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ABSTRACT

Classically, management information systems has been seen as the intersection of two factions within the firm: the technology workers and management. Those in management information systems were tasked with providing a means of communication between these distant groups that would enable synergy within the organization. To do this, management information systems professionals have a need to understand behavioral aspects of individual psychology. This research examines the intersection of information systems and three areas of psychology: personality, counseling, and social. Three separate papers examine a specific research question within each of these separate areas. The first paper investigates the influence of personality and cognitive style on the preference for individuals to work in virtual teams. The second paper explores the drivers of interest and intention to major in information systems. Finally, the third paper analyzes the impact of impressions with regard to mobile users of technology. Together, these papers provide an interesting cross-section of work within information systems across differing areas of psychology.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 ORGANIZATION

This document is composed of three separate manuscripts exploring the intersection of information systems and psychology. Each manuscript is copied almost exactly from the original submission (except for some minor formatting changes). The figures, tables, and references for each manuscript are included in the same chapter as the respective manuscript as they did for the original submission. A general introduction is provided here as well as a general conclusion at the end of this document. Also, references utilized in the introduction and/or conclusion are included in a reference section at the end of the entire document.

The manuscripts included in this document provide a wide-angle view of information systems in three separate areas of psychology. The first manuscript lies in the area of personality psychology and information systems. This paper extends the work of McElroy and colleagues (2007) by examining the differences between personality and cognitive style in the context of virtual teams. Specifically, this research develops a new measure of preference for working in virtual teams that extends the work of preference for group work over working alone (Shaw, Duffy, & Stark, 2000) by adding a new dimension of preference for working face-to-face over virtually. This new measure is then evaluated in the context of personality using the Revised NEO-PI (Costa & MacCrae, 1992) and cognitive style using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Form M (I. B. Myers & Myers, 1998).

The second manuscript lies in the area of counseling psychology and information systems. The paper addresses the recent enrollment crisis in IS (Panko, 2008) by examining methods to increase interest in and intention to major in IT. Specifically, Social Cognitive Career
Theory (Lent, 2005) is used to examine the drivers of interest in majoring in IT using a sample of high school students involved in an outreach program.

Finally, the fourth manuscript lies in the area of social psychology and information systems. This paper examines the role of impression formation (Asch, 1946) when evaluating mobile technology users. An initial instrument development is used to develop a metric for impression formation within a professional business environment. Two studies are then utilized to examine the differences of impressions formed of male vs. female targets with varying message bias in the context of mobile technology use.

1.2 LITERATURE REVIEW

This section provides a brief literature review of some of the more pertinent topics concerning the research in this document. Each of these topics is discussed in greater depth in at least one of the included manuscripts. This section is only intended to give the reader a brief introduction to the topics.

1.2.1 PERSONALITY

Personality psychology involves the patterns of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that distinguishes individuals and persists over time (Phares & Chaplin, 1997). Trait theories subscribe to this notion of enduring patterns that are 1) stable over time, 2) differ between individuals, and 3) influence behavior in some way (Feist, Feist, & Roberts, 2009). Costa and McCrae (1992) formulated the widely used five-factor personality model (Big Five) as a method for measuring individual personality on five separate dimensions: openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. Another trait-based theory is that of cognitive style. Cognitive style refers to the differences in individual information
processing and decision-making (Ausburn & Ausburn, 1978). Jung (Jung, 1921) developed cognitive style dimensions which are captured in the popular Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (I. B. Myers & Myers, 1998) using four two-dimensional areas: extraversion/introversion, sensing/intuition, thinking/feeling, and judging/perceiving.

1.2.2 COUNSELING

Counseling psychology deals with helping people with personal, educational, and career-related problems that they are unable to solve alone (Heppner, Cooper, Mulholland, & Wei, 2001; Heppner, Wampold, & Kivlighan, 2008). A major aspect of this help involves guiding individuals in their career-related interests. Many different models have been developed to aid in career choice including the learning theory of careers counseling (Krumboltz, Mitchell, & Jones, 1976; Mitchell & Krumbolt, 1996; Mitchell & Krumboltz, 1990), a developmental-contextual approach to career development (Vondracek, 2001; Vondracek, Lerner, & Schulenberg, 1986), the psychological theory of work adjustment (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984), the theory of career choice – RIASEC (Holland, 1959, 1997), and the life-span, life-space theory (Super, 1957, 1981, 1990). Social Cognitive Career Theory (Lent, 2005) attempts to integrate these other career theories by incorporating Bandurra’s Social Cognitive Theory (1986). Social Cognitive Career Theory postulates that individual self-efficacy and career-related outcome expectations influence interest in an area, with all three influencing intention to major in the area.

1.2.3 SOCIAL

Social psychology is the study of social connections through the exploration of how we think about, influence, and relate to other individuals (D. G. Myers, 2012). When interacting with people, first impressions are typically the first, and sometimes most powerful, social
interaction we encounter. Asch was one of the first to demonstrate that individuals use specific information to form initial impressions of target individuals (1946). Impression formation involves the assessment by observers of physical and behavioral information presented by a target that leads to impressions of that target (Sherman, Crawford, Hamilton, & Garcia-Marques, 2007). Much of the research involving impression formation deals with stereotypes. Individuals are found to utilize stereotypes when making initial impressions of individuals so as to minimize the cognitive effort expended (Brewer, 1998; Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). These stereotypes are often activated by a response to a particular observed characteristic (Devine, 1989; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995) that signifies a specific group membership to the observer (Perdue, Dovidio, Gurtman, & Tyler, 1990) (e.g. the gender of the subject). Furthermore, the observer develops a certain level of expectancy for how certain individuals in certain groups will perform a given task or in a given context (Correll & Ridgeway, 2006) (e.g. how women will interact with technology).

1.3 Plan of Presentation

The following chapters are reprints of papers that have been written pertaining to the research plan above. Chapter 2 explores personality and cognitive style in the context of preference for working in virtual teams. Chapter 3 uses the Social Cognitive Career Theory model to explore the drivers of intent to major in IT. Chapter 4 provides a two-study analysis of impression formation in the context of mobile technology use. Chapter 5 will offer some concluding remarks in regard to the papers.
CHAPTER 2: PERSONALITY AND COGNITIVE STYLE AS PREDICTORS OF PREFERENCE FOR WORKING IN VIRTUAL TEAMS

A paper accepted by Computers in Human Behavior

Andy Luse, James C. McElroy, Anthony M. Townsend, Samuel DeMarie
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ABSTRACT
This study tests the effects of personality and cognitive style on preference of individuals for working in virtual teams. The results support the use of both personality and cognitive style as predictor variables with each uniquely contributing to two facets of virtual team preference, namely preference for virtual teams over working alone and preference for virtual teams over traditional groups. Results are discussed regarding the impact of cognitive style and personality for corporate implementation of virtual teams.
INTRODUCTION

A virtual team is defined as a group of people with unique skills who work interdependently but are separated geographically which necessitates their interacting using technology (Lipnack & Stamps, 2000). Thus, virtual teams allow members to accomplish specific tasks while transcending traditional restrictions of time and proximity (Montoya, Massey, & Lockwood, 2011; Townsend, DeMarie, & Hendrickson, 1998). Consequently, virtual teams differ from face-to-face teams in that members are physically separated from one another and they rely on technological devices for communication and information exchange (D’Souza & Colarelli, 2010). Virtual teams have become commonplace in large organizations, with one study reporting that 50% of all companies with more than 5000 employees incorporate virtual teams as vehicles for conducting work (Martins, Gilson, & Maynard, 2004). Various issues related to virtual teams have been investigated including effectiveness (Furst, Blackburn, & Rosen, 1999; Maznevski & Chudoba, 2000), trust (Jarvenpaa, Knoll, & Leidner, 1998; Sarker, Valacich, & Sarker, 2003), and adaptation (Majchrzak, Rice, Malhotra, King, & Ba, 2000).

Recent research has begun to examine issues surrounding the selection of virtual team members. A study by D’Souza and Colarelli (2010) found that the skills one brings to a team are a more important selection criteria for virtual team membership than for face-to-face team membership, but that personal characteristics (attractiveness, race, gender, and attitudinal similarity) are more important criteria for selecting face-to-face teams members, as self-reported by team members. What remain unexplored are the factors that predict why someone would want to be a member of a virtual team. The purpose of this study is to fill this gap in the literature on virtual teams.
The two major differences between virtual and face-to-face teams offer insight into this question. Traditional explanations for why people would want to work in a team focus around personal characteristics. Simply put, we prefer working with those who are physically attractive (Patzer, 2006) and/or who are similar to ourselves in terms of race (Wade & Okesola, 2002), gender (Colarelli, Spranger, & Hechanova, 2006) and attitudes (Byrne, 1971). However, since virtual teams do not meet face-to-face, we must look elsewhere for predictors of virtual team preference. The fact that virtual teams rely on computer mediated communication suggests that how one feels about using technology to communicate may play a role in virtual team preference.

Early research on information systems identified personal factors as important determinants of successful IS implementation and adoption (Lucas, 1981). These personal factors were of a dispositional nature and included personality and decision (cognitive) style. Research has looked at the effects of personality (Landers & Lounsbury, 2006; Zmud, 1979) and cognitive style (See Huber (1983), and Robey (1983), for a debate on the role of cognitive style.) as well as on their comparative effects (McElroy, Hendrickson, Townsend, & DeMarie, 2007) on one form of computer mediated communication, Internet use. We build off of this literature by examining the respective roles played by personality and cognitive style as determinants of preference for working in virtual teams.

Personality and cognitive style have already been shown to be important predictors of team member attitudes within the virtual team environment. For example, personality traits have been argued to affect individual trust among team members and willingness to collaborate in virtual teams (Brown, Poole, & Rodgers, 2004) as well as readiness to adopt collaboration technology (Vreede, Vreede, Ashley, & Reiter-Palmon, 2012). Moreover, cognitive style has
also been argued to be a significant predictor of the effectiveness of computer-mediated knowledge sharing among team members (Taylor, 2004).

One avenue which has not yet been explored is the connection between personality and cognitive style, and the relative contribution of both factors towards preference for participating in virtual teams. Our purpose is not to delineate how specific components of personality or cognitive style influence virtual team preference, but rather the collective role played by each of these dispositional factors. Understanding individual preferences for participating in virtual teams is important in that by preemptively selecting or assigning those individuals who prefer working in such teams organizations can minimize resistance and other problems that may occur after virtual team implementation.

BACKGROUND

Personality

Personality is a stable pattern of psychological processes, characteristics, and tendencies arising from motives, feelings, and cognitions which can be used to determine individual commonalities and differences in thoughts, feelings and actions (Maddi, 1989; Mayer, 2005). One way in which personality has been described is in terms of traits. These traits serve as measures of individual dispositions as well as comparative mechanisms of individual differences (Allport, 1966). Various instruments have been developed to measure individuals based on certain specified trait dimensions. Recently, research has shown that several of these measures are related hierarchically with each providing a varying degree of abstractness (Markon, Krueger, & Watson, 2005).
Among the contemporary measures of personality, the Big Five model has proven to be a robust and useful tool for understanding personality among individuals. The Big Five is based on the lexical hypothesis, which posits that socially relevant and salient personality characteristics are embedded in natural language (Allport, 1937; John, Angleitner, & Ostendorf, 1988; Saucier & Goldberg, 1996). The Big Five structure has been extensively tested using disparate samples in various contexts for a number of years, providing substantial evidence of its merits as a measure of individual personality and personality differences (see John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008 for an extensive review of the history of the Big Five factor model).

Within the Big Five, extraversion represents sociability, cheerfulness, and optimism with extraverts seeking out new opportunities and excitement. Neuroticism represents a lack of psychological adjustment with high negative emotional stability. Neurotic individuals are typically fearful, sad, embarrassed, distrustful, and have a difficult time managing stress. Agreeableness represents a tendency to be sympathetic, good-natured, cooperative, and forgiving with highly agreeable people tending to help others more readily. Conscientiousness represents the tendency to be self-disciplined, strong-willed, reliable, and deliberate with conscientious people actively planning, organizing, and carrying out tasks. Openness represents curiosity and willingness to explore new ideas with open individuals tending to devise novel ideas, hold unconventional values, and question authority (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

Recent research has linked personality traits to socio-technical characteristics of virtual teams. For example, personality traits have been argued to affect individual disposition to trust (as it does in face to face teams) and willingness to collaborate in the computer-mediated communication environment used by virtual teams. Research finds that individuals high in affiliation exhibit higher levels of trust in virtual collaboration (Brown et al., 2004).
the five Big Five measures (minus neuroticism) were found to correlate with subjects’ ease of transition to collaboration technologies, with extroversion negatively correlated, while agreeableness, openness, and conscientiousness had a positive correlation with the ease of transition construct (Vreede et al., 2012). Extraversion (from the Big 5 instrument) was found to be related to both the nature of group interactions and to the actual performance of virtual teams. Virtual teams with either high levels of extraversion or high variation in extraversion between team members had less constructive interaction styles within teams (Balthazard, Potter, & Warren, 2004). Personality-based trust was also found to affect overall trusting motives in a virtual team environment (Sarker et al., 2003). Higher levels of extraversion and agreeableness were found to lead to shorter pauses, and therefore greater trust, among virtual team members in technology assisted communication (Kalman, Scissors, & Gergle, 2010). Furthermore, using meta-analysis techniques, team performance was found to be positively affected by all five dimensions in the Big Five model (where emotional stability is utilized as opposed to neuroticism) (Bell, 2007; Mathieu, Maynard, Rapp, & Gilson, 2008).

While none of these studies juxtapose the personality differences between successful face to face and virtual team members, they do underscore that the socio-technical environment of the virtual team is distinct from the face to face team, and that there are personalities that perform better within this distinct environment. Since the personality requirements for a virtual team are demonstrably distinct, an examination of the impact of personality on individual preference for the virtual environment allows us to assess if an individual’s personality profile also directs their disposition toward the virtual work environment. Therefore, we hypothesize:

H1: Personality will explain variation in preference for working in virtual teams.
**Cognitive Style**

Cognitive style refers to a broad range of theory related to information processing and decision-making among individuals (Armstrong, Peterson, & Rayner, 2011; Ausburn & Ausburn, 1978; McElroy et al., 2007; Messick, 1976). There are a number of measures of cognitive style, such as the Kirton Adaption Innovation (KAI) instrument (Kirton, 1989), the Cognitive Style Index (CSI) (Allinson & Hayes, 1996), and the Kolb Learning Style Inventory (KLS) (Smith & Kolb, 1986). The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) is an omnibus instrument used to capture Jung’s (1921) conceptual cognitive style dimensions (Wheeler, Hunton, & Bryant, 2004) and is a (at least partial) theoretical antecedent to the CSI (Allinson & Hayes, 1996), the KAI (Kozhevnikov, 2007), and the KLS (Isaksen, Lauer, & Wilson, 2003). Despite criticism on its psychometric properties (Boyle, 1995; Gardner & Martinko, 1996) and length (Allinson & Hayes, 1996), the MBTI has undergone extensive validity and reliability assessments (Harvey, 1996) and is widely used. The MBTI is designed to measure individual preferences in how people apprehend and process information (Myers, 1995), which lends itself nicely to business environments including decision-based environments such as team-work.

The MBTI consists of four dimensional pairs combining to form 16 possible psychological types. The extraversion/introversion dimension refers to the outward or inward attitudes of the individual with extroverts drawing energy from action while introverts prefer reflection and time alone to reenergize.\(^1\) The sensing/intuition dimension refers to how new

---

\(^1\) Extraversion/introversion as measured by the MBTI is related to the extraversion dimension of the Big Five, but is theoretically distinct. The E/I dimension of the MBTI deals with the degree to which individuals look externally or turn inwardly in seeking out and processing information, while the extraversion factor of the Big Five is a measure of one’s disposition to behave. Note that in the MBTI the construct is Extraversion /Introversion, not extraversion alone as in the Big 5. Costa and McCrae note: “Users familiar with Jungian psychology should note that the conceptualization of extraversion embodied in the NEO PI-R differs in many respects from Jung’s …theory” Costa and McCrae (1992, p. 15). In the NEO PI-R, introversion is characterized as a lack of extraversion, rather than as an end of a dialectic preference set. Moreover, extraversion in the NEO PI-R is a broader concept than the
information is understood and interpreted with sensing individuals preferring concrete, tangible facts while individuals prone towards intuition trust information that is more abstract or theoretical. The thinking/feeling dimension refers to how decisions are made with thinkers employing a more detached, logical perspective while feelers tend to associate or empathize with the situation. Finally, the judging/perception dimension refers to individual preference when relating to decision making and the external world with judgers preferring matters to be settled while perceivers prefer to keep decisions open (Myers & McCaulley, 1985).

Substantial research has linked MBTI measures of cognitive style to decision-making and organizational processes. For example, the MBTI was found to influence the type of ideas in group idea generation (Garfield, Taylor, Dennis, & Satzinger, 2001). The MBTI has also been shown to have a significant impact on overall team project results with extroverted, thinking, judging members showing better overall results (Peslak, 2006). With regards to virtual teams, cognitive style has been shown to have a significant impact on learning effectiveness in virtual environments (Chen & Macredie, 2002). Also, cognitive style has been shown to impact computer-mediated knowledge sharing among organizational team members with analytical thinkers showing higher use of data mining software and knowledge management systems (Taylor, 2004). Finally, in a test of MBTI factors on performance among teams in face to face or computer-mediated communication scenarios, Barkhi (2002) found different cognitive styles were associated with different reactions to the two communication environments.

The above studies suggest that cognitive style has utility as a determinant of various aspects of preferences and abilities relevant to virtual teams, and thus those preferences may affect an individual’s preference for virtual teamwork. Therefore, we hypothesize:

---

extraversion/introversion dimension of the MBTI. It includes not only gregariousness but also warmth, assertiveness, activity, excitement seeking and positive emotions.
H2: Cognitive style will explain variation in preference for working in virtual teams.

