ISSN: 2473-4901
v9 n5990

The Perceptions of Undergraduate Students Associated with a Career in Technology – An Analysis by Academic Year

Kenneth J. Sousa
ksousa@bryant.edu
Bryant University
Smithfield, RI

Abstract

In both the educational and business environments, two trends may be inarguable. The difference between the demand of technology positions as compared to the number of people majoring or interested in technology-based careers. Secondly, the education environment is radically changing in several aspects including a high number of undecided majors entering undergraduate institutions as well as the ability of skills development by higher education students entering the marketplace. The recent and historic attention in artificial intelligence and machine learning technology may have an impact on both a change in the demand for total positions and interest in technology-based careers. This research study will investigate the attitudes and perceptions of first-year college students over four academic years to determine changes, if any, are found. The implications from this research will provide insight to both business organizations for recruiting as well as all educational institutions.

Keywords: Technology career, Student perceptions, Career exploration, Experiential integration, Artificial intelligence, Machine learning

1. INTRODUCTION

Demands of Business Organizations

Since the early 1980s, information technology has become a dominant influence for business organization in both strategic, business analysis and operational activities. The rising dependence and integration of technology systems requires a corresponding need for technology personnel. Technology personnel will require skills and conceptual knowledge. The source of these requirements can be gained from either traditional higher education (two and four year) as well as technical institutions. However, the demand for personnel compared to people completing a technology-based major is widely different.

Technology Career Trend and Supply

A recent survey found that 86% of the respondents believed that the chief information officer (CIO) has a critical influence to lead business and technology transformation (Stackpole & Betts, 2011). This fact asserts that the information technology function and responsibilities have evolved from operation-focused activities (processing and reporting data) to business analysis/strategy (mobile applications, data analytics). Therefore, the integration of technology outcomes requires the availability of skilled talent.

Another critical component of this discussion is associated with the gender gap. Females are underrepresented in technology-based positions. Currently, women hold only 26% of the technology related positions (Hubbert, 2023). The percentage of females in technology firms (> 10K employees) is the same. Additionally, the percentage of work in technology positions has decreased by 2.1% over the last two years. One of the issues that may affect the low employment of young women without role models associated with CEO and leadership roles as well as imposter syndrome tendencies (Clay, 2023; Hubbert, 2023).

ISSN: 2473-4901
v9 n5990

Research Objective

The objective of this study is to examine the attitudes and perceptions of first-year undergraduate college students specific to technology careers and majors to explore trends, if any, over a five-year period. The response data will be categorized into four groups to examine the data as shown below in Table 1. These groups are comprised of data collected for two semesters (fall and spring).

Group	Academic Year
1	2016-17
2	2017-18
3	2020-21
4	2021-22

Table 1 – Survey Population Data

These academic years were chosen because consisting of a full academic year which included a survey administration including two semesters.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Employment Data for Technology Careers

From an anecdotal perspective, it is common knowledge that demand for technology professionals continues to increase over the next decade. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics compiles data associated with occupations are compiled in Table 1.7. A summary of the various occupational codes associated with technology careers, under the Computer and Mathematical Occupations summary (BLS employment matrix code: 15-0000) has been compiled into Table 2 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2023).

The first row depicts the summary statistics for the 15-0000 matrix code. The remaining rows of Table 2 summarize all matrix codes relating to the six computer (technology) occupations summarized within the 15-xxxx matrix code. The last row provides a total of the computer occupation sub-codes (six). The projected growth for all computer operations matrix codes over a ten-year period through 2032 is 14.2%. However, several sub-classifications (analysts, scientists, support specialists) are double-digit growth (14.9%, 22.7% and 21.7%).

Comparing BLS data from two time periods (2019 – 2029 and 2022– 2032), the occupations with the largest estimated increase are Software and Web Developers (51%) and Computer and Information Analysts (19%). Two occupations have negative trends (Computer Support Specialists and Database and Network Administrators).

Table 2 – Trends in Information Technology Careers (BLS Table 1.7)

While government statistics are important, empirical data relating to actual open job positions can provide more clarity. The actual technology job openings were compiled from the website of a large financial service firm every six months. The open job statistics for technology positions have tracked between 387 – 549. The larger number of positions during 2022 (546, 549) may be due to pandemic and early retirement decisions. However, the current number of positions at 271 (as of September 2023) continues to illustrate a high percentage of the open positions.

Factors Influencing Student Perceptions

A compilation of foundational research is required to form the basis of the factors to investigate the perceptions of students toward a technology career. These factors would form the definition of a model to support the objective of this research. Various research studies were examined and reviewed to gather the appropriate factors for the research model. A review of literature was compiled to identify research studies which focused on a range of factors to collect data associated with the attitudes toward career choices with a STEM or technology focus.

Moore & Burrus (2019) applied the Theory of Planned Behavior from Ajzen (1991) to include several factors including subjective norms, perceived behavioral control and intention to major. Finlay et al (1999) defined subjective norm as an individual's opinion or perception about what others believe the individual should do. Ultimately, influence integrates an individual's peers, family, and friends. Several research studies identified parents (and their professions) as an influence on their child's career (Cohen & Hanno, 1993; Law & Yuen, 2012; Pearson & Dellman-Jenkins, 1997; Saleem et al., 2014). Kuechler et al. (2009) found that both families and advisors significantly affected the intention to choose an IS major. Subjective norms and attitudes were also found to predict intentions (Hagger et al., 2015).

