Janice Miller-Young, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA, jmilleryoung@ualberta.ca
Danielle Gardiner Milln, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA, milln@ualberta.ca
Eklovepreet Singh, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA, eklovepr@ualberta.ca

Incorporating Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Intersectionality in First-Year Engineering: An Exploration of Students' Application to Teamwork

ABSTRACT

Teamwork skills are a vital learning outcome in higher education, yet negative interpersonal interactions within teams can diminish students' sense of belonging and inclusion. To address this challenge, the introduction of equity, diversity, inclusion, and intersectionality (EDI&I) topics into course curriculums has been proposed. This study examines how integrating these concepts into a first-year engineering design course impacts students' sense of inclusion and their ability to apply EDI&I principles to teamwork. Specifically, our research questions were: 1) To what extent did students experience a sense of belonging and uniqueness (inclusion) on their teams? 2) To what factors do students attribute their sense of belonging and uniqueness on their teams? And 3) How do students describe their design team experiences in relation to their ability to apply EDI&I? Data was collected through questionnaires from and interviews with forty-six participants using a qualitative empirical approach. Findings were that most students reported a strong sense of belonging and uniqueness within their teams, contributing to an overall feeling of inclusion. However, a small minority reported difficulties in applying EDI&I concepts to their teamwork. The discussion explores these difficulties and includes teaching strategies aimed at enhancing support for inclusive student teaming processes.

KEYWORDS

inclusion, belonging, uniqueness, questionnaire, interviews

INTRODUCTION

Developing teamwork skills is a fundamental goal of team-based learning and is a critical component of engineering education (Kaupp et al. 2012). As a result, engineering design courses incorporate team projects, typically as cornerstone and capstone experiences, frequently throughout all four years of the undergraduate curriculum. Therefore, it is essential to recognize that the dynamics of peer interaction within these assigned teams significantly shape students' engineering experiences (Joshi 2014; Rohde et al. 2019; Tonso 2006). While positive design experiences can foster students' identification with and sense of belonging in the field, a comprehensive review of the experiences of women of color in engineering revealed that negative team interactions can adversely impact their engineering identity, self-efficacy, and overall sense of belonging in STEM (Ong, Jaumot-Pascual, and Ko 2020).

Students' sense of belonging in STEM has emerged as a critical factor influencing student success and retention in higher education (Howson and Kingsbury 2024). In educational contexts,

sense of belonging can be understood as a broad feeling of membership that arises from students' perceptions of their engagement across various settings, alongside the support they receive from their peers and instructors (Tinto 2012). Despite the importance of students' sense of belonging and inclusion, there is a disconnect between the technical and social dimensions within the field of engineering which fosters an educational setting where individuals, particularly underrepresented minorities, frequently experience a sense of not belonging (Smyser and Freeman 2023). Critical reviews of engineering culture show that engineering schools are often framed as meritocratic spaces (Riley 2017), emphasizing traditionally masculine traits like grit and competitiveness (Direito, Chance, and Malik 2021). Such gendered values cultivate a culture of individualism and competition, reinforcing barriers to collaboration and inclusivity (Hanson 2022; Secules 2019). While teamwork is central to engineering education, there is limited research on incorporating the topics of equity, diversity, inclusion, and intersectionality (EDI&I) in order to enhance inclusivity.

While most of the literature on engineering culture is American, researchers in multiple Canadian contexts have recently found that male engineering students often demonstrate a lower awareness of issues related to EDI&I compared to their women counterparts (Kristufek and Mavriplis 2023; Miller-Young, Jamieson, and Beck 2023). This disparity highlights the critical need for teaching about and fostering a more inclusive and equitable educational environment in the Canadian context.

However, the integration of EDI&I into engineering education remains insufficient and in its infancy (Casper et al. 2021; d'Entremont et al. 2022). Several studies in the field of engineering education have shown that an emphasis on diversity in engineering is insufficient (Kirn et al. 2017; Pearson, Godwin, and Kirn 2018). Rather, it is imperative that the concepts of EDI&I are all incorporated into the curriculum. Recently, one study has shown that students' engineering experiences can be enhanced and their exposure to diverse cultures can be increased by integrating EDI concepts into the first-year engineering curriculum (Murray and Kwaczala 2023), noting that this paper is an early work-in-progress. Our study aims to help fill the existing gap by exploring students' team experiences of inclusion after the topics of EDI&I are introduced in a first-year engineering design course.

First, we introduce the construct of inclusion and show how it is relevant to student team experiences. Next, we describe the context of the study and our research questions. We then describe our qualitative methodology and report student responses in the results. Finally, we discuss how EDI&I content and student inclusion interact with teamwork in engineering and suggest further inclusive interventions and areas for future research.

