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Purpose

Common approaches to teaching ethics in engineering (e.g. case studies and memorizing ethical codes) may not be the most effective. This study aims to evaluate a variety of pedagogical approaches to determine their impact on students’ development of ethical reasoning.

Research Questions

- Do different curricular approaches to ethics education have differential impacts on undergraduate students’ ethical reasoning ability?
- How does the impact of these approaches differ for students across academic class-years?
- Regardless of approach, what impact does the depth of cognitive processing of the experiences have on students’ ethical reasoning ability?

Model of Students’ Engineering Ethical Development

Variables of Interest

- Ethical Reasoning Ability
  - Measured by Defining Issues Test-2 N2 Score, a measure of complexity of students’ moral judgment

- Curricular Experiences
  - 27 specific experiences classified into 3 contexts (introductory, advanced, or capstone course) and 9 modes of presentation (e.g. presentation, class discussion, video, etc.)
  - Used in models individually and also as a sum of total experiences to which a student was exposed

- Cognitive Depth
  - 6-point scale related to Bloom’s taxonomy of intellectual objectives, ranging from 1=“Remember facts presented through the activity” to 6=“Justify the decision you would make if faced with the same ethical dilemma”

Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Direction and Sig of Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of experiences</td>
<td>– **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation by professor, advanced course</td>
<td>+ **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation by professor, capstone course</td>
<td>+ **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation by experienced engineer, capstone course</td>
<td>+ ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion, capstone course</td>
<td>+ **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of cognitive processing</td>
<td>+ ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

- The total number of curricular experiences of a student is negatively related to ethical reasoning for all class levels except seniors, where there was no relationship
- Experiences found to have positive and statistically significant relationships with ethical reasoning:
  - Presentation by a professor in an advanced or capstone course
  - Presentation by an experienced engineer in a capstone course
  - Group discussion with classmates in a capstone course
- Approaches requiring a higher level of cognitive processing were found to be related to higher levels of ethical reasoning across all groups

Implications

- Amount of ethics curricular experiences does not appear to be the most important aspect in developing ethical reasoning ability.
- Presentations involving students in advanced and capstone courses may be the best ways to specifically target the development of ethical reasoning skills
- While mode of presentation plays some role, depth of cognitive processing required, no matter the mode or context, has a positive and significant relationship with ethical reasoning ability
- These findings suggest instructors should seek to incorporate higher levels of cognitive processing (e.g. require students to synthesize concepts and evaluate alternatives) when possible
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