DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 454 849   IR 020 828

AUTHOR   McCoy, Leah P.; Heafner, Tina L.; Burdick, Matthew G.;
                Nagle, Laura M.
TITLE   Gender Differences in Computer Use and Attitudes on a
                Ubiquitous Computing Campus.
PUB DATE   2001-04-00
NOTE   7p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American
                Educational Research Association (Seattle, WA, April 10-14,
                2001).
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   College Students; *Computer Attitudes; Computer Mediated
                Communication; *Computer Uses in Education; Higher
                Education; Sex Differences; *Student Attitudes; Student
                Reaction; *Student Surveys

ABSTRACT
        As colleges and universities consider various options for
wide scale "computerization," one southern liberal arts university has
instituted a technology program that insures that all students have equal
access to laptop computers. At this university, each student is issued his or
her own IBM ThinkPad, and activities involving this computer are infused
throughout the academic and social life of the campus. This study examined
the computer uses and attitudes of male and female students who had
experienced a technology-rich environment for four years. Participants in the
study were students in the Class of 2000 at this ubiquitous computing
university. Approximately 800 students were surveyed near the end of their
senior year to obtain their self-reports of computer use and computer
attitudes. Overall, use data indicated that students used the computer in
various ways. Students reported that they used the computer "often" for: word
processing (97%); e-mail for pleasure (98%); e-mail for classes (73%); and
Web resources for classes (50%). For further analysis, the frequency of
individual use was added and the following categories were created to form
scores: Tool; Communication; Resources; Entertainment; and Total Use. These
categories of use were compared for males and females using independent
T-tests. Results showed that males were more frequent users in the categories
of Resources, Entertainment, and Total Use. There were no significant
differences for Tool Use or Communication. On the attitude survey items, 73%
of the students reported that they "loved" computers, while 23% "liked" them,
4% "disliked" them, and 1% "hated" them. Eighty-three percent of the seniors
felt that the ThinkPad had significantly impacted the campus culture, 75%
felt that it had helped in their overall educational life, and 48% felt that
it had helped in their overall social life. Responses on all of these
attitude items were independent of gender. (Contains 17 references.) (AEF)

Gender Differences in Computer Use and Attitudes on a Ubiquitous Computing Campus

Leah P. McCoy, Tina L. Heafner, Matthew G. Burdick, Laura M. Nagle

Wake Forest University

Paper presented at AERA Annual Meeting, April 2001, Seattle, WA

As colleges and universities consider various options for wide scale "computerization," one southern liberal arts university has instituted a technology program that insures that all students have equal access to laptop computers. At this university each student is issued his or her own IBM ThinkPad, and activities involving this computer are infused throughout the academic and social life of the campus. Students use the computer extensively in class activities and projects and also in social communication and entertainment.

We are all familiar with the classic studies of gender differences in mathematics, science, and technology. Even though there has been recent progress in fostering gender equity in these subjects, there are still disturbing differences in use and attitudes (AAUW, 1998; Campbell & Bailey, 1999; Campbell & Clewell, 1999).

Much has been written about the infusion of technology into academic life. While colleges are moving at different paces in its integration, we all recognize that technology is an integral part of education in the 21st century (Brown, 2000, 1999). Research studies describe an intensive computing environment as a positive influence on academics

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(Corwin & Marcinkiewicz, 1998; Geissler & Horridge, 1998; Mitra & Steffensmeier, 2000; Walters & Necessary 1996).

Previous studies have shown marked differences between male and female use of and attitudes toward computers (Chen, 1985; Collis, 1985; Fetler, 1985; Lockheed, 1985; Lockheed, Nielsen, & Stone, 1983; Sadker, 1999; Sheingold, 1981). This study sought to examine the computer uses and attitudes of male and female students who had experienced a technology-rich environment for four years.