Huber’s (1983) debate with Robey (1983) pertaining to the role of cognitive style in the context of technology called for abandoning cognitive style as a determinant of IS design due to the lack of explanatory power. While no research has compared the predictive power of both personality and cognitive style in the context of virtual teams, McElroy et al. (2007) compared the relative contribution of each in the context of on-line shopping behavior, finding personality to have greater explanatory power as compared to cognitive style. In this research we do not examine the specific role of each personality trait or cognitive style type, but instead seek to determine the relative contribution of personality versus cognitive style as antecedents of virtual team preference. Since we are examining subjects’ thoughts and feelings about the virtual team environment, we expect that personality will predict more variance in preference than cognitive style given personality’s usefulness in gauging thoughts, motives, and feelings (Maddi, 1989; Mayer, 2005) as compared to cognitive style which focuses on information processing and decision-making (Armstrong et al., 2011; Ausburn & Ausburn, 1978; Messick, 1976). Thus, we hypothesize:

H3: Personality will explain more variation in preference for working in virtual teams as compared to cognitive style.

DATA COLLECTION

Participants for this research included 153 business students from a variety of majors. Students received a packet containing the questionnaire and were offered a small amount of extra credit for the completion of the survey. Students were asked to complete the questionnaire on their own time outside of class and return it the next week. Those electing not to participate were
simply asked to return the questionnaire blank, and were rewarded the same extra credit as the other students. Of the 153 subjects, 132 answered every question and offered useful data for analysis. Participants were evenly distributed among genders with 52 percent male and 48 percent female.

MEASURES

Control Variable

Given the technological nature of virtual teams, one’s technological background could potentially have a confounding effect on the results of this study. To control for previous individual technological knowledge, a control variable measuring technological background was used. This control variable consisted of one item asking subjects about previous technology courses they had taken, which was used as a proxy for prior technological knowledge.

Personality

Personality was measured in this study using Costa and McCrae’s Revised NEO Personality Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992). This instrument includes the full 240-item questionnaire which describes the individual’s personality according to the Big Five factors. The NEO-PI-R is a widely used instrument whose validity and reliability have been well documented (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Reliability estimates of the items in this study ranged from 0.89 (Agreeableness) to 0.93 (Neuroticism).

Cognitive Style

Cognitive style was measured using the MBTI Form M (Myers & Myers, 1998). We chose the MBTI for this research for several reasons. First, the MBTI focuses on how one makes judgments and arrives at conclusions, which is an important aspect of corporate life and teamwork. Second, other scales such as the CAI, have been shown to correlate highly with the
MBTI (Allinson & Hayes, 1996). Third, the MBTI is popular in industry, and researchers have argued that its wide use by corporations provides more relevance for organizational research (Garfield et al., 2001).

This 93-item instrument uses a forced-choice format where subjects select which of two statements for each item is most applicable. Difference scores were calculated for each subject on the four dimensions of extraversion/introversion, sensing/intuition, thinking/feeling, and judgment/perception, with higher scores indicating preferences for extraversion, sensing, thinking, and judgment. KR-20 estimates of reliability were used, given the dichotomous nature of the scoring, with values ranging from 0.73 for extraversion/introversion to 0.92 for judgment/perception.

**Preference for Working in Virtual Teams**

Given the novelty of the construct, preference for working in virtual teams has not been operationalized in the literature. Traditional measures of group work have involved several measures including preference for group work, group-member satisfaction, and group-member performance (Shaw, Duffy, & Stark, 2000). Preference for group work, however, is the only construct which occurs prior to group work and, as such, has utility in terms of the selection of virtual team members.

In an attempt to measure preference for working in virtual teams, we first looked at the literature for existing measures. We found none but did discover an existing instrument measuring preference for group work over working alone (Shaw et al., 2000). Four items from this scale were adapted to capture preference for working in virtual teams versus working alone and included “When I have a choice, I would rather work in virtual teams than by myself,” “I prefer to work on a virtual team task than on individual tasks,” “Working in a virtual group is
better than working alone,” and “Given the choice, I would rather do a job where I can work alone rather than do a job where I have to work with others in a virtual team” (reverse coded).

While these items measure one’s preference for working in virtual teams over working alone, they do not address the degree to which one would prefer working in virtual versus face-to-face teams. Consequently, four additional items were developed contrasting the degree to which individuals preferred virtual to face-to-face teams and included “I would be as comfortable working on a virtual team as I would a face-to-face team,” “If given the appropriate technology, I can be just as effective working on a virtual team as I can on a face-to-face team,” “I could not feel a part of a team that did not meet face-to-face,” (reverse coded) and “I would participate as easily on a team that used chat rooms, e-mail and conference calls to communicate with my fellow team members as I could in face-to-face discussions.” Preference for working in virtual teams was, therefore, operationalized as a two-faceted construct; preference for virtual teams over working alone and preference for virtual teamwork over face-to-face group work. The model being tested is shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1: Proposed research model.](image-url)
RESULTS

Measurement Model

Given the novelty of the proposed virtual team preference construct and the fact that the preference items contrast preference for working in virtual teams to two different alternatives (i.e., working alone and working in face-to-face teams), a full confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to evaluate the psychometric properties of the purported construct. Multiple fit criteria were used to evaluate the measurement model including the comparative fit index (CFI), the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). Acceptable levels for each included CFI ≥ 0.95, TLI ≥ 0.95, RMSEA ≤ 0.06, and SRMR ≤ 0.08 (Bearden, Netemeyer, & Mobley, 1993; Browne & Cudeck, 1993; Gefen, Straub, & Boudreau, 2000; L. Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kim & Son, 2009; MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996).

The measurement model included the two latent factors measuring the two facets of virtual team preference used in the model. The results from the measurement model revealed excellent fit $[\chi^2(19) = 17.52, p = 0.55, \text{CFI} = 1.00, \text{TLI} = 1.00, \text{RMSEA} = 0.000, \text{SRMR} = 0.028]$. This analysis confirms the existence of two separate dimensions of preference for working in virtual teams. Numerous tests of reliability and validity were used to evaluate the quality of the latent constructs in the measurement model (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Reliability was examined by employing construct reliability using Cronbach’s coefficient alpha and composite reliability. Values for Cronbach’s alpha are above the recommended level of 0.7 with the lowest value being 0.82 (Nunnally, 1978). Composite reliability, a reflection of the impact of error on the measurement scale, is widely utilized in the evaluation of latent variable measurement models (Raykov & Grayson, 2003). All constructs
within the measurement model were found to have a composite reliability well above the recommended cutoff of 0.7, indicating high composite reliability (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Bearden et al., 1993; Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Both convergent and discriminant construct validity were tested using the measurement model. Convergent validity is evaluated using the composite reliability (described above), AVE, and factor loadings of items on their respective latent variables. The AVE measures the amount of variance that a construct captures from its indicators and is recommended to be above 0.5 (Chin, 1998; X. Hu, Lin, Whinston, & Zhang, 2004). In the measurement model, the lowest AVE value is 0.55, which is above the recommended cutoff point. Convergent validity is also assessed by item loadings on latent constructs, with each item loading on their respective latent variable at least 0.6 and ideally 0.7 or above. This indicates that each measure is accounting for 50 percent or more of the variance in the underlying latent variable (Chin, 1998; X. Hu et al., 2004). All factor loadings were found to be above the 0.6 cutoff, with only two items (0.69 and 0.66 respectively) falling below the ideal 0.7 mark, indicating good convergent validity (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006). Discriminant validity was assessed using a derivation of the AVE, namely, the square root of the AVE. The square root value represents the average association of each latent construct to its respective item measures while the corresponding correlation between the constructs indicates the overlap of associations among the latent variables. Thus, if the square root of the AVE is higher than the correlation of that latent construct with the other construct in the measurement model, this indicates that the construct is more closely related to its own measure than to the measures of the other latent construct (Chin, 1998; Gefen & Straub, 2005; Majchrzak, Beath, Lim, & Chin, 2005). The square roots of the AVE values are both much higher than the correlation between the two latent constructs. In
summary, the results from the measurement model demonstrate high reliability as well as high convergent and discriminate construct validity for both preference constructs. Descriptive statistics, along with the validity and reliability measures are shown in Appendix A.

**Research Model**

Two hierarchically nested structural analyses were used to test the three hypotheses, with each of the two analyses containing three nested models. Step one in each of the two analyses consisted of entering the control variable of technological background, providing a baseline from which to test the hypotheses. In step two, either the Big Five personality factors or cognitive style dimensions were entered separately. Finally, the third step added both the Big Five factors and cognitive style dimensions to create an omnibus model. Table 1 shows the results.

**Table 1:** Standardized loadings for personality and cognitive style on virtual two aspects of team preference, controlling for technological background (* p ≤ 0.05, ** p ≤ 0.01, *** p ≤ 0.001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VT Preference over Alone</th>
<th>VT Preference over F2F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality first</td>
<td>Cog Style first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Background</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTI T-F</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTI E-I</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTI S-N</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTI J-P</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first model with only the covariate of technical background freely estimated was initially run and the model was found to have very good fit [$\chi^2(97) = 116.58, p = 0.09, CFI = 0.97, TLI = 0.97, RMSEA = 0.039, SRMR = 0.076$]. Next, allowing personality to be freely estimated revealed an excellent fitting model [$\chi^2(87) = 96.69, p = 0.22, CFI = 0.99, TLI = 0.98, RMSEA = 0.029, SRMR = 0.051$] which fit significantly better than the initial covariate only
model $[\Delta \chi^2(10) = 19.89, p < 0.05]$. In this model, personality explained a significant amount of variance in virtual team preference over face-to-face teamwork ($R^2 = 0.13, p < 0.05$), but was not a significant predictor of preference for working in virtual teams over working alone. Consequently, H1 received only partial support. Allowing cognitive style to be freely estimated in the second model also produced an excellent fitting model $[\chi^2(89) = 93.90, p = 0.34, \text{CFI} = 0.99, \text{TLI} = 0.99, \text{RMSEA} = 0.020, \text{SRMR} = 0.059]$ which fit significantly better than the initial model with only the covariate $[\Delta \chi^2(8) = 22.68, p < 0.05]$. This cognitive style-only model explained a significant amount of variance in virtual team preference over working alone ($R^2 = 0.11, p < 0.05$), but not over face-to-face teamwork. Thus, H2 was partially supported. Taken together, these results suggest that both personality and cognitive style are important predictors of preference for virtual teamwork, but that they differentially affect the two facets.

A closer look at the individual dimensions of personality and cognitive style reveals that openness to new experiences ($\beta = 0.33, p < 0.001$) is the driver behind the significant effect for personality on preference for virtual teams over face-to-face, while both the thinking/feeling ($\beta = 0.18, p < 0.05$) and the judging/perceiving ($\beta = 0.22, p < 0.05$) dimensions of cognitive style are the significant predictors of virtual team preference over working alone. The finding that the extraversion/introversion ($\beta = -0.19, p < 0.05$) dimension of cognitive style significantly predicts virtual team preference over face-to-face groups is discounted by the fact that cognitive style as a whole failed to add significantly to the model.

The inclusion of both personality and cognitive style separately as freely estimated parameters (Step 3, Table 1) significantly improved model fit $[\Delta \chi^2(8) = 27.14, p < 0.05$ and $\Delta \chi^2(10) = 24.35, p < 0.05$, respectively]. Moreover, when both personality and cognitive style are entered into the model, the ability to predict preference for working in virtual teams was
significantly increased over the ability of either one alone. This finding, which applies to both dimensions of virtual team preference, suggests a lack of support for H3.

**DISCUSSION**

For this research, a theoretical construct of virtual team preference was operationalized based on previous research and accepted measures of face-to-face team research. Two facets of virtual team preference, preference for working in virtual teams over alone and preference for working in virtual teams over face-to-face, were measured. A thorough psychometric analysis indicates that these two facets hold very well and show excellent validity and reliability. In fact, we believe that our virtual team preference construct offers promise for future research analyzing individual preparedness for virtual team work.

The results of our research show that both personality and cognitive style predict aspects of virtual team preference. The overall model fit demonstrates that both cognitive style and personality provide significant improvements in predictive capacity for understanding individual preference to participate in virtual teams and can be used to assess individual preference prior to implementation of such work teams.

The results also show that personality and cognitive style predict the two aspects of virtual team preference differently. First, personality explains a significant amount of variance (ten percent) above that explained by one’s technical background in preference for working in virtual over face-to-face teams. This finding is primarily due to the effect of openness. Open individuals may perceive virtual team environments as a way to explore new ideas within a nontraditional team environment, thereby leading to an easier transition to using such technology (Vreede et al., 2012). Second, cognitive style explains a similar amount of variance (eight
percent) in preference for working in virtual teams over working alone, a finding resulting from
the roles played by the thinking/feeling and the judging/perceiving dimensions. Given the more
detached nature of thinkers, the separated nature of the online environment may be preferential.
Also, judgers may perceive the online environment as less accommodating for drawn-out team
discussions, leading to decisions which are more quickly finalized with better overall results
(Peslak, 2006).

It is significant to note that both personality and cognitive style provide a meaningful
explanation of two distinct but critical aspects of virtual teamwork preference. This research
suggests that if the issue at hand requires a team approach, then the openness to new experience
personality factor will indicate those more likely to prefer a virtual team environment over face-
to-face. On the other hand, cognitive style predicts virtual team preference over working alone
because of its focus on information processing and decision making. The decision process used
in a team situation will vary greatly from individual decision making. Thus the use of cognitive
style to assess virtual team preference will be most effective when individuals have the choice of
either a team-based or individual work process. Given the added value of both personality and
cognitive style, a combined model offered even greater predictive power by explaining 19 and 23
percent of the variance in the two aspects of virtual team preference respectively.

One purpose of this research was to comparatively test personality and cognitive style as
predictors of virtual team preference. In contrast to earlier research in a technology-based
environment (McElroy et al., 2007), both personality and cognitive style offer significant model
fit with regard to virtual team preference, albeit with respect to different dimensions. This
argues for a dual approach to the study of virtual team preference using both personality and
cognitive style as each shows different relative strengths in predicting our two dimensions of preference for virtual work.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE WORK

This research specifically tests the predictive power of personality and cognitive style on virtual team preference. One limitation of the study is that we focused our work on preference for working in virtual teams rather than what aspects of the virtual team environment potential members might find appealing or repelling. Future research could address the role of personality and cognitive style on individual preferences for specific aspects of the virtual team environment. Because we focused on preference for working in virtual teams, we did not contrast the effects of personality and cognitive style on preference for working in face-to-face groups. Future research using a more complete design could determine whether the personality and cognitive style effects found here for preference in virtual teams also apply to preference for working in face-to-face teams. In addition, other personal factors may be useful in predicting virtual team preference and other methods for measuring personality and cognitive style may produce different results. Personality has also been shown to have various levels of abstraction (Markon et al., 2005) with varying trait levels having different predictive outcomes. Future research should investigate whether the Big Five aggregations offer optimal predictive capacity or whether less broad dimensions are better at predicting virtual team preference as has been suggested in previous research (George, 1992). Also, future research should investigate the impact of personality and cognitive style on other aspects of virtual team use beyond initial preference including during and after implementation of such work teams. It would also be prudent to examine the effect of past experiences in working in virtual teams. Finally, our study
looked only at preference for working in virtual teams. Preference is a far cry from performance. Future research should examine whether preference for working in virtual teams is a determinant of the actual performance of those teams.

The survey method used may also provide some limitations for this research. The data in this study were self-reported at a single point in time. Future research should investigate other methods of reporting as well as longitudinal approaches to data collection. While the student population in this sample represents a population likely to be influenced by virtual teams, student samples can be problematic when generalizing to the workforce at large. Also, given students’ above average Internet and technology usage, this research may provide a bias which may not apply as readily to other individuals who are not as technologically literate.

