

Editorial

There has been little research to date about the position of women and STEM in East Asia, so the article by Sayaka K Shinohara and Tetsushi Fujimoto <u>Gender</u> <u>Differences in Career Persistence among Research and Development (R&D)</u> <u>Engineers in Japan</u> offers some welcome new insights into women in engineering careers in this country. Their results showed that women were less likely than men to envisage themselves carrying on with their careers as engineers. The research indicates that Japanese industry is likely to be facing the same issues about retention and progression of women as elsewhere.

Career choices and intentions are also the focus of Alison Hunter and Raewyn Boersen's paper, <u>Attracting Girls to a Career in Programming: A New Zealand</u> <u>Investigation</u>. They report on a pilot study that investigated the career preferences of teenage girls who participated in an initiative to encourage girls into coding. This is highly important work as there are many countries currently engaged in attempting to increase the participation of young women in programming, with limited success. They found that the girls wanted a career that would allow them to engage socially, with a sense of fun, and in a 'cool' environment.

In their paper <u>Stemming the Tide: The Presentation of Women Scientists in CSI</u> Shane Warren and colleagues review three of the 15 years of the TV series CSI (Crime Scene Investigation) to understand the media presentation of women scientists. They found stereotypical views of the female investigators but also conclude that the show provides an opportunity for the story of women to be told by these female characters.

Amy S. Teller and Apollonya M. Porcelli examine the emergence of a new "feminist ecology", resulting from changes in the discipline including more female scientists, interdisciplinary work, and research in human-altered landscapes. In their paper *Feminist ecology: Doing, undoing, and redoing gender in science* they use ethnographic and autoethnographic methods during ecological fieldwork in the north-eastern United States, and show that gender inequality persists through daily interactions in their work.

This journal uses Open Journal Systems 2.4.8.1, which is open source journal management and publishing software developed, supported, and freely distributed by the <u>Public Knowledge Project</u> under the GNU General Public License.



International Journal of Gender, Science and Technology, Vol.8, No.3

The final two papers in this issue focus on higher education. Christopher Davison and Evangelia Argyriou explore mobile learning (mLearning) technologies and their adoption at a US university in <u>Gender Preferences in Technology Adoption: An</u> <u>Empirical Investigation of Technology Trends in Higher Education</u>. They look at gender differences in the use of communication tools, collaborative tools and technology activity. The findings suggest that technology adoption is consistent across genders but that there are some distinct trends in preferences between men and women students. Men preferred wikis for individual learning tasks while women preferred text messaging for collaborative learning tasks. Additionally, there appears to be a preference among men for using phone Apps for oral presentations and for reading course materials. Perhaps not surprisingly, they conclude that women are underrepresented in the 'highly technologically active' group, making up only 37% of that category.

Using a national sample of U.S. college graduates, Yonghong Jade Xu examines the gender differences in motivations for studying towards a graduate degree in STEM. The paper <u>Advance to Graduate School: How the Path is Different for Women in STEM</u>, concludes that women in STEM are more likely to use a cost-benefit calculation in their decision-making about graduate education and are less likely to pursue doctoral education if their earning at the labor market entry is low. However, other factors such as marital status, academic performance, and other social and structural factors also influenced women's decisions about graduate education in STEM.

Our thanks go to all our reviewers and other volunteers who have helped to produce GST over this past year. Wishing you all the best for 2017.

Clem Herman, on behalf of the editorial executive: Helen Donelan, Barbara Hodgson, Victoria Pearson, Elizabeth Whitelegg, Carol Morris, Esther Ruiz-Ben and Gunjan Sondhi