BACKGROUND

Inclusion

A recent study on belonging in our context (Gardiner Milln et al. 2024) revealed that undergraduate engineering students often conflate their sense of belonging among peers with their sense of belonging within the profession. This insight led us to focus our investigation to examine students' experiences within their teams. While inclusion has received less attention than belonging in the field of engineering education (Rodriguez-Simmonds et al. 2023), the two concepts are interconnected, as conceptualized by Shore et al. (2011). They developed a conceptual model of inclusion grounded in optimal distinctiveness theory (Brewer 1991). This theory posits that individuals strive to balance the need for belonging within social groups with the need to maintain a sense of uniqueness. The conceptual model has since been transformed into a validated measurement tool by Chung et al. (2020). Thus, work group inclusion, as a validated construct, comprises two essential components: belonging and uniqueness. The two components are related, but not in opposition to

one another; rather, fulfilling both aspects through one's experiences in a work group enhances perceptions of inclusion. Individuals can meet their needs for both belonging and individuality by taking on specific roles within a group or by engaging with a team that actively promotes the expression of each member's identity (Chung et al. 2020). This dynamic interplay positions belonging and uniqueness as equally central to the success of EDI&I initiatives in team settings. Therefore, this study uses Chung et al.'s validated measure for work group inclusion in order to better understand the inclusiveness of first-year engineering student design teams and whether students could apply EDI&I concepts within their team-based, project-driven assignments.

Context

The study took place at a large, Canadian research-intensive university in the winter semester of 2024. The course is a required first-year engineering design course, which introduces students to design and to the profession through a semester-long, team-based design project. The structured, team-based approach provides a unique setting to evaluate the influence of EDI&I integration on students' teamwork experiences. In the year of the study, there were 10 sections of the course, seven instructors, 30 teaching assistants (TAs), and 1,257 students. The instruction was highly coordinated, with all instructors using the same set of slides, notes, and projects for all classes, and instructor and TA teams meeting weekly to discuss course progress. The course employed competency-based grading, requiring a minimum passing standard on both individual and team assignments. The course was also in a blended delivery format, with 80 minutes of face-to-face class time per week and an expectation that students would spend additional time working in their teams outside of class. All students in the course were invited to participate in the research.

In the course, students work in teams of five on a design project that they choose from a list of five possible projects. In alignment with recommended practices (Felder and Brent 2024) the instructors randomly formed teams with one constraint: no female student was to be the only woman on a team (Table 1). The topics of equity, diversity, inclusion, and intersectionality were introduced in week three of the semester, at the same time that students were drafting their team contracts (Table 1). These EDI&I components aimed to equip students with the tools to address diverse perspectives and reduce potential team conflicts. Potential team roles and conflict management strategies were also discussed.

Table 1. EDI&I course components

Component	Type	Description
Team formation	Instructor task	Students were assigned to teams by the instructor such that no team comprised just a single woman
Intro to equity, diversity, inclusion, intersectionality	Interactive lecture	Students participated in a lecture and discussion of EDI&I as it relates to design and team performance
Team asset mapping	Team activity	Students were asked to share their unique strengths, interests, and relevant previous experiences with their team members
Team contract	Team assignment	Teams drafted a contract outlining team expectations on communication, conducting meetings, managing conflict, etc.

Peer evaluations	Individual assignment	Students completed anonymous peer review of each of their team members using ITP metrics (O'Neill et al. 2018)

Our research questions were:

1. To what extent did students experience a sense of belonging and uniqueness (inclusion) on their teams?
2. To what factors do students attribute their sense of belonging and uniqueness on their teams?
3. How do students describe their design team experiences in relation to their ability to apply equity, diversity, inclusion, and intersectionality?

METHODOLOGY

We investigated students' team experiences within the first-year engineering course via a qualitative, empirical methodology (Yeo, Miller-Young, and Manarin 2023). This qualitative approach allows for an in-depth exploration of individual perceptions on inclusion within team settings, leaving space for unanticipated discoveries. Students were invited to complete a voluntary post-semester inclusion questionnaire and/or interview in order to reflect and report on their team experience (approved ethics application ID Pro00139467).

Participants and data collection

After the course concluded, an email invitation was sent to all enrolled students. Following the guidelines for intersectional research outlined by Christensen and Jensen (2012), our aim was to gather a diverse participant base in order to mitigate data homogeneity. A total of 46 students responded to the questionnaire, opting into the study by completing a Google form that allowed them to share demographic information, including age, GPA, gender, and ethnic or geographic identities. Despite being a volunteer sample, our participants were fairly representative of the diversity in our student population (Table 2).