CONCLUSION

This research adds to the extant literature in two significant ways. First, we offer a validated operationalization of a construct central to research concerning virtual teamwork, virtual team preference. This two dimensional latent construct should prove valuable to future research that attempts to explain varying levels of performance in virtual team environments. Second, we have shown that two widely used frameworks, personality and cognitive style, have utility in identifying those most likely to prefer virtual teamwork. Both have explanatory power when used in concert with each other, and need not be posed as an either or choice in future research. However, depending on whether the nature of the structural problem to be solved is one of virtual teams versus face-to-face teams or whether it is virtual teamwork versus individual efforts, either personality or cognitive style will offer insight. In either case, this study offers a first step in understanding why some people prefer working in virtual teams while others don’t.
Knowing this in advance of virtual teamwork can go a long way toward alleviating problems associated with virtual teamwork.
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| VT Pref  | Mean  | Std. Dev | Alpha | CR   | AVE over Alone | AVE over F2F | Agreeableness | Conscientiousness | Extraversion | Neuroticism | Openness | Thinking | Extraversion | Sensing | Judging |
|----------|-------|----------|-------|------|--------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|---------|---------|
| E        | 3.04  | 0.98     | 0.90  | 0.05 | -            | -            | -             | -              | -           | -           | -        | -        | -        | -        | -         | -       |
| O        | 3.33  | 0.62     | 0.97  | 0.42 | 0.76         | -            | -             | -              | -           | -           | -        | -        | -        | -        | -         | -       |
| N        | 115.13| 20.99    | 0.88  | 0.78 | -            | -            | -             | -              | -           | -           | -        | -        | -        | -        | -         | -       |
| S        | 125.54| 21.56    | 0.92  | 0.48 | -            | -            | -             | -              | -           | -           | -        | -        | -        | -        | -         | -       |
| T        | 118.58| 23.08    | 0.92  | 0.48 | -            | -            | -             | -              | -           | -           | -        | -        | -        | -        | -         | -       |
| F        | 85.01 | 24.46    | 0.94  | 0.48 | -            | -            | -             | -              | -           | -           | -        | -        | -        | -        | -         | -       |
| J        | 114.05| 22.37    | 0.92  | 0.48 | -            | -            | -             | -              | -           | -           | -        | -        | -        | -        | -         | -       |
| E        | 2.28  | 12.49    | 0.74  | 0.48 | -            | -            | -             | -              | -           | -           | -        | -        | -        | -        | -         | -       |
| O        | 0.19  | 13.96    | 0.74  | 0.48 | -            | -            | -             | -              | -           | -           | -        | -        | -        | -        | -         | -       |
| N        | 5.45  | 12.83    | 0.92  | -    | -            | -            | -             | -              | -           | -           | -        | -        | -        | -        | -         | -       |
| S        | 0.01  | 13.51    | 0.54  | 0.48 | -            | -            | -             | -              | -           | -           | -        | -        | -        | -        | -         | -       |
| T        | 5.45  | 12.83    | 0.92  | -    | -            | -            | -             | -              | -           | -           | -        | -        | -        | -        | -         | -       |
| F        | 0.01  | 13.51    | 0.54  | 0.48 | -            | -            | -             | -              | -           | -           | -        | -        | -        | -        | -         | -       |

Means, standard deviations, Cronbach’s alpha, composite reliability (CR), average variance extracted (AVE), and correlations (with square root of AVE along the diagonal for the two latent variables)
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ABSTRACT

In the USA, the number of students entering into and completing degrees in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) areas has declined significantly over the past decade. While the past four years has shown modest increases in enrollments in computer-related majors, the prediction is that even in three to four years when these students graduate there will be shortages of computer-related professionals for industry. The challenge this paper focuses on is attracting students to select an information technology (IT) field such as computer science, computer engineering, software engineering, or information systems as a major when many high schools do not offer a single computer course and high school counselors, families, and friends do not provide students with accurate information about the field. Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) has been used extensively within counseling and career psychology as a method for understanding how individuals develop vocational interests, make occupational choices, and achieve success within their chosen field. In this paper the SCCT model identifies factors which specifically influence high school students to select a major in an IT-related discipline. These factors can then be used...
to develop new or enhance existing IT-related activities for high school students. The paper demonstrates that both interest and outcome expectations have a significant positive impact on choice to major. Interest also is found to mediate the effects of self-efficacy and outcome expectations on intent to major. Overall the model predicts a good portion of variance in the ultimate outcome of whether or not an individual chooses to major in IT.
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INTRODUCTION

In the USA, the number of students entering into and completing degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) areas has declined significantly over the past decade (Aasheim, Li, & Williams, 2009; Aken & Michalisin, 2007; Granger, Dick, Jacobson, & Slyke, 2007; Patterson, 2005; Pollacia & Russell, 2007; Riemenschneider, Armstrong, & Moore, 2009; Vegso, 2005). A recent NAE report (Committee on Prospering in the Global Economy of the 21st Century: An Agenda for American Science and Technology, National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, & Institute of Medicine, 2007) noted that in addition to a declining number of students studying areas of basic scientific knowledge, the country is not producing enough professionals and skilled labor to apply technology in industry. The traditional computer-related college graduates with majors such as Computer Engineering, Computer Science, Information Systems, and Software Engineering are no exception to this large, overarching trend. The bottoming out of student enrollment in Computer Science and Computer Engineering was documented in 2007 by Computer Research Association. Even with increases over the past four years (Zweben,
2012), enrollment will in no way offset the anticipated shortages of computer-related professionals for industry; as expanded growth within the computing industry is expected to continue through 2018 ("Bureau of Labor Statistics," 2010).

The challenge the discipline faces involves attracting students to select an information technology (IT)\(^2\) field as a major when many high schools do not offer a single computer course (Wilson, Sudol, Stephenson, & Stehlik, 2010) and high school counselors, families, and friends do not provide students with accurate information about the field (Babin, Grant, & Sawal, 2008; Huang, Greene, & Day, 2008; Lomerson & Pollacia, 2006a, 2006b). Without coursework or career counseling options to help students make their decisions, we are challenged to find other ways high school students can be encouraged to major in an IT-related discipline.

This paper uses the Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) to identify factors which specifically influence high school students to select a major in an IT-related discipline. Historically, SCCT has been used extensively within counseling and career psychology as a method for understanding how individuals develop vocational interests, make occupational

\(^2\) We understand in the strictest definition IT means the study, design, development, application, implementation, support, or management of computer-based information systems. However, in this paper, the term IT is used as a broad umbrella category when introducing the possible areas of inquiry to novice high school students participating in the IT-Adventures program. The IT-Adventures program is a highly successful high school outreach program developed and delivered by Iowa State University (Rursch, Luse, & Jacobson, 2010) that uses extracurricular clubs and events to increase student interest in IT. Students could explore one, two, or three different technologies in the year-long, inquiry-based learning program. The entire program, as well as the culminating capstone competitive event, is run with an intramural sports flavor where every student is welcome to participate and learn, rather than a varsity sport where students have to already be very good at a specific skill set to participate. Most of the current competitions for students in IT are varsity sports. Because the program was stressing the inclusiveness of all students, not just exclusiveness of the elitist few who already are interested in IT, it was necessary to find an overarching word to be the placeholder to introduce students to disciplines such as Computer Engineering, Computer Science, Information Systems, and Software Engineering. By using the intramural, inclusive approach, IT-Adventures strives to allow high school students to explore and consider a career in an IT-related area without any prior knowledge. The model presented in this paper demonstrates influences on choice of IT-related major and those influences can then be used to modify or enhance the high school outreach program, such as the one used here as the study population for this research.
choices, and achieve success within their chosen field (Lent, 2005). However, previous research conducted on SCCT uses college students who have already chosen which major they will pursue, which can confound the results. This research provides novel contribution in three distinct ways. First, this paper provides a highly detailed exposition of the SCCT model. Second, by utilizing a sample of high school students, this paper demonstrates that SCCT can be used to better understand those aspects which drive the decision of high school students to major in IT. Finally, this paper provides a valuable discussion of high school outreach programs that build self-efficacy, interest, and outcome expectations in IT.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Social Cognitive Career Theory

Career development research has produced a number of theories which aim to explain the career decisions of individuals and also to aid career counselors in assisting in career related problems. Several theories have been developed including the learning theory of careers counseling (Krumboltz, Mitchell, & Jones, 1976; Mitchell & Krumbolt, 1996; Mitchell & Krumboltz, 1990), a developmental-contextual approach to career development (Vondracek, 2001; Vondracek, Lerner, & Schulenberg, 1986), the psychological theory of work adjustment (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984), the theory of career choice – RIASEC (Holland, 1959, 1997), and the life-span, life-space theory (Super, 1957, 1981, 1990). Research has suggested that it may be beneficial to the field of career counseling to consolidate these explanations of career choice and development by…
(a) bringing together conceptually related constructs (e.g., self-concept, self-efficacy),
(b) more fully explaining outcomes that are common to a number of career theories
(e.g., satisfaction, stability), and (c) account for the relations among seemingly
diverse constructs (e.g., self-efficacy, interests, abilities, needs) (Hackett & Lent,

Social cognitive career theory (SCCT) (Lent, 2005; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994) is
an effort to provide an overarching integration of previous theories in career counseling.
Bandura’s social cognitive theory (1986) is utilized as the primary foundation for the theory,
which explores the complex ways in which people, behavior, and environmental
surroundings jointly influence one another. SCCT recognizes the capacity for individuals to
direct their own vocational behavior while also acknowledging personal and environmental
influences that may strengthen, weaken, or negate human agency in career development.

SCCT explores how people (1) develop vocational interests, (2) make occupational
choices, and (3) achieve career-related performance goals. To this end, the SCCT theoretical
framework consists of three segmental models (Lent, 2005). The Interest Model explores the
development of academic and career interests investigating aspects of home, educational,
recreational, and peer environments and how they affect interest in a certain vocational area
(Lent, 2005). The Choice Model deals with the formation of educational and vocational
choices. This model consists of the (1) expression of career choice as derived from career
interests, (2) actions designed to implement this choice (such as participating in training
programs or choosing a particular major), and (3) subsequent performance achievements
(Lent et al., 1994). The Performance Model can be used to help explain achievements related
to goals which have been selected or adopted (Lent et al., 1994). This model is helpful in
explaining the level of attainment achieved by individuals and the degree of persistence at a
particular task or career path, primarily when obstacles are encountered (Lent, 2005). Lent,
et al. (2008) investigated SCCT in the context of collegiate interest and choice in the computing disciplines and showed support for the model while Smith used SCCT in the context of IT academic performance for undergraduate students (Smith, 2002). A partial examination of the SCCT model was conducted by (Heinze & Hu, 2009), as well as a supplemental model by (Akbulut-Bailey, 2011) in which social supports are included.

One limitation of all the previous SCCT research concerns the samples used. The examples above use college students to test the model. The problem is that many students have already formed their interests and intentions to major in a certain discipline by this time in their academic career. One notable exception is work done by Fouad and Smith (1996), who utilized SCCT to investigate interest of middle-school students in math and science. Their analysis provided support for the relationships proposed in SCCT with strong support for indirect paths within the model. With this exception in mind, the problem remains that much more research needs to be conducted to test the SCCT model on students before they are in college, while they are still forming their interests in possible areas to major.

The SCCT model utilizes three overarching person-centric variables to measure career development: self-efficacy beliefs, outcome expectations, and individual interest. The Choice Model within SCCT utilizes these constructs to help determine the likelihood of an individual majoring in a particular area and is the model used for this paper.

**Self-Efficacy**

Self-efficacy has been extensively researched in various disciplines as a method for measuring a person’s ability to perform a specific task. Self-efficacy says that successful task completion is not only dependent on skills, but on a dynamic set of self-beliefs of an
individual’s ability to perform tasks (Bandura, 1986) or activities in particular domains (Lent, 2005). Self-efficacy can be influenced by four primary sources:

1. Personal performance accomplishments (enactive mastery)
2. Vicarious learning
3. Social persuasion
4. Physiological and affective states (Bandura, 1997).

Enactive mastery offers the most influence over self-efficacy in a particular domain (Bandura, 1986) because it enables hands-on interaction within a particular area which, if done correctly, allows the individual to experience personal success with completing the task (Scheibe, Mennecke, & Luse, 2007). Repeated experiences of success within a particular domain raise the individual’s self-efficacy with regard to the task.

Measuring self-efficacy within information systems has received a large amount of research. One of the first, and most popular, metrics for measuring computer self-efficacy was proposed by Compeau and Higgins (1995b). This research popularized the notion that one overarching, general measure of computer self-efficacy can be used to measure the entire area of information systems. Later research has drawn serious doubts on an omnibus model of general computer self-efficacy. Research has called for task-specific computer self-efficacy to measure personal self-efficacy within a particular domain area within information systems (Agarwal, Sambamurthy, & Stair, 2000; Johnson & Marakas, 2000; Marakas, Johnson, & Clay, 2007). This requires the researcher to develop self-efficacy measures for the specific area which they are studying (i.e. internet, database, etc.).

While research points towards specific computer self-efficacy as more valid and reliable, a method for measuring general computer self-efficacy is still very attractive.
Marakas, et al. point out that general computer self-efficacy can be thought of as an aggregated, weighted collection of multiple task-specific computer self-efficacy measures (2007). Using this method, a researcher could develop multiple measures of task-specific self-efficacy for the specific computing areas under study and combine these separate measures into one omnibus measure of general self-efficacy in the area.

**Outcome Expectations**

Outcome expectations refer to an individual’s beliefs about consequences of performing a certain behavior (Lent, 2005). While self-efficacy deals with an individual’s capabilities, outcome expectations consist of anticipated consequences of particular actions. Bandura describes several classes of outcome expectations including anticipation of physical (e.g. monetary), social (e.g. approval), and self-evaluation (e.g. self-satisfaction) expectations (1986; Lent et al., 1994).

Individuals can develop outcome expectations related to particular career paths through both direct and vicarious learning experiences (Bandura, 1986; Lent, 2005). For example, an individual may decide to pursue math as a major due to past success in the area while another female student may choose not to pursue a major in IT due to secondhand knowledge from others that IT is not for women. As these examples portray, self-efficacy beliefs can have either a positive or negative impact on outcome expectations. Self-efficacy can especially affect outcome expectations when the activity is tied to performance quality as individuals expect more favorable outcomes when performing tasks at which they feel confident (Lent, 2005).

Outcome expectations have been explored within IT quite extensively. For example, they have been used to predict performance. Szajna and Scamell (1993) found an association
between the realism of user outcome expectations and their perceptions of an IT, but not their performance with the same IT. Similarly, Compeau and Higgins found a strong negative effect between outcome expectations and performance (1995a). Studies have also shown a link between self-efficacy and outcome expectations, with user outcome expectations changing as they become more familiar with a particular IT technology (Mathieson, 1991). Utilization of knowledge sharing systems have also been shown to depend both on the knowledge and perceived understanding of the system (i.e. self-efficacy) and the outcome expectations of using the system (Bock & Kim, 2002; Bock, Zmud, Kim, & Lee, 2005).

Outcome expectations play an important role for individuals when deciding to major in IT. Given the research above, it can be hypothesized that an individual’s self-efficacy with regard to IT will have an impact on their outcome expectations with regard to majoring in IT. Taking this all together and considering the nature of the high school student population used for this study (described in greater detail in the Methodology section), the following hypothesis is given.

\[ H1: \text{The greater the IT self-efficacy, the higher the outcome expectations towards IT.} \]

**Interest**

Interests describe those subjects or activities which we enjoy. Strong states “…an interest may be defined as a liking/disliking state of mind accompanying the doing of an activity, or the thought of performing the activity” (1943). He goes on to explain that interests do not have to be consciously thought about, but instead resemble tropisms where an individual is attracted to liked activities and repelled from disliked activities (Strong, 1943). These interests are relatively stable psychological characteristics of individuals (Lowman, 2003) and may cover both occupational, as well as leisure and vocational interests,
from which an individual might find enjoyment (Weiner, Freedheim, Graham, & Naglieri, 2003).

There are many different instruments used to measure individual interest in a particular activity. Probably the most well-known interest assessment instrument was developed by Strong (Campbell, 1971; 1926, 1943). The current Strong Inventory (Hansen, 2000; Harmon & Borgen, 1995; Harmon, Hansen, Borgen, & Hammer, 1994) consists of scales to measure both occupational interest and basic interest, as well as personality related scales which are grouped in line with Holland’s Big Five personality types (Holland, 1997; Lindley & Borgen, 2000). Other interest assessment instruments include the Campbell Interest and Skill Survey (Campbell, 1995), the Kuder Occupational Interest Survey (Diamond & Zytowski, 2000; Kuder & Zytowski, 1991), the Unisex Edition of the ACT Interest Inventory (Prediger & Swaney, 1995), and many others. The overarching purpose of all these interest inventories is to assist individuals in identifying career paths which fit with their particular interests.

Interest in IT is a fairly recent phenomenon. Liao, Armstrong, and Rounds developed individual measures for different vocational areas to measure interest in each particular area (Liao, Armstrong, & Rounds, 2008). Their argument is that interest measures should be an ongoing endeavor which changes with the times and the various areas of interest available. Also, the public domain basic interest markers are provided free for use as opposed to the Strong and others which are proprietary material. One of the interest measures developed is in the area of information technology (Liao et al., 2008).

The social learning approach to interest development assumes interests are derived from reinforcements such as parents, educators, or other environmental stimuli (Mitchell &
Krumboltz, 1990). Theories within this approach assume that individuals develop interest in those things they are good at, or believe they are good at, and become disinterested in those things which they do not believe they are good at (Weiner et al., 2003). Given this information we hypothesize

\[ H2: \text{ The greater the IT self-efficacy, the higher the interest in IT.} \]

Bandura claims that interests come not only from self-efficacy but from outcome expectations (1986). Outcome expectations have also been hypothesized to influence career-related interests both positively and negatively through a pattern of likes and dislikes (Lent, 2005). SCCT maintains that outcome expectations are one of two pieces which influence an individual’s interest in a particular career-related area (Lent et al., 1994; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 2000; Lent, Brown, et al., 2005). Given this background, we hypothesize

\[ H3: \text{ The higher the outcome expectations towards IT, the greater the interest in IT.} \]

**Major in Information Technology**

As discussed above, the SCCT model is comprised of three separate sub-models: the interest model, the choice model, and the performance model. Each of these models has a different outcome variable based on what is being measured. Given the enrollment crisis currently in effect, the choice to major in IT was the outcome desired, yet raising interest in IT remained a secondary interest in the study. The SCCT choice model allowed for investigation of both interest and major choice in one model providing the best metric for utilization in our study.

Self-efficacy in an area has been theorized to be among the most important determinants of thought and action with regard to the activities that individuals pursue (Bandura, 1986). These beliefs in personal ability to perform a particular task is one of the
most central and pervasive mechanisms of personal agency (Bandura, 1989). Regarding vocational pursuits, self-efficacy has been found to be predictive of both academic and career-related choice as well as performance (Hackett & Betz, 1981; Hackett & Lent, 1992; Multon, Brown, & Lent, 1991; Sadri & Robertson, 1993). Research has shown that there is a link between computer self-efficacy beliefs and choices regarding future endeavors in the area. Those individuals with higher levels of computer self-efficacy may perceive themselves as being able to accomplish more difficult computing tasks (Compeau & Higgins, 1995b) which could lead to greater probability of pursuing a career in the area. Hill et al. found evidence of a relationship between self-efficacy and registration in university computer courses (1987). Perceived self-efficacy has also been shown to be an important consideration in determining computer interest, use, and course enrollment, especially when considering gender differences (Miura, 1987). Also, a correlation has been found between higher computer self-efficacy scores and choice of IT as a major (Heinze & Hu, 2009).

