

Breaking Barriers: Investigating Gender Dynamics in Introductory Physics Lab Classes

Bilas Paul,^{1,*} Shantanu Chakraborty,² and Ganga Sharma³

¹*SUNY Farmingdale State College, Farmingdale, NY, 11735*

²*Valdosta State University, Valdosta, GA, 31698*

³*Fairmont State University, Fairmont, WV, 26554*

The persistent underrepresentation of women and other gender minorities in physical science fields has been an ongoing concern. This study investigates gender dynamics in introductory physics laboratory courses, specifically exploring whether students of different gender identities exhibit equal inclination and confidence in conducting lab experiments, and whether they face barriers that impact their participation. The study was conducted across three institutions, involving non-physics students enrolled in algebra-based and calculus-based physics courses. Our findings reveal no significant differences in participation levels across genders in various lab activities. However, a subtle yet significant trend was observed: non-male students tend to express greater preferences and comfort levels for note-taking, calculations, and graphing tasks compared to their male counterparts, who gravitated more towards hands-on equipment handling. Although no overt barriers deterring participation based solely on gender were identified, some students reported experiences or witnessed instances where gender dynamics hindered full engagement, such as assumptions about competence or difficulty asserting voices in male-dominated groups. These findings contribute insights into potential gender-based inclinations and experiences within laboratory environments. The results underscore the importance of fostering an inclusive climate that encourages equitable opportunities and engagement from all gender identities in scientific exploration and learning.

I. INTRODUCTION

Women remain significantly underrepresented in physics and other STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) fields, particularly in academic settings [1]. Despite significant efforts to increase diversity and inclusion in physics, the disparity between male and female participation in physics-related disciplines remains a persistent issue [2]. This underrepresentation is influenced by various factors, including societal norms, stereotypes, and institutional barriers. Studies have examined the impact of gender stereotypes on female students' performance in introductory physics courses, highlighting potential barriers to their success [3]. Additionally, comparisons of self-efficacy between male and female students with similar academic backgrounds have shed light on how self-perception can influence performance and persistence in physics [4].

Studies have also scrutinized female students' experiences in physics classes, particularly during lab experiments, to identify existing barriers. Investigations have examined issues related to equipment handling based on gender and race in both remote and in-person lab settings [5]. Interestingly, some studies suggest that female students often take on leadership roles in group settings in physics labs to ensure tasks are completed and the group stays on track [6]. However, gendered task divisions in labs can lead to disruptions in learning and equitable participation for female students [7]. Gender differences in perception and agency in physics labs have also been studied to determine if there are disparities in outcomes between men and women [8]. It has been noted

that without active intervention to structure equitable group dynamics, gendered divisions of roles can emerge, potentially leading to inequitable learning experiences [9].

By exploring the gender dynamics in introductory physics classes at medium-sized 4-year institutions, this study aims to contribute to the existing body of knowledge on female students' performance, preferences, and potential barriers in physics education. Understanding these factors is essential for promoting gender equity and inclusivity in physics and addressing the underrepresentation of women in the field [10, 11].

II. METHODS

This study utilized a mixed-methods approach to investigate gender dynamics within introductory physics laboratory classes, with a particular emphasis on students' engagement in conducting lab experiments. Participants consisted of non-physics majors enrolled in algebra-based and calculus-based introductory physics courses at three distinct institutions: Fairmont State University in Fairmont, West Virginia; SUNY Farmingdale State College in Farmingdale, New York; and Valdosta State University in Valdosta, Georgia. The summary of these participants is detailed in Table I. The subject pool for data collection comprised students primarily from aviation, biology, engineering, engineering technology, and pre-medical programs. These students were essential in providing a diverse and representative sample for the study, allowing for a comprehensive analysis of gender dynamics within the laboratory setting.

In the laboratory portion of these courses, students conducted experiments weekly in groups of three or four members. The research methodology encompassed both observa-

* Please address correspondence to palb@farmingdale.edu

TABLE I. Summary of the experiments we analyzed, including the number of enroll students and their genders. Students who identified as neither male nor female are categorized as "other."

Institution	Course	Lab Experiments	Enrolled students	Male	Female	Other
Fairmont State University	Algebra-based Physics II	Resistors & Ohm's Law, Capacitors and B Field in a Current Carrying Wire	33	20	11	2
Farmingdale State College	Algebra-based Physics II	Gas Laws, Heat Engine, and Mapping Electric Potential	24	13	10	1
Valdosta State University	Calculus-based Physics II	Oscilloscope, Ohm's Law, and Kirchoff's Rule	28	19	8	1

tional and survey-based approaches to capture a holistic view of students' engagement levels and perspectives on participating in lab activities. Observations were conducted by the instructors during these lab sessions to assess student engagement and participation levels. Each instructor employed a cyclic observation method, observing student groups at approximately 20-minute intervals and recording whether each student was actively involved in one of the following tasks: setting up equipment, data collection, note-taking, calculations, plotting graphs, or engaging in group discussions related to the experiment. An observation score was assigned to each student based on their level of involvement across the observed activities. Observations were compiled for three separate experiments for each laboratory group, also shown in Table I. These scores were analyzed to identify potential gender differences in engagement levels.

