

## **Building Supports for Diversity through Engineering Teams**

### **Dr. Adam Kirn, University of Nevada, Reno**

Adam Kirn is an Assistant Professor of Engineering Education at University of Nevada, Reno. His research focuses on the interactions between engineering cultures, student motivation, and their learning experiences. His projects involve the study of student perceptions, beliefs and attitudes towards becoming engineers, their problem solving processes, and cultural fit. His education includes a B.S. in Biomedical Engineering from Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology, a M.S. in Bioengineering and Ph.D. in Engineering and Science Education from Clemson University.

### **Dr. Allison Godwin, Purdue University, West Lafayette (College of Engineering)**

Allison Godwin, Ph.D. is an Assistant Professor of Engineering Education at Purdue University. Her research focuses what factors influence diverse students to choose engineering and stay in engineering through their careers and how different experiences within the practice and culture of engineering foster or hinder belongingness and identity development. Dr. Godwin graduated from Clemson University with a B.S. in Chemical Engineering and Ph.D. in Engineering and Science Education. She is the recipient of a 2014 American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE) Educational Research and Methods Division Apprentice Faculty Grant. She has also been recognized for the synergy of research and teaching as an invited participant of the 2016 National Academy of Engineering Frontiers of Engineering Education Symposium and 2016 New Faculty Fellow for the Frontiers in Engineering Education Annual Conference. She also was an NSF Graduate Research Fellow for her work on female empowerment in engineering which won the National Association for Research in Science Teaching 2015 Outstanding Doctoral Research Award.

### **Mr. Nelson Pearson, University of Nevada, Reno**

### **Mr. Hector Enrique Rodriguez-Simmonds, Purdue Engineering Education**

Raised in South Florida, born in Mexico. Half Colombian and half Mexican; proud Mexilombian. Héctor acquired an MS in Computer Engineering and is currently pursuing a PhD in Engineering Education, both from Purdue University. His research interests are in investigating the experiences of LGBTQ+ students in engineering, dabbling with critical methodologies and methods for conducting and analyzing research, and exploring embodied cognition.

### **Ms. Jacqueline Ann Rohde, Clemson University**

Jacqueline Rohde is a senior undergraduate student in Bioengineering at Clemson University. Her research in engineering education focuses on the development student identity and attitudes with respect to engineering. She is a member of the National Scholars Program, Clemson University's most prestigious merit-based scholarship. She is also involved in efforts to include the Grand Challenges of Engineering into the general engineering curricula at Clemson University.

### **Dina Verdín, Purdue**

Dina Verdín is an Engineering Education and Industrial Engineering graduate student at Purdue University. She completed her undergraduate degree in Industrial and Systems Engineering at San José State University. Dina's research interest focuses on first-generation college students, specifically around changing the deficit base perspective to an asset base approach.

### **Dr. Monique S Ross, Florida International University**

Monique Ross holds a doctoral degree in Engineering Education from Purdue University. She has a Bachelor's degree in Computer Engineering from Elizabethtown College, a Master's degree in Computer Science and Software Engineering from Auburn University, eleven years of experience in industry as a software engineer, and three years as a full-time faculty in the departments of computer science and

engineering. Her interests focus on broadening participation in engineering through the exploration of: 1) race, gender, and identity in the engineering workplace; 2) discipline-based education research (with a focus on computer science and computer engineering courses) in order to inform pedagogical practices that garner interest and retain women and minorities in computer-related engineering fields.

**Dr. Kyle Patrick Vealey, West Chester University of Pennsylvania**

Kyle P. Vealey is an Assistant Professor of English at West Chester University of Pennsylvania. His research interests include technical and professional communication, rhetoric of science, rhetorical theory, and public rhetoric.

**Benjamin P. Jackson, Purdue University**

**Ms. Swetha Nittala, Purdue University, Engineering Education Dept.**

**Ms. Tiantian Li, Purdue University**

Pursing a Bachelor's Degree in Pharmaceutical Processing Engineering within the ABE department in Purdue University. Has a profound interest in Engineering Education.

