

Chapter 7.7

Theorizing Gender and Information Technology Research

Eileen M. Trauth

The Pennsylvania State University, USA

INTRODUCTION

A fundamental consideration when attempting to understand the complex factors leading to the underrepresentation of women in IT is the choice and use of theory. Theories about women and their relationships to information technology and the IT profession guide the conceptualization of the research problem, the methods of data collection, the basis for analysis, and the conclusions that are drawn. However, a criticism of gender and IT research is that the topic of gender and IT is currently undertheorized (Adam, Howcroft, & Richardson, 2001, 2004).

This undertheorization takes on several different forms. First, there are cases in which there is no theory in evidence to guide the conceptualization of the research project or to inform the data collection and analysis. Rather, the focus is typically on compiling and representing statistical data regarding the differences between men and women with respect to technology adoption, use or involvement in the IT profession. This form of undertheorization can be labeled *pre-theoretical research*. Second, other research, while not explic-

itly articulating a particular theory, nevertheless, is guided by a theory-in-use. For example, quite often a theory of inherent differences between males' and females' relationships to IT is used implicitly to guide data collection and analysis. This form of undertheorization can be labeled *implicit-theoretical research*. This approach is considered to be a type of undertheorization in that the lack of explicit discussion of a theory makes it difficult for others to discuss, challenge or extend the research. Finally, the body of research that reflects explicit theory-in-use has been shown to have gaps in the theoretical landscape (Trauth, 2002). That is, an argument has been made that current theories about gender and IT do not fully account for the variation in men's and women's relationships to information technology and the IT field. This form of undertheorization can be labeled *insufficient-theoretical research*. It is this third condition that is addressed in this article: the need for new theoretical insights to guide our effort to understand the underrepresentation of women in the IT profession.

BACKGROUND

Two dominant theoretical viewpoints are currently reflected in the majority of literature about gender and IT: essentialism and social construction (Trauth, 2002). Essentialism is the assertion of fixed, unified and opposed female and male natures (Wajcman, 1991, p. 9). The existence of biological difference between the sexes has led to a tendency to assume that other observed differences between men and women are due to biological determinates as well (Marini, 1990). When applied to the topic of gender and IT, the essentialist theory presumes the existence of relevant *inherent differences* between women and men with respect to information technology. It uses the observed differences in the participation of women and men in the IT field as evidence of this view. Thus, the causes of gender underrepresentation in IT are attributed to biology. It turns to observed differences in men's and women's behavior for explanations of what are believed to be inherent, fixed, group-level differences that are based upon bio-psychological characteristics.

Essentialism underlies research on gender and IT that views gender as a fixed variable that is manipulated within a positivist epistemology (e.g., Dennis, Kiney, & Hung, 1999; Gefen & Straub, 1997; Venkatesh & Morris, 2000). Adam et al.'s (2001) analysis of this perspective points out that focusing on a background literature of psychology, alone, places too much emphasis on individual gender characteristics where a form of essentialism may creep in. Looking only to psychological explanations of observations without giving attention to the influence of context¹ results in a determinist stance with respect to gender.

One inference that could be drawn from an essentialist approach to gender and IT research is that women and men should be treated differently. For example, Venkatesh and Morris (2000) recommend that trainers adopt different approaches toward men and women and that marketers design different marketing campaigns for

men and women. Trauth's critique of essentialist approaches to gender and IT research suggested that one logical extrapolation from this line of thinking to IT workforce considerations would be the creation of two different workforces: a "women in IT" workforce and a "men in IT" workforce. Thus, policies for addressing the gender imbalance would focus on differences between women and men and the equality issue would focus on "separate but equal," something that was rejected in the arena of racial equality decades ago (Trauth, 2002; Trauth & Quesenberry, 2005; Trauth, Quesenberry, & Morgan, 2004).

The other dominant theoretical perspective focuses on the *social construction* of IT as a male domain. According to this theory, there is a fundamental incompatibility between the social construction of female identity and the social construction of information technology and IT work as a male domain. This explanation for women's relationship to information technology looks to societal rather than biological forces. Thus, the causes of gender underrepresentation can be found in both the IT sector and in the wider society. The literatures of gender and technology in general (e.g., Cockburn, 1983, 1988; Cockburn & Ormrod, 1993; Wajcman, 1991) and that of gender and information technology, in particular (e.g., Adam et al., 1994; Balka & Smith, 2000; Eriksson, Kitchenham, & Tijdens, 1991; Lovegrove & Segal, 1991; Slyke, Comunale, & Belanger, 2002; Spender, 1995; Star, 1995; Webster, 1996) look to social construction theory (Berger & Luckmann, 1966) rather than biological and psychological theories. According to this view, the social shaping of information technology as "men's work" places IT careers outside the domain of women.

Recommendations for addressing this situation vary. One school of thought based on a multi-year investigation of female underrepresentation in both academe and the workplace in Australia explores the development of strategies to help women fit in to this male domain (e.g., Nielsen, von Hellens, Greenhill, & Pringle, 1998; Nielsen,

5 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:
www.igi-global.com/chapter/theorizing-gender-information-technology-research/22387

Related Content

Hybrid Representation: Embodied Pedagogical Agent Interface Design

Katherine R. B. Greysen (2013). *Digital Identity and Social Media* (pp. 192-209).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/hybrid-representation-embodied-pedagogical-agent/72389

A Contextualization of the Technology Acceptance Model to Social Media Adoption Among University Students in Cameroon

Josue Kuiika Wataand Dario Bonaretti (2022). *International Journal of Technology and Human Interaction* (pp. 1-18).

www.irma-international.org/article/a-contextualization-of-the-technology-acceptance-model-to-social-media-adoption-among-university-students-in-cameroon/297619

Narcissism as a Predictor of Facebook Users' Privacy Concern, Vigilance, and Exposure to Risk

Karen Smith, Francis Mendezand Garry L. White (2014). *International Journal of Technology and Human Interaction* (pp. 78-95).

www.irma-international.org/article/narcissism-as-a-predictor-of-facebook-users-privacy-concern-vigilance-and-exposure-to-risk/115217

Establishing and Testing a Quantitative Measure for Evolving Third-Place Characteristics

Michael Langlaisand Dana E. Vaux (2022). *International Journal of Technology and Human Interaction* (pp. 1-15).

www.irma-international.org/article/establishing-and-testing-a-quantitative-measure-for-evolving-third-place-characteristics/293201

A Taxonomy of Stakeholders: Human Roles in System Development

Ian F. Alexander (2005). *International Journal of Technology and Human Interaction* (pp. 23-59).

www.irma-international.org/article/taxonomy-stakeholders-human-roles-system/2858