Given this information, we hypothesize

*H4: The greater the IT self-efficacy, the more likely an individual will major in IT.*

Outcome expectations are constructed by individuals pertaining to environmental conditions, which influences the actions which are taken (Bandura, 1986). Individuals adapt their behavior to achieve “positive” outcomes and avoid “negative” outcomes which are determined by the individual’s outcome expectations (Bandura, 2001). Given this information, it is likely that an individual will pursue those vocational endeavors which they perceive as having positive outcomes in their lives. Also, outcome expectations about future employment have been shown to strongly influence college major (Berger, 1988; Farley & Staniec, 2004; Felton, Buhr, & Northey, 1994).
Research within information systems has shown a strong link between user outcome expectations and future actions and outcomes. For example, user outcome expectations have been shown to be related to actual system use (DeSanctis, 1983). User outcome expectations have also been shown to be significantly related to user attitudes and use of the system as well as explain the success or failure of the system (Ginzberg, 1981). Other research has found a negative relationship between outcome expectations and future performance when utilizing an information system (Compeau & Higgins, 1995a). This research implies that while positive outcome expectations may lead to greater future utilization and success, negative outcome expectations could result in the opposite. Given this research, we hypothesize

\[ H5: \text{The higher the outcome expectations towards IT, the more likely an individual will choose to major in IT.} \]

Interests, along with self-efficacy and outcome expectations, have been shown to encourage intentions, future goals, and involvement in a particular area (Lent, 2005). An individual’s interests orients them towards choices and options which will allow them to pursue these interests (Lent, 2005; Spokane & Cruza-Guet, 2005). These interests push an individual to pursue the career path which aligns with their particular interests (Lent, 2005). Furthermore, interests have been shown to become fairly stable in late adolescence or early adulthood (Hansen, 2005). This strengthens the argument for positively influencing these interests before college which is the purpose of this research.

Interest is a strong indicator of future major or career-related goals with regard to IT. Research has shown that interest in related areas, such as computer gaming, causes students to major in computing-related disciplines (Carter, 2006). Also, interest in specific study
areas, such as math and science, has been shown to be related to a future major in IT (Babin et al., 2008). Personal interests in computing technology have also been shown to lead to a future major in the area (Akbulut, Looney, & Motwani, 2008; D. Kim, Markham, & Cangelosi, 2002; Malgwi, Howe, & Burnaby, 2005; McInerney, DiDonato, Giagnacova, & O'Donnell, 2006; Zhang, 2007). This implies that by spurring interest in computer-related areas, an individual will be more likely to major in a computer-related area in the future.

Given this information, we hypothesize

\[ H6: \] The greater the interest in IT, the more likely an individual will major in IT.

Figure 1 shows the SCCT research model with hypotheses delineated.

![Figure 1. Hypothesized research model.](image)

**METHODOLOGY**

Subjects for this study were participants in a year-long, statewide high school IT outreach program called IT-Adventures organized by Iowa State University. The target audience for the high school outreach program is those students who previously have not exhibited an interest in studying information technology (IT). There are already programs
available in IT-related areas such as the Lego First Tech Challenge and the Cyber Patriot Games where students who have IT knowledge and experience can gain more knowledge and can compete in these sponsored events. These programs and the students they attract are comparable to varsity athletes competing in a varsity sport where students need to be very good to be able to participate. Instead, our high school outreach program’s approach is modeled after an intramural or recreational sport. Through this delivery method, our goal is to enable every student to have an opportunity to explore IT and consider it as a career choice, not just the ones who already excel in mathematics and science in the classroom. This wide exposure is relevant to this research as these students were all in high school and had not yet entered college and/or declared a major. Furthermore, the limited applied knowledge in the area increases the generalizability of the sample.

The IT-Adventures high school outreach program combines educational programming, competitive events, and service learning projects to engage students in learning significant IT content. The underlying tenet of the program is through increasing understanding of and excitement for IT at the high school level, the authors can increase the number of students enrolling in IT-related programs at post-secondary institutions and increase the number of graduates who will fill future IT needs. A secondary and arguably as worthy goal is to make the whole experience fun, just as intramural sports participation is.

In the fall of each year all schools within the state were contacted about the program. Those schools interested could sign up to participate in any or all of three content areas: cyber defense, game design, and robotics. Extracurricular IT clubs which allow students to study one, two, or all three venues are formed by high schools in the fall of the academic year. Students spend the year using the learning materials provided by the program, asking
their own questions about the content areas, exploring additional resources, and determining how to solve the challenges presented to them. The capstone event for students who participate in the high school outreach program is a two-day competition called the IT-Olympics held in April of each year. Students showcase the IT knowledge they gained during the past year by exhibiting a primary challenge solution they have worked on prior to the event, undertaking real-time challenges that are introduced during the competition, and making presentations about their clubs’ IT-related community service projects.

Students were solicited by email to participate in the study during the fall of the school year just after they had signed up for the program and their emails had been registered by their advisors. Permission to participate in the survey was handled by each advisor, who received permission from the student’s parent or guardian. By surveying the students before the start of the program, this allowed for a cross-section of individuals who had not yet been introduced to the program, so the study could be a measure of initial student assessment without effects of the program confounding the results. The survey was offered online by providing students with a link to the survey sent in the solicitation email. Those who filled out the survey were entered into a drawing for an MP3 music player. The questions were measured on a Likert scale from 1 to 7 and can be viewed in Table 1.

In total, 309 students completed the survey online (a response rate of 30%). These students represented 40 different high schools from across the state. From among the students, 31% were seniors (i.e. fourth year of high school), 30% juniors, 24% sophomores, and 15% freshman (i.e. first year of high school). Also, 83% of the respondents were male while the remaining 17% were female. While it seems the female population is under represented in this survey, the female population in computer engineering and computer
science is under 12% nationwide (Zweben, 2012). Most respondents described themselves as Caucasian (92%) which is not unanticipated since the population of Iowa is only 7% non-white. 95% of the sample showed some intent to go to either a two or four-year college upon graduation.

Table 1. Survey Questionnaire Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT Self-Efficacy: designed after recommendations from (Johnson &amp; Marakas, 2000; Marakas et al., 2007)</th>
<th>questions 1-3: network computer self-efficacy; 4-6: game-design computer self-efficacy; 7-9: robotics computer self-efficacy measured from 1 (not at all confident) to 7 (totally confident)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I believe I have the ability to effectively setup an enterprise email server.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I believe I have the ability to administer group permissions in an enterprise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I believe I have the ability to modify the configuration of a web server.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I believe I have the ability to design an interactive user interface.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I believe I have the ability to program for effective user interaction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I believe I have the ability to program stimulating game logic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I believe I have the ability to successfully construct the physical structure of a machine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I believe I have the ability to fine-tune gear ratios for a mechanical device.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I believe I have the ability to use available parts to accomplish a task.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Expectations: (Cherry, 1975; Lent et al., 2008)</th>
<th>measured from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. My chosen career path will allow me to earn a good salary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My chosen career path will keep me intellectually motivated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. There will be good chances for promotion in my chosen career path.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. There will be many opportunities for employment in my chosen career path.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in IT: adapted from (Liao et al., 2008)</th>
<th>measured from 1 (strongly dislike) to 7 (strongly like)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Maintaining hardware and software for my family and/or friends’ computer(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Keeping up-to-date on the latest software</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Researching components and building my own computer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Improving computer performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Installing a new computer system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intention to Major in IT</th>
<th>measured from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. I intend to major in an IT related discipline upon entering college.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

Measurement Model

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to evaluate the psychometric properties of the latent variables in the model; those variables which are not directly measured but are inferred from other variable measurements. Multiple fit criteria were used to evaluate the measurement model including the comparative fit index (CFI), the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). Acceptable levels for each are CFI ≥ 0.95, TLI ≥ 0.95, RMSEA ≤ 0.06, and SRMR ≤ 0.08 (Bearden, Netemeyer, & Mobley, 1993; Browne & Cudeck, 1993; Gefen, Straub, & Boudreau, 2000; L. Hu & Bentler, 1999; S. S. Kim & Son, 2009; MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996).

The measurement model included all the latent factors used in the research including the three subfactors of IT self-efficacy (cyber, game design, and robotics), outcome expectations, and interest. The second-order factor of IT self-efficacy was not estimated directly in the measurement model, but the three subfactors were instead extracted and correlated with the other latent variables in the model as directed by previous research (Bagozzi & Heatherton, 1994). The fit results from the measurement model had good fit $[\chi^2(124) = 211.79, \ p < 0.001, \ CFI = 0.97, \ TLI = 0.97, \ RMSEA = 0.048, \ SRMR = 0.041]$. The means, standard deviations, Cronbach’s alpha, composite reliabilities, average variance extracted (AVE), and correlations are given in Table 2.
Several tests of reliability and validity were used to evaluate the quality of the measurement model (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Two measures of reliability were examined including construct reliability using Cronbach’s coefficient alpha and composite reliability. Values for Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were all above the recommended level of 0.7 (Nunnally, 1978) with the lowest value being 0.85. Composite reliability reflects the impact of error on the measurement scale and is widely used in SEM validity checks (Raykov & Grayson, 2003). All constructs in the measurement model had a composite reliability well above the recommended cutoff of 0.7 (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Bearden et al., 1993; Fornell & Larcker, 1981), indicating high composite reliability.

Construct validity, including both convergent and discriminant, was also tested using the measurement model. Convergent validity is evaluated using the composite reliability (above), AVE, and the standardized factor loadings of the latent variable indicators. The AVE measures the amount of variance that a construct captures from its indicators (Chin, 1998) and is recommended to be greater than 0.50 (Chin, 1998; X. Hu, Lin, Whinston, & Zhang, 2004). The lowest AVE value in the measurement model was 0.58, above the recommended cutoff point. Another technique for measuring convergent validity is that most loadings of items on each latent variable should be at least 0.60 and ideally 0.7 or above, which indicates that each measure is accounting for 50 percent or more of the variance of the underlying latent variable (Chin, 1998). All items loaded on their respective latent variable at

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>ITSE Cyber</th>
<th>ITSE Game</th>
<th>ITSE Robotics</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSE Cyber</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.88 [CI=0.86,0.91]</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSE Game</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.90 [CI=0.88,0.92]</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSE Robotics</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.87 [CI=0.82,0.88]</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.85 [CI=0.81,0.86]</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.88 [CI=0.86,0.90]</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0.71 or above, indicating good convergent validity (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006).

The AVE was again used as a measure of discriminant validity. The square root of the AVE represents the average association of each construct to its respective item measures while the correlations between the constructs are indicators of overlap associations among the latent variables. Therefore, if the square root of the AVE is higher than the correlation of that construct with the other constructs in the measurement model, this indicates that the construct is more closely related to its own measure than to the measures of other constructs (Chin, 1998; Gefen & Straub, 2005; Majchrzak, Beath, Lim, & Chin, 2005). As shown in Table 2, the square roots of the AVE values (along the diagonal) were all higher than the correlations of each construct with all other constructs in the measurement model. In summary, the results from the measurement model demonstrate high reliability as well as high convergent and discriminate validity for all constructs.

**Research Model**

Structural equation modeling (SEM) was used to test the proposed research model. Maximum Likelihood estimation was incorporated using an expectation maximization algorithm. Mplus was the software package used to estimate the model (Muthen & Muthen, 1998-2011). The results suggest that the model fit the data well [$\chi^2(143) = 235.35$, $p < 0.001$, CFI = 0.97, TLI = 0.97, RMSEA = 0.046, SRMR = 0.047] and explain a significant amount of the variance in the endogenous variables of Interest ($R^2 = 0.45$, $p < 0.001$) and Intent to Major ($R^2 = 0.31$, $p < 0.001$). Additionally, the overall model showed significant paths from IT Self-Efficacy to Outcome Expectations ($\beta = 0.19$, $p = 0.003$) – supporting H1, IT Self-Efficacy and Outcome Expectations to Interest ($\beta = 0.52$, $p < 0.001$; $\beta = 0.34$, $p < 0.001$) –
supporting H2 and H3, and Outcome Expectations and Interest to Intent to Major ($\beta = 0.19, p = 0.001; \beta = 0.40, p < 0.001$) – supporting H5 and H6. One insignificant path was found from IT Self-Efficacy to Intent to Major ($\beta = 0.07, p = 0.29$) – not supporting H4. Figure 2 shows these results.

![Research model with standardized results](image)

Figure 2. Research model with standardized results (*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001).

**CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK**

The enrollment crisis in IT continues to be a critical problem with lagging enrollments threatening both the major in colleges as well as corporations needing this expertise. We have used SCCT (Lent, 2005; Lent et al., 1994) to help demonstrate influences on individuals’ choices to major in IT. The results of this work show that both interest and outcome expectations have a significant positive impact on choice to major. Also, interest is found to mediate the effects of self-efficacy on major choice and partially mediate the effects of outcome expectations on major choice. Overall the model predicts a good portion of variance in the ultimate outcome of whether or not an individual chooses to major in IT.
The research also holds promise in increasing interest in IT. The model demonstrates that a substantial portion of the variance in interest in IT can be explained by both self-efficacy and outcome expectations. Given that interest is a strong predictor of major choice, it would behoove us to increase the interest of the individual in IT as a mechanism for improving choice to major in the area. Our research demonstrates that both self-efficacy and outcome expectations have a strong impact on interest in IT and therefore provide two important areas to increase interest in IT and subsequently increase choice to major.

A great deal of research related to the SCCT model has been performed with college students in various areas of study (Cunningham, Bruening, Sartore, Sagas, & Fink, 2005; Gainor & Lent, 1998; Lent & Brown, 2006; Lent et al., 2003; Lent, Brown, et al., 2005; Lent, Singley, & Sheu, 2005; Lent, Taveira, Sheu, & Singley, 2009). While this previous research helps shed light on intent to major in given areas, the fact remains that many college students already have majors or have a good idea of what their major will be. To more fully influence intent to major, students must be reached during those years prior to college. This research addresses this need by utilizing a sample of high school students for the study. By using high school students, we are able to verify the model’s utility for this age group as well as provide actionable results.

Given that self-efficacy, interest, and outcome expectations are found to positively influence choice to major in IT for high school students, programs and initiatives that increase these areas are needed. We proffer that the IT-Adventures program, from which this sample was taken, is one such program that strives to increase student levels of self-efficacy and interest in IT. The program combines educational programming, competitive events, and service learning projects to engage students in learning significant IT content. The program
Strives to increase positive performance beliefs towards (self-efficacy) and excitement for IT (interest) at the high school level, which holds potential to increase the number of students enrolling in IT-related programs at post-secondary institutions thereby increasing the number of graduates who will fill future IT needs.

While interest is the primary, direct driver of choice to major in IT, self-efficacy and outcome expectations play a critical role in driving interest and should be investigated as to methods to increase both. Bandura (1986) describes two methods, vicarious experience and enactive mastery, for increasing self-efficacy with regard to an area. Vicarious experience can be provided by viewing others completing the activities being learning while enactive mastery can be provided by allowing students to engage in hands-on work in IT-related projects. The IT-Adventures high school outreach program provides both vicarious experience and enactive mastery types of experiences. Vicarious experiences are provided in each of the subject areas through learning materials such as books, web sites, and video lessons prepared for this program. While the books and web sites provide large amounts of background and reference information, the video lessons take a stepwise, cumulative approach to the inquiry-based projects the students complete. Each video lesson demonstrates a particular skill or concept the students need to understand before they tackle the small, stand-alone project assigned at the end of each lecture. When they begin the small, hands-on inquiry-based learning projects, the enactive mastery begins. Each of these small projects that they successfully complete builds their self-efficacy in that specific area and provides them the ability to successfully complete one step in the very large, cumulative project that they will complete during the two day competition. By taking this cumulative approach throughout the year, students build upon their success (enactive mastery) and end
the year with higher self-efficacy than they began with when they complete their final project.

Outcome expectations also is a significant positive driver of interest in IT, implying that the expectations students hold with regard to their future major and career can significantly impact their interest in IT. Educational awareness becomes a critical issue here as students can only have expectations which align with what they have been told. With the current media climate propagating the message that IT jobs are nerdy, boring, and going overseas, the need to educate students as to the promising potential of a career in IT is imperative. In the past the IT-Adventures program has hosted an in person job panel, career discussions, and vendor displays during the two-day competitive event, but these aspects need to be better integrated into the current overall program. The IT-Adventures program is currently working to add online, asynchronous delivery from IT experts talking and demonstrating technical or career aspects of IT not only at the final two-day event, but during the entire year-long program.

The IT-Adventures program provides one example of an intervention mechanism which can be used to potentially raise self-efficacy, interest, and outcome expectations towards IT, thereby hopefully leading to higher intent to major in IT. We hope that other programs can emulate the IT-Adventures program approach to increase interest, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations in high school students.

LIMITATIONS

This research, while providing valuable insight, must be viewed in recognition of its limitations. First, this study uses a high school student population for its subject pool. Some
may argue that some high school students are not yet at the point of making a decision with regard to college major. While we agree with this fact, previous research has utilized college students, many of which may already have a concrete plan as to their major. So while high school students may provide limitations in some regards, we believe that these individuals are at a more optimal place for assessing future major choice and subsequently implementing measures based on these findings to more fully convince students to major in IT.

