

GenderMag Facets Survey

From the GenderMag Project (<http://gendermag.org>)

Where available, how to cite: ACM Digital Library. It's in the supplemental materials for this paper:

[Vorvoreanu et al. 2019] Mihaela Vorvoreanu, Lingyi Zhang, Yun-Han Huang, Claudia Hilderbrand, Zoe Steine-Hanson, Margaret Burnett, “From Gender Biases to Gender-Inclusive Design: An Empirical Investigation”, 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems Proceedings (CHI 2019), May 4-9, 2019, Glasgow, Scotland, UK. ACM, New York, NY, USA. Paper 53. 14 pages. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3290605.3300283>

You can also download it directly from <http://gendermag.org>

[illegible]

use.									
7. I explore areas of <insert type of technology> before it is time for me to use it.									
8. I'm never satisfied with the default settings for my <insert type of technology>; I customize them in some way.									
9. I want to get things right the first time, so before I decide how to take action, I gather as much information as I can.									
10. I always do extensive research and comparison shopping before making important purchases.									
11. When a decision needs to be made, it is important to me to gather relevant details before deciding, in order to be sure of the direction we are heading.									
12. I avoid "advanced" buttons or sections in <insert type of technology>.									
13. I avoid activities that are dangerous or risky.									
14. Despite the risks, I use features in <insert type of technology> that haven't been proven to work.									

KEY

If agree on Questions....	
1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 1f, 1g	High Self Efficacy (Tim)
2	Low Self Efficacy (Abi)
3, 4, 5	Motivations: Technology for its own sake (Tim)
6, 7, 8	Learning: Tinkerer (Tim)
9, 10, 11	Comprehensive Information Processing (Abi)
12, 13	Risk Adverse (Abi)
14	NOT Risk Adverse (Tim)

Interpretation key:

- Facet values: All facet values are relative to their peers, not “absolute values”.
- Definition of “their peers”: Unless there is some compellingly better source of data about “their peers”, we usually define “their peers” as meaning the other participants in the study. (If there are multiple treatments, we use ALL participants regardless of what treatment group they were in.).
- Tim vs. Abi Comparisons: For each facet, we define people more like “Tim” as being participants above the median of “their peers”, and people more like “Abi” as being participation below the median. Since we’re using median as the dividing point, that means that the number of Tim’s and Abi’s will be about equal. What you do with participants directly on the median is up to you. We usually call them Tims if there are slightly more Tim’s than Abi’s, or vice versa if there are more Abi’s than Tim’s.
- Analysis note: Although a few people are “pure Abi” (all 5 facets on the Abi side of the median) and a few are “pure Tim”, most have a mix of facets. For this reason, it’s much more useful to analyze by facet (ie, all low-self-efficacy people vs all high-self-efficacy people, then all risk-averse people vs all risk-tolerant people, and so on for the other facets) than it is to lump all the facets together to classify a whole person as an Abi or Tim. (See [Vorvoreanu et al. 2019] for examples.)