

# **Research and Evaluation Results for the *Engineering is Elementary* Project: An Executive Summary of the First Six Years**

March 1, 2011

Engineering is Elementary (EiE) is a research-based program that has incorporated research, evaluation, and assessment into all aspects of curriculum design and testing from its inception. Our research questions, assessment instruments, and methods continue to evolve as the project grows and matures. This document summarizes some of the most notable findings from the project's first six years as reported by studies conducted by project staff and external evaluators. The findings from most of these initial studies merit larger-scale, follow-up studies to examine them in more detail. The cited full reports and papers can be found on our website: [http://www.mos.org/eie/research\\_assessment.php](http://www.mos.org/eie/research_assessment.php)

## **Conceptions of Engineering**

### Student Conceptions:

An instrument—the Draw an Engineer Test—probed children's conceptions of engineering, asking them what engineering was, to draw an engineer at work, and to describe their picture in words. The results suggest that students have limited understandings of the type of work engineers do. Drawings focus heavily on constructing roads, buildings, or bridges; fixing cars; using or fixing computers; and driving trains. An awareness of the range of fields that engineering encompasses is fairly limited and student responses focus heavily on structures (construction workers: civil engineering), cars/machinery (auto mechanic: mechanical), and computers (computer technician: computer/ electrical engineering). (Knight & Cunningham, 2004)


To more systematically probe children's conceptions of engineering the EiE team developed the "What is Engineering?" instrument that included captioned images of people working and asked students to choose those items that an engineer would do at work. Students were also asked to respond to the open-ended question "What is an engineer?" Over 7000 students completed a pre- and post- test of the validated instrument. Findings reveal similar patterns between students from all regions and ethnic groups—students tend to focus on the descriptor noun and not the verb: they are most likely to choose jobs involving construction or machines as engineering, such as "install wiring", "construct buildings" or "repair cars" and least likely to identify engineering that focused on non-mechanical/civil fields such as environmental "design ways to clean water", chemical "develop better bubble gum", and industrial "figure out ways to track luggage". (See Figure 1). (Cunningham, Lachapelle, & Lindgren-Streicher, 2005)

In a first comparison with a control sample drawn from Massachusetts students, we have found through pre- and post-assessments that students participating in EiE units show dramatic and significant change in their understanding of the kinds of work that engineers do compared to children who do not use the EiE materials. Post-test of EiE students indicate they are significantly more likely to identify engineering items relating to the design of all types of technology, and they are less likely to choose non-design items relating to construction or repair work. (See Figure 1). (Cunningham et al., 2005; Lachapelle & Cunningham, 2007)

### Teacher Conceptions:

The "What is Engineering?" instrument was also administered to 100 teachers. Teachers' responses followed a pattern similar to students, although they were more likely on all items to correctly discriminate between engineering types of work and non-engineering work. (Cunningham & Lachapelle, 2007)

Figure 1: Elementary Students' Conceptions of Engineering



**Conceptions of Technology**

Student Conceptions:


A “What is Technology?” instrument that asked children to choose which captioned items were technology was also developed by the EiE team and administered to nearly 7,000 grade 2-5 students across the country. In general, children identify technology with items that run on electricity and power (Cunningham et al., 2005; Lachapelle & Cunningham, 2007) and are unlikely to view items such as bandages, cups, or shoes as technology. These results are robust when compared by region or gender, though males are slightly more likely than females to have a broader conception of technology. (Lachapelle & Cunningham, 2007)

Pre- and post-assessments of a national sample of students engaged with EiE materials when compared with a control group in Massachusetts that did not use EiE demonstrate that the EiE curriculum has a dramatic, significant impact on broadening students’ understanding of technology (see Figure 2). After completing an EiE unit, students are significantly more likely to indicate that common-place, human-made items are technology. (Lachapelle & Cunningham, 2007)

Teacher Conceptions:

Teachers show a similar pattern of responses though their conception of technology is much more likely to be congruent with the definitions of technology as any thing or process that humans have created to meet human needs or desires. (Cunningham & Lachapelle, 2007; Cunningham, Lachapelle, & Keenan, 2010)

Figure 2: Elementary Students' Conceptions of Technology



## Impact of EiE on Students

### Impact of EiE on Student Understanding of Engineering and Science Concepts

During the development, pilot testing, and field testing of each EiE unit, students in grades 2-5 engaged in that unit complete a pre- and post-assessment. Questions measure (a) general engineering and technology concepts, (b) concepts specific to the engineering field of focus in that unit, (c) engineering and technology concepts that are taught in the unit, and (d) understanding of the relevant science concepts that are reinforced by engineering activities.

