BULLETIN OF THE POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
TECHNICAL SCIENCES
Vol. 58, No. 2, 2010

Materials education: now and in the future

P.J. GOODHEW*, T.J. BULLOUGH, and D. TAKTAK

UK Centre for Materials Education, University of Liverpool, Liverpool 69 3BX, United Kingdom

Abstract. The state of education in materials science in the UK is reported, based on a National Subject Profile developed by the UK Centre for Materials Education. The curriculum content and methods of teaching are reviewed, and compared with the results of the largest ever education survey of materials scientists at Euromat 2009.

A wide range of national opinions are presented, but the overall state of materials education in Europe is concluded to be very healthy.

Key words: materials education, teaching, subject profile, UKCME.

1. Introduction

Education in Materials Science takes place in the context of modern society. Students have to choose to study the discipline and those who make this choice bring with them attitudes and expectations derived from their social and educational background. These attitudes and expectations have changed quite rapidly over the past one or two decades. Some of these are fairly obvious: the rise of computing and the internet has changed the availability and accessibility of information. Others are more subtle but no less important; social networking has had an impact on the way people learn and share both information and understanding; the day of the single career with a single employer has probably disappeared for ever – portfolio careers, with regular bursts of new learning or training, are probably here to stay; this could, perhaps should, alter the learner's expectations of their initial undergraduate education. In some ways undergraduate education has become a mass-market product and is perceived by many of its "customers" as a utilitarian product, only worth the investment of time, money and effort if it results in a quantifiable payback in terms of enhanced salary or career opportunity.

Other changes are evident in education and some of these are discipline-based. There has been a move away from passive education (chalk and talk) towards active learning (exemplified by, but not restricted to, problem-based learning; team work; dialogue between staff and students). Single-subject programmes (metallurgy, polymer science, ceramics) have been replaced by the more general materials science or materials engineering. There has also been a trend to associate the study of materials with engineering rather than science, driven partly by professional accreditation and to some extent by the needs of industry and other employers. In an attempt to make Materials more popular as a subject of undergraduate study, many universities have offered combinations of disciplines designed to be attractive to students who do not see themselves as engineers in a mainstream discipline such as mechanical or civil engineering. Examples include biomaterials, sports materials and aerospace materials.

Against this background, the UK Centre for Materials Education (UKCME) has developed the first UK National Subject Profile for Higher Education Programmes in Materials. While the details of this study are specific to the UK, many of the lessons and conclusions have wider currency. In this paper we will describe some of the findings of the study, and will also present the results of a survey carried out at Euromat 2009 in which delegates were asked, inter alia, their opinions of the appropriate content for a materials education.

2. The UK national subject profile

The major restructuring within many UK universities in recent years has often left materials exposed as a taught discipline, especially where student numbers are relatively low. While materials research is still buoyant, the bottom-line in higher education is often undergraduate and taught-postgraduate numbers.

The National Subject Profile for Higher Education Programmes in Materials 2008 is a snapshot of materials education at university level. The profile reveals that about half of the 21 materials course providers say they have responded to declining numbers by developing new courses, as well as investing in recruitment and schools liaison activities.

Companies have also been experiencing difficulties – for instance, steelmaker Corus reported at the European Steel Companies-Universities Joint Conference [1] that it only recruited 17 of the 33 materials graduates needed in 2006.

The Higher Education Funding Council for England, which funds all English universities, has identified metallurgy and materials engineering as strategically important and vulnerable, and an additional £1,000 per student per year is being provided for three years from 2007/8 to support the teaching of these disciplines at six universities with the most related undergraduate students – Birmingham, Cambridge, Leeds, Manchester, Oxford and Exeter.

But how has the status of materials-related provision and student numbers come to where it is now?

*e-mail: goodhew@liv.ac.uk

Metallurgy as a subject in UK higher education started in the second half of the 19th century. Courses often had their origins in the chemical analysis of minerals and assaying for precious metals. The first example was in London at the Government School of Mines and Sciences Applied to the Arts, established in 1851 after the Great Exhibition and the forerunner of Imperial College London.