Methodology

Participants in this study were the students of the Class of 2000 at this ubiquitous computing university. At the end of their fourth year, this senior class had lived and worked in a computer-intensive environment for their entire college career. Approximately 800 students were surveyed near the end of their senior year to obtain their self- reports of computer use and computer attitudes.

A survey was constructed to obtain use and attitude data. The survey was posted online (with a CGI script to encode responses in a text file) and an email message was sent to all 800 seniors encouraging them to follow the included link and complete the survey. After one week, a reminder email was sent. Then after another week, a paper version of the survey was sent to all students who had not responded. After two more weeks, a random sample of the remaining nonresponders were interviewed by phone and asked the survey questions. To check for representativeness, Computer Expertise scores were compared for the three groups (web (n=274), paper (n=35), phone interview (n=10)) and there were no significant differences ($F_{(2, 316)} = 0.391$, p=0.67).

Results

Overall Use data indicated that students used the computer in varied ways. Students reported that they used the computer "often" for Word Processing (97%), Email for Pleasure (98%), Email for Classes (73%), and WWW Resources for Classes (50%). For further analysis, the frequencies of individual uses were summed within categories to form scores for Tool, Communication, Resources, Entertainment, and Total Use. These categories of use were compared for males and females by Independent T-tests. Results revealed significant gender differences for Resources ($t(317)=2.930$, $p<.05$), Entertainment ($t(317)=4.979$, $p<.05$), and Total Use ($t(317)=2.045$, $p<.05$). Examination of the means showed that males were more frequent users in all three. There were no significant differences for Tool Use or Communication.

These data were further analyzed by including gender and 11 classifications of major as predictor variables (coded as dummy variables) in a Stepwise Multiple Regression with Total Use and then each of the four Use subscores as the criterion variable. In four of the five analyses, gender was excluded as a variable in the equation ($p >.01$). The regression equation for Total Use included two significant variables: Business major (beta=.233) and History major (beta=-.144), ($R^2 = .084$, $F(2,316)=15.493$, $p< .01$). The equation for Tool Use included History major (beta=-.323), English major (beta=-.274), and Communications major (beta=-.186), ($R^2= .190$, $F(3,315)=24.563$, $p< .01$). Communication Use was not significantly related to any of the predictor variables ($R^2= .020$, $F(1,317)=6.418$, $p> .01$). Resources Use was predicted by Business major (beta=. 259), ($R^2= .064$, $F(1,317)=22.811$, $p< .01$). The only dependent

4

variable for which gender was a significant predictor (beta=-.259) was Entertainment

Use, where males were more positive (R^2= .064, $F(1,317)$=22.789, $p<$ .01).

On the attitude items, 73% of students reported that they "loved" computers,

while 23% "liked" them, 4% "disliked" them, and 1% "hated" them. 83% of the seniors

felt that the ThinkPad had significantly impacted the campus culture. 75% felt that it had

helped in their overall educational life, and 48% felt that it had helped in their overall

social life. Responses on all of these attitude items were independent of gender (Chi-

Squares (n=318) = 0.541, 0.731, 2.801, and 7.051, all $p>$.01). The one remaining item

was related to gender: Self-report of Computer Expertise ranging from 1 (Neanderthal)

to 5 (Bill Gates, Jr.) (Chi-Square (4, n=316)=22.438, $p<$.01).

Conclusions

On this campus all students had exactly the same computer and used it for various

academic and non-academic tasks. Comparison of Use category scores by gender found

differences for males and females. However, when this data was further analyzed

considering both gender and major, the variance from gender differences was accounted

for by the "major" variable in all Use categories except Entertainment. The only

difference was that males used the computer more for games and music. Attitudes

toward computers were positive, and were not different for males and females, but the

males rated their computer expertise higher than did the females.