The first round of analysis of student results from the pre- post-assessments of the first six EiE units found that, on more than 75% of questions, EiE students performed significantly better on the post-assessment than on the pre-assessment. In most cases where a control sample was available for comparison, EiE students performed significantly better than the control. This was true for both genders and all racial/ethnic groups (Lachapelle, 2007). An analysis of improvements made by students of teachers participating in the Pre-College Engineering for Teachers (PCET) professional development project found similar results (Lachapelle, Cunningham, Oware, & Battu, 2008). After completing an EiE unit, students demonstrated:

- A better understanding of the specific kind of tasks that engineers working in a specific field (e.g., environmental engineers) might do for their job
- A better understanding that engineering involves design and teamwork.
- A better grasp of relevant engineering and technology vocabulary.
- A better understanding of the engineering design process.
- A better understanding of materials, their properties, and their uses in engineering design scenarios.

- An increased likelihood of understanding science content related to the unit.
- A better understanding of how to improve technologies.
- A better understanding of what a process is and how it is a type of technology.
- A better understanding of the criteria for judging the effectiveness of a technology. (Lachapelle, 2007; Lachapelle et al., 2008)

A second round of analysis of units 7 through 15 compared EiE student performance against control groups, using HLM methodologies for 7 of the 9 unit analysis (the other 2 units had insufficient sample sizes for HLM analysis). Modeling again found that EiE students:

- Improved significantly on assessments,
- Performed significantly better on post-assessments than control groups when pre-assessment performance was taken into account,
- Performed significantly better than control on science questions, where a subgroup of science questions was available for analysis.

Details of findings can be found in Table 1. (Lachapelle et al., 2011)

Table 1: Effect Sizes for Classroom Participation in EiE Field Test Units

Unit	Outcome	Treatment Effect Size	Pre-assessment Classroom Mean Effect Size	Topics Assessed
7: Designing Alarm Circuits	PostAll	0.372	0.257	interpret schematic diagrams of circuits; identify aspects of electrical engineering; also science topics listed below
	PostScience	0.470	0.273	electrical current; insulators; conductors; forms of energy
9: Seeing Animal Sounds	PostAll	0.420	0.301	how to change sounds; how to represent sounds; how different materials affect sound; aspects of acoustical engineering; also science topics listed below
	PostScience	0.311	*	properties of sound: pitch, volume, duration
10: Evaluating a Landscape	PostAll	1.367	0.272	geotechnical engineering; foundation design; models; erosion
	PostScience	1.070	0.356	erosion
11: Designing Maglev Systems	PostAll	2.339	0.408	aspects of transportation engineering; design of maglev transportation systems; properties of magnets
13: Designing Plant Packages	PostAll	0.324	0.272 By treatment: 0.218	Packages; package engineering; needs of plants; functions of plant structures
14: Designing Solar Ovens	PostAll	0.689	0.570	green engineering; how solar ovens work; heat energy; insulation
15: Designing Parachutes	PostAll	1.292	0.551	design and operation of parachutes; aerospace engineering; also science topics listed below
	PostScience	1.045	0.456	atmospheric properties; the effects of drag on falling objects

\*Variable tested but not significant.

Effect sizes found for participation in EiE units 7-15 ranged from small to large across units; however, effect sizes are likely to be somewhat inflated for “PostAll” scores, which included engineering

questions, since the control group did not receive engineering instruction. Similarly, significance of changes pre- to post- on engineering questions for students participating in EiE units 1-6 are likely to be inflated because classrooms were not randomized into control and test groups. For this reason, and also because the data was collected from convenience samples (not randomized samples) of field test and control classrooms, these findings are promising but not conclusive. (Lachapelle, 2007; Lachapelle et al., 2011)

### Impact of EiE on Students' Interest in and Attitudes towards Science and Engineering Careers

Students who completed the Engineering is Elementary curriculum were significantly more likely to report interest in being an engineer on the post-survey than control students. They were also significantly more likely than control students to report interest in and comfort with engineering jobs and skills, and to agree that scientists and engineers help to make people's lives better. (Cunningham & Lachapelle, 2010)

The responses of boys and girls changed similarly in direction and size from the pre-survey to the post-survey, but girls' and boys' responses overall were significantly different on all questions regarding engineering jobs. Boys showed more interest than girls in the questions having to do with inventing, figuring things out, cars, and structures; girls showed more interest in the jobs to do with helping society and people. Both boys and girls were significantly more likely to agree that they would enjoy being an engineer after completing an EiE unit, but boys reported more interested than girls on both the pre- and post-survey. (Cunningham & Lachapelle, 2010)