A second limitation is the use of students which signed up to participate in an IT-related school club. The fact that the students signed up for the program demonstrates some preexisting interest in IT. There is the potential that this interest could be above those individuals that did not sign up for the program, and thereby the average starting point for interest in IT may be greater. To combat this, the IT-Adventures high school outreach program is modeled after an intramural sport. By its inclusive nature, it casts a wider net to allow every student to have an opportunity to explore IT and consider it as a career choice, not just the ones who already excel in mathematics and science in the classroom. This lessens the argument of preexisting interest in IT.
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Table A1. Covariance matrix for the structural model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ITSE1</th>
<th>ITSE2</th>
<th>ITSE3</th>
<th>ITSE4</th>
<th>ITSE5</th>
<th>ITSE6</th>
<th>ITSE7</th>
<th>ITSE8</th>
<th>ITSE9</th>
<th>Career1</th>
<th>Career2</th>
<th>Career3</th>
<th>Career4</th>
<th>Intrest1</th>
<th>Intrest2</th>
<th>Intrest3</th>
<th>Intrest4</th>
<th>Intrest5</th>
<th>Intrest6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSE1</td>
<td>2.827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSE2</td>
<td>2.208</td>
<td>3.045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSE3</td>
<td>2.014</td>
<td>2.181</td>
<td>3.182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSE4</td>
<td>1.732</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td>2.099</td>
<td>2.828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSE5</td>
<td>1.698</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>2.039</td>
<td>2.611</td>
<td>3.155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSE6</td>
<td>1.407</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td>1.698</td>
<td>2.127</td>
<td>2.253</td>
<td>3.418</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSE7</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>1.455</td>
<td>1.269</td>
<td>1.381</td>
<td>1.395</td>
<td>1.156</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSE8</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>1.218</td>
<td>1.327</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>2.622</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSE9</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>2.156</td>
<td>1.971</td>
<td>2.904</td>
<td>2.904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career1</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career3</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career4</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>1.395</td>
<td>1.395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrest1</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td>1.021</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>1.912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrest2</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>1.842</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrest3</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrest4</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>1.639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrest5</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>1.374</td>
<td>1.107</td>
<td>1.874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrest6</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>3.195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A2. Standardized factor loadings, standard errors, z-values, and associated p-values for observed items in the structural model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>estimate</th>
<th>std err</th>
<th>z-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSE1</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>25.803</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSE2</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>29.877</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSE3</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>41.281</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSE4</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>83.922</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSE5</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>70.156</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSE6</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>25.372</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSE7</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>41.938</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSE8</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>35.486</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSE9</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>24.953</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREER1</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>29.515</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREER2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>27.546</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREER3</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>20.611</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREER4</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>21.973</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT3</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>33.751</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT5</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>23.324</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT7</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>24.808</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT9</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>26.066</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT11</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>35.846</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4: AN IMPRESSION FORMATION-BASED EXAMINATION OF THE DIFFERENTIAL INFLUENCE OF TECHNOLOGY ACROSS GENDER AND MESSAGE

Andy Luse, Brian Mennecke, Anthony Townsend

ABSTRACT

This research examines the relationship between gender, message bias, and technology use on the way that observers form impressions of others. Building on impression formation and gender stereotype research and theory, we develop a two-part research methodology for examining how impressions are formed of technology users. Specifically, we have a male or female “target” engage in either discussions about or use of technology and ask observers to rate the target on several personality characteristics. The results of our two studies indicate that technology use is an important component in impression formation, causing a three-way interaction with gender and informational bias. A key finding of this research is that the presence of technology significantly disrupts the impact of gender stereotyping on both women and men. In other words, when technology is present or used by targets, the technology appears to directly moderate gender cues that are otherwise at play when technology is not present. The result is that technology subverts both the male and female stereotypes observers normally engage and this can potentially be used to equalize the playing field for female technology users. The paper concludes with a discussion of how this process occurs and the implications of these findings for research and practice.
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INTRODUCTION

As social beings, humans have an innate inclination to interpret actions, displays, and other stimuli offered by those around them, and the influence of these interpretations is often long lasting. We often create a stage for our presentation of self and use the tools at our calling to create a scene through which we can enact, either purposefully or without intent, our presentation of self. As mobile information technologies have proliferated, they have become a ubiquitous accessory for a large segment of society, and we are curious as to the effect that information technology has on observers’ impressions of a technology user. In general, we expect that an individual using technology induces different impressions on observers than would the same individual without the technology. Of course, technologies do not create impressions in a vacuum; stereotype and impression formation research suggests that factors such as a person’s appearance, behaviors, and gender all have important effects on the perceptions people form of one another. Our sense, though, is that the presence and use of technologies will make a pronounced contribution to the impressions formed by those observing the technology-user. In the present study, we are particularly interested in how the gender\(^3\) of the technology-user and his or her technology-use interact in the formation of an impression.

\(^3\) In this research we refer to our experimental manipulation of male and female as sex (i.e., we present targets that are male or female) while the subjects’ interpretations of the target individual is affected by the social context and therefore our sex manipulation becomes an interpretation of gender in the eyes of the subject. As a result, when referring to the independent variables in the study itself, the manipulation is characterized as sex, but when referring to the interpretation of the target by the subject the characterization is referred to as gender (Myers 2012).
BACKGROUND

The research examining impression formation spans multiple disciplines and contexts, generally focusing on how the physical and behavioral information presented by a target[^1] individual is interpreted and used by an observer to develop impressions of the target (Sherman et al. 2007). Asch (1946), in an early work, demonstrated how individuals utilize specific information to form initial impressions as to the personality of the target individual. Early research also found that observers integrate trait or behavioral information into strong dispositional impressions of the targets that they evaluate (Anderson 1966; Asch 1946).

Impression formation (Reynolds et al. 2000; Rudman 1998) takes place in most social contexts (Ellemers et al. 2002), but one stream of research has focused on the formation of stereotypes and impressions in the context of observers evaluating targets in a situation where these parties do not directly interact (i.e., the observers are passive participants). Within this area, two perspectives have gained prominence (Reynolds et al. 2000): 1) the Attentional Resources Perspective (Brewer 1998; Fiske et al. 1999; Fiske et al. 1990) and 2) Self-Categorization Theory (Oakes et al. 1994). Research in this area has focused on identifying the factors that influence the development of impressions and whether observers interpret specific versus aggregate characteristics of the individual being observed (Neuberg et al. 1987).

The Attentional Resources Perspective, represented by the Continuum Model (Fiske et al. 1990) and the Dual-Process Model (Brewer 1998), is based on the theory that observers will attempt to minimize the cognitive effort expended to develop conclusions about a target.

[^1]: “Target” refers to the individual being observed and evaluated; it is a conventional term in impression formation research, and as such, we will use it throughout.
whenever possible; thus, observers will tend to use a category-based approach (i.e., stereotypes) to draw conclusions about the target (Macrae et al. 1994). This categorization process is often spontaneously enacted through the activation of a stereotype in response to the observation of a particular stimulus characteristic (e.g., race, gender, or other social categories) (Devine 1989; Greenwald et al. 1995). Nevertheless, many times it will not be possible for an observer to place a target into a specific, predefined category. For example, a target may not easily fit into a category or the observer may have motivation to seek out additional information about the target. Motivation to evaluate a target on an attribute-by-attribute basis may come from a number of factors such as the observer’s interdependence with the other party (either cooperative or competitive interdependence) or when goals exist that emphasize accuracy in the assessment of the target (Moskowitz 1993; Reynolds et al. 2000). When motivation is present, the observer engages in a process of initial categorization, re-categorization, and categorization by attributes. As this process unfolds, refined impressions are formed through consideration of individual attributes and an integration of these attributes (i.e., piecemeal integration or personalization) (Brewer 1998; Fiske et al. 1990).

Self-Categorization Theory focuses on group membership and the perceived relationship between the observer and the target (Hogg et al. 2000; Reynolds et al. 1999). Like the Attentional Resources Perspective, Self-Categorization Theory predicts that impressions will be formed using categorizations, attributes, or a combination thereof. However, Self-Categorization Theory argues that the impetus leading to attribute-based impression formation involves perceptions of group association (Perdue et al. 1990). Three factors mediate the target categorization process: 1) perceiver readiness – the perception of
the perceiver is framed by goals, needs, and the context of the perceiver, 2) comparative fit (i.e., the way a target is grouped as being within or outside of a particular group), and 3) normative fit (i.e., the attributes used to identify and classify groups have certain values, direction, and meaning that influence the categorization process) (Reynolds et al. 1999). Comparative fit is especially relevant in stereotype formation when targets are seen as being outside of the observer’s group based on certain attributes (Reynolds et al. 2001; Turner et al. 2008). The process is moderated by the way the perceiver categorizes him or herself by framing the observations of others based on the personal and social identity that he or she assigns to themselves (Reynolds et al. 1999).

During this process, observers use normative fit values to assign relative weights to the attributes being considered during impression formation and, as a result, different attributes may become more or less salient in different contexts (Oakes et al. 1991). For example, high value may be assigned to the target’s features (e.g. skin color, gender, etc.), actions taken by the target (e.g. skill level demonstrated during a task), or the content of the target’s message (e.g. negative or positive comments). While self-categorization theory argues that these values are relative, research has shown that certain characteristics have a relatively consistent influence in similar contexts. For example, research has shown that the nature of what the target says in relation to what he or she is expected to say can more strongly affect impressions (Fiske 1980; Jones et al. 1976; Skowronski et al. 1989). For example, statements that are non-normative receive greater weight in impression formation and often lead to more extreme impressions (Fiske 1980; Jones et al. 1976; Skowronski et al. 1987; Skowronski et al. 1989). Furthermore, the context in which the statement is made will influence perceptions, with targets giving information that is consistent with the context
being perceived more favorably than information that is either non-contextual or contextual but not consistent with expectations (Jones et al. 1987).

In addition to the Attentional Resources Perspective and Self-Categorization Theory, Expectations States Theory (EST) (Berger et al. 1974) is useful as a theoretical foundation for further understanding the cognitive processes associated with the salience and valence of cues and the influence of these evaluations on impression formation. EST proposes that individual social actors will develop expectations about the capacity of other actors to behave or perform in a given task or context (Correll et al. 2006). The two primary factors influencing impression formation posited by EST are the observer’s assessment of the target’s power and the target’s prestige. EST suggests that perceived differences in one or both of these variables from the observer’s expectations will strongly influence perceptions (Wagner et al. 2002). Status Characteristics Theory (SCT) extends EST and focuses on how status characteristics are defined and interpreted by observers (Berger et al. 1986). For example, exhibited characteristics include *indicative cues*, which involve explicit expressions or claims made by a social actor (e.g. I am the leader), and *task cues*, which involve information about task specific knowledge, skills, or capabilities (e.g. fluency with completing a specific task). Inferred characteristics include *expressive cues*, which involve external symbols or behaviors that are used to infer status (e.g. style of dress), and *categorical cues*, which incorporate information about group or social affiliation (e.g. speech, dialect, or normative behavior) (Berger et al. 1986; Wagner et al. 1993). These status cues are particularly relevant when social actors are not familiar with each other and are not similar with respect to salient external characteristics. Research has shown that expectations are developed based on these status cues unless there is evidence garnered from other cues.
that demonstrates that the status cue is not relevant in the particular context (Wagner et al. 2002).

Expectation States Theory also provides a useful theoretical framework for defining the factors that influence impression formation, providing a theoretical basis for defining and categorizing cues and understanding the processes used by observers to develop impressions of targets. Many times, categorical cues such as gender and race are immediately obvious to observers and will typically be the first cues used in the formation of impressions. These cues will typically interact with exhibited behaviors such as task performance or statements made by the target as the observer has time to develop and refine his or her impression based on these behaviors. The category/behavior linkage can be either confirmatory (i.e., the “expert” demonstrates “expertise”) or dis-confirmatory (i.e., the “expert” behaves incompetently); when the linkage is confirmatory, the observer’s category-based impressions are activated. However, when the linkages are dis-confirmed, the observer is forced to form an attribute-based, more nuanced evaluation of the target.

**Gender and Impression Formation**

Considerable research has been conducted examining the role that gender plays in influencing the impression formation process (Carli 1990; Carli 1991; Granié et al. 2011; Kriwy et al. 2013; Nieva et al. 1980; Pugh et al. 1983; Rudman 1998; Wagner et al. 2002). Much of this research has examined how gender leads to stereotype formation as well as the way that gender influences the way that information is processed by the observer in relation to the gender of the information source. Research indicates that negative information provided by a male actor will cause observers to consider the target to be more powerful, forceful, and in control (Foschi 1996). Thus, male targets who engage in forceful comments
will likely be viewed more favorably than female targets that make similarly forceful comments. Conversely, females are perceived more favorably when they are less assertive. Thus, when a female makes supportive statements rather than negative statements, she is likely to be viewed more favorably (Abramson et al. 1977; Carli 1991; Nieva et al. 1980; Pugh et al. 1985).

**Gender and Technology**

As noted above, the gender of the target is a primary influence on impression formation; as it represents a cue that activates a number of assumptions, biases, and expectations on the part of the observer. When impressions are formed of women and men interacting with technology, a set of very complex social and cultural stereotypes are activated. The simplest of these stereotypes are expressed as negative expectations about the potential technological performance of women. While some of these stereotype effects may be moderated in the face of demonstrated competence, they remain an important subtext within organizational and personal narratives of individuals’ evaluations of others (Liu et al. 2001). Morley (2004) provides evidence that negative stereotypes related to women and information technology come from older cultural biases that question the general technical skills of women, which indicates that these stereotypes are substantially entrenched and powerful. But however entrenched these attitudes that are derived from the general women/technology stereotype, those that relate to women and information technology specifically are more nuanced.

**Masculinized Technology**

Feeney (2002) notes that technology advertising is dominated by depictions of male users, which reifies the stereotype that women are not technology users or experts, and would
seem to indicate a technology-aversion on the part of women. But the aversion, if it actually exists, is an aversion learned from the broader culture’s identification of information technology as a “masculine” domain (Cooper et al. 2003; Hemwood 1993; Lohan et al. 2004; Wajcman 2004).

Perspectives on the origins of this masculinization differ. Wajcman (2004) asserts that the masculinization of technology is a deliberate coding to reinforce patriarchal control; by declaring technology masculine, men continue to control a critical resource of power and production. Wajcman further asserts that this process of masculinization affects the design and use of technologies (a theme that will be repeated by others), with the primary purpose of technology (including information technology) being domination and control. This process then, of first claiming male ownership of technology and then making it attractive primarily for male uses, effectively marginalizes women with regard to technology and its attendant power.

A less radical perspective, argues that the process of masculinization comes not from deliberate efforts to buttress the patriarchy, but rather from the sensibilities extant in the patriarchally dominated system (Bodker et al. 1993; Knupfer 1998; Webster 1993). Discussing business information systems, both Bodker and Greenbaum (1993) and Webster (1993) assert that the business system itself is a product of historic masculine sensibilities, and that information systems are, in turn, built to reflect extant masculine protocols. The information systems developed then are masculinized more by default than by intent, but the result is the same in that technologies’ features and function often serve to enhance or sustain masculine prominence of, or association with, technology.
Regardless of one’s perspective as to how the systems were masculinized, the effect is the same; information technologies are seen as a male domain (Cooper 2006; Cooper et al. 2003; Lohan et al. 2004; Mercier et al. 2006; Wajcman 2004). This intensely gendered position then has a significant impact on both men and women; for men, it creates expectations of competence with information technologies, while for women, it eliminates the possibility of expectations. Hence the stereotype of women vis a vis information technology is not that they lack the intellect or acumen for it, so much that they have no role in it...no expectation of performing more than perfunctory operational tasks with information technologies (Cooper et al. 2003; Lohan et al. 2004; Wajcman 2004).

**Hypothesis Development**

The background section paints a picture of impression formation as dependent on various extenuating factors. First, the message content of the target individual can effect viewer impressions of the individual, especially when this content is non-normative in nature for the given context (Fiske 1980; Jones et al. 1976; Skowronski et al. 1989). Also, this message content effects impressions of a target based on the gender of that target (Abramson et al. 1977; Carli 1991; Nieva et al. 1980; Pugh et al. 1985). This research extends previous research by adding technology as a third factor by investigating the influence of technology, message bias, and target gender on the impressions individuals form of the target. Figure1 shows the research model identifying the hypotheses discussed below.
Study 1 Hypotheses

Prior research indicates that negative information provided by a male actor will cause observers to consider the target to be more powerful, forceful, and in control (Foschi 1996). Thus, male targets who engage in forceful comments will be viewed more favorably than female targets that make similarly forceful comments. Conversely, females are perceived more favorably when they are less assertive; thus, when a female makes supportive statements rather than negative statements, she will be viewed more favorably (Abramson et al. 1977; Carli 1991; Nieva et al. 1980; Pugh et al. 1985). Taken together, these expectations suggest a clear interaction between the gender of the target and the information bias (favorable/unfavorable).

The literature also indicates that the use of technology by a male is seen as more consistent with stereotypical roles for males than the use and mastery of technology by a female (Feeney 2002). A male using technology is consistent with observers’ stereotypes about “maleness” and results in observer impressions that are the result of simple
categorizations. However, when subjects are presented with a female target that is using technology, this violation of the stereotype (i.e., women are uncomfortable/less competent with technology) will subvert the observers’ simple categorization and will force observers to make idiosyncratic evaluations of the target. Further, since the subversion is associated with the gender categorization, the presence of technology will weaken other gender categorizations as well.

These arguments, considered together, indicate that an interaction will exist between the three variables in this study. Specifically, absent technology, males will likely be held to a different standard than will females while in the presence of technology, both will be evaluated based upon the information that they are presenting:

H1: Technology presence will subvert simple categorization of the target (re. Attentional Resources Theory) and will moderate expected effects of the targets’ gender and message.

H1a When not using technology, impressions of a target individual are dependent on an interaction of the gender of that individual and the bias of the information communicated.

H1b. When using technology, impressions of a target individual are solely dependent on the bias of the information communicated.

