Can New Learning Opportunities Reshape Gender Attitudes for Girls?: Field Evidence from Tanzania

> So Yoon Ahn, Youjin Hahn, Semee Yoon Presenter: Ahn (University of Illinois at Chicago)

> > September 23, 2021 RISE Annual Conference

#### Motivation

- Gender inequality is widespread in developing countries.
  - Women in many developing countries are less educated, paid less, and have less decision-making powers than men (UN Statistics Division, 2018).
  - Enrollment rates in upper secondary education are 50% higher for boys than girls (Tanzania National Bureau of Statistics 2018).
- In particular, science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) education is generally lacking even though it is crucial for economic and social development (Semali and Mehta, 2012).
  - Lack of resources limits opportunities to learn "practical skills".
  - Science is perceived as hard, which discourages female students from taking science subjects.

### This Research

- Do practical STEM learning programs affect gender attitudes?
  - We analyze the effects of providing 5-day STEM bootcamp for elementary/secondary school students (Standard 7 to Form 3, Age 13-16) in Tabora, Tanzania.
    - Students learned how to code and build robots.
  - We collaborate with two NGOs, Compassion International and E3empower.
    - Compassion is a leading child sponsorship organization, sponsoring more than 100,000 children in Tanzania.
    - E3empower is a local social enterprise that provides various educational programs.

# How Does a STEM Education Opportunity Affect Gender Attitudes?

- Through new hands-on learning experiences in STEM
  - More self-confidence and boost interest in STEM (Nourbakhsh et al., 2005; Rogers & Portsmore, 2004).
  - Changes in their attitudes towards further education opportunities and social participation for women.
  - Labor market aspirations and perceived earnings, if skills relevant to STEM are perceived to generate a higher return in the labor market (Jensen, 2012).
- Through female role models or instructors
  - Porter and Serra, 2020 in the U.S.; Kipchumba et al, 2021 in Somalia; Riley, 2017 in Uganda; Lim and Meer, 2020 in Korea; Carrell et al, 2010 in the U.S.

the education aspirations and gender attitudes of male and female students.

- Through peer effects
  - Interactions with opposite sex students while solving STEM problems/ exercises (Markussen & Roed, 2017; Brenoe and Zolitz, 2020)

#### Related Literature

- Formation of gender-related preferences
  - Dhar et al. (2020) found a strong impacts of a gender-equality education on gender attitudes among both boys and girls.
  - Du et al. (2020) showed that a Chinese compulsory education reform that increased the years of education induced more egalitarian gender role attitudes.
  - Cable television; having female role models; having teachers who hold weaker gender stereotypes (Jenson & Oster 2009; Carlana, 2020; Porter and Serra, 2019; Beaman et al., 2012)
- Effects of the use of robots to teach in education literature
  - Promotes interests in math and science careers; Promotes learning of scientific and math principles through experimentation; Encourages problem solving; Promotes cooperative learning (Nourbakhsh et al., 2005; Robinson, 2005; Rogers & Portsmore 2004; Barker & Ansorge 2007; Karaahmetoglu & Korkmaz, 2019)

# Outline

#### Context

- Country background
- Intervention
- Study design
- Results
- Conclusion

# Country Background: Tanzania

- Location: East Africa
- GDP per capita: \$1,172 (2019)
- Official language: Swahili and English
- Computer access: 0.04 computers per student in secondary school (2016)
- Gender inequality
  - For the gender equality index, Tanzania ranked 140th out of 189 countries in 2019 (UNDP, 2019)
  - About 21% of boys and only 16% of girls who completed lower secondary schooling joined upper secondary in 2015-2018
  - Monthly income: 166k (in TZS) females, 279k (in TZS) for males



#### Intervention: The STEM bootcamp

- STEM bootcamp: 5-day intensive program offered by e3empower, a local social enterprise
  - At Compassion centers in Tabora
    - GDP per capita: 19th out of 23 regions in Tanzania
  - Was offered to children who have basic math knowledge (who were finishing or completed primary school)



# Intervention: The STEM boot camp (cont'd)

- Exposed students to STEM through experiential learning curriculum.
- Provided sessions to assemble robots, use basic coding to create robots, and also use coding to create a simple app.
- Each boot camp was intensively conducted from 8:30 am to 6:00 pm for 5 days.
- A total of nine boot camps were conducted on the sites of AICT Kiete (Site 1), Morvaian Chemchem (Site 2) and Anglican Isevya (Site 3) from November 12 to 30, 2018.