### Impact on Underrepresented / Underserved Students

Teachers participating in the Pre-College Engineering for Teachers (PCET) professional development project reported that EiE works well with all students, whether low- or high-achieving, including students: with cognitive challenges, linguistic challenges, behavioral challenges, who are gifted and talented, who are girls, who are children of color, and who are at-risk in other ways. Of all these populations teachers agreed most strongly that the curriculum worked with children of color. (Faux, 2008)

A small study of teachers' perceptions of the impact of EiE on students from groups historically underrepresented in STEM fields (females, low-income, historically underrepresented minorities, IEP, English Language Learners), found that the majority of the 46 teachers responding to the survey indicated that student engagement, as well as their performance, in EiE was higher than it was in science. For some but not all groups, most teachers indicated that engagement in EiE was also higher than it was in school in general. Between 30 and 52 percent of teachers (percentages varied depending upon the sub-group) also indicated that performance in EiE was higher than it was in school in general. Most teachers also reported that using EiE had a positive impact on student interest in science, engineering, and mathematics, as well as student engagement and performance in school. (Weis & Banilower, 2010)

A large-scale study of field test versions of EiE units 7-15 provides further evidence that EiE works well for all students. In most cases, demographic variables including whether a student has limited English proficiency (LEP), received free or reduced-price lunch (FRL), has an Individualized Education Program (IEP), or is from an underrepresented minority group (Is\_Black or Is\_Hispanic) were associated with poorer performance on both pre- and post-assessments, but this relationship was not

moderated by treatment: the difference was the same for both the control and test groups. (Lachapelle et al., 2011)

### **Teachers' Perception of the EiE Curriculum**

Teachers who use EiE in their classrooms rate the EiE curricular materials highly (Carson & Campbell, 2007a, 2007b; Faux, 2007; Lachapelle et al., 2011). Teachers participating in the Pre-College Engineering for Teachers (PCET) professional development project strongly and significantly agreed that EiE units are well designed, that the EiE units they used fit into the required curriculum, rather than being 'one more thing' to teach, and that EiE units are well matched to the level of students (Faux, 2007). Teachers participating in field testing of EiE units 7 through 15 similarly agreed that EiE units furthered their objectives for science and engineering, positively affected their students' motivation, and are age-appropriate. Teachers rated highly EiE's reinforcement of science learning objectives, and also cited other connections in free response to literacy, math, and social studies. (Lachapelle et al., 2011)

After using the EiE materials with their students, PCET teachers and field test teachers highly rate aspects of EiE indicating that they would do the unit again with their class, and that they found the directions clear and felt comfortable leading the lessons (Carson & Campbell, 2007a; Lachapelle et al., 2011). PCET teachers additionally agreed that the science and literacy connections were useful, and that overall they found that the materials for the activities were easy to get and students were able to successfully complete the design challenge (Carson & Campbell, 2007a).

Teachers see the EiE materials as an excellent fit for elementary school students and teachers, most often citing as strengths: the hands-on approach used by the units, the sound pedagogical design of the units, the ease with which they can be adapted to fit local circumstances, the collaborative nature of the activities, and the many ways in which using the units promotes a greater awareness of the ubiquity of engineering in the lives of the students. Concerns about the units, when voiced, focused on the length of time required to do the lessons, the acquisition and management of material resources to support the lessons, and the reading level of the EiE stories. (Faux, 2006; Lachapelle et al., 2011)

When asked to compare their experiences teaching EiE and traditional elementary science curricula, PCET teachers strongly agreed that with EiE students: learn science concepts better, are more engaged, are more collaborative, are more creative, and make real world science/engineering connections (Faux, 2008). Similarly, many EiE field test teachers indicated, when asked "How did your students benefit, academically or otherwise, from taking part in this unit?" that EiE units provide opportunities for students to learn more about science and engineering, and their students learned unit-specific science and engineering content. Many teachers also mentioned that their students gained a deeper understanding of the work of an engineer and were better able to recognize engineering in everyday life. A number of field test teachers also described how their students' problem solving, critical thinking, teamwork, and communication skills were improved. Another common response was that students enjoyed the unit and were engaged, especially with hands-on activities (Lachapelle et al., 2011).

