This is PTCMW: Or Some Reflections, After Reminiscing About SIOP, On Our Membership

Today, we’re exploring where current PTCMW membership stands. That’s you—well, if you’ve paid your dues. We’ll also be exploring how our membership compares to SIOP more broadly. In the future, PTCMW will keep an on-going membership roster, investigating where our members live and work.

## Membership Status

Of our 328 total members, 31% are currently active as student members, with 69% identifying as full professional members. Almost half of our members are doctoral-level (48%), followed by Master’s level (43%), and finally bachelor’s level (9%, who are primarily current students).

First, in comparison to SIOP’s membership, it is worth noting that PTCMW is in fact smaller1. Although SIOP demarcates more types of membership (i.e., retired, associate, and fellow) than PTCMW, there was no significant difference between the proportion of student members and professional memberships between these two organizations (z =-1.13, p = .26). SIOP’s 2018 Membership Survey reported 28% of members were student compared to PTCMW’s 31% student members.

PTCMW and SIOP did diverge in terms of the education-level of its members. SIOP reports 58% of its members at the doctoral-level, significantly more than PTCMW (*z* = 3.52, *p* < .01); and only 30% of its members at the master’s-level, significantly less than PTCMW (*z* = -4.09, *p* < .01).

## Where Members Live

Perhaps not surprisingly, the bulk of our membership (90%) lives in Washington, DC (25%), Maryland (15%), and Virginia (50%). And while we appreciate our more remote colleagues in the Northeast, Midwest, Southeast, Southwest, and West—this pie chart ran out of PTCMW brand colors, so they’re ingloriously labeled as “Other” (10%). Sorry to y’all, yinz, and youse guys2.

## Organizational Status: Where Members Work

Of our members, PTCMW has traditionally broken down our members’ organizations thusly: Academia (35%), Consulting Firm (30%), Federal Government (20%), Non-profit (9%), Private Sector Business (5%), Local Government (2%), and (currently), no Independent Practices (0%). Based on the way this data is collected by both PTCMW and SIOP, only one affiliation is recorded. But, it would appear quite possible that many of our members have multiple statuses.

PTCMW and SIOP’s membership are roughly comparable in terms of proportion of academic appointments. However, SIOP includes a larger proportion of private sector businesses than PTC (*z* = 6.39, *p* < .01); and a lower proportion of consulting firms (*z* = -3.77, *p* < .01). Finally, 8% of SIOP members operate an independent practice, compared to PTCMW’s 0% (*z* = 5.37, *p* < .01).

SIOP operationalized employment status by collapsing non-profit organizations, and local and federal government into “public sector organizations”. Perhaps not surprisingly, PTCMW differed from SIOP here: 31% of PTCMW members fell under public sector organizations compared to SIOP’s 13% (*z* = -7.67, *p* < .01).

PTCMW is continually striving to better understand our unique members’ needs and support the local I/O Psychology community. To supplement this data in the future, keep an eye out for our upcoming membership survey. Curious about other demographics of PTCMW’s members? Let us know, and email membership.ptcmw@gmail.com.

*Footnotes*

1 Are you serious? We do not need to run that statistic, Reviewer 2.

2 *Query*: Is there a unique regional second-person plural pronoun in the Southwest?