First day schedule

# Site photos





# Timeline

- Baseline surveys: Nov 8 to 10, 2018
- STEM boot camp: Nov 12 to 30, 2018
- Endline surveys: Dec 2018/Jan 2019

### Selection Criteria for STEM Bootcamp

- 180 students were chosen among 829 students (Std7 Form3) in Compassion centers
- Children were randomly chosen from each Compassion center with some consideration for the class year and their attendance to the centers.
- Given some imbalances observed between participants and non-participants, we take the selection-on-observable approach under the conditional independence assumption (CIA).

### Summary Statistics

|   | STE    | M     | Non-S  | TEM   | Diff   |       | Diff (w/ center FE) |       |
|---|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|---------------------|-------|
|   | Mean   | SD    | Mean   | SD    | Coef   | SE    | Coef                | SE    |
| Age                                     | 15.032 | 1.609 | 14.930 | 1.530 | 0.102  | 0.174 | 0.120               | 0.164 |
| Female                                  | 0.517  | 0.501 | 0.494  | 0.500 | 0.023  | 0.055 | 0.019               | 0.053 |
| Grade:                                  |        |       |        |       |        |       |                     |       |
| Standard7                               | 0.209  | 0.408 | 0.256  | 0.437 | -0.047 | 0.040 | -0.043              | 0.037 |
| Form 1                                  | 0.339  | 0.475 | 0.350  | 0.478 | -0.011 | 0.051 | -0.014              | 0.050 |
| Form 2                                  | 0.256  | 0.438 | 0.240  | 0.428 | 0.016  | 0.044 | 0.018               | 0.045 |
| Form 3                                  | 0.196  | 0.398 | 0.153  | 0.361 | 0.042  | 0.057 | 0.038               | 0.050 |
| Religion:                               |        |       |        |       |        |       |                     |       |
| Christianity                            | 0.695  | 0.460 | 0.641  | 0.476 | 0.054  | 0.051 | 0.048               | 0.048 |
| Islam                                   | 0.305  | 0.460 | 0.359  | 0.476 | -0.054 | 0.051 | -0.048              | 0.048 |
| Household Characteristics:              |        |       |        |       |        |       |                     |       |
| Father in household                     | 0.591  | 0.453 | 0.594  | 0.449 | -0.004 | 0.050 | -0.007              | 0.048 |
| Mother in household                     | 0.830  | 0.363 | 0.816  | 0.369 | 0.014  | 0.036 | 0.014               | 0.035 |
| Father years of education               | 9.828  | 3.322 | 9.658  | 3.240 | 0.170  | 0.369 | 0.117               | 0.312 |
| Mother years of education               | 8.841  | 3.024 | 8.702  | 3.395 | 0.138  | 0.334 | 0.101               | 0.293 |
| Piped water source                      | 0.735  | 0.437 | 0.722  | 0.445 | 0.013  | 0.048 | 0.011               | 0.044 |
| Electricity or solar energy source      | 0.695  | 0.456 | 0.680  | 0.463 | 0.016  | 0.048 | 0.011               | 0.044 |
| Flush toilet                            | 0.457  | 0.494 | 0.425  | 0.490 | 0.032  | 0.056 | 0.028               | 0.055 |
| Number of rooms in HHs                  | 3.147  | 1.520 | 3.134  | 1.465 | 0.014  | 0.134 | 0.015               | 0.131 |
| P-value for joint test of orthogonality |        |       |        |       | 0.997  |       | 0.997               |       |
| Number of observations                  | 174    |       | 494    |       |        |       |                     |       |