In a number of other UK cities, particularly in the Midlands and the North around steelmaking industries, local concern about technical training led to colleges that taught metallurgy and/or related materials disciplines. A significant increase in courses and distinct departments took place in the 1920s.

The academic study of materials science and engineering, as opposed to isolated disciplines of metallurgy, ceramics or polymers, was initiated in the USA in the 1950s. Initial development of materials departments was in research-driven graduate-schools created in response to US government initiatives. Teaching of materials undergraduate programmes came a few years later.

This was an attempt to broaden the attractiveness of 'old-fashioned' metallurgy programmes, which had suffered from declining recruitment. Northwestern University in Illinois became the first university to create a Department of Materials Science.

The Department of Materials at Queen Mary, University of London, was founded in 1968 as the UK's first materials department. Undergraduate degree courses developed more quickly in the less tradition-bound newer universities – the first being Sussex, Loughborough, Bradford, Bath and the Open University.

In 1975, Sir Alan Cottrell at the University of Cambridge commented at a meeting at the Royal Society in London that 'the total number of students admitted annually to degree courses in metallurgy and materials dropped, from nearly 700 [in 1969] to only about 530 in 1973' [2]. Of these students, he said, the numbers taking materials had actually increased from 110 to over 200, but those taking metallurgy had fallen from about 440 to just 200. Only one-third of available places were filled.

Cottrell ascribed this decline to the general unpopularity of science in schools, the negative 'cloth cap and sweat rag' image that school leavers had of the metallurgical industry, and to a preference for university students to study pure sciences initially, leaving the applied sciences for later in their studies.

He also commented that 'there is still very little awareness of these subjects among schoolmasters'. It was acknowledged that the general materials engineering courses may be the way forward at undergraduate level.

However, expansion in materials-related provision of the 1960s-70s was not matched by student numbers. The landscape had to change significantly, particularly following the general decline of the related manufacturing industries. By 2007, of the 21 universities offering materials-related programmes, only 12 provided materials science and engineering, and only one metallurgy-specific undergraduate course remains. The recruitment problems have forced a move towards interdisciplinarity, with a focus on, for instance, bio/medical, aerospace and sports materials (Fig. 1).



Fig. 1. Number of accepted applicants within each Materials programme category in 1996, 2001 and 2006

Code for all figures:

Cat 1: (MSE) General Materials Science and Materials Engineering programmes.

Cat 2: (Bio/Sp) Bio/Medical- and Sports-Materials programmes.

Cat 3: (AAM/Des/Mech/Env) Aero/Auto/Marine/Design/ Mechanical/ Environmental- Materials programmes linked to industrial sectors.

Cat 4: (Met/Pol/Co/Nat) Metallurgy, Polymers, Composites & Natural Materials programmes related to specific types of Materials.

Cat 5: (Matls &/with) General MSE programmes and/with Business/Management/Language/Physics/Chemistry programmes.

The overall number of materials graduates has remained fairly constant over the last few decades, but over the last ten years, fewer than two-thirds of 400-plus graduates from materials-related undergraduate programmes have been from traditional materials science and engineering courses.

Post-graduate Masters materials courses remain buoyant with just over 300 graduates each year from the 26 UK universities offering advanced materials qualifications. Many of the established courses do rely heavily on overseas students, and university-industry collaborations have been a feature of recent postgraduate programmes.

The National Subject Profile [3] has highlighted that materials is widely recognised as a discipline of critical importance to the economy. However, interdisciplinarity has become an important feature, leaving specialisation to postgraduate level. This is, of course, the pattern in a number of countries. It is hoped that the current major efforts directed at raising awareness among school-age children, such as the Institute of Materials, Mining and Minerals (IoM3) Schools Affiliate Scheme and the UKCME's 'Why Study Materials' initiative [4], will encourage more students.