# **Building Supports for Diversity through Engineering Teams**

## **Project Overview**

Engineering is a globally focused career with the need to work with people from diverse backgrounds. Significant research and tools have been designed to develop and assess team member's effectiveness<sup>1</sup>; however, despite the emphasis on the importance of developing engineering students' teaming skills, little research has been conducted on how students develop sensitivity for students from different cultures and backgrounds within teams in first-year engineering programs. Here we define diversity sensitivity as students' multicultural openness (i.e., openness to other cultures, experiences, and ways of being) and actions taken to incorporate diverse students within students' teams. To address the lack of literature on diversity and teaming this work examines the following research questions: What changes occur in students' diversity sensitivity, multicultural openness, and engineering practices as a result of working in diverse teams? How do students' perceptions of diversity, affect, and engineering practices change as a result of working on diverse teams?

This research addresses these questions through the implementation of three research phases:

- Phase 1: Examination of the development of student diversity sensitivity and multicultural openness of engineering students as a result of working on diverse engineering teams.
- Phase 2: Understanding of the development of social networks in first-year engineering courses
- Phase 3: Replication of Phases 1 and 2 at institutions that are culturally distinct from the institutions of the previous phases.

The focus of this paper is on the first phase of this three phase project, in which students' multicultural openness, diversity sensitivity, and teaming effectiveness were measured at the beginning and end of a first-year engineering experience working in diverse teams. We also present results from qualitative in-depth interviews with selected students to further explain emerging trends from the quantitative results of this work.

## **Background**

In recent decades, engineering has begun to require working with people from a variety of technical and diverse backgrounds. Researchers seeking to improve students' teaming skills have found successful ways to assess team member effectiveness and help develop skills to work in teams<sup>1-3</sup>. Researchers have also striven to provide support for students in engineering from underrepresented groups for better inclusion in engineering<sup>4-6</sup>. Despite these efforts, the numbers of underrepresented groups in engineering have not increased proportionately to the effort expended by the community.

Additionally<sup>8</sup>, little research has been conducted on how students develop sensitivity to students from different cultures and backgrounds within engineering teams in first-year engineering programs. In an increasingly global economy, the development of diversity sensitivity and ability to work with a variety of people is of utmost importance. Today, mostly homogeneous engineering teams are no longer able to deal with ever diversifying customer needs. Thus, the issue of underrepresented groups in engineering is achieving more economic and political relevance<sup>7</sup>. Inclusion of underrepresented people can capture a wider variety of ideas and lived experiences<sup>8,9</sup>, be more representative of customers<sup>10,11</sup>, lead to more innovation<sup>12,13</sup>, and meet workforce needs more fully<sup>14,15</sup>.

Research findings on working in diverse teams are mixed. Some research on professionals working in diverse teams has shown that virtual meeting is better for diverse teams than face-to-face meetings initially to develop teaming skills across cultures<sup>16,17</sup>. This phenomenon may be true of practicing engineers from across the globe, but in engineering classrooms, students interact in teams within physical spaces. Therefore, understanding how these peer-to-peer interactions occur and what factors can improve understanding of diversity in engineering teams is a needed area of research. Additionally, heterogeneous teams have been shown to outperform their homogeneous counterparts on divergent-thinking and creativity. However, the inclusion of diversity on these heterogeneous teams also decreases affect, possibly due to diverse approaches to problems and a more frustrating experience for diverse individuals to work together<sup>18</sup>. These findings illustrate that successfully forming diverse teams that effectively work together, appreciate each other's differences, and develop engineering teaming, communication, and diversity sensitivity within engineering classrooms is a complex issue.

