

# SOUTHERN JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING EDUCATION

Publication details, including instructions for authors and other information can be found at <https://journals.uct.ac.za/index.php/sjee>

## **Impact of curricula on student learning: a comparison of six chemical engineering programmes in three Washington Accord countries**

Ashish Agrawal<sup>a,†</sup>  
Margaret Blackie<sup>c</sup>  
Nicole Pitterson<sup>e</sup>

Johnson Carroll<sup>b,†</sup>  
Kayleigh Rosewell<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Cape Town, South Africa*

<sup>b</sup> *Faculty of Engineering and Built Environment, University of Johannesburg, South Africa*

<sup>c</sup> *Centre for Higher Education Research, Teaching and Learning, Rhodes University, South Africa*

<sup>d</sup> *Department of Educational Research, Lancaster University, UK*

<sup>e</sup> *Department of Engineering Education, Virginia Tech, USA*

<sup>†</sup> *The majority of work for this paper was done at the institutions listed. However, the first and second authors moved institutions during the period the paper was written and published.*

Submission received: 26 April 2023 / Published: 9 November 2023

**To cite this article:** Agrawal, A., Carroll, J., Blackie, M., Rosewell, K. & Pitterson, N. (2024). Impact of curricula on student learning: a comparison of six chemical engineering programmes in three Washington Accord countries, *Southern Journal of Engineering Education*, 3, 4–28. DOI: [10.15641/sjee.v3i1.1474](https://doi.org/10.15641/sjee.v3i1.1474)

This article is published under the [Creative Commons License 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

The *Southern Journal of Engineering Education* is a scholarly forum for the publication of original research that is relevant to the international engineering education community. Please see the journal's [Aims & Scope](#) for more information about the focus as well as the journal's Open Access Policy.



## **Impact of curricula on student learning: a comparison of six chemical engineering programmes in three Washington Accord countries**

Ashish Agrawal<sup>\*a,1</sup>

Johnson Carroll<sup>b,2</sup>

Margaret Blackie<sup>c</sup>

Kayleigh Rosewell<sup>d</sup>

Nicole Pitterson<sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Cape Town, South Africa*

<sup>b</sup> *Faculty of Engineering and Built Environment, University of Johannesburg, South Africa*

<sup>c</sup> *Centre for Higher Education Research, Teaching and Learning, Rhodes University, South Africa*

<sup>d</sup> *Department of Educational Research, Lancaster University, UK*

<sup>e</sup> *Department of Engineering Education, Virginia Tech, USA*

Despite homogenisation due to accreditation requirements, there remain significant variations in day-to-day structuring of engineering curricula. This article shows these variations, and their influence on students' learning experiences, in three Washington Accord countries – England, South Africa, and the United States. The curricular parameters that we focus on include weekly contact hours, curricular rigidity, and the structure of the first year of the degree. Findings obtained through an analysis of undergraduate handbooks, weekly timetables of the different courses, and student interviews suggest considerable differences across the engineering programmes along these parameters, both within and across national boundaries. A high contact time, particularly in the South African programmes we studied, limits students' capacity to self-study and participate in extra-curricular activities. In contrast, programmes that we studied in the US and England, which offer more opportunity for electives, allow students to diversify their skillsets but potentially prevent them from acquiring discipline-specific engineering competency. Finally, we noted variations in the structuring of the first year of the degree. Where a programme introduces a significant number of courses specific to chemical engineering from the first year, students tend to build an early understanding of the discipline, while limiting their capacity to change majors.

*Keywords:* ABET accreditation criteria; chemical engineering; curricular differences; outcome-based education; student experiences with curriculum; Washington Accord

---

<sup>1</sup> Present affiliation: College of Engineering Technology, Rochester Institute of Technology, USA

<sup>2</sup> Present affiliation: The MITRE Corporation, USA

\*Email: [atacet@rit.edu](mailto:atacet@rit.edu)

## **Introduction**

The connection between advancement in engineering, innovation, and economic growth is well established in both developed and developing countries (Centre for Economics and Business Research, 2016; Matthews et al., 2012). In the debates on engineering education, curriculum occupies an important place. It is generally agreed that engineering curricula are in need of reform to address several issues, including attracting and retaining more students; improving diversity in engineering; and enhancing graduate preparedness by better training engineering students to serve the needs of the industry (Graham, 2022; Jamieson & Lohmann, 2012; Morgan & Ion, 2014; Scott et al., 2013). The links between engineering curricula and how they influence students' experiences and choices has been previously studied. Stevens et al. (2005, 2008) note that students' experiences of navigating through an engineering degree is closely related to what they call 'navigational flexibility' at a university. Through examples of different students, they highlight that at institutions where there was limited flexibility in the curriculum in taking courses outside engineering, students either struggled to complete the engineering coursework while also taking courses based on personal interest, or followed a pre-determined plan of study as recommended by their departments. Similarly, Lichtenstein et al. (2009) highlight that a curricular structure that affords students flexibility in choosing majors and taking courses outside of the chosen major allows them not only to explore other majors, but also to easily shift majors by leaving engineering. However, it is important that a greater flexibility in curricula is balanced with the need to retain a sufficient core of engineering content.

Several other studies have highlighted the role of specific curricular features in shaping engineering students' experiences. For example, Mann et al. (2009) show that project-based learning in curricula can help students better learn professional engineering skills such as teamwork and project management. Kotys-Schwartz et al. (2011) note that service-learning can lead to an increased knowledge of the subject matter and improvements in critical thinking, problem-solving skills, teamwork, and communication among students. Along similar lines, internships and cooperative learning projects can help students better understand theoretical concepts by seeing their practical implementation (Mann et al., 2009). They can also help students self-evaluate their interest in pursuing an engineering career (Matusovich et al., 2010) and competence in being a successful engineer (Matusovich et al., 2008).