Demographic trends. The UK's undergraduate materials students are, and always have been, predominantly male, although females now account for just over a quarter of the student body. The bio/medical and sports materials programmes are attracting equal numbers of men and women (Fig. 2).



Fig. 2. Gender of Accepted Applicants within each Materials programme category in 1996, 2001 and 2006

Although materials undergraduates are principally from the UK, overseas students make up about one third of the cohort, with the majority choosing 'traditional' materials science and engineering rather than newer interdisciplinary programmes. Overseas students take up most places on taught-postgraduate courses, where they can often study for a Masters degree in one calendar year rather than two, as in most other countries.

Students who enter undergraduate materials programmes in the UK are also coming from an increasingly diverse academic background. Most UK full-time materials students still enter university with 'A' levels, but in 2006 less than a fifth had 'A' levels in all three of mathematics, physics and chemistry, compared with over twice as many 10 years previously (Fig. 3). The drop is a reflection of a national trend. The interdisciplinary bio/medical- and sports-related materials programmes typically ask for 'A' level chemistry in combination with biology, and hence can admit students without mathematics and physics. The increasing population of overseas students also comes with a variety of entry qualifications.

Coping with a range of academic backgrounds was highlighted as a major challenge faced by materials teaching staff who participated in the National Subject Profile. Many materials programmes have had to make significant adjustments by developing new modules/activities and providing remedial teaching, especially in the first year.

These changes have an impact on content and some traditional recruiters are increasingly looking towards graduates with the four-year MEng "Integrated Masters" degree rather than three-year Bachelors degrees.

The MEng was introduced by UK universities in the mid 1980s in response to a growing perception among university staff, engineering institutions and employers that an additional year of study was needed to match the competencies of graduates from elsewhere in Europe and cope with the ever-increasing breadth and depth of materials knowledge. Industry also expected graduates with business and group-working skills. The MEng is now the degree standard for chartered engineer status, although pan-European comparability is still up for discussion.



Fig. 3. Proportion of accepted applicants onto undergraduate full-time Materials programmes in 1996, 2001 and 2006 who have an A-level in Maths, Physics and Chemistry, and the proportion that have all three A levels. Note that those students who have all three (Maths, Physics & Chemistry) A-levels are also included in the individual 'A' level data

Changing content. So what is the materials student experience? The typical materials student in the UK will be taught for 17–20 hours each week, with around 11 hours of lectures, four to five hours of laboratory work, two to three hours of design and/or computer classes, and two to three hours of tutorials and/or seminars in their first and second years. In the final year of an MEng, students spend about 11 hours per week doing individual and group project-work to develop teamwork and problem-solving skills.

Although some programmes incorporate more varied teaching approaches such as problem-based learning, the lecture still remains the apparently most cost-effective knowledge-transfer activity. However the chalk-and-talk lecture, with students producing copious hand-written notes, has largely been supplanted by PowerPoint presentations and lecture handouts.

The National Subject Profile found that just over half of the total teaching time is spent studying materials-specific topics (see breakdown in materials-specific topics in Fig. 4), with the remainder covering topics such as mathematics, business and underlying science. This satisfies the IOM3 professional accreditation requirement of at least 50% materials-specific content.

Aerospace materials programmes contain less about functional properties and characterisation than traditional materials science and engineering programmes, but more about mechanical behaviour, degradation and durability. Although some interdisciplinary courses may teach mathematics and physics at foundation level initially, bio/medical- and sports-related materials generally contain less mathematics and phase equilibria, and more about materials degradation and durability. Some recruiters of materials science and engineering graduates are cautious when recruiting graduates from interdisciplinary programmes. A recent report from the industry representative body, Materials UK [5], states that 'some employers observed that the graduates of such courses are not always well equipped for employment' in traditional materials industries.



Fig. 4. Average materials teaching contact time over whole degree programme for different aspects of the Materials curriculum in general MSE undergraduate programmes

However, universities are more aware than ever before that their undergraduate programmes must produce the workforce that the UK economy needs, with the skills that employers value. The National Subject Profile found that materials degree courses largely embed the majority of these.