In addition to the observational data, a survey was administered to students to self-identify their gender and indicate their preferred and most comfortable lab activities, choosing from options such as (A) setting up equipment, (B) data collection, (C) note-taking, calculations, and data visualization, and (D) report writing. The survey also aimed to identify potential barriers perceived by students as hindrances to their full participation in lab experiments, offering valuable qualitative insights into the students' perspectives.

Quantitative analysis involved calculating mean observation scores and conducting statistical comparisons between genders to discern potential disparities in participation and comfort levels. Qualitative analysis entailed thematic examination of survey responses and qualitative insights derived from observational data to contextualize gender dynamics within the laboratory setting. Ethical considerations were addressed through institutional review board approval, ensuring compliance with ethical guidelines for research involving human participants. The anonymity and confidentiality of the participants were maintained throughout the data collection and analysis processes. The study's limitations included potential observer bias during data collection and the reliance on self-reported survey responses.

III. RESULTS

Figure 1 illustrates the distribution of the time students spend on various tasks during physics lab sessions, including setting up equipment, data collection, note-taking, calculations, plotting graphs, and engaging in group discussions related to experiments. Our observations indicate that there are no significant differences in the involvement of male and non-male students (students who identified as other than male) in lab activities across the three institutions' introductory physics classes. However, the study acknowledges the limitation of a small sample size, necessitating further investigation for more conclusive results. Despite these initial observations, the persistent underrepresentation of women in physical science fields underscores the need for continued research into potential causal factors. The root causes of this disparity likely stem from a combination of societal, cultural, and educational influences that extend beyond the scope of introductory physics lab courses.

Building upon the initial findings that revealed no significant differences in the involvement of male and non-male students in lab activities, further analysis delved into the preferences and comfort levels of students regarding specific tasks within physics lab sessions. Figure 2 presents the distribution of students' preferences and comfort levels across various activities in physics lab sessions at the three institutions under study. The results indicate a nuanced difference in preferences and comfort levels between male and non-male students.

The analysis of students' preferences and comfort levels across various lab activities revealed distinct patterns among male and non-male students. Male students displayed a tendency to prefer and feel more comfortable with technical tasks such as equipment handling and setting up experiments. On the other hand, non-male students gravitated towards activities that involve note-taking, performing calculations, and data visualizations, along with other organizational tasks. Interestingly, both groups exhibited a similar preference and comfort level when it came to data collection, suggesting a shared interest in this central aspect of lab work. However, while both male and non-male students showed a lower pref-




FIG. 1. The distribution of time students spend on various tasks during physics lab sessions is shown across three institutions: Fairmont State University (top), SUNY Farmingdale State College (middle), and Valdosta State University (bottom). These tasks include setting up equipment, data collection, note-taking, calculations, plotting graphs, and participating in group discussions related to the experiments. The blue histograms represent male students, while the orange histograms represent students who are not male.

erence for report writing, non-male students reported a higher comfort level with this activity compared to their male counterparts. This variation in preferences and comfort levels in-

dicates that there may be underlying gender-based factors influencing the selection of tasks within the lab environment.

Moreover, the slight differences in preferences and com-




FIG. 2. The distribution of students' preferences and comfort levels across various activities in physics lab sessions at the three institutions under study: (top) Fairmont State University, (middle) SUNY Farmingdale State College, and (bottom) Valdosta State University. The blue and orange bars represent the preferences of male and non-male students, respectively, while green and red bars represent the comfort levels of male and non-male students. In all cases, darker colors represent the first choice, and lighter colors represent the second choice. Here, A = Equipment handling, B = Data collection, C = Note-taking, performing calculations, and plotting graphs, and D = Report writing. It is important to note that some students indicated more than one first and/or second choice for both preference and comfort level, while others did not have a first or second choice for either category.

fort levels between male and non-male students could potentially impact their overall engagement and satisfaction during physics lab sessions. Understanding these nuances is crucial for educators and institutions to tailor their approaches to accommodate diverse preferences and ensure equitable participation and learning experiences for all students.

While the study did not identify significant barriers or challenges related to gender in conducting physics lab experiments among the participants, a few students, both male and non-male, reported instances where gender dynamics influenced their experiences. Comments such as

"Sometimes as a woman, male partners just assume that they know more and do not want to mess up steps."

"Being the only woman in a lab group with all men can be challenging at times. I am overlooked and not listened to, which affects my comfort level."