Information and data can be gathered from many sources including informal (word of mouth) and formal (structured and codified sources). Walstrom et al. (2008) researched the various information sources associated with information systems careers. Based on the average importance (six-point scale) from student responses, the top four sources (average scores > 3.0) were information from

ISSN: 2473-4901
v9 n5990

college/department websites, brochures about the major, information on the web/internet, and newspaper articles (Walstrom et al., 2008). The most influential information is from the institution's internal sources.

The research by Wu et al. (2018) investigated various factors in relation to STEM careers to include their attitudes, beliefs, confidence, and enjoyment. Moore and Burrus (2019) investigated two dimensions of attitudes; experiential and instrumental. Moore and Burrus believed that experiential attitudes that consider math boring by students may affect their attitudes toward STEM-related activities. Additionally, a student's instrumental attitude toward math may not be considered important for their future career decisions. Therefore, these attitudes will reduce their engagement toward math courses and careers.

Compeau & Higgins (1995) defined computer self-efficacy (CSE) as the judgement of one's capability to use a computer, defined in this research study as interest (IN). Higher levels of CSE tend to more likely to use computers (Compeau et al., 1999) as well as likely to form positive assessments of IT (Venkatesh & Davis, 1996). Kuechler (2009) found that a genuine interest in IS as significant factor to intent to major. Walstrom et al. (2008) found that 56% of the respondents said that information systems was not of interest to them. Additionally, Walstrom found the highest factor in the choice of major was personal interest in the subject matter (5.1 / 6).

Decisions are often completed based on outcome expectations. The declaration of an undergraduate major is a natural and required decision for a college student. Bandura (1986) believed that these outcomes are based on an integration of the results of actions. Bandura's research categorized these outcomes in three categories: physical, social, and self-evaluating. Three factors from Bandura have been integrated into this study including job availability, job salary, and work environment. Additionally, Bandura believed that the reaction of others (family and friends) as well as the social impact of the environment lead to several factors to be explored by this study (social image, personal image). The starting salary and availability of jobs factor were supported as important factors (4.8/6.0) as reported by students (Walstrom et al., 2008).

Heinze & Hu (2009) found that undergraduate students who had a positive attitude toward IT careers and higher perceived behavioral control regarding IT majors had a greater intention to major in IT. Their research measured the control beliefs of students that will affect the pursuit of an IT major using the definition of CSE.

The image, both personal and social, could provide an influence on the selection of an IT Major. The personal image is reflective of the students' self-image of technology professionals while the social image is focused on whether it is a respectable career. Kuechler (2009) found a positive effect on intent to major from social image while no significance on personal image (PI). Walton (2012) researched the power of social connections enhanced achievement motivation.

After reviewing the various research studies, twelve factors were found to be appropriate measures of student perceptions relating to adoption of technology majors and careers. These studies were used to compile a list of questions to form a survey instrument to gather data to support the research objective. Each of these factors is described in Table 3.

Table 3 – Citations for Research Model Factors

Research Hypotheses

Based on the research objective and the completion of the literature review, twelve hypotheses have been developed to complete the research model. Table 4 defines a detailed listing of the research hypotheses.

Table 4 – Summary of Research Hypotheses

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Survey Instrument

To complete the research objective, a survey instrument was designed to include questions to gather data on students' perceptions. The final survey instrument included 36 questions to gather the perceptions and beliefs for the factors outlined in Table 4. Many of the questions were gathered from either research included in Table 4 as well as other articles used in the literature review. In a few cases (e.g., media influence), the questions were structured based on the media categories included from past research studies.

These questions were structured using a Likert scale for the student's response. A seven-point scale was selected in order to show higher reliability than any number of options (Chang, 1994; Wakita et al., 2012). The seven-point scale also includes a benign response in the middle of

ISSN: 2473-4901
v9 n5990

the scale (neither agree or disagree). Two Likert scale structures were used for each of the questions: 1) strongly disagree vs. strongly agree and 2) not important vs. extremely important. The values associated were designed from 7 (strongly agree, extremely important) to 1 (not important, strongly disagree). Table 5 outlines the details of the survey instrument.

Table 5 – Summary of Survey Composition by Factor

Several questions were included for classification purposes including gender, grade point average, and the completion date (semester) of the survey.

Survey Population and Administration
The population selected for this study consisted of first year students. Since most courses completed in the first year consist of core/general education courses, this population was selected to gain perceptions early in their higher education experience. Students entering higher education as undecided are considered high-risk while a significant percent (61%) change their major (Mowreader, 2023). A study completed by Junior Achievement USA found that only 46% of students believed that they should have a concrete career goal after starting college but before graduating (Anonymous, 2019). All responses associated with this research are from one higher-education institution, a four-year university.

An electronic survey software tool (Qualtrix) was used at the portal for the administration of the survey. The individual questions associated with the factors were scattered throughout the survey to increase reliability of responses. All questions were set up with a required response to each survey question except for the gender question. In the initial deployment of the survey, the gender question a required response was mistakenly not set properly. Therefore, the early semesters contained some "empty" responses for the gender question.