Materials subject area	How useful knowledge has been since graduation	Would graduates benefit from more teaching in these areas	Materials subject area
'Underlying Science & Eng	1.48	0.80	'Characterisation of composition & microstructure
'Mechanical Behaviour	1.40	0.76	'Mechanical Behaviour
'Characterisation of composition & microstructure	1.35	0.74	'Underlying Science & Eng
Structure of Materials	1.28	0.73	'Processing & manufacture
'Processing & manufacture	1.16	0.71	'Degradation/durability of Materials
'Degradation/durability of Materials	1.06	0.70	Design with Materials
Phase equilibria & phase transformations	1.05	0.66	Mathematics
Design with Materials	1.05	0.63	'Sustainability
Mathem atics	0.97	0.58	Phase equilibria & phase transformations
'Sustainability	0.67	0.54	Structure of Materials
'Extraction	0.50	0.36	'Extraction

Fig. 5. 'How useful' the Materials knowledge in each Materials subject area has been to graduates since graduation, and the benefit to graduates of more teaching in that subject area. A ranking of 'Essential' (=2), 'Desirable' (=1) and 'Not useful/did not study' (=0) was used to indicate 'usefulness'. A ranking of 'Yes, a lot more' (=2), 'Yes, a little more' (=1) and 'No' (=0) was used to indicate the perceived benefit of more teaching in each subject area

Higher education in Materials has seen many changes in the last decade – universities have had to adapt to students from an increasingly diverse academic background, and progressively more undergraduates are choosing interdisciplinary materials programmes, such as in bio/medical or aerospace materials.

The Subject Profile includes retrospective views from more than 120 materials graduates who had completed an undergraduate degree post-1998 and embarked on a materials-related career. Over 80% completed a traditional materials science and engineering degree, or a specialist degree in metallurgy or polymers, with fewer than 20% having chosen an interdisciplinary programme.

Most respondents were satisfied with the materials knowledge they had acquired in terms of its relevance and usefulness. They rated underlying science and engineering, mechanical behaviour and characterisation of composition and microstructure as the most useful areas and felt they would have benefited from more teaching on these topics (Fig. 5).

Graduates of both traditional materials degrees and interdisciplinary programmes said there would be little benefit in increasing the amount of mathematics teaching.

Overall, the NSP concluded that universities are getting subject coverage levels right.

Skills in employment. Data obtained from the Higher Education Statistics Agency show that six months after graduation about half of all materials graduates are in full-time employment, with two-thirds of the remainder either in full-time postgraduate education or working and studying part-time. These proportions are roughly half-way between those for physical science graduates (a higher proportion undertake further study) and other engineering graduates (a higher proportion go into full-time employment).

The majority of materials graduates work in manufacturing industries, but they also enter retail trade, and health, education and financial services.

The graduates surveyed were also asked whether their studies gave them the competencies, skills and attributes that are needed when employed. They agreed with a separate survey of the materials academics who taught them that report writing, written communication, problem solving and project planning are the most important workplace skills relevant to a materials career. While graduates thought they had been well equipped with three of these skills, they felt more experience in project planning would have been worthwhile.

Materials academics also believe that laboratory skills are important. However, although graduates from traditional materials degrees acknowledge that they have been well trained in laboratory skills, they said they had not found this particularly relevant or beneficial to their career. Possibly this reflects the decline of the materials laboratory in industry, or perhaps materials graduates would be more likely to supervise technical staff.

Graduates from the bio/medical materials disciplines, meanwhile, did rate laboratory skills as 'very relevant' to their employment.

It is also interesting that neither traditional materials graduates nor their teachers consider entrepreneurship, ethics, environmental issues and safety legislation to be particularly relevant or important in early careers. However, ethics and safety legislation were 'very relevant' to bio/medical disciplines.

