

Teaching Technology Literacy: An Opportunity for Design Faculty?*

DAVID OLLIS

Chemical Engineering, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695, USA. E-mail: ollis@eos.ncsu.edu

JOHN KRUPCZAK

Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423, USA. E-mail: krupczak@hope.edu

The National Academy of Engineering, the National Science Foundation, and various prominent engineering faculty and administrators have pleaded over the last decade that technological literacy for non-technical majors is a topic which engineering faculty ought to provide. This paper explores the notion that design faculty are well qualified, perhaps uniquely so, to teach such courses for non-technical majors, i.e., to represent engineering and technology to the non-technical campus population. Previously we reviewed the attributes of the various groups promoting technological literacy. We showed that engineering, with its balance between theory and practice, has a distinct and highly effective perspective on technology, making engineers uniquely qualified to explain technology to the non-engineer. Here we focus on engineering design faculty as those engineers most qualified to carry out this effort. Inasmuch as design instruction is universally present on the more than 300 campuses boasting an engineering school, and each engineering department has at least one design instructor, a potential teaching faculty in excess of 1000 is identified from which to recruit future technology literacy instructors. We make the case for this novel activity as a logical component of design instruction, and argue further that such novel participation will accomplish a second goal, long sought by design instructors, namely that their profession will have an increased, and more public, visibility and appreciation. Thus, creating a cadre of design instructors as teachers of technology literacy will assist a national need and at the same time will satisfy a professional goal.

Keywords: technology literacy; design faculty.

INTRODUCTION

A DECADE AGO, Edward W. Ernst penned an editorial [1] on technological literacy of students in non-technical majors:

Within the past decade (approx. 1985–1995), those at NSF concerned with science, engineering and mathematics education have suggested that technical education of non-specialists should concern those in higher education as much as the education of technical specialists.

He noted further that curricula for non-technical programs often require a technical component, presenting an opportunity for election of engineering and technology courses. This opportunity goes routinely unrealized because engineering schools fail to provide ‘service courses’ for non-engineering students. In consequence, for such students ‘there is nearly always a selection of science and mathematics courses’. This situation is untenable, Ernst argued, because ‘technology literacy for the 21st century requires not only an understanding of mathematics and science, but also an increasing understanding of engineering, which has shaped, if not created, our man-made world.’

In the national context, for K-12, colleges, and universities, and the broad citizenry, the situation today is not greatly different. A two-year study of US technological literacy by NAE, funded jointly by NSF and Batelle Memorial Institute, was completed in 2002. The final report, *Technically Speaking, Why All Americans Need to Know More About Technology* [2] concluded that ‘the idea that all Americans should be better prepared to navigate our highly technological world has been advocated by many individuals and groups for years. Nevertheless, the issue of technology literacy is virtually invisible on the national agenda’ [1].

As one outcome of this 2002 study, NSF this year sponsored an expert workshop [3] to gather current technological literacy instructors, with NSF and NAE observers, to explore academic issues associated with providing increased undergraduate instruction in technological literacy on US campuses. The random backgrounds of the dozen or so practitioners of technical literacy instruction was intriguing, with instructors drawn from electrical engineering, chemical engineering, mechanical engineering, and physics. Such arbitrariness of prior background suggests strongly that there is not yet an inherently unified instructional group which could seize the academic high ground and lead a charge towards increased technological literacy instruction. If instruction in this

* Accepted 16 December 2005.

topic is to increase, from whence will come the US instructional manpower pool?

We advance the notion that engineering design faculty are particularly qualified to teach such courses for non-technical majors, i.e., to represent engineering and technology to the non-technical campus population. Recently we reviewed the attributes of the various groups promoting technological literacy [4]. We noted that engineering, with its balance between theory and practice, has a distinct and highly effective perspective on technology, making engineers especially qualified to explain technology to the non-engineer. Here we focus on engineering design faculty as those engineers most qualified to carryout this effort.