4. FINDINGS AND RESULTS

Population Assumptions
All surveys were administered in a business course required of all first year and transfer students. Students cannot complete multiple surveys within the same semester while registered for different courses. Therefore, the independence of observations as well as the homogeneity of variance assumptions associated with the survey population are appropriate and valid.

Survey Response
For this research study, the survey data was confined to four years (eight semesters) as shown in Table 6 below.

Table 6 – Frequency of Survey Results

The composition of males and females (57.3% and 31.9%) are like the distribution of students at the university. As noted previously, the initial version of the survey did not require the entry of a response to the gender question. Since this research does not investigate any differences with gender, all respondents (1,128) were included in the analysis.

ANOVA Results
Twelve summary variables were created for each of the factors. The average of the individual questions associated with each factor (as outlined in Table 5) was calculated for each factor. The SPSS Mean function was used to calculate the mean of the individual question responses to exclude missing values (no response to a question).
An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was completed on the survey response data using the average (mean) of the twelve factors. The statistical results of the ANOVA mean values have been compiled in Table 7. The table includes the four group means (academic years) as well as the grand mean for the twelve factors. It also includes the number of observations (n) for each factor.

Table 7 – Summary of Group and Grand Means by Factor

The results of the ANOVA statistical test of significance values (p-value) associated with each of the twelve factors. The following table (Table 8) summarizes the values of the ANOVA.

Table 8 – Summary of ANOVA Test of Significance Results

Hypotheses Evaluation
Of the twelve factors analyzed, only six factors have resulted in significant differences between the mean values: Attitude, Job Availability, Personal Image, Social Image, Subjective Norm, and Intent to Major. Three of these factors calculated a highly significant p-value ($p<.001$). The remaining six factors (Aptitude, Difficulty of Major, Interest in IT, Job Salary, Media Influence, and Workload Environment) resulted in no

ISSN: 2473-4901
v9 n5990

significant differences between the mean values of the four academic years.

Each of the twelve hypotheses were evaluated based on the results of the ANOVA tests as shown in the previous table. A summary of the evaluation of the null hypotheses is contained in Table 9.

Hypothesis	Result
H1	Accept
H2	***Reject***
H3	Accept
H4	Accept
H5	***Reject***
H6	Accept
H7	Accept
H8	***Reject***
H9	***Reject***
H10	***Reject***
H11	Accept
H12	***Reject***

Table 9 – Summary of Research Hypotheses

The ANOVA calculated 48 calculated group means (four years multiplied by 12 factors). Most of the differences between group means and the factor grand means were less than 0.10. As expected, each one of the factors resulting in significant differences included at least two mean differences (group mean – grand mean) greater than 0.09. Two of the factor's grand mean with $p<.05$ were greater than 5; personal image (5.56) and social image (5.30).

5.0 DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Discussion

Six of the ANOVA tests (50%) resulted in significant differences between the four academic years. Students' perceptions have not changed in the areas of aptitude, difficulty of the major, interest in technology, job salary, media influence, and workload environment. The lack of change for some factors is not surprising, specifically with aptitude and difficulty of major; with the associated group means (3.17 – 3.53) below the benign response value of four. Anecdotally, many students believe that science- and mathematical-based majors are more difficult and require a higher aptitude for success. Technology-based careers often follow a similar stereotype as mathematics and science careers.

The group mean values associated with the media influence were less than 4.36 (equating just higher than neither agree/disagree response). With the exponential increase in the use of social media, the influence of media on younger age groups has changed significantly since this study began in 2016. The author considered changing the various categories of media at various points over the last few years. However, it would have precluded any multi-year, such as this research study, analysis as the scale would have changed. The workplace environment issue is also not surprising. With the group means between 4.82 and 4.97, their responses are just below a *slightly agree* response. After reviewing the question averages in detail, students believe that the environment for technology professions lacks four traits: 1) no variety in tasks, 2) fails to lead to leadership positions, 3) lack of creativity, and 4) will not benefit people and society.

The two remaining nonsignificant factors (interest in technology and job salary) are more puzzling. The group mean values remained close to the *slightly agree* response (5). The interest in information technology careers investigates five perceptions (learning software, working in a team, using software, and analyzing/presenting business-related problems). Considering the level of technology adoption associated with young people, the results of this survey can only provide one conclusion – students enjoy using technology, but not as a career. Students enjoy using their phone or tablet. However, they do not have any interest in developing mobile or desktop applications. The author believes that technology has become an "appliance" like a refrigerator or a car. They know that the equipment works when the power is turned on, but do not care how it works. It simply functions for the purpose in which students desire.

The group mean scores for the job salary factor resulted between 4.73 and 4.94; again, below the *slightly agree* response. With the current level of information about job postings available online, it is surprising that students are not more knowledgeable about the higher salaries for technology personnel.

Six of the factors resulted in significant differences between the means of the four academic years (attitude, job availability, personal image, social image, subjective norms, and intent to major). The group mean scores for attitude and job availability are like the responses of previous factors reflecting a *slightly agree* response (5) to the questions. The image factors (personal and social image) calculated group means between 5.16 and 5.92. These values are trending closer to the *agree* response (6) suggesting a more positive image toward

ISSN: 2473-4901
v9 n5990

technology personnel and careers. On a positive note, these factors (attitude, personal image, and social image) have all realized significant increases over the last two academic years (0.42, 0.44, 0.39 respectively).