Questionnaire items about belonging and uniqueness were taken from Chung et al. (2020), and two additional questions were added about students' perceived ability to apply what they learned about EDI&I to their teamwork (Appendix A). Additionally, 15 students volunteered for follow-up interviews, which were conducted by Danielle. The interview was semi-structured, designed to give students a chance to expand upon their questionnaire responses. Interviews averaged 30 minutes in length and were conducted online; Zoom was used to both record and transcribe them. Transcriptions were verified by the interviewer. As a token of appreciation for their time, interview participants received a small gift card.

Table 2. Participant demographics

	Number of students
Gender identity	
Man	32
Woman	13
Transgender woman	1

Geographic/ethnic identity	
Caucasian (e.g. European, North American)	17
South Asian (e.g. East Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, etc.)	12
Chinese	4
Black	4
Arab	2
Korean	2
Indigenous (e.g. First Nations, Métis, Inuit)	1
Other or prefer not to answer	8
Grade point average	
A range	9
B range	27
C range	6
D range	1
Prefer not to answer	3

Data analysis

For this multimethod study we employed descriptive statistics on the quantitative questionnaire responses and a content analysis on the qualitative questionnaire and interview responses (Yeo, Miller-Young, and Manarin 2023). Content analysis is a deductive method, and as we were interested in the manifest content, or "easily identifiable content of the textual data" (Yeo, Miller-Young, and Manarin 2023, 127), we employed a single researcher for the first stage of data analysis. Janice conducted the data analysis, discussing the findings with the interviewer, Danielle, until consensus was reached.

Positionality

While our qualitative, empirical approach aims for objectivity (Miller-Young and Yeo 2015), it's crucial to acknowledge the positionality of those involved in data collection and analysis. The lead author, Janice, was one of the course instructors and was involved in preparing the interactive lecture and activities related to teamwork and EDI&I. She is a White, cisgender, heterosexual woman with lived experience of working and researching in male-dominated spaces. Given the prevailing engineering culture, which often assumes meritocracy and prioritizes technical knowledge over other forms of understanding (Eastman, Miles, and Yerrick 2019; Ong, Jaumot-Pascual, and Ko 2020), she felt a genuine concern about how students would respond to the new EDI&I content in the course. Consequently, she aimed to authentically capture and represent student experiences in this study.

Danielle, the interviewer, is a PhD student in the Faculty of Education focusing on equity in higher education and identifies as a White, cis-gendered, queer female. She has experience in both qualitative research and interviewing. Eklovepreet assisted with literature review.

FINDINGS

Our findings are organized according to our research questions: belonging, uniqueness, inclusion, and application of EDI&I. Descriptive statistics are presented (Table 3) and quotes from individual students are presented with pseudonyms.

Table 3. Extent to which students experienced a sense of belonging, uniqueness, and inclusion on their teams and felt they could apply EDI&I principles

Questionnaire items	Mean, median
Belonging (5 = strongly agree)	4.01, 4.1
Uniqueness (5 = strongly agree)	4.17, 4.2
Inclusion (belonging + uniqueness)	8.18, 8.5
Applying EDI&I (5 = strongly agree)	3.44, 4.0

Belonging

The majority of students expressed a positive response to the five questionnaire items concerning their sense of belonging within their team (Table 3), with high median and mean scores. Of the four who expressed disagreement (an average response of 2.5 or less), 50% were women and three were Caucasian. In their questionnaire responses, Sarah indicated "One of my teammates yelled at me and made me cry during a meeting," Jessica said "It was hard for us to get along with each other and that caused me to feel less connected with the team," Ravi reported "All the members were in minimal contact and were not at all interested in any talk that was not related to the course," and Ethan did not provide a comment. All of these quotes demonstrated what Huerta et al. (2024) categorized as "relationship conflict," which includes strained relationships and unprofessional conduct. Unfortunately, none of these four students volunteered for an interview to expand upon their questionnaire responses.

