# AN INSIDER'S LOOK AT THE PER COMMUNITY 

## Laura McCullough <br> University of Wisconsin-Stout

## PER SURVEY

- Survey sent to 39 members of the PER community
- 21 women, 18 men
- Avg. age: 36 for women, 37 for men
- Avg. time spent in PER:
8.2 years for women (range of 2-25 years)
9.6 years for men (range of 3-30 years)
- Responses coded, names removed, analyzed by major themes then by gender


## WHY CHOOSE PHYSICS?

Enjoyed the content 5 (0 w, 5 m)Had ability3 (0 w, 3 m)
For the content 9 (1 w, 8 m)Cool/fascinatingChallenging3 (2 w, 1 m)Lack of women/wanted to prove it could be
done
Encouraged
4 (4 w, 0 m)
3 (2 w, 1 m)

## WHY CHOOSE PER?

Enjoyed the content<br>6 (2 w, 4 m)<br>Had poor experience as student<br>For the content<br>Be a better teacher<br>Liked teaching<br>Physics not interesting<br>4 (1 w, 3 m)<br>9 (1 w, 8 m)<br>3 (1 w, 2 m)<br>9 (3 w, 6 m)<br>4 (1 w, 3 m)

## GENDER RATIO IN PHYISCS

Low but OK
11 people ( $9 \mathrm{w}, 2 \mathrm{~m}$ )
Low but I never considered it 4 people ( $1 \mathrm{w}, 3 \mathrm{~m}$ ) Low-not sure how I feel about it 8 people ( $6 \mathrm{w}, 2 \mathrm{~m}$ ) Low-not comfortable with it 10 people ( $2 \mathrm{w}, 8 \mathrm{~m}$ ) [Note: NSF data suggests about 20\% women in physics.]

## GENDER RATIO IN PER

Better than traditional physics! 19 people ( 8 w , 11 m ) Less than $25 \%$ women 1 person ( $1 \mathrm{w}, 0 \mathrm{~m}$ )
25-50\% women
50\% women
8 people ( $7 \mathrm{w}, 1 \mathrm{~m}$ )
2 people ( $1 \mathrm{w}, 1 \mathrm{~m}$ )
[Note: My estimate is about 40\% women in PER.]

## WHEN DID YOU CHOOSE PHYSICS?

Middle school<br>High school<br>Early college<br>Mid-college<br>Late college<br>Graduate school<br>Post-grad school<br>3 (1 w, 2 m)<br>8 (3 w, 5 m)<br>14(8w, 6 m)<br>3 (2 w, 1 m)<br>3 (2 w, 1 m)<br>3 (2 w, 1 m)<br>1 (1 w, 0 m)

## WHEN DID YOU <br> CHOOSE PER?

Undergraduate<br>Graduate school<br>Post-doc<br>Pre-tenure prof. HS Teaching

# DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF PART OF THE PHYSICS COMMUNITY? 

Yes 32 people ( $16 \mathrm{w}, 16 \mathrm{~m}$ )<br>No 6 people ( $4 w, 2 \mathrm{~m}$ )

## DO YOU CONSIDER

## yOURSELF PART OF THE

 PER COMMUNITY?Yes 31 people ( $13 \mathrm{w}, 18 \mathrm{~m}$ )
No 0 people
Other 6 people ( $6 \mathrm{w}, 0 \mathrm{~m}$ )

Warm fuzzy community? Or exclusive and unwelcoming? Both; there were strongly-felt opinions on both sides of this issue.

## TRAD. PHYSICS VS. PER

My reading:
There are distinct differences in the answers about physics and PER.
People come to PER later (makes sense, it's not a high school topic nor much of an undergraduate on). There is a sense that there are more women in PER. This would appear to be true. One person voiced a concern that since women tend to appear on the edges, it makes sense they are in PER since PER is on the edge of physics. Another noted that the increased proportion of women makes it more obvious that PER is not physics.

## AAPT MEETINGS

What is important to you about meetings such as the AAPT?

Meet friends, network, socialize 18 people ( 8 w , 10 m ) Share own research, get feedback, and learn about others' work
Keep up with the field
Opportunities for collaboration Recharge batteries

3 people ( $1 \mathrm{w}, 2 \mathrm{~m}$ )
5 people ( $2 \mathrm{w}, 3 \mathrm{~m}$ )
3 people ( $1 \mathrm{w}, 2 \mathrm{~m}$ )
2 people ( $2 \mathrm{w}, 0 \mathrm{~m}$ )

## MENTORING

No mentor
Advisor/supervisor
Formal mentor through program
Department chair
Professor/met through class
Other person found on own
Positive experience
Mixed experience
Negative experience

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 6 \text { people }(2 \mathrm{w}, 4 \mathrm{~m}) \\
& 11 \text { people } \quad(5 \mathrm{w}, 6 \mathrm{~m}) \\
& 7 \text { people } \quad(6 \mathrm{w}, 2 \mathrm{~m}) \\
& 3 \text { people } \quad(0 \mathrm{w}, 3 \mathrm{~m}) \\
& 3 \text { people } \quad(1 \mathrm{w}, 2 \mathrm{~m}) \\
& 4 \text { people }(2 \mathrm{w}, 2 \mathrm{~m}) \\
& 20 \text { people }(13 \mathrm{w}, 7 \mathrm{~m}) \\
& 2 \text { people }(1 \mathrm{w}, 1 \mathrm{~m}) \\
& \text { 0 people }
\end{aligned}
$$

Issues important to mentoring:
Promotion \& tenure/bureaucracy/politics (6); Social/cultural (2); Grants \& publishing (2); Similarity of mentor/mentee (3); Independence (4); Teaching advice (3); Respect for mentee (2); Availability of mentor (2)

## FAMILY BACKGROUND

Father in STEM Mother in STEM

Sister in STEM

Brother in STEM
Other family in STEM
Other/peripheral
No family in STEM

13 people ( $7 \mathrm{w}, 6 \mathrm{~m}$ )
3 people ( $2 \mathrm{w}, 1 \mathrm{~m}$ )
3 people ( $2 \mathrm{w}, 1 \mathrm{~m}$ )
4 people ( $3 \mathrm{w}, 1 \mathrm{~m}$ )
8 people ( $3 \mathrm{w}, 5 \mathrm{~m}$ )
7 people ( $4 \mathrm{w}, 3 \mathrm{~m}$ )
11 people ( $6 \mathrm{w}, 5 \mathrm{~m}$ )

## FAMILY BACKGROUND

23 had "traditional" upbringing (11 women, 12 men), 4 had non-traditional ( 3 women, 1 man), 7 had mixed upbringing (2 women, 5 men)

The majority were from nuclear families (26 people; 13 women \& 13 men)
4 from multi-generational families ( 1 woman, 3 men)
3 from multi-parent families ( 2 women, 1 man)
1 from single-parent family (1 woman)

## initial readings

My reading of this data:
AAPT is a good thing.

Mentoring is a good thing.

Family background is fairly traditional among PER people. Many had at least one family member in STEM fields.