The subjective norms and intent to major factors ($p<.05$) are concerning and require some discussion. These factors calculated mean values which are the lowest of the twelve factors. The grand means for subjective norms and intent to major are 2.92 and 2.51 respectively; below the *slightly disagree* response for the questions. These results illustrate that students have limited interest in majoring in technology. Additionally, the results of the subjective norm factor indicate that the advice of several groups (family, friends, advisors, peers, and educators) suggest that information technology careers are not a "*good fit*" for them. It is plausible that these subjective norms may influence, possibly negatively, the major decision.

The importance of the results could be interpreted in a variety of ways using the base (2016-2017) and final year (2021-22) of the study as well as the four years of individual means.

Of the six factors identified as statistically significant, the only factor (subjective norm) declined from the base year to the last year; a small decline of 2.4%. The subjective norm for AY2017-18 to AY2020-21 years declined by 12.1%; (3.06 to 2.69); while increasing slightly to 2.84 in AY2021-22. These results can explain that the pandemic shutdown in early-2020 affected education and its students at all levels with the importance of relationships.

These results could be explained by avoidant coping. Madrigal and Blevins (2022) believed that students escaped the challenges and or stressors caused during the pandemic. Self-medicating the lock-down period with social media breaks. Madrigal and Blevins reported that students' sources of support decreased during the pandemic from the pre-pandemic period. Therefore, it is conceivable that this period reduced the consistency, frequency, and depth of relationships with the groups associated with the subjective norms. Furthermore, Madrigal reported that while there was decrease in socialization with many groups, social media/technology use increased during the same period. Other research supports the loss of social support, isolation, development of social relationships and interaction (Alsubaie, 2022; Elmer et al., 2020; Luan et al., 2023). While these discussions are all negative, there should be some hope that the post-pandemic period will rebuild and restore the interaction in an education setting as noted in the small rise in subjective norm for the last study year.

Personal image factor was the only factor to have increased steadily over the four-year study period. It is plausible that the increase of students' personal image of technology may been explained by the increase in the of technology in classes as well as the new teleconferencing software deployed during the lockdown. The increased reliance during these periods may have acclimated students with technology throughout their educational journey. Additional exposure can create knowledge and a level of comfort in any subject.

The remaining factors (attitude, job availability, social image, and intent to major) resulted in various increases and decreases over the four research years. Except for intent to major factor, the last research year (2021-22) all resulted in an increase over the grand mean for each period. Considering all the turbulence and challenges, over the six years of the research period, this may provide some positive influence on the future academic years.

Practical Implications and Conclusions

If the research period is an accurate representation of undergraduate students' perceptions, the intent to major shows challenging "headwinds" toward the future. In three of the four research years, students clearly responded closer to the "disagree" response (2.0) to the question that they intend to major in information technology.

The results of this research clearly indicate that the population does not consider technology a suitable career. Therefore, if these perceptions are believed to be accurate on a broader scale, the gap between the demand and supply of candidates for technology positions in the marketplace will continue to be wider. The consequences for business organizations will consist of delayed project delivery, reduction in completed projects, increased salaries to retain/attract personnel, and/or increased offshoring deployment of technology activities.

The current trend of technology appears to imitate the issues associated with the accounting profession. The accounting industry is experiencing a sharp decline in the number of accounting majors while the 300,000 accountants/auditors have left their positions in the last two years (Ellis, 2022; Somaiya, 2023).

ISSN: 2473-4901
v9 n5990

A study by Hsiao (2016) researched factors to investigate career choices in accounting including intrinsic characteristics (contribution to society, challenge, workplace environment), extrinsic characteristics (job availability/salary), and influence on decisions (subjective norms).

Students sometimes have incomplete and inaccurate stereotypes of technology-based careers. One of these stereotypes focuses on the advancement to a leadership position. The chief-information officer (CIO), has transitioned from the "back-office manager and order taker" to an organizational leader managing the strategic decisions which require technology integration (Stackpole & Betts, 2011). Stackpole asserts that 84% of CIOs are viewed as a "critical changemaker" accepting the leadership of business and technology.

A recent article highlighted a list of the highest paying technology positions (Anonymous, 2023). Three of those job titles would be considered "steppingstones" positions from entry-level to leadership (CIO-type) positions: project manager, program analyst/manger, and MIS manager. These job titles earn an average salary of $130k with a salary increase of 13.1% over the last two years.

Implementation Strategies

Five implementation strategies have been compiled to address the conclusions and implications of this research.

Promotion of Career – Many students major in marketing to be employed in entry-level positions as sales representatives gaining experience and knowledge about their trade (sales techniques, communication, proposals, etc.) to build a collection of skills to transition to leadership positions (sales managers, strategy analysts, sales vice presidents). Promotional and educational materials should include detailed narratives and examples focusing students' attention on the transition from entry-level positions through middle-management and then to leadership positions. Technology positions should be no different. Specific narratives with applied examples (professional profiles of people from industry, job postings, etc.) will engage students with facts to negate speculation or stereotypes.

