, Balch CM, Bechamps GJ, Russell T, Dyrbye L, Satele D, et al. Burnout and
- 44 Career Satisfaction Among American Surgeons. *Annals of Surgery*. 2009 Sep;250(3):463–
- 45 71.
- 46 59. Shanafelt TD, Hasan O, Dyrbye LN, Sinsky C, Satele D, Sloan J, et al. Changes in Burnout
- 47 and Satisfaction With Work-Life Balance in Physicians and the General US Working
- 48 Population Between 2011 and 2014. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*. 2015 Dec;90(12):1600–13.
- 49 60. Hafferty FW. Beyond curriculum reform: confronting medicine's hidden curriculum. *Acad*
- 50 *Med*. 1998 Apr;73(4):403–7.
- 51 61. Erikson CE, Danish S, Jones KC, Sandberg SF, Carle AC. The role of medical school

- 1 culture in primary care career choice. *Acad Med*. 2013 Dec;88(12):1919–26.
- 2 62. National Resident Matching Program, Results and Data: 2020 Main Residency Match
- 3 [Internet]. Washington, DC: National Resident Matching Program; 2020 [cited 2021 Apr 8].
- 4 (Charting Outcomes in the Match). Available from: [https://www.nrmp.org/main-residency-](https://www.nrmp.org/main-residency-match-data/)
- 5 [match-data/](https://www.nrmp.org/main-residency-match-data/)
- 6
- 7

1 **Tables**

2 **Table 1. Survey questionnaire.**

3 Simplified questionnaire presenting the questions and response options for the students to
 4 complete.
 5

Questions	Response Options
What residency are you most likely to pursue following medical school? (choose one)	List of residency specialties (see Table 3)
What career path(s) are you most likely to pursue following residency? (choose any/all that apply)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Fellowship/Subspecialty Training -Research -Industry
Rank the following six factors in terms of importance to you in deciding your specialty/career choice (1=least important and 6=most important).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Family and/or location -Interest in the field itself (e.g. underlying science, day-to-day duties, target patient population, subsequent training opportunities, etc.) -Prestige -Lifestyle (e.g. hours) -Financial incentive (e.g. salary) -Residency match confidence (e.g. ease of matching)
Degree program (choose one)	MD - MD/PhD - MD/MBA - MD/MPH - other
Current year (choose one)	MS1 - MS2 - MS3 - MS4
Age	(fill in)
Are you married?	Yes - No
Do you have children?	Yes - No

6
7

1 **Table 2. Respondent demographics.**

2 This table includes the number of student volunteers who completed the questionnaire in each of
3 the four years it was administered, as well as the demographic data they provided.

4

Medical School Year	Number of Respondents	Age Range of Respondents	Married Respondents	Respondents with Children
Year 1	76	21-33	5 (6.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Year 2	54	22-30	3 (5.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Year 3	31	23-30	1 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Year 4	65	25-34	10 (15.4%)	2 (3.1%)

5

1 **Table 3. Residency specialty results.**

2 This table represents the number of students reporting their preferred residency specialty (Years
 3 1-3), chosen residency specialty (Year 4), and Match outcome for this cohort. The percentage
 4 for each response/result by year is also provided.

5

Residency	Year 1 Response (n=76)	Year 2 Response (n=54)	Year 3 Response (n=31)	Year 4 Response (n=65)	NRMP Match Outcome (n=100)
Anesthesiology	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (6.2%)	8 (8.0%)
Child Neurology	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Dermatology	3 (4.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.1%)	4 (4.0%)
Emergency Medicine	11 (14.5%)	10 (18.5%)	3 (9.7%)	8 (12.3%)	12 (12.0%)
Family Medicine	2 (2.6%)	4 (7.4%)	2 (6.5%)	7 (10.8%)	8 (8.0%)
General Surgery	9 (11.8%)	5 (9.3%)	4 (12.9%)	3 (4.6%)	4 (4.0%)
Internal Medicine	11 (14.5%)	11 (20.4%)	5 (16.1%)	10 (15.4%)	15 (15.0%)
Med-Peds	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Neurosurgery	3 (4.0%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (3.2%)	1 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Neurology	3 (4.0%)	4 (7.4%)	1 (3.2%)	4 (6.2%)	4 (4.0%)
OB/GYN	6 (7.9%)	2 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (9.2%)	8 (8.0%)
Ophthalmology	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.0%)
Orthopedic Surgery	11 (14.5%)	2 (3.7%)	1 (3.2%)	3 (4.6%)	2 (2.0%)
Otolaryngology	3 (4.0%)	4 (7.4%)	2 (6.5%)	2 (3.1%)	4 (4.0%)
Pathology	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Pediatrics	6 (7.9%)	4 (7.4%)	8 (25.8%)	6 (9.2%)	9 (9.0%)
Physical Med & Rehab	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Plastic Surgery	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)
Psychiatry	2 (2.6%)	2 (3.7%)	3 (9.7%)	1 (1.5%)	8 (8.0%)
Radiation Oncology	2 (2.6%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Radiology	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (9.2%)	8 (8.0%)
Urology	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.5%)	3 (3.0%)
Vascular Surgery	2 (2.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

6

1 **Table 4. Career paths following completion of residency.**
2 Students were asked to choose which career path they were most likely to follow after
3 completion of residency. Students were given the option to choose multiple pathways if they
4 wished.

5

Medical School Year	Fellowship/ Subspecialty Training	Research	Industry
Year 1	39 (51.3%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.6%)
Year 2	32 (59.3%)	8 (14.8%)	2 (3.7%)
Year 3	21 (67.7%)	5 (16.1%)	3 (9.7%)
Year 4	43 (66.2%)	9 (13.8%)	3 (4.6%)

6

7


8

1 Figures

2 Figure 1. Factors motivating residency choice.

3 Median and interquartile range for the six motivational factors influencing choice of residency
4 specialties from least important (1) to most important (6), comparing the student cohort in Year 1
5 (white circle) versus Year 4 (black square). *P*-values were calculated using Mann-Whitney U
6 tests.

7




8

9

10


1 **Figure 2. Percentage of students selecting primary care versus surgical residencies.**
2 **A)** Percentage of students selecting primary care specialities in Year 1, Year 4, and the Match
3 outcome. **B)** Percentage of students selecting surgical specialities in Year 1, Year 4, and the
4 Match outcome.

5



6
7


1 **Figure 3. Factors influencing residency choice by year within primary care and surgery.**
 2 Median and interquartile range for the six motivational factors influencing choice of residency
 3 specialties from least important (1) to most important (6), comparing **A)** the student cohort in
 4 Year 1 (white circle) versus Year 4 (black square) amongst those who chose primary care
 5 specialties, and **B)** the student cohort in Year 1 (white circle) versus Year 4 (black square)
 6 amongst those who chose surgical specialties. *P*-values were calculated using Mann-Whitney U
 7 tests.
 8



9
 10
 11

1 **Figure 4. Factors influencing residency choice between primary care and surgery in Years**
2 **1 and 4.**

3 Median and interquartile range for the six motivational factors influencing choice of residency
4 specialties from least important (1) to most important (6), comparing **A)** Year 1 medical students
5 who chose primary care (white square) versus surgical (black triangle) specialties, and **B)** Year 4
6 medical students who chose primary care (white square) versus surgical (black triangle)
7 specialties. *P*-values were calculated using Mann-Whitney U tests.
8



9