One significant facet of the ongoing discussions on curricular reform is the facilitation of movement of engineering graduates between countries. This need has led to the creation of global accreditation requirements (Case, 2017) which have been achieved through, for example, the mechanism of the Washington Accord. Established in 1989, the Washington Accord initially aimed at mutual recognition of undergraduate engineering programmes in the participating countries. The initial signatories to the Washington Accord included Australia, Canada, the Republic of Ireland, New Zealand, the UK, and the US. Since 1989, the Washington Accord has spread across the globe. However, the European Union, most of Latin America, and most African countries are still not signatories (Lucena et al., 2008). In the European Union, the alignment of curricula across countries facilitating international movement of engineering graduates is achieved through the Bologna agreement signed in 1999 (Adelman, 2009; Case, 2017). In recent years, there have been increased efforts to link more countries to global accreditation, with Peru joining the Washington Accord in 2018, Costa Rica in 2020, and Chile gaining provisional signatory status in 2018 (Washington Accord, 2022). In Africa, substantial differences remain in engineering programmes with Anglophone and Francophone nations reflecting the degree structures of their former colonisers (Case, 2017). To date, South Africa, which joined in 1999, remains the only signatory from Africa (Washington Accord, 2020).

The Washington Accord is closely based on the accreditation criteria of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET). Membership to the Accord requires the participating countries to accredit their engineering degrees to a similar set of criteria (Case, 2017). ABET's own accreditation criteria have changed over the years. The initial ABET criteria focused on inputs; the emphasis has shifted to an outcome-based approach through the adoption of the Engineering Criteria 2000 (ABET, 2002). The Engineering Criteria put more emphasis on clearly articulating programme objectives and learning outcomes while reducing detailed specifications on the content of engineering curricula (Prados et al., 2005). As a result, the accreditation requirements for engineering programmes, which are being adopted by an increasing number of countries across the world, have adopted an outcome-based model since 2000.

This focus on learning outcomes has considerably influenced the design of curricula across undergraduate engineering programmes at different universities in countries that are signatories to the Washington Accord. These programmes have deliberately incorporated

various elements into the curricular structure to meet the accreditation requirements, for example ensuring appropriate coverage of engineering topics such as engineering science and design, including modules on mathematics, science, and general education, and incorporating a capstone project that requires students to use the knowledge and skills from the previous coursework (e.g., Buyurgan & Kiassat, 2017; Chandrasekaran et al., 2013; Meah et al., 2020).

As a result of adopting outcome-based approaches through accreditation requirements, there has been some homogenisation of undergraduate engineering curricula across national boundaries. However, this homogenisation has generally been at a level of the overarching structure of the whole degree rather than the specifics of particular course curricula. For example, most Washington Accord programmes are four-year degrees allowing similar development towards the outcomes. There is some variation: in England, the Washington Accord equivalent is a three-year bachelor's plus a one-year master's programme, or an integrated four-year master's degree. South African Washington Accord programmes are typically four-year bachelor's degrees despite the national norm of three-year bachelor's degrees. Additionally, most degrees incorporate various practice-related elements such as capstone projects in the curriculum, and assessment of these tends to aim to directly demonstrate outcome achievement. Accreditation requirements have also ensured that curricula meet the requirements of incorporating certain disciplinary content, i.e., courses on mathematics, science, or humanities (Chandrasekaran et al., 2013; Jawitz et al., 2001). The reason for homogenisation of engineering curricula at a degree level is that the Engineering Criteria 2000, which was a significant starting point for the formulation of these global accreditation criteria, 'emphasise[s] learning outcomes, assessment, and continuous improvement rather than detailed curricular specifications' (Prados et al., 2005, p. 165).

Nonetheless, the adoption of outcome-based approaches has allowed undergraduate engineering programmes to meet the global standards while preserving institutional autonomy and alignment with national requirements and engineering cultures, as illustrated by Klassen and Sá (2020) in their study of three Canadian schools of engineering. Similarly, Downey et al. (2006) highlight how engineering problem solving varies between countries, which in turn influences the design of engineering curricula. They note that engineering curricula in the UK emphasise the use of engineering knowledge in solving practical problems, while those in France focus on using first principles and curricula in Germany on the attainment of a high degree of precision. In the US, engineering curricula have been significantly influenced by the

technical needs of the country during the Cold War period, and consequently incorporated a high level of mathematics and engineering science to produce cutting-edge technologies such as computers, jets, and rockets to meet the needs of the military (Seely, 1999). Along similar lines, given the diversity of the student population in terms of backgrounds and preparedness for university education, the Council on Higher Education (Scott et al., 2013) in South Africa has also advocated for a flexible curriculum for higher education (including engineering education) in the country. This flexible curriculum is intended to suit the needs of a diverse set of students with different levels of preparedness by allowing them to complete the degree requirements at different speeds according to their needs and preferences. This flexibility remains in tension with the push to get students through the system in regulation time.

It is thus clear that accreditation requirements allow universities considerable scope for the incorporation of particular needs while maintaining institutional autonomy. It follows then that there could be considerable differences in how undergraduate engineering curricula are structured at the micro level in terms of credit requirements, contact time, experiential learning activities, and the incorporation of interdisciplinary courses across institutional and national lines.

While prior studies have highlighted how engineering curricula meet both local and national requirements (e.g., Downey et al., 2006; Klassen & Sá, 2020) and accreditation requirements (e.g., Buyurgan & Kiassat, 2017; Chandrasekaran et al., 2013; Meah et al., 2020), this literature highlights the structuring of and the variation in engineering curricula at the macro level, i.e., at the level of the entire degree. Within chemical engineering specifically, comparative studies have been done to highlight the different ways of teaching certain aspects of the degree and an increased or reduced emphasis on some topics (Voronov et al., 2017; Yao et al., 2022). Our study expands this literature by exploring the structures of undergraduate engineering degrees at the micro level that concerns students' day-to-day involvement with classes and their ability to make decisions in terms of choosing courses and specialisations within the degree. The reason for our focus in this article is that these elements do shape the students' perception of their experience of the programme. Usually these are simply taken as a given: 'this is how we do things here'. The purpose of this article is to show that there is a wide variation in these structures. This information may help educators and institutions make more informed decisions in the design of engineering curricula with respect to aspects of curriculum design that are often overlooked. The research questions that guide this study are:

**RQ1:** How do chemical engineering curricula vary at a micro level that influences students' day-to-day experiences?

**RQ2:** How do these variations shape students' experiences?

This article focuses on the structures of six chemical engineering programmes in three different countries, two each in England, South Africa, and the United States, all of which are four-year degrees accredited under the Washington Accord. It highlights the similarities and differences across these programmes in terms of contact hours, flexibility in the curricula, and the structure of the first year of the degree; and their influence on students' experiences. The reason for choosing chemical engineering for this study is that it is both a traditional and an important engineering discipline. It was formally established as a discipline more than a century ago (van Antwerpen, 1980). It is also notable that although the participation of women in chemical engineering remains lower than that of men, the discipline does tend to greater diversity in gender than other engineering programmes (Brawner et al., 2015).