Exposure to Technology Careers and Personnel – It is important to create a "*vision*" of various technology careers and occupations. A strategy to complement the previous strategy is to expose students to the actual tasks and responsibilities of some technology occupations. In addition, this exposure is required to refute the "Wargames" (the movie) stereotype in which students believe that technology positions are "chained" to their desk developing code, hacking, and monitoring computer systems.

Many positions, specifically computer and information analysts (15-1210), are responsible for analyzing and documenting processes, integrating corporate strategies, innovative technology requirements and solving business problems through technology. However, these positions do **not** require or consist of coding and advanced technical skills. Additionally, many information technology personnel are promoted as Project Mangers. These positions require presentations, project management, analysis, and meeting with various stakeholders of a business. Again, all non-technical and business-oriented tasks performed by technology-based occupations.

Research supports that the level of self-efficacy associated with career decisions is a significant predictor of occupational indecision and career exploration (Blustein, 1989). With the exposure of vocational tasks (selecting goals, gathering occupational information, problem solving and self-appraisal), career self-efficacy increases (Hackett & Betz, 1981). Therefore, these strategies can directly enhance toward position outcomes.

Changing Business, "Society" and People – Generally, Generation Z students are expressing an increased interest in changing people and society. However, these aspirations need to be conveyed and connected to technology positions in a defined context. Every position and facet of our society can translate to those ideals by implementing two concepts: 1) reset students' perspective with different metaphors and 2) compiling narratives using direct examples of technology careers can serve a societal purpose. For example, wait staff in restaurants and hotels can provide exceptional and quality customer service to guests daily by enhancing the customer experience on vacation.

This outcome can be achieved through training, exposure and role playing to develop awareness as well as operationalize within their careers. Technology is no different. Students can analyze and design platforms (tablets, laptops, etc.) with an interface that can help the wait staff with technology solutions to enhance their job satisfaction and productivity. Students are so immersed in technology use (phones, apps,

ISSN: 2473-4901
v9 n5990

games, etc.) that they view the strategy of the technology in a similar manner to the *engine* behind driving the car to a destination safely and efficiently. For students, it works, and it does not matter how or why it works.

Interactive Job Fairs and Career Exploration Sessions – Develop and plan sessions to promote technology careers that are staffed with industry personnel; providing a "face" to communicate specific ideas using "real world" examples. The compilation of narratives (printed and online) depicting the emphasizing the previous topics may not be accessed or read. However, the strategy of complimenting these materials with interactive sessions with industry personnel can gain their students' attention. As important, it will also increase their interaction skills that are desperately needed at the present time. The previous strategy discussed the exposure to personnel and careers can add significant value to the exploration process.

Business organizations will agree to volunteer to these events to increase their exposure, build community relations, and (most importantly) develop interest in technology careers for their recruiting efforts. Ainslie (2019) found that companies and practitioners that engage with educational institutions will create a pipeline of workers interested in upward mobility. Ainslie further explains that employers miss opportunities by not engaging in these partnerships.

Integration into Curriculum – Educators at all education levels need to be engaged to focus on career exploration. To prepare for job fairs and interaction sessions, homework and in-class assignments can organize various thoughts and ideas for the students prior to interacting with business leaders. Career to Education (CTE) strategies integrated into high schools can provide an environment to "deep dive" into exploration by "doing" and learning and learning immersion. This strategy will dramatically increase the students' knowledge for the career exploration and education decision process by replacing inaccurate stereotypes with objective facts and a hands-on, visual experience.

7.0 LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

Limitations

There are a few limitations from this research study including:

- A few semesters were not included in the survey administration due to the Pandemic and other issues. The lack of data from these semesters limited the number of academic years included in this study.
- Using research, the survey was designed in 2016 and remained consistent over the last six years. No updates or modifications to the survey were implemented to complete a multi-year analysis using several factors and variables with a consistent structure (responses, questions, wording, etc.). It would have been interesting to include additional items such as social media for the media influence factor but may complicate future research studies.

Further Research

As this research study was compiled, one additional idea was uncovered. To replicate this research into a regression for the four academic years using all current factors. Additionally, it may be important to extend the survey administration into the AY2023-24 to gain additional responses. The regression analysis could be completed using the academic year value as a dummy variable in the regression analysis. This research study will amplify the results and outcomes associated with the weights of the several factors on the dependent variable (intent to major).

REFERENCES

Adya, M., & Kaiser, K. M. (2005). Early determinants of women in the IT workforce: A model of girls' career choices. *Information Technology & People*, *18*(3), 230–259. https://doi.org/10.1108/09593840510615860

Ainslie, P. J., & Huffman, S. L. (2019). Human Resource Development and Expanding STEM Career Learning Opportunities: Exploration, Internships, and Externships. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *21*(1), 35–48. https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422318814487

Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *50*(2), 179.

Alsubaie, M. A. (2022). Distance education and the social literacy of elementary school students during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Heliyon*, *8*(7).

