DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 479 754 SO 034 898

AUTHOR	Beyer, Sylvia; Chavez, Michelle; Rynes, Kristina
TITLE	Gender Differences in Attitudes toward and Confidence in Computer Science.
SPONS AGENCY	National Science Foundation, Arlington, VA.
PUB DATE	2002-05-00
NOTE	6p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association (74th, Chicago, IL, May 1-3, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Behavioral Science Research; College Freshmen; Comparative Analysis; *Computer Science; Females; *Gender Issues; Higher Education; Males; Questionnaires; *Sex Differences; *Sex Stereotypes; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Confidence; Gender Gap; Students as Subjects

ABSTRACT

A study examined gender and student group differences in stereotypes and confidence for first-year and more advanced computer science (CS) students. In the spring of 2001, 18-page questionnaires were distributed to first-year students (n=30: 21 females, 9 males) and students enrolled in an introductory CS course (n=32: 11 females, 21 males) designed for students considering majoring in CS. Findings showed no gender difference in computer confidence for first-year students, but females in CS had significantly lower confidence than did males. (Contains 27 references.) (Author/BT)

Gender Differences in Attitudes toward and Confidence in Computer Science.

Sylvia Beyer
Michelle Chavez
Kristina Rynes

Gender Differences in Attitudes toward and Confidence in Computer Science[1]

Sylvia Beyer[2,3], Michelle Chavez, & Kristina Rynes

University of Wisconsin-Parkside

Abstract

We examined gender and student group differences in stereotypes and confidence in Computer Science (CS) in first-year and CS students. First-year students' attitudes towards CS were more stereotypical than CS students'. There was no gender difference in computer confidence for first-year students, but females in CS had significantly lower confidence than did males.

This nation faces a serious shortage of computer scientists. From 1986 to 1996, the number of men majoring in Computer Science (CS) dropped by 33%, whereas the number of women dropped by 55% (calculated from data in U.S. Department of Education, 2000). This shortage of computer scientists provides a major impetus for increasing the representation of women in CS. Two reasons for the small number of women in CS are negative attitudes towards the field and low confidence. Beyer (1990, 1998, 1999b, 2002; Beyer & Bowden, 1997) has repeatedly found that females have inaccurately low confidence in masculine domains.

CS is stereotyped as even more male-dominated than the traditional male bastions of chemistry and mathematics (Beyer, 1999a). Both males and females *incorrectly* believe that males in CS have higher GPAs than females (Beyer, 1999a). Furthermore, those women who do succeed in CS are often viewed as "exceptional", leaving the stereotype that women do not belong in CS intact (Henwood, 1999/2000).

The stereotypes about CS majors are unflattering. They are perceived to be intelligent but deficient in interpersonal skills (Beyer, 1999a). This has been termed the "computer nerd syndrome" or "geek mythology" (Margolis & Fisher, 1997; Rasmussen & Hapnes, 1991). These perceptions of CS majors conflict more with the gender roles of females than of males, because women tend to have a stronger interpersonal orientation than men (Cross & Madson, 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

The major goal of the present research is to discover the barriers that discourage undergraduate women from taking courses in CS. To this end we examine gender and student group differences in attitudes and confidence in CS in first-year students and more advanced students taking a CS course.

Method

In the spring of 2001 we distributed 18-page questionnaires to 30 first-year students (21 females, 9 males) and 32 students enrolled in an introductory CS course (11 females, 21 males) designed for students seriously considering majoring in CS. Unless otherwise noted, questions were of our own design.

Participants filled out questionnaires assessing demographic and family background information; ability and preparation in quantitative areas; educational goals and interests (Farmer, Wardrop, Anderson,& Risinger, 1995; Lips, 1992); experience with and attitudes towards computers (Lips, 1992); stereotypes and knowledge about CS; confidence (Nickell & Pinto, 1986); interpersonal relations (Cross, Bacon, & Morris, 2000; Cutrona & Russell, 1984); family orientation (Ethington & Wolfle, 1988); personality attributes (e.g., self-esteem [Rosenberg, 1965], gender roles [Bem, 1974], and the Big 5 [John & Robins, 1993]); stress (Cohen, Kamarck,& Mermelstein, 1983); financial and family issues; support and encouragement; gender discrimination; and academic environment. In addition, participants' course-taking behavior, CS attitudes, and confidence are being followed for three years.

