



Assessing Personality Differences in Human-technology Interaction: An Overview of Key Self-report Scales to Predict Successful Interaction

& a New Scale to Assess Affinity for Technology

Christiane Attig¹, Daniel Wessel², & Thomas Franke²

¹Technische Universität Chemnitz, Germany; ²Universität zu Lübeck, Germany

Personality differences in HCI

- Pervasiveness of technology increases user diversity in technology interaction
 - High pace of innovations = high demands on learning to cope with technology
- Crucial: Focus on the individual fit between users & technical system
 - Numerous, interconnected and partly overlapping personality constructs exist in HCI
 - Need for structuring the prevailing constructs and scales
- Research objective: Review & structure existing HCI personality scales
- Research questions:
 - (Q1) Which technology-related personality scales are frequently applied in HCI research?
 - (Q2) Which technology-related personality scales have been recently proposed?

Method

- 1st Step: Identification
 - Literature search in Google Scholar with the search string

("human-technology interaction" OR "human-computer interaction") AND "personality" and ("questionnaire" OR "scale") AND "reliability"

- Iterative forward and backward search including five review articles [6, 12, 13, 19, 24]
- 59 technology-related personality scales identified
- 2nd Step: Selection
 - Criteria: citations in HCI/HFE journals/proceedings & recency 3 clusters:
 - (C1) established scales: >10 citations in key HCI/HFE journals/proceedings
 - (C2) recent scales: published in last 10 years & >5 citations
 - (C3) very recent scales: published in last 5 years

Results

- (Q1): Frequently applied scales (see Table on right; full table in paper)
 - Most frequent: computer attitude (9x), c. anxiety (8x), c. efficacy (3x)
 - Also relevant: c. playfulness, personal innovativeness, technology readiness (each 1x)
 - Established computer attitudes scales are rarely cited anymore
 - Attitude, anxiety, and efficacy scales are conceptually overlapping
- (Q2): Recently proposed scales
 - Control beliefs while dealing with technology, internet attitude and self-efficacy, technology commitment, computer-related motivations, nomophobia, geekism
 - Constructs and scales have become more domain-specific
 - Shift from computer anxiety and technophobia to nomophobia (fear to be w/o device)

The ATI scale

- Affinity for technology as key personal resource for coping with ever-new systems
 - Specifically: affinity for technology interaction
- Previous related scales:
 - Focus on outcomes (e.g., competence), purchase-related facets, general attitudes [9]
 - Assess rather intense forms of affinity for technology (e.g., geekism [21])
- The <u>Affinity for Technology Interaction</u> (ATI) scale:
 - ATI as a preferred interaction style (i.e., cognitive style)
 - Grounded in established psychological construct need for cognition [4; see also 21]
- First results with *N* = **502** participants:

[12] LaLomia MJ, Sidowski JB (1991). Measurements of computer attitudes: A review. Int J Hum-Comput Int 3:171-197

- Excellent reliability (Cronbach's alpha = .90) & unidimensionality (factor analysis)
- The **ATI score**: reverse negatively worded items (3, 6, 8) & compute mean

Authors	Scale names and abbreviations	Co	C5
(C1) established scales: >10 citations in key HCI/HFE journals/proceedings		Citation counts overall (Co) a within the last five years (C5	
Loyd & Gressard (1984) [14]	Computer Attitude Scale (CAS-L)	90	4
Nickell & Pinto (1986) [17]	Computer Attitude Scale (CAS-N)	56	6
Kay (1993) [10]	Computer Attitude Measure (CAM)	39	0
Heinssen et al. (1987) [7]	Computer Anxiety Rating Scale (CARS-H)	87	17
Rosen et al. (1987) [20]	Computer Anxiety Rating Scale (CARS-R)	65	2
Barbeite & Weiss (2004) [2]	New Computer Anxiety and Self-efficacy Scales	29	17
Compeau & Higgins (1995) [5]	Computer Self-Efficacy Measure (CSEM)	180	93
Murphy et al. (1989) [15]	Computer Self-Efficacy Scale (CSE)	45	9
Webster & Martocchio (1992) [25]	Computer Playfulness Scale (CPS)	70	23
Argawal & Prasad (1998) [1]	Personal Innovativeness in Information Technologies (PIIT)	57	38
Parasuraman (2000) [18]	Technology Readiness Index (TRI)	17	13
(C2) recent scales: published in last 10) years & >5 citations		
Beier (2009) [3]	Control Beliefs while Dealing with Technology (KUT)	8	
Karrer et al. (2009) [9]	Affinity for Technology Questionnaire (TA-EG)	8	
Schulenberg & Melton (2008) [22]	Computer Aversion, Attitudes, and Familiarity Index (CAAFI)	7	
Joyce & Kirakowski (2015) [8]	General Internet Attitude Scale (GIAS)	6	
(C3) very recent scales: published in la	st 5 years		
Neyer et al. (2012) [16]	Technology Commitment (TB)	1	
Kim & Glassman (2013) [11]	Internet Self-Efficacy Scale (ISS)	3	
Yildirim & Correira (2015) [26]	Nomophobia Questionnaire (NMP-Q)	3	
Senkbeil & Ihme (2016) [23]	Short Scale for Computer-Related Motivations in Adults (FECA	vE) 0	
Schmettow & Drees (2014) [21]	Gex (Geekism, explicit)	0	

apps and other software applications, as well as entire digital devices (e.g. mobile phone, computer, TV, car navigation).									
	ease indicate the degree to which you ree/disagree with the following statements.	completely disagree	largely disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	largely agree	completely agree		
1	I like to occupy myself in greater detail with technical systems.								
2	I like testing the functions of new technical systems.								
3	I predominantly deal with technical systems because I have to.								
4	When I have a new technical system in front of me, I try it out intensively.								
5	I enjoy spending time becoming acquainted with a new technical system.								
6	It is enough for me that a technical system works; I don't care how or why.								
7	I try to understand how a technical system exactly works.								
8	It is enough for me to know the basic functions of a technical system.								
9	I try to make full use of the capabilities of a technical system.								