### **Impacts of EiE Professional Development and EiE Implementation on Teachers**

EiE is very interested in the effect of professional development and implementation of an EiE unit on teachers and their pedagogies. In general, EiE staff conduct a workshop evaluation at each program we offer—most of our data to date come from teachers who have both attended professional development and implemented a unit in the classroom and we have not yet teased apart the relative influence of these two experiences on teachers' responses.

However, because EiE was initially funded as a curriculum development program that was not supposed to require professional development for implementation, one evaluation study did examine whether both trained and untrained teachers could use the materials effectively. It revealed that teachers found it easy to implement the EiE curricular materials, even without training. Both types of teachers indicated that they were comfortable doing the units, felt their knowledge after reading the unit guide was adequate to do the units, and believed that their students were successful in completing the design challenges. (Carson & Campbell, 2007b)

### Teachers are Satisfied with Professional Development Programs

EiE staff have offered hundreds of professional development programs to thousands of teachers and have also trained hundreds of teacher educators who do EiE professional development in diverse localities across the country. Professional development may range from a program that is two hours to one that is more than two weeks in length.

Teachers consistently express a high degree of satisfaction with EiE professional development services. They strongly agree that workshops are well planned and structured, that they are learning by doing, and that the EiE units and materials are presented in a manner that helps them feel comfortable using them in their classroom. The workshops, they feel, prepare them to do an engineering project in their classroom. (Faux, 2007)

### Teacher Gains in Knowledge of Engineering and Technology

Teachers also report large gains in their engineering knowledge and understanding as a result of participating in professional development programs and using EiE. They indicate significant increases in their knowledge and understanding of the range of engineering disciplines, what engineers do, and the pervasiveness of engineering in our society. Teachers report they are more knowledgeable about how engineering is practiced as well: they understand that there is not necessarily one “right” answer for engineering problems, they know about the engineering design process, they know more about the types of constraints that influence the design and selection of engineering criteria, and they are more confident in their ability to analyze the engineering solutions that their students might generate (Faux, 2007). Their understanding of engineering changes as well; after participating in EiE, the number of teachers including design, problem solving, and process/design process as part of their definitions of engineering increased dramatically (Carson & Campbell, 2007a).

Teachers’ open-ended responses about engineering and technology were closer to standards-based definitions on a post-survey than on a pre-survey, after participating in EiE professional development workshops and teaching at least one EiE unit. Before participating in EiE, teachers were more likely to define technology in terms of examples – particularly tools, machines, computers and electronics – and less likely to define technology as a solution to a problem, or something designed or invented. Also before participating in EiE, teachers were slightly more likely to identify engineering as building or constructing, and less likely to define it as problem solving, a process in itself, having to do with improving things and processes, and having to do with math and / or science. Teachers also reported making greater use of engineering concepts and examples, including the engineering design process, across STEM subjects after participating in EiE. (Cunningham et al., 2010)

### Teachers Report Changes in Their Pedagogy as a Result of EiE

Teachers report changes in their pedagogy after learning about EiE and teaching it in their classrooms. Interestingly, teachers report changes in their engineering teaching, their science and math teaching, and

their pedagogical strategies more generally. Such changes, particularly across such a wide range of fields, are rare in education and professional development.

After participating in EiE, teachers significantly increase their use of engineering in their teaching in both science and other content areas. Particularly large increases were found in the frequency with which teachers describe engineering careers to their students, use engineering examples in science lessons, and, most impressively, use an engineering design process in their science classes. They also discuss the courses and skills needed to enter engineering. Teachers are also significantly more apt to use an engineering design process in other areas—in math lessons and science lesson as well as content areas outside of math and science. (Faux, 2008)

For years, educators have been trying to help teachers develop children’s problem-solving capacity. EiE seems to offer one successful possibility. External evaluations (Carson & Campbell, 2007a; Faux, 2007) have found that teachers report changes in their pedagogical strategies. After participating in EiE, teachers significantly increase their use of problem-solving strategies not explicitly related to engineering in their teaching. After using EiE teachers evince improved attitudes toward problem-solving strategies and use more inductive methods (Faux, 2006, 2008). They also significantly increase their use of four other problem-solving strategies. They were more likely to have students: ask what they know related to the topic being studied, use things from everyday life in solving problems, work on problems for which there is no immediately obvious method of solution, and explain how they solve complex problems (Faux, 2008).

Teachers report significant changes in their use of engineering examples and the engineering design process in science, math, and other content areas. They increase the time they spend on complex and open-ended problems with their students, and increase the amount of explanation of solutions they require of their students. Over the course of implementation the reasons teachers offer for wanting to do more engineering in the classes changes from not only introducing engineering to their students to also including more of a focus on problem-solving and on incorporating more real life topics.