Results

2 (gender) x 2 (student group: first-year students vs. CS students) analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were calculated.

Demographic variables. As expected, CS

[1] Poster presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association in Chicago, Il., May 2002.

[2] To whom correspondence should be addressed at Department of Psychology, University of Wisconsin-Parkside, Kenosha, WI 53141. e-mail: beyer@uwp.edu

[3] This research was supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation (EIA-0089957) to the first author.

students were significantly older (24.7 years) than first-year students (21.5 years), $F(1, 55) = 4.14, p < .05$, and more advanced in their university career, $F(1, 55) = 132.81, p < .0001$. Male and female students were remarkably similar in terms of demographic variables including age, race, number of siblings, year in college, marital status, number of children, prevalence of disabilities, socioeconomic status while growing up, and parental level of education. The significant interaction between gender and student group indicates that for CS, females were less likely to be full-time students than were males, but no difference existed for first-year students, $F(1, 53) = 6.08, p < .02$.

Ability and preparation in quantitative areas. First year students' ACT test scores were significantly lower than CS students' in Math, $F(1, 29) = 5.45, p < .03$, and Geometry, $F(1, 25) = 4.56, p < .05$. They also had lower math placement test scores, $F(1, 36) = 7.42, p < .01$. CS students reported significantly higher GPAs in high school, $F(1, 49) = 5.12, p < .03$, and college than did first-year students, $F(1, 41) = 8.84, p < .005$.

The only significant gender difference in actual ability and preparation variables was for placement test scores in math with males scoring significantly higher, $F(1, 36) = 6.28, p < .02$.

Educational goals and interests. There were no gender or student group differences in the level of education participants aspired to completing. CS students reported spending significantly more time on school work (25 hours) than did first-year students (10 hours), $F(1, 53) = 19.85, p < .0001$. First-year students were significantly more people-oriented in their career selections than were CS students, $F(1, 55) = 5.14, p < .03$. For CS students, opportunities to use their abilities were more important in their career selection than they were for first-year students, $F(1, 55) = 4.02, p < .05$.

Previous experience with and attitude towards computers. There were no gender or student group differences regarding the age at first computer use. About 97% of CS students reported owning a computer compared to 71% of first-year students $F(1, 55) = 8.37, p < .005$. The average CS student spent 35.5 hours a week on a computer compared to 10.3 hours for first-year students, $F(1, 55) = 29.63, p < .0001$.

There was a significant interaction between student group and gender in programming experience, $F(1, 53) = 4.22, p < .05$. Whereas no difference in programming experience existed for CS students, male first-year students had more programming experience than females. Not surprisingly, CS students had more programming experience (97%) than did first-year students (37%), $F(1, 54) = 28.00, p < .0001$.

The two variables that showed the largest gender difference in experience with computers relate to questions about having taken a computer apart, $F(1, 55) = 9.35, p < .003$, and having installed internal components such as RAM into a computer, $F(1, 55) = 11.65, p < .001$, with males having more experience. CS students have more experience in taking a computer apart, $F(1, 55) = 8.56, p < .005$, and in installing internal components, $F(1, 55) = 6.27, p < .02$, than do first-year students.

Stereotypes and knowledge about CS. First-year students' responses to what the typical CS student is like were more stereotypical than were CS students'. First-year students were significantly more likely to describe CS students as uninteresting and asocial, $F(1, 55) = 17.22, p < .0001$. The only gender difference was that males were more likely to believe that CS majors enjoy games like chess than were females, $F(1, 53) = 5.53, p < .03$.

There was no gender difference in knowledge of what CS is. However, CS students had significantly more accurate knowledge of CS than did first-year students, $F(1, 53) = 6.51, p < .02$. Both males and females rated the career opportunities of students with CS degrees as excellent.

Whereas only 25% of first-year students knew someone with a CS degree, 44% of CS students knew someone with a CS degree before taking a CS class. This suggests that knowing a computer scientist may increase the likelihood of taking a CS class.

First-year students thought that there are significantly more women in CS (30.3%) than CS students thought (20.5%), $F(1, 54) = 8.29, p < .006$. First-year students also thought that CS majors have higher GPAs (3.5) than CS students did (3.0), $F(1, 54) = 23.99, p < .001$.