THEMES OF MUDD V DESIGN CONFERENCE AND RELATION TO 'TECHLIT' INSTRUCTION

The multiple dimensions of technological literacy instruction (historical, economic, technical and social) relate clearly to the central themes of the present MUDD V design conference:

- *Psychology of learning.* Technology literacy instruction may contain lectures on history and technical content, laboratory work involving device dissection, assembly, or even de novo construction, and complete case studies (technical, economic, social and cultural aspects). As students with different learning styles will find some of these approaches more facile than others, the multi-dimensionality of technology literacy instruction opens a broad door to exploring the psychology of how students learn information presented in different contexts
- *Design as inquiry and learning.* Design is an activity driven by needs. The history of artifact design tells us about how we have responded to characteristic social needs (e.g. communication, transportation, sources of mechanical power, etc.). Thus design presents a pathway for non-technical undergraduates to understand technology and the impact it has had on their lives.
- *Learning how we design.* The exploration of our current artifacts, through dissection and assembly of existing devices, provides a deep contact with designed objects. The dissection and assembly of such devices, and the step-by-step consideration of their operation, reveals much about how we design.

NEED FOR TECHNOLOGICAL LITERACY

We have always needed to understand our environment. Our increasingly technical world of man-made objects requires that such understanding include a knowledge of our devices, i.e., a literacy about things technical. Such knowledge, according to viewpoint, may include knowing the

object and its functions (how stuff works), knowing as well the process by which it arose as a designed object, and even knowing the historical and social context from whence it arose. All three dimensions are included in case examples, such as biographies of scientists and engineers, and histories of particular technical developments. Among undergraduate technical subjects, design is pre-eminent in its content of these dimensions. Hence, design faculty may be those instructors particularly well suited to develop an instructional community in technology literacy.

Instructors need instructional materials. For technological literacy, there is no shortage of material from which we can draw the corresponding courses. Materials available to address this need include an increasing number of books by engineering and science authors (Florman, Petroski, Billington, Bloomfield, Lienhard *et al.*), of radio programs featuring engineers (Lienhard on PBS, Hammack on Illinois public radio), and commentators (Flatow on National Public Radio, and 'Modern Marvels' on the History Channel, as well as an endless supply of texts on how stuff works (McCauley, Brain, . . .) and the modern web page version, www.HowStuffWorks.com (Brain). Outside the campus, we are thus awash in explainers, authors, commentators, historians of technology, and even predictors of the future (via science fiction).

Within the undergraduate campus, silence reigns, despite this abundance of materials potentially useful for technological literacy instruction. Our recent NAE workshop on technological literacy struggled to field a dozen faculty involved in teaching some version of this topic, this dozen constituting scarcity considering the existence of more than 300 US schools of engineering which could teach 'Engineering for Everyman' and the more than 1000 departments of physics to explain 'The Physics of Everyday Life'. Why the lack of instructors, how to increase their number, and why are design faculty a promising reservoir for recruitment to a new academic crusade for increased instruction in technological literacy?

Defining technological literacy

Every subject needs definition in order to structure useful discussion. 'Technological literacy' is remarkable for the range of definitions found even among the present scarce offerings. We begin with the most general, that for an informed citizenry, including K-12, college, and the larger US population. What is technological literacy?

Technological literacy encompasses three interdependent dimensions: knowledge, ways of thinking and acting, and capabilities . . . Like literacy in reading, mathematics, science, or history, the goal of technological literacy is to provide people with the tools to participate intelligently and thoughtfully in the world around them. While 'the kinds of things a technologically literate person must know can vary from society to society and from era to era,' the

characteristics of such literacy for our times are clearly identifiable [2].

Characteristics of a technologically literate citizen [2]:

- Knowledge:
 - recognizes the pervasiveness of technology in everyday life;
 - understands basic engineering concepts and terms, such as systems, constraints, and trade-offs;
 - is familiar with the nature and limitations of the engineering design process;
 - knows some of the ways technology shapes human history and people shape technology;
 - knows that all technologies entail risk, some that can be anticipated and some that cannot;
 - appreciates that the development and use of technology involve trade-offs and a balance of costs and benefits;
 - understands that technology reflects the values and culture of society.
- Ways of thinking and acting:
 - asks pertinent questions, of self and others, regarding the benefits and risks of technologies;
 - seeks information about new technologies;
 - participates, when appropriate, in decisions about the development and use of technology.
- Capabilities:
 - has a range of hands-on skills, such as using a computer for word processing and surfing the Internet and operating a variety of home and office appliances;
 - can identify and fix simple mechanical or technological problems at home or work;
 - can apply basic mathematical concepts related to probability, scale, and estimation to make informed judgments about technological risks and benefits.

