

ASKING CULTURALLY NEUTRAL QUESTIONS IN ENGINEERING

Peter Goodhew

Department of Engineering, University of Liverpool, L69 3GH, UK

ABSTRACT

Assessment problems can arise in classes containing students from a variety of cultures with different experiences, attitudes and expectations of education, and often a very different range of relevant engineering experiences. It is possible inadvertently to set assessment questions or tasks which require responses of a type which are unfamiliar or antipathetic to the student, which use vocabulary which is not understood in a sufficiently sophisticated way or which implicitly require a set of experiences or knowledge which not every student possesses. There is very little literature on this topic relating to engineering students. In this paper I cite several examples of culturally loaded questions and suggest that all engineering assessments should be scrutinised from the cultural perspective.

INTRODUCTION

'Some academics ... write exams in which part of the challenge is to work out what the question means before answering it. Too often academics applaud this approach for being "clever", claiming that assessment is to sort out the sheep from the goats, and understanding the question's true meaning is part of that. "Nice one", their colleagues say, "the clever ones will work it out". But we do not include "cleverness" among the intended learning outcomes ...'

Phil Race, The Higher, December 23rd 2005.

We may not intend to write "clever" exam questions but without sensitive scrutiny some difficult-to-decode questions may slip through the net.

It is self-evident that all students are different. It is equally clear that for every student in a cohort, the assessment associated with that module is the same. This is usually true for both the method(s) of assessment and for what is assessed. If, as is now regarded as good practice, the assessment is intended to verify the achievement of the intended learning outcomes, then it seems obvious that it must be the same for every student. This is surely required to ensure equity of treatment among students and between groups of students, and to establish confidence in the evidence provided by the assessment outcome (e.g. exam mark).

On the other hand, there is plenty of evidence (both academic and derived from common sense), for the difficulty of devising assessments which are totally free from bias towards or against one or more groups of students. There is a substantial literature relating to unintentional bias in assessment. Researchers have identified

the potential for bias arising from cultural differences, gender difference, disability and other factors (1-6).

BIAS IN ENGINEERING ASSESSMENT

Let us define a “neutral” assessment item (exam question or any other type of assessment) as one in which every student has an equal opportunity to demonstrate the extent to which they have met the intended learning outcome (ILO) which is being tested. The item must therefore relate to a ILO which has been published to the students in advance, and it must be phrased so that the way in which the ILO should be demonstrated is clear to the student at the time of the assessment. In less pompous words, the question should be clearly understandable and relate to the appropriate curricular content. This is easier to write than to achieve.

There are a number of features of engineering education, at least in the UK, which either increase the difficulty of devising neutral assessment exercises or tend to disguise the presence of bias. Among these are:

- A high percentage of students for whom English is not their first language. This can be as high as 50% in many classes. In many UK universities the Engineering Faculty contains the highest proportion of overseas students in the university.
- Many classes contain students from several quite different cultural backgrounds. For these purposes there are significant cultural differences between students within Europe (Northern Europe vs Eastern Europe vs Mediterranean Europe for instance) as well as between the continents and sub-continents of Asia, America and Africa. Not least among the differences is the understanding of what an engineer is and does – the very word has no universality of meaning.
- A significant content of practical work, in laboratories and on field trips.
- A large mathematical content, which can often mean that connected prose writing is not required in order to meet many of the ILOs, but on the other hand;
- A professional milieu which demands clear reporting, both written and spoken, and a proportion of professional (as opposed to technical) material such as project management and business skills.
- The high cost of provision of a good engineering education, because of the need for laboratory space, equipment, materials costs and high staffing levels to ensure safety and practical skills training.

The net effect of these factors on assessment is that there will be items which are essentially numerical, mathematical, practical, oral and essay-based, but that no one of these forms dominates. These items will be attempted by students who have different English language skills, different understanding of engineering and different expectations of higher education, for which they may be paying an apparently high price. It is therefore quite easy for biased items to be hidden within this welter of assessment styles.

Types of Bias

Level of ILO. In higher education we expect to be assessing ILOs at all six levels of Bloom’s taxonomy – simply expressed as knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation (7). However these are merely the levels of cognitive skills, based around knowledge. In a professional engineering education we also expect to develop (and therefore must test) the affective and psychomotor domains, that is attitudes and practical skills. I suggest that we nowadays rarely test practical skills, although our students are often exposed to practical experiences, and

we almost never assess attitudes. As Elton (6) rather resignedly reports “The difficulty with designing attitude assessments is that in traditional forms of assessment, e.g. essays, it is almost impossible to distinguish a genuine attitude from a pretended report.” However, he offers no alternative!