# Summary Statistics

|   | ST    | EM    | Non-S | STEM  | Di     | iff   | Diff (w/ | center FE) |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|----------|------------|
|   | Mean  | SD    | Mean  | SD    | Coef   | SE    | Coef     | SE         |
| Computer use:                             |       |       |       |       |        |       |          |            |
| Ever used a computer at school            | 0.216 | 0.398 | 0.172 | 0.359 | 0.044  | 0.056 | 0.038    | 0.050      |
| Hours on math and science per week        | 6.325 | 6.251 | 6.027 | 6.579 | 0.298  | 0.795 | 0.301    | 0.712      |
| Educational goal:                         |       |       |       |       |        |       |          |            |
| Senior secondary or below                 | 0.041 | 0.193 | 0.058 | 0.227 | -0.018 | 0.019 | -0.018   | 0.019      |
| Technical/ vocational                     | 0.153 | 0.357 | 0.111 | 0.306 | 0.042  | 0.054 | 0.038    | 0.047      |
| Higher education                          | 0.806 | 0.390 | 0.830 | 0.365 | -0.025 | 0.055 | -0.020   | 0.047      |
| Expected occupation:                      |       |       |       |       |        |       |          |            |
| Clerical, sales and services              | 0.013 | 0.109 | 0.017 | 0.124 | -0.004 | 0.009 | -0.005   | 0.009      |
| Education sector                          | 0.128 | 0.331 | 0.137 | 0.332 | -0.009 | 0.033 | -0.007   | 0.032      |
| Engineering/science/technology sector     | 0.296 | 0.451 | 0.305 | 0.446 | -0.009 | 0.046 | -0.011   | 0.047      |
| Health and social/community work          | 0.088 | 0.281 | 0.090 | 0.277 | -0.002 | 0.026 | -0.001   | 0.026      |
| Professional/ managerial (government)     | 0.331 | 0.465 | 0.337 | 0.457 | -0.005 | 0.050 | -0.001   | 0.046      |
| Professional/ managerial (non-government) | 0.061 | 0.238 | 0.060 | 0.230 | 0.001  | 0.028 | -0.001   | 0.026      |
| Agriculture/domestic service/manual job   | 0.082 | 0.273 | 0.054 | 0.219 | 0.028  | 0.051 | 0.025    | 0.043      |
| P-value for joint test of orthogonality   |       |       |       |       | 0.997  |       | 0.997    |            |
| Number of observations                    | 174   |       | 494   |       |        |       |          |            |

### **Summary Statistics**

|   | STE    | EM    | Non-S  | TEM   | Di     | ff    | Diff (w/ | center FE) |
|---|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|----------|------------|
|   | Mean   | SD    | Mean   | SD    | Coef   | SE    | Coef     | SE         |
| Desired marriage age (male)             | 27.439 | 5.006 | 27.559 | 4.526 | -0.121 | 0.704 | -0.186   | 0.704      |
| Desired marriage age (female)           | 28.385 | 3.375 | 27.940 | 4.817 | 0.446  | 0.509 | 0.263    | 0.499      |
| Standardized gender attitudes           | 0.129  | 1.156 | 0.112  | 0.992 | 0.017  | 0.182 | 0.020    | 0.166      |
| Standardized self-esteem index          | 0.130  | 0.922 | 0.054  | 0.970 | 0.076  | 0.102 | 0.071    | 0.097      |
| Big 5 personality:                      |        |       |        |       |        |       |          |            |
| Extroversion                            | 0.053  | 0.916 | 0.023  | 0.970 | 0.030  | 0.090 | 0.020    | 0.089      |
| Agreeableness                           | 0.097  | 0.882 | 0.043  | 0.952 | 0.055  | 0.089 | 0.040    | 0.089      |
| Conscientiousness                       | 0.091  | 0.859 | 0.044  | 0.951 | 0.047  | 0.085 | 0.041    | 0.085      |
| Neuroticism                             | 0.081  | 0.831 | 0.036  | 0.954 | 0.045  | 0.083 | 0.041    | 0.083      |
| Openness                                | 0.096  | 0.857 | 0.035  | 0.956 | 0.061  | 0.082 | 0.053    | 0.078      |
| P-value for joint test of orthogonality |        |       |        |       | 0.997  |       | 0.997    |            |
| Number of observations                  | 174    |       | 494    |       |        |       |          |            |



#### **Empirical Specification**

• We use the following model to estimate the impact of the STEM program with the IPW:

$$Y_{ict} = \alpha + \beta STEM_{ic} + \delta Y_{ic,t-1} + \theta X_{ic,t-1} + \gamma_c + \epsilon_{ict}$$
(1)

where *i*, *c*, and *t* indicate individual students, Compassion centers, and time of the survey. t-1 and *t* indicate the time before and after the treatment.