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT EDUCATION

Within the context of undergraduate education, we may utilize that definition proposed by Prof. Nan Byars of University of North Carolina-Charlotte in her admirable 1998 review 'Technology Literacy: The State of the Art' which provides the following working definition [6]:

- The ability to understand, intelligently discuss and appropriately use concepts, procedures and terminology fundamental to the work of (and typically taken for granted by) professional engineers, scientists, and technicians; and being able to apply this ability to:
 - critically analyze how technology, culture and environment interact and influence one another;
 - accurately explain (in non-technical terms) scientific and mathematical principles which form the bases of important technologies;

- describe and, when appropriate, use the design and research methods of engineers and technologists;
- continue learning about technologies, and meaningfully participate in the evaluation and improvement of existing technologies and the creation of new technologies.

Example student learning objectives for lecture-laboratory format

The majority of technology literacy courses presented in the NSF 2005 workshop contain a device demonstration and dissection laboratory in addition to lectures. Here our course definition would logically include aspects related to laboratory evaluation and assessment, as the following NCSU example student learning objectives illustrates [7]:

- Students in this course will:
 - develop a basic vocabulary and conceptual framework for describing the technical and historical origins of modern technological devices;
 - explain the conceptual operating bases of current and prior technologies which address similar societal needs;
 - use and dissect devices to develop understanding of the relationships between technical subsystems of a device (e.g., the optical, electrical, and mechanical subsystems of a facsimile (FAX) machine), and their influence on device design and operation;
 - develop an understanding of the impacts (technical, economic) of a device in a given context, through lecture and individual analytic written papers.

MATCHING DESIGN TO TECHNOLOGICAL LITERACY

Design instruction for engineering students usually includes many more dimensions than the typical engineering science offering. Economics, ideation, product development, customer needs, manufacturability, ease of assembly and if needed, repair and service, reliability, and teamwork are among the plethora of topics present in design but otherwise absent from broad visibility in engineering curricula.

A convenient approach for connecting prospective technology literacy instruction to present design instruction is to consider Byars' Successful Strategies for TLCs (Technology Literacy Courses). We can re-order her fourteen suggestions to show that the first six are common to design courses, and the remaining recommendations are simply guidelines appropriate to teaching a non-technical audience. Thus, with only a slight stretch, we may claim that Technological Literacy is merely 'Engineering Design Literacy' for the general university audience!

Successful strategies for technological literacy courses (re-ordered from [6]):

- Synonymous with design:
 - Teach design and the engineering design process. Have students design and construct projects themselves, hands-on.
 - Build on your strengths as an engineer and use what you know to demonstrate principles of engineering and technology.
 - Focus on what engineers actually do.
 - Duplicate the manufacturing process, from design through production.
 - Use team teaching.
 - Encourage open discussion and thoughtful analysis of technology and its impacts on culture and the environment. Exploration of topics such as product design, safety and testing, cost-benefit analysis and engineering ethics can help develop technological literacy and critical thinking skills.
- Audience-specific items for non-technical majors:
 - Make the course fun through activities, videos and projects.
 - Remember that the first few weeks are crucial, especially for students belonging to groups under-represented in engineering such as women and minorities, and those who have a poor preparation in math.
 - Focus on four or five key concepts.
 - Choose topics relevant and familiar to students. Focus on ‘real world’ applications and technologies that make a difference in daily life (computers, transportation, heating and cooling, xerography, aviation, communications ...).
 - Draw on introductory engineering textbooks in your field as a source of simple problems for the class to tackle.
 - Use computers for more than word processing. Introduce students to programming, CAD/CAM and computer modeling. Have students use e-mail and explore the Internet.
 - Arrange visits to places where technology can be seen in action, such as labs and such taken-for-granted places as the college heating and air conditioning facilities.
 - Involve engineering and/or engineering technology students in teaching liberal arts students.