In the domain of cognitive assessment, which is in practice where most engineering assessment items remain, the first two levels of Bloom’s taxonomy present relative few problems (but not none – see below). We can assess knowledge (level 1) by demanding the recall of information and comprehension (level 2) by asking for an explanation in the student’s own words. Even at this level we meet a cultural issue – it is deeply embedded in many (predominantly Eastern) cultures that there is no point in re-writing the words of a great master, because s/he has already expressed the ideas to perfection and it would be discourteous to paraphrase. Although many academics would have difficulty describing themselves as a great master, nonetheless this is how they may be viewed by some students. This issue can only be addressed by attempts to change attitudes prior to assessment, and is often tackled in the (unfortunately pejorative) context of plagiarism.

At level 3 and above (application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation) potential problems of bias abound. Words we might use in assessment items could include analyze, categorize, compare, compose, contrast, create, criticize, critique, deconstruct, defend, demonstrate, design, devise, discriminate, distinguish, evaluate, generate, interpret, illustrate, justify, manipulate, modify, plan, predict, relate, reconstruct, relate and show. Each of these requires a sophisticated grasp of language as well as the required cognitive understanding. At levels 5 and 6 (synthesis and evaluation) a critical approach is essential and it would be impossible to demonstrate ILOs at these levels without using words and phrases which had come neither from lecturer nor book.

The above paragraphs have focused on answering the question. This is predicated on the writing of a clear question, which has two elements – the use of a vocabulary which is understood and the use of contextual examples which can be interpreted on the basis of the student’s prior experience. An extreme example illustrates this latter point. Many universities in South Africa are now teaching engineering to a cohort of students some of whom have grown up in townships without electricity. Following a course on materials selection it would not be helpful to base an assessment on the reverse engineering of a 13 amp plug (which is an example used in many UK universities).

More subtle examples can be found when teaching management or business studies to engineers. A module on Project Management at Liverpool is given to a large class drawn from every engineering discipline, computer studies and some pure sciences. To assess at level 3 (application of knowledge in a new situation) it is necessary to select a number of “new situations” but to choose them in such a way that they are equally accessible to all the students. This rules out using excellent project scenarios based on dam-building (familiar to the Civil Engineers but to no-one else), or software engineering, or car manufacture, or banking or in fact almost anything! A level 3 question such as “devise a work breakdown structure for(some familiar process)” is very difficult to write in a neutral manner. What process is familiar enough to all students? No industrial process, certainly. One cannot assume that every student has, and has taken apart, a car, or even a bicycle. The unfortunate result is that the remaining scenarios are mundane, unexciting and tend to lack complexity – which is the key aspect which makes a task worth undertaking as a project. Domestic scenarios like “preparing a meal”, as well as

being seen as trivial, are in fact not universal. Quite a number of students have never prepared a meal from raw ingredients, as becomes evident on reading their answers.

Similar issues arise from a question designed to allow students to be creative in the context of a SWOT analysis. The obvious question is “Analyse the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats of the following proposition, and then make a recommendation whether it should be adopted.” It is very difficult to then identify a neutral proposition. Consider the proposition “let us build a fourth tunnel under the River Mersey for the use of pedestrians and cyclists.” However, many Liverpool students, although aware of the existence of the road and rail tunnels, have never been through any of the existing tunnels and do not understand how they were and are funded, so a proper analysis is not available to all students. In an attempt to use only concepts known to everyone, I used the real proposition (reported in The Times) “An advertising company should rent advertising space on students’ foreheads.” This appears to be totally neutral: surely every student understands advertising and certainly every one has a forehead. However on reading 220 answers (some very imaginative) it became clear that a small minority (2 or 3%) of students did not understand the word “forehead”. This was clearly a failure of general (not technical) vocabulary, but it arose from the most thoughtful and well-meaning intentions.