In this research, we use the lens of cultural diversity to understand how students interact and develop diversity sensitivity and multicultural openness within their teams. Cultural diversity refers to the representation of people with distinctly different group affiliations of cultural significance<sup>19</sup>. Prior research suggests that there is a seemingly universal human tendency to respond positively to others like us and negatively to dissimilar groups<sup>20-21</sup>. Additionally, groups have to work through a number of stages before they can be successful as a team<sup>22</sup>. Participants usually start in a state of high member uncertainty and search for common goals, work to develop group norms, begin to exchange information, and if effective, stabilize into team roles. Teams are only able to achieve these steps if they develop a common identity within a group<sup>21</sup>. Members of diverse teams come from a variety of social identities based on their backgrounds, cultures, and prior experiences. To develop this group identity, members of diverse groups need to develop diversity sensitivity and multicultural effectiveness which aid in integrating individual cultural identities into a group identity. This integration occurs early on in team formation processes<sup>23</sup> and is vital to team effectiveness.

## **Data Collection**

### *Data Collection Sites and Population Descriptions*

First-year engineering courses at two land-grant institutions were studied to understand the engineering teaming experiences of students. Institution One has a large international student population<sup>24</sup>. This international population makes first-year student teaming experiences particularly interesting due to the increased possibility of interacting and working in teams with students from different backgrounds and cultures. Additionally, Institution One is on track to graduate 5% of the nation's engineering students in the near future<sup>25</sup>. Changes at this university in representation can have dramatic impacts on the future of engineering in the U.S.

Institution Two provides an alternative perspective on diversity. Nearly 24% of the student population at Institution Two qualifies for Pell Grants (approximate household income under \$30,000<sup>26</sup>) and approximately 35% of students are first generation<sup>27</sup>. These diversity statistics are in addition to above average engineering enrollments of students self-identifying as Hispanic (14%) and multiethnic (5%).

### *Quantitative Data Collection and Analysis*

Survey data were collected from participants enrolled in first semester first-year engineering programs at the described institutions ( $n = 1206$ ) twice during the semester (pre and post) as well as data from the Comprehensive Assessment of Team Member Effectiveness (CATME;  $n = 2763$  inclusive of survey participants). We utilized the CATME tool to group students in first-year engineering programs at both institutions into diverse teams<sup>28</sup>. CATME Team-Maker generates team assignments based on a variety of criteria including sex, race/ethnicity, and English as a first language. Thrice during the semester students were asked to rate themselves and their teammates on their teaming effectiveness using the CATME Peer Evaluation. We used linear modeling, advanced clustering techniques, and pre-post comparisons to understand underlying student attitudes as well as the ways in which students' attitudes may shift over the course of the semester.

### *Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis*

Additionally, five teams were observed throughout the course of the semester. These teams were chosen to maximize the variation of diversity sensitivity as well as the composition of the team by racial/ethnic, gender, nationality, and disability identities. These observations were conducted to understand how students interact in ways both explicit and implicit that may or may not improve belongingness in engineering during teaming activities. Students from teams were interviewed individually two times after the completion of their project to understand their perceptions of diversity.

Addressing how student teaming experiences influence students' diversity sensitivity and multicultural openness can uncover how we can train engineers to work to include diverse

individuals in engineering and potentially warm the chilly climate in engineering. Creating environments and individuals who are fostering of and open to diversity can serve to generate engineers who are capable of designing for diverse needs when addressing the grand challenges in engineering. The next phase of this study will include an expansion at additional institutions.

## **Results**

### *Awareness without Action*

Quantitative results indicate that students' awareness of diversity increased over the semester; however, unwillingness to take action to support diverse groups also increased. We also found that students' attitudes towards teaming are difficult to shift over a single-semester experience even when teaming effectiveness and diversity are explicitly taught in the classroom. Student attitudes about teaming are "sticky," that is, they do not easily change over the course of one semester even with explicit instruction and interventions.

Initial trends indicate that students' value of diversity increased, but their willingness to adapt their behaviors for diverse individuals decreased due to the demands of engineering tasks. Students became more aware of differences and the impact of diversity on working in teams. However, they were more likely to engage in biased behavior as well as be unwilling to take action to support diverse individuals. Analysis of survey results reveal four trends: 1.) Students felt like it was less important to clearly notice and define racial and ethnic differences in their teams; 2). Students reported less discomfort in working with students who do not speak standard English; 3). Students reported less importance of showing diverse engineers in course materials and indicated that it was NOT the responsibility of instructors to teach about diversity; and 4). Students experienced higher levels of frustration working in diverse teams and indicated higher preferences to work with individuals like themselves. These trends indicate a higher awareness of diversity but a lack of agency or motivation to combat bias or to grapple with difficult topics.