This study indicates a "leveling" effect when males and females have equal

computer access, as suggested in the earlier work of Arch and Cummins (1989),

Kolehmainen (1992), and Sacks, Bellisimo, and Mergendoller (1993-94). The frequency

of utilization of the computer for tool, communication, and resource location tasks was not different for males and females. The amount of Total Use was not different. Males used their computers more for entertainment, playing games, music, and movies. Similarly, there were no differences in self-reported attitudes toward the computer, but males rated their expertise higher than females. The implicit cultural messages that have impeded females' computer use seemed to be overcome when the technology environment was equivalent for male and female students. Further study is recommended to further track and verify this apparent trend toward equity in computer use and attitudes.

References

American Association of University Women (AAUW). (1998). Gender gaps: Where schools still fail our children. Washington, DC: Author.

Arch, E. C. & Cummins, D. E. (1989). Structured and unstructured exposure to computers: Sex differences in attitude and use among college students. *Sex Roles, 20* (5 - 6), 245-255.

Brown, D. G. (2000). Computing environment at Wake Forest University. In D.G. Brown (Ed.), *Teaching with Technology* (pp. 41-42). Boston, MA: Anker.

Brown, D. G. (1999). *Electronically enhanced education: A case study of Wake Forest University.* Winston-Salem, NC: Wake Forest University Press.

Campbell, P. B. & Bailey, S. M. (1999, May). *From statistics to stories: Girls and math and science in 1999 and the implications for engineering.* Paper presented at National Academy of Engineering, Washington, DC.

Campbell, P. B. & Clewell, B. C. (1999). Science, math, and girls. *Educational Week: Editorial Projects in Education, 19* (2), 50-53.

Chen, M. (1985). A macro-focus on microcomputers. In M. Chen and W. Paisley (Eds.), Children and Microcomputers (pp. 37-58). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Corwin, T. & Marcinkiewicz, H. (1998). Prediction of and differences in computer use when universally available. (ERIC No. ED 423 832).

Fetler, M. (1985). Sex differences on the California Statewide Assessment of Computer Literacy. *Sex Roles, 13* (3 - 4), 181-191.

Geissler, J. E. & Horridge, P. (1998). University students' computer knowledge and commitment to learning. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 25* (3), 347-365.

Kolehmainen, P. (1992, June). *The changes in computer anxiety in a required computer course.* Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, Enschede, The Netherlands. (ERIC No. ED 350 957).

Lockheed, M. (1985). Women, girls, and computers: A first look at the evidence. *Sex Roles, 13* (3-4), 115-22.

Lockheed, M., Nielsen, A., & Stone, M. (1983, April). *Sex differences in microcomputer literacy.* Paper presented at the National Educational Computer Conference, Baltimore, MD.

Mitra, A. & Steffensmeier, T. (2000, Spring). Changes in student attitudes and student computers use in a computer-enriched environment. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 32*, (3), 416-433.

Sacks, C. H., Bellisimo, Y., & Mergendoller, J. (1993-94, Winter). Attitudes toward computers and computer use: The issue of gender. *Journal of Research on Computing Education, 26*(2), 256-269.

Sadker, D. (1999). Gender equity: Still knocking at the classroom door. *Educational Leadership, 56*, 25.

Walters, J. & Necessary, J. (1996). An attitudinal comparison toward computers between underclassmen and graduating seniors. *Education,* 116, 623-630.

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

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Gender Differences in Computer Use and Attitudes on a Ubiquitous Computing Campus

Author(s): Leah P. McCoy, Tina L. Heafner, Matthew G. Burdick, Laura M. Nagle

Corporate Source:

Publication Date: 4/2001

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	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	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	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ↑ [✓]	Level 2A ↑ [ ]	Level 2B ↑ [ ]
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g.. electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	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: Leah P. McCoy

Printed Name/Position/Title: Leah P. McCoy

Organization/Address: Wake Forest University
P.O. Box 7266
Winston-Salem, NC 27109

Telephone: 336-758-5498   FAX: 336-758-4591

E-Mail Address: mccoy@wfu.edu   Date: 4-23-01

(over)

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:
University of Maryland
ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
1129 Shriver Laboratory
College Park, MD 20742
Attn: Acquisitions

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
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com