Vocabulary. The vocabulary available to students is worthy of separate consideration. There have been many studies of the vocabulary skills of school students; One of the most relevant is by Farrell and Ventura (8), who looked at the technical and non-technical vocabularies available to 300 17 year old A-level physics students. These are the students from whom Engineering undergraduates are drawn one or two years later. Farrell and Ventura measured both the claimed understanding and the actual understanding of 50 non-technical and 25 technical words, all taken from A level exam papers. Their results revealed some astonishing disparities, even among non-technical words. 96% of the surveyed students claimed to understand “transmitted” whereas only 30% could explain or define it. The equivalent results for “qualitative” were 66 and 29%; for “marked” they were 82 and 12% and for “significant” 91 and 46%. The situation was similar for technical words. For example “couple” scored 97 and 24%. The conclusion must be that we cannot assume that the vocabulary used in assessment items can be universally understood, even when questions are couched in “ordinary” English. Particular misconceptions revealed by Farrell and Ventura included “qualitative” meaning “of fine quality” and “yield point” defined as “the amount given out”.

My own experiences recently revealed first year engineering students who did not understand “opaque” or “inflammable”. The vocabulary used in the last three years’ exam papers on Project Management in Liverpool included the following words which were not defined in classes:

Assembly, auditor, balanced, batch, blizzard, chromium, client, construction industry, deadline, deliverable, finishing, functional, generalist, Human Resources Department, machining, morale, particulate, polishing, process, rapid prototyping, resource, revenue, review, sandwich, script, shooting (of film), stamping, standards, stock, trollies.

It is not clear whether all of these were understood by all students, although their inclusion was intended to give appropriate contextual colour to otherwise dry questions. One recent email from a student, just before the 2006 examination, gives a clear indication that this might be a problem:

“dear professor:

While i was reviewing the past exams papers ,i found i didn't know the meaning of some words, which are not about the knowledge of this module but comes from the problem of my English level. Such as the "refurbishing your bathroom", i lost the meaning of it. to be honestly, my English is not good enough.

*in these cases, what can i do? can i ask the monitor teachers in the room for explanation?
I hope it won't going to be considered cheating or what's your suggestion?"*

There are also cultural and contextual differences of meaning for identical words. This section of the paper started with a discussion of the vocabulary skills of "school students". In a recent question it became clear that some students interpreted this to mean undergraduates at university, while others took the intended meaning of secondary school students. Farrell and Ventura (8) give a similar example with the word "primary". This is readily understood by A level students in the context "primary school" but not in the intended context "of primary importance".

CONCLUSIONS

Under UK quality assurance procedures examination papers, but not always other assessment items, are usually checked both by the setter and by a moderator. If the assessment is not supposed to be a test of language skills, then it should be checked for technical accuracy, for alignment to the ILOs and for grammatical accuracy. This review indicates that moderators should also be asked to check for unintentional bias. It would not be easy to produce a comprehensive check list for this purpose but the issues and vocabulary discussed in this paper could form a starting point.

Recent trends in engineering education may also help to mitigate the problem of cultural bias. Movements such as CDIO (9) and ALE (10) promote active learning which makes it less likely that any student can remain culturally isolated. Students who are regularly working in teams, making engineered products and considering the engineering context of their studies will have a better chance of absorbing the local engineering (and wider societal) culture.

REFERENCES

1. **Martin, L.T.F.**, *Cultural differences in risk perception: An examination of USA and Ghanaian perception of risk communication*, MS thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 2003
2. **McCullough L.**, *Gender, context and physics assessment*, J International Women's Studies 5, 20-28, 2004
3. **Watkins, D.**, *Learning and Teaching: a cross-cultural perspective*, School Leadership and Management, 20, 161-173, 2000
4. **De Vita, Glauco**, *Cultural equivalence in the assessment of home and international business management students: a UK exploratory study*, Studies in Higher Education, 27, 221-231, 2002
5. **Baumgart, N. and Halse, C.**, *Approaches to Learning across Cultures: the role of assessment*. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 6, 321-339, 1999
6. **Elton, Lewis**, *Assessing Materials Students*, UK Centre for Materials Education, 2003
7. **Bloom B. S.**, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain*. New York: David McKay Co Inc, 1956

8. **Farrell, M. P. and Ventura, F.**, *Words and Understanding in Physics*,
Language and Education, 12, No 4, 243-253, 1998
9. **CDIO**: Conceive Design, Implement, operate, www.cdio.org
10. **ALE**: Active Learning in Engineering Education network, www.ale.tudelft.nl