Students with the largest positive shifts in teaming attitudes (top quartile) were more often assigned to diverse teams. Diverse teams are defined by having individuals different in race/ethnicity, gender, and nationality than each individual within the team. Students were also less likely to exhibit the largest negative shifts in teaming attitudes (bottom quartile) if they had positive shifts in their multicultural awareness - openness. Results of this quantitative work were used to further refine instruments and data collection protocols for replication in the subsequent phases of the project.

### *Diversity Orientations*

Qualitative results indicate that students consistently described why diversity was important in their teams and in engineering as a field. These descriptions reflected conversations within their

classes and the language used by instructors to discuss why diversity and working in teams were important learning objectives in the courses. However, when talking about their teaming experiences specifically, these students became exclusively task focused and only valued diversity in terms of dividing tasks according to each individual's skills and the ability to accomplish assignments efficiently. Further analysis has also indicated that for students to work with and prioritize diverse individuals they need a coherent connection between three aspects of their “diversity orientation” which includes not only a value for diversity but also a definition of diversity that they connect to teaming and the ability to connect diversity to specific engineering tasks. Without any one of these three components, engineering teams did not integrate diverse individuals and develop their understanding and sensitivity toward diverse individuals.

### **Conclusions and Discussion**

Our results show that students became more aware of diversity over the course of their experiences in working with diverse teams. However, they also became less willing to act to support diverse individuals and often prioritized engineering tasks over incorporating the diverse perspectives and non-engineering skills of individuals in their teams. For individuals and teams to prioritize their development of positive attitudes of diversity, a complex interaction of three factors is needed. The interaction between these factors indicated that teaching about the value of diversity alone is not enough, but that the value of diversity must be attached to the specific engineering tasks that students undertake. Our work emphasizes that teaming must be a deliberate and distributed practice in engineering not only limited to the first and last years of engineering curriculum. The results mirror previous findings in engineering that have displayed dominant cultural valuing of student technical performance over social development<sup>29</sup>, and that students will not work to understand different concepts unless they can connect it to their careers in the future<sup>30</sup>.

### **Future Work**

Diversity sensitivity and diversity orientations manifest differently across teams. Further analysis of teaming experiences is ongoing to understand why some teams prioritize diversity and others do not. Additionally, the next phase of this work has begun to explore the social networks that exist within first year engineering classrooms and how these networks incorporate or exclude diverse individuals from participation in engineering. Further development of these findings will allow for the generation of pedagogies and interventions that serve to positively foster students attitudes towards diverse populations and hopefully serve to shift the culture of engineering to one that is more inclusive.