- *Y<sub>ict</sub>* is the outcome. The vector *X<sub>ic,t-1</sub>* comprises control variables, including all the variables in the baseline survey.
- The propensity score is estimated (probit) using these variables, and the inverse of the weight from propensity scores is applied in each regression.

#### The effect of STEM bootcamp on gender attitudes

|                                   | Dependent variable: Gender attitudes |            |                               |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
|                                   | (1)<br>OLS                           | (2)<br>OLS | (3)<br>Inverse<br>probability |  |  |
|                                   |                                      |            | weighting                     |  |  |
| STEM                              | 0.189**                              | 0.183**    | 0.163**                       |  |  |
|                                   | (0.079)                              | (0.084)    | (0.077)                       |  |  |
| Control baseline gender attitudes | Yes                                  | Yes        | IPW                           |  |  |
| Control covariates                | No                                   | Yes        | IPW                           |  |  |
| Control group mean                | 0                                    | 0          | 0                             |  |  |
| R-squared                         | 0.128                                | 0.240      |                               |  |  |
| Observations                      | 668                                  | 668        | 668                           |  |  |

Note: Significance levels: \* 10%, \*\* 5%, \*\*\* 1%.

 Comparable to Dhar et al. (2020): 20 hours discussion program on gender equality (45 minutes every 3 weeks, over 2.5 years): 0.18 std

### The effect of STEM bootcamp by gender

|                    | Dependent variable: Gender attitudes |          |  |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|----------|--|
|                    | (1)                                  | (2)      |  |
|                    | Males                                | Females  |  |
| STEM               | 0.035                                | 0.294*** |  |
|                    | (0.119)                              | (0.101)  |  |
| Control group mean | 211                                  | .464     |  |
| Observations       | 339                                  | 329      |  |

Note: Significance levels: \* 10%, \*\* 5%, \*\*\* 1%.

• In Dhar et. al (2020), the effects on gender attitudes for boys were larger.

# Girls' results on disaggregated gender attitude outcomes



The largest impact on the traditional gender view that women should not earn more money than their husbands. Also large improvements in gender attitudes on women's role, political participation, and tertiary education opportunities.

# Heterogeneous effects for girls

|  |                  | Dep               | oendent variabl  | e: Gender attitu    | ıdes             |                   |
|--|------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------|
|  | (1)              | (2)               | (3)              | (4)                 | (5)              | (6)               |
| STEM   | 0.174<br>(0.129) | 0.256*<br>(0.142) | 0.144<br>(0.183) | 0.297***<br>(0.102) | 0.230<br>(0.161) | 0.267*<br>(0.158) |
| $STEM\times1(Below\text{ median baseline gender attitudes})$   | 0.194<br>(0.192) |                   |                  |                     |                  |                   |
| $STEM \times 1(Below median mother's education)$   |                  | 0.023<br>(0.194)  |                  |                     |                  |                   |
| ${\rm STEM}\times 1({\rm Below}\ {\rm median}\ {\rm number}\ {\rm of}\ {\rm rooms}\ {\rm in}\ {\rm the}\ {\rm HHs})$ |                  |                   | 0.209<br>(0.216) |                     |                  |                   |
| $STEM \times 1(Baseline education goal \ ! = higher education)$  |                  |                   |                  | -0.015<br>(0.199)   |                  |                   |
| ${\sf STEM} \times 1 ({\sf Never used computer before})$   |                  |                   |                  |                     | 0.086<br>(0.170) |                   |
| STEM $\times$ 1(Below median weekly study hours on math and science)   |                  |                   |                  |                     |                  | 0.032<br>(0.200)  |
| p-value: STEM + STEM $\times$ 1(Below median mother's education)=0   |                  | .0353             |                  |                     |                  |                   |
| p-value: STEM + STEM $\times$ 1(Below median number of rooms in the HHs)=0   |                  |                   | .0024            |                     |                  |                   |
| p-value: STEM + STEM $\times$ 1(Never used computer before)=0  |                  |                   |                  |                     | .0032            |                   |
| p-value: STEM + STEM $\times$ 1(Below median weekly study hours on math and science)=0                               |                  |                   |                  |                     |                  | .0156             |
| Control mean   | .464             | .464              | .464             | .464                | .464             | .464              |
| Observations   | 329              | 329               | 329              | 329                 | 329              | 329               |