‘Representation’ is the road

How is engineering to be represented through technological literacy? Recall two differences between scientists and engineers:

‘Scientists explore the laws of nature; engineers create that which never was.’

‘Scientists play with ideas; engineers build devices.’

The kernel of each claim is that engineers are connected inextricably to their devices. Such being the case, then we engineers ought to represent ourselves and our profession through the

devices we design and build, a vantage point which would clearly distinguish us from our science colleagues. This approach applies not only to our own engineering students, but also to our non-engineering students, i.e. those whom we (are about to) instruct in technological literacy. Such an educational approach could also provide a *professional and social representation* of the engineer to the rest of society.

Representation is a word with great resonance within the community of design professionals and instructors. For example, in *Engineering Design: A Synthesis of Views*, C. Dym writes: ‘The principal thesis of this book is that the key element of design is representation. If we were to consult a standard dictionary, we would find representation defined as ‘the likeness, or image, or account of, or performance of, or production of an artifact’. He continues that representation may have ‘aspects of a verb because it defines the design process in terms of a performance or a production’, raising the possibility that ‘representation in design incorporates both representation of the artifact, being design, as well as representation of the process by which the design is completed’ [5]. Thus, the *technical representation of design* has great parallelism to the *social representation of engineering*.

The similarity continues. Dym notes that ‘a multiplicity or diversity of representation is needed for design, a collection of representation schemes’ that would enable description of:

- those issues for which analytical physics-based models are appropriate;
- those that require geometric or visual analysis to reason about shape and fit;
- those that require economic or other quantitative analysis;
- those requiring verbal statement not easily expressed in formulas or algorithms.

The teaching strategies for technological literacy listed earlier similarly argue for a ‘multiplicity or diversity of representations’ for teaching technological literacy. Thus, design faculty are professionally aligned with such teaching strategies, and as such, are a natural manpower pool from which to draw future instructors for this national need.

LABORATORIES FOR TECHNOLOGICAL LITERACY INSTRUCTION

Laboratories for technological literacy explorations may contain many devices, most of which are suitable for table top use and assembly with ordinary tools such as screwdrivers, small wrenches, and simple gauges.

As an example, our NCSU laboratory for our technological literacy course, ‘How Stuff Works’, currently houses the following devices and apparatuses:

- Bar code scanner and PC

- Compact disc (CD) players and burner
- Facsimile (FAX) machines
- Satellite TV (portable)
- Bicycle and cycle exercise machines (floor)
- Electric and acoustic guitar
- Electric motors (drill, mixers, hair dryer)
- Photocopier and scanner
- Optical fiber communications and devices (lamps, endoscopes)
- Videocameras, VCRs, digital cameras
- Water purification system
- Internal combustion engine
- (Model) airplanes (battery powered flyers)
- Laptop and PC versions of computers.

Yet other versions of such laboratories focus upon information technology (IT) and include both hardware and software aspects, and others are centered around mechanical devices appropriate to the discipline of mechanical engineering. Some devices straddle these areas, e.g., digital photography combines device (camera) and software (image manipulation and processing) to bridge both device and IT domains, as does laptop and PC dissection.

Finding facilities

Most, but not all, current examples of technological literacy courses [3, 4] include use of a device laboratory, wherein everyday devices may be used, dissected, assembled, or where simple equivalents (e. g. of radio, telephone, etc) may be created by students. From whence is such instructional space to spring on campuses often strained for such resources? We identify common candidate spaces for device laboratories below, and suggest processes for their (periodic) conversion to technology literacy labs:

- *Mechanical dissection laboratories.* Device dissection as an activity to introduce new engineering students to their discipline via use of engineering products has a history reaching back in time to the early 1990s. One design pioneer, Prof. Sherri Sheppard of Stanford initiated such a course and corresponding website for instructional materials (bicycle, internal combustion engine, etc.). She has surveyed adoption and adaptation of such labs, finding in excess of forty (S. Sheppard, private communication). In all likelihood, these lab spaces are used once per year, and their devices may offer dual use for 'tech lit' instruction, or be sufficiently portable to allow periodic displacement for set-up of technology literacy lab devices such as those listed above.
- *Laptop instructional classrooms:* Many campuses offer laptop computer instructional space, with auditorium style curved desks which could provide adequate set-up space for a portable technology literacy class. These rooms contain Internet wiring or are 'wireless', allowing real-time access to technological literacy related websites such as 'HowStuffWorks.com.'