**Study2 Hypotheses**

Study 1’s hypotheses test a present/not present condition of technology vis a vis the male and female targets. In Study 2, we want to make the strongest possible test of H1b, to determine if technology completely thwarts the gender stereotype, and so we form hypotheses 2, 3, and 4 around male and female targets directly engaging an information technology in a manner that indicates their level of mastery with the technology.
As noted above, males and females are held to different standards with regard to how they are expected to use and master technology (Foschi 1996). Our belief, as articulated in Hypothesis 1, is that these expectations, when confounded by observation of a specific target, set in motion a process that thwarts the gender categorization when a woman is using a technology. While gender/technology stereotypes may exist in the abstract, our belief is that they can be overcome in an individual evaluation. Study 2 is designed to test the effect predicted in H1b at a granular level. When male and female targets are presenting observers with either a display of competence or incompetence with a technology, the stereotype literature would argue that males will be judged more harshly when they fail to demonstrate technological competence, while females demonstrating the same incompetence will be less harshly evaluated (because expectations are lower). When both genders succeed with the technology, males should gain a more positive response from observers due to the observers’ expectations that males should demonstrate such mastery and the observers’ lack of a category to recognize the female’s technical mastery to her benefit. We believe that these latent categorization preferences are vulnerable to confounding confrontation in the case of a specific target evaluation. When demonstrations of each target’s mastery or non-mastery of a technology is specifically enacted for the observers, we expect the stereotype to be subverted, and the observers forced to make idiosyncratic evaluations of the target, according to the following hypotheses:

H2: The impact of an enacted informational bias (i.e., mastery/non-mastery) on impressions of a target individual is not dependent on the gender of that individual, when using technology (i.e. no interaction).

H3: Gender does not impact impressions of a target individual when using technology, regardless of their demonstration of mastery/non-mastery.
H4: Irrespective of gender, an enacted informational bias (mastery/non-mastery) significantly impacts impressions of a target individual when using technology.

METHODOLOGY

To examine our research question, we manipulated three variables that are expected to influence impression formation: the gender of the target, the bias of the information or message presented by the target, and technology use by the target. To accomplish this, we conduct two separate studies to test our hypotheses. Study 1 tests an omnibus model by examining the impact of technology use/non-use, information bias, and gender of the target on impressions of the target formed by subject observers. Study 2 holds technology use constant, but amplifies the interaction between the male/female targets and the technology by having them succeed or fail at an operational task using the technology (while observers form their impressions). Conducting two studies allows us to examine the hypothesized relationships uniquely with different controls and contextual factors and refine our understanding of the relationship between information content and gender. Further, given the unique role of technology use in the context of impression formation, the use of a two-study approach allows us to validate our instrument using data from the two studies, which results in more robust and generalizable findings (see Appendix A for a detailed overview of the instrument development). An overview of the studies and each set of manipulations is explained in more detail below.

STUDY 1

Procedure

A 2x2x2 full factorial design with the independent variables of technology use, information bias, and gender of the target was utilized for the study. The technology
manipulation included 2 levels: the target either read information from a PDA or from a paper document (i.e., the no-PDA manipulation). The gender manipulation was implemented by having either a male or a female target read the article. Both targets were students who were of the same general appearance, similar speaking ability, of about the same height and build, and approximately the same age. The information bias manipulation was implemented by having the targets read an article that either had a positive bias toward PDA use or a negative bias (Fiske 1980; Skowronski et al. 1989). The article described a recent study of Japanese PDA usage in either a positive or negative light, depending on the

5 These similarities among the targets in both Study 1 and Study 2 were independently reviewed and confirmed by a separate panel. Furthermore, a more rigorous post-hoc examination was run to help rule out alternative explanations in the differences observed between the targets under study – outside gender and the treatments of bias and technology. This study consisted of subjects viewing still photographs of each of the targets with neutral facial expressions and without technology present. The subjects then answered five questions for each target regarding the target’s perceived level on each of the five impression categories under study (i.e. professionalism, character, power, sociability, intelligence) on a five-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree (these categories are described in greater detail in the primary prose of the manuscript). For the primary two studies conducted for this research, we hypothesize that these subjects are of the same general appearance, height, build, and age, so when technology and bias are removed from the situational setting, no significant difference should be seen between the male and female subjects in either study one or study two. We wanted to be certain that no difference would be seen between the negative and positive ends of the measurement scale for each of the five categories, which would conservatively mean there would be no significant difference from somewhat disagree to somewhat agree on the five-point scale. The distance between these two points on the scale would be at least two, so we conservatively chose a confidence interval width for our test of 1.5 to rule out any differences between the subjects. A 2x2 within-subjects full factorial ANOVA was run where each subject saw both the male and female from study one and study two. The sample size requirement needed to find a confidence interval width of 1.5 given the highest variance and lowest correlations among the scores was used (see formula below) (Bonett 2011). Linear contrasts were used for a full factorial when determining the sample size as a conservative estimate, even though we were only interested in the simple main effects of male vs. female for each of the studies separately (i.e. we did not wish to consider effects between study one and study two). Given we were examining two simultaneous simple main effect tests, a reverse Bonferroni adjustment was used so we could claim that the results were not significant at p > 0.1 (providing a more strenuous test of insignificance). Results showed that subjects did not perceive a significant difference between the male and female targets on any of the five categories for either study one or study two. This provides support that, without bias and technology present, the male and female subjects were perceived as not significantly different on the categories of interest. Furthermore, the differences found in study one and study two between males and females must be a result of the contextual treatment effects of technology and bias.

\[ n = 4\sigma^2 \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n} h_j^2 \right) (1 - \bar{p}) \left( \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{w} \right)^2 + \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^2}{2} \]
manipulation. Japanese PDA usage was used given the widely held stereotype that the Japanese are thought to be leaders in handheld technology (California 2009), which would cause cognitive dissonance in the subjects given the disparity between the Japanese persona of high technological competence and the negative information regarding this use. Manipulation check questions showed that subjects correctly identified the technology used by the target and the information bias was shown to produce a statistically significant difference in perceptions of the content of the informational article ($p < 0.001$).

Subjects consisted of volunteers from accounting or management information systems (MIS) courses at a large mid-western university. Subjects were recruited in classes in which they were offered the opportunity to participate in this exercise as an alternative to another outside of class assignment. The same targets were used throughout the study by videotaping each target reading the article in each treatment manipulation and then having subjects view the recorded video of the target on a large projector in the front of the room. The use of a recorded presentation provided consistency across research sessions by making sure the targets performed exactly the same in each treatment manipulation. The targets were instructed to read the scripted materials consistently across treatment conditions. To reduce random error from uncontrolled factors, identical rooms were used for each treatment recording and the targets wore neutral-colored shirts and blue jeans when making the presentations.

When subjects arrived at the room, a non-target research assistant greeted them, took attendance, and handed out a questionnaire. Students were randomly assigned to each

---

6 The consistency provided by prerecording became even more important in study 2, where the target had to portray either success or failure using a particular technology.
treatment based on the session for which they signed up. The number of subjects per session varied and multiple sessions were used to collect data for each treatment cell (i.e., none of the treatment conditions were completed during one session). Subjects were told in the introduction that they would be asked to complete several questions about PDAs after information about PDAs was read to them. Following the short presentation, subjects were asked to complete a questionnaire about PDAs. This questionnaire was presented to be the main purpose of the research in order to reduce the likelihood that subjects would identify the true nature of the study (i.e., impression formation). Following the questionnaire, subjects were asked to rate the target on the 34 adjective questions related to individual characteristics of the target. The questionnaire specifically asked subjects to rate their impressions of the person who read the article so that they would not confuse the target with the other research assistant. Following completion of the impression formation questionnaire, subjects were asked to provide demographic information and information about their recollections related to the content of the article. The questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

The fictitious article used to present the information bias was adapted from an actual article about cell phone use in Japan by recasting the story in the context of PDA usage among Japanese users. A positive version of the article included information that reported on favorable attitudes that Japanese users had regarding their use of PDAs, its positive impact on their productivity, and its ease of use. Facts and figures used in the article included numeric results from surveys of users, anecdotal reports, and similar pieces of information. For the negative bias, the same basic information was presented; however, the adjectives and

---

7 Only one person reported in a follow up questionnaire that they thought the purpose of the research was to examine impression formation. This subject’s data were dropped from further analysis.
adverbs describing Japanese user experiences were presented negatively. All of the numeric descriptors reported in the article remained the same; the negative versus positive tone was all that was changed. For example, in the positive version of the story a statement such as the following was made: “65 percent of the respondents under 20 years of age voiced satisfaction with connecting with the Web.” In the negative version of the story a statement such as the following was made: “65 percent of the respondents under 20 years of age voiced dissatisfaction with connecting with the Web.” The scripts for both conditions are provided in Appendix C.

**Results**

A total of 134 subjects participated in the research and provided usable data. The factors garnered from the instrument development were utilized for analysis. The means and standard deviations for the dependent measures are summarized in Table 1 and the results of the statistical analyses are presented in Tables 2 and 3 (graphic representations of the interaction effects are presented in Figure 2).
To examine the overall model, we analyzed the data using MANOVA because of the interrelatedness of the factors used as the dependent variables. The results show that the overall model is significant for the three-way interaction of technology, bias, and gender ($F_{(5,122)} = 2.34, p < 0.05$) and that several interactions exist between the three independent variables (see Tables 2 and 3). Specifically, there is a 3-way interaction between the target’s gender, information bias, and PDA use for the factors Professionalism ($F_{(1,126)} = 3.94, p <$

---

8 The sex of the observer was originally added as a covariate to both Study 1 and Study 2 but was found to be non-significant in both ($F = 0.222, p = 0.952; F = 1.666, p = 0.142$); therefore, the sex of the observer was dropped from both analyses.
0.05), Character \((F_{(1,126)} = 5.50, p = 0.02)\), Power \((F_{(1,126)} = 8.55, p = 0.004)\), as well as Intelligence \((F_{(1,126)} = 3.221, p = 0.075)\).^9

Table 2. MANOVA multivariate test results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wilks Value</th>
<th>(F)-value</th>
<th>Hypo df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>(p)-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>technology</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bias</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology*bias</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology*gender</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bias*gender</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology<em>bias</em>gender</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. MANOVA tests of between subject effects for 3-way interaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>(F)-value</th>
<th>(p)-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis H1 predicted that there would be a 3-way interaction between the technology used to read the article, the gender of the target, and the information bias presented in the article. The results indicate that there is a significant interaction between these variables for Professionalism, Character, Power \((p < 0.05)\), and Intelligence \((p < 0.1)\). There was no significant 3-way interaction for the dependent variable Sociability. In summary, the results largely support Hypothesis H1. Figure 2 shows graphical depictions of the three-way interaction effects for each of the five impression measures.

^9 Given the exploratory nature of the study and the fact that these data are examined in an omnibus model viewing 3-way interactions, we consider p-values below the 0.10 cutoff.
Figure 2. Graphics of 3-way interaction effects for study 1
To gain greater understanding of these data, simple 2-way interactions were investigated (Kerlinger et al. 2000). When viewed within the context of no technology versus technology, we found a significant simple 2-way interaction of bias and gender in the no technology group ($F_{(5,64)} = 3.29$, $p = 0.01$) with Professionalism ($F_{(1,68)} = 3.95$, $p = 0.05$), Character ($F_{(1,68)} = 4.66$, $p = 0.03$), Power ($F_{(1,68)} = 5.45$, $p = 0.02$), and Intelligence ($F_{(1,68)} = 3.96$, $p = 0.05$) showing between subject significant effects, while only Sociability showed no significance (see Tables 4 and 5). Next we investigated the simple 2-way interactions in the technology group and found a significant main effect for bias ($F_{(5,54)} = 2.10$, $p = 0.001$), with all five dependent variables showing significant between-subject effects, but no interaction effect with gender ($F_{(5,54)} = 0.68$, $p = 0.64$) (see Tables 6, 7, and 8).

Table 4. MANOVA multivariate test results for simple 2-way interaction effect in the no technology group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wilks Value</th>
<th>$F$-value</th>
<th>Hypo df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bias</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bias*gender</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. MANOVA tests of between subject effects for simple 2-way interaction of bias and gender in the no technology group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$-value</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. MANOVA multivariate test results for simple 2-way interaction effect in the technology group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wilks Value</th>
<th>$F$-value</th>
<th>Hypo df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bias</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bias*gender</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis H1a predicted that there would be a simple 2-way interaction between the gender of the target, and the information bias presented in the article when technology was not used to read the article. The results indicate that there is a significant simple 2-way interaction between gender and bias for Professionalism, Character, Power, and Intelligence ($p < 0.05$). There was no significant simple 2-way interaction for the dependent variable Sociability. In summary, the results largely support Hypothesis H1a. Furthermore, Hypothesis H1b predicted that there would not be a simple 2-way interaction between the gender of the target, and the message bias presented in the article when technology was used to read the article, with the results supporting H1b ($p = 0.64$). This implies that technology is the driver of the 3-way interactions and that a gender-message bias interaction is not evident when technology is present. Furthermore, in the technology-present condition, only message
bias has a significant main effect on all the dependent variables, with gender retaining a significant main effect on only two of the dependent variables.\textsuperscript{10}

**STUDY 2**

Study 2 provides a more nuanced insight into impression formation of users of technology. Specifically, part of the motivation for the design of Study 2 is to better understand the relationship between the information bias and the gender of the target. An inspection of the pattern of the results from Study 1 (Tables 4 and 5) suggests that while the information bias causes the perception of female and male targets to differ in the no technology sub-condition, this bias does not appear to be sufficient to directly interact with the target’s gender in the technology condition (Table 6), even though there is a significant main effect of this information bias (Table 8). An important consideration in interpreting the results of Study 1 is that the technology present/non-present condition was presented in a relatively passive manner; that is, the condition was introduced by having the target read an article from paper or a PDA, which means that there was no demonstration of the target’s level of competency with the technology. As a result, in Study 2 we focus our attention on generating a bias that closely associates the target and his or her use of technology. Specifically, we want to examine how an *enacted bias* (the exhibited behaviors of the target when using the technology) influence the impressions formed about the target. In Study 1, we used an *information bias* (a positive or negative story), along with gender and the presence/non-presence of technology to examine the impact of technology on impressions.

\textsuperscript{10} Technically, given that we have blocked all but the technology-present condition for this part of the analysis, the specific terminology would be simple two-way interaction (describing the interactions at this level) and simple-simple main effects (describing the impact of gender and message bias individually on the dependent measures).
formed of our targets; in Study 2, with technology presence held constant, we examine target gender and an enacted bias on impression formation.

**Procedure**

A 2x2 full factorial design was utilized for the study, with the independent variables of enacted bias and gender of the target. The gender manipulation was implemented by having either a male or a female target read the article. Both targets were students who were of the same general appearance, similar speaking ability, of about the same height and build, and approximately the same age. The enacted bias manipulation was implemented by having the target read an article where the target either correctly operated the tablet during the presentation (positive bias) or made mistakes with the technology and failed in the completion of tasks while using the tablet (negative bias). The targets were well rehearsed for both the failure and no-failure condition, and implemented each manipulation correctly as verified by a research assistant. The scripts for both the failure and no-failure conditions are provided in Appendix D.

The observers who were the subjects in our research consisted of volunteers from a management information systems (MIS) course at a large mid-western university. Subjects were recruited in classes in which they were offered the opportunity to participate in this exercise as a form of extra credit. The same targets were used throughout the study. To reduce random error from uncontrolled factors, the same room was used throughout the study.

When subjects arrived at the room, a non-target research assistant greeted them, took attendance, and handed out a questionnaire. Students were randomly assigned to each treatment based on the session for which they attended. Subjects were told in the introduction
that they would be asked to complete several questions about tablet computers after some information about tablets was read to them. Following the short presentation, subjects were asked to complete a questionnaire about tablets; as in Study 1, this questionnaire was presented as the main purpose of the research in order to reduce the likelihood that subjects would identify the true nature of the study (i.e., impression formation). Following the questionnaire, subjects were asked to rate the target on the same 34 items describing individual characteristics of the target that were used in Study 1. As in Study 1, respondents were asked to provide demographic information and provide information about their recollections related to the content of the article that they were read.

**Results**

A total of 405 subjects participated in the research and provided usable data. The means and standard deviations for the dependent measures are summarized in Table 9 while the results of the statistical analyses are presented in Tables 10 through 13 (graphic representations of the effects are presented in Figure 3).

**Table 9. Descriptive statistics for Study 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professionalism</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Sociability</th>
<th>Intelligence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>3.35 (0.92)</td>
<td>3.28 (0.81)</td>
<td>2.72 (0.94)</td>
<td>3.15 (0.95)</td>
<td>3.11 (0.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>2.98 (1.07)</td>
<td>3.04 (1.04)</td>
<td>2.75 (1.05)</td>
<td>3.21 (0.86)</td>
<td>2.53 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>3.29 (1.02)</td>
<td>3.34 (0.92)</td>
<td>2.83 (1.11)</td>
<td>3.39 (0.89)</td>
<td>3.31 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>2.83 (1.12)</td>
<td>2.91 (1.03)</td>
<td>2.52 (1.05)</td>
<td>2.98 (1.08)</td>
<td>2.71 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-items</td>
<td>4-items</td>
<td>5-items</td>
<td>5-items</td>
<td>3-items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 6</td>
<td>1 to 6</td>
<td>1 to 6</td>
<td>1 to 6</td>
<td>1 to 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α = 0.90</td>
<td>α = 0.85</td>
<td>α = 0.88</td>
<td>α = 0.86</td>
<td>α = 0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[CI=0.88,0.91]</td>
<td>[CI=0.82,0.87]</td>
<td>[CI=0.86,0.90]</td>
<td>[CI=0.84,0.88]</td>
<td>[CI=0.77,0.84]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To examine the overall model, we analyzed the data using MANOVA given the interrelatedness of the dependent variables. The results show that the overall model is significant for the two-way interaction of bias and gender \( (F(5,397) = 2.378, p = 0.04) \) but that only one interaction exists between the two independent variables (see Table 11).