Note: Significance levels: \* 10%, \*\* 5%, \*\*\* 1%.

# Inspecting mechanisms

- The intervention induces progressive gender attitudes among girls.
- We investigate several channels.
  - Self-esteem
  - Interests in STEM subjects, potentially affecting gendered stereotypes.
  - Perceived earnings in labor markets and career aspirations.

### Potential channels for girls

| Dependent variable                        | STEM     | SE    | Control mean |
|---|----------|-------|--------------|
| A. Self-esteem                            |          |       |              |
| Standardized self-esteem index            | 0.296*   | 0.164 | -0.022       |
| B. Interests in STEM subjects             |          |       |              |
| 1st favorite subject-math and science     | 0.132**  | 0.059 | 0.589        |
| 2nd favorite subject-math and science     | 0.164**  | 0.065 | 0.437        |
| 3rd favorite subject-math and science     | -0.075** | 0.033 | 0.166        |
| C. Perceived labor earnings               |          |       |              |
| Earnings compared to others at 25 (max10) | 0.922*** | 0.301 | 6.689        |
| Earnings compared to others at 35 (max10) | 0.580*** | 0.223 | 7.782        |
| D. Career aspiration                      |          |       |              |
| Standardized career aspiration pca        | 0.072    | 0.166 | 0.281        |
| Number of observations                    | 329      |       |              |
|   |          |       |              |

Note: Significance levels: \* 10%, \*\* 5%, \*\*\* 1%.

# Decomposition results



- Quantify contribution of each channel to the main effects using a method by Heckman et al. (2013) and Gelbach (2016).
  - Self-esteem (9.4%)
  - Interests in STEM subjects (4.1%)
  - Perceived labor market earnings (16%)
  - Career aspirations (1.5%)

# The effect of STEM bootcamps on behavior and long-term expectations for girls

| Dependent variable   | STEM     | SE    | Control mean |
|--|----------|-------|--------------|
| A. Weekly study hours  |          |       |              |
| Weekly hours of study  | 5.276*** | 1.947 | 12.232       |
| Kiswahili/English weekly hours of study                                    | 1.174*   | 0.656 | 3.798        |
| Math/Science/Computer weekly hours of study                                | 2.202*** | 0.701 | 4.372        |
| ${\sf Geography}/{\sf Civics}/{\sf History} \text{ weekly hours of study}$ | 1.900*** | 0.665 | 4.061        |
| B. Educational goal  |          |       |              |
| Senior secondary or below  | 0.036    | 0.057 | 0.070        |
| Technical/ vocational  | -0.014   | 0.042 | 0.078        |
| Higher education   | -0.022   | 0.070 | 0.853        |
| C. Preferred major in college  |          |       |              |
| Business   | -0.101** | 0.047 | 0.250        |
| Engineering/Technology   | 0.189*** | 0.053 | 0.103        |
| Other majors   | -0.013   | 0.068 | 0.571        |
| Number of observations   | 329      |       |              |

Note: Significance levels: \* 10%, \*\* 5%, \*\*\* 1%.