### **Theoretical framework**

The work of the sociologist Basil Bernstein (2000) on recontextualisation of disciplinary knowledge into curriculum provides the theoretical underpinning for this work. Bernstein distinguishes disciplinary knowledge from the curriculum in any field and argues that the disciplinary knowledge is converted into the disciplinary curriculum through a process of recontextualisation. Bernstein (2003) makes a distinction between regulative and instructional discourse. The instructional discourse entails the academic content of the curriculum and involves choices of what is included in the curriculum and its pacing and sequencing. In a discipline such as chemical engineering, there is core knowledge content that must be covered despite the language of outcome-based education used by the Washington Accord. The use of textbooks for core content may also shape pacing and sequencing to some extent. The main interest here is on factors which fall under the regulative discourse and the ways in which those elements influence student experience. Regulative discourse refers to the structures within which the content of the curriculum is communicated. In the context of this study the 'curriculum' is broadly understood as the instructional discourse, and the regulative discourse is the structure in terms of time and flexibility. It has been noted in several studies that the way the student interacts with the regulative discourse can have a significant impact on their perceived experience (Bertram, 2012; Blackie, 2021).

Given different histories and different social and cultural contexts, it follows that there will be differences in the day-to-day structuring of the curricula across national and institutional contexts. This exploration of curricular differences across contexts, along with their influences on students' experiences, is the focus of this article. This exploration and elucidation will provide engineering educators with empirical examples of different ways of structuring curricula, thus helping them make more informed decisions about curricular design.

## Methods

Data for this study were collected from six universities across three countries.<sup>3</sup> All institutions are publicly funded and have been given pseudonyms of chemical elements to reflect the focus of the study. Table 1 provides the details about these six universities in terms of their locations.

Table 1: *Details of research sites*

Country	England		South Africa		USA	
University pseudonym	Erbium	Europium	Sodium	Samarium	Argon	Astatine

The data analysed for this article were drawn from two sources: 1) curricular documents such as undergraduate handbooks that detailed the degree requirements in terms of core and elective courses and weekly contact times of the different courses that students needed to take to complete the degree requirements; and 2) annual semi-structured interviews with up to ten students per research site conducted throughout the course of their degree, which captured students' experiences with their courses and assessment practices, relationship with the discipline, engagement in co- and extra-curricular activities, and future plans after the completion of their degrees. Student interviews were carried out between 2017 and 2021.

A preliminary analysis of the curriculum data from each institution and wide-ranging discussions among the authors about possible curricular variations led to a variety of potentially

---

<sup>3</sup> These data were collected as part of a larger international project that seeks to understand how STEM students engage with disciplinary knowledge in two different STEM disciplines – chemistry and chemical engineering (for details, see [here](#)). The longitudinal research design for the larger project drew from McLean et al. (2018). The overarching interest of the broader project is the development of student agency and knowledge gain. Thus, the focus of this article is on elements of the curricula which can be directly linked to student experience. The analysis herein is an important component of interpretation of the larger project, but the variation discovered is of sufficient interest to be a useful contribution to the engineering education literature.

significant curricular features. Through iteratively focusing on and refining the definitions, three features of the chemical engineering programmes were identified that clearly illustrate the links between curriculum and its influence on students' academic experiences. These curricular features included contact hours, curricular rigidity, and first year of the degree. While these features are not exhaustive, they are illustrative of the distinctions between programmes and serve to illustrate the significance of the regulative discourse on student experience.

The next step of analysis included preparing weekly timetables and the four-year degree plans, considering the different elective and specialisation options, which was primarily done by the second author in close consultation with the first author. Reference was made to university handbooks to obtain details about compulsory, elective, and specialisation courses and their weekly contact times. The decisions made by the first two authors to quantify contact hours or elective and specialisation requirements or first-year credit requirements in cases of ambiguities were achieved through discussion. The final set of decisions were then considered by all the five authors and any disagreements were resolved through conversation with referral to curriculum documents.

To compute contact hours, average weekly contact time was calculated for each year of study and each programme. Sessions scheduled in alternate or intermittent weeks alongside regular contact time were averaged across the term or semester. Atypical weeks (such as examination periods or field trips) were excluded, as were any sessions without a specified schedule. The latter exclusion is often evident in the third and fourth years of study when students may be completing projects and other assignments during unscheduled laboratory work. The reason for choosing weekly contact hours as opposed to the total contact time over an entire semester or an academic year is that we wanted to choose a criterion that relates to students' day-to-day academic experiences and interaction with the academic timetable. A cumulative measure over an entire semester or an academic year may hinder this understanding, as it is the weekly contact time that can either enable or inhibit choices of electives, part-time employment or extracurricular activities, and can also drive different approaches to teaching and learning. Semester and year totals can disguise these variations over the course of the programme.

For curricular rigidity, we wanted to explore the extent to which the degree is constrained by compulsory courses that must be completed by all students, and the extent to which students have some freedom of choice. All institutions use the notion of credits to designate workload.

Hence the unit of measure used here was the course credit. Since the definition of a credit varies across institutions, we quantified fractions of a curriculum in terms of the university's own allocations of credits. It is noted that credits may not be a reliable indicator of workload but, as they are linked to notional hours of work, is the most accurate measure that can be attained from course documentation. We therefore define the rigidity of a curriculum in terms of the fraction of course credits that are compulsory for all students in the programme. We chose curricular rigidity as a construct to analyse the curricula as opposed to curricular flexibility, because all institutions have a similar conception of compulsory courses, making rigidity an easily measurable construct. By contrast, the non-compulsory features that provide curricular flexibility take various forms, making flexibility more difficult to quantify consistently across curricula.

To analyse the degree to which students are exposed to the discipline-specific content in the first year, we compared the first year of the chemical engineering programmes to another engineering programme: mechanical engineering. Mechanical engineering was chosen as it was common across all the six institutions. By calculating the proportion of first-year course credits that each chemical engineering curriculum shares with another discipline, we quantified how much of the first year of the engineering degree in each programme is discipline-specific and how much is common.