Uniqueness

A majority of students also reported a positive attitude toward the five questionnaire items related to their sense of uniqueness within their team (Table 3). Specific reasons were related to engineering skills and included experience with makerspaces, experience with Computer Aided Drafting, and leadership experience connected to being a mature student. Two women specifically mentioned gender, and Priya indicated "Being female, the documentation lead, and the overall manager of my group, I brought to the table various qualities such as timely completion of tasks and equally assigning responsibilities in order to produce the best possible outcomes." Brittany said, "As a female, I think I have a different perspective than many of my male teammates. I found that I was more realistic, and took initiative to keep us organized." Even though she also stated she applied the EDI&I principles in her teamwork, Brittany attributed her positive experience to luck, sharing in her interview: "I think that, I mean, I hope that all of my group members felt like they belonged. I was

lucky; I had a really good crew." Her response also revealed an awareness of inclusiveness, in that she refrains from speaking for her teammates, expressing instead her hope that they all felt a sense of belonging. These insights indicate that students were able to leverage their unique identities in a way that reinforced inclusiveness on their teams.

No students responded with an average uniqueness score of 2.5 or less, meaning the majority of students reported a strong sense of uniqueness within their team. Two women emphasized the importance of their gender perspectives, and one attributed her positive experience to a matter of luck.

Inclusion

Taking the inclusion measure as the sum of the average belonging and average uniqueness score (Table 3), 37 students (80%) scored 7/10 or above on inclusion and 28 students (61%) scored 8/10 or above. Only two students, Sarah and Jessica, scored low on both belonging and uniqueness (inclusion scores of 5). Sarah indicated "I tried my best to incorporate the strategies that we were taught in the class, by communicating and trying to resolve problems in a composed manner" while Jessica strongly disagreed with the statement: "People on my team listened to me even when my views were dissimilar."

Applying EDI to teamwork

The majority of students agreed with question 19 regarding whether they could apply what they learned about EDI&I to their teamwork. Taeho made the representative comment, "I believe that our team successfully made an environment where everyone feels comfortable and safe to engage and share each other's ideas." Ravi was the only student who spoke about the impact EDI&I had on them personally, "Well, EDI&I did help me be confident about expressing my ideas and putting them forward without feeling embarrassed, that was it."

Yet, seven students expressed disagreement with statement 19 (rating it a 1 or 2), with most indicating that they hadn't encountered any team challenges necessitating the application of EDI&I concepts. Notably, Ethan, an 18-year-old Caucasian man, indicated he didn't think EDI&I applied in engineering:

> Equity and diversity don't really affect engineering projects, all that matters is that the team members are able to work together effectively to complete the project. Inclusion is all that really pertains here, and it is not difficult to include the members of your team in the work.

Only two other students ranked the application of EDI&I low, citing team issues; one said, "I basically carried the team." The other, Phil, pointed out a lack of structured decision-making. In an interview, Phil elaborated on this issue:

> Phil: Well, I think, 'cause our group never really established a proper like, roles or a hierarchy for everyone. We just kind of like, said that we would just kind of be quote unquote, equal, which didn't end up working out. So I think if we, like, were more serious about discussing it at the beginning and made something more concrete, like commitments.
>
> Interviewer: Did the team charter help with that at all?

Phil: The team charter, like, we were supposed to fill it out for like, the rules and stuff, but we didn't actually do anything for that.

Interviewer: Okay. Do you think that that would have helped?

Phil: Yes.

However, Phil also acknowledged that the peer feedback assignment was useful. In talking about his sense of belonging, he reflected, "It increased heavily around and after the peer feedback assignment, potentially due to changes in my and my teammates' attitudes after the assignment required us to better understand each other."

While most participants felt confident in applying EDI&I concepts to their teamwork, a minority highlighted specific challenges that suggested a need for more structured approaches.

DISCUSSION

This study explored students' experiences on teams after receiving an interactive lecture and completing team activities related to EDI&I and constructive team processes. It is the first study that we are aware of that covers undergraduate engineering students' team experiences through the lens of inclusion (Shore et al. 2011), providing valuable insights into students' experiences.

The high scores regarding students' sense of belonging highlight the overall supportive environment fostered within the students' teams. However, the experiences of the four students who expressed disagreement reveal significant relationship conflicts that negatively impacted their sense of connection. For instance, Sarah's comment about being yelled at during a meeting underscores the detrimental effects of unprofessional behavior, aligning with Huerta et al. (2024) who identify such dynamics as detrimental to team cohesion. While the lack of follow-up interviews with these students limits the full understanding of student perspectives, the occurrence of such behavior invites reflection on additional skills we could foster in the classroom. One possible area for development includes some instruction and practice with bystander intervention strategies.