- *Office carrels:* Our NCSU Technology Literacy laboratory lab is set-up on metal office desks in a conventional space requiring no fume hoods, no floor drains, and no unusual power supplies. Such desks (most without drawers) allow teams of two students to easily sit at a single device station to use, dissect, and assemble the common devices above.
- *Design studio:* Colleges of Design feature the studio approach, which provides permanent, semester-long assignment to design teams of a given exploration space, suitable for table-top devices and for providing floor space for yet larger devices (e. g., full auto engine, furniture, etc).

CONCLUSION

The National Academy of Engineering, the National Science Foundation, and American industry and academic leaders have argued and pleaded for a greater level of technology literacy among students (all levels) and the general population. The question which naturally arises on the undergraduate campuses is: 'Who will bell the cat? Who will create and teach these technology literacy courses, and why?' By framing technology literacy as a series of design-related topics (design history of a device, design of modern device, dissection of modern device, and case history of a creator (person), manufacturer (company) or artifact (device), a new role appears for design instructors as purveyors of technology literacy.

The broadened subject consideration engendered through teaching 'tech lit' may also prove rewarding to individual instructors who seek design considerations broader than those of their disciplines. Also, the multiplicity of subject approaches nicely encourages future cross-college collaborations, e.g., with a 'history of science/technology' instructor taking the first approach, an engineering faculty member the second and third, and an instructor in English or technology management taking the case exercises. Thus, enlarging the community of technological literacy faculty through collaborative modes of instruction is encouraged naturally, potentially leading to cost-effective initiatives and reforms.

In sum, the national challenge of creating and improving the technology literacy of undergraduates could be approached through the recruitment and reward of design faculty, inter alia. This instructional group is widely present on every engineering campus. Further, as S. Sheppard has documented, the presence of device dissection labs in US engineering schools is also appreciable. The combined availability of both instructors and device lab space suggests a natural doorway for widespread enhancement of technology literacy instruction at the undergraduate level.

Acknowledgement—The preparation of this paper was supported by the National Science Foundation.

REFERENCES

1. E. J. Ernst, *Engineering Education*, April 1993.
2. G. Pearson and A. T. Young, eds, *Technically Speaking: Why All Americans Need to Know More About Technology Literacy*, National Academy of Engineering (2002).
3. J. Krupczak and D. F. Ollis, D. F., *Technological Literacy: Workshop Report*, ASEE, Portland, OR (2005).
4. J. J. Krupczak, Reaching out across campus: engineers as champions of technological literacy, *Liberal Education in Twenty-First Century Engineering*, Worcester Polytechnic Institute series on Studies in Science, Technology, and Culture, Vol. 17, Peter Lang Publishers, New York (2004)
5. C. L. Dym, *Engineering Design: A Synthesis of Views*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK (1994)
6. N. A. Byars, Technology literacy classes: the state of the art, *J. Eng. Educ.*, Jan. 1998, pp. 53–61.
7. D. Ollis, Installing a technology literacy course: trials and tribulations, *Proc. ASEE Annual Meeting*, June 2004, Salt Lake City, UT.

David F. Ollis, Distinguished Professor of Chemical Engineering, NC State University. Dave's work include development of a 'take-apart' course for first year undergraduates students. He has served as chair of the Liberal Education division of ASEE. He has received the United Technologies Excellence in Teaching Award, the Corcoran Award from the ASEE, and a Director's Award for Distinguished Teaching Scholars (DTS) from the National Science Foundation.

John Krupczak, Jr., Associate Professor of Engineering, Hope college, Holland, MI, has taught Science and Technology of Everyday Life to non-engineering students at Hope College since 1995. He has written *Demystifying Technology*, ASEE Prism, October 1997 and 'Reaching Out Across Campus: Engineers as Champions of Technological Literacy' in *Liberal Education for 21st Century Engineering*, Peter Lang (2004). He organized session on technological literacy at four ASEE national conferences and is chair-elect of the ASEE Technological Literacy constitutive committee.