Once we identified the three curricular features and quantified the curricular differences across the programmes under study, the next step involved reading through the interview transcripts to identify instances that connected student experiences with these three features. The initial identification of relevant interview excerpts was done by the first author, which was then cross-checked by the third author.<sup>4</sup> It should be noted that since the interview questions explored students' broader curricular experiences, there was ample scope for students to recount experiences that challenged our findings. It should also be noted that not all students talked about the influence of all three curricular features on their experiences, and hence the findings from the qualitative analysis of interviews provide exemplars of experiences rather than establishing prevalence among all students. Moreover, the article does not use student data

---

<sup>4</sup> Interviews included a range of questions related to students' course and assessment experiences, engagement with disciplinary knowledge, experiences with diversity, extra-curricular activities, and expectations from the university. These interview topics were shaped by the broader project of which this article is a small product, therefore not all interview questions were relevant to this particular study.

to strengthen the analysis of curricular differences; rather the interviews are used to illustrate the patterns that were found in the analysis of curricular data.

## **Findings**

Our investigation of curriculum documents highlights three themes that were common across institutions and national contexts. We saw evidence of difference between these contexts as well. In this section we will discuss these themes: contact hours, curricular rigidity, and first year of the degree, in terms of how they were illustrated across institutions and countries. Following the discussion of each theme, we describe how the curricular feature shaped students' experiences using interview quotes as evidence. Pseudonyms are used to refer to individual students.

### *Contact hours*

One notable difference between the curricula among all the sites is the amount of contact time required of students. Though all programmes are four-year programmes, the time that students must spend in a classroom or laboratory varies significantly. To illustrate differences in contact hours, we chose to focus on average weekly contact time as the indicative measure.

There are two ways in which student choice impacts the contact hours (discussed in detail in the section on curricular rigidity). Firstly, some universities offer explicit variations on the chemical engineering programme in the form of specialisations, such as environmental science or biochemistry, that include different courses. The averages presented here exclude these options and focus on the traditional or mainstream chemical engineering curricula. It is acknowledged that some courses in the specialisations could be considered core elements within the specialisation. Secondly, some of the chemical engineering programmes incorporate electives: courses that students can select from a range of options. Where an explicit list of options was provided in the university documentation, the option with the least contact time was used. Where elective requirements were more open (e.g., allowing students to select from any qualifying course offered at the university), values were chosen based on a brief survey of qualifying courses. For example, if the university required students to take a three-credit course, we chose contact time for a typical three-credit course at the university. Additionally, some institutions allowed students to apply to pursue self-study courses in lieu of some course

credits, usually meeting with a lecturer on an ad hoc basis. These self-study options were also excluded from the averages.

Figure 1 shows the variation across the research sites in terms of weekly contact hours. There is a surprising variety of contact time both among institutions and across years of study. The South African universities exhibit the most contact time, particularly in the first and the second year, while the programmes at the English universities have the lowest overall contact time requirements. The US institutions show the most consistency across the four years. Two institutions (Erbium and Samarium) show a substantial difference in contact time between the initial years of study and later years. This difference is due to the project and dissertation work that students are required to undertake in the later years. At Erbium especially, the weekly contact time dips quite significantly in the third year, as students spend significant time on their dissertations in that year. It is important to note here that a change in weekly contact time does not necessarily indicate a change in the amount of time a student is expected to spend on their studies. All of the programmes maintain a reasonably even distribution of expected workload across the curriculum as indicated by course credits, despite the clear differences in contact time. Course credits are usually calculated on the basis of notional hours that a student is expected to spend on the course, and these hours include both the structured contact time and the time a student is expected to spend on the course requirements on their own. All curricula show a general decrease in contact time as the programme progresses, likely indicative of a transition to more self-directed learning and project work.




Figure 1: *Contact hours per week across the four years of study*

A relatively packed schedule, especially in the initial years of the degree, was highlighted by several students in their first-year interviews. As Nina from Samarium University notes:

I start at 9:00 with Maths and then I go to my second lecture, which is chemical engineering. After that I go to chemistry and then my final lecture at 12:00 is stats until 1:00. Monday afternoons I have off or we use our time to do project work or practicals in chemical engineering or catch up on any work that you have. Tuesday I have the same morning from 9:00 to 1:00, and then afternoons I have chemical engineering from 2–5 pm, which is usually used for the project work, group work. Wednesday I have the same morning again and then I have a Maths tut from 2–4 pm and then Thursday the same morning and from 2–5 pm I have a chemistry prac. Friday is the same morning and then I have chemical engineering again from 2–5 pm, project work. (Nina, Samarium, Year 1)

Similarly, Lawrence from Erbium University highlights that some of his weekdays are very tightly packed with lectures, labs, and tutorials.

Monday, we usually have a few lectures, two or three, and then a little bit of a break. Then, we'll have a lab for three hours. Monday is quite busy. Then, Tuesday and Wednesday, we just have lectures. We'll probably have two lectures on both those days. On Tuesday, we also have a tutorial with a personal tutor, and we just talk over work that we can set for the week before. Then Thursday, we have three more lectures and a lab. Then on Friday, we have a Maths workshop and another lecture. It's quite packed in, especially on Mondays and Thursdays. (Lawrence, Erbium, Year 1)

It is important to note that Lawrence experiences a day with 5–6 hours of contact time as packed even though this schedule is less demanding than a typical day's schedule for Nina. The student's perceived experience of this aspect of the regulative discourse is likely to be influenced by what is taken to be the norm.

A relatively light schedule allows students to engage in self-study and co- and extra-curricular activities. Sameer describes how his schedule allows this:

Mondays and Wednesdays I have three classes... on Tuesdays I have two classes. I have like an early morning 8 am class and then I have one that's more in the afternoon. Then during then I'll either be working on stuff for those classes or studying for those classes or I'll be working on homework for... if I have any work due further that week, later that week, then I'll be working on that as well. Thursdays are a bit busier. I have four classes that day and two of them are like... and one of them is a lab so it's like a three-hour, two-and-a-half hour block I think. Then I also have seminar later that day so those days are usually pretty busy. I'm kind of going between classes the whole day. Then Fridays are pretty light. I only have two classes which like my morning class and my afternoon class. Those days I'll either be working and then I'm also researching under two professors so

I'll have like a meeting with the professors that I'm researching under and then kind of go over what I've been working on that week for the research. (Sameer, Argon, Year 2)

As can be specifically seen in Sameer's case, due to a lighter timetable, he is already able to engage in undergraduate research in the second year of the degree. Other students from the two US institutions also note how a lighter timetable means that they spend more time learning the materials outside the class than during the scheduled contact time:

Yeah, I definitely feel like there's definitely a lot more time outside of class, just in general. For most of my classes, we meet twice a week, so definitely a lot more time on my own with that kind of material. (Drew, Argon, Year 2)

I definitely spend more time outside of class than in class because we have classes for three hours per class a week. So I end up spending like fifteen, twenty hours for that one class outside of it. So definitely more outside of class. (Liliana, Astatine, Year 2)

Conversely, the South African students struggle to find time for self study.

