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APS Study Site: Cohort 1’
This study extended the APS study to a cross section of engineering students in upper and lower division programs at the University of Minnesota. We used an online survey and focus groups to gather data on student motivations to study engineering and student experiences in engineering programs.

Research Design & Questions
Gather direct input from students through an exploratory, descriptive study.
• Quantitative data gathered from two administrations of the APS online survey: Fall ‘05 (123 students) and spring ’06 (217 students—including 55 transfer students).
• Qualitative data gathered from six focus groups: Spring ‘07 (nearly 50 students).

Research questions
• What motivates students to study engineering?
• How do students navigate their educational programs at UMN?

Student Motivations to Study Engineering.
Students reported their highest motivational factor was improving social well-being (solving and fixing societal problems) followed by financial incentives (pay and job assurance). We found no differences by gender or division, although non-transfer students (m = .63) were significantly more motivated by financial incentives than transfer students (m = .53, p = .019).

The qualitative analysis indicated an additional motivating factor to be students’ fascination with math and science.

Student Learning Experiences.
Students reported the highest level of frustration and disillusionment with the grading system, perceived disconnect of course work from reality, and low levels of support.
• Women reported more difficulty coping with course pace and load (t(158) = 3.625, p < .001).
• Women reported higher levels of involvement in extra-curricular activities (t(158) = 2.311, p = .022).
• Transfer students reported higher levels of academic disengagement for liberal arts classes (t(161) = -2.351, p = .020).
• Transfer students reported lower levels of satisfaction with overall collegiate experiences (t(214) = 2.943, p = .004).

Conclusions & Discussion
Student motivators
• Personal interest in science, math, and engineering
• Student-student interactions
• Student-instructor interactions
• Student-professional (practice) interactions

Student demotivators
• Extreme difficulty or course content
• Highly competitive and disconnected grading system (the curve)
• Poor levels of support from TAs, faculty, and institution

Principles for good practice
• Encourage contact between faculty and students.
• Develop reciprocity and cooperation among students.
• Encourage active learning.
• Provide prompt feedback.
• Emphasize time on task.
• Communicate high expectations.
• Respect diverse talents and ways of learning.
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