Specifically, the results show that there is a 2-way interaction between the target’s gender and information bias for the factor Sociability \( (F(1,401) = 5.77, p = 0.02) \). Therefore, while the overall Wilk’s test for the interaction effect is significant, the between-subject’s effects show that only Sociability displayed an interaction effect of gender and bias, offering good support for Hypothesis H2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10. MANOVA multivariate test results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias*Gender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11. MANOVA tests of between subject effects for 2-way interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. Graphics of 2-way interaction effects for study 2 (only Sociability shows a significant interaction)
Tables 12 and 13 show results of the main effects for each of the independent variables. These results demonstrate that the gender of the target has no significant main effect on the impression of the target for each of the remaining four factors (Professionalism, Character, Power, Intelligence), supporting H3. In addition, bias has a significant effect on Professionalism ($F_{(1,401)} = 15.71, p < 0.001$), Character ($F_{(1,401)} = 12.17, p = 0.001$), and Intelligence ($F_{(1,401)} = 28.17, p < 0.001$), with these effects being much larger than the simple-simple main effects of bias on each of these same dependent variables in the technology group in study 1.\(^{11}\) These significant effects provide partial support for H4, with the increase in effect size providing support for the use of the more salient enacted bias treatment in study 2, a goal of the study.

### Table 12. MANOVA tests for between subject effects for main effect of target gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>p -value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13. MANOVA tests for between subject effects for main effect of technology-use bias

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>p -value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>34.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.32</td>
<td>28.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{11}\) Although Sociability approached significance ($F_{(1,405)} = 3.427, p = 0.065$), the interaction supersedes the main effect for this variable.
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The results of these two studies demonstrate that the normal process of impression formation is drastically altered by the targets’ use of technology. Study 1 shows that the presence of technology moderates the relationship between gender and message bias, creating a three-way interaction effect. When investigating the simple 2-way interaction effects we see that when technology is not present, the message content interacts with the gender of the presenter. Specifically, men tend to be judged more favorably when making negative comments and more negatively when making positive comments. Women, on the other hand, are evaluated within a much narrower range of favorability, regardless of whether they are speaking negatively or positively, and (different from the men) are perceived favorably when making positive comments and unfavorably when making negative ones. When technology is present, women and men are both evaluated with the same message/favorability standards; a negative message yields a negative impression and a positive message yields a favorable one. In other words, the gender-based differentiation of the message/favorability impact is subverted by the presence of technology.

Study 2 was meant to more thoroughly test the effects seen in Study 1. In Study 1, the technology is present for the targets, but it is not a focus of their activity; in Study 2, we made the technology-use of the target a highly-focused part of the presentation (the targets either succeed or fail to repair a technology glitch in their presentation tablet). The results again show that, in this technology-present condition, the target is evaluated based solely on their success or failure with the technology, with gender having no moderating or main effect on the impressions formed of the targets. These results further demonstrate that when technology is present, the gender of the target is no longer a factor in subject impressions of
them, which are only a function of the content of their message or of the abilities that they project.

In summary, these results indicate that the stereotype effect for gender is only apparent when technology use is contrasted. Without technology, we would argue that the stereotype effect is such that it obviates a rational evaluation of the target by the observer; the differential stereotype that evaluates men and women by such different standards has its basis only in archaic attitudes toward the sexes. The disappearance of the stereotype effect in the technology-present condition in Study 1, and the failure of the stereotype to appear in technology-centered Study 2, indicates that a target’s use of technology disrupts the simple stereotype-driven categorization process and allows the observer to evaluate the target’s specific performance in a context.

We suspect that this effect is the result of one of two processes: First, it is possible that the technology distracts sufficiently from the gender cues of the target to make them inoperative, or second, that the technology modifies the gender cues in such a way as to make them inoperative. In the first case, the technology presence is a simple distraction, making the environment more complex and thus prone to a nuanced evaluation. The gender of the target is proportionally reduced in the cue set of the evaluator, and stereotypes associated with gender are obviated when the complexity demands a nuanced evaluation. In our second possible process, the presence of the technology directly moderates the gender cue itself, subverting both the male and female stereotypes as they become male and female technology users, which is a new combination that does not activate the gender stereotype. This is compatible with dual-process models of attitude change posited by the Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) (Petty et al. 1981; Petty et al. 1986) and the Heuristic-Systematic
Model (HSM) (Chaiken 1987). When confronted with a target who is speaking about a
technology, but with no heuristic cue (i.e. physical technology), individuals are unmotivated
to expend cognitive resources and therefore revert to low effort persuasion using innate
biases relating to gender (Taylor 1981). Conversely, when technology is included as a
situational factor, an observer’s confidence in their personal knowledge about the situation
decreases (Chaiken et al. 1989) leading to the individual’s personal expectations being
disconfirmed, which increases cognitive effort regarding the situation (Maheswaran et al.
1991). In such circumstances, the observer is presented with a scenario where they engage in
a deeper, more nuanced evaluation of the target resulting in perceptions that align with
actions presented by the targets.

The one evaluation variable that works differently is sociability. Sociability does not
show a three-way interaction in Study 1, and in Study 2 it has a two-way interaction between
the gender of the target and the targets’ success or failure to correct their tablet’s problem. In
Study 1, sociability simply seems to lack strong evaluative attention in the observer; however
in Study 2 it appears to retain importance to the observer. The success or failure of the female
target had little effect on the sociability perceptions of the observers (similar to Study 1);
however, males were viewed with higher sociability when they succeeded and were rated
lower when they failed, which is consistent with the findings associated for both sexes with
the other four factors. In other words, the only sociability effects in Study 2 were for the
male target. We are suspicious that the exaggerated context in Study 2 (direct technology
interaction, with technology failure or success) may have uncovered an occasion of a gender
stereotype that technology did not obviate. Here too, we think one or both of two processes
occurred. First, previous research has attributed to females roles that are more social, warm,
and nurturing (Diekman et al. 2000), interacting better in small groups (Rose et al. 2006), and valuing, and more focused on, relationships (Konrad et al. 2000; Pinker 2008; Tannen 1990). In this light, preexisting perceptual biases about women’s roles may have overwhelmed any perceptions developed associated with exhibited aptitude with technology. The sociability measure is much more focused on relational factors, compared to the other measures examined in this study, and the observers’ sense of their relationship potential with the female target was unaffected by her technology aptitude. This is then exacerbated by extant attitudes toward women’s technology competencies which predisposed observers to low expectations in the first place. These same factors then affected the male target’s evaluations, as he was expected to be competent, and his technology abilities affected evaluations of his relative attractiveness for social relationships.

**Limitations and Future Research**

The study uses an undergraduate student population for its subject pool; while student subjects do represent an important user-group of personal technologies, their use of stereotypes may be confined by their limited life and work experiences and their biases may be different than those of different age groups. Because these students will be in the workforce within the next three years, we believe that they are fairly representative of, at least younger, members of the workforce. The study also uses only mobile technologies, and may not represent the impact of the use of larger scale installed technologies (i.e., presentation systems, desktop units, servers, etc.).

While we believe the present work is an important first step in looking at the impact of technology and technology use on impression formation, we also believe that it suggests a number of interesting future projects. Primary among these is the investigation of these
effects with larger technologies, particularly units where the technology itself is less physically apparent to the observer. In these contexts, mastery is more of an abstraction and it would be interesting to see what kinds of signals are important for target evaluations.

Our subjects in both of our studies were obviously male and female, but we had them in fairly unisex outfits (slacks and shirts). We believe it would also be useful to examine how clothing signals alter the impact of technology use; would skirts, dresses, or formal business attire make the gender stereotype reappear in spite of technology use?

**Implications**

Our findings offer important implications for users of technology as well as for anyone interested in understanding how impressions are formed. This research demonstrates that technology use can have a moderating effect on traditional gender stereotypes, meaning that the increasing proliferation of technology-present situations may well result in less gender stereotyping in the workplace. While we doubt that carrying a high-tech device will completely obviate gender stereotypes everywhere, our analysis indicates that they may be moderated in presentation situations where the technology is an important and appropriate tool.

Our research offers promise by demonstrating that women who exhibit competence when using technology are held accountable in a manner consistent with men. As a result, women will benefit from the increased successful usage, or perceived usage, of technology, which may help to alleviate the gender stereotypes that exist for technology use, when seen in an actual evaluative context.
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APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT

Instrument development involved two phases; an exploratory factor analysis followed by a confirmatory factor analysis. The exploratory factor analysis was run on data from Study 1 to identify relevant underlying constructs within the data that present themselves as salient characteristics for impression formation. Next, a confirmatory factor analysis was run on data from the second study to verify the factors identified through the exploratory factor analysis. In this section we describe the instrument development and leave the description of the experimental procedures (task, participants, manipulations, etc.) for the primary manuscript prose.

Various methods, items, and instruments have been developed to help measure impressions formed by subjects toward target individuals. One commonly used method involves subject ratings of targets based on individual descriptive adjectives. For example, the subject will rate how strongly he or she disagrees or agrees with the word “relaxed” as it applies to the target. Many different word lists have been developed for use in impression formation (Anderson 1968; Christman et al. 1990; McCroskey et al. 1974; Walther 1993). These instruments vary from an ad hoc list of words (Walther 1993), to words listed within constructs (Christman et al. 1990; McCroskey et al. 1974), and, ultimately, to an omnibus list of 555 different words (Anderson 1968). While a large list provides an exhaustive mechanism for measuring impression formation, the sheer magnitude of such a list is not tenable for use in this study due to time constraints and the potential for instrument fatigue. Further, we sought to focus the evaluation on adjectives that would reflect on the nature of the treatments’ anticipated effects; that is, perceptions related to competence, intelligence,
decisiveness, and similar concepts related to technology use. For this reason, a new instrument is adapted and validated in tandem with the two studies in this research.

The vast word list from the impression formation literature was first narrowed to a shorter list for use in this research. This involved the researchers analyzing the words and adjectives in each list using a number of criteria. First, duplicate words were dropped between the lists as well as antonym words, with only one of the antonym pairs retained (for example responsible and irresponsible). Second, words were examined based on their understandability by the target demographic of the study (i.e. college students). Given the exhaustiveness of the lists as well as the dated nature of some of the words, many adjectives were removed if they were thought to have the potential to be confusing, ambiguous, or misinterpreted. Third, words were analyzed for their contextual parallel to the topics at hand (namely technology and gender). Those adjectives that did not pertain to the focus of the study were dropped. Based on these criteria, 34 words remained for use in the two studies (see the questionnaire in Appendix B).

For study 1, an exploratory factor analysis was performed using the selected adjectives. While some of the previous impression formation research has included adjective groupings associated with constructs (Christman et al. 1990; McCroskey et al. 1974), much of the prior literature associated with impression formation begins with word lists that are not associated with established factors (Anderson 1968; Walther 1993). Additionally, we determined that given the exploratory nature of a study of impression formation associated with technology use by a target user, it would be useful to not pre-define item groupings. Nevertheless, we did select items that we presumed would align with the important concepts
associated with impression formation such as competence, intelligence, and similar evaluative concepts.

Exploratory factor analysis provides a mechanism for aggregating items into common factors, which help to better explain the constructs that are affected by impression formation. Principal components analysis was chosen as the extraction method because its primary use is for data reduction as compared to principal axis factoring or maximum likelihood estimation extraction techniques. An oblique rotation method (covaramin) was first utilized to test for high interfactor correlation. Given that no interfactor correlations were above 0.36, this allowed for the use of an orthogonal rotation method (varimax), which assumes that the factors are uncorrelated and provides for a simpler interpretation of the factor solution. Running the PCA analysis with orthogonal rotation, we find that the factorability of the data is quite good with an overall Kaiser Measure of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) of 0.95 and each of the individual MSA values for each variable well above the 0.7 cutoff (the lowest being 0.87).

With the initial requirement met for factorability, next we determined the number of factors from the data. First, the Kaiser-Guttman rule (Kaiser 1960) would recommend extracting six factors given that there are six eigenvalues greater than the value of one (see Table 14). The percent variance explained is also quite high for a six-factor solution at 67%. Parallel analysis\(^\text{12}\) (Horn 1965) in tandem with a scree plot (Cattell 1966) hints at a 6-factor solution (see Figure 4). The eigenvalue line and the randomized parallel analysis line cross

---

\(^{12}\) Parallel analysis has been found in simulation studies using data sets with clear factor structure to work well for separating items into factors (Zwick et al. 1986).
between six and seven indicating a six factor solution as optimal, which also keeps three or more indicators per factor. For this reason, we decided to utilize a six-factor solution.

Table 14. Eigenvalues, differences, and proportional and cumulative variance explained for exploratory factor analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Parallel analysis and scree plot

Next, to assess the six-factor solution the residual correlation matrix, communalities, and uniqueness values were analyzed. The residual correlation matrix showed that very few values were close to zero, indicating an adequate solution. Next, the uniqueness values were
reviewed. Given that uniqueness values roughly correspond to reliability values, we would like to see these high (above 0.6) and the communalities low as these correspond to error variance. Two uniqueness values were found to be below 0.5 and were marked for further analysis in the next round of testing (see Table 15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Sociability</th>
<th>Intelligence</th>
<th>Agressiveness</th>
<th>Uniqueness</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sociable</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggressive</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interesting</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experienced</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasant</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependable</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficient</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logical</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seriously-minded</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>businesslike</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likeable</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsive</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decisive</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impressive</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualified</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expert</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliable</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persuasive</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharp</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trustworthy</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incompetent</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Rotated factor solution, uniqueness, and communalities

Finally, the rotated factor loadings were analyzed and categorized along each factor. Three items were dropped due to not exceeding 0.5 on any of the six factors. Also, a fourth item was dropped due to strong cross-loading on two factors (0.53 and 0.50 respectively).

The factors were also given names based on common themes among the items.
To further verify the proposed instrument, a confirmatory factor analysis was run on the data from the second study using the factors and items derived from the exploratory factor analysis run on the data in Study 1. The measurement model was evaluated using multiple fit criteria, specifically the comparative fit index (CFI), the Incremental Fit Index (IFI), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), and the adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI). Acceptable levels for each include CFI and IFI $\geq 0.90$ (adequate) to 0.95 (superior), RMSEA $\leq 0.08$ (good) to 0.1 (reasonable), SRMR $\leq 0.08$, and AGFI $\geq 0.80$ (Bearden et al. 1993; Bentler 1992; Bollen 1989; Gefen et al. 2000; Hu et al. 1999; MacCallum et al. 1996).

The measurement model included the six factors from the exploratory factor analysis including all 31 retained items. The first run of the measurement model indicated that the model did not fit the data well: $\chi^2 (390) = 1802.87, p < 0.001$, CFI = 0.83, IFI = 0.84, RMSEA = 0.092, SRMR = 0.064, and AGFI = 0.69. Upon further investigation, we found that the Aggressiveness factor did not fit well with two of the three loadings below 0.5. Given that two of the three items were well below the recommended cutoff of 0.7 (Hair et al. 1998), the Aggressiveness factor was dropped from the analysis. Further, inspection of the parameters also revealed that one item under Professionalism (seriously minded), two items under Character (honest and dependable), and one item under Power (attractive) were also well below the recommended cutoff of 0.7. Considering content validity, seriously minded was deemed to be a confusing term and attractive did not seem to fit well under the construct of Power, so these two items were obvious candidates for removal. Conversely, both honest and dependable seemed to fit well under the concept of Character, but given the low values and the fact that Character had four other items belonging to the factor, both of these items
were dropped. Upon rerunning the measurement model, the model was found to fit the data well on most of the fit indices $\chi^2 (216) = 831.81$, $p < 0.001$, $CFI = 0.91$, $IFI = 0.91$, $RMSEA = 0.082$, $SRMR = 0.047$, and $AGFI = 0.80$. The means, standard deviations, Cronbach’s alpha, composite reliability, average variance extracted (AVE), and correlations of the measures are shown in Table 16.

**Table 16. Measurement model statistics including means, standard deviations, Cronbach alphas, composite reliability, average variance extracted, and correlations, with the square root of the AVE along the diagonal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Professionalism</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Sociability</th>
<th>Intelligence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.90 [CI=0.88,0.91]</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.84 [CI=0.82,0.87]</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.88 [CI=0.87,0.90]</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.86 [CI=0.84,0.88]</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.80 [CI=0.76,0.83]</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation of the quality of the measurement model included several tests of reliability and validity (Bagozzi et al. 1988; Fornell et al. 1981). Reliability was assessed by examining construct reliability (using Cronbach’s coefficient alpha), and composite reliability. All values for Cronbach’s alpha are above the recommended cutoff of 0.7 (Nunnally 1978), with the lowest value being 0.8. Composite reliability is an index that reflects the impact of error on the measurement scale and is widely used in reliability checks in SEM (Raykov et al. 2003). All the factors have a composite reliability above the recommended cutoff of 0.7 (Bagozzi et al. 1988; Bearden et al. 1993; Fornell et al. 1981) indicating high composite reliability for the measurement model.

Both convergent and discriminant construct validity were also tested for the measurement model. Convergent validity can be evaluated using the average variance extracted (AVE), and the factor loadings of the indicators for each factor. AVE, representing the amount of variance a construct captures from its indicators (Chin 1998), is recommended
to be higher than 0.5 to indicate good convergent validity (Chin 1998; Hu et al. 2004). All factors in the measurement model were found to have AVE values above the 0.5 cutoff (see Table 16). The literature suggests that factor indicator loadings should be at least 0.6 and ideally 0.7 or above, indicating that the latent variable is accounting for 50 percent or more of the variance of the observed item (Chin 1998; Hu et al. 2004). All factor loadings were found to be above the 0.6 cutoff, with only two items (a 0.69 indicator for Professionalism and a 0.67 indicator for Sociability) falling below 0.7, indicating good convergent validity (Hair et al. 2006).