Financial issues. It is a common conception that all students face significant financial pressures, and studies have shown that about half of all students in higher education undertake some sort of paid employment during term time, compared to almost none 25 years ago. A number of universities reported that they were considering introducing flexibility into the timetabling of materials degree programmes to allow for part-time employment.

Positive feedback. Finally, materials graduates were asked, 'Do you believe that materials and materials related disciplines are a good choice of subject to study at undergraduate and/or taught postgraduate level?' Positive comments were received describing materials as 'underpinning everything we do and make'.



Fig. 6. Materials graduates' views on whether Materials is a good choice of subject to study at university. The four bars refer to the following four "themes" of the classified comments (from the top): Curriculum, Careers, Job relevance, Employer Recognition

Some respondents did express concern that 'manufacturing in this country is on the decrease' and the materials industry 'is not as well paid as others'. But most graduates thought their courses led to good career prospects, and some even suggested that a shortage of graduates in their industry worked to their advantage. All comments have been categorised in Fig. 6 above.

Moving forward. The NSP was designed to provide a non-judgemental snap-shot of materials teaching provision in higher education in the UK.

It appears that materials degree programmes are providing graduates with most of the subject knowledge and skills they need for a career in the field, and they find the experience rewarding. For this to remain the case, the UKCME plans to regularly update the data to reflect changes and longer term trends.

The Centre is also particularly interested in facilitating dialogue between industry and higher education as to how materials-related education should be developing. The UKCME therefore welcomes comments from managers and supervisors in industry, and from materials graduates themselves. To comment, please email.

3. Euromat 2009 survey

During a plenary session on education at the biennial Euromat conference in Glasgow in 2009 [6] more than 300 delegates completed a survey designed to reveal their attitudes to materials education. The respondents came from many different countries, from academe, from industry and government, and 40 or so of them were doctoral research students. For the purpose of statistical analysis they were categorised into three work groups; academic; industry and government, or; student, and seven country groups: UK, Swiss, German, French, Benelux, Rest of Europe and Rest of World. Some of the key findings are summarized below. In all cases where a difference between national or employment groups is commented on, the difference is statistically significant at the 95% confidence level or better.

What is materials education for? There was strong agreement that Materials programmes should serve the needs of industry, with a smaller proportion of people believing that they should serve the needs of a research career. The students were significantly less enthusiastic about Bachelors degrees meeting the needs of industry, while German respondents were less in favour of Masters degrees meeting industrial needs. There was general enthusiasm, somewhat lower among the Swiss, that Masters degrees should meet the needs of a research career.

These views contrasted with the responses to the question whether current programmes actually met the needs of industry or research. There was a lower level of agreement that this was the case, with delegates from the Rest of Europe showing the greatest degree of scepticism about Masters programmes actually meeting the needs of industry.

A surprising number of respondents felt that there would be merit in a Europe-wide core curriculum for the discipline (62%) while a slightly smaller fraction – but still a majority – thought that this was a good idea for Masters level programmes (57%). There were national differences, with respondents from the UK and Switzerland least enthusiastic for a core curriculum at either Bachelors or Masters level. Students were the least in favour of a core curriculum at Bachelor level, but they still favoured it by a small majority. Industrial delegates were most strongly in favour (73% in each case).

What should a materials graduate have studied? The questions asked here were fairly general. Respondents were almost unanimous that the science of materials should be studied, with a strong preference that this should embrace a wide range of classes of material (metal, alloy, polymer, ceramic, semiconductor, composite …). This mirrors the findings of the UK National Subject Profile (NSP). They also supported the teaching of mathematics. Respondents were divided whether one class of materials should be studied in detail, and on the whole opposed to the idea that one specific material should be studied in detail at Bachelor level. Responses were neutral about the inclusion of extraction of materials or ethical issues, negative towards project management, and only slightly positive towards environmental impact and recycling. Again, the NSP results confirm that these views are supported by UK graduates.

French delegates were the most strongly opposed to studying one material in detail (89% strongly opposed). UK delegates were the most strongly in favour of studying a range of materials classes (76% strongly agreeing). Only an average of 10% of respondents felt that project management or finance should be given a high priority.