I think that maybe if they could give us more time to actually go through the things that they are teaching us. I think we would do better. (Tawanda, Sodium, Year 2)

It's a lot of things in a short period of time. That's, like, the measure. Some of the concepts I realise that I could've understood better, but because of time I just tend to rush over things. (Ndodzo, Samarium, Year 2)

As can be seen from the student quotes, the weekly contact time significantly influences students' perceived learning experiences. A low contact time gives students ample opportunities to engage in self-study, and importantly, creates extra-curricular learning avenues for themselves. On the other hand, a relatively high contact time leads to students' perceptions of being occupied and not having enough time to study on their own. It is debatable whether such opportunities would actually be taken up. Nonetheless, the fact that students perceive this as being a constraint on their learning experience should be considered.

### *Curricular rigidity*

Another type of curricular variety is whether and to what extent students can control the direction and breadth of their own studies. The structures of the curriculum that allow students to choose what they will study is most usefully considered at the level of the entire curriculum.

As noted earlier, we refer to curricular rigidity as the fraction of course credits that is required by all students in the programme. We distinguish between two aspects affecting curricular rigidity: degree specialisations and elective courses. Elective courses are allocated credits within the curriculum that the student can choose how to fulfil. Some elective credits come from a short list of specified courses chosen to meet particular requirements, such as advanced chemical engineering or science courses. Some fulfil credit requirements in broad categories such as humanities or writing. And some allow the student to select any courses of an appropriate level. We acknowledge that this allows greater possibility for students to influence their day-to-day schedule in terms of the order in which they take different compulsory and elective courses, the way they create their weekly schedule during a particular semester, or the time of the day when they take a particular course. However, that fine-grained analysis is beyond the scope of this article.

Degree specialisations allow students to select a particular area of chemical engineering (e.g., environmental science or biochemistry) within the programme and take a fixed sequence of courses focused on that area. Specialisations are often presented as alternative degree plans or structural choices that are specified within a programme.

Although specialisations reduce the curricular rigidity for students by giving them options to take courses from a focused area of their choice, they complicate the understanding of curricular rigidity. Firstly, specialisations, typically chosen by students during the second or the third year of their degree, may require students to take some prerequisites, thereby constraining the freedom of choice. Secondly, prerequisite requirements or specialisation rules often make it difficult for students to change to another specialisation once they start taking courses for a particular specialisation. Thirdly, once a specialisation is chosen, further opportunities for the student to direct their studies can be limited by the structure of the specialisation.

In order to give some measure of course rigidity, we compared the number of credits of elective or specialisation-linked courses to the total number of credits in the programme. Where an elective was only offered to students who were pursuing a certain specialisation, it was counted under specialisation; otherwise, it was counted under the elective category. Note that the percentages given are an approximate estimate rather than an absolute value. Table 2 depicts the variations across the six universities in terms of the curricular rigidity in the chemical engineering programmes they offer.

Table 2: *Variation of curricular rigidity expressed as percentages of course credits*

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Specialisation</b>	<b>Elective</b>	<b>Combined Choice</b>	<b>Curricular Rigidity</b>
Erbium	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Europium	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Sodium	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Samarium	7.5%	14.3%	21.8%	78.2%
Argon	0.0%	20.3%	20.3%	79.7%
Astatine	18.6%	24.0%	42.6%	57.4%

As can be seen from Table 2, Erbium, Europium, and Sodium, have an entirely rigid curriculum structure without any electives or explicit specialisation options. In contrast, Samarium and Argon each have slightly less than four-fifths of their degree requirements determined by a rigid degree structure; and at Astatine, chemical engineering students can choose to have less than two-thirds of their coursework in common. The internal variation in rigidity between the two US and the two South African institutions suggest that rigidity may be more determined by institutional culture rather than national context. It would be necessary to use this measure across more institutions in each national context to draw any substantial conclusion on this observation. It should be noted that electives, especially non-engineering electives, come at the cost of specialised engineering content. This may benefit the student's sense of a well-rounded education but may not be desirable to potential employers. Nonetheless, this is an aspect of the regulative discourse that will influence student experience and is most likely to be aligned with the culture and values of the university.

The ability to choose courses according to their interests allowed students to explore different disciplines, thereby expanding their knowledge and worldview. For example, Adrian from Argon University notes that taking electives will help him with his minor in addition to expanding his knowledge base.

For my ceiling classes or my electives, I've taken two science-related classes. The first one was Global Science and Technology Policy, and this one I'm taking this semester is Leading Global Sustainability. And I picked this one because it helps me with pursuing a green engineering minor. (Adrian, Argon, Year 1)

Similarly, Nicholas reflects during the first-year interview how taking a humanities elective is shaping him into a person who is more considerate of diversity and differences.

I am very accepting of people. I do realise that [prejudice and discrimination against people] happen and [it is important] to be able to look out for that and to check myself. I think doing gender studies is also helping a lot in this regard. (Nicholas, Samarium, Year 1)

Ndodzo describes how her elective adds a different dimension to her development as a professional engineer in that she recognises the importance of planning and executing engineering work in a way that prioritises the need of the community.

It [a humanities elective course] talks about social infrastructures, infrastructures that are meant to bring communities together. The course is about ... discussing and actually exploring how it really would be when you are dealing with projects in the community ... Sometimes you do projects trying to improve people's lives, but that is not their first need. And when they see you guys doing that, they might destroy your work. And then money's down the drain because you didn't communicate with the community to see first what they actually need. (Ndodzo, Samarium, Year 3)

These student experiences suggest that curricular rigidity can affect students in two significant ways. Firstly, it can prevent students from pursuing different minors and specialisations based on their interests and career aspirations. Secondly, it can also deny students the opportunity to explore disciplines other than engineering, which may prevent them from developing a diverse worldview and considering an engineering problem from different perspectives.