The majority of students also reported a strong sense of uniqueness, with many attributing their distinct contributions to specific engineering skills and leadership experiences. Notably, Priya and Brittany articulated how their gender shaped their perspectives and roles within the team, demonstrating an awareness of the interplay between identity and team dynamics. This may be due to women being more experienced with talking about their identities in underrepresented spaces, and racialized students being less comfortable talking about their ethnic identity. For example, a previous study (Gardiner Milln et al. 2024) found that when given the choice, White, female, and queer students gravitated toward a White, female, queer interviewer. Meanwhile, the majority of racially minoritized students opted for a heterosexual, cisgender Latinx male interviewer. These patterns suggest that comfort and perceived safety when discussing identity may vary significantly depending on how students experience intersectionality and representation. Ravi, a South Asian man, hinted at these complexities when he described how exposure to EDI&I principles gave him greater confidence to voice his ideas within the team. Though he stopped short of naming ethnicity explicitly, his comments subtly underscored how EDI&I frameworks can empower students to navigate identity in professional and collaborative spaces. Finally, Brittany's reflections on luck highlight how some students may fail to recognize their own EDI&I skills when their team experiences are predominantly positive. This

suggests a need for intentional reflection and dialogue around EDI&I principles in order to ensure all students fully acknowledge and develop their contributions.

When examining inclusion—understood here as the balance of belonging and the recognition of uniqueness—the overall data suggest generally positive outcomes. Yet the experiences of Sarah and Jessica, who reported low inclusion scores, highlight the persistent challenges to fostering truly inclusive team environments. Their stories of unrecognized contributions and struggles with ineffective communication confirm an important gap: teaching EDI&I principles is not enough. These principles must be actively woven into team practices, ensuring all members feel valued and capable of meaningful contributions.

A key factor may be the absence of explicit team guidelines. Without clear structures and norms, students may struggle to translate EDI&I concepts into practice. For example, Priya and Brittany's positive experiences, while encouraging, illuminate an adjacent issue. Both students assumed leadership and coordination roles, which are often viewed positively (Ayre, Mills, and Gill 2013), yet women in engineering teams remain disproportionately likely to take on non-technical roles. Research indicates they are sometimes explicitly excluded from technical tasks (Keogh, Zarske, and Tsai 2018; Strehl and Fowler 2019), reinforcing gendered dynamics that undermine equitable participation. One actionable approach to addressing these dynamics is the rotation of team roles throughout the project. Mandatory rotation ensures all team members have opportunities to engage in both technical and non-technical tasks, developing students' skill sets across a broader range of competencies (Earle et al. 2024).

Ultimately, the majority of students felt capable of applying EDI&I concepts to their teamwork, although their expressions of this sentiment were not as strong as those regarding the constructs of belonging and uniqueness. According to student comments, many participants indicated that they didn't have any team issues and therefore had no need to apply EDI&I principles. Creating inclusive teams while fostering diversity is inherently challenging, as it requires navigating the delicate balance between ensuring a safe and supportive environment for marginalized identities and maintaining enough diversity for students to engage meaningfully with EDI&I concepts. In balancing these two goals, we believe it is best to continue forming groups randomly with no isolated women within first-year courses. Forming more diverse teams requires students to develop their skills further, supported by intentionally weaving EDI&I topics throughout the curriculum and accompanied by a more longitudinal approach to studying the development of skills over time. By continuing this work to embed efforts across courses and contexts, we aim to support sustained growth, ensuring that learning is not confined to isolated moments.

Finally, based on Ethan's comment, we can assume that some students still hold a common assumption that being blind to diversity is inherently equitable. Moving forward, we could address this assumption directly by presenting students with research that highlights how this perspective is often held by men (Kristufek and Mavriplis 2023; Miller-Young, Jamieson, and Beck 2023) and how the experiences of students from underrepresented groups negates this assumption. Additionally, Phil's concerns about the lack of structured roles and decision-making illustrate a gap in team organization that may hinder the effective application of EDI&I principles. His acknowledgment of the beneficial impact of the peer feedback assignment reinforces the idea that structured interventions can significantly enhance team dynamics.

While a majority of participants demonstrated confidence in applying EDI concepts, the experiences of a minority reveal the need for more structured approaches and interventions. Our instructional strategies align with most, but not all, recent recommendations for faculty implementing courses that include team-based assignments and projects (Earle et al. 2024; Huerta et al. 2024). We

will therefore incorporate three additional strategies in the next iteration of the course. First, we plan to introduce peer evaluations earlier and implement them on a recurring basis throughout the semester. This approach will enable students to receive team feedback sooner and provide them with more opportunities to practice giving constructive feedback. Additionally, it will offer valuable insights into team dynamics to instructors and TAs at an earlier stage. Second, we will implement a team reflection activity where students will revisit and revise their team contract later in the semester, reflecting on what worked or did not work from the first draft. Finally, we could diversify teams not only by considering gender but also according to students' experiences and skills. We believe that addressing these changes will help us continue to cultivate an environment where all students feel both a sense of belonging to their teams and the ability to express their unique contributions.