We asked questions regarding CS as a career for parents of young children. Participants indicated that it would be a good career because of high income and the ability to work from home, but simultaneously thought the high number of working hours and stress would be difficult for parents of young children. Participants did not view CS as a field where success and raising a family are incompatible goals. An interesting gender difference revealed that females more than males valued CS as a career choice of parents due to the high pay, $F(1, 51) = 4.65, p < .04$.

Confidence. A gender difference regarding confidence in computer ability emerged. Whereas first-year males and females had equally high computer

confidence, females in CS showed significantly lower confidence than did males, $F(1, 30) = 4.82$, $p < .04$. This gender difference was not due to differences in ability (math grades and ACT scores were controlled).

Personality variables. There were no gender or student group differences in interdependent self-construal, self-esteem, family orientation, or conscientiousness. However, first-year students scored significantly higher in neuroticism, $F(1, 51) = 17.69$, $p < .0001$, and openness to new experiences, $F(1, 51) = 12.48$, $p < .001$, than did CS students. CS students were more likely to score as masculine (57%) on the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974) than first-year students (25%), $F(1, 55) = 3.87$, $p < .06$. Conversely, first-year students scored higher on femininity than did CS students, $F(1, 55) = 5.81$, $p < .02$. CS students also scored higher than first-year students on interpersonal scales measuring social integration, $F(1, 55) = 5.05$, $p < .03$. It is noteworthy that no gender differences in any of the personality variables emerged.

Stress and financial issues. There was a significant interaction between gender and student group for stress, $F(1, 54) = 4.03$, $p < .05$. It reveals that first-year females reported experiencing significantly more stress than did first-year males, $F(1, 28) = 6.29$, $p < .02$, whereas no gender difference in stress emerged for CS students. There were no differences in employment status, hours of outside employment, or financial responsibilities. CS students were significantly more certain of having adequate financial support to finish college than were first-year students, $F(1, 55) = 11.62$, $p < .001$.

Discussion

This research found negative stereotypes regarding CS, especially among first-year students who described the typical CS major as uninteresting and asocial. It is unclear whether the attitudes of CS students were less stereotypical to begin with, increasing their likelihood of taking a CS class, or whether taking a CS class changed their attitudes in a less stereotypical direction. The longitudinal design of this research will eventually address this issue.

The stereotypes of CS majors as "nerds", their perceived obsession with machines and lack of interest in people, and associations of technology with masculinity conflict with the gender roles of females (Cross & Madson, 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Coupled with the stereotypical but inaccurate perception of women's lower ability in CS (Beyer, 1999a), these stereotypes probably conspire to deter women from CS.

The gender difference in computer confidence among CS students is of concern. It may lead to greater attrition of women. The low confidence among females in CS is not due to a lack of ability. Males and females perform equally well in computer programming courses (Armstrong, LeBold, & Linden, 1986). In fact, women students majoring in CS have higher GPAs than males (Beyer, 1999a; NSF, 1996). Our longitudinal research is currently investigating the cause of this drop in females' computer confidence. Interestingly, no gender difference in confidence was found for first-year students.

One cause of women's low confidence is their less playful and relaxed attitude towards computers (Rasmussen & Hapnes, 1991). This is exemplified in this study by men's greater likelihood to have taken a computer apart. Confidence is also affected by the amount of previous experience with computers (Zubrow, 1987). Women tend to have less computer experience than men (Aman, 1992; Zubrow, 1987), which negatively affects their confidence. However, in this study no gender difference in computer experience was found for the CS students.

What is the consequence of this low confidence? Positive self-perceptions of ability are intimately tied to aspirations, educational choices, preference for challenging tasks, intrinsic motivation, persistence, and thus have desirable effects on performance (for a review see Beyer, 1995). Indeed, high performance expectations are a better predictor of mathematics participation and of continued high confidence for the future than are grades (Beyer, 1999b; Lantz & Smith, 1981). Positive self-perceptions of ability are related to self-esteem and psychological health, whereas negative self-evaluations of ability are related to depression (see Beyer, 2002, for an overview). This suggests that females' low confidence has deleterious affective and behavioral consequences. Importantly, low confidence may decrease the likelihood that women will choose to major in CS and may negatively affect their retention in the field.