Anonymous. (2019). Survey Finds Teens and Young Adults Continue Putting off Career Decisions as They Progress from High School to College. *PR Newswire*.

https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/survey-finds-teens-and-young-adults-continue-putting-off-career-decisions-as-they-progress-from-high-school-to-college-300802136.html

Anonymous. (2023). 10 hottest IT jobs for salary growth in 2023. *CIO*. http://bryant.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/trade-journals/10-hottest-jobs-salary-growth-2023/docview/2823879759/se-2?accountid=36823

Apostol, O., & Näsi, S. (2013). Firm-Employee Relationships from a Social Responsibility Perspective: Developments from Communist Thinking to Market Ideology in Romania. A Mass Media Story. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *119*(3), 301–315. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1642-1

Bandura, A. (1986). The explanatory and predictive scope of self-efficacy theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *4*(3), 359–373.

Beckhusen, J. (2016). *Occupations in information technology* (1–1 online resource (16 pages): color illustrations.). U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau; http://purl.fdlp.gov/GPO/gpo71526

Blustein, D. L. (1989). The role of goal instability and career self-efficacy in the career exploration process. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *35*(2), 194–203.

Chang, L. (1994). A psychometric evaluation of 4-point and 6-point Likert-type scales in relation to reliability and validity. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, *18*(3), 205–215.

Clay, L. (2023). *The Biggest Challenges for Women in Tech: Explained*. https://www.advantisglobal.com/blog/biggest-challenges-for-women-in-tech

Cohen, J., & Hanno, D. M. (1993). An Analysis of Underlying Constructs Affecting the Choice of Accounting as a Major. *Issues in Accounting Education*, *8*(2).

Compeau, D., Higgins, C. A., & Huff, S. (1999). Social cognitive theory and individual reactions to computing technology: A longitudinal study. *MIS Quarterly*, 145–158.

Compeau, D. R., & Higgins, C. A. (1995). Computer self-efficacy: Development of a measure and initial test. *MIS Quarterly*, 189–211.

Derricks, V., & Sekaquaptewa, D. (2021). They're Comparing Me to Her: Social Comparison Perceptions Reduce Belonging and STEM Engagement Among Women With Token Status. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 1. https://doi.org/10.1177/03616843211005447

Eddy, S. L., & Brownell, S. E. (2016). Beneath the numbers: A review of gender disparities in undergraduate education across science, technology, engineering, and math disciplines. *Physical Review Physics Education Research*, *12*(2).

Ellis, L. (2022, December 28). Why So Many Accountants Are Quitting. *Wall Street Journal*. https://www.wsj.com/articles/why-so-many-accountants-are-quitting-11672236016

Elmer, T., Mepham, K., & Stadtfeld, C. (2020). Students under lockdown: Comparisons of students' social networks and mental health before and during the COVID-19 crisis in Switzerland. *Plos One*, *15*(7), e0236337.

Epsztajn, I. (2019). Where are all the women in tech? *Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. The OECD Observer*, 1–3.

Finlay, K. A., Trafimow, D., & Moroi, E. (1999). The Importance of Subjective Norms on Intentions to Perform Health Behaviors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *29*(11), 2381–2393.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (2010). *Predicting and changing behavior: The reasoned action approach*. Psychology Press.

Gill, J., Sharp, R., Mills, J., & Franzway, S. (2008). I still wanna be an engineer! Women, education and the engineering profession. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, *33*(4), 391–402. WorldCat.org.

Hackett, G., & Betz, N. E. (1981). A self-efficacy approach to the career development of women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *18*(3), 326–339.

Hagger, M. S., Sultan, S., Hardcastle, S. J., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. (2015). Perceived autonomy support and autonomous motivation toward mathematics activities in educational and out-of-school contexts is related to mathematics homework behavior and attainment. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *41*, 111–123.

Heinze, N., & Hu, Q. (2009). Why college undergraduates choose IT: a multi-

ISSN: 2473-4901
v9 n5990

theoretical perspective. *European Journal of Information Systems*, *18*(5), 462–475.

Hsiao, J., & Nova, S. P. de C. C. (2016). Generational Approach to Factors Influencing Career Choice in Accounting *. *Revista Contabilidade & Finanças*, *27*(72), 393–407. ABI/INFORM Global. https://doi.org/10.1590/1808-057x201602980

Hubbert, J. (2023, April 25). 70+ Women In Technology Statistics (2023). *Exploding Topics*. https://explodingtopics.com/blog/women-in-tech#women-in-tech-stats

Joshi, K. D., & Kuhn, K. (2011). What Determines Interest in an IS Career? An Application of the Theory of Reasoned Action. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, *29*, 1.

Kuechler, W. L., McLeod, A., & Simkin, M. G. (2009). Why Don't More Students Major in IS? *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, *7*(2), 463–488.

Law, P., & Yuen, D. (2012). A multilevel study of students' motivations of studying accounting. *Education & Training*, *54*(1), 50–64. https://doi.org/10.1108/00400911211198896

Luan, L., Hong, J.-C., Cao, M., Dong, Y., & Hou, X. (2023). Exploring the role of online EFL learners' perceived social support in their learning engagement: A structural equation model. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *31*(3), 1703–1714.

Madrigal, L., & Blevins, A. (2022). "I hate it, it's ruining my life": College students' early academic year experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Traumatology*, *28*(3), 325–335. https://doi.org/10.1037/trm0000336

Mims-Word, M. (2012). The Importance Of Technology Usage In The Classroom, Does Gender Gaps Exist. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research (Online)*, *5*(4), 271.