What should a Masters graduate have studied? Delegates agreed that a Materials Masters programme should, like a Bachelor programme, focus on the science of materials and mathematics, with coverage of a wide range of materials types. The responses to the remaining questions however differed significantly from those for the Bachelor qualification. Respondents reported that they felt that one class of materials could be covered in detail, with a significant minority happy for the programme to focus on a single material. There was significantly greater acceptance of environmental and recycling issues and a slightly warmer response towards project management than for Bachelors programmes.

There were some national differences, with almost half of the delegates from Benelux giving a high priority to the study of extraction while a third of UK respondents gave a low priority to ethical issues.

What non-technical competencies should a materials Bachelor graduate have? The four most important non-technical attributes were reported to be the ability to speak and write English, competence working in a team and the ability to give a confident verbal presentation. Behind these, positive responses were also recorded for having 3 months experience in industry, being able to speak two languages and being able to plan, undertake, manage and report a research project. Much less support was given to the need to have studied or worked in two countries or the aspiration to become a professional engineer after graduating.

Within this general picture respondents from the Rest of the World were more strongly in favour of Bachelor graduates working in another country, while only 31% of Swiss thought that fluent English speaking was of high importance, compared with 60% of UK and 72% of Rest of Europe delegates. This attitude was repeated with 32% of Swiss delegates (contrasting with about 6% of other delegates) giving a low importance to the writing of accurate English.

UK and Swiss respondents gave a significantly lower priority than all other countries to the ability to speak two languages (8% and 10% respectively compared to an average of 35% for the other countries). The Swiss were the least concerned about the ability to plan and run a research project.

What non-technical competencies should a materials Masters graduate have? For Masters graduates the order of priorities of the respondents were very similar to those for Bachelors graduates, but in every case the response was stronger. In other words the delegates felt that each of the items mentioned above was more important for a Masters graduate than it was for a Bachelor graduate.

The British were by far the least enthusiastic about working in another country (44% gave it a low priority compared to only 10% of other delegates). Delegates from the Rest of the World were least concerned that the graduate should have experience of working in industry. Unsurprisingly industrial respondents were most enthusiastic about industrial experience (72% gave it a high priority compared with about 50% of academic and student respondents). More surprisingly, industrial respondents were significantly less concerned about the fluent speaking of English than either of the other groups (52% giving it a high priority compared with more than 80% of other respondents).

Awareness of support available for materials education. The vast majority of respondents reported no familiarity either with software or with organisations which exist to support the teaching and learning of materials. A significant minority had not heard of either podcasts or problem-based-learning, two of the most widespread educational tools currently available. This is in agreement with the finding from the NSP that both techniques were used in less than 2% of materials teaching.

This perhaps indicates that across the whole of Europe newer teaching techniques have not yet gained significant ground, with most teaching methodologies at present still being similar to those which have been deployed for the past 50 years.

The visibility in society of the discipline of Materials is often discussed within professional bodies and universities. The opinion of the respondents to this survey was that school leavers are moderately well informed about Materials. The two countries with the greatest concern about visibility in schools were the UK and Benelux, where fewer than 10% of the respondents felt that school leavers are well informed. This contrasts with other countries in which more than 75% of school leavers were thought to be well or moderately well informed about the subject.

The final question revealed encouraging answers for the profession of Materials: A large majority of respondents agreed that Materials is an appropriate discipline to study at Bachelor level. The lowest level of support was 62% from the French delegates, and the highest 92% from the UK.

4. Discussion and conclusions

What do we learn from both the UK NSP and the wider Euromat survey? Are the results what we might expect? They certainly reveal that Materials is a vibrant discipline throughout Europe. Its curriculum appears to have changed to embrace a wider range of materials and single-material programmes such as metallurgy or ceramics have been replaced by materials science, sometimes in combination with user-communities (sport, aerospace, automobile, medicine). There appear to have been only relatively modest changes in teaching style and methodology despite the widespread availability of computers, IT and the internet. However there is no evidence of widespread dissatisfaction, by students or employers, with materials programmes at Bachelor or Masters level.