### **References**

1. Layton, R. A., Loughry, M. L., Ohland, M. W., & Ricco, G. D. (2010). Design and validation of a web-based system for assigning members to teams using instructor-specified criteria. *Advances in Engineering Education*, 2 (1), 1-28.
2. Loughry, M. L., Ohland, M. L., & Woehr, D. J. (2014). Assessing teamwork skills for assurance of learning using CATME Team Tools. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 36(1), 5-19.
3. Ohland, M.W., Loughry, M.L., Woehr, D.J., Finelli, C.J., Bullard, L.G., Felder, R.M., Layton, R.A., Pomeranz, H.R., & Schmucker, D.G. (2012). The Comprehensive Assessment of Team Member Effectiveness: Development of a Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scale for Self and Peer Evaluation. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11 (4), 609-630.
4. Brown, A. R., Morning, C., & Watkins, C. (2005). Influence of African American engineering student perceptions of campus climate on graduation rates. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 94(2), 263-271.
5. Lord, S. M., Camacho, M. M., Layton, R. A., Long, R. A., Ohland, M. W., & Wasburn, M. H. (2009). Who's persisting in engineering? A comparative analysis of female and male Asian, black, Hispanic, Native American, and white students. *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering*, 15(2), 167-190.
6. May, G. S., & Chubin, D. E. (2003). A retrospective on undergraduate engineering success for underrepresented minority students. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 92(1), 27-39.
7. Ihsen, S. (2005). Special gender studies for engineering? *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 30(4), 487-494.
8. Chubin, D. E., & Babco, E. L. (2005). Diversifying the engineering workforce. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 94(1), 73-86.
9. Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (2005). Understanding Student Differences. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 94(1), 57-72.
10. 2010 U.S. Census Data. (2010). Retrieved January 10, 2014, from [www.census.gov/2010census/data](http://www.census.gov/2010census/data)
11. Miller Jr., J. A. (2003). The Science and Engineering Workforce: Realizing America's Potential. Rep. No. NSB 03-79.
12. Keith, J. L., Ayer, D. B., Rees, E., Freda, D. V., Lowe, J. K., & Day, J. (2003). Brief of Amici Curiae Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Leland Stanford Junior University, EI Du Pont de Nemours and Company, International Business Machines Corp., National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, National Action Council, 02-241.
13. Wulf, W. A. (1988). Diversity in Engineering. *The Bridge*, 24(4).
14. Committee on Prospering in the Global Economy of the 21st Century: An Agenda for American Science and Technology. (2007). *Rising Above the Gathering Storm*:

Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future. National Academies Press.

15. (PCAST) President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology. (2012). Engage to Excel: Producing One Million Additional College Graduates with Degrees in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (p. 130). Retrieved from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/eop/ostp/pcast/docsreports>
16. Carte, T., & L. Chidambaram. (2004). A Capabilities-Based Theory of Technology Deployment in Diverse Teams: Leapfrogging the Pitfalls of Diversity and Leveraging its Potential With Collaborative Technology. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 5(11–12), 448–471.
17. Staples, D. S., & Zhao, L. (2006). The effects of cultural diversity in virtual teams versus face-to-face teams. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, 15(4), 389-406.)
18. Kurtzberg, T. R. (2005). Feeling Creative, Being Creative: An Empirical Study of Diversity and Creativity in Teams. *Creativity Research Journal*, 17(1), 51-65.
19. Cox, T. (1994). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research and practice*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
20. Byrne, D.S. (1999). *Social exclusion*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
21. Van Der Zee, K., Atsma, N., & Brodbeck, F. (2004). The influence of social identity and personality on outcomes of cultural diversity in teams. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 35(3), 283-303.
22. Tuckman, B.W. (1965). Developmental sequences in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 63, 384-399.
23. Milliken, F. J., Bartel, C. A., & Kurtzberg, T. R. (2003). Diversity and creativity in work groups: A dynamic perspective on the affective and cognitive processes that link diversity and performance. *Group creativity: Innovation through collaboration*, 32-62.
24. Institute of International Education. (2014). *Open Doors 2014 Report*. <http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors>
25. (Engineering) Purdue University College of Engineering. (2014). *Extraordinary People, Global Impact: Strategic Plan Update*. Retrieved October 10, 2014, from [https://engineering.purdue.edu/Engr/AboutUs/StrategicPlan/2009-2016/update\\_2012-10.html](https://engineering.purdue.edu/Engr/AboutUs/StrategicPlan/2009-2016/update_2012-10.html)
26. Houston, E. (n.d.). *Promising and Practical Strategies to Increase Postsecondary Success*. Reno.
27. Chacon, C. (2011). *Documentary sheds light on first-generation students*. Retrieved from <http://www.unr.edu/nevada-today/news/2011/documentary-sheds-light-on-first-generation-students>
28. CATME Smarter Teamwork. (2015). Retrieved January 7, 2015, from [www.catme.org](http://www.catme.org).
29. Cech, E. A., & Sherick, H. M. (2015). Depoliticization and the Structure of Engineering Education. In *International Perspectives on Engineering Education* (pp. 203-216). Springer International Publishing.

30. Kirn, A., & Benson, L. (In Review). Engineering Students' Perceptions of Problem Solving and their Future. *Journal of Engineering Education*.