As a qualitative study, we intended to delve into students' experiences in detail rather than acquire generalizable findings. However, one limitation to our approach was reliance on volunteer sampling. While our participant demographics do reflect diversity in terms of gender, ethnic/geographic identity, and GPA, we don't know exactly how representative our participants' experiences were of the larger student population. Also, our study relies on student self-reporting, and it is possible that some students may find it difficult to critique their peers or mention issues related to ethnic/geographic identities. There is also the potential for social desirability bias in their responses, although we hope that having an anonymous questionnaire and a student interviewer from outside the faculty of engineering mitigated this possibility. Future research should focus on purposeful sampling and mixed method inquiry into team practices to ensure all voices are heard and valued.

CONCLUSION

This qualitative, empirical study highlights the need for ongoing EDI&I training within team-based settings in engineering classrooms. It illustrated that the incorporation of equity, diversity, inclusion, and intersectionality was generally well received and positively applied by students. However, our findings underscore that the team experience itself can significantly shape students' reflections on the usefulness of EDI&I. To enhance diversity, as well as inclusivity, we propose several additional strategies that could be applicable to other team-based and project-based learning contexts. Future studies should investigate how structured EDI&I interventions could further support student inclusion on teams.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank the students who participated in this study. We would also like to thank Dr. Nicole Wilson for connecting us with the literature on work group inclusion and Kineshta Pillay for co-creating the interactive lecture. Finally, thanks to the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada (IDG grant # 430-2021-00088) and the Institute for Intersectionality Studies at University of Alberta for the financial support of this research.

We would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge our team's efforts and highlight specific contributions made by each member. Janice was the principal investigator for the project and led the data analysis and writing of the manuscript. Danielle led the data collection and supported the writing of the manuscript. Eklovepreet conducted the literature review. ChatGPT was used to support some editing at the sentence level.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Janice Miller-Young (CAN) is a professor in mechanical engineering at the University of Alberta. Her current research focuses on education and educational development in both multidisciplinary and engineering contexts.

Danielle Gardiner Milln (CAN) is a PhD student in Adult, Community, and Higher Education at the University of Alberta where she focuses on equity, reconciliation, and Indigenization within higher education.

Eklovepreet Singh (CAN) is now a graduate of the masters of engineering, engineering management program at the University of Alberta, who works for the Government of Alberta.

REFERENCES

Ayre, Mary, Julie Mills, and Judith Gill. 2013. "'Yes, I Do Belong': The Women Who Stay in Engineering." *Engineering Studies* 5 (3): 216–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/19378629.2013.855781.

Brewer, Marilynn B. 1991. "The Social Self: On Being the Same and Different at the Same Time." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 17 (5): 475–82. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167291175001.

Casper, A. M. Aramati, Rebecca A. Atadero, Amir Hedayati-Mehdiabadi, and Daniel W. Baker. 2021. "Linking Engineering Students' Professional Identity Development to Diversity and Working Inclusively in Technical Courses." *Journal of Civil Engineering Education* 147 (4). https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)EI.2643-9115.0000052.

Christensen, Ann-Dorte, and Sune Q. Jensen. 2012. "Doing Intersectional Analysis: Methodological Implications for Qualitative Research." *NORA-Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research* 20 (2): 109–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/08038740.2012.673505.

Chung, Beth G., Karen H. Ehrhart, Lynn M. Shore, Amy E. Randel, Michelle A. Dean, and Uma Kedharnath. 2020. "Work Group Inclusion: Test of a Scale and Model." *Group & Organization Management* 45 (1): 75–102. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601119839858.

d'Entremont, Agnes, William Shelling, Jennifer Pelletier, and Heather Gerrits. 2022. "Developing and Deploying an Introductory Equity Curriculum for Engineering." *Proceedings of the Canadian Engineering Education Association (CEEA), November*. https://doi.org/10.24908/pceea.vi.15959.

Direito, Inês, Shannon Chance, and Manish Malik. 2021. "The Study of Grit in Engineering Education Research: A Systematic Literature Review." *European Journal of Engineering Education* 46 (2): 161–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/03043797.2019.1688256.

Earle, Shayna, Madison McDonald, Esra Bengizi, and Kim S. Jones. 2024. "Will I Fit? The Impact of Social and Identity Determinants on Teamwork in Engineering Education." In *Frontiers in Education* 9 edited by Dina Tavares. Frontiers Media. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1412882.