Implications for the future. It is of course difficult to predict what will happen to Materials education in the context of advances in IT and increasing interest in education on one hand, but a global recession on the other. One clear issue, which must apply in every country, is that changing the methodology of Materials education in order to improve its quality and the employability of its graduates – for instance by introducing problem-based-learning - will be more expensive than doing nothing (at least until numbers fall sufficiently for unchanged programmes to be forced to close). Also, if programmes are to change to better meet the needs of industry, then an increased involvement of industry in the form of money or staff time will be needed.

Appendix

Some of the questionnaire data

Number of responses, N=253. Printed below are the total numbers of responses to each question.

Academic	Industry	Government	Student
161	28	22	37

Bachelors degree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Should meet needs of					
Industry	6	20	19	75	116
Research	9	11	44	75	72
Actually meets needs of					
Industry	21	37	56	62	42
Research	13	28	58	66	38

Masters degree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Should meet needs of					
Industry	4	7	20	73	116
Research	2	3	17	47	150
Actually meets needs of					
Industry	13	26	46	75	45
Research	6	14	35	76	73

European curriculum

	Yes	No
Euro Bachelor curriculum:	146	88
Euro Masters curriculum:	133	101

Technical content

Bachelors degree	Low	Medium	High
The science of materials	6	54	186
A wide range of types of Materials	13	81	156
One class of materials in detail	72	118	47
One material in detail	146	75	19
Extraction of Materials	75	121	41
Ethical issues	52	115	74
Project man & finance	95	107	30
environmental impact	26	119	94
Recycling and reuse	25	113	99
Mathematics	14	103	127

Masters degree	Low	Medium	High
The science of materials	3	25	217
A wide range of types of Materials	10	76	161
One class of materials in detail	11	95	140
One material in detail	56	110	77
Extraction of Materials	74	122	41
Ethical issues	33	116	77
Project man & finance	49	116	69
environmental impact	11	94	134
Recycling and reuse	10	101	136
Mathematics	16	86	139

Non-technical content

Bachelors degree	Low	Medium	High
studied or worked in another country	108	97	38
three month's experience in industry	42	93	106
Speak English fluently	16	93	134
Write correct English	24	114	103
Speak at least two languages	60	101	71
Team competence	22	95	124
Plan, undertake, manage and report a research project	53	119	66
Be able to give a confident verbal presentation	22	105	117
Professional materials engineer within a few years	73	102	46

Masters degree	Low	Medium	High
studied or worked in another country	30	89	121
three month's experience in industry	18	96	127
Speak English fluently	2	40	201
Write correct English	4	62	177
Speak at least two languages	27	95	123
Team competence	9	68	167
Plan, undertake, manage and report a research project	5	29	206
Be able to give a confident verbal presentation	3	25	213
Professional materials engineer within a few years	35	108	78

Is Materials an appropriate degree programme to study at undergraduate level?

Yes	No
174	59

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to acknowledge support from the UK Centre for Materials Education, particularly Adam Mannis, and especially from Freya Norman who performed the statistical analysis of the questionnaire responses.

REFERENCES

[1] J.H. Schmidt, "Highly trained researchers to promote science and innovation in the steel industry", *European Steel Companies – Universities Joint Conf.* 1, www.eurofer.be/events/warsaw (2009).

[2] A.H. Cottrell, "The task for the educator", *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc.* 282 (1307), 467 (1976).

[3] *The National Subject Profile for Materials*, http://www.materials.ac.uk/subject-profile/report.asp (2008).

[4] *Why Study Materials?*, www.whystudymaterials.ac.uk (2010).

[5] R. John and D. Pulling, "A wake up call', *Materials UK Report* 1, http://www.matuk.co.uk/docs/MATUK-EduReport(Web).pdf (2010).

[6] *Euromat 2009*, www.euromat2009.fems.eu (2010).