References

Aman, J. R. (1992). Gender and attitude toward computers. In C. D Martin & E. Murchie-Beyma (Eds.), *In search of gender free paradigms for computer science education* (pp. 33-46). Eugene, OR: International Society for Technology in Education.

Armstrong, P. S., LeBold, W. K., & Linden, K. W. (1986). Predicting achievement in beginning-level computer-programming courses. *Proceedings of the*

1986 Frontiers in Education Conference. Arlington, TX: American Society for Engineering Education.

Bem, S. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*, 155-162.

Beyer, S. (1990). Gender differences in the accuracy of self-evaluations of performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 960-970.

Beyer S. (1995). Maternal employment and children's academic achievement: Parenting style as mediating variable. *Developmental Review, 15*, 212-253.

Beyer S. (1998). Gender differences in self-perception and negative recall biases. *Sex Roles, 38*, 103-133.

Beyer, S. (1999a). The accuracy of academic gender stereotypes. *Sex Roles, 40*, 787-813.

Beyer, S. (1999b). Gender differences in the accuracy of grade expectancies and evaluations. Sex Roles, 41, 279-296.

Beyer, S. (2002). *The effects of gender, dysphoria, and performance feedback on the accuracy of self-evaluations.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Beyer, S., & Bowden E. M. (1997). Gender differences in self-perceptions: Convergent evidence from three measures of accuracy and bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 157-172.

Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24*, 385-396.

Cross, S. E., Bacon, P. L., & Morris, M. L. (2000). The relational-interdependent self-construal and relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 791-808.

Cross, S. E., & Madson, L. (1997). Elaboration of models of the self: Reply to Baumeister and Sommer (1997) and Martin and Ruble (1997). *Psychological Bulletin, 122*, 51-55.

Cutrona, C. E., & Russell, D. W. (1987). The provisions of social relationships and adaptation to stress. In W. H. Jones & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Advances in personal relationships* (pp. 37-67). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Ethington, C. A., & Wolfle, L. M. (1988). Women's selection of quantitative undergraduate fields of study: Direct and indirect influences. *American Educational Research Journal, 25*, 157-175.

Farmer, H. S., Wardrop, J. L, Anderson, M. Z., & Risinger, R. (1995). Women's career choices: Focus on science, math, and technology courses. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*, 155-170.

Henwood, F. (1999/2000). Exceptional women? Gender and technology in U.K. higher education. *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine*, 21-27.

John, O. P., & Robins, R. W. (1993). Determinants of interjudge agreement on personality traits: The Big Five domains, observability, evaluativeness, and the unique perspective of the self. *Journal of Personality, 61*, 521-551.

Lantz, A. E., & Smith, G. P. (1981). Factors influencing the choice of nonrequired mathematics courses. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 73*, 825-837.

Lips, H. M. (1992). Gender- and science-related attitudes as predictors of college students' academic choices. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 40*, 62-81.

Margolis, J., & Fisher, A. (1997). Geek mythology and attracting undergraduate women to computer science. Impacting change through collaboration. *Proceedings of the Joint National Conference of the Women in Engineering Program Advocates Network and the National Association of Minority Engineering Program Administrators.*

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-253.

National Science Foundation. (1996). *Women, minorities, and persons with disabilities in science and engineering: 1996.* Arlington, VA: Author.

Rasmussen, B., & Hapnes, T. (1991). Excluding women from the technologies of the future? A case study of the culture of computer science. *Futures, 23*, 1107-1119.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2000). *Digest of education statistics, 1999.*

Zubrow, D. (1987). How computing attitudes change during the freshman year. In S. Kiesler & L. Sproull (Eds.), *Computing and change on campus* (pp. 195-211). New York: Cambridge.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Gender Differences in Attitudes toward and Confidence in Computer Science

Author(s): Beyer, Sylvia, Chavez, Michelle, Rynes, Kristina

Corporate Source: University of Wisconsin-Parkside

Publication Date: May 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ↑ [X]

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ↑ [ ]

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ↑ [ ]

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: Sylvia Beyer Assoc. Prof.
Organization/Address: Univ. of Wisc.-Parkside, Kenosha WI 53141-2000	Telephone: (262) 595-2235 FAX:
	E-Mail Address: beyer@uwp.edu Date: 6-16-02

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC/CHESS
2805 E. Tenth Street, #120
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org