### *First year of the degree*

A third way in which the chemical engineering programmes under consideration differ from one another is in the design of the first year of study. The first year of the degree varies across the six institutions in two ways: 1) admission of the students into the major; and 2) exposure of students to the discipline-specific course content, i.e., courses required only of students who are pursuing a chemical engineering degree.

In terms of admission of students into the major, four out of the six programmes (Europium, Sodium, Samarium, and Astatine) admit students directly into the chemical engineering degree. At the other two, Erbium and Argon, students join a general engineering programme in the first

year of the degree. It is only at the end of the first year that they choose their engineering major based on their interest and performance in the general engineering courses taken in the first year.

In terms of exposure of students to the discipline-specific course content, some engineering programmes present a common first year, allowing – and sometimes requiring – students to learn about different engineering disciplines before choosing a course of study. Others incorporate substantial discipline-specific (i.e., chemical engineering) content from the first year. Again, this is an important aspect of the regulative discourse. The design may be driven by factors individual to each institution. For example, at Samarium there is intentional fostering of chemical engineering student identity which includes building social connections between students. At Sodium, the common first year is favoured to allow students to switch between programmes.

Table 3 presents these variations in the first-year curricula across the six institutions under study in terms of exposure of students to the discipline-specific content. To provide further insight into the first-year curricular differences, we also provide in Table 3 a categorisation of the discipline-specific courses taken by chemical engineering students, identified by the department that offers the course.

As can be seen from Table 3, the six programmes present a wide variety of approaches to the first year. For instance, Europium and Samarium introduce a significant number of courses related to chemical engineering in their curricula from the first year of the degree, with some courses from the field of chemical engineering itself. Sodium and Argon offer a very small number of courses specific to chemical engineering in the first year; the majority of their first-year courses are common across all engineering disciplines. Students at all four of these universities study a course in chemistry as a discipline-specific course requirement.

Erbium and Astatine have the first year of the degree as entirely common across all engineering disciplines. Common first year courses at the six universities generally include introductory courses in engineering problem solving and design, mathematics, and science. At Astatine, students can opt for a specialisation in biotechnology during the course of their chemical engineering degree. Those who do so are required to take one-discipline specific course in biology during their first year instead of taking all common first-year courses. Although students are admitted to a general engineering programme in the first year at Argon,

they are encouraged to take more courses in chemistry if they plan to pursue chemical engineering. It is these chemistry courses that lead to a first-year curriculum at Argon that is not entirely common across all engineering disciplines.

Table 3: *Structure of the first-year curricula across the six chemical engineering programmes*

<b>Institution</b>	Erbium	Europium	Sodium	Samarium	Argon	Astatine
<b>Common credit requirements</b>	100.0%	16.7%	96.0%	37.0%	87.9%	100.0% (91.2%)
<b>Discipline-specific credit requirements</b>	0.0%	83.3%	4.0%	63.0%	12.1%	0.0% (8.8%)
<b>Discipline-specific subjects</b>	—	Chemistry, Chemical Engineering	Chemistry	Chemistry, Chemical Engineering, Statistics	Chemistry	— (Biology)

*Note: The first-year curriculum is slightly different at Astatine for students who want to specialise in biotechnology, as indicated by the parenthesis in the table.*

Another point to note here is that a higher common credit requirement in the first year does not necessarily mean higher curricular rigidity. It is possible that students, while pursuing the common first-year curriculum, have an option to choose electives within the common courses. This is why Astatine, with a very high common credit requirement in the first year, still has the lowest curricular rigidity.

Further, as Table 3 shows, the variation within countries is also significant, with dramatically different structures from different institutions within England and South Africa. As with curricular rigidity, further study in each national context would be necessary to determine the influence of national engineering culture on these choices.

The differences in the first-year curricular structures significantly influenced students' experiences in terms of identifying with their major of study. An early exposure to chemical engineering through their specialised first-year courses helped students relate better to their discipline. For example, as Rabea from Europium University notes:

I have for certain lab experiments, for example, fluid flow which is another subtopic of one of my modules, heat transfer and fluid flow. Yes, so maybe because I've done the lecture now and I've done the lab practical for it now and I was interested, so yes, maybe I would

want to go and see how other big chemical engineering companies use it in action or how it actually worked in society. (Rabeea, Europium, Year 1)

As evident in this quote, an early exposure to both laboratory and theory work in chemical engineering ignited her interest in the discipline. Similarly, Nisha from Samarium University highlights how she has already started to learn about the work of a chemical engineer through her first-year chemical engineering course.

In our chemical engineering course ... we have guest speakers who come back and tell us what they do and what opportunities are out there and what their careers were like; so we learn from that. We are also doing this assignment... to find a chemical engineer and correspond with them through email about what their job is like. [Through these activities] you get a better idea of what is expected of us [when we graduate]. (Nisha, Samarium, Year 1)

Thus, a more discipline-focused first year has helped both Rabeea and Nisha gain a better understanding of chemical engineering. Conversely, when students have not found their first year directly related to their major of study, they not only struggle to develop an understanding of the discipline, but also do not recognise the value of the courses.

The first year is all common for all engineers. It's just something you're learning things and you think, 'Okay, I don't really think I'm going to use this in my degree'. (Lucas, Erbium, Year 1)

I don't think my Intro to Engineering class was a very useful class. I don't think it really taught me anything. I think that class could be more specialised towards each of the different engineering disciplines. (Marley, Astatine, Year 1)

While a common first year posed difficulties for students in understanding the relevance of the courses they studied, it also afforded some advantages. Specifically, a common first year gave students the option of changing majors should they not find chemical engineering to be a good fit. As Luke from Erbium University notes:

I don't like it [my common first-year electronics course], and I don't see when I am going to use it. I will be surprised if I get over 60% in the final exam for electronics. But it has also benefited me because if I had gone straight into nuclear [chemical] engineering, I doubt I would be able to change [my major if I didn't like it]. It is a mixture. But I have benefited from it so I shouldn't complain too much. (Luke, Erbium, Year 1)

The student experiences show that a discipline-specific first year can play an important role in helping students learn about professional practice, which may lead to an increased interest in the discipline. Conversely, a first-year curriculum more generic in nature may feel a bit irrelevant to students and also prevent them from seeing the value in what they are studying. Once again, this simply illustrates the way in which the regulative discourse frames student experiences.