Eastman, Michael G., Monica L. Miles, and Randy Yerrick. 2019. "Exploring the White and Male Culture: Investigating Individual Perspectives of Equity and Privilege in Engineering Education." *Journal of Engineering Education* 108 (4): 459–80. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20290.

Felder, Richard M., and Rebecca Brent. 2024. *Teaching and Learning STEM: A Practical Guide*. John Wiley & Sons.

Gardiner Milln, Danielle, Janice Miller-Young, Eric Chan, and Chris Avelar. 2024. "'It Doesn't Feel Like I'm Swimming With The Fishes': Intersectional Understanding of Belongingness in Canadian Undergraduate Engineering Education." (Submitted, manuscript).

Hanson, Cori. 2022. "From Diversity to Inclusion: Centering the Voices of Undergraduate Engineering Students." *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 52 (4): 15–26. https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.vi0.189787.

Howson, Camille K., and Martyn Kingsbury. 2024. *Belonging and Identity in STEM Higher Education*. UCL Press. https://doi.org/10.14324/111.9781800084988.

Huerta, Mark V., Susan Sajadi, Lisa Schibelius, Olivia J. Ryan, and Marin Fisher. 2024. "An Exploration of Psychological Safety and Conflict in First-Year Engineering Student Teams." *Journal of Engineering Education* 113 (3): 635–66. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20608.

Joshi, Aparna. 2014. "By Whom and When is Women's Expertise Recognized? The Interactive Effects of Gender and Education in Science and Engineering Teams." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 59 (2): 202–39. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839214528331.

Kaupp, James, Brian Frank, Robert Brennan, Susan McCahan, Lata Narayanan, Peter Ostafichuck, Nariman Sepehri, and K. Christopher Watts. 2012. "A Comparison of Institutional Approaches to CEAB Graduate Attribute Requirements." In *Proceedings of the Canadian Engineering Education Association (CEEA)*, June: 1–7. https://doi.org/10.24908/pceea.v0i0.4642.

Keogh, Megan, Malinda S. Zarske, and Janet Y. Tsai. 2018. "Active Learning Group Work: Helpful or Harmful for Women in Engineering?" *ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition Conference Proceedings*.

Kirn, Adam, Allison Godwin, Nelson Pearson, et al. 2017. "Building Supports for Diversity Through Engineering Teams." *ASEE Annual Conference Proceedings*.

Kristufek, Leah, and Catherine Mavriplis. 2023. "Sense of Belonging in Engineering-a Survey of Engineering Students at a Large Comprehensive Ontario University." *Proceedings of the Canadian Engineering Education Association*. https://doi.org/10.24908/pceea.2023.17062.

Miller-Young, Janice, and Michelle Yeo. 2015. "Conceptualizing and Communicating SoTL: A Framework for the Field." *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* 3 (2): 37–53. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.3.2.37.

Miller-Young, Janice, Marnie Jamieson, and Seth Beck. 2023. "Diverse Experiences and Belonging in an Online, First-Year, Team-Based Engineering Design Course." *Teaching in Higher Education*: 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2022.2162816.

Murray, Lisa K., and Andrea T. Kwaczala. 2023. "Promoting Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion through Culture-Related Design in First-Year Engineering Curriculum: A Work in Progress." *2023 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition*.

O'Neill, Thomas A., Amanda Deacon, Katherine Gibbard, Nicole Larson, Genevieve Hoffart, Julia Smith, and B. L. M. Donia. 2018. "Team Dynamics Feedback for Post-Secondary Student Learning Teams." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 43 (4): 571–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1380161.

Ong, Maria, Nuria Jaumot-Pascual, and Lily T. Ko. 2020. "Research Literature on Women of Color in Undergraduate Engineering Education: A Systematic Thematic Synthesis." *Journal of Engineering Education* 109 (3): 581–615. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20345.

Pearson, Nelon, Allison Godwin, and Adam Kirn. 2018. "The Effect of Diversity on Feelings of Belongingness for New Engineering Students." *2018 IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference*, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE.2018.8658443.

Riley, Donna. 2017. "Rigor/Us: Building Boundaries and Disciplining Diversity with Standards of Merit." *Engineering Studies* 9 (3): 249–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/19378629.2017.1408631.

Rodríguez-Simmonds, Héctor E., Allison Godwin, Tara Langus, Nelson Pearson, and Adam Kirn. 2023. "Building Inclusion in Engineering Teaming Practices." *Studies in Engineering Education* 3 (2). https://doi.org/10.21061/see.84.