# The effect of STEM bootcamps on behavior and long-term expectations for girls

| Dependent variable                      | STEM      | SE    | Control mean |
|---|-----------|-------|--------------|
| D. Expected occupation                  |           |       |              |
| Clerical, sales and services            | -0.058*** | 0.022 | 0.087        |
| Education sector                        | 0.006     | 0.057 | 0.121        |
| Engineering/science/technology sector   | 0.067     | 0.063 | 0.341        |
| Health and social/community work        | 0.028     | 0.041 | 0.085        |
| Professional/ managerial (gov)          | -0.030    | 0.043 | 0.230        |
| Professional/ managerial (non-gov)      | 0.049     | 0.045 | 0.058        |
| Agriculture/domestic service/manual job | -0.062*** | 0.023 | 0.078        |
| E. Household outcomes                   |           |       |              |
| Desired marriage age                    | 0.089     | 0.472 | 26.729       |
| Number of children wanted               | -0.259*   | 0.141 | 3.516        |
| Number of observations                  | 329       |       |              |

Note: Significance levels: \* 10%, \*\* 5%, \*\*\* 1%.

#### Long-term effects

|  | Dependent variable:<br>Gender attitudes |
|--|---|
|  | (1)                                     |
| STEM   | 0.338**<br>(0.143)                      |
| STEM $\times$ 1(Above median days btw STEM camps and post surveys) | -0.077<br>(0.183)                       |
| Control group mean   | .464                                    |
| Observations   | 329                                     |

Note: Significance levels: \* 10%, \*\* 5%, \*\*\* 1%.

• We exploit variations in the differences in the timing of the intervention and the post-survey to test the heterogeneous effect by time.

# Conclusion

- We study how educational opportunities change adolescents' gender attitudes, using an experiential education program focused on STEM.
- The STEM bootcamp had a significant positive impact on gender attitudes for girls but not for boys.
- Improved labor market opportunities appear to be an important channel to explain the observed changes in girls ' attitudes.
- The intervention also increased girls' weekly hours of studying and boosted interests in STEM-related subjects and occupations.
- Our results suggest that an indirect approach of providing practical STEM education opportunities can be as effective as direct interventions at changing gender attitudes for girls.

# Sample of First Day Schedule at STEM boot camp

- 8:30 9:30 intro, survey, growth mindset
- 9:30 11:00 intro to block programming, graph paper programming, debugging
- 11:00 11:30 break
- 11:30 12:00 change the world video
- 12:00 12:30 block coding: star wars coding
- 12:30 13:30 amazing robots video
- 13:30 14:00 Q n A
- 14:00 15:00 lunch
- 15:00 15:30 arduino robot video
- 15:30 17:00 assembling racebot part I
- 17:00 18:00 wrap-up and close the day

### Measure of Gender Attitudes

#### 3C: Gender norms

|  | 1 Agree Strongly 2 Agr | ee 3 Disagree 4 S | trongly Disagree |
|--|------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| 321. A woman's most important role is being a good ho    | memaker                |                   |                  |
| 322. Husband and wife should both contribute to incom    | ne                     |                   |                  |
| 323. Men make better political leaders than women do     |                        |                   |                  |
| 324. University is more important for a boy than for a g | irl                    |                   |                  |
| 325. Pre-school child suffers with working mother        |                        |                   |                  |
| 326. Women want a home and children                      |                        |                   |                  |
| 327. Men should take as much responsibility as women     | for home and children  |                   |                  |
| 328. Problem if women have more income than husbar       | nd                     |                   |                  |
| 329. Having more than one wife is fine                   |                        |                   |                  |
| 330. Wife must obey husband                              |                        |                   |                  |
| 331. Men make better business executives than women      | do                     |                   |                  |

- Aggregated the answers for these questions using PCA so that higher number indicates more progressive gender attitudes
- $\bullet\,$  Normalized the control group's mean and std as 0 and 1

#### Measure of Self Esteem

#### 3B: Self esteem index

|  | 1 Agree Strongly 2 Agree 3 Disagree 4 Strongly Disagree |
|--|---|
| 311. Overall, I am satisfied with myself                 |   |
| 312. I feel that I have a number of good qualities       |   |
| 313. I am able to do things as well as most other people | ·   |

- Aggregated the answers for these questions using PCA so that higher number indicates more progressive gender attitudes
- Normalized the control group's mean and std as 0 and 1

▶ Go back