Moore, R., & Burrus, J. (2019). Predicting STEM Major and Career Intentions With the Theory of Planned Behavior. *The Career Development Quarterly*, *67*(2), 139–155. https://doi.org/10.1002/cdq.12177

Pearson, C., & Dellman-Jenkins, M. (1997). Parental influence on a student's selection of a college major. *College Student Journal*, *31*(3), 301–313.

Prescod, D. J., Daire, A. P., Young, C., Dagley, M., & Georgiopoulos, M. (2018). Exploring Negative Career Thoughts Between STEM-Declared and STEM-Interested Students. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, *55*(4), 166–175. ABI/INFORM Global. https://doi.org/10.1002/joec.12096

Saleem, N., Hanan, M. A., & Shamshad, R. M. (2014). Career Selection: Role of Parent's Profession Mass Media and Personal Choice. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, *36*(2). Research Library. http://bryant.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/career-selection-role-parents-profession-mass/docview/1662043250/se-2?accountid=36823

Somaiya, S. (2023). *Why Are Students Leaving Accounting?* https://www.financialexecutives.org/FEI-Daily/March-2023/Why-Are-Students-Leaving-Accounting.aspx

Stackpole, B., & Betts, M. (2011). THE MOBILE APP GOLD RUSH. *Computerworld*, *45*(15), 18-21,23.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2023). *BLS Occupational projections and worker characteristics (Table 1.7)*. https://www.bls.gov/emp/tables/occupational-projections-and-characteristics.htm

Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (1996). A model of the antecedents of perceived ease of use: Development and test. *Decision Sciences*, *27*(3), 451–481.

Wakita, T., Ueshima, N., & Noguchi, H. (2012). Psychological distance between categories in the Likert scale: Comparing different numbers of options. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *72*(4), 533–546.

Walstrom, K. A., Schambach, T. P., Jones, K. T., & Crampton, W. J. (2008). Why Are Students Not Majoring in Information Systems? *Journal of Information Systems Education*, *19*(1), 43–54.

Walton, G. M., Cohen, G. L., Cwir, D., & Spencer, S. J. (2012). Mere belonging: The power of social connections. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*(3), 513. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025731

Wang, M.-T., & Degol, J. (2013). Motivational pathways to STEM career choices: Using expectancy-value perspective to understand individual and gender differences in STEM

ISSN: 2473-4901
v9 n5990

fields. *Developmental Review*, *33*(4), 304–340.

Wu, X., Deshler, J., & Fuller, E. (2018). The effects of different versions of a gateway STEM course on student attitudes and beliefs. *International Journal of STEM Education*, *5*(1), 1–12. Publicly Available Content Database. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-018-0141-4

Zhang, W. (2007). Why IS: Understanding Undergraduate Students' Intentions to Choose an Information Systems Major. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, *18*(4), 447–458.

 ISSN: 2473-4901
v9 n5990

APPENDIX

Occupational Description	Employment (thousands) 2022	2032	Change 2022-32 Number/	Percent	Openings Annual Avg 2022-32 (thousands)
Computer and mathematical occupations (summary of 15-0000)	5,277	6,081	803	15.2%	411
Computer and information analysts (15-1210)	700	804	104	14.9%	54
Computer and information research scientists (15-1221)	36	44	8	22.7%	3
Computer support specialists (15-1230)	914	963	49	5.4%	66
Database and network administrators and architects (15-1240)	669	696	27	4.0%	40
Software and web developers, programmers, and testers (15-1250)	2,159	2,628	469	21.7%	179
Computer occupations, all other (15-1299)	449	493	43	9.7%	33
Totals – Computer Occupations	***4,929***	***5,630***	***701***	***14.2%***	***377***

Table 2 – Trends in Information Technology Careers (BLS Table 1.7)

 ISSN: 2473-4901
v9 n5990

Factor	Research Citations	Factor Category
Aptitude to study information technology	(Epsztajn, 2019; Joshi & Kuhn, 2011; Kuechler et al., 2009, 2009)	AP
Interesting to use; complete work with technology	(Heinze & Hu, 2009; Kuechler et al., 2009; Mims-Word, 2012; Walstrom et al., 2008)	AT
Difficulty of major; requiring significant study time	(Kuechler et al., 2009; Prescod et al., 2018); (Zhang, 2007)	DM
Interest in information technology	(Joshi & Kuhn, 2011; Mims-Word, 2012; Walstrom et al., 2008)	IN
Availability of job positions	(Heinze & Hu, 2009; Joshi & Kuhn, 2011; Walstrom et al., 2008)	JA
Gaining a high starting salary	(Beckhusen, 2016; Joshi & Kuhn, 2011)	JS
Influence of media	(Apostol & Näsi, 2013; Walstrom et al., 2008)	MI
Importance of self-image; image of information technology professionals	(Adya & Kaiser, 2005; Walton et al., 2012)	PI
Social image; considered a respectable career	(Eddy & Brownell, 2016; Walton et al., 2012; Wang & Degol, 2013)	SI
Influence of family, friends, professors, advisors, and peers	(Derricks & Sekaquaptewa, 2021; Joshi & Kuhn, 2011; Walton et al., 2012)	SN
Work environment	(Gill et al., 2008; Joshi & Kuhn, 2011)	WE
Intent to major	(Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010)	IM