"Being in a lab group where I am the only girl made it difficult for me to feel comfortable enough to speak out on my opinion. I was often too nervous to try and correct a lab

members mistake with the fear my lab member may discredit my finding or shrug off my input since I am just a girl."

highlight the importance of addressing gender biases and fostering inclusive environments within physics education.

The study is ongoing, with data collection efforts aimed at expanding the dataset and enhancing the analysis. This research provides an opportunity to extend into other physical science and engineering disciplines to examine gender disparities and develop inclusive strategies for equitable participation and success for all students. Exploring these dynamics across various academic domains can offer insights into common challenges and aid in developing inclusive strategies to promote equitable participation and success for all students.

IV. DISCUSSIONS

In conclusion, the study on gender dynamics in introductory physics laboratory classes at medium-sized 4-year institutions has provided valuable insights into students' involvement in physics lab activities, their preferences, comfort levels, and potential barriers in physics education. While no significant differences were found in the involvement of male and non-male students in lab activities, the analysis revealed slight disparities in their preferences and comfort levels. Male students tend to gravitate more toward technical, hands-on tasks like equipment setup and handling, while non-male students show a greater inclination toward more analytical aspects such as note-taking, calculations, and data visualization. These tendencies, though not universal, suggest that some stereotypical gender roles and societal expectations may still influence students' self-perceptions and comfort zones within academic laboratory settings.

Importantly, a few students reported experiencing or witnessing gender-related barriers that hindered their full partic-

ipation and sense of belonging in group lab work. Comments highlighted concerns about assumptions of competency, feeling dismissed or discredited due to gender, and difficulties in asserting one's voice, particularly for non-male students in male-dominated groups. While limited in number, these accounts underscore the persisting need for greater inclusivity and allyship within STEM education.

Moving forward, continued research into gender dynamics across STEM disciplines is essential to address the underrepresentation of women and foster inclusive learning environments. By exploring and understanding the factors influencing students' experiences in physics labs, educators and institutions can implement strategies to enhance engagement and support the success of all students. This ongoing research serves as a foundation for developing inclusive practices that promote gender equity and inclusivity in physics and related fields.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that the research was conducted without any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors extend their gratitude to their students for their participation in this study. Author BP thanks the Provost's Office of SUNY Farmingdale State College for its support. Author SC thanks Valdosta State University Office of Sponsored Programs and Research Administration (OSPRA) for its support. Author GS thanks Dr. Deb Hemler, Chair of Natural Science Department of Fairmont State University for creating conducive research and learning environment within the department.

-
- [1] A. M. Porter and R. Ivie. Women in physics and astronomy, 2019. <https://ww2.aip.org/statistics/women-in-physics-and-astronomy-2019>, 2019.
 - [2] Rachel Henderson. An exploration of diversity and inclusion in introductory physics. Graduate Theses, West Virginia University, WV, 2018.
 - [3] A. Maries, N. Karim, and C. Singh. Is agreeing with a gender stereotype correlated with the performance of female students in introductory physics? *Physical Review Physics Education Research*, 14, 2018.
 - [4] E. Marshman, Z. Kalender, T. Nokes-Malach, C. Schunn, and C. Singh. Female students with a's have similar physics self-efficacy as male students with c's in introductory courses: a cause for alarm? *Physical Review Physics Education Research*, 14, 2018.
 - [5] M. Dew, A. Phillips, S. Karunwi, A. Baksh, E. Stump, and N. Holmes. So unfair it's fair: equipment handling in remote versus in-person introductory physics labs. *Physics Education Research Conference*, 2022.
 - [6] D. Doucette and C. Singh. Views of female students who played the role of group leaders in introductory physics labs. *European Journal of Physics*, 42, 2021.
 - [7] D. Doucette, R. Clark, and C. Singh. Hermione and the secretary: how gendered task division in introductory physics labs can disrupt equitable learning. *European Journal of Physics*, 41, 2020.
 - [8] Z. Y. Kalender, M. M. Stein, and N. G. Holmes. Sense of agency, gender, and students' perception in open-ended physics labs. *Physics Education Research Conference*, 2020.
 - [9] Katherine N. Quinn, Michelle M. Kelley, Kathryn L. McGill, Emily M. Smith, Zachary Whipps, and N. G. Holmes. Group roles in unstructured labs show inequitable gender divide. *Phys. Rev. Phys. Educ. Res.*, 16:010129, May 2020.

- [10] M. Sundstrom, D. G. Wu, C. Walsh, A. B. Heim, and N. G. Holmes. Examining the effects of lab instruction and gender composition on intergroup interaction networks in introductory physics labs. *Phys. Rev. Phys. Educ. Res.*, 18:010102, Jan 2022.
- [11] D. Doucette and C. Singh. Gender equity in physics labs. *Phys. Rev. Phys. Educ. Res.*, 20:010102, Jan 2024.