Discriminant validity is assessed through examination of cross loadings of constructs by inspection of the square root of the AVE for each factor and then comparing this to the factor’s inter-factor correlations. This square root value stands for the association of each of the factors to its respective items while correlations with the other factors indicate overlap of items among the constructs. Table 16 shows that the square root of the construct AVE values (along the diagonal) are equal to or higher than the correlations with the other constructs, indicating that each construct is more closely related to its own measure than to the measures of other constructs (Chin 1998; Gefen et al. 2005; Majchrzak et al. 2005). Taken together, the results of the measurement model demonstrate high reliability as well as satisfactory convergent and discriminant validity for the factors.
APPENDIX B

A Tablet PC is a notebook or slate-shaped mobile computer. Its touch screen or graphics tablet/screen hybrid technology allows the user to operate the computer with a stylus, digital pen, or a fingertip instead of a keyboard or mouse. Typically, it can be held in one hand leaving the other to input data with a pen type stylus or a reduced size keyboard. They are usually designed to provide the user with computing and information storage and retrieval capabilities for personal or business use, such as taking notes, keeping calendars and address book information handy. Most Tablet PCs have one or more of the following features:

- Wireless connectivity to the Internet
- A pen or stylus interface with handwriting recognition
- Speech recognition and voice recording capabilities
- High-capacity storage using flash memory and hard disk drives
- Applications such as MS Word, Excel, and other types of PC-type software

Questions about Tablet PCs

Please answer the following questions about Tablet PCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Using a Tablet PC in my job/class would enable me to accomplish tasks more quickly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Using a Tablet PC would improve my performance in my job or in my classes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Using a Tablet PC in my job or in my class would increase my productivity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Using a Tablet PC would enhance my effectiveness in my job or in my class work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Using a Tablet PC would make it easier to do my work in my job or in my classes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would find a Tablet PC useful in my job or in my classes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Learning to operate a Tablet PC would be easy for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would find it easy to get a Tablet PC to do what I want it to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My interaction with a Tablet PC would be clear and understandable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I would find a Tablet PC to be flexible to interact with.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It would be easy for me to become skilled at using a Tablet PC.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I would find a Tablet PC easy to use.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Do you expect that a Tablet PC would provide you with the precise information you need?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do you expect that the information content provided by a Tablet PC would meet your needs?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do you expect that a Tablet PC would provide you with output that seems to be exactly what you need?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Do you expect that a Tablet PC would provide you with sufficient information for your needs?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Does a Tablet PC provide accurate information?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Do you think the output of a Tablet PC would be presented in a useful format?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 The same survey instrument was used for both studies with the term “Tablet PC” replaced with “PDA” in the first study.
19. Is the information clear? 1 2 3 4 5 6
20. Are Tablet PCs user friendly? 1 2 3 4 5 6
21. Are Tablet PCs easy to use? 1 2 3 4 5 6
22. Would you expect that you would get the information that you need from a Tablet PC in a timely manner? 1 2 3 4 5 6
23. Do Tablet PCs provide up-to-date information? 1 2 3 4 5 6

Please answer the following group of questions based on your feelings about your skills with Tablet PCs.

If I were asked to use a Tablet PC that I was not familiar with, I usually could perform tasks using such a device…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Totally Confident</th>
<th>Not at all Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. if there was no one around to tell me what to do as I go</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. if I had only the manual for reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. if I could see someone else using it before trying it myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. if I could call someone for help if I got stuck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. if someone else helped me get started</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. if someone showed me how to do it first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. if I had a lot of time to complete the tasks for which the device was provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please answer the following group of questions based on your feelings about your skills with these devices.

Please rate yourself on your confidence with using …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Totally Confident</th>
<th>Not at all Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Video Conferencing Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A Personal Digital Assistant (Tablet PC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The Internet via mobile phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Voice via mobile phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Internet-based communications (e.g., chat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please answer the following group of questions based on your feelings about Tablet PCs.

If you currently own a Tablet PC, check here and go to question 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. I will buy a Tablet PC in the next 6 months?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. If I possessed a Tablet PC, I would make extensive use of it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. A Tablet PC would be very useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I would like to own a Tablet PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you answered questions 14-18, please go to the next page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions about the person who read the article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person who read the article is…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sociable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Experienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Dependable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Logical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Seriously Minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Businesslike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Likeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Responsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Decisive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Impressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Attractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Persuasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Trustworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Incompetent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions about the Article**

**Answer these questions based on the article that was read about Tablet PCs**

| 35. The article provided only positive information about Tablet PCs? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 36. The article indicated that most users are satisfied with their Tablet PC? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 37. The article indicated that most users find Tablet PCs easy to use? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 38. The article indicated that most users think that Tablet PCs made them more productive? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 39. The article indicated that most users would think that their Tablet PC helps them complete important business functions? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 40. The article indicated that most users would think that their investment in their Tablet PC was worthwhile? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

41. When the article was read the person reading the article read the story from a ____________
42. How important was what was used to read the article in influencing your opinions?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. Did what the person use to read the article help you understand the article?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. Was it important to you that the person reading used this item to read the article?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The person reading the article…  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45. Made a lot of mistakes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Had trouble reading the article</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Struggled with using the Table PC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions about Yourself

Age: __________  Sex: M  F  Collegiate GPA: __________

Highest Degree Earned: __________  #Years Professional Work Experience: __________

Major or Degree Program: __________
APPENDIX C

STUDY 1 SCRIPTS

Negative Bias

Japanese mobile Internet customers not happy with Tablet PCs

A recent survey by Gartner Group Japan has shown that the majority of the customers in Japan using Tablet PCs are unhappy with their devices.

The survey showed that 75 percent of the users are dissatisfied with the Tablet PC capabilities, and that the majority of dissatisfaction was with the interface.

In spite of the findings, however, Japan has built up a user base of more than 10 million people who use Tablet PCs, to lead the world in use of these devices.

Gartner said the two main reasons why users were dissatisfied was because of the lack of availability of quality products and difficulty of use. This is particularly surprising since the Japanese generally accept new technologies readily, in spite of their shortcomings.

65 percent of the respondents under 20 years of age voiced dissatisfaction with the user interface, and of respondents between the ages of 31 and 39 and over 50, the figure was nearly 60 percent. The main disadvantages cited by the respondents under the age of 20 centered on poor handwriting recognition and high costs. Respondents 20 and over voiced dissatisfaction with the content and performance of the device, such as 'the operating system’s features are hard to use.'

The survey, conducted by the local subsidiary of Gartner Dataquest, also found that 68 percent of users found that their Tablet PCs were not making them more productive or efficient workers.

Gartner Group Japan expects that devices with greater functionality and better handwriting recognition will be available in the future. In spite of this, it is doubtful that these new technologies will help users to be more productive since these devices still lack many of the capabilities that help knowledge workers to improve their ability to complete important business functions. Most users said that they thought that their investment in a Tablet PC at this time was a foolish decision because of the shortcomings of these devices. For example, Rob Severson, a Tablet owner who works at Cromwell Products, Inc., indicated that, “I don’t think anyone should invest in, or for that matter, bother using a Tablet PC because they reduce your productivity and are hard to use.”

Now that I have told you about this survey by Gartner Group on Tablet PCs, please answer the questions about these devices that you will find in the packet.

Positive Bias

Japanese mobile Internet customers happy with Tablet PCs

A recent survey by Gartner Group Japan has shown that the majority of the customers in Japan using Tablet PCs are happy with their devices

The survey showed that 75 percent of the users are satisfied with the Tablet PC capabilities, and that the majority of satisfaction was with the interface.
In line with the findings, however, Japan has built up a user base of more than 10 million people who use Tablet PCs, to lead the world in use of these devices.

Gartner said the two main reasons why users were satisfied was because of the availability of quality products and ease of use. This is not too surprising since the Japanese generally accept new technologies readily.

65 percent of the respondents under 20 years of age voiced satisfaction with the user interface, and of respondents between the ages of 31 and 39 and over 50, the figure was nearly 60 percent. The main advantages cited by the respondents under the age of 20 centered on handwriting recognition and low costs. Respondents 20 and over voiced satisfaction with the content and performance of the device, such as 'the operating system’s features are easy to use.'

The survey, conducted by the local subsidiary of Gartner Dataquest, also found that 68 percent of users found that their Tablet PCs were making them more productive and efficient workers.

Gartner Group Japan expects that devices with greater functionality and better handwriting recognition will be available in the future. Given this, it is likely that these new technologies will help users to be more productive since these devices have many of the capabilities that help knowledge workers to improve their ability to complete important business functions. Most users said that they thought that their investment in a Tablet PC at this time was a wise decision because of the advantages of these devices. For example, Rob Severson, a Tablet owner who works at Cromwell Products, Inc., indicated that, “I think most anyone should invest in and use a Tablet PC because they increase your productivity and are easy to use.”

Now that I have told you about this survey by GartnerGroup on Tablet PCs, please answer the questions about these devices that you will find in the packet.
APPENDIX D

STUDY 2 SCRIPTS

Positive Bias (i.e. No Failure Condition)

[READ FROM TABLET PC]

Inventing the Tablet PC
by Suzanne Rossi, Microsoft Research

For over twenty years scientists have been dreaming about creating a real P.A.D.D., the slate device that the inhabitants of Star Trek used to record and access data as they moved around the starship Enterprise.

There have been attempts to duplicate it over the years, but the Tablet PC may be the first successful incarnation. Some of this is timing - consumers are demanding more from their computers, and they want what the Tablet offers. The other reason is research - years of hard work and data gathering have made the Tablet PC possible.

Tablet PC is an evolution of the portable PC. It takes the best from a standard laptop and adds features that make retiring your laptop one of the smartest ideas you've ever had. To start with, it uses multi-modal input - you can input with keyboard, pen, or voice. While you may be committing a social faux pas by burying your head behind a computer screen as you click on a keyboard during a meeting, you will feel perfectly comfortable taking notes in your own handwriting on the Tablet PC.

I will now review a few of the advantages and disadvantages of using Tablet PCs.

Tablet PC Advantages:

There are several advantages to using Tablet PCs.

- Portability — tablets are very slim and light compared to typical laptops and can easily be tucked under the arm like a book.
- Horizontal orientation — most tablet PCs do not interrupt line of sight since they lie flat on the table or in one's arms. This allows for better interaction in business meetings and conferences and also makes it easy for digital artists who wish to draw on a horizontal medium.
- Tablets have a more natural form of input — sketching and handwriting are a more familiar form of input than a keyboard and mouse, especially for people who are new to computers.

I will demonstrate how these actions work. If I open an MS Word document, for example, I can write my text in MS Word and have it recognize what I write.

[MAKE A GESTURE ON THE TABLET AS THOUGH YOU ARE WRITING ON THE SCREEN. ACT AS THOUGH YOU ARE SUCCESSFUL]

As I write my name it converts it to text. [WRITE ON THE SCREEN AND RESPOND AS THOUGH IT WORKS]

- Note-taking — taking handwritten notes at a class or conference increases productivity and retention of information. The notes can also be searched automatically if handwriting recognition is implemented.
In this same MS Word document I can take notes and have it record my handwriting. As I write down my signature, it will keep it as my signature. There, it recorded my signature.

- Gesture recognition — gestures involve moving the pen in special patterns over the screen. This is a powerful way to increase efficiency. Many applications, or the operating system itself, can be programmed to respond in different ways to certain gestures created by the pen.

If I want to delete my signature, I can scratch out the text and it will be deleted. Ok, it deleted the signature.

- Digital Drawings — tablets are useful for drawing sketches. For many, this is one of the most important features of Tablet PCs.

As I draw the picture, it records it in the Word document. It will be saved in the word document along with the text and handwritten words.

Tablet PC Disadvantages

There are also several problems with using Tablet PCs. These include…

- Higher cost — Tablet PCs cost roughly $300 more than their non-tablet counterparts.
- Screen size — the size of tablet PC screens currently peaks at 14.1 inches. However, some models make up for this with very high resolution (a higher pixel density per unit area).
- Input speed — maximum handwriting speed can be significantly slower than maximum typing speed.
- Screen damage risk - Because Tablet PC's are handled more than conventional laptops yet built on the frames of conventional notebooks, and because their screens also serve as input devices, many Tablet PC's run a higher risk of screen damage. PDAs carry some of the same risk.
- No built in optical drive (some Tablet PCs).

Now that we have told you about Tablet PCs, we would like for you to evaluate these devices. Please follow the instructions of the student assistant in the room to complete this session.

Negative Bias (i.e. Complete Failure Condition)

[READ FROM TABLET PC]

Inventing the Tablet PC

by Suzanne Rossi, Microsoft Research
For over twenty years scientists have been dreaming about creating a real P.A.D.D., the slate device that the inhabitants of Star Trek used to record and access data as they moved around the starship Enterprise.

There have been attempts to duplicate it over the years, but the Tablet PC may be the first successful incarnation. Some of this is timing - consumers are demanding more from their computers, and they want what the Tablet offers. The other reason is research - years of hard work and data gathering have made the Tablet PC possible.

Tablet PC is an evolution of the portable PC. It takes the best from a standard laptop and adds features that make retiring your laptop one of the smartest ideas you've ever had. To start with, it uses multi-modal input - you can input with keyboard, pen, or voice. While you may be committing a social faux pas by burying your head behind a computer screen as you click on a keyboard during a meeting, you will feel perfectly comfortable taking notes in your own handwriting on the Tablet PC.

I will now review a few of the advantages and disadvantages of using Tablet PCs.

**Tablet PC Advantages:**

There are several advantages to using Tablet PCs.

- **Portability** — tablets are very slim and light compared to typical laptops and can easily be tucked under the arm like a book.
- **Horizontal orientation** — most tablet PCs do not interrupt line of sight since they lie flat on the table or in one's arms. This allows for better interaction in business meetings and conferences and also makes it easy for digital artists who wish to draw on a horizontal medium.
- **Tablets have a more natural form of input** — sketching and handwriting are a more familiar form of input than a keyboard and mouse, especially for people who are new to computers.

I will demonstrate how these actions work. If I open an MS Word document, for example, I can write my text in MS Word and have it recognize what I write.

**[MAKE A GESTURE ON THE TABLET AS THOUGH YOU ARE WRITING ON THE SCREEN. ACT AS THOUGH YOU ARE SUCCESSFUL]**

As I write my name it converts it to text. **[WRITE ON THE SCREEN AND RESPOND AS THOUGH IT WORKS]**

- **Note-taking** — taking handwritten notes at a class or conference increases productivity and retention of information. The notes can also be searched automatically if handwriting recognition is implemented.

**[MAKE A GESTURE ON THE TABLET AS THOUGH YOU ARE WRITING ON THE SCREEN. ACT AS THOUGH YOU FIRST ENCOUNTER SOME DIFFICULTY BUT THEN RECOVER]**

In this same MS Word document I can take notes and have it record my handwriting. As I write down my signature, it will keep it as my signature. **[WRITE ON THE TABLET]** Oh, wait, it converted it to text. Wait, let me change the settings in this document. **[WRITE ON THE TABLET]** Ok, let me try again. **[WRITE ON THE TABLET]** Oh no, it converted it to text again. I’ll try this one more time. **[WRITE ON THE TABLET]** OK, that time it worked.

- **Gesture recognition** — gestures involve moving the pen in special patterns over the screen. This is a powerful way to increase efficiency. Many applications, or the operating system itself, can be programmed to respond in different ways to certain gestures created by the pen.
If I want to delete my signature, I can scratch out the text and it will be deleted. [MAKE A SCRATCH
GESTURE ON THE TABLET] Ok, it’s not working. I’ll try one more time. [MAKE A SCRATCH
GESTURE ON THE TABLET] Ok, I give up, I can’t make this work! I will just read the rest of these features
so that I don’t have other problems with this demonstration.

- Digital Drawings — tablets are useful for drawing sketches. For many, this is one of the most
  important features of Tablet PCs.

**Tablet PC Disadvantages**

There are also several problems with using Tablet PCs. These include…

- Higher cost — Tablet PCs cost roughly $300 more than their non-tablet counterparts.
- Screen size — the size of tablet PC screens currently peaks at 14.1 inches. However, some models
  make up for this with very high resolution (a higher pixel density per unit area).
- Input speed — maximum handwriting speed can be significantly slower than maximum typing speed.
- Screen damage risk - Because Tablet PC's are handled more than conventional laptops yet built on the
  frames of conventional notebooks, and because their screens also serve as input devices, many Tablet
  PC's run a higher risk of screen damage. PDAs carry some of the same risk.
- No built in optical drive (some Tablet PCs).

Now that we have told you about Tablet PCs, we would like for you to evaluate these devices. Please follow
the instructions of the student assistant in the room to complete this session.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

The objective of this research is to provide insight into the intersection of psychology and information systems. This was carried out through the use of three papers which provided research on psychology and information systems in three separate areas of psychology; specifically personality psychology, counseling psychology, and social psychology.

The first paper provided a comparison of the Big Five personality indicator and the Myers Briggs cognitive style indicator in the area of virtual team work. A new scale to measure preference for working in virtual teams was developed and validated for this research. Findings show that while cognitive style displays greater predictive power with regard to preference for working in virtual teams over working alone, personality displays greater predictive power with regard to preference for working in virtual teams over working face-to-face.

The second paper utilized the Social Cognitive Career Theory model measuring interest of students in majoring in information technology. The study measured high school students in order to gain a greater understanding of the relationship of the predictors of intent to major before the students have made more substantive decisions after entering college. The results show that both self-efficacy and outcome expectations lead to interest in IT, but only interest and outcome expectations lead to greater intention to major in IT.

Finally, the third paper looks at the impression formation process in relation to mobile technology use. A two-study approach was used to both develop and validate a measure of impression formation as well as thoroughly investigate the research question. The results
show that when users are speaking about technology, the presence of the technology interacts with the gender of the target and the bias of the message with impressions of men differing between technology use/disuse while women do not differ across the technology use dimensions. Specifically, impressions of men are lower when technology is present as compared to not present when the target speaks negatively about the technology. Conversely, impressions of men are higher when technology is present as compared to not present when the target speaks positively about the technology. In comparison, impressions of women are lower when they speak negatively about technology and higher when they speak positively about technology. The findings of the second study confirm those of the first study, implying that the use of technology mitigates biases in impressions of men and women.
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