Table 3 – Citations for Research Model Factors

Factor Name	Number of Questions	Question Scale
Aptitude	2	SD/SA
Attitude	2	SD/SA
Difficulty of Major	2	SD/SA
Interest in IT	5	SD/SA
Job Availability	2	SD/SA
Job Salary	2	SD/SA
Media Influence	5	ENI/EI
Personal Image	2	SD/SA
Social Image	2	SD/SA
Subjective Norm	5	SD/SA
Workload Environment	5	SD/SA
Intent to Major	2	SD/SA
Total	**36**	

Table 5 – Summary of Survey Composition by Factor

ISSN: 2473-4901
v9 n5990

Hypothesis	*Hypothesis Definition*
	There are no significant differences between the academic years based on the …
H1	*aptitude to gain a career in information technology.*
H2	*attitude toward information technology.*
H3	*difficulty to major in information technology.*
H4	*interest in information technology.*
H5	*availability of information technology positions.*
H6	*salaries for information technology positions.*
H7	*influence by various media environments.*
H8	*personal image of information technology professionals.*
H9	*social image of information technology professionals.*
H10	*influence by others relating to information technology careers.*
H11	*work environment for information technology professionals.*
H12	*intention to declare information technology as a major.*

Table 4 – Summary of Research Hypotheses

Group	Academic Year	Total Responses	Percent of Total	Male	Female	Missing, Not Disclosed
1	2016 – 2017	403	35.7%	241	121	36
2	2017 – 2018	379	33.6%	171	138	68
3	2020 – 2021	169	15.0%	109	50	10
4	2021 – 2022	177	15.7%	125	51	0
	Total	**1,128**	**100.0%**	**646**	**360**	**114**

Table 6 – Frequency of Survey Results

		Mean Values				
Factor	**N**	**2016-17**	**2017-18**	**2020-21**	**2021-22**	**Grand**
AP-Aptitude	1,127	3.42	3.46	3.17	3.43	3.40
AT-Attitude	1,127	4.91	4.74	5.00	5.16	4.91
DM-Difficult of Major	1,126	3.53	3.47	3.46	3.43	3.48
IN-Interest IT	1,127	5.02	4.90	4.92	4.99	4.96
JA-Job Availability	1,127	4.60	4.77	4.48	4.81	4.67
JS-Job Salary	1,127	4.73	4.94	4.77	4.76	4.81
MI-Media Influence	1,127	4.36	4.38	4.17	4.15	4.30
PI-Personal Image	1,127	5.44	5.48	5.64	5.92	5.56
SI-Social Image	1,127	5.32	5.16	5.33	5.55	5.30
SN-Subjective Norm	1,127	2.91	3.06	2.69	2.84	2.92
WE-Workload Environment	1,126	4.84	4.82	4.89	4.97	4.86
IM-Intent to Major	1,125	2.38	2.80	2.31	2.39	2.51

Table 7 – Summary of Group and Grand Means by Factor

 ISSN: 2473-4901
v9 n5990

Factor		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Aptitude	Between Groups	10.303	3	3.434	1.776	.150	ns
	Within Groups	2174.207	1124	1.934			
	Total	2184.510	1127				
Attitude	Between Groups	22.615	3	7.538	4.311	.005	**
	Within Groups	1965.454	1124	1.749			
	Total	1988.069	1127				
Difficulty of Major	Between Groups	1.699	3	0.566	0.546	.651	ns
	Within Groups	1164.247	1123	1.037			
	Total	1165.946	1126				
Interest in IT	Between Groups	3.051	3	1.017	1.015	.385	ns
	Within Groups	1126.109	1124	1.002			
	Total	1129.160	1127				
Job Availability	Between Groups	15.570	3	5.190	3.649	.012	*
	Within Groups	1598.525	1124	1.422			
	Total	1614.095	1127				
Job Salary	Between Groups	9.162	3	3.054	2.371	.069	ns
	Within Groups	1447.739	1124	1.288			
	Total	1456.901	1127				
Media Influence	Between Groups	10.432	3	3.477	2.234	.083	ns
	Within Groups	1744.834	1121	1.556			
	Total	1755.266	1124				
Personal Image	Between Groups	32.288	3	10.763	7.597	.000	***
	Within Groups	1592.350	1124	1.417			
	Total	1624.638	1127				
Social Image	Between Groups	18.016	3	6.005	6.075	.000	***
	Within Groups	1111.076	1124	0.989			
	Total	1129.092	1127				
Subjective Norm	Between Groups	17.099	3	5.700	4.301	.005	**
	Within Groups	1489.561	1124	1.325			
	Total	1506.660	1127				
Workload Environment	Between Groups	3.076	3	1.025	1.355	.255	ns
	Within Groups	849.519	1123	0.756			
	Total	852.595	1126				
Intent to Major	Between Groups	47.443	3	15.814	7.995	.000	***
	Within Groups	2219.450	1122	1.978			
	Total	2266.893	1125				

Table 8 – Summary of ANOVA Test of Significance Results