In the following questionnaire, we will ask you about your interaction with technical systems. 'Technical systems' refers to

[1] Argawal R, Prasad J (1998). A conceptual and operational definition of personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology. Inform Syst Res 9:204-215 [13] LaLomia MJ, Sidowski JB (1993) Measurements of computer anxiety: A review. Int J Hum-Comput Int 5:239-266 [2] Barbeite FG, Weiss EM (2004) Computer self-efficacy and anxiety scales for an internet sample: Testing measurement equivalence of existing measures and [14] Loyd BH, Gressard C (1984) Reliability and factorial validity of computer attitude scales. Educ Psychol Meas 44:501-505 development of new scales. Comput Hum Behav 20:1-15 [15] Murphy CA, Coover D, Owen SV (1989) Development and validation of the computer self-efficacy scale. Educ Psychol Meas 49, 893-899 [16] Neyer FJ, Felber J, Gebhardt C (2012) Entwicklung und Validierung einer Kurzskala zur Erfassung von Technikbereitschaft [Development and validation of a brief [3] Beier G (1999) Kontrollüberzeugungen im Umgang mit Technik [Control beliefs in dealing with technology]. Rep Psychol 9:684-93 [4] Cacioppo JT, Petty RE (1982) The need for cognition. J Pers Soc Psychol 42:116-131. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.42.1.116 measure of technology commitment]. Diagnostica 58:87-99 [5] Compeau DR, Higgings CA (1995) Computer self-efficacy: Development of a measure and initial test. MIS Quart 19:189-211 [17] Nickell GS, Pinto JN (1986) The Computer Attitude Scale. Comput Hum Behav 2:301-306 [6] Garland KJ, Noyes JM (2008) Computer attitude scales: How relevant today? Comput Hum Behav 24:563-575 [18] Parasuraman A (2000). Technology Readiness Index (TRI). J Serv Res-US 2:307-320 [7] Heinssen RK, Glass CR, Knight LA (1987) Assessing computer anxiety: Development and validation of the computer anxiety rating scale. Comput Hum Behav 3:49-59.[19] Powell AL (2013). Computer anxiety: Comparison of research from the 1990s and 2000s. Comput in Hum Behav 29:2337-2381 [8]Joyce M, Kirakowski J (2015) Measuring attitudes towards the internet: The general internet attitude scale. Int J Hum-Comput Int 31:506-517 [20] Rosen LD, Sears DC, Weil MM (1987) Computerphobia. Behav Res Meth Ins C 19:167-179 [9] Karrer K, Glaser C, Clemens C, Bruder C (2009). Technikaffinität erfassen – der Fragebogen TA-EG. In: [21] Schmettow M, Drees M (2014) What drives the geeks? Linking computer enthusiasm to achievement goals. In: Proceedings of HCI 2014, Southport, UK. BCS Lichtenstein A, Stößel C, Clemens C (eds) Der Mensch im Mittelpunkt technischer Systeme. 8. Berliner Werkstatt Mensch-Maschine-Systeme 7. bis 9. Oktober 2009 VDI, Learning and Development Ltd., Swindon, pp. 234-239 Düsseldorf, pp.196-201 [22] Schulenberg SE, Melton AMA (2008) The Computer Aversion, Attitudes, and Familiarity Index (CAAFI): A validity study. Comput Hum Behav 24:2620-2638 [10] Kay RH (1993) An exploration of theoretical and practical foundations for assessing attitudes toward computers: The computer attitude measure (CAM). Computer at Hum Behav 9:371-386 and Validation of a Short Scale for Computer-Related Motivations in Adults. Diagnostica. [24] Shaft TM, Sharfman MP, Wu WW (2004). Reliability assessment of the attitude towards computers instrument (ATCI). Comput Hum Behav 20:661-689 [11] Kim Y, Glassman M (2013) Beyond search and communication: Development and validation of the Internet Self-efficacy Scale (ISS). Comput Hum Behav 29:1421-1429 [25] Webster J, Martocchio, JT (1992) Microcomputer playfulness: Development of a measure with workplace implications. MIS Quart 16:201-226

[26] Yildirim C, Correira A (2015) Exploring the dimensions of nomophobia: Development and validation of a self-reported questionnaire. Comput Hum Behav 49:130-137



www.mytuc.org/dsdn scale as pdf

(English and German)



poster as pdf

Authors at the Conference



Christiane Attig is a PhD candidate in the field of Engineering Psychology. Her current project examines behavioral indicators for the need for help in HCI.

Thomas Franke

Thomas Franke is a professor of Engineering Psychology and Cognitive Ergonomics. He is particularly interested in user diversity and a resource perspective on user-technology interaction.