### **Discussion and conclusion**

The findings show that there is a lot of variation in the ways in which chemical engineering courses are structured not only across countries, but also within the same national context in terms of the three parameters: contact hours, curricular rigidity, and first year of the degree. In Bernsteinian terms, this shows that the manner in which the recontextualisation of the disciplinary knowledge into the curriculum is done may be divergent, but it can still be perceived to fulfil a common goal. Nonetheless, the choices made with respect to the regulative discourse will have an impact on the students' perception of their experience. In this article we have shown the different ways chemical engineering curricula can be structured while meeting the accreditation requirements of the Washington Accord. Thus, our findings add to the existing literature (e.g., Downey et al., 2006; Klassen & Sá, 2020) on how engineering curricula differ from one another based on the local and the national requirements while maintaining the accreditation goals. However, the unique contribution of our work is the exploration of curricular differences at the micro level that concerns students' ability to attend classes and choose electives and degree specialisations. Through this article we hope to alert engineering educators to the influence of these aspects, in an attempt to ensure that they are at least considered when undergoing curriculum review or curriculum renewal. Note though that the elements discussed in this article should be considered a small subset of regulative factors.

The variations in the day-to-day structuring of the curriculum may have significant implications for the formation of students as engineers. For example, the degree to which the first-year courses overlap with courses in other engineering programmes (most pronounced at Erbiun) determines how easy it is for a student to switch into another engineering programme before the commencement of the second year, as also highlighted by Luke. Where the first-year requirements are very similar between disciplines, students are more likely to be able to change to another discipline without substantial delays in their overall degree completion time. The same flexibility is afforded to students who enter a general engineering programme and

choose chemical engineering as their major only at the beginning of the second year, a feature of curricula at Erbium and Argon. However, the advantage of this capacity to switch between engineering programmes is balanced by the advantage of developing a clear identity for chemical engineers early in the programme. At Samarium, for example, there are several elements in the first year which are clearly aimed at community building and early identification with the discipline and the profession. Through an early exposure to the discipline through these curricular elements, students start to build an understanding of the discipline sooner rather than later, which has implications for the formation of professional identity and student retention in the major (Mann et al., 2009; Matusovich et al., 2010).

The possibility of different degree streams in terms of specialisations, which are present at Astatine and Samarium, give leeway for students to follow a path that inclines more towards their particular interests. However, the retention of a substantial commonality between different streams suggests that there may still be strong coherence in the training of the students who come through different streams. Along similar lines, the ability to choose elective courses (often across a diverse range of academic disciplines), present at Samarium, Argon, and Astatine, allows students to study and be exposed to a diverse range of subjects. This allows students not only to pursue different interests leading to the development of diverse skills, but also to develop alternate worldviews. A curriculum that offers alternatives for technical coursework has been shown also to enable students to shift their majors and sometimes to leave engineering (Lichtenstein et al., 2009). An exploration of diverse interests and exposure to different worldviews is also enabled by a curriculum that has a relatively low number of weekly contact hours. Fewer weekly contact hours allow students more flexibility to structure their day-to-day schedule, thus enabling them to engage in extra-curricular and co-curricular activities. However, these aspects of divergence of experience must be balanced against adequately covering the core content for the cohort of students, given their educational backgrounds and the capacity of academic staff to deliver specialised courses.

Given that all of these institutions have accredited chemical engineering degrees, it is evident that there are multiple ways to achieve the outcomes determined by the Washington Accord. The substantial variation in structure presented here should give engineering educators and institutions pause for thought. Just because a course has been currently structured in a particular way does not mean that it is necessarily the best way. For example, are the relatively high contact times found at Sodium actually necessary? Does the low contact time in the third

year at Erbium provide adequate teaching conditions? Likewise, is the rigidity of curricula at Erbium, Europium and Sodium essential? And is something lost in terms of engineering identity by allowing enormous flexibility at Astatine? The national academic context does indeed determine some of these salient features of the engineering curriculum (Case et al., 2016), but our analysis also provides examples of significant differences between the universities situated within the same national context. Nonetheless, educators should be mindful of the fact that the regulative discourse is operational, whether it is actively considered and chosen, or unintentionally overlooked.

### Acknowledgements

This article is from the Centre for Global Higher Education (CGHE) Understanding Knowledge, Curriculum and Student Agency Project. We acknowledge the contribution of the other project team members: Paul Ashwin, Jenni Case, Jan McArthur, Reneé Smit, Janja Komljenovic, Alaa Abdalla, and Benjamin Goldschneider. The support of the Economic and Social Research Council and Research England (grant references: ES/M010082/1, ES/M010082/2 and ES/T014768/1) and National Research Foundation, South Africa (grant reference: 105856) are gratefully acknowledged along with support from CGHE.

### References

- Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology. (2002). Criteria for accrediting engineering programs: Effective for evaluations during the 2003–2004 accreditation cycle. Engineering Accreditation Commission. ABET.
- Adelman, C. (2009). The Bologna Process for US Eyes: Re-learning higher education in the age of convergence. Institute for Higher Education Policy.
- Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control, and identity: Theory, research, critique*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bernstein, B. (2003). *Class, codes and control: Applied studies towards a sociology of language* (Vol. 2). London: Psychology Press.
- Bertram, C. (2012). Bernstein's theory of the pedagogic device as a frame to study history curriculum reform in South Africa. *Yesterday and Today*, 7, 1–11.
- Blackie, M. A. (2021). Diversity is an asset to science not a threat. *International Journal of Critical Diversity Studies*, 4(2), 96–113. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48687065>
- Brawner, C. E., Lord, S. M., Layton, R. A., Ohland, M. W., & Long, R. A. (2015). Factors affecting women's persistence in chemical engineering. *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 31(6A), 1431–1447.