One of the external evaluators ended his report “It is rather rare in education program evaluation to view such a large and far-flung undertaking be so consistently and strikingly successful as [the EiE summer workshops]. The data are clear in underscoring the truly stunning degree to which the workshop program met its core objectives. Participants spoke effusively and often of the tremendous gains they had made, the revelatory quality of their newfound appreciation for engineering, and the clarity of their understanding on how to introduce EiE materials in their classrooms.” (Faux, 2007)

## **Ongoing Efforts**

EiE staff and external evaluators continue to evaluate and research the Engineering is Elementary project. Student assessment continues as part of the development process to ensure that each unit as designed and implemented can, in fact, meet its stated learning objectives. EiE’s evaluation process continues to evolve (Lachapelle & Cunningham, 2010). A number of the pilot studies reviewed here have revealed very interesting, sometimes unanticipated effects of the EiE materials and professional development and merit detailed, larger-scale studies that we hope to conduct. In the coming year, we hope to begin a large-scale, randomized and controlled study of the published versions of a number of EiE units. Finally, we are also fortunate that a number of other researchers across the country have begun to use and study the EiE program—we plan to enrich our program with results of their studies.

## References

- Carson, R., & Campbell, P. B. (2007a). *Museum of Science: Engineering is Elementary; Exploring the impact of EiE on participating teachers*. Groton, MA: Campbell-Kibler Associates, Inc.
- Carson, R., & Campbell, P. B. (2007b). *Museum of Science: Engineering is Elementary; Impact on teachers with and without training*. Groton, MA: Campbell-Kibler Associates, Inc.
- Cunningham, C. M., & Lachapelle, C. P. (2007). *Engineering is Elementary: A global perspective on engineering for children*. Paper presented at the ASEE Global Colloquium.
- Cunningham, C. M., & Lachapelle, C. P. (2010). *The impact of Engineering is Elementary (EiE) on students' attitudes toward engineering and science*. Paper presented at the ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition.
- Cunningham, C. M., Lachapelle, C. P., & Keenan, K. (2010). *Elementary teachers' changing ideas about STEM and STEM pedagogy through interaction with a pedagogically-supportive STEM curriculum*. Paper presented at the P-12 Engineering and Design Education Research Summit. from [http://www.mos.org/eie/pdf/research/Cunningham\\_R1362.pdf](http://www.mos.org/eie/pdf/research/Cunningham_R1362.pdf)
- Cunningham, C. M., Lachapelle, C. P., & Lindgren-Streicher, A. (2005). *Assessing elementary school students' conceptions of engineering and technology*. Paper presented at the ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition.
- Faux, R. (2006). *Evaluation of the Museum of Science PCET Program: Interim report*. Somerville, MA: Davis Square Research Associates.
- Faux, R. (2007). *Evaluation of the Museum of Science PCET Program Interim report*. Somerville, MA: Davis Square Research Associates.
- Faux, R. (2008). *Evaluation of the Museum of Science PCET Project: Evaluation Report*. Somerville, MA: Davis Square Research Associates.
- Knight, M., & Cunningham, C. M. (2004). *Draw an Engineer Test (DAET): Development of a tool to investigate students' ideas about engineers and engineering*. Paper presented at the ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition.
- Lachapelle, C. P. (2007). *Engineering is Elementary: A national evaluation of years 2-3*. Boston, MA: Museum of Science.
- Lachapelle, C. P., & Cunningham, C. M. (2007). *Engineering is Elementary: Children's changing understandings of science and engineering*. Paper presented at the ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition.
- Lachapelle, C. P., & Cunningham, C. M. (2010). *Assessing elementary students' understanding of engineering and technology concepts*. Paper presented at the ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition.
- Lachapelle, C. P., Cunningham, C. M., Jocz, J., Kay, A. E., Lee-St. John, T. J., Mabikke, H. N., et al. (2011). *Engineering is Elementary: An evaluation of years 4 through 6 field testing*. Boston, MA: Museum of Science.
- Lachapelle, C. P., Cunningham, C. M., Oware, E. A., & Battu, B. (2008). *Engineering is Elementary: An evaluation of student outcomes from the PCET program*. Boston, MA: Museum of Science.
- Weis, A. M., & Banilower, E. R. (2010). *Engineering is Elementary: Impact on historically-underrepresented students survey results*. Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research, Inc.