Rohde, Jacqueline, Lisa Musselman, Brianna Benedict, Dina Verdin, Allison Godwin, Adam Kim, Lisa Benson, and Geof Potvin. 2019. "Design Experiences, Engineering Identity, and Belongingness in Early Career Electrical and Computer Engineering Students." *IEEE Transactions on Education* 62 (3): 165–72. https://doi.org/10.1109/TE.2019.2913356.

Secules, Stephen. 2019. "Making the Familiar Strange: An Ethnographic Scholarship of Integration Contextualizing Engineering Educational Culture as Masculine and Competitive." *Engineering Studies* 11 (3): 196–216. https://doi.org/10.1080/19378629.2019.1663200.

Shore, Lynn M., Amy E. Randel, Beth G. Chung, Michelle A. Dean, Karen H. Ehrhart, and Gangaram Singh. 2011. "Inclusion and Diversity in Work Groups: A Review and Model for Future Research." *Journal of Management* 37 (4): 1262–89. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310385943.

Smyser, Bridget M., and Susan F. Freeman. 2023. "Student Definitions of DEI in First-Year Engineering and Capstone Design." *2023 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition*.

Strehl, Elizabeth Ann, and Robin Fowler. 2019. "Experimental Evidence Regarding Gendered Task Allocation on Teams." 2019 *ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition Conference Proceedings*. https://doi.org/10.18260/1-2--32797.

Tinto, Vincent. 2012. *Completing College: Rethinking Institutional Action*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tonso, Karen L. 2006. "Teams that Work: Campus Culture, Engineer Identity, and Social Interactions." *Journal of Engineering Education* 95 (1): 25–37. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2006.tb00875.x.

Yeo, Michelle, Janice Miller-Young, and Karen Manarin. 2023. *SoTL Research Methodologies: A Guide to Conceptualizing and Conducting the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003447054.

APPENDIX

Questionnaire items

Student information

1. What is your current age? Please specify. _____
2. How many hours a week on average are you employed?
   a. I am not working
   b. 1-9 hours
   c. 10-19 hours
   d. 20-29 hours
   e. 30-39 hours
   f. 40+
3. How many courses are you taking this semester?
   a. 1
   b. 2
   c. 3
   d. 4
   e. 5
   f. 6+
4. What is your current overall GPA?
   a. A- / A+ (3.7 - 4.0)
   b. B- / B+ (2.7 - 3.3)
   c. C- / C+ (1.7 - 2.3)
   d. D+ or less (less than 1.3)
   e. Prefer not to answer
5. How would you identify in terms of gender (e.g. woman, trans, genderqueer, gender fluid, etc.)?
   a. Woman
   b. Man
   c. Different Gender Identity. Please Specify _____
   d. Prefer not to answer
6. What racial and ethnic/geographic origins do you identify with? Choose all that apply [please note this is not an exhaustive list] or indicate your racial and ethnic/geographic origins in the comment box.
   - Prefer not to answer
   - Arab
   - Black
   - Caucasian (e.g. European, North American)
   - Chinese
   - Filipino
   - Indigenous (e.g. First Nations, Métis, Inuit)
   - Japanese
   - Korean
   - Latin American
   - South Asian (e.g. East Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, etc.)
   - Southeast Asian (e.g. Vietnamese, Cambodian, Thai, etc.)

- West Asian (e.g. Iranian, Afghan, etc.)
- Another

If another, please specify: _____

Belongingness

In this section we ask you general questions about your sense of belonging on your team.
Please indicate your agreement with the following statements **(Likert 1-5):**
1=Strongly Disagree
5=Strongly Agree

7. I am treated as a valued member of my team.
8. I belong in my team.
9. I am connected to my team.
10. I believe that my team is where I am meant to be.
11. I feel that people really care about me in my team.

Short Answer

12. Is there anything else you'd like to tell us about your sense of belonging on your team?

Uniqueness

In this section we ask you about your sense of uniqueness on your team.
Please indicate your agreement with the following statements **(Likert 1-5):**
1=Strongly Disagree
5=Strongly Agree

13. I can bring aspects of myself to my team that others on the team don't have in common with me.
14. People on my team listen to me even when my views are dissimilar.
15. While working on the project, I am comfortable expressing opinions that diverge from my team.
16. I can share a perspective on project issues that is different from my team members.
17. When my team's perspective becomes too narrow, I am able to bring up a new point of view.

Short Answer

18. Is there anything else you'd like to tell us about your uniqueness on your team?

Please indicate your agreement with the following statement **(Likert 1-5):**
1=Strongly Disagree
5=Strongly Agree

19. I can apply what I learned about EDI&I to teamwork.

Short answer

20. Please explain your answer above.

You have now completed the questionnaire. Thank you for your time.