- Buyurgan, N., & Kiassat, C. (2017). Developing a new industrial engineering curriculum using a systems engineering approach. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 42(6), 1263–1276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03043797.2017.1287665>
- Case, J. M. (2017). The historical evolution of engineering degrees: Competing stakeholders, contestation over ideas, and coherence across national borders. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 42(6), 974–986. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03043797.2016.1238446>
- Case, J. M., Fraser, D. M., Kumar, A., & Itika, A. (2016). The significance of context for curriculum development in engineering education: A case study across three African countries. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 41(3), 279–292. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03043797.2015.1056103>
- Centre for Economics and Business Research. (2016). Engineering and economic growth: A global view. Royal Academy of Engineering.
- Chandrasekaran, S., Stojcevski, A., Littlefair, G., & Joordens, M. (2013). Accreditation inspired project oriented design based learning curriculum for engineering education [Conference presentation]. IETEC 2013: Enhancing Global Engineering and Technology Education: Meeting the Future: Proceedings of the 2nd International Engineering and Technology Education Conference 2013, 1–11.
- Downey, G. L., Lucena, J. C., Moskal, B. M., Parkhurst, R., Bigley, T., Hays, C., Jesiek, B. K., Kelly, L., Miller, J., Ruff, S., Lehr, J. L., & Nichols-Belo, A. (2006). The globally competent engineer: Working effectively with people who define problems differently. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 95(2), 107–122. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2006.tb00883.x>
- Graham, R. (2022). Crisis and catalyst: The impact of COVID-19 on global practice in engineering education. CEEDA. <https://www.4tu.nl/cee/Publications/2022-10-31-crisis-and-catalyst.pdf>
- Jamieson, L. H., & Lohmann, J. R. (2012). Innovation with impact: Creating a culture for scholarly and systematic innovation in engineering education. American Society of Engineering Educators. <https://www.asee.org/publications/ASEE-Publications/ASEE-Reports/Innovation-with-Impact>
- Jawitz, J., Marais, N., & Hanrahan, H. (2001). Using accreditation to drive curriculum development in engineering. *Australasian Journal of Engineering Education*, 9(2), 137–146.
- Klassen, M., & Sá, C. (2020). Do global norms matter? The new logics of engineering accreditation in Canadian universities. *Higher Education*, 79(1), 159–174. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00403-6>
- Kotys-Schwartz, D., Besterfield-Sacre, M., & Shuman, L. (2011). Informal learning in engineering education: Where we are – Where we need to go [Conference presentation]. 2011 Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE), T4J-1. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/FIE.2011.6142836>

- Lichtenstein, G., Loshbaugh, H. G., Claar, B., Chen, H. L., Jackson, K., & Sheppard, S. D. (2009). An engineering major does not (necessarily) an engineer make: Career decision making among undergraduate engineering majors. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 98(3), 227–234. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2009.tb01021.x>
- Lucena, J., Downey, G., Jesiek, B., & Elber, S. (2008). Competencies beyond countries: The re-organization of engineering education in the United States, Europe, and Latin America. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 97(4), 433–447. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2008.tb00991.x>
- Mann, L., Howard, P., Nouwens, F., & Martin, F. (2009). Influences on the development of students' professional identity as an engineer [Conference presentation]. Proceedings of the Research in Engineering Education Symposium 2009, Palm Cove, QLD, Australia. [https://rees2009.pbworks.com/f/rees2009\\_submission\\_64.pdf](https://rees2009.pbworks.com/f/rees2009_submission_64.pdf)
- Matthews, P., Ryan-Collins, L., Wells, J., Sillem, H., & Wright, H. (2012). Briefing: Engineers for Africa: Identifying engineering capacity needs in sub-Saharan Africa. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers*, 165(4), 187–188. <https://doi.org/10.1680/muen.12.00052>
- Matusovich, H. M., Streveler, R. A., & Miller, R. L. (2010). Why do students choose engineering? A qualitative, longitudinal investigation of students' motivational values. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 99(4), 289–303. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2010.tb01064.x>
- Matusovich, H., Streveler, R., Loshbaugh, H., Miller, R., & Olds, B. (2008). Will I succeed in engineering? Using expectancy value theory in a longitudinal investigation of students' beliefs [Conference presentation]. Proceedings of the 2008 American Society for Engineering Education Conference.
- McLean, M., Abbas, A., & Ashwin, P. (2018). *Quality in undergraduate education: How powerful knowledge disrupts inequality*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Meah, K., Hake, D., & Wilkerson, S. D. (2020). A multidisciplinary capstone design project to satisfy ABET student outcomes. *Education Research International*, 2020, 9563782. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/9563782>
- Morgan, R., & Ion, S. (2014). *The universe of engineering: A call to action*. Royal Academy of Engineering.
- Prados, J. W., Peterson, G. D., & Lattuca, L. R. (2005). Quality assurance of engineering education through accreditation: The impact of Engineering Criteria 2000 and its global influence. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 94(1), 165–184. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2005.tb00836.x>
- Scott, I., Ndebele, N., Badsha, N., Figaji, B., Gevers, W., & Pityana, B. (2013). A proposal for undergraduate curriculum reform in South Africa: The case for a flexible curriculum structure. Report of the Task Team on Undergraduate Curriculum Structure. Council on Higher Education Pretoria.
- Seely, B. E. (1999). The other re-engineering of engineering education, 1900–1965. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 88(3), 285–294. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.1999.tb00449.x>

- Stevens, R., O'Connor, K., & Garrison, L. (2005). Engineering student identities and the navigation of the undergraduate curriculum [Conference paper]. ASEE PEER 2005 Annual Conference, Portland, Oregon.
- Stevens, R., O'Connor, K., Garrison, L., Jocuns, A., & Amos, D. M. (2008). Becoming an engineer: Toward a three dimensional view of engineering learning. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 97(3), 355–368. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2008.tb00984.x>
- van Antwerpen, F. (1980). The origins of chemical engineering. In W. Furter (Ed.), *History of Chemical Engineering* (pp. 1–14). ACS Publications.
- Voronov, R. S., Basuray, S., Obuskovic, G., Simon, L., Barat, R. B., & Bilgili, E. (2017). Statistical analysis of undergraduate chemical engineering curricula of United States of America universities: Trends and observations. *Education for Chemical Engineers*, 20, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ece.2017.04.002>
- Washington Accord. (2020). Washington Accord: Signatories. <https://www.ieagreements.org/accords/washington/signatories/>
- Yao, Z., Yan, T., & Hu, M. (2022). Comparison of undergraduate chemical engineering curricula between China and America universities based on statistical analysis. *Education for Chemical Engineers*, 38, 55–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ece.2021.10.003>